

①
Johann
JAHN'S HISTORY

OF THE

HEBREW COMMONWEALTH;

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN

Ellis
BY CALVIN E. STOWE, A. M.
Of the Theol. Seminary, Andover.

ANDOVER:

PRINTED AT THE GODMAN PRESS BY FLAGG AND GOULD,

FOR G. & C. CARVILL, NO. 108,

BROADWAY, NEW YORK.

1828.

Jud 108.28

v

HARVARD COLLEGE LIBRARY

1858 Jan 8

In exchange for
Fulda's Moral Principles
given by Eliza Montwazer Paine
of Portsmouth NH

Wishes to be returned all rec'd at
the same time

SOUTHERN DISTRICT OF NEW-YORK, ss.

Be it remembered, that on the fifth day of November, A. D. 1838, in the fifty third year of the Independence of the United States of America, G. & C. Carvill, of the said district, have deposited in this office the title of a book, the right whereof they claim as proprietors, in the words following, *to wit*:—“Jahn's History of the Hebrew Commonwealth; translated from the German by Calvin E. Stowe, A. M. of the Theological Seminary, Andover.”—In conformity to the Act of the Congress of the United States, entitled, “An Act for the encouragement of Learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies, during the times therein mentioned;” and also to an Act entitled, “An act supplementary to an Act, entitled, An Act for the encouragement of learning, by securing the copies of maps, charts and books, to the authors and proprietors of such copies during the times therein mentioned; and extending the benefits thereof to the arts of designing, engraving and etching historical and other prints.”

FRED. J. BETTS, } Clerk of the Southern
District of New York.

1

139-129
16

PREFACE.

Of all nations that have yet existed in our world, the Jews are the most singular and interesting. History gives no knowledge of any people, who have preserved a separate and distinct existence for so long a period, and at the same time maintained, for substance, most of their religious rites and customs. Their present existence, as a separate and distinct nation in many respects, and yet scattered over the whole earth, may justly be considered as a kind of standing miracle, in attestation of the facts concerning them which are recorded in their Sacred Books. What reason can be given, that all other nations, however peculiar in their religion and laws, have been swallowed up in the vortex of time, or have been so commingled with foreigners by conquest or emigration, that no traces of them as a living and distinct people are any more to be found; while the Jews remain what they were three thousand years ago? The history contained in the Old Testament, and this only, gives an adequate and satisfactory answer to this question.

The Christian religion is built upon the Jewish. The Christian Scriptures are intimately connected with the Jewish Sacred Books, and they cannot be understood and explained, except by means of them. The words of the New Testament are Greek; but its idioms, its costume, its manner of thought and reasoning, its allusions, in short the *tout ensemble* of it, is Jewish; nor can these ever be duly understood by any person, who is ignorant of the Jewish nation, its laws, customs, and history.

The design of the principal part of the present volume, is, to impart a succinct, and critically arranged history of the Hebrews, from their first rise in Abraham, down to the destruction of Jerusalem, when their proper national existence may be said to have been suspended. We have no book, in our language, which does this in such a manner as to satisfy the wants of a critical student, at the present time. The works of Shuckford and Prideaux, which in respect to learning, may be mentioned with approbation, particularly the latter, are so copious, and contain so much irrelevant, not to say uninteresting, matter, that the student goes through them with great toil, and with little fruit of his labour. Other books are of a popular form, and ill adapted to the wants of a critical inquirer.

Jahn has bestowed great pains and labour on the following work. None of his numerous publications give higher evidence of this, than the present. The labour bestowed on harmonizing the various accounts of persons and occurrences, contained in the Old Testament, is in itself great, and useful; and that bestowed on the prophecies contained in the sacred volume, in order to exhibit the fulfilment of them, the student will find to be valuable.

Besides a regular and continuous history of the Jews, Jahn has also given a succinct account of all the other nations connected with them; so that the student may regard the present book, as containing an epitome of the ancient history of Western Asia, and of Eastern Europe. For example; the history of the Assyrians, Egyptians, Canaanites, Babylonians, Medes, Persians, the Greeks in Europe and Asia, and of the Romans, besides many other short historical sketches, is here briefly presented to the reader, with all its substantial features. In addition to this, references are every where made to the sources from which the information is drawn; so that the student has before him a kind of general directory for an extensive course of reading, in regard to all these topics.

I know of no book in our language, so well adapted as this volume, to accompany the *Archaeology* of Jahn, which has already found so much approbation with our religious public. It

bears manifest impressions of the same diligence, care, sound judgment, and unwearied effort.

If all the conclusions in this work should not hold the test of further critical investigation, it will not be strange; for what history, so various and important as this, has been composed at any time, except under special divine guidance, of which it could be said, that it contained no mistakes? If the writer has committed mistakes, he has, at least, furnished his readers with references to such sources as may enable them to make the requisite corrections. And this is all that we can reasonably ask of any writer, who has bestowed as much labour and time on a work which he publishes, as he could possibly bestow.

I would urge it upon every theological student, in a particular manner, to make himself familiar with this work throughout. It is impossible that he should not reap the benefit of such an acquisition.

In regard to the Appendix, it may be said, that it fills up a chasm in the history of the Jews, which it is desirable to have supplied. Basnage is a discursive, loose writer, as to style; but on the whole a sober minded man, and by no means destitute of critical ability. One might well spare the putid fables and stories of Rabbins, which he has so copiously inserted; but they could not be separated from his work, without more labour than it would cost to write a new history. The second destruction of the Jews under Adrian, about half a century after the first, was more dreadful than the first; and it makes a crisis in their history, to which a student naturally wishes to come, before he stops in his investigations. On this account the Appendix is desirable. The account also, of the subsequent dispersions of the Jews, which is superadded, will be found to be useful.

In regard to the *Translation*; it was undertaken by Mr. Stowe, at my request; and it is performed in a manner which entirely satisfies me, and which, I hope, will satisfy the public. A few errors have crept into the Appendix; but these are noticed in the Advertisement which follows.

I shall merely add the expression of my earnest hope and

wish, that Mr. STOWE may find his labours acceptable to the public ; and that this book, on which he has expended so much time and pains, may prove to be as useful and important, as those have deemed it, who have been concerned with bringing it before the world, in its present form.

M. STUART.

Andover, Theological Seminary,
Nov. 7, 1828.

ADVERTISEMENT.

It is the duty of a translator, to give a faithful representation of his author's meaning, without violating the purity of his own language. In executing the following work, I have uniformly endeavoured to make this principle my guide ; but I have found it more difficult to adhere to it, than I supposed it would be, before I commenced the task. There is such a total diversity in the whole mode of constructing sentences, in the German and English languages, that it is no easy achievement for a translator, to do justice to himself, and, at the same time, remain faithful to his original. I hope, however, I can venture to say, that I have not failed, in any important instance, to give a true expression of my author's meaning ; but I must leave the reader to judge how far I have succeeded in preserving the purity of the English language.

In the course of the work, a few slight alterations were deemed expedient, which may be seen and appreciated by those who will take the trouble to compare the translation with the original. Most of the references to Scripture have been reexamined, and numerous errors in them corrected ; and the same has been done in regard to references to the Classics, so far as I could have access to the proper editions. In the original, these references are all intermingled with the text ; but in the translation, they have been removed to the end of each section, in order to prevent the interruption occasioned by the former method. To assist the reader in the investigation of the prophecies of the Old Testament, I have taken pains to prepare an Index of all those illustrated in this book.

The translation of JAHN was nearly through the press, when Professor STUART suggested the propriety of continuing the narrative down to the reign of Adrian. This seemed necessary to a complete view of the history of the Hebrews, as that was the time when their national existence actually terminated. It was, therefore, my earnest wish to continue the history ; but my health being then so much reduced that I could not undertake the task myself, I request-

ed a friend to furnish me with a translation of that part of Basnage's *Histoire des Juifs*, which relates to this period. The result of his labours will be seen in the Appendix, (pp. 515—692.) Owing to the unavoidable haste with which this was prepared, it was impossible to give it so careful a revision as would have been desirable; but it is believed that all the important errors will be found corrected at the end of the volume.

I cannot conclude without expressing my obligations to Professor STUART for the interest which he has taken in this work, and for the encouragement which he has afforded me in the execution of it.

I would also cheerfully acknowledge the assistance which I have received from Professor GIBBS of New Haven, whose judicious and well-timed criticisms enabled me to correct many errors and supply several deficiencies, in the first sheets of the translation.

CALVIN E. STOWE.

Andover, Theological Seminary,
Nov. 7, 1828.

CONTENTS.

CHAPTER FIRST.

SURVEY OF BIBLICAL HISTORY TO THE DEPARTURE OF THE HEBREWS FROM EGYPT.

Sect.	Page.	Sect.	Page.
1. Origin of Civil Society	9	5. Civil Society at Time of Jacob	19
2. Civil Society before the Flood	11	6. ——— at the Time of Moses	21
3. ——— after the Flood	12	7. Departure of the Hebrews from Egypt	25
4. ——— at Time of Abraham	16		

CHAPTER SECOND.

CIVIL CONSTITUTION OF THE HEBREWS.

8. Form of Government before the Mosaic Law	28	13. Relation of the Tribes to each other	53
9. Fundamental Law of the Mosaic Institutions	31	14. Legislative Assemblies	56
10. Relation of the Hebrews to other Nations	37	15. Form of Government	58
11. Hebrew Magistrates	45	16. The Chief Magistrate	60
12. The Learned Class	48	17. March of the Hebrews from Horeb to Canaan	62
		18. The last Acts of Moses	67

CHAPTER THIRD.

HISTORICAL SURVEY FROM THE DEATH OF MOSES TO THE INTRODUCTION OF MONARCHY.

19. Conquest of the Land of Canaan	69	20. Theocracy from Joshua to Samuel	71
20. Theocracy from Joshua to Samuel	71	21. Predominant States from Joshua to Samuel	73
21. Predominant States from Joshua to Samuel	73	22. Office of the Judges	77
		23. Condition of the Hebrews in the Times of the Judges	79

CHAPTER FOURTH.

HISTORY FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF MONARCHY TO THE REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES.

24. The Rulers request a King	82	29. Saul persecutes David	91
25. The Institution of Monarchy	83	30. Death of Saul	93
26. Limitations of the Royal Power	85	31. The Reign of David	94
27. The Reign of Saul	87	32. Character of David	97
28. Saul's Conduct towards David	88	33. The Reign of Solomon	99

CHAPTER FIFTH.

HISTORY FROM THE REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES TO THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY.

Sect.	Page.	Sect.	Page.
34. Revolt of the Ten Tribes . . .	105	39. Judah from 884 to 759 B. C.	120
35. General View of the two Kingdoms	106	40. Israel from 759 to 722 B. C.	122
36. Israel from 975 to 884 B. C.	110	41. Judah from 759 to 699 B. C.	125
37. Judah from 975 to 884 B. C.	114	42. ——— 699 to 611 B. C.	131
38. Israel from 884 to 759 B. C.	118	43. ——— 611 to 508 B. C.	133

CHAPTER SIXTH.

THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY.

44. Theocracy of the Hebrews during the Captivity	138	47. Evil-merodach—Nabonned	145
45. Condition of the Hebrews during the Captivity	141	48. Survey of the History of Media	147
46. Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar	142	49. Destruction of the Chaldeo-Babylonian Empire	148
		50. Conquest of Babylon	152

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

HISTORY FROM THE RETURN OF THE HEBREWS TO THE TIME OF ALEXANDER.

51. Release of the Hebrews	155	61. Nehemiah Governour of Judea	175
52. First Caravan of the Hebrews to Judea	157	62. Xerxes II. Sogdianus. Darius Nothus	177
53. Return of the Ten Tribes	158	63. Second Administration of Nehemiah	179
54. Building of the Temple	159	64. Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim	182
55. Historical Survey of the Persian Empire	160	65. Artaxerxes Mnemon	184
56. Reigns of Cambyzes & Smerdis	161	66. The Hebrews under Artaxerxes Mnemon	187
57. Reign of Darius Hystaspis	163	67. Darius Ochus	188
58. Reign of Xerxes I.	166	68. The Hebrews under Ochus	191
59. Second Caravan of the Hebrews to Judea	171	69. Arsēs. Darius Codomanus	191
60. Artaxerxes Longimanus	173		

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

HISTORY OF ALEXANDER AND HIS IMMEDIATE SUCCESSORS.

70. First Victories of Alexander	193	77. War between Antigonus and Eumenes	208
71. Alexander at Jerusalem	195	78. Wars of Antigonus	210
72. Destruction of the Persian Empire	199	79. Condition of the Jews 320—311 B. C.	213
73. Alexander 327 to 323 B. C.	202	80. The Wars renewed 311—305 B. C.	216
74. Aridaeus and Alexander Aegus	204	81. Partition of the Empire 305—301 B. C.	218
75. Wars of the Provincial Governments	205		
76. The Jews under Ptolemy	207		

CHAPTER NINTH.

HISTORY FROM THE PARTITION OF THE EMPIRE TO THE TIME OF ANIOCHUS EPIPHANES.

Sect.	Page.	Sect.	Page
82. History of the four Kingdoms		88. Syria and Egypt	221—204 B.
301—279 B. C.	223	C.	238
83. The Jews	311—279 B. C.	89. Antiochus the Great	204—187 B. C.
	226		243
84. Antiochus Soter	279—260 B. C.	90. The Jews	221—187 B. C.
	228		250
85. Antiochus Theos	260—245 B. C.	91. Seleucus Philopator	186—175 B. C.
	230		254
86. Syria and Egypt	245—221 B. C.		
C.	232		
87. The Jews	279—221 B. C.		
	236		

CHAPTER TENTH.

ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES AND THE MACCABEES TO THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE JEWS.

92. Antiochus Epiphanes	257	97. Antiochus Eupator	164—163 B. C.
93. Antiochus Epiphanes	175—171 B. C.		277
	258	98. Demetrius Soter	162—154 B. C.
94. Campaigns of Antiochus Epiphanes in Egypt	171—167 B. C.		290
	262	99. Alexander Balas	154—146 B. C.
95. Revolt of the Jews	167—166 B. C.		268
	266	100. Demetrius Nicator	146—144 B. C.
96. War between the Jews and Syrians	165—163 B. C.		293
	271	101. Antiochus Theos II.	144—143 B. C.
			296

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

HISTORY OF THE JEWS DURING THEIR INDEPENDENCE FROM 143 TO 63 B. C.

102. Independence of the Jews	143 B. C.	106. Alexander Jannæus	104—77 B. C.
	300		318
103. Simon Prince of the Jews	141—136 B. C.	107. Alexandra Queen of the Jews	77—68 B. C.
	302		330
104. John Hyrcanus	135—106 B. C.	108. Aristobulus II. King of the Jews	67—63 B. C.
	307		334
105. Aristobulus I. King of the Jews	106 B. C.		
	316		

CHAPTER TWELFTH.

HISTORY FROM THE CONQUEST OF JERUSALEM BY POMPEY TO THE REIGN OF HEROD THE GREAT.

109. Conquest of Jerusalem	63 B. C.		—44 B. C.
	342	113. Hyrcanus II. Prince of the Jews	44—41 B. C.
110. Hyrcanus II. Prince of the Jews	63—55 B. C.		359
	345	114. Hyrcanus II. Prince of the Jews	41—37 B. C.
111. Aristocracy of the Jews	54—47 B. C.		363
	348	115. Antigonus King of the Jews	37—34 B. C.
112. Hyrcanus II. High Priest	46		373

CHAPTER THIRTEENTH.

REIGN OF HEROD THE GREAT.

Sect.	Page.	Sect.	Page.
116. Herod King of the Jews	34—	120. ————	16—13 B. C. 402
31 B. C.	377	121. ————	10—1 B. C. 405
117. ————	30—27 B. C. 385	122. Birth of Christ and Death of	
118. ————	26—22 B. C. 393	Herod	413
119. ————	21—16 B. C. 397		

CHAPTER FOURTEENTH.

HISTORY FROM THE DEATH OF HEROD THE GREAT TO THE BEGINNING OF THE JEWISH WAR.

123 Archelaus	2—11 A. C.	417	129. Cumanus Procurator of Judea	47—53 A. C.	440
124. Judea a Roman Province	12		130. Felix Procurator of Judea	53	
—26 A. C.	421		—60 A. C.	442	
125. Pilate Procurator of Judea	26		131. Festus Procurator of Judea		
—38 A. C.	423		60—63 A. C.	447	
126. Agrippa King of the Jews			132. Albinus Procurator of Judea		
38—45 A. C.	429		64 A. C.	448	
127. Fadus Procurator of Judea			133. Florus Procurator of Judea		
45—46 A. C.	437		65—66 A. C.	450	
128. Tiberius Procurator of Judea					
46—47 A. C.	440				

CHAPTER FIFTEENTH.

THE JEWISH WAR.

134. Beginning of the Jewish War			147. Conquest of the Lower City	481
66 A. C.	452		148. Condition of the City	481
135. General Revolt of the Jews			149. Siege of the Tower of Antonia	483
66. A. C.	456		150. Condition of the City	484
136. Campaign of Cestius	66 A. C. 458		151. Conquest of Tower of Antonia	486
137. Preparations for War	66—67		152. Assault on the Temple	486
A. C.	460		153. Conquest of the Outer Court	
138. Vespasian in Galilee and Samaria	67 A. C.	462	of the Temple	488
139. Condition of the Jews	67—		154. Burning of the Temple	489
68 A. C.	467		155. Burning of the Lower City	491
140. Conquest of Perea	68 A. C. 471		156. Conquest of the Upper City	492
141. Conquest of Judea and Idumea	69 A. C.	472	157. Destruction of Jerusalem	493
142. Condition of the Jews	69 A. C. 473		158. Fate of the captive Jews	495
143. Vespasian elected Emperour			159. The Jews at Antioch	495
69 A. C.	475		160. End of the Jewish War	497
144. Three Parties at Jerusalem	70		161. The Jews in Egypt & Cyrene	499
A. C.	476		162. The Jews in subsequent Times	501
145. Siege of Jerusalem	71 A. C. 477		163. Survey of the Theocracy	505
146. Conquest of the Outer Wall	480		Manetho's Dynasties of the	
			Kings of Egypt	DXIII
			Index of Prophecies illustrated	DXVII

HISTORY
OF THE
HEBREW COMMONWEALTH.

CHAPTER FIRST.

SURVEY OF BIBLICAL HISTORY TO THE DEPARTURE OF THE HEBREWS
FROM EGYPT.

I. ORIGIN OF CIVIL SOCIETY.

AN observance of the laws of marriage and a regard to the rights of private property, presuppose a mutual understanding among men, not to disturb each other in their possessions, to repel lawless aggressors by force or to punish them as they deserve, and thus to deter all from encroaching on the rights of others. To secure these purposes the combined strength of many individuals is often requisite, and consequently, in the early stages of human improvement, a numerous family, particularly of males, is earnestly desired and highly valued as a means of defence. But the members of one family, however numerous, are not always able to maintain their own rights, and often needing the aid of those in their vicinity, they readily grant them assistance in similar circumstances. This need of mutual support against the attacks of wild beasts and of human foes, and a consequent willingness to help one another, induced men to form compacts for their common defence. These compacts were confirmed by the religious sanction of an oath. Men were therefore soon united respecting the external observances of religion, and the public worship of God was very early introduced. Such is the origin of civil society, as appears both from the natural course of human affairs and from history. The most ancient law, (which we call *Common Law*,) and the earliest statutes of which we

have any knowledge, refer only to marriage, private property, the punishment of transgressors, and the duties of religion.¹

As new occasions and new necessities arose, these first principles of society were gradually strengthened, improved and enlarged by other compacts and laws, either expressly enacted or tacitly admitted. As individuals endeavoured to increase their property, to lighten their labours, to attain more of comfort and enjoyment, and in every way to improve their circumstances, society itself acquired firmness and strength; and was aided in its progress by an increasing abundance of food, as well as by inventions and improvements in the arts. Individuals multiplied and became more powerful against their external foes; and as their internal regulations kept pace with their increase and their growing strength, the whole community was continually rising to a still higher degree of perfection.

History exhibits a great difference in this respect between the Nomadic and the settled nations; a difference which can be easily accounted for by a view of the circumstances of these two states of society. The social bond was very weak among those who lived as herdsmen and hunters, for they were continually roving about with their herds and attached themselves to no fixed abode; and though they were for the most part related to each other, their residence together was entirely voluntary.² As they retained this mode of life from a love of independence, they willingly renounced the pleasures and advantages of a society more closely united rather than restrict their liberty by civil laws. They did not even wish to reach any higher degree of perfection. If their chiefs or *Emirs* had more enlightened views and were desirous of improvement, they could not contravene the prejudices of their subjects without subverting their own authority. In such a state of society it was difficult to prevent rapine and its attendant evils, for expert robbers could easily commit depredations upon the wandering herds and escape unpunished.

Men on the contrary, who have fixed dwellings and employ themselves in tillage, become attached to the soil which affords nourishment to themselves and their families, and are reluctant to tear themselves from their immoveable property. They are desirous to improve their possessions and to secure them from the attacks of robbers and wild beasts. The bond of social life is more closely drawn; the community is enlivened by a spirit of activity, whence

arise inventions and improvements in the arts, a greater abundance and variety of food, and many comforts and pleasures which all have a tendency to elevate the human character. The necessity of reciprocal aid for the common defence renders compacts more firm and durable. Thence men derive succour in sudden emergencies. They readily relinquish the privileges of complete independence when such important advantages can be gained by so small a sacrifice. They experience the happiness resulting from a community closely connected, and will not part with it unless hostile invasions, or other adverse occurrences, compel them to separate. A community may be scattered by distant emigrations, or broken up by failures in husbandry; and these circumstances may occasion a return to the savage state. A second elevation to civil society after such a relapse is slow and difficult.

¹ Goguet L'Origin des Loix, des Arts &c. T. I. p. 1 and 11. ² Gen. 13:9—12.

II. CIVIL SOCIETY BEFORE THE FLOOD.

In the fragments of Antedeluvian history preserved by Moses there is nothing explicit respecting civil societies. If there was any authentic information on this subject extant in his time it did not appertain to the book of Genesis, which was designed merely as an introduction to the history of the Mosaic legislation. As such, it preserves a knowledge of the Creator, gives a general view of the conduct of men and a more particular account of the ancestors of the Hebrews, from the creation of the world to the origin of the Hebrew Commonwealth.

The first man undoubtedly kept his children and other descendants about him as long as possible, and exercised paternal authority over them. Cain was the first who separated from his father's society, and he was impelled to this step through fear of punishment for the murder of his brother. In the course of time, various motives, such as a desire to obtain land for cultivation or pasturage for cattle, might induce others to follow his example. Thus there arose separate families which were governed by their own patriarchs. This is the state of nature, that *Golden Age*, which the prophets and poets of later times have painted in the liveliest colours and exhibited as a picture of perfect happiness.¹

When families had increased to tribes and nations, then without doubt civil societies began. Even at this early period we find that men were engaged in agriculture and in the improvement of the arts; that the laws of marriage, the rights of private property, and the public institutions of religion were recognized and observed.² These societies however, during the ten generations enumerated in the fifth chapter of Genesis, were very imperfect; for those lawless deeds of violence which arose from profligacy and impiety, prove but too clearly, that the power of the strong then generally passed for right.³ Those famous heroes of great stature, the giants of the old world, who are mentioned as the authors of these crimes, were either powerful chiefs who engaged in open wars, or perhaps mere wandering thieves who with their lawless bands every where plundered and murdered the defenceless. The prevailing form of government during this period was probably the patriarchal; though the patriarchs were either unable to restrain and bring to punishment stronghanded transgressors, or swayed by the ties of relationship and in some cases perhaps by a participation in the spoil, they were unwilling to exert their authority for this purpose.

¹ Isa. 2: 4. 11: 6—9. 65: 17—25. Joel 3: 18. Micah 4: 1—5. Ovid. *Metam.* l. 89. Virgil. *Ecl.* IV. ² Gen. 2: 15. 4: 2, 3, 17—22. 5: 29. ³ Gen. 6: 4, 11, 13 comp. 9: 3—6. Gen. 4: 26. comp. 6: 2.

III. CIVIL SOCIETY AFTER THE FLOOD.

The family of Noah retained a knowledge of the first principles of civil society and of the infant arts which had existed before the deluge; and some of them again applying themselves to husbandry, we find them in Egypt and Southern Asia soon reunited as political communities. At first the new race of men seem to have acknowledged the patriarchal authority of Noah and his lineal descendants. But after the dispersion which followed the unsuccessful attempt to build the Tower of Babel, Nimrod, the celebrated hunter and hero, laid the foundation of the Babylonian Kingdom. In consequence of the protection which he afforded to the people against wild beasts, he might have become by their own consent their leader and chief, or turning his weapons of hunting against men, he might have compelled them to submit to his dominion.

His name seems to favour the latter supposition.¹ His empire extended from Babylon in Mesopotamia towards the north over Calneh (Ctesiphon) as far as Accad (Nisibis) and Erech (Edessa,) including the whole land of Shinar. But however powerful this empire was for those times, we cannot suppose it to have been either populous or well organized. Even the four cities which are mentioned as the strong holds of this kingdom, were nothing more than small villages slightly fortified. As this was the first attempt to establish an extensive domain, it must have been universally disagreeable to the men of that period. Consequently we shall find that it was of short duration, and Nimrod's Babylon must not be regarded as the germ of that great universal monarchy which began (as will be shown hereafter) in a later age and among a different people.

The kingdom of Assyria was established soon after in the region afterwards denominated Adiabene, situated between the rivers Lycus and Caprus, (the greater and smaller Zab.) The cities or fortified places of this empire were Nineveh, Rehoboth, Calah and Resen. The latter being distinguished by Moses as *a great city*, was probably at that period the metropolis. This monarchy was also of small extent and for a succession of ages it entirely disappears from history, either because it had received no accession during that time or had been subjected to a foreign yoke. Balaam prophesied respecting its future power and final overthrow;² but as late as the reign of David it was an inconsiderable state. The Assyrians seem first to have distinguished themselves about two hundred years after David, and in the time of Isaiah their dominion extended to the Mediterranean sea. What the Greeks have related therefore of a great and very ancient Assyrian Monarchy, is altogether unfounded.³

According to the unanimous testimony of the ancients, Menes was the first king of Egypt. His reign commenced about the middle of the second century after the flood. Shuckford dates it in the year 116, and Silberschlag 195 after the flood, but Gatterer in 153.⁴ The site of his kingdom was This, afterwards called Ptolemais, between the twenty sixth and twenty seventh degrees of N. Latitude. About the same time a second kingdom was founded at Thebes, and twenty years later, a third, at Memphis. As Herodotus was told by the Egyptian priests that Menes reigned over

the Thebain Nomos or District, and that the rest of Egypt was then a marsh, it is obvious that by the *Thebain Nomos* he understands all Upper Egypt and the Heptanomis, as he afterwards observes himself that Thebes was once the name of all Egypt. Perhaps Menes gave up the southern district to one of his sons, and soon after, having confined the overflowings of the Nile by a dike, founded Memphis.⁵ It appears that he here placed another of his sons. The declaration of Herodotus, that Egypt was then a marsh, can be understood of the Delta only; and even this district must have been so much raised by deposits from the Nile, as to become dry and habitable at a very early period. Tanis or Zoan at the Tanitic mouth of the Nile, is mentioned as a well known town only 200 years later; and Hebron, which was no new city in the time of Abraham 367 years after the deluge, was built but seven years before Zoan.⁶ Besides, the road from Canaan to Egypt was easily travelled by Abraham, but if the Delta had then been a marsh, it is hardly possible that he could have entered the country from the great plain east of Egypt, especially as the Bay of Heroopolis must at that time have extended much farther north than at present. Homer indeed says that Pharos in his time was a day's sail from Egypt, but by *Egypt* he means the *Nile*, from which Pharos is a day's sail distant at the present day.⁷

The Cushites, descendants of Ham, established themselves very early in south-western Arabia. They probably emigrated thither and founded a state immediately after the first dispersion of the tribes; which seems the more likely as Nimrod, the founder of the kingdom of Shinar, was a Cushite.⁸ They therefore had possession of Arabia before the Joktanites. Hence some of the Arabs themselves denominate the Joktanites *emigrated Arabians* in distinction from the Cushites, whom alone they acknowledge as the original inhabitants of the country.⁹ In the reign of Asa, the Cushite monarch Zerah invaded Judea with a numerous host, and at another time Sennacherib hastened home to Assyria on account of a false rumour that Tirhaka, king of Cush, was leading an army against him.¹⁰ At an early period they crossed the straits of Babel-Mandel and founded the African Cush, anciently called Aethiopia and now Abyssinia, which was often united with the Arabian Cush and governed by the same king.¹¹ Heeren has rendered it probable that the order of Egyptian priests, which included the royal

family, was composed of Cushites who emigrated from Abyssinia and established governments in Egypt. If this were so, the Abyssinian Cushites must have penetrated to Egypt as early as the middle of the second century after the flood.¹²

Thus anciently did the people of southern Asia establish political communities which they gradually perfected; while the tribes who wandered to more distant regions, sank into a state of barbarism from which they rose by slow degrees, and in which some remain at the present day.

¹ נמרוד from נמרד *to rebel*. Gen. 10: 8—10. Perizonius, Orig. Babyl. 112, 230—239, 263, 304. ² Numb. 24: 22, 24. ³ Gen. 10: 11, 12. ⁴ Sam. 10: 6. Michaelis, Vorrede zu Jesaias. ⁵ Gatt. Weltgesch. S. 219. Silber-schlag. Chron. der Welt. S. 141. Shuckford, Connexion of sacred and profane History, Book IV. p. 136. and B. IX. p. 174. ⁶ Herodotus II. 4. 15. 99. ⁷ Num. 13: 22. ⁸ Odyss. IV. 355 comp. XIV. 258. XVII. 427. ⁹ Gen. 10: 8. ¹⁰ Pocock. Specimen. Hist. Arab. p. 39. Herbelot. Bibl. Orient. T. I. p. 215. ¹¹ Chron. 14: 9. 2 Kings 19: 9. Isa. 37: 8, 9. ¹² Michaelis. Spicil. Geogr. Hebr. ext. P. I. p. 143—157. ¹³ Heeren, Ideen ueber die Politik, den Verkehr und den Handel der Alten Welt. Th. I. S. 230, 305—317, 344 ff. comp. 419 ff.

NOTE. In the tables of Suessmilch (Göttl. Ord. in den Verord. des Menschl. Geschl. Th. I. R. VIII. S. 92) in which he computes the increase of population after the Creation and Deluge, it is supposed that there were upon the earth at the middle of the second century after the Deluge only about 131,072 or 262,144 persons; and at the end of this century not more than 1,048,576 or 2,097,152; a number scarcely adequate to the founding of so many and such remote states, allowing them to be of small extent. In the computation of Euler quoted by Suessmilch (S. 295) the number is still less. This led Michaelis to suppose that the chronology deduced from Gen. 11: 10—25 is incorrect, and that in this genealogy some families are omitted. But he could adduce no example of such omission in those genealogical tables with which the chronology is interwoven. (Eichhorn's Repert. Th. XIII. S. 168—177.) But the difficulty vanishes when we observe that the calculations of both Suessmilch and Euler proceed on the supposition, that population then increased in general no faster than it does at the present day. When will men cease to measure the old world by the standard of the new, and to believe that every thing in ancient

times must have been just as it is now? Let any one examine Suessmilch's periods of duplication, which in the first century are placed at 10 and in the second at 15 years, and also Euler's mode of computing, and compare them with the condition of the ancient world, when life was long, deaths unfrequent, and nothing to prevent or hinder early marriages, and their incorrectness will be perceived at once. Who will believe that Adam during the first ten years of his life had only two, or (according to Euler) during the first eighteen years, only six children; so that at the close of the ten years there were only four, or of the eighteen years, only eight persons upon the earth? Or that from the marriages of the three sons of Noah there were but six children in ten years? Gatterer instituted a new mode of computation (*Einleit. in die Synchro. Universal. Hist. B. I. Th. II. S. 118*) according to which the rate of increase is much greater; but even he seems to make the period of duplication too long, and the number of children by one marriage too small, for such remote antiquity. I might here introduce my own calculations by which I have shown a much more rapid increase of population after the flood, but I will in this place merely suggest the inquiry, whether in the enumeration of the family of Noah, as well as of that of Jacob, (*Gen. 46: 8—27*) the servants are not omitted? If they are, then there will not be the least difficulty remaining in regard to the rapid increase of population during this period.

IV. CIVIL SOCIETY AT THE TIME OF ABRAHAM.

In the tenth generation after Noah, while Abraham dwelt in Canaan, (from 367 to 467 after the flood,) there were in that country several small states and kingdoms which had been founded by the descendants of Canaan, the son of Ham. These Canaanites frequently occur in the Arabian poets, historians and scholiasts under the name of Amalekites (*عَالِبِيَّة* and *عَالِبِيَّة*) as a very ancient, numerous and celebrated people who inhabited Arabia before the Joktanites; and some of whom removed to Canaan, whence they were expelled by the Hebrews. Herodotus also says that the Phenicians (who are the same as the Canaanites) originally dwelt on the coasts of the Red Sea, whence they emigrated to the Medi-

terreanean and there engaged in navigation to distant countries.¹ When Abraham arrived in Canaan, it is observed in Genesis that *the Canaanite was then in the land* ; a plain intimation that the Canaanites had emigrated thither not long before. The enumeration of the Canaanites among the Amalekites who inhabited Arabia Petrea, but made distant excursions into other countries, is also an indication that Arabia was their original residence.² Of these Canaanites there were three distinct classes.

I. The Canaanites who remained in Arabia and formed a numerous people, of whom in the seventh century there were distinguished families still in existence. In the Bible these are called Amalekites. They were not descended from Amalek, the grandson of Esau ; for they occur long before his time on the southern boundaries of Canaan, and Balaam calls them one of the most ancient people, and their king the most powerful monarch whom he knew.³ They attacked the rear of the Hebrews in their march through Arabia Petrea. For this offence they were punished at the time and destined to extermination. They defeated those Hebrews who attempted to penetrate into Canaan contrary to the command of God. In later times they united with the Moabites and Ammonites, and afterwards with the Midianites against the Hebrews. They were vanquished by Saul, by David, and finally by the Simonites in the reign of Hezekiah.⁴ They were Nomades, who subsisted principally by pillage and led a wandering life, though we find them for the most part on the southern borders of Palestine.⁵

II. The Canaanites who emigrated to the northern coasts of Canaan and built Zidon, their most ancient capital.⁶

III. The Canaanites who took possession of the interior of Palestine.⁷

The states in Palestine founded by these Canaanitish tribes were small, and generally confined within the circle of a single city. The greater part of the land was unoccupied, and Abraham could pasture his herds in the open country without hindrance. It appears that the *children of Heth* at Hebron were not subject to a king. Neither did Mamre, Eshcol and Aner, three brothers in alliance with Abraham, bear the regal title, though they as well as he, maintained a body of armed servants. Gerar, afterwards Philistia, and Salem, afterwards Jerusalem, were governed by the kings, Abimelech and Melchizedek.⁸

The five cities in the vale of Siddim which is now covered by the Dead Sea, viz. Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, and Bela or Zoar, were under regal government. Chedorlaomer, king of Elam, (or Elymais, the ancient name of Persia,) had made the kings of these cities tributary to him. After thirteen years of subjection they threw off the yoke; and in conjunction with their neighbours, the Rephaims of Ashteroth Karnaim, the Zuzims of Ham, the Emims of Shaveh Kiriathaim, the Horites (or dwellers in caves) of Mount Seir, the Amalekites of Kadesh, and the Amorites of Hazezon Tamar, they in the following year made war upon their oppressor; but they and all their allies were vanquished in one battle. Though this successful expedition of the Elamite king appears so formidable when we view the number of nations concerned in it, the contending armies must have been very small: for Abraham, as soon as he heard that Lot was among the captives, pursued the victorious troops with only his three hundred and eighteen armed servants and the bands of his confederates, Mamre, Eshcol and Aner. He overtook them at Dan near the source of the Jordan, attacked them by surprise in the night, retook all their booty, and drove them to Hobah, north of Damascus.⁹

It appears that Elam was the most powerful kingdom of that period, and that Shinar, which, (with Elassar and Gouim, two nations equally unknown,) was in alliance with Elam, had lost the superiority it possessed under Nimrod. Had Djemjid been a Persian instead of a Mede, the tradition respecting him would correspond very well with the scriptural account of Chedorlaomer, for Zoroaster dates the commencement of the empire which he founded a few generations after Noah. This indeed is somewhat too early, but the custom of omitting some families in the genealogical tables will easily account for such an error.¹⁰

About the year 380 after the flood, Abraham found in Egypt not only a well cultivated soil and an abundance of food, but also a Pharaoh upon the throne who had his ministers and courtiers, and who did not, like the petty king of Gerar, enter into an alliance with the patriarch as with an equal.¹¹ The Thinitic Dynasty was then extinct, and the reigning monarch was of the Dynasty of Memphis, whose dominions included a part of Upper and all Lower Egypt.

That this part of Egypt was then dry, and had been for a long

period habitable, appears from the remark already made respecting the antiquity of the city Tanis or Zoan.¹²

¹ Herodot. I. 1. comp. Justin. Trog. XVIII. 3. Abulfede, Descrip. Syr. p. 5. ² Gen. 11: 10—26. Pocock. Specimen. Hist. Arab. p. 39. Herbelot. Bibl. Orient. T. I. p. 215. Reland. Palaest. p. 82. Gen. 12: 6. 13: 7. 26: 34. 28: 8. Num. 13: 29. Pt. LXXXIII. comp. Deut. III. Josh. XII. and 13: 2—32. ³ Num. 24: 20. ⁴ Ex. 17: 8—16. Num. 14: 40—45. Gen. 36: 12. 1 Chron. 1: 36. Gen. 14: 7. Judg. 3: 12, 13. 6: 3, 4. 1 Sam. xv. 27: 8—11. 30: 1—25. 2 Sam. 8: 12. 1 Chron. 4: 42, 43. ⁵ Gen. 14: 7. Num. 13: 29, 30. 14: 45. 1 Sam. 15: 7. 27: 8—10. 30: 1, 9, 15, 16. ⁶ Gen. 10: 15. ⁷ Gen. 12: 6. comp. Michaelis, Spicil. Geogr. Hebr. ext. P. I. p. 167—176. ⁸ Gen. 23: 4—18. 14: 13, 14, 24, 18—20. 21: 22—34. 26: 1—16. ⁹ Gen. XIV. ¹⁰ Zend-Avesta Th. I. S. 92. II. 132. 197. 265. 304—308. III. 99. 116. 121. ¹¹ Gen. 12: 10—20. 21: 22—32. ¹² Num. 13: 22. Gen. 23: 2.

NOTE. Greece was peopled principally by colonies from Asia Minor. These colonists were called *Pelasgi* because they came by sea (*πῆλγος*). About the time of the death of Abraham, Inachus led the first colony to Argos. About one hundred and thirty years after this, during the latter part of the life of Jacob, the *Pelasgi* sailed from Arcadia to Italy.

V. CIVIL SOCIETY AT THE TIME OF JACOB.

During the two hundred and fifteen years which intervened between the arrival of Abraham in Canaan, and the journey of Jacob to Egypt, the petty states of Canaan appear to have made but little progress, with the exception of those on the coast who carried on an extensive trade by sea.¹ Egypt on the contrary had advanced in civilization with a rapid pace. Towards the close of this period the Thebain or Diospolitic dynasty became extinct, and all Egypt was united under the sceptre of the Memphian Pharaoh, whose power was greatly increased in consequence of this union. To this monarch Jacob was presented by his son Joseph in the 562 year after the flood. A well regulated court, dignified courtiers, a lifeguard, a strict ceremonial at audience, a powerful prime minister, high officers of state, a state prison under the command of the captain of the lifeguard, a scrupulous distinction of rank, all indicate a rich, flourishing, and well ordered government.² The *learned*, and the *labouring class* of people, composed two separate tribes.

The *learned class* were not devoted to the cultivation of the sciences merely, but all the religious and civil offices of the government were in their hands. For their public services they received a stated salary from the king, although they owned large estates in land. This class was divided into three orders. They kept their knowledge secret, and preserved it in hieroglyphics, the care and explanation of which were intrusted to the order of ³ כֹּהֲנֵי חֹרֵם, who were set apart for this purpose. Priests, and physicians or embalmers, were retained in the service of the great.⁴

The *labouring class* comprehended husbandmen, mechanics, artists, and merchants. The works of art with which Egypt abounded, were various and costly. The watermen, who were so useful on account of the frequent inundations of the Nile, formed a distinct tribe. Shepherds, particularly Nomades who neglected agriculture, though numerous, were from motives of policy held in great disrepute.⁵ The commencement of the *military order* is seen in the royal lifeguard, if indeed this institution does not rather imply that such an order had been previously organized. In later times the soldiery was divided into two classes, (*Καλασιμεις τε και Ερμουρβεις*;) and when in its most flourishing state consisted of 400,000 or 600,000 men. They had lands assigned to them in Lower Egypt, where most of them were settled. Each class was obliged to furnish an annual quota of 1,000 men for the royal lifeguard, who received pay, during their term of service, in natural productions.⁶

At this time the king of Egypt, through his minister, provided against an impending famine by purchasing great quantities of corn, in which he afterwards carried on an extensive trade to the advantage of the crown. The Egyptians had hitherto been free from taxation, but during the famine they sold their lands to the king for corn; and when he afterwards made a new and proportional division of landed property among the people, he required a fifth part of the produce as a tax. The priests were maintained during the famine by their salary. Their lands were therefore not sold, and they were exempt from taxation. The same privilege was afterwards extended to the soldiery.⁷

Egypt at this early period was so celebrated for its affluence, that caravans of Ishmaelites or Midianite merchants went thither through Palestine and Arabia Petrea, with the productions of their

country. It appears that they also purchased slaves on the way.⁸ The mercantile routes from Egypt, according to Herodotus, were the following: 1. From Thebes to Meroe, (Saba,) thence to Azab and over the straits of Babel-Mandel to Arabia. 2. From Thebes northwesterly through Oasis Magna and the desert of Ammon to Augela. Here it was met by a road from the northern coast of Africa, and continuing on southwesterly to the country of the Garamantes, it was again intersected by a road from the regions of Carthage. Thence it proceeded in a southwestern direction to the Atarantes and Atlantes.⁹ These routes appear to have been frequented at a very early period, for in Job mention is made of constellations belonging to the southern hemisphere. Moses was well acquainted with the ancient Ethiopia or Cush, and Southern Arabia. He alludes to incense and precious stones from Arabia and Ethiopia, and cinnamon from the East Indies, as well known articles. He mentions many distant colonies of Egyptians who are now unknown. He speaks of gold and onyx stones from the interior of Africa.¹⁰

¹ Gen. xxxiv. 49: 13. ² Gatterer, Weltgeschichte im ganzen Umfang. Th. I. S. 220. Gen. 39: 1. 40: 1—3. 41: 40—45. 47: 1—10. ³ In the English translation rendered *Magicians*. See Exod. 7: 11 &c. ⁴ Gen. 37: 22, 26. 41: 45. comp. Herodot. II. 168. Diodor. Sic. I. 63. Gen. 41: 8, 24. 50: 2. ⁵ Gen. 41: 42, 43. 44: 2, 12. 45: 19—22, 27. 46: 5, 34. Herodot. II. 128. VII. 164. ⁶ Herodot. II. 155. 164. 188. ⁷ Gen. 41: 47—57. 47: 13—26. Herodot. II. 168. ⁸ Gen. 37: 25—28. 39: 1. ⁹ Herodot. II. 29. IV. 181—185. ¹⁰ Job 9: 9. Gen. 10: 6—8. Exod. 30: 23. Gen. 10: 13, 14. Exod. 28: 20. 39: 13. Job 22: 24, 25. Heeren, Ideen über die Politik, den Verkehr und den Handel der vornehmsten Völker der alten Welt. Th. I. S. 151—182. 263—330. 448—455. Gatterer, Weltgeschichte. Th. I. S. 104—106.

VI. CIVIL SOCIETY AT THE TIME OF MOSES.

Into this flourishing country Jacob came with his family, by the invitation of Pharaoh, in the 582 year after the deluge. During the four hundred and thirty years that his descendants remained there, till they had increased to a great nation, they learned much from the Egyptians, who, for more than a century united under the Pharaohs of Memphis, were constantly improving their political institutions, perfecting the arts, and extending their knowledge of the

sciences, which it was impossible for them to keep wholly secret. Here the Hebrews were made acquainted with the advantages of a well regulated government, the utility of agriculture, and the value of the arts, to the cultivation of which some of their own nation applied themselves.¹ Though most of them continued their Nomadic life, yet what they had seen in Egypt could not fail to exert an important influence upon their feelings and habits.² They became so much attached to the country of their adoption, that even those who had acquired sovereignty over the Moabites at length returned to Egypt.³ Their separation and dispersion was prevented by this means, and as the Egyptians despised all Nomadic tribes, they could not easily become intermingled with them. Such a blending of the two nations was the more difficult, because all conditions of life among the Egyptians were strictly hereditary. Thus the Hebrews in Egypt became a numerous and distinct nation, insomuch that about the three hundred and fiftieth year of their residence there, they awakened the suspicions of a jealous government. When a king of a new dynasty ascended the throne, ignorant of the public services of Joseph, and fearing that in the event of war the Hebrews might join the standard of the enemy, or return to Palestine; he began to oppress them by unreasonable demands of personal service. When he saw that their numbers were not diminished by his severity, he issued the murderous order respecting their infant sons. But in consequence of this very decree, Moses was introduced to his court, where he had opportunity to acquire that knowledge which, if not indispensably necessary, was very useful to him as the lawgiver of his nation. This oppression was continued for more than eighty years, till at last the Egyptian monarch was compelled to release the Hebrews by supernatural and public calamities, which Moses always accurately predicted, and readily removed as often as Pharaoh relented and promised submission.⁴

¹ Exod. 1: 14. 1 Chron. 4: 21—23. ² 1 Chron. 7: 20—22. ³ 1 Chron. 4: 22. ⁴ Exod. 1: 8—22. 2: 1—10.

NOTE. The kings by whom the Hebrews were oppressed cannot now be individuated, nor can we ascertain with any degree of certainty even the dynasty to which they belonged. The early history of Egypt is involved in obscurity till the reign of Psammetichus, the fifth king of the twenty sixth dynasty. We have a few

notices by Herodotus, who, in his travels through Egypt in the fifth century before the Christian Æra, diligently explored the ancient history of the country and acquired much information from the archives under the care of the priests. Syncellus who wrote in the eighth century, has preserved an old chronicle which contains thirty Egyptian dynasties. In the third century before Christ, Ptolemy Philadelphus employed Manetho, a learned Egyptian priest, to compose a work on the dynasties from the sources then extant. Manetho gives the names of the kings belonging to each dynasty. Eratosthenes, a Cyrenian who was educated at Athens and was afterwards royal librarian at Alexandria, apparently dissatisfied with the work of Manetho, (as indeed he must have been if he had compared it with Herodotus,) wrote at the request of Ptolemy Euergetes a catalogue of the Thebain kings for one thousand and seventy six years, which differs widely from Manetho's. Diodorus Siculus visited Egypt in the time of Julius Cæsar and Augustus, and has recorded in his history what he himself discovered, as well as what he learned from others. But these authors are all inconsistent with each other. Manetho's work would probably deserve more credit than is generally given to it, if we had it uninjured and entire. But the original is lost, and we have only a meagre, imperfect, and to all appearance, very corrupt extract which Syncellus made in the eighth century. And even this extract was not derived directly from the work of Manetho, but it was copied from Julius Africanus of the third, and Eusebius of the fourth century. The extracts made by these two writers do not agree with each other, and what Josephus has quoted from Manetho differs from both. (Against Apion, B. I. Sec. 14, 15.) Even if these differences could be accounted for, there remain others which are wholly irreconcilable. (Shuckford's Connexion of Sacred and Profane History Vol. III. B. XI. p. 141—182. Silberschlag, Chronologie der Welt. S. 127—143.) These extracts from Julius Africanus and Eusebius are inserted in the appendix to this work. Africanus for the most part appears more accurate than Eusebius, yet there are undoubtedly frequent errors in him, and not seldom in both at the same time. It is evident that these dynasties were not successive, but, with the exception of the eleven last, were mostly contemporary; and that Manetho in his arrangement followed a *geographical*, and not a *chronological* order. Thus the first Thinitic, the eleventh Diospo-

litic, and the third Memphitic dynasties, are undoubtedly contemporary, and they belong to the period of the first dawning of the civilization and refinement of Egypt. Even the dynasties of the same state seem not always to have followed each other in immediate succession.

The eleven last dynasties according to Africanus, continued nine hundred and three years, but according to Eusebius, only six hundred and fifty nine years. The latter asserts, that they extended back only to the year 1035 B. C.; but the former, to the year 1227 B. C. (Compare Gatterer, *Weltgeschichte* S. 216—230.) But of what dynasty was the *king who knew not Joseph*? It is scarcely credible that a grateful remembrance of the services which he had rendered to Egypt, should be entirely obliterated by the transfer of the sceptre from one native family to another. The succession was always in the order of priests, who all had a share in the government and in whose archives a record of the public acts of Joseph was undoubtedly preserved. It is probable then, that the government had passed into the hands of foreigners. Now as we find a dynasty of Phœnician Shepherd-kings, it is a very natural conclusion that this is the one for which we are inquiring. Julius Africanus makes the duration of this dynasty two hundred and eighty four years, Josephus, two hundred and sixty, and Eusebius, one hundred and six. But the length of time need occasion no difficulty, for it is not necessary to suppose that the oppression of the Hebrews commenced under the first king of the dynasty. As it began when their numbers had so increased as to awaken the suspicions of the government, it might have been during the reign of the last but one of these kings. Some, as Josephus and Perizonius, suppose these Shepherd-kings to be the Hebrews themselves. Silberschlag thinks it was one of this race who invited Jacob to Egypt. The Pharaoh who finally dismissed the Hebrews these writers take to be Chencheres, the eleventh king of the eighteenth Diospolitic dynasty, because Berosus says that he with his army was destroyed in the Red Sea. But this opinion is encumbered with many difficulties. It may be sufficient to remark in this place that Berosus, a Babylonian, could scarcely obtain very accurate information on this subject; and that the Hebrews were not oppressed by a Diospolitic king, but by the Pharaohs of Lower Egypt.

Should it be asked who these Shepherd-kings were, and how

they came to be called by the Egyptian name *Hyksos*, (which according to Forster in Epist. ad J. D. Michaelis in Spicil. Geogr. Hebr. P. I. p. 9. signifies in Coptic at the present day, *pastores cincti*.) the answer is found in the name *Phenician*, that is, *Canaanite*. But they certainly were not Canaanites from Palestine, for these were not strong enough to penetrate into Egypt and take possession of the country. We have shown before, that the Canaanites originally dwelt on the Arabian coast of the Red Sea, and sent only a few tribes, as colonies, to Palestine, while the great body of that ancient and powerful nation remained in Arabia under the name of Amalekites. The *Hyksos* then were probably Amalekites from Arabia. This supposition is confirmed by the assertion of the Arabic historians, that the Amalekites once conquered Egypt and for a long period held possession of the country. Thus we may perceive a reason why the Amalekites attacked the Hebrews in their march through Arabia Petrea, and why the extermination of this people was enjoined by Jehovah. Some light is also thrown upon the causes which influenced Cecrops, the founder of Athens, to emigrate to Attica with some citizens of Sais, about twenty or thirty years before the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt.

It may be observed in this place, that Lelex the first king of Sparta, began to reign about two hundred and sixty eight years before the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt; and that eighty five years after this event, Cadmus the Phenician, (who, as Bochart observes, is said to have led several colonies to the northern coasts of Africa and to have built many cities there,) founded Cadmea or Thebes, in Beotia. (Comp. Parische Chronik von Wagner herausgegeben, Göttingen 1790. S. 3, 12 and 26. Epoche 7.) That the Grecian states were then but just beginning to emerge from barbarism, may be concluded from the fact, that Cecrops was the first who introduced into Attica the institution of marriage.

VII. DEPARTURE OF THE HEBREWS FROM EGYPT.

Moses requested permission for the Hebrews to go three days journey into Arabia Petrea to celebrate a festival in honour of Jehovah, and Pharaoh was willing to grant the request, for the sake of avoiding calamities still greater than those which he had already suffered. But when he required that their wives and chil-

dren, or at least their cattle, should be retained as a pledge of their return, he perceived from the reply of Moses, that it was the real purpose of the Israelites to escape beyond the reach of his tyranny. Still perhaps he might hope, that he should be able by his soldiers to compel them to return, if they refused. But when Moses, instead of leaving the western arm of the Red Sea on the right and taking the direct road to Arabia, had directed his course southerly, with the Sea on his left hand, and was leading the Hebrews towards Suez or Colsum, Pharaoh imagined that he had been deceived, and that those fearful miracles which he had witnessed, were merely natural occurrences and not interpositions of the deity; *for surely (he thought) a God, who would exert such power for the deliverance of his people, would not after their deliverance, so forsake them that they could not find their way to Arabia.* He therefore speedily drew together his army from the Delta and pursued the Hebrews by forced marches, and on the third day came up with their encampment near Suez. Thus they were enclosed by the army between the sea and the mountains which surround this place on the south and west.

As Pharaoh now threatened to treat as enemies his Hebrew guests, whom before, contrary to all right, he had treated as slaves, they were wholly free from obligation on their part, and might justly repel force by force. But a people unaccustomed to arms were not able to contend with a regular military force, provided with a large body of cavalry and six hundred chariots of war. God again interposed, as he had so often done in Egypt, and by night opened a way for his people through the sea. At this place the sea is now one thousand five hundred and fourteen paces broad, and has a sand bank running across to the opposite shore; but at that time it must have been over two thousand paces broad, and much deeper than it now is.¹

In the morning Pharaoh perceived that the Hebrews had passed through the sea; "And the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them, to the midst of the sea; even Pharaoh's horses, his chariots and his horsemen. And it came to pass, that in the morning watch the Lord looked unto the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians, and took off their chariot wheels, that they drave them heavily: so that the Egyptians said, Let us flee from the face of Israel;

for the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyptians. And the Lord said unto Moses, Stretch out thy hand over the sea, that the waters may come again upon the Egyptians, upon their chariots and upon their horsemen. And Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea, and the sea returned to his strength when the morning appeared; and the Egyptians fled against it; and the Lord overthrew the Egyptians in the midst of the sea. And the waters returned and covered the chariots, and the horsemen, and all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them: there remained not so much as one of them."

By this fearful overthrow, the fame of which as well as that of the miracles in Egypt, was spread through all the neighbouring countries, the deliverance of the Hebrews was not only perfected, and their independence secured; but a fear of Jehovah, and a dread of his people, was impressed upon all the surrounding nations.²

¹ Jabn's *Biblische Archaeologie* Band I. S. 83. ² *Exod.* 14 and 15: 12—16. *Josh.* 2: 10.

NOTE. Respecting the miracles of Moses in Egypt, and the passage of the Hebrews through the Bay of Heroopolis, see Michaelis, *Anmerkungen zur Uebersetzung des zweyten Buches Mosis*, K. 3—15. and *Zerstreute Kleine Schriften gesammelt*. Brief I. S. 1—142. Compare Niebuhr, *Reise Th.* I. S. 215, 247 ff. 251. *Beschreibung Arab.* S. 358, 408, 408 ff. Kleuker, *Neue Prüfung und Erklärung der vorzüglichsten Beweise für die Wahrheit und den göttlichen Ursprung des Christenthums und der Offenbarung*. Th. I. S. 276 ff. Hess, *Geschichte Mosis*, Band I. Erstes Buch K. 3 and 4. and *Zweytes Buch* K. 1—4.

CHAPTER SECOND.

CIVIL CONSTITUTION OF THE HEBREWS.

VIII. FORM OF GOVERNMENT BEFORE THE MOSAIC LAW.

It is now time that we turn our attention to the ancient polity of the Hebrews, as we are soon to describe their new constitution, in which many features of the old were retained.

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, governed their respective families with unlimited paternal authority. The number of servants in these families was so great, that the power of the patriarchs was by no means inconsiderable. Allowing a fourth part of the males to be capable of bearing arms, it appears from the mention of Abraham's three hundred and eighteen *homborn* armed servants, that the whole number of males in this class only, exclusive of those who had been purchased, was twelve hundred and seventy two. His subjects then must have amounted to several thousands, and hence an estimate may be made of the number of his herds, to attend which so many servants were necessary. With this view of the subject it will no longer appear surprising, that the land of Canaan was scarcely sufficient for the residence of Abraham and Lot.¹

These patriarchs were powerful princes, as the Emirs of the Nomades are at the present day. They were completely independent, and owed allegiance to no sovereign; they formed alliances with other princes and even with kings; they maintained a body of armed servants, and repelled force by force. For their vassals, they were the priests who appointed the festivals and presented offerings; the guardians who protected them from injustice; the chiefs who led them in war; the judges who banished the turbulent, and when necessary inflicted even capital punishment upon transgressors.²

The twelve sons of Jacob, after the death of their father, ruled their own families with the same authority. But when their descendants had increased so as to form tribes, each *Tribe*, מְשֵׁבֵט, acknowledged a *Prince*, נָשִׂיא, as its ruler. This office, was at first hereditary, and belonged to the oldest son of the founder of the tribe, but afterwards it probably became elective. The division of nations into tribes very generally prevailed in ancient times; and the custom is still retained by the Beduin Arabs, and even by the Persians.³

As the numbers of each tribe increased, the less powerful families united themselves with their stronger relatives, and acknowledged them as their superiors. Hence there arose a subdivision of the tribes into collections of families. Such a collection was called בֵּית אָבוֹת, מְשֻׁפָּחָה, אֵלֶּה, a *House of Fathers*, a *Clan*, or a *Thousand*; not because each of these subdivisions consisted of a thousand persons, for it is evident that the number varied.⁴

Before the departure from Egypt, the Hebrews were under the immediate government of the rulers of these clans, who were denominated רְאֵשֵׁי בֵּית אָבוֹת, רְאֵשֵׁי אֵלֶּה, אֲבֵרֵים, *Heads of Houses of Fathers*, *Heads of Thousands*, etc. and were in rank subordinate to the *Princes*, נְשִׂיאִים. These two classes of rulers were comprehended under the general names of רְאֵשֵׁי שְׁבֵטִים, זְקֵנִים, *Seniors*, or *Heads of Tribes*.⁵ They were *Fathers* rather than *Magistrates*, governing according to the regulations established by custom, according to the principles of sound reason and natural justice. They provided for the general good of the whole community, while the concerns of each individual family still continued under the control of its own father. In general, those cases only which concerned the fathers of families themselves, came under the cognizance of the *Seniors*.

Such is the *Patriarchal form of Government*, which the Nomads, particularly the Beduin Arabs, have in a great measure preserved to the present day. They call their *Princes*, *Emirs*, and their *Heads of Clans*, *Sheichs*, (*Elders*.); under the last of which appellations the Hebrews included both these orders of rulers. The Arabian Emirs have their *Secretaries*, who appear to be officers similar to those denominated שׁוֹטְרִים among the Hebrews. The Hebrew *Shoterim*, (in the English version translated *Officers*.) whose peculiar business it was to register the genealogies, possessed

considerable authority, as will be seen in the sequel, and sustained an important part in the government.⁶

With such a political organization, the Hebrews in the land of Goshen continued for the most part the Nomadic life of their ancestors, for which the wilds of Egypt and the open plains of Arabia Petrea afforded them ample room. In early times they had driven their herds through Arabia to Canaan, and built cities in that country. Some penetrated into the land of the Moabites and subjected it to their power.⁷ They were at length excluded from Canaan by the increasing population of the Canaanites; though they possessed in that country, (in addition to the right of pasturage they had acquired,) certain lands and cities, with many wells and cisterns, which they had inherited from their ancestors. When in Egypt some applied themselves to the arts, and they are mentioned particularly as potters and manufacturers of fine cotton in the service of the crown.⁸ In Arabia Petrea several distinguished themselves in the structure of the sacred Tabernacle; an evidence that the Hebrews had been much improved by the refinements of Egypt. The Egyptian sovereigns treated them as guests rather than subjects, until the entrance of that foreign dynasty of monarchs, who were ignorant of the services which one of their ancestors had rendered to the nation. But even these monarchs did not change the patriarchal form of their government. On the contrary, the Hebrew *Shoterim* were employed, under the direction of Egyptian overseers, to apportion and press forward the labours, exacted from the people.⁹ But as the Hebrews after their deliverance from Egypt, were to become a settled and agricultural nation, and were designed to subserve especial and important purposes; it was necessary that they should be provided with new political institutions, suited to such a condition and destination. For this purpose Moses led them to the foot of Mount Horeb, where the people entered into a peculiar relation with God, upon which their whole civil constitution was unalterably grounded.

¹ Gen. 14: 14. 13: 6. compare 33: 1—18. ² Gen. 8: 20. 14: 14, 24. 15: 9, 10. 21: 14. 22: 13. 34: 14. 38: 24. Job. 1: 5. ³ Shaw's Travels, p. 216. Della Valle, Reise. T. II. S. 189. ⁴ Judges 6: 15. 1 Sam. 10: 19. 23: 23. Num. 26: 5—50. ⁵ Num. 1: 16. 10: 4. ⁶ Arvieux, Merkw. Nachrichten. Th. II. S. 138. Th. III. S. 128 ff. Exod. 3: 16. 5: 10—21. ⁷ 1 Chron. 7: 21, 24. 4: 22. ⁸ 1 Chron. 4: 21, 23. ⁹ Exod. 3: 16. 4: 29. 5: 10, 14, 21.

IX. FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE MOSAIC INSTITUTIONS.

A correct knowledge of the Creator and Governor of heaven and earth, and of the relation of man to his almighty judge, is certainly the principal, if not the sole ground of all morality and of all moral happiness among human beings, influenced as they are by the objects of sense. It constitutes in fact man's chief good.¹ Now, even though we should allow that a superior mind at the present day,—furnished with all the learning of preceding ages and surrounded by the light of revelation, after so many errors of the ancients have been detected and so many warnings have been given to guard against false conclusions,—can derive this correct knowledge from a view of the universe, or from contemplating the situation and wants of man; yet it was certainly unattainable by those men of high antiquity, in the childhood of the world, whose minds were unaccustomed to intellectual effort, who inherited no learned labours from their ancestors, who were destitute of a thorough acquaintance with the works of nature, and were situated in the midst of exposures to error. This conclusion is confirmed by proof far superior to all speculation, by the history of all nations, even of those which were much more recent in their origin and more highly cultivated. We find, nevertheless, this correct knowledge of God among the pious patriarchs of the highest antiquity; and unless we will absurdly suppose that those simple and unlearned fathers were speculative philosophers and profound thinkers, we must acknowledge the truth of the declarations, that God from time to time revealed himself in a supernatural manner to the men of the old world, and that the knowledge thus communicated was afterwards transmitted from father to son.²

But it was difficult to preserve the knowledge of God among sensual men, even after it had been revealed. Before the flood, profligacy and practical atheism prevailed;³ and four centuries after, superstition and idolatry had crept in on all sides. Their influence was constantly extending, and at last became universal; and no people, who were left to themselves, ever regained a knowledge of the true God.

That a knowledge of the Deity might not be crowded entirely from the earth by the encroachments of idolatry, God revealed himself to an illustrious Chaldean, and appointed him, with his descen-

dants by Isaac and Jacob, to the important trust of preserving this invaluable treasure in the world, and finally of imparting it to other nations.⁴

In time idolatry became so general through the earth, that it acquired the credit of a settled, undoubted truth, and the authority of a plain principle of common sense. Hence even the descendants of Jacob, though they never entirely forgot the God who created heaven and earth, who caused the deluge and gave their ancestors such magnificent promises respecting their descendants, became, for the most part, so infected with the idolatry of Egypt during their residence in that country, that all the miracles which they witnessed there, at the Red Sea and Mount Horeb, were scarcely sufficient to cure them of their superstition, and bring them back to a constant worship of the true God.⁵

That the Hebrews might answer their high destination and preserve the knowledge of God through succeeding ages, civil institutions were necessary, by which the knowledge and worship of the true God should be connected with the political structure of this nation so intimately, that they must be imperishable, so long as the nation remained a nation; and could be annihilated only by the annihilation of the political existence of the people. Such institutions were provided by a civil constitution, which was closely interwoven and inseparably connected with the worship of the true God.

Such a constitution could be established without difficulty, as it was exactly suited to the condition of the world at that time, when the civil regulations of all people were identified with their religion. Though the independent patriarchs, nomadic as well as agricultural, were forced by circumstances to enter into societies, they were never very willing to receive the new constitutions and new laws which were prescribed to them by others. For this reason the ancient legislators, that they might secure the reception and authority of the new order of society introduced by them, always pretended that they had been authorised to impose laws by some divinity. Thus Menes in Egypt gave out that he had received his instructions from Mercury; Cadmus at Thebes, from an oracle; Minos in Crete, from Jupiter; Lycurgus at Sparta, from Apollo; Zathraustes among the Arimaspi, from their national god; Zamolxis, from the tutelary goddess of his nation; and Numa at Rome, from the nymph Egeria.⁶ These lawgivers, however, did not invent the

religious systems of their people, as some have erroneously supposed, but they improved the false religions already in existence, and artfully employed them as the means of establishing and perpetuating their civil institutions. But Moses did not, (as Strabo and Diodorus Siculus assert,⁷) proceed in the same manner. He did not deceitfully pretend, that he received his laws from the God *Jao*; (יְהוָה i. e. יְהוֹה) but he proved his mission to be really divine by such supernatural works and wisdom, as no other lawgiver could ever lay claim to. The whole nation heard God himself speak from Sinai. Neither did Moses employ religion to support his political institutions; but he reversed the usual order, and introduced a civil constitution which was designed as a means, and as the event has proved, was in reality a means, of establishing pure religion permanently upon the earth, and of preserving the knowledge and worship of the true God to the latest generations.

He accordingly made the worship of the one only true God the *Fundamental Law of his Institutions*, which was to remain forever unalterable, through all the changes which might occur in the lapse of time. The God, who created heaven and earth; who caused the deluge; who revealed himself to the ancestors of the Hebrews as the most High, and gave them promises respecting their far distant descendants; who was acknowledged by Abraham as the Judge of all the earth; and who now revealed himself as Jehovah, that is, as the immutably faithful performer of his promises: in short, he who alone is God, whose are the heavens and the earth, and all that they contain; the God over all, who can neither be seen, nor represented by any image; who loves, feeds, and clothes all men;—this only true God was set forth by Moses, the Mediator between God and the Hebrews, as their national and tutelary deity. This was done in accordance with the prevalent notion of those ages, that every nation must have its tutelary divinity. Jehovah had acquired a peculiar right over the Hebrews, by the miraculous deliverance which he had afforded them from Egyptian bondage; and to him were they all under the most sacred obligations, both on account of that deliverance, and because he is the only true God.⁸

The condescending manner in which Jehovah really represented himself to the Hebrews, was yet insufficient to perpetuate the knowledge and worship of the true God among them. He, therefore,

through the intervention of Moses, suffered himself to be elected their king by a voluntary choice.⁹ The land of Canaan was considered as the royal possession, of which the Hebrews were to be the hereditary occupants, and from which they were to render to Jehovah a double tythe, as the Egyptians did to their king.¹⁰

The invisible king then published from the summit of mount Sinai, with circumstances of awful grandeur, a brief summary of moral and religious duties, among which, the worship of the only true God, and a total prohibition of the use of images, held the most conspicuous place. This was designed for the unalterable fundamental law of the commonwealth. These first principles were to be further developed by Moses, and applied to particular cases according to circumstances.¹¹ God finally promised his subjects such a government, and such a peculiar direction of their affairs and destinies; that blessing and national prosperity should follow the observance of the law as its reward; but cursing and national calamity, the transgression of the law as its punishment, till they should again return to their duty.¹²

This fundamental law exhibited the maxims according to which the king was to rule; and these the people accepted and promised to observe. The Hebrews bound themselves to the observance of this great compact by a solemn oath, and their king Jehovah then delivered to them the summary of his law, written upon two tables of stone, which were to be preserved as a perpetual memorial of their obligations, and as the *Magna Charta* of the state.¹³

That the Hebrews might have their peculiar relation to God kept constantly before their eyes, there was indeed no image allowed, which would have been pregnant with mischief among a people so much inclined to idolatry; but God, as their king, caused a royal tent to be erected in the centre of the encampment, (where the pavilions of all kings and chiefs were usually erected,) and to be fitted up with all the splendour of royalty, as a moveable palace. It was divided into three apartments, in the innermost of which was the royal throne, supported by golden cherubs; and the footstool of the throne, a gilded ark containing the tables of the law, the *magna charta* of church and state. In the anteroom a gilded table was spread with bread and wine, as the royal table, and precious incense was burned. The exterior room, or court, might be considered the royal culinary apartment, and there music

was performed, like the music at the festive tables of Eastern monarchs.¹⁴ God made choice of the Levites for his courtiers, state officers, and palace guards; and Aaron for the chief officer of the court and first minister of state. For the maintenance of these officers, he assigned one of the tythes which the Hebrews were to pay as rent for the use of the land. He finally required all the Hebrew males of a suitable age to repair to his palace every year, on the three great annual festivals, with presents to render homage to their king; and as these days of renewing their homage were to be celebrated with festivity and joy, the second tythe was expended in providing the entertainments necessary for those occasions. In short, every religious duty was made a matter of political obligation; and all the civil regulations, even the most minute, were so founded upon the relation of the people to God, and so interwoven with their religious duties, that the Hebrew could not separate his God and his king, and in every law was reminded equally of both. Consequently the nation, so long as it had a national existence, could not entirely lose the knowledge, or discontinue the worship of the true God.

As God was the king of the Hebrews, a defection from God, was a defection from their rightful sovereign. Whoever in the Hebrew nation, over which Jehovah was king, worshipped another God, or practised any superstitions, by this very act renounced his allegiance to his king and deserted to another. He committed high treason, and was properly considered a public criminal. Whoever incited others to idolatry, incited them to rebellion, and was a mover of sedition. Therefore death was justly awarded as the punishment of idolatry and its kindred arts, magic, necromancy and soothsaying; and also of inciting to idolatry. The punishment of an idolatrous city was the irrevocable ban, בְּרִית , followed by complete destruction.¹⁵ So strict was the law upon this subject, that the inciter to idolatry was never to be pardoned, even though he should claim the character of a prophet, and utter predictions which should be exactly fulfilled.¹⁶ The Hebrews were required to deliver up to just punishment their nearest relatives and dearest friends, if they enticed to idolatry; and the accuser, as the first witness, was required to cast the first stone at the convicted traitor. Even a foreigner who dwelt among the Hebrews, could not be exempted from capital punishment, if he practised idolatry himself,

or tempted others to practise it ; for by so doing he became a mutineer, and excited the people to rebellion by disseminating discontent against the king, and against the whole civil government.

Though coercion for the purpose of preserving the worship of the true God, was in this manner sanctioned by the Mosaic law, it was in that age no restraint upon the liberty of conscience. According to the universal opinion of the pagans, every people, and every country, must have its own deities, and pagan religions obligated no man to worship this or that particular deity, much less, all deities without exception. Each individual was left at liberty to choose what gods he would worship, and what, neglect. Consequently, a superstitious Hebrew, or a foreign idolater, could not complain of violence done to his conscience, if he were required while in Palestine to discontinue the worship of idols, and, when he engaged in the public services of religion, to worship Jehovah only, the divine king of the country.

Moreover, as the pagans did not in their religious worship supplicate the gods to strengthen their virtue, and confer upon them true moral happiness, but to grant them blessings merely temporal, such as abundant harvests, rich booty from their enemies, victories, freedom from sickness, and the like ; if they while among the Hebrews, were directed to seek those things from no deity but the God of the nation, it imposed no restraint upon their feelings, but was in perfect accordance with the opinion universally adopted, that in every land, the god of that land ought to be worshipped in preference to all others. The law which required capital punishment for idolatry as treason, was not applied to the inward faith, which manifested itself by no external acts, and consequently could not be known or proved by a human tribunal ; but solely to the public worship of other gods by adoration, prostration, kissing, altars, sacrifices, statues, groves, etc. ; and to the enticing of others to idolatry. He who believed in the existence of many gods, and secretly put his trust in idols, was indeed guilty of impiety ; but as his transgression was unknown, how could it be punished with death ? This distinction, which arises from the very nature of the case, is every where implied by Moses. When he awards capital punishment to the crime of idolatry, he always speaks of the external worship of false gods, and of enticing others to idolatry.¹⁷ On the contrary, when he speaks in the character of a religious

teacher, he requires an internal faith in the one true God, and inculcates in the most decided manner, supreme love, perfect confidence, and constant obedience to God and his laws.¹⁸ They therefore, who so boldly assert that Moses taught the Hebrews to believe in the existence of a God merely national and tutelar, and prescribed to them nothing more than an external worship of this God, cannot be supposed to have read his writings with very close attention.

¹ John 17: 3. ² Gen. 1: 28—30. 2: 15 ff. 3: 14 ff. 4: 9. 6: 3, 12 ff. 9: 1—18. 12: 1 ff. 15: 1 ff. 18: 17 ff. and many other places. ³ Gen. 4: 16. 6: 2 ff. ⁴ Gen. 18: 16—20. compare Gen. 17: 9—14. 12: 3. 22: 18. 28: 14. ⁵ Exod. 32: 1—35. Amos 5: 26. ⁶ Diodor. Sic. I. 94. Strabo, p. 162. Plutarch. Lycurg. V. XXIX. and Numa, IV—XVII. ⁷ Diodor. Sic. I. 94. Strabo, p. 762. ⁸ Gen. 1: 1 ff. Exod. 20: 8—12. Gen. 6: 7, 8. 14: 18—20. 17: 1. 18: 16—33. Exod. 6: 3. Gen. 12: 1—3. 15: 13—21. 18: 17 ff. 22: 17 ff. 26: 1—4. 28: 12—16. 49: 1—27. Exod. 24: 8—12. 33: 18—23. Deut. 4: 12, 15, 32—39. 6: 4—6 10: 12—20. Gen. 18: 25. Exod. 6: 3. 20: 1—11. Deut. 5: 5—15. ⁹ Exod. 19: 4—8. comp. Judg. 8: 23. 1 Sam. 8: 7. 10: 18. 12: 1. 1 Chr. 29: 23. ¹⁰ 1 Chr. 29: 15. Lev. 27: 20—38. Num. 18: 21, 22. Deut. 12: 17—19. 14: 22, 29. 26: 12—15. ¹¹ Exod. 20: 1—20. 21 etc. ¹² Deut. xxvii—xxx. ¹³ Exod. xxiv. Deut. xxvii. Hess, Geschichte Mosis, Buch III. Kap. 4. and Reich Gottes, Abschnitt VI. S. 181—214. ¹⁴ Lev. 21: 6, 8, 17. Num. 28: 2. Deut. 23: 4. Ezek. 44: 7. ¹⁵ Lev. 19: 31. 20: 6. Deut. 17: 2—6. ¹⁶ Deut. 13: 2—12. ¹⁷ Lev. 19: 31. 20: 6. Deut. 13: 2—19. 17: 2—5. ¹⁸ Deut. 6: 4—9. 16: 9—22. and other places.

X. RELATION OF THE HEBREWS TO OTHER NATIONS.

The civil polity of the Hebrews was thus altogether peculiar, and the fundamental principles of it appeared absurd to all other nations of that age. Even Cicero condemns it as a foreign superstition, unsuited to the dignity of the Roman people.¹ The Hebrews were to govern themselves by this constitution in the midst of nations who looked upon idolatry as the only rational religion; who regarded their greatness, power and prosperity, as the gifts of their gods, the magical effects of their worship. Pagan superstition was made attractive and alluring to the senses, not merely by religious pomp and ceremony, but by indecent imagery and lascivious songs, by indulgence in fornication and unnatural lust, as a part of the

worship of their gods. That the Hebrews might live uncontaminated among people so grossly superstitious, and yet highly celebrated for their wisdom, it was necessary that they should avoid all intimate friendships, and as much as possible, all intercourse with pagans. Formal prohibitions of such intercourse would be scarcely sufficient, and it could be most effectually prevented by the introduction of peculiar customs, which, though in themselves decorous and useful, were diverse from the manners of other nations. Such customs, once established, become a second nature; and as they must be relinquished by those who wish to associate with people by whom they are despised, they would remain a durable barrier against union with the heathen. The Hebrews had already witnessed a similar state of things among the Egyptians; and they had previously adopted several peculiar rites, particularly that of circumcision. These peculiarities formed the foundation upon which was built the great partition wall between them and other nations. Their ancient usages were more accurately defined by the Mosaic law, and new rites were added. Every thing was placed in strong contrast with the customs of pagans, or was designed to remind the Hebrews of their relation to Jehovah, their king. All the details of the law, which, considered without reference to circumstances, might appear arbitrary or trivial, tended to separate the people from the heathen, and to guard them against idolatry; and in this view they were of essential importance to the general purpose of preserving a knowledge of the true God.

This separation from pagans was indispensable to the accomplishment of the purpose which the Hebrews were destined to answer. But they were not to be the enemies of all foreigners, and to indulge national animosity and hatred to all nations. Individuals were forbidden to form intimate friendships with the heathen; but whenever they had any necessary transactions with them, they were required to treat them affectionately as neighbours, עֲרֵב, and to fulfil in respect to them all the common duties of philanthropy. Precepts to this effect are of frequent occurrence in the Mosaic law.² The Hebrew Government could also enter into alliances with other states, when the public good required it. Moses indeed makes an exception in regard to a few nations; but the very exception is a tacit permission to form connexions with others, when necessary. The exceptions were

I. All the Canaanitish nations ; who had become very numerous in Palestine after the time of Jacob, had taken possession of the whole country destined for the Hebrews, and had established at least thirty one small kingdoms, besides democracies and aristocracies.³ The Phenicians on the northern coasts, whose metropolis was Zidon, did not come under this exception ; for, although Canaanites, they had settled in that country long before Abraham, and they had in their possession none of the pasture grounds of the ancestors of the Hebrew nation. But the Philistines, who came from Caphtor (Cyprus) not long before the arrival of the Hebrews, and had expelled the Avim from the low country in the southern part of Palestine, and there founded five governments סְרַרְיִם, were among the excepted nations ; for although not Canaanites, but originally Egyptians from the Pelusian branch of the Nile, they had taken possession of land which belonged to the Hebrews.⁴

The Canaanites had appropriated to their own use the pastures occupied by Abraham, Isaac and Jacob, and expelled from their possessions those Hebrews, who had occasionally visited Palestine during their residence in Egypt.⁵ The Hebrews were now about to redemand their property, sword in hand. These usurpers of the Hebrew lands, wells and cisterns, were a perfidious race who paid little regard to treaties. Even in much later times, the *fides Punica*, (that is, *Phœnicia, Canaanitica*,) of Africa was infamous among the Romans, themselves no very conscientious observers of treaties.⁶ The Tyrians delivered up their Hebrew allies to the Edomites, in violation of all the laws of hospitality, and in times of peace, sold them as slaves to the Greeks ; while the Hebrews religiously observed their treaty with the Gibeonites, though it had been obtained by fraud.⁷ The morals of the Canaanites were corrupt in the extreme. Incest was common, they practised fornication and indulged unnatural lust in honour of their gods, and offered human victims upon their altars. This shocking idolatry, which was high treason in the land of Jehovah, the king of the Hebrews, had taken such deep root that it could not be eradicated. Consequently these nations could not be tolerated as allies or neighbours, nor even as subjects or slaves, by the Hebrews who were the sole depositaries of the knowledge of the true God. They might undermine the foundation of the government, frustrate the design, and destroy the prosperity of the Hebrews, if permitted to live among

them ; or at least, might expose them to great injuries, as is abundantly proved by the subsequent history in the Book of Judges. It was therefore made an inviolable law to the Hebrews, to form no alliances with those people, not to make them tributary, nor even to receive them as subjects or slaves ; but to cut off unsparingly all who fell into their hands, and in this manner to warn the others to flee from the land where Jehovah was king.⁸ The decree of extermination must be understood as implying, that the Canaanites might leave the country in peace, if they chose. Many betook themselves to flight, and embarking on board of Phenician vessels, sailed to Africa and there planted colonies. This not only appears probable from the well known fact, that the Phenicians transported many colonies to Africa ; but it receives historical confirmation from the pagan Procopius, who relates, that the Phenicians, (Canaanites) who were "expelled by Joshua, dispersed themselves over all Africa, and built a castle in a city of Numidia, which is now called Tigisis. There are still standing in that place two pillars of white marble. on which is engraved a Phenician inscription of the following import :—" *ἡμεῖς ἐσμεν οἱ φυγόντες ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἰησοῦ τοῦ ληστοῦ, υἱοῦ Ναυῆ, we are they who fled from the face of Joshua, the robber, the son of Naue.*⁹ All, or at least the greater part, might have adopted this course to save their lives and treasures ; but they seem to have preferred to try the event of a war with the Hebrews. No city except Gibeon, sought peace, and they were all subdued by arms.¹⁰ If any of these nations had remained in the country, well disposed towards the Hebrews and willing to renounce idolatry, they might undoubtedly have been spared, according to a proper construction of the law. David not only permitted the remains of the Canaanites to live, but he promoted them to high stations in his army.¹¹ Some suppose that the Hebrews were no longer obligated to expel the Canaanites ; because, not having at first fulfilled the conditions on their part, but having made some tributary and formed alliances with others, the divine promise respecting their expulsion had been recalled.¹²

II. Hereditary enmity, unceasing war and total extermination, were destined also for the Amalekites, or Canaanites of Arabia. They had too clearly manifested their hostility to the Hebrews, by an unprovoked attack upon the sick and fatigued in the rear of their march through Arabia Petrea.¹³ They probably had a secret

understanding with the Egyptian tyrants, if the *Hyksos* were Amalekites, as they probably were. They were, besides, a plundering race of Nomades, hovering about the southern borders of Palestine ; and the Hebrews could never be secure from their predatory excursions, unless they exterminated them.¹⁴ If a regular government were to be established at Algiers, it would probably be found necessary to adopt similar measures in respect to the pillaging hordes who infest that country.¹⁵

III. Against the Moabites and Ammonites, who were descendants of Lot, and consequently relatives of the Hebrews, there was no decree of exterminating war ; but all political connexion with them was prohibited. The Hebrews were never to promote the interests of these people, nor to admit them to the privileges of citizenship, even in the tenth generation. The reason of this was, that they, notwithstanding the free passage through their territories which they had granted to the Hebrews, had refused to supply them with provisions ; in conjunction with the Midianites they had called the Prophet Balaam to curse them, which, in consequence of the then prevalent opinion respecting the efficacy of a curse, must have depressed their courage and rendered them an easy prey to their enemies ; and finally, when Balaam instead of a curse repeatedly pronounced a blessing upon them, they enticed them to idolatry and fornication, that is, to high treason and rebellion against their king.¹⁶

The Hebrews were expressly forbidden to wage war against the Ammonites and Moabites.¹⁷ Not because these nations were too powerful for them ; for though the Moabites had formerly expelled the Emims, and the Ammonites, the Zamzummims, the gigantic heroes of the old world, from the region between the rivers Jordan, Arnon and Jabbok ; they were afterwards themselves driven back over the Arnon by the Amorites, and their power was much broken. They therefore entered into an alliance with some Midianitish tribes ; but notwithstanding this accession to their strength they still stood in awe of the Hebrews, and did not venture to attack them.¹⁸ Though the Hebrews, in compliance with the injunction of Moses, had never made war upon these hostile nations, they were not appeased by this clemency. In later times they commenced hostilities themselves against the Hebrews, and sometimes distressed them ; but at length they were completely subdued by David.¹⁹

The Midianites, allies of the Moabites and Ammonites, were descendants of the fourth son of Abraham and Keturah. In scripture they are often interchanged with the Ishmaelites.²⁰ Their residence was the country about the Elanitic gulf, south of the Moabites and east of the Edomites. They were Nomades, manufacturers and merchants, and had amassed great wealth. They possessed many cities and fortified places.²¹ They did not all make common cause with the Moabites against the Hebrews. Jethro, the father-in-law of Moses, who was a prince of the Midianites, always remained with his subjects, a friend to the Hebrews. There were only a few tribes who connected themselves with the Moabites, and these were exterminated by war upon the same principle that foreigners, who excite people to rebellion, are in modern times, condemned to capital punishment by the government against which the offence is committed.²² With the nation at large there was no hereditary enmity; and those tribes which had not participated in the hostilities against the Hebrews, were included among the people with whom alliances were permitted. But in later times they conducted in so hostile a manner, that with them no permanent peace could be preserved.²³

The Edomites, descendants of Esau, had expelled the Horites, (*dwellers in caves*.) from mount Seir, and had there established a powerful empire.²⁴ At the time of Moses, their eighth king was on the throne. Eleven princes were subordinate to him, so that the king was no more than the chief of twelve princes; a relick of the patriarchal form of government to which the Edomites, in common with all ancient nations, were originally subject.²⁵ This empire at the time of Moses was in very prosperous circumstances. Mention is made incidentally of eight considerable cities; also of fields, vineyards and highways in this country, as well as in the land of the Moabites.²⁶ Though they refused to listen to the repeated request of the Hebrews for a peaceable passage through the heart of their country, that they might enter Palestine on the south, and even intercepted their way by a numerous army; yet they allowed them to march undisturbed along their frontiers, on the Elanitic gulf, and supplied them with provisions for money.²⁷ War against the Edomites was therefore prohibited, and it was expressly enacted, that in the tenth generation they, as well as the Egyptians, might be admitted to citizenship. These people also on their part,

conducted peaceably towards the Hebrews, till the time of David, when they gave occasion to a war in which they were overcome.²⁸ From that time they cherished a secret hatred against the Hebrew nation.

No war was enjoined against the Amorites on the east of Jordan, for the progenitors of the Hebrews had possessed no pasture grounds in that region. These Amorites had driven back the Moabites and Ammonites over the river Arnon, founded two considerable kingdoms and built several fortified cities. But when Sihon, king of the peninsula between the Jordan, Arnon and Jabbok, of which Heshbon was the capital, not only refused the Hebrews a quiet passage through his dominions, which was all they requested, but marched out with his army as far as Jahaz and offered them battle; they attacked and defeated him, and took possession of his territories by right of conquest.²⁹ Og, the king of Bashan, whose dominions were still farther distant from the direct route of the Hebrews, conducted with a rashness even less excusable. He led his army against them to Edrei, and met with the same fate as Sihon.³⁰ All the Amorites were cut off or dispersed, and the Hebrews settled in their country.³¹

With the Edomites, Egyptians, Phenicians or Zidonians, and all other people, alliances were permitted, provided they were such as would tend to the public welfare. Thus David was suffered without reproof to become the ally of the kings of Geshur, Hamath and Tyre; Solomon, of the kings of Tyre and Egypt, and of the queen of Sheba. Even the Maccabees, those zealots for the law, did not hesitate to enter into a compact with the Romans. When the prophets speak against confederacies with the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Egyptians, they do not condemn them as direct violations of the law, but as impolitic and ruinous measures, which betrayed a want of confidence in their king Jehovah. The event always showed in the most striking manner, the propriety of their rebukes.

The league which Ahaz entered into with Tiglathpileser, king of Assyria, contrary to the admonitions of Isaiah, made him the vassal of a haughty monarch, who without affording him the least assistance, so distressed him, that all the treasures of the temple and palace, were scarcely sufficient to deliver him from this troublesome ally. The wounds which this treaty inflicted

on the kingdom of Judah, were for a long time unhealed. The devastation of the country and the tottering state of the nation in the time of Hezekiah, were consequences of that ill judged confederacy. The treaties which the kingdom of Israel purchased at an enormous expense of the Egyptians, in order to obtain chariots and cavalry, were never of any real advantage. They only fostered vain hopes, and led the kings to measures which occasioned the destruction of the kingdom. Even the league which Hezekiah made with Egypt, proved altogether useless, and but for the interposition of providence, his power would have been annihilated. The alliance of Josiah with the Babylonians gave occasion to that unfortunate conflict in the plain of Jezreel, the consequences of which brought Judah first under the Egyptian, and afterwards under the Chaldean yoke. Finally, Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, and Hosea, the last king of Israel, relying on their confederacy with Egypt, rebelled against their conquerors; and then Egypt gave up Hosea to the power of Assyria, and Zedekiah to the power of Chaldea, as Jeremiah had constantly predicted, notwithstanding the threats and bitter persecutions which he suffered from the men in power.³⁹

¹ Cicero pro Flacco. 28. ² Exod. 22: 20. 23: 9. Lev. 19: 34. Deut 10: 18, 19. 24: 17. 27: 19, compare Jer. 22: 3. Zach. 7: 10. ³ Josh. 9: 3, 11. 12: 8—24. ⁴ Deut. 2: 23, compare Exod. 13: 17. 15: 14. Jer. 47: 4. Amos 9: 7. Josh. 13: 1—3. Judg. 1: 18. 3: 3. ⁵ 1 Chr. 7: 20—29. ⁶ Diodor. Sic. XXVI. 27. ⁷ Amos. 1: 9. Joel 3: 5, 6. ⁸ Exod. 23: 32, 33. 34: 12—16. Deut. 7: 1—11. 20: 16—18. ⁹ Procopius de Vand. Lib. II. compare Bochart, Canaan, Lib. I. Cap. 24. p. 520. ¹⁰ Josh. 11: 19. ¹¹ 2 Sam. 23: 39. ¹² Judg. 2: 1—3, 20—23. ¹³ Exod. 17: 8—14. Deut. 25: 17. 14 Judg. 3: 12, 13. 6: 3—5. 1 Sam. 14: 28. 15: 1 ff. 27: 8, 9. 30: 1 ff. 1 Chr. 5: 42, 43. ¹⁴ 2 Sam. 8: 12. ¹⁵ Peiret, Travels in Barbary, Vol. I. p. 68. ¹⁶ Deut. 2: 9—19. 23: 7. 2: 29. 23: 4. 22: 2. 25: 15. 23: 3—8. compare 2: 9—19, 37. ¹⁷ Deut. 2: 9—19. ¹⁸ Num. 21: 26—30. 22: 4 ff. Deut. 2: 19—21 compare Judg. 11: 16. 13: 25. ¹⁹ Judg. 3: 12—30 1 Sam. 14: 47. 2 Sam. 8: 2 ff. 10: 1 ff. 12: 26 ff. ²⁰ Gen. 25: 2—4. 36: 35. 37: 28. 1 Chr. 1: 33. Gen. 37: 25—28. Judg. 8: 24. Isa. 60: 6, 7. ²¹ Num. 31: 9, 10, 32—36. Isa. 60: 6. Hab. 3: 7. Judg. 8: 24—26. ²² Num. 25: 16, 17. 31: 1—24. ²³ Judg. VI—VIII. ²⁴ Deut. 2: 12, 22. ²⁵ Gen. 17: 20. 36: 31—43. ²⁶ Gen. 36: 31—39. Num. 20: 17, 21, 22. ²⁷ Num. 20: 14—21. Deut. 2: 4, 22, 29. ²⁸ 2 Sam. 8: 13, 14 compare Gen. 27: 29, 40. ²⁹ Num. 21: 21—31. Deut. 2: 24—37. ³⁰ Num. 21: 33—35. Deut. 1: 4. 3: 1—12 ³¹ Num. xxxii. Deut. 3: 12—18. Judg. 11: 13—23. ³² Isa.

vii. 2 Chr. 28: 20, 21. Isa. xxxvi—xxxviii. 2 Kings xviii—xx. Hos. 7: 11. 12: 1 ff. Isa. 30: 2—12. 31: 1—3. 2 Kings 17: 4 ff. 18: 20, 21. 23: 29 ff. Jer. 37: 5—10.

XI. HEBREW MAGISTRATES.

Having thus exhibited the foreign relations of the Hebrews, which were regulated by the fundamental law of the state, we shall now turn our attention to their domestic polity. This remained much as it had been under the patriarchal government, but reorganized in such a manner, that the people in every civil institution, might recognise the sovereignty of Jehovah their king. The Hebrews were still divided into twelve tribes, as before. The tribe of Levi was separated from the rest, and devoted to the service of the court and state; but the tribe of Joseph, (whose two sons, Ephraim and Manasseh, were adopted by Jacob,¹) was subdivided into two, and received two portions in the allotment of the promised land; so that the number of twelve tribes continued the same. The ancient subdivisions of the several tribes into collections of families, remained unchanged. The princes of tribes and heads of families, as chiefs of these divisions, were the natural representatives of the people, and the magistrates in the realm of Jehovah. At the time of Moses the larger collections of families were fifty nine in number,² the heads of which, together with the twelve princes of the tribes, composed a council of seventy one members. But it is evident that the number of subordinate divisions of the tribes, and consequently the number of heads of families, was much greater than this; for there were no less than two hundred and fifty chiefs of this rank who attached themselves to Korah, Dathan and Abiram, in the disturbance which they raised.³ It is not certain whether the office of these magistrates was hereditary or elective. It is probable that the heads of families were chosen by the fathers of individual families, and the princes of tribes, by the heads of families. At least this must have been the case, whenever one of these chiefs died without sons, or with such only as were under age.

The *Shoterim*, (*genealogists, officers,*) are also mentioned in connexion with the elders, שְׂרָפִים, i. e. the princes of tribes and heads of families.⁴ They therefore must have been elevated to the dignity of representatives and magistrates of the people. The peculiar na-

ture of their office may be understood from the employments in which they were engaged. In Egypt, during the oppressions of Pharaoh, it was their business to see that every Hebrew delivered the requisite number of bricks; they afterwards gave their discharge to those soldiers who were legally exempt from military duty; under Joshua they communicated the orders of the general to the soldiery; and in the time of the kings, the chief Shoter, שׁוֹטֵר, had a certain superintendence over the whole army, although he was not a military commander.⁵ They must therefore have possessed an accurate catalogue of the Hebrews, with an account of the age, ability and domestic circumstances of each individual; and it has been remarked already that they kept the genealogical tables. This business at first might have belonged to the princes of tribes, and in time, to the heads of families, who afterwards committed it to their private secretaries; and they, having gradually acquired more and more importance by the possession of an office esteemed so honourable among the Hebrews, were at last able to raise themselves to the dignity of magistrates and representatives of the people. They were chosen from the most respectable citizens, who were well acquainted with the art of writing, and who had the reputation of being men of strict integrity. In Palestine they were distributed into every city, and performed the duties of their office for the city and its surrounding district. They were under the general superintendence of a *chief genealogist*, or שׁוֹטֵר. The chief genealogist or Shoter must be distinguished from the officer denominated שׁוֹטֵר, who was the military officer that kept the muster-rolls. But as the etymology of both these names indicates a *writer*, they are sometimes interchanged.⁶

To these magistrates Moses added a new class, for the administration of justice; and that this institution, useful as it was, might be distinguished from those which were given by divine command, he candidly acknowledges that he was indebted for it to the advice of his father-in-law, Jethro. When the people brought all their controversies before Moses, a whole day was scarcely sufficient to give them a hearing. Accordingly Moses, to facilitate the administration of justice, by the advice of Jethro divided the people into *tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands*; and over each of these divisions he placed judges who were recommended to him by the choice of the people, as wise, prudent, honest and pious men. They were

selected for the most part from the heads of families, genealogists, or other people of rank.⁷ There were about sixty thousand judges of tens, twelve thousand judges of fifties, six thousand judges of hundreds, and six hundred judges of thousands. This institution was willingly received by the Hebrews, for they had witnessed the regular administration of justice in Egypt, and had learned the advantages of it. There was undoubtedly such a subordination among these judges, that the cases which the judges of tens found too difficult to decide, they referred to the judges of fifties; and in like manner the judges of fifties, to the judges of hundreds, and these last, to the judges of thousands. Very intricate controversies which the judges of thousands did not feel themselves competent to decide, they brought before Moses himself.⁸ After his death, the most important and difficult controversies were brought before the chief magistrate of the nation; or if there was no such magistrate, the high priest, who was the prime minister of the invisible king, decided causes of this kind, after consultation with the wisest and most learned of the priests.⁹ As this institution was designed to be perpetual, when judges died or went out of office, their places were supplied by new elections. After the people were settled in Palestine, as they could not dwell together in companies of ten, fifty, one hundred, and one thousand, judges, as well as genealogists, for each city and its surrounding district, were stationed in the several cities. Both offices were very frequently, if not generally held by the same person. This is evident from the manner in which they are connected with each other in the Bible; and sometimes indeed the *judges*, שֹׁפְטִים, as chiefs of tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands, are expressly denominated שֹׁפְטֵי הָאֵלֶּיךָ, *genealogists*.¹⁰ These judges, Moses included among the rulers, and Joshua summoned them to the general assemblies; and they are mentioned in one instance before the genealogists.¹¹ Unless then all the judges were at the same time heads of families or genealogists, they must, (at least, those over hundreds and thousands,) have been considered as rulers in the state, and as entitled to a seat in the legislative assemblies.

There were therefore, in every tribe, *judges, genealogists, heads of families, and a prince*. Each of these classes of magistrates had its own peculiar circle of duties. The judges administered justice. The genealogists kept the genealogical tables, in which they occasionally

noted the most remarkable occurrences of their times. The historical notices contained in the first Book of Chronicles, and which are not found in the books of Moses, were probably derived from these tables.¹² The heads of families, with the prince of the tribe, had charge of the general concerns of each tribe, and to them the judges and genealogists were in some sense, subordinate. In Palestine these magistrates were distributed among the several cities, and those who resided in the same city, composed the legislative assembly of that city and the surrounding district. When the magistrates of all the cities of any one tribe were collected, they formed the supreme court, or legislative assembly of the tribe. In like manner the magistrates of several different tribes might assemble in one body, and legislate conjointly for all those tribes which they represented. When the magistrates of all the tribes met together, they formed the general legislature of the whole nation.¹³ Though there was no pecuniary emolument attached to these offices, they conferred great dignity and authority upon those who held them.

¹ Gen. 48: 5. ² Num. 26: 5—50. ³ Num. 4: 16. ⁴ Num. 11: 16.
Deut. 16: 18. 20: 5—9. 29: 10. 31: 28. Josh. 8: 33. ⁵ Exod. 5: 10 ff.
Deut. 20: 5—9. Josh. 1: 10. 2 Chr. 26: 11. ⁶ Deut. 16: 18. 31: 28. 2
Sam. 8: 16. 20: 25. 2 Chr. 26: 11. 2 Kings 25: 19. Isa. 33: 18. Jer. 52: 25.
1 Chr. 24: 6. ⁷ Exod. 18: 13—26. Deut. 1: 12—15. compare Exod. 18: 21.
24. ⁸ Exod. 18: 22. Deut. 1: 17. ⁹ Deut. 19: 17. 2: 5. ¹⁰ Deut.
16: 18. 31: 28. 1 Chr. 23: 4. 26: 20. Deut. 1: 15, 16. ¹¹ Deut. 31: 28.
Josh. 8: 33. 23: 2. 24: 1. ¹² 1 Chr. 4: 21—23, 39—45. 5: 10, 19—22. 7:
20—24. ¹³ Deut. 25: 1—8. 19: 12. 22: 15. 25: 7, 9. Judg. 8: 14. 1 Sam.
16: 4. Judg. 20: 12—14. 1: 1—11.

XII. THE LEARNED CLASS.

The Hebrews had long acknowledged as Magistrates, the *Princes of Tribes, Heads of Houses,* and *Genealogists*; and they admitted without difficulty the institution of Judges, since their office was neither lucrative nor hereditary. When the invisible king afterwards secured forever to the tribe of Levi the most important offices of the court, state and church, and conferring upon the Levites great and peculiar privileges, put them in the place of the first born, to whom the priestly office had till then appertained; even this regulation was at first submitted to without opposition.¹ It was scarcely to be expected that disquiets would ever have arisen on

this account, as the Hebrews had witnessed in Egypt a similar institution which was productive of great public benefit. The Egyptian priests were a separate tribe, which was divided into three subordinate classes; and they performed, not only the services of religion, but the duties of all the civil offices to which learning was necessary. They therefore devoted themselves in a peculiar manner to the cultivation of the sciences. This *learned nobility*, (so to speak,) was strictly hereditary, and no one from another tribe could be received among its members. They studied natural philosophy, natural history, medicine, mathematics, (particularly astronomy and geometry,) history, civil polity, and jurisprudence. They were practising physicians, inspectors of weights and measures, surveyors of land, astronomical calculators, keepers of the archives, historians, receivers of the customs, judges, and counsellors of the king, who was himself a member of their tribe. In short, they, like Ragucl the priest of Midian, and Melchizedek the priest and king of Salem,² formed, guided and ruled the people by establishing civil regulations, performing sacred services, and imparting religious instruction. They were liberally rewarded for the discharge of these important duties. They not only possessed large estates in land, which, if we may credit Diodorus Siculus,³ occupied a third part of all Egypt; but they also received from their king a stated salary for their services as civil officers.⁴ However suspicious such an order may appear to many at the present day, it was admirably adapted to those times, and by means of it, Egypt was raised far above all the nations of antiquity, both in regard to her civil institutions and her advancement in the sciences. Hence even the Greeks in ancient times, were accustomed to borrow their politics and their learning from the Egyptians. If now an institution, in many respects so useful, could be imitated by the Hebrews in such a manner as to retain its advantages and avoid its disadvantages, as far as possible, it was evidently the wisest measure which that people could adopt.

In this manner the tribe of Levi, which had greatly distinguished itself by zeal for Jehovah,⁵ the invisible king, was actually devoted to the service of the sacred tabernacle and the altar, (that is, in a political view, to be the courtiers of king Jehovah,) to all those offices of state in which learning was requisite, and thus to the cultivation of learning itself.⁶ The *Princes of tribes* and *Heads of houses* however, still retained their ancient honours, and the mem-

bers of other tribes were permitted to hold civil offices and to apply themselves to the sciences. Thus on the one hand the advantages of this institution were secured, and the educated parent was able to instruct his sons in the sciences and prepare them for public stations; while on the other hand its disadvantages were avoided, and learning did not, as in Egypt, become the mystery of the learned order, nor was civil government transformed into a domination of priests. What fruits might not such a plant have borne, if the priests and Levites had faithfully accomplished the purposes of their appointment! Moses can never be accused of introducing regulations which tended to keep the people in ignorance; for no one of whatever tribe, who had a capacity, leisure and desire to apply to any study, was forbidden to devote himself to the sciences; and besides this, more than a fiftieth part of the whole nation was expressly destined to promote literary improvement.

In order to answer their destination, the Levites more than other Hebrews, were to study the book of the law; to preserve and disseminate it in exact copies; to perform the duties of judges and genealogists, and consequently to be theologians, jurists and historians. Accordingly when David reorganized the Levites, he designated six thousand for these offices; Jehoshaphat composed the supreme tribunal of his kingdom equally of *Priests, Levites, and Heads of houses*, and under Josiah the Levites are again mentioned as secretaries and genealogists.⁷ As the priests and Levites were to test the accuracy of measures and weights, of which there were several models preserved in the sanctuary, it was necessary that they should understand something of mathematics; and as they were to determine and announce the moveable feasts, new moons, years, and intercalary years, they had occasion for the study of astronomy.⁸ The priests were to instruct the people in religion and the law, and to solve questions which might arise upon these subjects.⁹ According to the spirit of the institution, the Levites also were instructors of the people, which office they in reality executed when they publicly sung psalms according to the arrangement of David, and to which they were expressly appointed by Jehoshaphat.¹⁰ It was also undoubtedly a part of their duty to read the law to the assembled Hebrews every seventh year; for in such a multitude of people many readers would be required, and the number of priests, at least in early times, was very small.¹¹ As the

priests by their exhortations were to inspire the soldiers with courage when about to engage in battle, they probably gave some attention to the cultivation of eloquence; and as they were to perform the duty of police physicians, it was necessary that they should know something of the art of medicine.¹³ It was the duty of the High Priest, as head of the learned class and minister of state to king Jehovah, to superintend all other persons in office. When there was no chief magistrate of the community, he also with the advice of the inferior priests, decided the most difficult legal controversies, and managed all the affairs of state, foreign and domestic. In important and doubtful cases he, at the request of the principal rulers or of the chief magistrate, consulted the invisible king by Urim and Thummim.¹³ But in all these employments the priests and Levites equally with the other Hebrews, were strictly prohibited the use of magic oracles, necromancy, astrology, omens, soothsaying from the entrails of sacrifices or the movement of clouds, and all those artifices,¹⁴ which, among the Egyptians and other ancient nations, were the usual means of managing the populace. Thus the Hebrew priests, who are so little esteemed by many at the present day, were the only priests of antiquity who were not allowed to impose upon the credulity of the multitude.

The Hebrew priests and Levites were therefore even more important and useful in church and state, than the three orders of Egyptian priests. Still they obtained of all the promised land only forty eight cities with small suburbs for their cattle; neither had they, like the Egyptian priests, real estate or a definite salary for their services. But it was requisite that they should be liberally provided for in some other way, lest being compelled to engage in business for their own subsistence, they should neglect the cultivation of learning, grow up in ignorance and fail to discharge the duties of their office; or by the pressure of want, should be tempted to dishonesty, injustice, and extortion. This was so much the more necessary because it was important that they, as the officers of king Jehovah, should make some show of grandeur, or be despised by the common people, who can be moved by nothing but external splendor. Accordingly Jehovah assigned for their maintenance the tithes, which the Hebrews were bound to offer him as rent for the land which he had granted them.¹⁵ Abraham had before given a tithe of all his spoils to Melchizedek, priest of the

Most High; many other nations afforded a like tribute to their gods, and it was only half what the Egyptians paid to their king.¹⁶ In addition to this, Moses assigned to the priests alone the firstlings of animals and the first fruits of the soil, which amounted to about the sixtieth part of the annual income of a Hebrew; the ransom of the first-born male; the trespass-offerings; most of the sin-offerings; the skins of the burnt-offerings and sin-offerings; that which was devoted; the breast and shoulder of every peace-offering; a shoulder, both cheeks and maw of all the sacrificed animals. This is what is meant, by the expression, *the portion of the priests and Levites is Jehovah*, that is, *what is offered to Jehovah*.¹⁷

Had Morgan taken into view the important services which this learned class rendered to the Hebrew state, and the necessity of a rich provision for such officers, he would have applauded rather than censured Moses for his assignment of the tithes of more than six hundred thousand Hebrews, to about twelve thousand adult Levites. This made the income of a Levite about five times the income of an ordinary Hebrew, but the tythes did not amount to any thing like those enormous sums at which Morgan has arrived by his erroneous calculations. The priests, who besides the perquisites above mentioned, received from the Levites a tenth of the tythes,¹⁸ were indeed liberally endowed; but they bore the expense of the daily sacrifices, and of those, which were offered at particular festivals. It must also be taken into the account, that the whole tribe of Levi received only forty eight cities of the promised land, and consequently the portions of the other tribes were much greater than they would otherwise have been. Moreover, the tithes, especially at certain periods, were not regularly paid, and sometimes they were almost entirely withheld.¹⁹ When the kingdom was divided after the death of Solomon, the priests and Levites, who all attached themselves to the kingdom of Judah, received the revenues of only two tribes. It must not be forgotten that this bountiful provision for the priests and Levites was nothing peculiar; but it was the usual, and not at all oppressive tax, which the Hebrews paid to their king, and which he himself devoted to the support of his officers.²⁰ An abundant revenue it certainly was, but one that was necessary for the performance of the duties which devolved upon this order; and after all, it fell far short of that which the Egyptians awarded to their priests. Had Moses designed merely

to enrich and exalt his own tribe, he would have had a more particular regard for his own family and confined the priesthood to that ; or at least he would have provided for his descendants so much property, that it would scarcely be necessary for one of them soon after, to withdraw from his native city for want of subsistence.²¹ Korah of the tribe of Levi, and Dathan and Abiram of the tribe of Reuben, (whom Jacob had deprived of the rights of primogeniture and of the priesthood,²²) with two hundred and fifty more of the principal rulers, endeavoured to usurp the priestly office ; but their insurrection only gave occasion for an unexpected and lasting memorial of the will of Jehovah their king.²³ If priests so well provided for, ever exacted more than their due, (of which however there is but one example known,²⁴) no blame on this account can be attached to the institutions of Moses. It should rather be recollected, that there never yet has been on earth an order of men, every individual of which was perfectly free from crime.²⁵

¹ Ex. 13: 12, 13 comp. Num. 3: 6—13. 8: 13—20. Deut. 10: 8, 9. 33: 8—11. Ex. 32: 29. ² Gen. 14: 18. Ex. 3: 16. ³ Diodor. Sic. I. 63. ⁴ Gen. 47: 22. Strabo, p. 737. ⁵ Ex. 32: 26—29. ⁶ Num. 13: 2—7. ⁷ 1 Chr. 23: 4. 26: 29. 2 Chr. 19: 8. 34: 13. ⁸ Deut. 10: 10. 28: 11. Lev. 25: 8—12. ⁹ Deut. 17: 9. Malachi 2: 4—7. ¹⁰ 1 Chr. 23: 5. 2 Chr. 17: 7—9. ¹¹ Deut. 31: 11, 12. ¹² Deut. 20: 2. Lev. XIII. XIV. 13 Deut. 17: 9, 12. Ex. 28: 30. Num. 27: 21. 1 Sam. 23: 10—12. 30: 6—8. 14 Deut. 18: 9—14. ¹⁵ Lev. 27: 20—23. 30: 32. Num. 18: 21 ff. Deut. 14: 23. ¹⁶ Gen. 14: 20. 47: 13—26. Diodor. Sic. IV. 21. X. 62. XIV. 93. 17 Lev. 2: 12. Num. 15: 18—21. 18: 8—21. Deut. 18: 1—8. Ex. 34: 20. Num. 18: 15, 16. Lev. 6: 10. 26: 29. Num. 18: 9. Lev. 7: 8. Num. 18: 14. Deut. 18: 3, 4. Num. 18: 20, 21. ¹⁸ Num. 18: 25—31. ¹⁹ Malachi 3: 10. Nehem. 13: 10. ²⁰ Num. 18: 8—24. ²¹ Judg. 17: 7—13. ²² Gen. 49: 4. ²³ Num. 16: 17. ²⁴ 1 Sam. 2: 13 ff. ²⁵ Lowman, Government of the Israelites, p. 195. 205—228.

XIII. RELATION OF THE TRIBES TO EACH OTHER.

As each tribe had its own magistrates and representatives, and administered its own affairs, each composed an entire political community in some respects independent of the other tribes. We often find single tribes conducting like independent nations, and as might be expected, sometimes justly and sometimes unjustly. Thus the tribe of Benjamin undertook the protection of the licentious cri-

minals of Gibeah, and sustained a war against all the other tribes. The tribe of Judah alone chose David for its king. It is imputed as a fault to several individual tribes, that they did not, each on their own account, prosecute the war against the weakened Canaanites, but made some of them tributary and formed alliances with others.¹ Hence it is evident that the Hebrew constitution authorized each tribe to provide for its own interests; or if the strength of any one of them was insufficient for this purpose, to unite with some of the other tribes and make common cause with them. We frequently find several tribes thus acting in concert. Judah and Simeon were united in their war against the Canaanites; as were also Ephraim and Manasseh. The tribes of Zebulon and Naphtali united with Barak to oppose the army of Jabin; Manasseh, Asher, Zebulon and Naphtali chose Gideon for their leader against the Midianites. The tribes east of the Jordan made choice of Jephthah for their general to carry on a war against the Ammonites. In later times and during the reign of Saul, the same tribes made war upon the Arabs of Hejr (Hagarites,) the Ituraeans (Jetur,) the Nodabites, and Naphishites. After the death of Saul, eleven tribes remained faithful in their allegiance to his family, and seven years intervened before they submitted to David. After the death of Solomon, ten tribes revolted from the house of David, and elected Jeroboam for their king. In short any tribe, or any number of the tribes united, exercised the power of convening legislative assemblies, passing resolves, waging wars, making treaties, and electing for themselves chiefs, generals, regents and kings.²

But though each of the twelve tribes was in some respects an independent state, and as such had its separate interests; still they were all united together by certain general interests, and formed but one nation. They were all descended from one ancestor, from whom they had inherited divine promises, which had already in part been fulfilled. This common bond of union which embraced all the tribes, was strengthened and drawn more closely by the necessity of mutual aid against their common enemies. Jehovah was the God and king of the whole nation, and the sacred tabernacle, which was his temple and palace, was common to all the tribes. They had one common oracle, the Urim and Thummim; one common high priest, the prime minister of the king; a common learned class who possessed cities in all the tribes; a common law of

church and state. In short, the constitution was so contrived, that notwithstanding the independence of all the tribes, each had a sort of superintendence over the rest, in regard to their observance of the law. Any of the tribes could be called to account by the others for a transgression of the law; and if they refused to give satisfaction, they might be attacked and punished by war.³

It is possible, as Michaelis has justly remarked, that a political community thus constituted, may exist without any proper sovereign power, to which the last appeal must be made; but there will probably be a want of promptness and energy in its movements. It may be quiet, prosperous and happy; or fall into anarchy, confusion and wretchedness, according to the conduct of its members. Many examples of both these conditions of the Hebrew state are found in the Book of Judges.

In a community composed of states so nearly independent, jealousies would naturally arise between the more powerful tribes, which might terminate in the dismembering of the commonwealth. Such jealousies and rivalry actually existed between the tribes of Judah and Joseph, the two most powerful in the Hebrew nation. The latter inherited a double portion, and was divided into two, Ephraim and Manasseh. They valued themselves upon their descent from such an ancestor as Joseph, who had been so honourably distinguished from his brethren in the blessings pronounced by Jacob and Moses. The tribe of Judah had the right of primogeniture, they had received the most splendid promises, and the expected Messiah was to spring from them. These two tribes were perpetually struggling for the preponderance, and at last, after the death of Solomon, the descendants of Joseph having brought over to their party eight of the other tribes, forcibly separated themselves from Judah. These jealousies and dissensions were the first causes of the weakening of all the tribes, and of the final destruction of the whole commonwealth.⁴

¹ Judg. xix. xx. 1: 21, 27—35. 2 Sam. 2: 4. ² Judg. 1: 1—3, 22. 7: 23, 24. 8: 1—3. 11: 1—11. 1 Chr. 5: 10, 18, 19. 2 Sam. 3: 17. 1 Kings 12: 1—24. ³ Josh. 22: 9—34. Judg. xx. ⁴ Gen. 49: 8—12, 22—26. Deut. 33: 7, 13—17. Verchuir, Dissert. Philol. Exeg. Leovardiae et Franekeræ 1773. IV. p. 66—84. de Aemulatione Israelitorum mutua tanquam vera causa sciæ ac debilitatæ Judæorum Reipublicæ. Michaelis, Mos. Recht. Th. I. 47. Alt. Or. Bibliothek, Th. VI. S. 50. ff.

XIV. LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLIES.

As the twelve tribes had many interests in common, and in some respects, formed but one political body; the magistrates of all the tribes met in general assemblies to consult for the general good of the nation. These general assemblies were convened by the chief magistrate of the commonwealth, by the commander of the army, or by the regent; and when the nation had no such supreme head, by the high priest in his capacity of prime minister to the invisible king. The great assembly mentioned in the twentieth chapter of Judges, was undoubtedly convoked by the high priest Phinhas, who was so zealous for the honour of Jehovah.¹

The place of assembling was usually before the door of the holy tabernacle, the palace of the invisible king; or on some spot which had acquired a degree of sacredness from its having been the theatre of some great event. While the Hebrews dwelt together in their encampments in Arabia, the assemblies were summoned together by the sound of the sacred trumpets; but after they were settled in Palestine, heralds must have been employed for this purpose.²

The legislative assemblies were of two kinds. The sound of one trumpet was the signal for the convoking of a select assembly, composed of the princes of the tribes, and the heads of thousands, or associated families. The sound of two trumpets was the signal for collecting the whole congregation, בְּלִ-הֶעֱדָה, including the genealogists, judges, and (at least upon very important occasions,) as many of the common people as chose to attend. In speaking of these assemblies, *the rulers of the congregation* are sometimes mentioned first, then *the children of Israel*; and in some cases the women and children are referred to as being present.³

The legislative assemblies received different denominations, according to the classes of persons of whom they were composed. When the whole people, בְּלִ-הֶעֱדָה, were collected, they formed what was styled, סוּד, or בְּלִ-הֶעֱדָה, *the whole assembly or congregation*. There were also נְשִׂאֵי הָעֵדָה, *the princes of the assembly*; קְרִיאֵי הָעֵדָה, or קְרִיאֵי מוֹעֵד, *those called to the assembly*; שְׂפָרְדֵי הָעֵדָה, *those deputed to the assembly*; and זִקְנֵי הָעֵדָה, *the elders of the assembly, or Senators*.⁴

It was to these assemblies that Moses immediately addressed himself, and to them he delivered the precepts which he received from Jehovah. He could not have held direct communication with the whole body of people, unless his voice had been strong enough to be heard by a multitude of more than six hundred thousand men, exclusive of women, children and aged persons.⁵ The magistrates, particularly the genealogists, then communicated to the people the precepts and orders of Moses, each one informing those families which were under his immediate direction. In like manner the commands of the general and the resolves of the assemblies, were made known to the people, who were sometimes already assembled, waiting to receive these communications; or if not, they were called together by the proper officers.

The legislative assemblies exercised all the rights of sovereignty. They declared war, made peace, formed alliances, chose generals, chief judges or regents, and kings. They prescribed to the rulers whom they elected, the principles by which they were to govern; they tendered to them the oath of office, and rendered them homage.⁶

There is no evidence that the magistrates received any instructions from the people, respecting the measures to be adopted in the legislative assemblies. Such a proceeding would have been contrary to the spirit of the patriarchal government, which was to a considerable extent, preserved in the Mosaic institutions. The assemblies acted independently. On very important occasions however, of great public interest, they sometimes submitted their resolves to the people for their approbation; as was the case when Saul was raised to the throne. Moses permitted the people to elect their own judges; and it appears that Jehovah was made king of the Hebrews, by the voluntary choice of the whole nation. At least, all swore fealty to him, without the exception of even the women and children.⁷

The people were attached to their magistrates, and generally accepted what they proposed, and rejected what they disapproved. Hence the revolt of the two hundred and fifty rulers, who were leagued with Korah, Dathan and Abiram, and who must have had numerous adherents among the people, was sufficiently dangerous to require a supernatural punishment. There were times, however, when the people raised their voices so loudly against the measures

adopted by the magistrates, that they were compelled to abandon them. Even in the times of monarchy, the people refused the honours of a regal burial to those kings who had incurred their displeasure, and elevated to the throne the prince with whom they were most pleased, without regard to the order of succession.⁸

¹ Num. 10: 2—4. Josh. 23: 2. 24: 1. 1 Sam. 11: 14, 15. Judg. 20: 27, 28.
² Num. 10: 3. Judg. 20: 1, 27, 28. 1 Sam. 10: 17. Josh. 24: 1. 1 Sam. 11: 14, 15. 1 Kings 12: 1. Num. 10: 2—4. ³ Exod. 34: 31—32. Deut. 29: 9—11. Judg. xx. ⁴ Exod. 19: 7. 24: 3—8. 34: 31, 32. 35: 1—4. Lev. 4: 13. 8: 3—5. 9: 5. Num. 11: 25, 30. 16: 2. ⁵ Exod. 19: 7. 24: 3—8. 34: 31, 32. 35: 1, 4. Num. 11: 25, 30. ⁶ Exod. 19: 7. 24: 3—8. Josh. 9: 15—21. Judg. 20: 1, 11—14, 18, 28. 21: 13 ff. 1 Sam. 10: 24. 11: 14. 2 Sam. 3: 17—19. 5: 1—3. 1 Kings. XII. ⁷ 1 Sam. 11: 14, 15, compare Josh. 23: 2 ff. 24: 1 ff. Exod. 19: 7, 8. 24: 3—8 compare Deut. 29: 9—14. ⁸ Num. xvi. Josh. 9: 18, 19. 2 Chr. 28: 1, 2. 1 Kings 21: 24. 23: 30, compare 2 Chr. 23: 25. 36: 1.

XV. FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

God condescended to be elected king of the Hebrews, to give them a code of civil laws; to decide their more important litigations; and to solve inquiries which they proposed. The obstinate and disobedient Hebrews he punished as rebellious subjects of his government.¹ According to his promise, he sent them prophets, by whom he made known the measures which the civil rulers were to adopt; and he led the nation on to the accomplishment of their great design, (the preservation of the true religion,) by a particular providence, such as no other people had ever been the subjects of. God thus reigning as king of the Hebrews, their *form of government* was in fact a *Theocracy*. This species of government was altogether suited to the character and necessities of those remote ages, when the political constitutions of all nations were so connected with the tutelary gods of those nations and with the national systems of religion, as to be, at least in appearance, theocratical. But the theocracies of the pagans can bear no comparison with the theocracy of the Hebrews. Those were impostures, this was a reality. In pagan theocracies, religion was employed merely as a means of strengthening and perpetuating the civil constitution; in the Hebrew theocracy on the contrary, the preservation of religion was the *end*, the civil constitution, the *means* of attaining it.

But though the constitution of the Hebrews was in reality theocratical, yet it was neither expedient nor proper that their political affairs should all be directed by the immediate interposition of God; and it was necessary that their polity should partake more or less of the usual forms of human governments. In the East at the present day, all governments are despotic or patriarchal. This is so universally true, that the orientalist, as all travellers testify, can scarcely form an idea of a different form of government. The same appears to have been the case in the time of the Maccabees.² In the most remote antiquity however, aristocracies and democracies were well known. The inhabitants of Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjathearim, had neither king nor prince. The national council and the people, commissioned ambassadors and concluded alliances. The Philistines were governed by five princes. The Phenicians were not at all times under regal government, and when monarchy existed, the power of the king was very much limited. The Carthaginians, who emigrated from Phenicia, and probably formed their government on the model of that of the mother country, from the first introduced an aristocracy, in many respects similar to the old Venetian oligarchy.³ If the story of Herodotus (III. 80, 81.) be true, the great Persian monarchy after the death of the impostor Smerdis, came very near being transformed to a democracy.

It is still true however, that monarchy in ancient times was the most usual form of government among the orientals. There were many subordinate and dependant kings. That the sovereignty of Jehovah over the Hebrews might be the more visible, he employed no viceroy; but he had a *minister of state* (so to speak) in the person of the high priest. The Hebrew magistrates, who were very jealous of their prerogatives, managed the political concerns of the nation; and their powers were so extensive, that Josephus chooses to denominate the government an aristocracy. Moses laid all the precepts and orders which he received from Jehovah, before the magistrates, acknowledged their authority in the strongest terms, and submitted their demands to the decision of Jehovah.⁴

But the magistrates could neither enact laws on their own authority, nor levy taxes. The people possessed so much influence, that it was necessary in all important cases to have their approba-

tion ; and when they were not consulted, they often remonstrated so loudly as to force the magistrates to listen to them. They also sometimes proposed laws to be adopted by their legislatures ; and they had power sufficient to rescue Jonathan, when his life was endangered in consequence of the hasty vow of their first monarch. It is evident, therefore, that the aristocracy was greatly modified and limited by the intermingling of democracy. On this account Lowman and Michaelis are inclined to denominate the Mosaic constitution a democracy.⁵

¹ Num 17: 1—11. 27: 1—11. 36: 1—10. 15: 32—41. Josh. 7: 16—22. Judg. 1: 1, 2. 20: 18, 27, 28. 1 Sam. 14: 37. 23: 9—12. 30: 8. 2 Sam. 2: 1. Num. 11: 33—35. 12: 1—15. 16: 1—50. Deut. 18: 18. ² 1 Macc. 8: 14—16. ³ Josh. 9: 11. 13: 3. Judg. 3: 3. 1 Sam. 6: 4. Heeren, Ideen über die Politik, den Verkehr, und den Handel u. s. w. Th. I. S. 194. ⁴ Num. xvi. 14: 5. 16: 4 ff. 27: 5. 36: 5, 6. ⁵ Exod. 19: 7, 8. 24: 3—8 compare Deut. 29: 9—14. Josh. 9: 18, 19. 23: 1 ff. 24: 2 ff. 1 Sam. 10: 24. 11: 14, 15. Num. 27: 1—8. 36: 1—9. 1 Sam. 14: 24. Lowman, Civil Government of the Israelites, p. 238—273. Michaelis, Mos. Recht. Th. I. S. 258.

XVI. THE CHIEF MAGISTRATE.

The invisible king Jehovah was in reality the only chief magistrate of the Hebrew state. The sacred tabernacle was his palace, and by it the people were made sensible of his presence. It is true that Moses was magistrate for the whole nation, but he held his office merely as an internuncio between God and the Hebrews for the purpose of delivering them from the power of Egypt ; of giving to them the law ; and of leading them through the wilderness to the promised land. God gave him a special commission for the transaction of this business, and as soon as the commission was executed, the office expired. Accordingly there was no successor appointed ; for Moses had, during his life, accomplished all the purposes for which his office was instituted.

At first, Moses ruled the whole state with the assistance of the ordinary magistrates only. But as the people, and even the magistrates themselves, were very jealous and suspicious, unmanageable and stubborn, and constantly inclined to rebellion, it was very difficult, and almost impossible, for this messenger of God to perform all the duties of his office without more efficacious aid. While en-

camped in the Arabian desert, a general discontent which threatened a dangerous revolt, broke out among the people on account of the want of flesh. On this occasion, Moses at the command of God, instituted a council of state consisting of seventy two Hebrews, distinguished for wisdom and possessing the confidence of the people, who were to assist him in bearing the burdens of the government, and in directing the affairs of the nation. They were selected from among the princes, the heads of associated families, and the genealogists. To prevent all jealousy between the tribes, six were chosen from each.¹

This council, having been appointed for the express purpose of aiding Moses in the discharge of the arduous duties of his peculiar office, no longer had an existence after his death. In the history of the succeeding periods, there is not the slightest mention of such a council; not even in those times when it must have acted a most important part, had it been in existence. When there was no chief magistrate, the whole business of the government would properly belong to the council of state. But we find no traces of such a council in the history of those times. When Saul became king; when after his death, the tribe of Judah withdrew from his house, and placed David on the throne; when the other eleven tribes attached themselves to David; when after the death of Solomon, ten tribes revolted from the house of David, and elected Jeroboam king; when the usurping queen Athaliah was hurled from the throne, and Joash placed upon it; to say nothing of the numerous revolutions in the kingdom of Israel; there is not the least mention made of a council of state. But in transactions of such deep interest to the Hebrew state, such a council, if it had existed, must have been actively engaged; and the historians would not have passed over its acts with such profound silence. The Rabbins therefore, are not to be credited, when they assert that the council instituted by Moses, continued uninterruptedly to the latest times after the captivity, and that the same institution was perpetuated in the Sanhedrim which existed after the times of the Maccabees.

Though the Mosaic state was so organized, that there could be regularly no chief magistrate except the invisible king Jehovah, and no minister of state except the high priest; yet it is plain from Deut. 17: 9, that when the necessities of the nation required it, a supreme ruler of the whole community might be legally chosen.

This seems to have been implied in the nature, or inferred from the customs, of constitutions of that kind. Such a ruler was denominated שֹׁפֵט, *Judge*, or rather *Governor*; for the root שֹׁפֵט has a very extensive meaning, and among other things, signifies *to set in order, to govern*. Accordingly Artemidorus remarks, *κρίνειν τὸ ἀρχεῖν ἔλεγον οἱ παλαιοί, to judge, signified to govern, among the ancients.*³

These magistrates were indeed supreme judges by virtue of their office; but this was not their only, nor even their most important duty. Such magistrates were known among the Tyrians, for Josephus relates from their own annals, that after the conquest of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar, Baal the king reigned nineteen years; and then *Judges* were introduced, whose names, with the time of their administration, he accurately sets down according to the order of succession.³ The Carthaginian *Suffetes*, were similar to the שֹׁפֵט of the Hebrews and Tyrians, only in name; for the latter were independent rulers, while the former were no more than members of the supreme executive council or senate. This is clearly intimated in several places by Livy. For example: "*Suffetes, qui summus Poenis magistratus, cum quaestore elicit, laceratosque verberibus cruci adfigi jussit.—Senatum itaque suffetes (quod velut consulare apud eos imperium) vocarunt.—Judicum ordo ea tempestate dominabatur. Qui unum ejus ordinis et omnes infestos habebat.—Cum suffetes ad jus descendum consedisent.*"⁴ Bochart has quoted African Inscriptions, which contain the names of individual *suffetes* of several cities of the Phœnician colonies in Africa. But these, so far as can be ascertained, were always delegated from the council of judges or *suffetes*, for the purpose of transacting some special business.⁵

¹ Num. xi. ² Artem. II. 14. Josh. 16: 31. 1 Sam. 8: 20. Isa. 11: 4. 1 Kings 3: 9. ³ Against Apion I. 21. ⁴ Livy, XXVIII. 37. XXX. 7. XXXIII. 46. XXXIV. 61. ⁵ Bochart, Lib. I. Cap. XXIV. p. 517.

XVII. MARCH OF THE HEBREWS FROM HOREB TO CANAAN.

The Hebrews remained at the foot of mount Horeb eleven months and nineteen days. During this time the necessary laws were given; the tabernacle was set up for the palace of their king,

Jehovah; the regular service of his court was established; the sanctions of the law were solemnly repeated; the people were numbered and mustered for the approaching war; the order of encamping, breaking up and marching, was accurately settled; and the whole constitution of the state was completed. On the twentieth day of the second month of the second year after their departure from Egypt, they broke up from Horeb and proceeded by short marches through the mountains, into the great sand desert of Zin, as far as to Kadesh.¹ Moses says with the utmost frankness, that he took with him as a guide his brother-in-law Hobab, who was well acquainted with the situation of the fountains, wells and pastures of that region. The descendants of Hobab from that time always remained among the Hebrews. They sometimes occur under the denomination of Kenites, and a race of them who were descended from Hemath, were called Rechabites. There was another tribe of Kenites much more ancient than they, from which they are to be distinguished.² It is worthy of remark, that the cloud which hung over the sacred tabernacle, and by its rising and settling determined the marches of the Israelites, did not supersede the necessity of another guide, who could conduct them to the secret fountains, the concealed wells, and the distant pastures of the desert.

From the wilderness of Zin, the Hebrews came to the southern borders of Canaan, with the intention of entering and subduing the country. But it soon appeared that this generation, whose spirit had been broken down by long slavery in Egypt, was entirely unfit for war. Twelve spies, selected from the most noble of the Hebrews in each tribe, were sent to explore the country. After an absence of forty days they returned: and with the exception of Caleb and Joshua, they gave so fearful an account of the great stature, strength and courage of the inhabitants, of the lofty position and strong fortifications of their cities, that the whole nation was struck with panic. A most dangerous insurrection broke out, and Moses and Aaron were in imminent danger of being stoned by the populace. Notwithstanding all that Caleb and Joshua could say, the people gave up the design of conquering Canaan in despair, and made preparation for returning to Egypt.³

Then followed the sentence of God, that all the Hebrews who were over twenty years old at the time of the departure from Egypt, should die in Arabia Petrea, and that Canaan should be conquered

by the next generation. The people now became sensible of their folly, took courage, and made an unsuccessful attempt to penetrate into the country. But this season of courage, even if they had had better success, would have been of but short duration, and it was productive of no benefit. By their repulse, they were taught that they were not adequate to the conquest of the country; and accordingly they acquiesced in a measure with which they would never have been satisfied, had it not been for this experience of their own weakness. They turned back from the borders of the promised land, to wander thirty eight years longer in the Arabian deserts, until that whole generation should become extinct.⁴

This long period was spent in wandering about mount Seir. Besides the promulgation of a few additional laws, the most remarkable event that occurred, was the rebellion of Korah, Dathan and Abiram. The history of this period is briefly related, and at the close of the narration, all the places of encampment are enumerated.⁵

In the fortieth year, the new generation returned to Kadesh, in the desert of Zin. Though more courageous, they were scarcely less turbulent and rebellious than their fathers. When water failed them, their recollections of Egypt revived, and they repeated the old reproaches against Moses, because he had not suffered them to remain in that fruitful country. At the command of God, Moses smote a rock with his staff, and water flowed in abundance. But as Moses and Aaron on this occasion, manifested some impatience and a distrust of Jehovah, they were both forbidden to enter the promised land.⁶

The Edomites, though frequently requested by Moses, steadily refused to grant the Hebrews a free passage through their country into the south part of Palestine. They were therefore compelled to take a more circuitous route. This was a new occasion of dejection and discontent, and the murmurings and complaints of the people rose so high, that an extraordinary chastisement was necessary to reduce them to obedience. They turned back from the desert of Zin to the Elanitic gulf, whence they were permitted to pass along the frontiers of the Edomites. They crossed the river Zared and proceeded northerly through the territory of the Moabites, to the river Arnon. Then Sihon, king of the Amorites, not only refused to permit them to pass peaceably through his country,

as they had requested, but led out his army to attack them ; as did also Og the king of Bashan, soon after. These two kings were defeated in quick succession, and their whole country, from the river Arnon to mount Hermon, fell into the power of the Hebrews.⁷

The Moabites and Ammonites saw with pleasure the defeat of their old enemies, the Amorites ; but they regarded with suspicious dread their new and more powerful neighbours, the Hebrews. They in reality had nothing to fear, for the Hebrew law prohibited all hostilities against them. They however united with some Midianitish tribes, who were at that time pasturing their herds in the country of the Amorites ; though with this accession to their strength, they ventured on no open acts of hostility. After the failure of the repeated attempts to curse the Hebrews by means of Balaam, the allied nations at length succeeded in seducing them to idolatry. As this was in fact instigating the people to rebellion against their rightful sovereign, the Moabites and Amorites might justly have been punished by the war which was prosecuted against Midian. But they were spared, because they were related to the Hebrews, and on condition that they would remain quiet for the future.⁸

The Hebrews were now separated from Canaan by nothing but the river Jordan. The conquest of the country was next to be undertaken. For this purpose the new generation of soldiers was reviewed and numbered ; and the number of men capable of bearing arms was found to be nearly the same as at the former enrolment. The tribes of Reuben and Gad, and half the tribe of Manasseh, received for their possession the conquered country east of Jordan ; but they were required to assist the other tribes in the conquest of Canaan, before they settled on their own lands. Finally, the boundaries of the country to be subdued were accurately defined ; the order for the expulsion of the inhabitants was repeated and enforced ; and the regulations respecting the cities of refuge were established. With this, the business was completed with which Moses had been intrusted, as the internuncio between God and the Hebrews.⁹

¹ Lev. 26: 3—46. Num. i. 10: 5—30. Deut. 1: 1. ² Num. 10: 29—32. Judg. 1: 16. 4: 11. 1 Chr. 2: 55. 2 Kings 10: 15, 23. Jer. 25: 2, compare Gen. 15: 19. Num. 24: 21, 22. 1 Sam. 15: 6. ³ Num. XIII.
⁴ Num. 14: 1—45. Deut. 1: 22—46. ⁵ Deut. 1: 45. 2: 1, 2. Num. 15: 1—41.

19: 1—22. 16: 1—32. xv—xix. xxxiii. ⁶ Num. 20: 1—14. Deut. 1: 29—46. ⁷ Num. 21: 4—9. xxi—xxvii. xxxii—xxxv. ⁸ Num. 22: 1—25. xvii. 31: 1—54. ⁹ Num. 33: 50—56. xxxiv. xxxv.

NOTE. The increase of the Hebrews during four hundred and thirty years, from 70 persons to 603,550 males over twenty years of age, besides 22,000 males of a month old and upwards among the Levites, (Exod. 12: 37. Num. 1: 45, 46. 3: 39.) has appeared to many incredible. The number of 600,000 men capable of bearing arms, necessarily makes the whole number of people amount to 2,400,000, or about two and a half millions. (Compare Süssmilch, Göttl. Ordnung in Veränd. des menschlichen Geschlechts, Th. II. S. 387 ff.) An anonymous writer in the *Literarischen Anzeiger*, 1796, Oct. 4. S. 311. has demonstrated, that the Hebrews in four hundred and thirty years, might have increased from 70 persons to 977,280 males over twenty years old. He supposes that of those seventy persons who went to Egypt, only forty remained alive after a space of twenty years; each one of whom had two sons. In like manner, at the close of every succeeding period of twenty years, he supposes one fourth part of those who were alive at the commencement of the period, to have died. Hence arises the following geometrical progression :

After 20 years, of the 70 there are 40 living, each having 2 sons.

	Consequently	= 80
80	$\frac{2}{4}$	= 120
120	$\frac{2}{4}$	= 180
180	$\frac{2}{4}$	= 270

and so on.

Thus the first term of the progression is	80 =	= a
The denominator	$\frac{2}{4}$ =	= b
The number of terms	$\frac{430}{20}$ =	= n

Therefore the expression for the whole sum will be

$$\frac{ab^n - a}{b - 1} \text{ or } \frac{80 \times \frac{2}{4}^{\frac{43}{20}} - 80}{\frac{2}{4} - 1} = \frac{80 \times 6109 - 80}{\frac{1}{2}} = 977,280.$$

XVIII. THE LAST ACTS OF MOSES.

Moses, having directed the Hebrews thus far during his life, wished to do all in his power towards preserving the knowledge and worship of Jehovah among them, after his death. The people and even the magistrates, during the forty years of his administration, were far from being thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the Theocracy which he had established. They had so often rebelled and offered sacrifice to idols, that it became necessary to have all animals slain at the altar, and under the inspection of the priests. In their journeyings through the wilderness, they carried with them portable tabernacles of Saturn; and it was but a short time since they had been guilty of the grossest idolatry.¹ It was evidently necessary, that religion should be made to them as much as possible an object of sense; that it should be so closely interwoven with the civil constitution, that it could be neither forgotten nor perverted; and it was particularly desirable, that the new generation should be made to perceive the nature of their polity, and the relation in which they stood to the true God.

Moses accordingly wrote for the people an earnest exhortation to obedience, in which he alluded to the instances of the kindness, severity, and providence of God, which the Hebrews had already experienced; he exhibited in a strong light the sanctions of the law; he repeated the most important statutes; and as circumstances had changed in many respects, he made alterations in some of the laws, and added a few new ones to the code. These exhortations, (which compose his Fifth Book or Deuteronomy,) he delivered to the magistrates as his farewell address, at a time when their minds were well prepared to receive wholesome instruction, by the accomplishment of the divine promises which had already commenced. The genealogists (each in his own circle) communicated all to the common people, including the women and children.²

That the latest generations might have a visible and permanent memorial of their duty, he directed that after they had taken possession of Canaan, the law, (or at least its fundamental principles, and the first developement of its sanctions as exhibited Exod. xx—xxiv,) should be engraved on pillars of stone, plastered with lime, and that these pillars should be erected with appropriate solemnities at She-

them on mount Ebal, or rather perhaps, mount Gerizim. On this occasion the priests were to utter particular imprecations against all the secret transgressors of the law, to which the people were to assent by responding *Amen*, at the close of each imprecation.³

Moses then developed a second time, and still more minutely than before, the conditions according to which Jehovah, their God and king, would govern them. He cast a prophetic glance into the most distant futurity, while he declared the different destinies that awaited them to the latest generations, according to their conduct in regard to the law. In full view of these conditions, and in order to impress them the more deeply on their minds, he caused the whole people, even the women and children, again to take a solemn oath of obedience, and that not only for themselves, but also for their posterity.⁴

The official duties of Moses were now closed. He commissioned Joshua, not as his successor, but as a military leader, divinely appointed to be the conqueror and apportioner of the land of Canaan. He delivered to the priests the whole book of the law, that they might deposit it in the sanctuary with the ark of the covenant. He also committed to them a song, in which he had represented in a most vivid manner the perverseness of the nation, their future disobedience and punishment, repentance and pardon. This song the Hebrews were to commit to memory, that they might be aware of the consequences of disobedience; and that, when the threatenings were fulfilled, they might think of the law and return to their duty. Finally, he viewed the land of Canaan from Nebo, the summit of mount Pisgah; and then this great man and distinguished servant of God, was gathered to his fathers.⁵ By the institutions which he introduced for the preservation of the knowledge of God, he conferred an invaluable favour not only on the Hebrews, but on the whole human race; a favour for which no wise and good man can withhold from him his gratitude, whatever objections he may imagine to exist against some of his laws.

¹ Amos 5: 26. Acts 7: 43. Num. 25: 1--9. ² Deut. 29: 10. ³ Deut. 27: 2--26. ⁴ Deut. 28: 1--68. xxix. xxx. ⁵ Deut. xxxi--xxxiv.

CHAPTER THIRD.

HISTORICAL SURVEY FROM THE DEATH OF MOSES TO THE INTRODUCTION OF MONARCHY.

XIX. CONQUEST OF THE LAND OF CANAAN.

After the death of Moses, the Hebrews under the command of Joshua, prepared themselves for the invasion of Canaan. The inhabitants of this country still retained a fearful remembrance of the miracles in Egypt and the passage through the Red Sea; and the recent victories over the Amorite kings, Sihon and Og, had greatly increased their apprehensions.¹ The Jordan, which was now the only barrier that separated the Hebrews from the Canaanites, was at that season (April) very much swollen, and its deep and broad channel was completely filled. Its breadth was then nearly two hundred fathoms, and its greatest depth about fourteen feet. The Canaanites therefore, thinking it impossible for so numerous a people to cross the river at that time, with their women and children, took no measures to prevent or obstruct the execution of such a design. But to this generation, there was granted as miraculous a passage across the Jordan, as had been opened for their fathers through the Red Sea; and ere the Canaanites were aware, the Hebrews had encamped on this side of the river, not far from Jericho.² By this miracle the idolatrous nations were not only struck with terror, but the greatness and power of Jehovah were shown in the clearest light, both to the chosen people and to their enemies. But however miraculous the passage over Jordan really was, the history is so far from betraying an undue love for the marvellous, that it relates with great minuteness the exploring of Jericho, and all the other human means employed in this expedition.

The Hebrews however did not take advantage of the panic of the Canaanites, but gave them time to recover themselves and prepare for war. Instead of laying immediate siege to Jericho, they

first circumcised all the males, who had remained uncircumcised during the last forty years, on account of the hardships of their journey. Then Jericho was taken, and in a manner which tended to depress still more the drooping courage of the Canaanites. After the conquest of Ai, which soon followed, the Hebrews advanced without opposition to Shechem; a city that Jacob gave to his son Joseph, and which, for aught that appears, had always remained in the possession of his descendants. Here were the mountains Gerizim and Ebal, where, in compliance with the injunction of Moses, the law was engraved on stone, and the covenant with the king, Jehovah, solemnly renewed in the promised land.³

The victorious arms of the Hebrews, and the confederacy which the inhabitants of Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth and Kirjathjearim, had so artfully obtained, multiplied the embarrassments of the Canaanites who dwelt in the south of Palestine. Adonizedek, king of Jerusalem, with four auxiliary or vassal kings, immediately made an attack on Gibeon. The Hebrews hastened to the assistance of their new allies, overthrew their enemies with great slaughter, and by this important victory subjugated almost all southern Palestine.⁴

By this time the northern kings, whose chief resided at Hazor, had collected at the Sea of Merom, an army provided with cavalry and chariots. Joshua fell upon them unexpectedly, and gained a victory so decisive that it in effect brought the northern parts of Palestine under his dominion.⁵ There still remained, however, not only scattered cities, but large tracts of country, in possession of the Canaanites, with whom a desultory war was continued for some time. But after the land had been divided by lot among the several tribes, it was left to each tribe to expel its own enemies.⁶ Of the forty eight cities which fell to the Levites, six were assigned for cities of refuge as Moses had prescribed.⁷ The forty thousand men of the tribes beyond the Jordan then returned to their country, and on the banks of Jordan erected a monument, as a memorial of their connexion with the tribes on this side of the river. From a misunderstanding of their design, this came near giving occasion to a civil war.⁸

While Joshua lived, the people were obedient and prosperous. Though idolatry was secretly practised here and there by individuals, it did not break out openly, and the nation remained faithful to

Jehovah their king. To prevent future degeneracy, Joshua in the latter part of his life convened two general assemblies, and earnestly inculcated on the rulers fidelity to Jehovah and a conscientious observance of his law. At the last assembly he caused a new election to be made of Jehovah for their king, and to be solemnly acknowledged by all the people. He erected a permanent monument of this renewal of their homage, and recorded the whole transaction in the book of the law. Soon after, seventeen years from the entrance into Canaan, and 1546 before Christ, this hero died; a man who had devoted his whole life to the settlement of the theocratic policy, and consequently to the preservation of the true religion; services which ought to endear his memory to all succeeding ages.⁹

¹ Josh. 2: 9—11. 9: 9, 10. ² Josh. III. IV. ³ Josh. 5: 1 ff. VI. 8: 1—29, 30—35. ⁴ Josh. IX. X. ⁵ Josh. XI. XII. ⁶ Josh. 13: 13. Judg. I. III. ⁷ Josh. XX. XXI. Num. 35: 9—35. ⁸ Josh. XXII. ⁹ Josh. XXIV.

XX. THEOCRACY FROM JOSHUA TO SAMUEL.

From Joshua to Samuel, (a period of about 450 years,) the fortunes of the Hebrew nation varied, according as the fundamental law of the state was observed or transgressed; exactly as Moses had predicted, and the sanctions of the law had determined.

The last admonitions of Joshua and the renewal of homage to Jehovah, failed to produce all the effect intended. That generation indeed never suffered idolatry to become predominant, but still they were very negligent in regard to the expulsion of the Canaanites. Only a few tribes made war on their hereditary foes, and even they were soon weary of the contest. They spared their dangerous and corrupting neighbours, and contrary to an express statute, were satisfied with making them tributary. They even became connected with them by unlawful marriages; and then it was no longer easy for them to exterminate or banish the near relatives of their own families. Thus the Hebrews rendered the execution of so severe a law in a manner impossible, and spread for themselves the net in which they were afterwards entangled.¹ Their Canaanitish relatives invited them to their festivals, where not only lascivious songs were sung in honour of the gods, but fornication and unnatural lust were indulged in, as a part of the divine service. These debaucheries, consecrated by the religious customs of all nations, were grati-

fyng to the sensual appetites ; and the subject of Jehovah readily submitted himself to such deities, which were so highly honoured by his relatives, and worshipped by all the surrounding people. At first probably, a representation of Jehovah was set up, but this was soon transformed to an idol, or was invoked as an idol by others, of which there is a remarkable example in the times soon after Joshua.² Afterwards idolatrous images were erected with the image of Jehovah, and the Hebrews imagined that they should be the more prosperous, if they rendered religious homage to the ancient gods of the land. The propensity to idolatry, which was predominant in all the rest of the world, thus spread itself like a plague. From time to time idolatry was publicly professed, and this national treachery to the king, Jehovah, always brought with it national misfortunes.

That madness of debauchery which was exhibited in the city of Gibeah, and the protection which the tribe of Benjamin afforded the criminals in opposition to all the other tribes,³ displays the true source of so obstinate an attachment to an idolatry that consecrated such vices, and which must have had many adherents among the Benjamites at the time of Phinehas, soon after the death of Joshua. The other tribes however were as yet more piously disposed, and idolatry was not openly tolerated, till that generation was extinct which under Joshua, had sworn anew to the covenant with Jehovah. After that, the rulers were unable or unwilling any longer to prevent the public worship of pagan deities. But the Hebrews, rendered effeminate by this voluptuous religion, and forsaken by their king Jehovah, were no longer able to contend with their foes, and were forced to bow their necks under a foreign yoke. In this humiliating and painful subjection to a conquering people, they called to mind their deliverance from Egypt, the ancient kindnesses of Jehovah, the promises and threatenings of the law ; they forsook their idols, who could afford them no assistance, returned to the sacred tabernacle, and then found a deliverer who freed them from the yoke of servitude. The reformation generally was of no longer duration than the life of the deliverer. As soon as that generation was extinct, idolatry again crept in by the same way, and soon became predominant. Then followed subjection and oppression under the yoke of a neighbouring people, till a second reformation prepared them for a new deliverance. Between these extremes of prosperity and adversity, as the consequences of their fi-

delity or treachery to the king Jehovah, the Hebrew nation was continually fluctuating till the time of Samuel. Such were the arrangements of providence, that as soon as idolatry gained the ascendancy, some one of the neighbouring people grew powerful, acquired the preponderance and subjected the Hebrews. Jehovah always permitted their oppressions to become sufficiently severe to arouse them from their slumbers, to remind them of the sanctions of the law, and to turn them again to their God and king. Then a hero arose, who inspired the people with courage, defeated their foes, abolished idolatry, and reestablished in their hearts the authority of Jehovah.⁴ As the Hebrews in the course of time became continually more obstinate in their idolatry, so each subsequent oppression of the nation was always greater and more severe than the preceding. So difficult was it, as mankind were then situated, to preserve on earth a knowledge of the true God ; though so repeatedly and so expressly revealed, and in so high a degree made evident to the senses.

¹ Judg. I—VI. ² Judg. XVII, XVIII. ³ Judg. XIX—XXIII. ⁴ Judg. II—VI.

XXI. PREDOMINANT STATES FROM JOSHUA TO SAMUEL.

The people, who acquired power during this period, and were employed to punish the idolatrous and rebellious Hebrews, were the following :

1. The Mesopotamians under king Chushan-rishathaim. This monarchy must have subdued several of the surrounding nations within thirty or forty years after the death of Joshua ; for at this time its conquests extended west as far as to Canaan, and here, by victory or by menaces, the Hebrews were made tributary. They were held in severe bondage for eight years. Their deliverer was the hero Othniel or Othoniel, a relative of the celebrated Caleb. He overcame the Mesopotamians, and was then acknowledged regent or judge. During the forty years of his administration the people remained faithful to their God and king, and consequently they were in prosperous circumstances.¹ This concludes a period of about eighty years from the death of Joshua, to the year 1446 B. C.

2. The Moabites by a long peace, had recovered from the defeats which they suffered from the Amorites before the time of Mo-

ses, and perceiving that the Hebrews were not invincible, their king Eglon united himself with the Ammonites and Amalekites, and made an attack upon them, probably under the same pretences which are mentioned on another occasion.² He defeated the idolatrous Hebrews in battle, subdued the tribes beyond the Jordan, and the southern tribes on this side of the river, and established himself in Jericho. The conquered tribes were obliged to *bring him presents*, that is, to pay tribute. This subjection to a king who resided among them, was still more oppressive than the preceding, and it lasted eighteen years, or to the 98th year after the death of Joshua. The deliverer was Ehud of the tribe of Benjamin, who was immediately received as regent. The people remained independent eighty years. The Philistines then made their first attempt to bring the southern tribes under their yoke, but unable to accomplish their design, they were repulsed with the loss of six hundred men by Shamgar and other husbandmen, who fought with ox-goads, being then employed in the cultivation of their fields. This period extended from the year 98 to 178 after Joshua, 1368 B. C.

3. The northern Canaanites, who suffered a total overthrow under Joshua, had gradually regained their power during the interval of one hundred and seventy eight years. Jabin, their king, dwelt at Hazor on lake Merom, as in the time of Joshua, and his power was now much greater than before. His general, Sisera, was an able warrior, and he retained in his service a numerous army with nine hundred chariots of war, which were always viewed with terror by the Hebrews. With such a force he greatly oppressed the northern tribes, and this servitude was undoubtedly far more severe than any which they had previously experienced. From such a multitude of licentious soldiers they were compelled to suffer every species of extortion, in addition to the royal tribute. These oppressions continued for twenty years, or to the 198th year after Joshua. Their deliverance was at length effected by a woman of the tribe of Ephraim, the prophetess Deborah. She aroused the courage of Barak of the tribe of Napthali, and in her capacity of regent or judge, appointed him commander of the Israelitish forces. With ten thousand men he routed the numerous army of the Canaanites so entirely, that they never recovered from the blow.⁴ There was then a peace of forty years, that is, to the 238th year after Joshua, 1308 B. C.

4. The Midianites, united with the Amalekites and other Nomadic Arabians, during seven years poured into Palestine in great numbers, and with their numerous herds trampled down all the fields, gardens and vineyards without distinction, seized the cattle, plundered men and houses, and rioted in the country as the Beduin Arabs are accustomed to do at the present day, when not restrained by force. This chastisement, the duration of which is not mentioned, was evidently far more distressing than any thing which had occurred before. The emigration of Elimelech, the father-in-law of Ruth, probably took place at this time.⁵ The great deliverer from this oppression, was Gideon of the tribe of Manasseh. The stratagem by which he obtained a decisive victory is well known. Two Midianite chiefs, Oreb and Zeeb, were taken prisoners and put to death. Two kings, Zebah and Zalmunna, fled; but they were pursued, overtaken, and likewise suffered death. Of the numerous army of the Midianites, one hundred and twenty thousand were left dead on the field of battle, and only fifteen thousand saved themselves by flight.

Gideon magnanimously rejected the proffer of hereditary royalty, which the rulers in the warmth of their gratitude had made him. *Not I*, (replied he in the true spirit of the theocracy,) *not I, nor my son; but Jehovah shall reign over you.* The Shechemites indeed after his death, elevated one of his sons to the throne, and he too the most abandoned wretch of the whole family. They also built an idolatrous temple; but they suffered merited punishment from their own king, and their temple was destroyed by fire.⁶ The Hebrews now remained unmolested by foreign enemies forty three years, excluding the period of the Midianitish oppression; to the 281st year after Joshua, 1268 B. C.

5. The foes, from whom Tola of the tribe of Isaschar defended the Hebrews, are not named; and of Jair the Gileadite it is merely mentioned, that he judged or governed Israel. The administration of Tola continued twenty three, and that of Jair, twenty two years.⁷ This includes in all forty five years, and brings the history down to the 326th year after Joshua, 1223 B. C. But it is most probable that these two regents were, a part of the time at least, contemporary; and perhaps Tola governed only the northern tribes on this side of the Jordan, and Jair, those beyond the river.

6. The Ammonites laid claim to a part of the land beyond the

Jordan, which had been wrested from them by the Amorites before the time of Moses. For eighteen years they distressed the two tribes and a half which were located there. They also made incursions upon Benjamin, Judah and Ephraim, who were at the same time obliged to defend themselves against the Philistines, whose power had become so considerable at this time, as to make them formidable enemies. In these severe troubles the Hebrews addressed themselves to their God, and the tribes beyond the Jordan choosing Jephthah for their leader, became victorious over their enemies. But the Ephraimites, envying the success of their brethren and the booty they had acquired, stirred up a civil war, which terminated very disastrously to themselves, for they were defeated with the loss of forty two thousand men. Jephthah died six years after.⁸ This period includes twenty four years, and extends to the 350th year after Joshua, 1199 B. C.

The regents, Ibzan of Bethlehem, who governed seven years; Elon of Zebulun, ten years, and Abdon of Ephraim, eight years; appear to have overawed their enemies by a judicious administration. During their times no war is mentioned.⁹ The whole period of their government comprehends twenty five years, and brings down the history to the 375th year after Joshua, 1174 B. C. But probably they were a part of this time contemporary, each exercising authority over a few of the tribes.

7. The Philistines held the Hebrews in subjection forty years.¹⁰ Perhaps the first part of this period ought to be included in the abovementioned twenty five years; for it is said,¹¹ that in the time of Jephthah, God had sold the Israelites into the hand of the *Philistines* and Ammonites, and it is certain that the Philistines then oppressed them in the most cruel manner. These forty years seem also to comprehend not only the twenty years of Samson, but also part of the twenty years of Eli, who held the united offices of high priest and regent. According to this, the whole time from the death of Jephthah to the death of Eli, includes but little more than forty years. But following our mode of computation, this period terminates in the 415th year after Joshua, 1134 B. C.

Samson was divinely appointed as a deliverer from the Philistines; but the nation had become so degraded and cowardly, that they were not ashamed to surrender their protector into the hands of their enemies. As the Hebrews refused to second his efforts,

he was able only to molest the Philistines by transient and desultory assaults.¹²

In the last year of the priesthood and regency of Eli, the Hebrews carried into the field of battle the Ark of the Covenant; but they were defeated, and this most precious treasure of the nation became the booty of the Philistines.¹³ Twenty years after this battle, a general assembly was held, in which idolatry was renounced and Samuel elected regent. Soon after, the Hebrews defeated the Philistines and handled them so roughly, that they dared not attempt another invasion of their territory.¹⁴ The Philistines however, not only remained their determined foes, but the Ammonites always continued formidable enemies to the Hebrews, as the sequel will show. Samuel governed the nation forty years. Supposing Eli's death to occur in the 425th year after Joshua, and adding to these, the sixty years between Eli and the close of Samuel's administration, and the sum is four hundred and eighty five. Allowing thirty five years for the time during which Tola and Jair, and afterwards Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, were contemporary, and we obtain the four hundred and fifty years which Paul assigns¹⁵ to the space between Joshua and Saul. This brings the commencement of Saul's reign to the year 1096 B. C. But an accurate and certain chronology of these times cannot be given.¹⁶

¹ Josh. 15: 17. Judg. 3: 7—11. ² Judg. 11: 13—15. ³ Judg. 3: 12—31. ⁴ Judg. iv. v. ⁵ Ruth 1: 1, 2. ⁶ Judg. vi—ix. ⁷ Judg. 10: 1—5. ⁸ Judg. 10: 6. xi. 12: 7. ⁹ Judg. 12: 8—15. ¹⁰ Judg. 13: 1. ¹¹ Judg. 10: 7, 8. ¹² Judg. xiii—xvi. ¹³ 1 Sam. 4: 1—18. ¹⁴ 1 Sam. vii. ¹⁵ Acts 13: 20. ¹⁶ Compare Michaelis, Schreiben an Hrn. Schlötzer u. s. w. im Göttin. Magazin der Wissenschaften und Literatur, Jahrg. I. Stück. 5. Die Zerstreut. klein. Schriften, Lief. S. 1. ff. Jena. 1794. Jahn, Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des Alten Bundes, § 153. S. 275 ff.

NOTE. According to the Parian Marbles, Epoch 25. the destruction of Troy took place in the year 1209 B. C.; consequently during the regency of Elon and Abdon, about one hundred and thirteen years before Saul.

XXII. OFFICE OF THE JUDGES.

From what has already been said respecting the judges and their achievements, we can ascertain with a good degree of certain-

ty the nature of their office. Most of them indeed had been at the head of armies, and delivered their country from foreign oppression; but Eli and Samuel were not military men; Deborah was judge before she laid the plan of a war against Jabin; and of Jair, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, it is at least uncertain whether they ever held any military command. Judges are mentioned in the Mosaic Law in connexion with the high priest, as arbiters of civil controversies without any allusion to war.¹ In like manner the judges who were appointed over Tyre after king Baal, were certainly not military officers, for the city at that time was tributary to Babylon. The conduct of armies therefore, can scarcely be considered as the peculiar destination of these magistrates. But as in ancient times the duties of a judge were reckoned among the first and most important duties of a ruler, so the Hebrew judges seem to have been appointed for the general administration of public affairs, and the command of armies fell to them as the supreme executive officers. In many cases, it is true, military achievements were the means by which men elevated themselves to the rank of judges; but we do not here inquire *how* the office was obtained; but, *for what purposes* it was instituted. It may be well to recollect however, that Jephthah, Eli, and Samuel, and for aught that appears, Jair, Elon, Ibzan, and Abdon, were raised to this office by an unsolicited election.

The office of these judges or regents was held during life, but it was not hereditary; neither could they appoint their successors. This arrangement was disadvantageous in one respect, as at the death of a judge the supreme executive authority ceased; but it had this important advantage, that no degenerate heir or successor could give to idolatry the support of his influence. Their authority was limited by the law alone; and in doubtful cases they were directed to the sacred lot of Urim and Thummim.² They were not obliged in common cases to ask advice of the ordinary rulers: it was sufficient if these did not remonstrate against the measures of the judge. In important emergencies however, they convoked a general assembly of the rulers, over which they presided and exerted a great influence. They could issue orders, but had no power to enact laws; they could neither levy taxes, nor appoint officers, except perhaps in the army. Their authority extended only over those tribes by whom they had been elected or acknowledged;

for, as we have before remarked, several of the judges presided over separate tribes. There was no salary attached to their office, and there was no income appropriated to them, unless it might be a larger share in the spoils, and those presents which were made them as testimonials of respect.³ They bore no external ensigns of their dignity, and maintained no retinue of courtiers, though some of them were very opulent. They were not only simple in their manners, moderate in their desires, and free from avarice and ambition; but they were noble and magnanimous men, who felt that whatever they did for their country was above all reward and could not be recompensed, who desired merely to be public benefactors, and chose rather to deserve well of their country, than to be enriched by its wealth. This exalted patriotism, like every thing else pertaining to politics in the theocratical state of the Hebrews, partook of a religious character; and these regents always conducted as the officers of God; in all their enterprises they relied upon God, and their only care was, that their countrymen should acknowledge the authority of Jehovah, their invisible king.⁴ Still, they were not all faultless, neither do the historians represent them as such; but on the contrary, with the utmost frankness they relate the great sins of which some of them were guilty. They were not mere deliverers of the state from a foreign yoke, but destroyers of idolatry, foes of pagan vices, promoters of the knowledge of God, of religion and of morality, restorers of theocracy in the minds of the Hebrews, and powerful instruments of divine providence in the promotion of the great design of preserving the Hebrew constitution and by this means, of rescuing the true religion from destruction.

¹ Deut. 17: 9. ² Num. 27: 21. ³ Judg. 8: 24. ⁴ Judg. 8: 22 ff
comp. Heb. xi.

XXIII. CONDITION OF THE HEBREWS IN THE TIMES OF THE JUDGES.

From a comparison of the periods during which the Hebrews were oppressed by their enemies, with those during which they were independent and governed by their own constitution, it is obvious that the nation generally in the times of the judges, had much more of prosperity than of adversity. The dominion of the judges continued four hundred and fifty years, but the whole time

of foreign oppression amounts only to one hundred and eleven years, which is scarcely a fourth part of this period. Even during these one hundred and eleven years, the whole nation was seldom under the yoke at the same time, but for the most part, separate tribes only were held in servitude; nor were their oppressions always very severe; and all the calamities terminated in the advantage and glory of the people, so soon as they abolished idolatry and returned to their king Jehovah. Neither was the nation in such a state of anarchy at this time, as has generally been supposed. There were regular judicial tribunals at which justice could be obtained; and when there was no supreme regent, the public welfare was provided for by the ordinary rulers.¹ These rulers, it is true, were jealous of each other, and their jealousies not unfrequently broke out in civil wars; but the union of the state was never entirely destroyed. They were not always provided with arms;² but yet, when united under their king, Jehovah, they gained splendid victories. They were not sufficiently careful to suppress idolatry, but they never suffered it to become universally predominant. The sacred tabernacle was never entirely deserted and shut up, nor was it ever polluted by the rites of heathen superstition.

These times would certainly not be considered so turbulent and barbarous, much less would they be taken, contrary to the clearest evidence and to the analogy of all history, for a *heroic age*, if they were viewed without the prejudices of a preconceived hypothesis. It must never be forgotten, (what indeed no impartial inquirer can deny,) that the Book of Judges is by no means a complete history. It is (so to speak) a mere *register of diseases*, from which no one can conclude, that there were no healthy men, much less that there were no healthy seasons; when the book itself for the most part, mentions only a few tribes in which the epidemic prevailed, and notices long periods during which it had universally ceased. Whatever may be the result of more accurate investigation, it remains undeniable that the condition of the Hebrews during this period, perfectly corresponds throughout, to the sanctions of the law, and they were always prosperous when they complied with the conditions on which prosperity was promised them; it remains undeniable that the government of God was clearly manifested not only to the Hebrews, but to their heathen neighbours, that the fulfilling of the promises and threatenings of the law were so many sensible proofs

of the universal dominion of the divine king of the Hebrews, and consequently, that all the various fortunes of that nation were so many means of preserving the knowledge of God on the earth. The Hebrews had no sufficient reason to desire a change in their constitution, but they needed only to observe the conditions on which national prosperity was promised them.

The great causes of the frequent interruptions in the welfare of the Hebrew state were : 1. The effeminacy and cowardice of the people ; and 2. The disunion and jealousy of the tribes, who never assisted each other with the requisite zeal and alacrity. But as this effeminacy arose from the vices of idolatry, and their cowardice from a want of confidence in Jehovah ; so the disunion and jealousy of the tribes, though selfishness was the immediate cause, resulted from a disposition to neglect their divine king, and not to consider themselves as the united and only people of Jehovah. This disposition, if not originated, was at least very much heightened by the multiplication of deities. Thus both these causes of their misfortunes, owed their origin to *idolatry*, that great source of all their calamities, so often mentioned in the sanctions of the law. Thus the people by increasing their gods, enervated themselves ; and prepared for themselves those sufferings and chastisements, by which they were again to be brought back to their king Jehovah.³

¹ Ruth 4: 1—11. Judg. 8: 22. 10: 17, 18. 11: 1—11. 1 Sam. 4: 1. 7: 1, 2. ² Judg. 5: 8. 1 Sam. 13: 19. ³ Compare Hess, Reich Gottes, Th. I. S. 251 ff. 269 ff. and Geschichte Josua und der Heerführer, Th. II. S. 261 ff.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

HISTORY FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF MONARCHY TO THE REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES.

XXIV. THE RULERS REQUEST A KING.

THE abovementioned causes of national misfortune were all in operation at the time of Samuel, and threatened to produce, after his death, calamities still more severe: for the tribes beyond the Jordan had formidable enemies in the Ammonites, and the southern tribes, in the Philistines, while the northern tribes kept themselves aloof from the dangers of their more exposed countrymen. This was the principal reason why the rulers in general assembly requested a king.¹ It appears that the tribes in southern Palestine and beyond the Jordan were particularly earnest for this change in the constitution, because they feared that, after the death of Samuel, there would be no supreme magistrate, and thus, the nation being again disunited, they would be left to their fate. The degeneracy of Samuel's sons, who had been appointed subordinate judges or deputies, increased their apprehensions. They therefore strenuously insisted on their demand: *Nay, but we will have a king over us, that we also may be like all the nations.*² They had reason to hope that a king, who possessed supreme authority, would unite the powers of the whole nation, and protect each tribe with the collected strength of all; that under him the affairs of the government would be more promptly administered, and necessary aid more readily afforded; that if he were a man devoted to Jehovah, he could more effectually suppress or prevent idolatry, and thus place the welfare of the state on a more solid foundation. They imagined that they might be justified in this request, because Moses himself takes it for granted that the nation would eventually have a king, and the same thing had been promised to their great progenitor Abraham.³

It conduces not a little to the honour of the Hebrews, that they attempted this change in their constitution not by their own power, but in accordance with the principles of theocracy, they requested it of their king Jehovah by the intervention of a prophet, and they effected it without bloodshed ; a manifest proof that the time of the Judges was neither a barbarous nor a *heroic* age.

¹ 1 Sam. 12: 12. 8: 4—21. ² 1 Sam. 8: 19. ³ Deut. 17: 14 ff. 28; 36. Gen. 17: 16.

XXV. THE INSTITUTION OF MONARCHY.

But as the invisible king, Jehovah, would necessarily be obscured by a subordinate, visible king, he, by means of Samuel, gave the rulers to understand his disapprobation of their request, and at the same time briefly represented to them the burdens they would have to bear under a king ; especially, how easily he might be induced to imitate the other oriental monarchs, and disregard the law of Jehovah.¹ When they, notwithstanding this, persisted in their request, it was granted them ;² probably because the desired change was sought for, in a lawful manner, of the invisible king himself through the mediation of the prophet, and in the present disposition of the nation, it could be brought about without bloodshed. If the remark of Polybius be universally correct, that *all Aristocracies and Democracies terminate at last in Monarchy*,³ the same change must have taken place at some future time, and perhaps it might have been the occasion of a civil war.

By this alteration of the constitution, the theocracy was indeed thrown somewhat into the shade, since it could be no longer so clearly manifest, that God was the king of the Hebrews. Still however, as the principles of theocracy were interwoven with the fundamental and unchangeable law of the state, their influence did not entirely cease, but the elected king was to act as the viceroy and vassal of Jehovah. On this account Moses had already established the following regulations.⁴

1. That the Hebrews, whenever they adopted the monarchical form of government, should raise those only to the throne who were designated by Jehovah himself. As monarchs (called *kings of kings*) were accustomed to appoint sub-kings or viceroys in the several provinces of their dominions, so was the king of the Hebrews to be call-

ed to the throne by king Jehovah, to receive the kingdom from him, and in all respects to view himself as his representative, viceroy and vassal. On this account the will of Jehovah was to be made known by a prophet, or by means of the sacred lot, Urim and Thummim; and the viceroy elect was to prove himself an instrument of God by protecting the commonwealth against its foes. The succession of the royal house depended on the appointment of God, and was indicated by prophets. Saul, David, and Jeroboam, received the promise of the throne from prophets, and by them was announced the succession of the family of David, and of the different families in the kingdom of Israel. These divine interpositions were well calculated to remind the kings of him on whom they were dependant, and to whose choice they were indebted for the throne. Saul was designated by the sacred lot, and David was elected by the magistrates for the express reason *that God had promised him the throne*. Saul was not established in his kingdom and generally acknowledged, till after he had delivered the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead from the Ammonites; and the rulers tendered the sceptre to David, because he, in the time of Saul, had defeated the enemies of Israel.

2. Moses had likewise ordained, that the king should be a native Israelite. Thus foreigners were excluded from the throne, even though they should be proposed by false prophets; for being heathens, they might transgress the fundamental law of the state by the introduction of idolatry; or at least, it might be difficult for them to conduct in all respects as the vassals of Jehovah. This regulation had reference merely to free elections, and was by no means to be understood, as it was explained by Judas Galileus⁵ and the Zealots, during the last war with the Romans, that the Hebrews were not to submit to those foreign powers, under whose dominion they were brought by an all-directing providence. On the contrary, Moses himself had predicted such events, and Jeremiah and Ezekiel earnestly exhorted their countrymen to surrender themselves quietly to the Chaldeans.

¹ Sam. 8: 7—19. comp. 12: 15—25. ² 1 Sam. 8: 20, 21. ³ Hist. Lib. V. 6, 7. ⁴ Deut. 17: 14—20. ⁵ Acts 5: 37.

XXVI. LIMITATIONS OF THE ROYAL POWER.

Upon such conditions the choice of, a king was permitted according to the law, and in the year 1096 B. C. the first election took place. The prophet Samuel privately announced to Saul his destination to the throne, and did homage to him as king. Though Saul belonged to a family of the tribe of Benjamin, which was celebrated for its valour, he was at that time far enough from aspiring to a crown and sceptre. Samuel afterwards convened a general assembly, at which it was resolved to designate the king by lot, (undoubtedly the *sacred lot*, by which God was accustomed to make known his will,) and in this manner to submit the choice to God, as their supreme ruler. As Samuel had predicted, the lot fell to Saul. The terms of the government, established by Samuel with the consent of the rulers, were sworn to by Saul, and the record was deposited in the sacred tabernacle before the throne of the invisible king.¹ What powers these terms allowed the king, and what they withheld from him, is nowhere mentioned; we know only that the regal authority was not absolute. The foundation for such restrictions on the power of the king had already been laid by Moses: for

1. By the fundamental law of the Hebrew Commonwealth the king was forbidden to introduce any new mode of religious worship; neither could he, like the kings of other nations, perform the functions of a priest, unless he was of the tribe of Aaron, as was the case with the Asmonean Princes. On the contrary, he was required to reign as the representative and vassal of king Jehovah, to promote the institutions of religion as a matter of obedience to Jehovah, to suppress idolatry as rebellion against Jehovah, to attend to the declarations of the prophets as the ambassadors of Jehovah, and to observe the law of Moses.² On this account it was required, that the king should take a transcript of the law from the copy of the priests, and *read therein all the days of his life, that he might learn to fear Jehovah his God, to keep all the words of the law, that his heart might not be lifted up above his brethren; that is, he should be no arbitrary despot, whose only law is his own pleasure.*³

2. Moses subjoins to this injunction, *that the kingdom may remain long to him and to his descendants*; whence it appears that the sceptre was indeed hereditary, but yet it might be transferred from one family to another by the appointment of Jehovah and the wishes of the people. In this manner it afterwards actually passed from the house of Saul to that of David, and in the kingdom of Israel the transfers were very frequent.

3. The king was forbidden to imitate the pernicious luxury of other oriental monarchs; neither was he allowed to hoard up large treasures, lest the circulation of money should be obstructed, industry discouraged, and his subjects impoverished; nor was he to keep a numerous harem, lest (not to mention other disadvantages) he should be alienated from God by his women, especially if they were foreigners.

4. As cavalry could be of little use in the mountainous regions of Palestine, and as the king of the Hebrews was never to become a conqueror of foreign lands, or a universal monarch, he was forbidden to maintain large bodies of cavalry, or to attempt the conquest of Egypt in order to obtain horses.

It was not necessary perhaps to enter these restrictions among the conditions on which the king was to hold the sceptre; but it was necessary that the tribute, and the services to be rendered to the king, should be defined. Of both these indeed mention is made.⁴ The tribute probably was not levied, since Saul, though king, returned to the plough among his father's family in Gibeah, and was presented with gifts by only a few, as tokens of their homage, while by others he was openly contemned. All innovations have their despisers, and it is not strange that this king of God's appointment should meet with them, although his house was illustrious, and his person commanding. *And when he (Saul) stood among the people, he was higher than any of the people from his shoulders and upward.* The orientals are accustomed to regard the stature and exterior of their kings as a matter of great importance.⁵ All however obeyed the first and indeed very express command of Saul, to march to the relief of Jabesh-gilead; perhaps because the order was issued with the sanction of Samuel's name. But after Jabesh-gilead was delivered, the Ammonites conquered, those ancient and powerful foes of the tribes beyond Jordan who had reduced the city to great extremities, and it was thus shown that Saul was indeed fa-

voured by Jehovah as his representative, his authority rapidly increased throughout the nation. At Gilgal he was confirmed in the throne by the whole army, and the transaction was sanctioned by sacrifices. At this renewed election of the king, the continuance of the theocracy was earnestly insisted on by Samuel, and he also declared that the Hebrews should be prospered if they and their king would worship Jehovah and obey his injunctions; but if not, Jehovah would be an adversary to them and to their king.⁷

¹ 1 Sam. ix. x. ² 1 Sam. 15: 1—20. ³ Deut. 17: 14—20 ⁴ 1 Sam. 8: 10—18. ⁵ 1 Sam. 10: 23. Paulsen, *Regierung der Morgenländer*, S. 17. Herodot. III. 20. VII. 187. Aristot. Polit. IV. 4. Curtius, VI. 5. ⁶ 1 Sam. xi. ⁷ 1 Sam. xiii.

XXVII. THE REIGN OF SAUL.

Saul affected no great exterior splendour. He was a *hero* in the true sense of the word. By degrees he increased his army with able soldiers, provided them with arms, of which the Hebrews had been at some times destitute, carried on successful wars not only with the Ammonites and Philistines, (at that time his nearest and most powerful foes, and against the last of whom he was obliged to contend as long as he lived,) but with the Moabites, Amalekites and the Nomadic tribes of the Arabian desert; the Hagarites, Itureans, (Jetur,) Nephishites, and Nodabeans, whose pasture grounds he overran as far as to the Euphrates; and finally, with the king of Aram-zobah, or Nisibis; who was perhaps a successor of Chushan-rishathaim, the ancient oppressor of the Hebrews.¹ Probably the defeated Arabs applied to this king for aid, which he readily granted them as he was not willing that the Hebrews, now grown so powerful, should obtain conquests in his immediate neighbourhood.

But however distinguished Saul was as a warrior, he never neglected the internal concerns of his kingdom. He tolerated no instance of rebellion against Jehovah, and was very severe in the punishment of idolatrous arts.² Consequently the Hebrew arms, according to the divine promise, were every where successful. In all respects he seems to have transacted the business of his office properly; for after his death no complaint was uttered against him, and eleven tribes remained faithfully attached to his son.

It was Saul's great failing and the source of all his errors, that

he did not adapt himself sufficiently to the theocratical nature of the Hebrew constitution, and thus rendered himself unfit to be the founder of a royal house, who was to be regarded as a pattern for the imitation of all his successors. He forgot that he was a vassal of king Jehovah, and did not always execute his orders, but made exceptions according to his own views.³ When on one occasion a part of his soldiers deserted him, and the rest were trembling with fear, he ought to have entertained the theocratic sentiments of Gideon, and given to all his successors a signal example of confidence in God. As he neglected to do this, and as he never conducted himself like a king altogether dependant on Jehovah, Samuel announced to him in the name of God, the transfer of the sceptre to another family. When Saul after this, neglected the divine command to inflict the predestined punishment on the Amalekites,⁴ those ancient, marauding, hereditary enemies of the Hebrews; and instead of utterly destroying them, retained the best of the cattle as booty, and brought back prisoner, Agag their king, and thus concluded the war without annihilating the nation; the divine decree for the exclusion of his descendants from the throne, was again and irrevocably pronounced by Samuel.⁵ This was made known to Saul at a time when he was daily strengthening himself on the throne, and becoming more powerful and more celebrated, and when Jonathan, his eldest son, was so much beloved by the whole people, that certainly no man could look on any one else as an heir to the crown.

¹ 2 Sam. 1: 17—27. 1 Sam. 13: 19—21. 1 Chron. 5: 18, 19. Judges 3: 8.
² 1 Sam. 28: 9. ³ 1 Sam. 13: 2—15. 15: 1. xvii—xix. ⁴ Ex. 17: 14.
 Deut. 25: 18. ⁵ 1 Sam. xv.

XXVIII. SAUL'S CONDUCT TOWARDS DAVID.

During this period, so prosperous for Saul, the invisible king directed the prophet Samuel to secure the throne privately by a prophetic anointing, to David, the youngest son of Jesse, a citizen of Bethlehem. He was of a princely family in the tribe of Judah, a tribe which in ancient times had received great promises.¹ David, at that time a youth of eighteen or twenty years of age, and deeply imbued with the spirit of the religion and the theocracy of his nation, was shepherd of his father's flocks; a condition which

in the East, is by no means despised, but yet not so elevated that he, who had hitherto only governed his flocks, and in order to protect them had carried on no other wars than those against wild beasts, could be expecting a kingdom. The invisible ruler of Israel so directed events, that Saul himself contributed the most towards rendering this magnanimous young man an experienced and worthy viceroy of Jehovah. For when he, continually brooding over that determination of God, so unwelcome to his feelings, at last fell into a deep melancholy, in order to divert his thoughts he took David into his court as a private musician ; and thus gave him the first opportunity to become acquainted with the court life and the business of government. The personal bravery of the young minstrel did not long remain unnoticed by the veteran hero, and he soon elevated him to the honourable station of royal armour-bearer.²

In an expedition against the Philistines, David with feelings altogether theocratical, full of confidence in the God of the armies of Israel, engaged in single combat with a champion of huge stature and heavily armed, whom no one else dared to encounter. The splendid triumph which he obtained, struck the Philistines with panic and the Hebrews with admiration ; acquired for him the friendship of Jonathan, the prince, and made him famous throughout the nation.

This act of heroism opened to David a new career, and he soon distinguished himself as an able soldier ; but it also prepared for him a series of persecutions and distresses, which however served to perfect and confirm his theocratic sentiments. When Saul felt indignant, that more merit should be ascribed in the triumphal songs to the vanquisher of Goliath, than to the king himself, he began to suspect that David might be the very man to whom the sceptre was to be transferred. He was now determined to put this hated rival out of the way, but he still retained so much sense of honour that he was unwilling to be known as a murderer. In one of his fits of melancholy he twice, as if by accident, hurled a javelin at his minstrel, who both times adroitly avoided the blow.

After this, Saul became more calm, and would not appear as a murderer even to himself. He resolved on another method of destroying David. He gave him the command of a thousand men, and by repeated promises of marriage with his eldest daughter, induced him to undertake hazardous enterprises, in the hope that he

might fall in some of his encounters with the Philistines. But by this means he only afforded him still greater opportunities to exercise himself in the art of war, and by his prudence and good conduct, to render himself still more celebrated among all the Israelites. When Saul perceived that his hopes were frustrated, he gave his daughter to another. Saul however, did not entirely relinquish his design. He caused a promise of the younger princess to be made to David, on condition that he would undertake a new enterprise against the Philistines. When he came off victorious in this expedition also, Saul could not, consistently with his dignity, refuse to fulfil his promise, and he accordingly became the father-in-law of David.

An alliance with the royal family made David yet more illustrious in the eyes of the people, and this again increased the jealousy of Saul. He was now determined to break over every obstacle and to destroy his son-in-law, cost what it would. He no longer made a secret of his intentions. He listened however to the representations of Jonathan, and desisted awhile from his purpose. But after David had gained a fresh victory over the Philistines, Saul resumed his resolution, and in a fit of melancholy, hurled with all his strength a javelin at David, who, though intent on his music, seasonably avoided the stroke. It was now high time for him to leave the court. His house was watched, but favoured by the artifice of his wife he made his escape, though with great difficulty. He went to Samuel at Nob, and was pursued thither by messengers, who were sent repeatedly, and at last by Saul himself; but he was rescued by the manifest intervention of providence. But Saul persevered in his intention. Even Jonathan endeavoured in vain to restrain him from deeds of violence against an officer, who had rendered such services to his king and country. For the security of his friend, Jonathan gave him secret notice of his father's feelings, and he effected his escape.³

¹ Gen. 49: 8—10.

² 1 Sam. xvi.

³ 1 Sam. xvii—xx.

XXIX. SAUL PERSECUTES DAVID.

The more Saul endeavoured to secure the crown to his posterity and to remove David out of the way, the more he, by his persecutions, directed the eyes of all the Israelites to that pious hero; and by these very exertions endangered the succession of his own family. The massacre of eighty five priests and of the inhabitants of Nob, who were the Gibeonite servants of the sacred tabernacle, which he, influenced by the calumny of Doeg, the Edomite,¹ caused soon after the flight of David, secured to David the sacred lot, with which Abiathar fled to him to save his own life, and deprived Saul of the affection of all the well disposed Hebrews. After this, many influential men, even of the tribe of Benjamin to which Saul himself belonged, joined the party of David.²

David, who was then in such danger, left untried no allowable means for his own deliverance; but still he kept his mind steadily fixed on the protection of divine providence. In difficult cases he always consulted the sacred oracle and obeyed its responses. He could scarcely have escaped from the hands of Saul, if providence had not exerted a special care over him. At Gath, whither he went at first from the high priest, he was probably well received by king Achish; at least Achish was afterwards very favourable to him. But the Philistine princes excited his suspicions, and David, in order to escape their snares, was obliged to feign himself insane. After this, the cave of Adullam in the tribe of Judah concealed him for some time. But this must have eventually become a prison in which he might be easily confined, or subdued by famine; for, besides his parents and relatives who had now likewise become suspected by Saul, four hundred Hebrew malecontents with their families, had joined themselves to him. He therefore conducted his parents and relatives to Moab, and commended them to the protection of the king; but by the direction of the prophet Gad, he returned with his party to the tribe of Judah and concealed himself in the forest of Hareth. His men had now increased to six hundred, and by him they were trained to be heroes. With them he rescued the frontier fortress of Keilah from a siege of the Philistines, but the citizens would have betrayed him for fear of Saul, had he not been warned of their treachery by the sacred lot. In the wilderness of Ziph, to which he then withdrew,

he received a very consolatory visit from his magnanimous friend Jonathan, who encouraged him in the most affectionate manner to place his confidence in God. His residence in this solitary retreat was soon made known to Saul by the inhabitants of the desert, and he would unavoidably have fallen into the power of the king, had not divine providence so ordered it, that Saul, who was now separated from David by only a single mountain, was called back by the report of an incursion of the Philistines.³

Neither the lofty, rough and rocky mountains of En-gedi, nor the remote frontier by the great sand desert of Arabia Petrea, were secure retreats from the snares of Saul. David was betrayed, and Saul scoured the mountains with three thousand men, and afterwards penetrated into the desert with the same number, in order to capture David. But in both enterprises Saul fell into David's power. In the mountains Saul composed himself to sleep, alone, in the same cave where David and his company were concealed; and in the desert, David stole by night unobserved into the camp to the very place where Saul lay, while all his men were asleep. His companions interpreted these events, as if God seemed to tell him by affording such opportunities, what he ought to do in order to secure his own safety at once and forever. But to the pious David, a divinely appointed king, though his enemy, was a sacred person. To lay violent hands on him, and to open a way to the throne by regicide, was a crime which he justly abhorred. For what God had promised him, he would wait, till he, who had promised, should deliver it to him in the ordinary course of providence. From such conduct it must be decided whether David was a revengeful man, as some have asserted. The vindictive resolution against Nabal was a precipitate step, as David himself soon saw and candidly acknowledged, and he resolved to be more on his guard in future. Generally, all events, and particularly persecutions, were to David, as we have already seen, lessons by which he was taught to be a good man and a wise ruler, and especially to place confidence in Jehovah, as many of the Psalms demonstrate.⁴

This confidence in God, however, did not lessen his care for his own security. As he had been several times betrayed to Saul by the members of his own tribe, he retired with his men to Gath, and received from Achish, the king of the Philistines, as a present, the small town of Ziklag, which was situated not far from the

brook Besor. Here he resided one year and four months, until the death of Saul. He engaged in excursions against the ancient predatory enemies of the Hebrews, the Amalekites, the Geshurites, and the Gezrites, who roved about in Arabia Petrea on the sea-coast as far as Pelusium, and on the southern frontier of the tribe of Judah. Here he was secure from the attempts of Saul; but in the last war of the Philistines against Saul, he was driven to the alternative of either taking the field with the Philistines against his brethren, the Hebrews, or of appearing ungrateful to his benefactor Achish. But now the jealousy of the Philistine princes, which had formerly been so dangerous to him, helped him out of this difficulty, and he was dismissed from the expedition. On his return to Ziklag he found the city pillaged and laid in ashes. He immediately commenced a pursuit of the Amalekites, Geshurites and Gezrites, (who had thus revenged themselves for his inroads on them,) overtook them, recaptured all that they had taken, and gained besides so considerable a booty, that he was able to send presents to all the rulers of Judah who had favoured his cause.⁵

¹ Psalm LII. ² 1 Sam. 21: 1—9. 22: 6—23. 1 Chron. 12: 1—22.
³ 1 Sam. XXI—XXIII. ⁴ 1 Sam. XXIV—XXVI. Hess, Geschichte Davids und Salomo's, Band I. B. I. Kap. 2—4. David von Jos. Ludw. Ewald, Band I. 1795. Abschnitte 2—5. ⁵ 1 Sam. XXVII, XXIX, XXX.

XXX. DEATH OF SAUL.

In the war with the Philistines mentioned above, Saul became so disheartened, that he applied for help even to enchantresses, whom he had formerly, in obedience to the law, punished with death as rebels against Jehovah. The battle which was afterwards fought in the plain of Jezreel (Esdraelon) proved very disastrous, and Saul, that he might not fall into the hands of his enemies, slew himself in the year 1056 B. C. after a reign of forty years. His three eldest sons were left dead in the field. Abner, his general, drew off the remains of the army to the other side of the Jordan, and caused Ish-bosheth, the youngest son of Saul, to be proclaimed king at Mahanaim. The Philistines meanwhile spread themselves over the country, and took possession of many cities.¹

David caused to be executed as a regicide, the Amalekite, who

brought to him at Ziklag the royal insignia, and boasted that he had slain Saul with his own hand. He lamented the death of Saul and of his friend Jonathan in a most affecting elegy, and even for Saul he poured forth tears, which they only can impute to hypocrisy, who are themselves incapable of such magnanimity and are determined to forget that David, during the life of his persecutor, always respected him as a king appointed by God, and spared him when he had him completely in his power. He then, according to the decision of the sacred lot, went from Ziklag to Hebron, where the rulers of the tribe of Judah, with views altogether theocratical, awarded to him the sceptre, as to one whom God had already designated as king. The other eleven tribes did homage to Ish-bosheth the son of Saul. His commander in chief, Abner, came with an army to force the tribe of Judah to obedience, but after the first victory of Joab, the general of David, Abner never again took the field, and David was far from wishing to continue a civil war. Thus the war was suffered to die away in silence without an express treaty.²

When, after two years, Ish-bosheth quarrelled with Abner, who had raised him to the throne and who was still his sole support, the indignant general made arrangements for bringing the eleven tribes to submit to David. But before the execution of his design, he was treacherously assassinated by Joab, and the union of the tribes was for a while retarded. Soon after, Ish-bosheth, while sleeping at mid-day, was murdered by Rechab and Baanah, two generals of his own tribe. The murderers expected to be rewarded by David, but he condemned them to the death which they deserved, and took no advantage of their treachery to hasten the submission of the eleven tribes to his authority. Thus five years passed away, so that David reigned seven years and six months over the tribe of Judah only.³

¹ 1 Sam. xxviii. Acts 13: 21. Josephus, Antiquit. VI. 14: 9. 1 Sam. xxxi. 1 Chron. 10: 1—15. ² 2 Sam. 2: 8—11. ³ 2 Sam. 11: 3: 1. ³ 2 Sam. 3: 6—39. iv.

XXXI. THE REIGN OF DAVID.

At last, in the eighth year of David's reign, 1048 B. C. the eleven tribes unitedly submitted to him. The rulers sent an embassy to him with the offer, that *he might become their ruler and general, because under Saul he had been the leader of the Israelites*

in war, and because *Jehovah* had said of him, that he should govern the people of *Israel*. We see from this, that the Hebrews were always very careful to recognise their theocracy, for they would submit to David only as to a king appointed by *Jehovah*, and who had proved himself to be such during the reign of Saul. The rulers came with the whole army to Hebron, David obligated himself by an oath to observe the conditions on which he received the sceptre (which are now unknown,) homage was rendered to him, and the whole transaction was solemnized by a feast.¹

The first act of David's reign, was to undertake the siege of *Jebus* or *Jerusalem*, whose citadel *Zion* had till then remained in the hands of the *Jebusites*. The castle was taken, and as the city, on the boundaries of *Judah* and *Benjamin*, was conveniently situated to be the metropolis of the whole empire, David selected it for his residence, and built a palace on mount *Zion*, which on this account was called the *City of David*. It is supposed that David first gave to the city the name of *Jerusalem*, (*the Possession of Peace*,) but this is not certain. Soon after, he transferred the *Ark of the Covenant*, which was the throne of king *Jehovah*, from *Kirjath-jearim* to *Jerusalem*. Thus the capital of David became the capital of the invisible king, and was therefore called the *City of God*, a name which it always retained, because afterwards the temple, the palace of king *Jehovah*, was built on mount *Moriah*.² David by the declaration of the prophet *Nathan*, was obliged to leave to his successor the charge of building a temple, as a palace for the throne of God; but he received the promise of a succession in his house and of an eternal kingdom for his posterity. This promise David valued so highly, that he seems to have had some conception of its extensive import. All the succeeding kings, therefore, of the family of David were in effect chosen and appointed by *Jehovah*.³

David brought the affairs of government into order, improved the military, and gave especial attention to the management of public worship as the most efficacious means of promoting religion and morality, and consequently, obedience to the invisible, supreme monarch. The solemn transfer of the ark of the covenant, at which almost all the people were present, had made a deep impression on their minds, and had awakened them to a sincere adoration of *Jehovah*. These favourable dispositions David wished to uphold and strengthen by suitable regulations in the service of the priests and

Levites, especially by the instructive and animating Psalms, which were composed partly by himself and partly by other poets and prophets; and they were sung not only by the Levites at all the sacrifices, accompanied with instrumental music, but also by the people while on their way to Jerusalem to attend the feasts. By such instructive means, David, without using any coercive measures, brought the whole nation to forget their idols, and to worship Jehovah alone; and he made their religion honourable and acceptable even to foreigners.⁴ The arms of the Hebrews were consequently victorious in every quarter. The Nomadic Arabs, the Amalekites, Edomites, Moabites, and even their more powerful enemies, the Philistines and Ammonites, were obliged to bow to their dominion. The Ammonites, having formed an alliance with the kings of Maachah, Tob, and Nisibis, collected a large body of auxiliary troops, but they were defeated. Even Hadarezer, the haughty king of Nisibis, who was an ally of the Assyrians, and with his other allies brought a formidable army into the field,⁵ was so much humbled that he was obliged to keep himself quiet on the eastern side of the Euphrates, and leave to the Hebrews the kingdom of Damascus as far as to Berytus. This was undoubtedly a most severe war, and cost much blood, but after many battles it terminated greatly to the advantage and glory of the Hebrews.⁶ Thus were fulfilled those ancient prophecies, that the Hebrews should extend their borders to the Euphrates, subject the Edomites, conquer the Moabites and other eastern people, and become formidable to all their neighbours.⁷ This success of their arms confirmed the nation still more in their religion, and inspired all the neighbouring people with reverence for the God of Israel.

¹ 2 Sam. v. 1 Chron. xi. 12: 23—40. ² 2 Sam. v. vi. 1 Chron. 11: 4—9. 15: 1—16, 43. 2 Sam. 24: 16—25. Ps. 46: 5. 48: 2. 1 Kings 11: 36.
³ 1 Sam. vii. 1 Chron. xvii. 1 Kings 2: 4. 3: 6. 1 Chron. 28: 4, comp. Ps. 89: 20—38. 132: 2 ff. ⁴ 2 Sam. 15: 19, 21. ⁵ Ps. LXXXIII. ⁶ 2 Sam. 10: 15—19. Ps. vi. viii. xxx. xxxvi. 60: 4—8. 83: 3—9. 89: 39 ff. Compare Michaelis, Comment. Soc. Reg. Gött. obl. XIII. de Bello Nisibeno. Paulus, Memorabilien, Th. IV. S. 105—120. ⁷ Gen. 15: 18. 27: 29, 40. Num. 24: 7—9, 17—20. 2 Sam. 5: 17—25. 8: 1—14. 10: 1—19.

XXXII. CHARACTER OF DAVID.

David, as a man, was in his sentiments and conduct a true Israelite ; as a king, he was a faithful vassal of king Jehovah. The Psalms, in which he pours forth his whole heart, exhibit a sincere and zealous worshipper of the true God, who places his religion, not in offerings, prayers, hymns and other external acts of devotion, but in obedience to the divine precepts, in which he seeks and finds all his happiness. God, and obedience to his will, is with David every where the first and predominant idea, which consoles him in his flight from Saul and attends him to the throne. All deliverances from danger, and all victories, from that over Goliath, to that over the king of Nisibis, he expected from the aid of God, and attributed them to the assistance of the Supreme Judge of men and nations.¹ As became a viceroy of Jehovah, he in all enterprises, viewed himself as one dependant on God and bound to execute the designs of his Lord and Sovereign. Therefore, he scrupulously followed the decisions of the sacred lot and the prophets ; he supported the authority of the priests and Levites, (though he was so far from being governed by them, that he on the contrary, prescribed to them laws and institutions ;) he dedicated to the sanctuary the spoil, for which he was indebted to the providence of Jehovah, that at some future period a palace might be erected more suitable to the majesty of God ; he loved his subjects, caused justice to be done them, called them his brethren, and thought himself not degraded by mingling with them in the public worship, like any other of the subjects of Jehovah. The Hebrews therefore, during the reign of David, clearly recognised the theocratical nature of their constitution.²

The imprecations and curses in the Psalms of David are to be judged of according to the knowledge and the situation of the ancient world. They refer either to inimical nations, or to individual oppressors of the people, and so are nothing more than prayers for victory and deliverance ; or they refer to the personal enemies of David, and thus are indications of what transgressors are to expect from a just God, and consequently, admonitions to the readers or singers not to suffer themselves to be borne away by a torrent of iniquity and vice. Poets express every thing strongly, and under

their pen, advice and admonition become a blessing or a curse. Such strong expressions therefore, are so many proofs of a zealous love for virtue and an irreconcilable hatred to vice. With a view to warn and deter from vice, the Hebrews, according to the law of Moses, were accustomed solemnly to pronounce curses on the secret transgressors of the law,³ and considered in this light, who can justly find fault with the practice? Yea, even God himself, in this theocracy, laid curses, that is, threatenings of temporal punishment, on transgressors. After all, these curses in the Psalms of David may be in part ascribed to the translators; and the original text, properly understood, may contain merely threatenings of what would take place as the punishment of crime. If David was in reality so vindictive as his curses seem to intimate, why did he not make Saul, his greatest enemy, feel the weight of his vengeance, when he had him in his power? How, in such a situation, could a revengeful man restrain himself?

The adultery with Bath-sheba, and the murderous transaction with Uriah, are shocking crimes which David himself is so far from excusing, that he confesses and laments them in all their horror. But how earnest was his repentance, and with what submission to the will of God did he bear those calamities which were sent on him for his punishment, and which, as they were caused by his own children, must have been so much the more distressing to his tender paternal feelings!⁴ Do we not here again see the soul entirely and steadily devoted to God? The numbering of the whole people in order, as it would seem, to push conquests into foreign countries, and the abovementioned transaction with Bath-sheba, are the only two instances in which David seems to have forgotten himself and his God. He was indeed no ideal model of human perfection; he was not without the blemishes incident to human nature. But on the whole, he was an example worthy of the imitation of his successors, and according as they appear on comparison with him, the sacred writers form their estimate of their characters.⁵

¹ Ps. xviii. ² 2 Sam. 16: 18. 19: 20. 20: 19. 1 Chron. 28: 2.
³ Deut. xxvii. ⁴ 2 Sam. xi. Ps. li. 2 Sam. 12: 1—23. 13: 1—20. xv—
 xviii.⁵ Hess, Geschichte Davids und Salomo's. Niemeyer, Charakteristik
 der Bibel, Th. IV. S. 128—410. David von Ewald, Band II. 1796. S.
 66 ff. 308 ff.

NOTE. The narrative of the three years' famine, and of the de-

livering up of seven descendants of Saul to the Gibeonites, is wanting in Chronicles, and occurs only 2 Sam. 21: 1—14. It is here plainly in a different style from the adjoining text, and seems to be from another hand. It is found however, in all the manuscripts and in all the ancient translations, and the famine seems to be alluded to Ps. 65: 5, 10, 13. and 85: 13. The obscurities of this narrative probably may never be entirely cleared up. One thing however is certain: these seven descendants of Saul, who were partly the children of a concubine, and partly of a daughter of Saul, were not pretenders to the crown; and David cannot be suspected of having embraced such an opportunity to put them out of the way. Neither is it to be supposed that David delivered up the innocent to death, contrary to the law. Deut. 24: 16.

They were therefore delivered up to the avengers of blood and punished with death, not on account of the crimes of Saul, but for the murders which they themselves, with the connivance of Saul, had committed on the Gibeonites, and for which they had hitherto remained unpunished. They themselves constituted the *bloody house*, which was generally notorious as such. Saul is mentioned with them, merely because he took under his protection the murderers, who were so nearly related to him, and delivered them from the hands of the avengers of blood. Compare David von Ewald, B. II. Abschnitt 11. S. 172 ff.

XXXIII. REIGN OF SOLOMON.

In the year 1015 B. C. David, about six months before his death, surrendered the government to his son Solomon, after a reign of forty years and a half. Solomon was at that time about eighteen years old, and consequently he was neither the first-born, nor the eldest prince; but he was appointed to the throne by the direction of Jehovah.¹ Adonijah, the oldest prince, made an attempt to seize the sceptre; but his design was seasonably frustrated, and Solomon confirmed himself in the government during the life of his father. The last charges which the dying monarch gave to his successor, are mentioned in the Scriptures as commendable; and let men judge of them as they please, they are neither revengeful nor unjust, but strictly conformable to the divine precepts. According to the law, criminals were to be punished for the purpose

of deterring others from the commission of similar crimes ; and it was with this view merely that David gave those directions, the execution of which he left entirely to the discretion of his successor.²

The kingdom under David had been very much extended and brought under good regulations. The arms of the Hebrews were feared by all the neighbouring people, and consequently the reign of Solomon was peaceable. Now the predominant tribe of Judah lay as a lion, and as a lioness, which no nation ventured to rouse up.³ The Hebrews were the ruling people, and their empire, the principal monarchy in Western Asia. From the Mediterranean Sea and the Phenicians to the Euphrates, from the River of Egypt and the Elanitic gulf to Berytus, Hamath and Thapsacus, and towards the east to the Hagarenes on the Persian gulf ; all were subject to the sway of Solomon. The Canaanites indeed had been neither annihilated nor expelled, but they were obedient and quiet subjects. Their whole number might amount to between 400,000 and 500,000 ; since 153,000 were able to render soccage to the king. The warlike and civilized Philistines, the Edomites, Moabites and Ammonites, the Nomadic Arabians of the desert, and the Syrians of Damascus were all tributary to him. Peace gave to all his subjects prosperity, the trade which he introduced brought wealth into the country, and promoted the arts and sciences ; which found an active protector in the king, who was himself one of the most distinguished of the learned men. The building of the temple, and of several palaces, introduced foreign artists by whom the Hebrews were instructed. Many foreigners, and even sovereign princes, were attracted to Jerusalem in order to see and converse with the prosperous, royal sage.⁴ The regular progress of all business, the arrangements for security from foreign and domestic enemies, the army, the cavalry, the armories, the chariots, the palaces, the royal household, the good order in the administration of the affairs of the empire, and in the service of the court, excited as much admiration, as the wisdom and learning of the viceroy of Jehovah. So much had been effected by the single influence of David, because he scrupulously conformed himself to the theocracy of the Hebrew state.

But in the midst of all this splendour, Solomon fell short of the virtues of his father. At first indeed, while the example of Da-

vid and the instructions of his preceptor Nathan, were yet fresh in his mind, he showed himself as faithful to the theocracy as his father, and wished for nothing more than wisdom and understanding, that he might govern his subjects well. The severity with which he treated Joab and Adonijah, is not to be blamed ; for they were seditious men who would otherwise have instigated a civil war. Also the removal of the high priest Abiathar, (by which a prophecy was fulfilled,⁵) was not a violation of the law, for the law did not determine by what power the high priest should be appointed. While there was no statute on the subject, it was a matter of policy that the nomination of so important and influential an officer should be retained in the crown. The people willingly offered their services for the building of the temple, and did not esteem it a burden. The administration of justice was also faithfully attended to.

Notwithstanding all this, Solomon, after the example of other oriental monarchs, governed in rather an arbitrary manner. His numerous harem, which consisted of one thousand females, was an express violation of the law of Moses.⁶ The introduction of a body of cavalry, which amounted to twelve thousand men, might perhaps be excusable in an empire so extensive ; and in this view it may be considered as not counteracting the law of Moses, which forbids the multiplication of horses. But the increase of the imposts to defray the expenses of the royal household, which in the East are always great, and in Solomon's court were extravagant, were burdens such as had been predicted ;⁷ and which the Hebrews after the death of Solomon wished to have diminished. Even the decision respecting the two prostitutes, which called forth so many eulogies on the king's knowledge of mankind, betrays a leaning towards that arbitrary exercise of the royal power, which is so common among the eastern despots. Solomon, as he grew older, continually receded farther from the law of Moses, which every king of the Hebrews was bound to obey. That he, as well as David, should tolerate idolatry in the foreign countries, they had conquered, was not a violation of the law, which was enjoined on the Hebrews only ; but that he should allow the idolatry of his wives in his own dominions and even in his capital ; that he should build temples to the gods, if he did not himself offer them sacrifices ; this was a breach of the fundamental law of the Hebrew state ; it was a seducing of the Hebrews to idolatry ; it was encouraging them to rebel against Jehovah their

king.⁸ On this account the prosperity of Solomon was interrupted by disquiets in Idumea and Syria, and it was foretold to him that only one tribe, (Judah and Benjamin, mentioned as one because the capital Jerusalem was situated on the borders of each,) should remain to his heirs. The dominion over the other ten tribes was promised to Jeroboam by Ahijah the prophet. Solomon died in the year 975 B. C. ; and notwithstanding his glory, was but little lamented.⁹

¹ 1 Chron. 28: 6. ¹ 1 Kings 1: 32—35. ² 1 Kings 1: 5—48. 2: 1—9.
David von Ewald, II. S. 227. ³ Gen. 49: 9. Num. 23: 24. 24: 9.
⁴ 1 Kings 5: 9—14. 10: 1—13. ⁵ 1 Sam. 2: 30, 31. 3: 13. ⁶ 1 Kings
11: 3. ⁷ 1 Sam. 8: 9—18. ¹ 1 Kings 12: 1—4. ⁸ 1 Kings 11: 4—8.
⁹ 1 Kings IX. Comp. Hess, Geschichte Davids und Salomo's, Th. II. S. 231 ff.

NOTE. 1. The chronology from the departure out of Egypt to the death of Solomon stands thus :

Moses ruled	40 years	Saul ruled	40 years
Joshua	17	David	40½
From Joshua to Saul	450	Solomon	40

Thus the whole period from the departure out of Egypt to the death of Solomon includes 627½ years.

The building of the temple was commenced in the fourth year of Solomon's reign, therefore subtracting 36 years there remain 591½ from the departure out of Egypt to the commencement of the temple. But in 1 Kings 6: 1, this period is mentioned as only 480 years. That some error must in very ancient times have crept into the copy here, appears evident from the following considerations :

(1.) Josephus (Antiq. VIII. 3: 1.) reads in this place 592 ; and he also (Jewish War, IV. 9: 7.) seems to compute in the same manner. See Michaelis, Alt. Or. Bibl. Th. XII. S. 31, 32.

(2.) Paul (Acts 13: 20.) reckons the period of the Judges at 450 years, and without doubt his teacher Gamaliel allowed the same space of time. But so many years could not have been allowed, if at that time the Palestine Manuscripts had read (1 Kings 6: 1.) 480, and not 592.

(3.) The reading 592 (in 1 Kings 6: 1) is farther confirmed by the circumstance, that it is so reckoned by the Jews of China, who wandered thither through Chorasán and Samarcand, A. D. 73.

Consequently, at the time of their emigration the passage must

have read 592 and not 480. See Michaelis, *Alt. Orient. Bibl. Th. V. No. 71*, S. 81 f. and Schreiben an Hrn. Schlötzer die Zeitrechnung von der Sündfluth bis auf Salomo betreffend in den *Zerstreut. klein. Schriften, Lieferung II. S. 224—232*.

NOTE 2. We find in these times no mention made of the Elamites and Babylonians. They took no part in the affairs of the western countries. Assyria, together with the king of Nisibis, afforded only twenty thousand auxiliaries to the Ammonites, and therefore it could not have been a very great kingdom. The most powerful empire of those times was the Nisibene, and even this could not long withstand the Hebrews. The Greeks, who place the great Assyrian monarchy very high in antiquity, have not accurately distinguished between the different predominant oriental monarchies which succeeded each other. Even Xenophon in his *Cyropaedia* always calls the Chaldee-Babylonian empire, the Assyrian, and the Chaldeans and Babylonians he calls Assyrians. Nor is this at all strange, for even in the Bible the two names are frequently interchanged.

NOTE 3. Hiram, king of Tyre, who sent timber and artificers to David and Solomon, and also Solomon, are mentioned by Menander. This authentic historian was a native of Ephesus, and he derived his history from the original sources in each of the nations respecting which he wrote. He celebrates Hiram, or as he calls him, Hiromos, as a lover of architecture and a hero; and Solomon, as a sage. His words, as quoted by Josephus against Apion, I. 18, are remarkable. "Upon the death of Abibalus, his son Hirom took the kingdom; he lived fifty three years, and reigned thirty four. He raised a bank on that called the *Broad Place*, and dedicated that golden pillar which is in Jupiter's (Baal's) temple: he also went and cut down timber from the mountain called Libanus, and got timber of cedar for the roofs of the temples. He also pulled down the old temples and built new ones: besides this, he consecrated the temples of Hercules and Astarte. He first built Hercules's temple in the month Peritus, and that of Astarte, when he made his expedition against the Tityans who refused to pay tribute; and when he had subdued them to himself he returned home. Under this king there was a younger son of Abdemon, who by his acuteness mastered the problems which Solomon, king of Jerusalem, had recommended to be solved." (*Whiston's Translation.*)

Although Menander here says nothing of the building of the temple at Jerusalem, it is easy to see how exactly every other circumstance corresponds with the Biblical history. It also plainly appears, that it was then customary to erect magnificent temples. We may even conjecture, that Menander confounded the temple of Jehovah at Jerusalem, with the temple of Jupiter at Tyre.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

HISTORY FROM THE REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES TO THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY.

XXXIV. REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES.

THE events which took place after the death of Solomon, showed the effect of the arbitrary maxims of government, that had prevailed at the court of this king during the last years of his reign. The rulers assembled at Shechem, the capital of the powerful tribe of Joseph, which had always been the jealous rival of Judah. They wished to enter into a new stipulation with Rehoboam, the heir to the throne; a precaution that had been neglected at the accession of Solomon. They would submit to him only on the condition, that he would diminish the burdens which his father had laid upon them. Rehoboam required three days to deliberate on their proposal; and when, after that time, instead of granting their request without hesitancy, as the older and more prudent counsellors urged him to do, he threatened them, according to the advice of his younger courtiers, with a still more intolerable yoke, ten tribes renounced their allegiance to him and elected Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, for their sovereign. He was of the tribe of Ephraim or Joseph, which had in ancient times received some obscure promises of a crown.¹ During the reign of Solomon, Ahijah, the prophet, foretold that Jeroboam should reign over ten tribes. Jeroboam was soon after obliged to escape to Egypt on account of his treasonable practices.²

Thus was the great and powerful empire of David and Solomon torn into two very unequal parts. Jeroboam possessed ten tribes, together with all the tributary nations as far as the Euphrates; and this was now called the *Kingdom of Israel*. Rehoboam retained only the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which were view-

ed as one tribe because the capital, Jerusalem, was situated on the frontiers of both. Benjamin is comprehended in the name of Judah.³ To this division also belonged Philistia and Edom; but the whole of this territory, which was now called the *Kingdom of Judah*, included scarcely a fourth part of the dominions of Solomon. Rehoboam was determined to reduce the ten tribes to obedience, and for this purpose he collected an army; but the prophet Shemariah announced to him the command of king Jehovah to relinquish the enterprise. Rehoboam was still reasonable enough to see the propriety of this requisition. No definite treaty of peace, however, was concluded, and the frontiers of the two kingdoms always presented a hostile appearance.⁴

¹ Gen. 49: 26. Deut. 33: 16. ² 1 Kings 12: 1—20. 2 Chron. 10: 1—19. 1 Kings 11: 26—40. ³ 1 Kings 11: 36. 12: 20. ⁴ 1 Kings 12: 21—24. 2 Chron. 11: 1—4. 12: 15.

XXXV. GENERAL VIEW OF THE TWO KINGDOMS.

In the preceding history we have seen that king Jehovah, from the time of Moses to the death of Solomon, always governed the Hebrews according to the promises and threatenings which he had pronounced to them from mount Horeb. If they deviated from the principle of worshipping Jehovah as the only true God, that is, if they revolted from their lawful king, he brought them, by suitable chastisements, to reflect on their obligations, to return to Jehovah, and again to keep sacred the fundamental law of their church and state. The same course we shall find pursued in the government of the two kingdoms. If the kings of both kingdoms had viewed the last great event, the sundering of the empire, which was a consequence of the idolatrous and unlawful principles of Solomon's court, as a warning, (for such it really was,) for them to uphold the authority of the fundamental law of the state, to govern their subjects according to the law, and to treat them as the subjects of Jehovah; then both kingdoms might have enjoyed uninterrupted prosperity. Even Jeroboam, though he had no promise of an eternal kingdom as David had, yet received the assurance that if he would obey the law as David did, there should be a long succession in his family.¹ But as the kings of both kingdoms often disregarded the fundamental law of the commonwealth, by idolatry rebelled against

their divine Sovereign, carried their disorders so far and treated their subjects in such a manner, that they are very aptly described by Isaiah and Ezekiel² under the image of wicked shepherds; there arose a succession of prophets, who, by impressive declarations and symbolic actions, reminded rulers and subjects of their duties to Jehovah, and threatened them with punishment; and there followed, as in ancient times, calamity after calamity in order to bring the nation to reflection.

In the kingdom of Israel, there was from the first the greatest disregard of the divine laws, and it was consequently destroyed one hundred and thirty four years earlier than the kingdom of Judah. Jeroboam trusted little to the divine promise made to him by the prophet, and feared that if the people went to Jerusalem to attend the feasts, they would return to their allegiance to the house of David. To prevent such a step, he set up two golden or gilded calves as images of Jehovah, an imitation of the Apis and Mnevis of the Egyptians, among whom he had long dwelt in exile. One of these was located at Bethel, not far from Shechem, for the southern tribes, and the other at Dan, for the tribes in the north. He built temples for these images, erected altars, appointed priests from all the tribes without distinction, and even performed the priestly functions himself. He appointed the festivals an entire month later than they had been formerly, and commanded that they should be celebrated before these images of Mnevis and Apis. The people took the images themselves for gods, and worshipped them as such. This kind of idolatry had formerly been very severely punished at mount Horeb.³ These arbitrary changes became now so interwoven with the constitution of the kingdom, that even the more pious successors of Jeroboam did not venture to abolish them, and reestablish the authority of the fundamental law of the commonwealth.

These rebellious deviations from the law, which had been so impressively inculcated on the whole people at the first introduction of monarchy, and afterwards, on Jeroboam himself,⁴ did not prevent Jehovah from governing the kingdom of Israel uniformly according to its sanctions. We shall see in the sequel, how he exterminated, one after another, those royal families, who not only retained the arbitrary institutions of Jeroboam, but tolerated and patronised idolatry with all its vices, and even introduced and protected it by their royal authority. Such an extermination of a reigning family he

caused to be announced beforehand by a prophet, and the successor appointed. We shall see that the higher their corruptions rose, so much the more decisive and striking were the declarations and signs which showed to all the Israelites, that the Lord of the universe was their Lord and king, and that all idols were as nothing when opposed to him. Even Naaman the Syrian acknowledged, and the Syrians generally experienced to their sorrow, that the God of the Hebrews was not a mere national God, but that his power extended over all nations. The history represents a contest, (as Hess expresses it,) between Jehovah, who ought to be acknowledged as God, and the idolatrous Israelites; and every thing is ordered to preserve the authority of Jehovah in their minds. At last, after all milder punishments proved fruitless, these rebellions were followed by the destruction of the kingdom and the captivity of the people, which had been predicted by Moses, and afterwards by Ahijah, Hosea, Amos, and other prophets.⁵

We shall find divine providence likewise favourable or adverse to the kingdom of Judah, according as the people obeyed or transgressed the law; only here the royal family remained unchanged in accordance with the promise given to David. We shall here meet indeed with many idolatrous and rebellious kings, but they are always succeeded by those of better views, who put a stop to idolatry, reestablished theocracy in the hearts of their subjects, and by the aid of prophets, priests and Levites, and of the services of the temple, restored the knowledge and worship of God. Judah therefore, though much smaller than Israel, continued her national existence one hundred and thirty four years longer; but at last, as no durable reformation was produced, she experienced the same fate as her sister kingdom, in fulfilment of the predictions of Moses, and several other prophets.⁶

Therefore the following history of the two kingdoms should be viewed as a history of a real theocracy, and thus, as a continued execution of the determination of God, that the true religion should be preserved on the earth; and in this view it certainly deserves our most attentive study. We shall divide it into five periods.

The First Period closes with the year 91 of the Revolt, 884 B. C. when both kingdoms lose their king on the same day.

The Second Period extends to the 216th year of the Revolt,

759 B. C. when Pekahiah king of Israel is murdered, and soon after, Uzziah dies.

The Third Period extends to the destruction of the kingdom of Israel in the 253d year of the Revolt, 722 B. C. and in the sixth year of Hezekiah's reign. In the kingdom of Judah, this period extends to the death of Hezekiah, 276 of the Revolt, 699 B. C.

The Fourth Period extends from the death of Hezekiah to the death of Josiah, 364 of the Revolt, 611 B. C.

The Fifth Period extends from the death of Josiah to the destruction of the kingdom of Judah, 387 of the Revolt, 588 B. C.

¹ 1 Kings 12: 21—24. ² Chron. 11: 1—4. 12: 15. 1 Kings 11: 37, 38. ³ 1 Kings 12: 25—33. Exod. xxxii. ⁴ 1 Sam. 11: 14. xii. 1 Kings 11: 58. ⁵ Deut. 28: 36. 1 Kings 14: 15. Hos. ix. Amos v. ⁶ Deut. 28: 36.

TABLE OF THE KINGS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH.

FIRST PERIOD.			
JUDAH.		ISRAEL.	
	<i>Year of the Revolt.</i>	<i>Year of the Revolt.</i>	<i>B. C.</i>
Rehoboam	1	Jeroboam	975
Abijam	17		
Asa	20	Nadab	22 954
		Baasha	24 952
		Elah	45 930
		Omri	46 929
		Ahab	57 918
Jehoshaphat	61	Ahaziah	78 897
		Jehoram	79 896
Jehoram	84		
Ahaziah	91		
SECOND PERIOD.			
Athaliah	91	Jehu	91 884
Joash	98		
		Jehoahaz	119 856
		Joash	135 840
Amaziah	137	Jeroboam II.	150 825
Uzziah	164		
		<i>Interregnum</i>	191 784
		Zachariah	202 773
		Shallum	202 773
		Menahem	202 773
		Pekabiah	214 761

JUDAH.			THIRD PERIOD.		ISRAEL.	
	<i>Year of the Revolt.</i>	<i>B. C.</i>		<i>Year of the Revolt.</i>	<i>B. C.</i>	
Jotham	216	759	Pekah	216	759	
Ahaz	232	743	<i>Interregnum</i>	235	740	
Hezekiah	247	728	Hoshea	244	731	
			End of the kingdom	253	722	
			FOURTH PERIOD.			
Manasseh	276	699				
Amon	331	644				
Josiah	333	642				
			FIFTH PERIOD.			
Jehoahaz	364	611				
Jehoiakim	364	611				
Jehoiachin	375	600				
Zedekiah	375	600				
End of the kingdom	387	588				

XXXVI. ISRAEL FROM 975 TO 884 B. C.

Jeroboam reigned twenty two years, or till 954 B. C. His palace was at Shechem, though he had a summer residence at Tirzah. The changes in the constitution, such as the removing of the festivals a month later, the setting up of the golden calves as images of Jehovah, the appointment of priests from all the tribes indiscriminately, which he had made in order to secure the throne to himself and to his posterity, brought upon him the judgements of Jehovah; and it was decreed that his family should soon be exterminated and the sceptre transferred to another. Many citizens also, who were displeased with these innovations on their fundamental laws, retired to the kingdom of Judah. The priests and Levites especially, all left Israel, and relinquished not only their tithes, (which Jeroboam then perhaps gave to his new priests,) but also their cities. From this sacrifice, (certainly no inconsiderable one,) which they made rather than violate the law, it is evident they were not easily seduced from the worship of the true God, and that they always contributed much to its preservation. They therefore could not have been so contemptible a class of men, as many at the present day have represented them.¹

Nadab, the son of Jeroboam, succeeded to the throne, but in the second year of his reign he was put to death with all his father's house by Baasha, as Ahijah had predicted.² Baasha reigned twenty four years. He fixed his residence at Tirzah. Because he did not reform the abuses of Jeroboam, the prophet Jehu, the son of Hanani, declared to him the determination of God to exterminate his family.³ Elah, his son, succeeded him in the 45th year of the Revolt, 930 B. C. ; but in the second year of his reign he was murdered with all his father's family by Zimri, according to the prediction of Jehu.⁴

When the army, who were besieging Gibbethon on the frontiers of the Philistines, heard of Zimri's treachery, they elected Omri, their general, king, and marched to Tirzah where Zimri had elevated himself to the throne. Zimri made no resistance, but fled to the harem, which he set on fire and perished in the flames. In the mean time a part of the people had made Tibni king, and though this was the weaker party, it existed for a considerable time ; and it was not till after Tibni's death, that Omri's claims were generally acknowledged. Omri reigned twelve years. He built Samaria, about thirty two miles north of Jerusalem, and made it his capital, and there all the succeeding kings of Israel resided.⁵

Ahab, his son, the weakest of all the Israelitish monarchs, reigned twenty one years, from the year 57 to 78 of the Revolt, and from 918 to 897 B. C. He was entirely under the influence of his idolatrous wife, Jezebel, a daughter of Ethbaal or Ithobalus, king of Tyre. Hitherto the golden calves had been the only objects of idolatrous worship ; but now Ahab and Jezebel united their authority to introduce the gods of other nations. The king built a temple at Samaria, erected an image and consecrated a grove, to Baal, the god of the Zidonians. Jezebel maintained a multitude of priests and prophets of Baal. Idolatry became the predominant religion. Jehovah, and the golden calves as representations of him, were viewed with no more reverence than Baal and his image. It appeared as if the knowledge of God was forever lost to the Israelites. But Elijah, the prophet, boldly resisted the regal authority, and retained many of his countrymen in the worship of the true God. The greater the power was which supported idolatry, so much the more striking were the prophecies and miracles which directed the attention of the Israelites to Jehovah, and brought dis-

grace on the idols and their worshippers. At last the judgement of God on Ahab and his house, was pronounced by Elijah, that during the reign of his son, his whole race should be exterminated. Ahab died of the wounds which he had received in a battle with the Syrians, according to the prediction of Micaiah, the son of Imlah.⁶

Ahaziah was no better than his father Ahab. In the second year of his reign, he fell through the lattice of an upper apartment of his palace, and died soon after, as Elijah had foretold.⁷ Jehoram, the second son of Ahab, reigned twelve years, from 79 to 91 of the Revolt, and from 896 to 884 B. C. By the prophecies and miracles of Elijah, he had been brought to acknowledge Jehovah as his God and Sovereign. He, however, suffered the golden calves to remain, made no attempt to abolish idolatry, and even left undisturbed the temple of Baal at Samaria; probably because he feared the power of his mother Jezebel, who patronised these abominations. He however took away the idolatrous image of Baal which his father Ahab had made. Elisha, who like Elijah, was a distinguished instrument of divine providence for the preservation of the law, and consequently for the protection and prosperity of Israel, or to use his own language, was *the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof*, always found a ready audience with Jehoram and gave him many good counsels, in consequence of which the Syrians, with whom Israel had been at war ever since the reign of Omri, suffered several considerable repulses and were forced to acknowledge the power of Jehovah. Jehoram also gained an important victory over the Moabites, who had revolted under the reign of Ahab, and under Ahaziah had made themselves completely independent. But idolatry and rebellion against Jehovah still continued. Even the seven years' famine, which forced many to emigrate, produced no reformation. Finally, the kingdom was promised to Jehu, the commander in chief, by a young disciple of Elisha; and he immediately executed the sentence pronounced against Ahab, and extirpated his whole family in obedience to the orders of king Jehovah.⁸

1 1 Kings 12: 25. 14: 7—17. 2 Chron. 11: 13—17. 2 1 Kings 15: 25—32. 14: 7—10. 3 1 Kings 15: 33, 34. 16: 1—7. 4 1 Kings 16: 8—14. 5 1 Kings 16: 15—29. 6 1 Kings 16: 29 to 22: 40. 7 1 Kings 22: 50 to 2 Kings 1. 8 2 Kings III—VIII.

NOTE. Ethbaal, king of Tyre, whose daughter Jezebel was Ahab's queen, is mentioned by Menander under the name Ithobalus. Josephus against Apion, I. 18. This accurate historian gives from the Tyrian annals a catalogue of the kings of Tyre that succeeded Hiram, who was contemporary with Solomon, in the following words:

“ After the death of Hiram, his son Balnazarus succeeded him in the throne, who lived forty three years and reigned seven. Next to him his son Abdastartus, who lived twenty nine years, reigned nine. He was murdered by the four sons of his nurse, the eldest of whom reigned twelve years. Then Astartus, the son of Deleastartus, who lived fifty four years, reigned twelve. Next, his brother Aserymus, who lived fifty four years, reigned nine. He was slain by his brother Pheletes, who then ascended the throne. He lived fifty years and reigned eight months. Ithobalus, a priest of Astarte, put him to death and assumed the sceptre. He lived sixty eight years and reigned thirty two. His successor was his son Badezorus, who lived forty five years and reigned six. His son and successor, Margenus, lived thirty two years and reigned nine. Pygmalion succeeded him, who lived fifty six years and reigned forty seven. In the seventh year of his reign, his sister, Dido, fled and built Carthage in Libya.”

According to this, the time from the death of Hiram to the beginning of the reign of Ithobalus is about fifty years; and from the death of Solomon to the beginning of Ahab's reign there are fifty-seven years. Hiram, who was already king in the time of David, and reigned only thirty two years, must have died at least ten years before Solomon, and consequently, from the death of Hiram to Ahab, there are about sixty seven years. If all these numbers are correct, Ahab must have married Jezebel after he became king. In these calculations, allowance should be made for the mistakes which transcribers are apt to make, in copying numerals. We here see the reason why Jezebel, the daughter of a priest of Astarte, was so zealous a promoter of idolatry; and as twenty one years after the death of Ithobalus, his granddaughter Dido built Carthage, and founded that celebrated commonwealth, we may judge what sort of a spirit animated the females of this royal family. Hence it appears less wonderful, that Jezebel was able to exert such an influence over the kingdom and the king of Israel, and that afterwards, her daughter Athaliah took possession of the throne of Judah. Finally,

as the son of the king's nurse was able to place himself on the throne, this confirms the opinion which was advanced in the *Archæologie*, Th. I. B. II. S. 285, that in the East, nurses held a very important rank in the family.

XXXVII. JUDAH FROM 975 TO 884 B. C.

Rehoboam reigned seventeen years, or to the year 958 B. C. The commencement of his reign was not reprehensible, but when he saw himself firmly seated on the throne, he permitted idolatry, which had already made great inroads during the last years of his father Solomon, to prevail with all its abominations. For his punishment, divine providence suffered Shishak, king of Egypt, to invade Judea with twelve thousand chariots, sixty thousand cavalry, and a great body of infantry. He took all the cities, and even Jerusalem itself was obliged to surrender unconditionally to the conqueror, according to the determination of Jehovah, which was made known by the prophet Shemaiah. Shishak contented himself with the riches of the temple and of the royal treasury, and returned to Egypt. Jeroboam, while in exile, had enjoyed the protection of this monarch, and it was he probably, who excited him to attack Judah. This kingdom was receiving constant accessions of strength by emigrations from Israel, and it was the policy of Jeroboam to weaken it, in order to secure himself against the hostilities of Rehoboam.¹

Abijah or Abijam, the son of Rehoboam, reigned only three years, to the 20th year of the Revolt, 955 B. C. With courage resulting from the principles of the theocracy, he ventured with four hundred thousand men to engage in battle with Jeroboam, whose army consisted of eight hundred thousand. He gained an important victory, and five hundred thousand of the Israelitish army were left dead on the field. In numbers so large, there may be some error of the transcribers, but it is certain that after this defeat, the kingdom of Israel was very much weakened, while Judah made constant progress in power and importance.² We must here mention once for all, that we cannot answer for the correctness of the great numbers of men in the armies which are mentioned here, and in the sequel; for transcribers were very liable to mistake in copying numerals. When there are no means of rectifying these numbers, we set them down as they occur in the books.

Asa, the son of Abijam, reigned forty one years, to 61 of the Revolt, 914 B. C. He ascended the throne two years before the death of Jeroboam, and as he was then very young, the affairs of the kingdom were administered by his mother, an Israelite of the race of Absalom, but a very superstitious woman, who encouraged idolatry by all the means in her power. But as soon as the young king assumed the government, he rooted out this disorder from the whole country, and walked in the steps of David. He neglected no human means to put his kingdom in the best condition possible, for which purpose the peace he enjoyed during the first ten years of his reign, afforded him time and opportunity. His people increased so much, that he was able to bring into the field an army of five hundred and eighty thousand men. In the eleventh year of his reign, relying upon God he attacked with this army and defeated the numerous host of Zerah, king of Cush, (undoubtedly both of the Arabian and Ethiopian Cush,) who had penetrated through Arabia Petrea into the vale of Zephathah, with a million of men and three hundred chariots. The prophet Azariah declared this splendid victory to be a consequence of the king's confidence in Jehovah, and exhorted him to perseverance; upon which he abolished the remains of idolatry, and caused the whole people to renew their covenant with Jehovah. Notwithstanding this, afterwards, when king Baasha had taken from him the city of Ramah and was fortifying it for a frontier barrier, he purchased the friendship of the king of Damascus with the wealth of the temple and of the royal treasury, and induced him to attack Israel. By this means he indeed regained Ramah, but his treasures were squandered. The prophet Hanani reproved him for his conduct, as it evinced a distrust of Jehovah; but the king imprisoned him for his fidelity. In the last years of his life, he treated many others with great severity, to which probably the ill humour occasioned by the gout in his feet, contributed not a little.³

In the time of Asa, the celebrated poet Hesiod flourished among the Greeks, about the year 944 B. C. according to the Parian Marbles.

Jehoshaphat, who ascended the throne in the fourth year of Ahab, king of Israel, and reigned twenty five years, to the 84th of the Revolt, and 891 B. C. was still more faithful to Jehovah, his Sovereign, than his father Asa had been. He not only suppressed

idolatry in the most careful manner, but he sent out priests and Levites into every town, to instruct the people. These teachers he raised to the rank of royal counsellors, in order to increase their authority. He travelled himself through the country to see whether his orders were executed. He improved the administration of justice by the establishment of a supreme tribunal, and brought his military affairs to a prosperous condition. The effect of his judicious government was visible in the number of his people, who so increased that he was able to bring into the field a well disciplined and well furnished army of one million, one hundred and sixty thousand men. Among these, however, are probably to be included the Edomites, the Philistines, and many Arabians, who acknowledged his authority. But although thus powerful, he was disposed to peace, and he was the author of the first treaty between Judah and Israel. He visited king Ahab at Samaria, and joined him in an expedition against the Syrians. This step was disapproved of by the prophet Jehu, the son of Hanani; and indeed, as the enterprise proved unfortunate, Jehoshaphat sunk greatly in the estimation of the neighbouring people, on account of the concern he had in it. He had before been feared by all the surrounding nations, but now the Ammonites and Moabites pressed into Judea by the way of Edom. Though they were defeated by Jehoshaphat, in connexion with Jehoram, king of Israel, and the Edomites, yet the victory was altogether the work of divine providence, and an evident reward of Jehoshaphat's fidelity to Jehovah. His attempt to revive the navigation of the Red Sea was unsuccessful. He seems, however, never to have relinquished the enterprise, though he refused to enter into a commercial alliance with the king of Israel. If he had never formed any connexion with the idolatrous house of Ahab, or at least, if he had not married Jehoram, his son and the heir of his crown, to Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, much commotion and bloodshed would have been avoided in Judea.⁴ During this reign, Homer flourished among the Greeks. The Parian Marbles place him in the year 907 B. C.

Jehoram was admitted to a participation in his father's throne in the 84th year of the Revolt, 891 B. C. and he reigned eight years. The unhappy consequences of the union with Athaliah, the Israelitish princess, now began to be visible. All the brothers of the king were murdered, undoubtedly through the influence of

Athaliah; and idolatry was introduced by royal authority. Upon this, the Edomites revolted, and although they were once defeated by Jehoram, who still had his father's army under his command, they nevertheless made themselves independent, according to the prophecy of Isaac.⁵ The Philistines also rebelled, and the Arabians who bordered on the Cushites. They made an incursion into Judea, plundered the whole country, and even Jerusalem and the royal palace. They led away into slavery all the women of the king's harem, and all the royal princes with the exception of Jehoahaz, or (as he is also called) Ahaziah. Even Libnah, the city of the priests, renounced allegiance to Jehoram because he had forsaken Jehovah, the God of his fathers. He died a miserable death, and was denied the honours of a royal burial.⁶

His son Ahaziah, or Jehoahaz, succeeded him, and reigned only one year. He was no better than his father, and suffered himself to be governed in every thing by the wicked counsels of his idolatrous mother, Athaliah. He joined Jehoram, king of Israel, in an expedition against Hazael, king of Damascus or Syria, for the conquest of Ramoth-gilead; and he afterwards visited king Jehoram, while he lay wounded in his summer palace at Jezreel. Here Jehu slew both kings on the same day, in the year 91 of the Revolt, 884 B. C.⁷

During the eighty five first years of this period, the kingdom of Judah made rapid advances, but afterwards it continually degenerated and finally lost all its power.

¹ 1 Kings 14: 21—31. 2 Chron. XII. ² 1 Kings 15: 1—8. 2 Chron. XIII. ³ 1 Kings 15: 9—24. 2 Chron. XIV—XVI. ⁴ 1 Kings 22: 1—50. 2 Chron. XVII—XX. ⁵ Gen. 27: 40. ⁶ 2 Kings 8: 16—24. 2 Chron. XXI. ⁷ 2 Kings 8: 25—29. 9: 27—30. 2 Chron. 22: 1—9.

NOTE. Shishak, who invaded Judea during the reign of Rehoboam, according to Marsham, Canon. Chron. XIV. p. 376, is Sesostris, the third king of the twelfth Diospolitic dynasty; according to Silberschlag, Chronologie der Welt, S. 143, Sesenchosis, the first of the twenty second Bubastic dynasty; according to Gatterer, Weltgeschichte im ganzen Umfang, S. 224, Susenes or Phusenes, the second of the twenty first Tanitic dynasty; according to Syncellus, Semendes, the first of the twenty first Tanitic dynasty; and according to others, he is the Asyches of Herodotus. (See the Table of the Egyptian dynasties at the end of the volume.) Such a con-

troversy cannot be easily decided. See Perizonius, *Orig. Aegypt.* Cap. 13. p. 222 seq. From 1 Chron. 12: 3, we know only that Shishak had in his army Troglodytes, Libyans and Ethiopians, and consequently, that his authority must have been very widely extended.

XXXVIII. ISRAEL FROM 884 TO 759 B. C.

Jehu, who had extirpated the family of Ahab, ascended the throne of Israel in the 91st year of the Revolt, 884 B. C. and reigned twenty eight years. He entirely abolished idolatry, condemned to death at a festival the idolatrous priests and prophets of Baal, as traitors to king Jehovah, and turned the temple of Baal into a draughthouse. He however suffered the golden calves to remain. For his services he received a divine promise, that his descendants should possess the throne for four generations. But the idolatry of Ahab and Jezebel was not annihilated by this coercive reformation. Many still practised it ; but it was no longer upheld by the regal authority. On account of this idolatry, the whole territory east of the Jordan fell into the hands of the Syrians.¹

Jehu's son, Jehoahaz, reigned seventeen years, to 135 of the Revolt, 840 B. C. He was pressed so closely by the Syrians, that at last he was able to retain only one thousand men of infantry, fifty of cavalry, and ten chariots. But as he acknowledged the authority of Jehovah over Israel, he was finally released from these haughty foes, and obtained peace. Joash, his son, reigned seventeen years. As the idolatrous generation had now become extinct, he was able to hold the Syrians in check, and in the end to gain the preponderance over them. He conquered several cities, and the prophet Elisha, while on his death bed, predicted that he should gain three victories.

Jeroboam II. a son of Joash, reigned forty one years, to 191 of the Revolt, 784 B. C. He was as much the enemy of idolatry as his father, and consequently his arms were also victorious. He recovered from the Syrians all the conquests they had made during the reigns of Jehu and Jehoahaz, and restored to the empire its ancient boundaries ; as Jonah, the son of Amittai, had predicted.²

As soon as Israel was quiet from the Syrians, it was disturbed by domestic broils, and hastened rapidly towards destruction. Upon the death of Jeroboam II. (in the thirty eighth year of

Uzziah or Azariah, king of Israel,) his son Zachariah ascended the throne. For twelve years great internal commotions prevailed. Kings were suddenly raised to the throne, and as suddenly removed; agreeably to the representation which Hosea, who prophesied at this time, gives of the state of the kingdom. This shows a gross degeneracy in respect to religion and morals; as appears also by the prophecy of Hosea. The people were dissatisfied with Zachariah, and he was murdered by Shallum in the sixth month of his reign, 202 of the Revolt, 773 B. C. Thus the prediction was accomplished, that the family of Jehu should retain the throne only to the fourth generation.³

The regicide Shallum placed himself on the throne, and notwithstanding the civil disturbances of the kingdom, he collected force sufficient to conquer Thapsacus, (Tiphseh,) on which occasion he treated the inhabitants with great cruelty.⁴ Soon after, he was slain by his general Menahem, having reigned only one month.

Menahem retained the sceptre ten years, and died a natural death. His reign was very unfortunate. Pul, king of Assyria, (which empire now emerges from its obscurity, and in the course of forty or fifty years acquires universal dominion,) made war against him, perhaps on account of the conquest of Thapsacus by Shallum. Menahem could not resist this powerful conqueror. He purchased peace by one thousand talents, that is, three million shekels of silver, and became tributary to Assyria. As the king raised this sum by a tax of fifty shekels a head on his military men, it appears that his army amounted to sixty thousand strong, and that the whole system of government during the preceding disquiets had become military.

Pekahiah, the son of Menahem, succeeded him, but after a reign of two years he was murdered by Pekah, the commander of his army, in the year of Uzziah's death, 216 of the Revolt, 759 B. C.⁵

During the first fifty years of this period, the kingdom of Israel sunk deeper and deeper in degeneracy and misery, in the next half century it regained its ancient power and greatness; but during the succeeding twenty five years it again rapidly degenerated.

¹ 2 Kings 10: 18—36. ² 2 Kings XIII. XIV. ³ 2 Kings 15: 8—12.

⁴ 2 Kings 15: 13—16. [The passage referred to attributes the conquest of Tiphseh to Menahem. But he might have taken the city while he commanded the army of Shallum. Tr.] ⁵ 2 Kings 15: 17—26.

NOTE. Benhadad, the king of Syria, who resided at Damascus, gave much trouble to Ahab, Ahaziah and Jehoram, the kings of Israel. Hazael, one of his principal officers, suffocated him as he lay sick, by wetting and applying to his face, the veil which is used to keep off the gnats during sleep. Hazael succeeded to the throne, and during the reigns of Jehu and Jehoahaz, took possession of all the Israelitish territory east of the Jordan. As late as the time when Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus, these two Syrian kings received divine honours from the inhabitants of Damascus, but were placed by them at a more remote period in antiquity. See Josephus, Antiquities, IX. 4: 6. His words are: "When Hazael was come to Benhadad, he told him good news concerning his distemper, but the next day, he spread a wet cloth, in the nature of a net, over him, and strangled him and took his dominion. He was an active man, and had the good will of the Syrians and of the people of Damascus to a great degree; by whom both Benhadad himself and Hazael, who ruled after him, are honoured to this day as gods by reason of their benefactions, and their building them temples, by which they adorned the city of the Damascenes. They also every day do with great pomp pay their worship to these kings, and value themselves upon their antiquity; nor do they know that those kings are much later than they imagine, and that they are not yet eleven hundred years old." (*Whiston's Translation.*)

XXXIX. JUDAH FROM 884 TO 759 B. C.

As soon as Athaliah heard at Jerusalem, that her son, king Ahaziah, had been slain by Jehu, she took possession of the vacant throne, and murdered all the males of the royal family, with the exception of Joash, the youngest son of Ahaziah. He being then an infant, was rescued by Jehosheba, a sister of Ahaziah: and he was privately brought up by a nurse in an apartment of the temple. The idolatrous Athaliah reigned more than six years, to the 98th of the Revolt, 877 B. C. During this year, by the management of the high priest Jehoiada, the young prince was publicly anointed king in the temple, under the protection of a strong escort of well armed Levites. Athaliah at the same time suffered the punishment of death, which she had merited by her idolatry, treason and violent usurpation. On this occasion the covenant with

Jehovah was renewed, and the people bound themselves by an oath to observe it; a precaution which had been rendered very necessary, by the long continuance of an idolatrous government.¹

Joash or Jehoash reigned forty years, to the 137th of the Revolt, 838 B. C. During the life of his guardian, the high priest Jehoiada, his government was entirely conformed to the principles of the theocracy. The idolatry introduced by Athaliah was abolished, and about the year 120 of the Revolt, the temple was repaired, and the people voluntarily contributed to defray the necessary expenses. But after the death of Jehoiada, it appeared that idolatry had taken deep root during the fourteen years of its predominance under Jehoram, Abaziah and Athaliah. The rulers themselves came before the throne and requested toleration for the worship of idols. Joash was weak enough to grant their request; and when the prophet Zechariah predicted national calamities on this account, the king was so ungrateful as to suffer him to be stoned in the court of the temple, though he was the son of his guardian Jehoiada, to whom he was indebted for his life, his education and his throne, and to whom the nation had awarded the honours of a royal burial. But this ingratitude and cruelty did not prevent the fulfilment of the prophecy. The king of Syria, who then possessed all Gilead, came to Jerusalem with a small body of troops, put to death the rulers who had demanded the toleration of idolatry, and returned, laden with spoil, to Damascus. Joash, who had been wounded, was slain soon after by his own servants and denied the honours of a royal burial.²

Amaziah, his son, reigned twenty nine years, to 164 of the Revolt, 811 B. C. Like his father, he began well and then degenerated. In the condemnation of his father's murderers, he observed the law which forbids children to be involved in the punishment due to their parents.³ At the admonition of a prophet, he dismissed one hundred thousand men, whom he had hired from the kingdom of Israel, to assist him in carrying on a war against the Edomites. He, however, gave them the one hundred talents of silver, which had been stipulated for their wages; and he then gained a decisive victory over his enemies in the valley of Salt, as the prophet had foretold. But when he afterwards worshipped the gods which he had taken from the Edomites, and set them up at Jerusalem, and refused to listen to the warnings of a prophet, the success of

his arms ceased. He engaged in a war with Jehoahaz, king of Israel, on account of the depredations committed by the mercenary Israelitish troops, who, enraged at their dismissal, had on their return murdered three thousand Jews and plundered in every place through which they passed. Amaziah was defeated and taken prisoner at the battle of Beth-shemesh. Jehoahaz replaced the captive monarch on his throne; but he plundered Jerusalem and the temple, demolished four hundred cubits of the city wall, and took hostages with him to Samaria. Amaziah was finally assassinated by conspirators at Lachish, whither he had fled for protection.⁴

Uzziah, also called Azariah, was raised to the throne by the people, after the death of his father Amaziah. He was then sixteen years old, and he reigned fifty two years, to the 216th of the Revolt, 759 B. C. He had an army of three hundred and seven thousand, five hundred men, he built new fortifications and repaired the old, provided them with suitable arms, and carried on wars successfully. He conquered Elath, Gath, Jabneh, and Ashdod; he defeated the Arabs of Gur-baal, the Mehunims and the Ammonites. Though so much engaged in military operations, he found time to cultivate the arts of peace. He advanced the interests of agriculture, and made great improvements in the pasturage and breed of cattle. He was for the most part obedient to the law, though he did not demolish the unlawful altars, and on one occasion he attempted to usurp the privileges of the priesthood. For this act of impiety he was punished with leprosy, and for the rest of his life he dwelt in a separate house. Meanwhile the affairs of government were administered by his son Jotham.⁵

The famous era of the Olympiads commenced in the thirty fifth year of Uzziah, 199 of the Revolt, 776 B. C.

¹ 2 Kings xi. 2 Chron. 22: 9—12. 23: 1—21. ² 2 Kings xii. 2 Chron. xxiv. ³ Deut. 24: 16. ⁴ 2 Kings 14: 1—22. 2 Chron. xxv. ⁵ 2 Kings. 15: 1—7. 2 Chron. xxvi.

XL. ISRAEL FROM 759 TO 722 B. C.

Pekah, the murderer of Pekahiah, ascended the throne of Israel in the last year of Uzziah. He formed an alliance with Rezin, king of Syria, for the purpose of making war upon Judah, expelling the family of David, and placing on the throne a tributary

king of another race. They probably engaged in this design in order to strengthen themselves against Assyria, who was becoming more and more formidable, and threatened to overpower all her neighbours. But when the allied sovereigns had gained a few advantages over Judah, Tiglath-pileser, king of Assyria, came and subdued Syria, Galilee, and all the territory east of the Jordan, in the year 735 of the Revolt, 740 B. C. He sent the principal inhabitants of Syria to the river Kir, (Cyrus,) which at the present day is called Kur by the Russians, and Kier by the Persians. It mingles its waters with the Aras or Araxes, and empties itself into the Caspian Sea under the thirty ninth degree of north latitude. A people of a foreign aspect, called *Usbecks*, dwell there to this time, who may be the descendants of these captives.¹ The principal inhabitants of Galilee were transferred to Assyria. Pekah was put to death by Hoshea.²

Though the kingdom of Israel was now enclosed within such narrow boundaries, and surrounded on two sides by the powerful Assyrians, it did not remain quiet, but was continually exhausting its strength by intestine broils and conspiracies. For Pekah was murdered in the third or fourth year of Ahaz; and Hoshea did not ascend the throne till the twelfth year of the same reign. Consequently this state of anarchy continued for nine years, that is, from 735 to 744 of the Revolt, and from 740 to 731 B. C.³

Hosea or Hoshea was a better ruler than most of his predecessors; but his kingdom was too much weakened to withstand the Assyrian power. Therefore, when Shalmaneser invaded him, he was obliged to become tributary. This was unavoidable, but Hosea very imprudently attempted to shake off the yoke. He formed an alliance with So, king of Egypt, and imprisoned the Assyrian officer who was appointed to collect the tribute. Upon this, Shalmaneser laid siege to Samaria, and after three years he gained possession of the city and destroyed it. During all this time, the king of Egypt made no attempt to come to the assistance of Israel, as Isaiah had declared from the first, and in language of strong reprehension against this alliance.⁴ Shalmaneser carried the principal inhabitants, soldiers and armourers, to Halah, (Chalachene,) to the river Habor, (Chaboras, and in Ezekiel, Chebar,) and to Gozan on the east side of the Tigris, and to the cities of the Medes. On the other hand, colonists were brought to Samaria from Babylon, Cuthah, Ava, Hamath and Sepharvaim. It appears also that Esar-had-

don afterwards sent other colonists into this country.⁵ These people mingled with the Israelites who still dwelt in the land, and they were all comprehended under the general name of Samaritans, which was derived from the city Samaria. They were at first all idolaters, but as wild beasts increased in their depopulated territory, they began to be disturbed by lions, and this calamity they supposed to be sent on them by the god of the country, as a punishment for their neglect of his worship. Accordingly an Israelitish priest was recalled from exile, in order to instruct these idolaters in the worship of Jehovah, as a national deity. He settled at Bethel, where one of the golden calves had formerly stood, and afterwards the Samaritans united the worship of Jehovah with the worship of their own gods.⁶

¹ Büschings Magazin, Th. X. S. 402. ² 2 Kings 15: 27—31. 16: 1—10. Isaiah vii. ³ The reading 2 Kings 15: 30 in the twentieth year of Jotham, is manifestly incorrect; compare 15: 23. ⁴ Isaiah 30: 1—7. ⁵ Ezra 4: 2, comp. 9, 10. ⁶ 2 Kings xvii.

NOTE 1. So, the ally of Hoshea, seems to be Sevechus, the second king of the twenty fifth Ethiopic dynasty; especially as the Hebrew consonants, סָוֶכ, may be pronounced Seve, and thus the name bears a near resemblance to Sevechus. Some suppose So to be Sabacon, the first king of the Ethiopic dynasty; but according to the account of Herodotus, II. 137—139, he was a hero to whom the description of So in Isaiah 30: 3—5, cannot well be applied. Others suppose him to be Anysis the Blind, who is said to have hid himself fifty years, during the Ethiopic dynasty, and then to have reascended the throne. Others again suppose him to be Sethos, the successor of Anysis. (See the table at the end of the volume.)

NOTE 2. The ancient Assyrian empire should be carefully distinguished from the modern, with which the Hebrew history of these times is so intimately connected. The accounts of the ancient empire are very scanty and uncertain. Though it has been represented by the Greeks as very great and powerful, we have already remarked that this representation does not agree with oriental history. It ended with Sardanapalus, and was destroyed by Arbaces the Mede, about the seventh year of Uzziah's reign, 171 of the Revolt, 804 B. C. After the death of Arbaces, there was an interregnum in Media of seventy nine years, and during

this period the Assyrians made themselves independent of the Medes.

This we call the *modern* Assyrian empire, the sovereigns of which are exhibited in the following table.

NAMES.	Year of the Revolt.	B. C.	Years of their Reign.
Pul	201	774	21
Tiglath-pileser	222	753	19
Shalmaneser	241	734	14
Sennacherib	255	720	7
Esar-haddon	262	713	35
Sardochaeus	297	678	20
Chyniladan	317	658	22
Saracus	339	636	13
End	352	623	

The golden age of this empire continued from Pul to Esar-haddon, when its boundaries extended towards the west as far as to the Mediterranean Sea. Esar-haddon brought the Babylonian empire under his dominion, though he still suffered it to be governed by princes or viceroys; but his successor Sardochaeus united it with Assyria. The Sargon (Isaiah 20: 1,) who conquered Ashdod by his general Tartan, appears to be Esar-haddon, or rather perhaps Sennacherib, as he, according to Jerome, (Comment. in Jes. 20: 1.) had several names.

XLI. JUDAH FROM 759 TO 699 B. C.

On account of the leprosy of king Uzziah, Jotham began to reign during his father's life. After the death of Uzziah, the reign of Jotham continued sixteen years, to 232 of the Revolt, 743 B. C. He was obedient to the law, he continued the improvements of the kingdom begun by his father, he built several fortresses, and made the Ammonites tributary. In the last year of his reign, the alliance between Pekah and Rezin, king of Syria, was formed; but the effects of it did not appear till after his death.¹ In the eleventh year of Jotham, 227 of the Revolt, 748 B. C. the city of Rome was founded, with the destinies of which the Hebrews were one day to be so intimately connected. Others place the founding of this city 750 or 752 B. C. In the year following, viz. the twelfth

of Jotham, 228 of the Revolt, 747 B. C. commences the era of Nabonassar, in the Canon of Ptolemy.

Ahaz, the son and successor of Jotham, was the most corrupt monarch that had hitherto appeared in Judah. His reign continued sixteen years, to 247 of the Revolt, 728 B. C. He respected neither Jehovah, the law, nor the prophets; he broke over all the restraints which the law imposed on the Hebrew kings, and regarded nothing but his own depraved inclinations. He introduced the religion of the Syrians into Jerusalem, erected altars to the Syrian gods, altered the temple in many respects according to the Syrian model, and finally shut it up entirely. His cowardice was equal to his superstition. After he had suffered a few repulses from Pekah and Rezin, his allied foes; when the Edomites had revolted from him, and the Philistines were making incursions into his country; notwithstanding a sure promise of divine deliverance, he called Pul, the king of Assyria, to his aid. To this monarch he became tributary, on condition that he would force Syria and Israel to relinquish their design of destroying Judah; and thus he gave to Tiglath-pileser, the successor of Pul, an opportunity to conquer Syria, Galilee and Gilead. But the Assyrian king afforded Ahaz no real assistance. On the contrary, he drove him to such difficulties, that the Jewish king could scarcely purchase a release from his troublesome protector, by all the riches of the temple, of the nobility of his kingdom, and of the royal treasury.²

Hezekiah succeeded, and reigned twenty nine years, to the 276th of the Revolt, 699 B. C. He did not follow the bad example of his father, but walked in the steps of his ancestor David. Immediately on his accession to the throne, he opened the temple, restored the worship of God, abolished idolatry, destroyed the brazen serpent of Moses, which had become an object of idolatrous worship, overthrew the altars illegally erected to Jehovah, and caused the festivals to be regularly celebrated. To these feasts he invited the Hebrews who still remained in the kingdom of Israel, which had been conquered in the sixth year of his reign. Like David, he provided for the instruction and moral improvement of his people, by the public singing of psalms in the temple, and by a new collection of the moral maxims of Solomon. He built new fortifications and magazines, and supplied Jerusalem more plentifully with water by a new aqueduct. He conquered the Philistines, who had penetrated into the southern parts of Judea, during the

reign of his father ; and shook off the Assyrian yoke which Ahaz had voluntarily taken on himself. But in the fourteenth year of his reign, Sennacherib came with a large army to reduce Judah to obedience, and to conquer Egypt. Hezekiah submitted to this potent conqueror, and paid the three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold, which were required. But after Sennacherib had gained possession of Ashdod, the key to Egypt, he thought it would be unsafe, in his invasion of this country, to leave unsubdued in his rear, the kingdom of Judah, which had already once thrown off his yoke. He therefore determined to complete the subjugation of Judah in the first place, especially as he had seen its weakness, and supposed that the enterprise would be attended with but little difficulty. He soon reduced all the cities to his power, except Libnah and Lachish, to which he laid siege, and Jerusalem, to which he gave a very haughty summons to surrender, by his general Rabshakeh. Though to all human appearance, every thing was now lost, Hezekiah still relied on the promise of divine deliverance, announced to him by Isaiah ; and this deliverance was soon accomplished, and in a manner that admirably corresponded to the implicit confidence of Hezekiah. A report was spread abroad, that Tirhakah, (Taracos or Tearcon,) king of Cush,—(one of the greatest heroes of all antiquity, who ruled over, not only the Arabian, and African or Ethiopian Cush, but also over Egypt, and is said to have pushed his conquests as far as the Pillars of Hercules,)—was on his march through Arabia to attack the Assyrian territories ; and soon after, one hundred and eighty five thousand men of Sennacherib's army died in one night. Sennacherib now fled to Assyria, and was soon after assassinated by his own sons in the temple of Nisroch at Nineveh.³ By these disasters, Assyria seems to have lost much of her power, or at least to have dreaded hostilities from Tirhakah ; for Esar-haddon, the successor of Sennacherib, though he sent colonists to Samaria, made no attempts against Judah.

Soon after, Hezekiah himself was attacked by the plague which had proved so fatal to Sennacherib's army, and though it made its appearance externally, there was so little hope of his recovery that Isaiah earnestly requested him to make his will. But he afterwards received from the same prophet a divine promise of recovery, and of an addition of fifteen years to his life. For the confirmation of this promise the king requested a miracle, and accord-

ingly, the shadow of the style went back ten degrees on the dial. This prolonging of the king's life was so much the more important, as at that time there was no heir to the crown.⁴ This event, (which was recorded in the annals of the nation, and celebrated in the thanksgiving ode of Hezekiah,) and the miraculous deliverance from Sennacherib, not only cured the Hebrews of the idolatry introduced by Ahaz, and retained them for some time in their fidelity to Jehovah, but it also excited the admiration of all the neighbouring people. Merodach-baladan, the son of Baladan, king of Babylon, sent an embassy to Hezekiah to congratulate him on his recovery, and on his deliverance from Sennacherib, (to whom Babylon was not at that time tributary,) and to make inquiry respecting this miracle.⁵ On this occasion, Hezekiah received the melancholy prediction of the Babylonian captivity; and that too at a time when Babylon was an inconsiderable kingdom, (262 of the Revolt, 713 B. C.) which was soon after subjugated by Assyria, (295 of the Revolt,) and when the people who were completely to fulfil this prediction, were almost unknown.⁶ If one would interpret this prophecy of the imprisonment of Manasseh at Babylon, whither he was carried by the Assyrians, he need only read the words of Isaiah to be convinced, that the prediction refers to some far more important events, which were first brought about by the Chaldeans.⁷

¹ 2 Kings 15: 32—38. 2 Chron. xxvii. ² 2 Kings xvi. 2 Chron. xxviii. ³ Prov. 25: 1. 2 Kings xviii, xix. 2 Chron. xxix—xxxii. Isaiah xxxvi, xxxvii. ⁴ Psalms lxxxviii, lxxxix. ⁵ 2 Chron. 32: 24—33. 2 Kings 20: 1—13. Isa. 38: 1—22. 39: 1, 2. ⁶ 2 Kings 20: 14—21. Isa. 39: 3—8 comp. 23: 13. ⁷ 2 Chron. 33: 11. Isa. 39: 6, 7.

NOTE. I. The overthrow of Sennacherib, whose expedition was designed particularly against Egypt, is described by Herodotus, (II. 141,) but evidently corrupted by the Egyptian priests, from whom Herodotus received the narration. His words are: "After this, a priest of Vulcan, by name Setho, ascended the throne. He very imprudently treated the soldiers with great severity, as though he should never stand in need of their services. He insulted them in many ways, and took from them the lands which had been granted to them by former kings, at the rate of twelve aruræ (*ἀρούρας*) to a man. (Compare Isa. 19: 1—4.) But afterwards,

when Sanacharib, king of the Arabs and Assyrians, was leading a great army against Egypt, the Egyptian soldiers refused to lend their aid against him. The priest was now in great perplexity, and going into the temple, he complained to his idol with tears, of the peril he was in. In the midst of his complaints he was overtaken by sleep, and there appeared to him in a vision the god standing by him, and bidding him to be of good courage, for no misfortune should befall him in encountering the Arabian army; for he himself would send him helpers. Confiding in this dream, he took such Egyptians as were willing to follow him, and encamped at Pelusium; for through this place the invaders must necessarily make their attack. None of the soldiers followed him, but only the merchants, artificers, and populace. When they had arrived there, fieldmice in great numbers spread themselves about among their enemies, and gnawed in pieces the quivers and bows and thongs of the shields, so that on the following morning they were obliged to flee, destitute of arms, and many fell. And now there stands in the temple of Vulcan a stone statue of this king, having a mouse in his hand, and speaking by an inscription to the following effect: *Let him who looks on me, reverence the gods.*" Ἐξ ἐμὲ τίς ὀπίων, εὐσεβῆς ἔστω.

From this narrative, though considerably distorted, it is plain that the Egyptians attributed the deliverance from Sennacherib to a deity, and to that deity whom the Greeks call Ἡφαίστος, Vulcan. Among the Egyptians he is named Phtha or Kneph; and because he is said to have made the world, he is also called *Ἀημιουργός*, the Artificer. Now as the God of the Hebrews was the Creator of the world, the Egyptians might easily confound him with their Phtha, and attribute this deliverance to the latter. The circumstance of Setho's going into the temple and complaining of his danger to Phtha, is manifestly borrowed from what is related of Hezekiah, Isa. 37: 14, 15.

Eusebius makes Setho the first king of the nineteenth Diospolitic dynasty, and assigns to his reign fifty five years. But if Tirkakah, whom Manetho places as the third of the twentyfifth Ethiopic dynasty, with a reign of twenty years, was master of Egypt, then Setho could be only a tributary king, and a vassal of this universal conqueror; or at most, could reign only over the Delta and

over Upper Egypt. (See the table of the kings of Egypt at the end of the volume.)

NOTE. 2. According to the Canon of Ptolemy, the kings of Babylon, with whom the Hebrews now began to be connected, and with whom they afterwards had much intercourse, were the following :

<i>NAMES.</i>	<i>Year of the Revolt.</i>	<i>Years of B. C. their Reign.</i>	
Nabonassar	228	747	14
Nadius	242	733	2
Chinzirus or Porus	244	731	5
Jugaeus	249	726	5
Mardoch-empadus (Merodach-baladan)	254	721	12
Arkianus	266	709	5
<i>Interregnum</i>	271	704	2
Belibus	273	702	3
Apronadius	276	699	6
Rigebelus	282	693	1
Messomordacus	283	692	4
<i>Interregnum</i>	287	688	8
Esar-haddon, king of Assyria	295	680	13
Sardochoaeus	308	667	20
Chyniladan	328	647	22
Nabopolassar, a Chaldean	350	625	20
Nabocholassar, (Nebuchadnezzar)	370	605	43
Iluarodamus, (Evil-merodach)		562	2
Nirichossolassar (Neriglissor)		560	4
Laborasoarchad (reigned nine months)		556	
Nabonned		556	17

In the Canon of Ptolemy, Laborasoarchad is omitted between Neriglissor and Nabonned, and the nine months of his reign are attributed partly to his predecessor and partly to his successor.

It may be inquired, where in this catalogue of the Babylonian monarchs is Merodach-baladan, the son of Baladan, who sent an embassy to Hezekiah? If the time of this embassy be considered, the fifteenth year of Hezekiah's reign, 262 of the Revolt, 713 B. C. it will be seen that he is the Mardoch-empadus of Ptolemy. The difference in the name, occasioned by the Greek pronunciation, Mardoch, (Merodach,) Empadus, (Baladan,) is trifling, and even if it were greater, it would be of no importance.

It may be remarked further, that Esar-haddon governed the Babylonian empire by tributary princes, and that Sardanapalus first united it to the Assyrian crown. Nabopolassar, the first Chaldean monarch, again made Babylon independent of Assyria. In the thirteenth year of his reign, 363 of the Revolt, 612 B. C. he took Nineveh and utterly destroyed it; for it was never rebuilt, as we are assured by the testimony of Herodotus, I. 106. Strabo, p. 737. Eusebius, Chron. p. 124. and Syncellus, p. 218. The city Mosul was built some time after, near the site of the ancient Nineveh, but on the west bank of the Tigris.

XLII. JUDAH FROM 699 TO 611 B. C.

Manasseh, who reigned fifty five years, to 331 of the Revolt, and 644 B.C. put an end to all the good which his father Hezekiah had done. He upheld idolatry by all the influence of regal power, erected idolatrous altars even in the temple, set up an image which was worshipped with obscene rites, maintained a herd of necromancers, astrologers, and soothsayers of various kinds, and sacrificed his own son to the idol Moloch. No king of Judah had hitherto rebelled against Jehovah in so daring a manner. For this he was defeated in battle by the general of Esar-haddon, or Sardanapalus, overtaken in his flight and carried a prisoner to Babylon, bound with two chains. Thus began the fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah,¹ which was completely accomplished by the Chaldeans. Manasseh, during his imprisonment, reflected on the threatenings of the prophets, repented of his folly and wickedness; and then God permitted him to be restored to his throne. Undoubtedly he remained tributary to the Assyrian monarch, and his territory was probably made to serve as a barrier between Assyria and Egypt. He now earnestly sought to repair the injuries which he had before occasioned. He abolished idolatry, he fortified the city of Zion on the west side by a second high wall, (or perhaps he only rebuilt and carried to a greater height, the wall which the Assyrians had thrown down,) and endeavoured as far as possible to bring his weakened kingdom into a better state.²

Amon appears to have derived little benefit from the instructive example of his father, for he again introduced idolatry. His courtiers formed a conspiracy and assassinated him in the second

year of his reign, 333 of the Revolt, 642 B. C. The people put the regicides to death, and raised to the throne Josiah, the son of Amon, then but eight years old.³

Josiah reigned thirty one years, to 364 of the Revolt, 611 B. C. While he continued a minor, and the affairs of government were administered by a guardian or regent, idolatry, if not protected, was tolerated. But in the sixteenth year of his age, he assumed the administration himself, and not only destroyed idolatry, but also took away the illegal altars of Jehovah. In the eighteenth year of his reign, while he was engaged in the repairing of the temple, the manuscript of Moses was found, and its curses were read to the king. After this, the reformation was forwarded with still greater zeal, and it may truly be said that Josiah endeavoured to render idolatry forever an object of universal disgust and abhorrence. He extended his efforts for the disgracing and the utter annihilating of the worship of idols, not only to the neighbouring tribes of Simeon, Ephraim, and Manasseh, but even to the distant tribe of Naphtali. The remnants of the Hebrews in Israel could offer little resistance to the progress of reformation; for at this time their sovereigns, the kings of Assyria, were involved in perilous wars with the invading Scythians, (so Herodotus calls them, but they were probably Chaldeans,) and with Nabopolassar, the Chaldean, who established his throne at Babylon, 350 of the Revolt, 625 B. C.⁴

In the year 623 B. C. Nabopolassar destroyed the Assyrian empire, and founded the Chaldee-Babylonian empire, which is also sometimes called the Assyrian in the Bible,⁵ and frequently by the Greek writers. In the year 364 of the Revolt, 611 B. C. Nabopolassar had made himself so formidable, that the great monarch of Egypt, Necho or Necos, (who according to Herodotus possessed a large fleet, circumnavigated Africa, and undertook to unite the Red Sea with the Nile by a canal,) exerted all his power to check the progress of this hero. If the Chaldee monarch were the leader of those Scythians who invaded Egypt, Necho might be excited by a desire of revenge; or otherwise, he might wish to make himself master of Asia through jealousy of this new and growing power. He came with a numerous army to Accho, (Ptolemais or Acre,) by sea in order to march through Palestine and Gilead, to the dominions of Nabopolassar. He assured Josiah of his friendly intentions in respect to him, but the pious king, being at that time,

as it appears, in alliance with Nabopolassar, on this account would not allow Necho a passage through his territories. He accordingly drew up his army in the plains of Esdraelon, and a battle was fought at Megiddo, in which Necho was victorious, and Josiah, who went disguised into the field, was mortally wounded. Herodotus mentions this battle in the following words: *Καὶ Σύροισι περὶ ὁ Νεχῶς συμβαλὸν ἐν Μαγδόλω ἐνίκησε μετὰ δὲ τὴν μάχην, Κάδυτιν πόλιν τῆς Συρίας τοῦσαν μεγάλην εἶλε.* He calls the Hebrews, Syrians; Megiddo, Magdolon; and Jerusalem, Kadytis, from *קָדִישׁ*, *The Holy*, as the Arabs at the present day call Jerusalem *أَلْقُدْسُ* or *بيت المقدس* *The House of Holiness, or The Holy City.*

1 Isaiah 39: 3—8. 2 2 Kings 21: 1—18. 2 Chron. 33: 1—20. 3 2 Kings 21: 18—26. 2 Chron. 33: 21—25. 4 2 Kings xxii. 23: 1—28. 2 Chron. xxxiv. 35: 1—19. Herodot. I. 104. Compare Sect. 40. Note, and Sect. 41. Note 2 of this volume. 5 2 Kings 23: 29. 6 2 Kings 23: 29, 30. 2 Chron. 35: 20—27. Herodot. II. 158, 159.

NOTE. This Pharaoh-necho, whom Herodotus calls the son of Psammeticus, and represents as an enterprising hero, with which representation the Bible perfectly accords, Manetho places the sixth, (Necho II,) of the twenty sixth Saitic dynasty.

XLIII. JUDAH FROM 611 TO 588 B. C.

After the death of Josiah, the kingdom of Judah hastened rapidly to ruin. The people raised to the throne Jehoahaz, the younger son of Josiah; probably because he appeared better qualified to reign than the elder. After three months, Necho returned to Jerusalem from the conquest of Phenicia. He deposed Jehoahaz, and placed on the throne the elder son of Josiah, Eliakim, to whom he gave the name Jehoiakim. He also levied a contribution of one hundred talents of silver and one talent of gold, and took the deposed king with him to Egypt. From the smallness of the contribution, it may be seen how low the kingdom of Judah had sunk.¹

Jehoiakim, an unworthy son of Josiah, was in reality, as he is represented by Jeremiah, one of the worst kings that ever ruled over Judah. His reign continued eleven years, to 375 of the Revolt, 600 B. C. In the third year after the battle of Megiddo, Pha-

raoh-necho undertook a second expedition against Nabopolassar, with a numerous army, drawn in part from Western Africa, Libya and Ethiopia. Nabopolassar, who is called Nebuchadnezzar I. was at this time, as Berosus relates, aged and infirm. He therefore gave up a part of his army to his son Nebuchadnezzar, who defeated the Egyptian host at Carchemish (Circesium) on the Euphrates, and drove Necho out of Asia. The victorious prince marched directly to Jerusalem, which was then under the sovereignty of Egypt. After a short siege, Jehoiakim surrendered, and was again placed on the throne by the Babylonian prince. Nebuchadnezzar took part of the furniture of the temple as booty, and carried back with him to Babylon several young men, the sons of the principal Hebrew nobles, among whom were Daniel and his three friends, to be employed in the service of his court, and at the same time to answer the purpose of hostages. Thus the prediction, announced to Hezekiah more than one hundred years before by Isaiah, received a still farther accomplishment.²

With this year commences the Babylonian sovereignty over Judah, or the Babylonian captivity, which, according to the prophecy of Jeremiah,³ was to endure seventy years. That this was the fourth year of Jehoiakim is evident from Jeremiah 25: 1, and 46: 2. In Daniel 1: 1 it is said to be the third year, but this arises merely from a different mode of computation. Jehoiakim came to the throne at the end of the year which Jeremiah reckons as the first, (and such a mode of reckoning is not uncommon,) but Daniel, neglecting the incomplete year, numbers one less. This is properly the 368th of the Revolt, and 607 B. C. But as Usher has made it the 369th of the Revolt, and 606 B. C., and as his computation has generally been received, it may be well to retain it, and not take into the account the small difference of a single year.⁴

Three years after, Jehoiakim rebelled against Babylon, probably in reliance on the assistance which he expected to receive from Egypt. It is said in the Book of Kings, that Jehovah sent the Chaldeans, Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites, against Judah, that Jehoiakim died, and that Jehoiachin his son ascended the throne. But in Chronicles nothing is said of the rebellion, but it is merely related that Nebuchadnezzar came up against Jehoiakim, bound him in chains, and carried him to Babylon. It is plain that some gross error has crept into the Book of Chronicles by means of transcrib-

ers. Probably Jehoiakim held out against Nebuchadnezzar, till the eleventh year of his reign ; that he then died, and while yet unburied, his son Jehoiachin, who had administered the government during his sickness, surrendered ; that the Chaldeans dragged the dead body of the perjured Jehoiakim before the city, and there let it lie unburied, as Jeremiah had predicted.⁵

Jehoiachin or Jeconiah raised himself to the throne, but he retained it only three months. Though he surrendered to the Chaldeans who besieged Jerusalem, he was held a close prisoner. The money of the royal treasury, and the golden utensils of the temple procured by Solomon, were carried away to Babylon ; and the whole court, seven thousand soldiers, one thousand artificers, and two thousand nobles and men of wealth, who with their wives, children, and servants probably amounted to forty thousand souls, were led into captivity to the river Chebar (Chaboras) in Mesopotamia. Thus only the lower class of citizens and the country people, were left behind. Among the captives was the prophet Ezekiel. Nebuchadnezzar placed on the vacant throne, Mattaniah, a brother of Jehoiakim, and gave him the name of Zedekiah.⁶

The Hebrews who remained in Judah, still cherished the hope of being able soon to shake off the Chaldee yoke, and the captives were looking for a speedy return to their native land. Jeremiah earnestly reprov'd the delusions of the former, and Ezekiel those of the latter class ; but their prophecies were not believed. Zedekiah, who seems not to have been a very bad king, otherwise than as he was misled by evil counsellors, in the ninth year of his reign was induced to renounce his allegiance to his powerful lord, and to enter into an alliance with the king of Egypt, Pharaoh-hophra, (Vaphres or Apries,) the eighth of the twentysixth Saitic dynasty. The Chaldee army immediately laid seige to Jerusalem. The Egyptians came up to their relief, but when Nebuchadnezzar marched against them, they returned to Egypt without hazarding a battle. The seige was then resumed, and the city taken in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, the eighteenth of the Babylonian captivity, 387 of the Revolt, 588 B. C. Zedekiah fled by night, but he was overtaken and carried to Nebuchadnezzar, who was encamped at Riblah in the province of Hamath. Here at the command of Nebuchadnezzar, Zedekiah's sons were put to death in his presence, and then his own eyes were put out, and he was led

βύην τήν πολλήν καί Ἰβηρίαν. Strabo says (p. 687.) "that Sesos-tris, king of Egypt, and Tearcon, (Taracos, Tirhaka,) king of the Ethiopians, went in their expeditions as far as Europe; but Nebuchadnezzar, who is venerated by the Chaldeans even more than Hercules is by the Greeks, went not only to the Pillars of Hercules, (for so far according to him (Megasthenes) had Tearcon penetrated,) but he marched through Spain to Thrace and Pontus." The same events are referred to by Eusebius.⁷

As Nebuchadnezzar in this expedition had enriched himself with the spoils of his enemies, he employed this wealth in the ornamenting of the temples at Babylon, and in adding to the splendour of this city in which he resided. He built the splendid temple of Belus, a new royal castle, a city on the other side of the Euphrates, and surrounded the whole with very high and thick walls. He caused the *Nahar Malcha* to be dug from the Euphrates to the Tigris, the *Pallacopas* to be turned into a very large lake formed by the labour of men, and various canals to be constructed to draw off the water, so that the city might not be overflowed by the inundations of the Euphrates. The artificial lake into which the *Pallacopas* flowed, is said to have been twelve hundred and eighty stadia, or about one hundred and twenty eight English miles in circumference. These works were afterwards attributed to the fabled Semiramis; and it has also been said that they were completed by Nitocris, the mother of Belshazzar, the last of the Chaldee monarchs.⁸

Berosus, as quoted by Josephus, says that Nebuchadnezzar "was attacked by a disease and died in the forty third year of his reign." This disease must have been something remarkable, or it would hardly have been particularly noticed in the history. Eusebius relates from Abydenus a tradition of the Chaldeans, that Nebuchadnezzar, after the enlarging and beautifying of Babylon, pronounced on the roof of his palace a prophecy respecting the conquest of the city by the Medes and Persians, and then disappeared. This tradition is evidently a story made up from his prophetic dreams, his insanity, during which he withdrew from human society and resided among wild beasts, and thus *disappeared*, and from Daniel's explanation of the unknown writing in the banquetting hall of Belshazzar.⁹

¹ Isai. 23: 13. ² Herodot. I. 103—106. ³ See Sect. 41. Note. Hero-

dot. I. 106. Strabo, p. 737. Eusebius, Chron. p. 124. Syncellus, p. 218. Berossus in Josephus, Antiq. X. 11: 1. and against Apion, I. 19. 4 Isa. 23: 1—13. Ezek. 26; 1, 8 ff. 27: 36. 28: 1 ff. 29: 18. Jer. 27: 3. 29: 22. 46: 1—26. 47: 1 ff. Amos 2: 9. Joel 3: 4. Comp. Diocles, Megasthenes, Philostratus, Annals of the Tyrians, as quoted by Josephus against Apion, I. 20. and Antiq. X. 11: 1. 5 Jer. xxv. XLVII—XLIX. Ezek. xxv. comp. Joseph. Antiq. X. 11: 1. 6 Herodot. II. 162. 163. Diodor. Sic. I. 68. Megasthenes and Berossus, in Joseph. Antiq. X. 11: 1 and against Apion, I. 20. Compare Jer. XLIV. 46: 14—19, 25. Ezek. 29: 12. 30: 7—14. 7 Praep. Evan. IX. 41. 8 Herodot. I. 184—186. Justin, I. 2. Diodor. Sic. II. 10. Strabo, p. 738. Arrian, de Reb. Alexand. VII. 21. 9 Daniel II. IV. v.

XLVII. EVIL-MERODACH—NABONNED.

Evil-merodach, the son of Nebuchadnezzar, inherited his father's throne. By Megasthenes he is called Evilmaluruch, by Berossus, Evilmardach, and by Ptolemy, Iloarudan. Immediately after his accession to the throne, he released Jehoiachin, king of Judah, from the imprisonment in which he had languished for thirty seven years, admitted him to his table, assigned him an annual pension, and gave him rank before all the kings who were at Babylon. Jerome mentions a Jewish tradition, that Evil-merodach, during his father's insanity, had administered the affairs of the empire in so faulty a manner, that after the restoration of Nebuchadnezzar to reason, he was cast into the same prison in which Jehoiachin was confined, and on this occasion a lasting friendship was contracted between them.¹ This is not improbable, but Jewish tradition is very uncertain authority. Uncertain as tradition is, however, it is at least as much to be relied on, as the conjectures of modern interpreters. According to the testimony of Berossus,² Evil-merodach, when he assumed the reins of government after his father's death, proved himself to be an unworthy and tyrannical ruler; on which account he was assassinated in the second year of his reign, 561 B. C. by Neriglissor, his brother-in-law. Jehoiachin must have died before this, since it is said that he ate at the table of Evil-merodach as long as he lived.

Neriglissor, called by Megasthenes, Niriglissor, by Ptolemy, Nircassocholassar, and by Josephus, Niglissaros, the son-in-law of Nebuchadnezzar, might have been, perhaps, one of the two officers who are mentioned in Jerem. 39: 3. under the name of Nergal-

sharezer. He made great preparations for war against the Medes, and invited to an alliance with him against the common enemy, the Lydians, Phrygians, Carians, Cappadocians, Paphlagonians, Cilicians, and all the neighbouring people. He was however defeated by Cyrus, and left dead on the field of battle in the fourth year of his reign, 557 B. C.

Laborasoarchad, his son, called by Megasthenes, Labassoarask, succeeded him. He was young, but unjust and cruel. Probably it is to this prince that Xenophon refers, when he relates that the king of Babylon in a hunting party slew the son of Gobryas, because he twice struck down an animal which the king had missed; and caused Gadatas to be mutilated because he had been praised by one of his concubines. He was put to death on account of his tyranny after a reign of nine months.³

Nabonned, one of the conspirators against Laborasoarchad, next ascended the throne. He is named by Megasthenes, Nabannidoch, by Ptolemy, Nabonad, by Josephus, Naboandel, and by Herodotus, Labynetus. Berosus says nothing of his family, but Megasthenes, as quoted by Eusebius, has these words: *τούτου δὲ ἀποθανόντος βιαιῶ μόρῳ, Ναβαννιδόχον ἀποδεικνυσὶ βασιλεία, προσήκοντα οὐδέν*: "After he (Labassoarask) had been put to death they made Nabannidoch king, *who did not approach him*." This sentence, being taken out of its connexion, is somewhat ambiguous. The sense however does not appear to be that he was not *related to*, but that he was *not like* Labassoarask, whose cruelty had been the subject of discourse. This king is the Belshazzar of Scripture, who was certainly of royal blood, and a descendant of Nebuchadnezzar. His mother, in Daniel, appears the same as Nitocris, the mother of Labynetus, in Herodotus; a very politic, active and resolute woman, who completed the works which Nebuchadnezzar had left unfinished, and in effect governed the empire under her dissipated and thoughtless son; for such is the character given to Belshazzar both in the Cyropaedia and the Bible.⁴ After a reign of seventeen years, he was slain at the taking of Babylon by the Medes and Persians, 540 B. C. Megasthenes and Berosus, as quoted by Josephus and Eusebius, say, that after being defeated in a battle before the walls of Babylon, he fled to Borsippa, and finally surrendered himself to Cyrus, who made him governour of Caramania. But Xenophon agrees entirely with the Bible, and says that Bel-

shazzar was slain by the Persians in his palace, together with all his attendants.⁵

1 2 Kings 25: 27—30. Jerome, Comment. in Jes. 14: 19. 2 Eusebius, Praep. Evan. IX. 41. 3 Berosus in Joseph. against Apion, I. 21. Megasthenes in Eusebius, *ubi supra*. Joseph. Antiq. X. 11: 2. Xenophon, Cyrop. IV. 6: 2 f. V. 3: 13 f. 4 Eusebius, *ubi supra*. Dan. 5: 2, 11, 15, 22. comp. 2 Chron. 36: 20. Jer. 27: 7. Herodot. I. 184—186. Prideaux, Connexions, Vol. I. p. 108—112. 5 Dan. 5: 30. Josephus and Eusebius, *ubi supra*. Xenophon, Cyrop. VIII. 5: 9—13. Compare Michaelis, Anmerk. zu Daniel, S. 51.

XLVIII. SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF MEDIA.

The Biblical history becomes now more and more connected with those people, whose history has come down to us and tends to throw light on the Bible. On this account we shall here give a brief view of the history of Media, in order to open the way to a more full history of the Persians and Hebrews. The succession of Median kings was as follows :

Revolt.	B. C.	years.	Revolt.	B. C.	years.
149	836	Arbaces reigned 29	332	643	Cyaxares I. 40
178	807	<i>Interregnum</i> 79	372	603	Astyages 34
257	728	Dejoces 53		569	Cyaxares II. 32
310	665	Phraortes 22		537	Cyaxares II. dies.

Cyaxares I. as has already been mentioned, is said to have formed an alliance with Nabopolassar, the founder of the Chaldee-Babylonian empire ; and Astyages, his son and general, in conjunction with the Chaldee monarch, destroyed the city of Nineveh and put an end to the Assyrian empire. This Cyaxares is Guspasp, under whose reign Zoroaster introduced his reformation into Media, between forty and twenty years before the birth of Cyrus.¹

Astyages was the father of Cyaxares II. and the grandfather of Cyrus. Under Cyaxares II. hostilities broke out between the Median and Chaldee-Babylonian empires, and did not terminate till the destruction of the latter. When Cyaxares called the Persians to his aid, Cyrus was placed at the head of the Median army, and defeated Neriglissor. This happened twenty one years before the conquest of Babylon, and from this period Cicero (following Herodotus) dates the commencement of Cyrus's reign. De Divinatione, Lib. I. speaking of Cyrus he writes : *ad septuagesimum*

annum pervenit, cum XL annos natus regnare coepisset. After this battle, Media gained the ascendant, and after the destruction of the Chaldee-Babylonian empire by Cyrus, maintained a very extensive domination. Cyaxares II. called Darius the Mede in the Bible, reigned thirty years over Media and the conquered countries, and two years over Babylon.²

¹ Tychsen de religion. Zoroast. apud veter. gentes Vestig. in Comment. Soc. Goett. Vol. II. p. 112 seq. Abbe Foucher, Appendix to the Zend-Avesta, Band I. Th. II. S. 65 f. and S. 253 f. ² Dan. 6: 1, 2. Prideaux, Connexions, Vol. I. p. 109 ff. Cyropaed. I. 5: 2. Herodot. I. 95—130. Diodor. Sic. II. 32—34.

XLIX. DESTRUCTION OF THE CHALDEE-BABYLONIAN EMPIRE.

Cyrus, the destroyer of the Chaldee-Babylonian empire, was born 599 B. C. about the seventh year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, and one hundred years after the death of Hezekiah, king of Judah. According to Plutarch his name, *Κύρος*, in Hebrew, שֶׁרָב, signifies the *Sun*. In the ancient Pehlvi dialect the name is *Korshid*, that is, *Splendour of the Sun*, from *Kor*, *Light*, the *Sun*, and *Shid*, or *Shed*, *Splendour*.¹ The name first occurs in Isaiah 44: 28. 45: 1. (with which compare Jeremiah 50: 44.) Herodotus informs us that this was not his original name, but one which was conferred on him at a later period. His father was Cambyses, according to Xenophon, king of the Persians; but Herodotus intimates no more than that he was a nobleman of the Achaemenides, the noblest tribe of the Persians, and the one to which their kings belonged. Both agree that his mother was Mandane, a daughter of Astyages, king of Media. Herodotus has admitted into his history some absurd fables respecting the birth and early education of Cyrus, which he had heard while on his travels in Persia. His education, as described in the Cyropaedia, agrees entirely with the Persian mode of educating princes and nobles, as it existed in the time of Xenophon; though the severity of the discipline had been then somewhat relaxed by the prevailing luxury. In the twelfth year of his age, he went with his mother to the Median court at Ecbatana, to visit his grandfather Astyages; and there he gained the affections of all the Medes by his sprightliness, good humour and affability. In the sixteenth year of his age he acquired great reputa-

tion in an expedition against the Babylonians, undertaken by Astyages to revenge an assault which Evil-merodach, the Crown-prince of Babylon, had made on Media while he was engaged in a hunting excursion. The next year, 582 B. C. he returned to Persia. This residence with Astyages perhaps gave rise to those stories related by Herodotus.²

The tale of Herodotus, that Cyrus rebelled against his grandfather and deprived him of his throne, is founded altogether on the tradition respecting the birth, early exposure, and secret education of this hero. But as this tradition cannot be reconciled with chronology and is manifestly fabulous, the account of the rebellion deserves no credit; especially since it is contrary to the whole character of Cyrus as it is represented by Xenophon and the writers of the Bible. The manner also in which he is said to have induced the Persians to revolt, has no internal marks of probability. In general, Herodotus, a traveller, who wrote down every thing that was told him, and comprehended in his plan so many subjects that it was impossible for him sufficiently to investigate them all, is authority far inferior to the Biblical writers, who were contemporary historians, and lived near the scene of the events they record; and they clearly assert that Darius the Mede, that is, Cyaxares II. reigned two years over Babylon after all the victories of Cyrus. Even Xenophon must be preferred to Herodotus, for, as Hutchinson has remarked, in the character of Cyrus and in his whole history, especially where he introduces the Medes as the predominant people against the Babylonians, and even in the very circumstance of the two years' reign of Cyaxares after the conquest of Babylon, he corresponds with the authentic and contemporary testimony of the Bible.³ Besides, Xenophon was for a long time intimate with Cyrus the Younger, from whom he undoubtedly received correct information respecting the elder Cyrus, and writing a *particular history* he was able fully to investigate the whole subject. The romantic garb in which the *Cyropaedia* is arrayed, does not affect the great truths it contains; for the *romance* is not concerned with the principal events, but only with the secondary matters, particularly the conversations which are put into the mouth of Cyrus and others. Xenophon undoubtedly intended, as Plato has remarked,⁴ to represent in Cyrus, a perfect oriental king, like the Djemjid of Zoroaster; but he would not have chosen him for his hero, unless he had been

the best of the eastern monarchs known to the Greeks. Should we deny the historical authority of the principal transactions related in the *Cyropaedia*, on account of the magnificent drapery in which its hero appears, we might on the same principle call in question the great events of Grecian history; for they are all ornamented by the pen of the historian, and adorned with such conversations as the heroes may well be supposed to have held, but which certainly are far enough from being the very words, they actually uttered. In the history of Cyrus then, we can rely with much more confidence on the authority of Xenophon than on that of Herodotus.

Cyrus came, in the 40th year of his age and the twenty first before the conquest of Babylon, with thirty thousand well disciplined Persian troops, to the assistance of his uncle Cyaxares II. against Neriglissor; and the old king appointed him general of the whole Median army. The decisive victory which he gained over Neriglissor, (as related in the preceding section,) had given a fatal blow to the Chaldee power, especially as Neriglissor's successors, Laborasorhad and Nabonned or Belshazzar, were weak and effeminate princes. The tyranny, cruelty and luxury of the last Chaldee monarchs formed so striking a contrast with the moderate, mild and generous conduct of Cyrus, that the Hyrcanians, the Cadusians, and the Sacae, also the princes, Gobryas, Abradatas, and Gadatas, with their principalities, revolted to him. Belshazzar appeared with an army to punish the revolt of Gadatas; but Cyrus put him to flight, pursued him even to the walls of Babylon, and captured some of his fortresses.⁵

As the Medes, under the conduct of Cyrus, were becoming every day more formidable, Nitocris, the mother of Belshazzar, made every exertion to put the empire, or at least Babylon, in a state of defence; but all her efforts were fruitless. Belshazzar in the fifth year of his reign, delivered himself up to the protection of Croesus, king of Lydia, and collecting a large army in Asia Minor from among the Thracians, Greeks, and other people, gave him the command.⁶ On this occasion Croesus consulted the most celebrated oracles respecting the result of the war, and receiving ambiguous and enigmatical answers, he interpreted them to his own advantage, according to their most obvious meaning. But after the fatal termination of his expedition, he called the oracles to an account for their deception; and then an altogether different and hid-

den meaning was found for their responses, with which explanation Croesus was obliged to rest contented, having then no power to do otherwise.⁷

Cyrus, who, by a trusty spy, had received accurate intelligence of the movements of his enemies, marched against Croesus, who had already passed the river Halys, captured the city Pteria and made inroads on the adjacent territories. He finally forced Croesus to action, put his cavalry to flight by the use of camels, and routed his whole army.⁸ Croesus immediately retired with his own soldiers to Sardis, his capital; and his allies returned home, the winter having already set in. But scarcely had he sent messengers to his auxiliaries, to warn them to be ready to take the field in the following summer, when Cyrus very unexpectedly approached Sardis with his victorious army. Herodotus relates that Croesus with his few soldiers, mostly cavalry, gave battle to the mighty host of Cyrus before the walls of the city, and that here Cyrus first made use of camels. How improbable this is, scarcely need be shown, since Xenophon, who resided so long a time at Sardis with Cyrus the Younger, makes no mention of it.⁹

The city was captured in fourteen days; and according to Herodotus, Croesus, who, not expecting such an end, had formerly pronounced himself the most fortunate of men in opposition to Solon, being condemned to the flames by the sentence of Cyrus, was again set free on his invoking in a melancholy tone the name of Solon from the already kindling pile. Xenophon says nothing of this, and besides, it agrees neither with the character of Cyrus nor with the customs of the Persians. This victory was gained in the eighth year of Belshazzar's reign, 549 B. C. and in the fifty-seventh of the captivity.

After this, Cyrus subjected Asia Minor and all the country west of the Euphrates, to the dominion of Cyaxares; and in the tenth year of Belshazzar he defeated the Chaldee army not far from Babylon, and marched immediately and without opposition to the walls of that great metropolis, into which the retreating hosts had thrown themselves.¹⁰

¹ Plutarch, Artaxerxes. Zend-Avesta, Th. III. S 146. 159. 163 and Appendix to Zend-Avesta, p. 85 and 132. Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. II. 132.
² Cyropaed. I. 2: 1. ff. Herodot. I. 107—122. ³ Herodot. I. 123—130.
Hutchinson's Xenophon, Diss. 1. Comp. Isa. 13: 17. 21: 2. Jer. 50: 3. 9:

41. 51: 11, 28—30. Dan. 6: 1. 4 De Legibus, III. 5 Cyropaed. I. 5: 4. II. 1: 3. III. 3: 12—29. IV. 2: 1. 6: 1—6. V. 2: 1—15. 3: 4—21. 4: 1, 5, 23. VI. 1: 23—25. 6 Herodot. I. 185—188. Cyrop. VI. 1: 15, 18—23. 2: 7—10. Herodot. I. 71. 75. 77. comp. Jerem. 51: 8, 9, 46. 7 Herodot. I. 46—55. 90, 91. Cyrop. VII. 2: 6, 7. compare Isa. 41: 21—29. 8 Cyrop. VII. 1: 4—22. comp. Isa. 21: 7. Herodot. I. 75—77. 9 Herodot. I. 79, 80. Cyrop. VI. 2: 1. 10 Cyrop. VII. 2: 2—4. 4: 1—7. Herodot. I. 81. 84. 86. 87. 153. 168—177. 190. comp. Jer. 51: 30.

L. CONQUEST OF BABYLON.

Babylon was considered impregnable. Its high and strong walls, surmounted by lofty towers, its broad and deep ditches, its large magazines, and the numerous squares within the city, which were planted with corn and yielded an annual supply of provisions, seemed sufficient to secure its inhabitants forever from all the attacks of their enemies. The Chaldeans had reason to hope that the besiegers would finally relinquish their enterprise in despair. They were accordingly in high spirits, and derided the Persians from their walls and towers. Cyrus, however, continued for some time the siege of the city, and employed each month a twelfth part of his army in the service. But every effort was in vain.¹

A stratagem finally brought the city into the power of Cyrus. Having heard that it was customary, at an approaching festival, for the Babylonians to spend the whole night in banqueting and revelry, he employed a part of his army, at some distance from the city, to turn the course of the Euphrates into a large lake, according to Herodotus, but as Xenophon relates it, into an extensive ditch, which he had sunk, as if for the purpose of rendering the blockade more complete; and by this means the water in the natural channel of the river was so diminished that it could be easily forded. Meanwhile the siege was to all appearance carried on with the greatest vigour, that the Babylonians might not suspect his designs. When the appointed festival arrived, as soon as it was dark, Cyrus placed one half of his army at the entrance of the Euphrates into the city, and the other, at its outlet. These two divisions entering the channel at the same time from above and below, pressed into the city through the gates leading down to the river, which in the negligence and dissipation of the feast, had not been closed,² and imitating the shouts of the revellers, they assembled by preconcerted appointment around the

royal palace. When the king, imagining that he heard the clamour of a drunken mob before his residence, ordered his guards to open the gates, in order to ascertain the cause of the disturbance, his foes rushed in with resistless force, overthrew every thing which opposed them, and penetrated to the royal apartment. Belshazzar indeed drew his sword, but he was immediately overpowered and slain with all his attendants. Now all who were seen in the streets, were put to the sword, and the Persians burnt those houses, from the roofs of which they were annoyed, by setting fire to the doors which were covered with bitumen. Herodotus informs us that when that part of the city which borders on the river, was already in the possession of the enemy, those who dwelt farther towards the centre knew nothing of it.³

Thus Babylon came under the dominion of Darius the Mede or Cyaxares II. 539 B. C. in the forty ninth year after the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the sixty seventh of the captivity. Cyaxares reigned two years after this, consequently to the sixty ninth year of the captivity. Babylon lost little or nothing of its splendour or strength by this change of masters; but the turning of the Euphrates, which was never brought back to its natural channel, caused many fens in the adjacent country; and thus a part, though not all of the prophecy against this magnificent city, was fulfilled.⁴ Cyrus brought the affairs of the empire into order, united the Median and Persian dress, and gave a great feast to his people.⁵

When Cyaxares died, Cyrus, who after his campaigns had married the only daughter of his uncle, inherited the whole Median empire, which in this manner passed from the Medes to the Persians, and was denominated from both people. If Cyrus, as Herodotus testifies, was obliged to resort to force in order to establish his authority, it was probably in consequence of the refusal of the Median nobles to acknowledge his right to the succession.⁶ But such disquiets he could the more easily allay, after the Persians had adopted the Median dress and religion, and thus in fact had become one people with the Medes. It could not have been difficult to introduce the Zoroastrian religion among the Persians, since, in all probability, its fundamental principles were familiar to them long before the age of Zoroaster. Cyrus in his youth, during his five years residence at the court of his grandfather, had become accustomed to this religion, by which the ceremonial of that court

was regulated. The Persians would readily receive the religious rites introduced by the reformation of Zoroaster, as well as the Median dress, since, according to the testimony of Herodotus, they were always very much inclined to adopt foreign manners and usages. For this purpose, therefore, no coercion or strict injunction was necessary.⁷ Still it cannot be supposed that the Persians at once entirely dismissed their old religious ideas, for among their more ancient writers we find frequent departures from the Zend-Avesta.

According to Xenophon, Cyrus, after the death of Cyaxares, subdued Egypt. He resided during the seven cool months of the year at Babylon, two months in the spring, at Shushan or Susa, and during three months of the hottest weather, at Ecbatana in Media; a practice which was kept up by his successors. It is said in the *Cyropaedia*, that he died in the seventh year of his reign, while on a journey to Persia, and was interred at Pasargada or Parsagada, (probably Persepolis,) in a small tomb, which seems to be the same that was discovered by Niebuhr among the ruins of Persepolis, and is described in his travels. Herodotus, however, asserts that he was slain in a battle against the Massagetæ. On account of his justice and kindness to his subjects, he was honoured during his life, and for a long time after his death, with the title of *Father of his people*.⁸

¹ Jer. 51: 53—58. Herodot. I. 190. *Cyrop.* VII. 5: 1—7. ² *Comp.* Isa. 45: 1. ³ Dan. v. Isa. 21: 5. Jer. 51: 39. Herodot. I. 191. *Cyrop.* VII. 5: 5—11. *comp.* Dan. 5: 29, 30. Jer. 50: 38. 51: 12, 29, 31, 32, 36. Isa. 13: 15. 21: 3, 4. ⁴ Isa. 14: 23. Jer. 51: 25—38, 43—45, 57. ⁵ *Cyrop.* VIII. 1: 14. 3: 1. ⁶ See *Anabasis*, III. 4: 5, 6. ⁷ Herodot. I. 123—130. 135. *Cyrop.* VIII. 5: 9, 10, 13. ⁸ *Cyrop.* VIII. 6: 11. 7: 1—3, 10. Niebuhr's *Travels*, Vol. II. p. 159. Strabo, p. 730. Plutarch, Alexander. Arrian, III. 18. Herodot. III. 89. *comp.* *Cyrop.* VIII. 1: 1. 2: 6.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

HISTORY FROM THE RETURN OF THE HEBREWS TO THE TIME OF
ALEXANDER.

LI. RELEASE OF THE HEBREWS.

CYRUS, in the first year of his reign, (536 B. C. seventy of the captivity, fifty two after the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple,) proclaimed throughout his empire by a herald and by a written order, that all the people of the God of heaven, without exception, had liberty to return to Judea and rebuild the temple at Jerusalem. This general permission, therefore, extended to the Israelites in Assyria, Halah, Gozan and Media, as well as to the Jews at Chebar and Babylon. As Cyrus announced in his edict that Jehovah, the God of heaven, had given him all the kingdoms of the earth and charged him to build a temple at Jerusalem, this proclamation was not merely a permission, but rather an invitation to all the Hebrews to return and rebuild their temple. He accordingly delivered to the returning exiles five thousand four hundred sacred vessels of gold and silver which Nebuchadnezzar had carried from Jerusalem to Babylon, prescribed the size of the temple, and directed that the expense of its erection should be defrayed from the royal treasury; all which particulars were verified by a written edict found fifteen years after in the archives at Ecbatana.¹

Thus divine providence directed, that the temple, which had been destroyed by a foreign king, should also by a foreign king be rebuilt. But if Cyrus, being a Madejesnan (Magian) or worshipper of Ormuzd, was more favourable to the worshippers of Jehovah than to any other people, on account of the similarity of the religious ideas of the Magians and the Hebrews; the same would undoubtedly have been true of Darius the Mede, for he was also a Magian. But Darius was far enough from granting the Hebrews any such liberty. Supposing Cyrus to have been generally more

indulgent than Darius, and perhaps also not so much of a zealot for Ormuzd, still he must have had important reasons for building a temple to Jehovah, since the Magians did not allow the erection of temples, but only of *Pyraea*, or small chapels for the consecrated fire. Daniel, who, on account of his interpretation of the prophetic dreams of Nebuchadnezzar and of the mysterious writing in the banqueting hall of Belshazzar, was as much esteemed by the Persian monarchs as Jeremiah had been by Nebuchadnezzar, seems indeed to have contributed most to this favourable disposition of Cyrus. But he had probably spoken on the same subject with Darius the Mede, by whom he was regarded with such veneration, especially after his preservation in the lion's den, that that monarch, in a public decree, enjoined it on all his subjects to worship the God of Daniel. That Daniel would not have failed in zealous application to Darius, cannot be doubted, since he looked with such anxious solicitude for the termination of the captivity, and having computed its duration by the prophecy of Jeremiah, in the first year of this Median monarch, earnestly entreated God, with mourning and fasting, to put a period to the exile.² From this disposition of Daniel, we may safely conclude that he would neglect neither opportunity to entreat, nor means to persuade Darius to grant the release of the Hebrews. But still, during the two years' reign of this monarch, he was unable to obtain that which Cyrus, immediately after his accession to the throne, granted so freely, that he seems even to have gone beyond the requests of Daniel. It is, therefore, by no means a vain tradition nor an arbitrary conjecture on which Josephus relies, when he tells us that Daniel showed to Cyrus the prophecies of Isaiah referring to him, and that it was the manifest supernatural foreknowledge evinced by these predictions, which were pronounced long, before his birth, that induced this monarch to bestow more than Darius had refused. This can scarcely be doubted by a reflecting mind, after a comparison of these prophecies with the expressions in the edict of Cyrus: *Jehovah, the God of heaven, hath given to me all the kingdoms of the earth, and hath charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem which is in Judah.* How could Cyrus have said this, if he had never read the prophecy of Isaiah?³

¹ Ezra 1: 1—11. 6: 2—5. ² Daniel 6: 26—29. 9: 1, 2. ³ Josephus, Antiq. XI. 1: 2. Isa. 44: 28. 45: 1. compare Jer. 50: 44.

LII. FIRST CARAVAN OF THE HEBREWS TO JUDEA.

Thus were the *mountains laid low and the vallies filled up* for the return of the Hebrews to Palestine ; that is, *all obstacles were removed*. Zerubbabel, grandson of king Jehoiachin, and Jeshua, a grandson of the high priest Jozadak, and ten of the principal elders, prepared themselves for the journey. To these were joined forty two thousand three hundred and sixty people, whose servants amounted to seven thousand three hundred and thirty seven, so that the whole number was nearly fifty thousand.¹ If this number is exclusive of women and children, as in other computations, according to Michaelis it would not exceed four times the number of those who were carried into captivity. Eleven thousand six hundred men were taken from Judea, and they, with their wives, children and servants, probably amounted to forty or fifty thousand persons. But as many of the Hebrews remained in the places of their exile, we must allow that they had increased very rapidly during their captivity ; though while under their last kings in Palestine, their numbers had been continually diminishing. Daniel, at this time nearly ninety years old, remained at the court, where he could be of greater service to his nation than he could in Palestine.

Those who were to return, assembled at an appointed place, according to the usual mode of collecting a caravan, and furnished themselves with provisions and other things necessary for their journey. Their camels, horses and beasts of burden, amounted to eight thousand one hundred and thirty six. Zerubbabel, the director of the caravan, received the sacred utensils which had been restored, and the donations towards the building of the temple, made by those who remained behind. He was appointed, not only leader of the caravan, but also governour of Judea, as he is styled by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, and fifteen years later, by Darius Hystaspis. The names *Sheshbazzar* and *Tirshatha*, are perhaps Persian denominations of the same office. Several months were consumed in preparations for the journey. Encumbered as they were with baggage and small children, they were obliged to travel slowly, and their journey took up four months.² Accordingly the caravan could not have arrived in Judea before the close of the

first year of Cyrus. Thus the Jews returned precisely at the termination of the seventieth year of the captivity, the fifty second year after the destruction of the temple. They were now in their own country, could be governed by their own laws, and form a distinct commonwealth. The Persian sovereignty afforded protection and security to the weak colony, and this was far more advantageous to the Hebrews than complete independence, which they could not demand.

¹ Ezra 2: 2, 64. comp. Neh. 7: 7. ² Ezra 1: 8, 11. 2: 63—67. 6: 7. 7: 9.

LIII. RETURN OF THE TEN TRIBES.

As the invitation of Cyrus to build the temple at Jerusalem, was directed to all the people of Jehovah, and proclaimed throughout the Persian empire, undoubtedly not a few of the Ten Tribes returned to Palestine. Those who supposed they could improve their condition by removing, would attach themselves here and there to a caravan of merchants, and proceed to the land of their fathers. But as they arrived one after another, and in small companies, their return is not particularly noticed in a history so concise. There might have been many Israelites in the great caravan of Zerubbabel already described, although it is not necessary to suppose that the *ten elders* with Zerubbabel and Jeshua, were the twelve princes of the different tribes,¹ or that the twelve thousand five hundred and forty two, the excess of the grand total given by Ezra 2: 64. above the actual sum of the several numbers mentioned in verses 3—63. were all Israelites. However this may be, it is highly probable that most of the Israelites returned early, when they heard of the prosperity of their brethren in Palestine. But whether their return was early or late, it is yet certain that they did actually return, for the history of later periods mentions Israelites as settled in Galilee and Perea, long before the time of Christ.² But connecting themselves with the tribe of Judah, they finally lost the name of Israelites, and all Hebrews were called *Jews*.

But since many of the tribe of Judah chose to remain in the land of their exile, it is reasonable to suppose that still greater numbers of the Israelites, who had lived in those countries two hundred

years longer, would have little inclination to exchange the happiness they there enjoyed, for the prospect of an uncertain good in Palestine. But as the jealousy between Judah and Israel had now ceased, according to the predictions of the prophets, those Israelites also who remained in exile, joined themselves to the tribe of Judah, which was in possession of the temple, and consequently, they too received the denomination of Jews. All questions, therefore, and investigations, for the purpose of ascertaining what has become of the *Ten Tribes*, and whether it is likely they will ever be discovered, are superfluous and idle.

¹ Ezra 3: 2. comp. Neh. 7: 7. ¹ Macc. 5: 9—24.

LIV. BUILDING OF THE TEMPLE.

That the Persian rulers of Palestine might not hinder the new colony from settling in the country and building the temple, it was necessary that Cyrus should issue a special order to this effect. But as this was sent directly to the Persian magistrates of the province, and was not received by the Jews, it is passed over by Ezra, though mentioned by Josephus.¹ Indeed the succeeding history renders the supposition of such an order necessary; for numerous caravans took possession of the country, built towns and villages, raised a city upon the ruins of their ancient capital; in the next month, (Tishri,) the whole colony assembled at Jerusalem to the feast of Tabernacles, erected an altar among the rubbish of their ancient temple, and resumed their customary sacrifices; and in the second month of the second year after their return, they, by voluntary contributions, laid the foundation of the house of God with great solemnity; and for all this not a Persian officer pretended to call them to account.

Joyful as this occasion was to the younger colonists, and loud as their shouts of exultation were, in this tumult of joy, the elder people, who had seen the temple of Solomon in its glory, were heard weeping as loudly; for they perceived from the very commencement of the work, that this edifice could be neither so large, so magnificent, nor so highly ornamented as the former. It is true, as appears from a record found in the palace at Ecbatana during the reign of Darius Hystaspis, that Cyrus had directed a sanctuary to be built of twice the dimensions of Solomon's temple, and the

expense to be defrayed from the royal treasury; but either the treasurer had neglected to execute these orders, or the Jews out of modesty, chose not to avail themselves of the favour of the monarch to its full extent, and were satisfied with what was granted without reluctance, lest they should awaken the envy of the worshippers of Ormuzd, and expose themselves to their persecutions. Accordingly they did not build the temple so large as Cyrus had directed.²

There was no opposition to this undertaking, except from the colonists of the Assyrian kings in Samaria, who had intermarried with the Israelites, and now formed one people with them, under the name of Samaritans. As they placed Jehovah, represented by the golden calves, among their gods, they imagined that they had some right in the temple at Jerusalem, and demanded to be associated with the Jews in the building of it. Certainly a most dangerous request to the Jews, for they were then scarcely cured of their propensity to idolatry. Because the proposal of the Samaritans was rejected, they made every possible exertion to thwart the enterprise, and though they were unable to accomplish their object during the life of Cyrus, yet they threw so many obstacles in the way that the people were wearied out, and the work went on heavily.³ This very naturally excited the enmity of the Jews, and thus there arose a hatred between the two nations which was continually increased by new provocations, till at last all friendly intercourse entirely ceased.

¹ Antiq. XI. 1. comp. 3 Esd. 6: 29, 30.
² Esra 3: 12, 13, comp. Hag-
 gai 2: 1—10. Ezra 6: 3. comp. 1 Kings 6: 2.

³ Esra 4: 1—5.

LV. HISTORICAL SURVEY OF THE PERSIAN EMPIRE.

The kings of the Persian universal monarchy, according to Ptolemy, were ten, and the whole time of their reign, two hundred and seven years. But Ptolemy's specific object being chronology, he omitted those who continued not on the throne a full year, and reckoned the months of their reign, partly to the preceding and partly to the succeeding monarch. The whole number of sovereigns was in reality fourteen, as appears from the following table.

<i>B. C.</i>			
538	Cyaxares II.	reigned	2 years.
536	Cyrus		7 years.
529	Cambyses		7 years and 5 months.
522	Smerdis		7 months.
521	Darius Hystaspis		36 years.
485	Xerxes I.		21 years.
464	Artaxerxes Longimanus		40 years and 3 months.
424	Xerxes II.		2 months.
424	Sogdianus		7 months.
423	Darius Nothus		19 years.
404	Artaxerxes Mnemon		46 years.
358	Darius Ochus		21 years.
337	Arses		2 years.
335	Darius Codomanus		4 years.

The monarchy remained powerful from the time of Cyrus till the death of Xerxes I. and from that period it was gradually weakened by the intrigues of the courtiers, and the insurrections of the provincial governors, till at last it was completely subdued by Alexander the Great, 331 B. C.

LVI. REIGNS OF CAMBYSES AND SMERDIS.

After the death of Cyrus, the Samaritans wrote to Cambyses, (named by Ezra, Ahasuerus,) against the Jews.¹ We are not informed what effect this letter produced, but we can easily judge from the character of this degenerate son of Cyrus, as it is represented in history. How much of favour or justice, or even of impartial investigation, could be expected from a thoughtless, gluttonous, cruel, furious warrior, who was considered as raving mad, even by his own subjects? It is said that he was subject to epilepsy, which is often attended with insanity. In the fifth year of his reign, he conquered Egypt, abused gods and men, and would not suffer even the dead to lie quietly in their graves. He was obliged to relinquish his design of subduing the Carthaginians and treating them in the same manner, for the Phenicians refused to employ their shipping against their ancient colony. He then sent out fifty thousand men from Thebes, through the wilderness, to lay waste Oasis Magna, in which the oracle of Jupiter Ammon was sit-

uated. But the army was overwhelmed in the desert with a shower of sand, raised by a hurricane, and thus miserably perished in consequence of the rashness of their sovereign. Meanwhile he himself proceeded with the remainder of his army towards Ethiopia, but he was forced to return before he had gone a fifth part of the way, having already suffered so much from the want of provisions, that every tenth man was slain to furnish food for the rest.² Under such a monarch, it was very easy for the Samaritans to obstruct the building of the temple; not to mention the hindrances occasioned by the march of the Persian army through Judea.

It is worthy of notice in this place, that the ancients generally supposed that Pythagoras was taken prisoner by Cambyses in Egypt and carried to Babylon, or Media, where he became a disciple of Zoroaster, (more probably, of his learned successors,) and made himself master of the oriental sciences.³

As Cambyses was returning from Egypt in the eighth year of his reign, there met him at Agbatana in Syria a herald from Shushan, who announced to the army the usurpation of the throne by Smerdis, the brother of Cambyses. This brother, Cambyses had some time before privately put to death by means of his confidant, Prexaspes, because he had dreamed that he was aspiring to the sceptre. But this murder had been kept such a profound secret, that the Median Magus, to whom the king had intrusted the administration of affairs during his absence, raised his own brother to the throne, pretending that he was the brother of Cambyses, to whom indeed he bore a strong resemblance. This was done for the double purpose of restoring the empire to the Medes, and of deposing an odious tyrant. Although Cambyses exposed the imposture to his generals, they gave no credit to the story, supposing it to be feigned out of hatred to his brother. Soon after, Cambyses died of a wound he received by the falling of his own sword from its sheath, as he was mounting his horse.

Smerdis retained the throne seven months. He is named by Ctesias, Spendadates, by Justin, Oropastes, and in the Bible, Artahshashta (Artaxerxes.⁴) To this monarch the Samaritans again addressed themselves, complaining that the Jews were building, (that is, *fortifying*,) the city of Jerusalem, which they had never thought of doing; and in consequence of this false accusation, Smerdis issued a positive prohibition of their work.⁵

The fraud of the Magus was soon discovered, and the pretended Smerdis was slain by seven of the principal nobles of Persia. These seven princes then held a council for the reestablishment of the government, and Otanes advised them to introduce Democracy, Megabyzus was in favour of Aristocracy, but Darius Hystaspis insisted on their retaining Monarchy; and he was himself raised to the throne.⁶ It was stipulated, however, that these seven princes should always have access to the king without announcing their names, except when he was in the harem; and that a daughter of one of them should be married to the monarch and have the title of Queen. But this last condition was not always observed, as is manifest from the example of Esther.⁷

¹ Ezra 4: 6. ² Herodot. III. 2—36. Justin, I. 9. Athenaeus, XIII. Didor. Sic. I. 46. III. 3. X. 2, 3, 5. ³ Apuleius, Orat. de Magia, p. 36. Jamblichus, Vit. Pythag. Porphyrius, Vit. Pythag. p. 185. Clemens Alex. Strom. I. p. 223. ⁴ Ctesias, X. Justin, I. 9. Herodot. III. 61—67. ⁵ Ezra 4: 7—24. ⁶ Herodot. III. 61—87. comp. III. 80. with IV. 43. ⁷ Herodot. III. 118. comp. Ezra 7: 14. Esther 1: 14.

LVII. REIGN OF DARIUS HYSTASPIS.

Darius Hystaspis, who reigned from 521 to 486 B. C. was, as Herodotus represents him, a mild and benevolent ruler. He strengthened his alliance with the family of Cyrus by marrying a daughter of the genuine Smerdis, and two daughters of Cyrus, one of whom, Atossa, till that time, had remained unmarried. Before his last war with the Greeks, he appointed Xerxes, his son by Atossa, successor to the throne, although he had an older son by another wife. He then divided the empire into twenty *Satrapies*, and made a new apportionment of the taxes, which Smerdis, the impostor, had remitted for three years.¹

As Smerdis was a mere usurper, his prohibition of the building of the temple, was of no authority. The Jews then, immediately on the accession of Darius, might have continued their work, especially as this prince was of so mild a disposition, and so highly esteemed everything which had its origin with Cyrus. Therefore when the Jews pretended that the time to build the temple had not come, because sixty seven years only had elapsed since its destruction, and they would reckon the period at seventy years according

to the duration of the captivity, while they were erecting splendid dwellings for themselves, and adorning their apartments with ornamental work, this was mere pretence, and designed as an excuse for their negligence. Accordingly in the second year of Darius there appeared two prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, who plied the governour Zerubbabel, the high priest Joshua, and the whole people, with such powerful appeals to the divine commands, that the building of the house of God was once more resumed.² This renewed and extraordinary interposition of Jehovah, enlivened them all with new zeal. Upon this, Tatnai, the Persian governour on the west of the Euphrates, came with his officers to call the Jews to account for their conduct; and when they referred to the permission of Cyrus, he was reasonable enough not to prohibit their undertaking, but wrote to Darius to have the affair investigated. Darius immediately caused search to be made among the royal acts, and in the archives at Ecbatana, (Achmetha, now Hamadan,) the edict of Cyrus was found, which directed that the temple should be built at the royal expense, and of much larger dimensions. Darius sent a copy of this edict to Tatnai, together with a letter, commanding him not to obstruct the building, but zealously to forward it, to defray the expenses from the royal treasury, and also to supply the priests with such animals as were necessary for the sacrifices, with wheat, salt, wine and oil, from day to day, for the divine service, *that they might offer sacrifices to the God of heaven, and pray for the welfare of the king and of his sons.* He gave a positive command that whoever obstructed the execution of this decree, should be crucified and his house demolished; and he added an imprecation on all kings and people, who should attempt to destroy that house of God. The work was now carried on with renewed vigour, and in the sixth year of Darius, on the third day of the month Adar, (March,) the edifice was completed. It was then joyfully consecrated with festive solemnities.³ It appears that Darius had heard of the obstructions to the building of the temple, occasioned by the Samaritans; or at least, had suspected something of the kind from the circumstance that an edifice ordered by Cyrus, still remained unfinished. This favouring of the Hebrews by a prince of so magnanimous a character as Darius, is well worthy of notice. He undoubtedly knew that Cyrus attributed all his victories to Jehovah, the God of heaven, and wished himself to obtain the assistance of this God.

During the disturbances occasioned by Smerdis, the Babylonians were preparing to revolt; and these preparations were privately carried on till the fourth or fifth year of Darius, when they broke out in open rebellion. They had taken every precaution, and to enable themselves to sustain a siege which, by its long continuance, might exhaust the strength and the patience of their besiegers, they put to death all the females of the city excepting one in each family, whom they retained as a servant.⁴ Darius marched against them. After a tedious blockade of nineteen months, Zopyrus, one of the seven princes and a general, cut off his own ears and nose, and fled to the Babylonians, pretending that Darius had thus mutilated him. He was believed, gradually insinuated himself into their confidence, and finally became commandant of the city, when he opened two gates to the Persians. Darius ordered the immediate crucifixion of three thousand Babylonian nobles, who had been the authors of the revolt; he took away the one hundred brazen gates of the city, and threw down two hundred cubits from the height of the wall. It is owing to this circumstance, that more recent writers assert that the walls were only fifty cubits high. Thus the prophecies against Babylon received a still further accomplishment.⁵

The remainder of the reign of Darius was spent in unceasing wars, which the prophet Zechariah represents by the *four winds* (spirits) of the heavens riding in chariots of war. The wind was worshipped by the Persians as a superiour spirit (*Ized*) under the name of *Behram*, and was considered the tutelar genius of war.⁶ The expedition of Darius with seven hundred thousand men against the Scythians, was very unsuccessful; but Thrace was subjected to his power, and though he was defeated in Scythia, he was victorious in Macedonia. Against the Indies he proceeded with more caution; for he first caused the country to be explored, and he then subdued the whole western part of that very rich territory. In the twentieth year of his reign, the Ionians revolted. They were upheld by the Athenians and Eretrians; but after seven years they were forced to submit to Darius, and at the same time, the islands of the Aegean Sea fell into the hands of the Persian monarch.⁷

The aid which the Athenians and Eretrians had afforded the Ionians, was the cause of the great Persian war with the Greeks, which began in the twenty eighth year of Darius. After the Persians

had lost the battle of Marathon, 491 B. C. thirty one of Darius, this monarch employed three years in making preparations for a still more energetic campaign against Greece. When every thing was ready, Egypt revolted, and consequently the army was divided, one part being destined for Egypt, and the other for Greece. The former division was commanded by a son of the king; but when the time arrived for the army to commence its march, Darius died in the thirty-sixth year of his reign, 485 B. C.⁸

During all these wars, the Hebrews enjoyed peace in their own country, a circumstance to which Zechariah alludes in his prophecies.⁹ In this last expedition, however, they might have been obliged to participate, as the rendezvous of the army was near their territory. But perhaps they merely supplied the army with provisions, without being obliged to engage personally in the service.

¹ Herodot. VI. 30. 41. 119. III. 88—97. VII. 1—4. Justin, I. 10. Cyrop. VIII. 6: 1—9. Plutarch, Apophthegm. VIII. p. 84. ² Ezra 4: 28. 5: 1, 2. Hagg. 1: 2—15. Zech. 2: 5—17. 3: 1—10 4: 1—14. 8: 1—17. ³ Ezra 5: 3—17. 6: 1—22. ⁴ Comp. Isa. 47: 9. 48: 20. Jer. 50: 20. 51: 6, 47. ⁵ Zech. 6: 6. Jer. 50: 15. 51: 44, 53, 58. Herodot. III. 150—159. Strabo, p. 738. Plutarch, Apothegm. VIII. p. 84. ⁶ Zech. 6: 1—8. Zend-Avesta, T. II. p. 271 ff. ⁷ Herodot. IV. 44. 83. 85—143. V. 17—126. ⁸ Herodot. VI. 43—48. 94—119. ⁹ Zech. 1: 7—17. 6: 1—8.

LVIII. REIGN OF XERXES I.

Xerxes, as weak in intellect and as unlike his father, as Cambyses had been, exceeded even that mad monarch in gluttony, voluptuousness and cruelty. In the second year of his reign he brought the Egyptians again under the Persian yoke, and then his general, Mardonius, and the Greek, Pisistratus, instigated him to a war against the Greeks, for which at first he felt no inclination. In the second year of his reign, (the year in which Herodotus, the historian of this war, was born,) he determined to undertake it. He accordingly called a council of all the noble Persians, to take into consideration the mode of conducting the war.¹ As the sessions of the Persian councils were always attended with feasting, these may have been the feasts of which mention is made in the Book of Esther. All the Persian nobles and officers could not collect at a single feast, and as they were arriving one after another, a half

year might easily pass away. The author of the Book of Esther has not mentioned the real purpose of this splendid assemblage, either because he knew not what it was, or considered it irrelevant to the design of his book.

Three whole years were spent in making the most stupendous preparations; and troops were collected from every part of the Persian empire. That the Greeks might derive no aid from their colonies in Italy and Sicily, an alliance was formed with the Carthaginians, by which they engaged to invade the Italian and Sicilian Greeks. This expedition was undertaken by Hamilcar with three hundred thousand men, but it terminated as unsuccessfully as that of Xerxes in Greece. Thus Xerxes, according to the prediction of Daniel, put in motion all the East as far as India, and all the West as far as Spain, where the Carthaginians had hired some of their mercenary troops.²

In the fifth year of his reign, 481 B. C. Xerxes led his enormous army to Asia Minor, and took up his winter quarters at Sardis. While on this march, he, with all his troops, was magnificently entertained at Celene, by Pytheus, the richest of the Lydians, who made him an offer of all his money, an immense sum, to assist him in carrying on the war. This Xerxes declined; but when Pytheus afterwards requested, that of his five sons who were in the army, the eldest might be suffered to remain with him as the support of his declining years, the ungrateful tyrant ordered the youth to be cut in halves, the parts of the body to be laid one on each side of the way, and his army to march between them. After a storm had destroyed the bridge of boats which Xerxes had built across the Hellespont, he ordered the superintendents of the work to be beheaded, the sea itself to be beaten with three hundred stripes, and a pair of chains to be sunk in it. In the spring of the following year, after a passage had been dug through mount Athos and a new bridge constructed across the Hellespont, Xerxes decamped from Sardis. At Abydos, seated on a throne of white marble, he reviewed his whole army, engaged in warlike exercises by land and sea; an exhibition by which he was at first highly elated, though he soon burst into tears.³

Seven days were consumed in the passage over the two bridges of boats built across the Hellespont. At Doriscus the army was numbered, and the infantry amounted to one million, seven hundred

thousand men. It was a mixture of all nations. Herodotus describes the dress and arms of each people; a spectacle certainly, such as never had been witnessed before, and probably never will be again. As all the subjects of the Persian empire, from India to Ethiopia and Macedonia, had supplied recruits for this war, there were undoubtedly Jews in the army, even if the opinion of Bochart be correct, that the Solymeans speaking Phenician, mentioned in Cherilus as quoted by Josephus, were Pisidians and not Hebrews. Besides these, there was a body of ten thousand Persians, named the *Immortal Band*, and eighty two thousand cavalry. In the fleet, there were one thousand two hundred and seven ships of war, and three thousand galleys of three banks of oars. These vessels had on board five hundred and seventeen thousand, six hundred and ten men. Numerous additions were made to the army during its march through Thrace and Macedonia, so that Herodotus reckons the whole number of fighting men at two million, six hundred and forty one thousand, six hundred and ten, who, together with the servants, sutlers and mariners, he computes at five millions. Diodorus Siculus, Pliny and Aelian, give the number somewhat less, but never under two millions.⁴

In the year 480 B. C. this immense army lost twenty thousand men, in a conflict of three days continuance at the pass of Thermopylae, of which Leonidas, king of Sparta, had taken possession with six thousand Greeks. The pass indeed was gained, and the Spartans, together with their leader, were put to the sword; but this desperate resistance brought to view difficulties which the boasting Xerxes had never foreseen. He wreaked his vengeance on the dead bodies of the Greeks, decapitated the corpse of the brave Leonidas and suspended the headless trunk on a gallows. The Persian fleet, which in the meantime had gone in pursuit of the enemy, soon after lost more than three hundred ships in a storm. They then resolved to blockade the Grecian fleet, which consisting of two hundred and eighty sail, lay at Artemisium in Euboea. But by the advice of Themistocles, the Greeks, in good order, sailed out to meet them, and although the bloody battle in which they then engaged, was not decisive, yet the Greeks had some advantage, and a storm which arose in the following night, proved very injurious to the Persians. Equally undecisive was the naval engagement at the straits of Euboea. The loss on both sides

was considerable. When the Greeks now heard that the Persians, having gained the pass of Thermopylae, were making their way without resistance to Athens, the Athenians all fled by sea to the island of Salamis. Meanwhile Xerxes, with his land forces, marched into Attica, devastated the country, burnt the temples, and laid waste the city of Athens, now deserted by its inhabitants. The Persian fleet at the same time sailed from Euboea to Attica, and laid waste the coast.⁵

The skill of Themistocles at length gained for the Greeks the decisive victory at Salamis, where more than two hundred Persian vessels were sunk, many fell into the hands of the Athenians, and the rest fled to Ionia, to take up their winter quarters at Cyme. In these battles the Persians lost in all, one million, two hundred thousand men. The haughty Xerxes, as Phanodemus and Acestodorus testify, was a spectator of this last naval action, which he viewed from an elevation, seated on a golden throne and surrounded by historians, to witness his own disgrace. Immediately after, on receiving the false intimation which Themistocles had sent him, that the Greeks were on the point of cutting off his retreat by the Hellespont, in an agony of terror he betook himself to flight, recrossed the Hellespont in a fishing boat, and returned to Sardis with all possible expedition. His general, Mardonius, remained in Greece with three hundred thousand men to prosecute the war.⁶

Mardonius endeavoured to make peace with the Athenians, but his proposals were rejected. Accordingly, in the spring he returned to Attica, laid waste the country, took possession of Athens the second time, and destroyed the empty city, its inhabitants having again deserted it. In the second year of the seventy fifth Olympiad, 479 B. C. he was defeated by land at Platea, on the same day in which the Persian fleet was overcome near the promontory of Mycale in Ionia. Mardonius was left dead on the field, and Artabazus led back to Asia forty thousand men, the poor remains of the mighty army of Xerxes. The Ionians now revolted from the Persians, and formed an alliance with the Athenians.⁷

Xerxes, ashamed of the result of his enterprise, returned from Sardis to Shushan by the way of Babylon. When he came to Babylon, he plundered and destroyed the magnificent temple of Belus, and carried off with him the celebrated golden statues and the

golden table, which Darius Hystaspis had not ventured to remove. Thus the prophecies against this city were yet farther accomplished. This year, 478 B. C. was the seventh of his reign, so that in the tenth month he could publicly acknowledge Esther as his queen.⁸

But the war was now far from being ended. The Athenians indeed remained at home during the year, in order to rebuild their city, but 477 B. C. they again took the field and prosecuted the war till the year 469 B. C. The martial zeal of Xerxes was nearly exhausted, for immediately after his first defeats he gave himself up entirely to his pleasures, and finally, 468 B. C. he ceased to provide either fleets or armies. During his residence at Sardis after his disgraceful flight from Greece, he conceived a passion for the wife of his brother and general, Masistius; but as she refused to listen to his overtures, he paid his addresses to her daughter. This intrigue led his wife, the queen Amestris, to an act of the most shocking barbarity against the wife of Masistius. This event is the more worthy of notice, as both the name and the character of Amestris favour the supposition, that she is the Esther of the Bible. Some suppose that Hegai, the keeper of the harem, is the same person with Hegias, whom Ctesias mentions as an attendant of Xerxes before the battle of Thermopylae. It is no objection to this opinion that Hegias is called *an Ephesian*, since this appellation might have been given him, from the circumstance that he was a eunuch, purchased at Ephesus.⁹

Xerxes at last arrived to such a pitch of voluptuousness, that he published an edict offering a considerable reward to the inventor of a new pleasure. "Si regem spectes, (says Justin,) divitias non duces laudes, quarum tanta copia in regno ejus fuit, ut, cum flumina multitudine consumerentur, opes tamen regiae superessent. Ipse autem primus in fuga, postremus in prelio semper visus est, in periculis timidus, sicubi metus abesset, inflatus."¹⁰

By such conduct Xerxes drew upon himself universal contempt; and in the twenty-first year of his reign, 464 B. C. he was murdered by Artabanus, the commander of his lifeguard. The assassin then persuaded Artaxerxes, the third son of the king, that Darius, the second son, had taken the life of his father in order to place himself upon the throne. To revenge the supposed parricide, Artaxerxes put his brother to death. But Artabanus, who aspired

to the sceptre himself, now attempted the murder of Artaxerxes, but failing in the attempt to inflict upon him a mortal wound, the young prince recovered himself, slew the traitor, and ascended the throne.¹¹

¹ Herodot. VII. 5—19. comp. Esther 1: 1—8. Aull. Gellius, XV. 23.
² Herodot. VII. 20—25. Diodor. Sic. XI. 1—2. 20—27. comp. Dan. 11: 2.
³ Herodot. VII. 26—44. ⁴ Herodot. VII. 56—187. Diodor. Sic. XI. 3. Josephus against Apion, I. 22. Bochart, Phaleg et Canaan. B. II. c. 6. p. 378 ff. Plutarch, Themist. XIV. Isocrates, Panthen. comp. Diodor. Sic. X. 5. Aelian, Var. Hist. XIII. 3. Pliny, XXXII. 10. ⁵ Herodot. VII. 175—VIII. 53. Diodor. Sic. XI. 4—14. Ctesias, Persic. XXVI. Justin, II. 11. ⁶ Herodot. VIII. 56—63. 74. 75. 79—91. 100—119. 126. Ctesias, Persic. XXVI. Diodor. Sic. XI. 16—20. Justin, II. 12. 13. Plutarch, Themist. XIII. ⁷ Herodotus, VIII. 136—144. IX. 1—4. 13. 27—89. 90—104. Diodor. Sic. XI. 28. 30—32. 36. Justin, II. 14. ⁸ Herodot. IX. 108. comp. I. 183. Diodor. Sic. II. 10. Strabo, p. 738. Arrian, Exped. Alex. VII. 17. Diodor. Sic. XI. 36. comp. Isa. 21: 9. 46: 1—2. Jer. 51: 44. Esth. 2: 16. ⁹ Herodot. IX. 108—112. Plutarch, Cimon, VI—XV. Ctesias, Persic. XXIV. Esth. 2: 8. ¹⁰ Athenaeus, Deipnosoph. comp. Justi in Eichhorn's Repert. Th. XV. S. 29 ff. Justin, II. comp. Dan. 11: 2. ¹¹ Ctesias, Persic. XXIX. Diodor. Sic. XI. 69. Justin, III. 1.

LIX. SECOND CARAVAN OF THE HEBREWS TO JUDEA.

From various circumstances, it appears very probable that both the Artaxerxes of Ezra, who is mentioned next after Darius Hystaspis, and the Ahasuerus of Esther, are names of Xerxes I. We can easily account for it that this king, who in the seventh year of his reign had made Mordecai the Jew, his prime minister, and Esther the Jewess, his queen, should give to Ezra the Jew, a commission conferring such full powers as we find that Ezra possessed.¹ Xerxes might hope that by thus patronising the Jews, he should obtain some favour, after his unsuccessful campaigns, from the God of heaven, whom the Jews worshipped, and to whom Cyrus attributed all his victories. So much seems to be intimated by the words of the edict, Ezra 7: 23. The commission of Ezra was given in the seventh year of the king, after the retreat from Greece. It is no objection to our hypothesis, that Ezra began his journey on the first day of the first month, and arrived at Jerusalem on the first of the fifth month, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, while Esther is said to have been declared queen in the tenth month of this year;

for the Book of Esther computes the months from harvest, or Tishri, while Ezra reckons from spring, or Nisan. Moreover, the favour of the king towards the Jews did not commence with the elevation of Esther to the throne; for before this time, Mordecai had a place among the nobles in the court of the palace, and consequently, he must have been one of the royal officers. The difference of the names, Artaxerxes, Xerxes and Ahasuerus, need occasion no difficulty, for these are not so much proper names, as appellatives, applied to every king at pleasure. Thus Daniel calls even Astyages, *Ahasuerus of the Median line*. The seventh year of Xerxes, 478 B. C. is the fifty eighth after the first return from the captivity.²

The Hebrew colony in Judea seems never to have been in a very flourishing condition. The administration of justice was particularly defective, and neither civil nor religious institutions were firmly established. Accordingly, the king gave permission anew for all Hebrews to emigrate to Judea. This was in fact renewing the invitation to the Jews to return to their native land. The priest, Ezra, a celebrated scribe, was appointed governour, with a commission to appoint judges, superiour and inferiour, to rectify abuses, to enforce the observance of the law, and to punish the refractory with fines, imprisonment, banishment, or death, according to the aggravation of their offences. He also had permission to make a collection for the temple, among the Hebrews who chose to remain in the land of their exile; and the king and his counsellors not only contributed generously towards the same object, but the managers of the royal revenues west of the Euphrates, were ordered to supply Ezra with all he should require, of silver to one hundred talents, wheat to one hundred cors, wine and oil to one hundred baths of each, and salt without limitation, to the end that the sacrifices might be legally and regularly offered, *that the wrath of the God of heaven should not be against the realm of the king and of his sons*. Also all who were employed in the services of the temple, even the common labourers, (Nethinims,) were exempted from tribute, and thus placed on an equality with the Medes and Persians. This was done to influence the priests and Levites to settle at Jerusalem, for as yet but very few of them had returned.³ From the whole letter it is manifest, that the God of the Hebrews was held in high veneration at the Persian court, ever after the time of Cyrus.

Although exemption from tribute was secured to the Levites who would emigrate to Judea, yet none of this tribe were found in the caravan which assembled in Babylonia, on the banks of the unknown river Ahava, and it was with difficulty that Ezra induced two families of priests to accompany him. The caravan consisted of sixteen houses, which, including women and children, probably amounted to six thousand persons. After a journey of three months and a half, the new colony arrived at Jerusalem, deposited at the temple the donations they had received for it, and Ezra delivered his credentials to the royal officers of that district.³ Of all the improvements and regulations which he introduced into Judea, the Book that bears his name mentions only the removal of the heathen women, a measure which was necessary in order to guard against a return to idolatry. But Nehemiah informs us that Ezra had the law publicly read to the people, and explained by interpreters to those who understood only Aramean. This undoubtedly gave occasion to the multiplying of copies of the law in Judea.⁴

¹ Ezra vi. vii. 8: 31. Esther ii. Dan. 9: 1. ² Ezra vii. 8: 15—20.

³ Ezra viii. ⁴ Ezra ix. x. Neh. 8: 1—12. comp: 1 Macc. 1: 57, 58.

LX. ARTAXERXES LONGIMANUS.

After Artaxerxes had inflicted merited punishment on the faction of the regicide Artabanus, he, in the second year of his reign, defeated his elder brother Hystaspes, who, as the lawful heir to the throne, had come against him with a considerable army from Bactria, where he was governour. Scarcely had he secured himself from this danger, when a war broke out with the Egyptians, who, on hearing of the disturbances in the royal family, elected Inarus their king, formed an alliance with the Athenians, and collected a large force by sea and land. Artaxerxes sent a still larger force against them, but it was repulsed, and the commander, Achaemenides, a brother of the king, was slain in battle by Inarus, 459 B. C. An attempt was then made to find employment for the Athenian allies at home, by exciting the Lacedemonians to a war against Athens; but as money could not effect this object, Artaxerxes, 458 B. C. sent, under the command of Megabyzus, a new army of three hundred thousand men, attended by a fleet of three hun-

dred ships, against Egypt, where Memphis had always been held by a Persian garrison. The rendezvous of the army was in Syria and Phenicia, where the troops were exercised in arms almost a whole year.¹

It was about this time that Themistocles, as a reward for all the services he had rendered his native country against the Persians, was obliged to flee for his life to these very Persians, where he was hospitably received and entertained by the king. He was now sent with a fleet to make a diversion of the Athenian forces, but that he might be neither ungrateful to his magnanimous protector nor an enemy to his native land, he put an end to his own life, by drinking a quantity of the warm blood of a bull that was offered in sacrifice.²

The Persian army now marched along the sea coast from Syria to Egypt, and the fleet sailed in company near the shore. The Egyptians were defeated, and surrendered on capitulation, but the Athenian auxiliaries, who had burnt their fleet and were determined to sell their lives as dearly as possible, were suffered to depart. The new fleet, however, which the Athenians had sent out after the first, fell into the hands of the Persians. Amyrtaeus retired with a part of the Egyptian army into the morasses, where he maintained himself for some time, as the place was inaccessible to the Persians; but he was unable to carry on any offensive operations. The war still continued with the Athenians, but in the year 450 B. C. the Persians were defeated by land and sea, and forced in the following year to accept a disgraceful peace. They gave up all the Grecian cities in Asia Minor, and obligated themselves to send no armed vessel farther west than Phaselis in Pamphylia, and no land force within three days' journey of the Aegean Sea; while the Athenians, on their part, engaged only not to commit hostilities upon the Persian dominions.³

Megabyzus had promised an amnesty to Inarus, with the Egyptians and Greeks of his party, when they gave themselves up to him; which promise was confirmed by Artaxerxes. But this prince, whose character was generally so honourable, at length yielded to the importunity of his mother Amytis, who, enraged at the death of her son Achaemenides, whom Inarus had slain in battle, was continually soliciting the punishment of these people; and Inarus, with fifty Greeks, was crucified. Irritated by this act of perfidy, Mega-

byzus revolted and raised an army in Syria. He twice defeated the royal forces which were sent against him, and afterwards the king received him to his favour.⁴

In the first year of the eighty seventh Olympiad, 431 B. C. the thirty fourth of Artaxerxes, the Peloponnesian war broke out, which, excited by Pericles from motives of selfish ambition, continued to rage for twenty seven years. Its horrors were greatly increased by that dreadful and wide spreading plague, so much spoken of in the history of those times. During this war, the Lacedemonians often sent ambassadours to Persia to solicit aid. But Artaxerxes, who was not sorry to see the Greeks weakening each other, would not understand their request; and it was not till the seventh year of the war that he sent an ambassadour to the Lacedemonians, and then his only charge was, to ascertain what they wanted. This ambassadour fell into the hands of the Athenians; but they, out of respect for the *Great King*, (as the Persian monarchs were then called by the Greeks,) sent him back to his master with every demonstration of honour. Soon after, Artaxerxes died, in the forty first year of his reign, 424 B. C.⁵

¹ Diodor. Sic. XI. 71. 74. Ctesias, Persic. XXX.—XXXII. ² Plutarch, Themist. XXXI. Thucyd. I. 137. 138. ³ Diodor. Sic. XI. 74. 75. 77. XII. 3. 4. Plutarch, Cimon, XII. XIII. ⁴ Ctesias, Persic. XXXVI—XXXIX. ⁵ Hippocrates de Epid. III. Thucyd. II. 47—55. Diodor. Sic. XIII. 38. 64. XII. 107. Ctesias, Persic. XLIII.

LXI. NEHEMIAH GOVERNOUR OF JUDEA.

If we recollect that in the years 459 and 458 B. C. Syria and Phenicia had been the rendezvous of two armies, and that in 448 and 447 B. C. Megabyzus had waged war in Syria against Artaxerxes, we need inquire no further for the causes of the decline of the Hebrew colony in Judea, which had been so well regulated by Ezra. Nehemiah, the cupbearer of Artaxerxes, learnt the unhappy state of the Hebrews 444 B. C. from a certain Jew, named Hanani, who had come from Judea to Shushan with a caravan. Of the regulations introduced by Ezra 478 B. C. there was little remaining, and amid the confusions of war, the condition of the Jews continually grew worse. This information so affected Nehemiah, a zealous worshipper of Jehovah, that the king observed his melancholy, and inquiring its cause, he appointed him governour of Judea

with full power to fortify Jerusalem, and thus to secure it from those disasters to which unprotected places are always exposed in time of war. Orders were sent to the royal officers west of the Euphrates to assist in the fortification of the city, and to furnish the requisite timber from the king's forest ; probably on mount Libanus, near the sources of the river Kadisha, as that was the place celebrated for its cedars. Thus commissioned, Nehemiah journeyed to Judea, accompanied by military officers and cavalry.¹

From the whole narrative it is manifest that Nehemiah, who presented wine to his royal master in the presence of the queen, and consequently in the harem, was a eunuch in high favour with the king ; and it is equally evident that he was a person of rank and authority at the court, for he travelled with a great retinue, maintained a large body of servants, and kept open table at Jerusalem, without receiving the usual compensation from the Jews as governor of the province. That a royal cupbearer should be invested with such dignity, will not surprise any one who has read the *Cyropaedia*.²

As soon as Nehemiah, on his arrival in Palestine, had been acknowledged governor of Judea by the royal officers, he made his proposition for the fortifying of Jerusalem, to the elders who composed the Jewish council. All the heads of houses, and the high priest Eliashib, engaged zealously in the work. The chiefs of the Samaritans, Sanballat, Tobiah and Geshem, endeavoured to thwart their undertaking by insults, by malicious insinuations that it was a preparation for revolt, by plots, and by threats of a hostile attack. The Jews, notwithstanding, proceeded earnestly in their business, armed the labourers, protected them still further by a guard of armed citizens, and at length happily completed the walls of their city. Nehemiah, during the progress of the work, had improved the condition of the people by the abolishing of illegal usury ; and now he provided the new fortifications with suitable defenders, by inducing his countrymen to settle at Jerusalem. He reestablished the regular services of the temple, and after the example of Ezra, expelled the heathen females who were married to Jews.³

At the close of the twelfth year of his office, 432 B. C. he returned to the king, and afterwards he came a second time to Jerusalem.⁴ It has generally been supposed that this second journey to Jerusalem took place in the following year, 431 B. C. the thirty

third of the reign of Artaxerxes, but we shall see in the 63d section of this work that it must have been several years later.

¹ Neh. I. and 2: 1—9. ² Neh. 4: 10, 17. 5: 14—18. Cyrop. I. 3: 7, 8.
³ Neh. 2: 10—20. 3: 33—37. 4: 1—17. 6: 1—19. 11: 1—36. 12: 27—43.
⁴ Neh. 13: 6.

LXII. XERXES II. SOGDIANUS. DARIUS NOTHUS.

Xerxes II. the only son of Artaxerxes by the queen Parysatis, ascended the throne after the decease of his father; but in forty five days he was assassinated by Sogdianus, the son of Artaxerxes by a concubine.

Sogdianus held the sceptre only six months and fifteen days; for when his brother Ochus, who was governour in Hyrcania, perceived that his own life was in danger from the jealousy of the monarch, he entered Persia with an army under pretence of avenging the death of Xerxes, and was every where hailed as king. Sogdianus now became a suppliant and obtained promise of pardon; but notwithstanding this, he was soon after put to death by being suffocated in ashes.¹

Ochus, who was known among the Greeks by the name of Darius Nothus, now commenced his reign, 423 B. C. He was governed almost entirely by his wife Parysatis, and his three principal eunuchs, Artoxares, Artibarxanes and Athros. His own brother Arsites revolted from him, but was subdued, and after his surrender he was executed in the same manner as Sogdianus had been. Ochus had yet many insurrections to quell, the most dangerous of which was that excited by Pysuthus, governour of Lydia, 414 B. C. This insurgent was at last induced by a stratagem to give himself up, and then he also suffered death in the ash-tower. Soon after, the Egyptians shook off the Persian yoke and made Amyrtaeus of Sais, their king; the same who had defended himself in the morasses during the revolt of Inarus. With the assistance of the Arabians, they drove the Persians from Egypt, 410 B. C. pursued them as far as Phenicia, and maintained their independence sixty four years. Ochus sent an army against them, but without success. The Persian forces marched to Egypt, along the coast through Judea; and this event was undoubtedly productive of great evil to the Jews. Eliashib, the high priest in the time of Nehemiah,

was no longer living. He died 413 B. C. and was succeeded by his son Judas.² This army, while on its march, might have laid waste Idumea, because the Idumeans, perhaps, had been united with those Arabs who, in conjunction with the Egyptians, had pursued the Persians to Phenicia, while the Hebrews remained faithful to the Persian monarch. To these circumstances Malachi alludes.³

Ochus was more successful against the Greeks in Asia Minor. His lieutenants, Pharnabazus and Tissaphernes, following the advice of Alcibiades, assisted in the Peloponnesian war the Athenians and the Lacedemonians alternately, according as the one or the other began to decline ; and thus, without any great effort on their part, helped the two parties to weaken each other. In the twentieth year of the war, 413 B. C. Ochus, in return for the money he had lent to the Lacedemonians, reannexed to his empire those Grecian cities and islands which Artaxerxes, in his disgraceful peace with the Athenians, had been forced to acknowledge independent.⁴

In 414, B. C. the Medes, after the example of the Egyptians, endeavoured to free themselves from the Persian yoke ; but they were soon vanquished and forced to submit. The Egyptians, however, still maintained their independence, and Pausiris succeeded Amyrtaeus to the throne.⁵

In the year 407 B. C. Ochus sent his younger son Cyrus, then scarcely sixteen, to Sardis as governour of Asia Minor, and gave him almost unlimited power. He was led to this imprudent step by his wife Parysatis, with whom Cyrus was a great favourite, and who wished by this means to open for him a way to the throne. Cyrus had ambition enough fully to second his mother's views : but he suffered his designs to be discovered so soon that he came near bringing on himself irretrievable ruin. He punished with death some children of royal blood, because they did not in his presence cover their hands with the sleeves of their robes ; a mark of respect never required but by the king himself. Darius immediately recalled him with a determination to punish him ; but he yielded to the solicitations of Parysatis, and reinstated him in his government.⁶

Cyrus no longer pursued the politic course of affording alternate aid to the Athenians and Lacedemonians ; but in accordance with the injunctions of his father and with his own wishes, he supplied the Lacedemonians with as much money as they needed. This

enabled Lysander, the Spartan admiral, to pay the men of his fleet ; and he then drove the Athenians to such extremities, that they were at last forced to desist from this long protracted war in the year 405 B. C. Darius Nothus died the next year, and was succeeded by his son Artaxerxes, who, on account of his retentive memory, was surnamed Mnemon.⁷

¹ Ctesias, Persic. XLIV—XLVIII. Diodor. Sic. XII. 71. comp. ² Macc. 13: 5—6. ³ Josephus, Antiq. XI. 7: 1. Ctesias, Persic. XLIX—LXI. ⁴ Malachi 1: 2—5. ⁵ Ctesias, Persic. LX. Diodor. Sic. XIII. 37. 38. 45. 46. 51. Thucyd. VIII. compare Nepos, Alcibiades, VIII. Plutarch, Alcibiades, XXV. XXXI. Xenophon, Hellen. I. 1: 4, 6, 9, 15—18, 23. 2: 3—4. II. 3: 4, 11. 3: 4, 6—9. 4: 1—3. ⁶ Xenophon, Hellen. I. 2: 12. ⁷ Xenophon, Hellen. I. 4: 1. II. 1: 6, 8, 10. ⁸ Xenophon, Hellen. I. 5: 1—5. 6: 6, 7, 12. II. 1: 7—9. 2: 1—14. III. 1: 1. Justin, V. 5. C. Nepos, Alcibiades, VIII. Diodor. Sic. XIII. 70. 104—107. Plutarch, Lysander, IV—XV. Diodor. Sic. XIII. 108.

LXIII. SECOND ADMINISTRATION OF NEHEMIAH.

Prideaux dates the second administration of Nehemiah from the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus, 408 B. C. It was then that he undertook the second reformation, in consequence of which Manasseh, the son of the high priest Joiada, (not Jaddu as in Josephus,) fled to Samaria, because he was unwilling to part with his wife, who was a daughter of Sanballat, the Samaritan chief. Though I do not attach equal importance to all the reasons which Prideaux has adduced in support of his opinion, yet some of them are conclusive, and I shall add others which he has not noticed. Still I would not venture to fix so definitely on the exact year.¹

The interval from the thirty second year of Artaxerxes, the date of Nehemiah's return to Persia, to the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus, from 432 to 408 B. C. includes only twenty four years, and is therefore not too great. When he came to Jerusalem the first time, he was royal cupbearer, an office most usually filled by handsome young men. He was then probably between twenty and thirty years old, and consequently, after a residence of twelve years in Judea and of twenty four more in Persia, he would have reached the age of fifty six or sixty six ; a time of life at which he might easily leave the service of the court and become governour of his own people. If, as Josephus says, Nehemiah lived to a very great age, he would now have many years to spend at Jerusalem. Had

his life extended to one hundred years, he might himself have written the twenty second verse of the twelfth chapter of the Book which bears his name: *The Levites in the days of Eliashib, Joiada, and Johanan (v. 11. Jonathan,) and Jaddua &c.* For though Jaddua, who was an old man in the time of Alexander, 331 B. C. could not have been high priest under Darius Nothus; yet in the last years of that monarch he might have been fifteen or twenty years old, and so have his name placed in the register, as heir to the priesthood. I would not, however, insist on this, for both this passage and the genealogy of the high priests in the tenth and eleventh verses, appear as if completed by a later hand.

Should it be objected, that if Joiada, the successor of the high priest Eliashib, entered his office in the eleventh year of Darius Nothus, there would be only three high priests (Jeshua, Jehoiakim and Eliashib) during the whole period from the first year of Cyrus to the eleventh of Darius Nothus, 536 to 412 B. C. I answer, that for three generations to continue one hundred and twenty four years, is nothing incredible. Moreover, the register may omit some one or more of the high priests, as being unworthy of notice or holding the office but a short time. But be that as it may, the difficulty is by no means so great as one we are obliged to encounter on the usual hypothesis: for according to this, there were four high priests, Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan or Jonathan and Jaddua, during the thirteen years between the first and second arrival of Nehemiah, 444 to 431 B. C.; while, through the whole period of one hundred and twelve years from Cyrus to Nehemiah, 536 to 444 B. C. there were only three, viz. Jeshua, Jehoiakim and Eliashib. Thus the received opinion makes a second difficulty, without relieving the first.²

But that the second arrival of Nehemiah at Jerusalem and his last reformation, could not have taken place in one year after his return to Artaxerxes, as is generally supposed, is evident from the narrative itself. For in the short space of one year, how could so many great abuses have crept in, as Nehemiah found it necessary to correct; the gross profanation of the temple, the open violation of the sabbath, the unjust withholding of the tythes, in consequence of which, the priests were forced to neglect their official duties and to accept defective offerings in order to obtain subsistence? Should the phrase קָצָה יְהִימִים, which Nehemiah employs to express the time

of his return, be appealed to ; I trust it will be granted, that *יָמֵי* does not always mean exactly one year, but is frequently used for an indefinite period comprehending several years. That the latter is the meaning of the phrase in this place is manifest ; for though we might suppose it possible for marriages to be contracted with foreign women, and for them to become mothers within the space of one year, yet their children could hardly learn so soon to speak a jargon made up of the Jewish and heathen tongues, much less, have beards for Nehemiah to pull. (*וְיִאֲמְרוּ*)³ On the contrary, all this is very easily explicable, if Nehemiah remained in Persia twenty four years. It is very surprising that these circumstances should have escaped the notice of all the commentators.

It is expressly stated Neh. 13: 28. that this last reformation took place under Joiada the high priest, for in the words : *one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib, the high priest*, the title *high priest* belongs not to the word *Eliashib*, immediately preceding, but to *Joiada*. Every tyro in the oriental languages knows, that — *the son of* — with the preceding and succeeding names, compose but one proper noun, and that the following name of office belongs to the son and not to the father. But that *Eliashib* was dead before the second arrival of Nehemiah at Jerusalem, seems evident from the manner in which he is spoken of Neh. 13: 4, 5, 7. From the tone of the narrative, we should naturally be led to suppose that the subjects of it were no longer living. The Alexandrian Chronicle places the death of *Eliashib* and the first year of his successor *Joiada*, in the eleventh year of *Darius Nothus*, 412 B. C. Consequently according to this Chronicle, the second return of *Nehemiah* must have taken place after this year.

The book of *Malachi* has reference to the circumstances of these times. Tradition places this prophet in the last administration of *Nehemiah* ; and the detention of the tythes, defective offerings and heathen marriages, first became general about this period. The severe censures which *Malachi* passes on the marriage of priests with foreign women, are perhaps aimed directly at *Manasseh*, the son of *Joiada*. The deplorable condition of which the Jews complained, as related in the book of *Nehemiah*, was occasioned principally by the Persian expeditions to *Egypt*, which passed through *Judea*, and consequently made that country participate in the evils of war. Amid the confusion of war the institutions of the

Hebrews might easily be shaken and corrupted by abuses, and the circumstances of the nation be depressed. It has already been remarked that Edom was laid waste at this period.⁴

¹ Prideaux, *Connexions*, Vol. I. Book VI. p. 383. Neh. 13: 4—31. ² Neh. 12: 10, 11. ³ Neh. 13: 23—25. ⁴ Sect. 62. Malachi 1: 2—5.

NOTE. The Alexandrian Chronicle, to which we shall have occasion frequently to refer, was first found in a library in Sicily. It was used at Rome by Sigonius and Onuphrius, and is quoted by them under the title of *Fasti Siculi*. Sylburg obtained another manuscript of it, and gave it to Hoeschelius, who sent it to the library at Augsburg. Here it was published in 1624 with a Latin translation, by Rhoderus the Jesuit. Because the manuscript contained a preface by an Alexandrian Patriarch, the work was entitled *Chronicon Alexandrinum*. Prideaux, *Connexions*, Vol. II. Book III. p. 145. Note aa.

LXIV. SAMARITAN TEMPLE ON MOUNT GERIZIM.

On supposition that Nehemiah returned to Judea in the latter part of the reign of Darius Nothus, it is easy to see what gave occasion to the mistake of Josephus, who assigns Sanballat, the chief of the Samaritans contemporary with Nehemiah, to the reign of Darius Codomanus, and makes Manasseh, the son of Joiada and son-in-law of Sanballat, the son of the high priest Jaddua. Misled by the similarity of the names, he confounded Darius Nothus with Darius Codomanus; and this is not at all surprising, for Josephus in his *Antiquities* treats of this period very negligently, and has fallen into numerous errors. The more modern Jews were very ignorant of the later periods of Persian history. If we correct this oversight of Josephus, it will be no longer necessary to maintain the very improbable assumption, that there were two chiefs of the Samaritans of the name of Sanballat, separated from each other by a century, (431 and 331 B. C.) each of whom had a daughter, married to a fugitive son of the Jewish high priest. There was but one Sanballat, chief of the Samaritans, whose daughter was married to a son of the high priest Joiada, and that about the year 408 B. C.¹

That important historical fact, therefore, which Josephus has placed in the reign of Darius Codomanus, properly belongs to the last years of Darius Nōthus. It was of this last mentioned monarch, that Sanballat obtained permission to build a temple for the Samaritans on mount Gerizim. This chief had distinguished himself perhaps, by his alacrity in furnishing with provisions the army destined to Egypt, and having thus insinuated himself into the favour of the king, his request was the more readily granted. In this temple, Manasseh, the son of the high priest Joiada, whom Nehemiah had expelled from Judea on account of his connexion with the daughter of Sanballat, was appointed high priest.² Afterwards, according to the testimony of Josephus, those Jews who in their own country had been guilty of criminal offences, or who from any cause became dissatisfied, took refuge in Samaria. By these emigrants, the Samaritans were withdrawn from idolatry and brought to worship Jehovah alone. But the enmity between the two nations was not at all allayed by this circumstance, but rather increased, at least on the part of the Jews, to whom this temple, built after the year 408 B. C. and the reception of fugitive Jews, was a constant source of provocation.

In this manner every thing falls naturally and without violence into its proper time, and the table of the high priests, Neh. 12: 10, 11. is found entirely consistent with history. For though this table was evidently completed by a later hand, this circumstance alone, without other reasons, cannot prove it incorrect. And no such other proof of its incorrectness now remains; for if Joiada entered the priesthood 412 B. C. there are for the eighty years which intervene between this period and the time of Alexander, three high priests; viz. Joiada, Jonathan or Johanan (John) and Jaddua; and it is known that Jaddua was very aged when Alexander visited Jerusalem. It is accordingly no longer necessary to assume without evidence, that there were two high priests of the name of Jaddua, one at the time of Nehemiah and a second in the days of Alexander.

¹ Josephus, Antiq. XI. 8: 2. Neh. 13: 28. ² Neh. 13: 28. Josephus, Antiq. XI. 8: 2,4.

LXV. ARTAXERXES MNEMON.

Artaxerxes II. surnamed Mnemon, also called Arsaces, ascended the throne on the death of his father, notwithstanding the exertions of his mother Parysatis to secure the succession to her younger son Cyrus. Though at the commencement of his reign, he permitted his queen Statira to be guilty of an act of the most horrid cruelty, and generally yielded too far to the wickedness of his mother, he was on the whole a just and magnanimous prince. He pardoned his brother Cyrus, who, at the suggestion of Tissaphernes, was detected in an attempt to assassinate him at his coronation, and even reinstated him in his government of Asia Minor.¹ But Cyrus was so little affected by his brother's generosity, that he now determined to accomplish his object by open rebellion. Under pretence of making war upon Thrace, and afterwards, upon Tissaphernes, he collected a large army, and was powerfully supported by the Lacedemonians, whom he had assisted with money in the Peloponnesian war. Clearchus, a Lacedemonian general, increased his army, already consisting of one hundred thousand men of various nations, with a body of thirteen thousand Greeks. With these forces, Cyrus marched to Babylonia, 401 B. C. the same year in which Socrates was put to death. Artaxerxes, who had been seasonably informed of the revolt by Tissaphernes, came against him with an army of nine hundred thousand men. They engaged in a bloody battle at the village of Cunaxa, which was situated about thirty English miles south of Babylon, between the Tigris and Euphrates. The thirteen thousand Greeks had already half gained the victory, when Cyrus, pressing on too zealously against his brother whom he wounded, was himself slain by the royal guards. This expedition, and particularly the astonishing retreat of the ten thousand surviving Greeks by a route of more than eighteen hundred English miles, have been described by Xenophon, the eye-witness and director of that achievement.²

Before the ten thousand Greeks had returned in the year 400 B. C. a new war broke out between the Lacedemonians and Artaxerxes. For when Tissaphernes, who succeeded Cyrus in the government of Asia Minor, demanded the submission of the Ionian states, they sought aid of the Lacedemonians. These readily acceded to their request, and were at first so successful against

the governour Pharnabazus, who was not sufficiently supported by Tissaphernes, that Agesilaus, their commander, conceived the design of destroying the Persian empire. But when the Athenians and other Greeks, excited by Persian gold, 394 B. C. declared war against the Lacedemonians, they were somewhat humbled. Artaxerxes finally, 387 B. C. made peace on his own terms, and all Asia Minor submitted to the Persian yoke.³

During this war the Athenians had afforded aid to Evagoras, 390 B. C. who brought the island of Cyprus under his power and renounced his allegiance to the Persian king. This was an act of treachery on the part of the Athenians, for they were at that time in alliance with Artaxerxes. But this difficulty also was settled by the same treaty, and Cyprus was reannexed to the Persian dominion.⁴

Artaxerxes now had the guardianship (so to speak) of all Greece. He often sent ambassadours thither and under colour of advice or admonition, courteously laid his commands on all the states. The Greeks also in their turn, sent frequent embassies to Persia to obtain the assistance, or rather perhaps, the gracious protection of the Persian monarch; though their ambassadours were still so proud as to refuse to yield the oriental homage in the royal presence. Even the Theban war, which had continued fifteen years, was concluded in the year 363 B. C. by the intervention of Artaxerxes.⁵

In his other wars Artaxerxes was not equally successful. The expedition which he undertook in person, 384 B. C. against the Cadusians between the Black and Caspian Seas, cost him many men. His provisions failing him while among the mountains of that region, his whole army would have perished by famine, had he not at last obtained peace by a stratagem.⁶

Equally unsuccessful was the expedition which he prepared against Egypt, 377 B. C. in order to subject that country again to the Persian power. During the thirty six years which had passed since Amyrtaeus ascended the Egyptian throne, Pausiris, Psammetichus and Nephereus had reigned, and the king now to be attacked was Achoris. But he died before the attack was made, for two entire years were consumed in preparations. His successor was Psammuthis, who reigned but one year, and was followed by Nephorites. He continued only four months on the throne,

and then Nectannebis assumed the sceptre, which he held twelve years. This king withstood the Persian power by the help of the Greeks, who favoured him with the military services of Chabrias. The Athenians, however, recalled Chabrias at the request of the great king, but Egypt, notwithstanding, still maintained her independence.⁷ In the year 362 B. C. Tachus succeeded to the Egyptian throne. He formed magnificent designs, made an alliance with the Lacedemonians, received from them a large body of auxiliaries under the command of Agesilaus their king, and determined to commence offensive operations against the Persians. He accordingly sent a great army into Phenicia, with the intention of soon following in person; but before his arrival the soldiers made choice of Nectannebus for their king, and to this election the Lacedemonians treacherously acceded. Tachus, now deserted by all, was forced to flee for protection to his enemy, Artaxerxes, by whom he was hospitably received. An opposing claimant to the throne now appeared with a strong military force against Nectannebus, but the Greek general, Agesilaus, was ashamed to be guilty of treachery a second time, and by his management the powerful rebel was overcome.⁸ The Idumeans were again subjected to great sufferings by their participation in these wars.⁹

Artaxerxes, the year before his death, named as his successor, Darius, his oldest son by the queen; but he, being soon after detected in a design against his father's life, because he had refused to give him one of his own concubines, was executed. Ariaspes, the second son of the queen, driven to despair by the false representations of his younger brother Ochus, the queen's third son, destroyed himself by poison. Ochus also procured the death of Orsanes, a favourite son of Artaxerxes by a concubine. The remaining one hundred and fourteen sons of the royal concubines, (among whom were two of the king's own daughters,) kept themselves quiet; but the afflicted monarch died of grief. Ochus kept this event secret for ten months, and having during this period made all the necessary arrangements, he promulgated at the same time his father's death and his own accession to the throne, 358 B. C. He assumed the name of Artaxerxes, but he is known in history by his true name Ochus.¹⁰

¹ Ctesias, Persic. LVII. Plutarch, Artax. III. XIX. XXIII. Xenophon, Anab. I. 1: 3. Justin, V. 11. ² Xenophon, Hellen. III. 1: 1. where reference is

made to Themistogenes of Syracuse in Κίθου Ἀνάβησις, comp. Diodor. Sic. XIV. 11. Ctesias, Persic. LVII—LIX. Corn. Nepos, Alcibiades IX. Plutarch, Artaxerxes IV—XIV. Justin, V. 11. Parian Marbles, Ep. 68. ³ Xenophon, Hellen. III. 1: 2—4, 7, 8. 5. 1—18. IV. 2: 1—3, 6—14. 3: 1—8, 39. V. 1: 22, 26—33. Plutarch, Agesilaus VI. IX—XV. XVII—XIX. XXIII. and Artaxerxes XXI. and Ly-sander XXIII. Corn. Nepos, Agesilaus II—VI. and Conon III—V. Justin, VI. 1—6. Diodor. Sic. XIV. 98. 99. 110. 117. ⁴ Xenophon, Hellen. IV. 8: 24. V. 1: 10. Diodor. Sic. XV. 1—4. 9. 11. ⁵ Xenophon, Hellen. VII. 5. 27. V. 4: 1. Diodor. Sic. XV. 25—89. Plutarch, Pelopidas XX. XXX. and Artaxerxes XXII. and Agesilaus XXVI—XXXV. Corn. Nepos, Pelopidas and Epaminondas. ⁶ Plutarch, Artaxerxes XXIV. Diodor. Sic. XV. 8. ⁷ Eusebius, Chron. Syncell. p. 257. Diodor. Sic. XV. 29. 41—44. C. Nepos, Iphicrates II. and Chabrias II. III. ⁸ Diodor. Sic. XV. 90—92. Plutarch, Agesilaus XXXVI—XXXIX. ⁹ Mal. 1: 4. ¹⁰ Plutarch, Artaxerxes XXVI—XXX. Diodor. Sic. XV. 93.

LXVI. THE HEBREWS UNDER ARTAXERXES MNEMON.

The Hebrews enjoyed peace during the greater part of the forty six years' reign of Artaxerxes Mnemon, 404 to 358 B. C. They were exposed to the burdens of a military rendezvous from 377 to 374 B. C. for at that period there were assembled in their vicinity two hundred thousand barbarian soldiers, besides twenty thousand Greeks; and three hundred ships of war, two hundred galleys of thirty rowers, and a great number of store ships were collected at Acco. The invading army of Persia marched along their coasts to Egypt, and returned by the same route. The landing of the Egyptian army of Nectannebus at Acco 362 B. C. at which time the inhabitants of that region revolted from Artaxerxes, was but a transient storm; for as soon as the Egyptians had made choice of Tachus for their king, they returned to their own country, and the rebellious Phenicians again submitted to the Persian monarch.¹

The high priest Joiada died eleven years before these disturbances, in the thirty second year of Artaxerxes, and was succeeded by his son Jonathan or Johanan (John.) About the time of the Egyptian invasion, this priest occasioned great trouble to his nation. His brother Jesus had become such a favourite with Bago-ses, the Persian general who commanded the military forces in that quarter, that he was by him nominated to the priesthood. When he came to Jerusalem in this capacity, Jonathan rashly murdered him in the temple. Bago-ses hearing of this outrage,

hastened to Jerusalem ; and when an attempt was made to exclude him from the temple as a Gentile, and consequently unclean, he pressed into the sanctuary, indignantly exclaiming "What ! am not I as pure as the dead carcass which lies in your temple ?" The Jews were very much pained by this profanation of their holy place ; but Bagoses, as a punishment for the sacrilegious murder of Jesus, required for every animal offered in sacrifice a tribute of fifty drachms, which was rigorously exacted during the seven years that he remained in that country. Reckoning only the usual daily and festive offerings, the paschal lamb and the sacrifices connected with it, this tax would amount to a sum of not less than two hundred thousand dollars annually. This must have been the more sensibly felt, as the priests had for many years been accustomed to receive from the Persian monarchs, large contributions towards defraying the expense of their sacrifices.²

¹ Diodor. Sic. XV. 41—43. 90—94.
Antiq. XI. 7: 1.

² Neh. 12: 11, 22. Josephus,

LXVII. DARIUS OCHUS.

However careful Ochus had been to secure the crown to himself after his father's death, immediately on his accession to the throne he made shocking havock among his relatives and all the nobles whom he suspected, filling his palace with blood, "scilicet, (as Justin remarks,) ne innocentior fratribus parricidis videretur." In the war which he undertook against the Cadusians, Codomanus, who was of the royal race by a concubine, honourably distinguished himself in a successful single combat with a Cadusian champion. As a reward for his valour, he was proclaimed by an *Astanda*, (a royal courier, or rather perhaps, president of the couriers,) governor of Armenia. This prepared the way for his future elevation to the throne of Persia.¹

In the third year of Ochus, the first of the one hundred and sixth Olympiad, three hundred and eighty five after the building of Rome, 356 B. C. Alexander, the future destroyer of the Persian empire, was born at Pella in Macedonia, and on the same day in which Erostratus, in order to acquire an imperishable name, set fire to the celebrated temple of Diana at Ephesus.²

In the years 354 and 353 B. C. the armies of Ochus were defeated by Artabazus, governour of Asia Minor, who had revolted from his royal master. He was at first upheld in his rebellion by the Athenians, but when they were deterred by the threats of Ochus from granting him any further assistance, the Thebans lent him their aid. Notwithstanding this, however, Artabazus was at last overcome and compelled to flee to Macedonia; but after three years he was again received into favour by the king.³

The Phenicians, in consequence of the oppressions of the Persian officers, followed this example of revolt, 351 B. C. They formed an alliance with Nectannebus, who had succeeded Tachus on the throne of Egypt; and this monarch, being then threatened with war by Ochus, gladly embraced an opportunity to employ the Phenicians as a barrier against him. He accordingly sent four thousand Greeks to their aid. They were then able to defeat the royal army, which was sent against them from Syria and Cilicia. The success of this revolt encouraged the inhabitants of Cyprus to renounce their allegiance to Persia. But when Ochus marched to Phenicia in person, at the head of three hundred thousand infantry and thirty thousand cavalry, Zidon was betrayed into his hands by Mentor, the commander of the Greek auxiliaries from Egypt, and Tennes, the viceroy of the city. The Zidonians, as soon as they discovered the treachery, shut themselves up in their houses, and setting fire to them, destroyed themselves and all their treasures. The other Phenicians now surrendered on the best terms they could obtain; and Ochus being anxious to invade Egypt, was not unreasonable in his demands. The Cypriots followed their example and surrendered by capitulation.⁴

After Ochus had drawn into his service ten thousand Greeks, he marched with his army along the coast towards Egypt, while the fleet sailed in company near the shore. It is said that he lost many men in lake Serbonis, which being then covered with loose sand blown from the deserts, his inexperienced soldiers mistook for solid ground. But notwithstanding this, his army was still large enough for the conquest of Egypt, which the imprudence of Nectannebus rendered an easy achievement. After the Persian fleet had come to anchor, and the troops having disembarked, had defeated the Egyptian army which was hastening to oppose them; Nectannebus, who had a force of one hundred thousand men, with-

drew all the soldiers from the defiles which he had well garrisoned, hastened to Memphis, and in this manner laid open the whole country to the invading army. The capitulation of Pelusium was the immediate consequence of these ill-judged measures. The Persians now proceeded unobstructed into the interior, and Nectanebus was forced to make his escape into Ethiopia. Thus Egypt again fell under the dominion of Persia, after an independence of sixty four years. Ochus plundered and destroyed the principal cities and temples, slew the ox Apis, and with his flesh provided a feast for the priests who had worshipped him as their god. He took away all the manuscripts from the archives and carried them, with an immense booty, to Babylon.⁵ From that period to the present day, Egypt has remained subject to the dominion of foreigners, and no individual of the race of the ancient Egyptians has ever attained to the throne. So exactly has the prophecy of Ezekiel been accomplished.⁶

After this successful campaign, Ochus gave himself up to indolence and luxury, leaving the administration of affairs to his eunuch Bagoas, and his general Mentor, both of whom had rendered him important services in the Egyptian war. But Bagoas, himself an Egyptian, could never forgive the severities which the king had practised on his native country. Accordingly, 338 B. C. he procured his master's death by poison, and in a horrid manner vented his rage upon his lifeless body. He then collected and sent back, as far as he was able, the manuscripts which Ochus had taken from Egypt. The removing of these manuscripts may, in part at least, account for the fact, that neither Manetho nor Eratosthenes, who had free access to the archives of Egypt, were able to collect from them a complete and accurate history of the country.⁷

¹ Justin X. 3. ² Solinus Polyhist. XL. 4. Plutarch, Alexander III. Justin, XII. 16. Arrian, de Reb. Alex. VII. 26. Aul. Gellius, Noct. Att. II. 6. ³ Diodor. Sic. XVI. 22. 34. 92. ⁴ Diodor. Sic. XVI. 40—45. ⁵ Diodor. Sic. XVI. 46. comp. I. 30. XVI. 47—52. Sev. Sulpitius, II. Aelian, Var. Hist. IV. 8. VI. 8. Suidas in *Ωγος*. ⁶ Ezek. 29: 13—16. ⁷ Diodor. Sic. XVI. 5. Aelian, Var. Hist. VI. 8.

LXVIII. THE HEBREWS UNDER OCHUS.

It appears that some of the Jews took part in the Phenician rebellion, 351 B. C. for Ochus went from Phenicia to Jéricho, subdued the city, took several of the inhabitants with him to Egypt, and sent others into Hyrcania to people that province. Still the nation at large evidently remained faithful to the Persian power, for Jerusalem was not disturbed. Jonathan, the murderer of his brother Jesus, continued in the high priesthood. He died in the eighteenth year of Ochus, 340 B. C. and was succeeded by Jaddua.¹

Among the Greeks, Plato flourished during the reigns of Artaxerxes Mnemon and Ochus, and died in the eleventh year of the latter, 348 B. C. Aristotle, his most celebrated disciple, disappointed that Speusippus instead of himself succeeded to the office of his master, withdrew to Mysia, where he married a relative of the king of Atarnea. Clearchus, one of the most distinguished disciples of Aristotle, relates in his book concerning sleep, (as quoted by Josephus,) that during the three years' residence of his master with this petty monarch, he became acquainted with a learned Jew, who had been conversant with many philosophers, and communicated to them more knowledge than they were able to impart to him.² When the king of Atarnea was made prisoner by Mentor, the general of Ochus, Aristotle fled to Mytelene. He afterwards went to Macedonia, where for eight years he was the instructor of Alexander, the ravager of the world.

¹ Alexand. Chron. Syncell. p. 156. Eusebius, Chron. Josephus, Antiq. XI. 7: 2. and against Apion II. Compare Justin. XXXV. 3. 8. Solinus Polyhist. XXXV. 4. ² Josephus, against Apion I. 22.

LXIX. ARSES. DARIUS CODOMANUS.

After Bagoas had removed Ochus out of the way, 338 B. C. that he might retain the direction of affairs in his own hands, he put to death all the elder sons of the king and placed Arses, the youngest, upon the throne. But as it soon appeared that the young king was determined not to leave unpunished the murderer of his father and brothers, Bagoas anticipated him, and in the second or third year of his reign, destroyed him and all his family. The old regicide then presented the sceptre to Darius Codomanus,

gouverneur of Armenia, who was a descendant of Darius Nothus, and had acquired great reputation in the Cadusian war. But Bagaoas soon repented of his choice and plotted the death of this king also ; but Abdomanus discovered his design, and forced the wretch to swallow the poison himself which he had prepared for him.¹

During the exhibition of these murderous scenes at the Persian court, preparations had commenced in Greece for the overthrow of the Persian monarchy. Philip, king of Macedonia, after his victory over the Athenians and Thebans at the battle of Cheronæa, under pretence of friendship, made himself master of all Greece. He convened at Corinth a general assembly of all the states. A war against Persia was determined upon, to avenge, as Philip pretended, the sacrilege which the Persians, particularly in the time of Xerxes, had committed against the Grecian temples. To conduct this war, Philip procured for himself the appointment of general of all the Greeks, with unlimited powers. He immediately ordered every city to furnish a certain quota of soldiers. The following year, 336 B. C. he sent his generals, Parmenio, Amyntas and Attalus, to Asia Minor with a part of the army, to commence hostilities, promising soon to follow in person. But a short time after, he was assassinated at the nuptial feast of his daughter, and the enterprise was for a while suspended.²

Alexander, the son of Philip, and his successor in the Macedonian throne, in a new assembly of all the Grecian states at Corinth, procured for himself the same powers in respect to Greece which his father had enjoyed, and was consequently acknowledged the absolute commander of all the Greeks in the Persian war. While he was engaged in war with the Illyrians and the Triballi, several of the Grecian states refused compliance with the resolution of the general assembly at Corinth ; but when he returned with his victorious army, his authority was immediately acknowledged by all the governments except that of Thebes. After a short siege, in which the Thebans defended themselves with great bravery, he took possession of the city and utterly demolished it, as a warning to all the rest.³

¹ Diodor. Sic. XVII. 5. Justin, X. 3. ² Diodor. Sic. XVI. 89. 91. 93. Justin, IX. 3. 5. 6. Plutarch, Demosthenes XIII—XX. and Phocion XII—XIX. ³ Diodor. Sic. XVII. 1—4. 3—16. Justin, I. 1—5. Arrian, de Reb. Alex. I. 1—11. Plutarch, Alexander XI—XIV.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

HISTORY OF ALEXANDER AND HIS IMMEDIATE SUCCESSORS.

LXX. FIRST VICTORIES OF ALEXANDER.

IN the spring of the year 334 B. C. the second year of the reign of Darius Codomanus, Alexander crossed the Hellespont with only thirty thousand or forty thousand infantry and five thousand cavalry, and provided with but seventy talents of money. On the fifth day after the passage of the Hellespont, he defeated a Persian army of five times his numbers at the river Granicus, and by this means gained possession of the Persian treasury at Sardis. Several provinces of Asia Minor then voluntarily surrendered to the conqueror, and others were subjected in the course of the summer. In the next campaign, 333 B. C. he subdued Phrygia, Paphlagonia, Pisidia, Cappadocia and Cilicia.¹

Darius, meanwhile, was not remiss in making preparations for a vigorous resistance. His admiral, whom he had sent with a fleet to make an incursion upon Macedonia, fortunately for Alexander, died in the midst of the enterprise. When the design was thus rendered abortive, Darius assembled in Babylonia an army of four hundred thousand or six hundred thousand men, and marched towards Cilicia to meet his enemy. Alexander, as soon as he heard of this movement, hastened forward to seize the passes of Cilicia. In this he succeeded, and stationed himself at Issus, in a situation where not more than thirty thousand men could march up to an attack. By this position, he was able to protect his flanks and at the same time bring his whole army into action, while scarcely a twentieth part of his enemy's forces could engage in the conflict. The Persians lost the battle; and their numbers were not only useless, but they so obstructed the retreat that more were crushed to death in the eagerness of the flight, than had been slain by the weapons of the

Greeks. Darius himself escaped with great difficulty, and was obliged to leave his whole camp, and even his own rich baggage, a prey to the victors. Of the Persian army, one hundred thousand men lay dead on the field.²

All Syria now submitted. Even Damascus, the capital, where the harem and the treasures of the king and his generals were kept, was given into the hands of the conqueror by the Persian commandant. At Zidon, which had voluntarily surrendered, Alexander made Abdolonymus his viceroy, after having in vain solicited others to accept the office.³

The Tyrians, to manifest their respect for the irresistible conqueror, sent him a golden crown, and thought they managed very adroitly to prevent his entrance into their city, where he wished to offer sacrifice in the temple of Hercules, by replying that the ancient and true temple of Hercules was at old Tyre on the continent. Tyre, which, since the destruction of the ancient city by Nebuchadnezzar, had been rebuilt upon an island about four hundred fathoms from the shore, relied on the aid of Carthage, which was promised by the Carthaginian ambassadours then present in the city; but still more, on its situation in the sea, Alexander being destitute of shipping, and on its strong walls. These were one hundred and fifty feet in height, and the citizens now constructed an inner wall at about five cubits distance from them, and filled up the intermediate space with rubbish. The city was plentifully supplied with provisions, and fresh supplies could at any time be brought in by sea, without the least difficulty.⁴

But Alexander, with the rubbish of the ancient city, constructed a causeway from the shore to new Tyre, and in seven months, took the city by storm, although the Tyrians had not only defended themselves with great bravery, but being warned by a dream, had fastened to the altar of Hercules with golden chains the colossal statue of Apollo, that it might not desert to Alexander. Many of the inhabitants fled to Carthage by sea, but of those who remained, eight thousand were put to the sword, thirteen thousand were sold into slavery, and two thousand were crucified. The city was plundered and laid in ashes, and new colonists were settled among its ruins.⁵ Thus the prophecy of Zechariah respecting new Tyre, was literally accomplished, as the previous prophecy of Ezekiel against the old city, had been fulfilled in the time of Nebuchadnezzar.⁶

From Tyre, Alexander proceeded along the coast to Gaza. Respecting the fate of the other cities on this route, history is silent, but Gaza resisted and was captured after a siege of two months. Alexander, who had been wounded during the siege, was greatly irritated by the courageous defence of the city. He put ten thousand of the citizens to death, and sold the rest, with the women and children, for slaves. Betis, the valiant commander of the city, he bound to a chariot with thongs thrust through the soles of his feet, and in this manner dragged him with horses around the city.⁷ By so base an act of cruelty, this Greek, the disciple of Aristotle, the diligent reader of Homer, boasted that he imitated Achilles, from whom, he would have it, he was himself descended. Yet Achilles, in an age far more barbarous, drew only the dead body of Hector around Troy, but Alexander abused, in this shocking manner, a brave officer, wounded and still living, whose fidelity to his king was his only crime.⁸

¹ Arrian, de Reb. Alex. I. 12--29. II. 1--5. Plutarch, Alexander XV--XVIII. Curtius, de Exped. Alex. I. 1--9. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 17--28. ² Arrian, II. 6--14. Curtius, III. 11. 14--24. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 29--31. Justin, XI. 9. Plutarch, Alexander XIX--XXIII. ³ Curtius, III. 25. IV. 1. 2. comp. Zech. 9: 1, 2. ⁴ Arrian, II. 16. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 40--43. Curtius, IV. 5. comp. Zech. 9: 3. ⁵ Diodor. Sic. XVII. 32--47. Arrian, II. 17--24. Justin, XI. 9: 10. Curtius, IV. 6--15. Plutarch, Alexander XXIV. XXV. Josephus, Antiq. XI. 8: 3. ⁶ Zech. 9: 4--8. Ezek. xxvii. xxviii. ⁷ Zech. 9: 5. ⁸ Curtius, IV. 17--19. Arrian, II. 27. 28. Plutarch, Alexander XXV. Diodor. Sic. XVIII. 49.

LXXI. ALEXANDER AT JERUSALEM.

That Alexander, when he invaded Syria, summoned all the cities in that region to surrender, to pay to him their usual tribute and to furnish his army with provisions, is in itself very probable. Josephus testifies that, during the siege of Tyre, a written order of this kind came to Jerusalem, directed by Alexander to the high priest Jaddua, as the chief magistrate of the nation. Jaddua returned answer, that he had sworn fealty to Darius, and could not violate his oath so long as that prince was living. Alexander, naturally of a furious and impetuous temper, was highly irritated by this reply, and threatened that as soon as he had completed the

conquest of Tyre, he would, by the punishment of the Jewish high priest, teach all others to whom they must keep their oaths.¹

After the subjugation of Gaza, 332 B. C. Alexander proceeded towards Jerusalem. Jaddua and all the citizens were thrown into the greatest consternation ; they offered many sacrifices and earnestly entreated God for deliverance. Josephus further relates, that God then appeared to the high priest in a dream, bade him be of good courage, to adorn the city in the most magnificent manner he was able, and to go out fearlessly and meet the conqueror, arrayed in his official robes, attended by the other priests in their sacerdotal garments, and by the citizens clothed in white. Every thing was done according to these directions. The solemn procession proceeded as far as the hill Sapha, which overlooks Jerusalem and commands an extensive prospect of the country. As Alexander approached and saw Jaddua in the robes of his office, he went forward alone towards the high priest, adored the name of God which was engraved on the golden frontal plate of his turban, and then saluted Jaddua. Immediately the priests and citizens surrounded the king and welcomed him with joyful acclamations. All the Greeks were astonished at the conduct of Alexander, and Parmenio asked him how it happened that he, to whom all others did homage, should now himself do homage to the high priest of the Jews. Alexander replied: "I did not adore the man, but that God who hath honoured him with the priesthood: for I saw this very person in a dream, and clothed in this same habit, when I was at Dios in Macedonia. I was considering with myself how I might obtain the dominion of Asia, and this man exhorted me to make no delay, but boldly to pass over the sea thither, for that he would conduct my army, and would give me the dominion over the Persians. Whence it is, that having seen no other in that habit, and now seeing this person in it, and remembering that vision and the exhortation I had in my dream, I believe that I have undertaken this campaign by divine direction, that I shall conquer Darius, annihilate the dominion of the Persians, and successfully accomplish my whole design." Alexander then gave his hand to the high priest, attended him into the city, went to the temple, and there offered sacrifices in the manner which the priests directed. When they afterwards showed him the prophecies of Daniel respecting himself,² he was highly gratified, and readily granted the request of

the high priest, that the Jews might be free from tribute on the sabbatical year, and every where have liberty to live according to their own laws. Of his own accord he promised the same indulgence to those Jews who would join his army, upon which many entered the service. Hecataeus also, as quoted by Josephus, testifies that there were Jews among the soldiers of Alexander.³

The Samaritans, who had previously submitted to Alexander and sent him auxiliaries to the siege of Tyre, now met him in solemn procession not far from Jerusalem; and as they were graciously received, they also requested exemption from tribute on the sabbatical year, since they, as well as the Jews, then left their lands uncultivated. But as they could not give a direct affirmative to the inquiry whether they were Jews, Alexander replied that he would take further time to consider their request, and make known his determination when he returned from Egypt. It was the part of prudence for him to keep his liberality within proper limits, for he had reason to fear that many others would come, and under like pretences, demand a similar privilege. The eight thousand Samaritans who had assisted him in the siege of Tyre, he took with him to Egypt, and assigned them lands in Thebais or Upper Egypt.⁴

During Alexander's absence in Egypt, some Samaritans, perhaps enraged that they had not obtained the same privileges as the Jews, set fire to the house of Andromachus, whom Alexander had appointed their governour, and he perished in the flames. The other Samaritans delivered up the offenders to Alexander when he returned from Egypt, but they would hardly dare at that time to repeat their request, as the enraged monarch, not satisfied with the punishment of the guilty, expelled the Samaritans from their city and transferred thither a Macedonian colony. This event is related by Curtius.⁵ The Samaritans now excluded from Samaria made Shechem their metropolis, at the foot of mount Gerizim, on which their temple stood. Josephus says that Shechem was their capital, but through inadvertency he places this circumstance in the preceding year, when they were still in possession of Samaria. Hecataeus, as quoted by Josephus, adds that Alexander gave to the Jews the Samaritan territory, which may certainly be correct, if we do not understand by this phrase, all Samaria, but only the tract of country on the coast as far as mount Carmel. That the more modern Jews did actually reckon this as a part of Judea, I have shown in another place.⁶

This favour of Alexander to the Jews, which is frequently referred to by the 'Talmudists, particularly in *Tractat. Taanith*, is mentioned by no author but Josephus. Justin only says in general: "tunc Syriam proficiscitur; ibi obvios cum infulis multos orientis reges habet. Ex his pro meritis singulorum alios in societatem recepit, aliis regnum ademit."⁷ These *obvii cum infulis multi orientis reges*, include the high priests of the Jews and Samaritans, who, as the chief magistrates of their people, are called *kings*, in the same manner as other rulers, by a historian who would not stop to inquire whether they really had the regal title, and mentions nothing respecting them but their splendid turbans, (*infulas*.) Though the meeting of Alexander with the Jewish high priest, is passed over by historians as too trifling to be mentioned in comparison with so many other greater events; yet the whole narration of Josephus well corresponds to the impetuosity of temper and superstitious trust in oracles, for which Alexander was remarkable, as his biographers have shown by many examples, and so far has every internal mark of probability. It is not necessary to maintain that Alexander and the high priest really had those dreams which are mentioned, though to one who takes into consideration the circumstances of that age, this will not appear at all incredible. But that the Jews, who had such good reasons for wishing to gain the favour of Alexander, should show him their prophecies respecting the Grecian conqueror of the Persian empire, is very credible; and that he should be gratified with them and lend a favourable ear to the high priest's request, will not appear strange, if we reflect that for the sake of an oracle he marched through a wilderness to the temple of Jupiter Ammon.⁸ But let men think of this as they please, the principal thing mentioned, the royal protection of the Jewish religion and the exemption from tribute on the sabbatical year, certainly rests on good evidence. For all exaggerated stories have some truth lying at the bottom, and so great and general a privilege must have been preserved in the archives of the nation and indelibly impressed on the memory of the people. It could not easily be feigned and imposed upon them, if they never had enjoyed such a privilege; and it is certain from the succeeding history, that their religion was protected. If this was the case, (and there can be no doubt of it,) there must have been some cause for it corresponding to the character of Alexander,

and such a cause is alleged by Josephus. There is no proof that his narrative is not true, and some allusion to a like occurrence is made by Curtius, Justin, and Hecataeus.⁹ If then we will not receive the narrative of Josephus in all its parts, we certainly cannot reject the principal circumstances contained in it.

Josephus, *Antiq.* XI. 8: 3. ² Dan. 7: 6. 8: 1—7, 21. 11: 3. comp. Zech. 9: 1—8. ³ Hecataeus in Josephus against Apion II. 4. ⁴ Josephus, *Antiq.* XI. 8: 4—6. ⁵ Curtius, IV. 21 comp. Eusebius, *Chron.* ⁶ Jahn, *Biblische Archaeologie*. Th. I. S. 179. ⁷ Justin, XI. 10. ⁸ Comp. Hess, *Geschichte der Regenten von Juda nach dem Exilio*. Th. II.S. 26—37. ⁹ See these authors as quoted above.

LXXII. DESTRUCTION OF THE PERSIAN EMPIRE.

From Judea, Alexander proceeded to Egypt, where he was received with joy as the deliverer from the yoke of the Persians, who had become odious to the Egyptians by their abuses of gods and men. The Egyptian nobles went out to meet him as far as Pelusium, to tender him their homage, and the Persian officers were forced to surrender without striking a blow.¹ Thus Alexander entered the capital Memphis in triumph. From this place, he set out on his mad journey through the wilderness to Ammonium, and there he was acknowledged by the oracle of Jupiter Ammon as a true son of this god, who, it was said, had cohabited with his mother in the form of a large serpent. On his return, when he arrived at the seacoast opposite the island of Pharos, where there was a good harbour, he ordered a city to be built on the spot and called Alexandria, after his own name. He afterwards, in the course of his extensive conquests, built several cities to which he gave the same name.²

In the spring of the following year, 331 B. C. Alexander left Egypt, inflicted on the Samaritans the punishment already related, recruited his army at Tyre, and hastened over the Euphrates to seek his enemy. After the defeat at Issus, Darius had retired to Babylon, and having in vain made repeated proposals of peace, he collected a new army of one million, one hundred thousand men, with which he was now encamped in Assyria, or to speak more accurately, in Adiabene. Alexander with fifty thousand men crossed the Tigris, and in open field defeated an army of more than twen-

ty times his own numbers.³ This battle, which decided the fate of Asia, occurred just two years after the battle of Issus, and in the same month, October. The field of action was at Gaugamela, but as this was an inconsiderable place, the battle was named from the celebrated city Arbela, though ten miles distant from the battleground. Alexander was in effect master of Asia, and this year was the commencement of the great Grecian monarchy. He pursued the Persian king as far as Arbela and took possession of his rich baggage, but Darius made his escape to Media.⁴

After giving his army a few days to rest, Alexander proceeded towards Babylon. Both the military commandant and the governor of the place, came out to meet him and gave up the city into his hands, together with the royal treasures which were kept there. In this place, thirty days were spent in feasting, drunkenness, prostitution and every species of debauchery; for the manners of the city were then exceedingly corrupt. His next march was to Susa, and thence to Persepolis, whither he arrived by the middle of December. Though almost all places surrendered without resistance, the army every where spread desolation and ruin around them. In Persia the passes were garrisoned, and Alexander was obliged to take a more circuitous route, which made the distance nearly thirty stadia greater. Persepolis was plundered, and the inhabitants were treated with such cruelty that many of them in despair put an end to their own lives. The whole place was given up to pillage, because it was the metropolis of the empire, from which the armies had been formerly sent against Greece.⁵

While in winter quarters, Alexander celebrated his victories with riotous banquets and caroused as furiously as he had before fought. During these revels many cruelties were perpetrated. At one of the feasts, when the senses of all the Greeks were drowned in intoxication, the licentious conqueror, heated with wine, set fire with his own hand to the palace of Persepolis, at the instigation of Thais, the celebrated Athenian prostitute, in order, as she pretended, to revenge the burning of Athens by Xerxes.⁶

Meanwhile Darius was endeavouring to strengthen himself in Media, but before he had collected his forces, in the spring of 330 B. C. he was pursued by Alexander. Hearing of this, he decamped from Ecbatana and pressed on towards Bactria, with the intention of increasing his army in that country. But fearing that he

should be overtaken and attacked by Alexander, he halted with the thirty four thousand foot and three thousand, three hundred horse, which he had with him, and made ready for the impending battle. At this time the unhappy monarch, to whom fortune was wanting rather than valour, was seized by surprise, loaded with golden fetters and conveyed to Bactria in a close chariot, by the treachery of Nabarsanes, a Persian nobleman, and Bessus, governour of Bactria and commander of the cavalry. Alexander, in the mean time, had been rapidly pursuing with his cavalry for eight days without intermission, and came as far as Rages; whence, in despair of overtaking his enemy, he returned to Parthia. But as soon as he heard that Darius was kept prisoner by two traitors, he started in pursuit of them with all possible expedition. He was, however, too late; for Nabarsanes and Bessus, hearing of his approach, mortally wounded their unfortunate king and fled. Darius was dead before Alexander arrived. He was moved to tears at the sight of the pale and lifeless body of the king, and sent the corpse to the queen at Susa, that it might be interred according to the Persian custom.⁷

Alexander now soon subjugated the Bactrians, Hyrcanians, Mardi, Aarii, Dragogians, Drangae, Arachotae, and several other tribes in the northern and north eastern parts of Asia. Having detected a conspiracy which had been formed against him, he ordered the execution not only of Philotas, the author of the conspiracy, but even of Parmenio, the father of the traitor, though one of the oldest, most valiant and most faithful officers in his army. In like manner, before his departure from Macedonia, he had put to death all the most influential men, even his own relatives, though entirely innocent, for fear they might excite disturbances during his absence.⁸ The campaign continued uninterrupted till late in the winter, and the army proceeded as far as Caucasus, on the northern boundaries of India, where Alexander built another Alexandria. He pursued the regicide Bessus, (for Nabarsanes had delivered himself up and received pardon,) over the Oxus or Gihon, and having taken him alive, gave him into the hands of Oxatris, the brother of Codomanus, for punishment. The following year, 329 B. C. he brought under his yoke the warlike Sogdiani, Dahae, Massagetae, and many other nations.⁹

With such unexampled rapidity did Alexander bring the whole Persian empire under his power! In the year 334 B. C. he cross-

ed the Hellespont, and in 329 he had subdued every thing from the Hellespont to Sogdiana, and from Egypt to India. Five years will scarcely suffice for a traveller to pass through these extensive regions, and yet during this period, Alexander overrun them with his army and conquered them. But he made frequent forced marches to a great distance, and often hurried on his soldiers for a week without giving them a day for repose. With his cavalry he frequently pursued his enemy night and day; and on one occasion he followed Darius eleven days without intermission through a distance of three hundred and forty English miles.¹⁰ Very appropriate imagery is employed by Daniel to represent this swift ravager.¹¹

¹ Arrian, III. 3. Curtius, IV. 20. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 49. Plutarch, Alexander XXVI. ² Curtius, IV. 21. Arrian, III. 1—5. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 49—52. Justin XI. 11. Strabo, p. 590. Plutarch, Alexander XXVI. XXVII. ³ Comp. Dan. 7: 6. 8: 5—7, 20—21. 10: 20. 11: 3. ⁴ Strabo, p. 737. Plutarch, Alexander XXIX—XXXIV. Arrian, III. 6—16. Curtius, IV. 22—38. V. 1. 2. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 39. 53—64. Justin, XI. 12—14. ⁵ Arrian, III. 16—18. Curtius, V. 3—11. 13. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 64—71. 73. Justin, XII. 5—7. Plutarch, Alexander XXXV—XXXVII. ⁶ Arrian, III. 18. Curtius, V. 14. Justin, XII. 6. 7. 11. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 72. Plutarch, Alexander XXXVIII. ⁷ Arrian, III. 19—22. Curtius, V. 15—24. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 73. Justin, XI. 15. Plutarch, Alexander XLII. XLIII. ⁸ Justin, XI. 5. ⁹ Arrian, III. 23—30. IV. 1—7. 15—22. Curtius, VI. 3. VIII. 10. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 74—83. Justin, XII. 5. Plutarch, Alexander XLIV—LVII. ¹⁰ Curtius, V. 11. Justin, XI. 8. Plutarch, Alexander XLII. ¹¹ Dan. 7: 6. 8: 5. comp. 11: 3.

LXXIII. ALEXANDER 327—323 B. C.

During these victorious campaigns, Alexander had adopted the oriental costume, and given himself up to the polygamy and sensuality, the despotism and luxury, of the degenerate Persians. He carried his folly so far that he determined in good earnest to be viewed as the son of Jupiter Ammon, and desired to be worshipped, not as a deity simply, but to be added, as the thirteenth god, to the twelve *dii majorum gentium*. At a banquet he murdered Clitus with his own hand, because this philosopher represented to him, in terms somewhat too strong, the truth that he was but a man. Because Callisthenes, his most faithful friend, loudly exclaimed against this folly, he unjustly put him to the torture, and as is generally supposed, to death. Historians indeed repre-

sent this affair of the apotheosis, as if his only aim in it was to hold the subjected nations in awe, without considering that by this means he would become despicable in the eyes of all the followers of Zoroaster, who were very numerous. But let his object be what it might, he did all in his power to confirm the opinion of his divinity. Because it was said, that Bacchus and Hercules, the sons of Jupiter, had made expeditions to India, Alexander also, by a like expedition, would prove himself a genuine son of the same god.¹

In setting out on his Indian campaign, Alexander, burnt all the superfluous baggage that his army might not be encumbered by it, and in the years 327 and 326 B. C. he made himself master of all India as far as the river Hyphasis, when his soldiers positively refused to advance any further. He then built a great number of ships, which he brought into the Indus by the rivers Acesines and Hydaspes. This fleet was sent into the southern ocean under the direction of Nearchus, with orders to sail by the Persian gulf into the mouth of the Euphrates. Alexander, meanwhile, conducted his army back along the coasts, through immense deserts of sand, where three fourths of his men perished by the violence of the heat and the want of water and provisions. Notwithstanding these sufferings of the soldiers, while in Carmania they marched seven days in Bacchanalian procession, that Alexander might in all respects imitate Bacchus. In the year 325 B. C. he reached Susa with a handful of men, and there celebrated nuptial festivals for himself and all his generals. At the close of the festivals, those officers who had rendered themselves odious during his absence by their cruelty and violence, were executed in great numbers.²

After recruiting his army, Alexander marched from Susa to Ecbatana, where he favoured his soldiers with a season of repose. He then subdued the Cossaei, and 324 B. C. he led his army to Babylon, still full of projects as to what campaigns he would next undertake, what nations he would subdue, what splendid buildings he would erect in different parts of his dominions. Above all, he wished to restore Babylon, which he destined for his capital, to its ancient beauty and magnificence. Labourers were employed to build dikes about the Euphrates to keep the river in its proper channel, but meeting with insurmountable obstacles, they were obliged to desist. Several others, together with ten thousand soldiers, were constantly occupied in removing the rubbish of the

temple of Belus, which had been destroyed by Xerxes.³ The Jews who were in Alexander's army, were ordered among others to engage in this labour, but they steadfastly refused to assist in the erection of an idolatrous temple, and no punishment could overcome their resolution. Alexander was accordingly obliged to dismiss them from that work.⁴ Thus Babylon would have regained nearly its ancient splendour, had not Alexander shortened his own life by his debaucheries. He died in the spring of 323 B. C. His body was embalmed; and after two years it was conveyed to Egypt with great pomp, where it was interred, first at Memphis and afterwards at Alexandria.⁵

¹ Curtius, IV. 20. V. 14. VI. 1. 11. VIII. 3. 11. 12. 15. X. 4. 6. 9. Arrian, IV. 8--22. VII. 29. Justin, XII. 5--7. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 54. Aelian, Var. Hist. II. 19. V. 12. VIII. 7. IX. 3. Plutarch, Alexander LVII. ² Arrian, IV. 22. VII. 6. Curtius, VIII. 17. IX. 18. X. 1. Justin, XII. 7--10. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 84--108. Plutarch, Alexander LVII. LVIII. LXX. ³ Arrian, VII. 13--15. 17. 21. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 110. 112. Plutarch, Alexander LXXI--LXXV. ⁴ Hecataeus in Josephus against Apion, I. 23. ⁵ Curtius, X. 7. 14. Arrian, VII. 25--28. Justin, XII. 14--16. Diodor. Sic. XVII. 117. 118. comp. XVIII. 26--28. Plutarch, Alexander LXXV. LXXVI.

LXXIV. ARIDAEUS AND ALEXANDER AEGUS.

Immediately after the death of Alexander, violent disputes broke out among his generals and principal officers. After eight days they came to an agreement to exclude from the succession Hercules, the son of Alexander by his wife Barsina, and to place on the throne Aridaeus, an illegitimate son of king Philip, and a man of no capacity. To him they gave the name of Philip. It was further agreed that if the queen Roxana, who was then in the eighth month of her pregnancy, should bear a son, he should share the throne with Philip. The infant of Roxana proved to be a son, and he was called Alexander Aegus. Perdicas was now appointed guardian and regent to the two kings, who were both incapable of reigning.¹

After some deliberation, Perdicas distributed the governments among the generals and ministers. Some who had been appointed by Alexander, were confirmed in their provinces, and the division among the remainder was as follows :

Porus and Taxiles had India		Laomedon had	{ Syria and Palestine.
Sebyrrius	{ Arachosia and Gedrosia.	Philotas	{ Cilicia.
Tleopolemus	Carmania.	Eumenes	{ Paphlagonia & Cappadocia.
Peucestes	Persia.	Antigonus	{ Pamphylia, Lycia, and Greater Phrygia.
Python	Media.	Cassander	{ Caria.
Phrataphernes	{ Parthia and Hyrcania.	Meleager	{ Lydia.
Stanasor	{ Aria and Drangiana.	Leonatus	{ Lesser Phrygia and the Country round the Hellespont.
Philip	{ Bactria and Sogdiana.	Lysimachus	{ Thrace.
Arcesilaus	Mesopotamia.	Antipater	{ Macedonia.
Archon	Babylonia.		
Ptolemy Lagus	Egypt.		

The important military office of commander of the cavalry called *ἑταῖρος*, was given to Seleucus, whom we shall see acting a very conspicuous part in the following history.²

Curtius, X. 10---13. Justin, XIII. 2-4. Diodor. Sic. XVIII. 2. Appian, Syriac. LII. 5---25. ² Appian, Syriac. LVII. 45. Justin, XIII. 4. Diodor. Sic. XVIII. 3.

LXXV. WARS OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNOURS.

Thus the great horn of the swift and strong he-goat of Daniel was broken; in other words, the mighty empire of Alexander, even while in the plenitude of its power, tottered on the brink of destruction; for two such kings, together with their regent, found it impossible to hold in subjection the powerful and ambitious governours of the provinces. Aridaeus was privately put to death, 316 B. C. by Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great; and in the same year, Alexander Aegus was imprisoned with his mother Roxana in the castle of Amphipolis, by Cassander, governour of Caria, and in 310 B. C. he also was murdered.¹ But even while these unfortunate princes seemed to hold the helm of state, they were but little regarded by the provincial governours. Immediately after the assignment of the provinces, wars broke out, not only between the governours, but also between them and the regent.² We shall describe only that which occurred in the regions nearest Palestine, and whatever else may be necessary in order to preserve the

thread of the narration unbroken to the time of the formal dismemberment of the empire.

It was necessary for Eumenes, before he could take possession of Cappadocia, his province, to expel the king who was then reigning there. Antigonus, governour of Pamphylia, and Leonatus, governour of Lesser Phrygia, received orders from Perdiccas to assist Eumenes in this enterprise. But Antigonus disregarded the commands of Perdiccas, and Leonatus having views on Macedonia, intrusted them to Eumenes, in the hope of inducing him to favour his design. But he laid the whole affair open to the regent Perdiccas, who had himself fixed his eye upon that kingdom. Eumenes was therefore established in his government by Perdiccas himself, and then sent to Cleopatra, the sister of Alexander the Great, to solicit her hand for the regent, that he might by this means lay claim to the Macedonian throne. Antigonus, who was himself likewise desirous of that crown, saw through the plan of Perdiccas, and fleeing to Antipater, he pointed out to him the storm which threatened them. Upon this, Antigonus, Antipater, Leonatus and Ptolemy, united themselves against Perdiccas, who kept the young kings with him wherever he went, and was at that time, 322 B. C. in Cappadocia.³

The next spring, Perdiccas, in company with the kings, led a large army through Syria to Egypt, in order to subdue Ptolemy in the first place, while Eumenes was left in Asia Minor to prosecute the war against Antipater and his allies. Eumenes, a brave and prudent officer, defeated Craterus, and the auxiliaries which Neoptolemus had sent to Antipater. Antipater himself had moved on to Cilicia to afford aid to Ptolemy. But he proceeded no further, for the army mutinied against Perdiccas in Egypt, put him to death and went over to Ptolemy. The soldiers then declared Eumenes an outlaw, and, at the suggestion of Ptolemy, made Aridaeus, who had conveyed the body of Alexander to Egypt, and Pithon, a general of Perdiccas, who had deserted to Ptolemy before the mutiny, guardians and regents to the two kings. These new regents, however, were compelled by the domineering spirit of Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great, to resign their office while on their return through Syria, and Antipater undertook the administration of affairs. He made some changes in the governments. The general of the cavalry, Seleucus, he appointed governour of Babylonia, An-

tigonus was made general of Asia to prosecute the war against the outlawed Eumenes, and to the command of the cavalry he appointed his own son Cassander, who was then with Antigonus. Antipater now returned to Macedonia, his province, accompanied by the two kings.⁴

¹ Dan. 8: 5--8. 11: 3, 4. Justin, XV. 2. ² Diodor. Sic. XVIII--XX. Justin, XIII. 6--XVII. 2. ³ Plutarch, Eumenes III. IV. Corn. Nepos, Eumenes II. III. Justin, XIII. 6. Diodor. Sic. XVIII. 16. 22. 23. Arrian, Excerpt. Photii. Appian, de Bell. Mithrid. VIII. 50--65. ⁴ Diodor. Sic. XVIII. 29--39. Justin, XIII. 8. Appian, Syriac. LIII. 30. LVII. 45. Plutarch, Eumenes V.--VIII. Corn. Nepos, Eumenes. IV. V.

LXXXVI. THE JEWS UNDER PTOLEMY.

A part of the royal army, in its expedition from Cappadocia to Egypt under Perdicas, 321 B. C. and in its return to Asia Minor, passed through Judea; and consequently the Hebrews were obliged to participate in the burdens of this war. But when the same army, under the command of Antigonus, was employed against Eumenes 320 B. C. Ptolemy, who had become very powerful and already subjected Cyrene to his yoke, embraced this opportunity to take possession of Judea, Samaria, Phenicia, and Coelosyria, and these provinces were subjugated by Nicanor, his general. The governor, Laomedon, who had endeavoured by bribery to withdraw these provinces from Ptolemy, was made prisoner. But he killed the soldiers appointed to guard him, and escaped to Alcetas in Caria.¹

Judea, for a part of the time, was the theatre of this short war. But as Laomedon was not able to make any great resistance, the country sustained but little injury, and the inhabitants were richly rewarded for all their sufferings by coming under the dominion of so just and benevolent a prince as Ptolemy. Josephus relates that Ptolemy himself came to Jerusalem, for the purpose of sacrificing in the temple after the example of Alexander, and that on this occasion he declared himself master of the country. In this statement Agatharchides so far coincides, as to say that Ptolemy took possession of Jerusalem without striking a blow, and for this purpose entered the city on the Sabbath, when the Jews, out of conscientious regard to their law, refused to take arms. This au-

thor was certainly deceived, if he supposed that the Jews, on any day except the Sabbath, could have resisted a power to which Laomedon himself was forced to submit.²

As Ptolemy did not feel perfectly secure in the possession of these countries, he took a number of the people with him to Egypt. Among these were several of the Samaritans and many thousand Jews. They certainly had no reason to regard this emigration as a calamity, for many of their countrymen who were left behind, afterwards followed them of their own accord. When Ptolemy heard of the fidelity of the Jews in the observance of their allegiance to the Persian kings, and even to Darius Codomanus in the midst of his misfortunes, he employed a part of them, on very advantageous terms, to garrison his fortresses; others he sent to Cyrene that he might have some faithful subjects in that newly acquired territory, and to the remainder he assigned a residence in Alexandria, granting them the same privileges as citizens, which Alexander had conferred on the Macedonian inhabitants of that city. For proof of these facts Josephus refers to the letters of Alexander and Ptolemy, which were extant in his time, and to the testimony of Hecataeus. If, however, we contrast the steady fidelity of the Jews to the kings of Persia with the continual rebellions of the Egyptians, we shall find nothing incredible in this whole narrative of Josephus.³

¹ Diodor. Sic. XVIII. 43. Appian, Syriac. LII. 15—23. Pausanias, Attic. I. 6: 4. ² Josephus, Antiq. XI. 1: 1. and against Apion, I. 22. and Agatharchides as there quoted. ³ Josephus, *ubi supra*.

LXXVII. WAR BETWEEN ANTIGONUS AND EUMENES.

The regent Antipater died in the following year, and appointed Polysperchon, the oldest of the surviving generals of Alexander, his successor in the regency. Cassander, the son of Antipater, irritated to find that Polysperchon had been preferred to himself, resolved to obtain by force the first office in the empire. He was encouraged in his views by Antigonus and Ptolemy, who wished to involve the regent in difficulties, that they might have opportunity to prosecute their own designs undisturbed. It was the intention of Antigonus, who, as commander in chief, had all Asia Minor in his power, and held under his command an army of seventy thousand men with thirty elephants, to subject the whole empire to his

own dominion. It was, therefore, his first desire to bring the valiant Eumenes to favour his views. He had already besieged him in Nora for a whole year, and he now offered him an honourable capitulation. The terms were agreed upon ; but when Eumenes came to confirm the compact by his oath, he added, with the unanimous consent of the besieging army, an article which completely thwarted the purpose of Antigonus. In this manner, he effected his own deliverance, without in the least promoting the designs of his antagonist.¹

The regent Polysperchon soon discovered the real intentions of Antigonus, and he appointed Eumenes his general for the purpose of resisting him. By this act, Antigonus was in effect declared an outlaw. As Eumenes had but few soldiers, he was obliged to retire before his opponent beyond the Taurus ; where he, during the next year, 318 B. C. increased his army to more than ten thousand men. His forces, however, were still far too small to hazard a battle with Antigonus, and accordingly, when the latter took possession of Phenicia, Eumenes retreated beyond the Euphrates. During his winter quarters at Haran or Carrae, he endeavoured to obtain more men from the adjacent provinces ; but all the instructions and commissions which the regent had sent him in the name of the kings, were insufficient to induce the jealous governours to comply with his requests. He, therefore, in the spring of 317 B. C. withdrew into Babylonia ; but Seleucus, the governour of that province, hearing of his approach, purposely broke down a dike of the Euphrates, and the whole army of fifteen thousand infantry and three thousand horse came near being destroyed by the consequent inundation. But Eumenes extricated his little army from this danger, and conducted it in safety to Susiana, where he, by virtue of his commissions, obtained from the neighbouring governours twenty five thousand men.²

In the following year, Antigonus came against him with a strong force, which was increased by Pithon from Media, and Seleucus from Babylonia ; and hostilities were again commenced. Through the whole campaign, both generals exerted all their military talents to the utmost, and though Eumenes gained some advantages, he was unable to acquire a decided superiority. During the winter Eumenes was surprised by Antigonus ; but he delivered himself by a stratagem, and was victorious in the battle which followed. But

while engaged in the action, his camp was rifled by a division of the hostile army, in consequence of which Eumenes was seized by his enraged soldiers, put in chains, and delivered up to Antigonus; and by this act of treachery they recovered their plundered property. A short time after, Antigonus procured the death of his illustrious prisoner.³

¹ Diodor. Sic. XVIII. 48—53. Corn. Nepos, Eumenes V. Plutarch, Eumenes XII. Justin XIV. 2. ² Justin, *ubi supra*. Diodor. Sic. XVIII. 57—83. 73. XIX. 13—15. ³ Diodor. Sic. XIX. 18—44. Justin, XIV. 4. Corn. Nepos, Eumenes VII—XIII. Plutarch, Eumenes IV.

LXXVIII. WARS OF ANTIGONUS.

Antigonus, having now destroyed the enemy whom he most dreaded, looked upon all Asia as his own. He removed the governours whom he suspected, and breaking with Seleucus, he intended to put him also out of the way. But that great man, 315 B. C. fled to Ptolemy in Egypt, and disclosed to him the dangerous power and ambitious views of Antigonus. Ptolemy immediately informed Lysimachus, governour of Thrace, and Cassander, governour of Macedonia, of the danger which was threatening them from that source; and in a short time after, they three formed an alliance against Antigonus, and thus new wars were excited.¹

Antigonus now, 314 B. C. wrested from the grasp of Ptolemy, Palestine, Phenicia, and Coelosyria, and as all the shipping had been prudently sent to Egypt, he built a considerable fleet with all possible despatch, and exerted himself to form alliances against his allied foes. The siege of Tyre, (which had been rebuilt since its destruction by Alexander nineteen years before, and was able to make a vigorous defence,) he left to the care of his son Demetrius, who afterwards acquired the surname of *Πολιορκητής*, the *Vanquisher of cities*. In fifteen months the city surrendered. During this time Antigonus was in Asia Minor, where he pressed so closely on Cassander, that he was forced to come to terms. But no sooner had he recovered himself, than he sent to Ptolemy for aid, in consequence of which Antigonus was still detained, 313 B. C. in Asia Minor. Meanwhile Ptolemy's fleet touched at Cyprus, Cilicia, and Syria, plundered the cities and made many prisoners.

Ptolemy himself led an army through Arabia Petrea, defeated Demetrius at Gaza, and drove him back to Syria. After a short siege he regained Tyre.²

Ptolemy now, 312 B. C. gave to Seleucus, who had been with him in this campaign, a body of two hundred horse and eight hundred foot, that he might regain possession of his government in Babylonia. He sent a strong division of his army into Syria to pursue Demetrius still further. But it was defeated by Demetrius, and as Antigonus had then returned with his army from Phrygia to Syria, Ptolemy pillaged Acco, Samaria, Joppa, and Gaza, and hastened back to Egypt, laden with the spoils of those cities. Thus Palestine came again into the power of Antigonus. But many of the inhabitants voluntarily went with Ptolemy to Egypt; for at Alexandria they could enjoy peace and great freedom under a mild government.³

In the mean time, Seleucus with his handful of soldiers had crossed the Euphrates and proceeded to Haran, in order to increase his army in Mesopotamia. Thence he marched to Babylonia. As he entered the province the inhabitants flocked to his standard; for they well remembered the justice of his administration when, four years before, he was governour subordinate to Antigonus. He found the gates of Babylon open to receive him, and in a short time he drove the garrisons of Antigonus from the two castles. Nicenor, whom Antigonus had made governour of Media in the place of Pithon, now appeared in Babylonia with an army; but he was defeated, and after the battle his soldiers went over to Seleucus. With this increase of strength, he took immediate possession of Media, Susiana, and all the adjacent provinces.⁴

The taking of Babylon by Seleucus occurred in autumn, 312 B. C. The next year Antigonus sent his son Demetrius to the East to reconquer that city, with orders to return at an appointed time. Demetrius arrived while Seleucus was in Media. The weak garrison of the city retired into the marshes of the Euphrates, the inhabitants fled, and scarcely any thing remained but the garrisons of the two castles. So Demetrius found an empty city; and when he had subdued one of the castles, his appointed time expired and he was obliged to return to his father. He left five thousand infantry and one thousand cavalry to prosecute the siege of the second castle, but when Seleucus returned they were put to flight.⁵

¹ Diodor. Sic. XIX. 55—57. Justin, XV. 4. Appian, Syriac. LIII. 35—50. ² Diodor. Sic. XIX. 58. 59. 62. 69. 72. 75. 80—86. Hecataeus in Josephus against Apion, I. 22. Justin, XV. 1. Appian, Syriac. LIII. 50—55. Plutarch, Demetrius V. ³ Diodor. Sic. XIX. 93. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 1:1. and against Apion, I. 22. Appian, Syriac. LIV. 65. Plutarch, Demetrius VI. ⁴ Diodor. Sic. XIX. 90—92. Appian, Syriac. LIV. 60—65. comp. Dan. 11: 5. ⁵ Diodor. Sic. XIX. 100. Plutarch, Demetrius VII.

NOTE. The era of the Seleucidæ commences with the first conquest of Babylon by Seleucus in October, 312 B. C. twelve years after the death of Alexander the Great. It is also called the Greek and the Alexandrian era, and because employed in all contracts, *æra contractuum*. Among the Jews it was denominated מְנִינֵן תְּשֻׁרֹת. But as Babylon was afterwards retaken by Demetrius, and Seleucus did not come into permanent possession of the city till the spring of 311 B. C. the Babylonians fixed the commencement of this era in the latter year. The First Book of Maccabees computes the years from April, 311 B. C. as Michaelis has shown in his note on 1 Macc. 10: 21; while the Second Book dates from October, 312 B. C. Consequently there is often the difference of a year in the chronology of these books. Compare 2 Macc. 11: 21 with 1 Macc. 6: 16. and 2 Macc. 13: 1 with 1 Macc. 6: 20. This era continued in general use among the orientals, with the exception of the Mohammedans, who employed it together with their own era from the flight of Mohammed, 622 B. C. The Jews had no other epoch until A. D. 1040; when, being expelled from Asia by the caliphs and scattered about in Spain, England, Germany, Poland and other western countries, they began to date from the creation, though still, without entirely dropping the era of the Seleucidæ. The orientals denominate this epoch طَرِيْفُ دِي الْقَرْنَيْنِ *the era of the two-horned*; by which it is generally supposed they mean Alexander the Great. But perhaps the name had primary reference to Seleucus; for on some coins he is represented with two horns. See Froehlich, Annales Syriae. Tab. II. Seleuc. Nicat. 1. and Tab. III. 29.

LXXIX. CONDITION OF THE JEWS 320—311 B. C.

The Jews remained undisturbed from 320 B. C. when they became subject to Ptolemy, till 314 B. C. when Antigonus possessed himself of Palestine. For the three following years, their country and its vicinity was the theatre of war, and they must have suffered severely, as during that time Judea frequently changed masters. Consequently many of the Jews emigrated to Egypt. Still the city of Jerusalem received no peculiar injury, and was spared when Ptolemy gave up to pillage Samaria, Acco, Joppa and Gaza.

The circumstances of this people, and the consideration in which they were held among the neighbouring nations at this period, can be best understood from Hecataeus of Abdera, who, in the reign of Ptolemy Lagus, wrote a book respecting the Jews. Herennius Philo, indeed, as quoted by Origen, expresses a doubt whether this work, so partial to the Jewish nation, did in fact proceed from that historian; and an anonymous writer in Eichhorn's "Bibliothek" has made it appear plausible that the work is the production of some Jew under an assumed character.¹ But as the argument rests entirely on the favourable opinion of the Jews which the author expresses, it cannot be considered decisive. Wherefore should there not be one Greek, in so many ages, willing to do justice to the Hebrew nation? And would a Jew who wished to deceive, fall into such gross mistakes as are found in this work? Josephus, in a controversial writing, confidently appeals to it as genuine; and therefore, even if it be not the work of Hecataeus, I should rather consider it the production of some proselyte to the Jewish religion. But if we allow the work to be supposititious, even this will not prove that all it contains, is false.

We shall submit to the judgement of the reader the quotations, which Josephus in his controversy with Apion, has made from Hecataeus.² "In this (117th) Olympiad, Ptolemy Lagus defeated in battle at Gaza, Demetrius, surnamed Poliorcetes, the son of Antigonus."—"After the battle Ptolemy took possession of the fortified places in Syria; and many of the inhabitants, when they had experience of Ptolemy's moderation and humanity, went with him voluntarily to Egypt, and devoted themselves to his service. Among these was Hezekiah, a chief priest of the Jews, a man about sixty six years old, and highly respected by his own peo-

ple. He was a man of learning and eloquence, and as skilful as any man could be, in the transaction of business. These Jewish priests, who receive tithes of all the products of the earth, and manage the public affairs, are in number about fifteen hundred." "This venerable man became acquainted with us, and he read to some of his friends a description of the peculiarities of his nation, for he had with him a written account of their institutions and civil polity."

Hecataeus then speaks of the firmness with which the Jews adhered to the directions of their law, and proceeds: "though they are despised by the neighbouring nations and by foreigners, and have often been ill treated by the Persian kings and satraps, yet they can by no means be made to deviate from their principles, and they willingly endure the most cruel tortures and deaths, rather than forsake the law they have inherited from their fathers."—"When Alexander was at Babylon, in order to rebuild the temple of Belus which was fallen down, he commanded all his soldiers to help remove the rubbish; but the Jews alone refused to put their hands to the work, and suffered stripes and severe punishments rather than engage in it, till at last the king gave over and released them from the work." "Certain people once came into their country and built temples and altars; but they destroyed them; and for this many of them were punished by the satraps, but some obtained pardon. In this respect they are indeed worthy of admiration."

Hecataeus writes also of the history of the Jews, of their country, and of Jerusalem their capital. "The Jews were formerly a very numerous nation; for the Persians (Chaldeans) carried many thousands of them out of their country to Babylon; and after the death of Alexander, on account of the disturbances in Syria, many thousands of them went to Egypt and Phenicia. (Arabia?)" "Their land contains three millions of arurae, principally of the best and most fruitful soil; for so great is Judea."—"They have many fortified places and many villages scattered about in their country; but only one fortified city, which is fifty stadia in circumference, and has about one hundred and twenty thousand inhabitants. They call it Jerusalem. In the midst of this city is a stone enclosure (the temple) about five plethra long and one hundred cubits broad, which has two doors. In this enclosure is a quadrangular

altar, not made of hewn, but of unwrought stone. Its sides are twenty cubits long and its height is twelve cubits. Near this altar is a great edifice in which there is an altar and a candlestick of gold of two talents weight. The light is not extinguished day or night. There is no image of the divinity there, no consecrated gifts, nothing planted, no grove, nor any thing of that kind. The priests are employed therein night and day; they perform certain purifications and drink no wine in the temple.”

Finally Hecataeus mentions that the Jews rendered military services not only to Alexander, but to his successors also, and relates from his own knowledge the following remarkable incident. “As I was once travelling by the Red Sea, there was one among the horsemen who attended us, named Masollam; a brave and strong man, and, according to the testimony of all the Greeks and barbarians, a very skilful archer. Now while the whole multitude was on the way an augur called out to them to stand still, and this man inquired the reason of their halting. The augur showed him a bird, and told him that if that bird remained where he was, it would be better for them all to remain; if he flew on, they might proceed; but if he flew back, they must return. The Jew said nothing, but bent his bow, and shot the bird to the ground. This act offended the augur and some others, and they began to utter imprecations against the Jew. But he replied: ‘Why are you so foolish as to take care of this unfortunate bird? How could this fowl give us any wise directions respecting our journey, when he could not save his own life? Had he known any thing of futurity he surely would not have come here to be killed by the arrow of Masollam the Jew.’”

¹ Origen, against Celsus, I. Eichhorn's Bibliothek, Th. V. S. 432 ff.

² Josephus against Apion, I. 22.

NORZ. The expeditions which Antigonus sent out against the Nabathæan Arabs, and their metropolis Hagr or Hejr, the first under the command of his general Athenæus, and the second under his son Demetrius, are worthy of attention for several reasons. But they do not enter into my plan. Demetrius, on his return, observed the asphaltos on the Dead Sea, and Antigonus wished to make it profitable to his treasury. He therefore sent thither Hieronymus, the learned historian, with men to collect the asphaltos for the ben-

efit of the crown. But the Nabathaeans annoyed them so much that they were forced to desist. Thus this otherwise useless lake became a source of wealth and an object of contention, in consequence of its asphaltos. Diodor. Sic. XIX. 94—100. Plutarch, Demetrius VII.

LXXX. THE WARS RENEWED 311—305 B. C.

In the year 311 B. C. Antigonus, Ptolemy, Cassander, and Lysimachus, the four most powerful governours, made a treaty, by virtue of which Cassander was to remain governour of Macedonia, till Alexander Aegus, (who had been imprisoned at Amphipolis with his mother ever since 315 B. C.) should come of age; Lysimachus was to have Thrace; Ptolemy, Egypt, Cyrene, and Arabia Petrea; and Antigonus was to retain all that part of Asia which he then possessed, except the Grecian cities, which were to be independent. But none of the contracting parties regarded these stipulations, and under every plausible pretext, each endeavoured to make some encroachment to his own advantage. Consequently war soon broke out afresh. When Alexander Aegus had entered his fourteenth year, 310 B. C. and there began to be rumours respecting his immediate elevation to the throne, Cassander caused this prince, and his mother Roxana, to be privately murdered in their prison. Lysimachus, Ptolemy and Antigonus, were well pleased that the heir to the empire was put out of the way; but Polysperchon, the governour of Peloponnesus under Antigonus, exclaimed loudly against the deed, took under his protection Hercules, the oldest son of Alexander the Great, and his mother Barsina, and pretended that he would place him on the Macedonian throne. But this was mere pretence; for he soon yielded to the solicitations of Cassander, and put to death the prince and his mother.¹

In the same year, (310 B. C.) Leonidas, the general of Ptolemy, invaded Cilicia, because Antigonus had not given freedom to the Grecian cities according to the treaty. But he was repulsed by Demetrius. As soon as Ptolemy heard of the ill success of his general, he set sail with a considerable armament, 309 B. C. for Phaselis, took possession of this city, and of several others in Lycia. The next year, 308 B. C. he sailed with a large fleet from Myndus, a port in Caria, to the Grecian islands, and set Andros free by

withdrawing its garrison. He next proceeded to the Isthmus, where Sicyon and Corinth came into his power. In order to make friends of the Greeks, he was disposed to give freedom to the remaining cities of Greece; but as the Peloponnesians did not supply him with money and provisions according to their promise, he came to an agreement with Cassander, that each should retain the cities which he then possessed. At this time he made proposals of marriage to Cleopatra, the sister of Alexander the Great, who was living in widowhood at Sardis. When she was ready to go to Ptolemy, she was detained by the orders of Antigonus, and shortly after, privately murdered.²

In the year 306 B. C. Demetrius Poliorcetes garrisoned Athens and several other cities of Greece, or, as it was said, restored to them their freedom. On this account he was honoured with the divine title of *Σωτήρ*, (*Saviour*), and the Athenians erected to him golden statues and altars. In the year 305 B. C. he invaded Cyprus and proceeded far in the conquest of the island. Ptolemy came with a fleet to the assistance of his allies, but he was repulsed, and the whole island came under the dominion of Antigonus. Antigonus was so elated by this conquest, that he and his son Demetrius assumed the diadem, and gave to themselves the regal title in their edicts and upon their coins. Though this was known in the East, in Egypt, Thrace and Macedonia, yet Seleucus, Ptolemy, Lysimachus and Cassander, did not imitate the example. Still they did not forbid their subjects to honour them with the title of *king*, which had then become very common.³

¹ Diodor. Sic. XIX. 105. XX. 20. 28. Justin, XIV. 6. XV. 2. Plutarch, Demetrius, VIII. Pausanias, Boeotic. VII. 2. 3. ² Diodor. Sic. XX. 19. 27. 37. ³ Diodor. Sic. XX. 47—53. Appian, Syriac. LIV. 70—80. Plutarch, Demetrius VIII—XIX. XXIII. 1 Macc. 1: 9. Comp. Froehlich, Anal. Syr. Tab. II.

NOTE. When Demetrius Poliorcetes gave freedom to the Grecian cities, he expelled from Athens the celebrated Demetrius Phalereus, who had governed the city under Cassander for ten years, with such wisdom, justice and humanity, that the Athenians had erected to him as many statues as there are days in a year. These were now all demolished, and their materials in contempt were made into vessels for ignoble uses. This great philosopher and statesman fled

first to Cassander, and after his death he went to Egypt, where Ptolemy, himself an eminent scholar, was a patron of learned men. Here Demetrius Phalereus became the king's librarian, and at his suggestion, according to the testimony of a spurious work ascribed to Aristæas, Ptolemy Philadelphus, the son and successor of Ptolemy Lagus, caused the books of Moses to be translated into Greek. But we shall see in the sequel, that Phalereus fell under the displeasure of Philadelphus at the very commencement of his reign. Diogenes Laertius, *Life of Demet. Phal.* V. 5: 2, 8. Aelian, *Var. Hist.* III. 18. XII. 43. Pliny, *Hist. Nat.* XXXIV. 12. Strabo, p. 398. Plutarch *de Rep. Ger. Praec.* Corn. Nepos, *Miltiades* VI. 4. and *Phocion* III. 1. Diodor. *Sic.* XVIII. 74. XX. 45. Josephus, *Antiq.* XII. 2.

LXXXI. PARTITION OF THE EMPIRE 305—301 B. C.

After the conquest of Cyprus, Antigonus fixed his eyes on Egypt. He collected in Syria an army of more than eighty thousand infantry, with eight thousand cavalry and eighty three elephants, and proceeded along the coast to Gaza; while his son, Demetrius Poliorcetes, went by sea with one hundred and fifty ships of war and one hundred store ships. A council of war was held at Gaza; but however judiciously the expedition might have been planned, it terminated very unfortunately. The fleet was much retarded in its voyage by unfavourable weather, and when it at length arrived on the coasts of Egypt, they were so well fortified that it was impossible to effect a landing. Accordingly Demetrius was obliged to return without accomplishing any thing. The land forces likewise suffered much in their march through Arabia Petraea; and when they came to the borders of Egypt, they could neither enter the kingdom by water for want of shipping, nor by land, because all the avenues were strongly garrisoned. Their provisions were now exhausted, and the soldiers deserted in great numbers from the severe Antigonus to the mild Ptolemy, who liberally rewarded all that joined his standard. Antigonus seeing his army in this manner daily melting away, was at last forced to retire in disgrace.¹ Ptolemy was now finally established in the possession of Egypt. For this reason, Claudius Ptolemy, who reckons the years before this period from Alexander Aegus, begins with this year, 305 B. C. to compute from Ptolemy Lagus.

The Rhodians, on account of their lucrative trade with Egypt, were attached to the interests of Ptolemy, and had refused to Antigonus the use of their shipping in his Egyptian expedition. To punish this refusal he made war upon them, 304 B. C. but they were so well supported by Ptolemy, that Antigonus was forced to relinquish his demand that they should aid him against the Egyptians as against his other enemies. The Rhodians, therefore, gave to Ptolemy the title of *Σωτήρ*, ordered divine worship to be paid him, and erected the Ptolemaeum in honour of their deliverer.³

During this time, Seleucus had established himself in the possession of Babylonia, Assyria, Media and the other oriental provinces as far as India; and in 303 B. C. he was endeavouring to subdue Sandrocottus, an Indian who had acquired the sovereignty in that country. But as this new Indian king had a large army in the field, and as the presence of Seleucus was necessary in the West, he concluded a treaty with the Indians, by which he obtained five hundred elephants.³

The same year, Demetrius Poliorcetes conducted another fleet to Greece, and in order to restore freedom to the Greeks he not only took from Ptolemy, Sicyon, Corinth and other cities, but pressed so closely upon Cassander in Macedonia, that he was forced to sue for peace with Antigonus. But as Antigonus required him to surrender unconditionally, he and his ally, Lysimachus, applied to Seleucus and Ptolemy, that their alliance might be renewed and aid afforded them. Accordingly Seleucus returned from India, as has already been related. The effects of this new alliance were first visible in the countries bordering on the Hellespont, 302 B. C. Cassander diligently prosecuted the war against Demetrius, who, relying too confidently on the great power of his father, was leading a scandalous life in Peloponnesus. Lysimachus, in the mean time, left Thrace, and passing the Hellespont, subdued Phrygia, Lydia, Lycaonia and Propontis, as far as the river Meander. This coming to the knowledge of Antigonus, who was then amusing himself with military games at Antiochia in Syria; he put his army in motion and recaptured many of the conquered cities. Lysimachus, on account of the inferiority of his forces, was obliged to hold himself on the defensive. Still he endeavoured to dispute every inch of ground with Antigonus, until both armies retired into winter quarters.⁴

During these occurrences, Seleucus was marching with a numerous army from Babylonia towards Cappadocia. Antigonus received notice of this movement early in the winter, and accordingly, recalled his son Demetrius from Greece. Thus Cassander was delivered from his enemy. On his march, Demetrius garrisoned some of the revolted cities, and then joined his forces to those of his father. While Seleucus was approaching, Ptolemy also put his army in motion, passed through Arabia Petrea, took possession of Palestine and laid siege to Zidon. But a rumour having got abroad that Seleucus had been defeated by Antigonus, Ptolemy, fearing that he should be suddenly attacked by the victorious army, concluded an armistice of four months with the Zidonians, and hastened back to Egypt. Meanwhile Seleucus entered Cappadocia with twenty thousand infantry, twelve thousand cavalry, four hundred and eighty elephants, and more than one hundred chariots armed with scythes. The hostile armies now approached nearer and nearer, and prepared themselves for a decisive engagement during the ensuing summer.⁵

This decisive battle was fought, 301 B. C. at Ipsus in Phrygia. Antigonus brought into the field between seventy thousand and eighty thousand infantry, ten thousand cavalry and seventy elephants. Seleucus and his allies had sixty four thousand infantry, ten thousand five hundred cavalry, above one hundred chariots armed with scythes, and more than four hundred elephants. After a bloody battle, Antigonus was defeated and left dead on the field, pierced with many wounds. Demetrius escaped with eight thousand or nine thousand men, and fled to Ephesus, where his fleet was stationed. After wandering about for some time, he sailed to Cyprus, which still remained in his possession together with some other cities and districts. He lived seventeen years after this, and undertook various expeditions which will be noticed as we proceed, but he could never regain his power.⁶

Seleucus, Ptolemy, Cassander and Lysimachus, now made a permanent treaty. They were each to assume the diadem and the royal title, and to govern their provinces with royal authority. The partition was made in the following manner: Cassander was to have Macedonia and Greece; Lysimachus, Thrace, Bithynia and some of the adjoining provinces; Ptolemy, Libya, Egypt, Arabia Petrea, Palestine and Coelosyria; and Seleucus, all that remained,

which comprehended many provinces in Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and the East as far as India; in all, seventy two satrapies.⁷

In the prophecy of Daniel, these princes are the four horns of the he-goat, which sprang up after the great horn was broken: and these are the four heads of the leopard. Seleucus is the prince at the court of the king of Egypt, (king of the south,) who was to acquire the most extensive power; and this power he now actually possessed.⁸

¹ Diodor. Sic. XX. 73—76. Plutarch, Demetrius XIX. ² Diodor. Sic. XX. 91—100. Plutarch, Demetrius XXI. XXII. Pausanias, Attic. LI. 8: 6. ³ Justin, XV. 4. Appian, Syriac. LV. 80—100. ⁴ Diodor. Sic. XX. 106—110. Plutarch, Demetrius XXIII—XXVII. ⁵ Diodor. Sic. XX. 111—113. Plutarch, Demetrius XXVIII. ⁶ Diodor. Sic. XXI. 2. Plutarch, Demetrius XXVIII—XXX. Appian, Syriac. LV. 85. compare Dan. 11: 5. ⁷ Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXI. 2. Appian, Syriac. LV. 90—100. LXII. 1. Polybius, V. 67. Plutarch, Demetrius XXX. ⁸ Dan. 8: 8, 21, 22. 7: 6: 11: 5.

CHAPTER NINTH.

HISTORY FROM THE PARTITION OF THE EMPIRE TO THE TIME OF
ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES.

TABLE OF THE GREEK-SYRIAN AND OF THE GREEK-EGYPTIAN
MONARCHS.

GREEK-SYRIAN.	B. C.	GREEK-EGYPTIAN.	B. C.
Seleucus Nicator	312	Ptolemy Lagus	323
Antiochus Soter	280	Ptolemy Philadelphus	284
Antiochus Theos	260	Ptolemy Euergetes	246
Seleucus Callinicus	245	Ptolemy Philopator	221
Seleucus Ceraunus	225	Ptolemy Epiphanes	204
Antiochus the Great	223	Ptolemy Philometor	180
Seleucus Philopator	186	Ptolemy Physcon	145
Antiochus Epiphanes	175	Ptolemy Lathyrus	116
Antiochus Eupator	164	Ptolemy Alexander	80
Demetrius Soter	162	Ptolemy Auletes	65
Alexander Balas	150	Cleopatra	51
Demetrius Nicator	145	The Romans	31
Antiochus Sidetes	140		
Demetrius Nicator II.	130		
Zebina	125		
Antiochus Grypus	123		
Seleucus	96		
Philip	92		
Tigranes	83		
The Romans	66		

LXXXII. HISTORY OF THE FOUR KINGDOMS 301—279 B. C.

Of the four sovereigns who shared the empire among them, Cassander died first, 398 B. C. after he had reigned nineteen years over Macedonia. Philip, his son and successor, dying soon after, the two younger sons of Cassander contended for the crown. Antipater, the elder of the two, was so eager in the prosecution of his claim, that he murdered his own mother because she favoured the

views of his brother Alexander. The latter fled to Demetrius Poliorcetes, who gladly embraced this opportunity of leading an army into Macedonia, under pretence of establishing Alexander on the throne. The intentions of Lysimachus at first were good, and he advised Antipater to an accommodation with his brother. But when Demetrius had put Alexander to death and seized the Macedonian sceptre for himself, Lysimachus murdered Antipater also. Thus Demetrius remained, for a few years, king of Macedonia.¹

Demetrius, 295 B. C. reconquered the Athenians, who had shaken off his yoke during his absence in Macedonia. He was not so successful in Cyprus, where Ptolemy had made an invasion, for he irrecoverably lost possession of that island, and, as it appears, of Phenicia also, for we shall find, hereafter, this territory under the dominion of Ptolemy. His power, however, was still considerable, for besides Macedonia, he possessed a considerable part of Peloponnesus and several cities in Asia Minor. He even entertained some hope of recovering his father's kingdom, and for this purpose, 388 B. C. he collected a fleet of five hundred sail, and an army of one hundred thousand men. But just as he was ready to embark, Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, invaded Macedonia, and almost all the soldiers of Demetrius forsook him and returned home; and he was accordingly forced to flee to Greece in the disguise of a common soldier. Afterwards he sailed to Asia with eleven thousand men, and at Miletus, in accordance with an engagement previously made, he married a daughter of Ptolemy, and then invaded Caria and Lydia. Here he was repulsed, but he went still further eastward, and was finally made prisoner by Seleucus, his son-in-law. He was treated with respect, but could never regain his freedom; and at last he died in captivity, 283 B. C.²

Lysimachus, in the year 299 B. C. took in marriage Arsinoe, a daughter of Ptolemy, and his son Agathocles married another daughter of the same king. The next year, Seleucus, as has been already intimated, married Stratonice, the daughter of Demetrius Poliorcetes. In the same year, Megasthenes died, the celebrated historian of Assyria, Babylonia and India. He was often consulted on affairs of state by Seleucus, and was employed by him in his negotiations with Sandrocottus, king of India. Nothing now remains of his works except some fragments preserved by Eusebius and Josephus.³

In the dominions of Seleucus, many cities had been entirely destroyed and others greatly injured by the ravages of war. To repair these losses, he built a great number of new cities, among which are reckoned sixteen of the name of Antiochia, nine, of Seleucia, five, of Laodicea, four, of Apamea, and one, of Stratonice. Antiochia or Antioch, on the Orontes in Syria, was the residence of all the succeeding kings, and in later times, of the Roman governours. About three English miles from the city was the grove of Daphne, which Antiochus made an asylum for criminals and a place of pleasure. It afterwards became so infamous for its licentiousness, that no man of good character would visit it. One Seleucia was likewise situated on the Orontes near the sea, and served as a port for Antioch, which was about twelve English miles further up the river. The most celebrated city of this name, however, was on the Tigris, between thirty and forty English miles north east of Babylon, near the site of the modern Bagdad, and opposite to the ancient Ctesiphon. This Seleucia, which was founded in 293 B. C. contributed very much to the final ruin and total desolation of the famous capital, Babylon. Great privileges were granted to the citizens of Seleucia, and on this account many of the inhabitants of Babylon removed thither; and these removals became still more frequent after the transfer of the trade to Seleucia. In this manner was Babylon gradually depopulated; especially after Himerus, a governour under Phraates, the Parthian king, about the year 130 B. C. for the most trifling causes, sold many of the Babylonians as slaves in Media, and burned the market, some temples, and the finest part of the city. Soon, nothing was left but the empty walls, and this once proud metropolis was used by the Parthian monarchs as a park for wild beasts.⁴ The precise period of the entire desertion of Babylon cannot be determined; neither from the occurrence of this name in more modern writers, can we infer that the ancient city was still in existence. For Seleucia was not only called *Seleucia Babylonia*, but sometimes, *Babylon* simply, as is evident from a passage in Lucan; for the Babylon mentioned by him as a capital of the Parthian empire, where were preserved the trophies of the victory over the Romans at Carrae or Haran, was situated on the Tigris, as Antiochia was, on the Orontes. Even Bagdad at the present day is frequently called Babylon or *Erak Babeli*.⁵

In the year 285 B. C. Ptolemy abdicated the throne of Egypt in favour of his younger son Philadelphus, and enrolled himself among the royal lifeguard. The elder son Ceraunus, thus excluded from the succession, fled to Thrace, where his two sisters were married, one to Lysimachus and the other to Agathocles. Demetrius Phalereus had advised against this measure of Ptolemy. This coming to the knowledge of Philadelphus, he, after the death of his father, put this celebrated philosopher in prison, where it is said he destroyed himself by the bite of an asp. Ptolemy Lagus, a valiant general, a just king, a man of learning and an author, a friend of learned men, and the founder of the library and the museum at Alexandria, died in 284 B. C. sincerely and universally lamented.⁶

The evil disposition of Ceraunus soon manifested itself, and proved that he had not been excluded from the throne without reason. At the court of Lysimachus he enkindled a quarrel between his sisters, to which Agathocles fell a sacrifice, 283 B. C. He fled with his widowed sister to Antiochia and excited Seleucus to a war against Lysimachus. At Corupedion in Phrygia, Seleucus gave battle to Lysimachus in the year 281 B. C. and the latter was slain. Seleucus now alone survived of all the generals of Alexander, and viewed himself with no small complacency as the conqueror of all the conquerors. It was on this account that he acquired the surname of *Νικῆτωρ*, *the Conqueror*. But he did not long enjoy his triumph, for while on his way to take possession of the conquered kingdom of Lysimachus he was assassinated by Ceraunus, 280 B. C. This wretch now banished his sister, the wife of Lysimachus, to Samothracia, put her two sons to death because they were the lawful heirs to the crown, and placed himself on the Macedonian throne. His successful career in crime was of short duration, for the next year, 279 B. C. he was taken prisoner and cut to pieces by the Gauls who had invaded Macedonia. His exiled sister Arsinoe then returned to Egypt, and so insinuated herself into the favour of her brother Philadelphus, that he married her.⁷

¹ Justin, XV. 1. ² Plutarch, Demetrius XXXVI—XXXIX. ³ Justin, *ubi supra*. Plutarch, Demetrius XLIII—LIII. Pausanias, Attic. I. 10: 1—2. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXI. 23. ⁴ Plutarch, Demetrius XLVII. Arrian, Indic. V. ⁵ Appian, Syriac. LVIII. 55—65. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXIV. 23. Justin, XLII. 1. Jahn, *Biblische Archaeol.* B. I. § 12. 16. Jerome, *Comment. in Jes.* XIII. XIV. Isa. 13: 19—22. Jer. 50: 9—46. LL,

5 Lucan, Pharsal. I. 10, 11. comp. VI. 50 ff. Pliny, VI. 26. Stephan. Byzant. in *Βαβυλών*. Abulfarag. Chronic. Syriac. p. 527. Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. Tom. I. p. 325. 6 Diogenes Laert. Life of Demet. Phal. V. 5: 8. Arrian de Reb. Alex. I. 1. Strabo, p. 793. Pausanias, Attic. I. 5: 1—8. Ammian. Marcellin. XXII. 16. Eusebius, Chron. 7 Appian, Syriac. LXIII. 5—15. Pausanias, Attic. I. 10: 4. 16: 2, 3. Justin, XVII. 1. 2. XXIV. 2—5. Strabo, p. 623.

NOTE. It is worthy of notice that the Greek monarchs now not only imitated the incest of the Persian kings by marriages with their own sisters, but carried this vice to still greater excess. About the year 392 B. C. Seleucus gave his own wife Stratonice, the daughter of Demetrius Poliorcetes, to his son Antiochus, and from this incestuous marriage were all the succeeding kings of Syria descended. Plutarch, Demetrius XXXVIII. Appian, Syriac. LIX—LXI. 25—95.

LXXXIII. THE JEWS 311—279 B. C.

During this period of thirty two years (from 311 to 279 B. C.) the Jews every where enjoyed tranquillity. By the peace of 311 B. C. Palestine came under the dominion of Antigonus; in 302 B. C. the country was subdued by Ptolemy Lagus, and the next year the possession of it was secured to him by treaty. The high priest at this time was Onias I. the son of Jaddua. He died in the year 300 B. C. and was succeeded by his son, Simon the Just.¹

This Simon is said to have been the last of the *Great Synagogue*, in which are included one hundred and twenty men, and among others, Ezra, Haggai, Zechariah, Nehemiah and Malachi. Hence it is plain, that this great synagogue, so celebrated among the Jews, is nothing more than that succession of patriots after the captivity, who distinguished themselves by their labours towards the collection and recension of the sacred books, and the settlement and improvement of the civil and religious constitution of their country. Indeed the Jewish traditions maintain that Simon the Just, as he was the last of the great synagogue, closed the sacred canon. The notices on this subject are so recent that they cannot be relied upon as historical evidence; but as such traditions are generally founded on some truth, it is very probable that Simon did complete the collection and revision of the sacred books,

and even add some things respecting events of more recent occurrence. Some of the apparent additions in the Old Testament well correspond to the age of Simon. The genealogical register of David in the first Book of Chronicles, comes down to about the year 300 B. C. and in the catalogue of high priests in the Book of Nehemiah, Jaddua is mentioned in a manner which seems to intimate that he had been dead for some time.²

Simon the Just, according to Eusebius, died in 292 B. C. in the ninth year of his administration. The Alexandrian Chronicle, which in the chronology of the preceding periods corresponds more nearly than Eusebius with Josephus and the Bible, makes the term of his office fourteen years, which is evidently too great, as has been demonstrated by Prideaux.³

The successor of Simon was his brother Eleazer, for his son Onias had not arrived at the age which the law required for induction to the high priesthood.⁴ Eleazer succeeded to the priesthood only, for the presidentship of the Sanhedrim was conferred on Antigonus Socho, the most learned Jew of that age. He, it is said, was the first of the *Mishnic* teachers, who studied the traditions and brought them into repute. This information also is derived from the more modern writings, which cannot be regarded as conclusive authority; though the tradition very probably is founded on fact. The collection of those precepts which afterwards acquired such great authority as the oral instructions of Moses, must have been commenced in this age; for we find manifest traces of them in the times immediately succeeding.

During this period, many colonies of Jews were established out of Palestine. On account of their fidelity to their oaths, Seleucus Nicator allured them to the cities which he built, by raising them to the highest rank of citizens; as the Ptolemies granted them in Alexandria the same privileges enjoyed by the Macedonians. Many of them settled at Antioch on the Orontes, the metropolis of the Syrian empire, where they enjoyed their ancient privileges even after the destruction of Jerusalem.⁵

1 Alexand. Chron. Syncellus. Eusebius, Chron. 2 1 Chron. 3: 17—24.
and Michaelis, Anmerk. in locum. Neh. 12: 22. 3 Eusebius, Chron. Pri-
deaux, Connexions, Vol. II. p. 145. note. 4 Josephus, Antiq. XII. 2: 5.
5 Josephus, Antiq. XII. 3: 1. against Apion, II. 4.

NOTE. The most ancient books which contain an account of these Jewish traditions, originated at about the tenth century of the Christian era. At this time the Caraites became numerous and demanded of the Rabbins some proof of the genuineness and authority of their traditions. This proof the Rabbins attempted to give, and named the men by whom their traditions were said to have been transmitted. They began with Adam, and where the writings of the Old Testament failed them, they introduced extracts from the Talmud, and the oral testimony of the men who were supposed to have communicated the traditions to their disciples at the high schools in Judea, Babylonia and other places. These books are the following :

1. Seder Olam Rabbah, in the early part of the ninth century.
2. Jeshuboth Rabbi Sherira Gaon, in the latter part of the tenth century.
3. Seder Olam Zeurah, in the early part of the twelfth century.
4. Sepher Kabbala Rabbi Abraham Levi Ben Dior, in the latter part of the twelfth century.
5. Sepher Juchasin, in 1580, at Cracow.
6. Shalsheth Hakkabbala, in 1587, at Venice.
7. Zemach David, in 1592, at Prague, by R. Ganz.

It is plain enough that the authors of these books lived at too late a period to afford satisfactory evidence respecting traditions so ancient; and that their testimony is of no greater value than the traditions, from which all their knowledge of these subjects was derived.

LXXXIV. ANTIOCHUS SOTER 279—260 B. C.

After the assassination of Seleucus Nicator, his son Antiochus ascended the throne of Asia, 279 B. C. He immediately sent Patrocles with an army to Asia Minor, to secure those provinces and to make war upon the murderer of his father. But the Bithynians drew Patrocles into an ambush, and destroyed him with all his army. Zipates, king of Bithynia, was so elated by his victory that he died for joy. His son and successor Nicomedes was unable to take advantage of this success, because he was involved in a long and dangerous war with his youngest brother. During these difficulties, Antiochus having threatened to revenge the destruction of

his army, Nicomedes solicited the aid of the Gauls. At his invitation they entered Asia Minor, 277 B. C. and took a very conspicuous part in all the succeeding transactions of that country. The greatness and extent of their influence is thus described by Justin : "Gallorum ea tempestate tantae foecunditatis juvenus fuit, ut Asiam omnem velut examine aliquo implerent. Denique neque reges Orientis sine mercenario Gallorum exercitu ulla bella gesserunt, neque pulsi regno ad alios quam ad Gallos confugerunt. Tantis terror Gallici nominis et armorum invicta felicitas fuit, ut aliter neque majestatem suam tutam, neque amissam recuperare se posse sine Gallica virtute arbitrarentur." The Galatians, settled on the river Halys, to whom Paul directed one of his epistles, were the descendants of these Gauls.¹

Antiochus, in consequence of the last victory of his father over Lysimachus, had claims upon Thrace and Macedonia ; but he was unable to prosecute them on account of the loss of his army under Patrocles. Accordingly, after Ceraunus had been cut off by the Gauls, Sosthenes succeeded him on the throne. He dying, 276 B. C. Antigonus Gonatas, a son of Demetrius Poliorcetes, who held the government of several Grecian cities, seized the sceptre of Macedonia. Antiochus now advanced with an army to assert his claims, but as Gonatas was in alliance with the Bithynian king Nicomedes, it became necessary for Antiochus to subdue Bithynia before he could proceed to Macedonia. He therefore consented to terms of peace. He gave his daughter Phile in marriage to Gonatas, and relinquished the crown of Macedonia to him and his descendants.²

Antiochus now (275 B. C.) turned his arms against the Gauls, who, having settled in Asia Minor with the consent of Nicomedes, infested the country with rapine and pillage. He put a stop to their depredations and forced them to remain quiet. The provinces, in the warmth of their gratitude for a deliverance from so severe a pest, conferred on him the divine title of *Σωτήρ*, *Saviour*.³

Against Pergamus he was not equally successful. Philetærus, a eunuch, governor and treasurer under Lysimachus, had made himself independent in that city. He died in 263 B. C. and was succeeded by Eumenes, the son of his brother. Antiochus attacked this prince in the year 262 B. C. but he was repulsed by Eumenes. The next year Antiochus nominated his son Antiochus II. for his successor, and died, 260 B. C.⁴

¹ Livy, XXXVIII. 16. Memnon, Excerpt. Cap. 16. 18. 21. Pausanias, Phocic. X. 19: 5—23. 9. Polybius, II. 13—25. Justin, XXIV. 4—8. XXV. 1. 2. XXVI. 2. Diodor. Sic. Fragment. XX. 16. ² Justin, XXV. 1. Plutarch, Demetrius LIII. ³ Appian, Syriac. LXV. 70—75. ⁵ Pausanias, Attic. I. 8: 12. 10: 4. Strabo, p. 623. Appian, Syriac. LXV. 75.

NOTE. After the Romans had driven from Italy Pyrrhus, king of Epirus, (274 B. C.) whom the Tarentines had called in to their aid, they became known in the oriental countries, and Ptolemy Philadelphus entered into an alliance with them. Plutarch, Pyrrhus XIII—XXV. Livy, Epitome of Books XIII. XIV. Eutropius, Brev. Hist. Rom. II. 15. 18. Eleven years after this, 263 B. C. the first Punic war began, which continued twenty four years, to 239 B. C.

LXXXV. ANTIOCHUS THEOS 260—245 B. C.

About this time Timarchus, governour of Caria under Ptolemy Philadelphus, made himself absolute master of Miletus. Antiochus II. delivered the Milesians from his tyranny. They were so overjoyed by the recovery of their freedom that they deemed the divine title of *Σωτήρ*, *Saviour*, too mean for so great a benefactor, and conferred on him the idolatrous appellation of *Θεός*, *the God*. This style he ever after bore on his coins.¹ But the deified monarch soon found that he had not risen above the ills of humanity, for he became involved in a disastrous war, which he was compelled to close by a disgraceful peace. We must go back a little in our narrative, in order more fully to develope the origin of this war.

Magas or Agas, a half brother of Ptolemy Philadelphus, who was appointed governour of Cyrene in 307 B. C. married Arsinoe, a daughter of Antiochus Soter. In the year 265 B. C. he threw off his allegiance to Ptolemy, and was marching with his army towards Alexandria, when the Marmarides, a Nomadic race in Cyrene, excited disturbances which compelled him to return. Ptolemy, who had collected his forces, was prevented from pursuing the rebel by a conspiracy among the four thousand Gauls whom he had taken into his pay, and his other mercenary troops. Thus Magas escaped unpunished; and in 264 B. C. he made an agreement with his father-in-law Antiochus Soter, that while he entered

Egypt on the west, Antiochus should at the same time invade it from the east. But Philadelphus sent bands of robbers (probably Arabic Nomades) and several bodies of light armed troops into the provinces of Antiochus, which obliged him to keep his army at home to protect his own territories from their depredations.³

Magas therefore failed to accomplish his purpose, but he maintained his independence nine years longer. In the year 257 B. C. he was pardoned by Philadelphus, on condition that he should give his daughter Berenice in marriage to the crown-prince of Egypt, with Cyrene for her dowre. But before the contract was fulfilled, Magas died. His widow Arsinoe broke off the negotiation and gave her hand to Demetrius, half-brother of Antigonus Gonatas, king of Macedonia. But in the following year, 256 B. C. Demetrius was put to death by the Cyreneans, the marriage of the princess with the crown-prince of Egypt was consummated, and Arsinoe fled to Antioch. There she instigated her brother Antiochus Theos to the unfortunate war above referred to, which commenced in 255 and continued till 249 B. C.³

Philadelphus, now bending under the weight of years and infirmities, intrusted the conduct of this war to his generals, but Antiochus, in the bloom of youth, led his troops in person. No complete history of the war has been preserved, but neither of the contending parties appear to have gained any very decided advantages. While Antiochus was thus wasting the strength of his empire in hostilities against Egypt to gratify his sister, Parthia, Bactria and other provinces beyond the Tigris, revolted from his dominion during the year 250 B. C. In consequence of these revolts, he was forced in 249 B. C. to make peace with Philadelphus, on such terms as he could obtain. The conditions were, that he should repudiate his beloved queen, who was his half sister, that he should take in marriage Berenice, a daughter of Philadelphus, and that the first male issue of this marriage should succeed to the throne. The bride was conducted to Selucia on the Orontes by Philadelphus in person with a fleet, and the nuptials of which Daniel had prophesied (Dan. 11: 6.) were celebrated with great solemnity.⁴

Immediately after the death of Philadelphus, which took place, 247 B. C. two years after the peace, Antiochus put away Berenice and restored his beloved queen Laodice. But she soon after murdered her husband. Meanwhile Berenice fled to the sanctuary

of Daphne, but it afforded her no protection, for she was slain together with her son.⁵

In the mean time, Ptolemy Euergetes, the brother of Berenice, who had ascended the throne of Egypt, and the cities in Cilicia, Pamphylia, Lycia, Caria and Cyprus, which were under the dominion of Egypt,⁶ despatched troops with all possible expedition to rescue Berenice from the power of her rival. But they arrived too late, for Berenice was already murdered. Euergetes then placed himself at the head of his army to revenge the death of his sister. He entered Syria, slew the queen Laodice and took possession of the whole country, as far as the Tigris on the east and Babylon on the south. He marched from province to province, levying heavy contributions, till he was forced to return by a rebellion which broke out in Egypt. He had acquired an immense booty, and among other things, about two thousand five hundred idolatrous images, principally of those which Cambyses had taken away from the Egyptians. When he restored these idols to their temples, the Egyptians, though they did not deify him as the Greek cities did the kings of Asia, testified the warmth of their gratitude by honouring him with the title of *Ευεργέτης*, the *Benefactor*.⁷

¹ Justin, XXVII. 1. Appian, Syriac. LXV. 75—80. Athenaeus, VI. 16. Froehlich, Annal. Syr. Tab. III. ² Pausanias, Attic. I. 8: 1—3. ³ Justin, XXVI. 3. Strabo, p. 789. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. 11: 5. ⁴ Justin, XLI. 4. Strabo, p. 515., Arrian, Parthic. apud Photium, Cod. 56. Syncellus p. 284. Valerius Maximus, IX. 14. Appian, Syriac. LXV. 75—85. ⁵ Valerius Maximus, IX. 14. Justin, XXVII. 1. Appian, Syriac. LXV. 75—85. comp. Dan. 11: 6. ⁶ Theocritus, Idyll. XVII. 85—90. ⁷ Appian, Syriac. LXV. 75—85. Polybius, V. 58 Justin, XXVII. 1. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. compare Dan. 11: 6—8.

LXXXVI. SYRIA AND EGYPT 245—221 B. C.

As soon as Ptolemy Euergetes had returned to Egypt, Seleucus Callinicus, the son and successor of Antiochus, fitted out a fleet on the coasts of Syria, for the purpose of reducing to subjection the cities of Asia Minor which had revolted during the war with Ptolemy. But a storm destroyed the fleet, and Callinicus escaped with only a few of his ships. The revolted cities then voluntarily submitted to their king out of compassion for his misfortunes.¹

The next year, 244 B. C. Callinicus fitted out a second fleet against Ptolemy. He was defeated in an engagement with the Egyptians, and fled with the shattered remnants of his armament.²

Callinicus, now desirous of increasing his strength, promised the independent possession of the cities of Asia Minor to his younger brother Antiochus Hierax, (who was governour of Asia Minor, though at that time but fourteen years old,) on condition that he would join him with his whole army in the war against Ptolemy Euergetes. But Callinicus in the year 243 B. C. havng obtained from Euergetes a truce for ten years, refused to perform the promise he had made to Antiochus. A bloody war accordingly broke out between the two brothers, in which Seleucus was so constantly unsuccessful that it appears as if the surname of *Callinicus* or *illustrious Conqueror*, could have been conferred upon him only by way of ridicule. He was defeated at Ancyra and with difficulty saved his life by flight. Antiochus Hierax gained but little by this success; for his auxiliaries, the Gauls, to whom he was principally indebted for his victory, became so mutinous that he was obliged to purchase his life of them at the expense of all his treasures. He was at that time threatened by Eumenes, prince of Pergamus, and on this account he was obliged to treat with the Gauls on equal terms, with whom he had before contracted as with mercenaries. This, however, availed him nothing, for Eumenes fell upon him and overwhelmed all Asia Minor with his power. It is probable that Antiochus fled to the East, as we find him there some time after. Eumenes died, 241 B. C. and was succeeded by the sagacious and active Attalus, the youngest son of his brother. Attalus effectually quelled the arrogant spirit of the Gauls, and assumed the regal title.³

While the Syrian monarchy, in consequence of the discord between the two brothers, was humbled by Eumenes in the West; Theodotus of Bactria, and Arsaces of Parthia, who had revolted in the year 250 B. C. during the imprudent war of Antiochus Theos with Philadelphus, were fortifying and strengthening themselves in the East. Immediately after the battle of Ancyra, Arsaces took possession of Hyrcania and annexed it to Parthia. He then formed an alliance with Theodotus, that he might the more easily withstand the king of Syria. This was the beginning of the Parthian empire, which afterwards became so powerful that it set bounds to

the conquests of the Romans and vanquished the vanquishers of the world.⁴

Notwithstanding these losses, the brothers, Seleucus Callinicus and Antiochus Hierax, persisted in their unnatural hostilities. The theatre of the war was now in Mesopotamia, where the battle mentioned in 2 Macc. 8: 20. must have occurred, in which eight thousand Babylonian Jews and four thousand Macedonians defeated the one hundred and twenty thousand Gauls whom Antiochus Hierax had in his army. The remaining history of this war is unknown, excepting that Seleucus Callinicus was at last the conqueror. Antiochus Hierax fled to his father-in-law Ariarathes, king of Cappadocia. Not feeling secure at the court of this monarch, he privately withdrew to Egypt, where he was put to death in the year 240 B. C.⁵

Seleucus, having thus shaken off his brother and brought the disturbed affairs of his empire into some degree of order, in the year 236 B. C. undertook an expedition to the East, for the purpose of subjecting Parthia and Bactria to his yoke. But he accomplished nothing, and was obliged to relinquish the enterprise on account of some disturbances which required his presence in Syria.⁶

In the year 230 B. C. Seleucus made a second attempt to subjugate Parthia; but he was himself defeated and taken prisoner. Arsaces treated the captive king with the respect becoming his rank, but never set him at liberty. He continued in captivity till the year 226 B. C. when he died in consequence of a fall from his horse.⁷

Seleucus Callinicus left two sons, Seleucus and Antiochus, by his wife Laodice, the daughter of his general Andromachus. Seleucus ascended the throne, a weak man both in body and mind, and therefore very unfitly surnamed *Κεραυνός*, *Thunder*. He was upheld by his father-in-law Achaeus, a prudent minister and valiant warrior, who administered the affairs of the empire as well as its weakened state would permit. But when Seleucus Ceraunus made war upon Attalus for the recovery of Asia Minor, he was poisoned by his generals in the year 223 B. C.⁸

As Ceraunus left no son, the army offered the sceptre to the brave and prudent Achaeus, who, besides his affinity with the royal family, was highly celebrated for his own achievements. But he honestly declined the offer and secured the kingdom to Antiochus,

the brother of Ceraunus, who was educated at Babylon, (Seleucia ?) or, as Polybius says, he had his residence in northern Asia. Antiochus accordingly come to Antioch ; and his reign proved so fruitful in great events that he acquired the surname of *Great*. He prosecuted the war against Attalus by means of Achaeus, who was governour of Asia Minor. He soon forced Attalus to keep himself within the boundaries of Pergamus.⁹

In the year 222 B. C. (the same year in which the Colossus at Rhodes was overthrown by an earthquake,) Ptolemy Euergetes, the last good king of Egypt, died after a reign of twenty five years. He had enjoyed peace during the twenty two last years of his reign, while the Syrian empire, by the quarrels of the two brothers and the subsequent accession of a weak king to the throne, lost much of its power. Euergetes employed this season of quiet in promoting commerce, and encouraging the progress of the arts and sciences in his dominions. His father Philadelphus, for the furtherance of the East India trade, had built Berenice and laid out a road from Coptus to that city. He had also made great additions to the royal library and to the collection of paintings and statues. Ptolemy Euergetes followed in his father's steps, and brought commerce and the arts and sciences to a high degree of perfection. After the death of Zenodotus, he appointed to the office of royal librarian Eratosthenes the Cyrenean, who resided at Athens. This is the Eratosthenes who compiled from the Egyptian archives a history of thirty eight kings of Thebais. Of this work we have only a meager extract in Syncellus.¹⁰

¹ Justin, XXVII. 2. Appian, Syriac. LXV. 90—95. Polybius, V. 40. comp. Dan. 11: 9. ² Justin, XXVII. 2. ³ Justin, XXVII. 3. Athenaeus, X. 16. Strabo, p. 623 f. Polybius, V. 78. and Fragments from Book XVIII. ⁴ Justin, XVII. 3. XLI. 1. 4. ⁵ Justin, XXVII. 3. Polyaeus, IV. 17. ⁶ Justin, XLI. 4. 5. ⁷ Posidonius in Athenaeus, IV. 13. Justin, XXVII. 3. ⁸ Polybius, II. 71. IV. 48. V. 40. Appian, Syriac. LXVI. 85—95. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. XI. ⁹ Polybius, IV. 48. V. 40. ¹⁰ Justin, XXIX. 1. Plutarch, Cleomenes, XXXIII. Polybius, II. 71. V. 88. Pliny, XXXIV. 18. Strabo, p. 652. 796. Jahn, Biblische Archäologie, Th. I. B. II. S. 10. Plutarch, Aratus XII. Suidas in *Ζηνοδότος, Ἐρατοσθένης, Ἀπολλώνιος*. Syncellus, p. 91—97. 147.

LXXXVII. THE JEWS 279—221 B. C.

During the fifty eight years from 279 to 221 B. C. the Jews lived in uninterrupted tranquillity. This was the period in which they became acquainted with Greek literature and began to engage in their peculiar philosophical speculations. The name of Antigonus Socho or Sochaeus, who was president of the Sanhedrim and the most learned Jew of his age, is of Grecian origin. He was the first to introduce those additions to the Mosaic law, which afterwards acquired so much authority under the title of *Traditions*. He died in the year 260 B. C. and was succeeded in the presidentship of the Sanhedrim by Joseph, the son of Joazar. Joseph, it is said, taught his disciples that they ought to serve God from disinterested motives, and not for the sake of reward. Zadok and Baithos, the most distinguished of his disciples, went still further, and affirmed that there is no reward to be expected after death; and this is supposed to have been the origin of the sect of the Sadducees. This tradition of the Jews is hardly consistent with itself; but from an examination of the history of the following times, in which mention is made of this sect, it appears in a high degree probable that about the middle of the third century before Christ, the opinions of the Traditionists began to find opposers, and thus a party arose, out of which the sect of the Sadducees was gradually formed. This seems to be the ground of the tradition to which we have referred.

In the year 249 B. C. the Jews came partly under the dominion of Antiochus Theos; for Ptolemy Philadelphus, when he married his daughter Berenice to Antiochus, gave her as a dowre one half of the revenues of Judea, Samaria, Phenicia and Coelosyria. But as he retained the other half in his own hands, and as the revenues of Judea were always farmed to the high priests, this circumstance made no change in their condition; especially as Berenice was murdered two years after, and Ptolemy Euergetes overcame the whole Syrian monarchy. In the year 245 B. C. the Jews had the pleasure of seeing this just and humane king at Jerusalem, while on his return from his victories in the East. He offered many sacrifices and made magnificent presents to the temple. Without doubt the Jews on this occasion showed him the prophecy in Dan.

11: 6—8. which had just been accomplished by his achievements, and this was probably the cause of his making those offerings and presents. The high priest at this time was Onias II. the son of Simon the Just. Eleazer died 277 B. C. and was succeeded by Manasseh; and he dying, 250 B. C. Onias become high priest.¹

This son, so unlike his virtuous father, was avaricious and niggardly to such a degree, that for twenty four years he withheld the twenty talents of silver, which his predecessors had always paid to the kings of Egypt as an annual tribute for the whole people. In the year 226 B. C. the arrears amounted to four hundred and eighty talents; and then Ptolemy Euergetes sent Athenion to Judea, to demand what was already due and to require a more punctual payment of the tribute in future, with the menace, that if these requisitions were not complied with, he would confiscate the whole territory and colonize it with his own soldiers. This fearful threat filled all the people with consternation, but made no impression on the headstrong old man, who would rather hazard every thing than part with his money.²

His nephew Joseph, a young man of prudence and activity, in vain represented to his uncle the unreasonableness of his conduct. He could not prevail upon him even to go to court and defend himself. With much difficulty he at last obtained permission to go himself to Egypt and attempt to satisfy the king. Joseph then quieted the fears of the people, and endeavoured to gain over to his interests the ambassador Athenion, in which he was completely successful. He obtained money for his journey of the Samaritans, probably because no Jew would comply with the law which required them to lend money without usury.³

Joseph went to Egypt with a caravan in which several rich Coelosyrians and Phenicians were travelling to Alexandria to obtain the farming of the revenues. From their conversation he learned the amount of these revenues, and in consequence of this information, he afterwards offered a much larger sum than they, for the privilege of farming. On his arrival he was very favourably received by the king, to whom he had before been warmly commended by Athenion. He so insinuated himself into the royal favour that when he took the revenues to farm, he had the boldness to offer the king and queen as his sureties, and he was intrusted with the business without bondsmen. Instead of the eight thousand tal-

ents which the Coelosyrians and Phenicians offered for the revenues, he promised double that sum, in addition to all the goods which should be confiscated for neglect of payment. In this manner Joseph became the farmer of the revenues of Judea, Samaria, Phenicia and Coelosyria, and he obtained a body of two thousand soldiers to compel the refractory to make payment.⁴

After Joseph had paid what was due to the royal treasury from his uncle, with five hundred talents which he borrowed in Egypt, he went to Askelon with his two thousand soldiers to demand the tribute due from that city. The inhabitants not only refused payment, but added insult to their refusal. Joseph immediately put to death twenty of their principal men, and sent one thousand talents of their confiscated property to the king. But this example of severity was not sufficient, for the citizens of Scythopolis offered similar resistance and suffered a like punishment. After this, he was every where acknowledged as royal collector, in which employment he continued for twenty years.⁵

This Jew, who had no scruples with regard to the lawfulness of eating at the table of the Egyptian king, and insinuated himself so much into the royal favour, must have possessed great versatility of native talent and have obtained some acquaintance with Grecian manners, and with the literature and sciences which were in that age so highly esteemed at the court of Egypt. We have here a confirmation of a remark made at the beginning of this section respecting the knowledge of Grecian literature among the Jews.

¹ Josephus, Antiq. XII. 4. 1. against Apion, II. 5. comp. Haggai 2: 7, 8. Alexand. Chron. ² Josephus, Antiq. XII. 4: 1. ³ Josephus, Antiq. XII. 4: 2. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XII. 4: 3, 4. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XII. 4: 5, 6, 10.

LXXXVIII. SYRIA AND EGYPT 221—204 B. C.

Ptolemy Philopator, the son of Ptolemy Euergetes, ascended the throne of Egypt in the second year of Antiochus the Great, 221 B. C. It is said that he poisoned his father, and in the course of his reign he murdered his mother, his brother and his wife. His whole character was marked with wickedness. Unfortunately for Egypt, all her succeeding monarchs followed his example; so that

Ptolemy Lagus, Ptolemy Philadelphus, and Ptolemy Euergetes, the three first Greek kings of that country, were the last of their race who proved themselves worthy of a throne.¹

Antiochus the Great sought to take advantage of the effeminacy of the Egyptian king, and he fixed his eye on Palestine, Phenicia, Coelosyria, and all the possessions which the crown of Egypt had held in Syria since the war with Ptolemy Euergetes. But his first campaign was broken off by the revolt of the brothers, Molon and Alexander, governours of Media and Persia, who had already twice repulsed the royal army which was sent against them. No sooner had he quelled these revolters, than Achaeus, who had formerly declined in favour of Antiochus the sceptre which was offered him, having been calumniated at court as a traitor, was obliged for his own safety to become one in reality. He accordingly declared himself independent. Antiochus contented himself with merely threatening Achaeus, and renewed his war with the Egyptians. In the year 219 B. C. he gained possession of Seleucia on the Orontes, which, though but twelve English miles from Antioch, the Syrian metropolis, had remained in the hands of the Egyptians ever since the war with Ptolemy Euergetes.²

After this, Theodotus, the Egyptian governour of Coelosyria, who had offered a bold resistance to Antiochus before the breaking off of his first campaign, betrayed the interests of his sovereign and voluntarily delivered Coelosyria into the hands of Antiochus. He was induced to this step, partly by desire of revenge and partly by his contempt for the character of his master. At the close of the first campaign with Antiochus, he had been recalled to Egypt to answer in person to some accusations which had been made against his conduct in the war. While detained at Alexandria by this disagreeable business, he saw that Philopator was a mean voluptuary, given up to the most shameful vices, and entirely governed by the creatures and instruments of his pleasures, Agathoclea, her brother Agathocles, and their mother Oenanthe; and that the minister Sosibius condescended to flatter these infamous wretches, and shunned no means, however base, of gratifying the passions of his master. To the injured and irritated Theodotus, the service of such a monarch appeared intolerable, and he accordingly went over to Antiochus.³

By this means Antiochus gained possession not only of Coelosyria

and Phenicia, but also of the Egyptian fleet which lay in the harbours of Phenicia, and of all the military stores which had been collected in those places. He then made himself master of the other fortified places in that region, as far as to Sora or Dora, which had formerly been the frontier city between Manasseh and Dan on the sea, and was less than eight English miles north of Caesarea. But as this fortress was in good condition, advantageously situated and plentifully supplied with provisions, he was unable to reduce it; and having received an offer from Philopator of an armistice for four months, he accepted it and went into winter quarters at Seleucia on the Orontes.⁴

By the negotiations which followed, both kings sought only to gain time; Ptolemy, that he might prepare himself for war, and Antiochus, that he might subdue Achaeus. The negotiations were finally broken off, because both parties laid claim to Palestine and Coelosyria by virtue of the alliance of 301 B. C. The war was accordingly renewed in the year 218 B. C. Nicolaus, the general of Philopator, collected his forces at Gaza, directed his march along the coast to Lebanon and occupied the defiles near the sea shore. Thither the Egyptian fleet attended him. Antiochus came down the coast by land, and was likewise accompanied by his fleet. In the naval engagement which followed, neither side could claim the victory; but by land, Antiochus broke through the defiles and drove the Egyptians to Zidon, and their fleet also took refuge in the harbour of that city. As the city was well provided for a siege, Antiochus left it, and marching into the interior, he brought under his power all the cities of Galilee, the city on mount Tabor, and the land of Gilead east of Jordan, together with the metropolis Rabbath-ammon, which Philadelphus had fortified and named Philadelphia. Antiochus at the same time subjugated some of the neighbouring Arabs, and on his return, threw garrisons into Samaria and the adjacent towns, and at the close of the campaign took up his winter quarters in Ptolemais.⁵

These repeated losses at length aroused Ptolemy from his lethargy. He forsook the drunken revels in which he had spent most of his time, and placing himself at the head of an army of seventy thousand infantry, five thousand cavalry and seventy three elephants, in the year 217 B. C. he marched from Pelusium through Arabia, and encamped at Raphia, between Rhinocolura and Gaza. Anti-

ochus came against him with sixty two thousand infantry, six thousand cavalry and one hundred and two elephants; and encamped at first within ten, and afterwards, within five stadia of his foe. After five days they came to battle. Antiochus, when confident of victory, was totally defeated. He lost ten thousand three hundred men slain, four thousand taken prisoners, and fifty elephants; while Ptolemy lost but two thousand two hundred men, and sixteen elephants. It is probable that the soldiers of Antiochus were diminished still more in the flight by being slain or captured, for he retired to Antioch, relinquished all the conquered cities, and made no attempt to repair his losses. Philopator now restored to his crown all its former possessions without striking another blow; for the cities emulated each other in their zeal to tender him their submission by ambassadours. This battle took place about the same time that Hannibal defeated Flaminius in Hetruria.⁶

Antiochus was fearful that discontent and insurrections among his own subjects would be the consequence of his ill success during this campaign, and as Achæus was still in arms against him, he deemed it necessary to send an ambassadour to Ptolemy with proposals of peace. Ptolemy was equally desirous of putting an end to the war, for he longed to return to his pleasures; and though he at first affected to answer the ambassadour with severity, he willingly grafted a truce for one year, and afterwards sent his own minister to Antioch. A final treaty was concluded in the year 216 B. C. by which Antiochus renounced all claims upon Coelosyria, Phenicia and Palestine.⁷

Antiochus now, in furtherance of his designs against Achæus, entered into an alliance with Attalus, king of Pergamus. Achæus was soon driven within the walls of Sardis, where he defended himself for a whole year; but in 214 B. C. he was delivered into the hands of Antiochus by the Cretan Bolis, and put to death. This Bolis had been sent by Ptolemy Philopator with a large sum of money for the relief of Achæus, but he suffered himself to be bribed by Antiochus to betray his trust. He thus gave proof of the shameless avarice and dishonesty of the Cretan character, and verified the old proverb: "*The Cretans are always liars.*" Κρήτες ἀεὶ ψεύσται.⁸

After Antiochus had adjusted the affairs of Asia Minor, in 212 B. C. he undertook an expedition to the East for the recovery of

his revolted provinces. But though he exerted himself to the utmost for seven years, he failed to accomplish his purpose. At the end of the year 208 B. C. he was obliged to acknowledge Arsaces II. whom he had defeated in several battles, as king of Parthia and Hyrcania. He also found it necessary, 206 B. C. to conclude a treaty with Euthydemon, who had expelled the son of the traitor Theodotus from Bactria, and made himself master of the country. By this treaty Antiochus obtained a number of elephants. He then proceeded to the borders of India and renewed his alliance with the king of that country, from whom he received an additional supply of elephants; so that he now had one hundred and fifty of these animals in his army. He then marched through Arachosia, and Drangiana to Carmania, where he passed the winter of 205 B. C. and in 204 B. C. he returned from his eastern expeditions, which had acquired for him the surname of *Great*.⁹

Ptolemy Philopator, meanwhile, had continued his effeminate and voluptuous course of life. An insurrection broke out in Egypt in 213 B. C., but it must have been soon suppressed, for Philopator not only kept possession of the throne, but pursued his infamous pleasures without interruption. His wife Arsinoe, (who was also his sister,) upon every opportunity raised her voice so loudly against Agathoclea and her brother Agathocles, who governed the kingdom according to their own pleasure, that finally, at the command of the king, she was put to death by the agency of the old minister Sosibius. This veteran in wickedness was at length compelled to resign his office in favour of Tleopolemus. But Tleopolemus, though a brave general, had not the talents necessary for the management of civil affairs, and consequently, this change of ministers produced no change for the better in the measures of the government. In the year 204 B. C. Ptolemy Philopator, exhausted by his continual dissipation, died in the thirty seventh year of his age and the seventeenth of his reign. He left an only son, Ptolemy Epiphanes, who was then but five years old. Agathoclea, Agathocles, and their mother Oeanthe, with their creatures, designed to retain the young king under their own management during his minority: and they kept the death of Philopator secret, till they had time to adopt such measures as they supposed necessary to the accomplishment of their purpose. But their efforts were all in vain. When they made their proposals to the Macedonian soldiers, they

were indignantly rejected. The soldiers placed the young prince on the throne in the circus, and gave up Agathoclea, Agathocles, Oenanthe, and their creatures, to the populace, by whom they were torn in pieces. The guardianship of the king was intrusted to Sosibius, a son of the old minister of that name.¹⁰

¹ Plutarch, Cleomenes XXXIII. Justin, XXIX. 1. XXX. 1. 2. Polybius, V. 34. Strabo, p. 795. 796. ² Polybius, III. 2. IV. 48. V. 41—57. 61. Justin, XXX. 1. comp. Dan. 11: 10. ³ Plutarch, Cleomenes XXXIII. Polybius, V. 40. 61. 92. Justin, XXX. 1. 2. Athenaeus, X:II. ⁴ Polybius, IV. 37. V. 62—66. Justin, XXX. 1. 2. Athenaeus, XIII. Polybius, V. 67—71. comp. Dan. 11: 10. ⁵ Polybius, V. 70. 71. ⁶ Polybius, V. 79—86. Justin, XXX. 1. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. 11: 11. ³ Maccabees I. comp. Dan. 11: 11. ⁷ Polybius, V. 87. Justin, XXX. 1. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. 11: 11. ⁸ Polybius, V. 107. VII. 4—7. VIII. 12—18. comp. Titus 1: 12. ⁹ Polybius, X. 25—28. XI. 32. Justin, XLI. 4—6. ¹⁰ Justin, XXX. 1. 2. Polybius, V. 107. XV. 24—34. Excerpta Valesii ex Polyb. de Virtut. et Vitiis XV. XVI.

LXXXIX. ANTIOCHUS THE GREAT 204—187 B. C.

Antiochus the Great, and Philip, king of Macedonia, determined to take advantage of the minority of the Egyptian monarch, and they entered into an alliance for the purpose of sharing his dominions between them. In pursuance of this plan, Antiochus, 202 B. C. took possession of Coelosyria, Phenicia and Palestine. During the same year, the Romans had become famous in the East by the victory of Scipio over Hannibal in Africa, and the consequent successful termination of the second Punic war. To these conquerors, with whom Philadelphus had been in alliance, the Egyptians now applied for aid, and offered them the guardianship of the young Ptolemy. The Roman senate accepted the offer with joy, and sent M. Aemilius Lepidus to Alexandria as guardian of the king of Egypt. Lepidus appointed Aristomenes first minister of state. Ambassadors were then sent to Philip and Antiochus, to signify to them that the Romans, having undertaken the guardianship of Ptolemy Epiphanes, would protect his possessions from all encroachment.¹

Notwithstanding this intimation, Antiochus still retained the territories of which he had possessed himself, until the minister Aristomenes, 199 B. C. sent Scopas with an army to Coelosyria.

Antiochus was then engaged in a war with Attalus in Asia Minor, and Scopas with little difficulty brought Palestine, Phenicia and Coelosyria again under the Egyptian yoke. But when the war with Attalus was closed, Antiochus returned with his army to Syria, 189 B. C. defeated Scopas at Paneas near the source of the Jordan, and then laid siege to Zidon, within whose walls his enemy had taken refuge. The garrison offered a vigorous resistance, but famine at length compelled them to surrender, while the Egyptians were making preparations for their relief. Antiochus then subdued Gaza and the other fortified towns; and at Jerusalem the Jews themselves assisted him in expelling the Egyptian garrison from the castle of Zion. That the Egyptians might seek no further aid from Rome, Antiochus promised to give his daughter Cleopatra in marriage to Ptolemy Epiphanes, as soon as the youthful pair should arrive at a suitable age, with the dowre of Coelosyria and Palestine. This stipulation was made in 197 B. C. in the seventh year of the reign of Ptolemy Epiphanes.²

In the same year, the Romans, under the command of Titus Quintus Flaminius and in alliance with the Rhodians and with Attalus king of Pergamus, made war against Philip, king of Macedonia. Antiochus, for the assistance of his ally Philip, sailed with a fleet to Asia Minor, whither his son at the same time led an army by land. In this expedition he seized the Asiatic cities belonging to Ptolemy Epiphanes. Attalus died during this campaign and was succeeded by his son Eumenes, the founder of the library at Pergamus and the inventor of parchment. The death of Attalus had no influence on the events of the war. In the battle of Cyncephalae in Thessaly, Philip was defeated with the loss of thirteen thousand men slain and captured, and was compelled to sue for peace. This the Romans granted the more willingly, as they had reason to dread the growing power of Antiochus.³

Antiochus proceeded steadily in his enterprises and made rapid advances in power. He had already subjugated several cities in Asia Minor, and taken up his winter quarters at Ephesus. Smyrna, Lampsacus and the other Grecian cities, who easily saw through the designs of the ambitious monarch, solicited the protection of the Romans. The Romans, desirous of checking the bold career of Antiochus, lent a willing ear to their supplications. Ambassadors were accordingly sent to the king with the demand, that he

should withdraw, not only from the cities of Asia Minor which he had wrested from Ptolemy Epiphanes, but also from those belonging to Philip, which he had garrisoned ; and that he should set at liberty the Grecian cities which he had subdued ; otherwise the Romans would compel obedience by arms. Before the legation arrived at Ephesus, Antiochus had already commenced the siege of Smyrna and Lampsacus, and with the remainder of his army, crossed the Hellespont, where he took possession of the Thracian Chersonesus, with the intention of forming it into a kingdom for his second son. The Roman ambassadours met him at Selymbria, where he resided while employed in the rebuilding of Lysimachia, which he designed to make the metropolis of his new empire. He replied to them in a manner becoming a great monarch, and when they persisted in their imperious demands, he broke off the conference with the declaration, that he would receive no commands from the Romans.⁴

Meanwhile a rumour was spread abroad that Ptolemy Epiphanes was dead ; and though this was known both to Antiochus and the ambassadours, each party forbore to mention it to the other. The Roman ambassadours hastened to Egypt, and Antiochus set sail with his fleet for the conquest of that kingdom. But when he arrived at Patara in Lycia, he learned that the report of Ptolemy's death was false. He then determined to turn his arms against Cyprus, which was subject to the Egyptian crown ; but his fleet was so shattered by a storm which ensued, that he was obliged to put in for repairs to the harbour of Seleucia on the Orontes. He spent the winter at Antioch.⁵

The report of the death of Ptolemy Epiphanes was occasioned by a conspiracy which had been fomented by Scopas, the commander of the Aetolian mercenaries. He was aided in his plans by the notorious Dicaearchus, who, before he left Macedonia, had erected in that country two altars, one to Impiety and the other to Injustice, and had offered sacrifices upon them to these hopeful goddesses. The disturbances in Egypt were soon suppressed, and as Ptolemy was then fourteen years old, he took the reins of government into his own hands. He retained Aristomenes in his office of prime minister, and the policy of the administration continued the same as before.⁶

The next year, 195 B. C. Antiochus having repaired his fleet,

sailed to Ephesus. There he was met by Hannibal, who had come to seek his protection. To a king engaged in a war with the Romans, this hero was most welcome ; and the Romans themselves had been principally instrumental in sending him thither. For having learned that he had advised Antiochus, in a written correspondence, to carry the war into Italy, they demanded of the Carthaginians that he should be delivered up to them. But Hannibal by a timely flight escaped falling into their hands.⁷

Antiochus now made every preparation for the war with the Romans, and took precautions for the security of his own dominions. With this view, he gave his daughter Cleopatra in marriage to Ptolemy Epiphanes, 193 B. C. in accordance with a former treaty. He indulged the hope that when his daughter became queen of Egypt, she would bring the kingdom under his influence ; but she proved more faithful to her husband than to her father. His second daughter he married to Ariarathes, king of Cappadocia, and offered his third to Eumenes, king of Pergamus, but he, as a friend to the Romans, refused a connexion with their enemy. Antiochus then visited the Thracian Chersonesus, and returned to Ephesus in the winter of 192 B. C. The next spring, his expedition against the Pisidians was interrupted by the death of his younger son. In a consultation which he held respecting the prosecution of the Roman war, Hannibal advised him to march immediately to Italy, where the Romans could be most easily conquered. But the Roman ambassadours, by their frequent and crafty visits to Hannibal, had succeeded in exciting the suspicions of the king against him ; and his judicious counsel was not valued according to its merits. An embassy arriving soon after from the Aetolians, inviting the king into their country, that they, under his direction, might defend themselves against the Romans, he resolved to carry the war into Greece. He accordingly set sail for Aetolia with ten thousand infantry and five thousand cavalry, leaving orders for more men to be enrolled and sent on after him.⁸

In Aetolia he held another consultation respecting his future undertakings, and Hannibal again insisted that the war ought to have been begun in Italy ; but as circumstances then were, he advised that a fleet should be sent to cruise on the Italian coasts and keep the Romans at home, until the remaining troops of Antiochus should arrive, and that he should then pass over into Italy with all

his forces. But Antiochus, out of pride and jealousy lest he should be obliged to share with Hannibal the glory of success, refused to adopt his judicious plan. He however sent orders to hasten the arrival of his remaining forces, but they were detained by contrary winds till it was too late.⁹

The rejecting of the counsels of Hannibal, who was so well acquainted with the Romans, would of itself have been sufficient to ruin the fortunes of Antiochus. But this monarch was no longer the active and prudent man he had formerly been. He took up his winter quarters at Chalcis, a city in the island of Euboea, 191 B. C. and there married Eubia, a young lady of great beauty, the daughter of his host Cleoptolemus. He celebrated his nuptials with great festivity and continued his amusements for a long time after, mindful only of his pleasure and totally inattentive to business. The example of the king corrupted the officers and the common soldiers. They sunk into voluptuousness, their duties were neglected and all discipline was destroyed; while the Romans were taking every precaution and making every preparation for a vigorous prosecution of the war.¹⁰

Antiochus had strongly intrenched himself at the pass of Thermopylae; but he was defeated by the Romans with the loss of ten thousand men, slain and taken prisoners. He fled with only five hundred horsemen, whom he hastily collected, first to Elateia, and then to Chalais, whence he set sail for Ephesus.¹¹

Here he was again wasting his time with his youthful bride, till, by the urgent representations of Hannibal, he was made sensible of his danger and aroused from his lethargy. He gave orders for the raising of troops, and sailed in person to the Thracian Chersonesus, where he fortified Sestus, Abydos and other places; and after having reinforced the garrison of Lysimachia, he returned to Ephesus. His admiral Polyxenidas was soon after defeated in a naval engagement near Corycus in Ionia, with the loss of twenty three ships.¹²

Antiochus, who meanwhile had collected an army at Magnesia, as soon as he heard of this disastrous battle, hastened back to Ephesus, where the remnant of his fleet had taken shelter. During the winter, he made every exertion to repair his losses and regain his strength.¹³

The next year 190 B. C. Philoxenidas by a stratagem surprised

the fleet of the Rhodians, which was sailing to aid the Romans, and destroyed or captured all but seven of their vessels. The Rhodians, exasperated by this loss, fitted out a still larger fleet, by which they raised the siege of Pergamus, repulsed Hannibal who was conducting the Phenician shipping to the assistance of Antiochus, and kept him blockaded with his fleet in a harbour of Pamphylia.¹⁴

As the naval forces of the Romans were now collected and in readiness to transport the army from Macedonia to Asia, Antiochus sent an embassy to Aemilius to propose peace. Aemilius replied, that no negotiations could be entered into before the arrival of the consul Lucius Scipio. Antiochus then ventured upon another naval battle near Myonesus in Ionia, and was again defeated.¹⁵

Antiochus now lost all presence of mind, and instead of fortifying the passes which led into his territories, he withdrew his garrisons from all the cities on the Hellespont, and in his precipitant flight, left all his military stores behind him. In this manner he not only removed every thing which could obstruct the landing of the Romans, but by leaving his magazines untouched, afforded a most important aid to their enterprise. He renewed his attempts to enter into negotiations for peace, but when he was required to relinquish all his possessions west of the Taurus and defray the expenses of the war, he resolved to try his fortune once more in a battle by land.¹⁶

Antiochus brought into the field seventy thousand infantry, twelve thousand cavalry and a great number of camels, elephants, and chariots armed with scythes. To these the Romans could oppose but thirty thousand men, and yet they gained a decisive victory. The chariot horses in the army of Antiochus, being terrified and rushing upon his own men, contributed not a little to his defeat. The Romans lost only three hundred and twenty five men; while of the forces of Antiochus, fifty thousand infantry, four thousand cavalry and fifteen elephants, were left dead on the field, fifteen hundred men were made prisoners, and the king himself with great difficulty made his escape to Sardis. Perhaps Antiochus would have succeeded better, could he have had the presence of Hannibal in the battle; but that hero was still held blockaded in Pamphylia by the Rhodians.¹⁷

Antiochus, by his ambassadours, now humbly sued for peace,

and gladly accepted it on the same terms with which he had formerly refused compliance. He relinquished all his possessions west of the Taurus. The Romans gave the Greek cities their freedom, but delivered Caria and Lycia to the Rhodians, and the other provinces to Eumenes, as a reward for the services they had rendered during the war. The expenses of the war, amounting to fifteen thousand talents, Antiochus agreed to pay in Euboean (the heaviest) weight and in Attic (the finest) silver; five hundred talents were to be paid as soon as the negotiations were closed, two thousand five hundred more, at the ratification of the treaty, and the remaining twelve thousand, during the twelve following years at the rate of one thousand talents a year. He was also to deliver four hundred talents to Eumenes, and to make him compensation for all the corn for which he was indebted to Attalus, the father of Eumenes. He further obligated himself to keep no elephants and not more than twelve ships. To secure the performance of these conditions, the Romans required him to deliver up to them twelve hostages of their own selection, among whom was his son Antiochus, afterwards surnamed Epiphanes. Antiochus was further required to deliver into the hands of the Romans his most able generals, Hannibal, Thoas of Aetolia, Mnasimachus of Acarnania, Philo of Chalcis, and Eubulides. But they had prudently made their escape at the commencement of the negotiations.¹⁸

By this expensive war and by the large sums Antiochus was obliged to pay to the Romans, his treasury was completely drained. He, therefore, in the year 187 B. C. went into his eastern provinces for the purpose of replenishing his coffers. But by attempting to plunder the temple of Elymais, he provoked the people to an insurrection, in which he was slain together with the soldiers who attended him. Thus perished Antiochus the Great. Until the fiftieth year of his age he maintained the character of a just and judicious ruler, but he rapidly degenerated after his marriage with the young Eubia. He was succeeded by his son Seleucus Philopator, to whom he had committed the government on his departure for the eastern provinces.¹⁹

¹ Polybius, XV. 20. Appian, Syriac. I. 1. Livy, XXXI. 14. XXXIII. 19. Justin, XXX. 2. 3. XXXI. 1. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. compare Dan. 11: 13, 14. Valerius Maximus, VI. 6. ² Dan. 11: 15—17. and Jerome, Comment. in loc. Polyb. Legat. § 72. Excerpta Valesii ex Polyb. de Virtut.

et Vitii, XVI. Justin, XXXI. 1. Livy, XXX. 1.. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 2: 3. 3 Dan 11: 18. Livy, XXXIII. 7—13. 19. 25. 30. 34. Plutarch, Flaminii III. —IX. Pliny, XIII. 11. Polyb. Legat. §§ 6. 7. 25. Valesii Excerpta ex Polyb. de Virtut. et Vitii, XXXI. 4 Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. Livy, XXXIII. 38—40. Appian, Syriac. I. 15—II. 50. III. 60—70. Polybius, XVII. 31. 32. Legat. § 10. 5 Appian, Syriac. V. 70—90. Livy, XXXIII. 41. 6 Polybius, XVII. 34—36. 7 Corn. Nepos, Hannibal VII. Appian, Syriac. V. 75—90. Livy, XXXIII. 47—49. 8 Dan. 11: 17. and Jerome, Comment. in loc. Livy, XXXV. 13. 19. 23. 43. XXXVII. 53. Appian, Syriac. V. 90—100. VII. 15—XI. 20. XII. 35—XIII. 80. Polybius, III. 7. 11. Legat. § 25. Justin, XXX. 4—6. XXXI. 3. 4. XXXII. 1. 9 Dan. 11: 18. Livy, XXXVI. 7. 8. Appian, Syriac. XIII. 80—XIV. 10. 10 Diodor. Sic. Fragmenta XXVI. 39. Plutarch, Flaminii XV. XVI. Philopoemen XVII. Cato the Elder XII. Livy, XXXVI. 11. Appian, Syriac. XV. 15—XVI. 70. Athenaeus, X. 12. 11 Diodor. Sic. XXVI. 41. Appian, Syriac. XVII. 75—XX. 70. Livy, XXXVI. 15. 16. 21. 12 Dan. 11: 18. Livy, XXXVI. 41—45. Plutarch, Cato the Elder XIII. XIV. Appian, Syriac. XXI. 75—95. XXII. 1—35. Athenaeus, X. 12. 13 Livy XXXVII. 8. Appian, Syriac. XXII. 5—35. 14 Livy, XXXVII. 8—12. 18. 23. 24. Appian, Syriac. XXIV. 65—95. Corn. Nepos, Hannibal VIII. Polybius, Legat. § 22. 15 Livy, XXVII. 19. 29. 30. Appian, Syriac. XXVII. 50—75. 16 Diodor. Sic. Fragmenta XXVI. 43. Livy, XXXVII. 31. 33—36. Appian, Syriac. XXVIII. 80—105. XXI. 10—45. Justin, XXX. 7. 17 Dan. 11: 18, 19. Livy, XXXVII. 39—45. Polybius, Legat. §§ 22. 23. Appian, Syriac. XXX. 50—XXXVII. 65. Justin, XXXI. 8. 18 Dan. 11: 19 and Jerome, Comment. in loc. Livy, XXXVII. 45. XXXVIII. 38. Appian, Syriac. XXXVIII. 70.—XXXIX. 24. Diodor. Sic. Fragmenta XXVII. 46. 19 Dan. 11. 20. and Jerome, Comment. in loc. Diodor. Sic. Fragmenta XXVI. 30. 49. Justin, XXXII. 2. Strabo, p. 744.

XC. THE JEWS 221—187 B. C.

According to the testimony of Josephus, the inhabitants of Judea and Coelosyria suffered severely in the wars of Antiochus the Great with the kings of Egypt; with Ptolemy Philopator between the years 219 and 216 B. C. and with Ptolemy Epiphanes between 202 and 197 B. C. Their country was devastated, and to whichever side victory might incline, they were equally exposed to injury. The same historian relates that, at the time when Antiochus gave his daughter Cleopatra in marriage to Ptolemy Epiphanes, (197 B. C.) the Samaritans laid waste the lands of the Jews, seized the persons of some of them by fraud, and sold them into slavery. Deducting the seven or eight years of these two wars, it appears that

during the remaining twenty six or twenty seven years of this period, Judea was free from commotion.¹

In the year 217 B. C. Simon II. succeeded Onias II. in the high priesthood. After the victory which Ptolemy Philopator gained over Antiochus the Great in 211 B. C. all the cities of that region sent ambassadors to Raphia to renew their homage to the Egyptian monarch. The Jews were not wanting in zeal on this occasion, and therefore Philopator visited Jerusalem as well as the other cities, offered sacrifices according to the Jewish law, and gave rich gifts to the temple. But when he ventured to violate the sanctuary, and attempted, notwithstanding the earnest expostulations of the high priest, to enter the holy of holies, it is said that he was suddenly seized with a supernatural terror and hastily rushed out of the temple; and that, when he returned to Egypt, he vented his rage on the Jews of Alexandria. This story, however, is of doubtful authority, for it is mentioned by no writer except the author of the third Book of Maccabees. The event which Josephus relates (against Apion, II. 5.) of a somewhat similar character, belongs to the times of Ptolemy Physcon. The story might have originated in the circumstances which are related in the Chronicle of Eusebius, p. 185. It is worthy of remark in this place, that when the Egyptians rebelled against Philopator in the year 213 B. C. forty thousand Jews were massacred, who, in all probability, had taken part in the rebellion.²

In the last wars of Antiochus the Great with Ptolemy Epiphanes, the inhabitants of these countries, and especially the Jews, appear to have suffered far more from the Egyptian than from the Syrian armies. Probably Scopas, the Egyptian commander, who, according to the testimony of Polybius, was excessively avaricious, had in the former wars been guilty of oppression, and now to cover his own extortions, permitted his soldiers to plunder the inhabitants without restraint. The Jews also might still remember with indignation, that their sanctuary had been violated by Ptolemy Philopator. Be this as it may, it is certain that in the last war of Ptolemy Epiphanes, the Jews favoured the cause of Antiochus the Great. After his victory over Scopas at Paneas, and after his conquest of Abila, Batanaea, Gadara and Samaria, they voluntarily tendered him their submission, supplied his army with provisions and assisted him in expelling the Egyptian garrison from the cas-

tle of Zion. This conduct of the Jews towards their old masters, the Egyptian monarchs, under whom they had lived for more than a century, and from whom they had received many favours, is mentioned by Josephus with approbation; but Daniel in his prophecy brands it as the conduct of robbers and traitors.³

Antiochus liberally rewarded the Jews for their attachment to his cause. He was under great obligations to them, for in his oriental expeditions, those of that nation who were scattered in the East, had proved themselves very faithful and serviceable to him. Josephus introduces the two following edicts of Antiochus in favour of the Jews, the one directed to his governour Ptolemy, the other addressed to his subjects throughout his dominions.

They are thus translated by Whiston :

“ King Antiochus to Ptolemy sendeth greeting.

“ Since the Jews, upon our first entrance on their country, demonstrated their friendship towards us; and when we came to their city (Jerusalem) received us in a splendid manner, and came to meet us with their senate, and gave abundance of provisions to our soldiers, and to the elephants, and joined with us in ejecting the garrison of the Egyptians that was in the citadel, we have thought fit to reward them, and to retrieve the condition of their city, which hath been greatly depopulated by such accidents as have befallen its inhabitants, and to bring those, that have been scattered abroad back to the city. And in the first place, we have determined on account of their piety towards God to bestow on them, as a pension, for their sacrifices of animals that are fit for sacrifice, for wine and oil and frankincense, the value of twenty thousand pieces of silver, and six sacred artabrae of fine flour, and fourteen hundred and sixty medimni of wheat, and three hundred and seventy five medjmi of salt. And these payments I would have fully paid them as I have sent orders to you. I would also have the work about the temple finished, and the cloisters, and if there be any thing that ought to be rebuilt. And for the materials of wood, let it be brought them out of Judea itself and out of the other countries, and out of Libanus, tax-free; and the same I would have observed as to those other materials which will be necessary, in order to render the temple more glorious. And let all of that nation live according to the laws of their own country: and let the senate, and the priests, and the scribes of the temple, and the

sacred singers, be discharged from the poll-money and the crown-tax and the other taxes also. And that the city may the sooner recover its inhabitants, I grant a discharge from taxes for three years to its present inhabitants and such as shall come to it until the month Hyperberetus. We also discharge them for the future from a third part of their taxes, that the losses they have sustained may be repaired. And all those citizens that have been carried away and are become slaves, we grant them and their children their freedom, and give order that their substance be restored to them."

'He also published a decree through all his kingdom in honour of the temple, which contained what follows:'

"It shall be lawful for no foreigner to come within the limits of the temple round about, which thing is forbidden also to the Jews, unless to those who according to their own custom have purified themselves. Nor let any flesh of horses or of mules or of asses be brought into the city, whether they be wild or tame; nor that of leopards or foxes or hares; and in general, that of any animal which is forbidden for the Jews to eat. Nor let their skins be brought into it, nor let any such animal be bred up in the city. Let them only be permitted to use the sacrifices derived from their forefathers, with which they have been obliged to make acceptable atonements to God. And he that transgresseth any of these orders, let him pay to the priests three thousand drachmae of silver."

Antiochus had such confidence in the Jews, that when he heard of the revolts which had broken out in Lydia and Phrygia, he wrote to his general Zeuxis to transport at the royal expense two thousand Jewish families from Babylonia and Mesopotamia, and place them in the fortified towns, where lands were to be assigned them with freedom from taxation for ten years. This was done that the country might be made secure by the fidelity of the new inhabitants.⁵

The high priest Simon II. held his office from 217 to 195 B. C. At his death he was succeeded by his son Onias III. a worthy man who lived in times of great commotion.⁶

About the year 187 B. C. Joseph, the farmer of the revenues, sent his son Hyrcanus to the court of Ptolemy Epiphanes to congratulate him on the birth of a son. It is not to our purpose to pursue the history of Hyrcanus, but it may be found circumstantially detailed in Josephus. From the fact that Joseph sent Hyr-

canus to Egypt on this occasion, it appears that after the marriage of Cleopatra with Ptolemy Epiphanes, or at least after the death of Antiochus, the Jews had again come under the dominion of Egypt, and were well treated.⁷

¹ Josephus, *Antiq. XII.* 3: 2. 4: 1. ² Haggai 2: 7, 8. Alexand. Chron. Eusebius, Chron. Josephus, *Antiq. XII.* 4: 10. 3 Macc. i. ii. ³ Polybius, *XVII.* 36. Josephus, *Antiq. XII.* 1: 3. Dan. 11: 14. ⁴ Josephus, *Antiq. XII.* 3: 3. ⁵ Josephus, *Antiq. XII.* 3: 3. ⁶ Josephus, *Antiq. XII.* 4: 10. Alexand. Chron. Eusebius, Chron. ⁷ Josephus, *Antiq. XII.* 4: 7—10.

XCI. SELEUCUS PHILOPATOR 186—175 B. C.

After the violent death of Antiochus the Great at Elymais in the year 187 B. C. his son Seleucus Philopator ascended the throne of Syria. We know nothing of his reign excepting what is contained in Appian, for Justin passes him over in silence, and the history of Polybius, relating to this period, is lost.¹

About the time that Seleucus came to the throne, Ptolemy Epiphanes, that his dissipations might no longer be interrupted by the admonitions of Aristomenes, destroyed that faithful and judicious minister by poison. He now became an unrestrained and shameless tyrant. The nobles, therefore, in the year 185 B. C. entered into a combination to depose him, but the conspiracy was detected and suppressed. Ptolemy, so far from learning a lesson of moderation from the danger to which he had been exposed, became still more furious, and vented his rage upon those conspirators who had surrendered themselves to him on his promise of pardon. A new insurrection broke out, but was suppressed by the minister Polycrates. Four of the principal insurgents, to whom Ptolemy when they gave themselves up, had solemnly pledged himself to show favour, he caused to be bound naked to his chariot, and after having dragged them about in this manner, ordered them to be executed. At length, in the year 180 B. C. his discontented subjects relieved themselves of their hated king by administering to him poison in the twenty fourth year of his reign, while he was busily engaged in making preparations for a war against his brother-in-law Seleucus. His son and successor, Ptolemy Philometor, was then but six years old; and was placed under the guardianship of his mother Cleopatra, the sister of Seleucus Philopator.²

From the preparations for a war against Syria, which Ptolemy Epiphanes began to make before his death, it would seem that Seleucus Philopator, taking advantage of the disturbances in Egypt, had reunited to the Syrian crown the provinces of Coelosyria and Palestine, which Antiochus the Great had given (with the reservation of half the revenues) in dowre to his daughter Cleopatra. At least, in the history of the succeeding period, we find Palestine actually under the dominion of the Syrian king, though no mention is made of any other war.

In the year 176 B. C. Simon, a Benjamite, who became governour of the temple at Jerusalem after the death of Joseph, the farmer of the revenues under the Egyptian kings, attempted to introduce some innovations, which were steadily resisted by the high priest Onias III. Simon, in anger because his designs were thwarted, went to Apollonius, the governour of Coelosyria under Seleucus Philopator, and informed him of the great treasures which were preserved in the temple. Apollonius sent word to Seleucus of what he had learned from Simon. The king, though a friend to the Jews, and though he had regularly made disbursements according to the directions of his father towards sustaining the expenses of the sacrifices at Jerusalem, determined to apply to his own use the treasures of the temple; for the annual payment of one thousand talents to the Romans had reduced his finances to a very low ebb. With the design therefore of replenishing his exhausted treasury, he sent Heliodorus to Jerusalem to plunder the temple. But his sacrilegious attempt is said to have been frustrated by a most striking miracle, to which perhaps Polybius has reference in the following words quoted by Josephus: "concerning which, (the temple of Jerusalem,) although I have more to say, and particularly concerning *the presence of God about that temple*, yet do I put off that history to another opportunity." If Polybius ever executed the design here intimated, time has destroyed this part, as well as many others, of his accurate and authentic history. The attempt of Heliodorus seems to be referred to in Daniel 11: 20.³

Seleucus Philopator, in the eleventh year of his reign, sent his only son Demetrius as a hostage to Rome, and released his brother Antiochus who had resided twelve years in that city. As the heir to the crown was now out of the way, Heliodorus sought to raise himself to the regal dignity, and for this purpose he destroyed

the king by poison. He attached a large party to his interests, and finally gained over those who were in favour of submitting to the king of Egypt, whose mother Cleopatra was the daughter of Antiochus the Great and sister of Seleucus Philopator. Antiochus Epiphanes received notice of these transactions while he was at Athens, on his return from Rome. He applied himself to Eumenes, king of Pergamus, whom, with his brother Attalus, he easily induced to espouse his cause; and they, with the help of a part of the Syrians, deprived Heliodorus of his usurped authority. Thus in the year 175 B. C. and 136 of the era of the Seleucidae, Antiochus Epiphanes quietly ascended the throne, while the lawful heir, Demetrius, the son of Seleucus Philopator, was absent at Rome.⁴

¹ Appian, Syriac. *XLV.* 60—65. ² Diodor. Sic. *Fragm. XXVI.* 35. *Excerpta Valesii ex Polyb. XX.* Jerome, *Comment. in Dan. XI.* ³ *2 Macc. 3: 4—40.* Josephus, *Antiq. XII.* 3: 3. and concerning the Maccabees, *IV.* ⁴ *Dan. 11: 21* and Jerome, *Comment. in loc. 1 Macc. 1: 10.* Appian, Syriac. *XLV.* 60—70.

NOTE. Under the reign of Seleucus Philopator, Josephus (*Antiq. XII. 4: 10.*) places the letter of Arius or Darius or Onairus, king of the Spartans, to Onias III. high priest of the Jews. This letter, together with a reply to it, is preserved in *1 Macc. 12: 5—23.* This unknown king is said to have found it written in a book, that the Spartans were the descendants of Abraham, and consequently the brethren of the Jews. This is altogether in the taste of those times, when all nations were curious to ascertain their origin and their relationship to other nations, but among the kings of Sparta, history preserves none of the name of Arius or Darius or Onairus, and the reply of the Jews is not such as we should expect it would have been, if intended for the Spartans. It is, therefore, highly probable that the true name of the people referred to, was corrupted by some early transcriber, and is now unknown. Michaelis in *Anmerkungen zu dem Ersten Buch der Makk. 12: 5. S. 263 ff.* conjectures that the true reading is *Σπαρδιᾶται, Spardians*, and that the country *רְסַרְדָּיָה, Sepharad*, (*Obadiah 20.*) is meant, the situation of which is now unknown. Jerome supposes that *רְסַרְדָּיָה* is the Bosphorus or Crimean Tartary, where it is very probable that there might have been in those times a petty king over a colony of Hebrew exiles.

CHAPTER TENTH.

ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES AND THE MACCABEES TO THE INDEPENDENCE OF
THE JEWS.

XCII. ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES.

By such means as have already been mentioned, Antiochus gained possession of the crown which of right belonged to his nephew Demetrius. He was surnamed *'Επιφανής*, (*the Illustrious*,) because (if we may credit the conjecture of Appian) he vindicated the claims of the royal family against the usurpations of the foreigner Heliodorus. He also bore the surname of *Θεός*, which is still seen upon his coins. But as he is represented by historians, he well merited the surname of *'Επιμανής*, (*the Insane*,) which his subjects gave him instead of *'Επιφανής*.¹

He often lounged like a mere idler about the streets of Antioch, attended by two or three servants, and not deigning to look at the nobles, would talk with goldsmiths and other mechanics in their workshops, engage in trifling and idle conversation with the lowest of the people, and mingle in the society of foreigners and men of the vilest character. He was not ashamed to go into the dissipated circles of the young, to drink and carouse with them, and to assist their merriment by singing songs and playing on his flute. He often appeared in the public baths among the common people, engaging in every kind of foolish jest without the least regard to the dignity of his station and character. Not unfrequently he was seen drunk in the streets, when he would throw his money about and practise various other fooleries equally extravagant.

Sometimes he exhibited still more decisive tokens of madness. He would parade the streets of his capital in a long robe and with a garland of roses upon his head, and if any attempted to pass by or to follow him, he would pelt them with stones which he carried

concealed under his garments. When the humour pleased him, he would array himself in a white robe like the candidates at Rome, and in this dress go about Antioch, salute the citizens whom he met, take them by the hand, embrace them and supplicate their suffrages for some Roman office, of which they probably had never before heard even the name. When he had thus obtained a sufficient number of votes to constitute him a tribune or an edile, he would with great solemnity seat himself in an ivory chair in the market place, after the manner of the Romans, listen with deep attention to the most trifling disputes, and pronounce judgement upon them with all the gravity of a Roman magistrate. At other times he publicly appeared in familiar intercourse with panders and common prostitutes.

His liberality was profusion without bounds and often ridiculous. He sometimes presented great sums of money to cities; and often he would give gold to any person whom he chanced to meet, though an entire stranger, and to another he would make a present of a few dates or some such trifle. He outdid all his predecessors in the splendour of the games which he celebrated at Daphne in honour of Jupiter Olympus; but his conduct was so ridiculous that the foreigners who were present, thought him insane. Yet he was so strict as to exclude all females from the exhibition.¹ He paid little regard to the other gods, but for Jupiter Olympus he built a magnificent temple, made offerings to him at an unparalleled expense, and attempted to compel all his subjects, and the Jews among the rest, to worship him. But without referring to this persecution of the Jewish religion, the other parts of his conduct are amply sufficient to justify the appellation נְבִיָּה, (*vile, contemptible,*) which Daniel gives him.²

¹ Appian, Syriac. XLV. 70—75. Fröhlich, Annal. Syr. Tab. VI. VII. Polybius as quoted by Athenaeus. V. p. 193. X. p. 438. Livy, XLi. 20. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXVI. 65. XXXI. 7. 8. ² Dan. 11: 37. ³ Dan. 11: 21. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi.

XCIII. ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES 175—171 B. C.

The Jews, having been so long under the dominion of Grecian monarchs, had now become familiar with the customs, the literature, and the sciences of Greece. They had acquired a taste for them; many preferred the Greek manners to their own, and even the idol-

atrous Greek religion, to the rational worship of one true God. Of this class was Jesus, a brother of the high priest, Onias III. He assumed the Greek name Jason, and had solicited the high priesthood of Antiochus Epiphanes at the commencement of his reign. He promised the king three hundred and sixty talents in addition to the tribute paid by his brother, (making three thousand, six hundred talents in all,) eighty talents more from another revenue; and he offered the sum of one hundred and fifty talents for the right of establishing a Greek gymnasium at Jerusalem, and for full power of conferring on the Jews the citizenship of Antioch, which was much sought after, on account of the privileges connected with it. Antiochus, without hesitation, granted a request which was so agreeable to his own feelings. His treasury was exhausted by the tribute which the Romans had exacted of his father, and his own prodigality rendered him necessitous. Thus Jason squandered immense sums for the purpose of depriving his countrymen of the privilege of living according to their own laws; a privilege for which they had made the greatest sacrifices, and which they had but just obtained of Seleucus Philopator by the aid of Eupolemus.¹

Jason soon came to Jerusalem in the capacity of high priest; and his brother, the pious priest Onias, was recalled to Antioch by order of the king, there to remain in exile, that he might offer no resistance to the contemplated innovations. The partiality of many of the nation for Greek customs, and the hope of obtaining the citizenship of Antioch, attracted great numbers to the party of Jason. His gymnasium was so much frequented, that even the priests neglected the services of the temple to engage in athletic exercises; and many Jews, by a painful process, obliterated the mark of circumcision, that when they contended naked in their games, they might appear in all respects like the Greeks. Josephus relates the transactions of these times in an obscure and inaccurate manner; and as he had no other sources of information than what we possess in the Books of Maccabees, we shall in the sequel adhere to these authorities, without always referring to the negligences and mistakes of the Jewish historian.²

The only apparent purpose of these athletic exercises was the strengthening of the body, but the real design went to the gradual changing of Judaism for heathenism, as was clearly indicated by the pains which many took to efface the mark of circumcision.

The games, besides, were closely connected with idolatry, for they were generally celebrated in honour of some pagan god. The innovations of Jason were, therefore, extremely odious to the more pious part of the nation, and even his own adherents did not enter fully into all his views. In the following year, 174 B. C. games were celebrated in the presence of Antiochus Epiphanes, at Tyre in honour of Hercules, and Jason sent thither some Jews of his own party, on whom he had conferred the citizenship of Antioch, with three hundred talents, (or rather, according to the Arundelian Manuscript, three thousand three hundred,) as an offering to the god. But the deputies had still too much sense of religion remaining to obey their instructions, and they devoted the money to the building of ships of war.³

In the following year, 173 B. C. Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, died. She was the sister of Antiochus Epiphanes, and guardian of the young king, Ptolemy Philometor; and the government of Egypt now devolved on Eulaeus, the eunuch, and Lennaeus, the prime minister, the tutors of the prince. They immediately demanded of Antiochus the possession of Coelosyria and Palestine; because these provinces had been secured to Ptolemy Lagus by the treaty of 301 B. C. and they had again been given by Antiochus the Great, in dowre, to his daughter Cleopatra, when she became queen of Egypt. Antiochus Epiphanes refused to listen to their demands. Both parties then sent ambassadours to Rome, to urge their respective claims to these provinces before the Roman senate.⁴

As soon as Ptolemy Philometor had reached his fourteenth year, he was solemnly invested with the government; and ambassadours came from all the surrounding nations to congratulate him on his accession to the throne. On this occasion Antiochus sent to Egypt Apollonius, the son of Mnestheus, apparently to congratulate the king on his coronation, but with the real purpose of sounding the dispositions of the Egyptian court. When Apollonius, on his return, informed Antiochus that he was viewed as an enemy by the Egyptians, he immediately sailed to Joppa to survey his frontiers towards Egypt and to put them in a state of defence. At this time he visited Jerusalem, when the city was illuminated, and he was received by Jason and the assembled people with every possible demonstration of honour. He then returned to Antioch by the way of Phenicia.⁵

Jason had now laboured for three years to destroy the Jewish constitution and religion ; and in 172 B. C. he commissioned his younger brother Onias, (who had adopted the Greek name Menelaus,) to carry the tribute to Antioch and transact other business with the king. But Menelaus, instead of attending to the business of Jason, embraced this opportunity to promote his own interests ; and by promising the king three hundred talents more of tribute, he obtained a nomination to the high priesthood. When he came to Jerusalem with this appointment, several joined his party, and, among the rest, the powerful sons of Tobias. But being unable to expel Jason, he was obliged to return to Antioch. Then he and his adherents solemnly abjured the Jewish religion before the king, and bound themselves expressly to bring the whole nation to take the same step, and to introduce the Greek religion. Antiochus then provided him with a competent force, which Jason was unable to resist, and he fled to the Ammonites.⁶

Menelaus had promised a larger tribute than his brother, but as yet he had paid nothing. After he had been frequently and in vain reminded of his neglect by Sostratus, the commander of the castle at Jerusalem, who had the charge of collecting the tribute, they were both summoned to appear at Antioch. At their arrival, Antiochus was in Cilicia to quell some disturbances that had arisen there ; and Menelaus gained time to order Lysimachus, whom he had left at Jerusalem as his deputy, to take some costly vessels out of the temple and expose them for sale at Tyre. By this means he obtained money enough to discharge his debt and to make large presents to Andronicus, to whom Antiochus had intrusted the administration of affairs during his absence. But Lysimachus, Andronicus, and Onias III. all lost their lives in consequence of this profanation of the temple. For the sacrilege and extortions of Lysimachus excited an insurrection at Jerusalem, and though he had three thousand armed men under his command, he was slain by the people in the treasury of the temple. Onias III. who dwelt at Antioch as an exile, and was universally beloved on account of his virtues, severely reprov'd his degenerate brother Menelaus, for the crime of robbing the temple, and then made his escape to the sanctuary at Daphne. At the instigation of Menelaus, Andronicus allured Onias from his place of refuge and treacherously murdered him. Antiochus on his return was so enraged at the crime, that he ordered Andronicus to be executed.⁷

¹ 1 Macc. 1: 11—14. 2 Macc. 4: 7—10. Josephus, Concerning the Maccabees, IV. compare Zech. 10: 2. 11: 3. ² 1 Macc. 1: 15. 2 Macc. 4: 11—17. Josephus, Concerning the Maccabees, IV. and Antiquities, XII. 5: 1. ³ 2 Macc. 4: 18—20. ⁴ Polybius, Legat. §§ 78. 82. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. 11: 21. ⁵ Polybius, Legat. § 72. 2 Macc. 4: 21, 22. ⁶ 2 Macc. : 23—25. Josephus, Antiquities, XII. 5: 1. compare Zech. 10: 2. 11: 3. ⁷ 2 Macc. 4: 27—42.

NOTE. According to the Alexandrian Chronicle, Onias III. was high priest twenty four years, reckoning to the time of his death. This confirms the statement which we made from Eusebius, (Sect. 83. of this work,) respecting the time of Simon the Just, for the death of Onias III. cannot be placed lower without contradicting the testimony of the Books of Maccabees and of Josephus. See Prideaux, Connexions, Vol. II. p. 146.

XCIV. CAMPAIGNS OF ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES IN EGYPT 171—167 B. C.

Meanwhile Antiochus Epiphanes made preparations for a war with Egypt. Ptolemy Philometor and his two ministers he viewed with contempt; but to the Romans, the allies or protectors of the young king, he sent an embassy to justify the hostilities he was about to commence. In the year 170 B. C. and 141 or (according to the first Book of Maccabees) 142 of the era of the Seleucidae, he led his army along the coast through Palestine and Arabia Petraea, and defeated the Egyptians between mount Casius and the city Pelusium. He then left garrisons on the frontiers and went into winter quarters at Tyre.¹

Here three deputies came to the king from the sanhedrim at Jerusalem, and made complaint against Menelaus on account of the sacrilege and the other crimes he had committed by the agency of Lysimachus. After a full investigation of the cause, there was no doubt remaining of the guilt of Menelaus; but yet he was acquitted and the three innocent accusers were put to death. This turn in his own favour Menelaus effected by the aid of Ptolemy Macro, who possessed unbounded influence with Antiochus on account of his having treacherously delivered up to him the island of Cyprus, when he held it as governour under the king of Egypt. But the execution of the innocent deputies was so odious in the eyes of the Tyrians, that they gave their dead bodies an honourable burial at their

own expense.² During the winter the prodigies are said to have occurred, which are related in 2 Macc. 5: 2, 3.

In the spring of 169 B. C. 142 or 143 of the Greek era, Antiochus undertook a second expedition against the Egyptians, and attacked them by sea and land. He defeated the Egyptian army on the frontiers, and took Pelusium. Diodorus Siculus and Josephus say that Antiochus, on this occasion, availed himself of a mean artifice, without specifying what it was. Possibly they may refer to the pretence that he came as the friend of Ptolemy. (Dan. 11: 23.) of which we shall say more hereafter. Antiochus, after this victory, might have cut the Egyptian army in pieces, but he rode round among his soldiers and restrained their fury, and by this act of humanity, gained great favour with the Egyptians. All now surrendered to him voluntarily, and with a small body of troops he made himself master of Memphis and of all Egypt as far as Alexandria, almost without striking a blow.³

While Antiochus was advancing into the heart of Egypt, king Ptolemy Philometor fell into his hands. He probably surrendered voluntarily, for, at that time at least, he was far from having the character of a hero; and the probability is rendered greater by the fact, that Antiochus admitted him to his table, and in all respects treated him, not as a prisoner, but as a king and a relative. Antiochus pretended that he had come to Egypt solely for the good of king Ptolemy, to set the affairs of his kingdom in order for him; and Ptolemy found it expedient to conduct as though he really thought him his friend. But he must have seen that Antiochus, with all his professions of friendship, was not unmindful of spoil, for he plundered Egypt in every quarter.⁴

While these two kings were endeavouring to deceive each other under the mask of friendship, a report was spread abroad in Palestine, that Antiochus Epiphanes was dead. Upon this, Jason came with one thousand men of the Ammonites, took possession of Jerusalem, and massacred great numbers of those who had opposed him; while Menelaus secured himself in the castle of Zion. The first accounts of these disturbances which Antiochus received in Egypt, were very much exaggerated. It was said that all the Jews were in rebellion, and rejoicing at his supposed death. He therefore returned hastily from Egypt and took Jerusalem by storm,

according to the united testimony of Diodorus Siculus, the author of the second Book of Maccabees and Josephus: Josephus indeed says, (*Antiquities*, XII. 5: 3.) that the city was taken by stratagem, and thus contradicts what he has stated in his history of the Jewish War, I. 1: 1, 2. and VI. 10: 1. But that Jerusalem was taken by force is most probable, for Antiochus plundered the city, slew eighty thousand persons, men, women, and children, took forty thousand prisoners, and sold as many into slavery. As if this were not enough, under the guidance of the high priest Menelaus, he went into the sanctuary, uttering blasphemous language, took away all the gold and silver that he could find there, the golden table, altar and candlestick, and all the gold vessels; and that he might leave nothing behind, he searched the subterranean vaults, and in this manner collected eighteen hundred talents of gold, which he carried away. He then sacrificed swine upon the altar, boiled a piece of the flesh, and sprinkled the whole temple with the broth. He appointed Philip, a Phrygian, governour of Judea, Andronicus and Menelaus, governours of Samaria, and confirmed Menelaus in the high priesthood. Before Antiochus arrived in Judea, Jason had fled to Ammonitis, to seek the protection of Aretas, a prince or king of the Arabians. Not feeling secure with him, he next escaped to Egypt, and at last, to the Lacedemonians.⁵

As Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt, was now in the power of Antiochus Epiphanes, king of Syria, the Alexandrians raised to the throne his brother, Ptolemy Physcon, (*the Gross*,) who assumed the name of Euergetes II. This furnished Antiochus with a pretext for invading Egypt a third time, 168 B. C. 143 or 144 of the Greek era. His pretended object was to support Ptolemy Philometor against the usurpation of his brother, but it was his real purpose to subject the whole country to his own power. He defeated the Alexandrians by sea near Pelusium, and he then drew up his land forces before the city of Alexandria. Ptolemy Physcon sent an embassy to Rome to solicit the protection of the senate, and at the same time, entered into negotiations for peace with Antiochus, in which he was assisted by the ambassadours from some of the small states of Greece, who were then at the Egyptian court. But Antiochus rejected their proposals, and a second attempt to pacify him, by the aid of the Rhodian ambassadours, was equally unsuccessful. But when Antiochus perceived that the conquest of

Alexandria would be no easy achievement, he retired to Memphis, and pretended to deliver up the kingdom to king Philometor; but he retained Pelusium, the key of the country, and leaving there a strong garrison, returned to Antioch.⁶

Ptolemy Philometor could not mistake the intentions of Antiochus in holding possession of Pelusium; and he therefore came to an agreement with his brother Physcon, that they should share the government between them and resist Antiochus with their united power. Accordingly they hired some mercenary troops from Greece. Antiochus now throwing off the mask, appeared openly as the enemy of the two brothers, and prepared for a fourth expedition against Egypt. In the year 167 B. C. 144 or 145 of the Greek era, he sent his fleet to Cyprus to secure the possession of that island; and he then led his army towards Egypt, to subdue the two brothers and annex the whole country to his own dominions. At Rhinocolura there met him an embassy from Ptolemy Philometor; but he quickly dismissed the legates with the positive requisition, that not only Cyprus, but all the region of Pelusium should be delivered into his hands. As no answer was returned to his demand on the day he had appointed, he proceeded along the coast through Arabia Petrea, took possession of all the territory as far as Alexandria, and then directed his march towards that city in order to besiege it.⁷

When he had arrived at Leusine, about four Roman miles from Alexandria, he met Caius Popilius Laenas, Caius Decimius and Caius Hostilius, ambassadours whom the Roman senate had sent to him at the earnest request of Ptolemy Physcon. They were instructed to assure Antiochus, that he must leave the kingdom of Egypt and the island of Cyprus in peace, or expect a war with the Romans. Antiochus, during his thirteen years' residence at Rome, had become acquainted with Popilius, and as soon as he saw him, offered him his hand with all the familiarity of intimate friendship. But the *ambassadour* would not recognise the friend of *Popilius*, and he handed to the king the written demands of the Roman senate. When Antiochus replied that he would lay the affair before his council, Popilius, the head of the legation, with his staff drew a circle about the king in the sand on which they stood, and exclaimed: "Before you leave this circle, you must give me an answer which I can report to the senate." Antiochus was confounded,

but on a little reflection he said that he would do whatever the senate required. Then Popilius recognised his friend and reached him his hand. The arrogance of the ambassadors and the submissiveness of Antiochus, were not without cause. The Romans had just made themselves formidable by their victory over Perseus, the king of Macedonia, in consequence of which that country was reduced to a Roman province; and these ambassadors had remained on the island of Delos, to learn the issue of the Macedonian war before they sailed to Egypt.⁸

¹ Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXVI. 79. Livy, XLII. 29. Polybius, Legat. 171. Justin, XXXIV. 2. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. 11: 22. ² 2 Macc. 4: 43—50. ³ Diodor. Sic. XXVI. 75. 77. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 5: 2. comp. Dan. 11: 23. 1 Macc. 1: 17, 18. 2 Macc. 5: 1. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. 11: 24, 25. comp. Dan. 11: 22, 25, 49. ⁴ Justin, XXXIV. 2. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXVI. 76. 1 Macc. 1: 19. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. 11: 25. comp. Dan. 11: 23, 24, 27, 42. ⁵ Diodor. Sic. XXXIV. 1. 1 Macc. 1: 18—28. comp. Zech. 13: 7—9. 14: 1, 2. 2 Macc. 5: 5—28. ⁶ Porphyrus as quoted by Scaliger, Graec. Eusebian. p. 60. 68. Polybius, Legat. 181. 82. 84. Livy, XLIV. 19. XLV. 11. Justin, XXXIV. 2. ⁷ Polybius, Legat. 189. Livy, XLV. 11. 12. ⁸ Polybius, Legat. 190. 92. Livy, XLIV. 14. 29. 41—46. XLV. 10. 12. Valerius Maximus, VI. 4: 3. Justin, XXXIII. 1. 2. XXXIV. 3. Velleius Paterculus, I. 10. Plutarch, Apophthegm. XXXII. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXVI. 78—80. 86. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. 11: 27. comp. Dan. 11: 29, 30.

XCIV. REVOLT OF THE JEWS 167—166 B. C.

Antiochus Epiphanes, being thus disappointed in his designs against Egypt and returning from that country in disgrace, sent Apollonius, his chief collector of tribute, with a division of twenty two thousand men from his army, to vent his rage on the city of Jerusalem. Apollonius arrived at Jerusalem in June, 167 B. C. just two years after the conquest and cruel treatment of the city by Antiochus himself. On the first Sabbath after his arrival, he sent out his soldiers with orders to cut down all the men whom they met, and to make slaves of the women and children. Now all the streets of Jerusalem flowed with blood, the houses were plundered and the city walls thrown down. Apollonius demolished the houses that stood near mount Zion, and with the materials thus obtained, strengthened the fortifications of the castle, which he furnished with

a garrison and held under his own command. This castle was so situated that it gave Apollonius complete control over the temple, and the Jews could no longer visit their sanctuary to perform the public services of religion. Accordingly, in the month of June, 167 B. C. the daily sacrifice ceased and Jerusalem was deserted, for the inhabitants were obliged to flee to save their lives. Josephus, whose history of this whole period is extremely careless and unsatisfactory, says that Antiochus himself was present at this time; but the Books of Maccabees, which are the only sources of information that he possessed, say nothing of the presence of the king; and their authority is far preferable to his.¹

An edict was now issued at Antioch and published in all the provinces of Syria, commanding the inhabitants of the whole empire to worship the gods of the king and to acknowledge no religion but his. The pagans, in accordance with their religious opinions, would feel no difficulty in complying with this order; but in the sequel we shall see the effects it produced among the Madejensans or disciples of Zoroaster in Armenia and Persia. The tradition of these worshippers of fire, that their books were destroyed by Alexander the Great, probably owes its origin to this edict of Antiochus Epiphanes, with whom their sacred books would be likely to find no more favour than the sacred books of the Jews; but as his authority did not extend to Media and Bactria, the books might have been preserved in those provinces. The Samaritans, who claimed a Jewish origin in the time of Alexander, now wrote to Antiochus, informing him that they were Zidonians and offering to dedicate their temple on mount Gerizim, to the Grecian Jupiter. Many Jews submitted to the edict for fear of punishment, and a still greater number, who had long been attached to the Grecian customs, gladly embraced this opportunity to declare themselves fully and pass over to the Syrians. But the better part of the people fled and kept themselves concealed.²

An old man by the name of Athenaeus, was sent to Jerusalem to instruct the Jews in the Greek religion and compel them to an observance of its rites. He dedicated the temple to Jupiter Olympius, and on the altar of Jehovah he placed a smaller altar to be used in sacrificing to the heathen god. This new altar, built by order of the desolator Antiochus, is what Daniel alludes to when he speaks of the *abomination that maketh desolate*. (מִשְׁקַנְתָּ מְשֻׁמֵּת. *To βδελ-*

λυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως. *The abomination of a waster.*) This interpretation agrees much better with the literal meaning of the words, than that which has been adopted by those who apply this expression to the erecting of an image to Jupiter Olympius; a mode of explanation which is at variance with the authority of Josephus and the first Book of Maccabees. (*Θυσιάζοντες ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.*) Undoubtedly there was an image erected to Jupiter Olympius, for the pagan religion required it; but this is not the circumstance referred to by the prophet in the words we have quoted. This altar was set up on the fifteenth day of the month Kislev, (כִּסְלֵב, December,) and the heathen sacrifices were commenced on the twenty fifth of the same month. The Samaritan temple on mount Gerizim was dedicated by Atheneus to Jupiter Xenios, or the Protector of strangers: because the Samaritans had pretended in their letter to Antiochus, that they were strangers in that country.³

Circumcision, the keeping of the Sabbath, and every observance of the law, was now made a capital offence; and all the copies of the sacred books that could be found, were taken away, defaced, torn in pieces and burnt. Groves were planted and idolatrous altars were built in every city, and the citizens were required to offer sacrifices to the gods and eat swine's flesh every month on the birth day of the king; and at the feast of Bacchus they were commanded to be crowned with ivy and walk in procession. Those who refused to obey these orders, were put to death without mercy. Among other instances of cruel punishment at Jerusalem, two women with their infant children, whom they had circumcised with their own hands, were thrown from the battlements on the south side of the temple, into the deep vale below the walls of the city. Officers were sent into all the towns, attended by bands of soldiers, to compel obedience to the royal edict.⁴

The Hebrews had never before been subjected to so furious a persecution; but they were so firmly established in their religion that all the threats and tortures which their enemies employed against them, could not force them to renounce it. At this time, Apelles, a royal officer, was sent to Modin or Modeim, (מֹדֵיִם) a city west of Jerusalem, near the seashore, to execute the orders of the king, his master. With fair promises he attempted to persuade Mattathias, one of the principal inhabitants of the place and

a priest of the fourth sacerdotal class of Jehoiarib, (Joarib,) and the son of Johanan, (John,) the grandson of Simon, (Simeon), and great-grandson of Hasmon, (Asamoneus,) to comply with the royal edict and offer sacrifice to the idol. But Mattathias indignantly and fearlessly repelled his offers, and with a loud voice, that the whole assembly might hear him, refused to offer sacrifice; and when a certain Jew approached the altar with the intention of sacrificing, the zealous priest, in obedience to the law of Moses, struck him down with his own hand as a rebel against Jehovah. He then rushed on the officer and his retinue, and being aided by his sons and some other Jews who were emboldened by his courage, he slew them and tore down the idolatrous altar. He then encouraged his pious countrymen to follow him, and fled into the wilderness of Judea, where he was soon joined by many Jews who were determined to maintain the religion of their fathers.⁵

These conscientious Israelites, however, adhered too closely to the letter of the law without fully comprehending its spirit; and in this they went the further, out of hatred to the looseness and impiety of their countrymen who had joined the Greeks. The law respecting the rest of the seventh day they interpreted literally, and considered it criminal to take arms on the Sabbath, even in defence of their own lives. Accordingly about one thousand men, who had concealed themselves in a cave not far from Jerusalem, were massacred on the Sabbath without offering the least resistance, by Philip the Phrygian, governour of Judea. This event opened the eyes of Mattathias and his adherents to their misunderstanding of the law, and they resolved at once to fight in their own defence, though not to commence an attack on the Sabbath.⁶

It seems that Antiochus, when he heard of the resistance of the Jews, came to Judea himself, 166 B. C. and that at this time he ordered the venerable scribe Eleazar, and the pious mother with her seven sons, to be put to death with the most cruel tortures.⁷

Meanwhile the party of Mattathias was continually increasing, for not only great numbers of the Assideans, (חַסִּידִים,) who in their religious observances even exceeded the demands of the law, resorted to his standard; but he was joined by many of the Zaddu-keans, (צַדִּיקִים,) who regarded only the written law. They were all resolved to hazard every thing in defence of their religion, and

their number soon became so large that they formed a considerable army. With these adherents Mattathias emerged from his concealment, went through the Jewish cities, demolished the idolatrous altars, circumcised the children, slew the apostate Jews and the royal officers, seized the copies of the law which the heathen had taken away, and gained several important advantages over the enemy. While engaged in these expeditions he died, in the year 166 B. C. He appointed Judas, his third and bravest son, military leader, and associated with him Simon, his second and most prudent son, as a counsellor.⁸ Judas, on account of his heroic exploits, received the surname of Maccabeus, (מַכַּבֵּי, *the Hammerer*,) and Simon was surnamed Thassi, (תָּוִשִׁי, *he increases*.)

About this time, Antiochus Epiphanes gave magnificent games at Daphne in honour of Jupiter Olympius, on which he squandered immense sums of money. He invited many strangers to the feasts, but he conducted in so ridiculous a manner that several of the guests withdrew in disgust. He rode along the solemn procession on a miserable horse, ordered some to go forward and some to remain behind, and gave places to others according to his own caprice; so that those who were unacquainted with him, would never have taken him for the king, seeing him without a diadem and in a dress no way above that of a common slave. At the feast, he went to the door of the banqueting hall, waited on some of those who were entering, ordered others to their couches, and busied himself in arranging the servants who were bringing in the dishes. He went from one guest to another, now seated himself at the table, and then reclined apart from the company. Before they were aware, he would suddenly throw his food and cup out of his hand, spring up, pace about the hall, run round the whole circuit of the tables, receive standing the cups which were drunk to him, and banter the musicians. When the feast had continued till late at night and most of the guests had retired, he rolled himself up in a cloth, and in this manner he was carried out and laid on the ground by the comedians. As soon as the music began to sound, he sprang up naked, played antics with the comedians, and joined them in the most ludicrous and comic dances.⁹

While Antiochus was spending his time in these ridiculous frolics at Daphne, Judas, after the example of his father, continued to purify Judea from idolaters; and he took possession of some

cities and provided them with garrisons. He defeated Apollonius, the governour of Samaria, who had drawn out his army against him; and also Seron, the lieutenant of Coelosyria, under the governour Ptolemy Macro, who had advanced with all his army to the heights near Beth-horon. By these conflicts the Jews were inured to war, their courage was confirmed, and their fallen enemies supplied them with suitable arms.¹⁰

¹ Josephus, Antiq. XII. 5: 4. 1 Macc. 1: 29—40. 2 Macc. 5: 24—26. compare Zech. 13: 8. 14: 1—12. and Dan. 11: 30, 31. ² Josephus, Antiq. XII. 5: 4, 5. Jewish War, I. 1. 2. Tacitus, Hist. V. 8. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. VIII. IX. 1 Macc. 1: 41—53. 2 Macc. 5: 27. 6: 2. ³ 1 Macc. 1: 44—64. 4: 54. 2 Macc. 6: 1—9. 10: 5. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 5: 4. Dan. 11: 31. Math. 24: 15. ⁴ 1 Macc. 1: 47, 60—63. 2 Macc. 6: 7, 10. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 5: 4. ⁵ 1 Chron. 24: 7. 1 Macc. 2: 1—30. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 6: 1, 2. compare Dan. 11: 32. ⁶ 1 Macc. 2: 31—41. 2 Macc. 6: 11. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 6: 2. ⁷ 2 Macc. VI. VII. Josephus, Concerning the Maccabees, v—xiv. ⁸ 1 Macc. 2: 42—49, 70. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 6: 2—4. compare Dan. 11: 34. ⁹ Polybius in Athenaeus, V. 4. X. 12. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXI. 7—9. compare Dan. 11: 21, 38, 39. ¹⁰ 1 Macc. 3: 1—26. 2 Macc. 8: 1—7. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 7: 1.

XCVI. WAR BETWEEN THE JEWS AND SYRIANS 165—163 B. C.

When Antiochus heard of these successes of the Jews, he determined to exterminate the whole nation and give their country to others. (Dan. 11: 39.) But his treasures were exhausted by his expensive games and extravagant donations, and he found it difficult to raise a large army; and at the same time he received intelligence that the Persians and Artaxias, the tributary king of Armenia, had refused to make him any more remittances. (Dan. 11: 44.) This was the effect of his religious persecutions, which could not but be odious in the eyes of those Madejesnans, who abhorred the worship of idols. Accordingly Antiochus was obliged to weaken his forces by dividing them. One division of his army he sent to Judea, under the command of Lysias, a nobleman of royal blood; and the other he himself led to Armenia in the year 165 B. C. after he had made Lysias regent of the countries west of the Euphrates, and had committed to the care of this officer, his son, and the heir to his crown, then but seven years old. He soon subdued the Armenians, and then marched against Persia.¹

After Philip, governour of Judea, had informed Ptolemy Macro, governour of Coelosyria, of the proceedings of Judas Maccabeus, and he again had sent word to Lysias; these officers collected a force of forty thousand foot and seven thousand horse. One half of this army was brought out under the command of Nicanor, who was accompanied by Gorgias, an experienced warrior; and with the other half, Ptolemy Macro, the commander in chief, formed a junction with Nicanor at Emmaus. Here they were joined by many Syrians and Philistines, and by more than one thousand merchants who came for the purpose of purchasing such Jews as should be taken prisoners; for it was then customary, as Polybius testifies, for slave-dealers to attend the march of armies.²

To this strong army Judas could oppose only six thousand men; and after they had commended themselves to God at Mizpeh, (*Μαζπηά*;) he separated them into three divisions. But the small army of Judas became still less, when he gave permission for those to withdraw who were exempt from military duty by the law of Moses; for many, terrified by the number of their enemies, took advantage of this law, and it appears that only three thousand remained with their leader. Notwithstanding this desertion, Judas, confiding in the help of God, was preparing to meet his foes the next day, when he learned that Gorgias, with five thousand foot and one thousand horse, designed to attack him by surprise during the night. Judas seized this opportunity to give the enemy a fatal blow, and leaving his encampment early in the evening, he rushed on the forces of Nicanor in the night, when they, not expecting any attack, fell into confusion, forsook their camp, and endeavoured to save themselves by flight. Three thousand Syrians were put to the sword, and many soldiers and slave-dealers were made prisoners. Early in the morning, as Gorgias was returning from his abortive attempt to surprise the Jews, he saw the Syrian camp in flames; when his soldiers in a panic immediately betook themselves to flight, while the Jews pressed on so zealously after the fugitives, that on that day they slew nine thousand of their enemies and wounded many more. Nicanor made his escape to Antioch in the habit of a slave, and acknowledged that the Jews were aided by a mighty God. In the camp of the Syrians, the Jews found great quantities of gold and silver, and they celebrated their glorious victory by a thanksgiving festival.³

On the news of this defeat, Lysias himself led an army of sixty thousand foot and five thousand horse into Idumea, and through that country invaded the Jews. But while he was besieging Bethsura, (*Βεθσοῦρα*), a frontier fortress which lay southwest of Jerusalem, he was attacked by Judas with ten thousand men, and put to flight with the loss of five thousand soldiers, who were slain in the engagement. This heroic exploit of Judas so disheartened the soldiers of Lysias, that he was forced to return to Antioch, and issue orders to raise recruits in distant countries for a new expedition.⁴

By this victory Judas became master of the whole country, and he determined to return to Jerusalem, to repair and purify the temple, which was then dilapidated and deserted. New utensils were provided for the sacred services; the old altar, which had been polluted by heathen sacrifices, was taken away and a new one erected. The sacrifices were recommenced on the twenty fifth day of the month Kislev, (*Χασιλεῦ*, December,) the same day on which, three years before, the temple had been dedicated to Jupiter Olympus; and after three years and a half had elapsed since the city was laid waste in June, 167 B. C. The festival of this new dedication was celebrated for eight days, with great joy and heartfelt gratitude; and it was resolved that an annual feast should be observed in commemoration of this event.⁵

But the joy of the Jews for the restoration of the public solemnities of their religion, was often interrupted by their enemies in the castle on mount Zion; for the apostate Jews who had taken refuge there, made frequent sallies and slew their countrymen who were repairing to the temple. The army of Judas was so small, that he could not leave a force sufficient to hold the castle in blockade; but he fortified the temple by surrounding it with a high and strong wall furnished with towers, and stationed there soldiers enough to protect the worshippers from the Syrian garrison of the castle. At the same time, he strengthened and secured the fortress of Bethsura, on the frontiers.⁶

These successes of the Jews awakened the hatred of their neighbours, who viewed them as the enemies of their king and their gods; and they began to commit hostilities against such Jews as fell into their power. The Idumeans especially, who possessed the southern parts of Judea, and the Baianites, (*υἱοὶ Βαιάν*) who

were probably a tribe of Arabians, laid in wait for the Jews by the public roads, and slew all who came in their way. Judas marched against these enemies, subdued them, and burned their towers. This is the expedition of which a particular account is given in 2 Macc. 10: 15—23. He then proceeded against Timotheus, the chief of the hostile Ammonites, defeated him and Bacchides, his ally, and subdued the whole country about Jazer. The battle described in 2 Macc. 10: 24—38. in which the Jews slew Timotheus and conquered Gazara, is one of the *many battles* mentioned in 1 Macc. 5: 7. as having occurred between Judas and Timotheus.⁷

As the pagans east of the Jordan had lost many friends and relatives in these defeats of Timotheus, they rose up against the Jews who dwelt in their country, put them to the sword, plundered their property, and made slaves of their wives and children. In the land of Tob (*ἐν τοῖς Τωβλοῦ*) not one Jew escaped the bloody massacre; but several from other places had fled to the fortress of Dathema, where they were besieged by another Timotheus, a pagan chief. At the same time the inhabitants of Ptolemais, Tyre, Zidon, and the neighbouring cities, united to destroy the Jews of Galilee. The Syrian governours, if they did not themselves instigate, undoubtedly encouraged these attacks; for they all contributed to accomplish the purpose of the king, who had determined to annihilate the Jewish nation and religion.⁸

When Judas heard of the sufferings of his countrymen in Gilead and Galilee, he sent three thousand chosen troops to Galilee, under the command of his brother Simon Thassi, who defeated the enemy in several engagements, and then conducted the Jews of this country with their wives and children to Judea, as it was impossible to secure them from the assaults of their foes in any other way. Judas himself, attended by his youngest brother Jonathan Apphus, (*ῥασημ*), led eight thousand men to Gilead. After a march of three days east of the Jordan, he came into the region of the friendly Nabathaeans, (*Ναβαθαῖοι*), and from them he obtained accurate intelligence of the true state of affairs in that quarter. He heard that the Jews were kept prisoners in many cities, and against these cities he immediately directed his efforts. He fell upon Bosora (Bozrah) by surprise and laid it in ashes. He then marched all night, and early in the morning, attacked the besiegers of Dathema, who fell into disorder and fled, and the Jews

slew seven thousand men in the pursuit. After this he took Maspha, (Mizpeh,) Casphor, Maked, Bosor, and other cities, put all the males to the sword, gave up the houses to pillage, and laid them in ashes. Among these expeditions was the conquest of the city of Caspis, mentioned in 2 Macc. 12: 13—16. but in all probability this is the city already referred to under the name of Casphor. Timotheus now drew up a numerous army; but the Jews defeated him, took possession of Carnein or Carnion, and burnt the city and temple of Atargatis.⁹ This is undoubtedly the expedition of which a particular account is given in 2 Macc. 12: 19—31.

Though the Jews had now humbled their enemies, they were in these regions continually exposed to new hostilities. Judas, accordingly, transferred them with their wives and children to Judea, by means of which, the strength of the nation was concentrated, and its metropolis supplied with inhabitants. Judas, on his return, conquered the city of Ephron, which had closed its gates against him. He then came to the city of Bethsan (Beth-shan) or Scythopolis, west of the Jordan, expressed his gratitude to its citizens for their kind treatment of the Jews who dwelt among them, and finally arrived in safety at Jerusalem.¹⁰

Judas, during his absence, had left Jerusalem under the command of Joseph and Azarias, with express orders that they should keep within the walls and make no attack on the enemy. They, however, disobeyed their instructions, and assaulted Jamnia, but were repulsed with considerable loss by Gorgias, the Syrian governor.¹¹

It was probably to revenge this repulse, that Judas, after he had taken Hebron and the adjacent territory from the Idumeans, invaded the land of the Philistines, and took the city of Azotus or Ashdod, though in a previous skirmish he had suffered some loss from the enemy. In the second Book of Maccabees, this expedition is mentioned as having been undertaken against Gorgias, who had defeated Joseph and Azarias.¹²

Antiochus Epiphanes received intelligence of the success of the Jewish arms and the overthrow of the Syrians, at Elymais in Persia; and as he was then detained there by an insurrection of the people, occasioned by his robbing the celebrated temple in which his father, Antiochus the Great, lost his life, his vexation was almost beyond endurance. He set out on his return with a determination

to make every possible effort to exterminate the Jews; but during his journey, he was attacked by a disease in which he suffered excessive pain, and was tormented by the bitterest anguish of conscience on account of his sacrilege and other crimes. He finally died at Tabas in Paratacene, on the frontiers of Persia and Babylonia, in the year 163 B. C. 147 or 148 of the Greek era, after a reign of eleven years. Coins of his are still to be found bearing the date of 147 of the Greek era.¹³

¹ 1 Macc. 3: 27—36. comp. Dan. 11: 39, 44, 45. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 7: 2. Porphyry in Jerome, Comment. in Dan. 11: 44. Appian, Syriac. XLVI. 80. ² 2 Macc. 5: 22. 8: 8. comp. Zech. 10: 5. 1 Macc. 3: 38—41. 2 Macc. 8: 9—11. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 7: 3. Polybius, III. 83. ³ 1 Macc. 3: 42—60. 4: 1—26. 2 Macc. 8: 12, 13, 16—29, 34—36. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 7: 3, 4. comp. Zech. IX. X. XII. ⁴ 1 Macc. 4: 26—35. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 7: 5. Jewish War, I. 1: 5. comp. Zech. 10: 5. ⁵ 1 Macc. 1: 59. 4: 54. comp. Zech. 6: 13—15. 8: 3. 1 Macc. 4: 36—59. 2 Macc. 10: 1—7. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 7: 6, 7. Jewish War. I. 1: 4. comp. John 10: 22. ⁶ 1 Macc. 1: 36, 37. 4: 60, 61. comp. Zech. 6: 13—15. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 7: 7. ⁷ 1 Macc. 5: 1—8. 2 Macc. 10: 15—23. 8: 30—33. 10: 24—38. ⁸ 1 Macc. 5: 9—14. ⁹ 1 Macc. 5: 21—44. comp. Zech. 10: 6—10. 2 Macc. 12: 10—31. ¹⁰ 1 Macc. 5: 45—54. comp. Zech. 10: 6—10. 2 Macc. 12: 29—31. ¹¹ 1 Macc. 5: 55—63. ¹² 1 Macc. 5: 65—68. 2 Macc. 12: 32—45. ¹³ 1 Macc. 6: 1—16. 2 Macc. IX. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 9: 1. Polybius in Excerpta Valesii de Virtutibus et Vitiis, XXXI. Appian, Syriac. XLVI. 80.

NOTE. The materials for the history of Antiochus Epiphanes are very scanty, for the writings which treat of this period, by Callinicus Sutoricus, Diodorus Siculus, Hieronymus the Historian, Polybius, Posidonius, Claudius Theon, and Andronicus Alypius, are all lost except a few fragments preserved by other authors, and we have these only from the second or third hand. Porphyry, in the third century of the Christian era, introduced copious extracts from these works into his fifteen Books against the Christians, especially into the twelfth Book, where he treats of Daniel and endeavours to prove from the agreement of the Book of Daniel with history, that it must have been written after the occurrence of the events to which it refers. But the work of Porphyry has perished, excepting a few fragments preserved by St. Jerome in his commentary on Daniel. The treatises written against Porphyry by Apollinarius, Eusebius, and Methodius, are also lost, excepting a few sentences

quoted by Nicetas and John Damascenus. The loss of Apollinarius is particularly to be regretted, since he, according to the testimony of Philostorgius, VIII. 14. was a very accurate writer. Had we all these writings, or at least, the fifteen Books of the learned Porphyry, they would throw great light on the obscurities of the Book of Daniel; for Jerome says of this opposer of the prophet: "*cujus impugnatio testimonium veritatis est, tanta enim dictorum fides fuit, ut propheta incredulis hominibus non videretur futura dixisse, sed narrasse praeterita.*" Praefat. Comment. in Dan.

XCVII. ANTIOCHUS EUPATOR 164—163 B. C.

Antiochus Epiphanes, before his death, delivered to his flatterer Philip the regal insignia, and appointed him regent of the empire and guardian to his son Antiochus, who was then but nine years old. But Lysias, who had the young king in his power and gave him the surname of Eupator, was determined not to relinquish so important a charge. Philip accordingly fled to Egypt to solicit the support of the Ptolemies; but when he saw that the two contending brothers and rival kings needed an umpire themselves to settle their own difficulties, he withdrew to Persia, whence he afterwards returned with an army to assert his claims to the regency.¹

Demetrius, the son of Seleucus Philopator, who was sent to Rome as a hostage in the place of Antiochus Epiphanes, had now reached his twenty third year; and when he heard of the death of Antiochus, made an effort to get himself established in his father's kingdom. But the wisdom of the senate decided, that it would be more advantageous for the Romans to have a minor on the throne of Syria than the able Demetrius, and they rejected his suit. Cneius Octavius, Spurius Lucretius, and Lucius Aurelius, were then sent from Rome to Syria as ambassadours, to confirm Antiochus Eupator on the throne, and to arrange all the affairs of his empire according to the treaty which had been concluded with Antiochus the Great.²

After the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Jews were kindly treated by Ptolemy Macro, the governour of Coelosyria; but this season of tranquillity was of short continuance and productive of but little benefit; for when Ptolemy saw that he was universally despised as a traitor for having betrayed into the hands of Antiochus Epiph-

anes the island of Cyprus, when he held it as Egyptian governour, he destroyed his own life by poison. Soon after, in the year 163 B. C. Lysias invaded Judea with an army of eighty thousand foot, eighty elephants, and a large body of cavalry. He laid siege to Bethsura, but was repulsed by Judas with the loss of eleven thousand foot and one thousand six hundred horse, and his whole army was broken up. Lysias was now convinced that all efforts against the heroic Jews were unavailing, and he gave them peace on reasonable terms. The Roman ambassadours, Quintus Memmius and Titus Manlius, afforded efficient aid in the obtaining of this treaty.³

But the Jews were exposed to continual injury from the Syrian garrison, which still held possession of the castle of Acra on mount Zion. Judas, therefore, laid siege to this fortress, in order, if possible to subdue it and secure his countrymen from future depredations. But some apostate Jews, who had taken refuge with the Syrian garrison and knew that if the castle should fall into the power of Judas, they could have no hope of pardon, stole out of the fort and made their way to Antioch, where they excited Lysias and the king to undertake a new war against Judea. The Syrian army which was raised for this purpose in the year 163 B. C. consisted of one hundred thousand foot, twenty thousand horse, thirty two elephants, and three hundred chariots armed with scythes; a very great force for those times, when, on account of the extravagant wages which soldiers received, it was difficult to keep more than eighty thousand men in the field. The Jews could make no open resistance to so numerous a host; but while the Syrians were besieging Bethsura, Judas fell upon them in the night, and before they were aware who had entered their camp, he slew four thousand men and drew off in safety by break of day. On the following morning they came to battle, and Judas, that he might not be surrounded by the numbers of his enemy, was forced to retire to Jerusalem: the fortifications of which he now strengthened and put in a state of defence. In this battle he lost his younger brother, the brave Eleazar Savaran or Auran, (*ὁ Σαυαράν* or *חורין*), who fell while performing a deed of desperate valour.⁴

The Jews were now reduced to great distress. Bethsura was forced to surrender, Jerusalem was closely besieged, and could not have held out long against the attacks of the enemy. All the advantages

which had been obtained at the expense of so much blood, seemed now about to be lost forever ; when, fortunately for the besieged, Lysias received intelligence that Philip, whom Antiochus Epiphanes had appointed regent, had entered Syria with an army drawn from Media and Persia, and taken possession of Antioch, the metropolis of the empire. Lysias accordingly found it necessary to make peace with the Jews. He acceded to all their demands, and was admitted into Jerusalem ; when, in violation of the treaty which he had sworn to observe, he threw down the walls of the city ; and then returned to Syria, where his victorious army forced Philip to retreat.⁵

Menelaus, the apostate high priest, who had attended the king in this expedition against the Jews, was now viewed by his royal master as the author of all these unhappy wars ; and by the orders of Antiochus he was suffocated in the ash-tower of Berea. The king then nominated to the priesthood Alcimus or Jacimus, whom we shall find by the subsequent history to have been an unprincipled and impious man. As Alcimus was not of the lineage of the high priest, Onias, the son of Onias III. the high priest who had been murdered at Daphne near Antioch, having no hope of attaining his father's dignity, fled to Egypt, where he established a new priesthood and filled the office himself, as we shall see in the sequel.⁶

In the following year, 162 B. C. Octavius, Aurelius, and Lucretius, the Roman ambassadours already mentioned, arrived at Antioch, in order that they, while the sceptre was held by a child of eleven years of age and the kingdom was in a very weakened state, might enforce the observance of the treaty concluded after the battle of Sipylus. Accordingly they burnt all the shipping except twelve vessels, and slew all the elephants ; but these measures were so odious to the Syrians, that Octavius, the head of the embassy and an ancestor of Octavius Caesar Augustus, was assassinated by Leptines, while he was anointing himself in the gymnasium at Laodicea. Lysias was suspected of having been at the bottom of this murder, and he immediately despatched an embassy to Rome to clear himself and the king from this imputation ; but the senate dismissed his ambassadours without giving them any answer.⁷

In Egypt the contest between the two brothers, Philometor and Physcon, was every day growing more violent. The Roman senate wrote to their ambassadours, Octavius, Lucretius, and Aurelius,

to settle the difficulties ; but before the letter arrived, Philometor had been expelled by his younger brother Physcon. Philometor immediately sailed to Italy and went to Rome on foot and in a miserable habit, in order to move the senate to compassion ; and for the same reason, he refused the royal robes and diadem which were offered him by Demetrius, the son of Seleucus Philopator, who was then detained at Rome as a hostage. The senate received Philometor very favourably, and sent Quintus and Canuleius as ambassadors to Alexandria, to reestablish him in his kingdom. As the result of their negotiation, it was agreed that Physcon should reign over Libya and Cyrene, and Philometor retain Egypt and Cyprus. But a new quarrel soon broke out between the brothers, respecting the possession of the island of Cyprus. Physcon now in his turn repaired to Rome, and the senate despatched a second embassy to Egypt ; but nothing was accomplished, for Philometor insisted on the terms of the first agreement. Polybius remarks, in his account of these embassies, that it was by taking advantage of such imprudent contentions that the Romans extended their dominion.⁶

¹ 1 Macc. 6: 17. ² Macc. 9: 26, 29. 10: 10, 11. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 9: 1. Appian, Syriac. XLVI. 80—85. Eusebius, Chron. ³ Polybius, Legat. † 107. Justin, XXXIV. 3. Appian, Syriac. XLVI. 85—95. ⁴ 2 Macc. 10: 12, 13. XI. ⁵ 1 Macc. 6: 19—51. 2 Macc. 13: 15—22. ⁶ 1 Macc. 6: 48—65. 2 Macc. 13: 3—23. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 9: 6, 7. ⁷ 2 Macc. 13: 3—8. 14: 3. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 9: 7. ⁸ Polybius, Legat. † 114. 122. Appian, Syriac. XLVI. 90—100. Cicero, Philippica, IX. 2: 4, 5. ⁹ Diodor. Sic. XXXI. 10. Porphyry in Graec. Eusebian. Scaligeri, p. 60. 68. Livy, Epitome of Book LXVI. Polybius, Legat. † 113. 116. 117.

XCVIII. DEMETRIUS SOTER 162—154 B. C.

While the Roman senate were disaffected towards Antiochus Eupator, on account of the murder of the ambassador Octavius, Demetrius again attempted to obtain from them an appointment to his father's throne ; but his efforts were unavailing. He, therefore, by the advice of his friends, particularly of Polybius the historian, privately embarked on board a Carthaginian ship ; and his designs were not known at Rome till the fifth day after his departure. The senate made no attempt to recall him, but immediately despatched an ambassador to observe his movements. As soon as Demetrius

landed at Tyre, he industriously spread a report that the Romans had given him the crown of his father. This intimation had the desired effect, for the soldiers flocked to him from every quarter, and even Lysias and Antiochus Eupator delivered themselves into his hands. He put them both to death, and took possession of the throne of Syria.¹

Demetrius then expelled Timarchus and Heraclides from Babylonia, where they were endeavouring to make themselves independent, and for this service the Babylonians gave him the surname of Soter, which he ever after retained. Timarchus was slain; but Heraclides saved himself by flight, and was soon engaged in other projects for his own aggrandizement. Demetrius now desired to have his claims to the throne acknowledged by the Romans; and for this purpose he sent an embassy with a golden crown as a gift to the Roman senate, and, at the same time, delivered up to them Lep- tines, the murderer of the ambassadour Octavius. The senate accepted the present, but dismissed the murderer; for they intended to take some opportunity to avenge the death of Octavius on the whole Syrian empire.²

In the mean time, Alcimus, the high priest appointed by Antiochus Eupator, was preparing new distresses for the Jews who refused to acknowledge him in his official capacity. He repaired, with his adherents, to the king and made complaint against Judas and the Assideans, that they were continually disobedient to the orders of their sovereign. Accordingly Demetrius, in the year 161 B. C. 151 of the Greek era, sent an army to Judea under the command of Bacchides, to establish Alcimus in his office by force. Bacchides entered the country under pretence of friendship; and many Jews, relying on his professions, intrusted themselves to his power, when they were treacherously put to death. Bacchides, after having confirmed the authority of Alcimus, withdrew with his troops, leaving with the high priest a force which seemed sufficient for his security. But now Judas, who had retired before Bacchides, again made his appearance, marched through the land with his people, and punished the apostate Jews. Alcimus could offer no effectual resistance, and he, therefore, went again to Antioch and renewed his complaints against Judas. Demetrius then sent another army to Judea under the command of Nicanor, with orders to kill Judas or take him prisoner, and secure Alcimus in the quiet possession of his office. Nicanor at first disguised his real intentions and ap-

peared as a friend, though he soon threw off the mask and made every exertion to get Judas into his power ; but this hero baffled all the efforts of his enemy and escaped. Hostilities were now renewed, for Nicanor ravaged the country with his troops and massacred the people.³

During this year, (161 B. C.) a battle was fought at Capharsalama, in which Nicanor lost five hundred men and was forced to seek refuge in the castle of Zion. Thence he sent out a party of soldiers to seize Razis, a Jew of great influence and celebrated for his justice and piety ; but he chose to lay violent hands on himself, rather than fall into the power of his enemies. Nicanor, enraged at his disappointment, then demanded of the Jews, with blasphemies and threats of vengeance in case of refusal, that Judas and his army should be delivered up to him ; but in a battle which took place soon after, he was himself slain, and his whole army, consisting of two thousand five hundred men, was routed and entirely dispersed. Judas cut off the head and the right hand of Nicanor, and brought them to Jerusalem as trophies of his victory. This battle was fought on the thirteenth day of the month Adar, (March,) and it was deemed of so much importance by the Jews, that they kept that day as an annual festival in commemoration of the event.⁴

After this victory, the Jews enjoyed a season of tranquillity. At this time, Judas sent an embassy to Rome to solicit the friendship of that powerful nation. The ambassadours employed in this negotiation, were Jason, the son of Eleazar, and Eupolemus, who had formerly obtained permission of Seleucus Eupator for the Jews to live according to their own laws. The Romans, who knew how to render alliances with other nations the means of their future subjugation, readily concluded a treaty on such terms as could do no injury to themselves, and might yet be of some advantage to the Jews. At the same time, they sent orders to Demetrius to make no encroachments on Judea. Justin writes respecting this transaction : " a Demetrio, cum defecissent Judaei, amicitia Romanorum petita, primi omnium ex orientalibus libertatem receperunt, facile tunc Romanis de alieno largientibus."⁵

But before Demetrius received the letter of the Romans, he had sent a large army to Judea under the command of Bacchides, which on its march subdued the famous cave of Mesaloth in Arbela of Galilee. He then, in the month Nisan (April) of the year 160

B. C. encamped near Jerusalem, whence he marched to Berea with twenty thousand foot and two thousand horse. Judas was stationed at Eleasa with three thousand men, and when this small number, by continual desertion, was at last dwindled down to eight hundred, he ventured on an attack in which he lost his life.⁶

The apostate Jews now regained their power, under the protection of the Syrians, and as Bacchides gave them all the offices of trust in the country, their insolence was without restraint. A severe famine occurring at the same time, they monopolized the provisions, and in this manner, reduced their countrymen to great distress. Bacchides, meanwhile, ravaged the country with his soldiers and massacred all the adherents of Judas who fell in his way.⁷

In this extremity of suffering, the pious Jews repaired to Jonathan Apphus, the youngest brother of Judas, and choosing him for their leader, they withdrew to the wilderness of Thecoe (*Θεκωλ*) and encamped at the cistern of Aspher, (*ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ λάκκου Ἀσφάρο.*) After a few skirmishes with the Arabic tribes in that neighbourhood, Jonathan sent the wives and children and the most valuable property of his soldiers to the Nabathaeans, under a convoy commanded by his oldest brother, Johanan or John Caddis, (*Καδδῖς, Ἰηλ.*) But while on their way, they were attacked and plundered, and John himself was slain, by the Arabic tribe of Jambri from Medaba, (*υἱὸι Ἰαμβροὶ ἐκ Μηδαβά.*) Jonathan, soon after, revenged this unprovoked assault by falling upon these Arabs, while they were walking in the marriage procession of one of their princesses.⁸

Jonathan, that he might the more effectually secure himself against the forces of the enemy, now withdrew into the marshes which were formed by the overflowings of the Jordan, where access to him was very difficult. But Bacchides, on the Sabbath, made an attack on the pass which led to his camp, and carried it by storm. The Jews defended themselves with great bravery, but being overpowered by numbers, they leaped into the Jordan and swam to the other side, whither their enemies did not venture to follow them. Bacchides then returned and repaired the fortifications of the castle on mount Zion, in which he placed the sons of the principal Jewish families, to be kept as hostages. He also fortified several other cities and provided them with garrisons, to hold the country in subjection.⁹

Alcimus was now established in the priesthood; but in the year 159 B. C. when he directed that the הַיִּת or the lower wall which separated the court of the Gentiles from the court of the Israelites, should be thrown down, that the heathen might have free access to the temple, he was seized with the cramp and died in great agony. Bacchides, having nothing to detain him in Judea after the death of the man on whose account his expedition was undertaken, now left the country, and the Jews had two years of rest.¹⁰

It was probably about this time, that Demetrius received the letter from the Roman senate, commanding him to regard the Jews as the allies of the Romans; and this will explain the reason why he undertook nothing further against Judea. For he was then making every effort to gain the favour of the Romans, that he might be confirmed by them in the possession of his throne. For this purpose he sent Menochares as his ambassadour to the court of Ariarathes, king of Cappadocia, to solicit the mediation of the three Roman ambassadours who were there at that time; but as they refused to listen to his representations, he followed them by a second embassy to Pamphylia, and again, by a third, to Rhodes; he promised every thing they could demand, and persevered in the most humiliating and earnest entreaties, till at last he induced them to espouse his cause, and, through their intervention, the Romans acknowledged him as king of Syria. As a testimonial of his gratitude, he sent to Rome, in the year 159 B. C. another crown, valued at ten thousand pieces of gold, and again delivered up to them Leptines, the murderer of Octavius, and also Isocrates, who had defended the cause of the assassin; but they were again set free by the senate, for the same reasons as before.¹¹

During the same year, Demetrius very unnecessarily involved himself in another affair, which occasioned him incredible trouble and became in the end a principal cause of his own ruin. He deposed Ariarathes, the lawful king of Cappadocia, and placed on the throne Holophernes or Orophernes, a pretended older brother of Ariarathes. In the year 157 B. C. the dethroned monarch laid his complaints before the Roman senate, and though the ambassadours of Demetrius and Holophernes exerted themselves to the utmost to defend a bad cause, these kings were compelled to admit Ariarathes to a participation in the throne of Cappadocia. Holophernes,

by his voluptuousness and gluttony, soon made himself contemptible to his subjects, and was expelled from his kingdom by Ariarathes with the assistance of Attalus, the successor of Eumenes in the throne of Pergamum. He fled to Demetrius and maintained himself at the Syrian court by the immense sums of money which he had deposited at Priene in Ionia. He afterwards attached himself to the party opposed to Demetrius, and made himself a dangerous enemy to his greatest benefactor.¹²

Meanwhile the apostate Jews grew uneasy at the peace which their nation enjoyed, and, in 158 B. C. they invited Bacchides to aid them in their malicious projects, by attacking Jonathan and his party. Bacchides, accordingly, advanced to Judea with his army; but Jonathan, having discovered the design of the malecontents to seize his person, put to death fifty of the principal conspirators, and thus deterred the rest from the execution of their purpose. But as his forces were not sufficient to oppose the invading army of Bacchides, he retired into the wilderness to Bethbasi, which was conveniently situated for a place of defence, though its fortifications had fallen to decay. He repaired the dilapidated fortress so thoroughly, that Bacchides, whose army had been increased by levies in Judea, was unable to subdue it; especially as Simon, the commander of the garrison, made frequent and successful sallies on the besiegers, and Jonathan, in his excursions, gave constant annoyance to their foraging parties. Bacchides broke up the siege, and, in his rage, put to death the apostate Jews who had induced him to undertake this ruinous campaign. Jonathan despatched after him a deputation with proposals of peace, and Bacchides acceded to the terms which were offered. The treaty was concluded and sworn to by both parties, and all who had been taken prisoners in the war, were released.¹³

In the year 156 B. C. the quarrel between the kings of Egypt broke out anew. The gluttonous and cruel Ptolemy Physcon was attacked by a party of conspirators in Cyrene, severely wounded and left for dead. But he recovered, and as soon as his wounds were healed, hastened to Rome and complained before the senate, of his brother Philometor, as having been at the bottom of the conspiracy. The senate gave credit to his accusations, without regarding the defence which Philometor made by his ambassadour, and sent five ambassadours to establish Physcon in the island of Cyprus, with

the help of the neighbouring allies. In the year 155 B. C. Ptolemy Physcon landed on the island with the army he had collected, but was defeated and taken prisoner. Ptolemy Philometor, so far from revenging himself on his brother, treated him with great respect, and sent him back to Cyrene, which he enlarged by adding to it some of his own territory; and, by this generous act, put the Roman senate to shame. But Philometor, soon after, came near losing Cyprus; for Archias, the governour of the island, had bargained to deliver it up to Demetrius, king of Syria, for five hundred talents of silver. The plot, however, was seasonably discovered, and the detected traitor hung himself.¹⁴

¹ Polybius, Legat. † 114. Appian, Syriac. XLVII. 1—10. Justin, XXXIV. 3. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 10: 1. 1 Macc. 7: 1—4. 2 Macc. 14: 1, 2. ² Polybius, Legat. † 122. Appian, Syriac. XLVII. 5—10. ³ 1 Macc. 7: 5—7, 25, 26. 2 Macc. 14: 3—25. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 10: 1—4. ⁴ 1 Macc. 7: 25—50. 2 Macc. 14: 37—46. 15: 1—36. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 10: 4, 5. ⁵ 2 Macc. 4: 11. 1 Macc. 8: 1—30. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 10: 6. Justin, XXXVI. 3. ⁶ 1 Macc. 9: 1—22. Josephus, Antiq. XII. 11: 1. ⁷ 1 Macc. 9: 23—27. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 1: 1. ⁸ 1 Macc. 9: 35—42. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 1: 2, 4. ⁹ 1 Macc. 9: 43—53. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 1: 3. ¹⁰ 1 Macc. 9: 54—57. Compare Jahn's Biblical Archaeology translated by Prof. Upham, † 199.V. ¹¹ Polybius, Legat. † 122. Appian, Syriac. XLVII. 10—15. Diodor. Sic. XXXI. 29. ¹² Polybius, Legat. † 126. Appian, Syriac. XLVII. 15—20. Livy, Epitome of Book XLVII. Polybius, III. 5. and in Excerpt. Valesii de Virtutibus et Vitiis, XXXI. p. 171. ¹³ 1 Macc. 9: 58—73. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 1: 5, 6. ¹⁴ Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXI. 27. Polybius, Legat. † 132. Polybius in Excerpt. Valesii de Virtutibus et Vitiis, XXXI. p. 170.

XCIX. ALEXANDER BALAS 154—146 B. C.

About the year 154 B. C. Demetrius Soter retired to the new palace which he had built near Antioch, and there gave himself up entirely to luxury and pleasure. As those who had business to transact, could seldom get access to the indolent king, discontented were excited that finally gave rise to a conspiracy, in which his guest, Holophernes, joined. Holophernes was detected and imprisoned; but Demetrius spared his life, for he intended, when an opportunity should occur, to employ him against Ariarathes.¹

Notwithstanding this check, the conspiracy gained strength and

was fostered by Ariarathes, king of Cappadocia, Attalus, king of Pergamus, and especially, by Ptolemy Philometor, king of Egypt, from whom Demetrius had taken the island of Cyprus. They availed themselves of the services of Heraclides, whom Demetrius expelled from Babylonia with Timarchus. Since that time, he had lived at Rhodes, and now, at the instigation of the three kings, the abettors of the plot against Demetrius, he persuaded a young man of low birth, named Balas, to give himself out for a son of Antiochus Epiphanes and lay claim to the Syrian throne. As soon as Balas had been sufficiently instructed in the part he was to act, in the year 153 B. C. Ptolemy, Ariarathes, and Attalus, publicly acknowledged him as the son of Antiochus Epiphanes. Heraclides then conducted him to Rome, together with Laodice, a genuine daughter of Antiochus, and presented them to the senate. The senators soon discovered the imposture; but out of hatred to Demetrius, they promised Balas the kingdom of Syria. He then, under the title of Alexander, king of Syria, proceeded to levy troops, and sailed to Ptolemais, where his party was strengthened by the accession of great numbers of the malecontents.²

Demetrius, at length aroused from his lethargy, left his palace and collected a numerous army; but Balas was ready to meet him with nearly an equal force. In these circumstances, both kings were anxious to secure the friendship of Jonathan, who was able to render essential service to the cause he espoused. Demetrius, in order to gain him over to his party, offered to make him commander in chief over Judea, with full power to levy soldiers, and promised to release the Jewish hostages who were detained in the citadel of Jerusalem. Jonathan read the letter of Demetrius to the garrison of the citadel, and they immediately delivered up the hostages. The Syrian garrisons which Bacchides had left in the fortified towns of Judea, then withdrew from the country, with the exception of the garrisons of Bethsura and of the castle of Jerusalem, which, consisting principally of apostate Jews, were afraid to leave their places of refuge. By these revolutions, the power of Jonathan was greatly increased; he levied soldiers and provided them with arms; he repaired the dwellings of Jerusalem and rebuilt its walls. The city was once more strongly fortified, and Jonathan built there a house for his own residence.³

Alexander Balas now attempted to excel Demetrius in the liber-

ality of his offers; in the very commencement of the letter which he wrote to Jonathan, he called him his brother, gave him the title and rank of a friend of the king, appointed him to the high priesthood, and sent him a golden crown and purple robe. Jonathan accepted all that was offered him, without openly joining the party of either king; and he became the high priest of the Jews. Thus this office was transferred from the first class of priests and from the family of Jozadak, in which it had remained ever since the time of Cyrus, to the family of the Hasmoneans or Asamoneans, of the twenty fourth class, denominated from Jehoiarib, in which it continued till the days of Herod.⁴

When Demetrius heard of the offers of Balas, he wrote again to Jonathan and endeavoured, if possible, to outdo Balas in the generosity of his promises. The letter of Demetrius is preserved in I Macc. 10: 21—47. and in Josephus, Antiquities, XIII. 2: 3. The following is a translation of it by Whiston :

“ King Demetrius to Jonathan, and to the nation of the Jews, sendeth greeting : Since you have preserved your friendship for us, and when you have been tempted by our enemies, you have not joined yourselves to them, I both commend you for this your fidelity, and exhort you to continue in the same disposition, for which you shall be repaid and receive rewards from us ; for I will free you from the greatest part of the tributes and taxes which you formerly paid to the kings my predecessors, and to myself ; and I do now set you free from those tributes which you have ever paid ; and, besides, I forgive you the tax upon salt, and the value of the crowns which you used to offer me ; and instead of the third part of the fruits of the field, and the half of the fruits of the trees, I relinquish my part of them from this day : and as to the poll-money which ought to be given me for every head of the inhabitants of Judea, and of the three toparchies that adjoin to Judea, Samaria, and Galilee, and Perea, that I relinquish to you for this time, and for all time to come. I will also, that the city of Jerusalem be holy and inviolable, and free from the tithe, and from the taxes, to its utmost bounds. And I so far recede from my title to the citadel as to permit Jonathan, your high priest, to possess it, that he may place such a garrison in it as he approves of for fidelity and good will to himself, that they may keep it for us. I also make free all those Jews who have been made captives and slaves in my kingdom.

I also give order that the beasts of the Jews be not pressed for our service : and let their Sabbaths and all their festivals, and three days before each of them, be free from any imposition. In the same manner, I set free the Jews that are inhabitants in my kingdom, and order that no injury be done them. I also give leave to such of them as are willing to enlist themselves in my army, that they may do it, and those as far as thirty thousand ; which Jewish soldiers, wheresoever they go, shall have the same pay as my own army hath ; and some of them I will place in my garrisons, and some as guards about mine own body, and as rulers over those that are in my court. I give them leave also to use the laws of their forefathers and to observe them ; and I will that they have power over the three toparchies that are added to Judea ; and it shall be in the power of the high priest to take care that no one Jew shall have any other temple for worship, but only that at Jerusalem. I bequeath also, out of my own revenues, yearly, for the expenses about the sacrifices, one hundred and fifty thousand drachmae ; and what money is to spare, I will that it shall be your own. I also release to you those ten thousand drachmae which the kings recieved from the temple, because they appertain to the priests that minister in that temple. And whosoever shall fly to the temple at Jerusalem, and to the places thereto belonging, or who owe the king money, or are there on any other account, let them be set free, and let their goods be in safety. I also give you leave to repair and rebuild your temple, and that all be done at my expenses. I also allow you to build the walls of your city, and to erect high towers, and that they be erected at my charge. And if there be any fortified town that would be convenient for the Jewish country to have very strong, let it be so built at my expenses."

These promises of Demetrius were so extravagant that they defeated their own object. The Jews gave them no credit, especially when they recollected the sufferings which Demetrius had formerly occasioned them ; and, accordingly, Jonathan and the whole nation espoused the cause of Alexander Balas.⁵

In the year 152 B. C. Alexander Balas lost his first battle with Demetrius ; but he was immediately reinforced by Ptolemy Philometor, Ariarathes, Attalus, Jonathan, and even by the discontented Syrians themselves ; for many soldiers from the army of Demetrius deserted to him. Demetrius was so dispirited by this unex-

pected termination of his victory, that he sent his two sons, Demetrius and Antiochus, with the most valuable of his treasures, to Cnidus, that, in case of the worst, they might be spared to avenge his ruin.⁶

Demetrius had, at this time, an opportunity to retaliate on the Romans the part they had acted in the imposture of Balas; for Andronicus, who pretended to be a son of Perseus, king of Macedonia, and was endeavouring to establish his claims to that kingdom, had taken refuge at his court. But Demetrius, either fearing the power of the Romans or designing to put them to shame for their dishonesty to him, delivered up the pretender to the Roman senate. The senate, despising this dangerous man, dismissed him; and by this imprudent measure, brought upon themselves a very expensive and bloody war.⁷

In the year 150 B. C. a decisive battle was fought between Demetrius and Alexander Balas. At the beginning of the engagement, Demetrius had the advantage, but at last his army was entirely routed, and he himself, becoming entangled in a morass with his horse, was slain by the darts of his enemies.⁸

Alexander Balas now ascended the throne of Syria and married Cleopatra, a daughter of Ptolemy Philometor, who was conducted by her father to Ptolemais, where the nuptials were celebrated with great magnificence. At Ptolemais, Jonathan paid his respects to both kings, and was received by them with such marked distinction, that all the complaints which his discontented countrymen sought to lay against him, were rejected without a hearing. Alexander honoured him with a purple robe, placed him among his principal friends, made him military commandant of Judea, and raised him to the rank of a meridarch (*μεριδάρχης*) or ruler of a part of the empire.⁹

As soon as Balas saw that his throne was secure, he resigned himself entirely to voluptuousness and debauchery, and left the administration of affairs to his favourite Ammonius. This minister made himself odious by his cruelties. To ensure the safety of his royal master, he murdered a son and a sister of Demetrius Soter, and all the other members of that family whom he could get into his power. Demetrius, the oldest son of Demetrius Soter, was then at Cnidus; and hearing that the Syrians were disaffected towards their new sovereign, in the year 148 B. C. he collected a

small body of Cretans by the aid of Lasthenes, his host, and landed with them in Cilicia, according to the testimony of Josephus, where he received considerable accessions to his numbers, and made himself master of that whole district.¹⁰

Alexander Balas now intrusted the concerns of his government at Antioch to Hierax and Diodotus or Trypho, and with his army took the field against Demetrius. Meanwhile Apollonius, the governour of Coelosyria, joined the party of the pretender, and collecting his forces at Jamnia, challenged Jonathan, who remained faithful to Alexander Balas, to meet him in arms. Jonathan advanced with ten thousand men, took possession of Joppa before the eyes of Apollonius, overcame this governour in a pitched battle, subdued Ashdod, (*Ἀζωτος*), to which the enemy had retired after his defeat, and laid the city in ashes. Askelon (*Ἀσκάλων*) opened her gates to the conqueror and gave him a magnificent reception; and he then returned to Jerusalem, enriched by the spoils of his enemies. When Alexander Balas heard of these victories of Jonathan, he presented this faithful vassal with a golden chain, such as was worn by none but princes, and gave him possession of Ekron, (*Ἐκκρωίν.*) This city was peopled by Jews, or the original inhabitants had submitted to circumcision and adopted the Jewish religion, and had thus become one people with the Hebrews; as the Jebusites of Jerusalem had done in ancient times. In Zech. 9: 7. there is an allusion to this occurrence.¹¹

During this period, Onias, the son of the high priest Onias III. who escaped to Egypt in the year 153 B. C. had acquired great favour with king Ptolemy Philometor and the queen Cleopatra, by his skill in political and military affairs; and in the year 149 B. C. he was raised to the office of commander in chief of the Egyptian army. The next to him in command was Dositheus, who was also a Jew. During the reign of Ptolemy Philometor, these two Hebrews had the government of all Egypt in their own hands. Onias represented to the king and queen, that it would be productive of great advantage to their kingdom, if the numerous Jewish inhabitants of Egypt and Cyrene could have a temple of their own, which would supersede the necessity of their repairing to Jerusalem, in the dominions of a foreign monarch, to perform their religious services; and that if such a temple was built, many more Jews would be induced to settle in the country, as Judea was continually ex-

posed to the evils of war. By such representations, he at last obtained permission to erect a temple for the Jews on the site of an ancient temple of Bubastis or Isis, at the city of Leontopolis in the Heliopolitan nomos, over which he was governour. To the Jews he justified his undertaking by the passage in Isa. 19: 18, 19. and the temple was soon completed on the model of that at Jerusalem. Onias himself was invested with the high priesthood, the subordinate priests were furnished from the descendants of Aaron, Levites were employed in the sacred services, and the whole routine of religious worship was performed in the same manner as at Jerusalem. This continued for two hundred and twenty years, when the temple was shut up and finally demolished by the emperor Vespasian, on account of the rebellions of the Jews.¹²

Josephus tells us that, at this time, there was a famous controversy in Egypt between the Jews and Samaritans; the former contending that mount Moriah in Jerusalem, and the latter, that mount Gerizim, was the proper place for the worship of God. The Samaritans lost their cause, which was argued before the king, and the advocates they employed were punished with death, in accordance with an agreement, previously made, that such should be the fate of the losing party.¹³

¹ Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXII. 6. Athenaeus, X. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 2: 1. Justin, XXXV. 1. ² Justin, XXXV. 1. Athenaeus, V. Livy, Epitome of Book LII. Polybius, Legat. † 140. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 2: 1. 1 Macc. 10: 1. ³ 1 Macc. 10: 2—14. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 2: 1. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 2: 2. 1 Macc. 10: 15—21. 1 Chron. 9: 10. ⁵ 1 Macc. 10: 21—47. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 2: 3, 4. ⁶ Justin, XXXV. 1. 2. Livy, Epitome of Book LII. ⁷ Livy, Epitome of Books XLVIII. XLIX. L. Eutropius, IV. 15. Florus, Epit. Rer. Rom. II. 14. ⁸ Justin, XXXV. 1. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 2: 4. 1 Macc. 10: 43—50. ⁹ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 4: 1, 2. 1 Macc. 10: 51—66. ¹⁰ Livy, Epitome of Book L. Justin, XXXV. 2. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 4: 3. 1 Macc. 10: 67—69. ¹¹ Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXII. 16. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 4: 4. 1 Macc. 10: 69—89. Zech. 9: 6, 7. ¹² Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 3: 1—3. XX. 10: 1. and against Apion, II. 5. ¹³ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 3: 4.

C. DEMETRIUS NICATOR 146—144 B. C.

In the year 146 B. C. Ptolemy Philometor, who had been invited the year before by Alexander Balas to assist him against Demetrius, proceeded along the coasts of Palestine to Syria, attended by a fleet and a numerous army. In compliance with the orders of Alexander, all the cities opened their gates to Ptolemy, who brought them entirely under his own power, by placing a body of soldiers in each as a garrison. At Joppa he was met by Jonathan, whom he received in the most friendly manner and paid no regard to the accusations that were made against him, for he then needed the alliance of that potent warrior. They marched together in great harmony as far as the river Eleutherus, when Jonathan returned to Jerusalem. Ptolemy, having now secured to his own interests all the cities as far as Seleucia on the Orontes, by means of the garrisons he had left in them, appeared openly as the enemy of the Syrian king. He sent an embassy to Demetrius, the pretender to the crown, promising to give him in marriage his daughter, the wife of Alexander Balas, and to place him on the throne of Syria. He alleged as a reason for his treachery to Alexander, that he had detected that monarch in a design against his life; an accusation which Josephus supposes to be well grounded, but the author of the first Book of Maccabees represents it as a mere pretence.¹

As Ptolemy Philometor drew near to Antioch, the discontented citizens of that metropolis excited an insurrection, murdered the hated minister Ammonius, while he was attempting to make his escape in a female dress, opened their gates to Ptolemy and made him an offer of the crown. This Ptolemy declined, and recommended to them Demetrius as the lawful heir to the kingdom. Alexander Balas was at that time in Cilicia, where he had taken the field against Demetrius; but on hearing of the proceedings of Ptolemy, he returned to Syria with his whole army. In the battle which ensued, he was defeated, and fled with five hundred cavalry to Abae in Arabia, where he took refuge with the emir Zabdiel or (according to Diodorus Siculus) Diocles, under whose protection he had placed his children at the commencement of the war. There Zabdiel murdered him, in the fifth year of his reign over Syria, and sent his head to Ptolemy. But Ptolemy did not long en-

joy his triumph, for, having been wounded on the head by a fall from his horse during the battle, he soon after died in the hands of his surgeons, in the thirty fifth year of his reign over Egypt. Demetrius then ascended the throne of Syria and assumed the surname of Nicator, (*Νικᾶτωρ, the Conqueror.*)²

Ptolemy Philometor and Alexander Balas died in the same year (145 B. C.) in which Lucius Mummius took and destroyed Corinth, and Scipio Africanus the Younger conquered Carthage, at the termination of the third Punic war, which had continued three years. In the burning of Corinth, the numerous statues in the city were melted and run together, and this mixture of different sorts of metal produced the celebrated *aes Corinthiacum* or Corinthian brass. In this year also, Polybius of Megalopolis in Arcadia, completed the fortieth and last book of his history. He was then at Rome, whither the Romans had transferred him with many other Grecian noblemen, for the purpose of breaking up the Achaean league.³

Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, the wife and sister of Ptolemy Philometor, endeavoured to secure the crown to her son; but as he was then very young, there was a strong party in favour of recalling from Cyrene Ptolemy Physcon, the turbulent and quarrelsome brother of Philometor. Onias and Dositheus, the two Jews at the head of the Egyptian army, espoused the cause of the queen and the young king, but Thermus, the Roman ambassadour, who was then at Alexandria, reconciled the two factions by proposing that Physcon should marry his sister Cleopatra and take the guardianship of her son. But on the very day of the nuptials, the unfeeling guardian murdered the young king in the arms of his mother. He then ascended the throne, and assumed the surname of Euergetes, (*the Benefactor*;) though he was called by all his subjects Cakergetes, (*the Evildoer,*) a name which he well deserved by his odious character, for, as Justin fully testifies, he was the basest and most tyrannical of all the Ptolemies.⁴

In Syria the change of rulers was productive of little benefit to the country; for Demetrius Nicator, a young and inexperienced prince, committed the government entirely to the hands of Lathenes, whose efforts had essentially contributed to his advancement to the throne. But this minister, a man of furious temper, massacred the garrisons which Ptolemy Philometor had left in the cities

of Syria, and put to death all those who had taken part in the wars against Demetrius, or against his father. As if these odious measures had made the king no enemies, from whose vengeance there was anything to be dreaded, Lasthenes then dismissed all his soldiers, and even the auxiliaries he had brought from the Grecian islands, who were hated equally by the Syrians and by the ancient Greek inhabitants of the country.⁵

During these transactions in the kingdom of Syria, Jonathan had laid siege to the Syrian garrison of the castle on mount Zion. Notice of the siege was sent to Demetrius Nicator, and he, accordingly, summoned Jonathan to appear before him at Ptolemais. The Jewish leader, on his arrival at that city, so represented the affair to the king, that he not only dismissed him without rebuke and confirmed him in the high priesthood, but added to his government the principalities of Apherima, Lydda, and Ramatha, which had before appertained to Samaria, and for the sum of three hundred talents, remitted to him all the tribute of the whole country. Jonathan then returned to Jerusalem with his wealth and power greatly increased. The siege of the castle, which had not been interrupted by his absence, was now urged forward with new energy; but the place was so strongly fortified and the garrison made so obstinate a resistance, that nothing could be effected towards its reduction. Jonathan then sent ambassadours to the king, with a petition that the garrison might be withdrawn. Demetrius was then in great distress, for the citizens of Antioch, weary of his tyranny, had rebelled against him; and the humbled monarch promised the Jewish ambassadours that he would comply with all their demands, on condition that Jonathan would immediately afford him some assistance. Jonathan, accordingly, despatched to Antioch three thousand well armed Jews, who summoned the rebellious citizens to lay down their arms; and on their refusal, they fell upon them, put about one hundred thousand to the sword, and set fire to the city. After Demetrius Nicator had, in this manner, been rescued from the dangers which threatened him, he not only refused to withdraw the garrison from the castle at Jerusalem, but made a demand on all the Jews for the full amount of the tribute, which he had remitted to Jonathan for three hundred talents. By such perfidy he alienated the affections of all his Jewish subjects.⁶

¹ 1 Macc. 11: 1—12. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 4: 5—7. comp. Livy, Epitome of Book LII. ² 1 Macc. 11: 13—18. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 4: 7. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXII. 17. Polybius in Excerpta Valesii de Virtutibus et Vitiis, XXXI. ³ Livy, Epitome of Book LII. Justin, XXXIV. 2. Pausanias, Achaic. VII. 16. Pliny, XXXIV. 3. Florus, II. 16. Appian, Punic. CXXVII—CXXXV. Velleius Paterculus, I. ⁴ Justin, XXXVIII. 8. comp. Josephus against Apion, II. 5. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXII. 24. 36. 37. Athenaeus, IV. 25. X. Valerius Maximus, IX. 1: 5. 2: 5. ⁵ Diodor. Sic. XXXII. 22. 26. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 4: 9. 1 Macc. 11: 38. ⁶ Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXII. 22. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 4: 9. 5: 2, 3. 1 Macc. 11: 20—53.

CL. ANTIOCHUS THEOS II. 144—143 B. C.

Demetrius had scarcely escaped from these perils, before another and still more dreadful storm was ready to burst on his head. Diodotus or Trypho, who, in conjunction with Hierax, had formerly administered the affairs of government at Antioch under Alexander Balas, repaired to Zabdiel, the emir of the Arabs to whom Alexander Balas had intrusted the care of his son Antiochus. By earnest entreaties and false representations, he at length induced the Arab chief to give up to him the custody of the young prince. Trypho then, in the year 144 B. C. conducted Antiochus to Syria, with the intention of placing him on his father's throne. This was no sooner known, than all the soldiers dismissed by Lasthenes, who were out of pay, extremely necessitous and enraged against Demetrius, eagerly pressed into the service of the pretender. Demetrius was defeated and driven into Seleucia. All the elephants, many of the most important cities, and the metropolis itself, fell into the power of Antiochus, who now ascended the throne and assumed the surname of Θεός, (*the God*.)¹

Antiochus Theos then applied to Jonathan, and on condition that he would join his party, the young king confirmed him in his rank of the first of the king's friends, established him in the office of high priest of the Jews, conferred on him the dominion of the four toparchies or principalities, gave him the right of wearing a purple robe and golden chain, and made his brother Simon commander of all the royal forces from the mountains near Tyre, called the Ladder of Tyre, to the boundaries of Egypt. Jonathan had sufficient cause to be dissatisfied with Demetrius, and readily accepted the proposals of Antiochus; and as soon as he began to levy troops under his standard, he was joined by great multitudes of the

discontented Syrians, by whose aid he, in a short time, subdued the whole country as far as Damascus, to the power of his new sovereign. The troops of Demetrius offered no resistance to his progress, but invaded Galilee. Shortly after, Jonathan fell into an ambush of his enemies and came near suffering a total defeat, but the bravest of his soldiers making a stand, gave the others opportunity to rally, when they happily succeeded in beating off their foes. During these enterprises of Jonathan, his brother Simon took the fortress of Bethsura and garrisoned it with Jews.²

When Jonathan returned to Jerusalem and found every thing tranquil, in order to provide against future vicissitudes, he sent ambassadours to Rome, where they were received with honour by the senate and dismissed with assurances of friendship. The ambassadours, on their return, visited the Spartans, or Spardians, (see Sect. 91. note,) as the ambassadours of Judas had formerly done. At this time, Josephus first makes mention of the three sects of the Jews, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, whose origin we have already had occasion to notice.³ (Sect. 87.)

As soon as Demetrius had recruited his army, after the defeat in Galilee, he ventured on another campaign against the Jews. Jonathan marched out to meet his enemies as far as Amathis, (Hamath,) on the extreme frontiers of Canaan; and when he had ascertained from his spies that the Syrians intended to attack him in the following night, he made such preparations for their reception, that they were not only deterred from their purpose, but retreated so hastily that, the next day, Jonathan was unable to overtake them, though he pursued them to the river Eleutherus. On his return, he subdued the Arabians who were attached to Demetrius, and took Damascus. Meanwhile Simon had conquered Joppa and garrisoned the city with his own soldiers.⁴

When the two brothers returned to Jerusalem, the council of the elders determined to prepare themselves in the best manner possible to meet future exigencies. Accordingly, the fortifications of Jerusalem were repaired under the inspection of Jonathan, the castle with the Syrian garrison was separated from the city by a high wall; and Simon was sent to several towns in the country, to fortify them and put them in a state of defence, and thus the Jews were gradually prepared for their future complete independence.⁵

The scene now began to change, and it soon appeared that the

precautions which had been taken for the security of Judea, were not unnecessary. Trypho, who had elevated Antiochus to the throne for the sole purpose of murdering him and usurping the regal authority himself, was now ready for the execution of his design, but he dreaded the power of Jonathan. He resolved if possible to secure the Jewish hero, and for this purpose he entered Palestine with an army and advanced as far as Bethshan. But when Jonathan came against him with forty thousand men, he pretended that his intentions were friendly, and that he had entered Palestine in order to put Jonathan in possession of Ptolemais. He acted his part so dexterously that Jonathan was deceived, and dismissing his whole army excepting three thousand men, he left two thousand of these in Galilee, and advanced with one thousand to take possession of Ptolemais. But he had no sooner entered the city, than the gates were shut, his men cut to pieces and he himself put in chains. Trypho then sent a division of his army to destroy the two thousand men whom Jonathan had left in Galilee; but when the Syrians saw that the Jews were determined to sell their lives as dearly as possible, they dared not attack them.⁶

When the Jews heard these gloomy tidings, their consternation was universal; but Simon called them together in the temple, encouraged them to make a vigorous defence, and offering himself to become their leader in the place of Jonathan, his proposal was joyfully accepted. When the Syrian army was again put in motion, Simon advanced with so strong a force that Trypho dared not hazard a battle; but he pretended that Jonathan was detained on account of one hundred talents of tribute which remained unpaid, and that if this money should be sent him, and two sons of Jonathan delivered to him as hostages, their leader should be set at liberty. Simon saw clearly that this was a new artifice of the crafty enemy, but that it might not be said that he had left any means untried for the release of his brother, he sent to Trypho the sons of Jonathan and the money he had demanded. But Trypho received the money and retained both Jonathan and his sons. He then proceeded to ravage and lay waste the country, but Simon pressed closely on his steps, and, as far as possible, thwarted his purposes.⁷

The garrison at the castle of Jerusalem now made known to Trypho the sufferings they endured, in consequence of their long continued blockade; and he ordered his cavalry to hasten to their

relief. But during the night, there was such a fall of snow as not only prevented the relief of the garrison, but forced Trypho himself to retire to winter quarters in Gilead, where he put Jonathan to death, near the city of Bascama, in the year 143 B. C. Soon after, he privately murdered king Antiochus, and gave out that he had died under the hands of a surgeon; but as he immediately proclaimed himself king of Syria, his story gained no credit. Simon took the corpse of his brother from Bascama and interred it in his father's sepulchre at Modin, where he erected a magnificent mausoleum which was standing in the time of Eusebius.⁸

As soon as Simon had assumed the high priesthood and the command of the army, he sent ambassadours to Rome, to inform the senate of the fate of Jonathan and of his own accession to the offices of his brother, and to renew his alliance with the Romans. The ambassadours were received at Rome with every demonstration of honour, and returned with the terms of the treaty engraved on tables of copper. The same ambassadours were intrusted with mandates to the Spartans, or Spardians, and the other allies of the Jews.⁹

¹ Diodor. Sic. XXXII. 16. 1 Macc. 11: 39, 54—56. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 5: 3. Livy, Epitome of Book LII. Strabo. p. 752. ² Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 5: 4—7. 1 Macc. 11: 57—74. ³ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 5: 8, 9. 1 Macc. 12: 1—23. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 5: 10. 1 Macc. 12: 24—34. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 5: 11. 1 Macc. 12: 35—38. ⁶ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 6: 1, 2. 1 Macc. 12: 39—52. ⁷ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 6: 3—5. 1 Macc. 12: 53. 13: 1—24. ⁸ 1 Macc. 13: 25—32. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 6: 6. Justin, XXXVI. 1. Livy, Epitome of Book LV. Eusebius *περί τῶν τοπικῶν ὀνομάτων*. comp. Jahn, *Biblische Archaeologie*, Th. I. Band II. § 245. S. 548, and Kupfertafel X. Nro. 8. ⁹ 1 Macc. 14: 16—23, 40.

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

HISTORY OF THE JEWS DURING THEIR INDEPENDENCE
FROM 143 TO 63 B.C.

CII. INDEPENDENCE OF THE JEWS 143 B. C.

MEANWHILE the hostilities between Demetrius and Trypho were not interrupted, though the former paid little regard to the progress of his rival, and continued his voluptuous life at Seleucia. His general Sarpedon lost a battle near Ptolemais, in the year 143 B. C. but it was far from being decisive.¹

The Jews, however, who had been grossly injured by Trypho, found that the dominion of Demetrius was more tolerable than the yoke of that deceitful tyrant; and they sent an embassy to Seleucia, with the present of a golden crown, to make peace with the king. Demetrius, who needed the aid of the nation against Trypho, readily acceded to all the demands of the ambassadours; he acknowledged Simon as the high priest and prince of the Jews, relinquished all his claims on them for tribute, customs and taxes, and consented to bury in oblivion all their former offences against him. These concessions he committed to writing in the form of a royal edict, which he gave to the ambassadours to be conveyed to Jerusalem. In this manner, the Jews once more became a free and independent people; and accordingly, with this year (143 B. C.) they commenced a new epoch, and dated from the year of the freedom of Jerusalem; an era which is used on the coins of Simon, as well as by Josephus and the author of the first Book of Maccabees.²

Simon, the prince of the Jews, now exerted himself to improve the condition of his country; he repaired the military works, and at Joppa, formed a harbour for shipping. He conquered Gaza, (Gazara?) and in the year 142 B. C. forced the garrison in the castle on mount Zion to surrender. Josephus relates that he then

not only demolished the castle, to prevent its falling again into the hands of the enemy, but that he levelled mount Zion itself, on which the castle stood, because it commanded the temple ; a labour which it took three years to accomplish. But the author of the first Book of Maccabees makes no mention of the levelling of the mountain, and the expressions in 1 Macc.14: 37. are entirely at variance with the story of Josephus, so that it probably originated in mistake. Simon then strengthened the fortifications of the mountain on which the temple stood, and built there a residence for himself.³ This was called *Baris*, (בָּרִיס, *Bápuç* or *Bápuis*,) originally the Persian name of a royal palace, but which, according to the testimony of Jerome, was afterwards adopted in Palestine and applied to all the large quadrangular dwellings, which were built with turrets and walls.⁴ Simon appointed his son John Hyrcanus the general of his army, and assigned him his quarters in the fortress of Gazara.

The Jews now enjoyed a season of quiet. They took this opportunity to renew their alliance with the Romans and with the Spartans, or Spardians ; and Simon deputed a special ambassadour to Rome with the present of a golden shield weighing one thousand minae, that he might be acknowledged by the senate as an independent prince.⁵

In the year 141 B. C. a general assembly was held at Jerusalem, in which the people, out of gratitude to the house of Mattathias, made both the high priesthood and the office of regent or prince of the Jews, hereditary in the family of Simon. This decree of the assembly was engraved on plates of copper, and fixed to a monument which was erected in the temple.⁶

If we may credit the traditions of the Jews and their modern books, such as *Sepher Juchasin*, *Shalsheth Hakkabbala*, and *Zemach David*, these times were distinguished by the celebrated teachers, Simon Ben Shetah and Judah Ben Tabbai, who are said to have established schools at Jerusalem at this period.

¹ Athenaeus, VIII. Diodor. Sic. XXXII. 26. Strabo, p. 758. ² Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 6: 7. 1 Macc. 13: 34—42. Jahn, *Biblische Archaeologie*, Th. I. Band II. Kupfert. VI. und Beschreibung der Kupfer im Band I. S. 56—61. ³ 1 Macc. 13: 43—52. comp. 14: 7. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 6: 7. Michaelis, *Anmerkungen zur Uebersetzung des Ersten Buches der Makkabäer*, bey 1 Macc. 13: 62. und 14: 37. ⁴ Jerome, *Epist. ad Princip.* Tom.

II. p. 689. Jahn, *Biblische Archaeologie*, Th. I. Band I. §§ 43—47. S. 199—219. Upham's Translation, † 34. p. 37. comp. 1 Chron. 29: 1, 19. 2 Chron. 17: 12. 27: 4. Neh. 1: 1. 2: 8. 7: 2. Esth. 1: 2, 5. 2: 3, 5, 8. 3: 15. 8: 14. 9: 6, 11, 15. Dan. 8: 2. ⁵ 1 Macc. 14: 16—24. ⁶ 1 Macc. 14: 25—49.

CIII. SIMON PRINCE OF THE JEWS 141—135 B. C.

The throne of Parthia was occupied, at this time, by Arsaces V. or VI. who was called Mithridates. During the disturbances in the kingdom of Syria which have already been mentioned, he had taken possession of all the country of the Euphrates and extended his dominions to India; and he was now improving the internal regulations of his enlarged empire, by collecting into a code the best laws of all the conquered nations.¹

The Macedonians who had settled in those countries, were not satisfied with this change of masters; and by messengers repeatedly sent, they invited Demetrius to lead an army to the East, where they promised to join his standard. Demetrius, accordingly, left Trypho master of the greater part of Syria, and marched over the Euphrates and Tigris, when the Elymaeans, the Persians and the Bactrians, welcomed him as their sovereign. Strengthened by these people, he defeated the Parthians in several engagements; but afterwards, deluded by a pretended negotiation, he was made prisoner and his army cut to pieces.²

Mithridates exhibited the captive king in every part of his empire, to show his discontented subjects that they could expect no aid from Demetrius. He then sent him into Hyrcania, where he treated him with the respect due to his rank, and even gave him his own daughter Rhodoguna in marriage. In this condition Demetrius remained under Phraates, the successor of Mithridates, though he twice attempted to make his escape from captivity.³

In the year 140 B. C. Cleopatra, the wife of the captive Demetrius, shut herself up with her children in Seleucia on the Orontes. Her force soon became formidable; for many, disgusted with the severity and tyranny of Trypho, went over to the party of the queen. Still she ventured to engage in no offensive operations; but when she learned that her husband had married Rhodoguna, she sent to Antiochus, the brother of Demetrius, who was then at Rhodes, and made him an offer of her hand and her kingdom. Upon this, An-

tiochus, who was surnamed Eusebes and Sidetes or Zidetes, assumed the title of king of Syria, levied soldiers, and wrote to Simon, the prince of the Jews, promising him his friendship.⁴

In the following year, 139 B. C. he sailed to Syria with a large army, married Cleopatra, joined her forces to his own, and took the field against Trypho. The soldiers of this tyrant deserted in great numbers to Antiochus, in consequence of which, the army of the latter was soon increased to one hundred and twenty thousand infantry and eight thousand cavalry. Trypho was defeated and forced to seek refuge in Dora, where he was immediately besieged by land and sea, by the numerous forces of Antiochus, and reduced to the last extremity. He, however, escaped on shipboard and sailed to Orthosia, whence he fled to Apamea, his native city; but there he was made prisoner and put to death, after he had reigned three years over a part of Syria. Thus Antiochus Sidetes became master of the whole Syrian empire, of which he held possession for nine years.⁵

When Antiochus, on his arrival in Syria, saw the strength of his party, he paid no regard to the promises he had made to Simon in his friendly letter to that prince; he rejected the two thousand auxiliaries, the gold and silver, the arms and military machines, which the Jewish ruler had sent to his aid in the siege of Dora; and despatched Athenobius to Jerusalem, to demand possession of Gazara, Joppa, the castle on mount Zion, and other fortified places, or, in lieu of them, the payment of five hundred talents; and five hundred talents more as a compensation for the damage which the Jews had done to the Syrian empire. Simon offered to pay one hundred talents for the possession of Gazara and Joppa; but the other places he claimed as the hereditary inheritance of his fathers, which had been wrongfully seized and retained, but were now restored to their lawful owners. This answer only served to irritate Antiochus. Even the friendship of the Romans afforded, at this time, no protection to the Jews; for though the senate, immediately after the embassy of Simon, had directed the consul Lucius Cornelius Piso to send letters to all the allied kings and nations, signifying the alliance of the Romans with the Jews and commanding them to abstain from all encroachments on that people, and to give them no cause of dissatisfaction; the letter to the king of Syria was addressed to Demetrius, who was then a captive in Parthia, and

therefore Antiochus chose not to consider himself bound by its requisitions. Accordingly he sent an army into the neighbourhood of Joppa and Jamnia, under the command of his general Cendebeus, who fortified Cedron, provided it with a garrison, and made hostile incursions on the Jewish territories. Simon, who was now too old to endure the fatigues of a campaign, sent out a detachment of twenty thousand infantry and some cavalry, under the command of his sons, John Hyrcanus and Judas. They soon repulsed Cendebeus and forced him to shut himself up in the fortress of Cedron. Judas was wounded in the battle, but John Hyrcanus pursued the fugitives and burnt the tower of Azotus or Ashdod, into which they had thrown themselves. By such energetic measures, the Syrians, in a short time, were expelled from Judea.⁶

The next year, 137 B. C. Antiochus Sidetes was constantly occupied in suppressing the adherents of Trypho; so that the Jews enjoyed a season of tranquillity. Simon took this opportunity to make a tour through Judea, for the purpose of examining and improving the condition of the country; and in the beginning of the year 135 B. C. he came to Jericho, where his son-in-law Ptolemy was governour. Ptolemy invited him into his castle, and at a feast, treacherously murdered him with his two sons, Mattathias and Judas, after he had governed Judea for eight years. Ptolemy, who intended to usurp the principality of Judea, immediately sent intelligence of the death of Simon to Antiochus Sidetes, with whom he probably had a secret understanding in respect to this perfidious murder. For the further promotion of his design, he despatched messengers to all the principal military officers of the country, in order to gain them over to his cause by promises. He also sent a party of assassins to Gazara, to murder John Hyrcanus, the son of Simon; but Hyrcanus, having received notice of his danger, put the assassins to death and hastened to Jerusalem, where he was universally acknowledged as the successor of his father in the high priesthood and principality of Judea. Ptolemy then fled to Zeno Cotylais, the tyrant of Philadelphia, and is no more mentioned in history.⁷

Though the treachery of Ptolemy had proved so fatal to himself, Antiochus Sidetes entered Judea with an army, laid waste the country and besieged Jerusalem. The siege was vigorously prosecuted, and the citizens defended themselves with great bravery;

but famine would soon have compelled them to surrender unconditionally, had not an opportunity offered of making peace with the king. John Hyrcanus requested an armistice during the feast of tabernacles that was approaching, which Antiochus not only granted, but even sent into the city sacrificial animals, to be used in the solemnities of the festival. Won by such a proof of humanity and piety, Hyrcanus sent an embassy to the king with proposals of permanent peace. Though the Syrian generals attempted to instigate their sovereign at this time to root out the Jews, who were so much hated by all other nations, he rejected their bloody counsels and listened to the proposals of Hyrcanus. He was probably influenced in some degree by a dread of the Romans, for he soon after sent a magnificent present to Scipio Africanus the Younger. The distresses of the Jews were so great, that in order to obtain relief, they consented to pay tribute for Joppa and several other cities, to demolish the fortifications of Jerusalem, and to rebuild the castle of mount Zion; and in their harassed state, even these conditions did not seem severe, especially after Antiochus, for the sum of five hundred talents, relinquished his demand to have the castle rebuilt. Thus the Jews again obtained peace, in the ninth month after the death of Simon. But three hundred talents of the money promised to Antiochus, were to be paid immediately; and, in order to obtain the money, John Hyrcanus is said to have opened the sepulchre of David, and to have taken from it three thousand talents. I have elsewhere expressed my opinion respecting this tradition. Allusion is made to the depressed circumstances of the Jews at this time, in the following words of Justin in his account of Antiochus: "*Judaeosque, qui in Macedonico imperio sub Demetrio patre armis se in libertatem vindicaverant, subigit.*"⁸

Egypt, during this period, was groaning under the tyranny of Ptolemy Physcon Euergetes, who by his repeated cruelties had well deserved the surname of Cakergetes. Hierax, who, in conjunction with Trypho, once governed Syria under Alexander Balas, had fled to Egypt, and was now the prime minister of Ptolemy. He exerted all his powers to prevent insurrections; but after the year 136 B. C. the whole kingdom fell into confusion; either because Hierax had been put to death by Ptolemy, as Athenaeus asserts, or because the minister was no longer able to repair the mischiefs of the sovereign. Ptolemy Physcon permitted his mercenary sol-

diers to murder his subjects at pleasure, and his empire was daily deluged with blood. He ravished his daughter-in-law and then married her, after he had repudiated her mother, who was his own sister. His cruelties compelled his subjects to emigrate in great numbers, and many houses in Alexandria were left destitute of inhabitants. The artists and learned men settled in Greece, Asia Minor, and the Grecian islands, and by their means, the arts and sciences were revived in those places, while they ceased to flourish in Egypt. Ptolemy attempted to allure foreigners into the forsaken dwellings of Alexandria, but they soon became disgusted with his voluptuousness and cruelty. About this time, Publius Scipio Africanus, Spurius Mummius, and Lucius Metellus, were sent from Rome by the senate as ambassadours to inquire into the condition of their allies; and they came to Egypt in the year 136 B. C. By their temperate mode of living and by their whole conduct, they formed the most striking contrast with the luxurious and inhuman king; and they could not without pain observe the miserable condition of Egypt, which, under a suitable government, might have been a prosperous and happy kingdom, and where there had been, according to the testimony of Theocritus, thirty three thousand three hundred and thirty nine cities in the reign of Ptolemy Philadelphus. This number may perhaps exceed the truth; but the flourishing cities were undoubtedly very numerous in the time of the two first Ptolemies. What idea must the temperate and sagacious Roman ambassadours have formed of Physcon, who, in his gluttony and cruelty and even in his person, resembled a wild beast rather than a man, and who heightened his natural deformities by wearing a garment so thin, that every part of his hideous form could be distinctly seen through it! He was surely a strange figure for a king; short of stature, and withal so thick that no man could clasp him; and, to finish the picture, arrayed in a transparent robe. "Erat enim (says Justin) et vultu deformis, et statura brevis, et sagina ventris non homini, sed belluae similis. Quam foeditatem nimia subtilitas perlucidiae vestis augebat, prorsus quasi astu inspicienda praeberentur, quae omni studio occultanda pudibundo viro erant."⁹

Attalus Philometor, the son of Eumenes, as unnatural a tyrant as Ptolemy Physcon, had occupied the throne of Pergamus ever since the year 138 B. C. He had been well educated by his uncle Attalus, his predecessor in the throne; but when he assumed the

government after the decease of his uncle, he murdered all his near relatives and friends with their wives and children, under pretence that they had been instrumental in the death of his mother. He then arrayed himself in a sordid garment, suffered his hair and beard to grow neglected, refused to appear in public, and cultivated the soil in his garden, as if he would now do penance for his crimes; but he sowed poisonous plants with the good, and sent them mingled together, as presents to his friends. At last he undertook himself to cast a statue for his mother; when, in consequence of the heat, he was thrown into a fever of which he died in the year 133 B. C. The most remarkable thing respecting him is, that in his will, he made the Romans the heirs of his kingdom. Aristonius, a natural son of Eumenes and half brother of Attalus, asserted his claims to the crown and made himself master of several cities; but after a four years' war, in which the Romans at last poisoned the waters of the country, he was overpowered and taken prisoner. The Romans then took possession of Pergamus, made it a Roman province, and dignified it with the name of Asia.¹⁰

¹ Justin, *XLI.* 5. ⁶ Diodor. Sic. *XXXII.* 34. Orosius, *V.* 4. ² ¹ Macc. 14: 3. Josephus, *Antiq. XIII.* 7: 1. Justin, *XXXVI.* 1. *XXXVIII.* 9. Orosius, *V.* 4. ³ Justin, *XXXVI.* 1. *XXXVIII.* 9. *XLII.* 1—3. ⁴ Justin, *XXXVI.* 1. Josephus, *Antiq. XIII.* 7: 1. ¹ Macc 15: 1—9. ⁵ Justin, *XXXVI.* 1. Josephus, *Antiq. XIII.* 7: 2. ¹ Macc. 15: 10—14. 38. ⁶ Josephus, *Antiq. XIII.* 7: 3. ¹ Macc. 15: 15—41. 16: 1—10. ⁷ Josephus, *Antiq. XIII.* 7: 3, 4. 8: 1. ¹ Macc. 16: 14—22. ⁸ Livy, *Epitome of Book LVII.* Diodor. Sic. *XXXIV.* 1. Justin. *XXXVI.* 1. Josephus, *Antiq. XIII.* 8: 2—4. comp. Jahn, *Biblische Archaeologie*, Th. I. Band II. § 244. S. 541. ⁹ Justin, *XXXVIII.* 8. Diodor. Sic. *Fragm. XXX.* 24. 28. 29. 36. 37. Athenæus, *IV.* 25. *VI.* *VII.* *XII.* Theocritus, *Idyll. XVII.* Valerius Maximus, *IX* 1: 5. 2: 5. Cicero, *Somnium Scip.* II. ¹⁰ Diodor. Sic. *Fragm. XXXIV.* 14. Justin, *XXXVI.* 4. Strabo, p. 624. Florus, *II.* 20. Livy, *Epitome of Books LVIII. LIX.* Eutropius, *IV.* 20. Orosius, *V.* 10.

CIV. JOHN HYRCANUS 135—106. B. C.

John Hyrcanus now enjoyed the government of his principality undisturbed; and in the year 131 B. C. he attended Antiochus in a campaign against Phraates, king of Parthia. Antiochus pretended that he undertook the war with Parthia, for the purpose of deliv-

ering his brother Demetrius from captivity ; but the real cause of his enterprise was a rumour he had heard, that the Parthians treated Demetrius with so much attention, in order at some future time to employ him against Syria, and perhaps reestablish him on the throne. The Syrian army consisted of only eighty thousand soldiers, but the servants, sutlers, comedians, and other attendants, amounted to three hundred thousand, and the most extravagant luxury prevailed during the whole expedition. Notwithstanding this, Antiochus Sidetes was at first successful ; for he defeated the Parthians in three battles, and confined them within the boundaries of their own country. At the approach of winter, John Hyrcanus led back his forces to Judea, with increased reputation for his conduct in the campaign. It was well for him that he returned so soon ; for when the army of Antiochus, which consisted in all of four hundred thousand men, went into winter quarters, and, in order to maintain their luxury, oppressed the inhabitants, they fell upon their uninvited guests when separated from each other, and overwhelmed them with a promiscuous massacre. Antiochus, with the soldiers under his immediate command, hastened to join the divisions of his army which were stationed nearest to his quarters ; but he was met by Phraates, defeated, and left dead on the field.¹

While Phraates, during this campaign, was exposed to danger from the inroads of the Syrians, he had called the Scythians to his aid and dismissed the captive Demetrius to Syria, to regain possession of that kingdom, that Antiochus might, in this manner, be compelled to return. But when Antiochus and his whole army were so unexpectedly destroyed, Phraates sent to recall Demetrius, who had safely arrived in Syria after a rapid journey, and had been every where received with joy by the inhabitants, who were fearful of new troubles. Phraates was also involved in a war with his Scythian auxiliaries, because he, having no further occasion for their services, refused to pay them their stipulated wages. In this war, he was so imprudent as to enrol among his own soldiers the Greeks, whom he had taken from the army of Antiochus Sidetes ; but they, in the first battle, went over to the Scythians, and turned their arms against the Parthians. The army of Phraates was totally routed, himself slain, and his whole kingdom given up to pillage. His uncle Artabanus then ascended the throne, but he was also killed in his first encounter with the Thogarian Scythians. The crown

then descended to Mithridates the Great, who afterwards became so celebrated by his wars and conquests.²

Syria had now a king, but the strength of the empire was exhausted by the defeats in Parthia. John Hyrcanus well knew how to avail himself of these circumstances. As soon as he received intelligence of the death of Antiochus Sidetes, he took the field, conquered Medaba, Samega, and several other cities of the Syrian empire, and made himself completely independent. From this time, the Jews disowned all the authority of the Syrians over their country, and their princes no longer acknowledged themselves the vassals of the Syrian monarchs. In allusion to these transactions, Justin observes: "*quorum (Judaeorum) vires tantae fuerunt, ut post hunc (Antiochum Sidetem) nullum Macedonum regem tulerint, domesticis imperiis usi, Syriam magnis bellis infestaverint.*" About the year 159 B. C. Hyrcanus subdued the city of Shechem and destroyed the temple of the Samaritans, which was situated on the south side of mount Gerizim, at a little distance from Shechem. The Samaritans, however, continued to perform the public services of their religion on the same mountain. John Hyrcanus then conquered the Idumeans and gave them their choice, either to be circumcised and keep the law of Moses, or to leave the country. They chose the former and became one people with the Jews.³

In the mean time, Ptolemy Physcon had continued his disorderly reign in Egypt; and when he saw that his tyranny was hateful to the inhabitants whom he had invited to Alexandria, in order to prevent an insurrection, he directed his mercenary soldiers to massacre all the youth of the city in the gymnasium. But this only hastened the insurrection which he dreaded. The enraged citizens set fire to the royal palace, hoping that the odious tyrant would perish in the flames. But he effected his escape, and fled to Cyprus with his young queen Cleopatra. The Egyptians then surrendered the government to Cleopatra, the sister and repudiated wife of Physcon; but he levied troops in Cyprus to make war on the queen. He had left his son as governour of Cyrene, but fearing that the Egyptians might raise him to the throne, he recalled him to Cyprus and put him to death. The Alexandrians were so exasperated by this unnatural murder, that they overthrew all the statues of Physcon. He, supposing that this was done at the instigation of the queen, his former wife, took his son Memphitis, whom he had by her, cau-

sed him to be beheaded before his eyes, and the body to be cut to pieces. The mangled remains he ordered to be deposited in a box and sent to Egypt, to be presented to Cleopatra, at the festival on her birthday. By this the Egyptians were still more enraged, and they resolved to make every effort to prevent the return of so inhuman a monster to their country. For this purpose, they raised a large army, which protected Egypt under the command of Marsyas. But in the year 128 B. C. Hegelochus led the forces of Physcon to Egypt, defeated Marsyas and took him prisoner. Contrary to the expectations of all, Physcon set Marsyas at liberty; for the tyrant hoped by this means to regain the affections of his subjects. Cleopatra now, in the danger which threatened her, sent an embassy to Demetrius, king of Syria, who after his return from Parthia, had married her oldest daughter by Philometor. She offered him the crown of Egypt, on condition that he would lead an army to her assistance.⁴

Demetrius listened with pleasure to so attractive an offer, and immediately conducted an army through Palestine to Egypt. But while he was engaged in the siege of Pelusium, the citizens of Antioch revolted from him and induced several others to join their party, and among the rest, the powerful city of Apamea. Demetrius, therefore, was compelled to leave Egypt, and returned along the coasts of Palestine to Antioch. Cleopatra being thus forsaken, collected her most valuable treasures, and fled by sea to seek protection with her daughter by Philometor, Cleopatra, queen of Syria, who was then residing at Ptolemais. This princess had been first married to Alexander Balas, then to Demetrius, afterwards to his brother Antiochus Sidetes, and she was now again the wife of Demetrius. Ptolemy Physcon then entered Egypt and took possession of the kingdom without opposition.⁵

As Demetrius, in his expedition to Egypt, had led his army through the land of the Hebrews by the seacoast, and returned by the same route, John Hyrcanus sent an embassy to Rome, not so much to get himself acknowledged by the senate as the successor of Simon in the principality of Judea, as to complain of the aggressions of Antiochus Sidetes and Demetrius; the former of whom had made war on the Jews, the allies of the Romans, and taken from them Gazara, Joppa, and several other cities, while the latter was at that very time leading an army through their country. The

Roman senate renewed their alliance with the Jewish ambassadors, and promised to take into consideration the aggressions complained of, when they had opportunity. Soon after, Hyrcanus sent a second embassy to Rome, consisting of Alexander, the son of Jason, Numenius, the son of Antiochus, and Alexander, the son of Dositheus, on the same business, and with them, a present of a golden shield valued at fifty thousand pieces of gold. But they accomplished nothing more than what had already been done by the former ambassadors. Josephus places this embassy in the high priesthood of Hyrcanus II. and says that the design of it was to obtain permission to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, which had been thrown down by Pompey. But this is evidently a mistake; for in the decree of the senate there is not a word respecting the rebuilding of the walls: besides, the permission to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem was granted as a reward for the services which Hyrcanus II. had rendered to Caesar in the Egyptian war, and consequently, it must have been given after the twenty third year of Hyrcanus II. when that war was closed; whereas this decree was issued in the ninth year of Hyrcanus: again, the permission to rebuild the walls was given in the ides of December, that is, on the thirteenth of October; but this decree is dated in the month of Panemus or July: and finally, the decree itself mentions Numenius, the son of Antiochus, as one of the ambassadors; but he had been sent as one of the ambassadors to Rome in the time of Jonathan, and consequently, could not have been living under Hyrcanus II. one hundred years after.⁶

When Ptolemy Physcon found that he was again secure on the throne of Egypt, he resolved to be revenged on Demetrius for his attempt to take possession of the kingdom by the aid of Cleopatra. For this purpose, he brought forward Zebina, the son of Protarchus a merchant, as an adopted son of Antiochus Sidetes, or Alexander Balas, and a claimant to the crown of Syria, and sent him with an army against Demetrius. However contemptible such a pretender might appear, he easily deprived Demetrius of his kingdom and his life; for this monarch had made himself universally hated by his severity. In the year 126 B. C. a battle was fought near Damascus between Zebina, and Demetrius, in which the latter was defeated. He withdrew to Ptolemais, where his wife Cleopatra then resided; but she ordered the gates of the city to be closed against her

husband, and, in this manner, compelled him to flee to Tyre, where he was slain. The Syrian empire was now divided; Cleopatra retaining a part, and the remainder coming under the dominion of Zebina, who was also called Alexander, an equitable and popular ruler. To secure himself more firmly on the throne, he entered into an alliance with John Hyrcanus.⁷

Seleucus, the only son of Demetrius Nicator, assumed the title of king of Syria; but the government was entirely in the hands of his mother Cleopatra. In the twentieth year of his age, 124 B. C. he manifested a determination to exercise the authority of a king; when his mother, with her own hands, murdered him with a javelin. Zebina did not enjoy his throne undisturbed; for Clonius, Aeropus, and Antipater, three of his ablest generals, revolted from him. They were however defeated at Laodicea on the Orontes, and pardoned by their sovereign.⁸

The next year, 123 B. C. Cleopatra, queen of Syria, recalled Antiochus Grypus, her second son by Demetrius, from Athens, whither she had sent him to be educated, and proclaimed him king; though she still retained all the authority herself. In the following year, the imperious queen had the satisfaction of seeing Ptolemy Physcon break off his connexion with Alexander Zebina, because the latter refused to do him homage for the sovereignty of Syria. Physcon then came to terms with Cleopatra, gave his daughter Tryphaena in marriage to her son Antiochus Grypus, and provided her with a large army. Alexander Zebina was then defeated; and when he attempted to obtain money for his flight to Greece from the temple of Jupiter at Antioch, the citizens rose against him, drove him out of the temple, and finally killed him. Thus Cleopatra became mistress of all Syria. She, however, enjoyed her good fortune but a short time; for, in the year 120 B. C. Antiochus Grypus was determined to take the government into his own hands, and Cleopatra, to preserve her own authority, prepared poison for her son. But she was detected, and Antiochus compelled his murderous mother to drink the poison herself.⁹

Three years after this, in 117 B. C. Ptolemy Physcon died, after he had reigned twenty nine years from the death of his more amiable brother Philometor. He made over Cyrene to Apian, his son by a concubine, and left the government of Egypt in the hands of Cleopatra, his wife and daughter-in-law, with directions for her

to bestow the sceptre on either of her two sons, Lathyrus, or Alexander, according to her own choice. She preferred Alexander, her younger son; though she was compelled by the people to raise to the throne Lathyrus, the first born, who was surnamed Philometor and Soter. But she forced him to repudiate his beloved wife and sister Cleopatra, and to marry his younger sister Selene.¹⁰

Antiochus Grypus had a half brother that his mother Cleopatra had borne to Antiochus Sidetes who perished in Parthia. Cleopatra, after the return of her former husband Demetrius from Parthia, sent this son to be educated at Cyzicus on the Propontis. Antiochus Grypus now attempted by poison to procure the death of this prince, who was called Antiochus Cyzicenus; but his murderous intentions were discovered, and Cyzicenus collected an army, with which he marched to Syria, to make war on his brother Grypus. The next year, 113 B. C. Cyzicenus married Cleopatra, the repudiated wife of Ptolemy Lathyrus, who brought him, as her marriage gift, an army she had levied in Cyprus. Notwithstanding this reinforcement, he was defeated in a battle with Grypus, and forced to flee to Antioch. Here he left his wife Cleopatra, and departed to levy more troops in the adjoining provinces; but Grypus meanwhile took possession of the city, and Cleopatra sought refuge in the temple. The conqueror was disposed to clemency towards her, but her sister Tryphaena, the wife of Grypus, contrary to the wishes of her husband, seized Cleopatra, cut off her hands by which she had clasped the altar, and put her to death because she had married the enemy of the king. But in the following year, 112 B. C. Antiochus Cyzicenus returned to Syria with a new army, overcame his brother Grypus in battle, took Tryphaena prisoner and sacrificed her to the manes of his murdered wife. Antiochus Grypus made his escape to Aspendus in Pamphylia. But in the year 111 B. C. Grypus was again successful in Syria, and then the two rival brothers agreed to share the empire between them. Antiochus Cyzicenus obtained Coelosyria and Phenicia, and fixed his residence at Damascus; while Antiochus Grypus held the remainder of the kingdom, and dwelt at Antioch, the ancient metropolis. Unfortunately, both kings were voluptuous libertines; and their endless contentions, which could never be entirely appeased, at last deprived them both of their dominions.¹¹

Cleopatra, the queen of Egypt, was not disturbed by the unhap-

py fate of her two daughters in Syria; for she was entirely occupied in exertions for the security of her own power. In furtherance of her designs, she had appointed Alexander, her youngest and favourite son, governour of Cyprus, that, in case of necessity, she might receive aid from him.¹²

John Hyrcanus took advantage of the disturbances and divisions in Syria, to increase his own power and extend his territories. In the twenty sixth year of his administration, 110 B. C. his two sons, Aristobulus and Antigonus, laid siege to Samaria, to retaliate on the Macedonians, (who had possessed that city ever since the time of Alexander the Great,) the hostilities which they, at the instigation of the Syrian kings, had committed against the Jewish colony at Merissa. Antiochus Cyzicenus came with an army to the relief of Samaria; but he was repulsed, and the siege continued to be vigorously prosecuted in the year 109 B. C. The citizens again applied to Cyzicenus for aid, but though he had received of Ptolemy Lathyrus six thousand auxiliary troops from Egypt, he could make no energetic effort for the relief of the distressed city. The aid of Egypt was of no real advantage to Cyzicenus, and had nearly deprived Lathyrus of his throne; for his mother Cleopatra, influenced by Chelcias and Ananias, two Jews, the sons of Onias who had built the temple at Leontopolis, was strenuously opposed to the design of sending troops against the Jews. Cyzicenus, with his Egyptian reinforcement, could do nothing but ravage the country of the Jews, intending by this means to withdraw the besieging army from Samaria; but in these predatory excursions, his army was continually weakened by skirmishes with the Jews and the desertion of his soldiers. At length he retired to Tripolis, and left his generals, Callimander and Epicrates, with the army, to prosecute the mode of petty warfare which he had commenced. But Callimander was soon cut off with his whole army by the Jews, and Epicrates betrayed into their hands Scythopolis and the adjoining places which belonged to Cyzicenus. At last, Hyrcanus, in the year 109 B. C. conquered Samaria, demolished its fortifications, and made it entirely desolate by laying it under water.¹³

John Hyrcanus, who, according to Josephus, had been favoured with divine revelations, was a zealous Pharisee, and universally beloved for his justice and virtues. Towards the close of his administration, about the year 108 B. C. he requested the Pharisees who

were present with him at a feast, to inform him of any failure in his duty towards God or man, which might have come to their knowledge. From all the guests he received testimony of his blameless conduct, and the highest praises for his virtues. But a certain Eleazer, a turbulent and peevish man, told him that he ought to resign the high priesthood and content himself with the civil government of the nation; because, his mother having been once a captive, it was uncertain whether he was a descendant of Aaron or of a pagan. Hyrcanus was the more offended at this, because, as Josephus assures us, the allegation was false. The Sadducees took this opportunity to excite the disgust of Hyrcanus against the Pharisees. Jonathan, his intimate friend, and a Sadducee, persuaded him that all the Pharisees agreed with Eleazer, as might be made evident by demanding of them what punishment the detractor merited, for they would certainly be very lenient towards him. This Jonathan could say with the more safety, as the Pharisees generally were milder in their punishments than the Sadducees. But Hyrcanus, in his displeasure, overlooked this principle of the sect; and when they answered his question respecting the punishment of Eleazer, by recommending imprisonment and scourging according to the law of Moses, he renounced all connexion with them and attached himself to the Sadducees. On this account, the Pharisees, who had unbounded influence over the common people, afterwards manifested great hostility and caused many embarrassments to the family of Hyrcanus. After Hyrcanus had governed Judea thirty or thirty one years, he died in 106 B. C. the same year in which Pompey the Great and Marcus Tullius Cicero were born. He is said to have made a regular castle of the house which Simon built north of the temple, and it was ever after the residence of the Asmonean rulers.¹⁴

¹ Nicolaus Damascenus in Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 8: 4. 9: 1. Justin, XXXVIII. 10. Orosius, V. 10. Valerius Maximus, IX. 1: 4. Athenaeus, V. 13. X. XII. ² Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 8: 4. Justin, XXXIII. 10. XXXIX. 1. XLII. 1. 2. ³ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 9: 1. 10: 1. Justin, XXXVI. 1. Compare Zech. 1: 14—17. 8: 20—23. ⁴ Justin, XXXVIII. 8. 9. XXXIX. 1. Livy, Epitome of Book LIX. Orosius, V. 10. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXIII. 28. 29. Graeca Euseb. Scaligeri, p. 61. Valerius Maximus, IX. 2. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 9: 3. Justin, XXXIX. 1. ⁶ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 9: 2. XIV. 8: 5. 1 Macc. 12: 16. ⁷ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 9: 3. Justin,

XXXIX. 1. Diodor. Sic. XXXIV. 24. Livy, Epitome of Book LX.
 8 Justin, XXXIX. 1. Diodor. Sic. XXXIV. 24. Livy, Epitome of Book LX.
 9 Josephus, Antiq. XII. 9: 3. Justin, XXXIX. 1. 2. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXIV. 26. 10 Justin, XXXIX. 3. Pausanias, Attic. I. 9: 1, 2. Eusebius, Chron. Ptolemy, Canon. 11 Josephus, Antiq. XIII 10: 1. Justin, XXXIX. 3. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXIV. 30. Porphyry in Graeca Euseb. Scallgeri, p 62. 12 Pausanias, Attic. I. 9: 1, 2. 13 Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 10: 2, 3, 4, 14 Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 10. 3, 5—7. 11: 2. 13: 1. Compare Velleius Paterculus, II. 9. Aulus Gellius, XV. 23. Pliny, XXXVII. 2. 1 Macc. 13: 53.

CV. ARISTOBULUS I. KING OF THE JEWS 105 B. C.

John Hyrcanus left the principality to his wife ; but Aristobulus, his oldest son, soon usurped the government, and as his mother refused to relinquish her authority, he committed her to prison, where she perished with hunger. He also imprisoned the three youngest of his four brothers ; but towards Antigonus, who was next to him in age, he entertained better feelings and intrusted him with the transaction of public business. No sooner had he, by these violent measures, secured to himself the high priesthood and principality, than he assumed the diadem and the regal title. Thus the Hebrews again had a king, and he at the same time held the office of high priest, as Zechariah had prophesied (6: 9—15.) more than four hundred years before. The fourth Book of Maccabees contains a decree of the Roman senate, in which John Hyrcanus is called a king, and Strabo, on the other hand, asserts that Alexander, the brother and successor of Aristobulus, first assumed the regal title ; but in this case, the testimony of Josephus is undoubtedly of greater weight than that of Strabo, or the fourth Book of Maccabees.¹

At this time, Syria was kept in constant commotion by the dissensions of the two dissolute brothers, Grypus and Cyzicenus ; and Aristobulus, taking advantage of these disturbances to extend his own dominions, subdued Iturea. He left it at the option of the Itureans, either to leave their country or become Jews ; and they accordingly submitted to circumcision, and were incorporated with the Jewish nation.² Aristobulus fell sick during this campaign, and before its close, returned to Jerusalem, leaving his brother Antigonus to complete the subjugation of the country and the settlement of its affairs. After Antigonus had accomplished the busi-

ness with which he had been intrusted, at the close of the feast of tabernacles he returned to Jerusalem and entered the temple in complete armour with his body-guard; when it was whispered to Aristobulus, that his brother had designs to take his life and usurp his power. Aristobulus could scarcely credit such a calumny, but he sent a summons to his brother in the temple to appear unarmed before the king, and, at the same time, stationed a party of well armed soldiers in the dark passage which led from the temple to the Baris or royal tower, through which his brother must necessarily pass, with orders to kill Antigonus if he came in his armour. But the enemies of Antigonus seduced the messenger appointed to bear the summons, to violate his instructions, and direct Antigonus to go to the royal castle in his armour, as the king desired to see it; and he was accordingly slain in the subterranean passage.³

Aristobulus was much disturbed by this event, and suffered severely from the reproaches of conscience, which were aggravated by the recollection of the cruel murder of his mother; and the disease of his body was increased by these distresses of his mind. A hemorrhage soon put an end to his life, after he had reigned one year. He was an admirer of the Greeks, and was highly esteemed by them. According to Josephus, Strabo quotes from Timagenes the following words respecting this king: "He was a reasonable man, and very serviceable to the Jews; he extended their territory, and united a part of the Itureans with the Jews by circumcision."⁴

Salome or Alexandra, the wife of Aristobulus, immediately after the death of her husband, released his three younger brothers from prison; the eldest of whom, Alexander Jannæus, ascended the throne in the year 104 B. C. He had been educated in Galilee, for, from his earliest infancy, his father John Hyrcanus would never suffer him to appear in his presence. The next oldest brother attempted to depose Alexander, and was executed; but Absalom, the youngest, lived contentedly in a private station, and was esteemed by the king.⁵

Meanwhile Cleopatra in Egypt had severely punished her son Lathyrus for his disregard to her wishes in furnishing Cyzicenus with auxiliary troops against the Jews. She took from him her daughter Selene, whom she had before compelled him to marry, and having wounded her daughter's most faithful eunuchs, she pretend-

ed, in an assembly of the principal citizens of Alexandria, that they had received these wounds in defending the queen against Lathyrus, who had attempted to murder her. Lathyrus then found it necessary to escape from Egypt, and he went to Cyprus; when Cleopatra recalled her youngest and favourite son Alexander, and placed him on the throne.⁵

¹ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 11: 1. Jewish War, I. 3: 1. Zech. 6: 9—15.
² Compare Zech. 8: 20—23. 14: 14—17.
³ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 11: 1—3. Jewish War, I. 3: 2. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 11: 3. Jewish War, I. 3: 6. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 12: 1. Jewish War, I. 4: 1. ⁶ Justin, XXXIX. 4. Pausanias, Attic. I. 9: 2.

CVI. ALEXANDER JANNEUS 104—77 B. C.

While Antiochus Grypus and Antiochus Cyzicenus, notwithstanding their dissentions, were continuing their idle and voluptuous course of life; Tyre, Ptolemais, Gaza and other cities, also Theodorus of Gadara and Amathus, and Zoilus of Dora and Strato's Tower, and other provincial governours, were attempting to establish their own independence. In these circumstances, Alexander Janneus was not idle, and he formed the design of subduing Ptolemais, Gaza, and Dora, to his own power. In the year 104 B. C. he took the field against the citizens of Ptolemais, defeated them, and laid siege to the city; when he sent a part of his army against Gaza and Dora to lay waste the country, that Ptolemais might derive no aid from that quarter. The citizens of Ptolemais then applied for help to Ptolemy Lathyrus who reigned in Cyprus; but being soon after convinced of the danger of employing such an ally, they declined his assistance. But as Ptolemy had already collected an army of thirty thousand men and prepared a fleet to transport them, he was determined on prosecuting his expedition. When he arrived at Ptolemais, the citizens closed their gates against him, and he was in great perplexity, till ambassadors came to him from Gaza and Dora and entreated him to march to their assistance. He accordingly directed his course towards those places, and consequently Alexander Janneus found it necessary to raise the siege of Ptolemais, in order to watch the motions of Lathyrus. As Alexander could gain no advantage over his enemy, he secretly sent to Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, to solicit her aid, and, at the same time,

concluded with Lathyrus a treaty which he had no intention of observing. In this he obligated himself to pay four hundred talents to Ptolemy, on condition that he would deliver Zoilus and the principality of Dora into his power. Lathyrus then turned his arms against his allies, made himself master of Gaza, and easily expelled Zoilus from his principality; but he detected the negotiation of Janneus with Cleopatra in season to prevent his surrendering these places to him.

In the year 103 B. C. Lathyrus with one division of his army laid siege to Ptolemais, and with the other, dispossessed Alexander Janneus of Asochis in Galilee, where he took ten thousand prisoners and enriched himself with the spoils of his enemies. He then made an attempt against Sepphoris, which was not far from Asochis; but there he was repulsed with the loss of many men. In his retreat from this place, he met Alexander Janneus, who had come against him with fifty thousand, or according to Timagenes, with eighty thousand men. The hostile armies were separated by the river Jordan, which Lathyrus forded with his troops and routed Janneus, who in this battle lost thirty thousand, or as Timagenes says, fifty thousand men. Lathyrus then devastated the country in every direction, and to increase the terror of his name, massacred the women and children of several villages, cut their bodies in pieces and boiled the flesh, to impress the inhabitants of Palestine with the belief that his soldiers were cannibals. At the same time, Ptolemais was subdued by the other division of his army.¹

Alexander Janneus fled with the remnant of his forces, and would probably have been entirely ruined, had not Cleopatra come to his aid in the following year, 102 B. C. with an army under the command of her two Jewish generals, Chelcias and Ananias; while her son Alexander went to Phenicia with a fleet and took possession of that country. She first laid siege to Ptolemais, and Chelcias pursued Lathyrus to Syria and there died. Lathyrus then set sail for Egypt, expecting to find the land defenceless and to regain the throne without difficulty. But the Egyptian garrisons held out so long that Cleopatra had time to send them a reinforcement from Palestine, which drove Lathyrus out of the country. In the mean time, Ptolemais had surrendered to Cleopatra. Afterwards, Alexander Janneus visited her and had nearly fallen a sacrifice to her ambition; for the Egyptian counsellors urged her to put him to

death, and unite Judea to Egypt. But Ananias, the Jewish commander of her army, advised the queen to more equitable measures, and she concluded an alliance with Janneus at Scythopolis.²

When Lathyrus now, in the year 100 B. C. perceived that he could effect nothing more in Palestine, he made a treaty at Damascus with Antiochus Cyzicenus, by which this king agreed to aid him in his next expedition to Egypt, and then sailed to Cyprus. Cleopatra, having heard of this alliance on her return from Phenicia, gave her daughter Selene, whom she had taken from Lathyrus, in marriage to Antiochus Grypus, and sent him auxiliaries to enable him to prosecute the war against Cyzicenus. Thus Lathyrus was deprived of the aid of Cyzicenus, and his contemplated expedition to Egypt was prevented. Ptolemy Alexander, the youngest son of Cleopatra, took offence at the marriage of Selene with Grypus, and perceiving that his life was not safe with his mother, he fled; and afterwards, when the Alexandrians were dissatisfied with the queen and demanded a king, he was with difficulty persuaded to return.³

After the departure of Cleopatra, Alexander Janneus, by a siege of ten months, gained possession of Gadara. He then took the strong fortress of Amathus, near the banks of the Jordan, and all the treasures which Theodorus, the son of Zeno, had deposited there; but on his return, he was attacked by Theodorus, and lost ten thousand men together with the captured treasures and all his own baggage. Alexander was not discouraged by this repulse, but crossing the Jordan, he entered Judea and directed his march towards the southern coasts, which had been left defenceless by the departure of Lathyrus. There he took possession of Raphia and Anthedon. The conquest of Gaza was a more difficult achievement, but at length, in the year 96 B. C. he took that place by treachery; for he entered the city under pretence of friendship, and massacred the inhabitants without distinction, because they had joined with Lathyrus. But the citizens made a determined resistance and slew many of the soldiers of Janneus; some even put their wives and children to death with their own hands, and set fire to their dwellings, that there might be no booty left for the enemy. Thus Alexander Janneus, after he had demolished the city, returned to Jerusalem without being in the least enriched by his conquest.⁴

While Janneus was revenging himself on the citizens of Gaza,

and thus giving an example of the extreme severity of the Sadducees, Antiochus Grypus was slain by his vassal Heracleon, in the twenty ninth year of his reign, 96 B. C. Antiochus Cyzicenus now attempted to make himself master of the whole kingdom and took possession of Antioch. But Seleucus, the oldest of the five sons of Grypus, attached a large party to his interests, and became so powerful that in the year 93 B. C. he made war on Cyzicenus, took him prisoner and put him to death. While Seleucus was engaged in the design of bringing the whole empire under his power, Antiochus Eusebes, a son of Cyzicenus, came to Aradus and drove Seleucus out of Syria; who then retired to Mopsuestia in Cilicia, and attempting to extort money from the citizens, was burnt by them in his house. Antiochus, the second son of Grypus and the brother of Seleucus, then made an attack on Eusebes; but he was killed, and his whole army cut to pieces. In the mean time, Philip, the third son of Grypus, had gained possession of a part of Syria. Eusebes had strengthened his party very considerably by a marriage with Selene, the widow of Grypus, who had a large part of the empire in her possession; but yet he was not able to subdue Philip, and in the year 91 B. C. a new enemy appeared against him. For Lathyrus, who had formerly been the husband of Selene, irritated by her marriage with Eusebes, called Demetrius Eucerus, the brother of Philip and the fourth son of Grypus, from Cnidus, where he had been educated, and sent him to Damascus as king of Syria. Eusebes and Philip, who had then taken the field against each other, could offer no effectual resistance to the designs of Demetrius; and in the same year Eusebes was defeated and compelled to flee to Parthia. Josephus relates that he was finally slain in a battle against the Parthians, while acting as an ally to Laodice, the queen of the Gileadites; but this must have taken place several years later, and after he had again returned to Syria. Philip and his brother Demetrius Eucerus now shared the empire between them.⁵

In Judea, during the year 94 B. C. the hatred of the Pharisees began to break out in open violence against Alexander Janneus, whose father Hyrcanus had withdrawn from their sect. For at the feast of tabernacles, while Janneus, the high priest and king, stood at the altar performing the functions of his office, the populace, instigated by the Pharisees, assailed him with the citrons which it

was customary for them to carry in their hands at that festival, and saluted him with the cry, that he was a slave, the son of a captive, and unworthy of the priesthood. Janneus, for his own security, had before taken into his pay six thousand Pisidians and Cilicians, and they were now almost his only supporters. By them, in accordance with the severe principles of the Sadducees, he cut down six thousand of the insurgents, by which the present disturbances were allayed; but three years after, they broke out again with much greater violence, as we shall see in the sequel.⁶

After quiet had been in this manner restored at Jerusalem, in the year 93 B. C. Alexander Janneus undertook a campaign to Arabia, made the Arabs of Gilead, and the Moabites tributary, and the next year, demolished Amathus, from which Theodorus, the son of Zeno, had withdrawn with his treasures. But during the year 91 B. C. in his campaign against the king or emir of the Arabs in Gaulonitis, he fell into an ambush in the mountainous regions near the village of Gadara, where his army was driven over the precipices and entirely destroyed, and it was with great difficulty that he effected his own escape.⁷

This defeat so imbibtered the feelings of the already discontented Pharisees, that they had recourse to arms, and for six years, maintained a bloody war against their king. They refused to listen to any proposals of peace, even though they might make their own terms, and nothing would satisfy them but the death of Janneus. After several defeats, the insurgents called the Moabites, and the Arabs of Gilead to their aid; and Janneus, to prevent hostilities with these tribes, whom he had made tributary, was compelled to remit their tribute and resign his sovereignty over them. But Demetrius Eucerus accepted the invitation of the rebels, and in the year 88 B. C. came with an army of forty thousand infantry and three thousand cavalry, composed of Jews and Syrians; and at Shechem, overthrew Alexander Janneus with great slaughter. Of the six thousand or the eight thousand Pisidians and Cilicians, which Jannens had in his service, not a man was left alive; and of the ten thousand or twenty thousand Jews of his party, the greater part perished. This bloody battle was decisive; and Alexander, no longer able to maintain his ground, fled to the mountains with the shattered remnants of his army.⁸

Six thousand of the rebels, pitying the misfortunes of their king,

now relented and went over to his party; and Demetrius, fearing a still greater desertion, returned to Damascus. Janneus was then again successful in all his battles; but yet he could bring his revolted subjects to no terms. At length, in the year 86 B. C. a second decisive battle was fought, in which the greater part of the rebels were slain; and the remainder, including some of the principal men, took refuge in the fortress of Bethone or Bemeselis, which was immediately besieged, and, during the next year, subdued. Janneus led the prisoners to Jerusalem, and in one day, he fastened eight hundred of the leaders to crosses, and massacred their wives and children before their eyes. During this barbarous execution, the Sadducean king, who had the reputation of a prudent and valiant general, was triumphing at a feast which he gave to his wives in sight of the crucified victims. This inhuman conduct, however, which acquired for Janneus the surname of *Thracian*, produced the designed effect; for the remaining rebels, consisting of about eight thousand, betook themselves to flight, and the quiet which had been purchased at so dear a rate, was never again disturbed during the reign of Janneus.⁹

Demetrius Eucerus, after his return from Judea in the year 86 B. C. took the field against his brother Philip, expelled him from Antioch, and then laid siege to Berea, (בְּרֵיָא or בְּרֵיָא, Aleppo.) Strato, the prince of Berea and an ally of Philip, called to his aid Zizon, an emir of the Arabs, and Mithridates Sinax, a general of the Parthians; and they, with their united forces, fell upon the camp of Eucerus, took him prisoner, and sent him to Mithridates, king of Parthia, who succeeded his father Artabanus in the throne, 128 B. C. and, as we have before remarked, acquired the surname of Great. Philip now, for a short time, was sole master of the Syrian empire, which, however, had been reduced to narrow limits. Demetrius Eucerus was treated with great respect in Parthia, but he died after a short captivity; and then the Parthians released Antiochus Eusebes who had fled to them, and must have restored to him a part of his kingdom, as we find him in possession of it soon after. During these transactions, Syria enjoyed no repose; for Antiochus Dionysius, the youngest brother of Philip, had taken possession of Damascus, and ruled over Coelosyria six years.¹⁰

This new ruler of Damascus, in the year 84 B. C. undertook a campaign against the Arabs; when his brother Philip came and

took possession of the city without striking a blow, through the treachery of the commandant Milesius. But Milesius, finding himself unrewarded and neglected, expelled Philip, and preserved the city for Dionysius; who, on hearing what had occurred, immediately returned; but his hostile brother, by a seasonable flight, escaped falling into his hands. Dionysius then prepared for a second expedition against the Arabs, and led his army along the coasts of Palestine, to penetrate into Arabia Petrea. Alexander Janneus attempted to intercept his march, and for this purpose, dug an intrenchment near Joppa, from Chabazaba or Antipatris to the sea, a distance of about sixteen English miles, provided it with a wall and wooden towers, and garrisoned it with his soldiers. But Antiochus Dionysius burnt the towers, forced his way through the garrison, and marched to Arabia. The Arabians at first retired before him, but soon reappeared with a force of ten thousand cavalry. Antiochus vanquished them, but lost his life in the battle; and his army then fled to Cana, where most of them perished by famine. The Damascenes then called to the throne of Damascus the Arabian chief whom Dionysius had attacked. This chief, who is called Aretas by Josephus, assumed the government of the city, expelled Ptolemy Menneus, who was aspiring to the throne, and undertook an expedition against Alexander Janneus, whom he defeated at Adija. He then concluded a treaty with Alexander, and retired from Judea.¹¹

In the year 83 B. C. the Syrians, weary of the perpetual dissensions of the Seleucidae, determined to free themselves from those quarrelsome princes; and they offered the crown of Syria to Tigranes, king of Armenia, who, having been a hostage among the Parthians, was by them placed on the throne of Armenia in the year 94 B. C. When Tigranes took possession of Syria, Philip fled; and Eusebes withdrew to Cilicia, where he remained concealed until his death. But Selene, the wife of Eusebes, retained Ptolemais and a part of Coelosyria and Phenicia, and there educated her two sons, Antiochus Asiaticus and Seleucus Cybiosactes.¹²

Meanwhile, in the year 83 B. C. Alexander Janneus had conquered Dios and Pella. As the citizens of Pella refused to adopt the Jewish religion, they were expelled, and their city destroyed. The next year, Janneus besieged Essa or Gerasa, where Theodorus, the son of Zeon, had deposited his treasures after his expulsion from Ama-

thus. Both the city and treasures soon fell into the hands of Janneus. In the year 81 B. C. he extended his conquests beyond the Jordan, took Gaulana or Golan, Seleucia, the vale of Antiochus, and the strong fortress of Gamala, in which Demetrius was governour. After this three years' campaign, he returned to Jerusalem and received from the citizens a joyful welcome on account of his victories. Alexander Janneus, having now subdued his enemies, was attacked by a quartan fever occasioned by excessive drinking, and of this disease he died, three years after, while engaged in the siege of Ragaba in Gerasena.¹³

The reign of Alexander Janneus continued twenty seven years, from 104 to 77 B. C. During his reign he made large additions to the Jewish territory by his conquests; for at the time of his death, the kingdom of Judea included mount Carmel, all Idumea, and all the coast as far as Rhinocofura; towards the north, it extended to mount Tabor and Scythopolis; beyond the Jordan, it comprehended Gaulonitis and all the territory of Gadara, including the land of the Moabites towards the south, and extended as far as Pella towards the east.¹⁴

In the year 96 B. C. the king of Cyrene, Ptolemy Apion, a natural son of Ptolemy Physcon, died; and, as he had no heir, he bequeathed his kingdom to the Romans. They, to promote their own interests, gave the Cyrenean cities their freedom; and consequently, many petty princes rose to power, who disturbed the country by their perpetual contentions, in which the African Jews are said to have taken a very active part; till at length, in the year 76 B. C. Cyrene was made a Roman province, and the numerous Jews of that region became subjects of the Roman empire.¹⁴

In the year 87 B. C. Cleopatra, queen of Egypt, attempted to take the life of her son Alexander, that she might reign alone; but he discovered her design and put her to death. Upon this, the Alexandrians revolted, expelled Alexander, recalled Lathyrus from Cyprus, and replaced him on the throne of Egypt. The next year, Alexander, with a small fleet, made an effort to regain his kingdom; but was defeated by the admiral of Lathyrus, and compelled to retire to Myra in Lycia. The attempt which he afterwards made against Cyprus, was still more unfortunate, for he lost his own life in a battle.¹⁶

Lathyrus then marched against Thebes which had revolted from him, and after a siege of three years, from 84 to 81 B. C. he conquered the city and demolished it so entirely that it never afterwards regained its importance. In the same year, Lathyrus died; and as he left no sons, his daughter, Cleopatra Berenice, succeeded him in the throne, in the year 80 B. C. But Alexander, the son of that Ptolemy Alexander whom we have just mentioned as the murderer of his mother, was now sent to Egypt by Sylla, the Roman dictator, to take possession of the kingdom. The Alexandrians, to avoid giving offence to the *Dictator perpetuus*, agreed that Alexander should marry the princess Cleopatra and share the throne with her; but in nineteen days after the nuptials, he murdered his wife and reigned alone. This Ptolemy Alexander was educated at Cos, whither he had been sent, with a large sum of money, by his grandmother; and afterwards, Mithridates, king of Pontus, robbed him of his money, though he still treated him with the respect due to a king. Alexander then fled to Sylla, who took him to Rome, and afterwards, as has just been related, sent him to Egypt. Appian says that he was put to death by the Alexandrians on account of the murder of his wife; but this cannot be true, for he reigned fifteen years.¹⁷

At this time, the Mithridatic war gave the Romans another opportunity to show their power and extend their conquests in the East. They were indeed very much weakened by civil dissensions; but they were still strong enough to maintain a war with the orientals; especially after Marius, in the year 101 B. C. had defeated the Cimbri, who invaded Italy from the Cimbrian peninsula, (Jutland, Sleswick, and Holstein,) and was on this account acknowledged as the third founder of Rome, after Romulus and Camillus. Mithridates, surnamed Eupator, was descended from a long line of kings and governours, and the founder of his family was one of those seven princes of Persia, who slew Smerdis the Magian. This prince was governour of Pontus, and having secured the province to his descendants, they at length made themselves independent, and assumed the title of kings of Pontus. Mithridates Eupator was the sixth, or more probably according to others, the sixteenth descendant of this prince. He ascended the throne in the twelfth year of his age, 123 B. C. the twelfth year of the reign of John Hyrcanus.¹⁸

In the year 90 B. C. Mithridates, after the death of Ariarathes, king of Cappadocia, who had married his sister, destroyed all the sons of that monarch, and placed on the throne of Cappadocia his own son Ariarathes, who was then a minor. Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, jealous of the growing power of his neighbour, then brought forward a young man of Laodicea, named Ariarathes, acknowledged him as the third son of king Ariarathes, and sent him to Rome to solicit the aid of the senate in obtaining the crown of Cappadocia. The senate rejected his suit, but at the same time, deposed the son of Mithridates, and decreed that the Cappadocians should govern themselves as an independent people. The Cappadocians declined this offer and requested a king; and the senate then resolved that they should elect a king for themselves. They accordingly made choice of Ariobarzanes, and he was established in the kingdom by Sylla.¹⁹

This was the first cause of the Mithridatic war. The offended Mithridates made no open resistance to the Romans, but secretly prepared himself for hostilities. In the year 89 B. C. he married his daughter Cleopatra to Tigranes, king of Armenia; and an alliance was concluded between the two monarchs, according to which Tigranes was to have all the prisoners and the booty that should be taken in the Roman war, and Mithridates, all the conquered territory. The first step was for Tigranes to expel Ariobarzanes, whom the Romans had established in the kingdom of Cappadocia, and restore the crown to the son of Mithridates. At this time, Nicomedes, king of Bithynia, died, and though he left a son, Mithridates took possession of his kingdom. The son of Nicomedes, thus deprived of his crown, and Ariobarzanes, the dethroned king of Cappadocia, both repaired to Rome; and the senate resolved to reestablish them in their kingdoms. At the instigation of the Roman ambassadors, they then invaded the dominions of Mithridates, and, after some ineffectual negotiations, hostilities were commenced. Lucius Cassius, the Roman praefect of Pergamus, Quintus Oppius, proconsul of Pamphylia, and Mannius Aquilio, in the year 88 B. C. collected three armies, each amounting to about forty thousand men, and began the war without waiting for orders from Rome. Mithridates had a force of fifty thousand infantry, four thousand cavalry, one hundred and thirty chariots, and three hundred ships; with which he defeated the three

Roman generals, and made prisoners of Aquilio and Oppius. Upon this, all the provinces and cities of Asia Minor, all the islands of the Aegean Sea as far as Rhodes, and several cities of Greece, forsook the party of the Romans and joined Mithridates.⁹⁰

In the following year, 87 B. C. Mithridates sent secret orders to his lieutenants in Asia Minor, to massacre all the Romans and Italians to be found in their respective governments, on a certain day which he designated; and accordingly, on the day appointed, eighty thousand, or according to some authors, one hundred and sixty thousand Italians were destroyed.⁹¹

Mithridates, being in want of money to prosecute the war, then robbed Ptolemy Alexander, who had been sent by his grandmother from Egypt to Cos, of all his treasures, which were very large; but yet he gave the prince an education befitting his rank, as has already been remarked. At the same time, he seized eight hundred talents which the Jews of Asia Minor had collected for the purpose of sending them to Jerusalem, to be kept in safety during the disturbances of the war.⁹²

Mithridates now levied a large army in Asia Minor, and had money enough to support it. At first he made an ineffectual attempt to subdue the Rhodians, with whom some of the Italians had taken refuge. He then sent Archelaus with one hundred and twenty thousand men to Greece, who, among other cities, took possession of Athens, and made it his headquarters. Mithridates had, besides, one hundred and ten thousand men under the command of Taxiles, and eighty thousand more under the command of Doryalus or Dorilaeus. But notwithstanding the great number of his troops, he soon lost all that he had acquired; and at length, in the year 85 B. C. he was defeated, first at Chaeronea, and then again, at Orchomenus, and compelled to retire to Asia with the loss of one hundred and sixty thousand men, by Sulla or Sylla, whose army consisted of only fifteen thousand infantry and fifteen hundred cavalry.⁹³

The next year, the army of Mithridates under the command of Archelaus, was defeated in Asia Minor by the Roman general Fimbria, (who, however, did not belong to the faction of Sylla,) and pursued to Pergamus. Mithridates then went to Pitana in Aetolia, where he was besieged; but he made his escape by sea to Mitylene.⁹⁴

Mithridates then made peace with Sylla; and he was obliged to give up Bithynia to Nicomedes, and Cappadocia to Ariobarzanes; to surrender to the Romans all they had possessed before the commencement of hostilities; and to pay the expenses of the war with two or three thousand talents and seventy ships. He would scarcely have been permitted to retain his hereditary dominions, had not Sylla been anxious to return to Rome on account of the disturbances in that city, of which he had been informed by some of his adherents who fled to his camp. Sylla, therefore, after having punished the Asiatic cities for their revolt by a fine of twenty thousand talents, which was to be paid in five years, hastened back to Italy.²⁵

¹ Josephus, Antiq. XII. 12: 2—6. Jewish War, I. 4: 2. ² Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 13: 1, 2. ³ Justin, XXXIX. 4. Livy, Epitome of Book LXXVIII. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 13: 3. Jewish War. I. 4: 2. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 13: 4. Porphyry in Graeca Eusebian. Scaligeri, p. 67. Eusebius, Chron. ⁶ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 13: 5. Jewish War, I. 4: 3. ⁷ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 13: 5. Jewish War, I. 4: 4. ⁸ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 13: 5. 14: 1, 2. Jewish War, I. 4: 4, 5. ⁹ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 14: 2. Jewish War, I. 4: 6. ¹⁰ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 14: 3. 15: 1, 2. Jewish War, I. 4: 7. compare Justin, XLII. 2. ¹¹ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 15: 1, 2. Jewish War, I. 4: 1. ¹² Josephus, Jewish War, I. 4: 8. Justin, XXXVIII. 3. XL. 1. 2. Appian, Syriac. XL. 25—35. Plutarch, Pompey XXVIII. Strabo, p. 532. ¹³ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 15: 3—5. Jewish War, I. 4: 6. ¹⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XIII. 15: 4. ¹⁵ Livy, Epitome of Book LXX. Plutarch, Lucullus II. Appian, Bell. Civ. I. 111. ¹⁶ Justin XXXIX. 4. Eusebius, Chron. Pausanias, Attic. I. 9: 1—3. Athenaeus, XII. Porphyry in Graeca Eusebian. Scaligeri. ¹⁷ Pausanias, Attic. I. 9: 3. Appian, Bell. Civ. II. 102. ¹⁸ Plutarch, Marius XI—XXVII. Florus, III. 3: 5. Justin, XXXVII. 1. Strabo, p. 477. Memnon, XXXII. Eutropius, VI. 6. Polybius, V. 43. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. IX. 65—80. ¹⁹ Justin, XXXVIII. 1, 2. Strabo, p. 450. Plutarch, Sylla V. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. X. ²⁰ Justin, XXXVIII. 3. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. X—XXI. Memnon in Excerpta Photii. XXXII. Livy, Epitome of Books LXXVII. LXXVIII. Strabo, p. 562. Florus, III. 5. Diodor. Sic. Fragm. XXXVII. 8—10. Velleius Paterculus, II. 18. Plutarch, Sylla XI. ²¹ Livy, Epitome of Book LXXVIII. Florus, III. 5. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. XXII. XXIII. Cicero pro Flacco, XXV. XXVI. pro Lege Manilia, II. Orosius, VI. 2. Valerius Maximus, IX. 3. Velleius Paterculus, II. 18. ²² Appian, Bell. Mithrid. XXIII. Bell. Civ. I. Strabo in Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 7: 2. ²³ Livy, Epitome of Books LXXVIII. LXXXII. Orosius, VI. 2. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. XXIV—L. Florus, III. 5. Eutropius, V. 6. 8. Plutarch, Sylla XI. XVI

—XXI. Memnon, XXXIV. ²⁴ Livy, Epitome of Book LXXXIII. Orosius, VI. 2. Memnon, XXXVI. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. L—LIII. Plutarch, Lucullus III. Sylla XXIII. ²⁵ Livy, Epitome of Book LXXXIII. Velleius Paterculus, II. 23. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. LIV.—LVIII. LXI—LXIII. Bell. Civ. I. 55. Plutarch, Sylla XXII—XXIV. Lucullus IV. Florus, III. 5.

CVII. ALEXANDRA QUEEN OF THE JEWS 77—68 B. C.

Alexander Janneus, who died at the siege of Ragaba in the year 77 B. C. as has been related, foresaw the troubles which awaited his family from the exasperated Pharisees; and therefore, during his last illness, he advised his wife Alexandra, to whom he left the government, to keep his death secret till Ragaba had been subdued, then to lead the army to Jerusalem, to deliver his corpse to the principal Pharisees that they might dispose of it as they pleased, and to promise them that she would conduct the affairs of government by their advice, and would do nothing without their approbation. Alexandra followed the counsels of her husband, and by this means, the hatred of the Pharisees was at once appeased. They spoke with the greatest reverence of the deceased king, whose death they had often desired while he was living; they eulogized his heroic achievements, and gave his body a magnificent burial.¹

Under these favourable circumstances Alexandra commenced her administration, and, because she had no power to do otherwise, faithfully observed her promise to the Pharisees. She appointed to the high priesthood her oldest son Hyrcanus, who was then probably about thirty years of age, but an inactive and indolent man; she reestablished the authority of the traditions and the sentiments of the Pharisees, which had been rejected by John Hyrcanus; and made the influence of this sect predominant in all the concerns of the nation. The Pharisees now opened the prisons and released all the rebels and traitors, and recalled from banishment all those who had fled during the reign of Alexander Janneus. In this manner the Pharisees governed according to their own principles; but Alexandra was not inactive, for she took so many mercenary troops into her pay, that she was feared by all the neighbouring petty princes and received hostages from them for security against their depredations. Consequently, her reign, which continued nine years, was peaceful; though many were dissatisfied because she gave up

to the power of the Pharisees those who had advised Alexander Janneus to crucify the eight hundred rebels, whose cruel execution we have already mentioned. The Pharisees called some of the counsellors to trial and put them to death, but the principal men among them, together with the young and enterprising prince Aristobulus, came before the throne and requested permission, either to leave the country or to retire to the frontier cities, where they might be secure from the enmity of the Pharisees. Alexandra dared do nothing that would offend the Pharisees, but she permitted Aristobulus and his adherents to go to the frontier cities, with the exception of Hyrcania, Alexandrium, and Macherus, where her principal treasures were deposited. Soon after, in the fifth or sixth year of her reign, she sent to Damascus the young prince Aristobulus with an army, to protect that city from Ptolemy Menneus, the priest of Chalcis or Antilibanus, who had begun to be troublesome to the Damascenes. But Aristobulus had different views, and sought only to gain the affections of his soldiers; and he returned to Judea without having accomplished any important object of the expedition.²

In the mean time, the Egyptians became very much dissatisfied with their king Alexander, and the country was disturbed by frequent insurrections; when Selene, the sister of Lathyrus, who still resided at Ptolemais and had a small territory under her power, sent her two sons, Antiochus Asiaticus and Selencus, whom she had borne to Antiochus Eusebes, to Rome, to obtain from the senate an appointment to the throne of Egypt. The Romans at first gave them some encouragement, but it was only for the purpose of extorting more presents from Alexander, king of Egypt; and when he was completely exhausted by his extravagant gifts, he was confirmed on the throne, and the two pretenders returned to Ptolemais without having effected their purpose, in the year 69 B. C. the eighth of the reign of Alexandra. While Antiochus was in Sicily, on his way home, he was plundered by Verres. After this, Selene imprudently attempted to extend her dominions in Coelosyria; for Tigranes had now become very powerful, both by the surrender of the kingdom of Syria and by the expeditions which he, at the instigation of Mithridates, had undertaken in Cappadocia, whence he led away three hundred thousand of the inhabitants, to people Tigranocerta, (ἄντιρρη,) his new metropolis. He came against Selene

with five hundred thousand men, subdued Ptolemais, took Selene prisoner, and on his return, ordered her to be executed at Seleucia in Mesopotamia.³

While Tigranes, in this campaign, 69 B. C. was besieging Ptolemais, Alexandra sent him an embassy with valuable presents to obtain his friendship; and as the Romans were then making rapid advances in Asia Minor, the Armenian king gave a favourable answer to the Jews and hastened back to his own country.⁴

In the year 75 B. C. both Cyrene and Bithynia became provinces of the Roman empire; for Nicomedes, the last king of Bithynia, who died during this year, made the Romans the heirs of his kingdom. By the successful termination of the piratical war, Crete and Cilicia were also reduced to the form of a Roman province. "Creta Ciliciaque (says Justin) piratico bello perdomitae, in formam provinciae rediguntur."⁵

Mithridates could not view without anxiety these accessions to the power of the Romans; for his last treaty with them had never been ratified, and his kingdom had continued to suffer from their hostile incursions. Accordingly, he united himself with Sertorius, who had revolted from the Romans in Iberia; and in the year 75 B. C. he made great preparations for war, while the Romans were detained in Italy by their civil dissensions. During the next year, he took possession of Bithynia and Paphlagonia; but the province of Asia, which had suffered severely from the extortions of the Romans, submitted to him voluntarily. The Mithridatic war was thus commenced anew in the year 74 B. C.⁶

In the year 73 B. C. the Romans sent two armies against Mithridates, under the command of Lucius Lucullus and Marcus Cotta. Cotta was soon defeated with great loss at the battle of Chalcedon; but in the year 72 B. C. while Mithridates was engaged, with three hundred thousand men and four hundred ships of war, in besieging the maritime city of Cyzicus on the Propontis, Lucullus, by cutting off his supplies, compelled him to retreat.⁷

Mithridates, who had lost a great part of his army by this repulse, fled to Nicomedia, and brought back to the Hellespont only ten thousand men and a few of his ships. In the two battles which were fought at Tenedos and Lemnos, he was entirely routed by Lucullus. Mithridates continued his retreat towards Pontus, and lost the greater part of his fleet on the stormy Black Sea. He then

went to Sinope and, at last, to Amisus, where he endeavoured to recruit his army. Lucullus meanwhile pressed into Pontus and laid siege to Amisus, Eupatoria, and Themiscyra.⁸

In the year 70 B. C. Mithridates gained some advantages; but afterwards his army was put to flight and entirely routed, and he escaped with only two thousand cavalry to the dominions of Tigranes his son-in-law. Here he was obliged to wait a year and eight months on the frontiers, before he could obtain an audience. Meanwhile, all Pontus fell into the hands of the conqueror.⁹

Lucullus sent Appius Clodius to Tigranes, to demand of him the surrender of king Mithridates, or to declare war against Armenia in case of refusal. Tigranes, on his return from Ptolemais, met Clodius at Antioch on the Orontes, in the year 69 B. C. but when he heard the haughty language of the Roman ambassadour, he indignantly broke off the negotiation and received the declaration of war.¹⁰

Soon after the departure of Tigranes from Ptolemais, Alexandra, queen of the Jews, was taken sick, and died in the year 69 B. C. During her sickness, the young prince Aristobulus put himself in readiness for the execution of a plan, which he had long before matured, of ascending the throne after the death of his mother. He secretly left Jerusalem during the night, and went to those cities where the friends of his father had been permitted to reside, in consequence of his own intercession; and, by their aid, he gained possession of twenty two fortified towns in fifteen days. Every facility was afforded to his enterprise by the soldiers and the common people, who expected from him a limitation of the odious power of the Pharisees, for which they could not hope from the inactive Hyrcanus, who was entirely devoted to that sect. The Pharisees had endeavoured to persuade the queen, during her sickness, to nominate a successor; but she replied that she had nothing more to do with the concerns of the government, and left them all in their hands. After her death, they placed Hyrcanus on the throne, and retained the wives and children of Aristobulus in the castle of Baris as hostages. Three months after, a battle was fought between the two brothers near Jericho, in which Hyrcanus was overcome. He fled to Jerusalem and shut himself up in the castle of Baris, while his party, which was every day diminishing, took possession of the temple. Soon after, the few soldiers who still adhered to Hyrcanus,

went over to Aristobulus, and then the two brothers came to terms. Hyrcanus engaged to retire from public life, and Aristobulus ascended the throne of Judea.¹¹

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII. 15: 5. 16: 1. *Jewish War*, I. 5: 1. ² Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII. 16: 1—3. *Jewish War*, I. 5: 2, 3. ³ Cicero in *Verr.* IV. 27—32. Appian, *Bell. Mithrid.* LXVII. Strabo, p. 532. 539. 749. Plutarch, *Lucullus* IXV. XX. Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII. 16: 4. ⁴ Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII. 16: 4. *Jewish War*, I. 5: 3. ⁵ Justin, XXXIX. 5. Eutropius, VI. 6. Appian, *Bell. Mithrid.* LXXI. *Bell. Civ.* I. Livy, *Epitome of Book XCIII.* Velleius Paterculus, II. 4. 39. ⁶ Appian, *Bell. Mithrid.* LXIV—LXVI. LXVIII—LXXXII. Livy, *Epitome of Book XCIX.* Plutarch, *Lucullus* VII. ⁷ Cicero *pro Lege Manilia*, II. Memnon, XXXIX. Appian, *Bell. Mithrid.* LXXXII—LXXXVI. Plutarch, *Lucullus* V—XI. Sallust, *Fragm.* IV. Livy, *Epitome of Book XCV.* Eutropius, VI. 8. Orosius, VI. 2. Florus, III. 5. Strabo, p. 576. ⁸ Orosius, VI. 2. Florus, III. 5. Appian, *Bell. Mithrid.* LXXXI. LXXXVIII. Plutarch, *Lucullus* XIII. XIV. Cicero *pro Lege Manilia*, III—VIII. ⁹ Livy, *Epitome of Book XCVII.* Eutropius, VI. 8. Memnon, XLV—XLVII. Phlegon and Trallianus in Photius, *Cod.* 97. p. 268. Appian, *Bell. Mithrid.* LXXIX—LXXXIII. Plutarch, *Lucullus* XV—XIX. XXII. Cicero *pro Lege Manilia*, III—XI. ¹⁰ Plutarch, *Lucullus* XIX. XXI. ¹¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XIII. 16: 5, 6. XIV. 1: 2. XX. 10: 1. *Jewish War*, I. 5: 4.

CVIII. ARISTOBULUS II. KING OF THE JEWS 69—63 B. C.

Josephus says nothing respecting the reign of Aristobulus till the year 64 B. C. when the dissensions between the king and his brother Hyrcanus broke out afresh. We shall, therefore, here resume our account of the Mithridatic war.

After the declaration of the Roman ambassadour, Tigranes prepared for war. He admitted Mithridates to his presence, and sent him to Pontus with ten thousand cavalry, to levy troops and act in concert with him. He himself remained at Tigranocerta and gave orders for the raising of soldiers throughout his dominions. But Lucullus anticipated him; for as soon as he had learned the result of his embassy, he despatched Sornatius with six thousand men to Pontus, and in the year 67 B. C. marched himself with twelve thousand infantry and three thousand cavalry through Cappadocia, crossed the Euphrates in the midst of winter, and appeared before Tigranocerta, ere Tigranes had completed his preparations. This monarch could not believe that the Romans had advanced so rapidly, and he put to death the messenger who first informed him of their

approach ; so that afterwards, no one dared give him any intelligence respecting the advances of his enemies. He, however, sent Mithrobarzanes against them, with orders to take Lucullus, dead or alive ; but this was not so easily done. Mithrobarzanes was defeated and left dead in the field ; and then Tigranes fled to mount Taurus. The Romans immediately besieged Tigranocerta, and by their incursions into the adjacent country, destroyed great numbers of the new recruits of Tigranes. Meanwhile, Tigranes had brought together about two hundred thousand men. Lucullus left a body of six thousand soldiers to prosecute the siege of the metropolis, and with the remainder of his forces, about nine thousand men, defeated the numerous army of the enemy, and Tigranes himself effected his escape with great difficulty. Mithridates, who had returned from Pontus and received intelligence of this defeat, endeavoured to encourage the disheartened Tigranes. They collected a new army, and Tigranes wrote to Arsaces Sinatrux, king of Parthia, to obtain his assistance. Meanwhile, Tigranocerta was treacherously surrendered into the hands of the Romans, and the citizens of this new city, who had been collected from various quarters, returned to their respective countries ; in consequence of which, the metropolis was reduced to an inconsiderable village. But Lucullus did not follow up his advantages against Tigranes, so as to put an immediate end to the war ; and, by this neglect, incurred the displeasure of the army, and of the Roman senate.¹

The delay of Lucullus gave Tigranes opportunity to assemble another army, to which he added the forces of Megadates, whom he at this time recalled from Syria. By the departure of Megadates, Syria was left defenceless, and Antiochus Asiaticus, the son of Selene and Antiochus Eusebes, seized the government, formed an alliance with Lucullus, and retained possession of a part of the empire till the arrival of Pompey in the East. The new army of Tigranes consisted of seventy thousand men, and during the campaign of 66 B. C. he endeavoured to cut off the supplies of the Romans, and to avoid the danger of another battle. Meanwhile, Lucullus conquered Nisibis, and then marched without opposition to Artaxata, the ancient capital of Armenia, where Tigranes had deposited his treasures. Tigranes thought it necessary to hazard an engagement in defence of his capital, and the Romans were again victorious. The soldiers of Lucullus now resisted his intention of terminating the war by the conquest of Artaxata ; and he was com-

pelled to pass over mount Taurus and march southward into Mesopotamia to winter quarters. Here the spirit of revolt among his troops was encouraged by Publius Clodius, the brother of his wife.²

In the year 65 B. C. Mithridates marched to Pontus with eight thousand men, defeated Fabius, and pressed on vigorously against Triarius and Sornatius, the two remaining Roman generals. The mutinous soldiers of Lucullus for a long time refused to afford their distressed comrades any assistance ; and when at length they were persuaded to march to Pontus, Triarius had already been defeated with the loss of seven thousand men. Lucullus, on his arrival, found the field of battle covered with the dead bodies of the Romans, and as he neglected to bury them, his army positively refused any longer to obey his orders. The mutinous disposition of the soldiers became the more obstinate, when they heard that Lucullus was out of favour at Rome, and that Pompey, who had just concluded the war with the pirates employed by Mithridates, had been appointed his successor in Asia. They, however, remained with the general whom they so much hated, till the next year, when Pompey arrived to take the command.³

As soon as Pompey had assumed the direction of the war, he concluded an alliance with Phraates, who had ascended the throne of Parthia the preceding year. He then made proposals of peace to Mithridates ; but as he was expecting to enter into an alliance with king Phraates, he would open no negotiations with the Romans. But when he heard that Phraates had made a treaty with Pompey, he proposed peace himself. Pompey required, as the first condition, that all the deserters should be surrendered ; and when this was known, Mithridates was compelled by his soldiers, among whom were many deserters from the Roman army, to bind himself by an oath to continue the war. The circumstances of Mithridates were at this time encouraging ; for while the soldiers of Lucullus refused to fight under their general, he had reconquered the greater part of his kingdom.⁴

All his efforts were now directed to avoid a battle with the Romans, and to cut off their supplies. This he was able to do for some time ; but at last he was compelled to retreat by little and little, and when he arrived in lesser Armenia, he was attacked by night on the banks of the Euphrates and entirely routed. He fled

beyond the sources of the Euphrates into the northern regions, and took refuge in Colchis.⁵

Pompey was now on the frontiers of the dominions of Tigranes, who was then engaged in a war with his son. Tigranes had put his two oldest sons to death, and the third then made his escape to Phraates, king of Parthia, whose daughter he had married. In Parthia he raised an army, with which he returned to Armenia, and commenced an attack upon the metropolis of his father's kingdom; but he was repulsed, and sought refuge with Pompey. The Roman general, who needed a skilful guide in Armenia, received the young prince very favourably, and marched with him directly to Artaxata. Then Tigranes, who had before felt the irresistible power of the Romans, went himself to Pompey and surrendered his person and his kingdom entirely to his disposal. Pompey was now umpire between Tigranes and his son, and he decided that Tigranes should retain the throne of Armenia, pay six thousand talents to the Romans for the expenses of the war, and relinquish all the conquests he had made west of the Euphrates; that the son should have Gordiena and Sophena, be appointed successor to the throne, and give up to Tigranes the treasures which he had in Sophena, that the six thousand talents might be paid to the Romans without delay. Tigranes was well pleased with the decision; but his son was so dissatisfied, that he attempted to make his escape privately, and Pompey ordered him to be carefully guarded. But as the prince persisted in his refusal to give up his treasures in Sophena, and even attempted to excite the Armenian and Parthian noblemen to a war, Pompey took him in custody to be reserved for his triumph. Tigranes, in the warmth of his gratitude, not only paid the money demanded of him, but made valuable presents to the Roman soldiers, and was acknowledged as a friend to the Romans.⁶

Pompey then marched in pursuit of Mithridates, into the northern regions between the Black and Caspian Seas. After he had crossed the river Cyrus, he subdued the Albanians and Iberians, who had always maintained their independence against the Medes and Persians, and against the Macedonians. He then subdued the Colchians, and reconquered the Albanians, who had shaken off his yoke during his campaigns with the Iberians and Colchians. Mithridates, meanwhile, after having passed the winter at Dioscurias on the Black Sea, marched through the Scythian provinces to the Cim-

merian Bosphorus; whence he expelled his son, who had concluded a treaty of peace with the Romans.⁷

Pompey did not venture to pursue the retreating king in those dangerous places, and therefore directed his march towards the south. In this campaign, he compelled Antiochus, the king of Comagene, to solicit the friendship of the Romans, and put to flight Darius the Mede. These were petty princes, who had made themselves independent during the disturbances in the Syrian empire. He then, by his generals, took possession of Syria, which Tigranes had relinquished to the Romans, after he had held it eighteen years. Pompey also subjected to the Roman yoke all the other countries west of the Euphrates as far as Arabia, and, in violation of his treaty with Phraates, a part of the territory between the Euphrates and Tigris. Thus all the dominions of the Syrian empire came under the Roman power. Antiochus Asiaticus humbly preferred his claim to the throne of his ancestors, but his representations were disregarded; and in the year 64 B. C. the empire of the Seleucidae ceased, after it had continued two hundred and fifty eight years.⁸

About this time, 64 B. C. Pompey went to Damascus, where he was met by many ambassadours and more than twelve kings. Among these was Ptolemy Alexander, king of Egypt, who had been deposed by his subjects. He requested that he might be reestablished on his throne; but as this request was not granted, he went to Tyre, where he soon after died and bequeathed his kingdom to the Romans. The Egyptians then raised to the throne Ptolemy Auletes, also called Dionysius Neos, a very effeminate man, and the son of Ptolemy Lathyrus by a concubine. He sent ambassadours to Pompey at Damascus, with the present of a golden crown valued at four thousand pieces of gold. Claudius Ptolemy, in his Canon, places this king immediately after Lathyrus, though Alexander reigned fifteen years between Lathyrus and Auletes.⁹

Aristobulus, king of the Jews, also sent an embassy to Pompey at Damascus, with the present of a golden vine valued at five hundred talents, to obtain of the Roman general an acknowledgement of his authority as king. But since the name of Alexander Janneus was inscribed on the vine, which was deposited in the capitol at Rome, it appears that Aristobulus was unsuccessful in his application, though a recognition of his regal title was then an object of great importance to him, on account of the dissensions which at that

time prevailed in Judea. It is necessary that we should now trace the origin of these dissensions.¹⁰

They were excited by Antipas or Antipater, the father of Herod the Great. According to the testimony of Nicolaus Damascenus, a friend of Herod, Antipater was descended from a distinguished Jewish family; but Josephus says that he was of a noble family of Idumeans who had adopted the Jewish religion. His father, who was also called Antipas, had been governour of Idumea during the reigns of Alexander Janneus and the queen Alexandra. Antipater, the father of Herod, was a man of great influence at the Jewish court, and, after the death of queen Alexandra, he joined the party of Hyrcanus against Aristobulus. Accordingly, he lost his influence when Aristobulus ascended the throne; and on this account, he persuaded Hyrcanus, under pretence that his life was in danger from his brother, to enter into a secret alliance with Aretas, a king of the neighbouring Arabs. After Antipater had made all the necessary preparations and brought over many Jews to his party, he and Hyrcanus fled to Aretas, who conducted them back to Judea, with an army of fifty thousand men, defeated Aristobulus and took possession of Jerusalem without resistance. Aristobulus, being deserted by most of his soldiers, took refuge in the temple, where he was besieged by Aretas. The hatred of the besiegers against Aristobulus was so great, that, at the feast of the passover, they would allow no animals for the sacrifices to be carried into the temple, though Aristobulus had given to them from the walls the full sum which they had demanded for such a permission. They even stoned the pious Jew Onias, because he refused to utter imprecations against Aristobulus. In these distressed circumstances, Aristobulus applied to Scaurus, the Roman general, who had then taken possession of Damascus, and promised him four hundred talents if he would come to his aid. Though Hyrcanus, immediately after, offered him an equal sum, the Roman general accepted the offer of Aristobulus and received the money; and, at the same time, a sum of three hundred talents was given to Gabinius. Scaurus now marched to Judea and commanded king Aretas to return to his own dominions, or expect to feel the power of the Roman arms. Awed by this threat, Aretas proceeded towards Arabia; but while on his march, he was overtaken by Aristobulus and defeated with great slaughter. In this battle, many Jews of the party of Hyrcanus

nus were slain, and among others, Phalion or Caephalion, the brother of Antipater. Aristobulus was now master of Judea; and he attempted to obtain an acknowledgement of his authority from the Romans, by the embassy to Pompey which has already been mentioned.¹¹

Pompey, in the mean time, had returned to Pontus, where many cities still remained unsubdued. He passed the winter at Aspis in Pontus, and conquered the city of Caine or Caene, where he found the treasures and medical writings of Mithridates; for this great king was distinguished for his learning, particularly in medical science, and is said to have been the inventor of the celebrated medicine called *mithridate* after his own name.¹²

After Pompey had stationed the Roman fleet in the Black Sea, to intercept the supplies of Mithridates in the Bosphorus, he returned to Damascus with the determination to push his conquests, which already extended to the Caspian Sea on the north, towards the south as far as the Red Sea, and thence through Africa and Spain towards the west to the Atlantic Ocean. On his march, he every where took measures to repress the robberies and extortions of the petty princes who had established their independence during the disorders of the Syrian empire; but Ptolemy Menneus, prince of Chalcis, the most tyrannical of them all, escaped unpunished by presenting Pompey with one thousand talents.¹³

Now Hyrcanus applied to Pompey by Antipater, and Aristobulus, by Nicodemus. Both parties were heard, and dismissed in a friendly manner, with orders that the two brothers should appear in person. But as Nicodemus had made complaint against Scarus and Gabinius for having received the bribes already mentioned, Aristobulus could entertain little hope of a decision favourable to himself. At the same time, Mithridates sent ambassadors from the Bosphorus with proposals of peace. He offered to accept the same terms which had been granted to Tigranes, namely, to retain his hereditary dominions, to surrender all the rest to the Romans, and to give up his sons as hostages. But when Pompey required him to make his proposals in person, as Tigranes had done, he refused, and made the best possible preparations for a renewal of the war. Pompey, therefore, marched again towards Pontus. It was the intention of Mithridates to cross the Ister or Danube, march through Pannonia, and penetrate into Italy over the Alps; but

his soldiers refused to follow him in so hazardous a campaign, and his son Pharnaces placed himself at the head of the revolt. Mithridates now administered poison to his wives and daughters, and drank of it himself, but without effect. He then fell upon his own sword, but the wounds which he gave himself were not mortal. At length this highly gifted, but ambitious, cruel and voluptuous monarch was slain by his seditious soldiers; or, according to some, by a Gaul, at his own request. His body was embalmed, and sent to Pompey by Pharnaces. Pompey gave the body of Mithridates a royal burial, and established his son on the throne of Pontus.¹⁴

¹ Eutropius, VI. 6. Orosius, VI. 3. Memnon in Photius, Cod. 55—59. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. LXXXIV—XC. Plutarch, Lucullus XX—XXXI. Livy, Epitome of Book XCVIII. Strabo, p. 532. 539. Dion Cassius, XXXV. ² Appian, Syriac. LXX. Bell. Mithrid. XCI. Justin, XI. 2. Dion Cassius, XXXV. Eutropius, VI. 9. Orosius, VI. 3. Plutarch, Lucullus XXXI—XXXIV. ³ Appian, Bell. Mithrid. XCI—XCVII. Plutarch, Lucullus XXXV. and Pompey XXV—XXIX. Compare Eutropius, VI. 12. Dion Cassius, XXXV. XXXVI. Cicero pro Lege Manilia, XI—XXII. ⁴ Dion Cassius, XXXV. XXXVI. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. XCII. XCVIII. Livy, Epitome of Book C. Plutarch, Lucullus XXXV, Pompey XXXII. ⁵ Dion Cassius, XXXVI. Florus, III. 5. Livy, Epitome of Book C. Eutropius, VI. 12. Orosius, VI. 4. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. XCIX—CII. CXV. Plutarch, Pompey XXXII. Strabo, p. 555. ⁶ Appian, Bell. Mithrid. CIV. CV. Dion Cassius, XXXVI. Eutropius, VI. 13. Velleius Paterculus, II. 37. Florus, III. 5. Plutarch, Pompey XXIII. Orosius, VI. 4. ⁷ Livy, Epitome of Books XCVIII. CI. Dion Cassius, XXXVI. XXVII. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. CII. CIII. Florus, III. 5. Eutropius, VI. 14. Orosius, VI. 5. Plutarch, Pompey XXXIV. XXXV. Strabo, p. 496. 498. ⁸ Appian, Bell. Mithrid. CVI. Dion Cassius, XXXVII. Justin, XC. 2. Plutarch, Pompey XXXVI. ⁹ Cicero contra Rullum, XVI. Strabo, p. 796. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 3: 1. Lucian de Calumniis. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. CVI. CXIV. Plutarch, Pompey XXXVIII. ¹⁰ Strabo in Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 3: 1. ¹¹ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 1: 3—2: 3. compare 3: 2. Jewish War, I. 6: 2. ¹² Plutarch, Pompey XXXVII. Strabo, p. 556. Pliny, XXV. 2. Valerius Maximus, XIII. 7. ¹³ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 3: 2. Plutarch, Pompey XXXVIII. XXXIX. Eutropius, VI. 14. Dion Cassius, XXXVII. Strabo, p. 551. 556. ¹⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 3: 2. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. CVII—CXII. Strabo, p. 541. 547. 558. 567. 796. Dion Cassius, XXXVII. Livy, Epitome of Book CII. Florus, III. 5. Plutarch, Pompey XLI. XLII. Pliny, VII. 24. XXV. 2. Orosius, VI. 5.

CHAPTER TWELFTH.

HISTORY FROM THE CONQUEST OF JERUSALEM BY POMPEY TO THE REIGN OF HEROD THE GREAT.

CIX. CONQUEST OF JERUSALEM 63 B. C.

WHEN Pompey returned to Damascus, Hyrcanus and Aristobulus appeared before him, and each produced a multitude of witnesses to prove the justice of their respective claims. At the same time, there came many other Jews, who protested against both princes and accused them of having changed the form of government, as the nation had formerly been subject to the high priests, and not to kings. Hyrcanus urged the right of his birth, and accused his brother of violence against him, and of robbery by sea and land; and more than one thousand Jews gave testimony to the truth of these allegations. Aristobulus excused himself by showing the necessity of his assuming the government, on account of the incompetency and indolence of his brother. Pompey reproved Aristobulus for the violent measures he had taken, and then dismissed the three parties with assurances of friendship, deferring a final decision till he should return from his campaign against Aretas. Aristobulus perceived that the sentence would not be favourable to him, and therefore withdrew without taking leave, in order to make the requisite preparations; by which he only rendered his cause the more desperate.¹

Aretas had sent an embassy to Pompey, to signify his good will and submission to the Romans; but, notwithstanding this, Pompey took the field against him, and, while on his march, received intelligence of the death of Mithridates, which has already been mentioned. With little difficulty, king Aretas was subdued, taken prisoner, and then, after he had submitted to all the demands of his conqueror, reestablished in his kingdom.²

Pompey then marched against Aristobulus, of whose hostile preparations he had heard. He found him in the frontier fortification of Alexandrium, which was situated on a high mountain and was well prepared against an attack. At the command of Pompey, Aristobulus descended from the fortress, and, after having had three fruitless interviews with the Roman general, in the fourth, he was compelled to send orders to all the fortified places to surrender to the Romans. He then fled to Jerusalem, whither Pompey followed him.³

While Pompey was advancing towards Jerusalem, Aristobulus went out to meet him, tendered him his submission, and offered him a sum of money, on condition that he would discontinue the war. Pompey accepted the proposal, but retained Aristobulus in his power and sent Gabinius, with a division of his army, to Jerusalem to receive the money. But the party of Aristobulus shut the gates against the Romans, and then Pompey put the captive prince in chains. But the adherents of Hyrcanus, who were the most numerous, afterwards admitted Pompey into the city; and the party of Aristobulus, to which many of the priests had attached themselves, retired to the temple, fully determined to try the event of a siege. Pompey immediately commenced the necessary preparations and brought his military machines from Tyre. He began his operations against the north side of the temple, as that was the least strongly fortified, and pressed on the siege with great vigour, in which he was zealously assisted by the faction of Hyrcanus. Notwithstanding this, the siege would have been protracted to a tedious length, had the Jews been willing to make the least effort in their own defence on the Sabbath; but as they scrupulously abstained from all labour on that day, Pompey, every Sabbath, filled up the ditch and brought his machines to the walls without any opposition, and consequently, he was able, on the other days of the week, to make his attacks with the more effect. In the third month of the siege, therefore, a breach was made and the temple was taken. The Romans rushed in and put twelve thousand Jews to the sword. Among these were many priests, who, being then engaged in the sacrifices, would not move from the altars nor interrupt their rites, to escape the attack of their enemies. They were accordingly slain, and their blood was mingled with the blood of the sacrifices. The Jews of the faction of Hyrcanus were the most furious in this mac-

sacre of their countrymen. Among the prisoners was Absalom, the youngest son of John Hyrcanus I. who was then an old man, and had given his daughter in marriage to Aristobulus. He was undoubtedly executed with the other instigators of this resistance to the Roman power.⁴

Thus the temple was taken in midsummer of the year 63 B. C. the first of the 179th Olympiad, during the consulship of C. Antonius and M. T. Cicero, on the very day which was observed with lamentation and fasting, in commemoration of the conquest of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar.⁵

In Josephus' Antiquities, XX. 10: 1. this event is said to have taken place in the third year of the reign of Aristobulus; but this is probably the mistake of some transcriber, for in Antiquities, XIV. 1: 2. XX. 10: 1. Josephus says that Hyrcanus assumed the kingdom and the high priesthood in the third year of the 177th Olympiad, and was immediately after (*εὐθύς*) overcome at Jericho; and the interval from the third year of the 177th to the first of the 179th Olympiad gives, not three, but six years for the reign of Aristobulus.

Pompey, attended by his generals, went into the temple, viewed the sanctuary and the holy of holies, but left untouched all the sacred utensils and even the treasures of the temple, which amounted to two thousand talents of gold, and gave orders that the temple should be purified and the divine service continued as before. But he demolished the walls of Jerusalem. He appointed Hyrcanus high priest and prince of the country, on condition that he should submit to the Romans and pay tribute; that he should not assume the diadem, nor extend his territories beyond their ancient boundaries. All the cities of Phenicia and Coelosyria, which the Jews had conquered, were now separated from Judea; and Gadara, which the Jews had destroyed, was rebuilt. These places were then connected with Syria, which was made a province of the Roman empire and left under the dominion of Scaurus, as prefect, with two legions to preserve tranquillity. Thus the Jews, who had been the allies of the Romans, were now reduced to a subordinate principality, and, in a short time, were compelled to pay more than ten thousand talents of tribute to their conquerors.⁶

Pompey then returned through Pontus, completed the subjection of some cities and confirmed Pharnaces, the son of Mithridates,

as king of Bosphorus. He afterwards went to Rome, laden with the spoils of the conquered countries, and, among other distinguished prisoners, he took with him, to grace his triumph, Aristobulus with his two daughters, and his two sons, Alexander and Antigonus. But Alexander made his escape during the journey, and returned to Judea; where he excited new disturbances, as we shall see in the sequel.⁷

In this triumph of Pompey, which was celebrated in the year 61 B. C. three hundred and twenty four noble prisoners were exhibited; and Pompey was the first of the Romans, who discontinued the barbarous practice of putting the prisoners to death in the capitol, after they had endured the disgrace of a public triumph. He even released them from their captivity and sent them home at the public expense, with the exception of Aristobulus and Tigranes, who were held in custody, that they might not excite disturbances in their native countries.⁸

¹ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 3: 2, 3. Jewish War, I. 6: 4. ² Dion Cassius, XXXVII. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. CVI. CXIV. Plutarch, Pompey XLI. ³ Plutarch, Pompey XXXIX. Dion Cassius, XXXVII. Florus, III. 5. Strabo, p. 762. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. CVI. CXIV. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 3: 4. 4: 1. Jewish War, I. 6: 5, 6. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 4: 1—4. Jewish War, I. 6: 9. 7: 1—5. Strabo, p. 762. f. Dion Cassius, XXXVII. Plutarch, Pompey XXXIX. Orosius, VI. 6. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 4: 3. ⁶ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 4: 4, 5. Jewish War, I. 7: 6, 7. Florus, III. 5. Tacitus, Hist. V. 9. Cicero pro Flacco, XXVIII. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. CVI. CXIV. ⁷ Dion Cassius, XXXVII. Plutarch, Pompey XLII. XLIV. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 5: 2—4. Jewish War, I. 7: 7. ⁸ Appian, Bell. Mithrid. CXVII.

CX. HYRCANUS II. PRINCE OF THE JEWS 63—55 B. C.

Aretas, the king of Arabia Petrea, appears to have occasioned some disquiets; for in the year 60 B. C. Scarus, the prefect of Syria, took the field against him. But at Pella, the Roman general was reduced to great distress for want of provisions, and was relieved by Antipater and Hyrcanus. Antipater at last brought about a treaty, by which Aretas agreed to pay Scarus three hundred talents. Soon after, Scarus was succeeded in his office by Marcus Philip; and he again, in the year 60 B. C. by Lentulus Marcellinus. He also was involved in a war with the Arabs, who made incursions into his province.¹

In the year 59 or 58 B. C. when Diodorus Siculus visited Egypt, Pompey, Crassus, and Julius Caesar, entered into the celebrated conspiracy to bring the whole Roman empire under their power. This gave rise to the change in the Roman form of government. As long as Crassus lived, he held the balance of power between the other two ; but after his death, they each aspired to universal dominion ; for Caesar would not submit to a superiour, and Pompey could not endure a rival. Each had his adherents, and the state was divided into two parties.²

When Julius Caesar was made consul, in the year 56 B. C. he deprived his colleague Bibulus of all influence in the government, and exerted the power which his office gave him, to prepare for his future undertakings. He was particularly careful to collect the requisite sums of money, and amassed great treasures by granting to different nations alliances with the Romans and by establishing kings on their thrones. Ptolemy Auletes alone paid him six thousand talents for his aid in securing the kingdom of Egypt. By a decree of the people, he obtained, at the close of his consulship, proconsular power for five years over Illyria and Cisalpine Gaul ; and took four legions with him to those provinces, contrary to the usual custom. At this period, he commences his Commentaries.³

He was succeeded in the consulship in the year 55 B. C. by Gabinius, who had attended Pompey in the Mithridatic war ; and the next year, Gabinius became proconsul of Syria. The tribune Clodius, who had excited the army of Lucullus to revolt, and violated the chastity of his own sister, and rendered himself notorious by his dissipation and wickedness, contributed to the elevation of Gabinius, whom he viewed as a man equally vicious with himself, and consequently, wished to attach him to his party, as one who would be subservient to his interests.⁴

Clodius then, by the agency of Cato, expelled Ptolemy, the son of Lathyrus and brother of Auletes, from his kingdom of Cyprus, stripped him of all his property, and made Cyprus a province of the Roman empire ; because this king had given him only two talents, when he was taken prisoner by the pirates. Clodius excused this act of oppression on the ground that Ptolemy Alexander, after he had in vain solicited the aid of Pompey against his subjects, died at Tyre, as has already been related, and bequeathed his king-

dom to the Romans ; a bequest of which they could not then avail themselves, on account of the Mithridatic war, but which they were now under obligations to assume. The avaricious Ptolemy, through grief for the loss of his treasures, destroyed himself by poison.⁵

While Cato was at Rhodes, after his expedition against Cyprus, he was visited by Ptolemy Auletes, king of Egypt, who wished to make a journey to Rome. This king had been deposed by the Alexandrians, because he refused to demand the possession of Cyprus from the Romans, or to attempt the conquest of the island by arms ; and he now intended to apply to the senate for aid to be reestablished in his kingdom. The honest Cato advised him to return to Egypt, and candidly assured him that if he were to sell the whole kingdom, he would not be able to satisfy the avarice of the principal men of Rome. The event but too clearly proved to the unhappy king the truth of this declaration ; for after he had exhausted all his property by his donations, he was told that the Sibylline books forbade the Romans to take any active part in the affairs of the king of Egypt. The condition of Ptolemy Auletes then became the more hopeless, because the Egyptians, in the meantime, had raised his daughter Berenice to the throne, and invited Antiochus Asiaticus to marry her and participate in the government.⁶

Antiochus died soon after ; but the Alexandrians then called his brother Seleucus Cybiosactes to Egypt, and gave him Berenice in marriage. Seleucus, however, stole the golden coffin of Alexander the Great, and, in other respects, proved himself unworthy of the crown. He was finally put to death by his wife Berenice. She then married Archelaus, the son of that Archelaus who went over to the Romans after the first Mithridatic war. Pompey had appointed him high priest at Comana in Pontus, and he now ascended the throne of Egypt.⁷

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. 5: 1. *Jewish War*, I. 8: 1. ² Plutarch, *Pompey* XLVIII. *Crassus* XV. *Lucullus* XLII. *Julius Caesar* XIII. XXVIII. *Dion Cassius*, XXXVII. *Appian*, *Bell. Civ.* II. 9. XIV. *Suetonius*, *Julius Caesar* XIX. *Lucan*, *Pharsal.* I. 125 ff. ³ *Dion Cassius*, XXXVIII. *Plutarch*, *Julius Caesar* XIV. *Appian*, *Bell. Civ.* II. 13. ⁴ *Plutarch*, *Cicero* XXVIII—XXX. *Julius Caesar* X. XIV. *Pompey* XLVIII. XLIX. *Cato the Younger* XXXIV. *Lucullus* XXXIV. *Cicero pro Domo sua*, and *de Provinc. Cons.* *Dion Cassius*, XXXVIII. *Florus*, III. 9. ⁵ *Cicero in Rullum*, II. 16. *Dion Cassius*, XXXVIII. XXXIX. *Strabo*, p. 648. *Plutarch*, *Cato the Younger* XXXIV—XL. *Lucullus* XLIII. *Pompey* XLVIII. *Velleius Pater-*

culus, II. 46. Appian, *Bell. Civ.* II. 23. ⁶ Dion Cassius, XXXIX. Suetonius, Julius Caesar XI. Livy, *Epitome of Book CIV.* Plutarch, Cato the Younger XXXV. Pompey XLIX. Strabo, p. 796. ⁷ Strabo, p. 558. 794. 796. Porphyry in *Graec. Euseb. Scaligeri.* Suetonius, Vespasian XIX.

CXI. ARISTOCRACY OF THE JEWS 54—47 B. C.

In the year 54 B. C. Alexander, the oldest son of Aristobulus, who had escaped from Pompey during his journey to Rome, came to Judea, collected an army of ten thousand foot and fifteen hundred horse, ravaged the country without opposition, and took possession of Hyrcanium, Alexandrium, and Macherus near the mountains of Arabia. Hyrcanus, not having a force sufficient to oppose his enemy in the field, wished to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, which had been thrown down by Pompey, but was prevented by the Romans. He then applied for aid to Gabinius, the proconsul of Syria. The proconsul immediately led a large army to Judea, and was attended by Mark Antony, his commander of cavalry, who afterwards acted so conspicuous a part in the affairs of Rome. Pitholaus, Malichus, and Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, with the forces of Hyrcanus, joined the Roman army; and a battle was then fought near Jerusalem, in which Alexander lost three thousand men slain, and an equal number taken prisoners. He sought refuge, with the remainder of his army, in the fortress of Alexandrium, where he was immediately besieged. During the siege, Gabinius passed through Judea, and found Scythopolis, Samaria, Dora, Azotus or Ashdod, Jamnia, Gaza, Anthedon, Raphia, Gamala, Apollonia, Marissa, and other cities, which had been destroyed by the Jews, lying in ruins; and he gave orders that they should be rebuilt. When he returned to his camp at Alexandrium, he was visited by the mother of the besieged Alexander, who had already offered to surrender on capitulation, and now, by the mediation of his mother, obtained leave to depart, on condition that the fortifications which he had in his power, should be demolished.¹

Gabinius then marched to Jerusalem and confirmed Hyrcanus in the high priesthood, but changed the form of government to an aristocracy. This was undoubtedly done at the desire of the Jews, who had formerly requested such a change of Pompey. Gabinius divided the country into five districts, and appointed in each an

executive council for its government. The first council held its sessions at Jerusalem, the second, at Jericho, the third, at Gadara, the fourth, at Amathus, and the fifth, at Sepphoris in Galilee. This form of government continued till the year 44 B. C. when Caesar came to Judea and restored Hyrcanus to his former power.³

About this time or a little before, Flaccus, the pretor of Asia, seized the money which the Jews of Asia Minor and the adjacent countries had collected for taxes and for presents to the temple of Jerusalem. For this he was afterwards put on trial, when Cicero, his advocate, remarked that the Jews were already very powerful at Rome.³

The next year, 53 B. C. Aristobulus, who had contrived to escape from his captivity at Rome, came to Judea with his younger son Antigonus. He soon gained adherents; and even Pitholaus, a general of Hyrcanus, went over to him with one thousand men. He rebuilt Alexandrium and collected an army, which, together with the garrison of Alexandrium, amounted to eight thousand soldiers, exclusive of a great multitude of unarmed men whom he dismissed. With this army he marched to Macherus and repaired its fortifications; but he was soon after defeated, with the loss of five thousand men, by Sisenna, the son of Gabinius, who had been sent against him, with Mark Antony and Servilius. He fled to Macherus and there intrenched himself; but was pursued by Sisenna, and in two days his intrenchments were carried by assault, and he himself was wounded and taken prisoner with his son Antigonus. Gabinius sent them both to Rome, but, at the same time, informed the senate, that he had obligated himself to the wife of Aristobulus, at the surrender of Alexandrium, to deliver her children from captivity. Accordingly, Antigonus and his two sisters were set at liberty, but Aristobulus, their father, was kept a prisoner.⁴

During this year, Orodes and Mithridates, the two princes of Parthia, murdered their father Phraates. Orodes ascended the throne, but was soon expelled by Mithridates. But Surenas, who was next to the king in power, found means to restore Orodes; and Mithridates then fled to Gabinius. The Roman general was, at that time, on the point of engaging in an expedition against the Arabians; but he was easily persuaded to conduct Mithridates to the rich kingdom of Parthia, where he could hope for a much larger booty. But after he had crossed the Euphrates, Ptolemy Au-

letes came to him with a letter of introduction from Pompey, and offered him ten thousand talents for his assistance in regaining the crown of Egypt. Upon this, Gabinius immediately returned, marched to Egypt and left Mithridates unaided; who then surrendered himself to his brother at Seleucia, and was put to death.⁵

Archelaus, at that time the king of Egypt, was a friend of Gabinius and Antony, and had undoubtedly ascended the throne with their approbation; but this circumstance was now of no avail to him. Antony was sent forward with a division of cavalry to seize the passes of Egypt, in which he succeeded so well as to gain possession of Pelusium; and during the winter, when the river Nile is lowest, Gabinius entered the country. Hyrcanus and Antipater, in order to gain the favour of the Romans, were very active in supplying the army with provisions on their march, and gave Gabinius letters of recommendation to the Jews of Leontopolis in the Heliopolitan nomos, that they might aid him in his enterprise. Archelaus made a bold resistance; but he was overpowered and slain in battle. Egypt was then easily subdued, and Ptolemy Auletes ascended the throne. For his own security, he took a body of Roman soldiers into his service; and, in order to raise the ten thousand talents which he had engaged to pay, put to death his daughter Berenice and several of the Egyptian nobles, and confiscated their property.⁶

During this campaign of Gabinius, Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, again collected a large army, with which he made himself master of Judea and massacred all the Romans who fell in his way. Several fled to mount Gerizim and were there besieged by Alexander, when Gabinius returned with his victorious army from Egypt. Gabinius sent Antipater to Alexander with proposals of peace; but Alexander, though many of his adherents then left him and went home, still retaining thirty thousand men under his command, would listen to no terms of accommodation. Accordingly, a battle was fought near mount Tabor, in which ten thousand men of Alexander's army were slain, and the remainder dispersed. Gabinius then marched to Jerusalem, and, after he had arranged the affairs of the city according to the views of Antipater, he subdued the Nabathaeans and returned back to Syria.⁷

The next year, 54 B. C. Gabinius was removed and Crassus appointed his successor; but as he refused to surrender his authority to the deputies of Crassus, he was recalled by a special order of

the Roman senate and cited to appear at Rome and answer for his conduct ; for he had openly exposed to sale all offices in his gift, and had been guilty of such extortion and oppression, that frequent complaints were made against him at Rome. On the first trial, which was for the part he had taken in placing Ptolemy Auletes on the throne of Egypt, he saved himself by bribery ; but on the second, when he was accused of extorting large sums of money from his province, he was condemned and banished. Cicero, who had formerly been banished by the efforts of Gabinius and Clodius, in a spirit of retaliation, now exerted himself to procure the condemnation of Gabinius. This proconsul is eulogized by Josephus, because he afforded protection to the Jews, for which he probably received large sums of money.⁸

Crassus, the successor of Gabinius, came to Syria in the year 51 B. C. with a commission conferring extraordinary powers ; for he, in conjunction with Pompey, his colleague in the consulship the year before, in order to balance the influence of Julius Caesar, had persuaded the people to give Pompey proconsular authority for five years over Spain and Africa, and had obtained for himself the same authority for the same time over Syria and the adjacent provinces ; and they were allowed to maintain as large an army as they should deem necessary, and to carry on wars, without consulting the senate and people of Rome.⁹

The province of Syria was not in the least benefitted by the change of proconsuls, for Crassus was as avaricious as Gabinius. Soon after his arrival, he appeared at Jerusalem with a part of his army, to pillage the temple. Eleazer, the treasurer of the temple, promised him a bar of gold, weighing three hundred minae, which was preserved in a beam at the entrance of the holy of holies, on condition that he would leave the remainder of the treasures untouched. This condition Crassus solemnly swore to observe ; but as soon as he had obtained the golden bar, he robbed the temple of the two thousand talents which Pompey had left, and took eight thousand talents of gold besides.¹⁰

In the same manner, he plundered the temple of Atargatis in Hierapolis, and when he was going out with the treasures, he fell over his son, who had stumbled on the threshold of the temple ; and this, according to the superstitious notions of those times, was considered as a bad omen. With the money thus obtained, he

made preparations for a war against the Parthians, who were the allies of the Romans and had given no just occasion for hostilities. The Parthians, not expecting a war, were unprepared; and Crassus, in the year 50 B. C. took possession of a great part of Mesopotamia without opposition, and returned to Syria to winter quarters, leaving only seven thousand foot and one thousand horse, as a garrison, in Mesopotamia.¹¹

For the next campaign, the Parthians made the necessary preparations; but Crassus, rendered haughty by his first success, rejected the counsel of Artabazes or Artavasdes, the king of Armenia, who advised him to march to Parthia through Armenia, and allowed himself, notwithstanding the warnings of his treasurer Cassius Longinus, to be deceived by a traitor; and, in consequence of his rashness, his whole army was defeated at Carræ or Haran. Still he might have effected a retreat during the night, had he not been led into a morass by the artifice of another traitor. Cassius Longinus, with one division of the army, made his escape in good time; another division gained possession of a mountain; and Crassus himself, with the third division, ascended another mountain; but he was allured from his place of refuge, under pretence of a negotiation for peace, and put to death. Now all the Romans who were able, betook themselves to flight; but twenty thousand were slain and ten thousand taken prisoners. Cassius Longinus collected the fugitives in Syria, and put the province in so good a state of defence, that the Parthians, who made an attempt against Syria during the next year, were compelled to return home unsuccessful. Artabazes had before made peace with Orodes or Hyrodes, who led an army against him from Parthia.¹²

In the year 49 B. C. Cassius Longinus defeated Pitholaus, who had connected himself with the faction of Aristobulus, at Tarichæe; and pressed on so vigorously against Alexander, that he at last compelled him to accept terms of peace.¹³

In the year 48 B. C. Cicero obtained the government of Cilicia, and Calpurnius Bibulus, that of Syria; but as the latter remained at Rome for some time after, Cassius Longinus still continued at the head of the administration in this province. He was besieged at Antioch by the Parthians, who had invaded Syria with a large army; but they were very unskilful in their mode of conducting sieges, and when they heard that Cicero, who received intelligence

of their movements from Antiochus, the king of Comagene, had led an army to the frontiers of Armenia, cut to pieces a horde of Parthian ravagers, and taken Pindenissus, they raised the siege of Antioch, and, soon after, retired from Antigonias, against which they had likewise made an attempt. Cassius Longinus, by an ambush, slew many of them and harassed them exceedingly on their retreat. They finally went into winter quarters at Cirhestia on the Euphrates.¹⁴

In the year 47 B. C. the Parthians again laid siege to Antioch. Bibulus, who had now assumed the government of his province, made no direct attack upon them, but secured himself against their depredations by affording aid to Ordophantes, a discontented Parthian, who had excited a rebellion in that empire. In consequence of this, the Parthian troops were obliged to return to their own country.¹⁵

At the close of this year, Bibulus returned to Rome and entered the service of Pompey as admiral of his fleet. Pompey had already commenced the war with Caesar, and was desirous to set sail for Epirus. Quintus Metellus Scipio, who had been colleague with Pompey in the consulship three years before, and had given him his daughter, the widow of Crassus, in marriage, then took the government of Syria. He came to the province in time to secure it to the interests of Pompey.¹⁶

Ptolemy Auletes, king of Egypt, died about this time, and left his kingdom to his oldest son and oldest daughter, the celebrated Cleopatra, who was to become the wife of her brother.¹⁷

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. 5: 2—4. *Jewish War*, I. 8: 2—5. ² Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. 5: 4. *Jewish War*, I. 8: 5. ³ Cicero pro Flacco, XXVIII.
⁴ Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. 6: 1. *Jewish War*, I. 8: 6. Plutarch, *Mark Antony* III. ⁵ Dion Cassius, XXXIX. Plutarch, *Mark Antony* III. Justin, XLII.
Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. 6: 2. *Jewish War*, I. 8: 7. ⁶ Plutarch, *Mark Antony* III. Livy, *Epitome of Book CIV.* Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. 6: 2. *Jewish War*, I. 8: 7. Dion Cassius, XXIX. Strabo, p. 558. 796. Julius Caesar, *Comment. de Bell. Civ.* III. 103. 104. ⁷ Strabo and Nicolaus Damascenus in Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. 6: 2—4. and *Jewish War*, I. 8: 7. Dion Cassius, XXIX. ⁸ Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. 6: 4. Dion Cassius, XXXIX. Cicero de *Provinc. Cons.* VIII. contra Pison. *Epist. ad Attic.* IV. 16. ad *Quint.* III. 4.
⁹ Livy, *Epitome of Book CV.* Dion Cassius, XXXIX. Plutarch, *Crassus* XV. Pompey LI. LII. Cato the Younger XLI—XLIII. Appian, *Bell. Civ.* II. 16. 17. ¹⁰ Plutarch, *Crassus* II. XVII. Florus, III. 11. Cicero de *Divin.* I. 16.

Dion Cassius, XXXIX. Velleius Paterculus, II. 47. Orosius, VI. 13. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 7: 1. Jewish War, I. 8: 8. ¹¹ Dion Cassius, XL. Plutarch, Crassus XVI. XVII. ¹² Dion Cassius, XL. Orosius, VI. 13. Eutropius, VI. 13. Florus, III. 11. Plutarch, Crassus XVIII—XXXIII. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 7: 3. ¹³ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 7: 3. Jewish War, I. 8: 9. ¹⁴ Dion Cassius, XL. Plutarch, Cicero XXXVI. Cicero ad Fam. II. 10. XV. 1—4. ad Attic. V. 18—21. VI. 1. Velleius Paterculus, II. 46. Livy, Epitome of Book CVIII. Orosius, VI. 13. ¹⁵ Dion Cassius, XL. Cicero ad Fam. II. 17. XII. 10. ad Attic. VII. 2. ¹⁶ Julius Caesar, Comment. de Bell. Civ. I. 1—25. III. 3. 4. Plutarch, Julius Caesar XXIX—XXXIV. Pompey LVI—LXIII. Cicero XXXVII. Cato the Younger XLVIII—LIV. Mark Antony V—VII. Appian, Bell. Civ. II. 19. 20. 27—40. Cicero ad Attic. IX. 1. Suetonius, Julius Caesar XXVIII—XXXIII. XLVI—LV. Dion Cassius, XL. XLI. ¹⁷ Cicero ad Fam. VIII. 4. Julius Caesar, Comment. de Bell. Civ. III. 103. Hirtius, Bell. Alexand. XXXIII. Ptolemy, Canon.

CXII. HYRCANUS II. HIGH PRIEST 46—44 B. C.

In January of the year 46 B. C. Pompey embarked his troops at Brundisium, in sight of Caesar, and sailed to Epirus; whither the consuls and the whole senate had gone before. In the mean time, Caesar brought all Italy under his power in sixty days, without bloodshed; went to Rome and quieted the people; then proceeded to Spain, where he suppressed the party of Pompey; and in September, reappeared at Rome and was chosen dictator. He now invited those who had fled, to return; and dismissed Aristobulus, the former king of the Jews, from captivity, that he might employ him in Syria against Scipio, the friend of Pompey. But this design miscarried; for the adherents of Pompey poisoned Aristobulus while on his journey. Meanwhile, Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, had been levying soldiers in Judea for the party of Caesar; but he was condemned to death by Scipio and beheaded. Caesar resigned the dictatorship in eleven days after his election, and was then chosen consul with Servilius Isauricus. In January of the year 45 B. C. he passed over with seven legions to Epirus; whither Antony, in a few months after, led the remainder of his troops.¹

Pompey had brought together a large fleet, and raised an army of forty five thousand infantry and five thousand cavalry from the oriental nations. With these forces, he won the two first battles, which were fought in the spring at Dyrrachium.²

Pompey was so well secured by his fleet, that Caesar, despairing of gaining any advantage over his enemy at Dyrrachium, and suffering for the want of provisions, withdrew to Thessaly; whither he had before sent Domitius Calvinus with a detachment of his army. Pompey was now so imprudent as to dismiss his fleet and retire to Macedonia, where Scipio had arrived with a new army from the East. A decisive battle was then fought in the plains of Pharsalia, where Pompey brought into the field forty five thousand infantry and five thousand cavalry, consisting principally of raw and undisciplined troops; while Caesar had twenty two thousand infantry and one thousand cavalry, who were all veteran warriors. Pompey was defeated and his army almost entirely destroyed, fifteen thousand of his soldiers being slain and twenty four thousand taken prisoners; and his whole camp became the prey of the conquerors. Pompey fled in disguise to the nearest port, sailed from Amphipolis to Mitylene, or, (according to Dion Cassius,) to Lesbos, where he took his wife and Sextus, his younger son, and then went to Attalia in Pamphylia. Here he found a few of his ships with about two thousand soldiers and sixty Roman senators, who had saved themselves by flight, after the battle of Pharsalia. From them he learned that Cato, whom he had left at Dyrrachium, had gone with his troops and the fleet to Africa; whither he also might have retired in safety, had he not been so improvident as to forsake his station at Dyrrachium. But his repentance came to late. He then went to Egypt by the way of Cyprus, to seek the protection of Ptolemy, whose father, in consequence of his recommendation, had been placed on the throne of that kingdom by Gabinus. Ptolemy was then at Pelusium, engaged in a war against Cleopatra, his wife and sister; and Photinus, the regent of the king who was still a minor, caused Pompey to be beheaded as soon as he reached the shore. His wife and son then fled to their ships, many of which were destroyed, and all on board massacred, by the Egyptian fleet.³

Caesar pursued Pompey with all possible expedition, and, with three thousand two hundred infantry and eight hundred cavalry, soon came to Alexandria, where the head of his rival was brought to him. He now, by his own imprudence, incurred dangers far greater than any which he had hitherto escaped; as he was at first prevented from sailing by the northern winds that prevail in Egypt

during the dogdays, and was afterwards detained by circumstances which we shall now relate.⁴

Caesar, on his arrival in Egypt, not only strenuously demanded the remaining half of the ten thousand talents, which Ptolemy Auletes had engaged to pay the Romans for their aid in establishing him on the throne; but he even summoned the king and queen to appear before his tribunal to settle their disputes. By this imperious conduct, the Egyptians were highly enraged; and though they were somewhat pacified by the assurance, that Caesar interfered in this controversy only as an umpire and the representative of the Roman people, to whom Auletes had committed the guardianship of his children, he soon after gave them new cause of dissatisfaction. For Cleopatra, who had heard of Caesar's weak fondness for her sex, obtained permission to appear before him in person with her husband, and plead her own cause; when she so bewitched him by her fascinations, that, on the next day, he laid his commands on Ptolemy to accept the conditions which were proposed by his wife. The king was well aware of the wrongs to which such a step would expose him, and he, accordingly, excited his people to rise against Caesar. The Roman soldiers without difficulty seized Ptolemy and led him a prisoner to their general; but the Egyptians, on this account, were so much the more furious in their opposition to Caesar, till at length, he was obliged to appear before them in public, and promise to do whatever they should require. The next day, he introduced the king and queen into an assembly of the people, and allayed the irritated feelings of the multitude by reading the will of Ptolemy Auletes, and still more, by engaging to give the younger brother of the king, who was to be married to the young princess, his sister, the kingdom of Cyprus, which the Romans had taken away. But Photinus, the royal minister, who had excited the quarrel between the king and queen, secretly inflamed the discontents of the people anew, and directed Achilles, the general of the king, to lead his troops from Pelusium to Alexandria. At the arrival of Achilles with twenty thousand men, the whole city was in consternation; but Caesar posted his handful of soldiers so judiciously, that he secured himself against all the hostile attempts of the Egyptians.⁵

Caesar, in the mean time, still kept king Ptolemy in custody, and beheaded his minister Photinus, after he had detected this

eunuch's secret correspondence with the insurgents. But the dangers of Caesar were not diminished by these measures ; for Ganymedes, a eunuch of the young princess Arsinoe, fled with her to the army, condemned to death the general Achilles on an accusation of treachery, and assumed the command under Arsinoe, who was acknowledged as queen. He then deprived Caesar of his supplies of water, or admitted the water of the sea into the aqueducts of the city. The Roman soldiers themselves, when they began to suffer from thirst, showed evident tokens of disaffection towards their general ; but Caesar, by digging deep wells, at length succeeded in providing them with water. Ganymedes next attempted to cut off the communication of the Romans with their fleet ; and, to avoid this danger, Caesar was compelled to set fire to that part of the city called *the Bruchium*, by which he burnt the library of four hundred thousand volumes, which was located there.⁶

At length, Caesar, who had sent to the neighbouring provinces for aid at the commencement of these disturbances, received intelligence, that the legion which Calvinus detached from the province of Asia, had arrived in Libya ; and he set sail with his fleet to receive them. On his return, he encountered the fleet of Ganymedes, which had sailed in pursuit of him ; but in the battle, Caesar was victorious, and conducted his troops in good condition to Alexandria. Ganymedes immediately repaired his fleet, and a second battle was fought in the harbour of Alexandria ; when Caesar was defeated, and his fleet scarcely escaped total destruction. He then set king Ptolemy at liberty, because he was told that this measure would be likely to conciliate the Egyptians. The released monarch, however, placed himself at the head of his army, and, by his fleet, attempted to cut off the communication of Caesar with the sea ; but the Egyptians were overcome soon after, in a naval engagement near Canopus.⁷

In the mean time, Mithridates of Pergamus, who was sent to the assistance of Caesar, had collected an army in Cilicia and Syria, which was increased by Antipater, the father of Herod the Great, with three thousand men, and, through the intervention of Antipater, with many other auxiliary troops from the high priest Hyrcanus, the petty princes in Coelosyria and Arabia, and the free cities in Syria and Phenicia. Antipater himself attended Mithridates to Egypt, and rendered important services to the army in the conquest

of Pelusium and in the march through the Heliopolitan nomos; since, by means of the recommendatory letters of the high priest Hyrcanus and by his own representations, he persuaded the Jews who were settled there, to offer no resistance, and even to supply the troops with provisions. By this example, the city of Memphis was induced to surrender. When the army, at this place, were preparing to cross the Canopic arm of the Nile, and to penetrate into the Delta, a detachment from the army of Ptolemy attempted to dispute the passage. Mithridates was compelled to give way before the fury of the Egyptians, but Antipater hastened to his aid; when the Egyptian army was routed and their camp pillaged.⁸

In the year 44 B. C. Ptolemy led out his whole army to meet the invaders; but Caesar formed a junction with his auxiliaries and defeated the Egyptians. Ptolemy, while attempting to get on board a ship, was drowned in the Nile; and thus all Egypt fell into the power of Caesar. He then gave up the kingdom to his beloved Cleopatra, who occasioned him all these dangers; though he required her to marry her younger brother, who was then but eleven years old. To please Cleopatra, he remained at Alexandria from January to April; and then, at her request, conducted her younger sister Arsinoe in chains to Rome. Arsinoe was afterwards released, and went into the province of Asia, where she was put to death by Mark Antony, at the request of Cleopatra.⁹

Caesar, before his departure from Egypt, confirmed all the privileges of the Egyptian Jews, as a reward for the important services which they had rendered him; and commemorated their merits by inscriptions on a brazen pillar which he erected at Alexandria.¹⁰

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XIV. 7: 4. *Jewish War*, I. 9: 1, 2. Julius Caesar, *Comment. de Bell. Civ.* I. 25—87. II. 1—44. III. 1. 2. 7—26. Appian, *Bell. Civ.* II. 41—48. 52—55. Florus, IV. 2. Eutropius, VI. 19. Dion Cassius, XLI. Suetonius, *Julius Caesar* XXXIV. Plutarch, *Julius Caesar*, XXXVI—XXXIX. Mark Antony VI. VII. ² Julius Caesar, *Comment. de Bell. Civ.* II. 3—7. 27—73. Appian, *Bell. Civ.* II. 49—52. 56—63. Dion Cassius, XLI. Eutropius, VI. 20. Plutarch, *Julius Caesar* XXXIX. XL. Mark Antony VII. Pompey LXIV. LXV. Cato the Younger LIV. ³ Julius Caesar, *Comment. de Bell. Civ.* III. 74—100. Dion Cassius, XLI. XLII. Appian, *Bell. Civ.* III. 64—83. Plutarch, *Julius Caesar* XLI—XLVII. Pompey LXVII—LXXX. ⁴ Julius Caesar, *Comment. de Bell. Civ.* III. 102—107. Dion Cassius, XLI. Plutarch, *Pompey* LXXX. Eutropius, VI. 21. Appian,

Bell. Civ. III. 83—89. 5 Dion Cassius, LII. Plutarch, Julius Caesar XLVIII. Julius Caesar, Comment. de Bell. Civ. III. 107—111. Orosius, VI. 15. 6 Julius Caesar, Comment. de Bell. Civ. III. 111. Plutarch, Julius Caesar XLIX. Hirtius, Bell. Alexand. VI—IX. Dion Cassius, XLII. 7 Hirtius, Bell. Alexand. IX—XXV. Julius Caesar, Comment. de Bell. Civ. III. 112. Plutarch, Julius Caesar XLIX. Appian, Bell. Civ. II. 90. Suetonius, Julius Caesar XXXV. Orosius, VI. 15. Dion Cassius, XLII. 8 Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 8: 1, 2. Jewish War, I. 9: 3—5. Strabo in Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 8: 3. Dion Cassius, XLII. Hirtius, Bell. Alexand. XXVI. 9 Appian, Bell. Civ. II. 90. Dion Cassius, XLII. XLIII. Hirtius, Bell. Alexand. XXVIII—XXXII. Suetonius, Julius Caesar XXXI. Eutropius, VI. 22. 10 Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 10: 1. against Apion, II. 4.

CXIII. HYRCANUS II. PRINCE OF THE JEWS 44—41 B. C.

Caesar was at length compelled to separate himself from Cleopatra, for he received intelligence that the king of the Cimberian Bosphorus, Pharnaces, the son of Mithridates the Great, had defeated the Romans during the disturbances in Egypt, and was gaining possession of Pontus.¹

When Caesar arrived in Syria, he was met by Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, the former king of the Jews, who complained that his father and brother had been put to death by the party of Pompey, and that he himself had been robbed of his kingdom by Antipater and Hyrcanus. But Caesar, in consequence of the representations of Antipater, not only dismissed Antigonus from his presence as a seditious person, but reinstated Hyrcanus and his family in the principality, gave him permission to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, which had been demolished by Pompey, and appointed Antipater procurator of Judea. He then wrote to Rome respecting these transactions, and Hyrcanus sent to the senate a golden shield, valued at fifty thousand pieces of gold; upon which the Jews, by a decree of the senate, were publicly acknowledged as the allies of the Romans. This decree, which is preserved by Josephus, (Antiq. XIV. 10: 2, 3.) was engraved on plates of copper and laid up in the capitol at Rome, and also in the temples at Zidon, Tyre, and Askelon. In this manner, the aristocracy which had been introduced by Gabinus, was destroyed, and the principality restored. About the same time, a letter is said to have been received at Jerusalem from the Athenians, to whom Hyrcanus had shown many favours.²

Julius Caesar, having appointed his relative Sextus Caesar governour of Syria, departed for Pontus, and was attended by Antipater to the frontiers of the province. At Tyre, he seized all the consecrated gifts in the temple of Hercules. On his arrival in Pontus, his success against Pharnaces was so rapid, that in writing to a friend respecting his campaign, he made use of these words only: "Veni, vidi, vici." Pharnaces fled to Sinope and sailed thence to Bosphorus; where he was slain by his son Asander, who had before taken possession of the throne.³

Caesar then rewarded Mithridates for his services, by making him tetrarch of Galatia and giving him the kingdoms of Pergamus and Bosphorus. But in consequence of the commotions which soon after broke out in the Roman empire, Asander was able to retain the kingdom of Bosphorus.⁴

When Caesar returned to Rome, he was again chosen dictator for the ensuing year. At this time, he found it necessary to undertake a campaign to Africa, where Scipio and Cato, the friends of Pompey, were raising a formidable party. He entirely subdued them, in the following year, and brought as prisoner to Rome Juba, the son of the king of Mauritania, who afterwards became a celebrated historian, and received from Augustus the kingdom of Getulia. Caesar then ordered Carthage and Corinth to be rebuilt. To Carthage he gave the name of Junonia; and both cities were peopled by Roman colonists.⁵

In the mean time, Antipater settled the affairs of Judea in accordance with the last directions of Caesar. He rebuilt the walls of Jerusalem, travelled through the country, and, by persuasions and threats, reduced the inhabitants to obedience. He made his oldest son Phasaël governour of Jerusalem, and his second son Herod governour of Galilee. Herod, though at that time very young, soon gave proof of his enterprising spirit. He attacked the robbers of Galilee and put to death all who fell in his power, and, among the rest, Hezekiah, their leader. By his heroism, he acquired the respect of the people and of Sextus Caesar, the prefect of Syria; but the sanhedrim of Jerusalem summoned him to appear before them, because he had exercised, in an arbitrary manner, the power of life and death. He obeyed the summons; but at the suggestion of his father, he presented himself to his judges, arrayed in a purple robe, with his hair neatly dressed, and attended by his life-

guard. The members of the sanhedrim were confounded ; but Sameas (perhaps the Simeon mentioned in Luke 2: 25—35.) reproved them for their cowardice, and assured them that the time would come, when Herod would not pardon them as they had now pardoned him ; a prediction which was verified by subsequent events. By the remonstrances of Sameas, the members of the sanhedrim were made ashamed of their timidity ; but the prince Hyrcanus, the president of the sanhedrim, to whose protection Herod had been commended by a letter from Sextus Caesar, put an end to the session and gave Herod a hint to depart from Jerusalem. He accordingly went to Sextus Caesar at Damascus, and not only obtained his protection, but received from him the government of all Coelosyria, on condition that he would pay a certain tribute. Herod, not satisfied with having set at defiance the supreme tribunal, now collected a small army and marched towards Jerusalem, in order to punish the sanhedrim and depose Hyrcanus ; but he was persuaded, by his father and his brother Phasaël, to relinquish his design.⁶

In the same year, 43 B. C. the sons of Antipater assisted the Roman general Antistius in a campaign against Caecilius Bassus. Bassus was a general of Pompey, who, after the defeat at Pharsalia, had fled to Tyre. While he remained there concealed among the merchants, he privately attached a party to his interests and collected a body of soldiers. When Sextus Caesar heard of the movements of Bassus, he called him to an account ; but Bassus pretended that he was going to the assistance of Mithridates, king of Pergamus, against Asander, king of Bosphorus. But he soon took possession of Tyre and marched with his army against Sextus ; and though he was repulsed and wounded, he yet found means to corrupt the soldiers of Sextus, so that they put their leader to death. Then most of the Roman soldiers, who had before been disgusted with the effeminaey of Sextus, joined the party of Bassus ; but the remainder retired to Cilicia, where they were collected by Antistius. Bassus now assumed the government of Syria. Antistius, after he had formed a junction with the forces of the sons of Antipater, drove Bassus to Apamea ; but being unable to reduce this fortress, he withdrew, to levy more soldiers.⁷

This year, 43 B. C. was extended by the Romans to four hundred and forty five days, to compensate for the errors of the ancient calendar ; and the next year, 42 B. C. was fixed upon for the

introduction of the new calendar, which Julius Caesar had formed by the aid of the Alexandrian astronomer Sosigenes and the scribe Flavius. By the calendar of Caesar the duration of a year was fixed at three hundred and sixty five days and six hours, and consequently, it was eleven minutes too long.⁸

This year Caesar was chosen consul for the fourth time. He suppressed the party of Pompey in Spain, and then proclaimed a general amnesty. He was afterwards chosen perpetual dictator, and received so many other offices and such demonstrations of honour, that nothing was wanting to satisfy his ambition but the title of absolute monarch.⁹

During this year, Caecilius Bassus still maintained his ground in Syria. Statius Marcus, the prefect of the province, joined Antistius with three legions, and again besieged Bassus in Apamea. But Alcandon, an Arabic emir, whom both parties invited to their assistance, accepted the offers of Bassus, who had made him the most liberal promises; and when Pacorus came from Parthia and united his forces with those of Alcandon, Marcus was forced to raise the siege of Apamea.¹⁰

In the year 41 B. C. Julius Caesar was elected consul the fifth time, and Mark Antony was his colleague in the office. During this consulship, the senate, in honour of Caesar, changed the name of the month Quintilis to July. At this time, Caesar sanctioned the fortifying of Jerusalem by a special edict. He also restored to the Jews all that they had formerly possessed, and confirmed them in the enjoyment of all their privileges. These edicts are preserved in detail by Josephus.¹¹

Caesar determined to undertake a campaign against the Parthians, to revenge the defeat of the Romans at Carrae or Haran. He accordingly resigned his office of consul to Dolabella, who was then only twenty five years old, and prepared for his expedition. He sent Caius Octavius, the son of his sister, to Apollonia, with orders to levy troops and await his arrival. But four days before the time fixed upon for his departure, in the month of March, he was assassinated in the senate house by Marcus Brutus, Caius Cassius, and some others, to whom he had shown great favours, a little more than four years from the death of Pompey, and after he had governed the Roman empire three years and six months.¹²

¹ Plutarch, Julius Caesar L. Appian, Bell. Civ. II. 91. Bell. Mithrid. CXX. CXXI. Dion Cassius, XLII. Hirtius, Bell. Alexand. XXXIV—XLII.

SECT. 114. HYRCANUS II. PRINCE OF THE JEWS 41—37 B. C. 363

Suetonius, Julius Caesar XXXV. Orosius, VI. 16. 2 Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 8: 4, 5 10: 2, 3. Jewish War, I. 10: 1—3. 3 Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 9: 1. Jewish War, I. 10: 4. Dion Cassius, XLII. Hirtius, Bell. Alexand. XXXIV—XLII. Appian, Bell. Civ. II. 91. Bell. Mithrid. CXX. CXXI. Plutarch, Julius Caesar L. Suetonius, Julius Caesar XXXV. Orosius, VI. 16. 4 Appian, Bell. Mithrid. CCXXI. Hirtius, Bell. Alexand. XLII. Strabo, p. 625. 5 Dion Cassius, XLII. XLII!. Hirtius, Bell. Afric. Plutarch, Julius Caesar LI—LV. Appian, Bell. Punic. ad finem. Bell. Civ. II. 92—102. Eutropius, VI. 23. Solinus, XXVII. 11. Pausanias, Eliac. I. 1. Corinthiac. I. 2. III. 1. Strabo p. 833. 6 Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 9: 1—5. Jewish War, I. 10: 7. Livy, Epitome of Book LXIV. Dion Cassius, XLVII. Josephus, Antiq. 4—9. XIV. 11: 1. Jewish War, I. 11: 10. 8 Dion Cassius, XLIII. Pliny, XVIII. 25. Solinus, I. Macrobius, Saturnal. I. 12—14. Suetonius, Julius Caesar XL. Plutarch, Julius Caesar LIX. 9 Hirtius, Bell. Hispan. Plutarch, Julius Caesar LVI—LVIII. Dion Cassius, XLIII. Lucan, Pharsal. Velleius Paternulus, II. 36. Livy, Epitome of Book CXVI. Appian, Bell. Civ. II. 103—110. 10 Velleius Paternulus, II. 69. Dion Cassius, XLVII. Cicero ad Attic. XIV. 9. Strabo, p. 752. 11 Macrobius, Saturnal. I. 12. Appian, Bell. Civ. II. 106. Dion Cassius, XLIV. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 10: 5—8. 12 Appian, Bell. Civ. II. 107—118. 150. Dion Cassius, XIV. Velleius Paternulus, II. 58. Plutarch, Julius Caesar LVIII. LX—LXVII. LXIX. Brutus XII. Suetonius, Julius Caesar LXXIX—LXXXV. Florus, IV. 2. Livy, Epitome of Book CXVI. Pliny, VII. 25. Eutropius, VI. 25.

CXIV. HYRCANUS II. PRINCE OF THE JEWS 41—37 B. C.

After the death of Caesar, the Roman empire was rent by new dissensions. Brutus and his party found it necessary to escape from the city; and when at last, after some resistance from Antony, a general pardon and amnesty was proclaimed, Antony still conducted, in many respects, in an arbitrary manner. Caius Octavius also, Caesar's nephew, came from Apollonia on the Ionian Sea to Brundisium, and declared himself the adopted son of Caesar. He gained many adherents among the soldiers, and entered Rome, attended by a great multitude of people, who had gone out to meet him, and there, before the pretor of the city, asserted his claims, as the heir of Caesar.¹

Mark Antony, to whom Caesar, by his will, had assigned the fourth part of his inheritance, was dissatisfied with so small a share; he refused to second the views of Octavius, who claimed the succession to the highest office in the state and demanded the punishment of his uncle's murderers. Consequently, a violent quarrel

ensued between the two leaders; and as the people, the army, and the senate inclined more and more to the party of Octavius, Antony with his adherents retired to Cisalpine Gaul, whence he attempted to expel Decimus Brutus, whom the senate had sent thither. Octavius pursued his rival with an army; and then Antony, in order to strengthen himself, united with Brutus, against whom he had just before threatened hostilities².

During the next year, 40 B. C. at the request of Octavius, Antony was declared an enemy to the commonwealth, on account of his connexion with Decimus Brutus. Antony was then besieging the city of Mutina or Modena, whither Octavius and the two Roman consuls led an army against him. In the battle which followed, the two consuls were slain; but the siege of the city was raised, and Antony again retired to Cisalpine Gaul. Octavius then, being disappointed in his expectations of attaining the consulship, entered into a secret negotiation with Lepidus, the confederate of Antony, and, by means of this new ally, formed a connexion with his rival, in order to strengthen himself against the senate and the party of Caesar's murderers. After this, Octavius marched to Rome and was chosen consul with Peditus. He now regulated the affairs of the empire according to his own pleasure, prosecuted some of the murderers of Caesar, and assumed the name of Caius Julius Caesar Octavianus. As his connexion with Antony was not suspected, he received a commission to prosecute the war against this public enemy. But he accomplished nothing, and indeed, he would have been unable to do any thing against the united power of Antony and Lepidus; but he had the sagacity to persuade his colleague Peditus to obtain an act of pardon and oblivion for those two confederates. Thus these three men, Octavius, Antony, and Lepidus, who were mortal enemies to each other, became united, because neither of them was able to subdue the others. They now marched together to Rome, and deluged the city with blood; for they put to death many of those who had opposed them, and, among the rest, Marcus Tullius Cicero.³

Immediately after the death of Caesar, during the consulship of Antony and Dolabella, Jewish ambassadors were sent to Rome by Hyrcanus; and they obtained a decree of the senate, confirming all the privileges and immunities which had been granted to the Jews by Julius Caesar. Afterwards, while Dolabella was pro-

consul of Asia, Hyrcanus sent an embassy to him with the request, that he would allow the Jews in his province the free exercise of their religion and grant them exemption from military duty. Dolabella complied with this request, and wrote accordingly to all the Asiatic cities. The letter of the proconsul, and the decrees of the several cities respecting the Jews, are preserved by Josephus.⁴

While the triumvirate were proscribing and murdering many of the best men of Rome, who had opposed their designs, party wars were raging in Spain, Africa, and Asia. In Syria, Bassus, who has already been mentioned, still remained unsubdued before Apamea; although Murcus or Marcus had received from Bithynia a reinforcement of three legions under the command of Martius Crispus. Cassius Longinus, one of the murderers of Caesar, who had been compelled with others to leave Italy on account of the predominant influence of Antony and Octavius, maintained himself against Dolabella, the proconsul of Asia after Caesar's death, and united himself with Murcus and Martius Crispus, who were besieging Bassus at Apamea. Bassus himself was finally compelled by his soldiers to join the same party; and in this manner, Longinus at last obtained the command of eight legions. Besides these, Longinus induced the four legions which Allienus was leading from Egypt to the assistance of Dolabella, to unite under his standard.⁵

For the support of such an army, which consisted of more than seventy two thousand men besides a large fleet, a heavy tribute was demanded; and Palestine alone was required to pay seven hundred talents. Herod paid the share which fell to his district before any of the others; and this was the greater recommendation to him, because Malichus could not pay his part. He would have been put to death for his neglect, had not Hyrcanus paid one hundred talents for him, and Antipater interceded in his behalf. But the ungrateful wretch, during this very year, destroyed his benefactor Antipater by poison. The citizens of Gophna, Emmaus, Lydda, Thamma, and some other cities, for refusing to pay the portion of the tribute assigned to them, were sold for slaves.⁶

In the mean time, Dolabella levied equally heavy contributions in Asia Minor for the support of his army. He then marched to Cilicia, took possession of Tarsus, and, after having been repulsed from Antioch, proceeded to Laodicea. Cassius Longinus and Murcus marched against him from Palestine, besieged Laodicea by

land and water, and at length conquered the city; not, however, before Dolabella and his officers had destroyed themselves with their own hands. Upon this, all the neighbouring princes came to Laodicea to offer their congratulations to the victorious Longinus. Herod and Malichus waited upon the Roman general at the same time; and Herod, who had hitherto concealed his purpose of revenging the murder of his father Antipater, now made such a representation of the affair to Cassius Longinus, that Malichus, as soon as he had arrived at Tyre, was put to death by the Roman soldiers.⁷

In the year 39 B. C. Cassius Longinus took the field against Egypt, because Cleopatra, who, during the preceding year, had poisoned her brother that she might reign alone, had refused to send him any auxiliaries, though he had repeatedly requested it. But while on his march, he received a very pressing letter from Brutus, entreating him to come to his assistance against the triumvirate. He accordingly returned; and leaving one legion in Syria under the command of his sister's son, hastened with the remainder of his army to Smyrna, where he joined the standard of Brutus. Brutus and Longinus had in their power all the country from the Euphrates to Macedonia; and now they led their army across the Hellespont, where Octavianus and Antony came to meet them with a superiour force, while Lepidus remained at Rome to manage the affairs of Italy. The battle at Philippi was severe and bloody; Cassius Longinus and Brutus were defeated, and, in despair, laid violent hands on themselves. Octavianus then returned to Rome, while Antony proceeded to Asia Minor and Syria, to settle the affairs of those provinces. On his march, he extorted heavy contributions on all sides from the already exhausted inhabitants, and intended to plunder Palmyra, but was prevented.⁸

Cleopatra, who had been so much celebrated by Caesar, was summoned to Tarsus by Antony; and she appeared before him to defend herself against the accusation, that she had afforded assistance to Cassius Longinus. She proved her entire innocence of the charge, and, at the same time, so gained the affections of Antony, that he could never, to the end of his life, free himself from her snares. She, immediately after, attended him to Tyre, and then returned to Egypt. Antony, during his march, expelled all the petty princes, who had purchased cities and districts of Cassius

Longinus or had seized the governments by force. Of this class was Marion, the king of Tyre.⁹

After the departure of Cassius Longinus from Palestine, the adherents of Malichus excited great disturbances at Jerusalem by their attempts to avenge the death of their leader on Herod and Phasaël. They brought Hyrcanus over to their party, and also the commander of the Roman troops, who had been left in Palestine by Longinus. A brother of Malichus, by the connivance of Hyrcanus, took possession of Masada and some other fortified towns. Herod at this time lay sick at Damascus; but his brother Phasaël expelled the insurgents and their leader Felix from Jerusalem; and when Herod at last arrived, the whole party was soon suppressed. Phasaël and Herod made heavy complaints against Hyrcanus, on account of the encouragement which he had given to the authors of these disturbances; but they soon effected a reconciliation with him, because Herod designed to marry Mariamne, a daughter of Hyrcanus.¹⁰

The party of Malichus, however, was soon revived; and they finally called Antigonus, the son of Aristobulus, from Chalcis to Palestine, with the intention of placing him on his father's throne. The undertaking was favoured by Marion, the king of Tyre, out of hatred to Herod; by Ptolemy Menneus, the prince of Chalcis, who had married the sister of Antigonus; and even by Fabius, the Roman prefect of Damascus, who had been gained over by money. But when Antigonus arrived in Judea with his army, he was entirely defeated by Herod, and compelled for a while to relinquish his purpose. The discontented party, however, were not yet satisfied; and in the year 41 B. C. they sent an embassy to Antony, who had then arrived in Syria, and made complaint against Phasaël and Herod, that they were undermining the authority of Hyrcanus. But Antony, having received gifts from Herod who was then with him, and having been reminded by him of the services which his father Antipater had formerly rendered to Gabinius in the expedition to Egypt, disregarded all their complaints.¹¹

At this time, Hyrcanus also sent an embassy to Antony, for the purpose of regaining those districts which Cassius Longinus had sold, and of obtaining the emancipation of those Jews who had at the same time gone into slavery. Antony readily granted the petition of Hyrcanus, and made known his determination to the Tyrrians, who had probably purchased most of the enslaved Jews.¹²

Although the complaints of the discontented Jews against Phasaël and Herod had been once rejected, yet nearly a hundred of the principal men of the nation repaired to Antony, while he was at Daphne near Antioch, to renew their accusations. Antony, in their hearing, asked Hyrcanus who was then present, whom he esteemed most capable of administering the affairs of government under him; and when he named Phasaël and Herod, Antony immediately appointed these two brothers tetrarchs of Palestine, and would have executed fifteen of their accusers, had not Hyrcanus interceded in their behalf. Notwithstanding this, while Antony was at Tyre a short time after, a thousand Jews appeared before him with the same complaints; but the Roman general, viewing so numerous a deputation as little short of rebellion, sent his soldiers among them, who put several to death and wounded many others.¹³

Antony then left the government of Asia Minor to Plancus and that of Syria to Saxas, and hastened to Alexandria, where he trifled away the whole winter with his beloved Cleopatra. He would scarcely have torn himself from her in the spring, had he not heard of adverse occurrences in Syria and Italy. For Syria and Palestine, having been so much oppressed by Cassius Longinus, and afterwards by Antony, could endure these extortions no longer; and the citizens of Aradus first began to offer open resistance to the collectors of tribute. Their example was soon followed by others. They united with the Palmyrenes and the princes whom Antony had deposed, and invited the Parthians to their aid. The Parthians entered the country in great numbers, under the command of their prince Pacorus and the Roman general Labienus, who belonged to the party of Pompey, and drove Saxas from Syria to Cilicia. While Pacorus was securing possession of all Syria, Labienus, with one division of the army, pursued Saxas, slew him, and took possession of all Asia Minor. Plancus, the prefect of this district, made his escape to the islands of the Aegean Sea.¹⁴

In Italy, meanwhile, Fulvia, the wife of Mark Antony, and his brother Lucius, who was consul in the year 38 B. C. were waging war against Octavianus; but they were defeated, and, after the conquest of Perusia, expelled from Italy.¹⁵

When Antony heard of these transactions in Italy and Syria, he sailed from Alexandria to Tyre; and having there learned the particulars of the success of the Parthians and of the defeat of his

wife Fulvia, he set sail for Italy with two hundred ships. While on his way, he met with Fulvia at Athens. On his arrival in Italy, he laid siege to Brundisium, which had been garrisoned by Octavianus. But Fulvia died soon after, and peace was restored. Antony married Octavia, the sister of Octavianus; Lepidus, immediately after the death of Caesar, had married a daughter of Antony; and Octavianus now married the daughter of Fulvia. Some interpreters have supposed that these marriages are referred to in Dan. 2: 33. 41—43. The triumvirate now divided the empire among themselves. Lepidus received Africa; Octavianus, all the West as far as Scodra in Illyria; and Antony, all the East, from Scodra to the Euphrates; while Italy was to be held in common.¹⁶

¹ Suetonius, Julius Caesar LXXXIII—LXXXVIII. Augustus VIII. Dion Cassius, XLIV. XLV. Compare XLVIII. Livy, Epitome of Book CXVII. Appian, Bell. Civ. III. 1—14. Plutarch, Mark Antony XIV—XVI. Brutus XIX—XXII. Cicero XL—XLIV. Velleius Paterculus, II. 59. Cicero ad Attic. XIV. 10. ² Plutarch, Mark Antony XIV. Cicero XLIII. Dion Cassius, XLV. XLVI. Appian, Bell. Civ. III. 14—49. Livy, Epitome of Book CXVII. Suetonius, Augustus X. Florus, IV. 3. ³ Plutarch, Mark Antony XVII—XXI. Cicero XLV—XLIX. Appian, Bell. Civ. III. 50—98. IV. 1—56. Dion Cassius, XLVI. Florus, IV. 4—6. Eutropius, VII. 1. 2. Livy, Epitome of Book CXX. Suetonius, Augustus X—XII. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 10: 9—26. ⁵ Appian, Bell. Civ. IV. 58. 59. Dion Cassius, XLVII. Strabo, p. 752. Cicero ad Fam. XII. 11. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 11: 2. Jewish War, I. 11: 1. ⁶ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 11: 2. Jewish War, I. 11: 2, 3. ⁷ Cicero ad Fam. XII. 13—15. Dion Cassius, XL. Appian, Bell. Civ. IV. 60—72. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 11: 4—6. Jewish War, I. 11: 3—8. ⁸ Appian, Bell. Civ. IV. 62—138. V. 1. 3—6. 9. Dion Cassius, XLVII. XLVIII. Plutarch, Brutus XXIII—LII. Eutropius, VII. 3. Velleius Paterculus, II. 70. Florus, IV. 7. ⁹ Plutarch, Mark Antony XXV—XXIX. Dion Cassius, XLVIII. Appian, Bell. Civ. V. 1. 8—10. ¹⁰ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 11: 7. Jewish War, I. 12: 1, 2. ¹¹ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 12: 1. 2. Jewish War, I. 12: 2—4. Compare Appian, Bell. Civ. V. 4. ¹² Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 12: 2—6. ¹³ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 12: 1, 2. Jewish War, I. 12: 5—7. ¹⁴ Appian, Bell. Civ. V. 52. 65. Plutarch, Mark Antony XXVIII—XXX. Dion Cassius, XLVIII. Livy, Epitome of Book CXXVII. Florus, VI. 9. Velleius Paterculus, II. 75. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 13: 3. Jewish War, I. 13: 1. ¹⁵ Appian, Bell. Civ. V. 12—51. Dion Cassius, XLVIII. Plutarch, Mark Antony XXX. Eutropius, VII. 3. Velleius Paterculus, II. 74. ¹⁶ Dion Cassius, XLIV. XLVI. XLVIII. Appian, Bell. Civ. V. 51—65. Plutarch, Mark Antony XXX. XXXI.

CXV. ANTIGONUS KING OF THE JEWS 37—34 B. C.

After the Parthians had made themselves masters of Syria in the manner which has already been related, Lysanias, who had succeeded his father Ptolemy Menneus in the principality of Chalcis during the preceding year, persuaded the Parthian prince Pacorus, by means of his general Barzapharnes, to place Antigonus on the throne of Judea for one thousand talents in money and five hundred female slaves. Accordingly, when Pacorus had subdued Zidon and Ptolemais, Antigonus led an army into Judea; and, at the same time, the Parthian prince sent his cupbearer, who also was called Pacorus, with a division of the Parthian army, to act in concert with Antigonus. Judea was not able to resist such a force. Antigonus proceeded towards Jerusalem; but there he was repulsed in a skirmish with Herod and Phasael, and obliged to take refuge in the temple. Herod and Phasael then garrisoned the royal castle of Baris, which was situated close to the temple.

The two parties now exerted all their power to annoy each other, but neither could gain any considerable advantage; and when the strength of both was increased by those Jews who came to Jerusalem to celebrate the feast of Pentecost, their conflicts, though more obstinate and bloody, were equally undecisive. At length they came to an agreement; and the Parthian cupbearer Pacorus, who was encamped before Jerusalem with his army, was admitted into the city with five hundred cavalry, at the request of Antigonus, to act as umpire between the parties. Hyrcanus invited him to his house, and imprudently suffered himself to be persuaded to go with the prince Hyrcanus to Barzapharnes, the Parthian governour of Syria, and lay the matter before that officer. The cupbearer Pacorus attended Hyrcanus and Phasael to Galilee with his cavalry, and then, after he had committed them to the care of another body of Parthian cavalry, returned to Jerusalem.

The Parthian governour Barzapharnes treated Hyrcanus and Phasael with great respect, till he supposed the cupbearer Pacorus had time to secure Herod at Jerusalem, and then he immediately put his guests in chains and retained them as prisoners. But Herod, suspecting the treachery of the Parthians, departed from Jerusalem in the night with his family and soldiers, and made his escape to Masada,

a fortress situated on a mountain on the western side of the Dead Sea. During his flight, he once determined to put an end to his own life, but was persuaded by his friends to desist from his purpose. His enemies pursued him, and he was obliged to maintain a constant conflict with them during his whole retreat; but as his forces were superiour to theirs, he succeeded in repelling their attacks. At Ressa he was joined by his brother Joseph with the remainder of his soldiers. He placed his family and treasures in the castle of Masada, and leaving there a garrison of eight hundred men under the command of his brother Joseph, he dismissed about nine thousand of his soldiers, because there was no room for them in the castle. He then retired with a small body of troops to Petra, to seek the protection of Malchus, the successor of king Aretas. But as Malchus refused to receive him, he was compelled to disband the remainder of his troops. He now, with a small retinue, went by the way of Rhinocolura and Pelusium to Alexandria; where he took ship and sailed to Rome.¹

After the escape of Herod, the Parthians plundered Jerusalem and all the adjacent places, raised Antigonus to the throne, and delivered into his power the prince Hyrcanus and Phasaël, the brother of Herod. Phasaël, that he might not suffer death from the hands of his enemies, dashed his head against the walls of his prison, and in this manner destroyed his own life. Antigonus, that he might render the prince Hyrcanus forever incapable of holding the office of high priest, cut off his ears, and sent him back, thus mutilated, to the Parthians, by whom he was carried to Seleucia on the Tigris.²

At Rome, Herod requested that Aristobulus, a grandson of Hyrcanus and brother of his espoused bride Mariamne, might be appointed king of Judea, and that he himself might be made governour under him, as he had been under Hyrcanus. He renewed his friendship with Antony, to whom he promised a sum of money; and by him he was so highly recommended to Octavianus, as the son of Antipater who had formerly rendered such important services to Caesar in Egypt, that, by the intervention of Octavianus, Herod was appointed king of Judea. Accordingly, during the consulship of Domitius Calvinus and Asinius Pollio, in the 184th Olympiad, in the year 37 B. C. Herod was conducted to the capitol by Antony and Octavianus, and there consecrated king with idolatrous sacrifices.

All this was done so soon, that in seven days Herod departed from Rome, and landed again at Ptolemais in three months after his precipitate flight from Jerusalem.³

The Parthians had left Syria before the arrival of Herod, for Ventidius, whom Antony, after his contract with Octavianus, had sent to take the command of the forces in the East, succeeded in driving Labienus back to mount Taurus. He then defeated the Parthians who held the passes of Syria, and took possession of the country without further resistance. Labienus was deserted by his soldiers; and, sometime after, while attempting to make his escape in disguise, was taken prisoner and put to death. Pacorus then retired with his troops across the Euphrates. In this manner, the Romans had again become masters of Syria when Herod arrived in Palestine.⁴

It was Herod's first care to collect an army; and after he had received some auxiliaries from Ventidius and his general Silo, he took possession of all Galilee with the exception of a few inconsiderable places, conquered Joppa, and then hastened to the relief of his family in the fortress of Masada, which was closely blockaded and violently assaulted by Antigonus. After he had raised the siege of this place, and thus delivered his own family from danger, he took possession of Ressa, a strong fortress in Idumea; and then returned and united himself with Silo, whom Ventidius had sent to his aid, and encamped before Jerusalem. But neither Ventidius nor Silo had any sincere intention of assisting Herod in the execution of his plans. The former indeed had threatened Antigonus, but he was induced by money to withdraw his forces; and Silo received large sums from both leaders, and was ready to afford assistance to the one who would pay most liberally for his services. Under pretence of a want of provisions, he permitted his soldiers to pillage the country, and finally, to plunder the city of Jericho. Herod was at length relieved from his troublesome auxiliaries, when Silo drew off his troops to the winter quarters which had been assigned them in Samaria, Galilee, and Idumea.⁵

Herod was now obliged to decamp from Jerusalem, but he still kept his soldiers in action. He sent his brother Joseph, with one division of his army, to Idumea, to secure that province; while with the other, he marched himself to Galilee, conquered Sepphoris and some other fortified places, and cleared the country of robbers,

who were so numerous, especially about Arbela, that they formed a regular army and engaged in pitched battles. They fought so obstinately that Herod came near being defeated. He, however, finally succeeded in driving them over the Jordan; though many still remained concealed in caves. Herod then distributed his soldiers into winter quarters, and committed to his brother Pheroras the care of supplying them with provisions.⁶

In the spring of the year 36 B. C. Herod renewed his exertions to subdue the robbers in their caves. He was obliged to let his soldiers down in chests by ropes over the steep rocky mountains of Arbela; and when they had thus come to the entrance of the caverns, they had severe conflicts with the banditti who were concealed within. But notwithstanding all his efforts to destroy them, he had no sooner turned his back, than the country was again infested with the ir depredations; for those who had fled beyond the Jordan, immediately returned to Galilee. Herod, accordingly, was compelled once more to take arms against them; and he now adopted the severest measures with these outlaws. He everywhere put them to the sword, destroyed the caves, which were their hiding places, and banished all who had in any manner favoured them. By these means, he at length restored quiet to Galilee.⁷

In the mean time, intelligence of the victories of Ventidius over the Parthians was brought to Antony at Athens, where he was amusing himself with his newly married wife in no very reputable manner. Lest Ventidius should acquire all the glory to be obtained by this war, Antony left his wife, in order to lead an army against the Parthians. But before he arrived in the East, Ventidius allured the Parthians into an ambush which he had prepared for them, and defeated them. Twenty thousand Parthians with their leader, the prince Pacorus, were slain in the battle; and king Orodes was inconsolable when he heard of the death of his son. Ventidius would not follow up the advantages which this victory gave him, lest he should leave nothing to satisfy the ambition of Antony. He accordingly besieged Antiochus, the last king of Comagene, in Samosata. When Antony arrived, he sent the brave Ventidius to Rome, for the pretended purpose of obtaining a triumph, but in reality, out of envy for the fame which he had acquired. The soldiers were so much dissatisfied with this dismissal of their general, that they could no longer be persuaded to press on the siege with any

vigour; and Antony, despairing of success, agreed to depart for the sum of three hundred talents, though Antiochus had in vain solicited Ventidius to accept one thousand talents for the same purpose.⁸

Antony committed the government of Syria to Sosius, and returned to Italy to assist Octavianus in a war against Sextus Pompeius, the son of Pompey the Great. On this occasion, the two rival leaders would have come to an open rupture, had not Octavia, the wife of Antony, pacified her brother Octavianus. This quarrel was settled in the fifth year of the triumvirate; and the three despots continued their arbitrary power five years longer, without any regard to the authority of the senate and people of Rome. Antony again went to the East; and Octavianus married Livia Drusilla, though she was then in the seventh month of her pregnancy by her husband Tiberius Nero.⁹

Herod, after he had expelled the robbers from Galilee, marched to Samaria against Antigonus; but Ptolemy, whom he had left in Galilee, being soon after defeated by the robbers who had again commenced their depredations, he was obliged to return to that province. Having restored peace once more in that quarter, he received from Ventidius, by the orders of Antony, two legions of soldiers and one thousand cavalry under the command of Macherus. But these auxiliaries, instead of affording him any assistance, were an injury to his cause; for when Macherus approached Jerusalem in order to hold a conference with Antigonus, he was driven back by the slingers on the walls of the city, and then, in his rage, he slew all the Jews whom he met, even the soldiers of Herod. Irritated by this wanton act of cruelty, Herod immediately departed to see Antony, who was then encamped before Samosata. Macherus overtook him on his way, and pacified him; but Herod, notwithstanding, continued his journey, in order to pay his respects to Antony and to obtain more efficient aid. During his absence, his brother Joseph, with whom he had left the command of his army, while marching towards Jericho, was surrounded by Antigonus, and cut down with the greater part of his troops. Herod received intelligence of this disaster at Daphne near Antioch, while on his return to Palestine. He consequently quickened his pace, raised eight hundred soldiers on mount Libanus, and obtained the assistance of two Roman legions. He marched into Galilee to regulate

the affairs of that disorderly province, and then proceeded towards Samaria. On his march, he suffered a repulse from Antigonus ; but soon after, he defeated Pappus, the general of Antigonus. The severity of the cold then compelled both armies to retire to winter quarters.¹⁰

For the next campaign Herod made the best preparations. Early in the spring of the year 35 B. C. he led his army to Jerusalem and commenced the siege of the city. He then went to Samaria and consummated his marriage with Mariamne, to whom he had been betrothed four years. By this union with the Asmonean family, which was very popular in Judea, he hoped to induce the people to favour his cause. When he returned to his camp, the Roman general Sosius, by the command of Antony, joined him with his troops ; and, by this accession, his army was increased to eleven legions, beside the Syrian auxiliaries and a body of six thousand cavalry. But notwithstanding all the exertions of so numerous an army, the city was not conquered till the next year, 34 B. C. The Roman soldiers were so enraged by the obstinate defence of the city, that they continued to massacre and pillage after all resistance had ceased ; and when Sosius, notwithstanding all the representations that were made to him, refused to impose any restraint on their fury, Herod, to prevent the total destruction of his capital, was obliged to purchase a pardon by a large sum of money. In this manner, Herod at last came in possession of the kingdom which the Romans, who had hitherto been accustomed to give thrones to none but princes of royal blood, had bestowed upon him three years before.¹¹

King Antigonus surrendered himself in a most cowardly manner, and was accordingly treated with the greatest indignity. He threw himself at the feet of Sosius ; but the Roman general repelled him with contempt, and scornfully called him *Antigona*, as if he was unworthy the name of a man. The deposed king was then loaded with chains and carried to Antioch ; where Antony, influenced by the representations of Herod, who assured him that the Jews, if the life of Antigonus was spared, would excite new disturbances on account of their attachment to the Asmonean family, condemned him to death ; and he was executed by the axe of the lictor like a common malefactor. Thus ended the dominion of the Asmoneans, during the consulship of Marcius Vipsanius Agrippa and Canilius

Gallus, in the 185th Olympiad, at the same season of the year in which Pompey the Great, twenty seven years before, had conquered Jerusalem.¹²

¹ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 13: 3—9. 14: 1—3. Jewish War, I. 13:1—8. 14: 1—13. Compare Dion Cassius, XLVIII. ² Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 13: 9, 10. Jewish War, I. 13: 9—11. ³ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 14: 3—5. 15: 1. Jewish War, I. 14: 3, 4. 15: 3. Appian, Bell. Civ. V. 75. ⁴ Dion Cassius, XLVIII. Appian, Bell. Civ. V. 65. Plutarch, Mark Antony XXXIII. XXXIV. Florus, IV. 9. Livy, Epitome of Book CXXVII. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 14: 6. Jewish War, I. 15: 2. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 15: 1—3. Jewish War, I. 15: 1—6. ⁶ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 15: 4. Jewish War, I. 16: 1—3. ⁷ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 15: 5. Jewish War, I. 15: 4, 5. ⁸ Plutarch, Mark Antony XXXIII. XXXIV. Dion Cassius, XLVII. XLIX. Appian, Bell. Civ. V. 75. 78. 79. Justin, XLII. 4. Livy, Epitome of Book CXXVIII. Eutropius, VII. 5. Velleius Paterculus, II. 65. 78. Strabo, p. 751. Orosius, VI. 18. Aulus Gellius, XV. 4. Pliny, VII. 43. Valerius Maximus, VI. 9. ⁹ Plutarch, Mark Antony XXXIV—XXXVI. Appian, Bell. Civ. V. 93. 95. Justin, XLII. 4. Dion Cassius, XLIX. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 15: 8. Jewish War, I. 16: 7. ¹⁰ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 15: 1—13. Jewish War, I. 16, 6: 7. 17: 1—3. ¹¹ Josephus, Antiq. XIV. 15: 14. 16: 14. Jewish War, I, 17: 8, 6. 18: 1—3. Dion Cassius, XLIX. ¹² Josephus, Antiq. XIV, 16: 4. Strabo in Josephus, Antiq. XV 1: 2. Plutarch, Mark Antony XXXVI. Compare Dion Cassius, XLI. and Micah 5: 1.

CHAPTER THIRTEENTH.

REIGN OF HEROD THE GREAT.

CXVI. HEROD KING OF THE JEWS 34—31 B. C.

ALTHOUGH the Jews were from the first very unfriendly to the king who had been imposed upon them by so long and bloody a war, Herod made himself still more odious to them by his cruelties. To secure himself on the throne, he every day murdered some of those who had opposed him. He condemned to death all the members of the sanhedrim, excepting Sameas and Pollio, who, during the siege of Jerusalem, continually urged their countrymen to receive Herod as king; a measure which their colleagues, proudly confiding in the temple of God, as constantly resisted. According to the traditions in the Jewish books entitled *Sepher Juchasin*, *Shalshaleth Hakkabala*, and *Zemach David*, Pollio is the same as Hillel, and Sameas, as Shammai, who are highly celebrated as the heads or founders of two different schools. Sameas is said by the Jews to have been the son or disciple of Hillel, and Josephus calls him the disciple of Pollio, which name, in Hebrew, is Hillel. The same testimony is given by Joseph Ben Gorion. This Sameas, who is represented by Josephus as a prophet, and to whom the Talmudists have given the surname of Just, is said to have been the father of Gamaliel; and it is not improbable, that he is the Simeon of whom such honourable mention is made in the Gospel of Luke.¹

That the disaffected Jews might find no support in a powerful high priest of their own faction, Herod appointed to that office Ananel of Babylon, a common priest, but a descendant of the ancient high priests, who had neither connexions nor influence that would render him dangerous. He then determined to get into his power Hyrcanus II. the former king and high priest of Judea, who was

still maintained in regal style at Seleucia by the oriental Jews, in order to secure his throne against any pretensions from that quarter. He accordingly invited Hyrcanus to Jerusalem, under pretence of recompensing him for former favours, and obtained permission for him to return, from Phraates, king of Parthia. The old man was weak enough, notwithstanding all the remonstrances of the oriental Jews, to give credit to the insidious professions of Herod; and in the year 33 B. C. he came to Jerusalem, where Herod for some time treated him with great respect.³

In the mean time, Sosius, who had been appointed prefect of Syria after the conquest of Jerusalem, undertook no enterprise of any importance, lest he should awaken the jealousy of Antony, as Ventidius had done. He was however recalled in the year 34 B. C. and Plancus was appointed his successor. At the same time, the government of Asia Minor was given to Furnius.³

The Parthians gave no disturbance to Sosius or his successor; for king Orodes was entirely disheartened by the death of his son Pacorus, and, after he had somewhat recovered from his immoderate grief, he surrendered his sceptre to his oldest son Phraates. This prince soon murdered his father, his brothers, his own firstborn son, and many of the Parthian noblemen; and, by these cruelties, he excited so much dissatisfaction in his own kingdom, that he had enough to do to preserve peace at home, without engaging in foreign wars. By his tyranny, he compelled the disaffected noblemen to leave the kingdom; and Monaeses, the most powerful man in Parthia, with some others, sought the protection of Antony. Monaeses was favourably received by the Roman general, and in the year 33 B. C. he instigated the Romans to a new war against his native country.⁴

Meanwhile, Publius Canidius, by the orders of Antony, had subdued the Armenians, Iberians, and Albanians; and Antony, in hopes of similar success, now resolved to undertake a war against Parthia. The Parthian war was a favourite project at Rome, and Monaeses, the Parthian refugee, advised Antony to undertake it, and offered his services as a guide in carrying it on. But soon after, Monaeses was invited home by his king, who made him such offers that he resolved to accept them. Antony was indeed displeased with this change; but he offered no obstruction to the wishes of Monaeses, lest other deserters should be deterred from applying to

him. He sent an embassy to Parthia with Monaeses, to commence negotiations, with a view to amuse the Parthians and allay their suspicions, that he might fall upon them unprepared.⁵

Antony had been in Syria but a short time, before he called Cleopatra from Egypt, and spent his time with her in idle pleasures. At her request, he put to death Lysanias, the son of Ptolemy Menaesus, and gave her the principality of Chalcis. To gratify Cleopatra, Antony treated many other petty princes in the same manner, though he refused to put her in possession of Judea and Arabia. In consequence of his reluctance to tear himself from his beloved mistress, he deferred the Parthian expedition till the season was far advanced; and then, because the winter was near and he longed to return to Cleopatra, he took all his measures with such precipitate haste, that the whole campaign proved worse than useless.⁶

Monaeses saw clearly through the design of the Roman embassy to Phraates; and consequently, when Antony marched by the shortest route to the Euphrates, he found all the passes strongly garrisoned. Accordingly, he listened to the request of Artabazes, the king of Armenia, and marched through his dominions to Media; for Artavasdes, the king of Media, was at that time engaged in a war against Artabazes. It was then the intention of Antony to penetrate into Parthia through Media. But though the season for the campaign was now so short, Artabazes, instead of leading the army of Antony by the shortest route, across the Euphrates at Zeugma, and so on to the Araxes, which formed the boundary between Armenia and Media, a distance of not more than four hundred English miles, took a circuitous way over the mountains, which made the distance eight hundred English miles. Antony also imprudently directed that his baggage and military machines, which filled a great number of waggons, should follow him leisurely, attended by a convoy of ten thousand men under the command of Stianus; while he, with the main body, pushed on by forced marches to Praaspa, the capital of Media, which was situated two hundred and forty English miles beyond the Araxes. He determined to besiege the city, but could do nothing effectually, because his military machines had not yet arrived. The Parthian and Median armies, which had advanced to meet Antony, left him before the city, and proceeded against Stianus, cut down his party of ten thousand men, and took possession of all the baggage and mili-

tary machines under his protection. This blow had already been struck, when Antony hastened to the aid of Statianus; but not finding the enemy, he imagined that they had fled; and he therefore drew back his forces to Praaspa. The enemy would not hazard a general battle for the relief of their capital; but they gave constant annoyance to the besiegers, by cutting off their foraging parties in desultory skirmishes and by making frequent sallies upon them from the city. Antony indeed twice forced the enemy to an engagement; but as Artabazes had forsaken him with his cavalry immediately after the defeat of Statianus, he could do nothing with the well mounted Medes and Parthians; and, with all his exertions, he slew only eighty, and made prisoners of about thirty men. At length, he was forced to raise the siege of Praaspa and march through a great extent of hostile country in the midst of winter. At the commencement of his retreat, he was obliged to maintain a constant conflict with the enemy in his rear, and when he came to the mountains of Armenia, he lost about eight thousand men in consequence of the cold and snow. He finally returned to Syria with scarcely a third part of his army, which was one hundred thousand strong when he set out on his expedition.⁷

As soon as Antony arrived at Leucocome, between Berytus and Zidon, he sent for Cleopatra who was then at Alexandria, and could scarcely restrain his impatience till she came to meet him. He then went with her to Egypt, and spent the whole year, 32 B. C. at Alexandria. There intelligence was brought to him, that the Medes and Parthians had quarrelled respecting the division of the spoils which they had taken from Statianus; the Medes even invited him to come and take the field with them against the Parthians; and he knew that Parthia was disturbed by intestine commotions and revolts, in consequence of the tyranny of king Phraates. But nothing could induce him to leave his licentious pleasures. He indeed accepted the invitation of the Medes, and went to Syria for the purpose of making the necessary preparations for a campaign; but when Cleopatra sent him word, that she was sick with love for him and should die, unless he returned to her immediately, he gave up all thoughts of the Parthian war, and hastened to the arms of his mistress. At this time, his wife Octavia had come as far as Athens for the purpose of visiting him; but he ordered her to remain in Greece.⁸

During these occurrences in the East, Octavianus and Lepidus had been carrying on a war against Sextus Pompeius, who, having collected a fleet of three hundred and fifty sail and taken possession of Corsica, Sardinia, and Sicily, had maintained himself by piracy ever since the defeat of Brutus and Cassius at Philippi. Octavianus and Lepidus expelled him from all his possessions and destroyed his fleet; and in the year 33 B. C. he fled to Asia with the seven ships which he still retained, and took refuge, first at Lesbos, and afterwards, at Mitylene. Here he began to excite new disturbances, after he had heard of the unsuccessful expedition of Antony against the Parthians; but he was finally taken prisoner and put to death by Titius.⁹

In the mean time, Lepidus, who had long cherished a secret enmity to Octavianus, came to an open rupture with his rival. But his soldiers deserted him; and he was compelled by Octavianus to spend the remainder of his life as a private man and under the custody of a guard of soldiers, at Circeius, a small village in Latium. Then Octavianus assumed the government of Africa and all the West, while Antony retained the East, as far as the Adriatic Sea.¹⁰

In Judea, during the year 32 B. C. Herod was reluctantly compelled, by the earnest entreaties of his beloved wife Mariamne, and still more, by the representations which her mother Alexandra, a daughter of Hyrcanus II. and the wife of Alexander, made to Cleopatra, and, by her intervention, to Antony, to depose Ananel, the high priest of his own choice, and bestow that office on Aristobulus, the brother of Mariamne, who was then only seventeen years old. In consequence of this appointment, the people became in some degree reconciled to their king. But Herod was so much displeased with Alexandra on account of her interference in this business, that he ordered her to be confined in her own palace, and placed around her some of his confidential servants to watch all her movements. In her letters to Cleopatra, she complained of the severity with which she was treated, and was advised by the queen to make her escape to Egypt. To effect this purpose, she procured two coffins, in one of which she placed herself, and in the other, her son Aristobulus; and under this concealment, their servants were to carry them by night to the seacoast, where a ship was ready to receive them. But Herod, who had received timely notice of their design, intercepted their flight; though still, through

fear of Cleopatra, he dared not treat them with severity. He therefore pretended to overlook the whole affair; but, from this time, he resolved to put Aristobulus out of the way, as a man whose influence he had reason to dread. At the next feast of tabernacles, while the youthful high priest was performing the functions of his office, the people manifested their affection for him in so lively a manner, as to kindle the jealousy of Herod to a flame. Accordingly, when he shortly after visited Alexandra at Jericho, he proposed, among other diversions, that they should go and bathe in a lake; and then, his servants, as if in sport, kept immersing Aristobulus in the water till he was drowned. The more Herod affected to lament the untimely death of this young man, and the more magnificent the funeral solemnities which he prepared for him, the more manifest it appeared to all, that he was secretly elated at the complete success of his stratagem.¹¹

Alexandra did not fail to inform Cleopatra of this perfidious murder; and she, on her part, engaged to do all in her power to punish the murderer. She succeeded so far as to persuade Antony, while he was at Laodicea in the year 31 B. C. to call Herod to account; but Herod, by his liberal bribes, effected a reconciliation with Antony, and Cleopatra, who was longing to gain possession of Judea, was satisfied for the present with the gift of Coelosyria.¹²

But though the affair was thus passed over, it gave occasion to new troubles in the family of Herod. For when he set out for Laodicea, knowing the influence which Cleopatra had over Antony, he entertained but little hope of escaping with his life. He accordingly committed the affairs of his kingdom and the care of his family to his uncle Joseph, with directions, in case that Antony should condemn him, to put Mariamne to death; that at all events the voluptuous Antony might not enjoy the charms of his wife, as a reward for having executed him. During the absence of Herod, Joseph watched over Mariamne with the greatest care, and informed her of his secret charge respecting her, as a proof of her husband's love. It is easy to imagine what effect this discovery must have had on Mariamne and her mother Alexandra. When a report was shortly after circulated, that Herod had been executed, Alexandra was very anxious to place herself under the protection of Julius, who was then encamped before Jerusalem with a legion of Roman soldiers. But the rumour was soon contradicted by letters

from Herod, by which it appeared that Antony had received him in a friendly manner. When he returned to Jerusalem, his jealousy was awakened by his sister Salome, who informed him of Joseph's frequent visits to the queen Mariamne. Herod conversed with Mariamne on the subject, and was convinced that the accusation was a mere calumny; but afterwards, hearing from her own lips that Joseph had revealed his secret commission to her, he took this for an incontestable proof of improper intimacy. In the first transports of his rage, he ran upon her with his drawn sword; but his anger was restrained by his love. He, however, ordered Joseph to be executed without being admitted to his presence, and commanded Alexandra to be imprisoned; but with Mariamne, whom he tenderly loved, he attempted to effect a reconciliation.¹³

In the course of this year, 31 B. C. Antony was obliged to make still greater sacrifices to the inordinate rapacity of Cleopatra; for she, not contented with the lands she had already received from Antony, namely, Cyrene, Cyprus, Phenicia, Coelosyria, Iturea, and the greater part of Cilicia and Crete, continually solicited her lover, with whom she still remained in Syria, for the possession of Palestine, and the district of Malchus, the king of Arabia Petrea. Antony was so much under her power, that he could not withstand her solicitations. Accordingly he gave her the most fertile part of Judea, the district of Jericho with its orchards of balsam, all the cities on the seacoast from the river Eleutherus to the river of Egypt, with the exception of Tyre and Zidon, and that part of Arabia Petrea which bordered on Egypt. Herod came to terms with the rapacious queen by engaging to pay her a yearly tribute of two hundred talents.¹⁴

Although Cleopatra had more than once exerted all her influence with Antony to procure the public execution of Herod, yet, on her return from the Euphrates, whither she had attended her lover on his march to Armenia, she visited this hated king at Jerusalem, and had the impudence to attempt to entangle him in her snares. But her fascinations were exerted to no purpose; and even her life would have fallen a sacrifice to her temerity, had not Herod dreaded the vengeance of Antony. From motives of prudence, the king concealed his disgust, and entertained his treacherous and unwelcome guest in the most hospitable manner. He even attended her to the frontiers of Egypt with every demonstration of honour, and, by

such means, attempted to screen himself from the effects of her malicious and vindictive spirit. He however determined to have a place of refuge, in case of necessity ; and, with this view, he strengthened the fortress of Masada and provided it with arms for ten thousand men.¹⁵

After Cleopatra had returned from the Euphrates, Antony proceeded against Armenia, in order to take vengeance on Artabazes for having forsaken him in his former campaign against Media. He, however, made the warmest professions of friendship for the king, and strengthened his assurances by such solemn oaths, that Artabazes was at length persuaded to visit him in person. But the Armenian king had no sooner entered the Roman camp than he was made prisoner. The Armenians then placed the crown-prince Artaxias on the throne, and took the field against Antony ; but they were defeated, their whole country fell into the power of the conqueror, and Artaxias fled to Parthia.¹⁶

Antony then married one of his sons by Cleopatra to a daughter of the king of Media, garrisoned Armenia with his troops, and returned with the remainder of his army to Alexandria, whither he led in chains the captive king of Armenia. After having celebrated a public triumph at Alexandria, as it was customary to do at Rome, he convened an assembly of the people. He and Cleopatra appeared in this assembly, seated on golden thrones, which were placed on a scaffolding overlaid with silver. He made an address to the people, and appointed Caesario, the son of Cleopatra by Julius Caesar, king of Egypt, on condition that he should share the throne with his mother. He then divided all the East, from the Hellespont to the Euphrates and even to India, among the three children whom he had begotten by Cleopatra. His oldest son Alexander was made king of Armenia and Parthia, though the latter kingdom yet remained to be conquered ; his daughter Cleopatra was made queen of Libya and Cyrene ; and to his son Ptolemy Philadelphus he gave all the country between the Hellespont and Euphrates, and the territory eastward of that river. On each of the three monarchs he conferred the title of *King of Kings*. To complete this ridiculous farce, which excited great attention at Rome, he assumed the name of Osiris, and Cleopatra, that of Isis ; and they often appeared in the costume in which these deities are represented.¹⁷

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 1: 1, 2. *Jewish War*, I. 18: 4. Joseph Ben Gorion, *Book V.* Chap. 13. p. 402. *Luke* 2: 25. Compare Michaelis, *Anmerk. in loc.* ² Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 2: 1—4. ³ Dion Cassius, XLIX. ⁴ Justin, XLII. 4. 5. Dion Cassius, XLIX. Plutarch, *Mark Antony* XXXVII. ⁵ Dion Cassius, XLIX. Justin, XLII. 5. Plutarch, *Mark Antony* XXXVII. Strabo, p. 591. ⁶ Plutarch, *Mark Antony* XXXVI. Dion Cassius, XLIX. Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 4: 1. *Jewish War*, I. 18: 4, 5. ⁷ Dion Cassius, XLIX. Strabo, p. 523. Plutarch, *Mark Antony* XXXIII—LII. Livy, *Epitome of Book CXXX.* Florus, IV. 10. Velleius Paterculus, II. 82. Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 4: 2. ⁸ Dion Cassius, XLIX. Plutarch, *Mark Antony* LII. LIII. ⁹ Dion Cassius, XLVI. XLVIII. XLIX. Livy, *Epitome of Books CXXIX. CXXX.* Velleius Paterculus, II. 79. Florus, IV. 8. ¹⁰ Livy, *Epitome of Book CXXIX.* Orosius, VI. 18. Florus, IV. 8. Suetonius, *Octavianus* XVI. LIV. Appian, *Bell. Civ.* V. 122—126. Dion Cassius, XLIX. ¹¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 2: 1—7. 3: 1—4. ¹² Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 3: 5—8. ¹³ Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 3: 9. ¹⁴ Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 4: 1, 2. *Jewish War*, I. 18: 4, 5. Compare Plutarch, *Mark Antony* XXXVI. Dion Cassius, XLIX. ¹⁵ Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 4: 2. *Jewish War*, I. 18: 5. ¹⁶ Plutarch, *Mark Antony* XLVI. Dion Cassius, XLIX. Livy, *Epitome of Book CXXXI.* Orosius, VI. 19. Velleius Paterculus, II. 82. Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 4: 2, 3. ¹⁷ Dion Cassius, XLIX. Plutarch, *Mark Antony* LIV.

CXVII. HEROD KING OF THE JEWS 30—27 B. C.

Early in the spring of the following year, 30 B. C. Antony marched to Armenia, for the purpose of making war on the Parthians. When he arrived at the river Araxes, Octavianus openly declared against him. Dissatisfaction with the whole conduct of Antony had been continually gaining ground at Rome; and this was cherished and promoted by Octavianus, because Antony had treated his sister Octavia with such neglect, and bestowed all his attention on Cleopatra. When Antony heard of this change in his affairs, he renewed his alliance with the king of Media, sent Canidius with sixteen legions to the coasts of the Ionian Sea, and soon followed him in person with the remainder of his army. Cleopatra resolved to attend him in this campaign, and it was impossible to dissuade her from her purpose. To all objections she replied, that she had contributed twenty thousand talents and two hundred ships to the maintenance of the war; but her real motive in going was to prevent, by her presence, a reconciliation between Antony and his wife Octavia. Accordingly, Antony proceeded, in company with Cleopatra, through Ephesus and Samos to Athens: where he sent orders to Rome for his wife Octavia to leave his house.¹

In the year 29 B. C. the consuls Sosius and Domitius Aenobarbus, who were friends of Antony, obtained an edict from the people against Octavianus, who was at that time absent from Rome. But this neither assisted Antony nor injured Octavianus; for the latter, on his return, renewed his complaints against Antony in the senate with still greater earnestness, and obligated himself to verify all his allegations by written documents. Upon this both the consuls fled to Antony; and Octavianus, with a view to induce his enemies to leave the city, gave a general permission to all who chose it, to follow the consuls. These fugitives were called to a council by Antony, and war was resolved upon. Notwithstanding this determination, Antony still continued his voluptuous course of life and gave Octavianus a whole year for preparation. In the mean time, Plancus and Titius, who had been offended by Cleopatra, went over to Octavianus and betrayed to him all the secrets of Antony, insomuch that he got possession of his will, which had been deposited with the vestal virgins at Rome. In this will, which was very prejudicial to the interests of the Roman people, Octavianus obtained a document fully sufficient to justify all his complaints against Antony; and consequently, the senate issued a declaration of war not only against Antony, but also against Cleopatra.²

At the commencement of hostilities, Octavianus had in readiness eighty thousand infantry, twelve thousand cavalry, and two hundred and fifty ships of war; while Antony was provided with one hundred thousand infantry, twelve thousand cavalry, and five hundred ships, though he was soon obliged to burn many of his ships for want of seamen to manage them. The two rivals now advanced towards each other; but no enterprise of any importance was undertaken this season.³

Herod was about to proceed to Athens with his army, when he received orders from Antony to march against Malchus, the king of Arabia Petrea, because he had refused to pay the tribute promised by treaty for that part of his dominions which bordered on Egypt, and which Antony had given to Cleopatra. Herod obeyed this injunction, and gained his first battle with Malchus; but he was afterwards defeated with great loss at Cana in Coelosyria. Immediately after this disastrous battle, Judea was visited by so violent an earthquake, that, according to the testimony of Josephus in his *Antiquities*, ten thousand, or, as the same author says in his *history* of

the Jewish War, thirty thousand men perished. Herod now attempted to make peace with Malchus ; but the Arabian king put the Jewish ambassadours to death, and led his army into Palestine. But Herod was well prepared to receive him ; for his army, having been in their camp at the time of the earthquake, had suffered nothing from it. Malchus, in his first battle, lost five thousand men ; and being then blockaded in his camp, he was forced, by want of water, to a second battle, in which seven thousand of his soldiers were slain. He then accepted peace on such terms as Herod chose to dictate.⁴

In the year 28 B. C. Octavianus and Antony encamped within less than one English mile of each other, near Actium, a small town in Epirus, on the south side of the Ambracian gulf. In the spring, several slight skirmishes took place between the two armies, which all terminated to the advantage of Octavianus. On this account several of the soldiers of Antony deserted to his rival ; especially when they perceived that, in the councils of Antony, every measure was regulated according to the capricious wishes of Cleopatra, who regarded nothing but her own interest. In the beginning of September, a battle was fought at sea, in sight of the two armies on the shore. The result was for some time doubtful ; but when Cleopatra, no longer able to endure the sight and the tumult of the battle, fled with her ship, she was immediately followed by the whole Egyptian fleet, which consisted of sixty sail. Antony then gave up the battle for lost, though it continued till midnight, and set sail in pursuit of his mistress. Early in the morning after the victory, Octavianus sent some of his ships to take Cleopatra ; but she outsailed them and escaped. Antony, however, succeeded in overtaking her and was received on board her ship ; but, without seeing her, he sat alone for three days at the head of her vessel, brooding over his shameful defeat, till they arrived at Taenarus. Here all was forgotten, and Antony rioted as before.⁵

From Taenarus Antony sent orders to his land forces under the command of Canidius, to march to Macedonia and prosecute the war. But on the seventh day of their march, they were overtaken by Octavianus, when they all joined his standard. Antony was now forsaken by his foreign auxiliaries. The princes and states who had furnished them, were treated by Octavianus according to their different demerits, and obliged to pay large sums of money.⁶

Cleopatra sailed to Alexandria, and, to secure herself from insult, entered the harbour with garlands on her ships, as if she had been victorious. She then ordered all the disaffected noblemen to be executed, that there might be less danger of rebellion when her people should learn the result of the battle at Actium. Antony, meanwhile, went to Libya, whither he had sent Pinarius Scaurus with an army to protect the western frontiers of Egypt. But when he arrived, he found that Scaurus and his troops had joined the party of Octavianus; and he then gave himself up to despair, insomuch that his attendants found it very difficult to restrain him from suicide. Afterwards he went to Alexandria; where he found Cleopatra very busily employed in transferring her ships from the Mediterranean to the Red Sea, over a neck of land of about fifty six English miles in breadth, in order to escape with her treasures to the south. But Quintus Didius, who had taken possession of Syria in the name of Octavianus, instigated the Arabs to set the Egyptian fleet on fire; and thus the execution of Cleopatra's design was prevented. Antony, in the mean time, built a small house at Alexandria, on the seacoast near Pharos; and there he shut himself up, determining to be a misanthropelike Timon of Athens; and he even carried his affectation so far as to call his house a *Timonium*. But the effeminate man soon visited his mistress Cleopatra, and lived with her as luxuriously as ever.⁷

After Octavianus had given orders for the building of a city, to be called Nicopolis, on the site of his camp, and had regulated the affairs of Greece and Asia Minor, he went to Samos. Thence he sailed in the midst of winter of the year 27 B. C. in great haste, to Brundisium, on account of disturbances among the soldiers whom he had dismissed after the battle of Actium without paying them their wages. By furnishing them with a part of their money and by promising them the remainder, he at length succeeded in pacifying them. He then returned to Asia; and his journey was performed with such rapidity, that Antony was ignorant of his departure till he heard of his return. On account of the storms which prevail in the winter, Octavianus, instead of sailing round the southern coasts of Peloponnesus, transported his ships across the isthmus of Corinth.⁸

Herod had hitherto remained faithful to Antony and assisted him with his counsels and his sword. But as Antony had rejected

his last proposal, to put Cleopatra to death, and, with her treasures, to levy a new army in Egypt, and had paid little regard to his offers of service, Herod determined, if possible, to make his peace with Octavianus. He resolved to visit him in person; and he committed the administration of the government to his brother Pheroras, with directions for him to ascend the throne, in case he should not return. About this time, Hyrcanus, who was then eighty years old, attempted to make his escape to Arabia, at the instigation of his daughter Alexandra; and Herod gladly availed himself of this opportunity to put to death, with some appearance of justice, one who had such claims to the crown. His favourite wife Mariamne and her mother he placed in the castle of Alexandrium, and gave orders to the commandants Joseph and Sohem, who were very faithful to him, to put both the women to death, whenever they should receive certain notice that he had been slain. After these preparations, he set out to meet Octavianus, and found him at Rhodes, after his return from Italy, in the year 27 B. C. Having been admitted to his presence, he laid his diadem aside, and frankly acknowledged all that he had done for Antony, and what he would have still continued to do notwithstanding Antony's misfortunes, had his services been well received; whence it was manifest how faithful he was to his friendships, and it remained for Octavianus to say, whether he would accept of such a friend, who now offered himself to him. Octavianus, who had at first exerted himself to procure the crown of Judea for Herod, now listened to his proposals with pleasure, and confirmed him in his kingdom.⁹

Herod returned to Judea, highly gratified with his success, and found the state of his affairs such as he could wish, excepting that his beloved wife Mariamne, who had again detected the murderous order respecting her, was in great trouble, and her affections were alienated from her husband. Cypros and Salome, the mother and sister of Herod, embraced this opportunity to excite his hatred against Mariamne; and with what success the sequel will show.¹⁰

Octavianus had sent Cornelius Gallus to Libya in the place of Scaurus, with orders for him to penetrate into Egypt on that side, with the army which had revolted from Antony; while he proceeded in person through Asia Minor and Syria, in order to invade Egypt on the east. When he arrived in Palestine, Herod endeavoured, in every way possible, to show himself an active and use-

ful friend. He entertained him and his whole army at Ptolemais with regal magnificence, made him a present of eight hundred talents, and supplied him with water and provisions during his whole march as far as Pelusium.¹¹

Antony and Cleopatra repeatedly sent embassies to Octavianus, and offered the most humiliating terms, for the purpose of obtaining peace. But Octavianus accepted none of their proposals; though he took care to encourage the hopes of Cleopatra, for he earnestly desired to gain possession of her person and treasures, to grace his triumph. This glimmer of hope had its effect, and Cleopatra was secretly a traitress to Antony.¹²

When Octavianus arrived before Pelusium, this key of Egypt was surrendered into his hands without resistance, by the orders of Cleopatra. At the same time, Antony attempted to gain possession of Paraetonium, the frontier fortress of Egypt on the west side. The garrison of this place had formerly been under his command, and he supposed that he could easily persuade them to join his standard; but when he began to address the soldiers from the walls, the commandant Gallus ordered all the trumpets to sound, so that his voice could not be heard. Gallus then made a sally from the city, and not only repulsed the land forces of Antony, but also took possession of his fleet; for, by the aid of machinery, he raised the chain which had been sunk across the mouth of the harbour, and thus rendered it impossible for the ships to escape to the open sea. Immediately after these disasters, Antony received notice of the surrender of Pelusium, and of the progress of Octavianus towards Alexandria. He accordingly hastened to secure his capital, and, on his march, dispersed the wearied cavalry of Octavianus; but he was afterwards defeated by the Roman army and obliged to take refuge on board his fleet. When he was now about to try his fortune in a naval engagement, the Egyptian fleet, by the orders of Cleopatra, went over to Octavianus.¹³

Antony at last discovered the perfidiousness of his mistress, and broke out in bitter complaints against her. But she had fled with her treasures to a high tower near the temple of Isis, with only two female attendants and one eunuch. There she caused a report to be circulated that she was dead; and when Antony heard of this, he pierced his body with his own sword. His wound did not occasion immediate death; and hearing that Cleopatra was yet alive,

he ordered his servants to carry him to the tower; when he was drawn up to her by a cord, and, soon after, expired. But Cleopatra, when she found, by a personal interview, that her fascinations were lost upon Octavianus, and heard that she was to be carried as a prisoner to Rome, destroyed herself by the bite of an asp, or, as some suppose, by poison. She died in the latter part of the month of August, in the thirty ninth year of her age and twenty second of her reign.¹⁴

With her ended the empire of the Ptolemies, in the year 27 B. C. the eighth of the reign of Herod, after it had continued, reckoning from the death of Alexander the Great, about two hundred and ninety six years. Egypt was made a province of the Roman empire, and continued such till the year 641 A. C. when it was conquered by the Saracens. Octavianus ordered the execution of Caesario, the son of Cleopatra by Caesar, of Antyllus, the oldest son of Antony by Fulvia, and of some others. He put it out of the power of the rich to raise disturbances by confiscating their property, and for the rest he proclaimed a general amnesty. To the remaining children of Antony he was very favourable, particularly to the younger son of Fulvia, who bore the name of his father.¹⁵

When Herod learned the result of the Egyptian campaign, he went to meet Octavianus, who departed from Egypt in the beginning of September, and left there the celebrated Cornelius Gallus as regent of the country. Herod accompanied the conqueror through Arabia, Palestine, and Syria, as far as Antioch; and received from him not only the district of Jericho and the orchards of balsam, but also Gadara, Hippos, Samaria, Gaza, Anthedon, Joppa, Strato's Tower, and even the four hundred Gauls who had composed the body-guard of Cleopatra.¹⁶

Octavianus found at Antioch Tiridates, the deposed king of Parthia, and an embassy from Phraates, who then had possession of the throne. A brief survey of the affairs of the East is necessary to explain the cause of their present mission to Octavianus. When Antony returned from his last campaign against Parthia, he took with him the auxiliaries of Artavasdes, the king of Media; and the Parthians then attacked the Median king, thus deprived of his supporters, took him prisoner, and made themselves masters of Media and Armenia. They placed on the throne of Armenia Artaxias, the son of Artabazes, who had been expelled by Antony. At the

same time, the government of Phraates was so tyrannical, that the Parthians dethroned him, and made choice of the above mentioned Tiridates for their king. But Phraates soon after expelled Tiridates and reascended the throne. Both parties now sought the aid of the Romans.

Octavianus amused them both with empty professions, but afforded aid to neither. On the contrary, he endeavoured to inflame their animosities, that the kingdom, weakened by civil wars, might be the less formidable to the Roman power. Tiridates had with him a son of Phraates, whom Octavianus took to Rome as a hostage. He gave Tiridates permission to remain in Syria, till he could find means and opportunity to undertake a campaign against Parthia. He then appointed Messala Corvinus prefect of Syria, and returned through Asia Minor and Greece to Rome; where he arrived in the following year, in the month Sextilis, which was afterwards called August, after his own name. In a short time, temples were dedicated to him, and he was worshipped as a god.¹⁷

¹ Plutarch, Mark Antony LV—LVII. Dion Cassius, XLIX. ² Plutarch, Mark Antony LVIII—LX. Dion Cassius, L. Suetonius, Octavius XVII. Orosius, VI. 19. Eutropius, VII. 7. Livy, Epitome of Book CXXXII. ³ Plutarch, Mark Antony LXI—LXIII. Dion Cassius, XLIX. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XV. 4: 4. 5: 1—5. Jewish War, I. 19: 1—6. ⁵ Dion Cassius, L. LI. Plutarch, Mark Antony LXIII—LXVII. Orosius, VI. 19. Florus, IV. 11. Velleius Paterculus, II. 85. Suetonius, Octavius XVII. Strabo, p. 451. Pliny, IV. 1. ⁶ Plutarch, Mark Antony LXVIII. LXIX. Dion Cassius, L. LI. ⁷ Plutarch, Mark Antony LXIX—LXXI. Strabo, p. 794. Lucian in Timon. ⁸ Dion Cassius, LI. Suetonius, Octavius XVII. XVIII. Plutarch, Mark Antony LXXIII. ⁹ Josephus, Antiq. XV. 6: 1—7. Jewish War, I. 20: 1—3. 22: 1. Plutarch, Mark Antony LXXI. LXXII. ¹⁰ Josephus, Antiq. XV. 7: 1, 2. ¹¹ Josephus, Jewish War, I. 20: 3. Comp. Plutarch, Mark Antony LXXIV. Dion Cassius, LI. ¹² Dion Cassius, LI. Plutarch, Mark Antony LXXII. LXXIII. Suetonius, Octavius XVIII. ¹³ Dion Cassius, LI. Plutarch, Mark Antony LXXIV. Orosius, VI. 19. ¹⁴ Dion Cassius, LI. Plutarch, Mark Antony LXXIV—LXXXVI. Suetonius, Octavius XVII. Florus, IV. 11. Velleius Paterculus, II. 87. Strabo, p. 795. Ptolemy, Canon. Josephus, Antiq. XV. 7: 3. ¹⁵ Plutarch, Mark Antony LXXXVII. Suetonius, Octavius XVII. XVIII. Dion Cassius, LI. Orosius, VI. 19. Velleius Paterculus, II. 87. ¹⁶ Josephus, Antiq. XV. 7: 3. Jewish War, I. 20: 3. Dion Cassius, LI. ¹⁷ Dion Cassius, LI. Justin, XLII. 5. Suetonius, Octavius XVIII. XXI. Macrobius, Saturnal. I. 12. Livy, Epitome of Book CXXXIII. Orosius, VI. 19.

CXVIII. HEROD KING OF THE JEWS 26—22 B. C.

Mariamne now could no more be reconciled to her husband. She indeed carefully concealed the secret which Sohem had betrayed to her, but she repelled with disdain all Herod's endeavours to please her. She even reproached him with the murder of her brother, the high priest Aristobulus, of her father Alexander, the son of Aristobulus II. of her uncle Antigonus, the brother of Alexander, and of her grandfather Hyrcanus II. She often upbraided Cypros and Salome, the mother and sister of Herod, for the meanness of their birth; and they, in revenge, made every exertion to excite the hatred of Herod against her. On one occasion, when Herod was very much irritated with Mariamne, on account of her obstinate refusal to gratify his wishes, Salome persuaded his butler to go to him with the false accusation, that Mariamne had once attempted to induce him to give a philter to his sovereign, which (as he hinted) might have contained poison. Herod then ordered the most faithful eunuch of Mariamne to be put to the torture; but he could give no information, excepting that the hatred of the queen must have arisen from something which Sohem had said to her, while the king was absent at Rhodes. From this Herod inferred, that Sohem had not only betrayed his secret instructions, but that he had also had criminal intercourse with Mariamne; and he accordingly gave orders for his immediate execution. He then accused Mariamne of adultery, before judges of his own selection. They decided the cause in conformity to the wishes of the king; though they supposed that the sentence of death would not be executed. Herod indeed wished to keep Mariamne imprisoned for a while; but Cypros and Salome represented to him, that he would by this means expose himself to the danger of an insurrection among the people, and he then ordered her to be led to execution. She met death with unshaken firmness; though, while on her way to the place of execution, her mother Alexandra, who began to entertain fears for her own safety from the suspicions of Herod, had assailed her with the most violent and indecent reproaches.

After the death of Mariamne, Herod suffered so severely through remorse for his own crimes and love for his murdered wife, that he lost all self-command. His mental anguish was aggravated by the

ravages of a pestilence, which, in the year 25 B. C. carried off great multitudes of his subjects. In this distress, he withdrew from all society and secluded himself in Samaria, where he was attacked by a severe fit of sickness. After the physicians had given up all hopes of his recovery, Alexandra attempted to gain possession of the fortifications of Jerusalem and the temple; but her designs were detected, and she was put to death. Herod finally recovered; and the sufferings which he had endured, served only to increase the natural cruelty and ferocity of his temper. He became more tyrannical than ever, and, on the slightest suspicions, would order his best friends to be executed.¹

In the year 23 B. C. Herod found an opportunity to cut off the last branch of the Asmonean race. For when his sister Salome had, in an arbitrary manner, according to the Roman custom, separated herself from her second husband Costobarus, the governour of Idumea and Gaza, she returned to her brother Herod, and alleged, as the cause of her divorce, that Costobarus, in conjunction with Antony, Dositheus, and Antipater, had entered into a conspiracy against Herod. In proof of her accusation she asserted that Costobarus, instead of putting the sons of Babas to death, according to the order of Herod, had conveyed them to a place of safety, and pretended that they had saved themselves by flight. The sons of Babas were found in the place which had been designated by Salome; and then Herod destroyed these last remains of the family of Hyrcanus, and ordered Costobarus and his associates to be executed.²

As all the claimants to the crown were now dead, Herod ventured openly to introduce innovations upon the Jewish customs. He built a theatre and an amphitheatre at Jerusalem; and, in the year 22 B. C. he instituted games, which were celebrated every fifth year with great magnificence, in honour of Octavianus. These games, especially the combats between men and wild beasts, caused much dissatisfaction among the Jews. They viewed with peculiar displeasure the military trophies which were suspended in the theatre, as they took them for idolatrous images; but when Herod, in their presence, removed the armour, and they saw nothing beneath but plain pieces of wood, their disgust was for once turned into laughter; but yet it was, by no means, entirely overcome. On the contrary, ten Jews, among whom was one blind man, formed a

conspiracy, and assembled with daggers concealed under their garments, for the purpose of assassinating Herod when he entered the theatre. But their design was discovered, and Herod put the conspirators to death with the most cruel tortures. On this account, the person who had informed against them, was torn in pieces, on the first opportunity, by some who had united for that purpose. Herod then put these offenders to the rack, and executed them and their families.³

Herod now saw clearly that he was far enough from possessing the affections of the Jews, and he found it necessary to erect fortresses for his own security. He first fortified Samaria, which had been destroyed by John Hyrcanus I. and was afterwards rebuilt, but not fortified, by the orders of Gabinius. In honour of Octavianus Augustus, he called this city Sebaste, that is, *Augusta*, and built there a temple to Augustus. He then newly fortified Strato's Tower, a castle in the plain of Esdraelon, which he called Caesarea, and built Gaba in Galilee and Hesebon (Heshbon) in Perea. In these cities he planted colonies of his foreign soldiers, to hold the country in subjection.⁴

During the same year, 22 B. C. the usual rains did not fall in Syria and Palestine; and, consequently, there was a severe famine, which was soon followed by a pestilence that carried off great multitudes of people. Herod exhausted his treasury and even sold the silver plate of his table, for the purpose of purchasing provisions, which he procured from Egypt through his friend Petronius, who was then governor of that country. By these means, he not only supplied the pressing wants of his own subjects, but also those of the neighbouring Syrians. At this time, most of the sheep in the country were slaughtered, both on account of the scarcity of provisions and because the drought had destroyed the pasturage; and Herod, at his own expense, bought great quantities of wool, in order to furnish his subjects with clothing. By these acts of generosity, he extended his fame and gained the affections of his subjects; but his government again became so tyrannical, that all remembrance of his kindness was soon obliterated.⁵

In the mean time, Octavianus had filled all the offices at Rome with his friends, whose fortune depended on the preservation of his own life. In the year 23 B. C. he resigned his office, pretending that he wished to restore the ancient form of government; but

the senate, which consisted of his creatures, and particularly *Mæcenas*, his most intimate friend, used every effort to persuade him to retain the sovereignty of the empire. He finally consented to receive it for the limited term of ten years, and it was afterwards renewed to him at regular intervals; by which means he avoided the hatred of his opposers, and, at the same time, retained his power as long as he lived.⁶

As though he were something more than human, they gave to him the divine appellation of *Augustus*, and the name *Octavianus* went out of use. He shared the administration of the empire with the senate; for he gave to them the government of the interior provinces, which were always peaceful and needed no military force, and they appointed over them proconsuls and propretors; while he retained the frontier provinces, which were always provided with armies, on account of the wars with the neighbouring nations, and governed them by prefects and procurators whom he sent thither. He pretended a willingness to take the dangers and burdens of war on himself; but his sole intention was to keep the army under his command, and thereby to hold the whole power of the empire in his own hands.⁷

Augustus, by his skilful management, obtained great favour among the people; and the senate gave him all the honours which it was in their power to bestow. In the year 21 B. C. he was raised above all law, and permitted to govern according to his own pleasure. He became in fact the unlimited monarch of the whole Roman empire; though neither he, nor his immediate successors, assumed the title of sovereign, which was very odious to the Romans, but he contented himself with that of prince, (*princeps*,) to which an allusion is made in *Mark* 10: 42.⁸

The fame of *Augustus* extended to the most distant nations; and ambassadors came with presents to Rome from *Scythia*, *Sarmatia*, *India*, and *Seres* or *Sina*, to testify their friendship for the Romans and their rulers.⁹

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 4—8. *Jewish War*, I. 22: 2—5. ² Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 7: 9, 10. ³ Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 8: 1—4. ⁴ Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 8: 5. *Jewish War*, I. 21: 2. ⁵ Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 9: 1, 2. ⁶ *Dion Cassius*, LIII—LV. ⁷ *Dion Cassius*, LIII. *Suetonius*, *Octavius* II. *Florus*, IV. 2. *Velleius Paterculus*, II. 91. *Livy*, *Epitome of Book CXXXIV*. ⁸ *Mark* 10: 42. Compare *Michaelis*, *Syntag. Comment.* II. p. 30—44. and

Suetonius, Tiberius XXIV. XXVI—XXXI. Octavius LVII—LX. Dion Cassius, LIII. ⁹ Suetonius, Octavius XXI. Florus, IV. 12. Strabo, p. 719. Eutropius, VII. 10. Orosius, VI. 21.

CXIX. HEROD KING OF THE JEWS 21—16. B. C.

After Palestine had recovered from the injuries of the famine and pestilence which have already been mentioned, Herod laid the foundation of a palace on mount Zion. The work was commenced in the year 21 B. C. the building was in the Grecian style of architecture, and finished in the most splendid manner. Two apartments, called Caesareum and Agrippeum, are particularly celebrated by Josephus. Herod then married Mariamne, the daughter of the priest Simon. To pave the way for this alliance, he had removed Jesus, the son of Phabet, from the high priesthood, and conferred that dignity on the father of Mariamne. He next built a castle, which he called Herodium, on a small round hill, near the place where he repulsed his enemies who were pursuing him in his flight from Jerusalem, under the command of the Parthian cupbearer Pacorus. At the foot of this hill, a city gradually arose, in consequence of the neighbourhood of the castle.¹

At this time, Aelius Gallus, by the command of Augustus, undertook an expedition to Arabia, in order to make the Arabs, and next, the Ethiopians or Abyssinians, who were both celebrated for their commerce and wealth, the allies or subjects of the Roman empire; and, in this manner, to extend the trade of the Romans. Gallus selected ten thousand men, the flower of the Roman army in Egypt, and received five hundred more from Herod, and one thousand from Obadas, the successor of Malichus, king of the Nabathaeans. Sylleus, whom Gallus employed as his guide, conducted the army, in one hundred and thirty transport ships, from Cleopatra across the Red Sea to Leucocome, a harbour of the Nabathaeans. During the passage, many ships were lost on the rocks and sand banks. The whole summer was spent at Leucocome, in consequence of the scurvy, which had broken out among the soldiers and rendered them unfit for service.²

The next year, the expedition was prosecuted for six months; many cities and tribes were subdued by arms, and several others submitted without resistance. But as the army was continually

diminished by the violent heat and the frequent want of water ; and as it was suspected that Sylleus purposely led them along the most circuitous and dangerous routes, Gallus, now distrusting his guide, found it necessary to return. He came back to the country of the Nabathaeans, by another way, in eighty days ; and embarking at Nera or Negra, he entered the harbour of Myos Hormos, after a passage of eleven days. He then marched to Coptos, and proceeded up the Nile with the remains of his army to Alexandria ; after he had for two years suffered incredible fatigues and hardships, without accomplishing the object of his expedition.³

But the failure of Aelius Gallus was compensated, as to Ethiopia, by the success of Petronius, the prefect of Egypt ; if the narrative of the expedition of the latter be correct, which may justly be doubted. When Candace, the queen of Ethiopia, invaded Upper Egypt, probably by the invitation of the Egyptians who were weary of the Roman yoke, Petronius hastened to oppose her progress ; and, after having suppressed an insurrection in Thebais, he defeated the Ethiopian troops, pursued them six hundred and forty English miles to Ethiopia, (through Nubia to Meroe,) and on his march, subdued and destroyed all the cities, and even the capital Napata, and was finally compelled to return only by the immense deserts which prevented his proceeding any further. He however left a garrison of four hundred men with provisions for two years in the fortress of Premnis. He brought back with him a great multitude of prisoners, of whom he sent one thousand of the most distinguished to Augustus, and sold the rest for slaves. Candace afterwards made an attack on the garrison of Premnis ; but Petronius immediately marched against her and put her to flight. She then sent ambassadours to the prefect with proposals of peace ; but Petronius referred them to Augustus.⁴

In the mean time, Tiridates had driven Phraates from the kingdom of Parthia ; but Phraates, by the aid of the Scythians, again dethroned his rival, who then, in the year 20 B. C. went to Rome with several Parthian noblemen, to solicit the help of Augustus in regaining the crown ; for which he promised to become a vassal of the Roman empire. At the same time, ambassadours arrived from Phraates, who requested the surrender of Tiridates and the release of the Parthian prince, whom Augustus had formerly taken to Rome. Augustus took Tiridates under his protection ; but dismissed the

young prince, on condition that the Parthians should deliver up the Roman soldiers whom they had taken prisoners, and the trophies which they had obtained by the defeat of Crassus.⁵

In the year 19 B. C. Herod completed the fortifications of Samaria, which were twenty stadia or two English miles in circumference; and commenced the building of Strato's Tower on the seacoast, in a most magnificent style, with square blocks of white marble. This city, which he called Caesarea in honour of the emperor, he adorned with a theatre, an amphitheatre, and a temple to Augustus; and, at great expense, formed for it a very convenient harbour. Herod was an enthusiastic admirer of architecture, and wished to immortalize his name by the magnificence of his buildings. He accordingly erected many splendid edifices in cities which were not included in his dominions; such as gymnasiums at Ptolemais, Tripolis, and Damascus; the city walls at Biblus; porticoes or covered walks at Tyre, Berytus, and Antioch; temples, bazars or market-places, and theatres at Zidon and Damascus; an aqueduct at Laodicea on the sea; and baths, reservoirs, and porticoes at Askelon. He also planted groves in several cities: to others he made rich presents, or furnished them with endowments for the support of their games; and, by these means, extended his fame throughout the Roman empire.⁶

About this time, 19 B. C. Herod sent to Rome his two sons, Alexander and Aristobulus, whom he had by the murdered Mariamne. Augustus received them with every mark of favour, and gave Herod permission to nominate the one whom he preferred as his successor in the throne of Judea. He also put Herod in possession of the districts of Trachonitis, Auranitis, and Batanea, which had formerly made a part of the territory of Lysanias, the son of Ptolemy Menneus, the prince of Chalcis, who had been put to death by Antony. After the execution of Lysanias, these districts had been farmed to Zenodorus, the tetrarch of a district between Galilee and Trachonitis. But Zenodorus, for a share of the spoil, afforded protection to the robbers in the caves of Trachonitis; and, consequently, the surrounding countries were continually disturbed by their depredations. Varro, the prefect of Syria, having complained of these disorders to Augustus, received orders to suppress the banditti; but he was recalled before he had time to execute his commission. Augustus, as the readiest method of exter-

minating these marauders, placed the districts which they infested under the government of Herod, who immediately applied himself to the business of quelling their disorders. Zenodorus, thus deprived of his territory, complained of his wrongs at Rome; but his representations were disregarded. He then instigated the Gadarenes to send an embassy to Mitylene in the island of Lesbos, to prefer the same complaints to Agrippa, the favourite of Augustus, who had been made governour of all the East. But Herod was there before them, and gained the friendship of the governour; so that, when they arrived, they were immediately put in chains and sent to Herod, who, to conciliate the malecontents, dismissed them without punishment.⁷

In the following year, 18 B. C. Augustus went to the East, and committed the administration of affairs at Rome to Agrippa, whom he, while in Sicily, had recalled from Mitylene. At this time, by the advice of Maecenas, he gave his daughter Julia in marriage to Agrippa, who was then obliged to repudiate his former wife, a daughter of Octavia, the sister of Augustus. While Augustus was passing the winter at Samos, the ambassadours of queen Candace, who have already been mentioned, presented themselves before him, and obtained the peace which they desired.⁸

In the spring, Augustus proceeded through Asia Minor; and when he arrived at Antioch in Syria, Zenodorus and the Gadarenes applied to him, and accused Herod of violence and sacrilege. At the audience, Augustus treated Herod, who was then present, with such marked respect, that the Gadarenes, during the following night, laid violent hands on themselves, and Zenodorus was found with his body burst open, probably from the effects of poison. Augustus, viewing this as a tacit acknowledgement of the injustice of their accusations, gave Herod the principality of Chalcis, which had belonged to Zenodorus, and associated him in the government with the prefect of Syria, with directions that the prefect should do nothing without his consent. At the request of Herod, Augustus raised his brother Pheroras to the dignity of a tetrarch; for Herod had given him a territory in Perea with a revenue of one hundred talents. To testify his gratitude for so many favours, Herod now, in the seventeenth year of his reign, built a temple of white marble at Paneas, and dedicated it to Augustus; and, to pacify the Jews, who could not

look upon such a temple in their own country without uneasiness, he remitted to them a third part of their tribute.⁹

While Augustus was at Antioch, he gave audience to the ambassadors of Phraates, the king of Parthia, who brought him the Roman trophies which had been taken from Crassus, and even delivered to him four princes of the blood with their families as hostages. This was done by the influence of the queen Thermusa, an Italian woman whom Augustus had formerly given to Phraates; for it was her design to transfer the sceptre to her own son, during the absence of the older princes. But when she afterwards destroyed the life of Phraates by poison, she and her son were driven from the country.¹⁰

Soon after, ambassadors came to Antioch from Armenia, who complained of the tyranny of their king Artabazes, and requested Augustus to give the kingdom to Tigranes, the youngest son of Artaxias, who was then detained at Rome as a hostage. Augustus sent an army against Artabazes under the command of Tiberius; but before the arrival of the Romans, the tyrant was put to death by his own subjects.¹¹

Augustus then gave Lesser Armenia to Archelaus, and Comagene to Mithridates; and, towards the end of the summer, set sail for Samos, where he spent the winter. Here he received an embassy from India with a letter in the Greek language; from which it appears that Greeks were then resident in that country. In this letter, Porus, the king of India, who called himself ruler over six hundred kings, (*rajahs*.) informed Augustus that he desired his friendship, because he had heard of his fame. The Indian sage Zarmarus, one of the three ambassadors, attended Augustus to Athens, where he burnt himself on a funeral pile, as Calanus had done in the time of Alexander the Great.¹²

When Augustus returned to Rome the next spring, he was received with every demonstration of honour; and the recovery of the trophies from the Parthians occasioned so much joy, that a new temple was built to Mars the Avenger, in which they were to be deposited.¹³

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 9: 3, 4. *Jewish War*, I. 21: 10. ² Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 9: 3. Strabo, p. 780. ³ Strabo, p. 780—783. Compare 118. 819. *Dion Cassius*, LIII. ⁴ Strabo, p. 719—722. *Dion Cassius*, LIV. ⁵ Di-

on Cassius, LIII. Justin, XLII. 5. ⁶ Josephus, Antiq. XV. 9: 5, 6. XVI. 5: 3. Jewish War, I. 21: 4—12. ⁷ Josephus, Antiq. XV. 10: 1, 2. Jewish War, I. 21: 4. Velleius Paterculus, II. 93. ⁸ Dion Cassius, LIV. Velleius Paterculus, II. 93. Strabo, p. 821. ⁹ Dion Cassius, LIV. Josephus, Antiq. XV. 10: 3, 4. Jewish War, I. 21: 3. 24: 5. ¹⁰ Dion Cassius, LIV. Livy, Epitome of Book CXXXIX. Justin, LII. 5. Strabo, p. 288. 748. 749. Tacitus, Annal. II. 1. Velleius Paterculus, II. 91. Orosius, VI. 21. Florus, IV. 12. ¹¹ Tacitus, Annal. II. 3. Dion Cassius, LIII. ¹² Dion Cassius, LIV. Strabo, p. 719. ¹³ Dion Cassius, LIV.

CXX. HEROD KING OF THE JEWS 16—18 B. C.

The innovations which Herod introduced, and particularly, the heathen temples which he built, were a constant source of dissatisfaction to his Jewish subjects; and though he excused himself by pleading the necessity of deference to the Roman power, this plea was far from being satisfactory to the people. He at length found it necessary for the peace of his kingdom, to forbid all assemblages of the people under the severest penalties. He maintained a great number of spies, and spared no pains or expense to make them diligent and faithful; and he frequently went himself by night disguised among the people, to learn their sentiments respecting him. The most refractory he brought to punishment, and, by his orders, many were carried, either publicly or secretly, to the castle of Hyrcanium and there put to death. But notwithstanding these exertions, his dangers continually increased; and he finally required all his subjects to take an oath of allegiance. Many who refused, were executed; but the Essenes, who esteemed all oaths unlawful, and the Pharisees, who were attached to Pollio and Sameas, were exempted from the general requisition.¹

In the year 16 B. C. when the building of Caesarea was nearly completed, Herod, in order to gain the affections of the Jews and acquire an imperishable name among them, formed the design of erecting a new temple at Jerusalem, on a larger scale and in a style of greater magnificence than the old one. He laid his project before the people assembled in the temple, and when he found that they distrusted his intentions, he promised not to demolish the old temple till all the materials for the new one should be in readiness. Two years were spent in collecting materials; and then the old temple was taken down by degrees, as fast as its parts could be re-

placed by the new building. The main body of the edifice was completed in nine years and a half; but the whole was not finished till long after the death of Herod, while Gessius Florus was procurator of Judea. To this circumstance an allusion is made by the Jews, John 2: 20.²

But the gratitude of the Jews for the building of this temple was soon counteracted by a new law which Herod promulgated, commanding that thieves should be sold into slavery out of the country. In consequence of this law, Jews were compelled to serve pagans; a measure which was extremely odious to the whole nation.³

The year after the commencement of the building of the temple, 13 B. C. Herod went to Rome. While on his way, he stopped to witness the games at Athens; and he settled a revenue on the inhabitants of Elis, that they might be able to give more splendour to the celebration of the Olympic games. In their gratitude they made him president of the games for life. When he arrived at Rome, he was received with great favour by Augustus. He found his two sons well instructed in the sciences, and on his return, took them with him to Jerusalem. He then married the oldest, Alexander, to Glaphyra, a daughter of Archelaus, the king of Cappadocia, who was the grandson of Archelaus, the former king of Egypt, and the great grandson of the general of that name, who deserted from Mithridates to the Romans. His youngest son Aristobulus he gave in marriage to Berenice, the daughter of his sister Salome.⁴

Not long after, Agrippa was again sent to the East by Augustus, and Herod, in the year 12 B. C. went to Asia Minor to meet him and conduct him to Palestine. On the way, he showed him the cities of Sebaste or Samaria, Caesarea, Alexandrium, Herodium, Hircanium, and his other cities, which were all magnificently built in the Grecian style of architecture; and then led him to Jerusalem. All the people came out of the city to meet their illustrious guest, and nothing was omitted which could contribute to his honour or pleasure. Agrippa, on his part, brought a hecatomb of offerings to the temple, which they were then building, and there gave them a feast. Before the approach of winter, he sailed back to Ionia.⁵

The next year, 11 B. C. Herod met Agrippa at Sinope, made

with him a campaign to the Cimmerian Bosphorus, and afterwards attended him through Paphlagonia, Cappadocia, Phrygia, and Ionia, to Ephesus; where he successfully exerted his influence in favour of the people who presented petitions to the Roman general. When this became known, the Jews of Ionia, who had at first been carried thither by Antiochus the Great, and had since become very numerous and spread over the whole country, applied to Herod to obtain from Agrippa a confirmation of their religious freedom, exemption from military service, and other privileges, which they had obtained in part from Antiochus, but which were now almost entirely lost. Herod very readily espoused their cause, as he hoped, by this means, to gain some credit with the Jews of Palestine; and accordingly, on his return, he did not fail to make known to the people assembled in the temple, the services which he had rendered to their brethren in Ionia. The edicts which were given to confirm the privileges of the Jews, are copied by Josephus. The edicts of Augustus, confirming the privileges of the Jews in Asia Minor and Cyrene, undoubtedly belong to the same period. Perhaps the Jews of these countries, after having heard of the favourable decision of Agrippa respecting the Jews of Asia, sent an embassy to Rome and obtained the confirmation of their religious freedom from the emperor himself. In the year 13 B. C. Agrippa was recalled; and the next season he died, when Sentius Saturninus and Titus Volumnius were appointed his successors in Syria.⁶

During the same year, 10 B. C. Augustus was made *Pontifex maximus*, an office which all his successors retained till the time of Valentinian, in the year 375 A. C. By virtue of this office, he ordered all the oracles extant at that time to be examined, and collected more than two thousand books, from which he made a selection, and deposited it in a golden casket, which he placed under the pedestal of the statue of Apollo, that stood in the chapel of his palace. The remainder of the books he committed to the flames. This collection is said to have contained the ancient Sibylline oracles; but the old Sibylline books, which Tarquin II. purchased of a foreign woman for three hundred pieces of gold, were preserved, if indeed they ever existed, in a single manuscript in the capitol, and were destroyed when that building was burnt, in the year 83 B. C. They were, consequently, irrecoverably lost; but their loss is little to be regretted, since the whole work was evidently

nothing more than a political contrivance, of which the rulers availed themselves, in order to obviate the ill effects of the discontent and cowardice of the people.⁷

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 10: 4, 5. ² Josephus, *Antiq.* XV. 11: 1—7.
 XX. 9: 7. *Jewish War*, I. 21: 1. ³ Josephus, *Antiq.* XVI. 1: 1. ⁴ Josephus, *Jewish War*, I. 21: 12. ⁵ Josephus, *Antiq.* XVI. 2: 1.
⁶ Josephus, *Antiq.* XVI. 2: 2—5. ⁶ 1—8. ⁷ Dion Cassius, *LIV.* ⁷ Dion Cassius, *LIV.* Suetonius, *Octavius XXXI.* Tacitus, *Annal.* VI. 12.

CXXI. HEROD KING OF THE JEWS 10—1 B. C.

Herod's brother Pheroras and his sister Salome, whose hatred to Mariamne had been the principal cause of her death, now looked with envious eyes on her sons Alexander and Aristobulus, who were much beloved by the people. These young princes occasionally let fall some incautious expressions respecting the execution of their mother, which were repeated to Salome and increased her enmity against them. She took advantage of their indiscretion, and, in conjunction with her brother Pheroras, contrived to excite the suspicions of Herod against his sons. Occasions were artfully given to draw out the sentiments of the unsuspecting princes, and all that they said, was exaggerated and reported to their father. Herod at length determined, by mortifying them, to make them more modest. He accordingly called to his court Antipater, the son of his wife Doris whom he had divorced when he married Mariamne, and gave him rank before the sons of Mariamne. Alexander and Aristobulus, irritated by this preference, became still more incautious and severe in their language; and Herod, when he learned the conduct of his sons, was still more imbittered against them. The intriguing Antipater neglected no opportunity to increase the suspicions of his father, in order to pave his own way to the throne.¹

When Herod made his last visit to Agrippa, which has already been mentioned, he took Antipater with him, and sent him to Rome in company with Agrippa. Antipater now, in every letter to his father, introduced something unfavourable to Alexander and Aristobulus; but always in such a way as to convey the impression, that the security of his father was his only motive in accusing the princes.²

By such means, the suspicions of Herod against the two sons of

Mariamne were at last raised so high, that in the year 8 B. C. he conducted them to Rome ; and at Apuleia, where Augustus was then residing, he formally accused them before his sovereign of having formed designs against his life. Augustus perceived that the whole accusation rested on mere suspicion, and he accordingly acquitted the princes and attempted to effect a reconciliation between them and their father. Notwithstanding this, Herod, on his return to Jerusalem, convoked a solemn assembly of the people in the temple, and there appointed Antipater his immediate successor to the throne, and the sons of Mariamne after him. The dissensions in his family were increased by this appointment ; for, though Alexander and Aristobulus had now learned to conduct with more discretion, Antipater, Salome, and Pheroras contrived to fill the ear of Herod with constant calumnies against the two princes, and thus the way was prepared for more serious troubles.³

Meanwhile, Herod completed the building of Strato's Tower or Caesarea in the year 7 B. C. and celebrated the occasion with magnificent games. He built many other cities, which he called after the names of the several members of his family ; as Antipatris, from the name of his father Antipater ; Cypron, near Jericho, from the name of his mother Cypros, who belonged to an Arabian family, though she was born at Askelon in Philistia ; and Phasaelis, in the plains of Jericho, from the name of his brother Phasael ; and he gave the same name to a tower which he built at Jerusalem.⁴

The next year, 6 B. C. the time when the Jews of Asia and Cyrene obtained from Augustus the confirmation of their religious freedom and their other privileges, Herod became so suspicious and fearful of his sons Alexander and Aristobulus, in consequence of the reiterated slanders of Salome and Pheroras, that he had no rest day nor night. He put several friends of the two princes to the torture, in order to extort from them a discovery of a pretended conspiracy against his life. Some, to obtain relief from pain, made false declarations which implicated Alexander ; and he was then immediately imprisoned, and others were put to the torture, to extort from them a confirmation of the falsehoods uttered by the first sufferers. In these circumstances, Alexander had recourse to an artifice which produced the desired effect. He wrote four letters to his father, acknowledging that he had been engaged in a conspiracy, in which Pheroras, Salome, and others who had awakened

the suspicions of Herod by their slanders, were accomplices. By this false confession, Alexander accomplished his purpose of destroying the influence which his calumniators had possessed over his father, who gave the more credit to his story, because he implicated himself in the guilt of those whom he accused. The whole court was now in confusion. Herod executed some, and put others to the torture in order to compel them to make confession; and several died under the hands of their tormentors. In the midst of these troubles, in the year 5 B. C. Archelaus, the king of Cappadocia, whose daughter Alexander had married, came to Jerusalem, as if by accident; and when he had learned from Herod the progress and state of the whole affair, he pretended to be still more indignant at the conduct of Alexander than Herod himself, threatened to take his daughter from him, and so wrought upon Herod by his assumed appearance of anger, that he at length began with tears to intercede in behalf of his son. Archelaus conducted in this emergency with so much prudence and dexterity, that he succeeded in effecting a complete reconciliation between Herod and his family. Herod was deeply affected by the friendly services of Archelaus and could scarcely express the warmth of his gratitude. He attended Archelaus to Antioch, and there lent his aid in settling the difficulties which had arisen between him and Volumnius, the prefect of Syria.⁵

Herod, who had before written to Augustus for permission to proceed according to law against his sons as traitors, now went in person to Rome to inform the emperor of his reconciliation with them. During his absence, the robbers, whom he had formerly subdued and compelled to engage in agriculture, again made their appearance in Trachonitis. They had once before attempted to recommence their robberies, while Herod was at Rome with his sons; but they were soon suppressed by the royal troops. Forty of the principal men among them then fled to Obadas, the king of Arabia, and, by means of his minister Sylleus, who had formerly been the guide of Aelius Gallus in Arabia, obtained for their residence the strong fortress of Repta. From this place of refuge they now rushed into Palestine and Coelosyria, harassing, pillaging, and laying waste the country. Sylleus protected these robbers in order to be revenged on Herod, for having refused to give him his sister Salome in marriage because he was an uncircumcised Arab. When

Herod, on his return, saw the unhappy condition of his subjects, and found that he was unable to subdue their enemies, on account of the protection afforded them by Sylleus, he took into his custody all the relatives of these robbers, who were in Trachonitis. But this only served to increase the fury of the robbers, and to render the condition of the country still more deplorable.⁶

Herod then went to Saturninus and Volumnius in Syria, and accused Sylleus of protecting the robbers and of withholding a sum of sixty talents which he had consigned to him for Obadas. Sylleus appeared before his judges and promised on oath to pay the sixty talents, in thirty days, and to deliver up all the robbers who had taken refuge in the dominions of Obadas. But instead of performing his promise, he went immediately to Rome; and Herod then obtained permission from Saturninus and Volumnius to vindicate his rights by arms. He accordingly led an army to Arabia, destroyed the fortress of Repta, and put the garrison to the sword. Naceb advanced to the aid of the robbers with an army of Arabs; but he was overpowered by Herod, and slain with twenty five of his men. Herod then, without committing any further hostilities, returned to Judea, and left three thousand Idumean soldiers in Trachonitis to secure the peace of that district. Sylleus, who received intelligence at Rome of all that had taken place in Arabia, now complained to Augustus, that Herod had not only destroyed the fortress of Repta, but had also seized a large treasure which was deposited there, and had massacred more than twenty five thousand Arabians. Augustus was so offended with Herod in consequence of this false accusation, that he sent him a severe reprimand, and would listen to no excuse nor receive an embassy from him. The Trachonites well knew how to avail themselves of these circumstances. They rose against the garrison of Herod, and renewed their depredations in conjunction with the Arabs, while Herod ventured to take no measures to suppress them.⁷

In the mean time, Obadas, the king of the Nabathæan Arabs, was poisoned by the contrivance of Sylleus; and the traitor then attempted to procure from the Roman government an appointment to the vacant throne. But the Arabs had no wish to receive a king from Rome, and they gave the sceptre to Anneas or Aretas.⁸

Herod now sent to Rome Nicolaus of Damascus, a man very much devoted to him and possessing in a high degree the qualities re-

quisite for an ambassadour. When he arrived at Rome, not expecting to be able to obtain an audience, any more than the two ambassadour, whom Herod had already sent, he offered his services as an advocate to the three Nabathaeans whom Aretas had sent thither, to assure Augustus of his friendship and to accuse Sylleus the murder of the king. Augustus refused to hear any thing respecting the first part of their commission, but he appointed a day to examine the charges against Sylleus. In the course of the accusation, Nicolaus asserted that Augustus himself had been abused before the whole world by Sylleus, since he had given him a false account of the proceedings of Herod in Trachonitis and Arabia. Augustus then demanding an immediate explanation of this point, Nicolaus obtained the desired opportunity of defending the conduct of Herod. Augustus, after hearing the defence of Herod, gave orders that Sylleus should be conducted to Arabia, and, after paying the sixty talents, (or, as Nicolaus had stated it, the five hundred talents,) which were due to Herod, should be there executed. But when Sylleus arrived in Arabia, he refused to pay any thing; and Antipater, the son of Herod, who had then returned to Rome, having reminded Augustus of the crimes of Sylleus, he ordered him to be brought back to Rome, to be scourged with rods, and beheaded.⁹

During these transactions, Herod, being in want of money, secretly broke open the sepulchre of David; but he found nothing there except the royal ornaments with which the king was buried.¹⁰

In the year 3 B. C. Augustus had thoughts of making Herod amends for the harshness with which he had treated him, and was about to offer him the kingdom of the Nabathaeans, when he received a letter from him, again begging permission to institute a legal process against his two sons Alexander and Aristobulus. For Salome, Pheroras, and Antipater, and especially Erycles, an unprincipled and intriguing Lacedemonian, had again excited his suspicions so strongly against these two sons of Mariamne, that he could not believe himself secure, although nothing was proved against them excepting that they had an intention of escaping from the kingdom, to save their own lives. Augustus was unwilling to commit the conquest and government of another kingdom to an old man who showed himself incapable of ruling his own family;

and he accordingly confirmed Aretas on the throne of the Nabathæans. He then gave Herod full power to proceed in his own way against his sons, who were already arrested, but advised him to consult the magistrates of the neighbouring provinces, and particularly, Archelaus, the king of Cappadocia. Herod invited all the rulers who were mentioned in the letter of Augustus, to a council at Berytus, excepting king Archelaus, the father-in-law of Alexander, whom he regarded as an interested person. When Herod had laid his accusation before this assembly, Alexander and Aristobulus were condemned; and they were sent to Sebaste or Samaria, where they were soon after strangled by the orders of their father.¹¹

No sooner had Herod's innocent sons fallen a sacrifice to his suspicions, than he was exposed to real danger by the treachery of other members of his family; for Antipater and Pheroras entered into a conspiracy to take him off by poison. Antipater wished to seize the crown, and Pheroras was determined to be revenged on his brother for some domestic difficulties which had arisen between them. Herod had offered to Pheroras two different princesses in marriage, both of whom he had refused, to the great dissatisfaction of his brother. This dissatisfaction was increased by the conduct of the wife of Pheroras in paying, out of her own property, the fines of more than six thousand Pharisees, who had refused to take the oath of allegiance to Augustus and Herod, alleging that it was unlawful. These Pharisees, out of gratitude for this favour, ventured to whisper that God would give the kingdom to Pheroras; and Herod, on this account, ordered several Pharisees and some of his own family to be executed. He then convened a council, in which he accused the wife of Pheroras as the cause of all these troubles, and called upon him, either to repudiate his wife or no longer to consider him as his brother. But Pheroras replied, that nothing but death could separate him from his wife; and then Herod commanded Antipater and his mother to have no further intercourse with Pheroras and his wife. They pretended to yield obedience to this order, but secretly continued their intimacy. Pheroras retired to Perea in his own tetrarchy, and Antipater contrived to be called to Rome at the same time. The murder of Herod was to have been effected by poison, during the absence of the two conspirators. But Pheroras was soon after taken sick, when he received a visit from his brother, and died immediately after.¹²

The death of Pheroras occasioned the discovery of the whole plot; for two of his freedmen came to Herod and accused his widow of having poisoned her husband; and when Herod, in consequence of this accusation, put some of the female slaves of his brother to the torture, in order to ascertain the truth, it appeared clearly from their confessions, that Antipater had prepared poison for Herod, which he had intrusted to Pheroras, and that he had consigned it to the care of his wife, till an opportunity should offer of conveying it to Herod. The widow of Pheroras, on her first examination, acknowledged her guilt, and immediately after, precipitated herself from the roof of her house. She however survived the fall, and gave a full relation of all the circumstances of the conspiracy, and added, that her husband on his death bed, deeply affected by the friendly visit of the king, had relented, and directed her to bring the poison, and throw it into the fire in his presence; which she had done, only reserving a little to destroy her own life, which she then showed to Herod. About the same time, Bathyllus, a freedman of Antipater, arrived from Rome with letters from his master, in which he attempted to excite the suspicions of his father against his brothers Archelaus and Philip. Bathyllus being put to the torture, acknowledged that he had brought with him a still stronger poison, which he was to have delivered to Pheroras. Herod then divorced his wife Mariamne, the daughter of Simon, who was proved to have been an accomplice in the conspiracy; he struck the name of her son out of his will, deposed her father Simon from the high priesthood, and gave this office to Matthias, the son of Theophilus. All these transactions were kept a profound secret from Antipater, who was then at Rome; and Herod sent to call him home, with many assurances of his paternal love.¹³

¹ Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 3: 1—3. Jewish War, I. 23: 1, 2. ² Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 3: 3. 4: 1. ³ Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 4: 1—7. Jewish War, I. 23: 3—5. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 5: 1, 2. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 7: 2—6. 8: 1—6. Jewish War, I. 24: 1—8. 25: 1—6. ⁶ Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 7: 6. 9: 1. ⁷ Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 9: 1—3. ⁸ Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 9: 4. ⁹ Strabo, p. 782. Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 9: 4. 10: 8, 9. XVII. 3: 2. Jewish War, I. 29: 3. ¹⁰ Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 7: 1. ¹¹ Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 10: 1—8. 11: 1—7. Jewish War, I. 26: 1—5. 27: 1—5. ¹² Josephus, Antiq. XVI. 7: 3—5. XVII. 1: 1—3: 3. Jewish War, I. 28: 1—29: 4. ¹³ Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 4: 1—3. Jewish War, I. 30: 1—31: 3.

CXXII. BIRTH OF CHRIST AND DEATH OF HEROD.

Jesus Christ was born about this time, at the commencement of the last year of the reign of Herod, or at the close of the year preceding. The year of Rome, in which the birth of Christ took place, is uncertain. Cato, in the year 202 B. C. placed the building of Rome in the fourth year of the sixth, or the first year of the seventh Olympiad, and this computation brings the birth of Christ in the 752d year of Rome ; but Varro, in the year 61 B. C. placed the building of the city in the third year of the sixth Olympiad, and this fixes the birth of Christ in the 754th year of Rome. Silberschlag places the birth of Christ in the 750th year of Rome ; and I have for the most part followed this accurate chronologist, as the difference is trifling, and perfect accuracy is scarcely to be expected. Chronologists are all agreed that our common era, which was first used by Dionysius in the year 526 A. C. and introduced into the western church by the Pope in the year 532 A. C. places the birth of Christ some years too late ; but it has not yet been determined whether the difference is two, three, four, five, or even eight years.¹

At this time Sentius Saturninus was proconsul in Syria, and Sulpitius Quirinus, (*Κυρήνιος*, Cyrenius,) in Cilicia. A census of the world, that is, of the whole Roman empire, (*orbis terrarum*,) like that to which Luke refers as having taken place while Quirinus (Cyrenius) was governour of Syria, was no uncommon occurrence during the reign of Augustus. About this time, he ordered a census to be taken ; but it applied only to those Roman citizens, who dwelt in Italy and possessed property to the amount of two hundred sesterces. But that Augustus, who was so constantly active in the transaction of the business of his whole empire, caused other censuses to be taken, is evident from what Livy says respecting the disturbances which arose in Gaul, on account of a census which was taken there. That similar measures were applied to the other provinces, in order to ascertain the strength of the empire, no one can doubt, who has examined what Tacitus, Suetonius, and Dion Cassius have said respecting the writings left by Augustus. According to Luke 2: 1, 2, a census of this kind was taken in Judea at the time of the birth of Christ, under Sentius Saturninus ; but as it occasioned no disturbance, it was not particularly remarkable,

and, therefore, the evangelist deems it necessary to distinguish it from the celebrated census which was taken twelve years after, under Sulpitius Quirinus, and excited an insurrection. Accordingly he says, that this census (under Saturninus) was previous to that which was taken while Cyrenius was governour of Syria: *αἴτη ἡ ἀπογραφὴ πρώτη ἐγένετο ἡγεμονεύοντος τῆς Συρίας Κυρηναίου.*²

The assertion that the temple of Janus at Rome was closed at this time, because there was peace throughout the Roman empire, rests entirely on the authority of Orosius, who wrote in the fifth century; for there is no allusion to the circumstance in any more ancient writer. But there was then a general expectation that a universal sovereign was to arise in Judea, (*egressum e Judaea, rerum potiturum*;) and the Jews were anxiously looking for the speedy appearance of their Messiah. The murder of the children at Bethlehem, which took place during this year, could excite but little attention among the other and far greater cruelties of Herod, especially as Bethlehem was a small village with few inhabitants. Consequently, Josephus passes over this massacre in silence.³

Antipater now returned from Rome to Judea, not without some fears and gloomy apprehensions. He found no one to welcome his return, and immediately on his arrival, Herod reproached him for having procured the execution of the innocent sons of Mariamne, and for attempting to take the life of his own father by poison. On the next day, he was formally accused of an attempt at parricide before Quintilius Varus, the prefect of Syria, who was then at Jerusalem. The crime was proved against him, and he was imprisoned, till the affair could be submitted to Augustus for his decision. Herod, at the same time, sent to Augustus a letter from Acme, a servant of the empress Julia, in which she attempted to fix on Salome, the sister of Herod, the guilt of being engaged in a plot against the life of her brother.⁴

At this time, Herod was taken sick, and as he was then sixty nine years old, he made his will, in which he appointed his youngest son Antipas his successor; for he had become suspicious of his two older sons Archelaus and Philip, in consequence of the slanders of Antipater.⁵

As the disease of Herod grew more violent, and the probability of his recovery diminished, the Jews began to take courage; and Judas, the son of Sariph, and Matthias, the son of Margaloth, two

celebrated teachers, instigated their disciples to tear down the golden eagle which Herod had placed over the eastern gate of the temple. This rash act was scarcely completed, when the royal guards appeared and seized the two teachers with forty of their most zealous disciples; some of whom were committed to the flames and others executed in different ways, by the orders of Herod. Herod deprived Matthias of the high priesthood, on account of the part which he had taken in this transaction, and raised to that office Joazar, the brother of Matthias's wife.⁶

The disease of Herod was a fever attended with violent internal heat. The rectum and intestines were ulcerated, the feet swollen, and the genitals gangrened and filled with worms. His breath was short and extremely fetid, he was subject to frequent convulsions, and still, he had a voracious appetite for food. The warm baths of Calirrhoe, which had been recommended to him by his physicians, were ineffectual; and an oil bath which was then ordered, threw him into a fainting fit and had nearly proved fatal. He now gave up all hopes of recovery, and, after having distributed presents among his attendants and soldiers, he returned from Calirrhoe to Jericho. The agonies of his disorder, the reproaches of his conscience, and the disturbances in his family, made this severe old man still more cruel. He knew that the Jews could have no reason to lament his death; and he therefore called around him the principal men of the nation, and charged his sister Salome and her husband Alexas to confine them in the hippodrome, and to massacre them all as soon as he had breathed his last, that there might be some cause of mourning after his death.⁷

At this time, letters were received from Augustus, informing Herod of the execution of Acme, and giving him full power to proceed against his son Antipater. On this intelligence, Herod appeared to revive; but he soon after made an attempt to commit suicide. Though he was withheld from the execution of his purpose, the customary cry was raised throughout the palace, as if he were really dead. When Antipater heard these lamentations, he attempted to bribe his guard, by a large sum of money, to permit him to escape from prison. But he was so universally hated, that the guard made his offers known, and Herod ordered him to immediate execution.⁸

Herod then made a new will. He appointed Archelaus his suc-

cessor in the kingdom, Herod Antipas tetrarch of Perea and Galilee, and Philip tetrarch of Batanea, Gaulanitis, Trachonitis, and Paneas. To his sister Salome he gave Jamnia, Azotus, and Phasaelis, together with five hundred thousand silver coins. To all his other relatives he gave legacies of money and revenues. He bequeathed to Augustus ten millions of silver coins, probably Roman denarii, a great quantity of gold and silver plate, and the most valuable part of his wardrobe; and to the empress Julia and some others, five millions of silver coins. He died a short time before the passover, on the fifth day after the execution of Antipater, in the thirty fourth year after the expulsion of Antigonos, the thirty seventh after his appointment to the throne, and the seventieth of his age.⁹

Before the public annunciation of the king's death, Salome, undoubtedly through fear of the vengeance of the people, dismissed all the noblemen from the hippodrome, as if by the orders of Herod. The corpse of Herod, under an escort of his lifeguard, which was composed of Thracians, Germans, and Gauls, was carried with great pomp to Herodium, about eight stadia from Jericho, and there buried.¹⁰

¹ Silberschlag, *Chronologie der Welt*, S. 21, 22, 27—35. Frank, *Astronomische Grundrechnung der biblischen Geschichte Gottes und der alten Völker*. ² Luke 2: 1, 2. Dion Cassius, LXV. LXVI. Livy, *Epitome of Book CXXXVII*. Tacitus, *Hist.* I. 11. Suetonius, Octavius CI. ³ Orosius, VI. 21. Luke 2: 26. Josephus, *Antiq.* X. 10: 4. 11: 7. *Jewish War*, III. 7: 31. VI. 5: 4. Suetonius, *Vespasian* IV. Tacitus, *Hist.* V. 13. ⁴ Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII. 5: 1—8. *Jewish War*, I. 31: 1—5. 32: 1—7. ⁵ Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII. 6: 1. *Jewish War*, I. 33: 1. ⁶ Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII. 6: 2—4. *Jewish War*, I. 33: 2—4. ⁷ Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII. 6: 5, 6. *Jewish War*, I. 33: 5, 6. ⁸ Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII. 7: 1. *Jewish War*, I. 33: 7. ⁹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII. 8: 1. *Jewish War*, I. 33: 8. ¹⁰ Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII. 8: 2, 3. *Jewish War*, I. 33: 8, 9.

Note. Herod had two wives who bore no children, and whose names are not mentioned in history. 3. Doris, the mother of Antipater who was executed five days before the death of his father. 4. Mariamne of the Asmonean family, the mother of Alexander and Aristobulus who were strangled, of one son whose name is not mentioned, and of two daughters, Salampso and Cypros. 5. Mariamne, the daughter of Simon Boethus, who bore one son. 6. Mal-

thace of Samaria, the mother of Archelaus and Herod Antipas, and of their sister Olympias. 7. Cleopatra of Jerusalem, the mother of Herod and Philip. 8. Pallas, the mother of Phasaël. 9. Phaedra, the mother of Roxane. 10. Elpis, the mother of Salome.

Josephus, *Antiq.* XVII. 8: 4. XVIII. 5: 3, 4. *Jewish War*, I. 28: 4.

CHAPTER FOURTEENTH.

HISTORY FROM THE DEATH OF HEROD THE GREAT TO THE BEGINNING OF
THE JEWISH WAR.

CXXIII. ARCHELAUS 2—11 A. C.

ARCHELAUS immediately delivered to the soldiers a letter of thanks from the deceased Herod for the services they had rendered him, in which the king requested them to continue faithful to his son Archelaus, who was to be his successor. The will of Herod was publicly read at the same time, and Archelaus was hailed as king. He however did not assume the regal title, because it was necessary that the will of his father should be first approved by Augustus. After eight days of mourning, he gave a feast to the people, and, seated on a golden throne in the temple, promised them an administration more mild and equitable than that of his father; but he deferred the consideration of the several petitions which were presented to him, till his authority should be confirmed by the Roman emperor.¹

The people, for the most part, were willing to wait; but, at the instigation of the Pharisees, they insisted on their demand that the high priest Joazar should be immediately deposed, and those men punished, who had advised Herod to the execution of the celebrated teachers Judas and Matthias and their disciples, who had torn down the golden eagle. It was in vain that Archelaus represented to them, by means of the most influential men, the impropriety of his adopting any public measure, before he had been confirmed in the throne by Augustus. The tumult constantly increased; especially as great numbers of the Jews who had then come to Jerusalem to celebrate the passover, attached themselves to the party of the disaffected. At length, the soldiers who had been stationed in

the temple by Archelaus, were attacked with stones ; and then, the whole body of the royal guard marched to the temple, massacred about three thousand Jews, and dispersed the remainder.²

Archelaus then went to Rome in company with Salome, who promised to use her influence with Augustus in his favour, though it was her real intention to render his suit fruitless. At Caesarea, where he embarked, he met Sabinus, the procurator of Syria, who had come for the purpose of confiscating the property of Herod. He was ordered back by Varus ; but, notwithstanding this, as soon as Archelaus and Varus were out of the way, he proceeded to Jerusalem, took possession of the palace, and commenced the seizure of the treasures and the fortified places ; by which he gave occasion to still greater disturbances, as we shall see in the sequel.³

At Rome Archelaus saw his brother Antipas, whom Herod had appointed his successor in his last will but one, come forward with a powerful party to oppose his claims ; for Salome and all the other relatives of the family had attached themselves to the interests of Antipas. They were all opposed to the establishment of a kingly government in Judea ; but, in case they were obliged to have a king, they very much preferred Antipas to Archelaus. Augustus listened to the claims of both parties, but deferred a decision till he should have time to examine the matter more thoroughly.⁴

In the mean time, letters were received at Rome, respecting new disturbances in Judea. Immediately after the departure of Archelaus, the whole nation had risen in open and formidable revolt against the Roman power. Varus indeed suppressed the insurrection, and left one legion in Jerusalem to preserve order in the city ; but permanent peace was by no means restored. For when Sabinus began to seize the fortified places, the castles, and the royal treasures by force, the Jews who had then assembled at Jerusalem to celebrate the feast of pentecost, combined in great numbers, took possession of the hippodrome and of the eastern and western quarters of the city, and kept the Roman soldiers besieged. Sabinus sent to Varus for aid, but it could not arrive immediately. The Romans at length forced a way through their enemies ; and the Jews, driven to desperation, then seized the temple, and fought with great bravery from the roof, till the Romans set fire to the lower part of the building, and rushed in upon them through the flames. They now began to plunder the treasures of the temple, by which

the Jews were so much enraged that they recommenced their attack with new vigour, and drove Sabinus and the Romans into the palace; when some of the royal guards joined the Jews, and others went over to the Romans. The Jews demanded nothing but the removal of the Roman troops from Jerusalem, and Sabinus, who feared to trust their word, and was daily expecting aid from Varus, was held closely besieged.⁵

At this time, almost all Palestine was in commotion. In Idumea, two thousand soldiers who had been dismissed by Herod, in conjunction with several others, took the field against Achiab, a relative of Herod's, and compelled him with his soldiers to withdraw to the mountains. In Galilee, Judas, the son of Hezekiah who was the leader of a band of robbers that had been suppressed by Herod, made himself master of Sepphoris, armed his numerous followers from the arsenal of that city, pillaged the country, and spread devastation and terror on every side. In Perea, Simon, one of Herod's slaves, assumed the diadem, collected a band of desperate men, robbed the inhabitants, and, among other acts of violence, burnt the royal castle at Jericho. Another mob fell upon Amathus on the Jordan, and burnt the royal castle which was situated there. A shepherd named Athronges also assumed the regal title, collected a large body of followers, and with his four brothers, who were all men of gigantic stature, devastated the country, murdered and plundered the inhabitants, and sometimes repulsed the Romans themselves. In short, the whole country was full of bands of robbers, who each had a king at their head, and were probably expecting the Messiah to deliver them from the Romans, who now, instead of protecting the people, increased the distresses of the nation by their extortions.⁶

In the mean time, Varus marched to Ptolemais with two legions, and was there joined by the auxiliaries sent to him by different tetrarchs and kings. He despatched one division of his army to Galilee under the command of his son, who defeated the insurgents, subdued and burnt Sepphoris, and sold the citizens for slaves. Varus himself proceeded through Samaria to Jerusalem, and, on his march, burnt cities and villages, and massacred the inhabitants. When he approached towards Jerusalem, the rebels fled; and even Sabinus, ashamed of what had happened, privately withdrew. As the citizens of Jerusalem affirmed that they had taken no part in

the rebellion, but that they had themselves been besieged by the rebels, Varus sent out his soldiers to seize the authors of the disturbances, and ordered about two thousand of them to be crucified. He then went to Idumea, where ten thousand Jews were collected, who were persuaded by Achiab to surrender to the Romans. The principal men among them Varus sent to Augustus. He punished only the relatives of Herod, who had fought against their own family, and dismissed the rest.⁷

Varus now left one legion in Jerusalem as a garrison, and returned to Antioch. By his permission, the Jews sent an embassy of fifty persons to Rome; and when they arrived there, they were joined by more than eight thousand Roman Jews. Philip, the son of Herod, came to Rome at the same time. When the Jewish ambassadors were admitted to an audience, they accused the deceased Herod of tyranny, complained that Archelaus, before his departure, had slain three thousand of their countrymen in the temple, and entreated Augustus to make Palestine a Roman province and unite it with Syria. After the defence of Archelaus had been made by his advocate Nicolaus, Augustus dismissed both parties; and, in a few days after, he confirmed the will of Herod, excepting that Archelaus was to have the title of ethnarch, and was not to assume that of king, till he had shown himself worthy of it. The fourth part of their tribute was remitted to the Samaritans, as a reward for their fidelity in keeping themselves aloof from the recent rebellions. The cities of Gadara, Gaza, and Hippos, which were inhabited by Greeks, were joined to the province of Syria. Archelaus had from Judea, Idumea, and Samaria, a yearly revenue of about six hundred talents; Antipas, the tetrarch of Galilee and Perea, about two hundred talents; Philip, the tetrarch of Batanea, Trachonitis, Auranitis, and the district of Zenodorus, (Panaea,) one hundred talents. Salome obtained Askalon from Augustus, for her place of residence, besides the cities which were bequeathed to her; and her income amounted to about sixty talents yearly. Augustus distributed among these princes the legacies which he had received from Herod, excepting a small quantity of plate, which he retained as a memorial of his friend.⁸

Archelaus then took possession of his ethnarchy in peace; for though a young Jew of Zidon gave himself out for Alexander, the son of Mariamne, to whom he bore a strong resemblance, and

excited some disturbances; yet, after he went to Rome, he was brought by Augustus to acknowledge the imposture, and was sent to the galleys. Archelaus, on his arrival at Jerusalem, complied with the request of the people and deposed Joazar from the high priesthood, and raised to that office Eleazar, the brother of Joazar, and soon after, Jesus, the son of Sia.⁹

In the third year of the reign of Archelaus, Caius Caesar, the grandson of Augustus, came to Palestine on his way from Egypt to Armenia, where some disturbances had been excited. This young prince declined bringing any offerings to the temple of Jerusalem, for which he was commended by Augustus.¹⁰

Archelaus rebuilt Jericho, planted an orchard of palms, and founded Archelais. He had no sincere reverence for the Mosaic law; for he married Glaphyra, the widow of his brother Alexander, the son of Mariamne, though she had children by her former marriage. His government was extremely tyrannical; and in the tenth year of his reign, 12 A. C. he was accused before Augustus by the Jews and Samaritans, and banished to Vienne in Gaul.¹¹

¹ Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 8: 3, 4. Jewish War, I. 33: 8, 9. II. 1: 1, 2.

² Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 9: 1—3. Jewish War, II. 1: 2, 3. ³ Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 9: 3. Jewish War, II. 2: 1, 2. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 9: 4—7. Jewish War, II. 2: 3—7. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 10: 2, 3. Jewish War, II. 3: 1—4. ⁶ Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 10: 4—7. Jewish War, II. 4: 1—3. ⁷ Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 10: 9, 10. Jewish War, II. 5: 1—3. ⁸ Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 11: 1—5. Jewish War, II. 6: 1—3. ⁹ Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 12: 1, 2. 13: 1. Jewish War, II. 7: 1—3. ¹⁰ Suetonius, Octavius XXXIX. Orosius, VI. 3. ¹¹ Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 13: 1—5. Jewish War, II. 7: 3, 4.

CXXIV. JUDEA A ROMAN PROVINCE 12—26 A. C.

In the year 12 A. C. Augustus united Judea and Samaria to Syria, and appointed Publius Sulpitius Quirinus (*Κυρήνιος*) prefect of the province. At the same time, the Roman knight Coponius was made procurator of Judea. Quirinus confiscated the property of Archelaus, and took the census which is referred to by Luke, in order to apportion the tribute among the people. The high priest Joazar, the son of Boethus, made every exertion to allay the discontents of the Jews, which were excited by this measure of the Roman government; but Judas, the Gaulanite of Gamalis, or the Galilean, (for Josephus gives him both of these surnames,) and

Sadduc, a Sadduocce, represented the census of the people, the valuation of their property, and the payment of tribute, as the most shameful slavery, and contrary to the law which required the Jews to acknowledge no sovereign but God. By these representations, for which there was no foundation in the Mosaic law, they soon raised a party and excited great commotions. They appear however to have been suppressed; but their adherents still remained and formed a considerable sect, which, in after times, contributed much to the disturbances of the nation and to their last rebellion against the Romans.¹

When Quirinus had completed the census, in the thirty seventh year after the battle of Actium, 12 A. C. he removed the high priest Joazar, who had incurred the displeasure of the people, and raised to that dignity Ananus, (called Annas in Luke 3: 2.) the son of Seth, who continued in office till the year 23 A. C. Herod Antipas, in the mean time, fortified and adorned Sepphoris, and made it the capital of Galilee. He also fortified Betharamphtha, and called it Julia, after the name of the empress. Philip built Paneas and named it Caesarea. He also enlarged Bethsaida on the shore of the lake Gennesareth, increased the number of its inhabitants, and called it Julia; but the ancient name still continued in popular use.²

In the year 14 A. C. the temple of Jerusalem was polluted by some Samaritans at the feast of the passover. They entered the temple by night, (for, at this feast, it was opened soon after midnight,) and strewed it with the bones of dead men, so that the Jews could not visit it. This took place in the second year of the procuratorship of Coponius, who soon after returned to Rome. Under his successor Ambivius, Salome died and bequeathed her cities to the empress Julia. Three years after, 17 A. C. while Annius Rufus was procurator of Judea, Augustus died at Rola in Campania, in the seventy sixth year of his age and the fifty seventh of his reign, including the first fourteen years while he shared the empire with Antony and Lepidus. He was succeeded by Tiberius Nero, the son of his wife Julia.³

Tiberius appointed Valerius Gratus procurator of Judea, who retained the office eleven years. He deposed Ananus and made Ismael, the son of Phabus, high priest. He next gave the office to Eleazar, the son of the former high priest Ananus; and afterwards,

to Simon, the son of Camithus; and finally, in the year 26 A. C. to Joseph, who is also called Caiaphas or Caiphas, who was the son-in-law of Ananus. He retained the high priesthood till the year 35 A. C. Soon after the accession of Joseph Caiaphas to this office, in the year 26 A. C. Pontius Pilate came to Judea as procurator.⁴

In the mean time, Herod Antipas built the city of Tiberias. The Parthian empire, at this time, was distracted by conspiracies and rebellions against its sovereign; and Comagene was changed to a Roman province by Germanicus, at the request of the noblemen of that kingdom.⁵

¹ Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 1: 1. 2: 1. Jewish War, II. 8: 1. Acts 5: 37.
² Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 2: 1. Jewish War, II. 9: 1. ³ Velleius Paterculus, II. 123. 124. Suetonius, Octavius C. Tiberius XXI. Tacitus, Annal. I. 5. 7. Dion Cassius, LVI. LVII. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 2: 2. Jewish War, II. 9: 2. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 2: 3—5. Jewish War, II. 9: 1. Tacitus, Annal. I. 54—60. 69. 70.

CXXV. PILATE PROCURATOR OF JUDEA 26—38 A. C.

Pontius Pilate, who, according to the testimony of Philo, set justice to sale, plundered the people, and executed the innocent, was procurator of Judea eleven years. His conduct from the first excited dissatisfaction in Judea. He sent his soldiers from Samaria to Jerusalem to winter quarters, and directed them to carry the images of Caesar, which were on their standards, into the city by night. The people regarded this as a violation of their law, and many Jews went to Caesarea to entreat Pilate to remove the images from the city. They remained five days before his palace without obtaining the object of their requests. On the sixth day, Pilate seated himself on a throne in one of the public squares; and when the Jews appeared before him, he surrounded them with his soldiers and threatened them with instant death, unless they departed to their homes. But they threw themselves on the ground, bared their necks, and exclaimed, that they would rather die than suffer the images to remain in their capital contrary to the law. Pilate was finally prevailed upon to give orders for the removal of the standards from Jerusalem.¹

If the relation of Philo be true, that Pilate set up shields with

idoltrous inscriptions at Jerusalem, and afterwards, at the request of the Jews, received orders from the emperor Tiberius to take them away; it was probably in part through desire of revenge, that he now determined to construct an aqueduct to Jerusalem from a fountain at the distance of twenty English miles, and demanded disbursements from the treasury of the temple to pay the expenses. In consequence of this demand, when on his throne at Jerusalem, he was beset with the most earnest entreaties by the people; but he sent disguised soldiers among the multitude, with daggers or bludgeons concealed under their garments, who slew several, and others were trodden to death in the crowd.²

In the fifteenth year of Tiberius, the seventy third Julian year, the third year of the administration of Pilate, 29 A. C. John the Baptist made his public appearance, and endeavoured, by producing a reformation among the people, to prepare their minds for the arrival and reception of the Messiah. The next year, he baptised Jesus and pointed him out to his countrymen as the promised Saviour.³

About this time, Paulina, a virtuous, but superstitious Roman lady, was allured into the embraces of the Roman knight Mundus, by a base stratagem, which was aided by idoltrous priests bribed for that purpose. She was told that the god Anubis desired to receive a visit from her by night in his temple; and when she complied with this supposed divine invitation, Mundus took the place and acted the part of the god. At the same time, Fulvia, another Roman lady, who had been converted to the Jewish religion by a teacher whose crimes had compelled him to flee from Judea, made a present of gold and purple to the temple of Jerusalem. This present she committed to the care of her Jewish teacher, who shared it with his three companions. Tiberius, having been informed of this fraudulent act by the husband of Fulvia, banished the Jews from Rome. He sent four thousand as soldiers to Sardinia; and on many, who refused to engage in military service, for fear that they should be compelled to violate the Mosaic law, he inflicted the severest punishments.⁴

During these transactions at Rome, hostilities broke out between Herod Antipas and Aretas, the king of Arabia, which were occasioned by the marriage of Antipas with the daughter of Aretas. For Antipas, while on his journey to Rome, visited his brother

Herod, a son of Mariamne, the daughter of the high priest Simon, and commenced an intrigue with his wife Herodias, a daughter of Aristobulus, the son of the Asmonean Mariamne, and promised to marry her and repudiate his Arabic wife. But while Antipas was absent at Rome, the Arabic princess heard of the fate which awaited her, and fled to her father at Petra. When Herod Antipas, on his return from Rome, consummated his marriage with Herodias, the irritated Aretas raised some difficulties respecting the boundaries of Gamalis, and a war was commenced. Some of the soldiers of Herod, on their march, (*σφατερόμενοι*,) listened to the instructions of John the Baptist. Herod Antipas, betrayed by deserters, was defeated, and his whole army dispersed.⁵

Respecting this occurrence, Josephus observes: "Now some of the Jews thought that the destruction of Herod's army came from God, and that very justly, as a punishment for what he did against John, that was called the Baptist; for Herod slew him, who was a good man, and commanded the Jews to exercise virtue, both as to righteousness toward one another, and piety toward God, and so to come to baptism; for that the washing with water would be acceptable to him, if they made use of it, not in order to the putting away of some sins only, but for the purification of the body; supposing still that the soul was thoroughly purified beforehand by righteousness. Now when many others came in crowds about him, for they were greatly moved by hearing his words, Herod, who feared lest the great influence John had over the people might put it in his power and inclination to raise rebellion, (for they seemed ready to do any thing he should advise,) thought it best by putting him to death, to prevent any mischief he might cause, and not bring himself into difficulties by sparing a man who might make him repent of it, when it should be too late. Accordingly, he was sent a prisoner, out of Herod's suspicious temper, to Macherus, the castle I before mentioned, and was there put to death. Now the Jews had an opinion, that the destruction of this army was sent as a punishment on Herod, and a mark of God's displeasure to him."⁶

The differences between this narrative of Josephus and that of the evangelists need occasion no difficulty; for Josephus wrote nearly fifty years after the event which he describes, when the true causes of the execution of John could not have been so well known by him, as by the contemporary disciples of Jesus, some of whom

had themselves been the disciples of John, and would not have neglected to ascertain the circumstances attending the death of a teacher whom they so much venerated.

At this time Jesus preached the gospel; and he was finally crucified at Jerusalem in the thirty fourth year of his age and the nineteenth of the reign of Tiberius. Josephus says respecting him: "Now there was about this time Jesus, a wise man, if it be lawful to call him a man; for he was a doer of wonderful works, a teacher of such men as receive the truth with pleasure. He drew over to him both many of the Jews and many of the Gentiles. He was the Christ." (The name of Christ was well known at the time when Josephus wrote; and the meaning of the author is: This was the Christ from whom the numerous sect of Christians are denominated.) And when Pilate, at the suggestion of the principal men among us, had condemned him to the cross, those that loved him at the first did not forsake him; for he appeared to them alive again the third day; (Josephus here merely relates what the Christians asserted;) as the divine prophets had foretold these and many other wonderful things concerning him. And the sect of Christians, so named from him, is not extinct at this day.¹⁷

I shall not here undertake to decide the contested question respecting the genuineness of this passage; but I would remark, that the common objections which have been urged against it with so much confidence, namely, that it stands too early in the order of time, and that the omission of it does not interrupt the connexion of the author's narrative, are little worthy of the importance which has been attached to them. For every attentive reader of Josephus must know, that he often, especially in his history of this period, when he was but a child, and the dates of which he could not have ascertained with any great degree of accuracy, neglects the order of time, and follows the order of subjects; and again, if every passage of a writer, particularly of such a writer as Josephus, the omission of which does not interrupt the connexion of the discourse, is to be regarded as spurious, large portions of their writings must be rejected; as, for example, the whole third Chapter of the third Book of the Jewish War. It is worthy of remark in this place, that Josephus, in his Antiquities, XX. 9: 1. refers to Christ as a well known person; for, in giving an account of the execution of the apostle James, he says, that "he was the brother of Jesus, who was called Christ;" and immediately adds: "his name was James."

The principal objections to the genuineness of the passage are the following :

1. The mentioning of Jesus is contrary to the plan of Josephus, for, as he says in the preface of his history, he designed only to relate the remarkable and memorable events of his nation ; but the history of Jesus, a man who died on the cross, could not be considered as honourable to the Jews.—But was it not an important and remarkable event ? Was it not even honourable, since Jesus then had so many distinguished disciples among the Gentiles ?

2. A zealous Pharisee, like Josephus, would not call Jesus simply Christ or the Messiah, and say that he wrought miracles and appeared again after his death ; as the prophets had foretold ; and accordingly, Josephus, in *Antiquities*, XX. 9: 1. refers to him as Jesus, who *was called* the Christ.—This objection has already been answered.

3. It is said that the style of the passage is different from the style of Josephus.—But a difference of style can scarcely be ascertained in so short a passage ; and at any rate, there are others who assert that the style is altogether the same as that of Josephus.

4. It is said that the passage is wanting in several manuscripts.—But it is quoted as genuine by Eusebius, Jerome, Ambrosius, Rufinus, Cassiodorus, and other fathers ; and consequently, it must have been extant in all the manuscripts of those times ; and it is found in almost all the manuscripts which exist at the present day. But on this subject, the reader must be left to judge for himself.⁸

In the year 35 A. C. the twentieth of the reign of Tiberius, the tetrarch Philip, a mild and equitable ruler, died in the thirty seventh year of his reign. As he left no children, Trachonitis, Gaulanitis, Batanea, and Abila were united to the province of Syria. It was probably during the same year that the martyr Stephen was stoned.⁹

Soon after, an impostor or false Messiah made his appearance in Samaria, who, under pretence of digging up the sacred vessels of Moses, which were supposed to have been buried in mount Gerizim, collected a body of armed men. A great number assembled at Tiribatha, in order to go to mount Gerizim ; but Pilate, with a body of horse and foot, intercepted their march, slew the greater part of the deluded multitude in the first attack, and dispersed the rest. A few were taken prisoners, and put to death by the orders of

Pilate. The Samaritans then sent an embassy to Vitellius, the proconsul of Syria, and complained of the violence of Pilate. Accordingly, Vitellius, in the year 37 A. C. sent Marcellus to Judea, to take the office of procurator, and ordered Pilate to Rome, to answer to the accusations which had been made against him. Caius Caligula, who succeeded Tiberius in the government in the year 37 or 38 A. C. banished Pilate to Vienne in Gaul, where he is said to have put an end to his own life.¹⁰

At the next passover, Vitellius went to Jerusalem, and was received with great splendour. He remitted to the citizens of Jerusalem all the taxes on fruit, and committed to the care of the Jews the wardrobe of the high priests. This had been preserved in the castle of Baris, which was built by Hyrcanus I.; and when Herod changed this edifice into the magnificent castle of Antonia, he retained possession of the sacerdotal robes. They remained there under Archelaus, and afterwards, under the Romans; till Vitellius again delivered them up to the care of the Jewish priests. He then removed Joseph Caiaphas from the high priesthood, and gave that office to Jonathan, the son of the former high priest Ananus, and returned to Antioch. At this time, the Christian churches enjoyed a season of tranquillity.¹¹

Meanwhile the disturbances in Parthia continued unabated. Artabanus, the king of Media, who had been called to the throne of Parthia, not only took possession of it, but added Armenia to his dominions, and was now attempting to make still further acquisitions. Vitellius endeavoured, by large sums of money, to excite the kings of Iberia and Albania against him; but he only obtained from them permission for the Scythians to pass through their territories into the dominions of Artabanus. These barbarians, accordingly, soon overran Armenia and Parthia. Vitellius likewise failed in his attempt to procure the assassination of Artabanus. The Parthian monarch fled to his northern provinces; whence he returned with an army of Dahae and Sacae, expelled the Scythians and reestablished himself in his kingdom. When Tiberius received intelligence of this, he ordered Vitellius to make peace with Artabanus. Vitellius and Artabanus accordingly met on a bridge which had been thrown across the Euphrates for that purpose, where they were entertained by Herod Antipas, who gave Tiberius the first information of the conclusion of the treaty.¹²

Herod did not ingratiate himself with Vitellius by this officiousness, but he gained the favour of Tiberius, who now directed Vitellius to make war on Aretas, and bring him to Rome alive or send his head, in order to revenge the defeat which Herod had suffered from him. Vitellius, accordingly, in the year 38 A. C. went with two legions and some auxiliary troops to Ptolemais, with the intention of marching through Judea to Arabia. But here he was met by an embassy of Jews, who entreated him to change his route, for they could not suffer the Roman standards to be carried through their country. He then sent his army by the way of the plain of Esdraelon, and went himself with Herod and some others to Jerusalem, to offer sacrifices to God in the temple at the approaching feast of the passover. He was received with every possible mark of respect, offered his sacrifices, and made Theophilus high priest in place of his brother Jonathan, whom he deposed. On the fourth day after his arrival at Jerusalem, in the year 38 A. C. he received notice of the death of the emperor Tiberius. He then required the Jews to take the oath of allegiance to Caius Caligula, and returned to Antioch.¹³

¹ Philo, Leg. ad Cai. p. 589. 590. ed Mang. Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 3: 1. Jewish War, II. 9: 2, 3. ² Philo, Leg. ad Cai. Josephus, Antiq. XVII. 3: 2. Jewish War, II. 9: 4. ³ Matth. 3: 1—4. 13—16. Mark 1: 1—9. Luke 3: 1—20. John 1: 13—40. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 3: 4, 5. Compare Suetonius, Tiberius XXXVI. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 5: 1—4. Luke 3: 14. ⁶ Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 5: 2. ⁷ Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 3: 3. ⁸ Knittel, Neue Kritik über das Zeugnis Josephi von Christo. ⁹ Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 5: 5. Acts VII. ¹⁰ Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 4: 1, 2. Compare Matth. 24: 11. ¹¹ Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 4: 3. Acts 9: 31. ¹² Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 4: 4, 5. Dion Cassius, LIX. Tacitus, Annal. VI. 33. 36. 37. ¹³ Josephus, Antiq. XVIII. 5: 3. Compare Matth. 34: 7—10.

CXXXVI. AGRIPPA KING OF THE JEWS 38—45 A. C.

Herod Agrippa, the son of Aristobulus and grandson of the Asmonean Mariamne, experienced many changes of fortune. A short time before the death of his grandfather Herod the Great, he went to Rome; where he was received among the friends of Drusus, the son of the emperor Tiberius, and guided by the judicious counsels of Antonia, the wife of the elder Drusus and a friend of Bere-

nice, the mother of Agrippa. While Berenice lived, the conduct of Agrippa was unobjectionable; but after her death, the thoughtless prince squandered his property and was reduced to want and distress, especially after Drusus died, and the emperor Tiberius refused all the friends of his deceased son access to him, that his grief might not be revived by their presence. Under these embarrassments, Agrippa went to Malatha in Idumea, and there determined to put an end to his misery by suicide; but his wife Cypros, who discovered his design, persuaded him to abandon it. By the aid of his sister Herodias, his wife then obtained for him, from Herod Antipas, a yearly pension and the government of Tiberias. But, being ridiculed by Antipas on account of his depressed circumstances, he was soon disgusted with this situation. He accordingly went to Flaccus, the proconsul of Syria, whose friendship he had enjoyed at Rome, and was well received.¹

But his stay there was short; for his half-brother Aristobulus, who was there at the same time, accused him before Flaccus of having promised the Damascenes, for a sum of money, to exert his influence with Flaccus in their favour, in a controversy which they had with the Zidonians respecting the boundaries of their territories. Agrippa being again left destitute, went to Ptolemais, where he obtained of Peter, a freedman of his mother Berenice, the sum of seventeen thousand five hundred drachmas, for which he gave a bond for twenty thousand. He now intended to set sail for Rome; but he was intercepted by a body of cavalry from Herennius Capito, the imperial procurator of Jamnia, who required him to pay a debt of three hundred thousand denarii, which he had formerly contracted. Agrippa promised payment, but took advantage of the night and fled to his ship. He went to Alexandria, and there obtained, on the security of his wife, two hundred thousand denarii from Alexander, the alabarch of the Egyptian Jews. With this sum he sailed to Rome, where he was favourably received by Tiberius, who was then residing on the island of Capreae. But the next day, a letter arrived from Herennius, giving notice of the debt and flight of Agrippa; and then Tiberius forbade him to come into his presence, till he had paid the three hundred thousand denarii, which were due to Herennius. Fortunately Antonia, the mother of Germanicus and Claudius, out of respect for his mother Berenice, loaned him money enough, to enable him to comply with this demand;

and he was then directed by Tiberius to attend his grandson. But Agrippa attached himself to Caius Caligula, the grandson of Antonia; and having soon after obtained from the Samaritan Thallus, a freedman of the emperor's, a loan of a million of denarii, he repaid Antonia, and expended the rest in securing the favour of Caius.²

While riding with Caius, he once expressed a wish that Tiberius might soon leave the empire to him. The charioteer overheard what was said; and having afterwards been guilty of theft, he was arrested while attempting to escape. He then pretended that he had something important to communicate to the emperor, and was accordingly sent in chains to Capreae. Tiberius for some time neglected to admit him to his presence, till at last Agrippa himself, by means of Antonia, obtained an audience for him. Immediately after the communications of the charioteer, Agrippa, though clothed in purple, was put in chains, and remained in close custody till the death of Tiberius, notwithstanding the exertions of Antonia in his behalf. In the sixth month after his arrest, it is said that a German soothsayer, who observed an owl on the tree under which Agrippa stood, assured him, that he would soon be set at liberty and raised to the highest honours, but that he would die in five days after having seen that bird again.³

Tiberius, under whom the Jews and Syrians, according to Tacitus, requested a diminution of their tribute, and Cappadocia was made a Roman province, died in the year 38 A. C. From his extravagancies, which are described by Tacitus and Suetonius, we may form a conception of the corrupt manners of that age, and ascertain the truth of Paul's description of them in Romans 1: 24—27. Caius Caligula, whom Tiberius, through superstition, had appointed his successor contrary to his own inclinations, immediately alleviated the severity of Agrippa's confinement, and, in a few days after, called him to his presence, gave him a diadem, and made him king of Gaulanitis, Batanea, Trachonitis, and the tetrarchy of Lysanias, and gave him, instead of the iron chain by which he had been fastened to a soldier, a golden one of equal weight.⁴

In the second year of the reign of Caius Caligula, Agrippa went from Rome to his kingdom by the way of Egypt. According to the testimony of Philo, he was insulted at Alexandria, but gazed at in Palestine and envied by Herodias, who now urged her husband Herod Antipas to seek an equal honour, to which he at last con-

sented, and went with her to Rome. But Agrippa immediately sent his freedman Fortunatus to Caligula with letters and oral communications, in which he accused Antipas of having a secret understanding with the Parthians, and affirmed in proof of the charge, that he had collected arms for seventy thousand men. He even went to Italy himself, that he might, by his personal influence, give more weight to his accusations. Upon this, Herod Antipas, in the year 42 A. C. was banished to Lyons in Gaul, whither his wife voluntarily attended him. Caligula then gave his tetrarchy and all his property to king Agrippa.⁵

At this time, the dissensions between the Greek and Jewish citizens of Alexandria rose so high, that each party sent three deputies to Rome. The celebrated Philo was at the head of the Jewish deputation, and Apion at that of the Greeks. Apion accused the Jews, among other things, of refusing divine honours to Caius, which he required, and which all his other subjects rendered him. By this the god Caius, who was guilty of every sort of wickedness, was so much irritated, that he offered nothing but insult to the Jewish deputies, and sent them home without attending to their business.⁶

Caius Caligula then sent Petronius to Syria in the place of Vitellius, with orders for him to place the image of the emperor in the temple of Jerusalem, and, in case of resistance, to compel submission by arms. When Petronius, in obedience to these orders, had collected an army at Ptolemais, many thousand Jews came to him and expressed a determination to die, rather than suffer such a violation of their laws. Petronius proceeded to Tiberias, and here again a multitude of Jews met him with the same protestations. This continued for forty days, during which all labour was suspended, and as it was then the time for planting, the fields remained uncultivated. Then Aristobulus, the brother of king Agrippa, and Helkias, who was surnamed the Great, and other distinguished men among the Jews, entreated Petronius to inform the emperor of the true state of affairs, as perhaps he might be induced to recall his order. Petronius at last consented, though this step exposed him to great danger. About this time, however, king Agrippa, while feasting with the emperor at Rome, had embraced an opportunity to interpose a petition in favour of the Jews; and, in consequence of this, Caligula had already written to Petronius to

says in his account of the Jewish war, more than ten thousand of them were crushed to death in the crowd.¹

Scarcely had the Jews ceased to mourn for the death of so many of their friends, before Stephanus, a servant of the emperor's, was murdered by robbers on the road near Beth-horon, about one hundred stadia from Jerusalem. Cumanus immediately sent thither a body of soldiers, who plundered all the villages in that neighbourhood, and made prisoners of the principal inhabitants. At this time, one of the Roman soldiers seized a copy of the Pentateuch and tore it in pieces before the people, with insulting and blasphemous language; and the Jews then repaired to Cumanus at Caesarea and demanded the punishment of the soldier. For the sake of putting a stop to the tumult, Cumanus ordered the soldier to be beheaded.²

Soon after, one of the Galilean Jews, as he was passing through Samaria on his way to celebrate the feast at Jerusalem, was murdered by the Samaritans of the village of Ginaea or Genan, on the borders of Samaria and Esdraelon. Several of the Galileans assembled in arms to punish the Samaritans for this outrage, and, at the same time, the noblemen of Galilee went to Caesarea, to lay their complaints before Cumanus. But as the Roman officer had been bribed by the Samaritans, he refused to give audience to the Jews. Upon this, the disaffected Jews conspired together to take the revenging of that murder into their own hands. They were deaf to all the representations of their magistrates, and placing themselves under the command of Alexander, and Eleazar, the son of Dineus, two captains of banditti, they began to plunder the villages of the Samaritans. But Cumanus came upon them with his troops, slew several, and took the rest prisoners. The principal men of the nation at Jerusalem, dressed in mourning and with ashes on their heads, then entreated the people to remain quiet; but their efforts were unavailing, for many collected themselves into bands of robbers and distressed the whole country by their depredations.³

The Samaritan chiefs then went to Tyre, to Humidius Quadratus, the prefect of Syria, and complained that the Jews had plundered and burnt their villages, and thus bid defiance to the Roman power. The Jews, on the other hand, threw the blame on the Samaritans, as they had committed the first aggression, and then

bribed Cumanus, so that he refused to punish them for the murder of a Hebrew. Quadratus replied, that he would go to Judea and there investigate the affair more thoroughly. When he arrived at Samaria, he was ready to condemn the Samaritans as the authors of the disturbances; but when he heard that the Jews had revolted, he immediately ordered the prisoners whom Cumanus had taken, to be crucified. At Lydda, where he gave the Samaritans a second audience, he ordered Doras, a distinguished Jew, and four others who had attempted to excite the people to revolt, to be executed; and sent the high priests Jonathan and Ananus, and the president of the temple, the son of Ananus, in chains to Rome. At the same time, he directed the principal Samaritans and Jews, the procurator Cumanus and the tribune Celer, to go to Italy and submit their cause to the emperor. He then went to Jerusalem at one of the great festivals, and, finding all things quiet in the city, returned to Antioch.⁴

At Rome Agrippa exerted himself very earnestly in behalf of the Jews, and the emperor did them justice. He ordered the three principal Samaritans to be executed, exiled Cumanus from Rome, and sent the tribune Celer back to Jerusalem, where he was dragged through the city and then beheaded, in obedience to the commands of the emperor.⁵

¹ Josephus, Antiq. XX. 5: 2, 3. Jewish War, II. 12: 1. ² Josephus, Antiq. XX. 5: 4. Jewish War, II. 12: 2. ³ Josephus, Antiq. XX. 6: 1. Jewish War, II. 12: 3—5. Compare Matth. 24: 6. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XX. 6: 3. Jewish War, II. 12: 5, 6. Compare Tacitus, Annal. XII. 54. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XX. 6: 2, 3. Jewish War, II. 12: 7.

CXXX. FELIX PROCURATOR OF JUDEA 53—60 A. C.

Claudius, in the twelfth year of his reign, 53 A. C. appointed his freedman Felix procurator of Judea. It is uncertain how long Felix held this office, but, according to Acts 24: 10, he had then been procurator many years, (*ἐκ πολλῶν ἐτῶν*.) Tacitus asserts that Felix was placed over the Samaritans in the time of Cumanus, and that each of these officers sent out bands of robbers against the other; but Josephus, an indigenous and contemporary witness, makes no allusion to any such circumstance. On the contrary, he makes Felix the successor of Cumanus, and says that the Galileans com-

plained of the Samaritans, not before Felix, but before Cumanus, who was the ruler of the Galileans and not of the Samaritans. Felix also, according to the testimony of Josephus, was procurator of Judea for some time under Nero.¹

About this time, Claudius gave to Agrippa, instead of the kingdom of Chalcis, the tetrarchy which had formerly belonged to Philip, namely, Gaulanitis, Batanea, and Trachonitis. Agrippa gave his sister Drusilla in marriage to Azizus, the king of Emesa, who had submitted to the rite of circumcision in order to obtain her. But this connexion was soon dissolved, for Felix, who, according to the testimony of Suetonius, already had two wives, became attached to the fair Drusilla, and, by means of Simon, a sorcerer, made her offers of marriage and obtained her hand. She bore Felix one son, with whom she afterwards perished at an eruption of mount Vesuvius, in the reign of Titus.²

However favourable Claudius was to the Jews, he at this time expelled them all from Rome, because they, in expectation of the Messiah as a temporal prince, were continually exciting disturbances; as Suetonius remarks: "Judaeos impulsore Chresto (Christo) assiduo tumultuantes Roma expulit." But, soon after, they were found at Rome again in great numbers. Probably the decree of the emperor was not strictly carried into execution, because the difficulties which it was intended to prevent, were increased by it; and in this way, perhaps, Dion Cassius is to be understood when he says, that Claudius did not expel the Jews from the city, because that could not be done without exciting disturbances. He however prohibited all assemblages among them; and the houses in which they collected to drink, were torn down.³

Claudius died in the year 55 or 56 A. C. after a reign of thirteen years and nine months. His successor was not his own son, but Nero, the son of his wife Agrippina, who, after his accession to the throne, put many innocent persons to death, and, among the rest, his own mother, to whom he was indebted for his crown. In the first year of his reign, he gave to Agrippa the cities of Tiberias and Tarichaea; and beyond the Jordan, Abila and Julias with the districts belonging to them; Lesser Armenia he gave to Aristobulus, the brother of Herod, the former king of Chalcis; and, after the death of Azizus, he gave the kingdom of Emesa to Soem, the brother of the deceased king.⁴

In the mean time, when Felix arrived in Judea, the country was full of robbers, magicians, false prophets, false Messiahs, and impostors, who deluded the people by promises of great events. The words of Josephus are: *ληστυγίων γὰρ ἡ χώρα πάλιν ἀνεπλήθη καὶ γοήτων ἀνθρώπων, οἱ τὸν ὄχλον ἠπάτων.* Felix took a number of the robbers prisoners, and crucified them. He invited Eleazar, the son of Dineus, who had infested the country with his banditti for twenty years, to visit him, under a solemn promise of security; but as soon as he arrived, Felix put him in chains and sent him to Rome.⁵

Scarcely had the robbers been in some degree suppressed, before a new set of assassins arose, who were called *Sicarii*, from the short dagger (*sica*) which they used, and soon became more numerous than the robbers had been. They committed numerous murders and escaped detection; for they carried their daggers concealed under their garments, and mingling in a crowd, they would despatch their victim, and immediately conceal themselves among the multitude. In this manner, they not only murdered their own enemies, but, for pay, performed the same service for others who chose to employ them. The high priest Jonathan fell by their hands. He had solicited the emperor to give Felix the procuratorship of Judea, and was now continually obtruding his friendly advice upon the procurator, in regard to the administration of the government. But Felix, who, as Tacitus says: "per omnem saevitiam ac libidinem jus regium servili ingenio exercuit," at length became weary of his admonitions, and bribed Doras, the most intimate friend of Jonathan, to hire the *Sicarii* to silence this well meaning but troublesome monitor; and the high priest was accordingly assassinated. As the murderers of Jonathan were not punished, the *Sicarii* became still more daring, and perpetrated their crimes not only in the country, but even in the midst of Jerusalem, especially at the great festivals. They committed their murders in the temple itself, where they could easily conceal themselves in the crowd. Respecting this state of things Josephus observes: "this seems to me to have been the reason why God, out of his hatred of the wickedness of these men, rejected our city; and as for the temple, he no longer esteemed it sufficiently pure for him to inhabit therein, but brought the Romans upon us, and threw a fire upon the city to purify it, and brought upon us, our wives, and children, slavery, as desirous to make us wiser by our calamities."⁶

Besides the Sicarii, the robbers again recovered their strength ; and many false prophets and Messiahs, jugglers and impostors, (*γῶντες καὶ ἀπατεῶνες,*) made their appearance, and persuaded the people to follow them into the wilderness, where they promised to shew signs and perform miracles. Many followed them, but they were brought back by the soldiers of Felix and executed. Among these impostors, an Egyptian Jew is principally notorious, who came to Jerusalem, claimed the character of a prophet, and persuaded about thirty thousand men to follow him to the mount of Olives ; promising his followers that the walls of Jerusalem should fall down at his command, when they might easily expel the Roman garrison and regain their freedom. Felix fell upon the deluded multitude with his infantry and cavalry, put about four hundred to the sword and made two thousand prisoners. The impostor however saved himself by flight. The robbers were not restrained by these measures from exciting the people to rebellion. They maintained that it was not lawful to obey the Romans, and wherever their seditious proposals were not listened to, they laid every thing waste with fire and sword.⁷

About this time, the Jews of Caesarea contended that the Syrian inhabitants of the city had not equal rights of citizenship with themselves, because the city was built by their king Herod ; while the Syrians alleged, on the other hand, that the city had existed long before the time of Herod, under the name of Strato's Tower, and had then no Jewish inhabitants. From arguments and reproaches they proceeded to assail each other with stones, by which many were wounded on both sides, but the Jews finally proved the stronger party. Felix, after many abortive attempts to quiet the Jews by expostulations, at length sent a body of soldiers against them, who slew several, made many prisoners, and plundered some of their houses. The Jewish noblemen at length prevailed on Felix to put a stop to the violence of the soldiers, and allow both parties to send a deputation to the emperor.⁸

Thus the spirit of disorder and rebellion was continually spreading, and it finally took hold on the chief men of the nation, who ought to have exerted themselves to appease the disquiets of a fickle populace. When Agrippa, in the year 60 A. C. gave the high priesthood to Ismael, the son of Phabus, the chief priests began to encroach on the rights of the lower priests and to quarrel

with the most considerable men among the people. They sent their servants to the threshing-floors and took away by force the tithes which belonged to the common priests. The principal men of the nation gained adherents among the populace, and then the two factions often proceeded from reproachful language to attack each other with stones; for there was no authority in the city to put a stop to the violence of the powerful men, and the common priests, from want of subsistence, were compelled to resist the encroachments of their superiours.⁹

¹ Suetonius, Claudius XXV. Tacitus, Annal. XII. 54. Josephus, Antiq. XX. 8: 5—9. Compare Walch de Felice Judaeae Procuratore, 1747. ² Acts 24: 24. Josephus, Antiq. XX. 7: 1—3. 8: 1—4. Jewish War, II. 12: 8. ³ Suetonius, Claudius XXXV. Compare Acts 18: 2. Dion Cassius, LX. ⁴ Josephus, Antiq. XX. 8: 4. Jewish War, II. 13: 2. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. XX. 8: 5. Jewish War, II. 13: 2. Compare Matth. 24: 11, 23—27. ⁶ Tacitus, Hist. V. 9. Josephus, Antiq. XX. 8: 5. Jewish War, II. 13: 3. Comp. Acts 23: 12—35. ⁷ Josephus, Antiq. XX. 8: 6. Jewish War, II. 13: 4—6. Compare Matth. 24: 11, 23—27. Acts 21: 38. ⁸ Josephus, Antiq. XX. 8: 7. Jewish War, II. 13: 7. ⁹ Josephus, Antiq. XX. 8: 8.

Note. 'The author of an article in Eichhorn's Allgem. Bibliothek der bibl. Litteratur, Band III. Stück 4. S. 680, respecting the passage in Matth. 24: 21, 23—27, maintains that there was no impostor or false Messiah excepting the Egyptian who has been mentioned in the preceding section. But what ground is there for such an assumption? Josephus, in many passages of his Antiquities and of his History of the Jewish War, speaks of the false prophets and impostors, who pretended to the power of working miracles. Compare Antiq. XX. 5: 1. 8: 5, 6, 10. Jewish War, II. 13: 4—6. VI. 5: 2. As to the earthquakes mentioned in Matth. 24: 11, 23—27, which were, in those times, generally regarded as omens of fearful import, there was one in Asia Minor in the year 60 A. C. which destroyed a great number of cities, as Phlegon, (de Mirabil. Cap. 12,) proves by a quotation from the grammarian Apollonius; and another in Campania in the year 63 A. C. But perhaps these may not have been meant in the passage referred to. In the history of these times we indeed find no mention made of an earthquake in Palestine; but it does not thence follow that there was none; for earthquakes and plagues, especially in a country like Palestine, which is frequently subject to these calamities, seldom find a place in history.

CXXXI. FESTUS PROCURATOR OF JUDEA 60—63 A. C.

In the year 60, or, according to Silberschlag, 57 A. C. Porcius Festus came to Judea as procurator; and Felix was accused at Rome by the Jews of Caesarea. He would have been condemned and punished, had not his brother Pallas, who possessed great influence with the emperor, interceded in his behalf. At the same time, two Syrian Caesareans, by the aid of Burrhus, the Greek secretary of Nero, whom they had bribed for that purpose, obtained an imperial edict, which deprived the Jews of Caesarea of the first rank as citizens. This measure exasperated the Jews, and blew up to a flame the glimmering fire of rebellion, as we shall see in the sequel.¹

Festus found Judea full of robbers who devastated the country with fire and sword; and the Sicarii in particular were very numerous and daring. Against a celebrated *γοήτης*, juggler, impostor, or false Messiah, who promised a deliverance from all calamities to those who would follow him into the wilderness, Festus sent out a body of horse and foot, who slew the impostor and his deluded followers.²

At this time, Agrippa gave occasion to a great excitement at Jerusalem, by building in the palace of Herod, near the gymnasium, a high apartment, which afforded a fine view of the city, and from which he could see all that was done in the temple. This gave great offence to the citizens of Jerusalem, and they accordingly built a high wall on the western side of the temple, which entirely intercepted a view of the interior from the apartment of Agrippa, and also from the western portico of the temple. Both Festus and Agrippa in vain gave orders for the demolition of the wall; the chief citizens of Jerusalem, instead of obeying their orders, earnestly begged permission to send a deputation to Nero, respecting the whole affair. This was finally granted them; and Nero, at the instance of his wife Poppaea, who, as Josephus says, was *θεοσεβής*, (that is, probably, a secret proselyte to the Jewish religion,) allowed the wall to stand; but he retained Helkias, the high priest Ismael, and the ten deputies, as hostages. Upon this Agrippa gave the high priesthood to Joseph Cabi, the son of Simon.³

¹ Acts 24: 26, 27. Josephus, Antiq. XX. 8: 9. ² Compare Matth. 24: 11, 23—27. ³ Josephus, Antiq. XX. 8: 11. Jewish War, II. 4: 1.

CXXXII. ALBINUS PROCURATOR OF JUDEA 64 A. C.

As Festus died in Judea about the year 63 A. C. Nero appointed Albinus his successor. At the same time, Agrippa gave the high priesthood to Ananus, whose father Ananus was esteemed a very fortunate man, because he had been high priest himself, and had five sons, who had all held the same office. The new high priest was a strenuous and harsh Sadducee, and, like all the Sadducees, very severe in his punishments. Respecting the first part of his administration, Josephus has the following words: "*Ἄτε δὴ οὖν τοιοῦτος ὦν ὁ Ἀνάνος, νομίσις ἔχειν καιρὸν ἐπεστήδειον, διὰ τὸ τεθνήσκειν τὸν Φῆστον, Ἀλβίνον δὲ εἶμι κατὰ τὴν ὁδὸν ὑπάρχειν, καθίξει συνέδριον κριτῶν καὶ παραγαγὼν εἰς αὐτὸ τὸν ἀδελφὸν Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λεγομένου Χριστοῦ, Ἰάκωβος αὐτῷ ὄνομα, καὶ τινὰς ἑτέροισ' ὡς παρονομησάντων κατηγορίαν ποιησόμενος, παρέδωκε λευθισομένους.*" Since therefore Ananus was of such a disposition, he thought that he now had a convenient opportunity for the exercise of his authority; for Festus was now dead and Albinus was yet on the road. Accordingly, he assembled the sanhedrim of judges, and brought before them the brother of Jesus who was called Christ, whose name was James, and some others; and when he had made an accusation against them as transgressors of the law, he delivered them to be stoned." Josephus adds, that the better part of the citizens and the most conscientious observers of the law disapproved of this measure, and privately sent a message to Agrippa, requesting him to write to Ananus and prohibit his proceeding in that arbitrary manner, as his official conduct had already been totally unjustifiable. Others went to meet Albinus, who had arrived at Alexandria, and informed him that it was unlawful for the high priest to hold a criminal court without his consent. Albinus then wrote an angry letter to Ananus, threatening him with punishment; and Agrippa deposed him from the high priesthood in three months after his elevation to that office, and appointed Jesus, the son of Damneus, to succeed him.¹

Albinus was a bad man; and though he exerted himself to seize the robbers, he immediately released those from whom he could obtain money, and punished such only, as were unable to gratify his avaricious disposition. The rich secured the favour of the procurator by presents, and the turbulent among the people

attached themselves to some one who was rich enough to protect them. The deposed high priest Ananus, who was the richest man in the nation, and had purchased the favour of Albinus, not only continued to take away the tithes of the priests from the threshing-floors by means of his slaves, and even to beat those who resisted, but he procured from Albinus the release of those robbers and Sicarii who had been taken by him, in order to regain possession of his own slaves, whom the robbers had seized. Accordingly, whenever any of the robbers fell into the hands of Albinus, their comrades always knew how to obtain their release by seizing some of the slaves of Ananus; and as they were thus secure from punishment, they became more numerous and daring. Even the procurator himself did not hesitate to promote theft and rapine, when it contributed to his own interest; and he might have been regarded, without impropriety, as the head of all the robbers in the country.³

Notwithstanding these disorders, Agrippa had at this time adorned Caesarea Philippi, which was formerly called Paneas, with many splendid buildings, and named the city Neronias, in honour of the emperour. At Berytus he had not only built a theatre and established annual games which cost him immense sums of money, but he distributed wheat and oil among the inhabitants and ornamented their city with statues and paintings, which were finished on the model of the ancient masterpieces in the arts. Though the Jews could not regard these proceedings without disapprobation, they had no particular influence on their dissensions. After the high priesthood had been transferred from Jesus, the son of Damneus, to Jesus, the son of Gamaliel, quarrels were continually occurring between the adherents of the two priests; and the opposing factions often assailed each other with reproaches, and sometimes came to blows. But all this was trifling in comparison with the conduct of Ananus. His riches enabled him to surpass all his contemporaries in violence and rapine; and his party, which he was continually increasing by his presents, was superiour to all the others. Costobarus and Saul, the relatives of Agrippa, emulated the deeds of Ananus; and though they could not equal them, they were violent and oppressive, and always ready to plunder the weak.³

This state of disorder was constantly growing worse, when Al-

binus, just before his departure for Rome, executed some of the most infamous of the transgressors ; but the others, for whose release he received money, he set free from their prisons at once, and they again joined themselves to the bands of robbers and Sicarii.⁴

During these disturbances, the class of singers among the Levites begged permission of king Agrippa to wear linen robes, which the law allowed only to priests. Their request was granted ; and then another class of Levites, who were employed in the lower services of the temple, petitioned to be admitted into the class of singers and wear the sacerdotal robes, and their wishes were complied with.⁵

About this time, 64 A. C. all the apartments of the Herodian temple were completed ; and as there were now about eighteen thousand labourers to be dismissed without any means of earning their bread, it was proposed to Agrippa to commence a repair of the eastern gate and cloisters of the temple, in order to find employment for this multitude of workmen. But the difficulties in the way of this undertaking were found to be insurmountable, and Agrippa employed the labourers to pave the streets of the city with white stone. He then raised Matthias, the son of Theophilus, to the high priesthood, in the place of Jesus, the son of Gamaliel.⁶

¹ Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. 9: 1, 2. ² Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. 9: 2, 3. *Jewish War.* II. 14: 1. ³ Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. 9: 5. ⁴ Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. 9: 5. ⁵ Josephus, *Antiq.* XX. 9: 6. ⁶ Compare *John* 2: 20. *Josephus*, *Antiq.* XX. 9: 7.

CXXXIII. FLORUS PROCURATOR OF JUDEA 65—66 A. C.

Gessius Florus, who was appointed procurator of Judea in the year 65 A. C. was worse than any of his predecessors ; and his wife Cleopatra, a friend of Poppaea, the wife of Nero, was no better than her husband. Even the infamous Albinus was praised as a good man in comparison with his successor ; for Florus was not only tyrannical, cruel, and avaricious, but his avarice was utterly insatiable. He readily afforded protection to all robbers, who would divide their spoil with him ; and nothing was wanting but an official proclamation, giving permission for all to rob, who were willing to bring a share of the plunder to the procurator. Under such protection the robbers became more numerous and daring than ever ; and many Jews emigrated to foreign countries, as they

were no longer able to endure the miseries which they were compelled to suffer at home. In short, the administration of Florus was such, that the Jews might justly complain that they were forced to revolt. "Duravit tamen (says Tacitus) patientia Judaeis, usque ad Gessium Florum procuratorem; sub eo bellum ortum."¹

When Cestius Gallus, the prefect of Syria, came to Jerusalem at the feast of the passover, in order to ascertain the number of the Jews, he ordered the paschal lambs to be counted, and found that they amounted to two hundred and fifty six thousand; though Josephus supposes that there were probably three hundred thousand paschal lambs, and consequently, three millions of Jews at that time in the city. This discovery could not have been pleasing to Florus, for they were all very much irritated against him; so much so, that, when Cestius was at Jerusalem, he was surrounded by more than thirty thousand Jews who entreated him, while Florus stood laughing at his side, to have mercy on their country. Cestius promised to recommend more mildness to Florus in the administration of his government; but as soon as he had departed for Syria, Florus pursued his plan of leading the Jews into greater crimes than those which he committed himself, that they might not be able to accuse him before the emperor.²

In the year 65 A. C. Rome was burnt. Nero was universally regarded as the author of this calamity; but he threw the guilt of it on the Christians, and ordered great numbers of them to be tortured and put to death. Tacitus, in his account of this transaction, calls the Christian religion *exitialis superstitio*, and represents the Christians as *in odio humani generis convicti*. From these expressions we may judge how a religion, which teaches men to worship the true God in a rational manner, was regarded in those times by the pagans, and even by a Tacitus.³

Josephus, Antiq. XX. 9: 9. Jewish War, II. 14: 2. Tacitus, Hist. V. 10.
² Josephus, Antiq. XX. 10. Jewish War, II. 14: 3. ³ Tacitus, Annal. XV. 44.

CHAPTER FIFTEENTH.

THE JEWISH WAR.

CXXXIV. BEGINNING OF THE JEWISH WAR 66 A. C.

IN the year 66 A. C. the twelfth year of the reign of Nero, and the second of the procuratorship of Florus, the imperial edict already mentioned, was received at Caesarea, by which the Syrian and Greek inhabitants of that city were raised above the Jews and became entitled to the first rank as citizens. Soon after, a Caesarean Greek, who owned a piece of land directly in front of the Jewish synagogue, began to erect a building upon it, which left the Jews a very narrow passage to their place of worship. The young Jews at first molested the workmen; but after Florus had taken measures to prevent their interference, John, a publican, with many other Jews of the first rank, went to the procurator and gave him eight talents to prohibit the further progress of the work. This Florus promised to do, but he soon after went to Sebaste or Samaria without having performed his promise; and it was thus made to appear as though he had sold the Jews permission to vindicate their rights by arms. They however remained quiet.¹

But on the next day, which was the Sabbath, a certain Caesarean, to insult the Jews, turned over an earthen vessel near the entrance of the synagogue, and began to sacrifice birds on the bottom of it. The Jews were very much irritated by this outrage on their sacred rites, and the more moderate among them thought of applying to the magistrates for protection; but the enraged multitude prepared themselves to fight, and they were soon met by a number of Greeks and Syrians, who had instigated the Caesarean to make the offensive offerings. Jucundus, the Roman master of horse, hastened to quell the tumult; but he was repelled by the superiour numbers of Caesareans. The Jews then took their sacred books from the synagogue and carried them to Nabata, about sixty stadia from

Caesarea. In the mean time, the publican John, with twelve other distinguished Jews, went to Sebaste to lay their grievances before the procurator: but, as soon as they arrived, Florus put them all in prison, because they had removed their sacred books from Caesarea.²

This arbitrary measure of the procurator caused great excitement at Jerusalem, but there was yet no appearance of sedition. Florus, therefore, in order to exasperate the feelings of the people, and, if possible, to provoke them to rebellion, sent to Jerusalem and demanded seventeen talents from the sacred treasury for the use of the emperor. This had the designed effect; a tumult was excited, and reproaches and insults were openly cast upon the procurator. Florus now approached the city in person, with a body of horse and foot, to enforce his demand. The people went out to meet him with the intention of paying him every mark of respect and saluting him with the customary shout of joy; but he, instead of receiving their homage, ordered his cavalry to drive them back into the city. The next day, he demanded from his throne the surrender of those who had joined in the reproaches which had been cast upon him. He would listen to no apology, or palliation, or petition for pardon, but, in his rage, ordered his soldiers to plunder the upper market; and they, not satisfied with this, proceeded to pillage several private houses and massacre the inhabitants. Many of the most peaceable citizens, and, among the rest, some publicans who held the rank of Roman knights, were dragged before Florus, and, by his orders, were scourged and crucified. Nearly thirty six hundred Jews lost their lives in this disturbance. King Agrippa was then at Alexandria; but his wife Berenice, who was at Jerusalem, was exposed to great danger from the fury of the Roman soldiers.³

The next day, the chief priests and principal citizens, dressed in mourning, made every exertion to silence the lamentations of the people over those who had been murdered, lest Florus should be still more enraged by these demonstrations of grief. But Florus was determined on inflaming their discontents. He accordingly called the principal citizens before him, and demanded that the people, as a proof of their return to obedience, should go out and meet with a shout of joy the two cohorts which were advancing from Caesarea. The priests and noblemen were obliged to resort to the most humiliating entreaties, before they could persuade the

people to take this step ; and when they at last consented to go, they were received with insult ; for Florus had sent orders to the soldiers not to answer the shout of the Jews, and, if they manifested any dissatisfaction at this neglect, to fall upon them sword in hand. The result was such as the procurator desired ; many of the Jews were wounded and slain, or crushed to death in the crowd, and the remainder driven back to the city. The next day, Florus attempted to press in to the temple with his soldiers ; but the people resisted by arms, and fought so bravely, that the Romans were compelled to retire into the royal castle. The Jews then demolished the covered way which led from the castle of Antonia to the temple, the more effectually to secure their sanctuary from the approach of the Romans. After Florus supposed that he had sufficiently kindled the fires of rebellion by these abuses, he returned to Caesarea, and left only one cohort in Jerusalem.⁴

Florus immediately sent notice of these occurrences to Cestius Gallus ; but the principal Jews and the queen Berenice, at the same time, informed Cestius of the unreasonable and cruel conduct of the procurator. Cestius put his army in motion, but he sent his friend Neapolitanus before him, to learn the disposition of the Jews and to obtain more accurate intelligence. At Jamnia Neapolitanus met Agrippa, who had returned from Egypt, and made known to him the object of his mission. The chief priests and noblemen of the Jews had assembled to pay their respects to the king, and they complained to him of the inhumanity of Florus. Agrippa reproved them for their seditious conduct, though he was in reality highly irritated against Florus. Agrippa and Neapolitanus were received at Jerusalem with every mark of respect. The people, who met them without the walls of the city with the customary salutation, called on Agrippa for aid, represented their unhappy condition to Neapolitanus, and showed him the ruins which had been made in their capital. When Neapolitanus perceived that the Jews had no hostile feelings against the Romans, but only against Florus, he collected them in the temple, exhorted them to peace, and then returned to Cestius. The people were entirely pacified and persuaded to remain subject to the Romans, by a speech which Agrippa addressed to them in the gymnasium. They willingly paid the arrears of their tribute, and rebuilt the portico between the temple and the castle of Antonia. But when Agrippa afterwards ventured

to advise them to remain obedient to Florus till another procurator could be sent to Judea, they insulted him, attacked him with stones, and drove him out of the city.⁵

In the mean time, a company of rebels pressed into Masada, put the Roman garrison to the sword, and took possession of the fortress. At Jerusalem, Eleazar, the president of the temple, a son of the high priest Ananus, persuaded the priests, contrary to the law of Moses, to reject all the offerings which were presented by pagans; and consequently, the sacrifices for the emperor were from that time discontinued. The chief priests and noblemen, who had in vain attempted to prevent this rash determination, now sent Simon, the son of Ananus, with other deputies, to Florus, and Saul Antipas and Costobarus and some others to Agrippa, to obtain a body of soldiers, who might check the insolence of the seditious party. Florus, who was rejoiced at the appearance of revolt, made no answer to their request. But Agrippa sent them a body of three thousand horse, consisting of Auranites, Bataneans, and Trachonites. With this force the obedient party took possession of the upper city; while the temple and lower city remained in the power of the revolters. There were many obstinate skirmishes between the adherents of the two factions. Seven days after, at the feast of Xylophory, when they collected wood for the altar, the seditious refused to admit those of the opposite party into the temple. They even broke into the upper city, supported by great numbers of the Sicarii, and set fire to the palace of king Agrippa and the public offices, in order to destroy the bonds which were deposited there, and thus to gain the favour of those who were in debt.⁶

The next day, the fifth of July, they attacked the castle of Antonia, which they took in two days, and put the Roman garrison to the sword. They then commenced an attack on the castle of Herod, in which several Jews of high rank had taken refuge, who now defended themselves with great bravery. In the mean time, Menahem, a son of the notorious Judas of Galilee, went to Masada, attended by a few followers, broke open the armory, and thus provided arms for a number of robbers and others, who attended him. He then returned to Jerusalem with his party, assumed the regal title, and took the direction of the siege of the royal castle. One of the towers was thrown down by means of a mine, but the besieged had erected a second wall within, which protected them

from the assaults of their enemies. This new obstacle damped the courage of the besiegers ; and when the besieged requested permission to depart, it was readily granted to all except the Romans. After the Jews had withdrawn, the Romans fled to the towers of the castle ; but many of them were overtaken and slain in their flight, and the towers were closely besieged.⁷

The next day, the high priest Ananus was found concealed in an aqueduct of the royal palace, and was put to death by the robbers. His brother Hezekiah also shared the same fate. Soon after, the usurping king Menahem, who was extremely arbitrary and cruel, was slain in the temple, together with most of his adherents, by his opponent Eleazar. A few of his party, however, escaped to Masada ; among whom was Eleazar, the son of Jair, a relative of Menahem's, who then assumed the command of that fortress.⁸

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, II. 14. 4. ² Josephus, Jewish War, II. 14: 5.
³ Josephus, Jewish War, II. 14: 6—9. 15: 1. ⁴ Josephus, Jewish War, II.
 15: 2—6. ⁵ Josephus, Jewish War, II. 16: 1—5. 17: 1. ⁶ Josephus,
 Jewish War, II. 17: 2—6. ⁷ Josephus, Jewish War, II. 17: 7—9. ⁸ Josephus,
 Jewish War, II. 17: 9.

Note. During the year 66 A. C. there was a pestilence in Italy, which is mentioned by Tacitus, *Annal.* XVI. 13. It was undoubtedly carried thither from Africa or the East. Compare *Matth.* 24: 7.

CXXXV. GENERAL REVOLT OF THE JEWS 66 A. C.

The people now hoped that the revolt would proceed no further ; but the seditious party still kept the Roman soldiers closely besieged in the royal castle, till at length, Metilius, the Roman commander, solicited permission for the garrison to depart. The besiegers granted the request, and promised on oath to let them pass undisturbed ; but as soon as the Romans had laid down their arms, the Jews treacherously massacred them all except Metilius, who saved his life by promising to be circumcised and adopt the Jewish religion. This perfidious transaction took place on the Sabbath. On the same day, almost all the Jews of Caesarea were massacred ; and those who remained and were unable to escape from the city, were taken by Florus and sent to the galleys. The Jews were all

highly exasperated by this massacre ; they collected in great numbers, and plundered and devastated the villages and cities of the Syrians. Philadelphia, Sebonitis, Gerasa, Pella, and Scythopolis suffered the most severely ; Gadara, Hippo, Gaulanitis, Kedasa of the Tyrians, Ptolemais, Gaba, and Caesarea were attacked ; Sebaste, Askelon, Anthedon, and Gaza were burnt.¹

On this account, the Syrians fell upon the Jews who dwelt in their cities ; and the whole country presented a scene of confusion and blood. In every city there were two hostile armies ; and there was no safety for any one, but in the strength of the party to which he belonged. At Askelon, Ptolemais, Tyre, Hippo, and Gadara, the Jews were involved in one general massacre ; but at Zidon, Apamea, and Antioch, they were spared by the compassion of their fellow citizens. Even in the kingdom of Agrippa, there was a secret conspiracy against the Jews ; and while the king was absent at Antioch, the regent Noarus put to death seventy Jewish noblemen, who had requested a guard of soldiers for their security. Wherever the Jews had been slain, the people stood in fear of the Jewish proselytes, whom they did not yet presume to attack. In the mean time, the revolters cut to pieces the Roman garrison of Cypros near Jericho ; and the Roman soldiers who were stationed at Macherus, voluntarily withdrew from that fortress. These are the wars to which our Saviour has principal reference in Matth. 24: 6.²

During these massacres in Syria, the Jews of Alexandria, who had all the rights of citizenship, were attacked as enemies ; and those who could not save themselves by flight, were put to the sword. Only three were taken alive ; and they were dragged through the city as malefactors condemned to the flames. The indignation of the Jews was aroused by this spectacle ; they furiously attacked the Macedonian citizens with stones, and rushed to the amphitheatre with lighted torches in their hands, in order to set it on fire and burn all the people who were there assembled. The prefect Tiberius Alexander, finding that milder measures were of no avail, sent out a body of seventeen thousand soldiers, who slew about fifty thousand Jews, and plundered and burnt their dwellings.³

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, II. 17: 10. 18: 1. ² Josephus, Jewish War, II. 18: 2—6. ³ Josephus, Jewish War, II. 18: 7, 8. Compare Matth. 24:6, 7.

CXXXVI. CAMPAIGN OF CESTIUS 66 A. C.

In order to quell the bloody commotions in Palestine, Cestius now marched to Ptolemais, with one legion of Roman soldiers and some auxiliaries from the neighbouring kings, attended by Agrippa. Then he proceeded to the borders of Galilee, where he burnt the city of Zabulon, and gave up the surrounding villages to plunder. But as the Syrians, especially those of Berytus, continued their depredations after the departure of Cestius; the Jews in that quarter again took arms, and slew about two thousand of their enemies. In the mean time, Cestius marched to Caesarea, whence he sent out a division of his army, which took Joppa, burnt the city, and put eight thousand and four hundred Jews to the sword. Another division, at the same time, marched to Narbatene, a place near Caesarea, which they pillaged and laid waste, putting the inhabitants to the sword. A third division, under the command of Gallus, was sent to Galilee. - Sepphoris, the strongest city of that district, gladly opened her gates to the Romans, and the other cities remained quiet. The revolted and robbers then fled to mount Asamon in the interior of Galilee; but they were pursued by Gallus, and more than two thousand of them put to death, so that only a few, who were able to conceal themselves, escaped the Roman sword.¹

As quiet appeared now to be restored in Galilee, Cestius recalled Gallus to Caesarea. He returned to Antipatris towards the close of October in the year 66 A. C. and expelled the Jews from the tower of Apeka. At Lydda, while most of the inhabitants were gone to Jerusalem to celebrate the feast of tabernacles, he slew about fifty Jews whom he found there, and set the city on fire. Then passing through Beth-horon, he encamped at Gabao, about fifty stadia from Jerusalem.²

When the Jews, who were assembled at Jerusalem at the feast, heard of the approach of the hostile army, they seized their weapons, and, confiding in their numbers, rushed out without order on the Sabbath; and, with a tumultuous shout, commenced so furious an attack on their enemies, that they forced them to give way, and slew five hundred and fifteen men, while they lost only twenty two of their own party. While the Romans were retreating towards Beth-horon, they were attacked in the rear by Simon, the son of Giora, and suffered considerable loss.³

Agrippa then sent Borceus and Phebus to the Jews, to exhort them to lay down their arms and to promise them forgiveness ; but the rebels fell upon the messengers, killed Phebus and wounded Borceus, who, however, effected his escape. The people in general strongly disapproved of this outrage, which had been committed by their seditious countrymen, and the city was divided into two parties. Cestius now returned to Scopus, seven stadia from Jerusalem, and waited in vain three days for proposals of peace. On the fourth day, the thirtieth of the month Hyperbereteus or Tishri, (October,) he penetrated into the two northern quarters of the city, Bezetha and Cainopolis, drove the rebels into the inner city and the temple, and burnt the timber market. He then advanced against the upper city, and encamped opposite the royal palace. Had he now immediately stormed the walls, he might have taken the whole city in a short time and put an end to the war ; but Tyrannius Priscus and other officers bribed by Florus, who wished to prolong the war, withheld him from the execution of this design. The peaceable citizens, at the instance of Ananus, the son of Jonathan, then invited Cestius into the city and promised to open the gates ; but the Roman general, distrusting their sincerity, hesitated so long, that the design was discovered, and Ananus, as the author of it, was thrown over the walls by the rebels. The Romans now for five days put forth the most strenuous efforts to gain possession of the walls ; and, on the sixth day, a chosen band attacked the temple on the north side ; but all their exertions were unsuccessful.⁴

The next step of the Romans was to form a testudo, under cover of which they undermined the walls and approached the gates to set them on fire. Then many of the rebels, seized with panic, fled from the city ; and the people opened the gates to Cestius, whom they received with joy, as their deliverer from their seditious fellow citizens. But the Roman general, not knowing the terrour of the rebels nor the friendly disposition of the people, very unexpectedly withdrew from the city ; when the robbers, whose drooping courage was revived by his retreat, pressed on him with so much vigour, that he suffered considerable loss and was scarcely able to reach his intrenchments at Scopus late in the evening. The next day, he was pursued with the same fury, and it was with great difficulty that he forced his way to Gabao.⁵

Cestius spent two days at Gabao before he could determine

what measures to take ; and thus gave the rebels time to collect their forces. He finally gave orders to kill all the beasts of burden which were not necessary to carry the arms and military machines, to burn all the unnecessary baggage, and to retreat towards Beth-horon. But the rebels waylaid him in the narrow defiles, attacked him in front and rear, and destroyed great numbers of his harassed and wearied troops before they could reach the place of their destination.⁶

From Beth-horon Cestius fled with his army by night, leaving only four hundred men to guard the camp, who were cut to pieces by the Jews early the next morning. Cestius, in the mean time, had gained a march of thirty stadia ; but when the day dawned, he left his military machines, and fled with still greater haste to Antipatris. The Jews collected the machines for future use against the Romans, and then plundered the dead bodies of their enemies, which amounted to five thousand and three hundred foot and three hundred and eighty horse.⁷

The more prudent citizens now left Jerusalem, and this is the time referred to in Matth. 24: 15—20. Philip, and the brothers Costobarus and Saul, who were of royal blood, fled to Cestius and obtained his permission to go to Achaia, where Nero then was, to give information of the state of affairs in Judea and to assign the conduct of Florus as the true cause of their troubles.⁸

When the citizens of Damascus heard of the unsuccessful campaign of the Romans, they determined to destroy the Jews of their city ; but they were restrained by fear of their wives, who were almost all favourable to the Jewish religion. They therefore kept their design secret, and having collected the Jews in the gymnasium, murdered ten thousand of them, while they were unarmed and defenceless.⁹

Josephus, Jewish War, II. 18: 9—11.

² Jewish War, II. 19: 1.

³ Jewish War, II. 19: 2.

⁴ Jewish War, II. 19: 3—5.

⁵ Jewish War,

II. 19: 6, 7.

⁶ Jewish War, II. 19: 8.

⁷ Jewish War, II. 19: 9. Tacitus,

Hist. V. 19.

⁸ Jewish War, II. 20: 1.

⁹ Jewish War, II. 20: 2.

CXXXVII. PREPARATIONS FOR WAR 66—67 A. C.

The revolters, on their return to Jerusalem from the pursuit of Cestius, persuaded or compelled the peaceable citizens to join in

their rebellion, and appointed civil and military officers for their government. The government of the city was committed to the high priest Ananus and to Joseph, the son of Gorion. No public office was given to Eleazar, the son of Simon, who had seized most of the booty which was taken from Cestius and had enriched himself from the public treasury, on account of his arbitrary disposition ; but, by his professions, promises, and gifts, he acquired unbounded influence over the people.¹

The military command in Idumea was given to Jesus, the son of Sapphias, a high priest, and to Simon, the son of the high priest Ananias ; and Niger, the governour of that district, was directed to obey their orders. The same office was given to Joseph, the son of Simon, in Jericho ; to Manasseh in Perea ; to John the Essene in Thamna, Lydda, Joppa, and Emmaus ; to John, the son of Ananus, in Gophnitis and Acrabatene ; and to Flavius Josephus, the historian, the son of Matthias, in Galilee and Gamala.²

These generals now endeavoured to put their respective districts in a state of defence. In Galilee Josephus appointed a supreme council of seventy members for the management of the more important civil affairs, and in every city, a council of seven judges to decide the less important legal controversies. In Lower Galilee he fortified Jotapata, Barsabe, Salamis, Capharecco, Japha, Sigoe, mount Tabor, Tarichaea, Tiberias, and the caves about lake Gennesareth ; in Uppér Galilee, the rock of the Achabari, Seph, Jamneh, and Meroth ; and in Gaulanitis, Seleucia, Sogane, and Gamala. He collected an army of more than one hundred thousand men, and armed them with such old weapons as he was able to procure. He divided the soldiers in the Roman manner, appointed officers, and exercised his troops in the use of their arms. His infantry amounted to sixty thousand, probably exclusive of the garrisons ; but his cavalry consisted of only two hundred and fifty effective men. He had, besides, four thousand five hundred mercenary troops and six hundred men for his lifeguard. Notwithstanding all these precautions, he was involved in imminent perils by the machinations of John the Gischalite, a very crafty robber, from which he could not extricate himself without great difficulty ; and besides the many open revolts which he had to quell, his life was often in danger from the perfidy of his own soldiers.³

When the high priest Ananus saw that all attempts to restore

peace were in vain, he put the wall of Jerusalem in a state of defence, provided armour and military machines, and exercised the youth in arms. He then sent an army against Simon, the son of Giora, who had collected a seditious mob in Acrabatene, by whose aid he was abusing the rich men, pillaging their houses, and endeavouring to make himself master of the country. Simon fled to the robbers of Masada, and excited disturbances in Idumea.⁴

When Nero heard of the disorders in Judea, he was highly exasperated against the prefect of Syria, by whose negligence they had been occasioned. He immediately sent Vespasian, who had just returned from his victories over the Germans and Britons, to Syria; and, at the same time, despatched his son Titus to Alexandria, to lead the fifth and tenth legions to the aid of his father in Palestine.⁵

The rebellious Jews, elated by their successes against Cestius, now ventured to attack the strong fortress of Ascalon, about fifty two English miles from Jerusalem, which was garrisoned by only one cohort and a squadron of cavalry. But the undisciplined multitude were repulsed with the loss of ten thousand men. A short time after, they proceeded again towards Ascalon in still greater numbers; but they fell into an ambush which Antonius, the commandant of the city, had laid for them, and lost eight thousand men. The remainder betook themselves to flight, and some sought refuge in the tower of Bezedel; but the Romans set the tower on fire, and all the Jews perished, excepting a few who crept into the deep subterranean vaults.⁶

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, II. 20: 3. ² Jewish War, II. 20: 4. ³ Jewish War, II. 20: 6—21: 10. ⁴ Jewish War, II. 22: 1, 2. ⁵ Jewish War, III. 1: 1—3. Compare Dion Cassius, LX. Tacitus, Hist. I. 10. ⁶ Jewish War, III. 2: 1—3.

CXXXVIII. VESPASIAN IN GALILEE AND SAMARIA 67 A. C.

In the mean time, Vespasian, attended by king Agrippa, led his army from Antioch to Ptolemais, where the inhabitants of Sepphoris, who had formerly received a garrison from Cestius, united with him against the other Jews, and obtained six thousand men to garrison their city, and one thousand cavalry who encamped without the walls and devastated the neighbouring places. Josephus made

an unsuccessful attempt against the fortifications of this city, which he had himself constructed; and the Romans afterwards spread their devastations still further.¹

After Vespasian had collected at Ptolemais the Roman troops and the auxiliaries of the kings Antiochus, Agrippa, Sohem, and Malchus the Arab, and had been joined by his son Titus with the soldiers from Alexandria, his army amounted to sixty thousand effective men. While these forces were gradually assembling, Placidus made short excursions to the adjacent places, slew many Jews, and drove the rest into the cities. The citizens of Jotapata marched out to meet him, and put him to flight.²

Upon this, Vespasian himself entered Galilee; when the appearance of his army struck the inhabitants with terror, and many fled, before any attempt had been made to resist the invaders. Josephus himself was forsaken by most of his soldiers near Garin, and was forced to retreat to Tiberias with the few who remained under his command. Gadara was taken on the first assault; and all the Jews of that region, without distinction of age or sex, were put to the sword, so that many villages were left entirely destitute of inhabitants. When Josephus arrived at Tiberias, the inhabitants were in consternation, for they saw that their general began to despair of success. Josephus sent an account of his situation to Jerusalem, and inquired whether he should surrender or expect a reinforcement.³

Vespasian then marched towards Jotapata, within whose walls many Jews had taken refuge; but Josephus, by a rapid march, reached the city first. The Romans encamped on a hill, seven stadia north of the city, whence they surrounded the walls and commenced the siege. Josephus and his garrison defended themselves with the greatest bravery, but, on the forty seventh day of the siege, the city was betrayed into the hands of the Romans. Forty thousand Jews had been slain during the siege, and, when the city was taken, twelve hundred were made prisoners. The city was burnt and entirely destroyed in the twelfth year of the reign of Nero, the first day of the month Panemus, that is, in July of the year 67, or, according to Silberschlag, 69 A. C.⁴

Josephus concealed himself with forty other Jews in a cavern; but they were betrayed by a woman who was taken prisoner. The Romans then entreated him to surrender, and promised to spare

his life ; but his companions would not suffer him to accept their offers. They finally agreed, at the suggestion of Josephus, to destroy one another by lot, and after they had all been slain excepting Josephus and one Jew, to whom the lot fell last, they both surrendered themselves into the hands of the Romans. Josephus was put in chains ; but afterwards, when he foretold that Vespasian would be raised to the imperial throne, he was treated with great respect, especially, after his prediction had been verified by the event.⁵

During the siege of Jotapata, Trajan gained the outer wall of Japha, a town in its immediate neighbourhood, and slew twelve thousand Jews ; and then Titus completed the conquest of the inner wall, when fifteen thousand more were slain and two thousand made prisoners, so that none were left but the women and children who were sold for slaves. The Samaritans, who had collected on mount Gerizim, were at this time surrounded by Celearis with one thousand foot and sixty horse ; when a part of them perished with thirst on the first day, and others went over to the Romans. Celearis then, on the twenty seventh day of the month Desius or June, ascended the mountain and put eleven thousand six hundred men to the sword.⁶

Four days after the conquest of Jotapata, Vespasian returned to Ptolemais, and then marched to Caesarea on the sea, one of the largest cities in Palestine. Here he left two legions in winter quarters, and sent two others to Scythopolis. He was soon after obliged to send a body of soldiers to Joppa, where a number of fugitives had rebuilt the ruins, and, as the surrounding country was desolated, supported themselves by piracy. The Romans entered the city by night without resistance, for the pirates had fled to their ships. But a storm which arose early the next morning, proved fatal to the Jews, and four thousand two hundred of their dead bodies were found on the shore. The new built city was destroyed, and the ruins were occupied by a garrison, which ravaged the neighbouring cities and villages.⁷

Vespasian then went to Caesarea Philippi in the kingdom of Agrippa, and was magnificently entertained with his soldiers for twenty days. On receiving intelligence of the disturbances in Tiberias, he marched to Scythopolis ; and his son Titus, at the same time, led the two legions from Caesarea on the sea to the great

city of Decapolis, which lay a little south of Tiberias. Thence he marched towards Tiberias, encamped at Senabris, thirty stadia from the city, and sent out Valerian Decurio with a body of fifty thousand cavalry to summon the city to surrender. But Jesus, the leader of the rebels, marched out and attacked Valerian without giving him time to execute his commission; while the principal citizens fled to Vespasian and entreated him to spare their city. Out of complaisance to Agrippa, Vespasian granted their request and marched to Tiberias, where he was received with acclamations of joy, while Jesus and his adherents fled to Tarichaea.⁸

They were immediately pursued by Vespasian, who stationed his soldiers in an intrenched camp between Tiberias and Tarichaea, because the strong fortifications of the latter city and its situation on the lake Gennesareth, where the rebels had a number of ships, gave him reason to expect a protracted siege. But after Titus had repelled a sally of the Jews, violent dissensions arose between the citizens and the rebels; and Titus pressed into the city with his cavalry through the sea of Tiberias. Jesus and his party then fled in great disorder; but, as Vespasian had surrounded the city in order to obstruct their flight, the Romans pressed so closely on the fugitives, particularly on those who fled towards the sea, that about six thousand Jews perished in the water or were slain by their pursuers. After this battle, although Titus had promised safety to all who would surrender, two thousand two hundred aged people and children, the relatives of the revolters, were massacred in the gymnasium, and six thousand able-bodied men were sent to Nero, to be employed in digging a canal across the Isthmus. The remaining thirty thousand four hundred, principally citizens of Trachonitis, Gaulanitis, Hippo, and Gadara, were sold into slavery; and the same fate was reserved for the prisoners whom Vespasian delivered to king Agrippa.⁹

After this, all Galilee surrendered excepting Gischala and mount Tabor. The city of Gamala in Gaulanitis, which was situated on the lake of Gennesareth near the frontiers of Agrippa's dominions, was still in rebellion; as were also Sogane and Seleucia, on the sea of Merom. The two latter cities, however, soon surrendered to Agrippa. But the citizens of Gamala relied on the inaccessible situation of their city, which was built on the summit of a high mountain in the form of a camel, and could be approached by only one

passage, which was intersected by a deep ditch. Vespasian now advanced against this city, after Agrippa had besieged it for seven months. He pitched his camp on the most accessible side, and made preparations for an assault, when Agrippa summoned the city to surrender, but was driven back, wounded by a slinger. The Romans soon made a breach in the walls and commenced their assault; but they met with so obstinate a resistance, that most of the assailants were slain. Vespasian himself, in the heat of the engagement, was surrounded by his enemies and escaped with great difficulty. This successful defence gave new courage to the Jews; but, as their provisions were now exhausted and some had already died of hunger, they were in great distress. Accordingly, while the Romans were making preparations for another assault, many made their escape from the city by clambering down the precipices or creeping through the common sewers.¹⁰

At last three soldiers undermined one of the towers by night without being observed, so that it fell. The next day, the twenty third of the month Hyperbereteus or Tishri, (October,) the Romans rushed into the city and the Jews fled before them into the citadel, which was situated so high that it placed them beyond the reach of the Roman arrows. But a violent storm, which blew in the faces of the Jews, soon came to the aid of the Romans, who now scaled the walls of the citadel and slew four thousand of their enemies; while five thousand destroyed themselves by leaping over the walls into the deep vale below. Two women only, who had concealed themselves during the assault, escaped with their lives; all the rest of the inhabitants, even the women and children, were cut to pieces or thrown over the rocks, and the city was destroyed.¹¹

During the siege of Gamala, Vespasian had sent Placidus with six hundred horse against mount Tabor, which Josephus had fortified in forty days. On the first summons of Placidus, many came down from the garrison with a secret intention of falling on the Romans by surprise; but Placidus, who could not ascend the mountain with his cavalry, was aware of their design and suffered them to advance unobstructed, in order to draw them into the plain. When the Jews commenced their attack, the Romans fled, for the purpose of drawing them still further from the mountain; and then, suddenly turning, they slew great numbers and cut off the retreat of the rest, so that they were obliged to flee towards Jerusalem.

Those who remained on the mountain, were soon after compelled to surrender for want of water.¹²

After the destruction of Gamala, Vespasian sent one legion to Scythopolis, and with two others, marched in person to Caesarea, in order to give his soldiers a little time for repose. At the same time, he sent his son Titus with one thousand cavalry against Gischala in Galilee, which still remained unsubdued. The citizens were disposed to peace; but the city was in the power of John, the son of Levi, a leader of a band of robbers. Titus might easily have taken the city by assault; but, in order to save the inhabitants, he opened a negotiation with John. The subtle robber alleged that that day was the Sabbath and ought to be kept sacred; but in the night, he fled with his own party and several other Jews, the weaker of whom, with the women and children, he forsook, after he had proceeded about twenty five stadia from the city. Titus took possession of the city, and sent, in pursuit of the fugitives, a party of horse, who slew about six thousand women and children and brought back three thousand; but John effected his escape to Jerusalem. Titus then ordered a part of the walls of Gischala to be thrown down, and left a garrison in the place, but was very lenient in his punishment of the citizens. All Galilee was now subjected to the Roman power.¹³

Titus now went from Gischala to Caesarea; where Vespasian, who meanwhile had conquered Jamnia and Azotus, arrived at the same time, with a great multitude of Jews who had surrendered.¹⁴

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, III. 2: 4. 3: 1. ² Jewish War, III. 4: 2. 6: 1.
³ Jewish War, III. 6: 2—4. 7: 2. ⁴ Jewish War, III. 7: 5—36. ⁵ Jewish War, III. 8: 1—9. Dion Cassius, LXVI. Tacitus, Hist. I. 10. ⁶ Jewish War, III. 7: 31, 32. ⁷ Jewish War, III. 9: 1—6. ⁸ Jewish War, III. 9: 7, 8. ⁹ Jewish War, III. 10: 1—10. ¹⁰ Jewish War, IV. 1: 1—7.
¹¹ Jewish War, IV. 1: 10. ¹² Jewish War, IV. 1: 8. ¹³ Jewish War, IV. 2: 3—5. ¹⁴ Jewish War, IV. 3: 1, 2.

CXXXIX. CONDITION OF THE JEWS 67—68 A. C.

Although John the Gischalite, on his arrival at Jerusalem, endeavoured as much as possible to conceal the defeats which the Jews had suffered in Galilee, the hopes of the people were much depressed in consequence of them. Such gloomy apprehensions

were awakened in regard to the future, that in every city those who were disposed to peace, were in arms against the rebels ; families were divided, and party was ranged against party. The young and rash, however, gained the superiority over the older and more prudent ; they collected into bands, roved through the land, and plundered and murdered their countrymen with so much cruelty, that they chose rather to perish by the Roman sword, than to fall into the hands of the Jews. After the robbers had thus ravaged the country, they returned to Jerusalem and were there joined by other robbers from the neighbouring territories. They now commenced the same depredations in the city, and robbed and murdered, not only secretly and in the night, but openly and by day. They seized and imprisoned the three royal princes, Antipas, Levias, and Sophias, with several other noblemen ; and finally put them to death, under pretence that they designed to deliver up the city to the Romans.¹

When the robbers perceived that the people were awed by these violent measures, they became still more daring. They now entirely disregarded the hereditary rights of the high priests, and disposed of the high priesthood by lot among the meanness of the priests, whom they kept entirely under their own influence. In this manner, they made Phannias, the son of Samuel, high priest ; a man who had been bred to labour in the field and was taken directly from the plough ; who knew nothing of the duties of his office and only served to bring it into contempt. They endeavoured to excite dissensions among the noblemen, and, by these means, to find opportunities for perpetrating new crimes. When the people were at last excited by the persuasions of Ananus, the oldest of the high priests, to rise against these outlaws, they withdrew to the temple and made it the citadel and refuge of their tyranny. Ananus, Gorion, the son of Joseph, Simon, the son of Gamaliel, and some others of the chief priests, at length succeeded in persuading the people to take arms against their seditious countrymen, who gave themselves the denomination of Zealots. But while Ananus was arranging his forces, the Zealots rushed out of the temple and massacred all who came in their way. The army of Ananus, though then but scantily supplied with arms, maintained their ground, and an obstinate battle was fought, in which many were killed and wounded on both sides. Such conflicts were afterwards

frequent, and the Zealots were generally victorious ; till at last, on one occasion, Ananus with his party pressed on so closely after the retreating Zealots, that he rushed with them into the temple ; when they withdrew to the inner court and closed the gates, and Ananus, out of reverence for the sacred place, declined to pursue his advantage any further. He however left a garrison of six thousand men in the outer court, who were relieved by others at regular intervals.²

John the Gischalite professedly espoused the cause of Ananus, but held a secret correspondence with the Zealots ; and when his treachery was suspected, he asserted his fidelity with a solemn oath, and so entirely freed himself from all suspicion, that he was sent to the Zealots to enter into negotiations for peace. He took this opportunity to advise the Zealots to call the Idumeans to their aid ; two thousand of whom soon after appeared before Jerusalem. Ananus shut the gates against them, and in vain endeavoured by the most earnest entreaties to dissuade them from their purpose. They remained all night before the city, exposed to the fury of a violent storm of rain and thunder. The Zealots, taking advantage of the noise occasioned by the wind, rain and thunder, sawed off the bars which confined the gates of the temple, without being heard by the garrison in the outer court, went unperceived to the gates of the city, which they opened, and conducted the Idumeans to the temple ; where their comrades had already issued from the inner court to meet them. They now with their united strength fell upon the garrison in the outer court, who at first defended themselves with great bravery ; but, as soon as they perceived that the Idumeans were among them, they threw down their swords and raised a cry of despair. By this the inhabitants of the city were awakened ; but not daring to go to the aid of the garrison, they, particularly the women, set up another shriek of terror. Meanwhile the garrison of the outer court was cut to pieces, and many precipitated themselves from the porticoes of the temple into the city. The Idumeans then rushed into the city and cut down all whom they met ; but sought principally for the chief priests, among whom Ananus was slain. Josephus intimates that Ananus would have restored peace with the Romans, had his life been spared ; since he had already done much towards suppressing the haughty spirit of the seditious. The Idumeans and Zealots massacred great num-

bers of the people and put the more distinguished citizens in prison ; where they attempted to compel them to join their party, by severe treatment and scourging ; and finally put those to death, who firmly refused to comply with their demands. They seized them by day, and murdered them in the night ; and then threw out their dead bodies to make room for other prisoners. They accused the wealthy Zacharias, the son of Barach, before seventy judges whom they called together, of a design to betray the city into the hands of Vespasian ; and when he began to make his defence and to show the injustice of the accusation, they made such a tumult that his voice could not be heard. Notwithstanding this, the judges acquitted him ; and, for this act of justice, they were immediately beaten from their seats, and Zacharias was murdered by two Zealots in the midst of the temple. When the Idumeans witnessed the violence of the Zealots and heard of all the barbarous crimes of which they had been guilty ; they released the two thousand prisoners whom they had taken, and went home mortified and disgusted by the conduct of their allies. The Zealots, however, did not cease to commit murder under pretence of punishing treason.³

Many now sought refuge with the Romans, who looked on with pleasure and saw their enemies destroying one another. All the avenues from the city were indeed strongly guarded, and those who were detected in their flight, were put to death ; but money could open for any one a way of escape, and it was those only who were unable or unwilling to bribe the guards, that were delivered up and executed as traitors. The dead bodies of such as had fallen by the hand of the executioner, lay unburied in the streets ; because no one ventured to bury them lest he should himself be regarded and treated as a traitor. All human laws were trampled under foot, the laws of God were despised, the prophets were ridiculed as fanatics and jugglers, although the Zealots themselves were now fulfilling their prophecies ; for, (as Josephus observes,) “ they had foretold that the city would be destroyed and the temple burnt, when a revolt should break out, and the temple should be profaned by the citizens themselves ; which predictions the Zealots were now accomplishing.”⁴

John the Gischalite, a brave and sagacious, but unprincipled man, now began to assume absolute authority, and endeavoured to

make himself sole master of the city; but his pretensions were strongly opposed. The citizens were consequently divided into two factions, who were frequently engaged in bloody conflicts. The robbers and Sicarii meanwhile had increased throughout the country in numbers and audacity. The robbers of Masada, who had hitherto plundered only to supply themselves with provisions, now undertook more extensive depredations. On the feast of the pass-over, they attacked the town of Engaddi, drove out the inhabitants, murdered more than seven hundred women and children, pillaged the town, and brought their booty to Masada. In a short time, they devastated that whole region; while others did the same in other places, and then fled with their booty to the deserts.⁵

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, IV. 3: 1—5. ² Jewish War, IV. 3: 6—12.

³ Jewish War, IV. 3: 13—6: 1. ⁴ Jewish War, IV. 6: 3. Dan. 9: 27.

Mal. 3: 2, 5, 19. Matth. 25: 15. ⁵ Jewish War, IV. 7: 2.

CXL. CONQUEST OF PEREA 68 A. C.

When Vespasian learned the miserable condition of Jerusalem from the fugitives who were continually flocking to his camp, he pitied the distresses of the people, and put his army in motion to relieve the city. But as it was necessary to secure the country in his rear, he marched first to Gadara, whither he had been invited by the principal citizens. When the rebels heard that the Romans were approaching, they put to death those who had invited them, and fled. The inhabitants opened their gates to Vespasian, and, as a proof of their fidelity, demolished the walls of the city without waiting for the Romans to require it.¹

Vespasian immediately sent Placidus in pursuit of the fugitives, with five hundred horse and three hundred foot. The Jews fled before the Romans and took refuge in the village of Bethennabris; where they armed the youth of the place and marched out to meet their pursuers. The Romans at first gave way in order to draw the Jews further from the walls; and then surrounding them, they put great numbers to the sword. The Jews at length broke through the ranks of their enemies and escaped to the town; but Placidus immediately took the place by assault, cut down all who offered resistance, plundered the houses and laid them in ashes. The Jews then fled towards Jericho, and were pursued by the Ro-

mans. Placidus attacked them a second time on the banks of the Jordan, when many were slain or driven into the river. The number of those who were drowned could not be estimated, but the Jordan and the Dead Sea were filled with their bodies; thirteen thousand were left dead on the field, twenty two hundred were taken prisoners; and a rich booty of asses, sheep, camels, and oxen fell into the hands of the Romans. Placidus then took Abila, Julias, Bezemoth, and all the other towns as far as the Dead Sea; and the rebels who had embarked on the sea, were slain in their boats by the Roman soldiers. Upon this, all Perea as far as Macherus, surrendered to the Romans.²

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, IV. 7: 3. ² Jewish War, IV. 7: 4—6.

CXLI. CONQUEST OF JUDEA AND IDUMEA 69 A. C.

When Vespasian received intelligence that Vindex had revolted from Nero in Gaul, he endeavoured to put an end to the Jewish war before the Roman empire should become distracted by civil commotions. During the winter, he rebuilt many of the places which had been destroyed, and, for their security, left garrisons in the cities under the command of centurions, and in the villages, under the command of decurions. In the spring, he subdued Antipatris and Thamnitis; but Lydda and Jamnia surrendered without resistance. He cut off the communication between Emmaus and Jerusalem by a line of intrenchments, in which he left one legion; and, with the remainder of his army, he laid waste the territory of Bethleptephou. He then fortified some castles on the borders of Idumea, and took Betharis and Caphartoba, two villages in the heart of the country, where he put more than ten thousand men to the sword, and made more than one thousand prisoners. He here left a strong garrison, which made hostile excursions into the mountains. He then returned to Emmaus and marched through Samaria by the way of Neapolis or Mabortha to Corea; where he encamped on the second day of the month Desius or June, and, two days after, proceeded to Jericho, where he was joined by Trajan with the troops from Perea. The inhabitants of Jericho had mostly fled to the mountains which lie between that city and Jerusalem; but those who remained were all put to the sword.¹

Several fortifications were now erected in the neighbourhood of Jericho and Abida, and provided with garrisons, in order to cut off all communication with Jerusalem. Meanwhile, Vespasian sent a body of troops to Gerasa under the command of Lucius Annius, who took the city by assault, slew about one thousand young men, took the remainder prisoners with the women, children, and aged people, gave the city up to pillage and laid it in ashes. In the same manner he destroyed all the cities in that vicinity. The whole region about Jerusalem was now in the hands of the Romans; so that those in the country who favoured the Jews, could not join them in the city, while those in the city who favoured the Romans, were prevented by the Zealots from joining their party.²

When Vespasian arrived at Caesarea and was about to lead his whole army against Jerusalem, he received intelligence that Nero, detested and forsaken by all his subjects, had killed himself, and that Galba had gone from Spain to Rome, and had been saluted as emperor. He therefore sent his son Titus to Galba, in company with king Agrippa. But when Titus heard in Achaia, that Galba had been murdered after a reign of seven months and seven days, and that Otho had been called to the imperial throne; he left Agrippa to pursue his journey, and returned himself to his father in Palestine. Vespasian was induced, by these revolutions, to defer the siege of Jerusalem for a while; and he waited at Caesarea for further intelligence.³

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, IV. 8: 1, 2. ² Jewish War, IV. 9: 1. ³ Jewish War, IV. 9: 2—9. Compare Dion Cassius, LXIII. LXIV.

CXLII. CONDITION OF THE JEWS 69 A. C.

While the rebels were left undisturbed by the Romans, a new dissension broke out among themselves. Simon of Gerasa, the son of Giora, a less subtle but more daring man than John the Gischalite, now attempted to place himself at the head of the rebels. After his expulsion from the district of Acrabatene by Ananus, which has already been noticed, he joined the robbers at Masada and gained their confidence by his daring depredations. After the death of Ananus, he withdrew to the mountains, and soon drew around him a numerous party by promising freedom to the slaves, and great rewards to the free men, who would join him.¹

He now began to plunder the villages on the mountains, and soon extended his depredations to the plains. In a short time, he became formidable to the cities, and was then joined by some of the nobles. He now carried his robberies into Idumea, fortified the village of Nain, deposited his booty in the caves of the vale of Pharan, and left there a large number of his adherents as a garrison. The Zealots took the field against him, but were overpowered and driven back to Jerusalem. In Idumea he fought with twenty thousand men against twenty five thousand Idumeans for a whole day without gaining a decisive victory. Soon after, he encamped at Thecoa with forty thousand men ; when Idumea fell into his power by treachery, and he desolated the whole country with fire and sword. The Zealots did not venture again to take the field against him ; and they were obliged to restore to him his wife and a great number of his adherents, who had fallen into their power by a stratagem. For the irritated Simon led his army to Jerusalem, put to death many who came out of the city, cut off the hands of others, and sent them back with the threat, that he would break through the walls and treat all the Jews in the same manner, unless they sent him back his wife. The intimidated Zealots were accordingly compelled to submit.²

Simon returned to Idumea and resumed his robberies ; and when the Idumeans attempted to escape to Jerusalem, he pursued them to the walls, surrounded the city, and slew all who were going out to their fields or returning from them. The condition of those within the city was no better than that of those without ; every species of enormity was practised by the Zealots, especially by John the Gischalite and his Galileans. To plunder and murder the rich and ravish the women was mere pastime to these shameless wretches ; they polluted themselves by nameless obscenities, and imitated the dress and ornaments and wantonness of females. Josephus says, "the whole city was one great brothel, a horrid den of robbers, and a hateful cave of murderers."³

At last an army to which the Idumeans attached themselves, was raised against John, and a bloody battle was fought in the city. Many of the Zealots fell, and the remainder took refuge in the palace which had been built by Grapte, a relative of king Izates, whence they were soon expelled and driven into the temple. The Idumeans now plundered the palace, which John the Gischalite

had made his place of residence and in which he had deposited his treasures. The Zealots who were dispersed in different parts of the city, collected for the aid of their comrades in the temple; and John made preparations for an assault on the Idumeans and the people. In this distress the people opened their gates to Simon, who indeed kept John closely besieged in the temple, but soon proved himself as tyrannical a master as his rival. He could gain little advantage against the temple, where the Zealots were favoured by the height of the place; and they now built for their greater security four additional towers, and provided them with engines for throwing stones and darts. Thus there were continual hostilities among the Jews themselves in the city.⁴

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, IV. 9: 3. Tacitus, Hist. V. 12. ² Jewish War, IV. 9: 4—8. ³ Jewish War, IV. 9: 10. ⁴ Jewish War, IV. 9: 11, 12.

CXLIII. VESPASIAN ELECTED EMPEROUR 69 A. C.

Vespasian left Caesarea on the fifth day of the month Desius or June, marched to the districts of Gophnitis and Acrabatene, took possession of the towns of Ephraim and Bethel, and provided them with garrisons. He then proceeded towards Jerusalem to learn the condition of the capital. Celasticus, in the mean time, had laid waste Upper Armenia, as far as Herodium, Masada, and Macherus, which still remained in the hands of the robbers.¹

After all the country around Jerusalem had been devastated, Vespasian returned to Caesarea, and there received intelligence that the German legions had raised Vitellius to the imperial throne. Vespasian and his whole army were highly displeased with this election. The soldiers immediately held a council, and declared Vespasian emperor of Rome. They entreated him to sustain the sinking glory of the empire; they would listen to no excuse, and even threatened him with death, if he refused to accept their proffers.²

It was Vespasian's first care to secure Egypt, and he immediately wrote to Tiberius Alexander at Alexandria, and confirmed him in his office. The two legions which were stationed there, received the letter of Vespasian as from their emperor. The news was rapidly spread; and many ambassadors came to Berytus, whither Vespasian had retired, to offer him their congratula-

tions. Here he released Flavius Josephus from his chains, and ever after treated him with great respect.³

When Vespasian had marched from Berytus to Antioch, he sent Mucianus with an army to Italy by land, because the lateness of the season made sailing unsafe, and proceeded himself to Alexandria. Soon after, Caecinus, who had revolted from Vitellius, arrived with the intelligence, that the army of Vitellius had been entirely defeated at Cremona by Primus.⁴

In the mean time, Sabinus took possession of the capitol at Rome for Vespasian; but he was overpowered and slain by the army of Vitellius. The next day, Antonius entered Rome with his troops; and, though he was engaged in three different conflicts with the soldiers of Vitellius, he at length succeeded in routing them. Vitellius came out of his palace drunk; when he was insulted by the people, dragged through the streets and put to death, after he had reigned eight months and five days. On the following day, Mucianus arrived with his forces at Rome; when the soldiers of Antonius, who were still plundering the houses of the citizens, were reduced to order, and Vespasian was universally acknowledged as emperour.⁵

This pleasing intelligence was brought to Vespasian at Alexandria. He immediately sent his son Titus to Judea, and set sail himself for Rome in the midst of winter.⁶

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, IV. 9: 9. ² Jewish War, IV. 10: 1—4. Compare Tacitus, Hist. II. 73. Dion Cassius, LXV. ³ Jewish War, IV. 10. 6, 7. Compare Tacitus, Hist. II. 74—81. Dion Cassius, LXVI. ⁴ Jewish War, IV. 11: 1—3. Dion Cassius, LXIV. LXV. ⁵ Jewish War, IV. 11: 4. Tacitus, Hist. II. 73—101. Dion Cassius, LXV. LXVI. ⁶ Jewish War, IV. 11: 5. Tacitus, Hist. II. 82. V. 1.

CXLIV. THREE PARTIES AT JERUSALEM 70 A. C.

While Titus was at Alexandria, a third party had arisen at Jerusalem. Eleazar, the son of Simon, who had first separated the Zealots from the people and induced them to retire to the temple, pretended to be displeased with the cruel conduct of John, though he was in reality influenced by no better motive than jealousy of his power. He attached some of the more powerful men and a part of the Zealots to his interests, and took possession of the inner temple; but, on account of the small number of his adherents, re-

mained quiet till John began to assault him. John could make little use of his military engines in these assaults, because the part of the temple which Eleazar occupied, was higher than that which he possessed, yet many were slain, even at the altars; for Eleazar admitted all into the temple, who wished to offer sacrifices. John was also obliged to maintain a constant conflict with Simon, the son of Giora, who had the upper city and a large part of the lower in his possession; and when he directed his arms for a short time against Eleazar, he was compelled to give way before Simon. Thus John, who maintained himself by plundering the people, was obliged to carry on a continual twofold war; the one against Eleazar, who lived on the stores of the temple, and the other against Simon, who was so liberally supported by the people that his men were often found intoxicated. John made frequent sallies against Simon, and set fire to the streets as far as he was able to penetrate; and Simon, in his turn, when he repelled the attacks of John, burnt the houses which stood in his way. Thus all the streets in the neighbourhood of the temple were laid waste, and great quantities of provisions were destroyed in the flames.¹

From this state of wretchedness there was no way of escape; for all the avenues of the city were strongly guarded. The citizens dared not even complain of their misery; for whoever showed any signs of discontent, was executed as a friend to the Romans, and his body thrown out unburied. The streets were filled with heaps of the dead bodies of those who had been slain in battle, or had fallen by the hands of the executioner.²

When John perceived that he could gain no advantage over Eleazar in the inner court of the temple, he constructed moveable towers of timber which belonged to the temple; but before he began to make use of them, Titus advanced against the city with four legions of Roman soldiers and a strong body of auxiliary troops.³

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, V. 1: 1—5. ² Jewish War, V. 1: 5. ³ Jewish War, V. 1: 5, 6.

CXLV. SIEGE OF JERUSALEM 71 A. C.

Titus led his army from Caesarea through Samaria and Gophna to Gabaath-saul. It was now time for all who wished to escape,

to flee from the city, according to the directions of Christ in *Matth. 24: 15—20*. Titus encamped about thirty stadia from Jerusalem; and then rode forward with six hundred cavalry, to examine the condition and strength of the city and to learn the dispositions of the Jews; for he had been informed that the people wished for peace. When he drew near the gates of the city, opposite the tower of Psephinus, the rebels rushed out of the gate by the Women's tower, near the monument of Helena, separated him from the main body of his party, and surrounded him and a few horsemen, who kept close by his side. He was unable to go forward on account of the ditches and garden walls; and a large body of Jews cut off his retreat. He at length broke through the ranks of his enemies, and escaped in safety from the shower of darts and arrows which flew about him on all sides, though he wore at that time neither a coat of mail nor a helmet.¹

Titus then marched from Gabaoth-Saul to Scopus, seven stadia from Jerusalem, whence he had a view of the northern part of the city. He here posted two legions, and formed a line of intrenchments three stadia behind them. When the legion arrived from Jericho, he stationed it on the mount of Olives, six stadia from Jerusalem, and began to form a line of circumvallation.²

While the Romans were intrenching their camp, the three conflicting parties in Jerusalem united, and sallied out against the legion on the mount of Olives, while the soldiers were at work in their trenches. These attacks were often repeated; and in one of them, Titus was exposed to great dangers, and the Jews were repelled with difficulty.³

This union of parties in the city was of short duration. For when Eleazar, at the feast of the passover, opened the gates of the inner court, to admit the people into the temple to celebrate the feast, John sent some of his adherents among them with their weapons concealed under their garments. The Zealots sought refuge in the subterranean vaults of the temple; but there was a bloody massacre among the people. The Zealots were at last drawn from their places of concealment and dismissed without injury. Thus John made himself master of the whole temple; and there remained only two parties at Jerusalem, that of Simon and that of John.⁴

According to the testimony of Theodosius as quoted by Dion

Cassius, Titus suffered considerably for want of water, which he was obliged to bring from a great distance; a circumstance which was to be expected in a country like that around Jerusalem. But this did not hinder his preparations for the siege. Under the protection of a strong guard, he cut down the trees, destroyed the garden walls and fences, and levelled the whole place from Scopus to the monuments of Herod, near the Serpent's pool. During the progress of this work, Titus summoned the city to surrender, but without effect. The day after, the Jews, by a stratagem, made a sally on the Romans with considerable success. Four days after this, the work of levelling the ground was completed; and Titus then stationed a party of his bravest soldiers near the walls on the west side of the city, to prevent the assaults of the Jews; and, under this protection, he removed his camp from Scopus to a position only two stadia from the city, and so arranged it, that one part of it was opposite to the octangular tower of Psephinus, seventy cubits high, on the northwest corner of the wall, and the other part opposite to the quadrangular tower of Hippicus, eighty cubits high, on the northeast corner. The camp on the mount of Olives was not removed. In this manner, the city was closely blockaded at the time of the passover, while a great multitude of Jews were within the walls to celebrate the feast.⁵

In the city, Simon had under his command about ten thousand men with fifty leaders, and five thousand Idumeans with ten leaders, and held possession of the upper and lower city, together with the walls as far as Cedron and Siloam; while John had six thousand men with twenty leaders, and twenty five hundred Zealots who had joined his party, and held the temple, the Ophla, the vale of Cedron, and the places adjoining the temple; which were the common battle-ground of both parties, where they still continued their bloody conflicts.⁶

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, V. 2: 1, 2. ² Jewish War, V. 2: 3. ³ Jewish War, V. 2: 3—5. ⁴ Jewish War, V. 3: 1. ⁵ Dion Cassius, LXVI. Jewish War, V. 2: 2—3: 7. ⁶ Jewish War, V. 6: 1.

CXLVI. CONQUEST OF THE OUTER WALL.

After Titus had blockaded the city, he determined to make an assault upon it near the monument of the high priest John ; where the outer wall was the lowest and was not connected with the second, and whence a passage to the third wall would be easier than from any other quarter. Flavius Josephus now approached the wall with a few Romans, in order to persuade the Jews to surrender ; but they answered only by a shower of arrows, and Nicanor, a Roman officer, was wounded in the shoulder. Titus then resolved to destroy the part of the city enclosed by the first wall, and gave orders for the raising of the necessary banks ; which the soldiers soon completed, being protected from the Jews by their military engines. John dared not attack the Romans through fear of Simon. Simon brought upon the wall the military machines which had been taken from Cestius, and began to ply them vigorously ; but, owing to the unskilfulness of his men, they produced little effect. The sallies which he made were equally ineffectual. After the banks had been raised, three moveable towers were constructed upon them, and the battering rams were brought to bear on the walls in three different places. The noise and destruction occasioned by these machines, excited a cry of terrour throughout the city. The two parties again united for their common defence. They exerted themselves to the utmost, and, in a desperate sally, set the machines on fire ; but many of them fell into the hands of the Romans, and were crucified before the city. Soon after, one of the moveable towers fell down ; but this accident did not at all hinder the progress of the siege, for the shot from the other two towers was sufficient to drive the Jews from the wall. Consequently, the working of the battering rams could not be prevented, and the wall soon gave way before them. The Romans then rushed in through the breach, opened the gates, and took possession of the new city on the fourteenth day from the commencement of the siege, the seventh of the month Artemisius or May. They demolished a great part of the outer wall ; while the Jews retired behind the second wall into the inner city.¹

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, V. 6: 2—5. 7: 1, 2.

CXLVII. CONQUEST OF THE LOWER CITY.

The camp was now removed into the new city, and the second wall was attacked ; when the Jews again defended themselves with great bravery and made several sallies on the besiegers. Notwithstanding this resistance, the Romans in five days made themselves masters of the wall, and rushed into the city. But as they intended to spare the city, they threw down none of the second wall, and their moderation had nearly proved fatal to them ; for the Jews made a vigorous resistance, and an obstinate battle was fought in the city, till at last Titus found himself obliged to open a way for the Romans to retreat. The courage of the Jews was reanimated by this transient success ; they took possession of the breach, and maintained their ground three days, before they could be again expelled. The Romans now demolished a large part of the wall, and took possession of this part of the city.¹

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, V. 7: 3—8: 2. Compare Theodosius as quoted by Dion Cassius, LXVI.

CXLVIII. CONDITION OF THE CITY.

Titus now suspended his operations four days, hoping that the Jews would be induced to surrender by the famine, from which they began to suffer. On the fifth day, he began to raise a bank against the tower of Antonia. The more obstinately the Jews resisted, the more warmly he pressed the siege, in order to compel them to surrender, that he might be able to preserve the city and temple from total destruction. He again sent Josephus to persuade them to submit ; but they answered him with insult and ridicule.¹

In the mean time, several Jews found means to escape from the city. They sold their property to any one who would purchase it ; and some swallowed their money, that they might not be plundered by the robbers. Titus permitted them to pass through his camp and go wherever they chose. Simon and John endeavoured to prevent the escape of the Jews, and executed all who attempted to flee, though they had the most pressing reasons to urge them to leave the city. The distresses of the famine were constantly in-

creasing ; the robbers began to break into the houses of the citizens in search of food ; they scourged those who pretended that they had none ; and if they afterwards found any in their possession, they tortured them still more for having deceived them. If any one appeared in good health or kept his house shut, he was suspected of having provisions ; his house was forcibly entered, the occupants beaten without regard to age or sex, the children dashed against the walls, and the family tortured to compel them to discover the places where their provisions were concealed. The rich were dragged before the tyrants, under pretence that they had betrayed the city or intended to desert to the Romans ; false witnesses were easily found, and the helpless victims were executed. Even those who escaped to the Romans, were not rescued from their calamities ; for many of them, suffering under the pangs of hunger, ate to repletion, and died. Josephus justly observes, that no city had ever suffered so severely. nor had there ever been on the earth so abandoned a race of men as those who then had possession of Jerusalem ; and that their abominable excesses compelled Titus to destroy the city.²

As the Jews were often compelled by hunger to venture out of the city in search of food, Titus waylaid them, and scourged and crucified, in sight of the besieged, all who fell into his power. Five hundred were often executed in one day, and the Roman soldiers even invented new modes of crucifixion, to render their punishment more ignominious. But when the rebels in the city pretended that those who were thus crucified, were deserters and not prisoners, Titus cut off the hands of some of the prisoners and sent them back to the city, to inform their countrymen that no deserters would be punished, but those only who were made prisoners of war. At the same time, he warned Simon and John not to compel him to destroy the city, but, by a timely surrender, to save their own lives, their country and their temple ; but the Jews from the walls answered all his admonitions with ridicule, alleging that they despised death and cared not for their country, and that, as to the temple, the world was God's temple, and a far more magnificent one than that which the Romans threatened to destroy.³

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, V. 9: 1—4. Compare Theodosius as quoted by Dion Cassius, LXVI. ² Jewish War, V. 10: 2—5. ³ Jewish War, V. 11: 1, 2. Compare Theodosius as quoted by Dion Cassius, LXVI.

CXLIX. SIEGE OF THE TOWER OF ANTONIA.

Titus continued his preparations for an attack on the tower of Antonia; and, about this time, he was joined by Antiochus Epiphanes, the king of Comagene, with a body of auxiliaries armed in the Macedonian manner; but they were almost entirely cut to pieces in an assault which they soon after made on the city. In seventeen days, that is, between the second and twenty ninth day of the month Artemisius or May, four banks were completed for the assault on the tower; the first, opposite the middle of the pool of Struthia, the second, twenty cubits distant from the first, the third, still further to the eastward, near the pool of Amygdalon, and the fourth, thirty cubits from the third, near the monument of the high priest John. Meanwhile John, the leader of the rebels, dug a mine from the tower of Antonia, by which one of the banks was destroyed. Two days after, Simon assaulted the other banks, on which the moveable towers had been placed and the battering rams put in operation, and succeeded in setting fire to the machines. Only the covering of the battering rams was burnt; but the flames spread so rapidly over the banks, that the Romans were compelled to retreat to their camp, where they had an obstinate and bloody conflict before they could drive back the Jews who had pursued them.¹

As materials for the construction of new banks could not be procured in the neighbourhood, Titus built a wall round the whole circumference of the city, in order to keep the Jews more closely besieged, that they might be compelled to surrender by famine, or that, being weakened by want of food, they might be unable to offer any vigorous resistance to an assault or to obstruct the operations of a siege. The wall was thirty nine stadia in circumference, and was furnished with thirteen castles, which were designed as stations for the guards, and were each ten stadia in circumference. This huge work was completed by the soldiers in ten days. The officers were on duty by turns every night, to quicken the diligence of the sentinels and to prevent the escape of the enemy from the city.²

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, V. 11: 3—6. Compare Theodosius as quoted by Dion Cassius, LXVI. ² Jewish War, V. 12: 1, 2.

CL. CONDITION OF THE CITY.

The distresses of famine were now witnessed in the city in all their horrors ; an immense multitude died, and those who survived were tortured with hunger. The robbers broke open houses, pillaged the dead bodies, tore the last fragment of covering from the dead and dying, and laughed at the horrid scenes which they witnessed. They pierced the dead bodies and goaded those who were expiring, with the points of their swords ; and when a languishing wretch entreated them to kill him and put an end to his misery, they left him to die a lingering death by famine. At first the dead were interred at the public expense ; but now their bodies were thrown over the walls, because it was impossible to bury them all. Titus, while riding round the city, saw the glens full of corpses, a spectacle which awakened his compassion, and he called God to witness that the Jews were the authors of their own miseries. The famine extended to the soldiers, robbers, and Zealots ; and they were so much weakened by it, that they could no longer make any assaults on the Romans. Their misery was so extreme, that Titus, pitying their distress and anxious to save the remainder of the people, again constructed banks against the tower of Antonia, though he was obliged to bring wood for the work from the distance of ninety stadia.¹

In the mean time, the tyranny of Simon remained unabated. He put to death the high priest Matthias, who had received him into the city ; and also his three sons, the high priest Ananias, the son of Masambal, and fifteen other men of the first rank. On account of the cruelty of Simon, Judas, an officer who had the command of a tower, and ten of his confidential friends determined to deliver the city into the hands of the Romans. They made known their intentions to the Romans, but while they delayed, distrusting the sincerity of the offer, Simon came and executed the officer and his accomplices.²

Titus, who still wished to preserve the city and temple, directed Josephus to make another attempt to persuade the Jews to surrender ; but, as he was going round the walls, he was so severely wounded in the head with a stone that he fell senseless ; and the Romans were scarcely able to rescue him from the hands of the

Jews, who rushed out to seize him and drag him into the city. It was supposed in the city that he was dead, till he again made his appearance and urged them to submit ; but without effect.³

The distress of the city was now so great, that many, finding no other way of escape, leaped down from the walls ; and others, under pretence of making an assault, went out and joined the Romans. The bodies of these deserters were swollen in consequence of their long continued sufferings from hunger ; and great numbers of them, soon after being supplied with food, destroyed their lives by eating too much. But when one of the Jews was seen gathering from his excrements the pieces of gold which he had swallowed, the Arabs and Syrians cut open the bodies of two thousand living deserters in one night, to search for money. Titus prohibited, under pain of death, this inhuman crime, which must necessarily have deterred the Jews from deserting to the Romans ; but it was still secretly practised, though very little gold was found in the bodies of the wretched victims. On this occasion Josephus observes, that " it was God who condemned the whole nation, and turned every course that was taken for their preservation, to their destruction."⁴

As there was now no more booty to be found among the people, John seized the sacred utensils and consecrated gifts of the temple ; alleging that they who fought for God, had a right to the things which were dedicated to God. He also appropriated to himself and his adherents the wine and oil, which were designed for the sacrifices.⁵

Soon after, Manneus, the son of Lazarus, fled to the Romans ; and he acknowledged to Titus, that since the Romans had encamped in the city, from the fourteenth day of the month Xanthicus or April to the first day of the month Panemus or July, one hundred and fifteen thousand eight hundred and eighty dead bodies had been carried through one gate of the city, where he was stationed, besides those who were buried by their relatives. The number of dead bodies carried through the gates was afterwards stated by some deserters to be six hundred thousand ; and the number of those which were disposed of in other ways, could not be estimated. At last the dead bodies became so numerous that they could no longer be carried out, and they were thrown together in heaps. After the building of the wall, the famine was so severe that many devoured the excrements of cattle. Even the Zealots and robbers

were tormented with hunger ; and the starving soldiers were obliged to make their way to the walls over mouldering corpses, which emitted an insupportable stench.⁶

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, V. 12: 3, 4. ² Jewish War, V. 13: 1, 2.
³ Jewish War, V. 13: 3. ⁴ Jewish War, V. 13: 4, 5. ⁵ Jewish War, V. 13: 6.
⁶ Jewish War, V. 13: 7. VI. 1: 1.

CLI. CONQUEST OF THE TOWER OF ANTONIA.

The banks for the siege of the tower were at length completed. John made a few attempts to set the works on fire, but his soldiers were too much weakened by famine to accomplish any thing. The moveable towers were pressed forward to the walls ; the battering rams were fixed, and put in vigorous operation. The Jews made a feeble resistance, and, the next night, that part of the wall from which John had dug the mine to the Roman banks, was thrown down. The rebels had constructed a second wall within ; but it appeared easy of access over the ruins of that which had fallen. The Romans, however, were repulsed in an attempt which they made to scale the wall, on the third day of Panemus or July. Two days after, the guards of the banks marched up to the tower in perfect silence in the ninth hour of the night, (three o'clock,) slew the Jewish sentinels, and immediately sounded their trumpets ; when the Jewish guards, supposing that the whole Roman army was upon them, betook themselves to flight. Titus brought up his army as speedily as possible, and rushed on after the Jews into the temple. An obstinate battle was then fought, which continued from three o'clock at night till noon the next day ; but the Romans were at last compelled to withdraw, and content themselves for the present with the possession of the tower of Antonia.¹

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, VI. 1: 1—8.

CLII. ASSAULT ON THE TEMPLE.

Titus gave orders for the entire demolition of the tower of Antonia, in order to open for his army a more easy passage to the temple. When he heard that the daily sacrifices had ceased, he directed Josephus to hold an interview with John, and inform him,

that he might draw out all his men to battle if he chose, so as to preserve the city and temple from destruction, and that the sacred services of the temple might be continued by men of his own selection. But the warnings of Josephus were treated with contempt, and John replied that the city of God could never be destroyed. Many Jews after this fled to the Romans and entreated their besieged countrymen to surrender, or at least to leave the temple; but they were answered with insult and blasphemy. At last Titus himself addressed them by Josephus, as his interpreter, and expressed his earnest wish to preserve the temple; but it was all in vain, for the robbers and Zealots attributed his moderation to the cowardice of the Romans. Accordingly Titus was obliged to recommence hostilities.¹

At three o'clock the next morning, he ordered the temple to be attacked. The Jewish guards were at their post, and raised a cry by which they soon obtained assistance; but, in the darkness of the night, they were unable to distinguish friend from foe and cut down many of their own men, while the armed Romans were made known to each other by the watch word. The battle continued till noon, when neither party could claim the victory.²

In seven days, the tower of Antonia was levelled with the ground, and a broad place was thus formed before the temple, on which four banks were constructed. This work proceeded very slowly, because all the country for ninety stadia about Jerusalem had been stripped of its trees, and the soldiers were obliged to procure timber from the distance of one hundred stadia, and were frequently attacked by the robbers, while absent from the camp. The Jews made a desperate sally, at this time, on the mount of Olives, which was attended with considerable loss on both sides. As the Roman banks were now nearly completed, the Jews themselves set fire to the northern cloister of the temple, against which the banks were directed; and two days after, on the twenty fourth of the month Panemus or July, the Romans burnt the adjoining cloister.³

In the mean time, the Jews not only resisted the Romans by force, but annoyed them as much as possible by stratagem. On one occasion, a party of Jews, by a pretended flight, allured several of the enemy into a cloister of the temple, which they then suddenly set on fire, and the Romans perished in the flames.⁴

The famine in the temple and upper city became still more

distressing, and multitudes daily died of hunger. The robbers ransacked houses and men and even dead bodies in search of food; and when none was to be found, they devoured any thing that they could swallow, even their girdles and sandals, and the leather of their shields, and dried grass, of which a very small weight was sold for four drachms. A women named Mary, of a distinguished family in Perea, who had frequently been plundered by the robbers and deprived of all her treasures and of every morsel of food, at last murdered and roasted her own infant child; and when the soldiers, allured by the smell, rushed into the house and demanded food, she boldly confessed what she had done, and showed them half of the child which remained, for she had herself eaten the rest. This horrid transaction was soon made known in the city and in the Roman camp; and Titus again protested that he was not the author of these miseries, as he had frequently offered peace to the Jews.⁵

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, VI. 2: 1—4. ² Jewish War, VI. 2: 5, 6.
³ Jewish War, VI. 2: 7—10. ⁴ Jewish War, VI. 3: 1, 2. ⁵ Jewish War, VI. 3: 3—5.

CLIII. CONQUEST OF THE OUTER COURT OF THE TEMPLE.

On the eighth day of the month Lous or August, two banks were completed, and battering rams were plied for six days without effect. At the same time, the Romans began to undermine the northern gate of the temple, but found the attempt impracticable. They then ascended the cloisters with their ladders; but the Jews made so obstinate a resistance, that they beat off their enemies and seized one of their standards. Titus was anxious to put a speedy end to the war, and the Romans were all weary of this irksome siege; for, as Tacitus observes: “Romani ad oppugnandum versi; neque enim dignum videbatur famem hostium opperiri, posebantque pericula, pars virtute, multi ferocia, et cupidine praemiorum. Ipsi Tito Roma, et opes voluptatesque ante oculos; ac, ni statim Hierosolyma conciderent, morari videbantur.” As Titus now had almost relinquished the hope of saving the temple, he ordered his soldiers to set fire to the gates; when the silver work was melted, the flames were communicated to the wood and spread into the cloisters. The fire continued to rage the whole day and night;

for the Jews made no effort to extinguish it, and it was necessary to burn the cloisters separately.¹

The next day, Titus ordered his soldiers to extinguish the fire, and open a way to assault the temple. He then held a council of war, to determine whether the temple should be destroyed or preserved. Though many decided that it ought to be demolished, as otherwise, the Jews would always make it their rallying point, and there excite perpetual disturbances, Titus persisted in his determination of preserving it, as so magnificent a building would be a great ornament to the Roman empire. He accordingly issued orders, that the sanctuary should not be injured. The next day, the Jews made two sallies through the eastern gate; but they were driven back and compelled to seek refuge in the inner court.²

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, VI. 4: 1, 2. ² Jewish War, VI. 4: 3, 4.

CLIV. BURNING OF THE TEMPLE.

Titus intended to storm the temple the next day with his whole army. But the Romans, who had extinguished the fire in the outer court, when they repelled the sally which the Jews had just made, on the fifth of Lous or August, rushed on after them into the inner court. A Roman soldier then seized a firebrand, and, with the help of one of his comrades, threw it through a small golden door or window (*θυρίς*) into a passage communicating with the apartments on the north side of the sanctuary. The flames immediately burst out, and the Jews, with a cry of despair, ran to extinguish them. On the first notice of this occurrence, Titus came with his officers to put a stop to the conflagration; but, though he raised his voice and beckoned with his hand, the soldiers who were fighting with the Jews, paid no attention to his commands; and even the legions who followed him, disregarded his entreaties and threats, and so far from complying with his wishes, made every effort and encouraged each other to increase the fire. Meanwhile, the whole space around the altar was covered with dead bodies, and streams of blood flowed down the stairs into the outer court.¹

When Titus saw that the soldiers could not be induced to extinguish the flames, he went with his generals into the sanctuary and holy of holies; while the fire was consuming the adjacent apart-

ments, and had not yet penetrated to the interior. After he returned, he made one more attempt to persuade the soldiers to put out the fire; but with no better success than before. On the contrary, they applied firebrands to the gates, and the flames burst out from the sanctuary with redoubled fury; when Titus, finding it impossible to save the temple, withdrew to his quarters.²

During the conflagration, the Romans plundered whatever they could lay their hands on, and cut down all whom they met; but the robbers and Zealots forced their way through them and fled to the upper city. The cloisters of the inner court were now burnt, and all the rest of the building except the eastern and southern cloisters, which were afterwards destroyed. About six thousand people, principally women and children, were burnt in the outer court, in consequence of their confidence in a false prophet, who directed them to go into the temple, where God would work miracles for their deliverance. Respecting this occurrence, Josephus remarks: "There was then a great number of false prophets suborned by the tyrants to deceive the people, and direct them to wait for deliverance from God." (Compare Matth. 25: 23—34.) The omens which are said to have preceded the destruction of the temple, are unworthy of notice; though they are related by Josephus and Tacitus, according to the custom of the Greeks and Romans of those times, and are to be found, with some variations, in the Talmud.³

After the rebels had fled, the Romans carried their standards round the burning temple, and set them up before the eastern gate, where they offered sacrifices and saluted Titus as emperor, a title which the soldiers always had the right of conferring. They were highly elated, not only on account of the difficulties they had surmounted, but still more by the rich booty they had taken; which was so immense, that gold fell in Syria to half its former value.⁴

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, VI. 4: 5, 6.

² Jewish War, VI. 4: 7, 8.

³ Jewish War, VI. 5: 1, 2. Tacitus, Hist. V. 12. Talmud, Joma, p. 39. 2. Cap. 31.

⁴ Jewish War, VI. 6: 1.

CLV. BURNING OF THE LOWER CITY.

The robbers and Zealots were now reduced to such extremities, that they requested a parley with the Romans. Titus, who wished, if possible, to save the upper city, readily granted their request; but when they demanded permission to depart from the city, he broke off all negotiation with these rebels, who would only have excited new disturbances if they had been suffered to seek refuge in other places. He declared that he would receive no more deserters, and, the next day, gave up the lower city to pillage and the flames. About this time, the sons and brothers of king Izates and some other persons of rank surrendered to him and entreated that their lives might be spared. He granted their request and received them favourably; though he put them under guard and sent them as hostages to Rome.¹

The rebels who had forced a way through their enemies, now crowded into the royal castle, where many of them had deposited their treasures on account of the strength of the place; but the Romans drove them out, put about eight thousand four hundred to the sword, and seized their effects. The next day, the robbers and Zealots were all compelled to retreat into the upper city, when the Romans burnt the remaining part of the lower city as far as Siloam. Josephus made another attempt to induce them to surrender; but they reviled him, and boasted that they had robbed the city and destroyed the inhabitants, so that there was nothing left for the Romans to plunder. But they were now closely besieged, and could no longer engage with the Romans in battle nor yet effect their escape; for their leaders kept a watchful eye over them, to prevent their flight, and put to death all who attempted to desert. The chiefs of the rebels crept into the subterranean vaults, in which they hoped to lie concealed till the Romans should withdraw. They, therefore, with their own hands pillaged and burnt different parts of the city, and even began to fight among themselves for a division of the spoil.²

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, VI. 6: 2—4.

² Jewish War, VI. 7: 1—3.

CLVI. CONQUEST OF THE UPPER CITY.

On the eighteenth day of Lous or August, Titus began to raise banks against the upper city. He stationed the four legions on the west side, against the royal tower, and the auxiliaries on the east side, against the gymnasium, the bridge, and the tower which Simon had built for himself.¹

During the progress of this arduous undertaking, a deputation arrived from the Idumeans who were in the city, offering to surrender, and Titus readily accepted their submission. But their design was discovered, and Simon executed their principal men and kept a strict watch over the remainder. Notwithstanding this, several effected their escape in secret. The Romans sold an immense number of the deserters for a trifling sum, and finally dismissed forty thousand captives of low rank, because they were unable to find purchasers.²

About this time, the priest Jesus, a son of Thebutus, on condition of having his life spared, brought to Titus, from the sacred treasury, two candlesticks formed like the candlesticks of the temple, some tables, cups and other vessels, all of solid gold and very heavy; as also the sacred veils, the official robes of the high priest, ornamented with precious stones, and many of the sacred utensils. Phineas, the treasurer of the temple, was also taken prisoner at this time; and he delivered to Titus the robes and girdles of the priests, a great quantity of purple and scarlet, which was preserved for the veils; and also cinnamon, cassia, and other sweet spices, which were used for incense.³

After a labour of eighteen days, the banks were completed on the seventh day of Gorpheus or September, and the machines were brought against the walls. Some of the rebels crept into the subterranean vaults, and others withdrew to the castle; while a few remained to defend the walls; but their resistance was very feeble. The Romans soon made a breach, and the Jews fled. The chiefs of the rebels indeed attempted to drive the Romans from the breach, or to fight their way through them; but when their party was scattered and some fugitives informed them that the western wall was already destroyed and the Romans were rushing in, they fell into confusion and betook themselves to flight. Even those who were

in the towers, where they might have held out for some time, fled into the valley near Siloam, to the Roman wall ; but they were released by the guards and sought refuge in the subterranean vaults. Meanwhile, the Romans made themselves masters of the wall, planted their standards on the towers, and entered the city without resistance. They massacred the Jews whom they met in the streets, and burnt the houses to which they fled. The houses which they entered for the purposes of pillage, they found filled, even in the highest apartments, with the bodies of those who had died of hunger. Notwithstanding this, such multitudes were slain that the fire was extinguished by their blood ; and it was not till evening that the conflagration became general. Josephus observes, that the city itself produced those monsters in crime, by whom it was brought to such extreme suffering.⁴

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, VI. 8: 1.² Jewish War, VI. 8: 2.³ Jewish War, VI. 8: 3.⁴ Jewish War, VI. 8: 4, 5.

CLVII. DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

When Titus examined the city, he was astonished at the strength of its fortifications, particularly of the towers which the rebels had so hastily abandoned, and exclaimed : " It was surely God himself who expelled the Jews from these fortifications, from which man could never have driven them." He gave orders that none should be slain excepting those who were found in arms ; but the soldiers massacred the old and weak, but drove the young and strong to the temple, where they were shut up in the court of the women and guarded by one of the freedmen of Titus. Fronto was appointed to pass sentence on the captives. He condemned the robbers and rebels to death, selected those of the handsomest form for the triumph, and sent the remainder who were over seventeen years old, to work in the Egyptian mines. Titus himself presented a great number to the theatres in the provinces. On the day while Fronto was examining them, about twelve thousand died, some for want of food, and others, because they refused to eat when food was offered them.¹

When the Romans searched the subterranean vaults, they found more than two thousand dead bodies of those who had slain themselves or died of hunger. They also found many prisoners whom

the chiefs had placed there in custody. John, who was suffering with hunger in the vaults, begged mercy of the Romans and was pardoned ; but he was ever after kept in chains. The Romans now set fire to the remaining part of the city and demolished the walls.³

Thus was Jerusalem destroyed with its temple in the second year of Vespasian and in the year 71 A. C. according to the common reckoning, but according to Silberschlag, in the year 74 A. C. Josephus expressly says, that the ground was levelled, as though no building had ever stood upon it, according to the prediction of our Saviour in Matth. 24: 2. Only the western part of the wall, and three of the highest towers, namely, Phasaël, Hippicus, and Mariamne, were preserved as a memorial to future generations of the former magnificence of the city, and to serve as a residence for the Roman garrison. The tenth legion was left as a garrison, and the other soldiers were dismissed to their stations, excepting two legions, whom Titus took with him to Caesarea ; whither he conducted his prisoners and booty, because winter was approaching and it was consequently unsafe to send them away by sea.³

The cause of the obstinate resistance of the Jews was partly an expectation of aid from the oriental or Babylonian Jews, to whom they had sent, and partly their reliance on an ancient prophecy, according to which a universal conqueror was to arise in their country about this time. This prophecy, as we have already remarked, was known to the heathen and is mentioned by Suetonius and Tacitus. In all probability, it originated in a misunderstanding of the passages in Dan. 2: 35, 44, 45 ; which Josephus (Antiq. X. 10: 4. and 11: 7.) intimates that he does not venture to explain, though he partly applies it to Vespasian. From his expression it would seem, that he had some expectations to which he dared not give utterance, for fear of offending the Romans.⁴

The number of captives taken during the whole war was ninety seven thousand ; but those who perished in the siege and conquest of Jerusalem alone amounted to one million. This will not appear incredible when it is recollected, that Jerusalem was besieged at the feast of the passover, while the city was filled with pilgrims from all parts of Judea.⁵

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, VI. 9: 1, 2.

² Jewish War, VI. 9: 4.

³ Jewish War, VI. 10: 1. VII. 1: 1—3.

⁴ Jewish War, VI. 5: 4. 6: 2.

⁵ Jewish War, VI. 9: 3, 4.

CLVIII. FATE OF THE CAPTIVE JEWS.

From Caesarea on the sea Titus went to Caesarea Philippi, and there celebrated games, in which many of the captive Jews were thrown to wild beasts, and others were compelled like gladiators to fight and kill each other. During these barbarous festivities, intelligence was received that Simon had been found among the ruins of Jerusalem. He had concealed himself and some others in a subterranean vault, with the intention of digging a passage underground and escaping; but he had not proceeded far before his provisions were exhausted, when he rose out of the earth like a spectre and demanded permission to speak with the commandant of the garrison, to whom he made himself known. He was put in chains and sent to Caesarea on the sea, and Titus destined him for his triumph. After this, many others were found in the caverns of Jerusalem.¹

At Caesarea on the sea, where Titus celebrated the birthday of his brother, and at Berytus, where he celebrated the birthday of his father, he ordered many more of the captive Jews to be thrown to wild beasts or to engage in mortal combat with each other. During this journey, Titus is said to have seen, between Arcea, a city of Agrippa's kingdom, and Raphanea, the Sabbatic river, which flowed on the Sabbath and was dry on the other days of the week; but Josephus does not say in express terms, that Titus actually saw the channel of the river empty on the weekdays and full on the Sabbath.²

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, VII. 2: 1. ² Jewish War, VII. 3: 1. 5: 1.

CLIX. THE JEWS AT ANTIOCH.

The Jews in foreign lands must have felt severely the hard fate of their native country. A people, who had always been disliked on account of their supposed unreasonable religion, and who had now lost their native land, their capital and temple, must have appeared in the eyes of all the heathen, as a race peculiarly odious to the gods.¹

These feelings of the heathen in some places broke out in action. This was remarkably the case at Antioch; where many of

the fugitive Jews had taken refuge, because they there enjoyed equal privileges as citizens with the Macedonians, and because they had in the synagogue of that city the sacred vessels which Antiochus Epiphanes had taken from the temple at Jerusalem, and which were afterwards given to the Jews of Antioch. Besides this, there were many proselytes to the Jewish religion from among the heathen. The pagans, nevertheless, had a strong antipathy to the Jews, which had already begun to break out at the time of Vespasian's arrival in Syria. Their animosity was kindled to a flame by Antiochus, a son of the archon of the Antiochian Jews. This abandoned wretch went to an assembly of the people in the theatre, and falsely accused his own father and several other Jews of a design to burn the city, and named some foreign Jews as accomplices. Upon this, some of the accused were immediately brought into the theatre and burnt. The populace could scarcely be restrained from attacking the remainder, especially after the apostate Antiochus offered sacrifice to idols, and advised them to require all the Jews to do the same, as the refusal of any would prove that they were the traitors. This advice was followed; and as but few Jews could be induced to sacrifice to idols, the Antiochians endeavoured to exterminate them. Antiochus obtained a body of soldiers, by whose aid he compelled the Jews of Antioch and some of the neighbouring cities, to profane the Sabbath. Sometime after, the archives, the royal palace, and the market were burnt, and the populace could then scarcely be withheld from a general massacre of the Jews, although they were told that the affair ought first to be laid before the emperor, especially as the prefect Caesius Paetus had not yet arrived. In the mean time, Curius commenced an investigation of the transaction, and found that the fire had been kindled by the debtors, to destroy the bonds in the archives.²

When Titus came towards Antioch, the people went out to meet him, with the customary salutation, thirty stadia from the city, and begged him to banish the Jews. Titus gave them no answer, but went immediately to Zeugma on the Euphrates; where he received the ambassadours of Volageses, king of Parthia, who had come to offer him their congratulations and present him with a golden crown. On his return to Antioch, the senate and people again entreated him in the theatre to expel the Jews from the city: but he replied: "Their native country is laid waste, and whither can

they go?" Neither would he listen to the petition of the Antiochians for the removal of the brazen table on which the privileges of the Jews were inscribed. From Antioch he went through Caesarea and Jerusalem to Alexandria; whence he sent Simon and John and seven hundred of the most beautiful captive Jews to Italy, to grace his triumph. He soon followed them, and celebrated a triumph in conjunction with his father Vespasian, in which the golden table, a golden candlestick somewhat different from the golden candlestick of the temple, and a copy of the law were carried in the procession. Simon Giora was dragged with a rope from the capitol to the forum, where he was scourged with rods and executed; but John the Gischalite was put in prison.³

¹ Compare Cicero pro Flacco, XXVIII. ² Josephus, Jewish War, VII. 3: 2—4. ³ Jewish War, VII. 5: 2—7.

CLX. END OF THE JEWISH WAR.

In the year 72 A. C. Lucilius Bassus was sent with an army to Judea, to crush the remnant of the revolters, who were still in arms. The fortress of Herodium voluntarily surrendered; but Macherus was prepared to try the event of a siege. This fortress was situated on the summit of a mountain, about sixty stadia from the Jordan, on the southern boundaries of Perea. It was at first built by Alexander Janneus, and afterwards destroyed by Gabinius; and finally rebuilt and more strongly fortified by Herod the Great. Bassus attempted to fill up the vale on the eastern side, and raised banks against the fortifications. The Jews who were capable of bearing arms, retired to the citadel, and left the other inhabitants in the city. In the sallies which the garrison of the citadel made upon the Romans, a bold young Jew, by the name of Eleazar, principally distinguished himself. He at length fell into the hands of the Romans, who took him and scourged him before the eyes of his besieged countrymen. When Bassus observed that they appeared to be much affected by this chastisement of one of their number, he ordered a cross to be erected and was about to suspend Eleazar upon it, when the garrison, at the instance of Eleazar, who entreated them to save him from an ignominious death by the sur-

render of the city, promised to capitulate on condition of being permitted to depart. But as the capitulation included only those in the citadel, many of the other inhabitants fled from the city; and, of those who remained, nearly seventeen hundred were put to the sword, and the rest, with the women and children, were sold for slaves.¹

Bassus next directed his cavalry to surround the forest of Jarden, in which many of the fugitives from Jerusalem and Macherus had concealed themselves, and ordered his infantry to cut down the trees. The concealed Jews made a desperate effort to force their way through the ranks of their enemies, but they all, three thousand in number, perished in the attempt.²

Bassus and the procurator Maximus then received orders from the emperor to sell the whole land of Judea, which Vespasian had reserved for himself. The Jews in all parts of the Roman empire were obliged to send to the capitol at Rome the didrachm or half shekel, which they had formerly paid yearly for the use of the temple at Jerusalem.³

After the death of Bassus, Flavius Silva was sent to Judea in the year 73 A. C. He laid siege to Masada, which was the only fortified place that still remained in the hands of the Sicarii. Their leader was Eleazar, a descendant of the notorious Judas the Galilean or Gaulanite, who excited a revolt in the time of the high priest Ananus, on account of the Roman census. His descendants had always maintained his opinions, that the census and submission to the Roman yoke were contrary to the law. They had a large party of adherents, who harassed and oppressed such as acknowledged the Roman power, and they acted a most conspicuous part in the war. Of all the rebels they were the most abandoned and blood-thirsty. "And indeed (says Josephus) that was a time most fertile in all manner of wicked practices, insomuch, that no kind of evil deeds was then left undone; nor could any one so much as devise any bad thing that was new, so deeply were they all infected, and strove with one another in their single capacity and in their communities, who should run the greatest lengths in impiety towards God and in unjust actions towards their neighbours; the men of power oppressing the multitude, and the multitude earnestly labouring to destroy the men of power."⁴

The fortress of Masada was situated on a mountain thirty stadia

in height, not far from the western shore of the Dead Sea. It was built by Jonathan Maccabeus, and its fortifications were afterwards improved by Herod the Great. The place was provided with large reservoirs for water, was abundantly supplied with provisions, and embraced in its limits some arable land; so that its supplies could not easily be exhausted.⁵

On the west side of the fortress, Silva raised a bank two hundred cubits high, and on this he built a platform of stone fifty cubits high, which was surmounted by a moveable tower sixty cubits in height. After the Romans had with great difficulty made a breach in the wall, they found that the Sicarii had constructed a second breastwork within. As this was formed principally of timber, it was easily destroyed by fire; and then the besieged Jews betook themselves to the last resort of despair. In the following night, at the suggestion of Simon, each man put to death all the members of his own family; and they then collected all their treasures into a heap and burnt them. Afterwards, ten of their strongest men were selected to kill the rest; and when that was done, one of the ten was chosen by lot to destroy the remaining nine; who accomplished his task, set fire to the royal castle, and then killed himself. This event occurred in the month Nisan or April of the year 73 A. C. and the number of the slain, including women and children, amounted to nine hundred and sixty. The Romans entered the city early in the morning, and found it silent as the grave. At length they raised a shout of victory, when two women and five children, who had concealed themselves in an aqueduct, made their appearance and related the particulars of this horrid transaction.⁶

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, VII. 6: 1—4.

² Jewish War, VII. 6: 5.

³ Jewish War, VII. 6: 6.

⁴ Jewish War, VII. 8: 1. Compare Matth.

12: 45. Luke 11: 26.

⁵ Jewish War, VII. 8: 2, 3.

⁶ Jewish War, VII. 8: 4—6. 9: 1, 2.

CLXI. THE JEWS IN EGYPT AND CYRENE.

When the war had thus been brought to a close in Palestine, disturbances began to be excited in Egypt; for many of the Sicarii had fled thither, who attempted to persuade the Jews to acknowledge no sovereign but God, and to throw off the Roman yoke. Those who opposed their designs they secretly assassinated, ac-

ording to their usual custom. But after the principal Jews had earnestly warned the people, in a general assembly, against the folly of these fanatics, who had been the authors of all the troubles in Palestine, about six hundred were delivered up to the Romans. Several fled to Thebais, but they were apprehended and brought back. They were so obstinate in their fanaticism, that they could not be compelled by all the tortures which could be inflicted upon them, to acknowledge the emperor for their sovereign; on the contrary, they appeared to rejoice, while suffering under the most cruel torments.¹

Lupus, who was then prefect at Alexandria, informed the emperor of these transactions; and when Vespasian saw that the Jews would be continually exciting new disturbances, he ordered Lupus to destroy the Jewish temple at Leontopolis, in the district of Onias. Lupus, however, at first only took the consecrated gifts out of the temple and shut it up. But he died soon after, and his successor Paulinus took every thing out of the temple, and prohibited the Jews from entering it. This was done in the three hundred and forty third year after the building of the temple by the high priest Onias.²

The Jews of Cyrene were also infected with the madness of the Sicarii. Jonathan, a weaver who had fled from Egypt, persuaded a multitude of the poorer class of Jews to follow him into the deserts, where he promised to work miracles. But the Roman prefect Catullus, who had been informed of this movement by the more distinguished Jews, sent a body of horse and foot in pursuit of Jonathan, who put the greater part of the deluded multitude to the sword, and brought the rest back as prisoners. Jonathan himself was seized while attempting to make his escape, and brought before Catullus. The impostor now, in order to be revenged on those who had informed against him, accused the rich Jews as accomplices in his undertaking; and Catullus, in consequence of this false accusation, put three thousand of them to death, and confiscated their property.³

At the suggestion of Catullus, Jonathan proceeded to make the same accusation against the rich Jews of Alexandria; and, among the rest, he named as his accomplice Flavius Josephus, who had formerly lived quietly at Rome. On this account, Catullus conducted the impostor to Rome, where Vespasian himself investigated the

whole affair ; and when he found the accusations entirely groundless, he ordered Jonathau to be scourged and burnt alive ; but Catullus escaped without punishment.⁴

¹ Josephus, Jewish War, VII. 10: 1. ² Jewish War, VII. 10: 2—4.

³ Jewish War, VII. 11: 1—3. ⁴ Jewish War, VII. 11: 2, 4.

CLXII. THE JEWS IN SUBSEQUENT TIMES.

The spirit of revolt, however, was not extinct among the Cyrenean Jews, and it broke out more furiously than ever during the reign of Trajan, in the year 117 A. C. They revolted under the command of a certain Andreas, murdered the Greeks and Romans wherever they could find them, cut their bodies in pieces, tore off their skin and wore it as a mantle, devoured their flesh and intestines, and besmeared themselves with their blood ; others were cut in halves from the head with saws ; some were thrown to wild beasts, and some were compelled to engage in mortal combat with each other. In this manner two hundred and twenty thousand people were destroyed. The revolt spread into Egypt and Cyprus, where Artemon headed the rebellious Jews. These insurrections were suppressed by Lucius, whom the emperor Trajan commissioned for that purpose.¹

But the seditious spirit of the Jews was not yet entirely quelled. Aelius Adrian, the successor of Trajan, rebuilt Jerusalem under the name of Aelia Capitolina, and erected a temple to Jupiter on the site of the ancient temple of Jehovah ; and prohibited the Jews from approaching the city under pain of death. The Jews, enraged at the profanation of their holy place by heathenish sacrifices, took arms in the year 134 A.C. and a long and bloody war ensued, in which the Jews of the whole empire participated, and for which they made great preparations. Their leader was Cozab or Cozba, (בְּזָב, בְּזָבָה,) who professed to be the Messiah, and was supported by Akiba, the son of Joseph, a celebrated Rabbi. At Bether he was crowned king of the Jews, and assumed the surname of Bar Cocab, (בַּר כּוֹכָב,) *the Son of a Star,*) struck medals, persecuted the Christians with the greatest cruelty, and pretended to work miracles. These rebels were finally suppressed by Julius Severus, whom Adrian had sent against them, and but few escaped with their lives. He took fifty fortified places, destroyed nine hundred and eighty large towns,

and slew in different battles five hundred and eighty thousand Jews. The number of those who perished by famine, disease, and fire, was incalculable ; so that Judea was depopulated and transformed to a desert. The Jews afterwards called this false Messiah Bar Cozba, (בַּר כּוֹזְבָא, or in Chaldee, בֶּר כּוֹזְבָא, *the Son of a Lie.*)²

After such a signal overthrow, the Jews still persisted in their rebellious attempts, and under the emperor Severus, who reigned from 194 to 211 A. C. they united with the Samaritans and again revolted ; but they were at length defeated and reduced to obedience.³

In the early part of the fourth century, they attempted to rebuild their temple at Jerusalem ; but they were prevented by the emperor Constantine and severely punished. The emperor Julian, however, in order to mortify the Christians, encouraged the Jews to proceed in the building, contributed liberally towards its expenses from the imperial treasury, and appointed Alypius to superintend the work. They now began to dig among the ruins with great zeal, and to lay the foundation of a magnificent temple, which they hoped soon to see completed ; but fire flamed up from the earth, (probably from the subterranean caverns in which the air had been long confined and become inflammable,) and killed the labourers ; so that they were at last obliged to abandon their undertaking.⁴

In Arabia, where the Hebrews appear to have settled as early as the time of the Babylonian captivity, there is some reason for supposing that the Jewish religion was professed by the kings of Jemen as far back as the year 129 B. C. and it is certain that the Jews were very numerous there in the fifth and sixth centuries after Christ, that they had kings of their own religion, that they were engaged in extensive wars, and severely persecuted the Christians. According to the testimony of Nihebuhr, there are still, in the district of Chaibar in Hegias in western Arabia, some tribes of independent Jews, who are governed by their Emirs or Sheichs and live a nomadic life ; but they are so much hated by all the Mahomedan Arabs, that their name, Beni Chaibar, is used as a term of reproach.⁵

In Abyssinia, where the Jews are called *Falasha* or *Foreigners*, they must have settled very early, at least some time before Christ ; though it is not at all probable that they are (as they pretend to be) the descendants of Hebrews who emigrated thither with

the queen of Sheba in the time of Solomon. In later times they are said to have been governed by kings of their own race for a considerable period. Equally uncertain or rather more improbable is that which is related in the *Sepher Cosri*, that in the eighth century, Khozar or Cosri, a king on the northern and western coasts of the Caspian Sea, was a Jew.⁶

However this may be, it is certain, that, since the destruction of Jerusalem, the Jews have never had a Mosaic or Theocratic government. Attempts have indeed been made to reestablish their independence; but they have always failed, and the nation has existed only to be the scorn and contempt of all other nations. At different times men have appeared, who pretended to be the Messiah, and promised to lead the people back to Palestine and restore their ancient constitution; but their undertakings have always terminated to the disadvantage and disgrace of the nation, who suffered themselves to be so grossly deceived. In the year 723 A. C. a false Messiah arose in Spain. In the twelfth century there were ten false Messiahs in Spain, France, Moravia, and Persia. As late as the year 1660 A. C. Sabbatai Sevi or Zebi made his appearance in Asia Minor, particularly at Smyrna, claimed to be the Messiah and gained a number of adherents; but when the Sultan ordered him to be executed, he turned Mohammedan, in order to save his life. Notwithstanding this, several were accused, a long time after, of being the secret favourers of this impostor.

Thousands of Jews became Christians in Palestine in the days of the Apostles; and, in the course of the following centuries, many more were converted to Christianity; great numbers also became Mohammedans. In the Jewish war and in the subsequent rebellions, millions were slain, and afterwards, thousands fell by the hands of the executioner. They have, in all countries and at all times, been despised and hated, and often, severely persecuted; yet they have constantly increased and spread themselves over almost all parts of the habitable world. They are found in the remotest East, as far as China and Japan; and in the extreme West, as far as Morocco and Fez. They have penetrated to the interior of Africa, to the Caribbean islands, and even to the continent of America.⁷

In only a few countries, where they have never been tolerated, such as Sweden, Norway, and the Russian empire, they are not to

be found. They have generally been somewhat protected by the civil governments; but they have always suffered more or less of persecution and oppression; and very often they have been compelled to embrace Christianity or leave the countries in which they were settled. Such a persecution they suffered in France in the year 600 A. C. and in Spain, where they were always severely oppressed, in the year 612 A. C. In the year 1492, they were all expelled from Spain, when thirty thousand families emigrated; the most of whom perished, though a few sought refuge in Africa, and some in Italy, where they were protected, even in the states of the Church, under the name of Marattes. They were expelled from the East by the Caliphs in the middle of the eleventh century, when they came in great numbers to Europe; but here they were soon after exposed to great abuse from the Crusaders, and many of them murdered. In the year 965, they had a residence assigned them in Prague and were placed under the protection of government, because they had assisted the Christians in their wars with the pagans; but one hundred years after, in 1096, they were compelled to receive baptism, and in 1744 they were all banished from Bohemia; though the next year, after many of them had emigrated, the order was recalled. In Germany many of them were burnt alive about the middle of the fifteenth century, because they were supposed to be the cause of a contagious sickness which prevailed there at that time. In England, France, and several of the German provinces, they were often executed under the pretence, that they had murdered Christian children, or profaned the Christian sacrament. In short, they have had no permanent repose in any country to which they have emigrated.⁸

¹ Dion Cassius, LXVIII. Orosius, VII. 12. ² Dion Cassius, LXIX. Orosius, VII. 12. ³ Orosius, VII. 17. ⁴ Fabricius, Lux Evang. p. 124—201. Ammianus Marcellinus, XXIII. 1. Compare Michaelis in dem Göttingischen Magazin von Lichtenberg und Forster, Jahrgang III. Stück 6. ⁵ Pococke, Specimen Hist. Arab. p. 60. Asseman, Bibl. Orient. Tom. I. p. 361—381. Michaelis, Syr. Chrestmonath. S. 18—44. Alt. Orient. Bibl. Th. IV. S. 84. 155—159. Th. VII. S. 155. ff. Compare Niebuhr, Description of Arabia, p. 184. Travels, Vol. I. p. 432—448. ⁶ Bruce, Travels in Abyssinia, Vol. II. p. 184, 231. 232. Ludolphus, Hist. Aethiop. Append. ad p. 198, 199. ⁷ Brotier, Taciti Opera, Tom. III. p. 537—566. Kögler de Bibl. Judaeor. Sinens. Anquetil du Perron, Travels, p. 244. Michaelis, Alt. Or. Bibl. Th. V. S. 72. Th. XII. S. 100. Th. XV. S. 16. ff. 123. Höst, Nachr.

von Marok. S. 143—147. Oldendorp, *Herrnhutische Mission*, S. 287. Hiob Ludolphus, *Hist. Aethiop. Lib. I. p. 14. Append. ad Hist. Aethiop. p. 198. 199. Comment. ad Hist. Aethiop. p. 278.* * Büsching, *Geschichte der Jüdischen Religion*, S. 205—256.

CLXIII. SURVEY OF THE THEOCRACY.

The attentive reader of the preceding history, who has preserved the thread of the narration unbroken in his own mind, and can comprehend at one view the principal subjects embraced in it, cannot fail to perceive a connected plan running through the whole. This plan commences with the call of Abraham, is sustained by the Theocracy of the Hebrew state introduced by Moses, is gradually developed by subsequent occurrences, and finally brought to perfection by Jesus Christ and his apostles. It is a plan which men could never have devised, nor have prosecuted without interruption through so many ages, nor have finally executed in so remarkable a manner, with such important results, and to so great an extent.

Abraham received the promise of a numerous posterity, who were to possess the land of Canaan and preserve the true religion in the world; Gen. 12: 1—4. 15: 1—21. 22: 16—18. and 18: 17—22. compare 17: 4—14; and by means of these descendants, or *the seed* of Abraham, all nations, who were then almost entirely given up to idolatry, were to be blessed, or, to esteem themselves happy. This benediction or blessing, according to Gen. 17: 4—14. and 18: 16—22, must have had principal reference to the propagation of the true religion, which the posterity of Abraham were to preserve, but which was at that time mostly, and soon after, entirely lost among the other nations of the earth. The prophets of later times, whenever they have predicted the spread of true religion among the heathen, have understood the promise given to Abraham, in this sense. But the words of the promise are susceptible of a more extensive meaning; and, as was shown by the result, they really did refer to something more than the mere propagation of religion. Gal. 3: 16. This promise was transferred to Isaac, Gen. 26: 1—4; and by him, to Jacob, Gen. 28: 12—18; and Jacob pronounced the same benediction principally on the tribe of Judah, Gen. 49: 8—10, to which he had given a part of the privileges of primogeniture; so certain was he of the complete fulfilment of

the promise, though the posterity of Abraham had increased to only seventy souls in two hundred and fifteen years, and though he had himself forsaken the promised land.

This little tribe of the descendants of Abraham, however, during their residence of four hundred and thirty years in Egypt, increased to two millions and a half; and thus this part of the promise was accomplished, while the other part, respecting the preservation of religion, was in some degree counteracted; for the Israelites had for the most part become deeply infected with the Egyptian idolatry, and they would have become entirely idolatrous, had not God interposed to prevent it. They indeed always cherished a hope of settling, at some future time, in the promised land of Canaan; but, to judge from their subsequent conduct in Arabia Petrea, they would never have had the desire nor the courage to leave the fruitful land of Egypt, had they not been oppressed by the murderous edict respecting their male children and by the services which they were compelled to render to the king. Thus, even this oppression which the Egyptians designed as a means of retaining them in the country, was that which first excited in them a desire to withdraw from Egypt, and which at last actually gave occasion to their departure.

The miracles which were wrought both before and after their departure from Egypt, and the establishment of their theocratic constitution, were very appropriate, and indeed, necessary means of confirming their already wavering religious principles and of securing them for the future. We have seen, in the preceding history, how well these means answered their purpose during the four hundred and fifty years under the Judges, the one hundred and twenty years under Saul, David, and Solomon, the two hundred and fifty three years under the kings of Israel, and the three hundred and eighty eight years under the kings of Judah; for, during all these periods, the nation was always treated according to the sanctions of the Theocracy, and God himself frequently interposed by means of his ministers. An eternal kingdom and an everduring throne were promised to king David, 2 Sam. 7: 12—16. 1 Chr. 17: 11—14; and in Ps. 89: 27—38, this promise is explained by the assertion, that the throne of David should stand as long as the sun and moon should endure in the heavens. Accordingly, the family of David was always preserved, though it was three times, (namely, under Jehoram, Athaliah, and Hezekiah,) in the utmost danger of

extinction. Therefore the prophets, even in those times when the kingdom of Judah was overthrown and the posterity of David degraded and obscured, were always looking for some great descendant of that king, to whom even the heathen would submit; a hope which was derived from the blessing pronounced on Abraham. See Isa. 2: 2—4. 11: 1—12: 6. XLIX—LV. 60: 18—20. 65: 1—66: 24. Amos 9: 11. Mic. 4: 1—7. 7: 20. Hos. 3: 4, 5. Jer. 23: 5, 6. Ezek. 34: 23—31. Compare Zech. 9: 9, 10. Mal. 3: 1, 2. 4: 2—6. Compare Ps. 110: 1. 89: 26, 35—40. Gen. 15: 8—22.

After the captivity, the family of David sunk still lower, as was necessarily the case, since the promised son of David was not to appear as a temporal prince. But the Theocracy did not cease during this period. We have already observed how it was manifested during the captivity, and after the captivity to the time of Malachi, 410 B. C. The promise given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, respecting the possession of the land of Canaan, was fulfilled according to the condition prescribed in the theocratic constitution; and exactly as those conditions were, subsequently, more accurately defined by Moses, Deut. XXVIII. 30: 1—5, and by the later prophets. Even the duration of the Chaldee-Babylonian dominion did not exceed the predicted period of seventy years. After the captivity, the prophets Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi made the necessary disclosures for the future; and, as these prophecies were continually fulfilling, by the building of the temple, by the victories of Alexander, by the Greek kings of Syria and Egypt, particularly by Antiochus Epiphanes and the Maccabees; and later, by Jesus Christ, and the last war with the Romans, (which Christ himself more clearly and definitely foretold, Matth. XXIV.)—so, the divine government over the nation was continued without interruption.

It may at first appear unaccountable, that God, during the last four hundred years from Malachi to Christ, never interposed in a supernatural manner for his people, not even in the times of the Maccabees, when men of the highest rank, and priests and high priests, did all in their power to abolish the worship of the true God and introduce heathenism. But what we have remarked above, respecting the constant fulfilment of prophecies during this period, is sufficient to prove the uninterrupted continuance of the Theocracy; not to mention, that, even in more ancient times, there

are long periods, in which we find nothing of supernatural intervention, and the people appear to have been left to themselves; as, for example, the four hundred and thirty years in Egypt, and the four hundred and fifty years under the Judges, during which latter period, supernatural interposition was very unfrequent, as is remarked in 1 Sam. 3: 1. The divine government of the Hebrews always proceeded in the ordinary course of providence, so long as that was sufficient for the preservation of religion; and it was only when natural means failed to effect this purpose, that supernatural methods were employed. But the history in the Books of Maccabees shows, that religion could then be maintained without the miraculous intervention of God, and consequently, that supernatural aid was unnecessary, and would have been superfluous. The fulfilment of the ancient prophecies respecting the Babylonian captivity, the return to Palestine, and the building of the city of Jerusalem and the temple, had so confirmed the Hebrews in their religion that, without any new miracles, they were ready to die as martyrs for its sake. Still, even during this period, the footsteps of divine providence, especially in some very dangerous conjunctures, are too plainly marked to be mistaken.

The absence of supernatural occurrences, therefore, during this period, is not to be explained on the supposition, that the Hebrews had then become wiser and more intelligent; and consequently, that those events which were anciently regarded as the supernatural exertions of divine power, were now known and acknowledged to be natural.

Such a supposed wisdom and intelligence was not to be found at this period among the boasted sages of Greece and Rome; they were then even far more eager after miracles and predictions than the Hebrews had ever been in the earliest periods of their history. In all unusual occurrences they saw prodigies and omens; and they pretended to immediate revelations, which they carefully distinguished from the explanation of signs. Whence, then, had the Hebrews this wisdom and intelligence, so far superiour to the knowledge of all the other nations of the earth? On the contrary, we know from Josephus and the New Testament, that the Jews, in the time of Christ and his apostles, were still too much inclined to expect supernatural events; for, after all the miracles which Christ had wrought before their eyes, they were always requiring of him

some new sign. *Math. 12: 38, 39. 16: 1—4. Mark 8: 11, 12. Luke 11: 16, 29. John 4: 48. 6: 30.* Finally; the supposition in question is refuted by the fact, that in the founding of the perfect kingdom of God by Jesus and the apostles, miracles and prophecies were again found necessary, as they had been in ancient times; and that, after the establishment of the Church, they again ceased.

But when the promise given to Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob: "*By thy seed shall all nations be blessed, or, esteem themselves happy,*" had been fulfilled by Christ; the power of God, his miraculous cooperation, appeared only in the disciples of our Saviour, and afterwards, the perfect kingdom of God was promoted by the ordinary course of divine providence. As soon as this kingdom was established among the Jews and Gentiles, during the first generation after the ascension of Jesus, the Theocracy of the Jews who remained in unbelief, was left to its decline; a decline which, according to the predictions in *Mal. 3: 1—5. 4: 1—5. Dan. 9: 24, 27. and Matth. xxiv.* was applicable only to the old Theocracy. Since the destruction of Jerusalem, the unbelieving people, in the course of seventeen hundred and fifty years, have been scattered over all the earth, and have every where suffered the most cruel persecutions, oppressions, insults, and every species of distress, without any manifestation of the Theocracy for their relief, without any supernatural aid, without a miracle or prophecy. The people however are constantly preserved by divine providence in all their distresses; millions have perished by the sword since their revolt from the Romans, and we may say, millions have become Christians, Mohammedans, and pagans; still the people remain and increase, and, according to the prophecies, *Deut. 4: 31. 30. 1—5. Jer. 23: 1—8. 31: 35—37. 46: 28,* they will continue to exist till the period arrives of which the apostle Paul speaks, *Rom. 11: 25—28,* and which some of the ancient prophets appear to have anticipated.

Note. The passages abovesited, from which the divine plan proceeds, are as follows:

- וּנְבָרְכוּ בְּךָ כָּל מְשֻׁפְחוֹת הָאָרֶץ Gen. 12: 3.
- וְהַבְּרָכָה בּוֹ כָּל גּוֹי הָאָרֶץ Gen. 18: 18.
- וְהַחֲבַרְכּוּ בְּזֵרְעֶךָ כָּל גּוֹי הָאָרֶץ Gen. 22: 18.
- וְהַחֲבַרְכּוּ בְּזֵרְעֶךָ כָּל גּוֹי הָאָרֶץ Gen. 26: 4.
- וּנְבָרְכוּ בְּךָ כָּל מְשֻׁפְחוֹת הָאָרֶץ וּבְזֵרְעֶךָ Gen. 28: 14.

From a comparison of these passages we find that the phrase:

בִּלְ מִזְעוּחֵיהֶם הָאֲרָמִים, Gen. 12: 3. 23: 14, is interchanged with בִּלְ גִיּוּרֵי הָאֲרָץ, Gen. 18: 18. 22: 18. 26: 4; and also נִבְרַכְו Gen. 12: 3. 18: 18. 28: 14, with הִתְבְּרַכְו, Gen. 22: 18. 26: 4; and consequently, that their meaning is the same. In like manner, בָּךְ and בּוֹ, Gen. 12: 3. 18: 18, are interchanged with בְּזִרְעֶךָ, Gen. 22: 18. 26: 4; and in Gen. 28: 14, בָּךְ is explained by בְּזִרְעֶךָ. Hence it is evident that the blessing or promised happiness for all the families and nations of the earth, was to be communicated, not by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob immediately, but by their posterity. The precise meaning of the words נִבְרַכְו and הִתְבְּרַכְו may, however, still remain doubtful. Jurien (*Hist. Crit. Vol I. C. I.*) has explained them in the following manner: *People shall wish each other happiness by thee*, as if they were to say: *God make thee as happy or prosperous as Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and their posterity*; as the phrase seems to be explained in Gen. 48: 20. But in this passage, where Jacob adopts the two sons of Joseph, namely, Ephraim and Manasseh, and blesses them, the phrase in question does not occur; for Jacob says merely: בָּךְ יְבָרֵךְ יִשְׂרָאֵל לְאָמֵר יְשִׁימֵךְ אֱלֹהִים בְּאִסְרֵיהֶם וּבְמַנְשָׁהּ. *By thee may Israel bless, (or wish happiness,) saying, God make thee as Ephraim and Manasseh.* Neither the words בָּךְ nor הִתְבְּרַךְ are here used, and of course, the passage is not parallel; much less, is בָּךְ here explained by בְּזִרְעֶךָ, as such an explanation would be superfluous in a mere form of salutation or wishing of happiness, but is necessary in a promise, in order to make it clear and definite. If the passages cited were intended as a mere formula of salutation, then Abraham, Isaac and Jacob were themselves so prosperous, that the formula would have been used without referring to the posterity of these men; or, at least, such an explanatory addition would have been altogether superfluous; and Jesus and Paul have certainly attached a more important meaning to the blessing pronounced on Abraham, John 8: 56. Gal. 3: 16. Further, Abraham himself was informed of great sufferings which his posterity were to endure, Gen. xv. and Moses threatened them with still heavier calamities; so that it is hardly probable that this expression could have its origin in the peculiar prosperity which was anticipated for the Israelites; and that people should then wish each other happiness by saying, *God make thee as prosperous as the descendants of Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob.* Undoubtedly, the blessing is to be understood of a happiness which consists

in a knowledge of the true God and of religion ; and this is the subject of discourse in Gen. 18: 16—22. and 17: 4—14. It is especially worthy of remark, that the promise is intimately connected with all the ancient dealings and revelations of God as the Lord of nature and the judge of men, who is determined to preserve and promote religion and morality on the earth ; and therefore, he directed the first human pair, Gen. 3: 9—24, and Cain, Gen. 6: 3, in the way of their duty ; gave warnings to men before the flood by the spirit of prophecy ; and preserved the pious Noah from destruction, Gen. 6: 8—23, and promised him security for the future. In like manner, the promise under discussion must necessarily have reference to religion, just as we have explained it. In this sense, undoubtedly, it was understood by the prophets, who have foretold the promulgation of true religion among the Gentiles ; and thus, Jesus and Paul, John 8: 56. Gal. 3: 16. have only followed the prophets, and made a new application of the passage in the same sense. Moreover, that בְּבָרַךְ and בְּהִתְבָּרַךְ, construed with ב before the noun, mean *blessed, to be blessed, to esteem one's self blessed, to be esteemed blessed*, is beyond all doubt, and appears undeniably from Deut. 29: 18. Isa. 65: 16. Jer. 4: 2. Ps. 72: 17 ; while, on the other hand, there is not a single passage where it means, *to wish one another happiness*, or, to indicate the salutation, *may you be as happy as another*. Accordingly, no ancient interpreter and no Targumist has ever explained it in this manner. But it should be borne in mind, that prophecies are, for the most part, like views and paintings in perspective, where the nearer objects in the foreground appear in a strong light, but the more distant objects are gradually obscured and finally lost in the shade, which is dispelled only by approaching them. So in this case, the promise of a son by Sarah and of a numerous posterity, is clear and definite ; that of the possession of Canaan and of the preservation of the true religion, is expressed in more general terms ; while that of the blessing upon all nations, as the most distant, is almost entirely concealed in the shade ; but the history of its fulfilment by Jesus Christ, has dispelled the darkness and brought the prediction clearly to view. At least, the most obstinate opposer cannot now deny, that not only two hundred millions of men (the number of Christians in the world) esteem themselves blessed by Jesus, the seed of Abraham ; but also, that six hundred millions of Mohammedans are blessed with a knowledge of the

true God by means of the posterity of Abraham ; for Mohammed derived his religious knowledge from the Jews and Christians ; and the name of Abraham is as much revered by the Mohammedans, as by them. The name of Abraham, therefore, is really a venerated name, according to the promise in Gen.12:2. The inference is unavoidable, that the meaning which we have attributed to the promise given to Abraham, is the only true meaning of the Biblical text.

MANETHO'S DYNASTIES

OF THE

KINGS OF EGYPT,

EXTRACTED FROM JULIUS AFRICANUS AND EUSEBIUS.

I. DYNASTY.		IV. DYNASTY.	
OF THIS.		OF MEMPHIS.	
Names.	Years of reign.	Names.	Years of reign.
1. Menes	62	1. Soris	29
2. Atosthis	57	2. Suphis I.	63
3. Cencenes	31	3. Suphis II.	66
4. Venephes	23	4. Mencheres	63
5. Usaphaedus	20	5. Rhatoeses	25
6. Miebidus or Niebes	16	6. Bicherer	22
7. Semenpeis	18	7. Sibercheres	7
8. Bienaches or Ubienthea	26	8. Thampthis	9
	<u>253</u>		<u>284</u>
II. DYNASTY.		Eusebius numbers 17 kings in this Dynasty; but he gives no name excepting Suphis.	
OF THIS.		V. DYNASTY.	
		OF ELEPHANTIS.	
1. Boethus	38	1. Usurcheris	28
2. Caeachus or Choeus	39	2. Sephres	13
3. Binoethris or Biophis	47	3. Nephercheres	20
4. Tias	17	4. Sisiris	7
5. Sethenes	41	5. Cheres	20
6. Choeres	17	6. Rhaturis	44
7. Nephercheres	25	7. Mercheres	9
8. Sesochris	48	8. Tarcheres	44
9. Cheneres	30	9. Obnus	33
	<u>302</u>		<u>218</u>
III. DYNASTY.		VI. DYNASTY.	
OF MEMPHIS.		OF MEMPHIS.	
1. Necherophes or Necherochis	28	1. Othoes	36
2. Tosorthrus or Sesorthus	29	2. Phius	53
3. Tyris	7	3. Methusuphis	7
4. Mesochris	17	4. Phiops	94
5. Soiphis	16	5. Mentesusphis	1
6. Tosertasis	19	6. Nitooris	12
7. Achis	42		
8. Siphuris	30		
9. Cerpherer	26		
	<u>214</u>		<u>203</u>
Eusebius assigns the kings of the V. Dynasty to the VI. and makes their number 31; but he men-			

tions none by name, excepting Othoes and Phiops, to the latter of whom he gives a reign of 100 years.

VII. DYNASTY.

OF MEMPHIS.

70 anonymous kings reigned 70 days; or, according to Eusebius, 5 anonymous kings reigned 75 days.

VIII. DYNASTY.

OF MEMPHIS.

27 Anonymous kings 146

Or, according to Eusebius,

5 Anonymous kings 100

IX. DYNASTY.

OF HERACLEUM.

According to Eusebius, there were 4 kings of this Dynasty, the first of whom was named Ach-tus. Eusebius calls this the Dynasty of Hera-cleopolis; probably the mistake of a transcriber, who wrote Heracleopolis instead of Heracleum. These kings are said to have reigned 100 years.

According to Africanus, there were 19 kings of this Dynasty, who reigned 409 years; but it is at least probable, that these 19 kings might have been taken from the following X. Dynasty.

X. DYNASTY.

OF HERACLEUM.

19 Kings 185

XI. DYNASTY.

OF DIOSPOLIS.

16 Kings 43

Ammenemes 16

XII. DYNASTY.

OF DIOSPOLIS.

1. Geson, Goses, Sesonchoris 46

2. Ammanemes 38

3. Sesostris 48

4. Lachares or Labaris 8

5. Ammeres 8

6. Ammenemes 8

7. Sermiophris 4

160

XIII. DYNASTY.

OF DIOSPOLIS.

13 Kings 184

According to Eusebius, there were 60 kings of this Dynasty, who reigned 453 years. But perhaps this Dynasty may have been confounded with the following Dynasty of Xoïs.

XIV. DYNASTY.

OF XOÏS.

76 Kings 484

According to Eusebius; but this Dynasty is not mentioned by Julius Africanus.

XV. DYNASTY.

PHENICIAN SHEPHERD-KINGS.

Names.	Years of reign.
1. Saites	19
2. Byon or Beon	44
3. Pachnan or Apachnes	61
4. Staan	50
5. Archles	49
6. Aphobis	61

284

Eusebius makes this Dynasty the XVI.

XVI. DYNASTY.

GREEK SHEPHERD-KINGS.

32 Kings 518

XVII. DYNASTY.

43 Shepherd-kings and } 143
43 Theban kings }

Probably this is the XVII. Dynasty of Diospolis, which Julius Africanus calls Theban, as Thebes was sometimes called Great Diospolis. In Eusebius the XV. XVI. and XVII. Dynasties appear to be interchanged.

XVIII. DYNASTY.

OF DIOSPOLIS.

1. Amosis or Tethmosis, a } 25
son of Asseth }

2. Chebron 13

3. Ammenophis 21

4. Miphris 12

5. Misphragmutosis or A- } 28
mosis II. }

6. Tuthmosis 9

7. Amenophis or Memnon 31

8. Horus 36

9. Achenehereses 12

10. Athoris 39

11. Chencheres 16

12. Acherres 8

13. Cherres 15

14. Armes or Danaus 5

15. Ammeses, Rammesses } 40
or Aegyptus }

16. Memophris 40

348

XIX. DYNASTY.

OF DIOSPOLIS.

According to Eusebius.

1. Sethos 55

2. Rhapses 66

Names.	Years of reign.
3. Ammenephes .	40
4. Ammenemmes	26
5. Thuoris	7
	<hr/> 194

XX. DYNASTY.

OF DIOSPOLIS.
According to Julius Africanus.

12 Kings	135
----------	-----

XXI. DYNASTY.

OF TANIS.
According to Eusebius.

1. Semendes	26
2. Pfusenes I.	41
3. Nephercheres	4
4. Ammenopthis	9
5. Osochor	6
6. Psinaches	9
7. Pfusenes II.	35
	<hr/> 130

XXII. DYNASTY.

OF BUBASTIS.

1. Sesenchosis	21
2. Osoroth	15
3.	
4.	25
5.	
6. Tacellothis	13
7.	
8.	46
9.	
	<hr/> 120

The three names are taken from Eusebius; but the anonymous kings from Julius Africanus.

XXIII. DYNASTY.

OF TANIS.

1. Petubastes	25
2. Osorthon or Hercules	9
3. Psammus	10
4. Zet	31
	<hr/> 75

The three first kings are from Eusebius; and the last from Julius Africanus.

XXIV. DYNASTY.

OF SAIS.

1. Bochchoris or Bonchoris	36
----------------------------	----

XXV. DYNASTY.

OF AETHIOPIA.

1. Sabbacon	12
-------------	----

Names.	Years of reign.
2. Sevechus (2 K. 17: 4.)	14
3. Taracus (2 K. 19: 9.)	20
	<hr/> 46

XXVI. DYNASTY.

OF SAIS.

1. Ammeris	22
2. Stephinates	7
3. Necheptos or Nerepsos	6
4. Nechao I.	8
5. Psammetichus	54
6. Nechao II. (2 K. 23: 29.)	6
7. Psammuthis or Psamme- tichus II. }	17
8. Vaphris (Jer. 44: 30.)	22
9. Amosis	44
10. Psammacherites 6 months	—
	<hr/> 186

XXVII. DYNASTY.

OF PERSIA.

1. Cambyses	3
2. The Magian 7 months.	
3. Darius Hystaspis	36
4. Xerxes I.	21
5. Artaxerxes Longimanus	40
6. Xerxes II. 2 months.	
7. Sogdianus 7 months.	
8. Darius Nothus, son of Xerxes	19
	<hr/> 120

XXVIII. DYNASTY.

OF SAIS.

1. Amyrtaeus of Amyrtanus, who revolted from the Persians	6
---	---

XXIX. DYNASTY.

OF MENDES.

1. Nepherites	6
2. Achoris	13
3. Psammuthis	1
4. Anapherites or Nepherotes 4 m.	
5. Muthis	1
	<hr/> 21

XXX. DYNASTY.

OF SEBENNYTUS.

1. Nectanebes I.	10
2. Teos	2
3. Nectanebes II.	18
	<hr/> 30

Silberschlag, in his *Chronologie der Welt*, (Chronology of the World,) S. 137, arranges these Dynasties according to the division of Egypt into Western and Eastern, from the course of the Nile; and the division of both parts into Upper, Middle, and Lower; as follows:

WESTERN EGYPT.

UPPER EGYPT.	MIDDLE EGYPT.	LOWER EGYPT.
I. This		
II. This		
	III. Memphis	
	IV. Memphis	
V. Elephantis	VI. Memphis	
	VII. Aristocracy of 70 days.	
	VIII. Memphis	
		IX. Heracleotis
		X. Heracleotis
		XIV. Xoia

EASTERN EGYPT.

UPPER EGYPT.	MIDDLE EGYPT.	LOWER EGYPT.
XI. Diospolis		
Ammenes		
XII. Diospolis		
XIII. Diospolis		
	XV. Hyksos	
XVII. Diospolis	XVI. Greek Shepherd-kings	
XVIII. Diospolis		
XIX. Diospolis		
XX. Diospolis		
	Contemporary with the Dynasties of Diospolis.	
		XXI. Tanais
		XXII. Bubastis
		XXIII. Tanais
		XXIV. Sais
		XXV. Aethiopia
		XXVI. Sais
		XXVII. Persia
		XXVIII. Sais
		XXIX. Mendes
		XXX. Sebennytus
		Upper Egypt
		Whole duration of the Dynasties

INDEX

OF THE PRINCIPAL PROPHECIES REFERRED TO AND ILLUSTRATED IN THE
PRECEDING WORK.

Genesis.	Sect.	Page.	25: 1—14	Sect.	Page.
15: 18	31	96	39: 3—8	41	128
27: 29, 40	31	96		24	131
27: 40	37	117	41: 21—29	49	150
49: 8—10	28	88	44: 28. 45: 1	51	156
49: 9	33	100	46: 1, 2	58	170
49: 26	34	105	47: 9. 48: 20	57	165
Numbers.			Jeremiah.		
23: 24	33	100	22: 19	43	135
24: 7—9, 17—20	31	96	25: 1—14	43	134
24: 9	33	100	XXV.	46	143
24: 22, 24	3	13	27: 7	47	146
Deuteronomy.			27: 1—11	46	143
28: 36	35	108	29: 10	43	134
28: 36, 49—68	43	136	36: 30	43	135
33: 16	34	105	37: 3—10	43	136
1 Samuel.			XL—XLIII.	43	136
2: 30, 31. 3: 13	33	101	XLIV. 46: 14—19, 25	46	144
1 Kings.			XLVII—XLIX.	46	143
14: 7—16	36	111	L. LI.	49	149, 150
14: 15	35	108		50	153
16: 1—4	36	111		51	156
21: 19	36	112		57	165
2 Kings.				58	170
1: 16	36	112		82	224
20: 16—18	41	128	Ezekiel.		
Isaiah.			XXV.	46	143
13: 15	50	153	XXVI.	44	139
13: 17	49	149		46	143
13: 19—22	82	224	XXVI—XXVIII.	70	194
14: 23	50	153	27: 36. XXVIII. 29: 18	46	143
19: 18, 19	99	292	29: 13—16	67	190
21: 2	49	149	29: 18	44	139
21: 3—5	50	152	Daniel.		
21: 7	49	151	2: 33, 41—43	114	369
21: 9	58	170	V.	50	153
22: 19	43	135	7: 6	71	196
23: 1—13	46	143		72	202

	Sect.	Page.		Sect.	Page.
8: 1—7, 20, 21	71	196		Zephaniah.	
8: 5—8	75	205	2: 13—15	46	143
8: 8, 21, 22	81	221		Haggai.	
9: 27	139	470	1: 2—15	57	164
11: 2	58	167	2: 1—10	54	160
11: 3	72	200—202	2: 7, 8	87	237
11: 3, 4	75	205		90	251
11: 5	78	211		Zechariah.	
	81	220	1: 7—17	57	165, 166
11: 6—8	85	231, 232	1: 14—17	104	309
11: 9	86	232	2: 5—17		
11: 10, 11	88	241	3: 1—10	} 57	164
11: 12—20	89	243—249	4: 1—14		
11: 14	90	252	6: 1—8	57	165, 166
11: 20, 21	91	255, 256	6: 9—15	105	316
11: 21, 37	92	258	6: 13—15	96	273
11: 22, 23, 25, 40	94	263, 264	8: 1—17	57	164
11: 29, 30	94	265	8: 3	96	273
11: 30, 34	95	267—270	8: 20—23	104	309
11: 21, 38, 39	95	270		105	316
11: 39, 44, 45	96	271	9: 1—8	71	196
	Hosea.		9: 3—8	70	194, 195
IX.	35	108	9: 6, 7	99	291
	Joel.		IX. X. XII.	96	271—275
3: 4	46	143	10: 2. 11: 3	93	259
	Amos.		13: 7—9	94	264
2: 9	46	143	13: 8	95	267
V.	35	108	14: 1, 2	94	264
	Micah.		14: 1—12	95	267
5: 1	115	375	14: 14—17	105	316
	Nahum.			Malachi.	
I. II. III.	41	131	1: 2—5	62	178
	46	143	1: 4	65	186
			3: 2, 5, 19	139	470

ERRATA.

Page 11, line 20 from bottom, for *Antedeluvian* read *antediluvian*.
 73 4 from bottom, for 1446 read 1466.
 124 16 from top, for 15: 23 read 15: 33.

APPENDIX.

CONTINUATION OF

THE HISTORY OF THE JEWS

TO THE REIGN OF

THE EMPEROUR ADRIAN,

WITH AN ACCOUNT OF THEIR VARIOUS DISPERSIONS;

TRANSLATED FROM THE FRENCH

OF BASNAGE.

CONTENTS.

CHAP. I.	Page.
History of the Jews from the taking of Jerusalem to their revolt under Adrian . . .	515
CHAP. II.	
History of the revolt of the Jews in the reign of Adrian, under Barchochebas and Akiba, to A. D. 138	532
CHAP. III.	
The disciples of Akiba, and other learned men, their contemporaries . . .	556
CHAP. IV.	
Sources of the Miseries of the Jews	563
CHAP. V.	
Dispersion of the Jews through the East. Examination of the narrative of the spurious Ezra, and of the time when he flourished	573
CHAP. VI.	
The different accounts of the dispersions of the Jews in the East, by their own historians	582
CHAP. VII.	
Whether the ten tribes retired to Tartary, and thence penetrated to America and the East Indies	593
CHAP. VIII.	
The situation of the Jews in India and China	611
CHAP. IX.	
True situation of the ten tribes in the Persian Irak, in Babylon, and on the banks of the Euphrates. A refutation of the opinion, that the Sabbatius was in Media	621
CHAP. X.	
Origin of the Jews in Egypt, Ethiopia, and Arabia	637
CHAP. XI.	
The Jews of Italy	656
CHAP. XII.	
Settlement of the Jews in Spain, Germany, France, and England	679

CHAPTER FIRST.

HISTORY OF THE JEWS FROM THE TAKING OF JERUSALEM TO THEIR REVOLT UNDER ADRIAN.

I. Whether there were sixty six millions of inhabitants in Judea. II. Errors in this calculation. III. The true state of Judea after the destruction of Jerusalem. IV. Domitian requires tribute. V. The payment of tribute under Herod. VI. Odious poll-tax imposed on the Jews. VII. Whether there was a peculiar coin for tribute. Refutation of this opinion. VIII. Amount paid in Judea. IX. Heavier taxes imposed by Titus and Domitian. X. The Jews are included in the persecution of the Christians. XI. Abatement of persecution under Nerva. XII. Rise of the Patriarchs. XIII. Eleazar the Great, his maxims and life. XIV. Rabbi Joshua influential with Trajan. XV. Simeon Jochaides and Ezekiel Haggalili, Cabbalists. XVI. The poet Ezekiel, a Jew. XVII. Testament of the twelve Patriarchs composed at this period. XVIII. The author was a converted Jew. XIX. Revolt under Trajan. XX. Inconsistency in Eusebius. XXI. Fables of the Jews. XXII. Imrah, daughter of Trajan. XXIII. Tumults in Mesopotamia. XXIV. Massacre in the island of Cyprus.

I. JUDEA was reduced to a miserable state, after the destruction of its capital in the reign of Vespasian. It could not however have been entirely depopulated by the loss of thirteen or fourteen hundred thousand who perished in the war; especially if the calculation of some authors be received, who compute the inhabitants of this province at sixty six millions two hundred and forty thousand. These extravagant calculations are suspicious, and, as they are commonly grounded on mere conjecture, we should receive them with the utmost caution.

Villalpand, for instance, maintains that, in the time of Jehoshaphat, there were one million one hundred and sixty thousand men capable of bearing arms in Jerusalem alone; but he is led into an error by misunderstanding the passage of Scripture, 2 Chron. 17: 13—19. The sacred historian is not speaking of the inhabitants of Jerusalem merely, but his computation includes all whom Jehoshaphat could bring into the field from every part of Judea; and, exclusive of garrisons, they amounted to one million one hundred and sixty thousand men. Thus Villalpand has been misled by a wrong interpretation of Scripture, and the amount of forces which

Jerusalem could then send forth, must have been much less than what he has stated.

Josephus, praising the fertility of Galilee, observes, that no part of the soil was uncultivated. Large towns arose on every side, the least of which contained fifteen thousand inhabitants. Hence Villalpand supposes about ninety two thousand souls to every walled city, and then allowing sixty such cities to each tribe, he obtains five millions five hundred and twenty thousand, which multiplied by twelve for the number of the tribes, produces sixty six millions two hundred and forty thousand, for the amount of population in Judea.² If this province contained so many inhabitants in the time of Josephus, it was far from being depopulated by the war with the Romans; for, deducting thirteen or fourteen hundred thousand for those who were massacred, there still remain about sixty five millions.

II. But it is easy to point out the errors in Villalpand's computation. 1. It blindly follows the estimate of Josephus, which allows, without pretending to exactness, about fifteen thousand inhabitants to the smallest towns. We cannot believe that the smallest towns contained such a population; and, moreover, Villalpand's conjecture of the number of inhabitants in the walled cities is equally extravagant, as he gives them each ninety two thousand citizens. 2. Villalpand infers the state of the other tribes from the condition of Galilee, whereas Josephus mentions the fertility of Galilee, to contrast it with the deserts and scattered population of the other parts of Judea.

There were undoubtedly many millions of inhabitants in the province; but it is idle to attempt to fix the number, and the estimate of Villalpand is altogether extravagant.

III. We reckon the population of Judea much lower; for it is more than probable, that Jerusalem was almost deserted after its capture, and colonies would not have been sent to people the province, if many of the Jews had still continued in their desolated country. The land was depopulated by the numbers of those massacred, by the prisoners sold as slaves, and by fugitives to other countries.

But, on the other hand, the native Jews were able to reestablish themselves in a short time, as sixty years after the destruction of the temple, they raised new forces, fortified fifty castles, in which

they defended themselves against Adrian, not to mention the city of Bithers, which sustained a long siege.

IV. Some have supposed, that the sanhedrim was removed to Jamnia, and thence to Tiberias, that it there continued its sessions until the death of Judas the Holy, that colleges were established in many cities, and that the nation was still governed by patriarchs; but we shall find all this a delusion as we advance in the history.³

The wretched Jews retained no shadow of power in the land which God had given their fathers; and Domitian, extremely avaricious, completed their ruin by taxes. Some authors have thought, that these referred only to the Jews who had been expelled from the imperial city, and were not permitted to reenter it without the payment of a fixed sum; but they are mistaken, for the imposts were laid on all the Jews, and were not a new thing. To prove this point we have only to look into their earlier history.

V. Pompey subdued Judea, and, as was customary, imposed tribute. Julius Caesar granted a partial exemption to Hyrcania and Judea; but as Josephus informs us that his countrymen were obliged to carry their amount of tribute to Sidon every second year, we infer that their privileges consisted in having no overseers or collectors, who at that time oppressed the people. They were likewise freed from the burden of supporting the soldiers during winter quarters, and of paying tribute during the Sabbatical year, as the land was then uncultivated. Alexander the Great had previously granted them the same exemption. The Jews expected, when Herod became their king, that their tribute would be remitted, on account of his friendship for the Romans; but they were disappointed.⁵ The Romans, as Tacitus says, willingly conceded to princes the title of king, but made the people feel their bondage, by the requisition of tribute.⁶ Appian mentions the kings on whom Mark Antony imposed tribute, and among others Herod, with the princes of Pontus and Pisidia, while an exception to this general law is made only in favour of Upper Armenia.⁷

The learned were misled by finding no overseers or receivers in Judea till after the death of Herod and Archelaus; and they thence inferred that the Jews, as a nation, paid no tribute until that time. The Jews were indeed allowed to collect their taxes by receivers from among themselves, (a mere shadow of liberty;) but this very

fact is a proof that they were tributary, and not that they were a solitary exception to a general law. Undoubtedly, during the life of Jesus Christ, this tribute was paid irregularly ; for we find the Pharisees questioning our Saviour as to the lawfulness of paying tribute, and when he perceived the image of the emperor on the coin which they presented him, he made them the answer : " Render to Caesar the things that are Caesar's."

VI. There were in fact two kinds of taxes ; one of which exacted the hundredth part of the produce of the soil, and the other was a capitation, as Appian observes, more insupportable to the Jews than every other tax.⁸ The Jews, on account of the burden of this tax, presented a petition to Tiberius, to exempt them and Syria from the imposts by which they were oppressed.⁹ This capitation does not appear high, since but a single denarius (about fourteen cents) was levied upon each man ; but it made no distinction between the poor and the rich, resembling the tax of the half shekel paid to the temple by all indiscriminately. There were two causes that rendered tribute more odious in Judea than elsewhere. The Jews believed themselves the peculiar people of God, and imagined that they " never were in bondage to any man." Hence their extreme hatred of heathen rule, especially after the decline of the Maccabees, when a poll-tax made them sensible of their degraded state ; and hence too sprung the insurrection of Judas the Galilean, when Augustus first took the census of Judea.¹⁰ There was another cause that rendered their yoke the more burdensome. The coin to be paid into the Roman treasury, bore the image of the emperor, and the Jew could not look upon it without feeling, that he was violating the spirit of his law, which forbade the worship of images.

"Dacicus aut scripto radiat Germanicus auro."

VII. Some authors say indeed, that the Jews coined money which presented on one side the head of a man with a radiant crown, and on the other a rose.¹¹ They produce in proof one of the pieces which Judas received from the college of priests, on which this head and word might be seen ; but such coin is of little value excepting at Rome and Paris, where travellers are found simple enough to be duped by purchasing it at an extravagant price, as explanatory of ancient usages ; whereas it only exhibits the credulity of the age. These authors say likewise, that there was a

peculiar coin for the payment of tribute, on which was impressed the heads of victorious consuls, and the provinces they had subdued, represented in slavery.¹² In fact, Freherus produces a piece of such coin cast by Plautus, Pompey's lieutenant in Asia. This officer subdued a Jew by the name of Bacchius, who had formed a kingdom in one part of Arabia, and he impressed on the tribute money this prince on his knees with a camel's halter in one hand, and an olive branch in the other, as if entreating for peace.¹³ The coin bore this inscription:

BACCHIUS JUDAEUS.

But these medals were intended to perpetuate the memory of conquests, and not to serve as a peculiar coin for the payment of tribute. The grief of the Jew would have been aggravated indeed, if every piece of money which he paid bore the evidence of his subjection. But we must distinguish between medals and money; for medals were never used in the provinces to the exclusion of other coin, but tribute was generally paid in current money, which, from the time of Julius Caesar, bore the head of the reigning prince. Tiberius thought this impression so sacred, that he made it a high crime to carry a piece with his head upon it, to any vile place; and he condemned a master as guilty of treason, for having chastised a servant who had about him some of the emperor's coin. His severity aggravated the misery of the Jews, and the Pharisees allude to it in a conversation with Jesus Christ. They are inquiring whether it was lawful to pay tribute, and they say to our Saviour: "Thou carest not for any man, for thou regardest not the person of men;" that is, You are braving a prince extremely severe in the exaction of tribute. Jesus Christ taught them, that the payment of a tax ought not to be blended with duty towards God, and that obedience to kings should be distinguished from religion. "Render (said he) to Caesar the things that are Caesar's." Pope Constantine was so far from following the rule and example of his master, that he wished to efface the head of an emperor from his currency, because he had been excommunicated as a heretic.

VIII. Judea had paid, up to this time, only a land tax and a capitation, which gave into the Roman treasury eight hundred and ninety talents of silver (about one million seven hundred and eigh-

ty thousand dollars ;) but Titus enacted that the half shekel which was given to the temple by each man, and which Cicero observes was sent from Rome, and all parts of the world to Jerusalem, as a tribute to the Deity from his subjects, should be in future confiscated to the emperour, who usurped the place of God, and appropriated the sacred money to his own use.¹⁴ The half shekel is worth about twenty seven cents, so that the amount levied was very considerable. This third impost was the more ignominious, because it obliged the Jews to purchase liberty of conscience ; and Domitian exacted it with the utmost severity.

IX. In the first place, Xiphilinus informs us that, after the conquest of Judea, those Jews who continued true to the faith of their fathers, were obliged to purchase the right to worship God as their conscience dictated, by paying yearly a half shekel to the Capitoline Jupiter.¹⁵ Secondly, Tertullian complains bitterly that Christians were placed on the same footing with common prostitutes, and that rogues (or Jews) were allowed to live at Rome, by the payment of a poll-tax. Then, as Judaism had become extremely odious after the destruction of Jerusalem, the Romans required its professors to buy the unmolested enjoyment of their faith. In fine, Suetonius mentions the rigid severity with which Domitian claimed his tribute ; in one case an individual was required to undress, that the receivers of the emperour might ascertain whether he were a Jew, and therefore liable to a tax.¹⁶ Neither the rank, age, nor oaths of individuals were regarded ; and the Jew was by no means secure, though he declared himself a pagan rather than pay the required sum. The receivers compelled a man ninety years old to undergo a disgraceful examination, which was made the pretext for every obscenity.

*"Sed, quae de Bolymis venit perustis
Damnatam modo mentulam tributis."* 17

X. The hatred of Domitian did not rest here, but included the Jews in a common persecution with the Christians.¹⁸ There can be no doubt on this point, if we reflect that Christians and Jews were both guilty, in the eyes of the Romans, of impiety, because they worshipped one God and rejected idols. Besides, Dion assures us, that many individuals, who had embraced Judaism, were condemned, some of them to death, and others to the confiscation of their property, on a charge of impiety or atheism, which was often

made a pretext for persecution. These severities were first felt by the Jews in A. D. 95.

I am not surprised that Baronius places this persecution six years after my date, for his desire to bring pope Cletus into the list of martyrs has induced him to alter the chronology of those times.¹⁹ But it is astonishing that he should reject the evidence of Brutus, an ancient author and a pagan, who gives the rise of this persecution to the fifteenth year of Domitian, agreeing perfectly with the accounts of Tertullian and Lactantius, which, besides, mention that the persecution was very short, continuing but a single year. Baronius is unwilling to allow that it ceased so soon, because he thinks it arose when orders were transmitted to Evocatus in Judea, to send the parents of Jesus Christ to Rome for examination; and as orders could not reach Judea, and the parents of our Saviour be sent to Rome, in a single year, he infers that the persecution was of longer duration. But there is no necessary connexion between the persecution and the sending to Judea for the parents of Jesus Christ; for Domitian might have had a distrust of Joseph and Mary, and a desire to examine them, long before the persecution arose. At any rate, Baronius is wrong, when he says, that letters could not have been sent to Judea, and a return made, in a single year.²⁰ Dodwel, whose chronology we here follow, maintains that Domitian was content with banishing the persecuted, and did not take their lives. But this is not true, for Tertullian compares Domitian, in temper and habits, to Nero, who carried every thing to extremes; and further, Dion assures us that proselytes to Judaism were capitally punished; and we may very naturally suppose that those accused of impiety and atheism, that is, the Christians, were punished as severely.²¹ It was on this charge, that Clemens, the emperor's own cousin, was condemned and executed.²² I am surprised that the ancient martyrologies do not mention him, and that they have received so many imaginary saints and rejected a true martyr, whose cruel death is attested by a pagan. Glabrian should also be considered a martyr, unless we class him with the Jews; for impiety was the charge on which he was condemned.

XI. But at length Nerva, who succeeded Domitian, enacted three laws in favour of the Jews. 1. He discharged all who were accused of impiety or atheism, and recalled those who had been banished. Therefore, if Domitian had ever purposed to recal them,

he was prevented, by his assassination, from executing his design. 2. Nerva prohibited the persecution of the subjects of his empire, on account of impiety or Judaism. 3. He freed the Jews from the burden of the taxes by which they were oppressed under Domitian. A medal confirms this last statement by this inscription:

CALUMNIA FISCO JUDAICI SUBLATA.²³

Some authors infer too much from this medal, when they tell us, that the tax of the half-shekel was remitted; for Origen so expressly asserts that it was still paid in his time, that we cannot doubt it.²⁴ The medal merely implies that the Jews were no longer calumniated, that is, they were no longer, as in the reign of Domitian, fined heavy sums on frivolous or false charges.

XII. We place the rise of the patriarchs in Judea under Nerva for two reasons. 1. There is little probability that the Jews could early reestablish themselves in their native land, after a dispersion almost total. 2. They would not attempt it under Domitian, whose avarice and cruelty allowed them no rest. Gamaliel II. was chief of the fathers, or as the Greeks express it, patriarch, in the time of Nerva. We shall relate in the sequel the misunderstanding between him and Joshua, which occasioned his deposition from that office. The Jews found considerable difficulty in selecting a suitable successor to Gamaliel, because his influence was still powerful and prevented the election of Joshua, his enemy. Akiba was the next candidate; but his mean birth induced a fear, that Gamaliel, who was skilled in magic, would cast a spell upon him. Eleazar, the son of Azarias, next presented himself as well fitted for the patriarchal office, because he was of noble birth and able to pay a considerable sum, if he was taxed by the emperor. He consulted his wife as to the propriety of accepting the dignity, if offered to him, and she expressed her apprehensions that the Jews would soon depose him; but Eleazar quieted her fears by observing, that we should use a glass to day, though we knew it would be broken on the morrow. "You will be despised, (said his wife,) for you have not yet a grey beard." This was indeed a formidable obstacle; for Eleazar had no beard, although at that time twenty eight years old. But God removed the difficulty, by covering his chin in a moment with a fine white beard. At the sight of the miracle, his wife ceased to object, and Eleazar immediately obtained a large increase of followers by open-

ing the gates of the academy to those, whom Gamaliel had deemed unworthy of its privileges.²⁵ Joshua was elected president of the senate, and Eleazar, patriarch. He associated Gamaliel with himself, and they enjoyed the dignity in common. The former, according to historians, presided two Saturdays and the latter one ; whence it may be inferred, that the duties of the patriarch respected particularly religion and the sacred rites.²⁶

XIII. The Jews believe that a body of learned men survived the destruction of the temple, and flourished as late as the beginning of the second century, who conduced to the glory of their enslaved nation by many works, which we however think supposititious.

Eliezer the Great then flourished.²⁷ He is said to have been the son of Hyrcanus, a man of rank, who had attended so little to his education, that Eliezer, at the age of twenty eight, had not read the law. His ignorance was a cause of deep grief to him, until the prophet Elias appeared, and informed him where he might find an instructor. Eliezer, unknown to his father, travelled to Jerusalem to find John, the son of Zechai, who introduced him to an instructor, able to teach him some points of the law and his prayers. Eliezer wept and fasted for eight days, until he had mastered his task. His father came to Jerusalem to disinherit him, at the suggestion of his brothers ; but was so much pleased with the wisdom and modesty of his son, that he abandoned his purpose and would hardly be seated in his presence. He punished the brothers, by disinheriting them and bequeathing his property to Eliezer. Of his instructor Eliezer said : " No man can draw more water from a reservoir than was put into it, but he could do it from a fountain which is perennial ;" that is, No one could teach more than he had learned, but his master, like a living fountain, was continually pouring forth more precepts than God had given on Sinai. Eliezer professed, on his death bed, that he understood the art of transporting a crop from one field to another.

" Atque satas alio traducere messes."

On one occasion, as he was walking with Akiba, he pointed out to him a field of cucumbers. He ordered them to collect themselves in a heap, and they obeyed him. The Talmudists²⁸ represent him as so inflated with the idea of his own worth, that, a short time before his death, he asked : " What precept of the law is there which I have not obeyed ?" But Akiba humbled his vanity by answering : " Sir, you have always taught us that there is not on earth a man just and sinless."²⁹

XIV. Rabbi Joshua (Jehoshua) was associated with Eliezer, and his reputation was so great, that he is cited in the Mishna without a title or mark of distinction. Such was his influence at the court of Trajan, that the emperor gave permission to the Jews, at his intercession, to rebuild the sanctuary.³⁰ Joshua was deformed in person, which led the emperor's daughter to ask him, why such profound wisdom was deposited in so mean a vessel. The princess smiled at her own wit, while she taunted him with his natural defects; but he continued unmoved by the sarcasm. He turned to her and inquired, why she allowed the wine to be kept in earthen jars, at the same time advising her to use silver or gold. The princess followed his advice, and the wine soured. Trajan was irritated to find the wine spoiled, and ordered Joshua into his presence. The Rabbi did not attempt to excuse himself, because he wished to inculcate the lesson, that treasures were sometimes kept in earthen vessels; but plainly told the emperor, that his daughter had first taunted him with his deformity. This man was thought to possess the power of flying through the air, by virtue of a magical word.

XV. We shall speak more fully, as we proceed, of Simeon Jochaides, the reputed author of the cabalistic work called Zohar, and of Eliezer Haggalili, or the Galilean, another cabalistic doctor and a contemporary, who wrote the thirty two Excellencies of the Law, corresponding to the thirty two Ways to Wisdom.³¹ The Rabbins tell us, that we should take the greatest pains to impress these mystical expositions on our minds. There was a third Eliezer, the son of James, whose mantle was burnt in the temple, to punish him for having slept there. This last Eliezer is the reputed author of a treatise on the temple, and Bartolucci believes, that as this doctor had seen the temple and was an able man, the Rabbins in after times derived much of their information respecting it from him. But this is allowing antiquity to a work which may be of modern origin.³² Indeed these doctors and their works are only known to us through the Rabbins who lived long after them; and we find in their books such frequent reference to works and facts of a later period, that we must believe them a mere fabrication.

XVI. At this period flourished the poet Ezekiel, who composed, in Greek verse, the Departure from Egypt.³³ He was a Jew, and apparently wished to console his nation, oppressed by the Romans,

by celebrating a miraculous deliverance, and exciting their hopes of a redeemer like Moses. He lived between the times of Josephus and Clement of Alexandria ; and is quoted by the latter. We must therefore place him at the close of the first, or early in the second century.

XVII. The author of the Testament of the twelve Patriarchs probably lived about the same time. This man has concealed his religious principles ; but he writes so often like a Jew, that a learned author, who first gave the world the Greek text of this work, (which was unknown before, except in a bad translation by the Bishop of Lincoln, and in a few fragments,) is of opinion, that the original was composed in Hebrew by a Jewish doctor, some time before the appearance of Jesus Christ ; for the author, whoever he may be, has embraced the general expectation of that period, namely, that the Messiah would be a great warrior renowned for victories, and not a moral teacher.³⁴

The Bishop of Lincoln was of the same opinion ; for he bitterly complains of the jealousy of the Jews, who had concealed this work so long from the Christians, through fear that they would take advantage of its prophecies referring to the Messiah, in reasoning with them.³⁵

XVIII. The Testament of the twelve Patriarchs was evidently written towards the close of the first century, for the author speaks of the destruction of Jerusalem, of the actions of the Messiah, and the writings of the evangelists, like one who had a personal knowledge of these subjects. Origen saw the work, and found in it much that was valuable in sentiment, though the Jews do not place it in their canon.³⁶

Tertullian applies to St. Paul, who was first a persecutor and afterwards a teacher of nations, these words : " Benjamin shall raven as a wolf ; in the morning he shall devour the prey, and at night he shall divide the spoil." Some authors have thought that Tertullian obtained this quotation from a passage in the Testament of Benjamin ; but I cannot coincide with them. For Tertullian was an African and not familiar with the Greek, and the citation differs from any thing which can be found in that work. The passage in the Testament which appears most like it, is a prophecy, which promises to posterity, that a man shall arise from the seed of Benjamin, who shall be loved of God, shall seize on knowledge with the rapacity of a wolf, and diffuse it among the nations. But there is no need of

going to the Testament of Benjamin for the quotation of Tertullian, when it may be found in the benediction of Jacob.³⁷ But whether Tertullian was acquainted with this work or not, it is undoubtedly very ancient, for Origen has quoted it. Probably, the original text was not Hebrew, for it has never appeared in that language, and the manuscript of the Bishop of Lincoln, discovered in the thirteenth century, was in Greek. Besides, the work exhibits no Hebraisms, nor idioms foreign to the Greek, which would doubtless be retained, were it a translation. In a manuscript copy of the work, it is written: "The transcribers have followed the Greek version of St. Chrysostom;" but this father does not exhibit, in any of his writings, sufficient knowledge of Hebrew for a translator. Besides, is it probable that the Greek fathers of the fifth century possessed the original Hebrew of this Testament, knowing it to be the work of a Jew, and yet made no use in argument of the prophecies, to be found on every page, when they might have thus silenced a Jewish opponent?³⁸

The author of the Testament of Benjamin was probably a Jew and a proselyte to Christianity, who lived in Egypt, where Origen found his work. His design was to spread a knowledge of the principal circumstances in the life and death of Christ; and to advance his object, he conceals himself under the venerable title of the twelve patriarchs, though his former Judaism constantly appears in his prophecies. We ought not then to attribute this work to a Jew, nor adduce against the Jews, arguments drawn from it.

XIX. The oppressed are always disorderly and mutinous. A spirit of revolt has been thought peculiar to some religions and to the bias of certain nations; but this is a groundless prejudice, for men are naturally inclined to a state of peace.³⁹ Allow them liberty of conscience, and the right of enjoying and accumulating property, and there will be no rebellions against the government. Men will not relinquish a state of peace, unless the hatred of parties, persecution, or the tyranny of rulers, which are the common causes of insurrection, drive them to despair and violence. We need not wonder then, that the Jews, in spite of their misfortunes, had the spirit to rebel; for it is under oppression that men are most restless, and seek redress by any means, though they often deepen their misery in the search.

The Jews were unfortunate in choosing the reign of Trajan for rebellion; but soured and irritated by former miseries, they pushed

their cruelty to a horrid extreme, and, in their infatuation, braved the utmost severity of a powerful prince. The insurrection broke out at Cyrene, a city of Libya, where the Jews had been settled and powerful for many centuries. They obtained at first some advantages over the Greeks, (another name for Egyptians;) but the fugitives took refuge in Alexandria, and spreading their own fears and thirst for vengeance, they massacred all the Jewish population of that city. The Cyreneans were enraged at this just reprisal, and furiously stormed the place under the command of a general named Andrew. Mr. Cuper has informed me that Abulfaragius calls this commander Luminum, and Eusebius, who relates the fact, calls him Lucuas.⁴⁰ It is not easy to ascertain the origin of this diversity of names, and it is idle to attempt it, where nothing can be offered but conjecture. Abulfaragius is wrong, when he relates that Andrew the Light marched into Palestine; for his conquests were not achieved there, but in Egypt. The forces of Andrew ravaged the open country and massacred two hundred and twenty thousand of the inhabitants. The Romans entered the field under Martius Turbo, whom Trajan had ordered to suppress the insurrection. He effected this object after many bloody battles; but Libya had been so depopulated by the massacres at the beginning of the war, that Adrian sent colonists to repeople it.⁴¹

XX. The account of this rebellion by Eusebius is not consistent with itself; for in his History, he places the insurrection in the twenty eighth year of Trajan, but in his Chronicle, a year later. As the History is more correct than the Chronicle, we adopt its date, and place this event in the beginning of the second century, A. D. 115. The Jewish historians attribute this war to the ambition of the fugitives, who took refuge in Alexandria after the destruction of Jerusalem, and there built a temple; but divisions arising, Trajan was requested to interfere by the weaker party. He complied, and massacred five hundred thousand Jews. But surely these historians are wrong in one respect, for the Jews never built a temple in Egypt, excepting that of Onias.

XXI. The Talmudists, always ignorant of history, give us a still more erroneous account. Some of them assert, that it was Adrian, who slew more Jews in Egypt, than went from it under Moses, while others refer the carnage to Trajan. They find it recorded, that this massacre was perpetrated by command of the Alexander the

Macedonian, and are at a loss how to reconcile the account with history. One suggests that Macedonian should be erased, and another thinks that this is unnecessary, for the commander in chief of Nero's army, who may be supposed to have served in the same capacity under Trajan and Adrian, was named Alexander, and was from Macedonia. Unfortunately, the general who commanded in the Jewish war was not called Alexander, but *Martius Turbo*. The Talmudists have fallen into a strange mistake; but it is equalled by another which we shall now relate.

XXII. Vorstius makes Rabbi Ganz say, that *Imrah*, the daughter of Trajan, was so deeply in love with Rabbi Joshua, that she wore a mean dress and kept her wine in earthen jars, rather than use gold or silver, to express her affection for the Jewish doctor. The fact was, that she taunted Joshua, because to his wisdom was united a deformed body, and Joshua answered her, that wine was kept in earthen jars and not in silver.⁴² The Jews inform us, that the Rabbi was in such favour at the court of Trajan, that permission was granted him to rebuild the temple, and the Jews eagerly made arrangements for the work. But it was represented to Trajan, that they would revolt and refuse to pay tribute, if allowed to reestablish themselves in so advantageous a situation as Jerusalem. Trajan, unwilling to recall his orders, asked the advice of his counsellors. They replied that he must direct the building to be made nine feet longer or shorter than the former temple. The Jews were assembled at *Rhumon*. When this order reached them, they were thrown into consternation, and had recourse to Joshua, the son of *Chanania*, whose profound wisdom was universally acknowledged. He related to them the apologue of the lion, who was tortured while devouring his prey, by a bone which he could not swallow. The animals were summoned to his aid with promises of a great reward; but when the stork had extracted the bone and claimed the reward, the lion answered: "You are fortunate to escape uninjured from my jaws." The application was readily made. "We are fortunate, (said Joshua,) in living peaceably among this heathen nation, and we must be contented." Some Rabbins refer this narrative to the time of Julian the Apostate, who conceded to the Jews the privilege, never granted them by Trajan, of rebuilding the temple. But in removing one difficulty, they create another; for, unless our chronology be altered, Joshua, who lived under Trajan, cannot be made contemporary with Julian the Apostate.⁴³

XXIII. But to proceed ; the insurrection of the Grecians was quelled, though new tumults distracted Mesopotamia the following year. The trembling inhabitants of this province anticipated the fate of the Egyptians, until their fears were removed by the arrival of Lucius Quietus, a Moor, one of the most skilful generals that the empire then possessed. In the execution of the orders of Trajan, he slew so many seditious Jews, that the spirit of the rest was broken ; but as his presence was necessary to restrain them, and his departure would have been the signal for renewed hostilities, he was appointed governour of Palestine by the emperour, to watch their motions.⁴⁴

XXIV. Another storm was lowering over the island of Cyprus. The Jews of this island began a revolt by the massacre of two hundred and forty thousand of the inhabitants. Their own historians do not palliate the act, but increase rather than diminish the number of the slain ; for they tell us, that information respecting insurrections elsewhere, having reached Gophri, that is, Cyprus, the Jews rose on the pagans, and the massacre was so complete that not a soul survived.⁴⁵ Trajan sent Adrian, the commander in chief of his forces, against them, and the Romans, after subduing them, passed an edict that no Jew should land on the island under the severest penalties. I know not why the critics should attempt to correct these historians. Some of them would substitute Egypt for Cyprus, and imagine their conjecture is well founded, because if a letter in the word Gophri be changed, it becomes Egypt ; others say that the massacre was perpetrated at Cyprus, a castle beyond Jericho, built by Herod the Great, and thus named from his mother ; but none of them attempt to prove their conjectures true, and their narratives are merely the vagaries of the imagination.⁴⁶ These critics should know that the Jews had been powerful in Cyprus for ages before Trajan, and that hence sprung St. Barnabas, the companion of St. Paul's travels ; and further, that all historians, Jewish, pagan, and Christian, agree as to the place of the massacre. Dion, a pagan, says in express terms, that the Jews of Cyprus, with Artemion at their head, killed two hundred and forty thousand of the inhabitants, and therefore no Jew was afterwards permitted to land there, and when driven ashore by tempests, they were slain. Besides the Jewish historians who agree with Dion, Eusebius too relates that the Jews ravaged Salamis, and murdered all its inhabitants ; and he confines the massacre to this

city of Cyprus : but when we reflect that two hundred and forty thousand dead were counted, and that the revoltors were probably more numerous still, we must be satisfied that the carnage could not be confined to a single city.

Some authors assure us, that there is no need of supposing an army sent to Cyprus to repress these disorders and avenge the massacre, because the inhabitants who escaped, took up arms and avenged themselves ; but there must have been an immense number of pagans in the island, to raise an army after such a carnage.

The Jewish account is more probable, which informs us, that Adrian transported an army to the island, killed the rebels, and forbade the Jews to land on it ; and they were so rigidly excluded that but few of them were afterwards found in Cyprus. But they could not complain of severity, with their own example before them.

¹ Villalpand on Ezek. Vis. Explanat. Tom. II. Part II. Lib. V. Disp. III. Cap. LII. p. 539. ² Chron. 17: 13—19. ³ Villalp. *Ibid.* ⁴ Lightfoot, Oper. Posth. p. 70. ⁵ Josephus, Antiq. Lib. XIII. Cap. XVII. p. 466. ⁶ Noris Epochæ Syr. Pagi App. ad Crit. Bar. Lamy, App. ad Harmon. ⁷ Tacitus in Agricola. ⁸ Appian in Syriac. ⁹ Tacit. Lib. II. ¹⁰ Josephus, Antiq. Lib. XVIII. Cap. I. ¹¹ Pödlor. V. Anton. August. Dial. II. n. I. ¹² See a dissertation by the author, on the coin and medals of the Jews, inserted in Vol. VI. p. 532. and seq. ¹³ Freher. Dissert. de Numism. Cens. p. 3636. ¹⁴ 890 talents of silver. Their Tribute was always paid in silver. ¹⁵ Xiphil. in Vesp. 217. ¹⁶ Suet. Lib. VIII. p. 137. ¹⁷ Mart. Lib. VII. Epigr. 14. ¹⁸ Xiphil in Domit. p. 236. ¹⁹ Baron. Annal. ²⁰ Apud Euseb. Lib. III. Cap. XVIII. p. 89. ²¹ Dodw. Diss. in Cypr. II. p. 60. ²² Xiphil. p. 236. ²³ Petit. Var. Lect. p. 2569. ²⁴ Orig. ad Afric. p. 243. ²⁵ In the Talmud, they call the day of Eleazer's election, the Great Day, and as often as these words are met with, בר בריה, the day of Eleazer's election is inteded. In Barachot. fol. 27. Wagenseil, in Sota Mishna, Tom. V. p. 247. ²⁶ Ganz, Zemach. ²⁷ פירקי רבי אליעזר, Pirke Rabbi Eliezer, Chapters or Maxims of Rabbi Eliezer. Wendelin, Canon of Gand, believed this work to be very ancient, and composed by the son in law of Gamaliel, the instructor of St. Paul, and he therefore had a great desire to see it ; but Father Morin says, that it was much more modern, and that Buxtorf was deceived in the opinion, that it was a historical work ; for it contains only the traditions of the Jews without arrangement, and some fables of the Talmudists. They cite many fables which were composed after Eliezer. Antiq. Eccles. Orient. Ep. XL. XLI. p. 340. ²⁸ Ex. Gemar. Sanhedr. Cap. VII. Cccc. duo Tit. p. 280. ²⁹ Sanhedr. Cap. XI. Cocc. duo. Tit. p. 410. ³⁰ Ganz, Zemach

David. Aetas post Excidium, An. 833. p. 97. 31 Lib. III. Cap. 10. לַב
 דָּרִיּוֹת. Middoth, XXXII. Proprietates. Bartoloc. Bibl. Rabb. Tom. IV. p. 255.
 32 כַּדְרִיּוֹת, in Taanith, fol. 7. Wagenseil, p. 311. 33 Ezekielis אַרְבָּעֵי
 There is a Fragment of it among the Gr. Poets of Etien. L. Moyne, Var.
 Sacr. Tom. II. p. 356. 34 Grabe, Spicileg. Patrum. Tom. I. Saec. I.
 35 Utrum autem iste liber ex typographiâ Græcâ nobis incompertum. Nour-
 ry, Apparatus ad Bibl. Pat. 240 fol. But the work of Mr. Grabe had appeared
 four or five years before. 36 Orig. in Joshua, Cap. I. p. 705. 37 Tes-
 tam. XII. Patriarch, Benjam. Sect. 12. p. 252. 38 Apud Grabe, ibid. p.
 143. 39 A. D. 115. sub. Imper. Trajan. 40 Euseb. Lib. IV. Cap.
 II. 41 Ganz, Zemach David. Chronol. p. 104. Solomon Fil. Virg. Tri-
 bus Judae, p. 67. 42 Ganz, Chronol. p. 97. Otho, Hist. Doct. Misnic.
 p. 126. 43 Vorstius makes Ganz say, that the daughter of Trajan was
 named Imrah, but Mr. Reland, a profound scholar in oriental antiquities,
 has made it appear to the satisfaction of all, that Imrah was not the
 name of the princess, but that the word means "She said." 44 Eu-
 seb. in Chronic. Id. Hist. Lib. IV. Xiphil. ex. Dion. Lib. LXXVIII. Auctor
 de locis Actuum Apost. Apud. Hieron. Orosius, Lib. VII. Cap. XII.
 45 בְּגִיפְרִי Begiphri. Zachutus in Juchasin. Ganz in Chron. p. 102. 46 They
 change R into D, which is easily affected from the resemblance of ר to ד,

CHAPTER SECOND.

HISTORY OF THE REVOLT OF THE JEWS IN THE REIGN OF ADRIAN UNDER BARCHOCHEBAS AND AKIBA TO A. D. 132.

I. The Jews become fortune-tellers. II. Project falsely attributed to the emperor Adrian. III. Cause of the war as related by the Jews, incorrect. IV. The cause to which it is attributed by St. Chrysostom. V. The true reasons of the war. Remarks on the prohibition of circumcision. VI. Colony sent to Jerusalem previous to the war. VII. Impostors who preceded Barchochebas. St. Luke arranges the false Messiahs differently from Josephus. St. Gamaliel invoked. VIII. Defeat of Judas. IX. Dositheus and Simon. X. Barchochebas and his children. XI. His genealogy and the length of his reign erroneous. XII. How he declared himself the Messiah. XIII. Jewish eulogies on Akiba his precursor. XIV. He was president of the sanhedrim. Difficulty with regard to his age. XV. Description of Bithur, the capital of king Barchochebas. XVI. Jewish date of the beginning of the war. XVII. Error of St. Jerome. XVIII. Conjecture of father Pagl. XIX. Other conjectures better founded. XX. This war is fabulous according to father Hardouin. XXI. Whether Adrian went to Judea, only in a time of peace and without an army. XXII. There were no Jews at Jerusalem, but it was inhabited by Greeks and called Capitolia. XXIII. Medals of the emperor Adrian, counterfeit. XXIV. Refutation of this conjecture. XXV. War breaks out. Advantages gained by Barchochebas. XXVI. Whether he slew only Christians. Justin Martyr refuted. Error of Ganz. XXVII. Conference of Akiba with Tinnius Rufus. XXVIII. Severus takes his place. XXIX. Siege and capture of Bithur. Death of Barchochebas. XXX. Akiba and other martyrs. XXXI. Dreadful massacre in this war. XXXII. Aelia built. XXXIII. How rendered odious to the Jews. XXXIV. Whether they were exiled from the Holy Land. XXXV. Medal of Adrian, badly explained by Tristan. XXXVI. Condition of the Asiatic Jews during the war. XXXVII. Whether the Jews purchased of Adrian the right to read the Scriptures in Hebrew. XXXVIII. Refutation of this opinion.

I. THE wretchedness of the Jews was aggravated by the oppression of Adrian to such a degree, that they were reduced to interpret dreams, and tell fortunes, for a scanty subsistence. Juvenal, who lived to the twelfth year of this prince, knew the Jews of Rome and Egypt, where he was exiled in disgrace; and he represents them as conjurers and beggars, in constant fear of chastisement.¹

"Cophino faenoque relicto,

*Arcanam Judaea tremens mendicat in aurem,
Interpres legum Solymarum, et magna sacerdos
Arboris ac summi fida internuncia coeli.²
Implet et illa manum, sed parcius aere minuto,
Qualiacunq; voles Judaei somnia vendunt."*

We can adduce no higher authority than that of the emperor Adrian himself, who declares that in all Egypt he had seen but one

Jew, and that he was a mathematician. The singular and happy discoveries in mathematics, and the noble descent and private worth of many devoted to this science, have brought it into repute with us ; but in ancient times it was despised, because connected with magic.

II. We should be better acquainted with the particulars of the revolt from Adrian, if the work of Anthony Julian were preserved ; for that gave a full account of the Jewish rebellions against this prince, in imitation of the history by Josephus of their war with Vespasian and Titus. Anthony Julian was a Spaniard by birth ; he is quoted by Minutius Felix, and highly praised by Aulus Gellius.³ Vossius declares his ignorance of the time when he flourished, but it was doubtless in the reign of Adrian. The Talmudists relate, that Adrian purposed to expel the Jews from his empire, and unfolded his intentions to his council, by asking: "Whether it was not more prudent for a man to amputate a diseased or mortified limb, than to retain it at the peril of his life;" referring plainly to the Jewish nation, as a diseased member of the state.⁴ A counsellor answered, that they could not be expelled from the empire, for God had predicted that he would scatter them to the four winds ; that is, he had made it as impossible for a people to exist without Jews among them, as for the winds to cease blowing ; besides, the Jews would look upon him as a tyrant, if he banished them from his empire. The prince was irritated by this free advice, and condemned the counsellor, who had given it, to death. A Roman lady exclaimed, when she saw him passing to execution : "Woe to the ship, that sails from port without a full cargo;" meaning, that the counsellor had no reason to expect happiness hereafter ; for though he had the glory of dying for the Jewish nation, yet he was not a Jew, nor even a proselyte. The man was immediately circumcised, professed himself a convert to Judaism and left his property to Akiba. The Talmudists do not name the emperor, who treated his minister with such severity ; but as Akiba lived under Adrian, we must refer this Roman proselyte to his reign. Adrian, however, never determined to persecute the Jews, until they rebelled against him.

III. The revolt of the Jews against that prince is attributed to different causes by the Talmudists and by Christian historians. The former relate, that it was customary in Judea for each family to plant a cedar before the house at the birth of a son, and a pine at the birth of a daughter. These trees were deemed sacred, and were

not cut down until they were needed to form their marriage bed. The daughter of Adrian was travelling in Judea, when her chariot was injured, and her attendants proceeded, in an overbearing manner, to cut down one of the sacred trees, to be used in repairing it. The inhabitants of the place rose and massacred the train of the princess, who was so enraged that she forced her father to make war against the Jews, to humble their pride. We have here a striking instance of the propensity of Jews to disorder history by introducing fictions for truth, even when these are not very creditable to themselves. If the above be the true cause of the revolt, then the Jews deserved much of what they suffered, because they made so trifling an aggression a reason for rebellion and bloodshed. Let us turn to the origin of the revolt, as given by Christian historians.

IV. St. Chrysostom assures us that the Jews, who always resisted the Holy Spirit, endeavoured to rebuild the temple at three different times.⁵ The first attempt was made, when they sought to reestablish their commonwealth by rebelling against Adrian; but they did not reflect, that their war was against God, and that they could not conquer the Almighty. He relates further, that Adrian subdued the Jews, and placed his statue in Jerusalem; but knowing that it would be destroyed by time, and wishing to leave a more durable monument of his victory, he gave the city his own name, which it retained while he lived, being uniformly called Aelia. St. Chrysostom has written on these events like an orator who does not pride himself on accuracy; for there were no movements among the Jews towards rebuilding their temple under Adrian, and therefore he is wrong as to the first attempt which he ascribes to them. He is equally so in regard to the second, if he thinks it was connected with an insurrection, whose object was to reestablish their commonwealth. It is not even true, that the Jews wished to rebuild Jerusalem, for Aelia rose on its ruins before the revolt. In fine, Jerusalem did not long retain the name of Aelia. It was indeed so called at the council of Nice; but when Constantine erected temples in the city, and Christianity triumphed over paganism, it resumed its ancient name. Eusebius calls it Aelia in his history, but in the life of Constantine, where he mentions the edifices constructed by the prince in that city, he uniformly speaks of it as Jerusalem. Gregory Nazianzen gives it the same name, and Cyril, at the council of Constantinople, subscribed himself Bishop of Jerusalem.

V. Three causes conspired to excite the general insurrection against Adrian. 1. This prince, in imitation of the example of Domitian and Nerva, had forbidden the Jews to circumcise; at least Spartian has so stated, and we are not competent to dispute the authority of an author, who lived under Diocletian. A law was passed, by which the Roman citizen, who allowed either himself or his children to be circumcised, was banished, and the physician, who performed the rite, was capitally punished; and further, the Jew who circumcised pagan children, or any individual of a different religion, was either banished or put to death.⁶ St. Chrysostom, and some distinguished men after him, have entertained the opinion, that the Jews sought to increase the number of their proselytes, by circumcising the heathen, in order to secure in the end the re-establishment of their commonwealth; but it does not appear probable, that they expected to raise from Roman converts or from their slaves, an army sufficiently powerful to effect this purpose.⁷ The edicts respecting circumcision, were only intended to prevent the changes in religious opinions which sometimes took place at Rome, and highly offended the pagans. Antoninus allowed the Jews to practise this rite, even after his war with them. He had become tired of insurrections, and seeing how irritated the Jews were, he conceded to them the privilege of circumcision; but they were in no state at that time, to obtain proselytes in such numbers, as to create an expectation of reviving their theocracy. The prohibition of Adrian deprived the Jew of one of the principle rites of his religion; it took from him the badge which distinguished him from the Gentiles, the seal of his peculiar relation to God, and the divine favour which he connected with it. We need not wonder then, that the Jews rebelled, when forbidden to practice circumcision.⁸

VI. 2. Moreover, Adrian sent a colony to Jerusalem, and built on its ruins a city which received his name, and was consecrated to Jupiter Capitolinus. This second cause of the war, has excited as opposite opinions as the first; for Eusebius says, that the colony was not sent to Jerusalem until Bithur was taken, and Dion, on the other hand, affirms that the war was occasioned by this colony, for the Jews could not endure in their city the presence of heathen who worshipped strange gods; and therefore took up arms against them.⁹ We cannot doubt the accuracy of Dion, and to reconcile him with Eusebius, we would observe that it is probable, that the designs of

the emperor were crossed at the outset, by the revolt of the Jews, who expelled the colonists; but were accomplished afterwards, when they were subdued.¹⁰ Thus then, Adrian sent colonists to Jerusalem before the war, as Dion informs us, and permanently established them there when the Jews were conquered, in conformity to Eusebius. 3. The ambition of Barchochebas, who took advantage of the excitement produced among the people by the circumstances we have mentioned, urged the Jews to rebellion. It may be proper, now we are speaking of the false Messiahs who deceived their nation, to give their history from an earlier period.

VII. About the time of Gamaliel, impostors appeared with the greatest hardihood. He had seen two of them perish, and the failure of their enterprise made such an impression on him, that he would not oppose the progress of Christianity, because he thought that God would suppress it, if it were not from heaven. "For before these days rose up Theudas, (said he,) and was defeated. After this man rose up Judas of Galilee, in the days of the taxing, and drew away much people after him, and he also perished. So if this counsel or work be of men, it will come to nought."¹¹ Christians have been so well pleased with his moderation, that they have made Gamaliel, with his son and grandson, saints; and their relics are shown at Pisa, where travellers are exhorted to invoke them, in the hope of obtaining salvation through their merits.

"Sanctus Gamaliel, Abybas et Nicodemus,
Insimul ipse pater, filius atque nepos.
Hoc epigramma legens, horum suffragia quaere,
Teque recommendans, poseo salutis opem."

The critics are much embarrassed, because St. Luke mentions Theudas before Judas; whereas Josephus places Judas in A. D. 10. and refers Theudas to a much later period.¹² Eusebius has followed Josephus and places Theudas in the reign of Claudius.¹³ Whence can this diversity of opinions have arisen? Has Josephus assigned these men to a wrong period? Or has St. Luke erred with Gamaliel, believing that this doctor of the Jews could not mistake respecting a fact in the history of his own country, of which he was an eye-witness? Finally, how could Eusebius prefer the evidence of Josephus to that of St. Luke, when he received St. Luke as an inspired writer? M. d'Valois, with the usual blindness of commentators to the faults of the historians whom they interpret, defends Eusebius, and, to set aside the authority of a sacred writer, supposes that

St. Luke adduces the example of the last rebel first; or rather, that he introduces Theudas into the speech of Gamaliel, although Theudas made no insurrection for ten years after this session of the Jewish sanhedrim. M. d'Valois would have us believe, that St. Luke foresaw this noted example and adduced it with that cited by Gamaliel, because it bore on the same point. Virgil has placed Aeneas, with equal propriety, in a harbour which did not exist in his day: "Portusque require Velinos." What does M. d'Valois think of a parallel between St. Luke and Virgil, between an inspired writer and a poet who cared little how he blended fiction with truth, if he could but add interest to his epic.¹⁴ The critics have hardly pardoned Virgil for making Dido contemporary with Aeneas, and mentioning the harbour of Piediluco, ("Portusque Velinos") at a time when it was not constructed; and could St. Luke anticipate an event by twelve or fifteen years without exposing himself to censure? Could St. Luke, with any propriety, make Gamaliel in the sanhedrim refer to an event as proof in point, when that event had not taken place and did not happen till after his death? The commentator, who has only thrown out these conjectures to defend Eusebius, might have done it in another way; he might have supposed two Theudas; the one, mentioned by Josephus, living under Claudius, and the other, by Gamaliel as quoted by St. Luke, revolting before Judas the Galilean. It is not incredible that two men of the same name, should live in the same age and attempt the same thing.

VIII. The Romans sent a body of troops against Judas, and put him to a cruel death; and his children were persecuted and finally murdered by Alexander, who succeeded Fadus. The followers of Judas maintained the tenets of their master with unyielding fortitude amidst the severest trials, and they existed until the destruction of Jerusalem, when they were besieged in the castle of Masada. Fugitives from among them spread their opinions in Egypt, and occasioned fresh massacres.

IX. Origen has likewise placed Simon the magician and Dositheus in the number of false Messiahs. These two men were Samaritans. The latter was an instructor, and the former his pupil. Dositheus, if we may believe Origen, openly declared himself the Messiah foretold by the ancient prophets. His disciples, to make his death accord with this character, spread the report that he had risen

from the grave; and, if he did not expose himself to public view, it was because he was obliged to pass a number of years in a cavern.

Simon proclaimed himself the Excellence of the great God, who had given the law on Sinai, assumed the body and nature of a son under Tiberius, and afterwards descended on the apostles at the feast of pentecost. It must be owned that Simon did not declare himself the Messiah very explicitly. But as he was the head of a sect, and as there are some chronological difficulties as to the time when Dositheus lived, we shall treat more fully of both as we proceed.

X. Coziba or Barchochebas assumed the character of Messiah, with greater splendour, than any other pretender to this dignity. He was a robber, as were the others, and wished to enrich himself by pillage, and to acquire an influence among his countrymen by opposition to the Romans. Some authors have thought that there were two impostors of this name, the grandfather and grandson; and the Jews thus relate their history. "Coziba I. was elected king fifty two years after the destruction of the former temple, and died in Bither, the capital of his dominions, situated near Jerusalem. His son called the Red succeeded him, and the throne was afterwards filled by his grandson Romulus or Coziba, whom the Jews acknowledged as their Messiah. When the emperor Adrian was informed of their proceedings, he marched against them with a powerful army, stormed Bither, and slew a great number of Jews, in the seventy third year from the destruction of the temple."¹⁵ Then the reigns of the three Cozibas lasted but twenty one years, though some writers extend this term, because they place the elder Coziba under Domitian.¹⁶ The ancient Jewish Chronicle allows but two years and a half to the Cozibas; but probably it only speaks of the grandson, who was slain by his followers, because he could not completely personate the Messiah and distinguish criminals by their smell. The Talmud relates the same thing.¹⁷

XI. This account is a fabrication so badly put together, that it is astonishing able commentators should be found among Christians, who maintain its correctness.¹⁸ 1. They are unfortunate in supposing two Cozibas or Barchochebas, for the greater part of the Jews acknowledge but one, and they are correct. 2. The rebellion of the Jews towards the close of Trajan's reign, was excited by a man named Andrew, not Barchochebas, and he made no pretensions to the Messiahship. Besides, his insurrection was in Egypt, whereas that

of Coziba was in Judea.¹⁹ 3. They display an ignorance of the genealogy of Trajan, for they relate, that he sent Adrian, his sister's son, against the Jews of Egypt. But Ulpia, the grandmother of Adrian, was Trajan's aunt, and therefore these princes were only cousins. 4. The critics are also in an error as to the length of Coziba's reign (twenty one years,) the duration of the war against him, and the successors and heirs to his throne and property ; for he was the last of his race, and his war was soon ended, as we shall see in the sequel. 5. They place his death in the seventy third year from the destruction of the temple, whereas Adrian, who in the eighteenth year of his reign closed the war by the storm of Bither and death of Coziba, died before A. D. 141. This chronological error plainly shows that the whole account is false. The author of the Jewish Chronicle is more correct than his commentators, for he allows but two years and a half to the reign of Coziba, and speaks of him only as an impostor. 6. Finally, the Jews relate a fable that savours of Rabbinic conceit, when they tell us that Coziba was put to the test by being required to distinguish criminals from others. Is there the least probability, that the Jews would test the Messiah by his powers of smelling ? I can admit but one Barchochebas, who lived under Adrian, and brought many dreadful calamities on his countrymen.

XII. This Coziba, endeavouring to persuade the Jews that he was their Messiah, furthered his design by changing his name, and calling himself the Son of the Star, or Barchochebas, to spread a belief that he was the star seen by Balaam in vision, Num. 24: 17. He proclaimed himself a light from heaven, sent to succour the people, and to deliver them from the oppression of the Romans. To confirm his assertions, he made fire issue from his mouth when he spoke ; at least St. Jerome relates that he made the people believe this, by means of lighted tow. He chose a precursor with a character like his own, and thus materially furthered his purposes.

XIII. Coziba selected for this dignity, Akiba, who was supposed to be a descendant from Sisera, commander in chief under Jabin king of Tyre, by a Jewish mother.²⁰ He passed forty years of his life as a shepherd, guarding the flocks of a rich citizen of Jerusalem, named Calba Chuva. His master's daughter fell in love with him, and urged him to apply himself to study because she did not wish a shepherd to be her husband.²¹ They were secret-

ly married, and Akiba left her, and spent about twelve years at a college. When he returned to his wife, twelve thousand disciples followed him; but his wife advised him to go back to his college, and he complied. At the close of the next twelve years, he went again to his wife with eighty thousand disciples. She came before him with her dress torn and disordered; for her father, in his rage at her marriage, had disinherited her. But when he saw Akiba, he knelt before him, and gave him a large amount of property, though in violation of an oath which he had taken.

We have no mention of the location of the college whence Akiba drew his disciples. Their immense number surprises us; and our wonder is increased when we learn, that these eighty thousand followers all died between the passover and pentecost, that no one should have any advantage over another, and that they were buried, together with Akiba and his wife, at the foot of a hill near Tiberias.²² Akiba continued to instruct his followers, and he wrote two works, one of which is cabalistic,²³ and called *Jetsirah*;²⁴ and must be distinguished from the book, with the same title, attributed to Abraham. He was so wise a man, that he could give a reason for the use of the most insignificant letter in the law, and it is boldly asserted, that God revealed more to him, than to Moses. The Mishna and Talmud contain a thousand maxims, which the Rabbins attribute to him and believe to inculcate the most profound wisdom. Indeed, a whole volume would not contain the wonderful things which he did and said.²⁵ The Deity permitted Akiba to enter paradise with doctor Asai to whom his sister was betrothed. Thus the Rabbins praise this man, who brought desolation on his country, and aided an imposter who pretended to the Messiahship.

XIV. According to Lightfoot, Akiba was president of the sanhedrim, while this sovereign council held its sessions at Jafna, assuming this office in the second year of Domitian, after the death of Jochanan whom he succeeded.²⁶ He enjoyed his dignity until his death at the capture of Bithur. We need not refute Lightfoot's opinion by a reference to what has been proved, that the sanhedrim never removed to Jafna, for there is other evidence that he is wrong. The Rabbins, his authority, are themselves in error, for they place the death of Akiba in the year fifty two or fifty five after the destruction of the temple, which corresponds with A. D. 125. But Bithur

was taken in A. D. 138 ; and therefore Akiba must be supposed to have lived one hundred and thirty three years, before these chronological computations can be reconciled. No confidence then can be given to the accounts of the Jews respecting the birth and death of Akiba, since they show themselves ignorant of the time when both these events happened.

XV. Barchochebas appeared, when Akiba enjoyed the highest reputation. This doctor exclaimed, when he saw the impostor : " Behold the star which was to rise in Judah," and he proclaimed himself, his precursor, as John the Baptist was the forerunner of Christ. These two men shaped their characters to the expectations of the people, who looked for a conquering Messiah to deliver them from the Roman yoke, which the last war, and the severities of Adrian rendered daily more burdensome. Barchochebas found many who were willing to follow him, and he assembled an army of two hundred thousand men. The Rabbins are extravagant in their praise of the bravery and bodily strength of each man in this army ; for they tell us, there was not a soldier in it who could not, with his horse at full speed, tear up a cedar of Lebanon.

Bithur was chosen for the capital of the empire, and for a place of refuge in case of defeat. The Jews call this city *the Dwelling of Spies* (בית-תר, Bethtar,) because, after the destruction of Jerusalem, informers watched here to discover who went up to Zion, that they might ingratiate themselves with the Romans by accusing the pilgrims, or perhaps, that they might enrich themselves with the offices and confiscated property of the impeached. The Jews were at times brought before the Romans on other charges. Eusebius places Bithur in the neighbourhood of Jerusalem, but there were two cities of this name, the one distant twelve and the other fifty two miles from that place. According to St. Jerome, both these places were called Beth-horon, were built by Solomon and ruined in war. Beth-horon was given by Pharaoh as his daughter's dower on her marriage with Solomon, who granted it to the Levites, because it was located in their division of the soil. But the Jews inform us, that this was not the true Bithur, for its name means the Dwelling of Spies ; whereas the capital of Barchochebas was called the Abode of Liberty. Coziba selected this city for the ceremony of

his coronation, and for the emission of his money as the Messiah and king of the nation. He only waited for the departure of Adrian from Egypt to declare war, which broke out in A. D. 134, corresponding to the seventeenth year of Adrian. As some may hesitate to receive this date of the Jewish rebellion, we shall establish its correctness.

XVI. St. Jerome has given us a very different date, from a computation of the seventy weeks of Daniel, by the Jews of his time.⁹⁷ Sixty two of these weeks, say they, had passed when Vespasian reduced Judea to complete submission. Seven weeks, that is forty nine years, after this emperour, appeared Adrian, who built Aelia on the ruins of Jerusalem, and, by his general Tinnius Rufus, subdued the Jews. Then the sacrifice ceased. A single week of the seventy remained, and this was divided between the two emperours; three years and a half were allowed to the war of Vespasian, and the same time to that of Adrian, and thus were accomplished the seventy weeks of the prophet. St. Jerome observes with much reason, that ninety nine weeks or six hundred and ninety six years elapsed from the delivery of the prophecy to Adrian, and therefore the computation of the Jews is incorrect. Moreover, if we calculate the seven weeks, from the death of Vespasian which happened in A. D. 79, then the war of Adrian must have broken out in A. D. 127; but, if from the destruction of Jerusalem, our error will be greater still, since the subjugation of the Jews would then fall in A. D. 119. But we shall see that this is impossible.

XVII. St. Jerome, however, receives this date, for he tells us that Adrian put down a second insurrection of the Jews in A. D. 119.⁹⁸ How could he call this the second rebellion, and how can Scaliger be correct in the conjecture, that it was in distinction from that under Vespasian; when the wars against Vespasian and Trajan had both preceded it? Besides, St. Jerome is at variance with himself, for he says as he proceeds, that the Jews revolted in A. D. 133, and Adrian sent an army under 'Tinnius Rufus to subdue them; that Barchochebas rose to power the following year, and the war ended in A. D. 135, by the complete subjugation of the Jews.⁹⁹ This statement cannot be reconciled with our former quotations from him. Scaliger attempts to do away these discrepancies by a conjecture, that there were seditious movements in A. D. 119, and an open declaration of war fourteen years after. But he

is unsupported by any authority. Then we must seek the date of the final conquest of Judea from other sources than those already mentioned.

XVIII. According to Dion, "Adrian sent a colony to Jerusalem and erected the statue of Jupiter where the temple of God had stood. The enraged Jews were only prevented from violence at this introduction of heathen idolatry, by the approach of the emperor, who was in Egypt, and thence intended to visit Syria.³⁰ They manufactured imperfect instruments of war, and sold them to the Roman soldiery, that these might be less effective in case of rebellion. The departure of Adrian from Syria was the signal of a general rising among the Jews." We must then ascertain when Adrian went to Egypt and Syria, to fix the date of the war. According to Pagi, the emperor visited those countries in A. D. 128, and he conjectures this from the number of medals cast by the cities of Syria and Egypt, at this period, in honour of Adrian.³¹ There is much plausibility in this supposition, for the presence of the emperor would naturally excite the liberality of the people; but no certain inference can be drawn from such grounds. The fact that Adrian was at Rome the year following, makes somewhat against this supposition.

XIX. Phlegon, secretary to Adrian, has preserved a letter from his master to the consul Servian. The emperor gives him an account of the wonders of Egypt, and of the rebellious spirit of its inhabitants, and he sends him and his wife (Adrian's sister) some vases, which he requests may be used at their table.³² The date of the Jewish war may be more correctly ascertained by this letter than by the medals of the Syrian cities, for it must have been written, while the emperor was in the East. Servian was his brother in law, and the letter is addressed to him as consul, which dignity he enjoyed under Adrian in A. D. 134. We may conclude then, that the prince was in Syria or Egypt early in this year, and that his departure was the signal of the Jewish revolt shortly after. Another Pagan historian, as quoted by Eusebius, informs us that the war was prosecuted with vigour at this date, and Bither, which had been fortified by the rebels, was taken the tenth of August in the eighteenth year of Adrian.³³ Then the war broke out the year preceding, as, at this date, it was at its height and drawing to a close. The emperor gave his own name to the city which he had built

on the ruins of Jerusalem, in A. D. 136, when he celebrated the twentieth year of his reign. Thence we conclude that the war began in A. D. 134, and ended two years after.

Buonarotti produces a medal cast by Adrian in the eighteenth year of his reign, on account of the expulsion of the Jews from Jerusalem, and of a great victory obtained over the rebels.³⁴ The evidence derived from this medal in our favour, is opposed only by the writings of the Jews as quoted by St. Jerome, which inform us that the war lasted three years and a half. But it is evident that the Jews gave this duration to the war, that it might accord with their erroneous computation of the seventy weeks of Daniel. They were obliged to divide seven years between the wars of Vespasian and Adrian, and therefore they have allowed three years and a half to each, without troubling themselves to ascertain whether they were correct. They were evidently wrong, when they made the interval between the captivity and the destruction of the temple but four hundred and ninety years.

XX. We would not conceal the fact, that a great author has maintained the war of Adrian in Judea to be a fabrication by Dion. He allows that Spartian has mentioned this war, occasioned by Adrian's forbidding the Jews to circumcise; but he says, besides that the account of Spartian differs from that of Dion, as the former declares that nothing important resulted from these seditious movements, Spartian was an impostor who took the name of an ancient author to gain credit for his fictions. This opinion is novel, and these conjectures deserve preservation, as they may exhibit to the curious reader the mist with which the critics have enveloped the clearest and most undoubted events of history. We shall now notice the objections of father Hardouin to the opinion that a war prevailed in Judea under Adrian.

XXI. In the first place, he maintains that the emperor visited Judea, when he made the circuit of the provinces.³⁵ He infers that there existed no seditious excitement in any part of the empire, particularly in Judea, previous to this time, from the medals, which represent him travelling with his head bare. Had war existed in any province, he thinks that Adrian would not have thus passed through his empire.

ADVENTUI. AUG. IUDAE. HADRIANUS. AUG. COSS. III. P. P.

Besides, these medals exhibit Judea sacrificing with the empe-

rou, who is clothed with the robe of peace, and not with armour. We do not believe that Adrian would have consented to sacrifice with the Jews, nor even in their manner; nor would the Jews have worshipped false gods with the emperour.

Erizzo produces a medal, on which Adrian is represented unarmed, clothed in his robe, and holding by the hand the kneeling figure of Judea. He infers that the emperour made but a single visit to this province, in A. D. 129, and then in a time of peace.

XXII. Another objection to the war in Judea under Adrian, is derived by father Hardouin from the fact, that Domitian rebuilt Jerusalem and settled there a colony of Greeks, who gave it the name of Capitolas, (*ΚΑΠΙΤΩΛΕΩΝ*.) A medal issued by this emperour, is shown with this inscription :

CAPIT. REST. CAPITOLIAS REBUILT.

The Jews were banished from Jerusalem, and indeed this city, and all Judea, was inhabited only by Pagans; and why should they revolt from the emperour? If there was a rebellion, it must have been excited by Jews; but how could there be a rebellion, when scarcely a Jew could be found at this period in all the Holy Land?

XXIII. Father Hardouin further observes, that if we had all the medals of the reign of Adrian, not one of them would possess the peculiar characters IMP. II. which indicated a victory obtained over the Jews, and which may be seen on the medals of Trajan. Gruterus, it is true, has mentioned some inscriptions in honour of Adrian, containing the letters IMP. II. but these are evidently spurious; for one belongs to the third year of the reign of Adrian, when surely the Jews had not rebelled, and another bears the date of A. D. 129, which can neither be that of the war, nor yet of the emperour's circuit. Hardouin infers that all the medals and inscriptions, which have any reference to a war in Judea under Adrian, are equally unworthy of credit, and the fabrication of interested men.

XXIV. We produce this strange opinion without refuting it; for we prefer the authority of ancient historians to the conjectures of a modern author, with no surer proof of their truth than his own word. He must allow us this preference, until he brings forward sounder arguments to rob the ancients of every work of merit, and to prove historical events, if not agreeable to him, the fabrication of designing men, who believed, with Dion and Spartian, that the Jews

did rebel against Adrian. We proceed briefly to record the tragic history of the war.

XXV. The Romans overlooked the first indications of the insurrection; doubtless through a belief that the Jews felt their weakness, remembered their sufferings in the war with Trajan, and therefore would not dare to rebel. The insurgents daily grew more powerful, by the number of robbers who joined them from the neighbouring provinces, in the hope of booty. The Romans were obliged to throw off their indifference, when they saw the insurrection spreading from Judea into the countries on its borders.³⁶ Some authors suppose that the emperor marched in person against the rebels; otherwise, say they, he would not, in writing to the senate, have put the common form of salutation at the head of his letter: "It will give me pleasure to hear that you and your children are well; as for myself and the army, our circumstances are prosperous."

They believe that he here refers to the great loss, which he occasioned the Jews; but Adrian never carried on a war in person, for a historian states the fact in express terms.³⁷ It would be giving too much credit to unfounded conjectures, to suppose that there were two wars under Adrian, one carried on by himself and the other by his generals. Moreover, we cannot reconcile the opinion that he waged war in person with his public acknowledgement of severe losses, which is no part of the character of a general, especially when he has subdued rebels, punished their chiefs, and taken their strong holds. The emperor was, during the war, in some neighbouring country, whence he issued his orders, and wrote to the senate.

XXVI. Barchochebas was superiour in numbers, and committed the greatest disorders. Justin Martyr charges him with persecuting and murdering only Christians, because they would not abjure their religion. The Talmudists allow that Barchochebas forced many persons to be circumcised a second time, and to reenter the Jewish community which they had left. Probably, his hatred towards those who forsook Judaism, and his inability to convert the Christians, notwithstanding they had a common interest with him in opposition to the Romans, rendered him more cruel towards them. But we cannot believe that the pagans, with whom he was at war, became proselytes to his faith, or that the colony, which Adrian had sent to Jerusalem, were treated with less severity than the Chris-

tians. This impostor was merciful only to his own countrymen, and practised the utmost cruelty against all others who fell into his hands. A Jewish historian has fallen into a more important error than Justin.³⁸ He charges Coziba with a horrible massacre at Alexandria in Egypt, and also with that in Cyprus, which was avenged by Adrian, the commander in chief under Trajan. He has confounded an event which happened in the reign of Trajan, with the revolt of Barchochebas against Adrian.

XXVII. Tinnius Rufus, the emperor's lieutenant for Syria, was at this time in Judea. The Jewish writers relate, that Akiba had an interview with him and his wife.³⁹ She wished to excite an illicit affection in this doctor; but he looked at her, spit on the ground, laughed, and wept.⁴⁰ He spit, because she reminded him of the taste of impure water; he laughed, foreseeing that she would become a Jewess and that he should marry her; and he wept, that so exquisite a beauty should have an influence over him. Akiba wished to induce Rufus to become a proselyte, by showing him that even nature observed the Sabbath, for the vapour did not rise from his father's tomb on that day; but his efforts were unavailing. As it would appear strange that Akiba, at the age of one hundred and nineteen, should think of marrying the wife of a Roman general, the expositors have supposed, that it was with Turnus Rufus that he had an interview, at the time when he ploughed up the ruins of Jerusalem; for Akiba was then but forty seven years old.

There is so much of fiction about this interview, that it is useless to inquire when it took place. Moreover, a Tyrannus Rufus is mentioned, a bad man, who declaimed publicly against the law, and was often silenced by Akiba; but his character is so variously described, that we can only conjecture who he was.⁴¹ Scaliger believed him to be Vespasian.

XXVIII. According to Eusebius, and Syncellus, who has copied him, the Roman general opposed to Barchochebas was Tinnices Rufus. As soon as Adrian knew the importance of the war, he sent him a powerful reinforcement; but Rufus being frequently defeated, he was obliged to send to England for Tullius Severus, the greatest general of his age. This able man would not risk a battle against superiour numbers; but he cut off the Jews separately, straitened their quarters, captured their convoys, and having thus ob-

tained a decided advantage, he laid siege to Bither, the strong hold of the rebels.

XXIX. The Rabbins relate, that this city alone contained four hundred colleges, and each college four hundred professors, and each professor instructed four hundred students, and that these united formed a powerful army.

They sustained the first assault on the place, though armed only with the styles which they used in writing. Barchochebas animated his subjects, and put to death Tryphon, a learned Rabbi, who hinted at capitulation; nevertheless, the city was taken and the impostor slain.⁴² His head was carried to Adrian, who expressed a desire to see the body. A serpent coiled about the neck of the corse and terrified the attendants of the emperour, who was forced to acknowledge that God alone had killed that man. The Rabbins were afterwards convinced that Coziba was an impostor, for they call him the son of falsehood. They relate, that the massacre was so general that a greater multitude perished at Bither, than came out of Egypt under Moses. The students were burnt to death with their books tied to them, and the skulls of three hundred infants were found on a single rock. Blood flowed so copiously, that the stream carried stones, weighing four pounds, a distance of four miles to the sea. In fine, the inhabitants of that region had no occasion to manure their soil for seven years, it being sufficiently enriched by the putrid bodies. The Jews have inserted in their forms of worship, a hymn referring to this massacre, and intended for children, when they celebrate the eighteenth of Ab, a part of July and August. They call Adrian, in this hymn, another Nabuchodonosor, and entreat God to remember the prince, who had destroyed four hundred and eighty synagogues.

XXX. Pappus, who is said by some Christians to have been the husband of Mary Magdalene, was taken prisoner at Bither with his father Akiba. The Rabbins relate, that Akiba was so devotional in his dungeon, that he washed himself with the water given him to drink, preferring to die of thirst rather than neglect his ablutions. But I hardly think that he was in prison long enough to endanger his life from thirst; for Adrian soon ordered him to be flayed, and the glory of the law perished with him.⁴³

I am surprised that Lightfoot, who is deeply read in the history of these times, should assert that Akiba was the only person of note,

who fell at Bither.⁴⁴ As he follows the Jewish historians closely, he ought with them to place among the martyrs of those times Ischbab, a scribe, who was slain while at prayers, and his body remained unburied, exposed to dogs and wild beasts.⁴⁵ Nor should Lightfoot pass over Chanina, the son of Thardion, who was condemned to the flames, and burnt with the book of the law, because he had dared to read and expound it, in opposition to the emperor's command. For this sacrilegious burning of the law, the Jews solemnize the twenty seventh of June. The emperor had forbidden the sanhedrim to elect new members, hoping gradually to annihilate it; but Judah, the son of Bava, confirmed them in their duty.⁴⁶ He held a session of the council between the cities of Uscia and Sciaphara, where they had frequently met before, and they inducted five doctors into their body by the imposition of hands. Among these was the great Meir. Thus the vacant seats in the sanhedrim were again filled, notwithstanding the command of the emperor; though the doctors who had been elected, were forced to flee, and leave Judah to the ferocity of the Roman soldiery. He awaited their coming with calmness, and was pierced through the body by lances in three hundred places. The son of Suma is also numbered with the martyrs of these times, and he is described as a wonderful man, and one of those to whom God disclosed, while living, the beauties of paradise.⁴⁷ He saw, according to the Talmudists, millions of spirits on the mount where the temple had stood, and far from expressing fear, he exclaimed: "Blessed be God, who has created so many beings for my service."⁴⁸ The time of his martyrdom is variously stated by different authors. He was the instructor of Judah the Holy, who was born the day in which Akiba perished, and thus the rising supplied the place of the setting sun. The fate of Rabbi Jose Setham, so prominent in the Mishna, shows the severity of the emperor towards the Jews.⁴⁹ This Rabbi had taken no part in the rebellion, and his only crime was, that he did not join others in praising the Romans, and therefore he was banished to Zippori.

XXXI. Dion describes this war as one of uncommon horror. The Romans were often defeated, and lost the flower of their army. The Jews, who yet retained a profound veneration for the tomb of Solomon, saw it in ruins; and the same year, wild beasts entered Jerusalem, an awful presage of the carnage which followed. Five hundred and eighty thousand Jews, exclusive of those who perish-

ed by fire, hunger or wretchedness, were slain in battle.⁵⁰ After the capture of Bither, the Jews had still in their hands fifty castles, with garrisons sufficient for their defence ; but at the death or submission of their chiefs, they made little resistance ; for we learn from a medal cast by Adrian, that they were subdued the year following.

XXXII. Aelia, the building of which the Jews absurdly attribute to Aelius Titus, the subverter of their commonwealth, was completed at the close of the war by Adrian. According to St. Epiphanius, the emperor made Aquila, his father in law, superintendent of the rising city ; but this man, who became a proselyte to Judaism after embracing Christianity, was not related by blood to Adrian, and there is no evidence, that he was overseer of the buildings erected in Aelia.⁵¹ The circuit of the wall enclosed much that was without the gates of the former city ; but the foundations of the old fortifications were frequently used in the new. M. d'Valois denies that Aelia was fortified, because he cannot believe that Adrian would rebuild the defences of a city hostile to the Romans, or that he would do the Jews a favour, when he had subdued them after a troublesome war. But the emperor did not rebuild Aelia to please the Jews ; for he settled a colony of foreigners there, and placed over them a bishop of gentile origin, and, to offend the Jews, he excluded them from Jerusalem.

XXXIII. In fact, Adrian rendered the place polluted in the eyes of a Jew, by desecrating the ruins of the holy city. He employed the stones which had been used in building the temple, to erect a theatre, and he placed the statues of the heathen gods on the site of the sanctuary. His hatred to Christians also was shown by occupying the spot where Christ was crucified and buried, for the worship of idols.

St. Jerome observes, that the emperor placed the figure of a hog on the gate towards Bethlehem, to remind the Jews of their subjection to the Romans ; but he mistakes the emperor's intention, which was to prevent the Jews from entering the city.⁵² The hog was an unclean animal, and the use of it as food was forbidden by the law ; therefore the Jews would not have entered a gate polluted by it.

Adrian deprived the Jews of any expectation of again inhabiting Jerusalem, by selling them at the fair of the turpentine tree.

According to Hegesippus, this tree had flourished from the time of the creation, and was deemed sacred, because Abraham had pitched his tent under it, and there received the angels who appeared to him. It was customary for the merchants to transact business under its shade. The Jews were exposed here for sale, and those unpurchased were carried to another fair at Gaza. Such was their miserable state in the days of St. Jerome, that the words of the prophet were commonly applied to them: "In Rama was there a voice heard, Rachel weeping for her children, and would not be comforted because they are not." St. Jerome accommodates the prophecy of Zechariah to the conduct of Adrian towards the Jews: "And I will feed the flock of slaughter, even you, O poor of the flock;" for he had learnt from tradition or history, that the emperor had put many Jews to death, and sold others at the fair of the turpentine tree, or transported them to Egypt.⁵³ We obtain light on three points from this father. 1. There existed traditions and historical records among the Jews of his day, for he had heard and read them. 2. The fair of the turpentine tree was still kept up, though the Jews were ashamed to attend it, when they remembered the fate of their fathers. He adds, that the nation who bought the blood of Christ, were forced to purchase from the Roman soldiery the privilege of seeing Jerusalem and weeping over its ruins.⁵⁴ Women and old men oppressed with years, and clothed in rags, assembled on the mount of Olives to lament the destruction of the temple. The soldiers took advantage of the veneration of the Jews for the ruins of the holy city, and of the edict of Adrian which excluded them from it, to exact a large sum for the privilege of looking at it, and casting their perfumes over its stones. 3. We learn from St. Jerome, that Adrian carried some of his prisoners to Egypt, where they increased in numbers.

XXXIV. This father, on the authority of Tertullian, relates that the emperor excluded the Jews forever from Judea; but the edict of Adrian did not extend to perpetual banishment. We can easily conceive that the province was nearly depopulated by the loss of six or seven hundred thousand men, who perished in war or from want; still it doubtless contained some native Jews, though they were poor and wretched. It is strange St. Jerome should have been ignorant or have forgotten, that the patriarchs resided in Judea, that celebrated schools flourished at Tiberias, and that Ori-

gen had seen and consulted learned Jews in their native land. Authors are sometimes betrayed into errors from mere carelessness, and Athanasius affords us an example in his observation, that, by the righteous judgement of God, Jerusalem no longer existed.

XXXV. When the war in Judea was brought to a happy termination, Adrian issued a medal with the representation of a woman sacrificing and holding two naked children by the hand. It was impressed with these words: *ADVENTUS AUG. JUDAEAE*.

Tristan advances the opinion, that the woman is intended to represent Judea, who consents by the sacrifice to receive the pagan religion; and that the naked children indicate the renunciation of circumcision.⁵⁵ He is certainly ingenious, if not correct, in the supposition, that the naked children refer to circumcision. The emperor more probably intended to commemorate the abolition of Judaism in the province, by the introduction of pagan inhabitants. There is another medal of the same reign, on which Judea is represented as a woman on her knees, and extending a supplicating hand to the emperor; three children are with her, and appear to be entreating for pardon or favour.⁵⁶ One of these children is naked; but must we therefore suppose that he was not circumcised? The medal indicates nothing more than the bondage and extreme wretchedness of Judea after the defeat of Barchochebas.

XXXVI. The Jews who lived to the east of Palestine, escaped the miseries of that country. Trajan indeed had carried the war against them into Mesopotamia; but Adrian, his successor, preferred an honourable peace to an uncertain war, and consented that the Euphrates should be the boundary of the Roman empire. The Jews of that country had no share in the war of Adrian with Judea, although Dion intimates the contrary. His words are: "The Jews rose in opposition to the Romans, and the whole land was in insurrection."

The confederation against the Romans consisted of three different classes of men. 1. Some soldiers from the neighbouring provinces, in hope of plunder and excited by the advantages gained early in the insurrection, joined their ancient enemies in opposition to the Romans. 2. There were many Jews in various parts of the empire, who engaged in this war, in the hope of recovering their liberty, now that a favourable opportunity offered itself. 3. Probably

a few came from a greater distance, even from beyond the Euphrates, to the help of their nation. The Jews of Palestine must have had reinforcements from other countries; for, at the close of the war, the number of the slain amounted to more than six hundred thousand, and Judea alone could not have furnished so many soldiers, after its losses under Trajan.

But Adrian did not carry on the war of the East in person, nor pass the Euphrates; for he threw himself into Twoli, a fortified place, and there rendered himself exceedingly odious by his cruelties.

XXXVII. Some critics maintain, that he oppressed the Jews by a new impost, exacting money for the privilege of reading the Bible in Hebrew, and that this tribute was still paid in the time of Tertullian. They quote this writer as their authority, for he observes in his Apology: "That the Jews obtained permission to read their sacred books publicly every Saturday, by the payment of an impost."⁵⁷ Now the critics aver, that the Jews, after having held the Septuagint version in the highest estimation, rejected it, because they found that it favoured the Christians more than the original Hebrew; and therefore they were forced to purchase from the emperor liberty to read the original text on the Sabbath.

XXXVIII. The critics are often bold enough to advance unfounded conjectures for truth. It is true that the Christians found the Septuagint preferable to the original; because few persons at that time could read the Hebrew text, whereas the Greek was understood throughout the empire, and was disliked by the Jews for that reason. The Jews retained the original text, and condemned those who read the Septuagint before Justinian; and we may easily conceive why this emperor, who was deeply interested in spreading the Christian religion, should confirm the rights of the readers of the Greek. But we know that Adrian had no motive to wish for the spread of Christianity, and therefore he was indifferent whether the Jews used the Greek or Hebrew text, and whether they read in their synagogues or houses. He would even have preferred the use of the original instead of taxing them for it; for Judaism would have obtained few proselytes, while its sacred rites were performed in a language almost unknown to the subjects of his empire. No author has mentioned this impost, and it would doubtless have been known and spoken of, if it had been paid from the beginning of the second century to the time of Tertullian. This writer does

not refer to Adrian, nor to the reading of the Bible in Hebrew rather than in Greek. The quotation from him by the critics relates only to liberty of conscience and the public exercises of religion, which were granted the Jews, on paying a fixed sum. The object of Tertullian was to prove the antiquity of the Scriptures, and after showing that Menedemus and Aristeus bore testimony in their favour, he refers to the Jews, who had always used the Bible, and who, by paying a tax, continued to read it every Sabbath day. This impost was probably that of the half-shekel, which the Jews paid from the time of Origen to Tertullian. I am confirmed in this opinion by the Jewish history; for it is recorded that Judah, the son of Sciammaia and disciple of Meir, procured the abrogation of the edict of the emperor, which forbade his countrymen to sacrifice on the Sabbath, to read the law, or to circumcise children. Some of the Jews wept and piteously exclaimed before the gate of a Roman lady: "We are children of one father by Isaac, and of one mother by Rebecca; why then do you treat us so harshly?"⁵⁸ They obtained a favourable answer to their request.

¹ A. D. 134. ² Juvenal, Sat. VI. ver. 543 et seq. ³ The Card. d'Aguirre, Biblioth. Hist. Lib. I. Cap. XVII. Tom. I. p. 82. ⁴ Talm. Tract. Abhodah Zarah, Cap. I. ⁵ Chrysoptom in Judaeos, Or. III. Tom. I. p. 434. ⁶ Jul. Paul. Recept. Sent. Lib. V. Tit. 22. ⁷ Spencer in Orig. cont. Cels. p. 35. ⁸ Spartian in Adr. p. 7. Modestinus ap. Casaub. Not. in Spart. p. 27. ⁹ Euseb. Histor. Eccless. Lib. IV. Cap. VI. Demonstrat. Evang. Lib. VI. Cap. XVIII. ¹⁰ Xiphil. in Adriano, p. 263. ¹¹ Acts 5: 37. ¹² Joseph. Antiq. Judaic. Lib. XVIII. Cap. II. p. 618. Lib. XX. Cap. II. p. 690. ¹³ Euseb. Lib. II. Cap. IX. p. 49. ¹⁴ Baronius expresses the same opinion as M. d'Valois, An. 34, num. 279. and Scaliger says that there were two men called Theudas. See Antiq. Baron. p. 133. ¹⁵ Rabbi Abraham, Cabala Historica, apud Petit. Obs. Sac. Lib. III. Cap. IV. p. 310. David Ganz. ad An. 388. Jud. p. 102. ¹⁶ Seder Olam, Cap. XXXI. ¹⁷ Fx Gemara, Tit. Sanhed. Cap. XI. Coch. duo. Tit. Talm. p. 401. ¹⁸ Petit. ibid. ¹⁹ Ganz, Lib. II. p. 180. ²⁰ Ganz, Zemach David, p. 99. ²¹ Ex Cetubos, fol. 62. Wagenseil in סוֹתָהּ, Sotah, p. 312. ²² Ganz, Zemach, p. 99. ²³ The first book is called מְכִילְתָּהּ Mechilta or Mechiltin. ²⁴ סֵפֶר יֵצִירָהּ. Seppher Jetsirah. It is lost, but Rittangelius has printed that attributed to Abraham. ²⁵ Zachutus in Juchasin, p. 62. לֵא יֵצִירָהּ סֵפֶר לְהַרְיֵר רַבְדִּי. ²⁶ Lightfoot, Chronica Temporum, Op. Tom. II. p. 143. Seder Olam Ruta, p. 43. Ganz, Zemach, p. 99. ²⁷ Hieron. in Daniel, Cap. IX. p. 1074. ²⁸ Hieron. in Chron. p. 166. ²⁹ Ibid, p. 167. ³⁰ Xiphil. p. 262. ³¹ Critica ad An. Christi, 132. Adriani. XVI. ³² Vopiscus in Saturn.

p. 245. 33 A. D. 134. 34 Buonarotti, Observations on some medales of Adrian. 35 Nummi Ant. Illustrati, p. 75. 36 Xiphilin. p. 263. 37 Dodwell, Dissert. in Iren. 38 Ganz, Zemach, p. 101. 39 V. Buxtorf, Synagog. p. 916. 40 Ex Gemara, Cap. VII. Coch. duo Tract. Tal. p. 275, 276. 41 They call him טורנוס רופוס הרשע, Turnus Rufus the Wicked. 42 V. Lent de Judaeor. Pseudo-mess. p. 17א. 43 Mishna in Sotah 515, p. 303. 44 Light. Chron. Temp. V. VI. p. 144, Tom. II. 45 Ganz, Zemach, p. 103. 46 Ex Gemara, Tit. Senhedr. Cap. I. † XIV, Coch. duo Tit. Talm. p. 161. 47 Talmud, Cod. Sanhedr. Bartiolocci, Tom. II. p. 276. 48 Wagenseil in Sotah. 44 Bartol. ibid. p. 291. 50 Ju. Adriano, p. 263. Hier. in Cler. p. 163. 51 Epiph. de Neup. Cap. XIX. p. 160. 52 Hieronym. in Chron. p. 168. An. 136. 53 Zech. 11: 78. Hier. in Zach. p. 501. 54 Hieronym. in Sophon. I. p. 1963. 55 Tristan, Comment. Histor. Adrian. p. 363. 56 Apud Freherum, de Numis. Censu, p. 3648. 57 Tertul. Apol. Cap. XVIII. p. 57, p. 2575. Petit. var. Sect. Cap. XVIII. p. 2569. 58 Rosch. Haschiana, Cap. I. Bartol. Biblioth. Rabbin. Tom. II. p. 270.

CHAPTER THIRD.

THE DISCIPLES OF AKIBA AND OTHER LEARNED MEN THEIR CONTEMPORARIES.

I. Judah the Sinless, a great orator and an encomiast of the Romans. II. Chanina, his application to study. III. Eleazar, author of the prayers still in use. IV. Meir, the light of his age. V. Why the Rabbins paid greater deference to his wife than to him. VI. A reply made by Baruna. The reason why she hung herself. VII. Death of Meir. The time when he lived not correctly ascertained. VIII. Dositheus, several doctors of the name. IX. Somechus, his acuteness in reasoning. X. Rabbi Jose, a carrier. Whether he is the author of the *Seder Olam Rabba*. XI. Scimon, an extraordinary saint. XII. Scimon, son of Eleazar, his pride humbled. XIII. Judah the Holy.

I. THE Talmudists inform us, that Akiba left behind him many learned and virtuous disciples. The modern Jews pride themselves in these men, and consider them as the glory of their nation; and therefore they preserve their names, and whatever else tradition has handed down respecting them, with the utmost care.

Judah, the son of Elai, continued sinless through his whole life; and every virtuous action which the Talmudists mention without the name of him who performed it, is uniformly attributed to Judah.¹ He was considered by his nation as the first of orators, and acquired the favour of the Romans, by praising them for improving the public buildings, and rebuilding bridges and baths. Simeon Jochaides could not patiently listen to his flattery, and replied: "If the Romans adorn the public buildings, it is for the reception of prostitutes, if they repair the bridges, it is that they may more readily collect their tribute, and if they rebuild the baths, it is for their own pleasure." These words were carried to the Romans by an informer. They condemned Simeon to death, and banished Jose to Zippori, because he had acknowledged the justness of Simeon's reproof by his silence; but they secretly favoured Judah their panegyrist, and he rose to be principal of an academy.² He wrote a commentary on Leviticus, which the Jews regarded as a work of great merit; and some of them believe it is still preserved, and produce an ancient treatise on the sacerdotal book as the work of Judah.³ He

fasted most of the year, or eat sparingly of beets, and only drank wine at banquets. Judah died with the highest reputation for his holiness; and the Jews still visit his tomb on a mountain covered with olive trees, near a small city in Galilee, called Er Zaithun.

II. The Talmudists mention also a Chanina, the son of Chachinai, who was one of the five judges, whose tribunal was established at Jafna. He married young, but left his wife in order to study the law; and such was the intenseness of his application, that on his return home, he could neither recognise the house in which he lived, nor even his wife.⁴

Eleazar Ghisma, another disciple of Akiba, was so profound an arithmetician, that he calculated the number of drops of water in the sea.⁵ He is said to have established the custom of prostration, which devotees of the present day practise by throwing themselves on the earth, before the depository of the law, and there they repeat their prayers, believing that they fulfil the words of David: "Out of the depths have I cried unto thee, O Lord."⁶

III. Jochanan Hassandalar, who lived under Adrian, is celebrated for the maxim, that every confederacy of men formed in the fear of God, flourished; for virtue is the life and bond of society, while vice ruins and dissolves it.

We should not mention Eleazar, the son of Simeon Jochaides, who with his father was forced for a long time to conceal himself from the Romans, were he not the reputed author of certain prayers still in use among the Jews of Italy and Germany. We doubt, however, whether he wrote them, for they contain the names of angels unknown to the ancient Rabbins.

IV. But Meir was the most illustrious of the pupils of Akiba. He was so called, because he was the *light* of the learned, and opened the eyes of his disciples to the perception of wisdom.⁷ The Talmudists say of him, that he was taught by Akiba, the light of the world; he became himself the glory of his age, and instructed Judah the Holy, who was the light of mankind. He is supposed to have been the son or grandson of the emperor Nero, and a proselyte of righteousness, like his master Akiba.

Vorstius makes him the son of Judah the Holy; but the historian, whom he translated, never advanced such an absurdity, for he only says, that Meir lived to assist at the marriage of a son of Judah the Holy.⁸ He married a learned woman, whose opinions the

Talmudists received with greater deference than even those of Meir himself.

V. Indeed, they observe that Meir, in explaining the law, only expressed the views of his instructor Elisciaa, without acknowledgement; because the latter had entered paradise, and, surprised by the glory of the angel Metatron, he fell into the heresy respecting the two principles.⁹ The Talmudists feared that Meir would advance the erroneous sentiments of his instructor, and were ashamed to receive their belief from a heretical doctor. Therefore they gave no weight to his opinions, except when they agreed with those of the other Rabbins. They place his wife among the Tanaites. She has left us three hundred traditions, which she learned from thirty instructors; though some Rabbins say three hundred, instead of thirty, to make the traditions answer exactly to the number of teachers.¹⁰

VI. There were in her neighbourhood certain wicked men, who persecuted her husband, and he prayed to God in the words of David: "Let the sinners be consumed out of the earth, and let the wicked be no more." Baruna his wife, displeased with this explanation, told her husband, that he did not understand the Psalm; for the prophet charitably entreated that sin only might be destroyed, as then there would be no sinners. David did not hate the wicked, but their crimes. A pagan asked Baruna, the meaning of Isaiah in the words: "Sing O barren, thou who didst not bear."¹² She replied that this barren woman, whose good fortune the prophet extols, was intended for the Jewish church, which did not bring forth infidels to be damned. But the wisdom of this woman did not preserve her from a miserable end. She was seduced by one of her husband's pupils, who informed Meir of an appointment which she had made with him. The husband took the place of the seducer, and the wife hung herself, from shame at the discovery of her guilt. Her husband left the Holy Land in chagrin at his misfortune, and went to Babylon. There he married a second wife, less learned than the first, and returned with her to Judea.

VII. Bartolocci places his death in A. D. 130; but this date cannot be correct if he was present at the marriage of the son of Judah the Holy. Judah was not born until the taking of Bithur in A. D. 135 or 136; and if Meir died five years previous to this event, he could not have been the instructor of Judah. We do not wish

to point out this date of Meir's death as an inaccuracy in Bartolocci.¹³ Indeed, the time when any of the learned men died, of whom we have spoken, cannot be correctly ascertained; for we derive all our information respecting it from the Jews, whose chronology is faulty. They have, for instance, placed the revolt of Akiba and the taking of Bither several years earlier than the true date. Perhaps it is enough for us to know, that all the doctors whose characters and lives we give here, flourished in the second century.

Meir heard a voice, which bade him to forsake commerce and apply himself to the study of the law. It warned him that God would punish severely his inattention to the command, and promised a recompense for his obedience. He followed the advice, which he believed was given from heaven. He knew three hundred parables respecting foxes. He was so skilled in argument, that he maintained the affirmative or negative of any question with equal ingenuity. He proved on one day that a certain thing was unclean, and the next, he convinced his audience, dazzled by his eloquence, of the contrary. Might he not then challenge the world, with God as judge, to produce a wiser man than himself?

VIII. Dositheus was the disciple of Meir. We must not confound him with Dositheus, a priest sent by Esarhaddon to teach the law to the Cutheans, that they might not be devoured by lions. These two men had the same name, as well as their fathers, and we must place an interval of six or seven years between them, or rather consider the first as a creation of the Talmudists.¹⁴ There is another Dositheus, the son of Jannai, who could not have studied under Meir, for his father was not born till the second century. Here is a new instance of the confusion existing in the Jewish chronology; for it is difficult to distinguish between these three men of one name, all doctors of the law, especially as the fathers of two of them had also one name. The last Dositheus decided that an individual was criminal in forgetting any part of the law, when it was done wilfully; but he was guiltless, if his forgetfulness was occasioned by application to study.¹⁵ This decision is unimportant; but it placed Dositheus among the Tanaites and fathers, whose maxims are deemed invaluable. He was questioned as to the difference in the voices of men and women, and the passage of Solomon's song was referred to, where the bridegroom addressing the bride, says: "Sweet is thy voice."¹⁶ He attributed the difference to the source whence

men and women derived their origin. Woman was formed from a rib, and bones when struck together emit a pleasing sound ; whereas man was created from the earth which gives no sound.

Somechus was another disciple of Meir, and so wise that he could produce forty eight arguments on any question proposed to him. The Talmudists err in praising a learned man for such a reason ; for his arguments could hardly have been as good as they were numerous. A reasoner may display ingenuity by the number of his arguments, but he weakens their force ; and good sense requires that arguments should be weighed, and not counted. One solid reason is worth more than forty eight arguments calculated to mislead. The Talmudists wish to praise the logical acuteness of Somechus, who has found imitators in the theologians of the schools.

X. Chelpeta, a citizen of Zippori, had two sons who studied under Meir. Jose was the most illustrious, and was banished by Adrian to his birth place, where the learned were held in no estimation. He practised the trade of a currier. The Jews acknowledge that most of their doctors were common mechanics ; but it redounds to their praise that, with all their learning, they should have had a trade in obedience to one of their laws. Some Christian authors have thought that the Rabbins practised the mechanic arts in emulation of the apostles and their successors, who laboured with their hands for a subsistence.¹⁷ If the council of Trent had thought the example of the apostles in this respect worthy of imitation, they would not have prohibited those who had no benefice or patrimony, from taking orders. Certainly it is more honourable to obtain an honest livelihood like St. Paul, than to encourage the beggarly indolence of monks. We do not wish to discuss the point, but freely allow, that the apostles and the Jewish doctors were forced to labour by necessity. Jose employed himself in dressing leather, because his patrimony could not afford him a subsistence ; for the Romans had cut down all the olive trees in Judea. Notwithstanding his poverty, he composed a chronicle which began with the creation of the world and ended with the reign of Adrian.¹⁸ At least, the Jews attribute this work to him, and they have reprinted it with notes.¹⁹ Bartolucci thinks he has found a further proof that this book was written by Jose, because his name is printed in it as the author ; but we have shewn that the work is a fabrication of modern times.

XI. Scimon, his younger brother, a contemporary of Judah the Holy, lived in the reigns of Antoninus and the succeeding emperours, and was truly an extraordinary man. He met a famished lion and would have been devoured, had not God rained bread from heaven, which the brute preferred to the doctor's body.²⁰ He was so poor, that he had no food for the Sabbath, and made his wants known to God, who placed in his hands a precious stone. He pledged it to a jeweller, and prepared a feast for his friends. His wife was displeased with the conduct of her husband, and ordered him to restore the jewel. He carried it to the place where he had obtained it, and, by a miracle more extraordinary than the first, God received it again.

XII. There was another Scimon, the son of Eleazar, contemporary with the son of Chelpeta. He met with an adventure which exposed his vanity, and taught him humility. He was returning from the school of his master, mounted on an ass, when he was saluted by a man extremely deformed, who entered into conversation with him. Scimon, thinking he was ignorant and foolish, inquired with evident disgust, if all the children of his village were as deformed as himself. "I know not, (answered the traveller,) but come and ask him who created me, why he has made a creature so deformed." Scimon perceived his error, and dismounting, entreated pardon. The traveller granted it, on condition that he would accompany him to the village, to see whether all its inhabitants were as ugly as himself. On their arrival, the people surrounded the traveller to pay him their respects, and exclaimed: "Rabbi, master, sir, whom have you brought with you? We greet you."²¹ The traveller related to them his adventure, and exposed the pride of Scimon; but pardoned him, on condition that he would never commit a like fault again. In fact, Scimon profited by the incident, and made it a maxim, that a doctor should not be inflexible like a cedar, but pliable like a reed, which may be shaped to any form, and is used in writing the law. Thus he censured his own harshness and inculcated the lesson, that travellers should accommodate themselves to those whom they may meet on the road.

XIII. Finally, Meir had the honour of instructing Judah the Holy, the author of the Mishna and the patriarch of his nation; but we have already spoken of him. From what we have said, the reader may gather the character of these doctors and of their encomiasts, and

he may perhaps think, that we have treated of them more fully than they deserve.

¹ We often meet with these words, *מעשה בחסיד אחד*, Opus alicui pio. We must understand them of Judah Bar Elai, or of Judah Ben Baba, of whom we shall speak. ² Ganz, Zemach, pag. 105. We know not how to understand those who tell us, that it was declared so by the order of the emperour. ³ *ספרא*, Siphra. They call it also *כניס*, תורה כניס, the Law of the Sacrificers. ⁴ Bartol. Bibl. Rabb. Tom. III. p. 271. ⁵ Ibid. Tom. I. p. 222. ⁶ Ps. 130: 1. ⁷ He previously called himself Meischa, but they gave him the name of Meir from *אורח*, Orah, Lux. Ganz, Zemach, p. 105. ⁸ Wagenseil in Sotah, Sec. 15. p. 390. ⁹ They call him, on account of this, *אחר*, Acher. We shall speak of his error, his condemnation, and his salvation by means of Meir. ¹⁰ Ganz, Zemach. Wagenseil, p. 300, ex Pesachim, fol. 62. ¹¹ Ps. 104: 35 *יחמו חטאים*, Let the wicked be consumed. She understood the passage as referring to sins. ¹² Isaiah 54: 1. ¹³ Bartol. Bibl. Rabb. Tom. III. Meir. ¹⁴ Their names were Rabbi Dostai, and Ben Rabbi Jannai. ¹⁵ Pirke Abbot, Chap. III. Artic. oct. p. 33. He supports himself by Deut. 4: 9. ¹⁶ Cant. 2: 14. ¹⁷ Bartol. Bibl. Rabb. Tom. III. p. 749. ¹⁸ Its title is *סדר עולם רבא*, Seder Olam Rabba, the Great Chronicle of Ages, to distinguish it from another chronicle called the Less. ¹⁹ Ganz, Zemach. Bartol. Bibl. Rabb. Tom. III. p. 795. *יוסי אומר*, Rabbi Jose has said it. ²⁰ *מיתותיהו*. See Bartol. *ibid.* p. 330. ²¹ Bartol. ex Juchasin, *ibid.* p. 324.

CHAPTER FOURTH.

SOURCES OF THE MISERIES OF THE JEWS.

I. The preservation of the Jews amidst all their sufferings. II. Comparison between their present condition and their former captivities. III. Peculiar nature of their miseries. IV. The inference which they should draw from their calamities. V. Error of St. Chrysostom, who says that Amos prohibited the perusal of the law, except in the Holy Land. VI. Corruption of the Jews after the destruction of Jerusalem. The extraordinary saints who flourished at this time. VII. The gates of prayer closed. VIII. The love of the Jews for women, one cause of their misery. IX. Whether the Jews suffered for the sins of other nations. X. Their belief that they partake in the guilt of every sin committed by their fathers. XI. The death of Christ an indirect cause of their sufferings. XII. The difference of religious opinions between Christians and Jews, a cause of hatred. XIII. This hatred grows more violent. Mutual curses. XIV. Several instances of their mutual detestation. XV. Division of the Jews into eastern and western.

I. HOWEVER uninteresting our history may be in other respects, it presents one fact, which excites our admiration. We refer to the preservation of the Jews as a distinct nation, notwithstanding all the miseries which they have endured for seventeen hundred years. The religions of other nations have depended on temporal prosperity for their duration ; they have triumphed under the protection of conquerors, and have fallen and given place to others, under a succession of weak monarchs. Paganism once overspread the known world, even where it now no longer exists. The Christian church, glorious in her martyrs, has survived the persecutions of her enemies, though she cannot soon heal the wounds which they have inflicted.¹ But Judaism, hated and persecuted for seventeen centuries, has not merely escaped destruction ; but it has always been powerful and flourishing. Kings have employed the severity of laws and the hands of the executioner, to eradicate it, and a seditious populace have injured it by their massacres, more than kings. Sovereigns and their subjects, pagans, Christians, Mohammedans, opposed to each other in every thing else, have formed a common design to annihilate this nation ; but without success. The bush of

Moses has always continued burning and never been consumed. The expulsion of the Jews from the great cities of kingdoms, has only scattered them through the world. They have lived from age to age in wretchedness, and shed their blood freely in persecution; they have continued to our day in spite of the disgrace and hatred which have every where clung to them, while the greatest empires have fallen and been almost forgotten.

II. After the destruction of Jerusalem, the wretchedness of the Jews was peculiar in its nature. During their other captivities, God always fixed a time when he would break the yoke of their tyrants and restore them to liberty and the Holy Land. Their longest captivity was that of Egypt, which lasted but a few centuries. They returned from Babylon at the end of seventy years, and the persecution of Antiochus ceased after three years and ten days. But God has not foretold by his prophets the length of their present sufferings, although the evangelists inform us that they are to be restored. God consoled them under former misfortunes, by raising up heroes and inspired men. Ezekiel prophesied at Babylon, and Daniel foretold the advent of the Messiah. The Maccabees too supported the glory of the Jews against the kings of Syria; but from the destruction of Jerusalem, false Messiahs only have appeared, and rendered the yoke which they wished to break, the more burdensome. The succession of prophets has ceased, and there is no one to mark out the time when the Jews shall regain their liberty. Formerly, when God delivered over his people to the heathen, he preserved the body of the nation in one place; as for instance, the Jews were assembled in the valley of Goshen, previous to leaving Egypt. Cyrus had no difficulty in uniting the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, when he restored them to their country. A part of the nation lived in the same villages, and the Israelites cultivated the banks of both branches of the Chaboras. But after the destruction of Jerusalem, and during the war of Adrian, the Jewish nation, weakened by horrid massacres, were scattered through every province of the empire. This dispersion continues to the present day, and a remnant of the ten tribes can now hardly be found in the East, where formerly they were numerous and powerful.

III. The judgement of God on this nation cannot be more terrible than it is. It has embraced at once the Jews, their religion, and the land in which they lived. The ceremonies of Judaism,

could not be observed in their dispersions, and the splendour of its rites, which dazzled even the pagans who sent victims and offerings to Jerusalem, is gone. The temple is destroyed and the sacrifice has ceased. It is not for us to inquire why God confined this religion to one spot, and to one temple; or why he has permitted the sacrifice to cease, if he had determined that it should always be observed. The judgement of God has extended to the Jews, as well as to their religious rites.² Those who had escaped the fury of war and the vengeance of the soldiers, were sold in the market. They were dispersed throughout the world, and are so still.

Indeed, Judea appears to be under the perpetual curse of God. In the various revolutions which have taken place, during the seventeen last centuries, almost every nation, pagan, Mohammedan, and Christian, have successively occupied Jerusalem, while God has kept it only from the Jew. He alone has not obtained possession of this little spot of earth, so highly valued by him; for he believes that on "this mountain" he must worship God. Julian of Toledo observes, that there are so few persons about Jerusalem who profess Judaism, that the Jews now purchase with difficulty six feet of earth for a grave.³

IV. There is no exaggeration in this remark, but I shall content myself with producing only known facts. I do not wish to render the Jews hated for their degradation, but to hold them up to view as exhibiting in their preservation one of those stupendous miracles, which we believe, though we cannot comprehend them. It is not the patient endurance of the Jew, but providence alone, which has preserved him through all his miseries. The Jew ought not to be so infatuated as still to look for a Messiah, who has so long cheated him with a groundless expectation of happiness. The Christian should regard with compassion a people so long preserved by the peculiar care of God, in the midst of calamities which would have destroyed any other nation.

V. The author of the Apostolic Constitutions believes that God increased the affliction of the Jews, by forbidding them to read the book of the law out of the Holy Land.⁴ St. Chrysostom is of the same opinion; and these two writers cite, as their authority, the prophet Amos, who blamed the Jews for reading the law out of Judea.⁵ But the first of these authors has betrayed himself, and cannot be allowed the antiquity which he claims; for the general dispersion

of the Jews did not take place until the reign of Adrian. Then it was that they were not permitted to remain in Judea, and were forced to read the law in foreign lands. There is no ground for the opinion of these authors; for Amos exhorts the Jews to present their offerings of unleavened bread, instead of blaming them for reading the law *without*, a phrase that is unmeaning.⁶ They were led into an error by the Septuagint; and if they were unable to consult the original text, their good sense ought to have suggested, that there were prophets, as Ezekiel and Daniel for instance, who thought it no crime to read the law out of Judea. These ancient authors then attribute to Moses a law which he never enacted, to the prophet Amos, a thought which he never expressed, and to the Jews, an affliction which they never endured. It is recorded in the work of a Jew who was converted to Christianity, that the readers of the law were torn in pieces with iron combs, and those who dared to instruct children in the mysteries of the passover and of circumcision, were punished severely, and sometimes put to death.⁷ But this work does not justify the opinion of St. Chrysostom; for it refers to a cruel persecution from pagans, and not to any law enacted by Moses or Amos, to prohibit the perusal of the law out of Judea. The Jewish writer does not mention when this persecution took place. He relates that the Jews seldom married, except with widows; for all the daughters of Jews were deflowered by the governor of the province. This story is a fabrication, and renders the persecution mentioned by the same author, at least doubtful. The Jews were overwhelmed with so many calamities, that we need not, like St. Chrysostom and this converted Jew, attribute to them miseries which they never suffered.

VI. Josephus, who lived to see some of the misfortunes which befell his nation, did not fail to perceive in them the hand of God.⁸ He imputed the judgements of Heaven to the impiety of the Zealots, who had profaned the temple by shedding there the blood of their enemies. Some Rabbins also affirm, that the destruction of Jerusalem was occasioned by the disorders and sacrilege of their profane countrymen. But there was no idolatry in the temple at that time; and when the doctors attribute the desolation of the holy city, among other causes, to the golden calf, they confess that they can give no good reason for it. They cannot charge their misfortunes on the wickedness of those times; for they extol the

wonderful saints who then lived. They would persuade us, that God ruled the world, only for the comfort of Ananias, the son of Doza. One day his wife and himself fasted; and his oven was miraculously filled with bread. Hunna, who flourished at this time, saw that the land was afflicted with a severe drought, and swore by the name of God, that he would not move from a circle which he had marked out, until it had rained. The miracle of Elias was again performed, and the harvest was abundant. Not a bird was permitted to fly over the head of John, the son of Zechai, while he was teaching. Some Rabbins have said, that perhaps these holy doctors never lived, and their miracles are a fabrication; and Josephus represents the nation as extremely corrupt at that time. I agree with them. It should be known, however, that as some modern doctors do not fully believe in the existence of their pretended instructors, therefore, when they extol their nation, for the number of learned men whom it has produced, they involve themselves in irreconcilable difficulties.

VII. Many Rabbins are of the opinion, that it is the law they revere, which has rendered them odious to the rest of mankind. The spot whence it was given indicates this; for Sinai means *hatred*. They add, that their prayers were not heard after the destruction of the temple; for, though God has left the gate of repentance ever open, he has closed that of prayer; and they apply to themselves the words of Jeremiah: "God has rejected their supplication." God commanded Ezekiel to place an iron plate on his side, as an impenetrable separation between him and Jerusalem. Repentance, say they, is like a sea, in which any one may wash himself; but no one can pierce that iron breast-plate. A man may repent when he pleases, but cannot always make his prayers effectual. The reasoning of these doctors is incorrect; for they maintain that prayer is useless, even while it produces a sincere repentance.

VIII. The Rabbins allow that the Jews loved beautiful women, even though they were Christians; and this gave occasion to two evils. The adulterous Jews were often slain by the injured husband, and the nation was hated for the crimes of an individual. Moreover, the children who sprung from this illicit intercourse, were educated as Christians, and therefore, in the opinion of a Jew, were exposed to the anger of God. The Jews loved money no less

than beauty ; and, as they disturbed the transaction of business among Christians and exacted excessive usury, they were sometimes severely punished. They perjured themselves for the sake of riches ; and Aben Esra considered the frequency of perjury as a sufficient cause for the continuance of their calamities. The Rabbins accuse the Jews of an immoderate ambition. They gave such evidences of it in their synagogues in Spain, that Ferdinand was forced to banish them from his kingdom.

IX. A Rabbi, who instructed the king of Cozar, wishing to explain the cause of the miseries which afflicted the Jews, maintained that they bore the penalty of the sins of mankind. " My nation, said he, is to the world what the heart is to the human body.¹⁰ As the heart suffers from weakness of constitution, copiousness of the juices, bad digestion, and the passions, so the Jews are punished for the sins of mankind. As the veins discharge themselves into the heart, so every nation burden the Jews with their crimes, who become the more sinful by an intercourse with pagans, as David predicted : ' They were mingled among the heathen, and learned their works.'¹¹ While the Jews are oppressed and wretched, the world enjoys a profound peace. But as an abscess does not form itself in the heart, so guilt belongs to the heathen and not to the Jew. Calamities will one day reestablish the law, and effect the object of God in preserving the Jews ; that is, the separation of the chaff from the wheat." In a word, the Jews look on themselves as the cause of happiness to every creature ; as the heart of mankind, which, though it may be diseased, is still the source of life and activity to all the members. Thus the Jews, in spite of their afflictions and calamities, consider themselves as exalted above every other people, to be the favourites of heaven. They represent God as prescribing for two sick men, one of whom is incurable and the other may be healed.¹² The first is permitted to indulge in wine and delicacies, which are forbidden to the second, lest they should increase his fever and destroy his life. The sick man whose case is hopeless, is intended for the Gentiles and Christians, who are permitted to enjoy worldly pleasures and prosperity. But the Jew is confined to a regular diet, lest he should become corrupt, and be condemned. It is thus that they gloss over their calamities, instead of confessing their own guilt.

X. The Jews believe, that they unite in themselves all the sins

which their nation have ever committed, and the good deeds which they have performed in every age. They regard themselves as the collective body of the Jews, from Abraham to their own time, and as guilty of the sins of their fathers; but they also expect to enjoy the benefit of their covenant with God. If the faithful and godly were led away captive to Babylon with the wicked, so also must the righteous men, who are now the salt of their nation, suffer the exile and poverty of the rest. They believe that God permitted the Jews to return to Judea after a captivity of seventy years, that he might know whether they were reclaimed; but finding that they persevered in committing the sins of their fathers, he was forced to banish them a second time, in order to effect their salvation.

XI. The Jews confess that the death of Jesus of Nazareth is one cause of their oppression.¹³

*Judaens patria de sede revulsus,
Supplicium pro caede luit Christique negati
Sanguine conspersus, commissa piacula solvit.*

But this source of their misery, they think accidental. The Christians have become masters of a large portion of the world, and retaining an irreconcilable hatred towards the people who crucified their God, they persecute the Jews for the sins of their fathers. They accuse themselves of idolatry, not that they worship a creature; but many of them, either in sincerity or dissimulation, have united with Christians in praying to images, and God has punished the nation for the crimes of these apostates.

X. To these causes of their miseries, the Jews add the hatred of the Christians, springing from their religious differences. Christianity rose on the ruins of the temple. This was a source of great grief to a nation proud of its privileges and of its covenant with God. The first Christians were Jews, who renounced their religion and regarded Jesus Christ as the true Messiah. Though they acted with discretion, and treated the synagogue with respect, yet they were forced to condemn and reject its rites. The Jews, enraged at this rejection of their sacred rites, left no means untried to excite persecution against the rising church, and to inflame it, where it already existed. The Christians thought themselves justifiable in rendering evil for evil, when they, in their turn, became masters. Trypho confessed to Justin Martyr, that the doctors forbade their pupils to mix in the society of Christians or to dispute

with them, because they blasphemed in comparing Jesus Christ with Moses.¹⁴ On the other hand, Christians would hold no argument with Jews, because they cursed Christ, while Moses was only a prophet, revered equally by both. Thus a mutual hatred was fostered between the rising and declining church.

XIII. Their detestation of each other was inflamed by a variety of causes. Christians, animated by a blind zeal, thought it an act of piety to persecute and kill the descendants of a people who had crucified Jesus Christ, and therefore, we shall find them, as we proceed, engaged in the most cruel massacres. It must be allowed too, that the Jew hated his bondage, and cherished a deadly enmity against Christians. There is a prayer against Christians, attributed to Samuel the Less, which was offered up in the synagogues. This prayer was the earliest indication of this hatred, and as Samuel was contemporary with the apostles, it has been thought that St. Paul wrote it before his conversion. Justin Martyr reproaches the Jews with accusing Christians of cursing them; whereas the Christians blessed them and prayed to God, in all their churches, for their conversion.¹⁵ At the installation of the president of the captivity, he entreated God at that time to reestablish Judah. There is nothing improper in the petition; but the Jewish historians add, that he closed with other petitions in a low voice, for fear some stranger should report, that he desired the destruction of the state in which he lived. The Talmud inculcates the principle, that the best man among the nations was worthy of death. By the nations they mean, not only idolaters, but Christians also. A monk, who had left the synagogue, pressed the Rabbins on this maxim of the Talmud; and they were forced to distinguish between the text, which was received with implicit confidence, and the glosses appended to it, which were of no authority. Solomon, the son of Jarchi, gave it as his opinion, that a man should crush the head of a woman, as he would that of a serpent; but he afterwards restricted his precept to Christian women.¹⁶ Maimonides is reported to have said, that it was the duty of a Jew to throw from a precipice those Christians who were found on the edge, to thrust into wells those who approached them, and to close the wells by rocks, or take from them the ladder used in ascending.¹⁷ But he referred rather to apostates from Judaism, than to Christians as such.

XIV. If the Christians abused the Jews, the latter were ready enough to retaliate. They called the Christians heretics, an illegitimate people, Nazarenes, and Idumeans.¹⁸ If Christians chose to die, rather than receive the advice of a Jewish physician; the Jews, on the other hand, were equally averse to the Christians. Schickard mentions an instance, where a Jew, whose nephew was dying from the bite of a serpent, positively refused the assistance of John Stephanetis, who would have cured him. He replied to the offer of the physician in the words of Solomon: "Whoso breaketh through a hedge, a serpent shall bite him." He rejoiced because he had not permitted his nephew's life to be saved, when it could not be done without destroying the separating "hedge" between the Jew and Christian. The Jews believe that the four unclean animals mentioned in Leviticus, indicate the four persecutions which they were to suffer.¹⁹ The camel represents the empire of the Babylonians, the hare, that of the Medes and Persians, the rabbit, that of the Greeks and Romans, while the hog, which is utterly detested, represents the Christians, who have persecuted them more than all the heathen. Alphonso, king of Spain, reproaches them, because they prayed to God regularly in their synagogues, that the proud kingdom might be brought low, at the very time when they enjoyed a profound peace under his protection.²⁰ The only excuse which they could offer, was, that the kingdom referred to, was that of the Amalekites, which God had commanded them to destroy.

XV. We proceed to describe the peculiar miseries of the Jews, without tracing them further to their source. We commence with the eastern, and close with the western Jews; but it is necessary to fix the limits of this division, for they have been variously marked out at different periods. Formerly, the Jews of Egypt and Palestine were called the western, in distinction from those who were carried away to Babylon and the plains of Assyria. We shall adopt the modern division, and include among the eastern Jews, all who are dispersed in Egypt, Judea, Greece, and the oriental world; while the western will comprise only the Jews of Spain, Germany, and England, in which countries they are numerous.

¹ Du Pin, in the edition of Paris, has placed a part of this chapter in the preface, and rejected the rest. ² The two next pages are an abridgement of Josephus. ³ Julian Tole. contra Judaeos. Biblioth. Max. Pat. Tom.

XII. p. 622. ⁴ Constit. Apost. Lib. VI. Chap. XXIIV. XXV. p. 453.
⁵ Chrysostr. Orat. III. contra Jud. ⁶ Amos. 4: 5. His expression is: *חמץ*,
ex fermento. The Greek phrase is: *καὶ ἀρτύσαντες ἕξασιν νόμον*. ⁷ Hie-
 ron. a sancta fide contra Judaeos, Lib. I. p. 51. V. Pet. Alfonsi Dial. Tit.
 IX. Bibl. Max. Patr. Tom. XX. p. 185. ⁸ Joseph. Antiq. Lib. XX. Chap.
 VI. p. 695. ⁹ Du Pin has inserted this in his preface, in the form of a
 note. ¹⁰ Cosri, Pars II. p. 112. ¹¹ Ps. 106: 35. ¹² R. Bechai.
¹³ See Schudt, *Judaeus Christicida gravissime peccans et vapulans*. This
 treatise was written to prove, that the death of Christ was the cause of all
 the calamities which have befallen the Jews. ¹⁴ Justin. Apol. II. p. 88.
 Dial. cum Tryph. p. 239 and 265. ¹⁵ Justin Martyr, Dial. p. 323 and
 335. ¹⁶ Solomon Ben Virgae, or Gentius Histor. p. 276 and 305.
¹⁷ Maimon. apud Hier. a sancta fide contra Jud. Lib. XI. Cap. VI. B. P.
 Tom. IV. Part I. p. 792. ¹⁸ מינים, Minim, Haeretici; גויי ממזר, Goy
 mamzer, a bastard nation. ¹⁹ Levit. 11: 4—6. ²⁰ Solomon Ben Virgae,
Schevet Judae, p. 345.

CHAPTER FIFTH.

DISPERSION OF THE JEWS THROUGH THE EAST. EXAMINATION OF THE NARRATIVE OF THE SPURIOUS EZRA AND OF THE TIME WHEN HE FLOURISHED.

I. Dispersion of the ten tribes through the East and their return to Judea. II. Josephus asserts that only a part of them returned. III. St. Peter preached to some of the dispersed Jews. IV. The countries through which they were scattered, according to Philo. V. The narrative of the spurious Ezra. VI. Character of this author. VII. Whether his works are canonical. VIII. He had some knowledge of Christianity. IX. Inferences from preceding remarks. Whether Ezra was a Jew or a Christian. X. The time in which he flourished. XI. The character of Ezra, communicated by an anonymous writer. XII. Proofs that Ezra lived under Trajan. XIII. He has imitated the style of the Apocalypse. XIV. His description of the character of the Messiah. XV. His pretended prediction of the reigns of the twelve emperors after Julius Caesar. XVI. He refers to the lives and deaths of the eight succeeding princes. XVII. Also to the desolation of Judea under Titus and Domitian. XIX. And to the death of Vespasian. XX. He expected the advent of the Messiah.

I. THE ten tribes who were carried away to Media by Shalmaneser, continued there for many centuries. Some of the Greek fathers, as Cyril of Alexandria, and Theodoret, have advanced the opinion, that they all returned with Ezra, because the predictions of the prophets concerning them could not otherwise have been fulfilled. They are confirmed in their belief by the twelve victims, which were sacrificed by Ezra for the twelve tribes. Besides, there were individuals in Judea from all the tribes, when Jesus Christ appeared; for Anna belonged to the tribe of Asher, and the apostles were chosen from four different tribes in Galilee. St. Chrysostom adds, that there were Pharisees scattered through all the tribes, but that the most influential lived at Jerusalem. A forced construction is put on a passage of Pico Mirandula, who is made to say that the Jewish doctors believed in the return of the ten tribes under Ezra; whereas he only asserts that they rejected the narrative of the spurious Josephus.¹ The Talmudists, far from acknowledging the return of the tribes, declare that the dregs of the people alone followed Ezra. All the nobility, and particularly the descendants of David, re-

mained in Chaldea. This is the reason why they consider Babylon superiour to the Holy Land, as we shall see in the sequel.

II. The return of the ten tribes is opposed to the Scriptures, and to ancient tradition. Besides the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, only twelve hundred families accompanied Ezra, and these could not form a fiftieth part of the nation, which was dispersed through the East. We cannot ascertain whether those families, the heads of whom are not mentioned and whose genealogy was probably lost, belonged to Israel or Judah. Ezra indeed sacrificed twelve victims; but his object was to strengthen the bond of union between the different portions of the nation, who came yearly from their dispersions to worship at Jerusalem. According to Josephus, the tribes of Benjamin and Judah alone returned to Judea.³ There were doubtless in the Holy Land many individuals from all the tribes in the time of Christ; for some families escaped from their captivity, and others returned with Ezra. There were, besides, many who took advantage of revolutions in governments, to revisit Jerusalem and to settle in the land of their fathers. But the great body of the nation were, and continue to be, dispersed throughout the East.

III. After the ascension of our Saviour, when the apostles began to preach the Gospel on the day of pentecost, there was a great number of oriental Jews at Jerusalem. We are not to suppose with some, that they were for the most part proselytes to Judaism, converted by the dispersed tribes; for they were more probably native Jews, who came, in obedience to the law, to sacrifice at Jerusalem. It appears from the enumeration of St. Luke, that the ten tribes were still dispersed through Media, Parthia, Mesopotamia, Cappadocia, Pontus, and Asia Minor.

IV. Philo, who lived at this period, represented Jerusalem to Caligula, not as the metropolis of Judea merely, but of a people scattered over a vast extent of territory, who were able to afford powerful aid in its defence.³ He mentioned, among other places where the Jews were numerous, the islands of Cyprus and Candia, Egypt, Macedonia, Bithynia, Persia, and all the eastern cities, excepting Babylon, from which they were banished. The ten tribes carried into captivity by Shalmaneser, still continued in Persia, and may be found there to this day, notwithstanding the various revolutions to which that kingdom has been subjected. I know not why the

Jews should consider these tribes as lost. The prophets predicted that Ephraim should no longer continue a nation, and that the land of their enemies should consume them. These prophecies have been fulfilled; for Ephraim no longer exists as a distinct part of the nation. The genealogy of the Jews became irregular, and their tribes were blended together. Their former glory departed with the presidents of their captivity, whom the kings and caliphs allowed them to elect; and persecution and the revolutions of empires have diminished their numbers. "The land of their enemies has consumed them." The ten tribes are not however extinct, but their descendants may still be found in the great cities of Persia and Media. We shall prove this as we proceed in their history.

V. There is an unfounded opinion, though very ancient, that the majority of the ten tribes emigrated to an unknown country. The spurious Ezra asserts: "that Shalmaneser carried them beyond the river, and they resolved to separate from the heathen and to seek a spot, where they might religiously observe the law, for the violation of which they had been so severely punished."⁴ Ezra characterizes the country, whither they retired, as follows: 1. It was uninhabited. (Then they must have sought an unexplored country.) 2. Its distance was such, that their journey lasted a year and a half. 3. To reach it, they crossed the Euphrates, which God miraculously divided for the passage of the Jews; and Ezra adds, that, on their return to Judea, God will again perform the same miracle. 4. This country is called Arsareth. But, we ask, how could a people completely subdued, rise in a body and march unresisted through the territory of their proud masters, to establish a kingdom elsewhere? This event happened, if ever, in the thirty first year of the captivity; but Ezra informs us, that they were then in the countries whither Shalmaneser had carried them captive. Their desire to keep the law strictly, is said to have been their motive; but the Jews in their dispersions revered the law so little, that they adopted the pagan customs and worship. There is a city called Arsareth beyond the river Araxes, and the Jews are supposed to have given it this name. But the country whither the ten tribes retired, being at a great distance from Media, this cannot be the Arsareth of Ezra. The route they took is as little known as the country to which they emigrated; and hence it is, that so many authors severally mention China, Tartary, India, and a second

river Sabbatius, as the retreat of the ten tribes; while they all appeal to Ezra as their authority. But the account of Ezra is suspicious; for it does not appear from the Book of Tobit, that the journey of the tribes was long, or that there was any separation from the heathen, for the more strict observance of the law. On the contrary, Jews were to be found in Susa, Ecbatana, Rages, and in the other cities of Media and Assyria, and also on the banks of the Tigris and Euphrates.

VI. There are many writers who regard the spurious Ezra as an author venerable for his antiquity, and worthy of credit in all that relates to the history and sacred rites of his nation. St. Ambrose has frequently quoted him. The Catholic Church have never placed his work among the canonical books, but they have quoted from it in their most sacred services. The passage of Ezra: "Rejoice in thy glory and render thanks to him, who has called thee to partake in the reign of heaven," is introduced in the mass for Whitsunday.⁵ The Catholics have made many martyrs on the authority of Ezra, and Pico Mirandula considers him as an author divinely inspired.⁶

VII. Father Gasper Zamora places this author, in his Concordance, after the second Book of Ezra, and he passes from him to the Maccabees, and then to the writers of the New Testament successively.⁷ Zamora must therefore have thought, that this impostor was inspired as well as the apostles. It is astonishing that his arrangement of the sacred writers, including the spurious Ezra, should have been allowed at Rome; for it appears from the Index Biblicus of the Vulgate, that he could not have printed his Concordance there, and introduced the work of Ezra, without permission. Urban VIII. placed him on the same shelf of the Vatican with the Evangelists, because, he said, the learned might derive valuable information from him. But it is evident: 1. That this man was an impostor, for the true Ezra traced his descent from Aaron through fourteen generations, and he mentions the names of his ancestors; whereas the spurious Ezra carries back his descent through nineteen generations, and thus betrays himself. 2. It is evident, that he was a man, who palmed off his extravagant ravings as the teachings of an inspiration which he never felt. He pretended to have received it by drinking a potion of the colour of fire, under the influence of which he dictated two hundred and four volumes. A part of these were

equally accessible to the worthy and unworthy ; but the seventy last volumes which he wrote, were reserved for the perusal of the sages of the people, because they were " the sources of intelligence, the fountains of wisdom, and the streams of science." Pico Mirandula supposes that these seventy volumes contain the secrets of the Cabala. He asserts that they were published by the order of pope Sixtus IV. who purchased this system of subtle metaphysics at an extravagant price, and found that it contained a theology almost Christian. Another critic blames Pico for valuing works containing so much alloy, and maintains that the seventy volumes extolled by Ezra, are nothing more than the Septuagint, which was read every where. Hence this critic proves the imposition of the spurious Ezra, for he observes, that the man who led back the Jews from their captivity to Judea, could not have praised a version which did not exist until many years after his time.⁸ The conjectures of both these critics are groundless. The seventy volumes do not contain the metaphysics of the Cabala ; for their system, and the traditions of the Jews, were not written until towards the close of the second century, and Judah the Holy was the first to collect the opinions of the ancient doctors. If there were seventy volumes of a cabalistic work written by Ezra, how came they to be buried until the time of the Count of Mirandula ? Neither did the author of the seventy volumes write the Septuagint, for then we must acknowledge the spurious Ezra as the translator, instead of the Seventy, the use of the Septuagint could not have been restricted to the learned, as this impostor has declared respecting his work. Do we not honour this man above his deserts, by attempting to ascertain his character and designs ? Is it not evident that he was an impostor, who endeavoured to impose a belief, that he had dictated to five individuals in forty days two hundred and four volumes, which never were dictated by him, and which have never appeared ?⁹

VIII. This author had some knowledge of Christianity. He predicted that " the world would come to an end, when blood should flow from wood."¹⁰ A writer has well said, that it is impossible to understand him.¹¹ Ezra probably did not refer in this passage to the blood which has miraculously flowed from images and wooden crucifixes, but to the death of Christ on the cross, and to the common opinion of the Christian Church in the second century, that the world would soon be destroyed. He points out the time

and manner in which Jesus, the son of God, was to appear. "This man, (he says,) sprung from the sea, that is, from an unfathomable abyss, and was cut out from a mountain; but the place whence he was taken is invisible. The kings of the earth and their subjects tremble before him; yet they dare to oppose him. He has in his hands no spear or instrument of war, but a flame of fire issues from his mouth; and when he has destroyed his enemies, he will summon a more peaceable race." The ten tribes, who were dispersed through the East, and whose emigrations, as related by Ezra, we shall attempt to trace, were that peaceful race, who were to be summoned by the Messiah.

IX. From the preceding remarks on the spurious Ezra, we suppose him to have been a Jew, who was educated in Chaldea. In his writings, he has borrowed his arrangement, style and prophetic expressions from Daniel. His object in writing was to lead the Parthians, Elamites, and Medes, who were converted by the preaching of St. Peter on the day of pentecost, to expect that the Messiah would gather them from their dispersions, to reign with him. Ezra, who was either present at the conversion, or had been informed of it, looked for great results. He supposed that all that part of his nation, who had taken no part in the death of Christ, would compose the church and subjects of the Messiah. He was in reality a Christian, for he often speaks of Jesus, the son of God; but he retained, after his conversion, the reverence which was felt by all the Jews, in the time of Christ, for their cabalistic learning and traditions. By following these traditions, or from ignorance, he has shortened the reigns of the Persian monarchs from the true Ezra to Christ, by placing an interval of only four hundred years between the appearing of our Saviour and the prediction of Ezra. This spurious Ezra was then a Jew, who retained, after his conversion to Christianity, his former respect for the traditions and conceits of his instructors.

X. He wrote early in the Christian era. St. Ireneus, Clement of Alexandria, and Tertullian, receive as canonical his Revelation of the Recension of the Scriptures. We must accordingly place him towards the close of the first, or early in the second century. But his visions and pretensions to inspiration, his reverence for uncertain traditions, and the time when he lived, will not allow us to credit his account of the emigration of the ten tribes to an undis-

covered country. Our confidence in this author is destroyed, the moment we know his character. The example of the Greek fathers should preserve us from falling into their error.

XI. I shall insert here a communication from an anonymous writer on the character of the spurious Ezra with the greater pleasure, because it nearly accords with my own views. It is indeed opposed to the opinion which I advanced in the first edition of this work ; but I have no wish to conceal my errors from the public, or to deprive them of the more correct views of this unknown author.

XII. He believes that the author of the fourth Book of Ezra was a Jew by birth and religion ; that he wrote to confirm the wavering faith of his nation, who were astonished to see the time which the prophets had assigned for the appearance of the Messiah, elapse without his advent. Therefore he assures them, in mystical language, that their deliverer was at hand.

XIII. The author of the fourth Book of Ezra imitated the style of St. John in the Apocalypse, because the mystical language there used, was susceptible of different meanings, and he could easily exculpate himself with the Jews, if the event did not conform to his ambiguous predictions. His prophecies embarrassed the lower class of Christians, who read his writings without knowing that they were spurious ; for they found in them a close conformity to the opinions and style of an inspired writer. As the Revelation of St. John was not widely circulated, and as it was almost unknown to the Jews, the spurious Ezra made use of the phrases and mystical style of the apostle without fear of detection from the Jews, for whose consolation he wrote.

XIV. I am confirmed in these views of this anonymous writer, by Ezra's description of the character of the expected Messiah. He speaks of him as a victorious king, subduing his enemies by the breath of his mouth. " Lo, (says he,) a wind rises on the sea, and disturbs the waters.¹² I looked, and behold the wind became a man with thousands of the heavenly hosts, and wherever he turned his face, all things trembled before him. Whosoever heard his voice, was burnt up, and the earth was consumed by fire. I looked again, and men without number were collected from the four winds, to fight the man who sprung from the sea. Fire issued from his mouth, a whirlwind of flame from his lips, and tempests from his

tongue. The multitudes who came to fight against him, were consumed, and there remained of their innumerable hosts only the ashes and the noisome smell. Horrible fear came upon me."

XV. The spurious Ezra predicts the reign of the twelve emperours, from Julius Caesar to Trajan, after their death. "Lo, the eagle which thou hast seen rising from the sea, is a kingdom which thy brother Daniel saw in vision; the interpretation of it was not made known to him, but I will explain it to thee.¹³ Behold, the days come when a kingdom shall spring up on the earth, and the dread of it shall be greater than that of all kingdoms before it. Twelve kings shall reign successively, and the second shall rule longer than all the others together. These are the twelve wings of the eagle which thou hast seen." By the eagle is represented the Roman empire, and by its wings, the twelve Cesars, the second of whom, Augustus, reigned longer than all the rest.

XVI. "After the reign of these emperours, great divisions shall arise in this kingdom and it shall be in danger of ruin, but shall be delivered. Eight feathers shall put forth from under the twelve wings, and this is their interpretation. Eight kings shall arise, but their years shall be short and their times soon pass away, and two shall perish." These eight kings are Caligula, Claudius, Nero, Otho, Galba, Vitellius, Titus, and Domitian, who all reigned but a short time. "Two shall perish." Titus erased the names of two of them, Otho and Vitellius, from the public registers, and thus their history was lost.

XVII. The spurious Ezra, after describing many events which took place under the four first of the above emperours, declares that two shall be reserved to rule over and afflict the land and its inhabitants. They are the head of the eagle. "They shall fill up the measure of their crimes and perish." The Land is intended for Judea, in opposition to the Sea, which represents the rest of the world. The land is called by way of eminence the *promised land*, flowing with milk and honey. The Romans seized on this land, because God designed to punish it for its sins, and to purify it by calamity. Titus and Domitian are the emperours, whom Ezra declared should tyrannise over it. The Lion of Judah, that is, the Messiah, is afterwards represented by Ezra as reproaching the eagle for its cruel treatment of the Land or Judea.

XVIII. Ezra in the passage: "The proudest head shall per-

ish in torment," refers to Vespasian, who died in the greatest agony from a violent cholera and a bloody flux.

XIX. Ezra declared, that the sword should destroy the two remaining emperours, referring to Domitian and Titus. The former killed the latter, and was himself slain by Domitia. Ezra then mentions the succession of Nerva to the throne, and, after him, of Trajan; but he shortened the reign of the last, because he expected the immediate advent of the Messiah. "Then the lion shall rouse himself, and roaring, rush from the forest, and reproach the eagle for her injustice."¹⁴

¹ Pic. Mirand. Epist. Aurear. Lib. Epist. ult. ad ignotum. Tom. I. p. 261. ² Joseph. Antiq. Judaic. Lib. XI. Cap. V. ³ Philo ad Caium.
⁴ 2 Ezra 13: 40 et seq. ⁵ 4 Ezra 2: 36, 37. Missa in ferias post Pentecostum Miss. Romanae. p. 316. ⁶ Pic. Mirand. Apol. Tom. I. p. 82.
⁷ This narrative was sent me by an anonymous Catholic, who maintained that Ezra was considered an inspired writer before the council of Trent.
⁸ Le Moine, Var. Sac. p. 838. ⁹ 4 Ezra 14: 39 et seq. ¹⁰ 4 Ezra 5: 5.
¹¹ Le Moine, ibid. ¹² 4 Ezra 13: 2 et seq. ¹³ 4 Ezra 12: 11 et seq.
¹⁴ 4 Ezra 12: 31.

CHAPTER SIXTH.

THE DIFFERENT ACCOUNTS OF THE DISPERSIONS OF THE JEWS IN THE EAST BY THEIR OWN HISTORIANS.

I. Design of this Chapter. II. The Jews preferred staying in Media to returning to Judea. III. Josephus places them in seven provinces of the East. IV. Josephus Gorienides asserts that the Rechabites established themselves in the dark mountains. V. Time in which Eldad flourished. VI. Whether the tribe of Dan emigrated from Judea in the time of Jeroboam. VII. Whether it was joined by three other tribes. VIII. Some account of the tribe of Moese. IX. Eldad places the tribe of Issachar among the Persians. X. Benjamin of Tudela. His travels. Thema, the capital of the kingdom of the Rechabites. XI. Salmon, one of the Rechabite kings. XII. Erroneous account of the pearl fishery, and of its location, by Benjamin. XIII. The tomb of Esra on the frontiers of Persia. XIV. The tomb of Daniel. Dispute for its possession. XV. Location of the tribe of Dan, according to Benjamin. XVI. His description of a peculiar race of Turks. XVII. Character of Peritool, a Jewish traveller. XVIII. The Jews, according to him, are to be found in great numbers in the mountains of Chabor and in the adjoining country. XIX. Also in the kingdom of Calicut. XX. And on the river Sabbatus beyond the Ganges. XXI. The kingdom of Prester John. The Jews settled there in great numbers.

I. AFTER refuting and rejecting the account of the dispersion of the ten tribes by the spurious Ezra, we proceed to examine what the Jewish historians have written on this subject. Much that is fabulous is blended with their history; but still it is important to learn what opinions they held and what they have published, on the dispersion of the Jews. We shall follow, as nearly as possible, the order of time, in which the different authors flourished.

II. Josephus relates, that Ezra obtained permission to lead the Jews of the captivity back to their country, and that many families came from Media to Babylon to accompany him. A large number of the Jews, however, preferred their situation in a heathen land, to a settlement in their own country, which must have cost them a long and dangerous journey. The Jews of the present day allow, that many families of the tribes of Benjamin and Judah refused to return to Judea, and that their posterity are still to be found in the East. The president of the captivity, who was always a descendant from David, was chosen from these families. We must then look to

Media for the ten tribes, as they were established there in the time of Ezra.

III. Josephus relates further, that the Jews who did not return from the captivity, amounted to many thousands in number.¹ The edict of Ahasuerus, respecting the Jews, was promulgated in one hundred and twenty seven departments of the empire, from Ethiopia to India, and therefore Josephus supposed that his countrymen were scattered throughout the East. Orosius and other Christian authors agree with Josephus.² The modern Jews, more credulous than their ancestors, have added to this account much that is fabulous and incredible.

IV. The impostor who took the name of Gorionides, is considered by the Jews, as higher authority than the historian whose name he assumed; because the former wrote in Hebrew and the latter in Greek. The spurious Gorionides pretends, that he saw and copied a work entitled the Life of Alexander the Great, written by the Magi of Egypt immediately after the death of that prince. He learned from this work, that Alexander, after marching through a vast extent of country, reached the dark mountains, (צור, *Choshec*.) The king attempted to penetrate beyond them, to the abodes of the posterity of Jonathan and Rechab. He ordered thirteen hundred picked men to accompany him. He was enveloped in gloomy darkness as he advanced, and the land was an extensive morass. The dead silence of the march was broken only by birds, who spoke Greek. One of these told Alexander, that he could never reach the house of God and the abodes of his servants, the descendants of Abraham; and another advised him to march to India and vanquish Porus. He followed this counsel and returned to his army, to push his conquests towards India.

V. Eldad is more interested than the other Jewish historians, in giving us an account of the dispersion; for he belonged to Dan, one of the ten tribes.³ According to some writers, he flourished in the thirteenth century, A. D. 1283, and according to others, four hundred years earlier.⁴ He wrote a letter on the dispersions to the Jews of Spain, which bears the former date. The Jews have a tradition, handed down from Isaac the Illustrious, that Eldad lived in A. M. 4640. If this tradition be correct, he flourished in A. D. 880, and not in the thirteenth century. It is difficult to ascertain the time when this author lived; because the Jews, from whom we de-

rive all our information respecting him, are themselves at variance on this point.

VI. Eldad assures us that, from the time of Jeroboam, the tribe of Dan determined that they would no longer go to war with their brethren, and therefore left their country. They marched into Ethiopia, and forced its inhabitants to pay them tribute. Eldad is wrong at the outset. God did not carry the tribe of Dan into exile, until long after Jeroboam. We must not understand by the Ethiopia which he mentions, the kingdom of Abyssinia, where the Jews at one time became powerful. He relates that the tribe, in marching towards Ethiopia, ascended the river Pison, and therefore he must refer to Chaldea, the kingdom of Nimrod, the son of Cush, which is often called Ethiopia in the Scriptures. He describes the inhabitants of this country as cannibals of a gigantic stature, with skins of a black colour. His last observation is incorrect, for a black skin is the characteristic of the Abyssinian, and not of the Chaldean.

VII. Eldad relates that the tribes of Naphtali, Gad, and Asher, followed their countrymen beyond the rivers of Ethiopia. They advanced by short stages, feeding their flocks and living in tents. A descendant of Oliab was their king, who enjoined on them a strict observance of the law. He could bring into the field an army of one hundred and twenty thousand cavalry and one hundred thousand infantry. These four tribes united, and by compact, each of them made war on the neighbouring nations during three months of the year. The spoil obtained in these expeditions was carried to their king, and by him equally divided among the four tribes. Eldad is nearly correct in his account of the emigration of Naphtali, Gad, and Asher; for the Scriptures inform us that these three tribes, together with Reuben and the half tribe of Manasseh, were carried away captive to Ethiopia by Tiglath-pileser. They might have cultivated the land and made war on the neighbouring provinces; but there is little probability that the Assyrian princes would have permitted them to choose a king from among themselves.

VIII. According to Eldad, a tribe but little known, joined the other four. He calls it the tribe of Moses, and says, that they were at one time grossly idolatrous, but afterwards returned to the worship of one God, and emigrated to Ethiopia. Here they built splen-

did palaces, and cultivated the most beautiful gardens, which were still to be seen in the time of Eldad. Heaven blessed them, and never permitted the children to die before their fathers, who uniformly lived to the full age of man. The tribe was wealthy, and more numerous than the Israelites who went from Egypt under Moses. Genebrard, in translating this passage in the letter of Eldad, has mistaken the authors meaning, and construed it: "Men in a costume like that of the Egyptians." Eldad is speaking of the numbers of the tribe of Moses, not of their dress. They spoke no language but Hebrew, and strictly kept the law. They were unacquainted with the Amoraim and the Gaons, (authors who have recorded traditions;) for these doctors lived in the time of the second temple. Eldad does not appear to know that they did not flourish until sometime after the destruction of the second temple. We cannot ascertain what he means by the tribe of Moses. He may refer to the descendants of Jethro, who were reclaimed from idolatry and settled in Ethiopia, or, as some expositors among Christians believe, to the posterity of Jonathan, the son of Gershom and grandson of Moses. This Jonathan was a Levite, who was employed in the tribe of Dan in the worship of the Teraphim, which had been taken from Micah. A Jonathan, the son of Manasseh, is mentioned in Judges 18: 30, and the ך is suspended in the word Manasseh.⁵ Therefore the Rabbins conjecture, and the expositors agree with them, that the true reading is both Moses and Manasseh; for, on the one hand, Jonathan was the son of Gershom and grandson of Moses, and on the other, he worshipped the idols of Manasseh. But how could Jonathan have been the grandson of Moses, when there is an interval of three hundred years between them? For this reason, we believe that the tribe of Moses never existed, except in the imagination of Eldad.

IX. After the five tribes who emigrated to Ethiopia, Eldad mentions that of Issachar. He merely observes, that this tribe was subject to the Medes and Persians, and that some of them became worshippers of fire and conformed to the customs of the country, which permitted the marriage of brothers and sisters. The tribe of Zebulun possessed the country from mount Paran to the Euphrates; and the tribe of Reuben, the land on the opposite side of Paran. Ephraim and the half tribe of Manasseh were situated further south. They lived by theft and pillage, and were as wicked as the other

tribes were holy. Simeon and Judah inhabited the kingdom of Chozar, of which we shall speak hereafter. These tribes were powerful and numerous, and imposed tribute on twenty five of the neighbouring provinces. In speaking of the power of this tribe, Eldad mentions that they subdued the Saracens, and thus he betrays the exaggeration and inaccuracy of his history. We now proceed to examine an account of the dispersions of the Jews by a different author.

X. Benjamin of Tudela, a celebrated traveller of the twelfth century, went through the East for the express purpose of ascertaining the situation of the dispersed tribes.⁶ He says that they were in possession of extensive tracts of country, and his evidence is the more worthy of credit, because he relates, for the most part, only what fell under his own observation. He took a northerly direction from Babylon, and after travelling for twenty one days in a desert, he reached the kingdom of the Rechabites. Two brothers, who traced their descent from David, by records which were kept with great accuracy, governed different parts of this country. Annas ruled over the kingdom whose capital was Thema. His dominions were so extensive as to require ten days to pass through them, and contained many cities, towns, fortresses and castles. The Rechabites, his subjects, enriched themselves by ravaging the territories of their neighbours, especially the Arabians. Colleges were established among them. They paid tithes to their Rabbins, and supported a body of men like monks, who dressed in black and lived in caverns. These ascetics drank no wine and were abstemious in their diet, and it was their constant occupation to bewail the misery of the dispersed tribes, and the desolation of Jerusalem. They yearly offered prayers for forty days in behalf of those who were exiled from Judea.

XI. The dominions of Salmon, the brother of Annas, contained forty cities, two hundred large towns, and one hundred castles. This extensive country supported a population of three hundred thousand Jews, and the inhabitants of Tanai, its capital, alone amounted to one hundred thousand. The city of Tilimase, situated between two mountains and strongly fortified, was the residence of the king, and possessed a population equally numerous. Unfortunately for Benjamin, this powerful kingdom is not known to exist in our day. He places Arabia to the north of Babylon, and this glaring error at the outset, leads us to suspect that he has written

about a country which he never saw, and flattered the pride of his nation at the expense of truth. But proceed with his account of the other tribes.

XII. Benjamin places the tribes of Reuben, Gad, and Manasseh, at the distance of three days journey from Tilimase, in a city called Cepar, which contained fifty thousand Jews, who were at perpetual war with the Babylonians and Arabians. These powerful tribes possessed beyond this, extensive and noble cities, which were situated in a frightful and almost impassable desert. Their armies were powerful and able to carry on wars with the neighbouring kingdoms. We remark here, that the author did not visit all the places which he mentions, but gives the account of travellers whom he met on the road. There is no surer way to be deceived, than to credit without examination the marvellous accounts which are given us of different places. We always believe the country which we have not visited, to be more beautiful and more worthy of our curiosity than any other. This Jewish traveller has altered the location of several places so much, that we suspect he spared himself the trouble of going to them, notwithstanding his assertion to the contrary. For instance, he mentions an island at the mouth of the river Tigris, much frequented by Indian and Persian merchants, who carried on an extensive traffic in the pearls found in its waters. He undoubtedly refers to Ormus, which is situated far from the Tigris and near the straits of Bassora. An author who errs so grossly in the location of places which he has seen, must expect that we should doubt the accuracy of his other statements. His account of the formation of pearls is ridiculous. He had probably heard that pearls were formed from drops of dew, and he improves on this idea. He relates, that the inhabitants who live on the banks of the rivers, skim the showers which fall on the twenty fourth of March, from the surface of the waters. They enclose the rain, thus obtained, in bottles and throw them into the sea; where they remain until the month of September. Expert divers are then employed to bring them from the bottom. When opened, they are found to contain reptiles, and these yield pearls by dissection. If Benjamin had ever been in Ormus, he would not have thus described the formation of pearls.⁷

XIII. It was customary for the oriental Jews to build their synagogues near the tombs of the prophets. Benjamin relates, that the sepulchre of Ezra was on the frontiers of Persia, to which coun-

try he was travelling at the time of his death, in order to have an interview with Ataxerxes. On one side of Ezra's tomb, rose a synagogue, which could contain fifteen thousand Jewish worshippers; and on the other, the Mohammedans had built a mosque, out of respect to the character of the Jewish prince. The tomb of the prophet Daniel was shown to our historian in a city situated on the banks of the Tigris, in the territories of the Elamites. The river ran through the city, and separated the dwellings of the rich Jews from those of their poorer brethren.

XIV. The latter complained, because the tomb of Daniel was on the side of the river occupied by the rich, and because the possession of it conferred wealth and every blessing on them alone. The poor took up arms, to obtain by force the tomb which was denied to their entreaties. The contention of the two parties was finally appeased; and by mutual agreement, the tomb was transported yearly from one bank of the river to the other, that the rich and poor might equally share in the blessings which it bestowed. The compact was observed with good faith by the rich and poor. After several years, Senigar, the king of Persia, would not allow the tomb of the prophet to be removed, and fixed it permanently at an equal distance from both banks of the river. From respect to the prophet, the king prohibited fishing on the river for the space of a mile above and below the tomb. A synagogue was afterwards built near it, which was much frequented by the Jews for prayer. This traveller says, that he found Turks in the territories of the Elamites, who had two orifices in their faces, which supplied the place of a nose. When we can credit the wonderful narrative of Benjamin, we shall be prepared to receive all the errors and prejudices of the vulgar.⁸

XV. He places the tribes of Dan, Napthali, Zebulun, and Asher, on the banks of the river Gozan, and in the mountains of Nisbor. The river and the mountains are equally unknown to me. Eldad and Peritsol, who have borrowed much of their narratives from Benjamin, are at variance with him and with each other.⁹ Eldad describes the mountains of Nisbor, as forming a long ridge near the banks of the Ganges in India; and Peritsol, with one exception, places the tribes who were said to inhabit these mountains, on the river Sabbatius. We shall speak of this stream hereafter. Benjamin relates, that the river Gozan flows through the kingdoms of Persia and Parthia; but modern travellers have been unable to find

it there.¹⁰ It is amusing to follow this author in his account of kingdoms which never existed, and to observe the pains which he takes, to exaggerate the power of his countrymen in their dispersions. His narrative proceeds as follows.

XVI. The Turks whom he describes as destitute of noses, had taken and plundered a city of Persia. The king of that country determined to make reprisals, and obtained a guide to direct his march across the dreary and nearly impassable desert, which separated Persia from the territories of the Turks. The guide lost his way, and the army suffered severely from famine during a march of fifteen days in a desolate wilderness; but they finally reached the mountains of Nisbor. The troops refreshed themselves on the banks of the Gozan, in the extensive orchards of the Jews. The king of Persia was surprised to find among these mountains, cities, fortresses, and a powerful nation, of which he had never before heard. He sent an ambassadour to them, after ascertaining that they were Jews, to propose an alliance and to obtain permission to purchase provisions for the army. The Jews were at first unwilling to form a league with him; but as he threatened to massacre all their countrymen, who were in his dominions, they were forced to yield obedience to his wishes. They informed their neighbours and allies, the Turks, of the intention of the king of Persia to attack them. The Turks awaited his approach in a pass of the mountains, attacked him unexpectedly, and forced him to retreat with the shattered remains of his army. Benjamin received this account from Moses, a Jew, who was forced to leave the mountains and accompany an officer to Persia, who was attached to this expedition, and who afterwards became king of that country. Benjamin adds, that all that part of his nation, which were dispersed among these mountains, were not under a regal form of government. We are unwilling to believe this narrative with no other authority for its truth than the assertion of an individual, who has taken care to place a desert nearly impassable between us and the kingdom which he describes. If such a nation existed, as powerful as he declares it to be, travellers would undoubtedly have discovered it before this time.

XVII. Peritsol or Parasol, an Italian Jew, who lived about two hundred years since, in a geography of the three continents which were then known, attributes to his nation the possession of a large

portion of the globe.¹¹ This able author had a profound knowledge of the ancient geographers, and he follows them, in his treatise, with great accuracy. He has fallen into some errors which were unavoidable in so great a work; still, however, he has succeeded better than any of his countrymen, who have written on the same subject. He was the author of the *Shield of Abraham*, a controversial work defending Judaism from the attacks of Christians. Some learned men, and among others Buxtorf and Hottinger, have attributed a commentary on Job to him; but they have confounded this work with his *Ways of the World*, the geography of which we have spoken. Peritsol asserts, that the Jews were numerous and powerful in many countries, where in fact none are to be found. Among these countries, he mentions particularly India on both sides of the Ganges, China, and a kingdom surrounded by mountains, which exists only in his imagination.¹²

XVIII. Peritsol places others of his countrymen in the desert of Chabor, where they live like the ancient Rechabites; they neither dwell in houses, till the ground, nor drink wine. To remove all suspicion of deception from his narrative, he marks out the route which we must take to reach Chabor. "Double the Cape of Good Hope, enter the Indian Ocean, make the continent of Asia, and you will find Chabor." But no one has yet ascertained where this country is situated. Peritsol relates, that the Jews in the deserts of Arabia were as numerous as the sand of the seashore, and governed by powerful kings. As they were on the route of the caravans to Mecca, they acquired wealth by a profitable trade in pepper and aromatics. He peoples the banks of the Ganges, the Philippines, Ceylon, and other islands, with Jews. These embarked, at one time, in vessels of a slight construction, and entered the Red Sea for the purpose of reaching Judea, that they might fulfil the prophecy which predicted the return of the Jews in that direction. They were accustomed to send their ambassadors to other nations, in vessels of bulrushes and papyrus.

XIX. According to Peritsol, the Jews, in great numbers, inhabit the islands of the Indian Ocean, especially those beyond Calicut.¹³ Notwithstanding that the Arabians did all in their power to degrade and destroy the Jews, they were prosperous and happy under the government of their own kings. Nothing can be more unfounded than his assertion, that the Jews possessed a regular

form of government in any part of India. To confirm his narrative, he cites Vesputius, who, in his description of the New World, affirms, that he had found Jewish merchants at Calicut. This is probably true, but are we warranted in the inference, that the ten tribes were established in India, and were wealthy and governed by kings, because a few solitary merchants visited that country for the sake of traffic ?

XX. Peritsol passes from the Jewish settlements in India, to those on the river Sabbatius, which he places beyond the Ganges. To prove that the ten tribes in their dispersions settled on the Sabbatius, he quotes a passage from the Scriptures, which mentions that they were carried over the river Gozan, 2 Kings, 17: 6. He believes that this Gozan is the Ganges, which separated the Jews from the Indians. He observes, that all who deny that the Jews were established on the Sabbatius, must reject the authority of the Talmud and of Josephus Gorionides, who relates that Titus, having marched to the river, was kindly received by the Jews, who had been in possession of that country for several centuries. The emperor was not allowed to cross the river on the Sabbath, which he thinks a proof that the Jews were numerous and powerful. Peritsol adduced the constant care with which God had preserved the ten tribes, as an argument in favour of Judaism, and he believed that the Christians could not answer it.¹⁴ Christians must have been poor reasoners, if they could make no reply to so weak an apology for Judaism. Peritsol appears to me to exult in an imaginary triumph.

XXI. Peritsol found on the Sabbatius, the celebrated Prester John, who has related in a letter, that the Jews of that region were governed by a king called Daniel. There were princes subject to Daniel, whose power was so great, that he would have made himself master of the neighbouring provinces, had not his ambitious designs been checked by disturbances in his own kingdom. Without offering any opinion on the truth of the narrative of this author, who was the son of a Jew of Avignon, we would observe, that he has been unjustly blamed by some authors for saying that the letter of Prester John was written from India, instead of Ethiopia. Peritsol is correct ; for if there ever was a king of that name, his dominions lay in India, and not in Ethiopia. It is to be wished that Eldad, Manasseh, and Peritsol, had produced clearer ev-

idence of their correctness in attributing such power and glory to their nation.¹⁵

Joseph. Antiq. Judaic. Lib. XI. Cap. V. VI. p. 380. ² Oros. Lib. II. Cap. VII. ³ Bartol. Bibl. Rabb. Tom. I. p. 129. ⁴ A. D. 1263. ⁵ Judges 18: 30. The son of Gershom, the son of מִיֶשֶׁה . If we admit the 1, the reading will be Manasseh, if we reject it, Moses. ⁶ Itinerarium Rabbi Benjaminis, בנימין מסעות שלרבי . 7 P. 104. 105. ⁸ Ps. 98. ⁹ Peritsol, Eldad. ¹⁰ He travelled from Media through Persia. ¹¹ נילוס אגרת אורחות , Epistola de Semitis Mundi, id est, Itinera Mundi, sic dicta, nempe Cosmographiac, Authore Abrahamo Peritsol, A. D. 1525. Cap. IX. p. 63. Cap. X. p. 70. ¹² Bartolocci found, in an edition full of inaccuracies, אסירה , Asira, for אֵיסְרָרָה , Estera, which means, *beyond the Ganges*, and he calls this country Assyria. In the same edition, פֵּרִיקָא , Perika, is substituted for אֵיסְרָרָה ; and Bartolocci has thence created the imaginary kingdom of Perrique, the China of Peritsol ; Regnum Sericae. Hyde, Notae ad Perit. Cap. IX. p. 63. ¹³ Peritsol, Cap. XXIV. p. 148. ¹⁴ Cap. XXIII. ¹⁵ Martinus, Cap. XXV. p. 153, asserts that the kingdom of Prester John is the present Si-Fan on the frontiers of China ; which contained the extensive provinces of Veugang, Kerig and Tiber. This kingdom supported a dense population.

CHAPTER SEVENTH.

WHETHER THE TEN TRIBES RETIRED TO TARTARY AND THENCE PENETRATED TO AMERICA AND THE EAST INDIES.

I. Account of the Jews of Tartary and China, by Manasseh. II. The arguments of Postel, in support of the opinion that the tribes of Dan and Naphtali are to be found in Tartary. III. The authors who suppose that the Jews retired to America. IV. The Indians have traditions of a deluge and of a race of giants. V. Whether Noah peopled America. VI. Resemblance between the rites of the Indians and those of the Jews. VII. Different conjectures on the origin of the Indians. VIII. Whether the prophet Obadiah predicted that the Jews should go to America. A passage in this prophet explained. IX. Exegesis of other texts of Scripture. X. No peculiar conformity between the customs and rites of the Indians and those of the Jews. XI. Some Christians have believed in the Jewish origin of the Indians. XII. Their rites resemble those of the Catholics more than those of the Jews. XIII. Whether the evangelists preached the Gospel to the Indians. XIV. Proofs of their former Christianity unsatisfactory. XV. The Indians are gross idolaters. XVI. Refutation of arguments in favour of the Jewish descent of the Tartars. XVII. Petachias found only heretical Jews in Tartary. Their opinions.

I. The great body of the Jews and of Christians have believed, either that the ten tribes went to Tartary, or that they penetrated to America. The former opinion is supported by the vestiges of ancient Judaism, which are to be found in Tartary; and the latter, by some passages of Scripture, which are thought to refer to an emigration of the tribes to America. We shall examine these texts as we proceed. Manasseh, one of the most learned doctors of the Jews, has adopted the opinion, that the ten tribes established themselves in Tartary. He places them there in possession of an extensive country, called Thabor, which he confounds with the Chabor on the frontiers of Media, mentioned by Isaiah. Manasseh relates, that a part of the ten tribes crossed the great wall which divides China from Tartary, and settled in the former country. He believes that the Scriptures clearly refer to this emigration of the dispersed tribes, and he applies the words of Isaiah: "The people shall return from the country of the Siniens (*Sinim*)," to those who entered China.¹ He did not consider that Sin, which in Arabic means the *morass*, was the celebrated city of Pelusium in Egypt.²

II. Manasseh is not the only author who has entertained the opinion, that the ten tribes are to be found in Tartary. Postel, who lived before him, held that the Turks are descended from the Jews of that country, and he cites an Armenian historian as his authority. Many writers have been misled by this unfounded assertion. Ortelius, an able geographer, in his description of Tartary, mentions: 1. The kingdom of Arsareth, whither, he says, the ten tribes retired after they left Judea.³ They expelled the Scythians, its former inhabitants, and from their strict observance of the law of God, they called themselves Gauthai, whence the kingdom of Cathay derives its name. 2. In another part of Tartary he finds the tribe or horde of Naphtali. Horde, Ortelius assures us, is derived from a Hebrew word which means *descent*. 3. He discovered, further to the north, the tribe of Dan, which retained its original name in Danois or Danites. 4. The Jews also spread over another kingdom, called by the Tartars Thabor; but they have lost their sacred books. Thabor means, in Hebrew, the *navel*; and being situated nearly in the centre of Tartary, it has given its name to that extensive empire.⁴ Thabor was the native country of the celebrated Jew, who travelled into Portugal and corrupted an officer of the court.⁵ He afterwards acquired so high a reputation in Italy, that Charles V. gave him an interview at Mantua.⁶ 5. Ortelius adds, that the name of the inhabitants, Totares, (for so he requires us to call them,) is Hebrew, and means the *remnant* or *excess*, which applies perfectly well to the tribes dispersed through northern Asia, who were the *remnant* of the Israelites. 6. He cannot account for the number of Jews to be found in Russia and Poland, except on the supposition, that the ten tribes emigrated to Tartary, and thence spread into the neighbouring provinces. 7. Vestiges of their former Judaism are to be found in the customs of the people, as, for instance, in the circumcision of children. Ortelius finds abundant evidence in the religion, the hordes, the language, and even in the names of the Tartars, that they have descended from Jewish ancestors. He observes, that it is not surprising that the ten tribes should pass from Assyria into Tartary, when the distance was so short from the former country to the latter. Armenia alone intervened.

III. From Tartary, many authors have supposed that the ten tribes penetrated to America. From the resemblance of the In-

dian to the Jewish countenance, William Penn thought that he had discovered the Jews in his new settlement.⁷ He observes: "When I look at their children, I imagine myself in the Jewish quarter of London. Like the Jews, the Indians have small black eyes. They reckon time by moons, and offer their first fruits to God. They celebrate a feast like that of Tabernacles. It is said that their altar is constructed of twelve stones. Their mourning for the dead continues for a year. The customs of their females resemble those of the Jewish women. Their language is laconic, vigorous, sententious, and full of energy, in which last particular it bears a striking resemblance to the Hebrew. A word with them expresses more than three with us; and their unfinished sentences are completed by the intelligence of the hearers. God declared that he would carry away the Jews into a country undiscovered and uncultivated; and he who purposed this, was able to execute his designs. The Jews might easily have crossed over from the eastern extremity of Asia, to the western extremity of America." Penn is not singular in his opinion. It is scarcely fifty years since Rabbi Manasseh published a work entitled the "Hope of Israel;" in which he shows that he had formed great expectations from the number and power of the Jews in America.⁸ He dedicated his book to the parliament of England, and he was well received by Cromwell; a circumstance which has given rise to a report that the Jews considered him to be the Messiah. Manasseh was misled by a narrative of Montesini, in which he asserts that he discovered a body of Jews beyond the Cordilleras, which run through Chili.⁹ The Jews were unwilling to reveal to him, or indeed to any one, the situation of their secret retreat among the mountains. The account of his meeting with the Indian Jews is as follows. Montesini was travelling with an Indian in the province of Quito, when he was overtaken by a violent tempest. The Indian took occasion from this circumstance to inveigh against the cruelty and wickedness of the Spaniards, which had involved two innocent travellers in the punishment, which God intended for them alone. When Montesini reached Carthagena, he was immured in the dungeons of the Inquisition. Here he had abundant opportunity for meditation; and his mind was deeply impressed by the constant recurrence of the thought, that the Indians were Jews. As soon as he was liberated from the Inquisition, he sought for his fellow traveller, to obtain a

full account of his religious belief. He was surprised to find, that the Indian was in reality a Jew, who traced his descent from Abraham, and worshipped God under the name of Adonai. The curiosity of Montesini, being thus awakened, led him to push his researches further, and to accompany the Indian on his return home.¹⁰ They arrived on the banks of a river, when the Indian gave a certain signal, and a number of persons made their appearance, and repeated the words in Deuteronomy : SCHELAH ISRAEL ADONAI ELOHENU ADONAI EHAD, *Hear, O Israel, the Lord our God is one Lord.* Montesini learned that they regarded Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, as their ancestors, and Reuben as the father of their tribe. They related, that God had transported them to America by a stupendous miracle ; and that they were treated with the same severity by the aboriginal inhabitants, which these had experienced from the Spaniards. At the instigation of their Magi, the Indians declared war against them at three different times ; but God protected his chosen people, and enabled them completely to destroy the armies of the idolaters. The Magi escaped death by the secrets of their art. They confessed that the God of Israel was the only true God, and predicted that the Jews would eventually become masters of the world. Montesini left these Indian Jews with the full persuasion, that he should one day see his countrymen ruling all nations. Manasseh believes in the emigration of the tribes to the New World, on the authority of Montesini, and traces the route, which the Reubenites followed to reach the West Indies. He quotes the passage of Isaiah : "The isles shall wait for thy law ;" and informs us that it means, the islands of America shall receive the knowledge of the true God from the Israelites. He tells us that Asia and America, now divided by Bhering's Straits, were formerly but one continent. Before their separation, the Jews penetrated to America by land, and there fortified their settlements against the attacks of the aborigines. Manasseh further relates, that the ten tribes came from the East Indies by Bhering's Straits.¹¹ They penetrated to the continent of America and peopled New Spain as far as Peru ; but they were forced by the Indians to retreat to strong holds in the mountains, where they were discovered by Montesini. We content ourselves with giving the opinion of Manasseh, founded on the narrative of Montesini, without refuting it ; for no argument is necessary to prove it erro-

neous.¹² Some authors among Christians have cited both Manasseh and Montesini in support of their conjectures.

IV. Finally, it is said by some, that the descendants of the Jews, who first emigrated to America, retain customs and traditions, which plainly indicate their origin.¹³ They have some knowledge of a deluge, but their account of it differs from ours. Those who live in Peru, relate, that when their country was overflowed by the waters, the inhabitants took refuge in caverns, and closed the entrances.¹⁴ After some time, they sent forth their dogs to ascertain whether the waters had abated, and these returning wet, they concluded that the flood was still upon the earth. The dogs were sent forth a second time, and came back again covered with mire. The inhabitants then left their retreats, and again cultivated the land. There is some resemblance between this and the Scriptural account of the deluge. In other parts of America, the supposed descendants of the ten tribes relate, that all the inhabitants of the world were drowned in the flood, with the exception of Viracocha, who came forth from a great lake.¹⁵ The ruins of his palace are still shown on the spot where he first lived. He removed to the city of Cusco, and his children again peopled the world. Others say, that six men alone were saved from the flood, by taking refuge in a cavern, and that they continued the human race. The country which they inhabited, is called Pacari Tampo, and their descendants are the most ancient race on the globe. Mango Campa, the high priest of the Incas, sprung from this people, and spread a religion which he asserted to be a revelation from heaven. These Incas subdued many provinces, under the pretence, that they were descended from those who first peopled these countries, and therefore had a just claim to them. The Indian Jews also speak of giants, who were attacked by a man, who came down from heaven, armed with lightning. A Spanish captain, who heard this relation, had the curiosity to visit the spot where the combat was said to have taken place; and he there dug up the bones of a perfect skeleton.¹⁶ The teeth were four inches long and two broad. The bones of a man, according to Acosta, were found in Mexico, which were larger still; for the molar teeth were of the size of a man's fist, and the other parts of the relics in proportion. Skeletons were also obtained there, which were three times larger than those of common Indians.

V. Some authors have thought, that Noah spent the three hundred and fifty last years of his life in obedience to the command of God, in colonizing the different parts of the earth. As he was directed by the Holy Spirit, he could not have been ignorant of the existence of the western continent. With his experience in the construction of vessels, and his knowledge of navigation, it was not difficult for him to reach the West Indies. He could sail to the New World much easier than to the Tiber from the extremity of the Mediterranean ; and he could send his children across the sea to New France, or from the Cape de Verd to Brazil, with the same facility as to Japan. Solomon, however, whose fleets were three years in making a voyage for gold, was not so skilful. If America has been peopled from the time of Noah, it is not at all surprising that its inhabitants should have traditions of a deluge, or that the skeletons of giants should be found there. But who can believe that Noah knew or visited this country ?

VI. The Jews believe that the Indians are lineally descended from Abraham, because the vestiges of Judaism may be found among them ; and they could not have learned its rites from the children of Noah. The Indians relate, that they were protected, like the Israelites, by the power of God in passing through a sea. They offer their first fruits to their gods, a custom they could have learned only from Jews. They practise circumcision, a rite of Judaism. They eat the paschal lamb ; at least, the priests yearly sacrifice a white lamb, mingle its blood with flour and distribute it among the people ; who receive it with the implicit belief, that it is the blood of their God who descended from heaven. Their palaces and temples have a striking resemblance to Jewish synagogues. They believe in the resurrection of the dead ; and, therefore, their wives and slaves are buried with them, in order that they may be suitably attended when they leave the grave.¹⁸ When the Spaniards broke open the tombs of the dead, for the sake of the gold which was buried with them, the Indians entreated, that the bones of their fathers might not be disturbed, lest there should be some difficulty in uniting them at the resurrection. The Mexicans rend their garments in token of grief. The inhabitants of Nicaragua prohibit the women after childbirth from entering the temple until they have been purified ; and the natives of Hispaniola consider commerce with a pregnant woman to be criminal. In Mexico

they have a jubilee every fifty years. They observe the Sabbath by sacrifices to idols, and retain traditions of the creation.¹⁹

VII. But, in the first place, the origin of the Americans cannot be satisfactorily ascertained, or it would not have given rise to such contrarieties of opinion. One author asserts that they are the posterity of the Canaanites, who, flying before Joshua and embarking on the ocean, were driven by tempests to the New World.²⁰ In proof of this, he tells us, that the Indians, like the Canaanites, eat the flesh of their enemies. Unfortunately, however, the Canaanites were never cannibals. He adds, that the Indians resemble the Canaanites, in making their children pass through the fire, around which they dance, when they invoke their demons.²¹ Alexo Vanegas, (Lib. II. Cap. II.) asserts that the Carthaginians peopled America. They first reached the island of Hispaniola, then Cuba, and finally penetrated to Panama and Nombre de Dios. His reasons for entertaining this opinion are : 1. Because the Carthaginians were navigators and planted many colonies. 2. They used, like the Peruvians, the figures of birds for letters. Manasseh, in refuting this conjecture, observes that the Carthaginians had beards and white skins, and were civilized ; but the Indians were beardless, tawny, and in a savage state.²² Arias Montanus believes them to be the descendants of Ophir, the son of Joktan and nephew of Heber, because, if the letters of the Hebrew word אופיר be transposed, they form Peru, the Ophir of 2 Chron. viii. and ix.²³ But the Ophir of the Scriptures is either the Chersonesus or Malaga.²⁴ Another author affirms, that America was not peopled before the time of Christ.²⁵ As God punished the impiety of those who built the tower of Babel, by scattering them over the earth, so the unbelief of those who rejected the Gospel, was visited with a similar judgement. He adds, that God carried them to distant islands, where they lived like brutes ; when they might have been happy, had they received Christianity. Grotius thinks that the inhabitants of Groenland were the first to penetrate to the New World.²⁶ He alleges in proof of this opinion, that there is a striking affinity between the languages of the Germans and North Americans. A part of their country is called Estotiland, which is a German name. Their word for a lamb is *lam*, and their god Theut at once recalls the Thoth of the Germans. We would observe, however, that the Indians have no word for God. Acosta, who had abundant op-

portunity to investigate this point, writes as follows: "If we seek in the Indian languages for the name of God, we shall find none in those of Cusco or Mexico; and therefore, those who preach or write to the natives, use our Spanish word Dios for the Supreme Being." Then the last remark of Grotius is unfounded. One of the American kings was called Theuch, and Grotius appears to have mistaken him for a god, whom they worshipped. Different authors have peopled America from every part of the world. Some suppose that sailors were driven from Ethiopia to the new continent; others, that the Tartars left their deserts for a more fertile country. To account for the animals to be found in America, a neck of land is sought for, connecting America with the old world. Plants and animals resembling those of America, are found in Ireland; therefore the two countries must be united, or at least the sea between them is not so broad but that it may easily be crossed. Many authors look to Wales for the first inhabitants of America. It is recorded in the history of that country, that Madoc, disgusted with the wars which his brothers waged with each other for the succession to the throne of their father, left his country in A. D. 1170, and boldly crossing the ocean, discovered an unknown continent. He landed with his comrades, and, delighted with the success of his voyage, returned to Wales. He ridiculed his brothers for their contentions about a sterile country, when they might easily obtain possession of a more fruitful soil. He sailed again to the land which he had discovered, established himself there, and peopled it. Historians have recorded and poets have sung the voyage of Madoc, and it is in vain for us to object to their narratives, that the present numbers of the aborigines could not in so short a time have sprung from the few individuals who might have reached America from Wales; for we are answered, that four hundred years were sufficient to people the country.²⁷ We may assert any thing for truth, when we assume the right to decide on what must always be uncertain. The authors of the various theories which we have mentioned, have all of them the satisfaction of reflecting, that if their conjectures cannot be shown to be true, still there are no others which are better founded. We are spared the trouble of pointing out their absurdities, by their refutation of each other; and the reader must be content with this, for we can offer nothing satisfactory on the manner in which America was peopled.

VIII. Secondly, the passages which are quoted from the Scriptures in favour of the Jewish origin of the Indians, prove nothing. The Rabbins cite, for instance, the prediction of Obadiah, that "the captivity of the hosts of the children of Israel shall possess the land of the Canaanites, even unto Zarephath; and the captivity of Jerusalem, which is in Sepharad, shall possess the cities of the south."⁹⁸ These doctors tell us, that Sarepta or Zarephath is France, and Sepharad, Spain; and that the Jews passed from these two kingdoms to America. Others find in the above passage, a prediction of the conversion of the Indians by the Spaniards and French. But do not the Jewish doctors pervert the meaning of the Scriptures? Why confound Sarepta, a city of the Sidonians, with Zarephath; and what reason is there for interpreting it France? Are the Jews to rule over that kingdom? Sepharad is not so well known as Zarephath; but St. Jerome, without any foundation for his supposition, conjectures that it may be the Bosphorus. The Rabbins are equally incorrect in calling it Spain. Zarephath is translated, in the Septuagint version, Ephrata. May not the true reading be Ephrates, by which the prophet understood the Comagene, which the Greeks call Ephrates?⁹⁹ Perhaps the prophet referred to the great river Euphrates. The Rabbins embrace in the promised land all that vast extent of country, stretching from Sarepta near the sea-coast to the Euphrates on one side, and on the other, as far south as Nageb or Arabia. Before the promise of God to Moses can be fulfilled, (say they,) the Jews must possess an empire bounded on the west by the Mediterranean, on the east by the Euphrates, and on the south by Arabia. The Rabbins have here forgotten to include America, France, and Spain, in the land, which the Jews are to govern.

IX. In the third place, the author of the fourth Book of Ezra assures us, that the ten tribes emigrated to a country entirely uninhabited. Some authors tell us, that he could not refer to Asia or Europe, and therefore must have meant America. We have already detected many errors in the narrative of the spurious Ezra, and if what he says of the place to which the ten tribes retired, be true, still nothing decisive can be inferred from it. He speaks in general terms, which may be applied to a desert in Africa, to America, or to an uninhabited part of Asia, with equal propriety. Then nei-

ther the Scriptures nor the apochryphal books any where imply, that the Indians are the descendants of the ten tribes.

X. In the fourth place, we are not to believe that these savages are Jews, merely because their religious rites resemble in some respects those of Judaism. The religious worship of other idolaters has much in common with Judaism; and can we infer that they too are the posterity of Jews? There are those who attribute this similarity in forms of worship, to the machinations of the devil, who seeks to rival the glory of God by receiving the same kind of adoration. But without allowing to the archfiend more power than he really possesses, this resemblance may be explained from the similar dispositions of men. Idolatry does not necessarily derive its ceremonies from the true church. Nations which have never had any intercourse with each other, have the same ideas of a God, and frequently worship him in the same manner. The aborigines of America have been taught neither by the Manicheans nor Egyptians, the belief in two first principles. Yet the inhabitants of Peru relate, that man was created by a powerful being named Con; but the sun and moon begat an evil being called Pachachauna, who was more powerful than Con. He transformed men into apes, parrots, and bears, and was the creator of the Indians. They worship both these beings, but especially the evil being, because they fear that he may again change men into brutes.³⁰ They may, in the same manner, have instituted rites resembling those of Judaism, without borrowing them from the Jews. They formed their altars of twelve stones, they offer to God the first fruits, and divide the year by moons; but these are customs which might have arisen from peculiar circumstances, in any country. It is by no means certain that the Indians practised circumcision. Peter Martyr asserts, that they "sacrificed their infants to idols, and circumcised themselves;" but Gomara says, that the rite was not universal among them.³¹ Acosta, who was well acquainted with the customs of the Americans, observes, "that they never circumcised their children, and therefore, could not be the posterity of the ten tribes." If they were uniformly circumcised, it would not prove their descent from the Jews; because there are other nations, besides the Jews, who practise this rite. We cannot then infer the origin of the Indians from an apparent resemblance in their forms of worship to those of Judaism.

XI. Many learned men, however, have believed that the ten tribes peopled America. If the reader wishes to know how far prejudice has carried some Christian authors on this point, he may consult the Bibliography of Fabricius, a man of vast attainments in sacred and profane learning. He has given us the names and arguments of several authors who maintained the above opinion. He mentions, that at the time when Manasseh, infatuated with the belief that the Americans were Jews, and wishing to revive the glory of his nation, published the *Hope of Israel*; a short treatise by Thomas Thorowgood also appeared, with the title: "*Jews in America, or Probabilities that the Indians are of that race.*" Hennepin, a monk who penetrated into the interior of the New World, believed that he had found the ten tribes, because he discovered a resemblance between the Indian and Jewish rites. The celebrated William Penn entertained the same opinion for the same reasons. A traveller maintains, that the Brazilians must have had a similar origin; for they practise circumcision and call one of their feasts the *Parasse*. M. Morin, in attempting to prove that there was a striking resemblance in the features of the Jews and Lacedemonians, expresses his belief that the Danites are descendants of the tribe of Dan and of the Tartars, through whose country the former must have passed in their way to America. He adds, on the authority of a celebrated traveller, that the Mungralians have a feast, at which a lamb is sacrificed yearly, and thus they practise the Jewish custom at the passover. It is said, that Bernier and other travellers found synagogues in China, which were built before the time of our Saviour. The Jews who worshipped in them, were asked, if they had heard of Jesus Christ, and replied that they had traditions of but one Jesus, the son of Sirach. It is strange that their ignorance of Christ should be considered a proof of the antiquity of their settlement in that country. The posterity of the Jews probably would not, at the end of a hundred years, have retained any knowledge of our Saviour, and therefore we cannot prove their emigration to have taken place before Christ, from the want of this knowledge among them. Finally, M. Rudbee Jr. maintains, that if we would discover the ten tribes, we must not look to Asia, Africa, or America for them, but to Lapland; and his opinion is formed on the same ground as that advanced by others, that is, the similarity of certain rites and customs to those of the Jews. The great variety of opinions or rather con-

jectures which we have cited, shows with what earnestness Christians have pursued their inquiries respecting the country to which the tribes retired. We must not suffer ourselves to be misled by their theories, which appear plausible without being supported by one solid argument.³²

XII. We must observe, however, that Christians have found among the heathen, customs and rites which resemble their own, quite as nearly as those of the Jews. They have exulted to find among the Indians a partial acquaintance with Christianity, even before it was preached to them. They believe that the cross is sometimes worn by them. The inhabitants of Darien perform a ceremony resembling the eucharist, and baptise their children by tracing with water the form of the cross on their foreheads. They appear to have some idea of a Trinity, and say that they derived their knowledge from a stranger who came among them. We may easily point out other usages, in which they resemble the Catholic Church. Their priests never approach the idols, except with a white napkin in their hands, as those of Rome always officiate in a white surplice, or as the women formerly covered their hands with a dominical or white handkerchief, when they partook of the eucharist. The Indians present to their idols the representation in gold or silver of those things which they wish to obtain of them, and the Catholics do the same to our Lady of Loretto.³³ Every trade has its particular deity. The fisherman and the hunter have their patron saints, like the same classes among Catholics. Their priests conduct the worship of the idols in a language which is not understood by the common people, that it may be more acceptable to their gods; and the services of the Romish Church are always in Latin. There is, among the Indians, a class of men who exclude all society from their retreats, and pretend to obtain, by fasting and mortification, revelations from heaven. They put a mitre on the heads of their gods, and a cross round their necks. Hence it was, that the Peruvians, when they first saw a bishop clothed in his pontificals, inquired whether he was the *Guaca* of the Christians. The high priest of the Indians has an influence and jurisdiction equal to that of the pope. Finally, there is an order of virgins in Mexico, who are consecrated to the service of their gods. They mix flour and honey together, and form an image which they distribute among the people, who eat it, believing that it is the body of their God. Do

they not believe in transubstantiation? We might prove by the same kind of reasoning, that the Americans were converted to Christianity by St. Thomas. In Brazil they relate many things of a man with supernatural power, who appeared among them, which are told at this day of St. Thomas in the East Indies. They call him *Meire Humane*, which undoubtedly means St. Thomas; for *Meire* in the Indian language signifies a *stranger*, a *man with a beard*, and *Humane* is the same name as *Thomas*. A medal of Augustus was found in the mines, which was probably carried there in the time of the apostle; and there is a valley which is called the *Imperial*, because the representation of the imperial eagle is to be found in most of the houses there situated.³⁴ We cannot doubt, with such evidence, that Christianity was long since introduced into America. And further, Christ commanded his disciples to preach the Gospel to all nations; and the sacred writers assure us, that it was preached to every creature. But how could this be true, if the immense population of America had never heard of the Gospel?

XIII. But we cannot convince ourselves by such arguments, that America was discovered in the time of the apostles. We cannot find a reference to it in the Atlantis of Plato, nor yet in the lines of Virgil, which are supposed to refer to it.

" Jacet extra sidera tellus;
Ultra anni solique vias, ubi coelifer Atlas
Axem humeris torquet, stellis ardentibus aptum."³⁵

Is it not evident that the poet, in this flight of fancy, referred to a land of his own creation? Where is the country beyond the stars, and not covered by the sky? If he intended to point out any particular region, it was Ethiopia, or perhaps Mauritania, where Atlas is supposed to have lived, and of which another poet writes:

" Anthiopumque solum, quod non premeretur ab ulla
Signiferi regione, poli nisi poplite lapsa
Ultima curvati procederet ungula tauri."³⁶

The predictions of the Old and New Testaments, respecting the spread of Christianity, have been more or less fully accomplished. The apostles preached the Gospel throughout a part of the world; but they were unable literally to obey the command of Christ. Persia did not receive a knowledge of the truth, until long after their death. The churches of Carthage, and of the north of Africa, were not founded by the apostles. The Donatists claimed a preeminence over others, because they embraced Christianity

at a later period, and it was written in the Scriptures: "the last shall be first." None of the disciples were able to penetrate into Ethiopia; and it was not until the reign of Constantine, that the kings of the earth and of the nations worshipped Jesus Christ. We are not to interpret literally the passages: "Go preach the Gospel to every creature under heaven," and "preach the Gospel to all nations;" for it is evident from the usage of Scripture, that this language means; *Go spread a knowledge of the Gospel over a wide extent of country.* Nabuchodonosor sent his edict "to every nation, people and tongue which dwells on the earth," and "his empire extended to the ends of the earth."³⁷ We immediately perceive that this cannot be understood literally, for he had not pushed his conquests as far as America. Many of the nations of Europe were not subject to him, and indeed, never heard of his edict. We should always remember, that the writers of the Old and New Testaments were orientals, and wrote in the metaphorical and glowing style of the East. Then it was not necessary, that the disciples of Christ should preach the Gospel from place to place throughout the world, to obey the command of Christ. It was fulfilled as to its true sense, when the apostles had spread a knowledge of the Saviour and of redemption through his death, over a large part of the world.

XIV. Moreover, the similarity of the Indian and Christian rites is not sufficiently striking to indicate a knowledge of our religion among the Indians before the time of Columbus. The Catholic Church practise a vast number of rites, which are the inventions of men. As they were instituted for the same purpose as those of idolaters, we should not be surprised to find that they resemble each other. All pagan nations have nearly the same idea of God. They look upon him as a Being who is to be worshipped by sacrifices and rites, and propitiated, like an earthly king, by offerings. Ceremonies of human invention are often the same in different places, although they were not instituted to advance the same end. The pagans have their ablutions and their sacrifices, like the Jews. The Guebres, disciples of Zoroaster and descendants of the ancient Persians, are baptised, by which rite they believe that their sins are washed away. They perform the rite however with urine. They are accustomed to auricular confession, which, together with a sincere repentance or the giving of alms to the poor, procures the

remission of the penalty due to their sins. Have they borrowed these rites from the Catholic Church? Christians and idolaters both believe, that fasting and meditation are favourable to communion with God. The separation of women to a monastic life, the use of a white dress in the services of religion, as an emblem of purity, and the construction of gold or silver symbols to express our wants to supernatural beings, are superstitious practises which are common to the professors of almost every religion. But we are told that the cross, which is placed on the tombs of the Indians, plainly indicates, that they once had some knowledge of Christianity. There are some authors who assert, that the Spaniards, who fled before the Moors under Rodrigo, escaped to America, and left among the natives this sign of their religion. But Lopez de Gomara, who has investigated the subject, does not believe this; because he could find no cross on any of the islands at which he touched, before reaching America. The Indians place stakes on the tombs of the dead, and they are sometimes crossed; and the above authors have mistaken these stakes, accidentally crossed, for a sign of our religion.

XV. Finally, we could not infer, even from a closer conformity than what has been shown to exist between the rites of Christians or Jews and those of the Indians, that these were converted to Christianity by the apostles, or that they are the descendants of the ten tribes. A vessel might have been driven to America by a tempest, and landed a Jew, who left among the natives some of the rites of his religion, without peopling the country himself. The Jews have always been a distinct people in the midst of other nations. For a long time before Christ, they were dispersed among idolaters in the East, and for the last seventeen centuries, they have been scattered throughout Christendom; but they have always preserved their sacred books, the use of the Hebrew characters, and the same expectation of a Messiah. They are indeed a people under the peculiar care of God. If then the Jews peopled America, it is the only place where they have lost the distinctive traits of their national character. They have no Scriptures, or Hebrew letters, neither Sabbaths, new moons, clean and unclean animals, nor yet any expectation of a Messiah, who is to subject all kingdoms to their power. Indeed, every nation which has been said to retain the vestiges of former Judaism, is grossly idolatrous. Some of

them burn incense in their temples to the images of black goats, serpents, cows and bulls. Others are worshippers of the sun. They invoke demons, to whom they sacrifice their children. Their worship consists in unmeaning and cruel rites. If they are the descendants of the Jews, they resemble them only in their features, and reflect in their character no honour on their ancestors. Penn thought, that he could discover a resemblance in the physiognomy of the Jews and Indians. Acosta asserted, that they were not alike in their love of money. But as the features and characters of nations are constantly changing, neither of these authors could argue conclusively on such grounds.

XVI. It can be clearly shown, that neither the Tartars nor the Turks are descended from the ten tribes. 1. The Scythians who inhabit Tartary, are a very ancient race. Justin mentions, that the Egyptians, after a spirited discussion, were forced to allow the claims of the Scythians to superiour antiquity. How could they then have derived their origin from the ten tribes? The north of Asia was early peopled by the posterity of Japheth, and Justin concedes the antiquity of its inhabitants. Then, is it probable that the ten tribes found Tartary uninhabited? And if it was inhabited, how could the tribes, who were few in numbers, vanquish and expel the Scythians, a people formidable from their ferocity and warlike habits? It is idle to suppose that the Jews would have left their treasures and families, and so fertile a country as Media, to attempt the conquest of Tartary. 2. We are told that those of the tribes, who established themselves in that country, were called Totares, because they were the excess of the Jewish population. Fuller maintained that the inhabitants of Tartary received their name from the Syrians, on account of their vast numbers.³⁸ But they who have thoroughly investigated this subject, inform us, that it was derived from a river and province called Tatar.³⁹ But this does not favour the supposition, that the Totares were the excess of the Jewish population, who emigrated to Scythia. 3. It is surprising that so learned a man as Ortelius should have persuaded himself, that he had discovered the tribes of Dan and Naphtali in Tartary. The Danois and Daciens, he tells us, are the Danites. Why may we not, with equal reason, call the Danes Danites? There was also a horde of Ephtalites in Tartary, and their name does not differ essentially from Naphtalites. But these Ephtalites

derived their name from a king Ephtalanus, whose dominions, according to Procopius, lay to the north of Persia, and neither the prince nor his subjects had any of the peculiar traits of the Jews.⁴⁰

4. The Tartars are divided into seven clans or hordes. But the word horde is not, as has been supposed, of Hebrew origin. It signifies a *camp, an assembly of the people* or a *canton* of Tartars.

5. It is ridiculous to suppose, that the ten tribes emigrated to Cathay and gave that country its name, to express their zeal for the pure worship of God. Its inhabitants have always been idolaters. A historian observes, on the authority of Postel, "that there is a great number of different sects in Cathay."⁴¹ Some of them worship idols of gold and silver. Others call the oxen which they use in ploughing, their gods. One sect worship the sun, the moon, and stars, and lofty trees; and another live like the brutes, and believe that there is no God." A learned man who passed seventeen years at the court of the cham of Tartary, asserts that they have always been pagans. Their supreme god is called Natagi. His wife and children are secondary gods, and so much revered by the Tartars, that they place the images of these deities in every part of their houses, and at meals uniformly offer them the choicest dainties. Their religion was modified by the partial reception of Mohammedanism. They now practise circumcision and many other sacred rites resembling those instituted by Moses. But these were introduced by Mohammedans, and not by Jews.

6. Finally, the Jews are to be found in great numbers in Russia and Poland. This fact by no means proves that the ten tribes emigrated to Tartary, and thence spread into these kingdoms. We shall see as we proceed, that the princes of those countries granted protection and peculiar privileges to the Jews, and hence it is that so many of them took refuge in their territories.

XVII. Petachias, who travelled through various countries to discover the ten tribes, allows that there are no genuine Jews in Tartary. He found there some heretical Jews, and asked them why they did not believe in the traditions of the doctors. They replied, that they had never heard any thing of these traditions from their fathers. These heretical Jews were accustomed to prepare for use on Friday before sunset, all the bread which would be needed on the Sabbath. They eat their food alone on that day, and continued in the same place, repeating psalms. As they did not pray, Peta-

chias recited the petitions which are used in the synagogues, and the forms of grace at table, and they approved of them. They had never heard of the Talmud.⁴²

¹ Isaiah 49: 12. ² Bochart, Geog. Sac. πηγους, lutum. ³ Ortel. Tartaria, sive Tabula LXII. ⁴ טבור. Tabur. Umbilicus. ⁵ Manasseh supposes him to have been a Jewish prince, and the brother of a king named David Reuben. ⁶ A. D. 1540. ⁷ Letter of Penn on the present state of the English possessions in America, p. 143 and 156. ⁸ Spes Israelis, Amstael. A. D. 1650. ⁹ Relacion, p. 9 et seq. ¹⁰ Montesini Aharon Levi, otherwise Antonia de Montesinos, Relacion. It was printed in A. D. 1644, with the Petakia of Israel. ¹¹ Manasseh, Esperanca de Israel. p. 47. ¹² Spizelii Eleratio Relat. Montesini. ¹³ Acosta, Lib. I. Cap. XVI. ¹⁴ Anthony Zarate, Hist. of the discovery of Peru, Tom. II. Cap. X. p. 49. ¹⁵ Acosta, ibid. ¹⁶ Zarate, Hist. of the discovery of Peru, Lib. I. Cap. X. p. 18. ¹⁷ Acosta, Lib. VII. Cap. X. Laet. de Origine Gent. Americ. p. 83. ¹⁸ Lescarbot, History of New France, Tom. I. Cap. III. ¹⁹ Zarate, ibid. Cap. XII. p. 55. ²⁰ Manasseh, Esperanca de Israel, p. 28, 29. ²¹ Lescarbot, Lib. I. Cap. III. ²² See Sap. Cap. XII. v. 4, 5. ²³ Manasseh, Esperanca de Israel, p. 19. ²⁴ Phaleg, Lib. VII. Cap. IX. ²⁵ Ibid. ²⁶ Ursini Analecta, Lib. VI. Cap. XXIV. p. 378. ²⁷ Grotius, Dissert. de Orig. etc. Gent. Americ. ²⁸ Meredish. A. D. 1477. Laet. de Orig. Gent. Americ. p. 137. ²⁹ Obad. Vers. 20. ³⁰ 'Εως 'Εφρατ: read *ἰὼς 'Εφρατ*, or rather *ἰὼς Εὐφρατου*, even unto the Euphrates, as Ex. 23: 31. ³¹ Zarate, Lib. II. Cap. XI. p. 49. ³² Petrus Martyr, Decad. Cap. IV. ³³ Fabricii Bibliographia antiquaria, p. 19, 20. The reader will find many other authors cited there. ³⁴ Zarate, Lib. II. Cap. XII. p. 55. ³⁵ Hornius de Orig. Gent. American. Lib. III. Cap. XIX. ³⁶ Marinus Siculus, Hist. Hisp. Lib. XV. Moebius, Diss. an Evangelium Americanis publicatum fuerit. ³⁷ Aeneis, Lib. VI. p. 460. ³⁸ Lucanus. ³⁹ Witsius, Miscellan. Sacra, Tom. II. Ex. 14. p. 430. ⁴⁰ Fuller, Miscellanea Sacra, Lib. II. Cap. V. p. 22, 83. ⁴¹ Leunclav. Pandect. Hist. Turc. Haithon de Tartaris, Cap. XVI. ⁴² Grotius calls these men *Euthatites*. Diss. de Orig. Gent. Americ. ⁴³ Haithon de Tartaris, Cap. I. ⁴⁴ Petachiaz, Itinera Mundi, p. 170.

CHAPTER EIGHTH.

THE SITUATION OF THE JEWS IN INDIA AND CHINA.

I. The Jews might have had intercourse with India in the time of Solomon. II. Whether that prince obtained his gold from Peru. III. The island of Taprobanes shown to be Ceylon. IV. Remarks of Reland on Ophir. V. Ophir was not situated beyond the Ganges in the Chersonesus of gold. VI. Ophir was probably on the coast of Malabar near Goa. VII. The fleet of Solomon might have sailed to Ceylon from Malabar. VIII. Explanation of the lines of Claudian, which intimate that the Jews were settled in India. IX. Claudian by India means Ethiopia. X. Narrative of Benjamin of Tudela, who met with many of his countrymen in the Indies. XI. The fathers Ricaut and Ricci met with Jews in China. XII. There was in that country, according to father Gozani, a synagogue built before the Christian era. XIII. Respecting the river Sabbatus. Josephus the first author who has mentioned it. XIV. Another river of this name beyond Babylon. XV. The confession of Rabbi Manasseh respecting this river. XVI. The contrariety of opinions among the Rabbins with regard to this river, proves that it does not exist.

I. The opinion that the ten tribes retired to the East Indies and China, has been plausibly maintained. The Jews were acquainted with these countries in the time of Solomon. This prince formed an alliance with the king of Tyre, and they sent their fleets to Ophir to obtain gold and ivory. Bochart has pointed out two places which were called Ophir, from the treasures they contained.¹ The Ophir which was known in the time of Job, was situated in Arabia and abounded in gold, which was dug with little labour from the earth. The inhabitants of Ophir, being ignorant of the true value of gold, exchanged it for an equal weight of copper or iron. Sometimes the Sabeans, a neighbouring people, raised the price of their copper, and would not part with it under double and even treble its weight in the more precious metal. This gold country was called Cassanitis, from a Hebrew word which means a *great treasure*.² David speaks of the gold of Ophir, but he does not refer to the country from which Solomon obtained his riches.

II. Those who assert that America was colonized by the Jews, maintain that Solomon dug the gold which he made as common in Jerusalem as the stones, from the mines of Peru. They forget that

the Jews were not sufficiently skilled in navigation, to undertake a voyage of such danger. The fleets of Solomon would have found equal difficulty in reaching America, by doubling the Cape of Good Hope and sailing along the coast of Africa, as in taking the direction of China and Japan. It is more probable that the precious metals were obtained from the island of Taprobanes, so often mentioned by the ancients, which lay but a short distance from the Red Sea and the Arabian Gulf, from which the fleets of Solomon and Hiram sailed.

III. Taprobanes is the island of Ceylon. Some writers tell us that it was called by the ancients Simunde; which readily becomes in their hands, Simmunde or Sumoende; and finally Sumatra. A celebrated geographer indeed mentions Taprobanes under this name, but it is an error of the press, and the reading should be Palæ Simunde.³ It was thus known to the ancients, and was afterwards called Sales, and then Ceylon, from which island Solomon undoubtedly obtained his great riches. The reader may consult on this subject Bochart, who has produced twenty one particulars, in which the Ceylon of the moderns answers to the Taprobanes of the ancients.⁴ It abounds in precious stones and ivory. The only objection to receiving Ceylon as the Ophir of Solomon, is, that it required three years for the fleets of that prince to complete their voyage to Ophir, whereas Ceylon lies at a short distance from the Red Sea. According to Strabo, the ancients, in sailing to this island from the main land, discovered it on the seventh day, but did not reach it until the twentieth. However this may be, the length of the voyage was occasioned by the miserable equipment of their fleets, which consisted in part of vessels of papyrus. Isaiah observes, that the Egyptians despatched *vessels of papyrus*, to the maritime cities, to announce that their god Osiris was again found. How could such vessels withstand the violence of the waves or winds, to which they would be exposed in a voyage to Ceylon? By papyrus vessels are meant those whose sails were made of papyrus, which was ill adapted to such a purpose. Strabo accounts for the length of the voyage to Taprobanes, by saying that the ships were either bad sailers or had poor sails. The Jews, in the time of Solomon, were even less experienced in navigation than the Egyptians; and they probably did not venture out of sight of land, but protracted the voyage by coasting along Arabia and India to Ceylon.

IV. A learned author observes, that the fleets of Solomon sailed from Ezion-geber, which was afterwards called Berenice. This city stood near the Red Sea, or (to be more exact) near the Arabian Gulf, which, with that vast collection of water to the south of India, was called by the general name of the Red Sea. He adds, that whatever country we may call the Ophir of Solomon, it must abound in gold, precious stones, monkeys, &c. Its situation must be such, that a vessel sailing from it to Judea, would unlade, as in the time of Solomon, in a port of the Arabian Gulf. It must lie at some distance from Judea; because the fleets of Solomon were three years in completing the voyage to Ophir.

V. Reland, guided by the above particulars, has concluded that Solomon obtained his wealth by trading in the East Indies.⁵ If he means by the East Indies, the Chersonesus beyond the Ganges, which yielded gold, he is mistaken; for that country was so little known, even in the reign of Tiberius, that certain authors complained that they could only obtain fabulous and incorrect accounts of it. If Solomon had traded to that country, would not the merchants of Tyre and Sidon, so celebrated for their enterprising spirit, have shared with him in this profitable trade, and obtained a correct knowledge of the country? There is little probability that Solomon held any intercourse with the countries beyond the Ganges.

VI. The fleets of Solomon stopped at the ports which are near Goa on the coast of Malabar. It has been thought that this country is the Ophir of the Scriptures, because it was called by the ancients Souppara, or as Josephus writes it, Sopheir, (*Σοφείρα*.) It contained no mines of gold, but the metal was found in the sands of the rivers. The territories of the Great Mogul, which are situated near this province, abound in gold, ivory, apes and parrots.

"Peltacus Eois alio mihl mibus ab Indis."

VII. We shall not pretend to decide whether Malabar or Ceylon is the Ophir of Solomon. These countries are so near each other, that a fleet which visited one of them, would naturally touch at the other.⁶ Perhaps individuals might have passed over from Malabar to Ceylon, though they did not form any settlement on that island. Benjamin relates that he saw a deep abyss in this island, which his interpreter, though a learned man, worshipped as God. The inhabitants made their children pass through a fire, which was

kept always burning, in honour of this deity, who was called Alhata. They derived this custom, however, more probably from the Canaanites and Tyrians, than from the Jews.

VIII. Claudian intimates, in his verses against Eutropius, that the Jews had formed extensive settlements in the East.

" Jam frugibus aptam
Aequor, et assuetum sylvis Delphina videbo;
Jam cochleis homines junctos, et quidquid inane
Natrix Judaicis quae pingitur India velis."

We are asked why the grotesque figures of Indians should be wrought in the tapestry of the Jews so frequently, if they had no intercourse with the East Indies? Some authors read in the above lines *Attalicas* for *Judaicis*, and think that *velis* refers to the veil of Solomon's temple. They assert that by the Jews, Claudian meant the Babylonians, as Juvenal calls the Jews the Chaldean magicians. But they are incorrect in their conjectures. Salmasius reads the last line of our quotation from Claudian thus: "*Lydiacis quae pingitur India velis.*"⁷

IX. The lines of Claudian do not refer to the East Indies, but to Ethiopia, which the ancient ecclesiastical historians call India. They assure us for instance, that Aodesius and Frumentius carried the Gospel to the Indians, meaning the Ethiopians. The Jews were established in considerable numbers in Ethiopia, and there manufactured tapestry. We are not then to suppose, that the tapestry or hangings of which we have spoken, was called Jewish, because it was there in common use in the houses of the rich Jews in the reign of Theodosius. Nor can we adduce in support of such a conjecture, the edicts and commands of Theodosius in favour of the Jews, which were transmitted to Claudian, who was not the poet of that name, but the prefect of the East.⁸ The Jews of Ethiopia, who gained their livelihood by the manufacture of tapestry, derived their name from the figures which they wrought into their work. They ornamented these hangings with the grotesque and unnatural forms of men and animals. Ethiopia was near Egypt, where the figures of monsters were common; and perhaps the Jews borrowed the practice of delineating them from that country. Or rather, they were unwilling to ornament their work with representations of the sun, or moon, or the human form, or indeed of any thing which a pagan was accustomed to worship. They wrought in their tapestry, therefore, the figures of animals and of monsters which had

nothing attractive in the eye of a pagan, that they might not give occasion to idolatry. We conclude, therefore, that Claudian refers to Ethiopia, and to this body of Jews.

X. Benjamin of Tudela assures us, that in his travels through India, he met with many of his countrymen, the Jews.⁹ He found one hundred in Ceylon, which he describes as producing white pepper and ginger. Sailing thence to Java and Sumatra, which are supposed to be the ancient Chersonesus, he learned that there were twenty professors of Judaism among the idolatrous inhabitants who worshipped fire and sometimes made a vow to burn themselves in honour of their god. Finally, passing through China to a city of India, which he calls Adan or Baadan, he discovered a body of Jews, who lived in fortresses and cities which they had built on the tops of the mountains. They were a free people, governed by their own laws, and constantly at war with the neighbouring nations, who did not dare to attack them in their inaccessible fastnesses. This author travelled into India, and relates only what fell under his personal observation. But we are forced by the following considerations, to regard his work as unworthy of credit. 1. Benjamin has introduced many ridiculous fictions into his book; and he has attributed customs to nations among whom he pretends to have travelled, which they never practised.¹⁰ 2. He has mistaken the location of several places through which he passed. In one part of his narrative, he speaks of a Libya in Egypt, at a great distance from the route which he had taken; while from another part, it appears that it was near his route, for when he returned from India through the same countries he had visited in going to it, a few days were found sufficient to carry him to Libya, notwithstanding its distance. The cities and countries, which he assures us are in the possession of a powerful body of his countrymen, were never heard of, before he mentioned them. No one has been able to ascertain the location of Adan or Eden, nor yet of the Telasser, on which it is said to be situated. Why did he not plainly point out the country and spot where these might be found, if he did not wish to perplex the reader, and to prevent the discovery of the deception which he was practising upon him? As no one has ever found so considerable a body of Jews in India, as he has mentioned, we may conclude that those who are now in that country, have removed to it within the last two centuries, and do not possess there

either kingdom or principality under their own government and laws.

XI. We allow that Jews are to be found in China at the present day. Trigaut relates, that an individual of this nation, who belonged to the province of Honan, entered the mission church, and expressed great astonishment at the sight of an altar, surmounted by a female figure holding a child by the hand.¹¹ There were four statues, one at each corner of the altar, and a prostrate figure before it. The Jew inquired whether the female and child were not intended for Rebecca and Jacob, the suppliant for Esau, and the other statues for the sons of Jacob. Father Ricci replied that they were. The Jew immediately prostrated himself before the altar, and worshipped in reality the virgin Mary, Jesus Christ and the apostles, instead of the patriarchs of his nation. The Jesuit smiled to see him bowing before those whom, had he known them, he would have deemed it idolatry to worship. Father Ricci deceived the simple Jew by an equivocation. The apostles were only the spiritual children of Jesus Christ, and the remote descendants of Jacob. But is equivocation ever justifiable, and can it be so when practised in order to betray the credulous into idolatrous worship? Trigaut mentions three other individuals of the Jewish nation, who worshipped the image of Christ, believing that it represented one of the patriarchs. There were indeed individuals of the Jewish nation in China; but we cannot suppose that they had established themselves there in any considerable numbers.

XII. Father Gozani discovered, in the province of Honan, a synagogue, founded before the Christian era, which does not exist at present. He found thirteen tabernacles in it, concealed by curtains, which were intended to represent the twelve tribes and that of Moses. The Jews possessed the *Kim* or Pentateuch, which was divided into portions or *paraschas*. In the centre of the synagogue was a chair with an ornamented cushion, which they called the chair of Moses. There was also a separate hall, in which the Jews paid the same honours to their patriarchs and great men, which the Chinese do to their ancestors. No monuments were erected to these worthies; but each of them had his peculiar censer. One of these was appropriated to Ezra, from which circumstance Gozani inferred, that the synagogue was erected after the return of the Jews from their captivity. The Jews related, that they settled in

China, under the dynasty of the Han, which commenced B. C. 226, and ended A. D. 220. These Jews were Talmudists, and blended the worship of heathen gods with their own sacred rites. They had never heard of Jesus Christ; but they cherished the memory of Jesus, the son of Sirach. Father Gozani was incompetent to the examination of their sacred books from his ignorance of Hebrew, but father Gobien has given us an account of them. The Jews, if indeed they were such, had blended the religious rites of the Chinese with their own.¹² Benjamin of Tudela was incorrect in his assertion, that they possessed a government and laws distinct from those of China. They cannot be the descendants of the ten tribes.

XIII. The Jews are said to have established themselves in great numbers on the banks of the river Sabbatius. Josephus is the first author, who has mentioned this river, which derived its name from the circumstance, that its current ceased to flow on the Sabbath.¹³ There is probably an error in the text of this historian; for, while he compares the stillness of the Sabbath to the quiet waters of this river on that day, he relates that its current was interrupted for six days of the week, but began to run on the seventh. The critics have altered this reading, to reconcile the author with himself, and their correction appears to be necessary; for Pliny, who probably obtained his account of the Sabbatius from Josephus, observes that it did not flow on the Sabbath. The Jewish historian has pointed out very exactly the situation of this river. It runs, according to him, through the kingdom of Agrippa, between the cities of Arcen and Raphanees, the former belonging to the tribe of Asher, and the latter to the province of Syria. The Latin translator of Josephus was misled by an error in the punctuation of this author, and placed both these cities in the kingdom of Agrippa. At the present day, the river Sabbatius cannot be found in the situation indicated by Josephus. Some critics have advanced the extravagant opinion, that, as the interruption of the waters of the river was intended by God to point out the Sabbath as a day of rest, therefore the miracle must have ceased when the Sabbath was no longer observed. A young traveller has attempted to confirm the relation of Josephus. He observes, that he stopt on the banks of the Sabbatius on Friday evening, and there was no perceptible current in the river. He continued his journey on Saturday, and had no opportunity to observe whether the river resumed its course at the

end of the Sabbath, but he ascertained by questioning the inhabitants who lived near it, that it uniformly did. If this traveller had seen the current of the river interrupted on the Sabbath, and flowing during the rest of the week, we should allow some weight to his testimony. But he only relates what he gathered by questioning the inhabitants; and we cannot concede the existence of the Sabbatius in that situation on their evidence. His narrative is directly opposed to the common tradition, that this river has ceased to flow through the kingdom of Agrippa. Moreover, there is another river between Arcen and Raphanees, called Eluetherus; but it does not exhibit the miracle which has been attributed to the Sabbatius. All that can be said to support the relation of Josephus and Pliny, is, that there might have been a torrent which flowed from mount Libanus and sometimes dried up on the Sabbath.¹⁴ If this circumstance had happened but a few times, it would probably have given rise to the popular opinion, that it uniformly ceased to flow on that day. The torrent may now be completely dried up, or it may run in another channel. But if such a torrent ever existed, its course must have been too short to furnish on its banks a retreat for any considerable number of the Jews. Accordingly, we must look elsewhere for the river which the Jewish historians have described in such extravagant terms.

XIV. The Talmudists mention another river Sabbatius. They could not, as some suppose, have derived their information respecting it, from Josephus; for this historian was little read by them, because they were for the most part unacquainted with Greek. Besides, they place this river in Media; but that mentioned by Josephus, was in Syria. Jonathan, whose paraphrase has been so highly valued, and who flourished before the time of Josephus, refers to the Sabbatius.¹⁵ He introduces God as addressing his people and promising, that when they were carried away captive, he would miraculously divide the rivers of Babylon for their passage, and give them a secure retreat beyond the Sabbatius. Then the Sabbatius, on which the Jews were to find a permanent refuge from their enemies, was situated beyond Babylon. Some of the Jews appeal to the miracle of its current, to prove to the incredulous, that the Sabbath ought still to be observed. "That river ought to convince you that the Sabbath is still a sacred day," they affirm with as much confidence as if they could demonstrate the existence of such

a stream.¹⁶ Others complain that the current of the river was so rapid and brought down such quantities of rocks in its waters, that it was impossible to pass it, without violating the Sabbath. Thus those who were on the further bank, were kept in perpetual captivity. In the letter which has been attributed to Prester John, a different reason is given for the impracticability of passing the river. It relates that troops were stationed along the banks, to prevent the Jews from crossing the river and dispersing over other parts of the country. Finally, the Jews have supposed, without a shadow of reason, that kings of their nation and religion have possessed, along the banks of the Sabbatius, extensive dominions peopled entirely by their countrymen.

XV. Manasseh has not failed to mention a river so intimately connected with the glory of his nation. According to him, the ten tribes were carried away captive to three different places. 1. To the Antioch which was near Daphne. The emperor Constantine, though a skilful interpreter, has made but a poor translation of this passage in Manasseh. He makes that author say, that the ten tribes were carried to the environs of Antioch. It is true that Daphne was in the vicinity of that place, and that *Dophen*, (דופן,) which does not differ much in sound from Daphne, means, in the *neighbourhood* of a place. But Constantine did not discover the particular intention of Manasseh, which was to distinguish Antioch, the capital of Syria, from other cities of the same name, by uniting it with Daphne, a place in the neighbourhood. 2. The mountains of darkness afforded a refuge for a part of the ten tribes. A perpetual cloud, (says Manasseh,) hung over the remnant of Israel and concealed them. It is impossible to ascertain where these mountains were situated. 3. The ten tribes found a secure retreat behind the rapid current of the Sabbatius. Manasseh confesses his ignorance of the source of this river, and of the direction in which it runs. But he gives us a vague account of the river on the authority of a Moor, who had filled two bottles with sand from its banks, which he was accustomed to present in derision to the Jews at Lisbon, who became converts to Christianity. Manasseh assures us, that a native of Poland had published at Warsaw, within his recollection, a full description of the Sabbatius; but unfortunately, the whole edition of the work was burnt, at the request of the Jesuits.

XVI. Moses of Gironne, a celebrated cabalist, asserts that the

Sabbatius is the river Gozan of the Book of Kings. Peritsol, on the contrary, affirms that the Gozan is the Ganges, and that the Sabbatius flows among the mountains of Chabor, where the Jews have established themselves in great numbers. These opposite opinions show how much confidence these Jewish doctors have placed in unfounded reports and traditions.¹⁷ It is for the honour of their nation, that there should be such a river as the Sabbatius, and therefore they strenuously maintain its existence, notwithstanding the uniform testimony of travellers, that no such stream can be found. They pretend also to have received letters from the kingdom of Cozar, stating that the Jews possessed great power in that country. The object of these forged letters evidently was to console the dispersed Jews, by pointing out one spot, where their countrymen were great and powerful. We shall treat more at large of Cozar, when we speak of the conversion of its king, which the Jews place in the eighth century.

¹ Bochart, Phaleg, Lib. II. ² בית צדיק חסד רב , Beth Zadik Chasan Rab. It is sometimes translated, *in the house of the just there is much strength*, but we must render it, *much treasure*. The Hebrew word means *to strengthen, to possess*. Prov. 15: 6. ³ Stephanus de Urb. ⁴ Boch. Canaan, Lib. I. Cap. XLVI. p. 770 et seq. ⁵ Roland, Dissertat. I. and III. Tom. I. ⁶ Bochart, *ibid.* p. 774. ⁷ Barthim in Claudian. ⁸ Colomesiana. p. 200. ⁹ Benjamin, Itinerar. p. 108, 109. ¹⁰ V. Const. l'Empereur, Not. ¹¹ Trigaut, Lib. I. Cap. II. de Christiana Expeditione apud Sinas suscepta. Manasseh mentions the same fact with additional circumstances. p. 5. I have this book, inter Historicos. ¹² Lettres Edifiantes. Tom. VII. Journal des Scavans, Paris, 1707. ¹³ Joseph. de Bello. Jud. Lib. VII. Cap. XXIV. p. 976. Plin. Hist. Nat. Lib. XXXI. Cap. II. p. 750. Casaub. Exerc. adv. Baron. Ex. XV. num. 20. Fuller, Miscell. Sacr. Lib. I. Cap. IX. p. 2236. Magri apud Bartol. Bibl. Rabb. Tom. I. p. 117. ¹⁴ Joseph. de Bello Judaico, Lib. VII. Cap. XXIV. ¹⁵ Jonathan, Paraph. in Exod. 34: 10. ¹⁶ Galatin. de Arcan. Lib. XI. Cap. IX. p. 692. ¹⁷ Manasseh, Hope of Israel. p. 66 and 73.

CHAPTER NINTH.

TRUE SITUATION OF THE TEN TRIBES IN THE PERSIAN IRAK, IN BABYLON, AND ON THE BANKS OF THE EUPHRATES. A REPUTATION OF THE OPINION, THAT THE SABBATIUS WAS IN MEDIA.

I. The ten tribes established themselves on the river Chaboras. II. Reasons in support of this opinion. III. Their occupations in Media. IV. Whether Artaxerxes Oehus transferred them to Hyrcania. V. A correct view of the emigration to Hyrcania. VI. Conjectures of Fuller respecting the country of the Cadusians. VII. His opinions and those of Allatius refuted. VIII. State of the Jews in Babylon under Alexander. IX. Antiochus the Great sent a colony of Jews to Lydia. X. Desertion of Babylon by its inhabitants. Whether it still contained Jews under Titus. XI. St. Peter laboured for the conversion of the numerous Jews at Babylon. XII. Whether the Epistle of St. James was addressed to them. XIII. A part of the ten tribes resided at Nahardea. XIV. History of two brothers, natives of that city. XV. The Jews take refuge in Ctesiphon and Nisibis. XVI. Monobazus, king of Adiabene, a proselyte to Judaism. XVII. The propagation of Judaism among the Parthians. XVIII. The Jews established at Mesene. The true situation of that place. XIX. They also resided in Sittacene, the New Palestine of Pliny. XX. And in Ourhoene, on the frontiers of Mesopotamia. XXI. General view of their situation in the East.

I. We may ascertain to what countries the ten tribes retired more readily from the Scriptures, than from the writings of the Talmudists or of modern critics. It is recorded in 2 Kings 18: 11, that the "king of Assyria carried away Israel into Assyria, and put them in Halah and in Habor by the river of Gozan, and in the cities of the Medes."¹ The critics differ somewhat respecting the location of these places. Bochart maintains, that Halah is the Chalacene of Ptolemy, which was situated north of Assyria; and that Habor is mount Chaboras, or rather Choatras.² Between this mountain and the Caspian Sea, lies the city of Gozan, from which the surrounding country and a neighbouring river derived their names. The river Gozan was afterwards called the Cyrus, when the Persians subdued the province of Gozan.³ But there are some objections to the opinion of Bochart. He has substituted mount Chaboras, for the river of the same name, and even changed the name of the mountain to Choatras. Further, the Scriptures do not expressly say, that Gozan was a river; and as there is no stream, which now bears this name, he is obliged to suppose that

the Cyrus was called Gozan before the invasion of the Persians. It appears to me, from the passage of Scripture quoted above, that the Israelites inhabited both banks of the Chaboras.

II. Bochart has not paid sufficient attention to this subject. The Jews were sufficiently numerous to form two colonies, and the Scriptures point out two different provinces, to which they were carried captive. The first of these is Assyria, and the sacred historian mentions Habor, Gozan, and Halah, as the cities which were assigned to them in that country. The other colony inhabited the cities of the Medes.⁴ Then we must seek for the ten tribes in these provinces, which are indicated as the land of their captivity both in the Chaldaic paraphrase and in the original Hebrew. The cities which were assigned to the Jews in Assyria, are easily pointed out. The river Chaboras, which is called by the Arabian geographers, Alchabor,⁵ rises among the mountains, runs through Mesopotamia, and falls into the Euphrates.⁶ The city of Halah, the Chalcite of Ptolemy, was situated on one bank of the Chaboras, and Gozan (both the province and city) on the other. Thus then, the ten tribes inhabited both banks of the Chaboras, and were separated from each other only by the river, which flowed through their territories.

III. The sacred historian has not named the cities of Media, which were assigned to the Jews.⁷ But this colony probably settled in the mountains; because their population was not so dense as that of the level country. Indeed, Ezra indirectly states this fact; for he says, that the Jews were carried to Hara, a province of Media, which derived its name from the Hebrew word for mountain. Herodotus calls the Medes, "*Ἀπιοί*," which was the ancient name for the whole nation; but it is now confined to the inhabitants of one province. According to Strabo, a colony of foreigners was sent to people the mountainous part of Media, which the ancients describe as a prosperous and happy country.⁸ Ecbatana, in which the kings of Media passed the spring of the year, was one of the most beautiful and extensive cities of the world. Susa, in which they spent the winter, was also a magnificent city. There were several high mountains to the north of Susa, and around their bases extensive pastures, from which the Persians were furnished with vast numbers of horses. The Persians needed a body of men to cultivate the soil in the neighbourhood of Susa, and the Jews

were well fitted for such an occupation by their skill in agriculture. The Talmudists suppose that the ten tribes retired to Media; for they relate that Akiba preached at Ginzak, which they consider the Gozan of the Scriptures, and that their countrymen inhabited Chemdam, and the neighbouring cities of Musek, Hidki, and Domki. But these places cannot now be found; probably because their original names are lost by translation from one language to another. The Talmudists however inform us, that they were all cities of Media.⁹ Benjamin of Tudela, who lived in the twelfth century, asserts that Madai, a city in the mountains of Media, contained fifty thousand Jews.¹⁰ This Madai derived its name from a province called by the ancients, and sometimes by the author of the Vulgate, Medena. It is difficult to fix the boundaries of this province, because they have often been changed. Algebal contains but a small part of the mountainous country, while the Irak extends far beyond the ancient Media. But it is enough for us to know, that the ten tribes were dispersed through the mountains of Media and through Assyria. They formed extensive settlements on both sides of the Chaboras, and afterwards on the Euphrates.

IV. The Israelites spread from Media into the provinces near the Caspian Sea, which are now called Georgia and Tabarestan. St. Jerome observes, that Artaxerxes Ochus, having taken Apodasma in Judea, carried away the inhabitants to Hyrcania, near the Caspian Sea.¹¹ There are two obvious errors in this passage of St. Jerome. 1. He has mistaken Apodasma, which, according to Syncellus, is a Greek word meaning a *part*, for a city of Judea. 2. It was the Jews of Egypt, and not those of Judea, whom Artaxerxes banished to Hyrcania. It is not probable that this prince, after munificently rewarding the Greeks who followed him in his expedition against Egypt, would have treated the Jews of Palestine, who also assisted him, with such severity as to banish them from their country. Artaxerxes Ochus, in his invasion of Egypt, marched through Judea, and took Jericho and several other cities. He afterwards defeated the Egyptians, and reduced their fortresses, which were defended by the Jews. A part of these he transferred to Hyrcania, which was situated near the country inhabited by the ten tribes, and another part to Babylon. "The Greek historians, (says Africanus,) assures us, that in their day the Egyptian Jews still re-

mained in the countries to which they had been carried by Artaxerxes."¹²

V. Hecataeus has been cited to confirm the testimony of Africanus.¹³ That ancient author merely observes, that the kings of Persia carried captive a vast number of Jews to Babylon ; but this remark does not apply more particularly to Artaxerxes than to any of his predecessors. Orosius relates, that the Jews who inhabited the provinces near the Caspian Sea, increased in numbers, and confidently expected to return, at some future day, to the Holy Land. But I apprehend that Orosius was misled by a passage in 4 Ezra 13: 40, which promises, that the Messiah should recall the dispersed Jews, and divide the waters of the Euphrates, that they might pass through and enter on the perpetual possession of Judea. Some modern authors have attempted to improve on the histories of the ancients. They assure us, that Alexander the Great, who pushed his conquests into India, found a body of Jews in Hyrcania, and shut them up in the fortresses of the mountains, near the Caspian Sea.¹⁴ But these authors lived so long after the events which they have recorded, that we must rest satisfied with the simple testimony of Africanus, that a part of the Jews inhabited Hyrcania. There can be but little doubt that Africanus is correct ; for Artaxerxes frequently transferred the population of one country to another, and he would probably have placed the Jews in Hyrcania, near their countrymen, who already possessed the greater part of ancient Media.

VI. The country which lay beyond the Caspian Sea, along the banks of the river Araxes, was peopled by a nation called Cadusians and Geles ; and Fuller maintains that they were Jews.¹⁵ He attempts to prove this point, by the etymology of their names. Geles, (he informs us,) is Chaldaic, and means a *foreigner* or *stranger*, which may be applied with great propriety to the Jews, whom God had expelled from Judea, on account of their sins. Cadusians is nearly the same word as *Kadoschim*, which means *saints* ; a title assumed by the Jews, because they considered themselves, by way of eminence, the holy nation. Finally, he observes, that Arsareth, the greatest city on the Araxes, derives its name from a Hebrew word, which means the *city of the remnant of Israel*.¹⁶ It is not surprising then, that the Jews, who had an interest in the defence of the soil, should have united with the Medes in resisting the invasion of their enemies.

VII. If these conjectures are well founded, the Jews must have possessed a large extent of territory. If they were able to change the former names of nations and cities, for those of foreigners, saints, and refugees, they were doubtless powerful. But why did they not alter the names of the river Chaboras and of Gozan, at the other extremity of Media, where they were more numerous and powerful, than beyond the Caspian Sea? History is directly opposed to the conjectures of Fuller. The Cadusians were a race far more ancient than the Jews, for they are mentioned among other nations which were subject to Ninus. In a war between this people and the Medes, Parsodius, one of their chiefs, defeated the king of the Medes, who attacked him with eighty thousand men. The Cadusians were subdued by the Persians, under Cyrus. We can see no reason for supposing, that the dispersed Jews obtained possession of the city Arsareth, on the banks of the river Erash, or of the territories of the Geles and Cadusians. Allatius has rightly placed the Jews on the Chaboras. He supposes that they also peopled the countries of Iberia and Colchis, and adduces the authority of Constantine Porphyrogenetes, in support of the Jewish origin of the inhabitants of Iberia. This author relates, that the Iberians trace their descent from the family of David. Colchis, according to Herodotus, was peopled by a nation who practise circumcision, and who probably emigrated from Egypt or Ethiopia. The opinion advanced by Allatius is plausible; for it is probable that the Jews spread from Media into the neighbouring provinces. But I would remark, that the passages which he has quoted from Herodotus and Constantine, are not conclusive; for the former infers the Jewish origin of the Colchians from their practising circumcision, which rite was common to many nations; while the latter believed that the Iberians were Jews, from a vague tradition among that people, who would naturally affirm that their ancestors were noble, that they were descended from David.¹⁷ We shall receive the simple opinion first advanced by Allatius, and shall not render its correctness doubtful, by deducing inferences from it, that may be unwarranted.

VIII. The Jews were numerous at Nineveh and Babylon, as well as on the river Chaboras. Some of them had lived in those cities from the commencement of the captivity, and others composed a part of that body of Jews, who were carried away from Judea

by Artaxerxes. The Jews had the rashness to resist Alexander the Great, the conqueror of nations, in his attempt to rebuild the temple of Belus. All the nations who were tributary to Alexander, with the exception of the Jews, readily furnished and transported the materials for the construction of this edifice. They only would not assist in the work, because it was intended for the worship of the heathen gods. Their firmness rendered them odious to the other nations, and exposed them to insults. Hecataeus intimates: 1. That the Jewish workmen did not live in Babylon, but were brought from their country or canton, to assist in the erection of the temple.¹⁸ They probably came from their settlements in Assyria and on the Chaboras; for these were at no great distance from the Euphrates and Babylon. 2. He intimates, that the land which the Jews inhabited was extensive, for it was governed by satraps. When the Jewish workmen were on the point of returning home, they destroyed the temples and altars which were consecrated to the worship of idols; but their satraps repaired the temples, and obtained a free pardon for the offenders.

IX. The number of Babylonian Jews diminished considerably under Antiochus the Great. This prince had learned, that there were seditious movements in Lydia and Phrygia, and he ordered Zeuxis, one of his generals, to collect two thousand Jewish families, who were well affected towards his government, from Babylon and Mesopotamia, and to transfer them to those countries. They carried all their property with them, and were furnished with materials for building; lands were assigned to them, and they were permitted to live under their own laws. Thus it was that the Jews spread from Babylon into Asia, where Seleucus granted many privileges to their nation.

X. After the Parthians had made themselves masters of Babylon, Vardanus, one of their kings, built Ctesiphon, at a short distance from Seleucia; and many of the inhabitants of the other cities removed to it. Babylon was declining in the time of Strabo, and Pliny represents it, in the reign of Vespasian, as one vast, unbroken solitude. The critics cannot agree whether St. Peter, to whom the conversion of the Jews was peculiarly committed by Christ, visited Babylon in the execution of his commission. One of these critics wishes to prove that the apostle never went to Rome, and

therefore he exaggerates the number of the Jews at Babylon.¹⁹ He observes, that they were so numerous as to require the presence of the apostle ; whereas the few individuals of the nation who were to be found in Rome, were comparatively unworthy of his care. He supposes that St. Peter, for the purpose of visiting Babylon, went from Antioch to the East, whence he wrote his Epistle, and where he died. On the other hand, another critic maintains that this city was completely deserted by the Jews. But, he says, as the apostle did visit a city of that name, and as it could not be Rome, we must conclude, that after founding the church at Alexandria, he went to Babylon in Egypt, which contained a large body of Jews.²⁰

XI. We take but little interest in the question, " whether St. Peter visited Rome ;" but we would remark, that it has not been shown, that he went to Egypt and there founded the churches of Babylon and Alexandria. There is but little probability, that his Epistle was written from Babylon in Egypt. St. Peter would have had greater inducements to proceed from Antioch, where he tarried some time, to the East, than to Egypt. The descendants of the ten tribes were numerous in the East, and were equally ready to receive the Gospel, as those whom he addressed on the day of pentecost. St. Epiphanius observes, that the apostle was frequently in Bithynia and Pontus ; and St. Jerome mentions his journey to the East. He has placed it in the second year of Claudius ; but this error ought not entirely to set aside his testimony. That St. Peter did travel into the East, is further evident from his Epistle to the churches of Pontus, Galatia, Cappadocia, Asia, and Bithynia. He speaks of their temptations and joys, which he could not have known, if he had not at some time had a personal intercourse with them. When he was in the neighbourhood of the Euphrates, a desire to see the ten tribes which were dispersed through that country, would naturally arise and might easily be gratified. The small number of inhabitants which Babylon then contained, was a consideration which could have had no weight with him. Babylon was still so extensive, that it required nineteen hours to walk round it. The geographers who have described it, might have supposed it completely deserted, at the same time that it contained a population of one hundred thousand souls, who would scarcely have been noticed in so vast a city. Allowing that Babylon was

depopulated ; we would ask, did St. Peter visit those places only, where the Jews were to be found in considerable numbers? The assertions of the critics respecting the population of that city, are altogether extravagant. Some of them exaggerate the number of its inhabitants, and thence infer that the presence of St. Peter among them was constantly necessary, and therefore, that he did not visit Rome. Others reduce their numbers below a correct estimate, to render it probable that the apostle went to Babylon in Egypt, and not to the city of that name on the Euphrates. It was a sufficient inducement for the apostle to visit the Jews in the neighbourhood of Babylon, that they were numerous enough to form a church of Christ. The Babylon on the Euphrates was a much greater city at that time, than the Babylon of Egypt ; and as the apostle is simply said to have visited Babylon, we must suppose, that the former city is meant. The order in which the apostle addresses the churches to whom his Epistle was sent, satisfactorily shows that he actually visited Babylon ; for he mentions that first which was nearest Babylon, and the next successively in proportion to their distance from that city. Finally, there are some traces of the Babylonian dialect in his second Epistle, which was written from that city.²¹ He calls Balaam the son of Bosor, and the author of the Vulgate supposed Bosor to be the name of a city. Grotius conjectures, that the Syrians changed Pethora into Bosor ; but his explanation is unsatisfactory.²² The true reason for the use of this word, is, that the Chaldeans substitute *β* for *ϑ* ; and thus Beor, the Hebrew name of Balaam's father, becomes Bosor in the Chaldaic.²³ St. Peter then not only visited Babylon, but dwelt there for some years. He wrote his second Epistle from that city, and learned its language. He laboured for the conversion of the Jews, who must have been very numerous ; for Philo informs us, that the government of that great city was in their hands. The pagans had removed to Seleucia or Ctesiphon, that they might be near the court.

XII. The critics have discussed the question, " whether St. James wrote his epistle to the tribes who were dispersed through the East." Torniel asserts, that it was not addressed to them, but to those of the twelve tribes, who fled from Jerusalem, during the persecution which began with the martyrdom of St. Stephen.²⁴ St. James, he observes, could not have written his Epistle to the

ten tribes, which alone were dispersed throughout the East, for it is directed to the twelve tribes. But this reason for his opinion is not satisfactory. All the tribes were carried captive beyond the Euphrates, and although a part of Benjamin and Judah returned with Ezra, the other tribes preferred the land of their exile to their native country. Thus the dispersed Jews belonged to all the tribes. Moreover, although there were individuals, who fled from Jerusalem during the persecution after the death of Stephen, yet there is no proof that they belonged to all the tribes, or that St. James wrote an epistle to them. Some believe that the apostle addressed the twelve tribes, who had returned from their dispersions to Judea. Scaliger, on the other hand, asserts that there was, at that time, no considerable body of Jews belonging to the ten tribes, in Judea. But both of these opinions are unfounded; for individuals from all the tribes escaped the captivity of Shalmaneser, and remained in Judea; and those who were dispersed, took every opportunity which the revolutions in the Greek and Persian governments afforded them, to return to their native land. But the great body of the ten tribes never returned from their captivity. The spurious Ezra observes, however, that there were many individuals of the ten tribes who came back to Judea and settled in Bethulia, which belonged to the tribe of Naphtali. Aristeas, another impostor, would not have recorded, that learned men were sent to Egypt from each of the tribes, if it had not been the received opinion of his time, that a part of each of the ten tribes had returned to Judea. Galilee contained four of these tribes, from whom Jesus Christ chose the apostles. We cannot, however, believe that St. James wrote to that part of the twelve tribes, who might have reestablished themselves in Judea, nor yet to the ten tribes who were dispersed throughout the East. The Epistle was probably addressed to the great body of his nation, wherever they were to be found.

XIII. The Jews inhabited the other cities which were situated on the Euphrates, as well as Babylon; for we learn from the Acts of the Apostles, that they came up thence to keep the passover and to worship at Jerusalem. Petronius, the governour of Judea under Caligula, was astonished at their numbers; and believing that they would unite with the seditious Jews of his province, he hesitated to place the statue of the emperor on the spot where the temple had stood. Philo observes, that they were at that time

masters of Babylon and of several provinces. They were also powerful at Nahardea, a city on the Euphrates. The brothers Anilaeus and Asinaeus, who created such disorders and occasioned so much bloodshed in the eastern provinces, sprung from Nahardea.

XIV. These brothers were mechanics of Nahardea, who, becoming dissatisfied with their employers, retired to the forests and became robbers.²⁵ They were joined by all the lawless of the neighbouring countries, and made their predatory expeditions into Parthia with success. Artabanus, the king of that country, sent a powerful army against them, which was defeated by the robbers, who fought with the courage of despair. The Parthian prince wished to enter into a negotiation with them, and pledged his word for their safety, if they would visit his court. The robbers complied, and presented themselves at court. The prince, in admiration of their courage and of their confidence in his promise, dismissed them in safety. The brothers continued to pillage the provinces and to defeat their enemies, until the following circumstance destroyed their mutual harmony. Anilaeus was in love with the wife of a Parthian general, and he resolved to obtain the object of his passion by force. He declared war against her husband, defeated and slew him. The wife of the Parthian accompanied Anilaeus to the retreats of the Jews, and she carried with her the idolatrous rites of her country. The Jews murmured at the secret transgression of the law in the worship of heathen gods. Asinaeus harshly rebuked his brother for countenancing idolatry, and led him to fear, that his beloved wife would be taken from him and delivered over to the rage of a fanatical mob. To secure his own safety, he resolved to poison Asinaeus, and effected his purpose. The active spirit of Anilaeus was not rendered inert by his affection for his wife. He placed himself at the head of his forces, and invaded the territories of Mithridates, a powerful prince among the Parthians. Mithridates assembled and armed his subjects. But he was defeated and taken prisoner by his enemy, who released him on condition that he would mediate a peace between the Jews and Artabanus, his father in law. He intended doubtless to perform his promise; but his wife, enraged at his conduct, charged him with cowardice, and bade him wash away the disgrace of his defeat in the blood of the Jews. Mithridates promptly assembled

his scattered forces, and, surprising Anilaeus in a desert, he defeated him with great slaughter. Anilaeus was not disheartened by his losses, but retreated towards Babylon with his shattered army, ravaging the country in his march. The Babylonians were irritated to see the neighbouring country laid waste, and demanded the head of Anilaeus from the robbers, which was refused them. The Parthians, who then possessed Babylon, immediately attacked Anilaeus. His usual good fortune deserted him, and he was defeated and slain, together with a large part of his forces. The death of Anilaeus removed the fears with which the Parthians had regarded the robbers. They were not satisfied with the destruction of Anilaeus, but, lest similar disorders should again occur, they murdered nearly all the Jews of the neighbouring country. The most vigilant, however, escaped to Seleucia, probably a city of Syria, which was inhabited principally by Greeks. But it is difficult to conceive how the Jews could have escaped afterwards from this city to Ctesiphon. The Seleucia which was built by Nicanor, is nearer to Ctesiphon, and therefore that may have been the city to which the Jews retired after the massacre. They lived peaceably in Seleucia for five years. But when Babylon was desolated by the plague, many Jews fled from it to Seleucia, and carried with them the seditious spirit which they had exhibited in the former city. The Jews of Babylon joined with those of Seleucia in oppressing the Greeks, who were rich and numerous in that city. But the idolaters of different countries, who were in the city, united, and in a furious attack, slew fifty thousand of the Jews. Some of the Jews were concealed by their friends among the idolaters, and saved from the fury of the populace.

XV. The numbers of the Jews were much diminished by the massacre at Seleucia. Those who escaped, took refuge in Ctesiphon on the Tigris. This city was the capital of Mesopotamia, and the residence of its kings; for Babylon was declining in power and almost deserted by its inhabitants. The Jews were persecuted at Ctesiphon, and forced to flee to Nisibis and Nahardea, which cities some of them had left previous to the revolt of Anilaeus and Asinaeus. They found many families whom they had formerly known, still residing in those cities, whose peculiar location placed the Jews out of all danger from popular insurrections. Agrippa, who began to reign a short time after the massacre at

Seleucia, represented the number of the Jews who were subject to him, as very considerable.

XVI. A singular circumstance occurred in Adiabene, a kingdom on the banks of the Tigris, which formed a part of the Parthian empire. According to Ammianus Marcellinus, the ancients gave it this name, because it was intersected by so many rivers, that it was difficult to travel through it.²⁶ His own belief was, that it derived its name, from the rivers Diavas and Adiavas; and the Talmudists are inclined to adopt his opinion.²⁷ They observe, that the Chabor of the Scriptures, was the river Diavas, and that their ancestors were transported by Sennacherib to Adiabene.²⁸ If their fathers were carried to that province by Sennacherib, then the Jews must have been settled there for many years; but there is no evidence that Judaism was known there in the time of Izates. Monobazus, the king of Adiabene, in selecting a successor to his throne from his large family of children, gave the preference to Izates. But fearing that his favourite son would be in danger at the court from the machinations of his brothers, Monobazus sent him to Abenneric, the king of a small country which lay along the banks of the Tigris, near the Persian Gulf. At that time the Jews had ingratiated themselves at the courts of the remotest kingdoms. Ananias, a Jew, was the favourite of Abenneric, and had prevailed on his wives to become proselytes to Judaism. Ananias insinuated himself into the good graces of Izates, while that prince was at the court of Abenneric, and gave him an impression favourable to the Mosaic law, which he retained through life. Izates was soon afterwards made king of a country, where the remains of Noah's ark were still to be seen. If this tradition is well founded, he must have governed Armenia; but that country was situated at such a distance from Adiabene, that there is little probability that Monobazus could have placed his son on its throne. The death of his father rendered the presence of Izates necessary in Adiabene. On his arrival, he found that his mother had proclaimed him king, agreeably to the last wishes of her husband; but she had crowned his brother Monobazus and thrown the other children into prison. He succeeded to his father's throne, however, without opposition from Monobazus. His first care was to secure his own safety by the removal of his restless and dangerous brothers. He did not attempt to destroy their lives; but sent them into honourable banish-

ment, as hostages to Artabanus, the king of the Parthians, and to the emperor Claudius. Now that he was in undisturbed possession of his kingdom, he resolved to make an open profession of Judaism, which he had long since secretly embraced. But his instructor Ananias, fearing that the Parthians would depose the king, if he should be circumcised, persuaded him that this rite was not essential, provided that he obeyed the other commands of God. Helena, the mother of Izates, supported Ananias with all her influence; for, though she had been instructed in the principles of Judaism, she did not wish her son to make a public profession of it, lest he should excite a rebellion among his subjects. Izates was fearful that his spiritual safety would be endangered by the omission of the rite, and sent to Galilee for Eleazar, to whom he disclosed his scruples of conscience. Eleazar was decidedly in favour of circumcising the prince, and accordingly performed the rite. The prince informed his mother and his former instructor, to their great astonishment, that he had been circumcised.

XVII. Izates immediately attempted to propagate Judaism, and gained over Monobazus, and some of his courtiers. The report of their conversion spread among the Parthians, and excited deep discontent at the introduction of a new religion into the country. They rebelled and called Abias, a king of the Arabians, to their aid. Izates gave them battle; but he failed to subdue them, because a part of his army deserted to the enemy. On the following day, however, he defeated the rebels and their allies, with the troops who continued faithful to him. Vologeses, another king of the Parthians, marched to the assistance of the rebels with a powerful army.²⁹ But Izates defeated him, and secured, by these two victories, the peaceful possession of his throne. Helena retired to Jerusalem, some time before these events, and there built herself a palace and a tomb, the last of which was considered one of the wonders of the world. She charitably supported the poor during a famine. After the death of Izates she returned to Adiabene, where she found that Monobazus had succeeded his brother.³⁰ Izates had set aside the claims of his own children to the kingdom, in favour of Monobazus, on account of the readiness with which this prince had resigned the crown to him, in compliance with the wishes of their father. Monobazus persevered in his attachment to Judaism, and sent his children to Jerusalem, to be instructed in its princi-

ples. They were in that city when it was taken by Titus, and were carried prisoners to Rome. The Christians are unwilling to allow the Jews the glory of possessing these royal proselytes.³¹ They maintain that Helena and Izates were Christians. But how can we reconcile the Christianity of the latter, with the number of his wives, and of his sons, who amounted to twenty four, not to mention his daughters? Besides, the Christians can only cite the authority of Orosius to support their assertions, and that author himself offers no reasons for his opinion.

XVIII. The Talmudists assure us, that the Jews settled also at Maeson; but they regard this race as illegitimate. Therefore they say, *Maeson is dead.*³² This province formed a part of Mesopotamia, with which it has been improperly confounded.³³ Mesopotamia is that extensive country which lies between the rivers Tigris and Euphrates; whereas Maeson is an island, which is formed by two branches of the Tigris. These branches are called at their junction, Pastigris, that is, the *main stream of the Tigris.*³⁴ On this island was situated the city of Apamea, called also Mesena, which must be distinguished from the cities of the same name in Syria and Persia.³⁵ The Jews are said to have inhabited Mesena, from the time when Shalmaneser led them into captivity; but this opinion supposes the ten tribes to have been dispersed through too many places at the same time. It is much more probable that the Jews of Mesena removed thither from Babylon, when Seleucia became the metropolis of the kingdom, which their business as merchants obliged them to frequent.

XIX. Pliny speaks also of a neighbouring province whose capital was built by the Greeks, and called Sitta.³⁶ The province was named Palestine, and contained, among others, the city of Sabbata or Sabbatic. It may be, that the Jews, who were numerous in this small district, gave the name of their native land to the country, and of their holy day to one of its cities, during the decline of the Greek empire. In some of the manuscripts of Pliny, we read Caestine for Palestine; but the latter reading is found in a manuscript in the royal library of France, and is used in every printed copy of Pliny's works.³⁷

XX. Finally, the Jews spread into Osrhoene, which Panvinus asserts to be the same kingdom as Adiabene. Abgarus, the king, held his court at Edessa. An account of the state of the province

at that time, speaks of a body of cavalry which formed the garrison of Sina which belonged to the Jews, (*Sina Julaeorum.*) This was not the mountain from which the law was given, for it was situated in Mesopotamia. The Jewish inhabitants gave it this name, as they had previously called the province of Sittacene Palestine. It is impossible to ascertain at what time the Jews first emigrated to that country. It is not necessary to go back to the colonies of Shalmaneser, to account for their presence in this province; for they undoubtedly removed, whenever an opportunity occurred, to those parts of the East where they were permitted to live unmolested.

XXI. The dispersed Jews received accessions to their number after the destruction of Jerusalem; for we may naturally suppose that those who fled from Judea, would join their countrymen elsewhere. The Jews took advantage of the general decline of the eastern empires in the following century, and became powerful under the presidents of the captivity. They founded colleges which were much celebrated for their learning. One of these was located at Nahardea, and another at Sora, and thus they were situated on both sides of the Euphrates. A third college was established at Pundebita, two hundred years after the destruction of Jerusalem. These seminaries were called the Babylonian, because they were in the vicinity of that city. Jewish courts of justice were established in the neighbouring cities, which is a proof that the Jews were numerous in those places.

¹ 2 Kings, 18: 11.

² Bochart, Phaleg, Lib. III. Cap. XIV. p. 220.

³ Reland maintains that Cyrus is an Arabian name, which is common to many rivers. See Dissert. 1. de Paradiso. ⁴ יְרֵדֵי מְדֵי, in *urbibus Medorum*.

The Chaldaic paraphrase is, יְקָרְיֵי מְדֵי, *the cities of the Medes*. Buxtorf, 2127. ⁵ L. Holst. de Sabbath. Flum. in Allat. Συμμοτις, p. 440. ⁶ Cellarius, Geogr. Ant. Lib. III. Cap. XV. p. 433. places the river Chaboras or Chalcites, and Carrae or Haran, near Edessa; and beyond it, the Gauzan,

between the Chaboras and the Saocoras. Thus the Israelites returned to the country from which their fathers removed. ⁷ Diodor. Sic. Lib. III. p. 64, 84. ⁸ Strabo, Lib. VI. ⁹ Bereschit Rabba, Sec. 33. apud Light-

foot, Horae Hebr. in 1 Cor. p. 631. ¹⁰ Benjam. Tudel. Itiner. Hier. in Chron. p. 136. ¹¹ In Euseb. Chron. et Syncelli Chron. p. 256.

¹² Hecataeus apud Joseph. cont. Apion, p. 1049. ¹³ Petrus Trecensis, Hist. Schol. ¹⁴ Fuller, Miscell. Sacr. Lib. II. Cap. V. p. 2225. חַרְשֵׁיט.

¹⁵ Arsareth est חַרְשֵׁיט, צִיר שְׂאָרֵית, *Civitas Reliquiarum*. ¹⁶ Allat. Συμμοτις, p. 440. ¹⁷ Εἰς τὴν Ἰσραὴλ, Hecataeus apud Joseph. contra Apion, Lib. I. p.

440. ¹⁸ Εἰς τὴν Ἰσραὴλ, Hecataeus apud Joseph. contra Apion, Lib. I. p.

1049. ¹⁹ Salmas. de Prim. Papae. ²⁰ Dodwell, Addit. ad opera
 posth. Pearson, p. 56 &c. ²¹ Drusius in 2 Pet. 2: 15. ²² Grot. ib.
²³ Lightfoot, Horae Hebr. in I. ad Cor. p. 932. ²⁴ Torniel, An. 3314.
 Tom. II. p. 180. ²⁵ A. D. 40. ²⁶ From the Greek word διαβίωσις.
²⁷ Ammian. Marcellin. Lib. XXIII. Cap. VI. p. 401. ²⁸ The Talmudists
 say חבור זה הדייב, *Chabor is Hadiabene*. ²⁹ A. D. 50. ³⁰ A. D. 60.
³¹ A. D. 70. ³² מישיב מרח, *Maeson mortua*. Kidduschim, fol. 72. Light.
 in 1 Cor. p. 904. ³³ Steph. de urbib. ³⁴ Ἰσὰς ἡ Τίγρις. ³⁵ Vide Am-
 mian. Marcell. Lib. XXIII. Cap. XI. ³⁶ Plin. Lib. VI. Cap. XXVII.
³⁷ Hardouin, Not. ad Plin. p. 717.

CHAPTER TENTH.

ORIGIN OF THE JEWS IN EGYPT, ETHIOPIA, AND ARABIA.

I. Whether the Jews removed to Egypt under Psammotichus. II. Alexander the Great and Ptolemy Lagus sent colonies to Egypt from Judea. III. Proof of the invasion of Syria by Ptolemy in person. IV. Sale and dispersion of the Jews in Egypt. V. Ptolemy becomes more lenient towards them. VI. Philadelphus redeems the Jewish slaves. VII. The work of Aristeas proved to be spurious. VIII. The design of translating the Scriptures originated with the two Ptolemies. IX. The pagans ignorant of the history of the Jews. X. The Septuagint was the work of the learned men of Judea and Alexandria. XI. The authority which we must allow to this version. Why it was equally prized by Jews and Christians. XII. Philopator persecutes the Jews of Egypt. XIII. The temple of Onias shown not to have been a work of great antiquity. XIV. Whether the Jews were forbidden by the Scriptures to emigrate from Judea. XV. The sons of Onias commanded the armies of Cleopatra. XVI. Respecting the synagogues of the Cyreneans and Alexandrians. XVII. Whether St. Peter visited Babylon in Egypt. XVIII. Deputies sent to Caligula by the Jews of Egypt. XIX. Respecting the office of Alabarch. XX. The temple of Onias closed by the order of Vespasian. XXI. Massacres and assassinations in Egypt. XXII. The Jews of Libya deceived by an impostor. XXIII. Origin of the Jews of Ethiopia. XXIV. The eunuch of Candace was either a Jew or a proselyte. XXV. The Jews passed into Arabia from Ethiopia. XXVI. The Jews established themselves in Asia and Greece. XXVII. The disorder which crept into the Jewish genealogies, proved to be the inevitable consequence of their dispersion.

I. THE Jews and Egyptians were often forced to lay aside their national prejudices against each other, and to unite for their common protection against the oppression of the Assyrian kings. According to Aristeas, a large body of the Jews marched into Egypt, even before their reconciliation, to assist Psammeticus in his war with the Ethiopians. But he is mistaken; for 1. The auxiliaries who aided Psammeticus in subduing the kings of Egypt, were soldiers from Ionia and Caria. He had consulted an oracle, and received the reply: "Seek help from men of iron;" and these troops answered this description, for they were armed with iron cuirasses. Herodotus relates, that they introduced the Greek language into Egypt, and taught the children who were sent to them for instruction, to speak it.¹ Diodorus mentions also a body of Arabian soldiers, who united, with the Greeks in aiding Psammeticus; but Aristeas

is the only author who has recorded that they were joined by the Jews.² 2. There is no proof that Psammetichus pushed his conquests into Ethiopia, for even the people between Egypt and Ethiopia, whom he defeated, did not submit to him; but retreated to strong holds, which could not be approached by an army, and there established a regular form of government under a queen. 3. We infer that the Jews were long at war with Psammetichus, from the following circumstances. Esar-haddon had taken Asbdod or Azotus from the Jews, but he neither destroyed nor removed its inhabitants. Therefore it must have been defended by Jews, when Psammetichus besieged it, some years afterwards. They resisted all his efforts to reduce it for twenty nine years, although they were unsupported by the king of Assyria.³ Therefore the Jews were at war with the king of Egypt, instead of furnishing him, as Aristæus has asserted, with auxiliary troops. Finally, Ptolemy Philadelphus does not mention the aid which is supposed to have been rendered to Psammetichus by the Jews. He has only recorded the removal of the Jews from their country, by the Persian kings and his father Ptolemy Soter. There is indeed an entire discrepancy between Aristæus and Philadelphus, but we shall see a reason for it as we proceed.

After the taking of Jerusalem by Nabuchodonosor, and the murder of Gedaliah, whom he had appointed governour of Judea, Johanan took refuge in Egypt from the cruelty of Ishmael. He forced the prophet Jeremiah to accompany him, notwithstanding that he protested against the violence offered his person, and foretold the miseries which would befall those who fled to Egypt. The refugees suffered from Nabuchodonosor all the afflictions which had been predicted by Jeremiah. This prince took advantage of a misunderstanding between Apries and Amasis, who were at the head of the rebels in Egypt. He did not offer them battle while united, but entered Egypt and subdued it by the defeat of Apries alone. Nabuchodonosor, in conformity with the custom of those times, removed the inhabitants of the conquered country to other provinces, to prevent them from rebelling a second time against his government. The Jews were treated with the same severity as the native inhabitants, and forced to leave Egypt. Some, however, remained, who increased in numbers.

II. Alexander the Great sent a colony of Jews to people Alex-

andria, and he granted them equal privileges with the Macedonians. It is said, that the Egyptians appeared before Alexander, and requested, that the Jews might be forced to reimburse the value of the gold, silver, and precious stones, which their ancestors had lent them at their departure from Egypt under Moses.⁴ The Jews allowed the justness of the claim of the Egyptians, and consented to pay them, provided, however, that they too would satisfy their demands for the services of four hundred years, which their fathers had rendered to the Egyptians. Alexander decided, that the claims of the Egyptians and Jews balanced each other. The latter are so assured of the truth of this tradition, that they perpetuate the memory of this decision by a yearly festival in the month of March. Ptolemy Lagus, one of Alexander's generals, having made himself master of Egypt, invaded Judea, and carried captive one hundred thousand of its inhabitants, whom he sold as slaves to the Egyptians. They were afterwards restored to freedom by Ptolemy Philadelphus. Aristeas records this event on the authority of the original letters of Ptolemy; but it has been doubted whether he obtained his information from those letters, and whether he is correct in the statements which he has made. We do not wish to defend this impostor, who assumed the name of a pagan that was sent by Ptolemy to Jerusalem. The discrepancies in the letters of Philadelphus, as cited by Aristeas and Josephus, plainly show, that the former did not possess the originals. But, though we cannot justify the imposition of Aristeas, we are not entirely to reject his account of the invasion of Judea by Ptolemy Lagus. For we may obtain much light from him on that expedition, which has presented irreconcilable difficulties to some authors, and been embellished by others with circumstances which have no foundation in fact.

III. In the first place, it is said that the spurious Aristeas is wrong when he assures us, that Ptolemy Lagus transported the Jews from their country to Egypt; because this removal of the Jews did not take place until the first expedition against Syria, two years after the death of Alexander. That Ptolemy did not make this invasion in person is evident, since Diodorus observes that he sent Nicanor, one of his generals, to Syria, who in a short time subdued several cities. The authority of Diodorus is of great weight; but we must be allowed to prefer that of Hecataeus, a contemporary

writer, who was perfectly acquainted with the history of the Jews.⁵ Hecataeus relates, that Ptolemy took Jerusalem on the Sabbath. Then Aristæus is correct in his assertion, that Ptolemy was present in the expedition against Syria. To reconcile Diodorus and Hecataeus, we observe, that Ptolemy probably placed a part of his army under the orders of Nicanor, and commanded the rest of his forces himself. Or it may be, that Nicanor commenced the expedition, and Ptolemy, hearing of his successes, followed him with the remainder of his troops, took Jerusalem, and carried its inhabitants captive to Egypt. I well know that some authors consider Hecataeus as doubtful authority, because Herennius has observed, that he was either prepossessed in favour of the Jews, or that the work which bears his name, was not written by him.⁶ Scaliger is decidedly of the same opinion.⁷ But the alternative of Herennius shows, that he wished to rob Hecataeus of the glory of having written the work which is attributed to him, but, that he did not dare to do it openly. If he had said decidedly, that Hecataeus did not write the work which bears his name, his opinion must have been supported by better reasons than his mere chagrin because that author was prejudiced in favour of the Jews. Hecataeus resided at the court of Ptolemy, and attended him in his expeditions. He was therefore an eye-witness of what he records, and his testimony must be of greater weight than that of any other author, respecting the reign of that monarch. We cannot doubt then, that Ptolemy accompanied the expedition against Syria, since he took Jerusalem and removed its inhabitants to Egypt.

IV. Some authors relate,⁸ that the Jews who were exposed for sale by Ptolemy, were purchased by merchants from all nations, and that they were carried by them to every country in the world; to which circumstance St. Luke is supposed to allude in Acts 2: 5. "There were dwelling at Jerusalem, Jews, devout men, out of every nation under heaven."⁹ But they labour under a mistake, for the Jews who lived in the cities of Asia, did not belong to that body of captives, who were exposed to sale by Ptolemy. This prince settled some of them in Phenicia, perhaps because it was thinly inhabited. He selected thirty thousand, who were capable of bearing arms, and sent them to garrison the fortresses of Cyrene, and their descendants are mentioned in the Scriptures. The remainder he sold for slaves.

V. Ptolemy visited Judea a second time, ten years after his expedition against it; and by his lenity he induced many of the Jews to emigrate to Egypt. It has been thought impossible, that Ptolemy should have been able to prevail on the Jews to settle in his dominions, after he had sold so many of their countrymen into slavery; and therefore Aristeas is supposed to have contradicted himself. But the contradiction is only apparent; for conquerors usually awe the nations whom they subdue by their severity, and afterwards conciliate them by their lenity. Ptolemy gained the confidence of the Jews, by intrusting them with the defence of his strong holds. Perhaps they were induced to leave Judea for Egypt, by the promises of Ptolemy, and by their countrymen at Alexandria, who represented their own situation as happy and prosperous, under the impartial government of that prince.

VI. Philadelphus conciliated the affections of the Jews, by redeeming those whom his father had sold into slavery, and restoring them to liberty. Many of them returned to their native land, and others, having become attached to Egypt, remained there. Scaliger is correct in his observation, that the numerous synagogues of Hellenistic Jews were composed of these redeemed slaves. Josephus states the amount of money paid by Philadelphus for the purchase of the captive Jews, differently from Aristeas. But does this discrepancy destroy the credibility of the fact? If those who believe that the Jews, who were enslaved by the father, continued in bondage during the reign of the son, will allow that Josephus is in error as well as Aristeas, I shall not object to their views. The Jews enjoyed great privileges and made the version of the Septuagint under Philadelphus. This version contained perhaps the first Greek translation of the Pentateuch.

VII. The Jewish and Christian authors cannot agree respecting the mode in which the Septuagint version was made.¹⁰ Three able critics have written on this subject at the same time, and therefore they could not have borrowed from each other.¹¹ The last of these authors supposes, that the account of this version by Aristeas has been suspected, in order to diminish the authority of the Septuagint, which he believes would be increased, if, as Aristeas relates, the interpreters were selected by the high priest. But surely the accuracy of the historian of the Seventy may be called in question, without detracting from the merits of their version. If

the interpreters were chosen by the high priest, we know not how this circumstance could add to the authority of their translation. We shall give our own views respecting this great work, in a few words. The authority of the fathers who have maintained the accuracy of Aristeas, ought not to weigh against the overwhelming proof which has been produced to the contrary. He wrote before Philo, who allowed that the seventy interpreters were inspired.¹² Fiction generally has its foundation in truth, especially in narratives like that of Aristeas, which are embellished by the imagination of the author. But there is no necessity for multiplying the number of authors of the name of Aristeas, because his work contains much that is fictitious. There is no need of supposing, that one drew the rough sketch of the performance which is attributed to Aristeas, some time before Christ, and that another completed it. Nor yet, that the command to love our enemies was annexed by a Christian. This precept was known even to pagans, and Socrates uttered it before the birth of Christ. Enlightened reason teaches it, and noble minds practise it; though it be not delivered to them as a law. Then we need not suppose, that the maxim was written by a Christian, and inserted in the reputed work of Aristeas. Probably, the stories told in Egypt respecting the Septuagint, were collected by a Jew, who assumed the name of Aristeas, an individual who had been sent to Jerusalem by Ptolemy. The object of this author was to promote the glory of his nation. He inserted in his history of the Septuagint all the fictitious circumstances, which fifty years had blended with the traditions respecting it. It is not astonishing then, that the work of the spurious Aristeas should have been received as genuine in the time of Philo, who flourished about one hundred years after it appeared, or that he should have received it as genuine, since it promoted the glory of the Egyptian Jews. St. Epiphanius had seen the work, but as he quotes from memory, and paraphrases rather than transcribes it, his citations differ much from any thing to be found in Aristeas, as he has come down to us. Let us attempt to separate truth from fiction in the traditions respecting the seventy interpreters.

VIII. The design of translating the Scriptures was first conceived by Ptolemy Lagus, who treated the Jews with great lenity and wished to be acquainted with their history. Demetrius Phalereus is also supposed to have been much interested in Jewish histo-

ry; and as the version was not completed until the reign of Philadelphus, the translation of the Scriptures is sometimes attributed to him. Two objections have been started to this opinion. 1. Philadelphus spent the most of his time in debauchery. He slew his two brothers and married his sister, and it is said that God, who forbade David to build him a temple, would not permit the law to be translated under the patronage of such a man. Such reasoning is ridiculous. The kings of Egypt had no intention of promoting the glory of God, by a Greek version of the Pentateuch. They were influenced only by a curiosity to investigate the history of a nation, whose account of the creation differed from that of the Egyptians. The Jews formed an important body of subjects, and the kings of Egypt wished to obtain a better acquaintance with their laws and their religious rites, which differed so widely from those of other nations. The incest of Ptolemy and the murder of his brothers, could have nothing to do with his desire for further information respecting the Jews.

IX. The objection of Hody to the opinion that the Scriptures were translated into Greek under the patronage of Philadelphus, is far more learned and reasonable than the former.¹³ He observes, that the pagan authors who flourished at that time, knew but little of the Jews, notwithstanding the Greek version of the Old Testament. But this argument proves too much. For it bears with equal force on his supposition, that the Septuagint was written by the Jews of Alexandria for the use of their synagogues, as on the other, that it was made by the order of the Egyptian kings, for their own libraries. In either case, the pagan authors might have been unacquainted with it; for they cannot be supposed to have had a knowledge of all the manuscripts in the royal libraries. The Ptolemies might have had no desire to spread a knowledge of the Septuagint among their learned men; for it was compiled simply to gratify their own curiosity. On the other hand, those authors might have been deeply read in that version, although it had been made by individuals not under the royal patronage. If Acron, Pliny, and Plutarch, were unacquainted with the Septuagint, it was their own fault; for we have incontestable proof that it was translated many years before they flourished. I allow that it was natural for the Jews of Alexandria to exaggerate the honour conferred upon them, by the protection of the king and by his orders to them to trans-

late their own history. But as the united testimony of all authors who have recorded the history of the Septuagint, is, that such orders were given, we must believe the fact. Besides, it appears very natural, that a king, whose subjects were many of them Jews, should have a strong desire to be acquainted with their history.

X. Hody has clearly proved, that the books of Moses were first translated by the Jews of Alexandria.¹⁴ But it is probable that they sent to Jerusalem, to obtain the aid of those who had always lived in Judea, and who might therefore be supposed to have a better acquaintance with Hebrew, than the inhabitants of Egypt, who had adopted the customs of the Greeks, and had partially forgotten their native tongue. There can be no objection to the supposition, that Ptolemy requested the high priest to select men who were thoroughly acquainted with Hebrew, to assist in the translation of the Scriptures. But it is absurd to suppose, that the learned men of Judea alone began and completed the Septuagint. Our own reason tells us, that it must have been, for the most part, the work of the Jews of Alexandria, who were accustomed to speak the Greek language. Moreover, the evidence that this was the fact, is incontestable. The history of the Septuagint version has been embellished with fictitious circumstances, by various authors. One of them has placed Ezra, by an error in chronology, unpardonable in an author who pretends to accuracy, at the court of Philadelphus.¹⁵ Another of these writers has made Eleazar, who attended Ptolemy Lagus, a high priest. The spurious Aristeas, and Josephus who has copied him, relate that the number of the interpreters was seventy two. They suppose that Philadelphus requested that six men should be sent to him from Judea, from each tribe.¹⁶ But what interest could that prince have in the number of the tribes, or of the interpreters who were selected for making the translation? That nothing might be wanting to their dignity, Aristeas and Josephus make the interpreters the nuncios or legates of the high priest, and members of the sanhedrim. They also record the magnificence with which they were received and maintained by Philadelphus. These fictitious circumstances are all added to dazzle the common reader. But if we confine ourselves to simple facts, then these interpreters were only learned men of Judea, who assisted the Jews of Alexandria in translating, by their superior knowledge of Hebrew and of the ceremonies of Judaism. We can-

not conceive why the Greek version should be called the version of the Seventy, unless the interpreters from Judea and Alexandria amounted to this number.

XI. The Jews who had established themselves in Egypt, valued the Septuagint highly; because they had lost their knowledge of Hebrew. But it is equally untrue, that the Jews express their approbation of this translation by a festival, or their detestation of it by a fast. There was no mention of these festivals before the time of Justin Martyr; and they who pretend to have seen them at the present day, teach us that we can place no confidence in the relations of travellers respecting them. The Christians also highly prized the Septuagint version. The Greek fathers were unacquainted with Hebrew and Latin, and could gain access to the Old Testament only by this translation. It throws light on texts which are obscure in the original Hebrew; for it gives us the opinion of learned men, profoundly acquainted with Hebrew and Greek, respecting those passages. But the original is equally necessary to detect the errors which have crept into the translation. When the original differs from the translation, reason tells us, notwithstanding the acuteness of interested or prejudiced critics who would warp our judgement, that we must prefer the former.

XII. We have already related the manner in which the Jews were induced to settle in Egypt. They were unmolested until the reign of Philopator, a monster of cruelty and debauchery. This prince, after ravaging Judea, returned to Alexandria, and shut up every individual of this nation, on whom he could seize, in the Hippodrome, intending to destroy them by means of elephants.¹⁷ The cries and wailings of the multitude, who were condemned to death, terrified Ptolemy, and he suspended their execution for a few days. They were finally delivered from their fears, and pardoned by Philopator, to whom they continued faithful. His other subjects detested him and rebelled the following year; when the Jews furnished this prince with a powerful army, from which he lost sixty thousand men.

XIII. The Jews had then no temple in Egypt for the worship of God. I know not whether the kings of that country refused them the privilege of building one; but God had forbidden it, by making Jerusalem the only place where men ought to worship. But Onias, who, after the rise of the Maccabees in Judea, took refuge in

Egypt, obtained permission of Philometor, to consecrate a deserted temple to the worship of God, or rather, to build a temple in that province of Lower Egypt, which was called the *second Augustan* or *Imperial*, from its vicinity to the Nile. Philometor was induced to permit the erection of this temple, by the hope, that the Jews would settle in Egypt, if they had a spot where they could sacrifice to God. It was built in imitation of Solomon's temple, and all the rites and ceremonies of Judaism were practised there, that the Jews might be induced to worship in it. Onias persuaded them, that it was expedient for the members of the different synagogues in Egypt, to have a common temple in which they might sacrifice to God. He assured them that Isaiah referred to this temple in the prediction: "In that day shall five cities of Egypt speak the language of Canaan, and one of them shall be called the *City of Destruction*; and in that day shall there be an altar to the Lord in the midst of the land of Egypt." He altered the sense of the passage, however, in two particulars. His temple was built by a Jew, and not by an Egyptian; and he substituted the *City of the Sun*, for the *City of Destruction*. Josephus places the erection of this temple in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, but he afterwards acknowledges that he was incorrect. Godfrey Viterbensis allows it a much higher antiquity. He supposes, that it was erected in the reign of Philadelphus, during the time that the seventy interpreters were labouring on their version of the Scriptures.

" Dum quasi legista Philadelphus transtulit ista,
 Instituit templum; templi Salomonis ad instar
 Judaico more similii fabricavit honore.
 Ubs Pharaonis erat quondam, cognomine Memphis,
 Qua dedit hoc templum Domino Sotber Philadelphus,
 Hanc sub Pompeio post cecidisse lego."

XIV. The Jews who were discontented with the state of affairs at Jerusalem, were attracted by this temple to Egypt, where many of them settled.¹⁸ It excited divisions among the Jews. Those of Alexandria would not go up to Jerusalem to worship, and those of Jerusalem considered the Alexandrine Jews as guilty of sacrilege. The Rabbins declared, that it was sinful for a Jew even to dwell in a foreign land, except when he was compelled by famine or by force to emigrate from Judea. They supported their opinion by the words of David: "They would drive me from the land, even the heritage of the Lord." Egypt was peculiarly obnox-

ious to these doctors, because "the sins of its inhabitants were greater than those of any other people." The law of Moses, however, does not forbid the Jews to settle in a foreign country; and the Rabbins were probably induced by their chagrin on account of the removal of the Jews from Judea to Egypt, to prohibit emigration.

XV. The number of the Jews was so great at Alexandria, that they were allowed to erect magnificent synagogues, and to choose a magistrate from among themselves, to judge them according to the Mosaic law.¹⁹ The sons of Onias afterwards commanded the forces of Cleopatra, when she disputed the possession of the kingdom with her son Ptolemy Lathyrus. The pagan historians praise the loyalty of the Jews, who continued faithful to the queen, even when she was deserted by the greater part of the Egyptians.²⁰

XVI. There is a tradition, that St. Mark converted many of the Jews who were dispersed throughout Egypt, at the time when he founded the church at Alexandria. But without recurring to uncertain tradition, we know from a passage in the Acts, that St. Stephen was most bitterly opposed by the synagogue of the Cyreneans and Alexandrians, and that his martyrdom was in part effected by them.²¹ The passage to which we have just referred, has occasioned the interpreters much perplexity, and to elucidate it, we would observe: 1. That the Jews are incorrect in supposing, that their nation ever possessed a temple at Alexandria. Selden believed with the Jews, that there were two temples in Egypt, although historians mention only one, which was built by Onias at Heliopolis. A synagogue, however, was erected at Alexandria, of such magnificence, according to the tradition, that he who had not seen its seats, had not seen the glory of Israel. 2. The Alexandrians erected at Jerusalem a synagogue, and an academy to which they sent their children to be instructed in the Hebrew language and in the law. During the passover, they performed their devotions in their own synagogue, because the temple could not contain the vast number of the Jews then assembled at Jerusalem. The Cyreneans built a synagogue for the same purpose. It was the leading men of these synagogues, who persecuted and killed the first martyr Stephen.

XVII. There was also a numerous body of Jews settled at Babylon in Egypt. Some authors maintain that St. Peter visited

Egypt, founded a church at Alexandria, and laboured for the conversion of the Jews of Babylon, whence he wrote his Epistle to the Asiatic churches. But as there is no evidence, that St. Peter ever went to Alexandria, we conclude that he never was at Babylon in Egypt. The Babylon which he visited, was the city in Chaldea, which then contained many Jewish inhabitants, as well as the Babylon of Egypt. From that place he wrote to the other Jews who were dispersed through Asia. Salmasius advocates this opinion; but he supposes that St. Peter never left Chaldea, though it is evident that the apostle died at Rome.

XVIII. Philo, who wrote at this time, while treating of the persecution of his nation in Egypt and of the deputation which they sent to Caligula, describes them as numerous and powerful in that country. They had offered their congratulations to the emperor, as soon as he ascended the throne. But they had only drawn up a written address and presented it to Flaccus, the governor of Egypt, with the expectation that he would send it to the emperor. Flaccus was inimical to the Jews, and therefore he kept their address, that the emperor might suppose that they alone of all his subjects, had not assured him of their loyalty on his accession to the throne. Flaccus had offended Caligula by putting Macron to death; and fearing that he should be deposed, he resolved to secure the favour of the Egyptians, as the surest way of confirming himself in the government of the province. To ingratiate himself with the people, he permitted them to insult the Jews; and the arrival of Agrippa at Alexandria furnished them with a favourable opportunity for displaying their hatred towards that nation. The populace dressed an idiot named Carabbas like a king, and collected a crowd of boys, who were taught to address him as a monarch. Agrippa felt the insult. From the similarity of the names Carabbas and Barabbas, it has been thought that the contempt with which the Jewish king was treated by the Egyptians, was a punishment from God, because the Jews had in mockery clothed Jesus Christ in purple. But this is attributing the judgements of heaven to a very remote cause. Flaccus determined to kill Agrippa, who was notified of this intention by the Jews. The governor never forgave them for revealing his purposes, and he permitted the populace to destroy them at pleasure; although those who professed Judaism in Egypt amounted to more than one million of souls.

The Egyptians burnt the synagogues of the Jews, many of whom were consumed in the flames. They forced the Jews to leave the quarter of the city where they lived, and to assemble in one place, where multitudes perished from hunger. Those who left it, were murdered by the people. This persecution was sanctioned by the governour, who declared that the Jews were foreigners, and had not the right of self-defence. He even ill treated some of them within the precincts of his palace. The Jews sent an account of this persecution to Caligula, who laughed at their miseries. There was afterwards a second persecution at Alexandria, on account of which the Egyptians and Jews both sent their deputies to Caligula. Apion, who assumed the title of Alexandrian, although he was born in the Oasis, was at the head of the Egyptian deputies. Josephus mentions only three individuals who were sent to represent the Jews; but Philo, one of the number, speaks of five. The Jews effected nothing by their deputation; for Caligula required them to recognise him as a god, and to offer sacrifices to him, before he would concede to them any privileges.

XIX. It is said, that the Jews of Egypt amounted to more than one million, most of whom perished in these persecutions. But they brought their miseries on themselves, by their restless and seditious spirit. They enjoyed at Alexandria all the privileges of citizens, and were eligible to office. They were governed by a magistrate called an Alabarch. M. de Valois is persuaded that this title was given to the Jewish magistrate in derision. Josephus, however, who could not have been ignorant of the state of the Jews in Egypt in his own times, represents it as an honourable appellation, and applies it only to persons of birth and rank. Philo was the brother of one of these magistrates, and Mariamne, the daughter of Agrippa, forsook Archelaus, and married Demetrius, who, according to Josephus, possessed great influence among the Alexandrian Jews, because he was nobly born, wealthy, and an Alabarch.⁹² The office was held for life, and has often been confounded with that of Ethnarch, which title was considered so honourable in Judea, that Archelaus, the son of Herod, never assumed any other.

XX. After the destruction of Jerusalem and of the temple, the Jews of Egypt received great accessions to their numbers from Judea, whose inhabitants had no longer any scruples respecting the lawfulness of emigration, after the sacrifice had ceased and their

country was laid waste. Their countrymen had been established there for many years, and perhaps this circumstance was some inducement for them to prefer Egypt to other countries. But the judgements of God still followed them, and they were unable to escape the miseries which awaited them wherever they fled. Egypt was far from being a place of safety. Besides, the emperor obliged the prefect of that province to close the temple which Onias had built. It was feared that the Jews would assemble round this temple, and excite a rebellion, which would be as obstinately maintained as that which had been but lately put down in Judea. Therefore it was, that Vespasian ordered it to be destroyed; but the prefect was satisfied with closing it. It does not appear to have been so strictly guarded, but that the Jews of the vicinity sometimes assembled in it; for Paulinus, the successor of Lupus in the prefecture of Egypt, also closed it, and carried away all the wealth which the liberality of the people had consecrated for the use of the temple.

XXI. This was not the only calamity which befell the Jews dispersed in Egypt. Six or seven hundred assassins, who had created such disorders in Judea, arrived in Egypt, and instigated their countrymen to revolt, and murdered those who would not comply with their wishes. The rulers of the nation, who had been settled at Alexandria for many years, suppressed the attempted revolt by delivering these rebels, to the number of six hundred, into the hands of the prefect. They afterwards paid the penalty of the many crimes which they had committed. Some of them, however, escaped to Thebes, and there involved many innocent persons, who were suspected of being their accomplices, in the same punishment with themselves. Neither women nor children were spared. The children were required to acknowledge the emperor as their master; but they chose to suffer death, rather than render him homage.²³ It appears from this circumstance, that the remnant of the faction of Judas the Galilean still existed at Thebes.

XXII. Finally, an impostor called Jonathas brought new calamities on the Jews. He was one of the assassins; but, having escaped the pursuit of justice, he collected new forces by promising to perform miracles to aid his followers. He was followed by two thousand men from the region of Cyrene and Libya. Jonathas was taken prisoner and his forces were routed by the army

of Catullus. This general profited by this opportunity to enrich himself. Jonathas, to ingratiate himself with Catullus, accused the richest Jewish merchants of Egypt of being accessory to his insurrection. They were condemned to death, and their property was confiscated. Three thousand persons were condemned on the accusation of Jonathas ; but Catullus, unfortunately for himself, charged some Jews of Rome with being the accomplices of Jonathas. Vespasian, having made himself acquainted with the particulars of the case, ordered the accuser and accused to be confronted. The perjury of Jonathas was detected, and he was burnt to death. The emperor ordered all the Jews who were charged with treasonable practices, to be set at liberty. He pardoned Catullus, but God punished him for his crimes. He was tormented by a guilty conscience, and saw phantoms constantly flitting before him.

XXIII. Some of the fugitive Jews penetrated from Egypt to Ethiopia. It has been supposed that Judaism was introduced into this country by the queen of Sheba, and that it was established as the national religion, under the reign of her son by Solomon. It is asserted with much confidence, that this religion was preserved from age to age simply by tradition, without the aid of books. The monarchs of Ethiopia are styled *kings of the Israelites*; and the princes, who are exiled to the mountains of Ghesen on account of state jealousies, are called *Israelites*. The Ethiopians produce ancient genealogies, by which it appears that their kings are descended from Solomon. They now profess Christianity; but the vestiges of Judaism are still very apparent among them. Although many learned authors, who have investigated the history and customs of Ethiopia, have felt satisfied that the queen of Sheba introduced Judaism into that country,²⁴ I can hardly persuade myself that she ever ruled over that kingdom, or yet, that Judaism was preserved for so many ages by tradition only, without the aid of books.²⁵ It is very clear that Ethiopia was first peopled by the Egyptians, and that the Jews who were settled in Egypt for many years, propagated Judaism in that country.

XXIV. It is difficult to fix the period when these events took place. However, it is enough for us to know, that the eunuch of queen Candace, who was baptised by St. Philip, was from Ethiopia. Baronius advances the opinion, that this eunuch professed the religion of the Ethiopians, which did not differ materially from

Judaism, or even Christianity. But the native Ethiopians were grossly idolatrous. The temple of Jupiter Hammon was situated in their country.²⁶ They worshipped barbarous gods, and uniformly deified their great men after death. Erasmus wittily observes, that the eunuch, who was baptised by Philip while he was travelling and without witnesses, took by stealth the blessing which appropriately belonged to the Jews alone. He thinks by his pleasantry to escape from the difficulties of the subject. The Gospel was not preached to the gentiles, until God had disclosed his will to St. Peter by a miracle. How then came St. Philip to baptise the pagan eunuch, long before the Gospel was sent to the Gentiles as well as the Jews? But this eunuch must have been either a Jew or a proselyte to Judaism, who had, in accordance with the customs of the dispersed Jews, gone up to worship at Jerusalem. There can be no doubt but there were many Jews in Ethiopia, who exerted themselves to make proselytes. The sacred books of the Jews must have been in common use in Ethiopia; for we find this eunuch reading Isaiah, and manifesting a readiness to acknowledge the Messiah whose advent was predicted by the prophet. The dominions of queen Candace must have been that tract of country called Merge; for the inhabitants of other parts of Ethiopia excluded females from the succession to the throne. From the vicinity of this kingdom to Egypt, it appears very probable that Judaism was introduced into Ethiopia from that country. Philostorgius and Procopius assures us, that in the reign of Constantius, there were many Jews dispersed among the idolatrous worshippers of the sun in Ethiopia; and in later times, several distinct nations have been found, who profess Judaism.²⁷

XXV. We know neither the mode nor time in which Judaism spread into Arabia. But as there was a constant intercourse kept up, for purposes of traffic, between Arabia and Ethiopia, it was probably introduced from the latter country. Our conjecture is confirmed by the circumstance, that a body of men called *Homerites*, who were for the most part Jews and were ruled by a Jewish king, inhabited the Arabian side of the Red Sea. They probably emigrated from Ethiopia; for when the Jews were pursued by the Romans, either under Titus or Adrian, and forced to take refuge in unexplored countries, those of that nation who were in Ethiopia, might easily have crossed the Red Sea, (as the Arabs had previous-

ly done to people Ethiopia), and thus escape the vengeance of their enemies. They established themselves in Arabia, and fortified their cities. They were governed by kings, and when Mohammed appeared, they sent an army into the field to oppose the spread of his religion and the extension of his conquests.

XXVI. The dispersion of the Jews in Asia and Greece is too well known to render it necessary for us to treat of it at length. In those countries the Jews were called Hellenistic. They were dispersed by Antiochus the Great, through Lydia and Phrygia. Thence they spread into Thrace, which they inhabited at the time when Constantinople was built. The other kings of Syria built many cities, and peopled them with professors of every religion. They granted to the Jews, not merely the unmolested enjoyment of their religious worship, but also every other right, which they conceded to their own subjects. Philo assures us, that his nation had established themselves, in his day, in Bithynia, Macedonia, Pontus, and Thrace, as well as in the islands of Cyprus and Candia. They were so numerous in the cities of Apamea, Antioch, and Sidon, that they were unmolested, while their countrymen were massacred without mercy by the inhabitants of Ascalon, Ptolemais, Damas, the capital of Syria, and by the Cyreneans and Arabians. Finally, those of the Jews who survived the destruction of Jerusalem and the desolation of their country, were sold as slaves, and carried away into every province of the Roman empire. We here conclude our brief sketch of the dispersion of the Jews in the East.

XXVII. It is surprising, that any author should venture to maintain that the Jews, while scattered over the known world, preserved the distinctions of tribes and families. Maimonides freely allows, that this distinction no longer existed from the time of Sennacherib.²⁶ "Hinc familiarum inter nos confusae sunt, ita ut dignoscinequeant inter se, nec e locis ipsarum cognosci." The Talmudists have pointed out the places, where the different grades of Jews were to be found. "Babylon is healthy, (say they;) Maeson is dead; Media is sick; and Persia is expiring." That is, *all the Jews of Babylon are of noble blood; those of Maeson are illegitimate; in Media there are some few families of high descent; and a very few such in Persia.* But they are too indefinite to enable us to infer from their distinctions the purity of the blood of the Jews in those places. The Talmudists who wrote at Babylon, extol the splendour of that city,

and pride themselves on their uncorrupted descent from the house of David. They found their claims to noble birth on a supposition, the correctness of which is by no means admitted. They believe that all the dregs of the people returned with Ezra to Jerusalem. "Ezra carried with him, (say they,) the chaff of the nation, and left the pure wheat at Babylon." They add, "that every country in the world is worthless in comparison with Judea, and that Judea must yield in excellency to Babylon." It is very evident that they flatter their self-love and deceive themselves, in their claims to a descent from David. The descendants of David were so highly honoured in Judea, that they would not leave it, to groan in slavery under foreign princes. Forty two thousand families returned to Judea with Ezra; thirty thousand of these families belonged to Benjamin and Judah, and they doubtless formed by far the largest part of these tribes. The twelve thousand families, the heads of which are not mentioned, were perhaps composed partly of the ten tribes and partly of the lower orders of the tribe of Judah, who could not produce an unbroken genealogy. We are not therefore to look to Babylon for the descendants of David. The Talmudists are in error in another respect. They tell us, that all the Jews of noble birth lived in one city, and those who were illegitimate, in another. But this is impossible. According to them, there were but few families of untainted blood in Media. But the Jews of Media were almost the only inhabitants of many cities and villages; and therefore, they were better able to preserve the distinctions of tribes and families, than those of Babylon. But the Talmudists display on this subject their usual inaccuracy, for the genealogies of the Jewish nation were very much confused by their various dispersions. Finally, they had no ground for their assertion, *that Maeson was dead*. The Jews were carried to that country directly from Judea, long after the captivity of those who dwelt in Babylon and Media; and therefore, we may suppose, that there was less confusion in their genealogies. Maeson appears to have been a province of Mesopotamia; but the Talmudists aver that it was the city of Emesus or Hems. Herodian relates, that Maesa, the mother of Saemus, who was the father of Heliogabalus, and of Mammea, the mother of Alexander Severus, derived her name from her birth place Emesus. This city was dependant on Antioch, which was inhabited by native Jews. It was in the vicinity of Palmyra, which was governed by a queen who

professed Judaism. We can see no reason then, why the Jews who removed from Judea or Antioch to Emesus, should not have been of as noble birth as those of Media. The Talmudists cannot with any propriety assert, that *Maeson was dead*, that is, that *there was not a genuine Jew in Emesus*. The Rabbins offer nothing satisfactory on the preservation of the distinctions of tribes, and we must rest satisfied with the avowal of Maimonides, that they were so blended together, as to render it impossible to distinguish one tribe or family from another.

1 Herodot. Lib. II. p. 152, 154, 157. 2 Diodor. Lib. I. p. 48. Aristea de LXX. Interpret. Strabo, Lib. XVII. p. 770. 4 Hody de Vers. Graec. Lib. III. Pars 1. p. 221. 5 Hecataeus apud Joseph. cont. Apion. 6 Herennius Philo, Comm. de Judaeis, apud Origen cont. Cels. Lib. I. p. 13. 7 Scalig. ad Casaub. Ep. 115. V. Voss. de Hist. Graec. p. 52. 8 P. Comestor. Histor. Scholast. 9 Acts 2: 5. 10 M. Du. Pin has omitted in the edition of Paris from this passage to Sec. XII. 11 Hody de Bibliorum Textibus Original. etc. Liber, Lib. II. de Versionis Graecae Auctor. veris. Antonius van Dale, Dissert. super Aristea de LXX. Interpret. 1705. Nourry, Apparatus ad Bibl. Pat. Diss. XII. Cap. 1. n. 2. p. 234. 12 Van Dale believed that this impostor appeared after the time of Philo, although he mentions this version. 13 Hody de Vers. Graecae Auct. Lib. II. Cap. III. p. 104. 14 Hody, ibid. Cap. IV. p. 110. etc. 15 Godfrid. Viterbensis, Chron. XI. 16 Scaliger denies that there were individuals of each tribe in Judea; but he is incorrect, for Hody has proved the contrary, in Diss. cont. Aristeam. 17 See an account of this transaction in the third Book of Maccabees, which some authors have attributed to Philo. Bibl. LXX. Tom. II. p. 904. 18 B. C. 150. 19 B. C. 103. 20 Joseph. Lib. XIII. Cap. XXI. Strabo Cappad. apud Joseph. 21 Acts 6: 9. 22 Joseph. Ant. Lib. XX. p. 693. 23 *Λισποτιγ*. 24 Bochart believed, that she came from the Sabeans, who lived near the Arabian Gulf, and he censures Josephus, who thought that she was queen of Meroe. Phaleg, Lib. II. Cap. XXVI. p. 150, 153. &c. 25 Consult le Tablean de l' Universe, or the author's History of the Old and New Testaments. 26 Plin. Lib. VI. Cap. XXIX. Strabo, Lib. XVII. 27 Philost. Lib. III. Cap. IV. p. 25. Procop. Persic. Lib. I. p. 34. 28 Maimon. Tract. מרינו, de Lotione Manuum, Cap. IV. Sec. IV. p. 49.

CHAPTER ELEVENTH.

THE JEWS OF ITALY.

I. Subject of this Chapter. Why the Roman empire was called the kingdom of Edom. II. There was a synagogue of the Libertines at Rome. III. Conjectures respecting them. IV. They were protected by Augustus. V. Persecutions falsely attributed to Augustus. VI. The opinion of Augustus, as recorded by Suetonius, respecting the God of the Jews. VII. The Jews might receive the rights of Roman citizens. VIII. They were allowed the public performance of their religious rites. IX. The quarter of Rome which was inhabited by the Jews. X. Refutation of the opinions of Aringhus and Fabretti on this subject. XI. The Jews inhabited the Vatican until the thirteenth century. XII. An examination of the work called the Wonders of Rome, published by father Montfaucon. XIII. The Jews dwelt in the valley of Egoria. XIV. They inhabited the island of Tiber. XV. The Jews of this island and of the valley were extremely poor. XVI. Tiberius sent a colony of Jews to Sardinia. Cause of their removal from Rome. XVII. The hatred of Caligula towards the Jews. XVIII. Claudius banished them on account of Chrestus. XIX. Whether Chrestus was Christ or a seditious Jew. XX. Cause of their exile. XXI. Error of Orosius respecting the time when this event happened. The Jews reestablished themselves at Rome. XXII. Explanation of the oath *per Anichialum*. XXIII. The Synagogue of Rome had some authority over those of other places. Cause of its superiour influence.

I. WE have already treated of that part of the Jewish nation, which was dispersed through the East. We shall now consider how they established themselves in the West, and throughout the Roman empire. Italy and Rome are called in the Talmud the *cruel kingdom of Edom*.¹ When we inquire of the learned Jews, as Abravanel, Aben Ezra, or Joseph Albo, why this title should be thus given, they maintain most strenuously, that a large body of Idumeans were converted to Christianity, and overspread Italy and the Roman empire. Abravanel observes, that we may call the subjects of the Roman empire, and Christians in general, Edomites, with the same propriety as Isaiah addresses the sinners of his time, "as the rulers of Sodom and the people of Gomorrah." His parallel between the Romans and Idumeans is carried much too far. "They had, (he says) like Esau and Jacob, a common father, even God. Esau, by his marriage, allied the family of the

patriarchs to strangers, and the Roman empire and the Catholic church are composed of various nations, who are all equally offensive to God. Esau hated Jacob, and wished to take from him his birthright, his property and his life; and the Christians treat the Israelites in the same manner. Further, the cabalists assure us, that the soul of Esau passed into the body of Jesus Christ; and hence it is that the letters in Esau, by transposition, form Jesus.² Esau was born under the planet Mars, and was therefore a blood-thirsty man and a hunter; and the Idumean heroes, his descendants, who ruled over Italy, were cannibals who devoured the bodies of their enemies whom they had slain. Further, the Roman emperours were dressed in scarlet, because Esau was of a red colour. The Cardinals also wear a red dress for the same reason. Jesus Christ was also born under the planet Mars, and *had blood upon his head*; therefore, he was put to death with many of his disciples." Finally, Ramban observes, that the Idumeans were the first converts to Christianity, and have therefore given their name to all who embraced it after them. Ramban had probably read in the history of former times, or learned from tradition, in accordance with the Talmud, that Edom was the Roman empire. Aben Ezra would not allow, that the *holy nation* was ever in subjection to the Idumeans, and, though he calls the Roman empire Edom, his reason for giving it this name differs from that of Abervanel.³ He maintains, that it was the Cutheans who took Jerusalem, and carried so many Jews captive to Rome. The Idumeans were a loyal people, who, under the reign of Agrippa, marched to the succour of Jerusalem. But Constantine, having embraced the religion of certain persons who had faith in a man whom they had deified, wished to introduce it at Rome. A few Idumeans only complied with the wishes of the emperour, and became Christians. Hence it was, that the Roman empire was called Edom, in the same manner as the Egyptians and Arabians are called Ishmaelites, although there are but few of the descendants of Ishmael among them. Joseph Albo relates, that a priest from Idumea first preached the Gospel at Rome; and that, as the proselytes to Judaism were called Israelites, so the subjects of the Roman empire were called Idumeans, from that nation which had converted them to Christianity.⁴ Thus there are three reasons given why the Roman empire is called Edom. 1. On account of the conformity in

manners. 2. Because Constantine and a few Idumeans embraced Christianity. 3. Because the Romans received Christianity from Idumea. These opinions are too absurd to require refutation. Their account of the Roman emperours, who ate the bodies of their enemies, because, like Esau, they were born under the planet Mars, and who wore a scarlet dress, because he was of a red colour, is perfectly ridiculous. Josephus Gorionides produces the following reason why the name of Edom was given to the Roman empire.⁵ Zepho, the grandson of Esau, was detained as a prisoner in Egypt by Joseph. He escaped to Carthage, and was made commander in chief of the army of Aeneas, the king of that city. Aeneas invaded Italy from Africa, twice defeated Turnus, the king of Beneventum, and carried away his betrothed wife Janiia or Lavinia.⁶ Pablus, the nephew of Aeneas, and Turnus, were killed in battle, and two towers or mausoleums were erected to their memory, which were still to be seen, in the time of Josephus Gorionides, between Alba and Rome. They were called Copablus and Capturnus. The Africans frequently invaded Italy under the command of Zepho. In one of these expeditions, Zepho lost a calf, which was found in the possession of a monster, half goat and half man, who lived in a cavern concealed by woods. Zepho killed him and rescued his calf. The inhabitants, being delivered from the monster who destroyed their flocks, regarded Zepho as a demigod, to whom sacrifices were to be offered. They called him Janus, from the monster which he had killed, and also Saturn, from a star which was worshipped at that time. Thus then, Janus and Saturn were the same individual, and the grandson of Esau, who ruled over a part of Italy during his life, and was worshipped as a god after his death. He was succeeded by Latinus, who declared war against Asdrubal, the king of Carthage.⁷ The war sprung from a dispute respecting the possession of a bridge, which Aeneas had built to connect Africa with Italy, that he might furnish his wife Lavinia with water from the latter country, because if she drank any other, it caused sickness. A part of the bridge was broken down, and Asdrubal was slain in battle. Latinus married his daughter, who was a celebrated beauty. The king of Italy, being delivered from his formidable enemy, pushed his conquests into Burgundy and Germany, and rendered them

tributary.⁸ He built a temple to Lucifer, and made his children pass through the fire. He was succeeded by Aeneas the Trojan. A long line of kings from Aeneas successively ascended the throne, one of whom defeated the tribes who inhabited Touraine and the banks of the Loire. Romulus, the founder of Rome, appeared long after Aeneas, and reigned thirty eight years. David, during his reign, made war with the Idumeans, and was deserted by Adareser and Zir, his son, who took refuge in Italy. There they built Alba, where, according to Josephus, their posterity still lived in his time. Romulus feared that David would claim the fugitives as his subjects, and that the protection which he had granted them, would occasion a war; and therefore, he enclosed the temples of his gods and the palaces of his predecessors, with a wall forty five miles in circumference. Thus then, according to Gorionides, the Jews of Italy are the descendants of Zepho, the grandson of Esau, and of two officers of the palace of David, who took refuge in Alba and Surentum. From this extract, the reader can judge of the character of Gorionides as a writer, and of the good taste of the nation, who preferred such a historian to the genuine Josephus. Abravanel, who has cited this passage to prove that Zepho emigrated to Italy, departs from the original, and supposes that Zepho built Palermo, and settled in Sicily, as well as Italy.⁹ He is followed by Fazellus, who, in his history of Sicily, produces in support of his opinion two inscriptions, which were dug up in the city of Palermo, in such ancient characters, that neither the Greeks, Arabians nor Chaldeans were able to decipher them.¹⁰ One of these inscriptions informs us, that Isaac, the son of Abraham, being king of Idumea, and Esau his son, being king of the valley of Damas, a body of Jews, accompanied by a great number of Syrians and Phenicians, landed in Sicily, and established themselves on that beautiful spot called Palermo.¹¹ The other inscription was as follows: "There is but one God. He alone is almighty. He whom we adore, is the only God, who giveth victory. The governour of this tower is Saphu, the son of Eliphar, the Son of Esau, the brother of Jacob, the son of Isaac, the son of Abraham."¹² If we may believe the Jews, their nation have inhabited both Sicily and Italy from the time of Esau; and they support their assertions by the above and other inscriptions. These possess, doubtless, some claims to antiquity; but they are not on that account the more

worthy of credit ; for we are satisfied that Italy was peopled from Greece. Oenotirus emigrated to that country with a part of the inhabitants of Arcadia. Italus, who belonged to the same family with Oenotirus, changed the name of the nation from Arcadians to Italiaus ; and thus their country came to be called Italy. The Arcadians, who are called the Aborigines, waged long and severe wars with the Sicilians, who invaded their territories ; but they were on good terms with the Pelasgians who emigrated from Thessaly. Evander afterwards entered Italy at the head of a body of Arcadians, who were well received by Faunus, the king of the Aborigines, because they were his countrymen. He gave them lands to cultivate in the vicinity of his capital. Hercules, accompanied by many of the Greeks and some Trojans, settled in Italy. Aeneas afterwards landed at the mouth of the Tiber, and obtained permission from the aboriginal inhabitants to build Lavinium. The foreigners and the natives built the city of Alba, and they formed one nation under the general name of Latins, from their king Latinus. They sent colonies into the neighbouring provinces. Romulus, who was at the head of one of these colonies, enclosed the city of Rome, which he had built, with walls. He was the seventeenth king from Aeneas. We have given above the true origin of the Romans, to show that they descended from the Greeks, and not from Esau or Jacob.¹³ Therefore we must look to later times for the establishment of the Jews in Italy.

II. A great number of Jews were carried to Rome as slaves by Pompey. They were set at liberty by their masters, but did not leave the city, where they received the name of freedmen or *Libertines*. They retained their attachment to Judaism, and sent their yearly offerings to Jerusalem, where they built a synagogue, which is mentioned in the Acts of the Apostles.¹⁴ It was the heads of this synagogue, who united with the Cyreneans and Alexandrians, to kill the first martyr Stephen. A critic has boldly asserted, that the persecutors of Stephen were three pagan sects. "The Libertines, (he says,) were the Academics ; the Alexandrians were the disciples of Aristotle, for whom they retained a profound veneration, as the instructor of Alexander, the founder of their city ; and the Cyreneans were another pagan sect from Cyrene." This strange opinion was formed from a passage in the Gemara, which relates, that four hundred students left the school of Abba,

and that these students had acquired a knowledge of the Greek language and philosophy, and were divided into sects similar to those of the pagans.¹⁵ We have produced this opinion only on account of its novelty. Little or nothing is known of Abba, who is said to have been at the head of this school. There was an author called Abba, who wrote several works; but his real name was Abraham Ben Asser, an author who knew nothing of the Greek philosophy. The Jews, in the time of our Saviour, knew so little of the different sects of philosophers, that we cannot believe, that schools were founded among them to propagate opinions, in which they were not interested.

III. M. le Moine maintains, that we should read *Lapethines* for *Libertines* in the Acts of the Apostles.¹⁶ Lapethus was one of the ports in the island of Cyprus, from which the Jews sailed when they went up to Jerusalem to worship. M. le Moine observes, that there is no need of supposing that the Cyreneans came from Cyrene in Africa, for there was a city of this name in Cyprus, where the Jews were so powerful, that they massacred all the pagans. This opinion is as unfounded as that which was cited before, respecting the Cyreneans. It has been said by some authors, that the Libertines who are mentioned by St. Luke, were pagans who had been sold in Judea as slaves. They were baptised, and becoming proselytes to Judaism, were set at liberty. But Tacitus is a better commentator on St. Luke, than these Christian authors. He observes that there were more than four thousand Libertine Jews at Rome.¹⁷ It is useless to look elsewhere for them, when a pagan historian has plainly pointed out their place of abode. It is not surprising that so considerable a body of foreign Jews should have possessed their peculiar synagogue at Jerusalem.

IV. Augustus patronised the Libertines of Rome, on account of their attachment to Julius Caesar. Fuscus Aristius, a poet of some reputation, and the correspondent of Horace, was one of these favourite freedmen.

“ Urbis amatorem Fuscum salvere jubemus
 Earis amatores : hæc in re scilicet una
 Multum dissimiles, ad cætera poene Gemelli :
 Fraternalis animis : quidquid negat alter et alter.¹⁸
 Annimus, pariter vetuli, notique columbi.”

These poets, however, differed in one respect. Horace was not a religious man. “Nulla mihi unquam religio est.” But Fuscus

was devotedly attached to Judaism. "Sum paulo infirmior unus multorum." It was this friend whom Horace stopt, while going to the synagogue, to free himself from an impertinent fellow who would not leave him.

"Sed meliori

Tempore dicam hodie tricesima Sabbata."19

This thirtieth Sabbath mentioned by the poet, was the thirtieth of the year, whether it began with the month of October or April. At least, this conjecture appears to me more plausible than any other which has been made to explain this passage.²⁰ The Libertines of Rome multiplied to such a degree, under the protection of Augustus, that when deputies were sent from Jerusalem after the death of Herod, to maintain the rights of the Jews, the freedmen, to the number of eight thousand, accompanied them to the emperour. Then, if we make allowance for the probable number of women and children, the Jews who at that time lived at Rome, must have amounted to twenty thousand souls.

V. The Jewish historians are so far from acknowledging the protection of Augustus, that they represent him as a bitter enemy to their nation. They have taken the following narrative from the archives of the kings of Arragon.²¹ Antony, the Roman emperour, and Caesius, a Greek king, were on the point of laying siege to Jerusalem, when the former received information that Cleopatra, the most beautiful woman in the world, was left a widow. He immediately asked her hand in marriage. She consented to marry him, provided that he would repudiate his wife, the sister of Augustus; and he complied with her conditions. The senate, offended with his conduct, deposed him, and gave the empire to Augustus. As they suspected that the Jews had effected this marriage between Antony and Cleopatra, in order to avert the dangers which threatened them, the senate ordered Augustus to attack Antony with a powerful army, and afterwards to subdue the Jews. Antony was defeated, and Cleopatra was put to death with her two sons. War was then declared against the Jews. They defeated one wing of the Roman army, and the emperour exclaimed: "We must retreat, for we are fighting with lions, and not with men." Augustus was encouraged by his generals, who resolved to wash out their disgrace in the blood of the Jews. Jerusalem was besieged, taken and pillaged by the soldiers. The emperour appointed a governour over

Judea, and returned in triumph to Rome. The army was scarcely withdrawn, when the presence of Augustus was again necessary in Judea to suppress a revolt. He returned with an army more powerful than that which he had previously commanded, and besieged Jerusalem. At the end of one year the city was taken, and the dead bodies were as numerous as the sands on the seashore. Augustus raised his hands to heaven, and entreated God not to attribute to him the misfortunes which the Jews had brought upon themselves. He carried the influential men of the nation prisoners to Rome, where they all fell victims either to the change of climate or to the crimes which they committed. We have cited this account, which differs so materially from the Roman history, without any intention of attempting a refutation of it, for it needs none.

VI. Suetonius observes, that Augustus expressed the highest satisfaction at the conduct of Caius, the son of Agrippa, who visited Jerusalem without offering sacrifice.²⁹ Casaubon, the commentator of Suetonius, maintains that the emperor spoke in opposition to his feelings and principles. A critic observes, in support of Casaubon, that Augustus must have had the highest reverence for the God of the Jews, for he called him *a sovereign God*. But 1. It was not Augustus, but Philo, who, in speaking of that prince, said that the deity who was worshipped by the Jews, was *the supreme God*. The emperor, in an edict respecting the Jews, speaks of a *most high God*, but he assumed the style of those whom he addressed. 2. Suetonius observes, that Augustus despised the *new ceremonies*, that is, the sacred rites of the Jews and Egyptians. It may be true, that his sentiments changed in his after life, as he commanded that a sacrifice should be offered to God for him, in the temple at Jerusalem. He grew superstitious in his old age, but through his whole life, he protected the Jews of Rome.

The Jews sometimes enjoyed the rights of Roman citizens. Caesar conferred the privileges of citizenship on Antipater. St. Paul claimed protection as a Roman; but he did not enjoy that honour, from being a native of Tarsus, for the inhabitants of that city were never made Roman citizens. Mark Antony exempted it from taxes, to indemnify it for the severe treatment which it had received from Cassius. It became a metropolis, but never a free city. The rights of citizenship were peculiar to the family of St. Paul. His father, though not a rich man, might have purchased

citizenship, or he might have obtained it by rendering important services to the state. A Jew, therefore, might become a Roman citizen, and thus rise to the highest honours of the empire.²³

VIII. They enjoyed also liberty of conscience and the unmolested worship of God. Their Sabbaths and holy days were observed in so public a manner, that Augustus, having placed the Jews on the list of those who shared in his distributions of corn and money, ordered the officers to keep the portion of the Jews until Sunday, because one of the days of distribution fell on Saturday. The Jews built chapels for prayer, and synagogues at Rome. They had doctors, who expounded the law, for the Jew who deceived Fulvia, was an interpreter of the law. Finally, they had a council or house of judgement, which decided on all matters of dispute. It was doubtless to this house of judgement, that St. Paul expected to give an account of his conduct, when he arrived at Rome in the reign of Nero. They probably kept up an intercourse with the *sanhedrim*; for the Jewish judges expressed surprise, that they had received no letter from Jerusalem, respecting the affairs of St. Paul.

IX. The Jews lived in a particular quarter of the city beyond the Tiber. Ancus Martius, fearing that the enemies of Rome would take possession of two hills, the Janiculum and the Vatican, which were near the city, sent a part of the citizens to inhabit them. A body of armed men were stationed there to guard against surprise from the enemy, during the comitia. These hills were less commodious than the other parts of the city, and the houses on them were of little value, and belonged to the porters, curriers, and in general, to the lower classes of people. Juvenal and Martial allude to this circumstance in the following passage.

" Nec te fastidia mercis
Ullius subeant ablegandae Tyberim ultra,
Et detracta cani transtiberina cutis."²⁴

The Janiculum and Vatican were also inhabited by some of the higher classes.²⁵ The quarter of the city, which was assigned to the Egyptian merchants and to the Jews, who lived at Rome and were held in high estimation previous to the destruction of Jerusalem, was on the Vatican. The Jews who were brought to Rome by Titus, afterwards removed to the grove of the nymph Egeria.

X. According to Aringhus, the Jews, in ancient times, inhabited the Janiculum.²⁶ He produces two reasons for this opinion. 1.

The aged Jews who reside at Rome, retain a tradition, that their ancestors lived on the Janiculum. 2. The church of St. Salvador della Corte, which derived its name from the Jews who were called *Curti*, because they practised circumcision, is situated on that hill. Horace applies this epithet to the Jews :

“ *Curtis Jadaasis oppodere.*”²⁷

But how could these aged Jews learn with any certainty from others of their nation, by mere tradition, that their fathers, fifteen hundred years before, inhabited the Janiculum? We cannot infer any thing from such evidence. The etymology which Aringhus gives of St. Salvador della Corte, is ridiculous. Horace applied the epithet to the Jews in raillery, as he speaks of a mule whose tail was cut off. “ *Nunc mihi curto ire licet mulo.*”²⁸ But it would be absurd to infer from his use of this word, that the Jews were called *Curti*, and gave this name to a quarter of Rome, and to the church of St. Salvador della Corte. *Curtis* was a word in common use among the lower classes, and meant the *palace*, the *tent* or *court*, of the emperor.²⁹ Anastasius, in speaking of Crummus, a celebrated king of the Bulgarians, observes, that his palace (*Curtis*) was burnt. This word passed into the Greek language, and was used by Theophanes and Cedrenus. Constantine Porphyrogenetes relates, that the emperor Michael was extremely offended with Bardas, because he had placed his hangings and curtains in a higher position than his own.³⁰ This is the translation of Allatius, which is evidently incorrect, for Constantine by the word *corto*, which he borrowed from the Latin, referred to the tent of the emperor. *Curtis* probably was a court of justice, on the ruins of which a church was erected, which for that reason was called St. Salvador della Corte. This conjecture is supported by the fact, that there was a tribunal beyond the Tiber, for the inhabitants of Janiculum. Pomponius relates, that five magistrates were chosen to quell all disturbances of the city during the night, on both sides of the Tiber. As this number was chosen to secure the peace of the whole city, we may suppose that some of them resided beyond the Tiber, in order to suppress whatever disturbances might arise there. Those who give credit to the Acts of Martha and her Associates, must allow this; for they were sent to a prison on the Janiculum. There was a tribunal and a prison on that hill, and thence it was call-

ed *Corte*, whence the church of St. Salvador della Corte derived its name.

XI. The Jews lived in three different quarters of Rome. They occupied the Vatican, where the palace of the pope now stands; for they lived beyond the Tiber, and near the Aelian bridge, which derived its name from Adrian, and is now called the bridge of St. Angus.³¹ Adrian died at Bayes, and Antonius, his successor, removed his body to Rome. As he could not place it in the tomb of Augustus, he buried it beyond the Tiber, in a spot which was called *Moles Adriani*.³² A small bridge was thrown over the Tiber, leading to his tomb, and beyond this bridge was that quarter of the city which was inhabited by the Jews. They occupied that situation before the destruction of Jerusalem, and for many centuries after it. It is evident: 1. That the Jews did not inhabit Janiculum in the reign of Augustus, as it was nearly as thickly settled at that time as the rest of Rome; but they probably occupied the Vatican, which was but thinly inhabited on account of its filth and the noisome odour which proceeded from it. Tacitus speaks of the *infamia Vaticanæ loca*. 2. Fuscus Aristius, the Jewish poet and the friend of Horace, was going to the synagogue on the Vatican, when he was met by that poet.³³ For if he had been going to the Janiculum, he would have accompanied Horace over the Tiber, to the Gardens of Caesar. But Fuscus parted with him at the temple of Vesta, because his route lay to the right towards the Vatican, while Horace turned to the left, and proceeded to Janiculum. 3. It was on the Vatican, that Nero put to death so many Christians, or rather Jews, (for at that time the Jews were confounded with the Christians,) as they came out of the synagogue. They were condemned and executed on the spot where they were taken. 4. There was a great number of sepulchres on the Vatican, which were levelled by Heliogabalus, because they obstructed the evolutions of his elephants. These tombs did not belong to the Romans, for they usually burned their dead; nor yet to the Christians, for at that time they were too few in number to need such extensive burying-grounds. They belonged to the Jews, who buried their dead there, and who had inhabited the Vatican for many years. 5. It has been said by the Catholics, that the martyrs were buried in these sepulchres; for they have found in them the relics of St. Victor, his wife and seventy individuals of the same family; of Palmatius the

consul, and forty of his domestics or relatives; of Calepodius, and of a multitude of other saints.³⁴ But how do the Catholics know, that these are the bones of St. Victor and the other saints, or that they were interred on the Vatican? It is not even certain, notwithstanding the Catholics entertain no doubt of the fact, that St. Peter, was buried on the Vatican.³⁵ The supposed tomb of St. Peter and of many other martyrs, has been discovered on that spot where the circus of Nero stood. But can we believe, that Nero repented of his cruelty, and that, after putting St. Peter and the other martyrs to death, he tore down his circus, that the Christians might have a spot in which to bury their dead? We cannot suppose, that the circus of the pagans was turned into a burying-ground for the Christians. The tombs of some of the martyrs might have stood on the Vatican, but not where the circus of Nero was built. The sepulchres which were destroyed by Heliogabalus, belonged to the Jews; for the Christians were so far from erecting monuments to the martyrs, that they concealed the spot where they were buried.

6. It was on the Vatican that Benjamin of Tudela, in the twelfth century, met with his countrymen and found the sepulchres of the *ten just men of his nation*. 7. A writer who lived in the year 1220, a short time after Benjamin of Tudela, and whose testimony on this subject is worthy of credit, has placed the Jews on the Vatican. He observes, that the Adrian or Aelian bridge, of which we have spoken, was called the *bridge of the Jews*, because they resided near it. Thence we may conclude, that the Jews of Rome occupied the Vatican, beyond the bridge of St. Angus, where they lived for twelve or thirteen centuries.

XII. There may be some objection to citing the authority of the above writer, because his work, which was for some time lost, but afterwards recovered by a learned Benedictine, contains much that is fabulous.³⁶ He relates that Romulus erected a statue with this inscription: "It shall not fall until a virgin shall conceive." He adds, that the statue fell at the birth of our Saviour. The work also contains the following narrative. "Phidias and Praxiteles visited Rome and presented themselves before Tiberius naked; thus intimating, that all things were naked in their sight, without even excepting the thoughts of the emperour. They repeated to Tiberius what he had thought and dreamed during the previous night. He offered them a reward, and they requested that statues might be

erected to them. They carved from marble equestrian statues, without pedestals, and before them the figure of a female, with a shell in her hand. The horses had the power of stamping on the ground. The sculptors thus intimated to the emperor, that a king should arise, who would strike the earth, that is, who would rule over all nations. The statue of the female represented the Christian church offering salvation to all. The shell in her hand was the symbol of baptism." This author still more absurdly relates, that a statue, with a small bell around its neck, was erected at Rome for each of the vanquished nations. Whenever any of the tributary provinces revolted, the bell on the statue which represented that province, uniformly rung. This fabulous story first gained currency in the thirteenth century, for it is referred to by Helinand, a monk of Fresmond. He attributes the exquisite invention of the statue and bell, which he calls the safety of Rome, to Virgil, whom he describes as a magician. The above fictions, although utterly ridiculous, have found credit with some, and they have copied them.³⁷ But 1. The Roman Catholics, with their legends and pretended relics of saints, should be the last to charge this author with absurdity in his fabulous narratives, which conduce to the glory of the Christian church. 2. Although he relates much that is fictitious, his testimony is worthy of credit on one point. He saw the Jews in possession of the Vatican. Therefore the tradition of the aged Jews, which is produced by Aringhus, to prove that the Libertines resided on Janiculum, is unfounded. If we would not charge these aged Jews with asserting a falsehood, we must suppose, that they confounded the Janiculum with the Vatican. They are not singular in this mistake, for Martial has placed the vineyard of Tullius Martial on the Janiculum, although it is well known, that it was on the Vatican towards the Milvian bridge.

"Tulli jugera paucis Martialis
Longo Janiculi jugo recumbunt."³⁸

3. The author of the above fictions was evidently a credulous man ; but we must concede that he was able to distinguish the bridges of Rome, and that he would not have asserted, if it had not been true, that the bridge of Adrian was also called the bridge of the Jews. Therefore we may conclude, that the Jews resided on the Vatican, and not on the Janiculum.

XIII. The Jews also inhabited that quarter of Rome, which lay in the valley of Egeria, and which is now called Caffarello. A

small brook called Almon ran through the valley, in which the ancient priests annually washed the statue of Cybele.³⁹

" Et lotam parvo revocant Almone Cybelem."

It has lost its ancient name, and is now called the *holy water*, because it possesses mineral properties, which have been thought efficacious in the cure of the diseases of men and beasts.⁴⁰ The grove of the muses and the grotto of Egeria, in which Numa pretended to hold secret interviews with that nymph, was situated in this valley. The grove was leased to the Jews, and on that account, it became the resort of the lower classes, who lived on the charity of their more wealthy countrymen. Juvenal speaks so positively of the removal of the Jews to the valley of Egeria, that we can have no doubt respecting it.

" Sed, dum tota domus Rhoda componitur una,
Substitit ad veteres arces, madidamque Capenam.
Hic ubi nocturnae Numa constituebat amicae,
Nunc sacri fontis nemus, et delubra locantur
Judaeis, quorum cophini fœneumque supellex;
Omnis enim populo mercedem pendere jussa est
'Arbor, et efficit mendicat sylva Camœnis
In vallem Egeriæ descendimus et speluncas."⁴¹

It has been said, that the removal of the Jews to the valley of Egeria took place after the destruction of Jerusalem. They were respected at Rome previous to that event; but the number of slaves who were transported to the capital by Titus, brought disgrace on their countrymen at Rome. Therefore the whole body of Jews in that city were obliged to remove from the Vatican, and to obtain a subsistence by begging beyond the Capene gate, or by selling wood. This conjecture is correct in part. The Jews who resided on the Vatican beyond the Tiber, were rich and powerful, and therefore were under no necessity of removing thence to become sellers of wood. They were neither deprived of their privileges nor of their houses, by the destruction of Jerusalem; for Juvenal, who mentions the Jewish beggars beyond the Capene gate, speaks also of their rich countrymen, who resided on the Vatican. Thus it appears that only a part of the Jews occupied Caffarello. Probably the captives from Judea were so numerous, that the Vatican was not extensive enough for their residence, and the lower orders, who depended on the charity of others for subsistence, were sent to the valley of Egeria, to cut wood for the use of the city. The location which we assign to the Jews, must embarrass the

Catholics somewhat ; for it is on the Vatican and in Caffarello, that the relics of so many Christian martyrs are found. It is well known, that they have discovered the bones of saints in abundance on the Appian way, where Jesus Christ is said to have appeared to St. Peter, and commanded him to return to Rome.⁴² There they have found the catacombs which were so well stored with the relics of martyrs. But if the Jews buried their dead in those places, how can their bones be distinguished at the present day from those of Christians ? The Catholics may answer, that the Jews interred their dead on the Vatican. But is it at all probable, that the beggars of the valley of Egeria would have incurred the unnecessary expense and trouble of carrying their dead the whole length of the city for burial, when there were cemeteries in their immediate neighbourhood ? The Catholics will never be able to exhaust the charnel-house near the Appian way, for the Jewish dead were deposited there for many centuries. It is evident, that the Jews resided at Caffarello, as well as on the Vatican.

XIV. Finally, the Jews inhabited the island of Tiber, which is said to have been formed from the sheaves of wheat, which the ancient Romans, in their indignation against Tarquin the Proud, threw into the river. This island was consecrated to Aesculapius, whose statue was erected on it. A temple was afterwards built there to Jupiter. Ovid thus describes the island :

“ Scinditur in geminas partes circumflexus amnis,
Insula nomen habet, laterumque a parte duorum
Porrigit aequales media tellure lacertos.⁴³

Quod tamen ex ipsis licuit mihi dicere fastis,
Sacra vere patres haec duo templa die.
Acepit Phoebæ nymphæque Coronide natam
Insula dividua, quam proruit amnis, aqua.
Jupiter in parte est. Coepit locus unus utrumque,
Jenetaque sunt magno templa nepotis avo.⁴⁴

The island was connected with the city by the Fabrician bridge.

“ Atque a Fabricio non tristem ponte reverti.”⁴⁵

The Jews reside at the present day on the island of Tiber, near the Fabrician bridge, which is also called the *bridge of the four heads*, on account of a statue erected there to Janus.⁴⁶ They were forced to remove from the Vatican by the pontiffs, who preferred that hill to any other quarter of the city. We shall not controvert the opinion of those who believe that the Jews also inhabited Janiculum. But we simply observe, that the tradition of the aged Jews

respecting this subject, is unworthy of credit; and if the Jews ever resided on that hill, it must have been only for a short time, and within the last centuries.

XV. The Jews have been scattered over the rest of Italy from the time of Augustus. Cicero relates, that they sent yearly offerings to Jerusalem, not only from Rome, but also from the other cities of Italy. The Jews of that country, with the exception of Rome, were always poor. Martial describes them as venders of matches, which they exchanged for broken glass.

"Urbanus tibi, Caselli, videris,
Non es, crede mihi: quid ergo? Verna es,
Hoc quod transtiberinus ambulator,
Qui pallentia sulphurata fractis
Permutat vitreis."⁴⁷

These verses undoubtedly refer to the Jews, although they are not named; for Martial reproaches them elsewhere, because they were born of mothers who taught them early to beg and to sell matches.

"A matre doctus nec rogare Judaeus,
Nec sulphuratae lippus institor mercia."

According to Juvenal, they were still more degraded, and obtained a livelihood as scavengers.⁴⁸ He seems to intimate, that the Jews, from their captivity in Egypt, had uniformly been employed in the most menial offices. But he probably meant only to reproach them on account of their miserable condition. They were obliged to sleep on straw, and obtain a subsistence by carrying earth and felling wood in the grove of Egeria.

"Cum dedit ille locum cophino, fenoque relicto
Arcanam Judaea tremens."⁴⁹

XVI. The emperor Tiberius was the declared enemy of the Jews at Rome, and purposed to abolish the exercises of their religion in his capital. He ordered four thousand of the Libertines to be transported to the island of Sardinia, whose climate had proved fatal to all the colonies which he had sent thither. Tiberius reasoned thus: "Either these wretches will perish, and they will be no loss to the empire; or they will subdue the robbers who infest that island." The number of the Jews at Rome must have been very great, since Tiberius collected among them four thousand freedmen capable of bearing arms. Suetonius and Tacitus assure us, that the Jews were not sent to Sardinia until the em-

perour had examined the nature of the religion of the Jews and Egyptians. Josephus attributes this exile to a cause which is disgraceful to his nation. He relates that an impostor, who associated with himself three men with characters like his own, gave lectures on the law of Moses, and obtained a considerable sum of money from Fulvia, a proselyte to Judaism, which was to be sent as an offering to Jerusalem. They appropriated the gift of the Roman matron to their own use; but their villany was discovered. A complaint was made to Tiberius, who punished the whole nation for the crime of four individuals. Philo charges Sejanus with having effected the banishment of his countrymen. That favourite of Tiberius, according to him, made use of all the means in his power to render the Jews odious in the eyes of the emperour. We shall be safe in following the narrative of Philo, which is confirmed by the circumstance, that the Jews were recalled by Tiberius, after the death of Sejanus; whence it is evident, that the exile of the Jews was connected with the intrigues of that minister.

XVII. Caligula proved to be no less an enemy to the Jews than Tiberius. When they heard that he had ascended the throne, they immediately offered at Jerusalem sacrifices for his prosperity. But the infatuated Caligula required the Jews to erect statues to him, and to worship him as a god. They acknowledged but one God, and never worshipped a created being; and accordingly, the requisitions of Caligula made them his bitterest enemies. Certain pagans erected an altar of brick in honour of that emperour at Jamnia; but the Jews, offended at this innovation, overthrew the altar. The pagans carried their complaints to Capito, the treasurer of the city, and indeed of all Judea, who took advantage of this circumstance, to prejudice Caligula against the Jews. Capito supported those who had built the altar, and misrepresented the Jews to the prince, who was previously prejudiced against them. Caligula was also urged to persecute the Jews by his two favourites, Helicon and Apelles. The first had been a slave in Egypt, and the last was a native of Ascalon, and a comedian. Both of them were irreconcilable enemies to the Jews; and therefore, it is not surprising that they advised the emperour to use severe measures with that nation, or that the prince, already offended with them, should follow the counsels of his favourites. Caligula ordered the Jews, as a punishment for daring to overthrow his al-

tar at Jamnia, to erect a colossal statue coated with gold, in the sanctuary of the temple at Jerusalem.⁵⁰ Petronius, the governour of Syria, who was ordered to carry the commands of the emperour into execution, foresaw that an armed force would be necessary to secure obedience. He marched to Ptolemais with a body of troops. The citizens with their wives and children surrounded Petronius, uttering piercing shrieks and tearing their hair. They assured the governour, that they had no intention of rebelling against the emperour, but they could not obey his commands without violating the principles of their religion. Petronius wrote to Caligula on the subject, and the Jews sent deputies to intercede with him. Agrippa, who was much loved by the emperour, exerted his influence in favour of the Jews, and the prince yielded to their solicitations. Caligula, however, only suspended the execution of his design; for, the following year, he ordered another statue of gilded copper to be prepared, which he intended to carry with him in his visit to Jerusalem, and to erect it in the temple. He wrote to Petronius, and ordered him to inflict on himself the punishment which was due to the man who had disobeyed his master. Caligula was slain before Petronius received his letter. The deputies who were sent from the Jews of Alexandria to Rome, met with an unfavourable reception from the emperour. They entreated that they might not be deprived of the rights of citizens of Alexandria, which they had enjoyed for a long time; and that they might not be forced to erect a statue to the emperour in their oratories. Caligula thought, for a moment, that the Jews were more unfortunate than criminal in not believing him to be a god. The situation of the Jews at Rome was extremely deplorable, while the deputies of their nation resorted to that city from different countries, and Caligula sometimes drove them ignominiously from his court.

XVIII. Dion, who spent much time in investigating the principal events which took place in the reign of Claudius, observes, that the emperour closed the synagogues of the Jews at Rome.⁵¹ He had formed the design of banishing them from the city, but their numbers were so great, notwithstanding the persecutions which they had suffered under Claudius, that he did not dare to execute it. On the other hand, Suetonius assures us, that Claudius banished the Jews from Rome, because their chief, *Chrestus*, excited frequent seditions.⁵² The testimony of Suetonius is con-

firmed by the Acts of the Apostles, where it is recorded, that St. Paul found Priscilla and Aquila at Corinth, because Claudius had driven the Jews from Rome.⁵³ Dion and Suetonius refer to different periods in the reign of Claudius, and they may therefore be easily reconciled with each other. Claudius, in the first year of his reign, closed the synagogues of the Jews, and forbade them to perform the services of their religion. But they assembled in secret for religious worship. Christianity, at this time, was introduced at Rome and occasioned warm controversies between the Jews and Christians, with respect to the character of the Messiah. Claudius, who was never friendly to the Jews, permitted them to live in the city for six or seven years; but he finally banished them on account of the above dissensions.

XIX. Baronius will not allow that Suetonius has accused Jesus Christ of having excited seditions at Rome, and occasioned the exile of the Jews from that city.⁵⁴ He maintains, that *history* refers the disorders at Rome to a certain *Chrestus*, whose disciples proclaimed, that he had risen from the dead; and that the rage of the Jews was excited because St. Peter, by his preaching, converted many of their countrymen. Baronius supposes, that the apostle, who was forced to leave Rome by the edict of Claudius, passed into Africa and there founded the churches of Alexandria and Carthage. The critics have thought these remarks of Baronius of little value, and they have sought on the medals of Claudius for the name of Chrestus, who is supposed to have been a Jew, and to have excited seditions at Rome. Baronius and the critics have erred, because they did not take the trouble to investigate the meaning of Suetonius. The preaching of Christ crucified excited divisions among the Jews. Some of them believed him to be the Messiah; others regarded him as an impostor, who had attempted to overthrow the institutions of Moses. The character of Christ was discussed with the same warmth in the synagogues of Rome, as in those of Judea. It was not the preaching of St. Peter, which excited the disorders at Rome in the reign of Claudius, for the apostle did not visit the city until the reign of Nero. It is asserted on the authority of Metaphrastus, that the apostle visited Africa from Rome, and established churches at Carthage and Alexandria. But Tertullian, on the contrary, observes, that the African churches were not founded by the apostles. Medals have been sought

for, which bear the name of Chrestus, in order to prove that seditions were excited at Rome by a Jew of that name ; but no one can be found, which refers to an individual of that nation, who created disturbances in the capital during the reign of Claudius.⁵⁵ Suetonius, a pagan author, knew little of Judaism and less of Christianity. He supposed that Jesus Christ, who had been crucified some years before, and whose character was the subject of spirited controversy at Rome, was still living. It was very natural for this pagan historian, who was ignorant of the particulars of the sedition, to believe, that it was occasioned by Christ, because it was excited by his doctrines, as taught by his apostles. It was on account of the violent disputes between the Christians and Jews, that Claudius banished them both from Rome.

XX. Some authors, in order to free the Christians from any imputation of being concerned in the banishment of the Jews from Rome, endeavour to account for it from what Josephus has related on the subject. According to him, a Samaritan informed Quadratus, that the Jews, instigated by a man named Dortus, were on the point of rebellion. The governour punished those engaged in this seditious plot, and sent two high priests prisoners to Rome, to answer for their conduct before the emperour. The above authors believe, that this was the sedition which occasioned the banishment of the Jews from Rome. But Suetonius accuses the Christians of being concerned in the expulsion of the Jews. Besides, we can conceive of no reason why the Jews of the capital should be punished for the plots of their countrymen in Judea. The opinion which we have maintained, appears to be the most natural and satisfactory.

XXI. Orosius, by following too closely the Chronicle of Eusebius, has given an incorrect date to several events which occurred in the reign of Claudius.⁵⁶ He says, that the Jews were expelled from Rome in the ninth year of Claudius, which corresponds with A. D. 49 ; but we must place that event two years later.⁵⁷ The mathematicians were banished from Italy at the same time, by order of the senate ; but the Jews were driven from the city by the edict of the emperour, and therefore, they soon returned. After their reestablishment, they enjoyed the unmolested exercise of their religious rites and had a council of their own ; for when St. Paul was brought to Rome, in consequence of his appeal to Caesar,

he assembled the chief men among his countrymen to answer before them for his conduct.⁵⁸ This circumstance proves, that there were not only Jews at Rome under Nero, but also that they were governed by a council of their own. It is likewise known that the exercises of their religion were public, and that their houses were illuminated on their festivals.

"Herodis venere dies, unctaque fenestra
Dispositae pinguem nebulam vomere lucernae."⁵⁹

Finally, the Jews engaged among the Romans in all the ordinary occupations of life. But they were not faithful to their oaths, because they did not conceive themselves bound when they swore by the heathen deities. Hence it is, that Martial, who knew their duplicity, exclaimed :

"Jura, verpe, per Anchialum."

XXII. It does not appear probable, that Martial wished the Jew to swear by the statue which had been erected to Sardanapalus in Anchialus, a city of Cilicia. He exacted an oath by the living God, which was common among the Jews. In fact, *Anchialum* means an oath of this kind ; for אֱלֹהֵי אֵל , *chi Ael*, signifies *God lives*, and אֱמֵן is used intensively. The word אֱמֵן is employed in this sense in Psalm 118, "*O God deliver us ;*" for thus the passage should be rendered, and thus it is translated in the Syriac version.⁶⁰ It would be very natural for the Jews to swear by the living God. He is often represented in the Old Testament as swearing by himself. It is not surprising then, that Martial, who wished to assure himself of the good faith of the Jew, should require him to take this solemn oath. A critic of profound learning has advanced the opinion, that Martial required the Jew to swear by *Aigialon*.⁶¹ This is a Greek word which means a *god who loves a river*, and the critic applied this title to the true God, because the Jews often performed their devotions on the seashore, or on the banks of rivers. He had previously thrown out a different conjecture, namely, that Martial referred to the temple of the true God, in opposition to that of Jupiter Tonans ; but he subsequently abandoned it, although more plausible than the other.⁶² But we cannot suppose that, because Tertullian calls the prayers of the Jews, *orationes littorales*, that God has a peculiar partiality for the banks of rivers, or that he was addressed as the Deity who presided over streams, to distinguish him from the false gods of paganism. There is no evidence, that the oath mentioned by this critic, was in such common

use among the Jews as to be known to a pagan poet. We cannot doubt that *Anchialum* means *God lives*, and there is no need of seeking for any other explanation of the word. Martial required the Jew to swear, not by Jupiter Capitolinus, an oath which he would not consider binding, but by the name of the God whom he adored, by the living God; "Jura, verpe, per Anchialum."

XXIII. We would only remark further: 1. That the synagogue at Rome possessed some degree of authority over the rest. There was an instance of their exercising this authority in the last century.⁶³ Rabbi Nathaniel Tribotti, in a treatise on the bathing of women, advanced several propositions which were objected to by the other Rabbins, who wrote an answer to his work. Their controversy was carried on with great warmth, and was decided by the synagogue and academy at Rome, in favour of the opinions of Tribotti. The Rabbins acquiesced in their decision. I do not say that the authority of the synagogue at Rome was founded on any right which they claimed. It was the natural consequence of the superior power of the Jews in the capital of the empire. Great bishops have thus subjected the weaker to their power, and thus papal Rome has obtained its boasted superiority. 2. Rome was the nursery of the Jews, and thence they spread through the rest of Italy. They sent their donations to Jerusalem from Rome and the other Italian cities, and we shall find, as we proceed, that they had established themselves at Cremona, Mantua, Bologna, Ferrara, and throughout the ecclesiastical states.

1 Ex Gemar. Tit. Sanhed. Cap. 1. † 34. p. 357. ² *Jesus*, יֵשׁוּעַ, by transposition, forms עֵשָׂו, *Esau*. Abravanel in Esaiam, Cap. XXXV. Esau was called the *Red*, and Abravanel has pointed out many allusions to this title, in the customs of the moderns. ³ Vide Aben Ezra in Genesis, Cap. XXVII. v. 40. ⁴ Joseph Albo de Fundam. Sermone IV. Cap. XLII. ⁵ Josippon, Lib. I. Cap. II. p. 4. ⁶ יֵשׁוּעַ. ⁷ Josippon, Cap. III. p. 6. ⁸ בְּרִיבְרוּנֵי אֶלְמֹנָה. ⁹ Gagnier, Praef. ad Josippon, p. 42. ¹⁰ Fazellus de Reb. Sicil. Dec. 1. Lib. VIII. Cap. de Panormo. ¹¹ It was discovered in the reign of William II. surnamed the Good, towards the close of the twelfth century. ¹² This inscription was found and explained in A. D. 1470. ¹³ Octavii Ferrarii Lib. de Orig. Roman. in Antiq. Graevii. Tom. I. p. 8. ¹⁴ Acts 6: 9. ¹⁵ Adami Tribbechovii Liber Singularis de Doctoribus Scholast. Cap. 1. p. 5. ¹⁶ Le Moine, Var. Sacr. Tom. I. Prolegom. ¹⁷ Tacit. An. Lib. II. Suet. ¹⁸ Hor. Ep. Lib. I. Ep. 10. ¹⁹ Sat. Lib. I. Sat. 9. ²⁰ A Rabbi persuaded Lambin, that the thirtieth Sabbath was more scrupulously observed than any other, because it was the

day on which the lamb was eaten; and he believed that the paschal Sabbath was the thirtieth from the beginning of the civil year in Tishri or October. Bucher and other critics believe that the paschal Sabbath depended on the new moon, which sometimes fell on the thirtieth, instead of the first day of the month. But he allows that this was not the appropriate appellative for the day, and he adds, that it should be called the *ultima prima*. Besides, the Sabbath never means the new moon. Bucher, *Doctrina Temp.* p. 390. Lamb. in Horat. p. 104. Turneb. *ib.* p. 106. ²¹ Solomon Ben Virgae, *Tribus Juda*, p. 1, 2. ²² Suet. *Tom. II. Cap. XXXIX.* p. 48. *Cap. Not.* p. 176. ²³ Spanheim. *Orb. Roman.* p. 142. ²⁴ Mart. *Lib. VI. Ep.* p. 485. Juvenal. *Sat. 13.* ²⁵ Vossius de Magnit. *Rom. Veter. Cap. IV.* p. 1506. ²⁶ Aringh. *Rom. Subt. Lib. II. Cap. XXII.* p. 236. *Tom. 1.* ²⁷ Hor. *Sat. Lib. I. Sat. 2.* ²⁸ *Sat. Lib. I. Sat. VI.* p. 76. ²⁹ Du Cange. See Cortis. ³⁰ Constant. Porphyrogen. in Basil. *Maced. Cap. XV.* In Allatii *Συμμιτρούς*, *Tom. II. p. 33.* *Τῆς βασιλείας Αὐλίας ἤτοι κόρτης, imperatoria Αὐλας seu Cortinae.* ³¹ Spartan. in Adrian. ³² Nardini *Roma Vetus, Lib. VIII. Cap. III.* ³³ Hor. *Sat. IX. Lib. I.* ³⁴ Du Pin has omitted this passage. ³⁵ Farniani Nardini *Roma Vetus, Lib. VII. Cap. XIII.* p. 1420. ³⁶ Liber de Mirabilibus *Romae*, apud Montfaucon, *Dir. Ital.* 284, 289, 297, etc. ³⁷ See an Apology for great men accused of magic, by Naude. *Chap. XXI.* p. 616. ³⁸ Mart. *Ep. Lib. I.* ³⁹ They were called Galli, quia castrati. Cuper, *Lettre Ms.* ⁴⁰ Nardini *Roma Vetus, Lib. II. Cap. III.* p. 978. Olai Borrichii *Antiqua urbis Romana Facies, Cap. III.* in *Thesaur. Antiquit. Roman. Graevii, Tom. IV.* p. 1531 and 1532. ⁴¹ Juv. *Sat. 3.* ⁴² V. Aringh. *Rom. Subt. Lib. II. Cap. XXI, XXII.* ⁴³ Ovid. *Metamor. Lib. XV. Fab. LI.* ⁴⁴ Marliani *Urbis Romae Topograph. Lib. V. Cap. XVI. XVII.* p. 183. *Thesaur. Ant. Graev. Tom. III.* ⁴⁵ Hor. *Ser. Lib. II. Sat. III. v. 37.* ⁴⁶ V. Fam. *Nard. Roma Vetus, Lib. VIII. Cap. III. ib. Tom. IV. p. 1443.* Montfaucon, *Diar. Ital.* ⁴⁷ Mart. *Ep. Lib. I. Ep. XLII. Lib. XX. Epigr. 46.* ⁴⁸ Juv. *Sat. III, VI.* ⁴⁹ Cophinus means a basket. ⁵⁰ A. D. 40. ⁵¹ Dion, *Cap. Lib. 60,* p. 768. ⁵² Suet. in Claud. *Lib. V. Cap. XXV.* p. 128. ⁵³ Acts 18: 2. ⁵⁴ Baron. *An. 51.* p. 378. ⁵⁵ *Impulsore Chresto.* Suet. p. 120. ⁵⁶ V. Pearson, *Ann. Paulini,* p. 21. ⁵⁷ A. D. 51. ⁵⁸ Acts 28: 10. ⁵⁹ Pers. *Sat. 5.* ⁶⁰ Ps. 118: 25. אַנא ירוּחַ הוֹשִׁיעָה. אַנא ירוּחַ הוֹשִׁיעָה. David repeats the same expression, אַנא ירוּחַ הוֹשִׁיעָה. *Oh Lord, save. Oh Lord, cause to prosper.* ⁶¹ Le Moine. *Var. Sacr. Tom. II. p. 85.* ⁶² הוֹשִׁיעָה יְהוָה, *Heical Jah.* Templum est juramentum per templum Dei. If the reader wishes to see a great number of conjectures on this subject, he may find them in the *Quaest. Sacr. David. Clerici. Quaest. XII.* p. 112. See also the *Hieroicoicon* of Bochart. Vossius, in Pompon. *Mel. reads Jurs per Anianum*, that is, by an ass. ⁶³ A. D. 1644.

CHAPTER TWELFTH.

SETTLEMENT OF THE JEWS IN SPAIN, GERMANY, FRANCE, AND ENGLAND.

I. The conjecture of Marsham respecting the emigration of the Jews to the West, shown to be unfounded. II. The supposed epitaph of Adoniram, an officer of Solomon, found in Spain. III. Whether Solomon sent his fleets to that country. IV. Refutation of this opinion. V. Whether Nabuchodonosor conquered Spain. The prophecy of Obadiah. VI. The countries referred to in that prediction, are all within the bounds of the Holy Land. VII. Fictitious account of the conquest of Spain. VIII. Nabuchodonosor conquered only Asiatic Iberia. IX. Refutation of the arguments of the Jews, in favour of the antiquity of their settlement in Spain. X. Whether Titus sent only the tribe of Judah to Spain. XI. Rejection of the pretensions of the Spanish Jews to a descent from David. Their origin. XII. The letter of the Jews of Ulm shown to be spurious. XIII. The letter of the Jews of Worms respecting the antiquity of the settlement in that city. XIV. The Jews established themselves at an early period in Treves and Cologne. XV. Observations of the author on a criticism of his views respecting the settlement of the Jews in those cities. XVI. In what sense the decurions were magistrates. XVII. The rights and privileges of the decurions. XVIII. Gratitude of the people towards them. XIX. Honours which were attached to the office of decurion. XX. The author vindicates himself against the charges of several critics. XXI. The Jews but little known in Germany for many centuries. XXII. Their settlement in Poland. XXIII. Their settlement in France and England.

I. THE celebrated Marsham has made the extravagant assertion, that the Jews did not emigrate to Europe until they were driven from the East in A. D. 1040, when they spread through France and the neighbouring countries. In refuting this opinion, we need not cite the laws which were enacted by Constantine respecting the Jews of France and of the neighbouring countries, or the regulations which were proposed respecting those of Spain, by the councils of Elvira and Toledo. For the Jews of Europe were numerous and powerful, and boasted of many celebrated Rabbins, long before the eleventh century. The Rabbins of Spain assert, in opposition to Marsham, that their nation was in possession of that country many centuries before the destruction of Jerusalem. We shall here examine the correctness of this statement.

II. In the first place, the Rabbins produce several inscriptions on stone, to prove that Spain was tributary to Solomon, who yearly sent his officers to collect the taxes of that country. These Rabbins were not very considerate to engrave their fictions on stones and tombs. In A. D. 1480, a body of extraordinary size was disinterred at Saguntum, and the following words, in the Hebrew character, were found on the stone which covered it.

זה האבן אדונירם עבד המלך השלמו שבא לנבוא את המס ונפטר יום
 "This is the tomb of Adoniram, the officer of king Solomon, who came to collect the tribute, and who died the day"

When the Rabbins are requested to produce this monument, they are unable to do it; and they say, it is not surprising, that it should be destroyed in the course of one hundred and fifty years. But several manuscripts are still preserved, in which this stone and Hebrew inscription are referred to, and the Scriptures mention an officer of Solomon, who was called *Adoniram*, and who was employed in the collection of the customs.² Villalpand infers from the remarks of the Rabbins, that the Jews had penetrated to Spain in the time of Solomon, and furnished that prince with the treasure which he expended in the construction of his temple. He produces, in support of his opinion, an epitaph in the Hebrew character, which was found on the tomb of a Jew in the city of Saguntum. "This is the tomb of the governour Oran Naban, who rebelled against his king. God supported his cause, and his glory endured to the reign of Amatsia."

III. Some of the critics maintain, that the Jews, in the time of Solomon, sailed to Spain, and established a colony in Andalusia. Posidonius, an ancient Greek author, assures us, that the precious metals were so abundant in Spain, that the mangers and hogsheads were made of silver. Casaubon could not credit this account, and therefore substituted floors for *mangers*. But this is not sufficient, for it is quite as extraordinary that the inhabitants of Spain should make their hogsheads of silver, as their *mangers*.³ We must acknowledge the justness of the remark of Strabo, that Posidonius frequently uses extravagant hyperboles. It is allowed, that Spain at all times could furnish as much of the precious metals as was employed in the construction of the temple of Solomon.

² *Astur avarus*

*Visceribus lacerae telluris mergitur imis,
 Et redit infœelix effuso concolor auro.*⁴

The critics observe, that the city of Tarshish, which was built by the Phenicians, and which was situated near the Pillars of Hercules, was doubtless known to the Jews in the reign of Solomon, as well as in that of Jehoshaphat; and that the reason why the fleets of Solomon were three years in completing their voyage to this city, was, that they coasted along the shores of the Mediterranean, instead of exposing themselves to the dangers of the open sea.

IV. There is no foundation for the opinion, that the Jews settled in Spain during the reign of Solomon, or that he rendered this country tributary. If the tomb of Adoniram had been preserved entire, we should only infer from it, that implicit confidence is not readily to be placed in the supposed monuments of antiquity, which may have been buried by impostors, in order to deceive the credulous. It might appear probable, that the fleets of Solomon visited Spain, had not Bochart clearly shown, that they sailed from the Persian Gulf, and not from the Mediterranean Sea. They sailed to India, and not to Spain. Therefore we cannot suppose that Solomon established a colony in the latter country, and we reject the spurious inscriptions which have been produced in proof of such an event, by the bishop of Mantua. The following words were carved on the stone which was found in the kingdom of Valencia. "Weep for the great captain, whom God has removed from Amatsia." According to Villalpand, the inscription was: "This is the tomb of the officer Oran Nabat, who rebelled against his king. God supported his cause. His glory endured to . . . of Amatsia."⁶ But we can infer nothing with certainty from such inscriptions.

V. It has also been thought, that the Jews passed into Spain with Nabuchodonosor, who pushed his conquests into that country, and thus fulfilled the prediction of Obadiah.⁷ God promised, by that prophet, that "the captivity of the host of the children of Israel should possess the land of the Canaanites unto Zarephath; and the captivity of Jerusalem, which was in Sepharad, should possess the cities of the south."⁸ We are told that the Canaanites are the Germans; that Zarephath is France, and Sepharad, Spain. If we ask why Spain was thus called by the Jews, we are answered, that Sepharad and Spain were both considered as the end of the world. In fact, the Jews did believe that it was impossible to pass

beyond the Pillars of Hercules, because the sun there went down in the waters, and the world ended.

* *In extremos aelium mittebat Iberos.*⁹

St. Jerome was informed, that Sepharad was the Bosphorus, by a learned Rabbin, who asserted that Adrian had sent thither a body of Jews, who would one day return and possess the cities of the south, near Jerusalem.¹⁰ But the Bosphorus and Spain are at a great distance from each other, and there is little probability that the prophet referred to either of these countries.

VI. If we examine this prophecy without prejudice, we shall find that the Holy Land embraced all the countries which are referred to by the prophet. The lands of Ephraim, of Samaria, and of Gilead, were in Palestine.¹¹ The Canaanites, whom the ancient Jews were not able to expel from Zidon and Zarephath, still existed there in the time of our Saviour. Therefore, there is no necessity for substituting the Germans for the Canaanites, and France, for the small city of Zarephath. The country of Sepharad is unknown, but the seventy have removed all difficulty by translating it Ephrata. As their version is more ancient than the Chaldaic paraphrase, and as Aquila read Ephrata for Sepharad, which might have been subsequently inserted, we ought to adopt their interpretation. We can see no reason, in the first place, for seeking Sepharad any where but in the Holy Land, of which Obadiab is speaking in his prophecy. As Spain is called Sepharad only by the modern Jews, we cannot suppose that the prophet had any reference to that country. 2. The ancients erroneously believed, that Spain was the end of the world; and even if they had been correct in this opinion, could we therefore conclude that Spain is Sepharad? 3. The prediction of Obadiah was accomplished by the return of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, and by the partial return of the ten tribes. The former took possession of the cities of the south, and the latter of those places which were marked out by the prophet, and which they continued to occupy under Herod the Great, and in the time of Jesus Christ.

VII. The second supposition, that Nabuchodonosor conquered Spain, is supported by the authority of Megasthenes, who assures us that that prince penetrated to the Pillars of Hercules.¹² He adds, that Africa and Iberia were conquered, and their inhabitants transferred to Pontus by this king.¹³ The Jewish historians boldly

assert, that Nabuchodonosor, assisted by his allies, besieged Jerusalem. He received powerful aid from Hispanus, from whom Spain derived its name, and from Pyrrhus, the king of the Greeks, who united their forces to those of Nabuchodonosor. Jerusalem was taken, and the spoil and prisoners were divided among the conquerors. Nabuchodonosor received as his share all the mechanics who lived between the first and second walls of the city, and Pyrrhus, the house of David and the priests, who lived between the second and third walls.¹⁴ Pyrrhus carried his royal captives and priests to Andalusia, and thence to Toledo. The posterity of David afterwards spread into Seville and the kingdom of Grenada.

VIII. But Megasthenes is a historian unworthy of credit, for he makes Nabuchodonosor a prophet, and tells us that he predicted that a mule should be foaled, which would overthrow the kingdom of Persia.¹⁵ Besides, it is very evident that he has mistaken the European for the Asiatic Iberia, that is, Spain for Georgia. The Jews also have fallen into the same error, for they inform us, that Tubal peopled Sepharad or Spain; but according to Josephus, the descendants of Tubal were the Iberians who lived near the Caspian Sea. It appears more probable, that Nabuchodonosor conquered Georgia, than Spain, which was at too great a distance for him to push his conquests thither. If we suppose him to have subdued Spain, still there is no evidence from sacred or profane history, that he carried the Jews to that country. The history of Hispanus, as given by the Jews, is evidently fabulous.

IX. But we are assured, that the Gothic kings were satisfied of the antiquity of the settlements of the Jews in Spain; for they ordered the laws which they enacted respecting the Jews, to be written in the language which was spoken by the ancient Jews, and which was still in use among their descendants, in order that they might understand the law, and not plead their ignorance, as an excuse for breaking it. As the Jews believed, that Ferdinand and his clergy were about to persecute them for the conduct of their fathers towards Christ, they endeavoured to prove that they were not descended from those who crucified Christ, by producing an inscription on an ancient monument in the city of Toledo. This monument is said to have been erected by a bishop of the city, to inform posterity, that the Jews, the ancient inhabitants, had constantly resided in that city from the erection to the destruction of the

second temple. Hence the Jews infer, that their fathers have been settled in Spain from the destruction of the first temple and from the reign of Nabuchodonosor. But these ancient public monuments, are often supposititious and unworthy of credit. Those who erected them, might laugh at the credulity of posterity. Yet, when they have acquired the venerable marks of antiquity, they are produced us the strongest proofs of the actual occurrence of events. It is with these monuments, as with men recently constituted nobles. We ridicule those who endeavour to rise above the sphere in which they were born, but we soon cease to think of the meanness of their birth, and another generation will look on their families as noble. It is not surprising that the Jews produce these monuments, since many Christians have been induced by them to concede to the Jews the antiquity of their settlements in Spain. St. Luke relates, that there were, at the feast of pentecost, *Jews from every nation under heaven*. He is thought to have referred to the Jews who, many years before, had emigrated to Spain. But the Jews were too much attached to the promised land, to leave it to establish colonies elsewhere. Those who were carried captives to Babylon, either continued there or returned to Judea; and it is therefore ridiculous to suppose that large bodies of the Jews emigrated from Chaldea to Spain.

X. The Jews probably entered Spain during the reigns of Titus or Adrian, who expelled them from Judea and forced them to take refuge in foreign countries. The Chronicle of the Jews relates that Vespasian transported many of their families to Sepharad or Spain. According to Abravanel, the number of these families amounted to fifty thousand. Two of them were descended from David and always ruled over the rest. Abravanel was thought to belong to one of those families, and Rabbi Manesseh, who endeavoured to obtain the government of the Jews both in France and Spain, founded his claim to the throne on his marriage with a daughter of the house of David. Thomas, the defender of the synagogue, in an interview with Alphonso, maintained that the Jews were sent to Spain by the king who destroyed Jerusalem. He agrees with Abravanel, and says that forty thousand families of Judah, and ten thousand of Benjamin, entered Spain. The families of Benjamin removed to France, and thus all the Jews of Spain belonged to the house of David and to the tribe of Judah. Finally,

we are assured that the Gothic kings were descended from Gad, one of the sons of Jacob; for one of his children went to Rome, and there became consul, and his posterity settled in the north of Europe. It is easy to show how unfounded are the claims of the Spanish Jews, who boast their descent from David and from Judah, while there is nothing to distinguish them from, or raise them above their countrymen. The Spanish Jews have acquired the habit of making high pretensions to birth, from the country in which they live.

XI. We can offer only three conjectures as to the origin of the Jews in Spain. 1. That they sprung from the Jews who accompanied Herod to Spain, whither he was exiled and where he died. This supposition would appear still more probable, if we could believe that Herod dethroned the king of Spain, (who was guilty of incest with his own sister in law,) and made himself master of the country. But how could an exiled king subdue a province of the Roman empire? Moreover, the attendants of Herod did not belong to the tribe of Benjamin, nor to the house of David and tribe of Judah. They were probably Galileans, who followed their tetrarch, and who could not return to their native country, on account of its distance and the difficulties of the journey. 2. When Jerusalem was taken by Titus, it was filled with Parthians, Elamites, Medes, and other foreign Jews, who had gone up to that city to keep the passover. If Titus sent any of his prisoners to Spain, is there any probability that he would have taken care to preserve the distinction of tribes, and to have separated the tribe of Judah from the others, to be transported to that country? According to Josephus, the emperor exposed the Jews for sale like brutes. The prisoners were all collected in the market-place, and the merchants from various countries purchased them without any reference to the tribes to which they belonged. Finally, if a colony consisting of fifty thousand families was sent to Spain, how has it happened that Josephus has not mentioned it? Even the pagan historians have given us an account of the Jews who were sent to Sardinia by Tiberius; and is it probable that Josephus, who was so deeply interested in all that concerned his nation, should have known nothing of this Spanish colony of three hundred thousand souls, if such a colony actually existed? He doubtless would have mentioned an event like this, rather than that general sale of the Jewish captives,

which covered his nation with disgrace. 3. The tribes were entirely blended together in the time of Adrian. The remnant of the tribes of Judah and Benjamin were left at Jerusalem, and a few families afterwards reestablished themselves there in the service of the Roman garrison, and enjoyed some intervals of rest. But Adrian did not collect forty thousand families of Judah and ten thousand of Benjamin, in order to assign them lands in Spain. We must be entirely ignorant of the manner in which they were treated by this prince, before we can make such a supposition. 4. Since neither Titus nor Adrian sent a colony of Jews to Spain, we must suppose, either that they were carried to that country by the merchants who purchased them in Judea, or that they sought there, as in other parts of the Roman empire, for a place of safety, which they could not find in Judea. But the Jews of Spain were in no respect superiour to their countrymen elsewhere, excepting in riches and power. The Abravanel, and the other branch of the house of David, were rival candidates for supreme power among these Jews, and according to the Rabbins, both families became extinct in the twelfth century. It is very certain, that the Jews were established in Spain early in the Christian era; for the council of Elvira, one of the first which was held, passed several resolutions respecting them.¹⁶

XII. The Jews pretend that they emigrated to Germany, as well as Spain, previous to the destruction of their temple. In A. D. 1348, the original of a letter was found at Ulm, which had been written from Jerusalem to the Jews of Germany, to inform them of the death of Christ.¹⁷ The letter was as follows: "To the Jews of Ulm in Suabia, greeting. We have reason to praise God, for Jesus of Nazareth, the son of Joseph, is dead. We could no longer endure his blasphemies, and therefore we accused him before the Roman pretor, who listened to our charges. He ordered Jesus to be scourged and crucified according to his deserts. His disciples are dispersed. God preserve you." This letter is spurious. The impostor who wrote it, intended to hasten the destruction of the Jews of Ulm; and he did not write in Hebrew characters, because his letter would have been useless in a language with which the priests and people were but slightly acquainted.

XIII. The Jews of Worms pretend to have produced convincing proof to the emperonr and to the states of the empire, that they had inhabited that city from time immemorial; and, therefore, that

they could have taken no part in the crucifixion of Christ.¹⁸ Thus they obtained privileges, which were not granted to other Jews. It was with a view to ingratiate themselves with the emperor, that they inserted in the *Toldos Jeschu*, an extract from a letter, which was written by the sanhedrim of Worms to the king of Judea, to prevent the death of Christ. "Set this Jesus at liberty and do not put him to death. Let him live until he has contracted some stain, and has become polluted."¹⁹ Huldreich, who published the above treatise with learned notes, observes, that the expressions respecting our Saviour are borrowed from sacrifices. The Jews did not eat, nor offer on the altar, any sacrificial animal which was thought to be impure or diseased. It was fed with great care until some symptoms of disease appeared. Thus the Jews of Worms advised that Jesus Christ should be left to commit some crime, and then be put to death. But, he adds, that this extract was inserted by the author of the treatise, to render the Jews of Worms odious to their countrymen. I am persuaded, however, that the writer of this work, was a member of the synagogue of Worms, to whose prejudices he has conformed, in order to gain the favour of the emperor. In fact, the synagogue boasted, that they had protected our Saviour, and this writer, one of their number, probably adopted their views. If they were rendered odious in the opinion of their countrymen, they were amply compensated by the superiour privileges which they obtained from Christian princes. Another Rabbi has made the Caraites say, that "Jesus Christ approved of their doctrines, and wished his disciples to practise their rites; and that he was slain by the Jews on account of their hatred to the law of Moses." This doctor makes but a slight difference between the sentiments of Christ and those of the Caraites, and that difference to refer to the manner in which the dead are to rise. But the Rabbi of Worms has attributed a different sentiment to his ancestors. According to him, they held nearly the language of Gamaliel. "Let him alone; if this work be of man, it will come to nought."²⁰ It is of little importance for us to ascertain what was the intention of the above Rabbi in writing his treatise. It is sufficient to remark, that there is no foundation for the pretensions of the Jews of Worms, who assert that they established themselves in Germany before the destruction of the second temple, and possessed a venerable council, which was consulted by the king of the Jews,

on important matters. The Jews in the bishopric of Mersburg make equal pretensions to antiquity, but they produce no proofs of the validity of their claims.

XIV. It has been satisfactorily ascertained, that the Jews have resided at Treves and Cologne from the time of Adrian. In the reign of Constantine they held such a rank in these cities, that an edict was passed by which the magistrates of Cologne were empowered to select Jews for the office of decurion.²¹ This edict has occasioned much difficulty to the interpreters of the laws.²² They supposed that the edict of Severus, which was irrevocable, was confirmed by the statute of Constantine, which was thought to confer a privilege on the Jews, because it permitted them to be decurions. But there are some offices which are a burden; and thus it was with that of the decurion, not only in Treves and Cologne, but throughout the empire. This is evident from Ammianus Marcellinus, who reproaches Julian, because he had taken away the privileges of those who had been exempted from holding the office of decurions.²³ The magistrates of Treves and Cologne represented to Constantine, that the exemption of the Jews from the duties of this office rendered it the more burdensome to the other inhabitants. Constantine declared, that the Jews might be chosen decurions. It is plain that he did not consider this as a privilege, for those whom the magistrates selected for the office, were not allowed to decline. The emperor exempted those who held any station in the synagogue, from the duties of police officers; whence it is clear, that such offices were considered a burden, and the liberty of declining them, a privilege. Constantine, in this manner, annulled the irrevocable edict of Severus, and forced the Jews of Germany to share in the burdens of government; which is a proof that they were numerous and powerful in that country, during the reigns of Severus and Constantine.

XV. As my remarks on the decurions, in the first edition of this work, have been criticised, especially where I have spoken of them as magistrates;²⁴ it is necessary to treat more at large of the situation of the Jews at Treves, and of the offices which they held.²⁵

XVI. In the first place, we must distinguish the decurions, from the Duumviri, and from the superiour magistrates of the city, who complained to Constantine that the exemption of the Jews

from the decurionate, rendered it burdensome to the other inhabitants. If the decurions had been municipal magistrates, there would have been no complaint because the Jews could not be elected, as well as the other citizens. I did remark that Constantine passed a law which imposed the duties of magistrates on the Jews. But there are two kinds of magistrates; the first, honourable and superiour; the second, inferiour, and their office a burden. The decurions were called by the Greeks *Βουλευται*, *counsellors*, which proves that they belong to the second class of magistrates.

XVII. It was the duty of the decurion to select the spots where statues and public monuments were to be erected. The fragment of an inscription, which father Mabillon has preserved, proves that this duty appertained at Rome to the overseer of the public works. This inscription was as follows: "Locus adsignatus ab Nigro Cosconiano Cur. operum publicorum." A learned author has substituted *Cosciano*, for *Cosconiano*, and united this fragment with the following inscription, also preserved by father Mabillon: "Cemitorium Rufum Albinum V. C. Cons. Philosophum."²⁶ In the colonies, the decurions performed the above duties, as is evident from the letters L. D. D. D. which are found at the end of many inscriptions.²⁷

APOLLINI BELENO. AVG. TIB. CLARISTIO ET. CORNELIAE. Q. TICILAN CONVX. CVM. FILIS. CLAVD CONSTANTE. FEROCIANO EVTICHIANAE. AERISTIONE EX. VOTO. POSVER. SIGNVM CVPIDINIS. L. D. D. D. Belenus, the patron god of Aquileia, has been thought by some interpreters to be Mars, but from the above inscription, he was evidently Apollo. The four last letters stand for *Locus Datus Decreto Decurionum*. Finally, the decurions had the right of making laws and regulations, and were therefore called *the Senate*. They also conferred certain offices on individuals, at the request of the people.

XVIII. It sometimes happened that the people, grateful to their benefactors, conferred on them some office which they were said to receive *Populi Beneficio*, *Populi Postulatione*.

C. LVCIVS. C. F. MANIACVS ETC. IIII. VIR. I. D. POPVLI. BENEFICIO.

But the people were obliged to apply to the decurions in order to confer honours on their favourites. It is therefore evident that the decurions enjoyed some privileges and honours, and there can be no objection to the title of *magistrate*, which I have given them.

XIX. Although the duties of the decurion were burdensome, for the care of the public lands was committed to him, still there was some honour attached to the office, and according to Ulpian, it was a disgrace to be excluded from it. The unworthy were sometimes deprived of it for two years. "Ordine decurionum te biennio abstinere jussit." The president having detected a lawyer, who had been guilty of forgery, deprived him of the office of decurion for ten years. "Ordine decurionum decem annis advocatum motum, qui falsum instrumentum," etc.²⁸ These officers often exercised such authority, that they were considered tyrants; and Salvianus reproaches them for their severity and injustice. "Quot curiales fuerint, tot tyranni sint."²⁹ They thought it an honour to be called tyrants; for though the title was odious, still it indicated their dignity. Finally, the decurions were rewarded as well as honoured. A rich individual left a sum of money, the interest of which was yearly appropriated by his will to feasting the decurions.³⁰ Accordingly, we may call the decurions magistrates, although they did not exercise the authority of the superiour magistrates.

XX. Those who have objected to my remarks, must allow, that I have attributed the perpetual and irrevocable edict which rendered the Jews eligible to office, to the emperour Severus. I have asserted this in two places.³¹ I have quoted Spartian, who has mentioned the fact, and have examined the causes which induced Severus, who at one time hated the Jews, afterwards to raise them to municipal offices. One reason may be found in his avarice; for the Jews purchased places of trust at an extravagant price; and a second, in their loyalty; for they did not side with Pescennius Niger. In the second place, I have cited the confirmation of the irrevocable edict of Septimius, by Alexander Severus. "Judaeis privilegia reservavit," says Lampadius. Finally, I have maintained that Constantine repeated this law; for the magistrates complained that the duties of certain offices were burdensome to the inhabitants of Cologne, because the Jews were exempted from them; which affords a proof that they were numerous in that city.

XXI. It is not surprising that but few Jews were to be found in Germany during the succeeding centuries; for that extensive country was inhabited by barbarous nations who held but little intercourse

with foreigners. They continued, however, to reside at Treves and Cologne, and thence spread into other places, as the inhabitants became civilized. In the tenth century, the Jews were already so numerous in Bohemia, that they afforded signal aid in the destruction of robbers, to the natives of that country, who, in gratitude for their assistance, allowed them to build a synagogue at Prague.

XXII. The Jews were expelled from the East in the following century, and joined their countrymen in Germany and the neighbouring kingdoms of Hungary and Poland.³² Villalpand supposed that they settled very early in the latter country, because he was informed by the Polish ambassadour at Naples, that a tomb had been opened there, in which was found a skeleton of gigantic size. A ring on one of its fingers was as large as a common bracelet.³³ This tomb was supposed to belong to a Jew, who had lain there since the happy times when the Jewish commonwealth was in its glory; for a vast number of silver shekels, like the currency of the Jews, were found in the tomb. Villalpand adds, that as Agrippa asserts that Jews had penetrated into Pontus long before his time, we cannot doubt that they had also emigrated to Poland, previous to the birth of Christ. But his proofs are so weak, that it is astonishing so able a man should have produced them.

XXIII. The Jews were established in many provinces of France about the middle of the fifth century; but previous to this time, their numbers in that country had been inconsiderable. They passed into England at a still later period; and in both countries they have had synagogues, academies, and learned men.

¹ Villalpand, Tom. II. p. 644. ² Villalp. Explan. in Ezech. Lib. V. Disp. III. Cap. LVIII. Tom. II. p. 544. ³ Φάττας. He reads, Φαττωματα. Posidon. apud Strabo. Lib. III. p. 155. ⁴ Sil. Ital. Lib. I. Vers. 28. ⁵ Gonzaga apud Villalp. ⁶ Hottinger de Cippis Hebraicis. Nicolai. de Sep. Hebraeon. Villalp. in Ezech. 20: 4. ibid. ⁷ Obad. vers. 20. ⁸ The reading in Obadiah is בִּשְׁפָרַד , *Bisepharad*, in *Sepharad*, which the Jews supposed to be one word, and translated it the *Bosphorus*. ⁹ Claudianus. ¹⁰ Hieron. in Abdiam, V. 20. p. 222. ¹¹ Vers. 12. ¹² Apud Strabo. Lib. III. ¹³ Apud. Euseb. Chron. Graec. Lib. I. p. 41. ¹⁴ Sol. Ben Virgae, p. 41. ¹⁵ Cyrus. ¹⁶ Concil. Illiber. Can. 49, 50, 78. ¹⁷ This is confirmed by a remark of Eusebius, in Comment. p. 424. Isaiah. Edit. Paris. 1606. Tom. II. He observes that the Jews wrote to all the synagogues in the world, to inform them of the death of Christ. They sent

letters even to Ethiopia, and to this event they apply the words of Isaiah 18: 1, 2. "Woe to the land shadowing with wings," etc. ¹⁸ Wagens. Lipman. Confut. Tom. II. p. 215. ¹⁹ Huldreich, Toldos Jeschu, *Hist. Jeru.*, p. 82. ²⁰ Acts 5: 34—39. ²¹ A. D. 312, 321, 331. ²² Cod. Theod. Lib. XVI. Tit. VIII. Lib. II, III, IV. p. 221. ²³ Ammian. Lib. XXV. Cap. V. p. 463. ²⁴ The Dissertation on the establishment of the Jews in France, by Father Liron. ²⁵ See History of the reclaimed Jews, p. 268. Diss. of Father Liron, p. 10, 14. ²⁶ Analecta, Tom. IV. p. 494. ²⁷ Apud Phil. a Turre, Monumenta veteris Antii, p. 259. ²⁸ Brisson. de Form. Lib. V. p. 5438. ²⁹ Vide Salvianum de Gubernatione Dei, Lib. V. p. 89. ³⁰ Brisson. Lib. VII. ³¹ History of the Jews, Tom. VI. Chap. VII. p. 1084. and Chap. XII. p. 1184, of the first edition. ³² A. D. 997. Ganz, Zernach David, Lib. II. p. 181. ³³ Villalp. in Ezech. Tom. II. Chap. LVIII. p. 443.

FINIS.

CORRIGENDA IN THE TRANSLATION FROM BASNAGE.

Page 521, line 25, *dele* who carried every thing to extremes. P. 522, 35, read 18 years. P. 327, 24, read 18th year. P. 528, 16, for deformed body read slovenly habit. P. 533, 1, for and that he was read who was not. P. 537, 5, for foresaw read added. P. 540, 5, read 24,000 disciples. 12, read 24,000 followers. P. 545, 22, for 1:9 read 136. P. 546, 12, for otherwise he would not have read because he did not. 16, for he here refers read this was owing. for occasional read suffered from. P. 550, 24, read 700 years. P. 566, 20, after or read mentioned by. P. 571, 35, after Germany read Franco. P. 574, 5, read 12,000 families. P. 586, 19, read 16 days. P. 588, 3, read 1,500 Jewish. P. 603, 20, for Danites read Danois. P. 612, 14, for press read manuscript. P. 614, 32, read gave their own name to their manufactures. P. 615, 9, read 20,000 professors. P. 625, 26, for infers read does not prove. P. 680, 31, for floors read ceilings.