Theology on the Web.org.uk

Making Biblical Scholarship Accessible

This document was supplied for free educational purposes. Unless it is in the public domain, it may not be sold for profit or hosted on a webserver without the permission of the copyright holder.

If you find it of help to you and would like to support the ministry of Theology on the Web, please consider using the links below:

https://www.buymeacoffee.com/theology

https://patreon.com/theologyontheweb

PayPal https://paypal.me/robbradshaw

A table of contents for *The Evangelical Quarterly* can be found here:

https://biblicalstudies.org.uk/articles_evangelical_quarterly.php

Philip E. Hughes, "The Jewish Problem in the Ancient World," The Evangelical Quarterly 12.3 (July 1940): 247-274.

THE JEWISH PROBLEM IN THE ANCIENT WORLD

THE Jewish Problem is not peculiar to the present day, nor even to the Christian Era; its roots are grounded in the soil of earlier days, and by the commencement of this age it had sprung up into a growth of no uncertain form.

Why is it that during the lapse of many centuries the name of Jew has been a name of scorn and reproach? Why is it that the Jew has been the international scapegoat against whom have been directed the calumny, malice, and opprobrium of every people with whom they have come in contact? The Jew constitutes the great enigma of history. Though suppressed time and time again, he has shewn himself in the end irrepressible; though persecuted beyond measure, he has proved that he is inexterminable and his spirit inextinguishable. Certainly in outlook and manners he was widely different from the other peoples of the civilized world (and this fact has an important bearing on our subject); but all nations are by nature characterized by notable dissimilarities—dissimilarities, however, which for the most part may be modified and even completely done away with as the result of mingling and intercourse with other nations and the appropriation of their culture and customs. Yet with the Jews this was by no means the case: in the ancient world they remained exclusive. Great empires have vanished, and illustrious nations have lost their glory and identity; but the Jew, despite all the changing fortunes and adversities of his destiny, still persists, distinctive, individualistic, and unassimilated. Martin Buber has remarked (*Kampf um Israel*): "The Jewish people has become the eternal people not because it was allowed to live, but because it was not allowed to live. Just because it was asked to give more than life, it won life." In these few simple words he has epitomized the never-ceasing struggle of the Jew for existence; but his estimate of the reason for their survival, though no doubt it explains in some measure at least the enigma of the "Eternal People", falls short of

providing an adequate and final explanation. His tenacity, his will to live, does not of itself satisfactorily account for the survival of the Jew and the retention of his individuality. Other minorities have struggled bravely—and sometimes for a while successfully—against suppression and submersion, only in the end to be wiped out, either with the sword, or by the more subtle and less drastic process of assimilation and intermarriage until they have become part and parcel in name and appearance with the stock of their conquerors. Of course, the very fight against an oppressor for existence has on notable occasions raised an insignificant minority to the heights of victory and conquest and prosperity. It is thus that great empires have arisen. But not so the Jews. They have neither disappeared off the face of the earth, nor have they ever been the founders of a mighty empire. Only for a comparatively brief period have they possessed a country which they could justly call their own; and for centuries as aliens and wanderers on the face of the globe they have suffered reproach and persecution. How, then, one may well ask, and for what purpose has the Jew so persistently survived? And it is here that we are faced with the everlasting riddle of the Jew.

In the following pages it will be seen that during the classical age it was the Hellenistic culture which, in its conquest of the civilized world, threatened more than anything else to overwhelm and annihilate the very elements of the Jewish spirit. Even under the Roman sway this conflict with Hellenism was, and had to be, carried on unremittingly, for the reason that culturally and intellectually the Empire was reared on a foundation of Hellenistic thought and learning. It will be discovered, too, that in many instances the main evidences and symptoms of the Jewish problem in the ancient world resemble to a remarkable degree the manifestations of the same problem at the present day. We are dealing, to all intents and purposes, with an eternal people and an eternal problem.

. . . . .

I

The Formation of the Jewish Spirit

When the people of Judah were carried into the Babylonian captivity in 586 B.C. the predictions of the prophets were

fulfilled. At length had fallen the dire, but just, retribution for their apostasy which the devout men among the people had foreseen, and, temporarily at any rate, their national independence was a thing of the past. The shock of the exile was sufficient, however, to turn the thoughts of many of the people back to their homeland and ruined temple, and to arouse the burning desire to return and rebuild home and temple, and thenceforth to serve their God with unswerving allegiance. But, it was also during the period of this exile that the Jewish problem had its beginnings. There was an unforeseen danger that the Jews, in contrast with their former faithlessness, would proceed, as it were, to the opposite extreme, and with a fresh, but proud, zeal strive even to surpass in their actions and observances the demands of the divine ordinances by the addition of numerous self-imposed rules and regulations, which had no place in their law. This, indeed, was what actually came to pass; and from it there sprang that spirit of national exclusiveness and intolerance which was to make the Jewish people odious to every other race.

It is a remarkable thing that within fifty years of the subjugation of the Babylonian sway by Cyrus—i.e. in 536 B.C. —the Jews were to be found scattered in every corner of the vast Persian empire, which extended from India in the east to Ethiopia in the west, and consisted of a hundred and twenty-seven provinces (v. Esther i. 1; iii. 8; and Jos. Antiqq. XI, vi. 5). This dispersion was in many respects characteristic and prototypical of the final and complete dispersion of the Jews which was to take place some six centuries later on. It was under these circumstances, then, that, amongst a section of the Jews at least, there came about a national reawakening, a zealous return to the faith of their fathers, and an uncompromising turning of the back on the outsider and his influence, who, it was felt, could only bring contamination into their midst; truly, were they not faced with the dreadful example of their apostate forebears? There was a new singleness of heart amongst them; and, yet, how could they, exiles in a land of strangers who worshipped false gods, far removed from their beloved Holy City, be expected to live conscientiously the holy life which their law demanded of them? They yearned for repatriation, and a fresh start. The psalmist has depicted with touching beauty the repentance and the nostalgia of the exiles:

"By the rivers of Babylon,
There we sat down, yea, we wept,
When we remembered Zion.
Upon the willows in the midst thereof
We hanged up our harps.
For there they that led us captive required of us songs,
And they that wasted us required of us mirth, saying,
Sing us one of the songs of Zion.
How shall we sing the Lord's song
In a strange land?
If I forget thee, O Jerusalem,
Let my right hand forget her cunning.
Let my tongue cleave to the roof of my mouth,
If I remember thee not;
If I prefer not Jerusalem
Above my chief joy." (Ps. 137.)

And in the following poem is described, again in lines of surpassing beauty, their joy at the restoration to their very own land:

"When the Lord turned again the captivity of Zion,
We were like unto them that dream.
Then was our mouth filled with laughter,
And our tongue with singing:
Then said they among the nations,
The Lord hath done great things for them.
The Lord hath done great things for us;
Whereof we are glad.
Turn again our captivity, O Lord,
As the streams in the South.
They that sow in tears shall reap in joy.
Though he goeth on his way weeping, bearing forth the seed;
He shall come again with joy, bringing his sheaves with him."
(Ps. 126.)

The Jewish spirit had had its conception, and had been brought forth, in an alien land. But in the ensuing centuries it grew up a bastard monster. True, the ancient irresponsibility and waywardness had given way to a sense of duty and a determination to avoid at all costs the errors of their forefathers; and nobody would deny that such an ambition was entirely commendable. But the failing of the Jew in general was that he seemed unable to prevent himself from going to extremes. Of old he had mixed freely with all and sundry, and in his perversity had learnt nothing but harmful lessons from the outsider; now he began to hold himself aloof from the men of other races and to adopt an exclusive, overweening attitude towards all who were not of his persuasion. Neither behaviour could be

justified by the laws of Moses, and the latter, just as much as the former, was detrimental to the best interests of the Jews as a people, and, in the end, disastrous in that it constituted the root cause of "antisemitism" in olden times.

. . . . . .

II

The First Evidences of Anti-Jewish Feeling

In the book of Esther there is considerable evidence to the effect that at that time there already existed an attitude of contempt and animosity towards the Jews. In the first place, Esther, in accordance with the advice of her uncle, Mordecai, took good care to conceal her nationality from the king and the palace officials (Esther ii. 10). Josephus also says (Antiqq. XI, vi. 2) that Esther was married "without making known to the king what nation she was derived from". Why was this, if not for the reason that the Jewish race was held in disrepute among the Persians? It is quite evident, too, that Haman despised the Jews, whatever his own personal reasons may have been for doing so. It was his vindictive temperament that brought into being the first recorded attempt at organized and authorised discrimination against the Jews, as described in this book. The portion of this narrative which contains the most interest for us is the anti-Jewish "Bill" which he brought before the king. It read as follows:

"There is a certain people scattered abroad and separated (R.V. margin) among the peoples in all the provinces of thy kingdom; and their laws are diverse from those of every people: neither keep they the king's laws; therefore it is not for the king's profit to suffer them. If it please the king, let it be written that they be destroyed: and I will pay ten thousand talents of silver into the hands of those that have the charge of the king's business, to bring it into the king's treasuries." (III, 8, 9.)

The record of Josephus is somewhat fuller, and also very interesting. He says that

"Haman came to the king, and accused them, saying: 'There is a certain wicked nation, and it is dispersed over all the habitable earth that is under thy dominion; a nation separate from others, unsociable, neither admitting the same sort of divine worship that others do, nor using laws like to the laws of others, at enmity with thy people and with all men, both in their manners and practices. Now, if thou wilt be a benefactor to thy subjects, thou wilt give order to destroy them utterly, and not to leave the least remains of them, nor preserve any of them,

either for slaves or for captives'. But that the king might not be damnified by the loss of the tributes which the Jews paid him, Haman promised to give him out of his own estate forty thousand talents whensoever he pleased; and he said he would pay this money very willingly, that the kingdom might be freed from such a misfortune." (Antiqq. XI, vi, 5.)

There can be little doubt that Josephus' account is expanded and exaggerated for the sake of impressiveness—for example, in comparison with the Biblical narrative, he quadruples the amount which Haman offered the king as compensation. But the points that carry significance are Haman's intense hatred of the Jews on the one hand, and the averred exclusiveness and unsociableness of the Jews on the other; unmistakable indications that the Jewish problem had had its commencement.

III

Traditional Formalism and the Unwritten Law

One of the first things that Cyrus did after his conquest of Babylon was to authorize the return of the Jews to their homeland under the leadership of Zerubbabel, to whom he restored the temple vessels which Nebuchadnezzar had carried off, and entrusted the supervision of the building of a new temple in Jerusalem (Ezra I). Of the exiles not more than fifty thousand went back with Zerubbabel. The majority, it seems, preferred to remain in the Persian empire where they had been born and educated; the patriotic spirit had not gripped them, not did the hardships, which would inevitably confront those who returned, hold out any enticement for them to leave the comfortable homes which they had established in the territory of their conquerors. As it was, fully twenty years elapsed before the new temple was finally completed and dedicated, and that, too, only after frequent interruptions, due either to opposition from without or to negligence from within.

In 457 B.C., that is some sixty years after the dedication of the new temple, Ezra, with the sanction of Artaxerxes Longimanus, led a further contingent of about six thousand exiles back to Jerusalem (Ezra vii, viii). Thirteen years later the same king sent Nehemiah to see to the rebuilding of the capital (Neh. ii). With the whole-hearted support of Nehemiah, who proved to be a vigorous and able governor, Ezra became the prophet of the Jewish reformation. The spirit of the re-

formation, as already intimated, had had its beginnings in the land of exile; but the ideals of the reformation had their realization in the "Promised Land".

The Jews—who from now on are constituted only of those who had availed themselves of the opportunity of repatriation; the rest in the course of time lost their identity —had once more regained their national status, and to a considerable extent their national independence, although Judaea remained officially under the Persian sway and was consistently taxed as a vassal state. In all matters they were treated leniently and with liberality, nor were the peculiarities of their way of living frowned upon or discouraged. Indeed, this subjugation was by no means intolerable or unpleasant, and it allowed the Jews adequate scope for spiritual and intellectual advancement.

Ezra's divine charge was, like Moses before him, to call the people back to the worship of the true and only God and to the observance of the law. But the circumstances were different from those which prevailed in Moses' day: the people were repentant and, for the most part, eager to walk in accordance with the pentateuchal teachings; and Ezra's task was in proportion an easier one than that of Moses. Ezra, the Levites, and certain others whose names are given, read to the assembled populace from the books of the law—a procedure requiring seven sessions on consecutive days—, and they

"caused the people to understand the law. . . . And they read in the book, in the law of God, with an interpretation; and they gave the sense, and caused them to understand the reading" (Neh. viii. 7, 8; R.V. margin).

The response was immediate and remarkable: the people, hearing the words of the Scriptures, were moved to tears, and pledged themselves by a solemn covenant

"to walk in God's law, which was given by Moses the servant of God, and to observe and to do all the commandments of the Lord our Lord, and his judgments and His statutes" (Neh. x. 29).

Ezra's cherished aim had been

"to seek the law of the Lord, and to do it, and to teach in Israel statutes and judgments" (Ezra vii. 10).

And he achieved his purpose with an outstanding measure of success. For this memorable work Ezra came to be regarded

with great veneration in the succeeding centuries: he was looked upon, not without some cause, almost as a second Moses, and as the reviver and revitalizer of the "Faith of the Fathers". The Rabbinical tradition states that

"when the law was forgotten of Israel, Ezra went up from Babel and founded it";

and, again:

"Ezra was worthy that the law should have been given through him to Israel, if it had not been that Moses preceded him."

It was felt, quite rightly, that Ezra's work should not die with him, and it soon became the custom for men who were well versed in the teachings of Moses to expound and interpret the law in suitable meeting-places three or four days of each week. These expositors who followed in Ezra's footsteps came to be known as the Sopherim, or Scribes, and constituted a recognized body of men who by their offices guided and controlled the spiritual life of the people of Judaea. So long as they adhered faithfully to the written law and inculcated its teachings, as Moses and Ezra had done previously, there was every likelihood that their fatherland would benefit and prosper, both internally and in its intercourse with other nations. But presently a new and subtle evil began to shew itself, an evil which in all probability had had its inception during the years of captivity, but now was coming openly to the surface gradually to permeate the whole mass of Jewry. This was the evil of traditionalism, which came to be superimposed, in ever increasing proportions, upon the body of the law, and to take precedence over the Word of God itself. A mass of unwritten precepts came into being which were zealously memorized, added to, and handed down along the line of the Rabbinical succession. It was not until well into the Christian era that these traditions were written down and incorporated as the Talmud; but, nevertheless, their influence was extensive and pernicious long before the Talmud was edited, and this is all the more readily understood when it is realised that the Pharisees, who became easily the most powerful and popular of the Jewish sects, were the great champions and propagandists of the formalities of the unwritten law.

The Mosaic teaching itself expressly forbade the addition of anything whatsoever to its precepts (v. Deut. iv. 2), and so it is undeniable that the Rabbinites and Pharisees were going counter to the very laws of Moses in fostering and imposing these traditional doctrines. There can be little doubt that a desire for self-gratification and a spirit of chauvinistic arrogance were prime agents in generating these dogmas, with the result that the Jews came to spurn and shun outsiders. And this, too, was contrary to the injunctions of the Mosaic code, in which they were exhorted to love foreigners as themselves—there could be no mistaking the terms:

"If a stranger sojourn with thee in your land, ye shall not do him wrong. The stranger that sojourneth with you shall be unto you as the homeborn among you, and thou shalt love him as thyself; for ye were strangers in the land of Egypt" (Lev. xix. 33, 34; v. also Ex. xxii. 21, et al.).

This embittered attitude of superiority, with its resultant overbearing contempt for strangers and foreigners, was the most obvious, and at the same time the most baneful, manifestation of the effects of the Rabbinical teachings.

The whole of this system of traditionalism was built up of innumerable nugatory rites and ceremonies, an elaborate formalistic code of falsified requirements, an intricate accumulation of dogmas demanding the painstaking observance of pettifogging and hypocritical non-essentials, which were so stressed as to lead the misguided followers of the Pharisaic teaching to believe that in their fulfilment lay the be-all and end-all of their religion. They constituted a rigmarole of rules and prohibitions, all arising from the dread of sacrilege or contamination, and dealing with the swearing of oaths, the washing of hands and utensils, the purification of clothing and houses, the eating of different kinds of meats, and the defilement resulting from contact with Gentiles.

Jesus Himself was under no illusions about the character of the scribes and Pharisees, nor did He scruple to veil His sentiments, as His slashing and ruthless indictment of their impostures in the twenty-third chapter of Matthew shews. The following is an extract:

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye tithe mint and anise and cummin, and have left undone the weightier matters of the law, judgment, and mercy, and faith: but these ye ought to have done, and not to have left the

other undone. Ye blind guides, which strain out the gnat, and swallow the camel. Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye cleanse the outside of the cup and the platter, but within they are full from extortion and excess. Thou blind Pharisee, cleanse first the inside of the cup and of the platter, that the outside thereof may become clean also.

"Woe unto you, scribes and Pharisees, hypocrites! for ye are like unto whited sepulchres, which outwardly appear beautiful, but inwardly are full of dead men's bones and of all uncleanness. Even so ye also outwardly appear righteous unto men, but inwardly ye are full of hypocrisy and iniquity" (Matt. xxiii. 23-28).

Such a denunciation lays bare the very soul of Pharisaism.

It is here, then, in this unwritten, traditional gospel of the scribes and Pharisees, which they reared, augmented, and disseminated far and wide, a sheer travesty of the original Mosaic law, that we are to discover the prime and root cause of the Jewish problem. This wretched system infected the greater part of Jewry with the contagion of an inordinate national and religious pride and deceived them with hallucinations of a self-inflated exclusiveness. Its effect was to kindle in the breast of the non-Jew the spark of resentment and vindictiveness which was liable at any moment to be fanned into the flame of anti-Jewish rioting and persecution.

IV

Judaism and Hellenism

It was not until Alexander the Great had carried out his conquests in the east that the Jews were really brought face to face with the culture of the Greeks, though there is evidence that Jew had come into contact with Greek long before that time. For instance, Herodotus (vii. 89) speaks of "Syrians from Palestine" as being amongst the Persian hosts that invaded Greece at the commencement of the fifth century B.C., and even during the two hundred years preceding this reference to Javan—that is Ionia—is found in the writings of Isaiah (lxvi. 19; c. 700 B.C.), Ezekiel (xxvii. 13; c. 600 B.C.), and Zechariah (ix. 13; c. 500 B.C.). But it fell to Alexander to sow the seeds of the Greek culture, which after his death sprang up and spread, a luxuriant growth, throughout the countries of the Near East.

Between Judaism and Hellenism there was not much in common. Perhaps at first sight the most striking differences were to be found in the religious viewpoints of the two peoples.

The Jews, on the one hand, worshipped the one supreme and omnipotent God, the eternal "I Am", Who through the prophets, His messengers, had vouchsafed them a clearly-defined collection of precepts and instructions, dealing with their relationships to Himself and to their fellowmen. The Scriptures were for them the only repository of truth and the sole text-book of ethical and spiritual standards. Sin, or the breaking of the divine laws, was to them an ever-present reality and danger, which could be expiated only by means of special sacrifices. Their conception of the Good and the Beautiful was indissolubly bound up with their conception of Holiness, that ultimate perfection which so essentially typified the character of the Godhead. Nothing could be better, nothing more beautiful, than the evidence, imperfect in measure though it might be, of holiness in a man's life and habits. And so the constant care of the sincere and thoroughgoing Jew was how to become more holy, and his constant aim the fulfilment of the demands made upon him by the divine commandments. The positiveness of his objective and the nature of his faith removed for him all the different perplexities of life and death and the infinitude of the universe; they were all gathered up and explained in God, the Creator and Regulator of everything, the final All in All.

The Greek, on the other hand, was not concerned with introspective inquisitions; his thoughts were turned outward and away from himself, and in consequence he was not troubled with the admonitions of conscience in the same manner as the Jew. For him the Good and the Beautiful were inextricably interdependent—what was good was necessarily beautiful, and what was beautiful was essentially good. And so he peopled the skies with divine beings who possessed bodies that were perfect in their porportions; the sculptor chiselled the figures of ideal manhood and womanhood; and all alike strove by the exercises of the gymnasia to acquire a beautiful and regular muscular development. Further, the religion of the Greek was an attempt on his part to interpret Nature in all its diverse manifestations around him. Confronted with these he sensed his own helplessness: fire might burn him, the sun scorch him, the sea overwhelm him, or rivers wash him away; the woods seemed alive, the mountains everlasting; and the stars at night ceaselessly watched and guided him. These potentialities of Nature had to be explained somehow, and, to

satisfy his bewilderment, he devised a number of localized divinities whose actions would effectively account for Nature's every caprice. Moreover, he was not so much responsible for his own passions and circumstances as were the various deities, over whom he had little or no control. Did he fall in love? it was Aphrodite's doing; was he warlike? it was the influence of Ares; was he a musician? Apollo had inspired him; was he a sea-farer? he was at the mercy of Neptune; had he been inhospitable? the god of hospitality would exact requital; had he committed a crime? the avenging Furies would pursue him! Even the Earth was a goddess, who could produce life-giving crops in abundance, or withhold the means of sustenance in times of famine, and who, once she had tasted the blood of some man unjustly slain, would not rest content until she had drunken in as well the blood of the slayer. A spirit of moderation and sobriety met with the favour of the gods, but insolence and arrogance, so frequently the offspring of excessive prosperity, could not fail to bring in their wake divine retribution.

But the Greek anthropomorphic divinities, though possessed of such physical splendour, were certainly not moral paragons; and if the gods themselves fell short in this respect, it could not be anticipated that mere mortals would shew forth, or have any desire to shew forth, the nobler moral virtues: one could not expect to surpass the gods! Taken all in all, then, the natural effect of his religion was for the Greek, unlike the Jew, to relegate his conscience into the undisturbed regions of the subconscious—if such a paradoxical occurrence is at all possible!—and to leave it reposing there seldom excited by precept or prohibition. The conception of the divine control of the universe was founded entirely on the imaginative and poetic proclivities of the Greek mind, and inevitably broke down when arraigned before the bar of reason and intellect. Mainly because of this there were two opposite tendencies in the history of Greek religion; the one, to congregate all the attributes and peculiar functions of the various anthropomorphic deities and to embody them in one supreme divine entity—that is, a movement towards the monotheistic belief; the other, to adopt an attitude of scepticism, which in turn frequently led on to rationalistic and atheistic theories. Either viewpoint was justifiable, for one could not seriously believe in a series of gods human in their form and mortal in their faults, no matter how perfect in

stature and ability they might be. The very concept of God demands the infinities of Spirit, Power, Knowledge, Presence, and Holiness. And it was in these very points that the Greek divinities were deficient.

However much he might have been attached by the bonds of sentiment to his own city-state, there is no evidence that the Greek was moved by any extraordinary feelings of affection for his mother country. Indeed, in the classical age of Greece the individual Greek would more accurately have been described as a member of his particular city-state—an Athenian, a Spartan, a Theban, or a Corinthian—rather than as a member of his country—that is, a Hellene. It must be remembered that the Greeks were not a united people living under one central government; but that each community was entirely autonomous and self-sufficient. At the most critical pass in the whole history of Greece it was only with the greatest difficulty, and then largely thanks to the insistent genius of Themistocles, that the various city-states could be induced to sink their differences and present a solid front to the menace of the Persian invader. The triumphant outcome of this general co-operation is well known; and had they acted unitedly like this all along there is little doubt that Greece would have risen to much greater heights than she actually did. But this was the sole period of collaboration between the city republics. In the normal course of events they were independent, proud, self-seeking communities, and during the latter part of the fifth century B.C., a mere fifty years after the Persian had been repelled, the vigour and vitality of Greece were wretchedly and senselessly sapped by the bitterness and bloodshed of internecine strife. Undoubtedly this paved the way for the hegemony of Philip of Macedon in the next century; but even then, had the Greeks stood firmly together as a nation, instead of their city-states squabbling weakly amongst themselves, there can scarcely be any question that Philip would never have been able to establish his supremacy over the land of Greece.

Still, whatever the failings of the city-state—and there were several major disabilities—nobody would deny that the Greeks were first-rate colonizers. Even in early times Greek settlements were to be found on the other side of the Aegean Sea, and at many points around the Mediterranean coast; and by the commencement of the Christian era there were colonies

of Greeks in practically every section of the civilized world. The two great institutions which meant more to the Greek than anything else, and which he carried with him wherever he went, were his democratic form of government and his language; both exercised a profound influence over the rest of the world, and the latter became, to all intents and purposes, the *lingua franca* of the Roman empire. So it came to pass that any spirit of exclusiveness there was in the Greek heart was grounded upon the superiority, as it seemed to him, of his mother tongue, and, to a lesser degree, of his democratic form of government.

The Jew, on the other hand, was not unduly affected by considerations of language or government. Although Hebrew was his own particular tongue and the medium in which he possessed his divine writings, he was at all times apt and ready to pick up the languages of other peoples; and, while his ideal state, as has been already shewn, took the form of a theocracy, yet he proved—we refer, of course, to the Jew of the diaspora —that he was capable of accommodating himself to almost any type of rule under which he might be placed—always with this one provision, that he be allowed the liberty and the facility to fulfil unimpeded the numerous demands made upon him by his religion. There was, however, one concept over and above all others that engaged the focus of the Jew's most loyal attention and which never failed to assume the place of priority in his thoughts and affections, no matter in what distant land he was settled or how long he and his family had been in exile. It was the concept that the land of Palestine was his people's own peculiar country, given them as a special inheritance by their God. This was no common spirit of patriotism, such as the love of a Scot for Scotland, or of a Dutchman for Holland; it was the great and eternal anchor to which were bound the innumerable chains of hope and fidelity, linking together the " Chosen People " who had become so widely scattered throughout the known world. Yet, spiritual and invisible though these bands were, they were given a material typification and substantiation, as it were, by the regular transmission by all Jews of the " didrachm " to the Temple at Jerusalem. So, then, one is not surprised to learn that every Jew of the dispersion cherished an ambition to set eyes on the " Promised Land " at least once in his lifetime, and trusted that after death, by some or other miraculous intervention, his own and the bodies of all his

compatriots would be collected from the countries of the heathen and congregated in Palestine, where one day would take place a mass resurrection and the ideal and everlasting theocratic state would be set up.

Hellenism, then, in its main fundamental issues, was a direct negation of the essential principles of Judaism; for the one was built up around man and the human mind, while the other was centred on God and His divine ordinances. The Jews worshipped a God Who spoke to them with a plain and unequivocal voice, whereas the Greeks, even at the best of times, could expect little in the way of guidance from above, except for occasional enigmatical pronouncements of oracular ambiguity. In the end, the Greek, because of his broad outlook on life, became the world's best " mixer ", whereas the Jew, thanks largely to the Pharisaic influence, became proud and intolerant, to such an extent that the struggle of Judaism against Hellenism, which we are now about to discuss, might appropriately be described as the struggle of the exclusivism of the Jew against the universalism of the Greek.

V

The Maccabean Resistance

In 332 B.C. Alexander the Great, in the full career of his victorious conquest of the East, marched up to Jerusalem. The inhabitants of the " Holy City " awaited his advent with anxiety, fearing that this invincible youth had turned his steps towards their state bent on its overthrow and the destruction of the " Chosen Race ". Having decided that their best and safest line of action was to accord him a special civic welcome, they sent out a deputation of priests, arrayed in white garments, to meet him and escort him into the city. Much to their relief, Alexander came peaceably and with goodwill, showing every reverence for their ancient religion and desiring to grant the Jews any favour they might wish. They even took him up to their Temple, and there, with the sanction and under the direction of the high priest, he worshipped and offered sacrifices with all due ceremony to the God of their fathers. Alexander, highly gratified at his reception, promised the Jews complete freedom of action in the matter of their laws and religious customs, the suspension of the payment of tribute every seventh

year, and a similar freedom to a large number of Palestinian Jews who volunteered for service in his army.[1]

Two important precedents were created by this visit of Alexander the Great to Jerusalem. In the first place, without so much as a demonstration of opposition or revulsion, the "Chosen People" and, what is more, even the very priests admitted into the "Holy City" and into the "Sacred Temple" a potentate from the pagan West with all his company of idolatrous Gentiles. Judaism had compromised with Hellenism, when for the devout Jew no such thing should have been possible; and this was in no small measure symbolical of the spirit of compromise which in later days was to call forth the bold and bitter antagonism of the faithful adherents of the conservative party, who were going to fight for the very existence of Judaism. In the second place, by conceding to the Jews, as he did, a number of privileges and special favours, Alexander set an example to the rulers of the western world which was frequently to be followed, and which, through the jealousy and enmity which it inevitably stirred up in the hearts of other less favoured communities, was destined to become an important factor in the rousing of anti-Jewish feeling. With such a weapon at his disposal it did not require much for the polemical tractarian by the venom of his pen or the street-corner demagogue by the vitriol of his tongue to inflame the passions of the masses against the arrogance and exclusiveness of the Jew.

Some one and a half centuries after Alexander had passed through Judaea there commenced the most crucial struggle for survival in the whole history of Judaism. It was a fight against the violent efforts of Antiochus Epiphanes to convert Judaea root and branch into a Hellenistic state. Antiochus himself was a man of alarming aberrations and eccentricities, full of ambition for the fame of conquest, and inordinately fond of munificence, grand spectacles, and splendid buildings. Polybius (XXVI, 10; v. Athenaeus, lib. X, p. 439) dubbed him "Epimanes"—the madman—rather than "Epiphanes"—the manifest god—

[1] These are the main points of the account which Josephus gives (Antiqq. XI, viii. 4, 5). Some critics regard the narrative as historically valueless because it is scarcely substantiated by the records of other historians who have dealt with the campaigns of Alexander. Unfortunately Josephus gives us no indication as to what source he made use of in acquiring this information; but it is probable that he got it from some Jewish chronicle or tradition, and, on the whole, there seems to be little cause for not viewing it as in the main correct.

because of the extreme impetuosity of his character.[1] Not only did he entertain lofty dreams of imperial magnificence and dominion, but also his great object was to render all the peoples and lands under his sway as thoroughly Greek as he was himself. This being the case, many of his actions in connection with Judaea may be explained in much the same words as Tacitus used (Hist. V, 8):

> "King Antiochus strove to overthrow the superstition of the Jews and to introduce among them Greek customs, but was prevented by the war with the Parthians from improving the condition of this most detestable race."

In pursuing this aim no doubt he did not expect to meet with any serious opposition, at any rate not the unremitting antagonism and dauntless resistance which a section of the Jews in Palestine actually offered. Indeed, he had every reason to hope that the hellenisation of Judaea would prove as easy of attainment as in any other district; for on his side and amongst his friends he could count a considerable number of apostatizing Jews, who eagerly backed up his projects for abolishing the old régime and establishing in its place the Greek culture, which was so different from and incompatible with all that their time-honoured Scriptures taught and enjoined.

The graecophils openly forsook their old religion and way of life, and set about trying to change Jerusalem into just another Hellenistic city. Their first important move, blatantly trampling upon all that the faithful and patriotic Jew held most sacred, was to build a Greek place of exercise right under the citadel. They introduced Greek fashions, and before long young men of high birth were to be seen parading the city in Greek caps; even the priests neglected their divine offices in the temple, preferring to pass the hours in the unlawful enjoyment of the worldly pleasures of the palaestra (v. 2 Macc. iv; Jos. Antiqq. XII, v. 1).

But worse things were to follow. Antiochus, returning from a successful campaign in Egypt, went up against Jerusalem and took it by force (170 B.C.). During the next three days his soldiers indulged in a savage and bloody massacre of men, women and children, putting no fewer than eighty thousand to the sword, and selling as many into captivity. Thereupon he dared to enter and ransack "the most holy temple of all the

[1] Cf. also, Polybius XXVI, 10; XXVIII, xviii, 3; XXIX, ix, 13; XXXI, iii, seq.; Diodorus XXIX, 32; XXXI, 16; Livy, XLI, 30.

earth", pulling down and removing the golden altar and all the consecrated vessels and ornaments, and appropriating the priceless treasures that were kept in the building. With these spoils he departed to Antioch; and Jerusalem was left, a city of inconsolable mourning and desolation, to labour and weep under the crude tyranny of the governors who had been appointed by the hated king (v. 1 Macc. i; 2 Macc. v; Jos. Antiqq. XII, vi.).

When affairs had continued in this state for two years, Antiochus decided that the time was ripe for further scenes of carnage and horror in Jerusalem, and for a reign of terror far outstripping in depravity and brutality that which had gone before. Accordingly he sent his chief collector of tribute to Judaea with a numerous company of militia. This man came up to Jerusalem with every ostentation of a peaceable mission, and deceived the inhabitants with solemn avowals that it was not his intention to use force of arms or to render them any disservice in any way. Scarce had the wolf entered the city gates, so credulously opened by the unsuspecting Jews, when he discarded his sheep's disguise and proceeded in a fit of treacherous villainy to glut the swords of his men with the blood of thousands of innocent citizens. Not content with this, he pillaged the city, set it on fire, smashed down houses and walls on every side, and took captive women and children. Then he set about fortifying the capital with great ramparts and towers, until it was a powerful citadel, manned by "a sinful nation, transgressors of the law". Bloodshed continued, and the Jewish worship was pronounced illegal and punishable with death; the temple was turned into a whore-house and a club for revellers; and profane foreign cults—amongst them the barbaric Bacchic ritual, which in later years was to be strictly prohibited even in Rome—were forced upon the unhappy Jews. Their tragic plight is poignantly described by the author of the books of Maccabees:

"She (sc. Jerusalem) became a habitation of strangers, and she became strange to them that were born in her, and her children forsook her. Her sanctuary was laid waste like a wilderness, her feasts were turned into mourning, her sabbaths into reproach, her honour into contempt" (1 Macc. i).

"The place of sacrifice was filled with those abominable things which had been prohibited by the laws. And a man could neither keep the sabbath, nor observe the feasts of his fathers, nor so much as confess himself to be a Jew" (2 Macc. vi).

But, as history has so clearly demonstrated again and again, oppression and persecution, so far from extinguishing the strength and vitality of a people, nourish and fortify all its reserves of obstinacy, resistance and national pride, confirming rather than dispersing its individuality. Of this truism the Jews have been, and still are, the most remarkable and constant witnesses: over a period lasting many hundreds of years, and in many different parts of the globe, they have been maligned and ill-treated, and yet, through all this, they have retained unfalteringly their distinctiveness. And the case in hand was no exception to this rule. A large section of the Jews set their faces grimly against this persecution; for nothing was more precious to them than their religion and the worship of the God of their fathers. Although the abomination of desolation had been set up in the temple, and idol-altars erected everywhere; although the books of the law had been publicly torn and burnt, and the penalty of torture and death was required of any person found in possession of the Holy Scriptures, and even circumcision was a capital offence; yet these steadfast and courageous Jews chose to die a martyr's death, rather than renounce their faith and deny the Lord God Almighty. Their holy covenant with God could never be superseded by any covenant with man. Theirs was no heroic fatalism, like that of Caesar's:

> "Cowards die many times before their death:
> The valiant never taste of death but once.
> Of all the wonders that I yet have heard,
> It seems to me most strange that men should fear,
> Seeing death, a necessary end, will come
> When it will come" (Shakespeare, *Julius Caesar*).

Rather it was a calm courage born of a stern determination not to defile themselves, and of an unflinching devotion to the convictions of their hearts:

> "Howbeit many in Israel were fully resolved and confirmed in themselves not to eat any unclean thing. Wherefore they chose rather to die, that they might not be defiled with meats, and that they might not profane the holy covenant" (1 Macc. i. 62, 63).

The inhuman and barbaric atrocities to which these devout Jews were subjected are almost past conception; nor were they restricted to any particular class, but young and old, male

and female, alike were compelled to suffer the most ghastly tortures and bestialities, as the following two or three incidents show all too clearly. For the crime of circumcising their infants two women were arraigned and condemned. After they had been conducted round Jerusalem with their babes hanging at their breasts, a spectacle for all to behold, they were cast headlong to destruction over the city wall (2 Macc. vi). An old man, Eleazar, of high standing, was flogged to death for resolutely refusing to eat swine's flesh (ibid).

"And it came to pass that seven brethren also with their mother were at the king's command taken and shamefully handled with scourges and cords, to compel them to taste of the abominable swine's flesh. But one of them made himself the spokesman and said, 'What wouldest thou ask and learn of us? for we are ready to die rather than transgress the laws of our fathers'. And the king fell into a rage, and commanded to heat pans and caldrons; and when these forthwith were heated, he commanded to cut out the tongue of him who had been their spokesman, and to scalp him, and to cut off his extremities, the rest of his brethren and his mother looking on. And when he was utterly maimed the king commanded to bring him to the fire, being yet alive, and to fry him in the pan. And as the vapour of the pan spread far, they and their mother also exhorted one another to die nobly."

Thus he died, and his six brothers in turn after him; and finally, as a last touch of refinement, their mother, too, suffered the same brutal fate. (2 Macc. vii.)

It was against atrocities such as these that the Jews had to struggle. But force and inhumanity do not always bring success in the long run; and Judaism, albeit sorely battered, weathered the tempest. After years of stubborn and passionate resistance, the indomitable spirit of the conservatives prevailed, the oppressor was evicted, and peace and freedom were restored. The exploits of the dauntless Hasmonaean band read more thrillingly than many of the adventures of fiction, and their brilliant and inspired leader, Judas Maccabeus, has been well named the "William Tell" of the Jews, for truly here is a character that for sheer reckless courage and heroism measures up to the dashing ideal of any stirring tale of the imagination.

The victory had been hard won; but, nevertheless, although for the time being an untroubled course lay ahead, on all sides there were perils, and beyond the immediate horizon was waiting many a buffeting. Judaism, which gradually, as the years went by, was becoming more and more corrupted by the narrow subtleties of Pharisaism, would survive them all, but

in the process the Jews were to be scattered ever more widely across the face of the earth, the ill-starred scapegoats of mankind's vindictiveness.

VI

The Dispersion

Apart from their proselytizing activities, which certainly did not augment their ranks to any appreciable extent, the Jews were a people that increased steadily and rapidly. To them the Greek method of population-control by the exposure of unwanted infants was, of course, anathema. From time to time, however, they suffered tremendous losses in the indiscriminate massacres which their seditious and turbulent natures brought upon their heads; and this more than anything else helped to keep their numbers within reasonable limits. Writing at about the beginning of the imperial age, Strabo says:

> "Now these Jews are already gotten into all cities; and it is hard to find a place in the habitable earth that hath not admitted this tribe of men, and is not possessed by it" (Quoted in Josephus, Antiqq. XIV, vii. 2).

Strabo was a well travelled man, and this statement of his, though doubtless an exaggeration, provides us with a valuable indication of the extensiveness of the Jewish diaspora. The westward dispersion received its first important impetus at the hand of Ptolemy I, one of Alexander's successors. Coming up to Jerusalem on a Sabbath-day, under pretext of wishing to offer up sacrifice, he occupied the peaceful city without a finger being raised against him; then he went through Judaea and took captive a vast number of Jews, whom he carried off and settled in Egypt. Later on, enticed by his liberality and the fertility of the Egyptian soil, many more Jews followed their kinsmen into the same country. (v. Jos. Antiqq. XII, i.) Once started, the movement continued and the "Chosen People" migrated to almost every corner of the civilized world.

The prolificity of the Jew must be accounted one of the main factors in the dispersion; for many families, owing to congestion and fierce competition in Palestine, were practically compelled to go in search of some new motherland which would adopt and foster them, and which, in the long run, would offer more favourable chance of success in the struggle

for existence and advancement. It has been estimated[1] that during the principate of Claudius—c. A.D. 50—there were just under seven million Jews in the empire; and of this number well over half were living in countries other than Palestine. The vast majority were to be found in the large cities, where they constituted a considerable and important section of the citizenry. Strabo (in the same passage quoted from above) states that

"there were four classes of men amongst those of Cyrene; that of citizens, that of husbandmen, the third of strangers, and the fourth of Jews".

He also remarks that a special area was

"allotted to this nation at Alexandria, which is a large part of that city. There is also an ethnarch allowed them, who governs the nation, and distributes justice to them, and takes care of their contracts, and of the laws to them belonging, as if he were the ruler of a free republic". (Ibid.)

So, then, in a great city like Alexandria the Jews, who occupied two out of the five wards of the city, were granted a large measure of autonomy and lived very much as a separate community within the complete organism. And this was the case, to a greater or a lesser degree, with the Jews in the other cities of the empire.

It is not difficult to see that these separate Jewish colonies in the great cities were the forerunners of the ghettoes of later times. The segregation took place quite naturally, with the synagogue always as the centre of each community, and facilitated to an appreciable degree the retention of the Jewish individuality. At the same time, of course, it simplified the effective carrying out of any demonstrations or methods of discrimination against the Jews, and offered a welcome handle to the "antisemitic" agitator.

Rome

In Rome, as elsewhere, the Jews were a privileged class. Augustus permitted them the enjoyment of very much the same favours and freedom as Julius Caesar had granted (e.g., v. Jos. Antiqq. XIV, x). In every way their religious sentiments were respected: should the distribution of free corn

[1] By Bar-Hebraeus; v. Baron; *Social and Religious History of the Jews*, p. 132.

fall due on a Sabbath-day, it was postponed for the sake of the Jews; the collection and transmission to Jerusalem of the "didrachm" for the temple treasury had the sanction of the Princeps, despite the fact that such a procedure was altogether contrary to the normal imperial policy; and, indeed, Augustus instructed the priests to offer up a special sacrifice for him in the temple at Jerusalem twice a day.[1] Altogether, the position of the Jews in Rome at this time was quite unique; for, while all other eastern cults were sternly suppressed by the authorities, they were allowed to observe unmolested their own form of worship—and this, too, although they stubbornly refused to participate in the state religion or pay homage to the official deities, and were vigorous in their efforts to win over to their way of life proselytes from among the other inhabitants of the capital.

Yet we have no cause for believing that the Jews and their customs were regarded with benevolence and equanimity by the Romans in general, no matter to what extent their idiosyncrasies might have been granted the sanction of those in authority. In his defence of Flaccus, Cicero made reference to the Jews and Jewish gold—which was connected with the charge made against Flaccus—and in so doing has probably left us with a pretty fair indication of the attitude of the average Roman towards the Jews. From the ensuing citation we can safely assume that the Jews, even at the close of the republican period, were living at Rome in large numbers, that, like the proverbial birds of a feather, they flocked together, and that they were a despised section of the community:

"There follows the odium that is attached to Jewish gold. This is no doubt the reason why this case is being tried not far from the Aurelian Steps. You desired this place and that crowd, Laelius, for this trial. You know what a big crowd it is, how they stick together, how influential they are in assemblies. So I will speak in a low voice so that only the jurors may hear; for those are not wanting who would incite them against me and against every respectable man. I shall not help them to do this more easily. When every year it was customary to send gold to Jerusalem on the order of the Jews from Italy and from all our provinces, Flaccus forbade by an edict its exportation from Asia. Who is there, gentlemen, who could not honestly praise this action? The senate often earlier and also in my consulship most urgently forbade the export of gold. But to resist this barbaric superstition was an act of firmness, to defy the crowd of Jews, when sometimes in our assemblies they were hot with passion, for the welfare of the state was an

[1] Philo: *Legatio ad Caium*, secs. 23 and 40, says that this was done at Augustus' expense; but Josephus states that it was at the cost of the Jewish people; v. *Wars of the Jews*, II, x, 4; xvii, 2-4; and especially Contra Apionem, II, 6.

act of the greatest seriousness. 'But Gnaeus Pompey when Jerusalem was captured laid his victorious hands on nothing in that shrine.' In that he was especially wise—as in many other matters. In a state so given to suspicion and calumny he left his critics no opportunity. But I do not think that illustrious general was hindered by the religious feelings of the Jews and his enemies, but by his sense of honour. . . . Each state, Laelius, has its own religious scruples; we have ours. Even while Jerusalem was standing and the Jews were at peace with us, the practice of their sacred rites was at variance with the glory of our empire, the dignity of our name, the customs of our ancestors. But now it is even more so, when that nation by its armed resistance has shewn what it thinks of our rule; how dear it was to the immortal gods is shewn by the fact that it has been conquered, reduced to a subject province, made a slave " (Cic., Pro Flacco, XXVIII)

With the accession of Tiberius to the imperial power, the Jews of Rome met with some unpleasant reverses. In his efforts to purify and stabilize the capital, the emperor pronounced all Oriental cults to be seditious and illegal. For this reason and because they had been evading military service the Jews were forbidden to practise their religion, and four thousand Jewish freedmen were deported to the island of Sardinia and told to rid it of the highwaymen and freebooters with which it was overrun. The contemptuous spirit in which this edict was issued is well illustrated by the words given by Tacitus:

" If they perish because of the unwholesomeness of the climate it will be a trifling loss. The remainder must leave Italy if they have not given over their impious rites before a given date." (Annals, II, 85; v. also, Suet, Tib. 36; Jos. Antiqq. XVIII, iii. 5).

At this time, as it happened, there were some twenty thousand Jews in the capital, over and above the numerous devotees of the various strange and mystic cults of the Orient, and in attempting to purge Rome of its undesirable elements Tiberius was tackling a task greater than he could achieve.

There was universal rejoicing at the death of Tiberius, that most detested of emperors, and simultaneously at the accession of the young Caligula. But whatever hopes were centred in the new ruler were soon rudely shattered, and the years of his principate were years of anxiety and uncertainty for the Jews, as well as for the other members of the Roman empire. There can be no shadow of doubt that Caligula, a man given to the most outrageous excesses and who earnestly believed that he was a god incarnate, suffered from serious mental derangement. It was the custom for the emperor to be apotheosized after death; Caligula, however, demanded the adoration of his subjects during his lifetime—a claim in which the great majority

were prepared to acquiesce without the least compunction, but which, as was to be expected, filled the Jews with abhorrence and revulsion. Enthused by his hallucinations and deeming that he was rendering all and sundry a signal service, Caligula sent forth edicts enjoining the worship of his effigies throughout the empire. Immediately there was great dissatisfaction among the Jews, and upheavals followed in Judaea and Alexandria. The appearance in 38 B.C. of Herod Agrippa—one of the emperor's profligate favourites—in Alexandria was the sign for a series of violent anti-Jewish demonstrations; it was insisted that the Jews should erect statues of the Princeps in their synagogues, and when, as might have been foretold, they refused, the Jew-baiters proceeded to assert their loyalty to the throne by hunting out and assaulting all the Jews they could lay hands on outside the Jewish quarter, by wrecking their houses and by plundering their ships that were riding at anchor in the harbour. Assured that the Jews were seditious aliens and that they had unlawfully appropriated to themselves the most desirable part of the city, and their savagery inflamed by the first taste of blood, the frenzied rioters set about desecrating the synagogues and re-dedicating them as temples to the Roman prince; a great number of unfortunate Jews were slaughtered, while many who escaped this fate were left destitute and without shelter; large and populous areas were turned into a shambles, and Jewish business came to a standstill.

In desperation the Alexandrian Jews sent a deputation led by Philo to Rome to plead with the emperor himself for permission to enjoy the freedom of worship and custom which had been their privilege in former years. Not to be outdone, the "anti-semitic" party of the same city despatched at the same time an embassy under the Leadership of Apion, a braggart who had been aptly dubbed "*cymbalum mundi*" by Tiberius. The two legations found Caligula in a sarcastic mood and preoccupied with other business, and Philo and his companions might just as well have spared themselves the journey. The emperor treated them with disrespect and contempt, and dismissed them after a while with the remark:

> "Men who deem me no god are after all more unlucky than guilty!"

When this mad ruler decreed that effigies of himself should be set up and worshipped, not only in the synagogues of the

empire, but even in the sacred temple at Jerusalem, a major upheaval was threatening. But a stroke of fate averted, for the time being at any rate, the catastrophe, when the conspirator's sword put a sudden, but not untimely, end to this travesty of a reign.

The news of Caligula's assassination brought the Jews in Alexandria courage to set on foot an insurrection against their oppressors. Claudius, however, succeeded in quelling the uprising by means of a diplomatic letter before it had reached serious dimensions (v. Jos. Antiqq., XX, v. 2). But this was for him only a foretaste of the turbulence of the Jews. As the days went by their temper seemed to become ever more stormy and truculent, their nature more prone to sedition, until at length the patience of the authorities came to an end, and all Jews were ordered to leave Rome (v. Suetonis, Claud., XXV; Acts xviii, 2).

Judaea

If in Rome the Jews were a troublesome and little loved section of the community, in Judaea they were a veritable tempestuous mass of seething fanaticism and discontent, which neither threats nor punitive measures could subdue. At one moment they would be clamouring against the sacrilegious indignities which they were called upon to suffer under the Roman yoke, and at the next they would be following blindly and hysterically in the futile train of some impostrous upstart Messiah, doomed to be cut down by the swords of the imperial soldiery or publicly crucified as a warning to all. Such warnings, however, so far from acting as a deterrent, only served to incite the Jews to further deeds of suicidal zeal, and intensified rather than alleviated the perplexities of the dilemma which must have caused the procurators of Judaea so many sleepless nights.

In the annals of Judaea there have been few more remarkable characters than Herod the Great; indeed, the record of a man so pitiably and groundlessly suspicious of his own next of kin, and so horribly stained with their blood, can scarcely be equalled in all the long and doleful history of man's treachery and remorse. Born to be a ruler, he exercised a despotic authority for a third of a century, and came to be hated by the Jews for his unrelenting tyranny almost to the same extent as Antiochus Epiphanes had been a century previously. But it

cannot be denied that on the whole he ruled ably and firmly, and that, unlike Antiochus, he knew very well what limits to set to his ambitions for introducing into Judaea the true spirit of the Hellenistic culture. Yet, although he avoided the error of going to extremes, he persisted in his definite policy, which was to build in Judaea fine temples and palaces and amphitheatres where the populace could take part in the same religious ceremonies and enjoy the same amusements as at Rome itself. To this end, and sparing no cost, he erected a magnificent theatre in Jerusalem and a great amphitheatre on the plain, and inaugurated games to be celebrated every five years in honour of Caesar, offering lavish prizes to the winners; contests in foot and chariot races, wrestling, and musical performance were organized, and were open to all comers. As an added attraction he imported wild beasts, which, either by fighting amongst themselves, or by mangling and tearing limb from limb unhappy individuals on whom had been passed the capital sentence, were to provide an amusing spectacle for the excited crowds (v. Jos. Antiqq. XV, 8). These and similar innovations, coupled with the harsh treatment meted out to all who raised a cry of protest, did not fail to arouse the enmity and bitter opposition of the devout and loyal Jews, and after Herod's death the turbulence and dissatisfaction of the Jew were handed on to the future governors of Judaea as a permanent, though little relished, legacy.

The climax came in A.D. 70. The Palestinian Jews, in a spasm of maniacal fervour, decided that the hour had arrived for them to cast off once and for all the Roman yoke—a project as ludicrously impossible of achievement as it was undoubtedly sincere. After a long and fiercely contested siege, Jerusalem was taken, the Temple destroyed, and the " Holy City " razed to the ground. Josephus informs us that during the course of this war no less than 1,100,000 Jews perished, while 97,000 were taken captive (Wars, vi, ix, 3). To add to the exasperation of their grief and shame, the Jews were now compelled to remit as a yearly tribute to the temple of the pagan deity, Jupiter, in Rome the " didrachm " which formerly they had contributed to the temple at Jerusalem.

In no way, however, did the sack of Jerusalem put a stop to the turbulence of the Jews. During the reign of Domitian, barely fifteen years later, there was another rising in Judaea

empire, but even in the sacred temple at Jerusalem, a major upheaval was threatening. But a stroke of fate averted, for the time being at any rate, the catastrophe, when the conspirator's sword put a sudden, but not untimely, end to this travesty of a reign.

The news of Caligula's assassination brought the Jews in Alexandria courage to set on foot an insurrection against their oppressors. Claudius, however, succeeded in quelling the uprising by means of a diplomatic letter before it had reached serious dimensions (v. Jos. Antiqq., XX, v. 2). But this was for him only a foretaste of the turbulence of the Jews. As the days went by their temper seemed to become ever more stormy and truculent, their nature more prone to sedition, until at length the patience of the authorities came to an end, and all Jews were ordered to leave Rome (v. Suetonis, Claud., XXV; Acts xviii, 2).

Judaea

If in Rome the Jews were a troublesome and little loved section of the community, in Judaea they were a veritable tempestuous mass of seething fanaticism and discontent, which neither threats nor punitive measures could subdue. At one moment they would be clamouring against the sacrilegious indignities which they were called upon to suffer under the Roman yoke, and at the next they would be following blindly and hysterically in the futile train of some impostrous upstart Messiah, doomed to be cut down by the swords of the imperial soldiery or publicly crucified as a warning to all. Such warnings, however, so far from acting as a deterrent, only served to incite the Jews to further deeds of suicidal zeal, and intensified rather than alleviated the perplexities of the dilemma which must have caused the procurators of Judaea so many sleepless nights.

In the annals of Judaea there have been few more remarkable characters than Herod the Great; indeed, the record of a man so pitiably and groundlessly suspicious of his own next of kin, and so horribly stained with their blood, can scarcely be equalled in all the long and doleful history of man's treachery and remorse. Born to be a ruler, he exercised a despotic authority for a third of a century, and came to be hated by the Jews for his unrelenting tyranny almost to the same extent as Antiochus Epiphanes had been a century previously. But it

cannot be denied that on the whole he ruled ably and firmly, and that, unlike Antiochus, he knew very well what limits to set to his ambitions for introducing into Judaea the true spirit of the Hellenistic culture. Yet, although he avoided the error of going to extremes, he persisted in his definite policy, which was to build in Judaea fine temples and palaces and amphitheatres where the populace could take part in the same religious ceremonies and enjoy the same amusements as at Rome itself. To this end, and sparing no cost, he erected a magnificent theatre in Jerusalem and a great amphitheatre on the plain, and inaugurated games to be celebrated every five years in honour of Caesar, offering lavish prizes to the winners; contests in foot and chariot races, wrestling, and musical performance were organized, and were open to all comers. As an added attraction he imported wild beasts, which, either by fighting amongst themselves, or by mangling and tearing limb from limb unhappy individuals on whom had been passed the capital sentence, were to provide an amusing spectacle for the excited crowds (v. Jos. Antiqq. XV, 8). These and similar innovations, coupled with the harsh treatment meted out to all who raised a cry of protest, did not fail to arouse the enmity and bitter opposition of the devout and loyal Jews, and after Herod's death the turbulence and dissatisfaction of the Jew were handed on to the future governors of Judaea as a permanent, though little relished, legacy.

The climax came in A.D. 70. The Palestinian Jews, in a spasm of maniacal fervour, decided that the hour had arrived for them to cast off once and for all the Roman yoke—a project as ludicrously impossible of achievement as it was undoubtedly sincere. After a long and fiercely contested siege, Jerusalem was taken, the Temple destroyed, and the " Holy City " razed to the ground. Josephus informs us that during the course of this war no less than 1,100,000 Jews perished, while 97,000 were taken captive (Wars, vi, ix, 3). To add to the exasperation of their grief and shame, the Jews were now compelled to remit as a yearly tribute to the temple of the pagan deity, Jupiter, in Rome the " didrachm " which formerly they had contributed to the temple at Jerusalem.

In no way, however, did the sack of Jerusalem put a stop to the turbulence of the Jews. During the reign of Domitian, barely fifteen years later, there was another rising in Judaea

against the Roman domination; but it was quickly checked; and Jewish insurrections occurred in both Trajan's and Hadrian's reigns. At length Hadrian, determined to quell once and for all the frequent Jewish outbursts of animosity, founded a military colony on the site of old Jerusalem, and named it Aelia Capitolina; over the foundations of the former temple pagan altars were set up; and even circumcision was proclaimed illegal. Yet again, with the strength and the fury of a beast of the jungle already mortally wounded, the Jews revolted, unable to tolerate this inexorable oppression (A.D. 131). After A.D. 70 it was an anti-climax; but it was a death struggle; and three years went by before Hadrian finally managed to subdue this desperate insurrection. The Jews received no quarter: old Akiba, one of their leaders, was rent limb from limb with red-hot pincers; 580,000 of the " Chosen Race " were butchered; and almost a thousand places were laid in ruins. The country-side presented a gruesome scene of death and desolation. The Temple, the Priesthood, the Golden City, were all gone; even the name Judaea was changed to Syria Palaestina.

Jewry had been conquered and decimated, but Judaism remained unvanquished; and with it there continued that spirit of arrogance, exasperation, and exclusiveness which exercised such a baneful influence on the destiny of the Jew.

PHILIP E. HUGHES.

B. C. M. & T. College,
Clifton, Bristol.

(*To be continued.*)