

*Chapter XXV*

## ***The Sabbath Year of 70/71 C.E.***

**I**t is unfortunate, indeed, that we possess no direct testimony by any contemporary historian or other such record that can testify directly as to whether or not a sabbath year was in progress during the period that Jerusalem was captured by the Romans (i.e. in the summer of 70 C.E.). Such a document would end all speculation on the issue and would settle the question once and for all.

Nevertheless, Josephus, who was contemporary with that event, goes a long way towards doing just that. In his history of the First Revolt, Josephus mentions an invasion of Judaeian Idumaea by Simon ben Gioras in the winter of 68/69 C.E. The fields of Idumaea, we are told, were cultivated. This detail is important because the Idumaeans in this region and of that period were Jewish by religion and would not have cultivated their fields in the few months prior to a sabbath year or during a sabbath year. Therefore, the evidence from Josephus strongly indicates that the sabbath year could not have taken place until the next year (70/71 C.E., Nisan reckoning).

### **The Chronology of Simon's Invasion**

The sequence of events for Simon's invasion of Idumaea are as follows: Vespasian, the Roman general, was in Caesarea preparing to march against Jerusalem when word arrived of the death of Emperor Nero.<sup>1</sup> Nero died on or about June 9, 68 C.E. Since it was early summer, it would have taken approximately three weeks for news to arrive from Rome to Palestine (this being a reasonable estimate due to the urgency of the message of the emperor's death). Vespasian must have heard of Nero's death on or about the beginning of July, which is supported by comparing the statements of Theophilus and Dio.<sup>2</sup>

Vespasian, after hearing of Nero's death and the civil war that ensued, deferred his expedition against Jerusalem, "anxiously waiting to see upon whom the empire would devolve after Nero's death; nor when he subsequently heard that Galba was emperor would he undertake anything, until he had received further instructions from him concerning the war."<sup>3</sup>

In response, Vespasian sent his son Titus to the new emperor for instructions. Yet before Titus could arrive in Rome, while he was still sailing in vessels of war around Achaëa, it being "the winter" season, Galba was assassinated" and Otho succeeded to the crown.<sup>4</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 4:9:2.

<sup>2</sup> Theophilus, 3:27; Dio, 65:1, 66:17; also see above Chap. XXIII, pp. 293f.

<sup>3</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 4:9:2.

<sup>4</sup> *Ibid.*

Titus then sailed back from Greece to Syria and hastened to rejoin his father at Caesarea. “The two (Vespasian and Titus), being in suspense on these momentous matters, when the Roman empire itself was reeling, neglected the invasion of Judaea, regarding an attack on a foreign country as unseasonable, while in such anxiety concerning their own.”<sup>5</sup>

Otho had ascended to the throne on January 15, 69 C.E. It would have taken about 14 to 21 days for news of Galba’s death to reach Greece where Titus was. Therefore, Titus must have started back for Syria in mid-February and rejoined his father at Caesarea in late February or early March of 69 C.E.

“But another war WAS NOW IMPENDING over Jerusalem.”<sup>6</sup> At this point Josephus backs up a little to tell the story of how the Jewish factional leader Simon ben Gioras came to lay siege against Jerusalem. The context of his discussion is that the siege of Simon ben Gioras against Jerusalem was about to occur at the same time that Titus made his return trip from Greece.

In the months before the siege Simon had collected a strong force and had overrun not only the province of Acrabetene but the whole district extending to the border of Idumaea. He then fortified himself in a city called Nain where “he laid up his spoils of corn” and “where most of his troops were quartered.” Here he began training his men “for an attack upon Jerusalem.”<sup>7</sup>

The Jewish Zealots, who were allied with and had many members from the Idumaeans, fearing an attack by Simon, made an expedition against him (unthinkable in a sabbath year), but they lost the contest. In turn, Simon “resolved first to subdue Idumaea” and forthwith marched to the borders of that country. A battle was fought but no one was the victor. Each side returned home.<sup>8</sup> “Not long after,” Simon invaded that country again with a larger force. This time he took control of the fortress at Herodion (Herodium). Through a bit of trickery, Simon was able to convince the Idumaeans that he possessed a force far too great for them to thwart. The Idumaeans unexpectedly broke ranks and fled.<sup>9</sup>

Simon, thus, “marched into Idumaea without bloodshed,” captured Hebron, “where he gained abundant booty and laid hands on vast supplies of corn,” and then “pursued his march through the whole of Idumaea.”<sup>10</sup> On his march through Idumaea, Simon made “havoc also of the country, since provisions proved insufficient for such a multitude; for, exclusive of his troops, he had 40,000 followers.” His cruelty and animosity against the nation “contributed to complete the devastation of Idumaea.”<sup>11</sup>

Just as a forest in the wake of locusts may be seen stripped quite bare, so in the rear of Simon’s army nothing remained but a desert. Some places they burnt, others they razed to the ground; ALL VEGETATION throughout the country vanished, either

---

<sup>5</sup> Ibid.

<sup>6</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 4:9:3.

<sup>7</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 4:9:3-4, cf. 2:22:2.

<sup>8</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 4:9:5.

<sup>9</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 4:9:5-6.

<sup>10</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 4:9:7.

<sup>11</sup> Ibid.

trodden under foot or consumed; while the tramp of their march rendered ἐνεργὸν (CULTIVATED LAND) harder than the barren soil. In short, nothing touched by their ravages left any sign of its having ever existed. (Jos., *Wars*, 4:9:7)

The land was ἐνεργὸν (*energon*), i.e. “cultivated,” “productive,” “active.”<sup>12</sup> This evidence proves that the land in Idumaea was at the time planted with crops. It also places Simon’s invasion in the months after Khisleu (Nov./Dec.), when the fields are first sown. The Jews under Simon were also harvesting all consumable vegetation, something not done during a sabbath year.

In turn the Zealots captured Simon’s wife and triumphantly entered the city of Jerusalem as if Simon himself had been captured. In response Simon laid siege to Jerusalem (which he would not have done in a sabbath year), causing a great terror among the people there. Out of fear the citizens allowed Simon to recover his wife,<sup>13</sup> but he was not yet able to take the city.

Josephus then backtracks to report the events occurring in Rome at that time. Galba was murdered (Jan., 69 C.E.), Otho succeeded to power, and Vitellius was elected emperor by his soldiers. The contest between Otho and Vitellius ensued, after which Otho died, having ruled 3 months and 2 days.<sup>14</sup> Otho’s death took place in April of 69 C.E.<sup>15</sup>

This evidence demonstrates, since aggressive war was committed and crops were in production during the winter of 68/69 C.E., that system “B,” which would have the sabbath year begin in Tishri of 68 C.E., is eliminated as a possibility. Also, since the Jews by custom did not plant crops during the six months prior to the beginning of a sabbath year, system “D,” which would begin a sabbath year in the spring of 69 C.E., must also be dismissed.

### **The Edomite Jews**

Those who hold to systems “B” and “D” object to our conclusion. They cannot deny the clear statements of Josephus. Instead, they argue, as Solomon Zeitlin does, that “the laws of the sabbatical year affected only the lands of Palestine, and had no application in Edom or in any other country that was annexed to Palestine.”<sup>16</sup> Though this interpretation may at first seem reasonable, the attempt by the advocates of systems “B” and “D” to circumvent the words of Josephus about the events during the winter of 68/69 C.E. cannot bear up against close scrutiny.

First, one must not confuse the original country of Edom (Greek “Idumaea”) with the country of Idumaea of the first century C.E. The Edomites had originally settled in the Khorite country of Seir, located southeast of the Dead Sea.<sup>17</sup> The people of Edom are descendants of Esau, who was later called Edom (Red) because he sold his birthright to his brother, Jacob Israel,

<sup>12</sup> GEL, p. 261; SEC, Gk. #1753–1756.

<sup>13</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 4:9:8.

<sup>14</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 4:9:9.

<sup>15</sup> Tacitus, *Hist.*, 2:47–55.

<sup>16</sup> JQR, 9, pp. 90, 101.

<sup>17</sup> Deut., 2:5, 12, 22; Jos., *Antiq.*, 1:20:3, 2:1:1; Yashar, 28:20, 29:12–13, 36:15–37, 47:1, 30–32, 56:46f, 57:4–38, 84:5; cf. Gen., 36:20.

for a bowl of red soup.<sup>18</sup> Before the death of Isaak, the father of both Israel and Edom, Edom migrated and settled in the Kanaani land of Seir the Khorite, located in the mountains southeast of the Dead Sea. Edom made this settlement permanent after Isaak's death. Later, the Edomite nation killed off the Seiri and became the dominant tribe in that land.<sup>19</sup>

In the days of Moses the country bordering south of Edom was Qadesh Barnea,<sup>20</sup> properly identified by Josephus,<sup>21</sup> Jerome, and Eusebius with the district near Petra.<sup>22</sup> On Edom's north side lay Moab,<sup>23</sup> their borders touching at the Zered river: the modern Wadi el-Hasa.<sup>24</sup> Through Edom's territory ran the famous King's Highway, the main highway that today extends from the Gulf of Aqabah to Al Karak.<sup>25</sup> The ancient capital city of Edom was Bozrah.<sup>26</sup> It was located about 30 miles southeast of the Dead Sea in the mountains east of the Arabah (the long valley located south of the Dead Sea and on the west side of the Seir mountains).<sup>27</sup>

At the time the Israelites divided up their shares of the Promised Land, Judah's portion included the Arabah. Judah's lot also retained Qadesh Barnea, which bordered on the south of Edom and extended southward towards the Gulf of Aqabah (Red Sea).<sup>28</sup> Importantly, the Israelites were not permitted to take any part of the land of Edom in their conquest.<sup>29</sup> After the Exodus, when the Israelites left the southern border of Edom in an effort to encompass that land so that they might gain access to the King's Highway without having to pass through Edom's territory, they went by way of the Arabah south of the Dead Sea.<sup>30</sup>

On their way north from the Gulf of Aqabah, the Israelites stopped off at Punon,<sup>31</sup> identified with modern Feinan, an Edomite border district on Edom's western side, located on the east side of the Arabah about 25 miles south of the Dead Sea.<sup>32</sup> This evidence proves that the original country of Edom proper laid north of Petra, east of the Arabah, and south of the Zered river (Wadi el-Hasa).

The Edomite families remaining in their original homeland were, by the beginning of the reign of King Darius of Persia (521 B.C.E.), driven out of their country by the Nabataean Arabs. These exiled Edomites, in turn, resettled in southern Palestine (cf. 1 Esdras, 4:45–50). The historian Strabo writes:

The Idumaeans (Edomites) are Nabataeans, but owing to sedition they were banished from there, (and) joined the Judaeans. (Strabo, 16:1:34)

<sup>18</sup> Gen., 25:19–34, 36:1–43.

<sup>19</sup> Gen., 32:3; Num., 24:18; Deut., 2:12, 22; Yashar, 47:1, 57:13–38.

<sup>20</sup> Num., 20:16.

<sup>21</sup> Jos., *Antiq.*, 4:4:7.

<sup>22</sup> *Onomastica*, pp. 108, 233.

<sup>23</sup> Deut., 2:1–5, 8–18; cf. Num., 21:10–12; Judg., 11:16–18.

<sup>24</sup> DB, p. 763; NBD, p. 1359; WHAB, p. 39a.

<sup>25</sup> Num., 20:14–21; cf. 21:21f; also see MBA, maps 9, 10, 52, 104, 126, 208; WHAB, p. 41, 65b; NBD, p. 700.

<sup>26</sup> Gen., 36:33; Isa., 34:6, 63:1; Jer., 49:13, 22; Amos, 1:12; Mic., 2:12.

<sup>27</sup> NBD, p. 165; MBA, maps 52, 104, 155.

<sup>28</sup> Josh., 10:16, 15:1–3, 18:18; Num., 34:3–4.

<sup>29</sup> Deut., 2:4–5.

<sup>30</sup> Deut., 2:8; cf. Num. 21:21ff; Yashar, 85:14.

<sup>31</sup> Num., 21:4–11; cf. 33:42ff.

<sup>32</sup> *Onomastica*, pp. 123, 299; MBA, p. 182, map. 52; ATB, p. 160.

The Nabataeans were an Arab tribe named after Nebaioth, the son of Ishmael, the brother-in-law of Edom.<sup>33</sup> In the post-exile period this tribe came to dominate the ancient Edomite country on the southeast side of the Dead Sea. They made their capital the ancient city of Petra.<sup>34</sup>

The Edomi were not Nabataeans; but, after they and their original homeland came to be dominated by the Nabataeans in the late Babylonian period, the Greeks identified these Edomi with the latter. Strabo, accordingly, identified the Idumaeans with their kinsmen tribe because they had once dwelt with the Nabataeans in part of the land presently known to him as Nabataea.

The territory occupied by the Edomites in the first century C.E., on the other hand, was located in the southern half of Judaea and was part of the Holy Land. Josephus states that the land of Idumaea that existed from the second century B.C.E. until the first century C.E. laid in “the latitude of Gaza” and was “conterminous with” the territory then held by the Jews.<sup>35</sup> Its cities included Hebron (formally an important Jewish city in the inheritance of Judah);<sup>36</sup> Adora (located 5 miles southwest of Hebron); Rhesa (8 miles south of Hebron); Marisa (1 mile south of Bit Jibrin); Thekoue (5 miles south of Bethlehem); Herodion (3 miles northeast of Thekoue); and Alurus (4 miles north of Hebron).<sup>37</sup>

Josephus makes Idumaea one of the 11 districts of Judaea.<sup>38</sup> In his book on the *Jewish Wars*, Josephus reports the defection “in many parts of Idumaea, where Machaeras was rebuilding the walls of the fortress called Gittha.”<sup>39</sup> In another version of this story, Josephus states it was “a good part of Judaea” that revolted when Machaeras fortified the place called Gittha.<sup>40</sup> Therefore, the first century C.E. country of Idumaea is interchangeably used as part of Judaea.

In pointing out how the Holy Land was divided up amongst the 12 tribes of Israel in the days of Joshua the son of Nun (1394 B.C.E.), Josephus uses the place names of cities and regions in his own day (the first century C.E.). In the allotments that came to the Israelite tribes of Judah and Simeon (Simeon obtaining a share of Judah’s territory),<sup>41</sup> Josephus gives the following description:

When, then, he had cast lots, that of Judah obtained for its lot the WHOLE OF UPPER IDUMAEA, extending (in length) to Jerusalem and in breadth reaching over to the lake of Sodom (Dead Sea); within this allotment were the cities of Ashkelon and Gaza. That of Simeon, being the second, obtained the portion OF IDUMAEA bordering on Egypt and Arabia. (Jos., *Antiq.*, 5:1:22)

<sup>33</sup> Gen., 25:13, 28:9; Jos., *Antiq.*, 1:12:4.

<sup>34</sup> Strabo, 16:4:21.

<sup>35</sup> Jos., *Apion.*, 2:9.

<sup>36</sup> E.g. see Josh., 21:9–11, 11:21, 15:1–14, 14:6–15.

<sup>37</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 1:2:6, 1:13:8, 4:9:4–7, *Antiq.*, 13:9:1, 14:13:9; and so forth.

<sup>38</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 3:3:5.

<sup>39</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 1:17:2.

<sup>40</sup> Jos., *Antiq.*, 14:15:11.

<sup>41</sup> For the location of the inheritance of Judah and Simeon see Josh., 15:1–63, 19:1–9. The tribe of Simeon took its portion out of the land allotted to Judah, see Josh., 19:1.

Diodorus states that the Dead Sea extends along the middle of the satrapy of Idumaea<sup>42</sup> (i.e. the Dead Sea laid on the eastern side of Idumaea). Pliny points out that “Idumaea and Judaea” were part of the “seacoast of Syria,”<sup>43</sup> i.e. they both border upon the Mediterranean Sea. He adds that Palestine begins with the region of Idumaea “at the point where the Serbonian Lake comes into view.”<sup>44</sup> The Serbonian Lake is located along the Mediterranean Sea, forming the northeastern sector of the Sinai Peninsula. Pliny also makes Judaea proper lie between Idumaea and Samaria.<sup>45</sup>

Strabo notes, “As for Judaea, its western extremities towards Casius are occupied by the Idumaeans and by the lake (Serbonia).”<sup>46</sup> The famous second century C.E. geographer Ptolemy makes Idumaea one of the districts of greater “Palestina or Judaea.” He writes that “all” of Idumaea lies “west of the Jordan river.” Ptolemy describes and defines Idumaea and its cities as that district lying immediately south of Judaea proper.<sup>47</sup>

This geographical data proves beyond any doubt that the country of Idumaea which existed in the first century C.E. occupied a portion of the Promised Land that had formally been given by allotment to the Israelite tribes of Judah and Simeon. The land they possessed, therefore, was part of the Holy Land; more specifically, part of greater Judah (Simeon’s portion being extracted out of Judah’s share). It stands to reason that if part of the Holy Land is occupied by those professing the Jewish faith, in the eyes of the Jews, it certainly would be subject to the Laws of Moses.

What then of the Idumaeen religious beliefs? In the reign of John Hyrcanus (134/133–105/104 B.C.E.), the Jews conquered the country of Idumaea.<sup>48</sup>

Hyrcanus also captured the Idumaeen cities of Adora and Marisa, and after subduing all the Idumaeans, PERMITTED THEM TO REMAIN in the country SO LONG AS they had themselves circumcised and WERE WILLING TO OBSERVE THE LAWS OF THE JEWS. And so, out of attachment to the land of their fathers, they submitted to circumcision and to making their manner of life conform in all other respects to that of the Jews. AND FROM THAT TIME ON THEY HAVE CONTINUED TO BE JEWS. (Jos., *Antiq.*, 13:9:1)

No other neighboring countries located outside of the lands anciently inhabited by the Israelites and conquered by the Jews in the second and first centuries B.C.E. were forced to meet the requirements of either becoming Jewish by religion and practice or suffer under the threat of being forced to vacate their land. Nevertheless, there are two extremely important questions that have not been asked in reference to this above cited passage: “Is this exemption true for those

<sup>42</sup> Diodorus, 19:98.

<sup>43</sup> Pliny, 5:13.

<sup>44</sup> Pliny, 5:14.

<sup>45</sup> Pliny, 5:15.

<sup>46</sup> Strabo, 16:2:34.

<sup>47</sup> Ptolemy, 5:15, and *Map of Asia Four*.

<sup>48</sup> Jos., *Antiq.*, 13:9:1, Wars, 1:2:6.

people living on territories anciently inhabited by the Israelites?" and, "Why would the Jews demand compliance from these Idumaeans?"

The answers are easily unveiled. When the Jews dominated Samaria and the Trans-Jordan districts, once inhabited by the House of Israel, Jewish customs were also demanded. The Samaritans, for instance, had long practiced a form of Judaism and, for the Jews, were not an issue.<sup>49</sup> But the Ituraean Arabs give us an excellent example. A tribe of Ituraeans lived in a Trans-Jordan district once inhabited by the Israelite tribe of Manasseh. When a portion of them were conquered by the Jewish king Aristobulus (104/103 B.C.E.), and their territory annexed, they were joined to the Jews "by the bond of circumcision."<sup>50</sup>

The Idumaeans, meanwhile, were living in that part of the Holy Land which historically belonged to the Jews, who had occupied it centuries before the Jewish exile to Babylonia during the sixth century B.C.E. The Jews identified themselves with their own heritage in Judah yet they still saw reasons to require the conversion of the foreign nations now occupying the territory that had once belonged to the House of Israel. This requirement was even more stringent within territory traditionally considered Judahite. In the Torah, aliens dwelling with the Israelites were required to observe the sabbath year.<sup>51</sup> As a result, either the Edomites, who were living in Judah proper and not just greater Israelite territory, had to conform to Jewish law or they had to leave. The Idumaeans chose to stay in the land, "And from that time on they have continued to be Jews!"

In the days of King Herod the Great of Judaea an Idumaeen named Costobarus was appointed governor of Idumaea and Gaza. Costobarus held the belief that the Idumaeans should not have adopted the customs of the Jews, so he sent to Cleopatra of Egypt in an attempt to have Idumaea stripped from Judaea as a possession. The attempt failed, but in discussing this issue Josephus also comments that in earlier times the Jewish priest "Hyrcanus had altered their (the Idumaeans') way of life and made them adopt THE CUSTOMS AND LAWS OF THE JEWS."<sup>52</sup> Strabo writes:

The Idumaeans are Nabataeans, but owing to a sedition they were banished from there, joined the Judaeans, and SHARED IN THE SAME CUSTOMS WITH THEM.<sup>53</sup>

Antipater, the father of the Judaeen king Herod (37–4 B.C.E.), was an Idumaeen held in high esteem among the Idumaeen people.<sup>54</sup> Though Herod's father was Edomite, the Jews themselves proclaimed that he "was a Jew."<sup>55</sup> Four of Herod's wives (Doris, Mariamme the daughter of Alexander, Mariamme the daughter of Simon, and Cleopatra) are known to be Jewish.<sup>56</sup> In fact, Mariamme the daughter of Alexander was the granddaughter of the Jewish

<sup>49</sup> Cf. 2 Kings, 17:24–28; Jos., *Antiq.*, 9:14:1–3.

<sup>50</sup> Jos., *Antiq.*, 13:11:3.

<sup>51</sup> E.g. Lev., 25:2–7.

<sup>52</sup> Jos., *Antiq.*, 15:7:9.

<sup>53</sup> Strabo 16:2:34

<sup>54</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 1:6:2, 1:13:7, 2:4:1, *Antiq.*, 14:1:3, 14:7:3, 14:15:2.

<sup>55</sup> Jos., *Wars*, 2:13:7.

<sup>56</sup> Doris was of Herod's "own nation," i.e. an Edomite (Jos., *Antiq.*, 14:12:1), yet is said to be "a native of Jerusalem" (Jos., *Wars*, 1:22:1) and "a Jewess of some standing" (Jos., *Wars*, 12:3). Mariamme, the daughter of Alexander, the son of Aristobulus, was the granddaughter of the

high priest named Hyrcanus and the other Mariamme was the daughter of the high priest named Simon.<sup>57</sup>

It would not have been possible for Herod to have retained the Judaeen crown if he had not himself been Jewish by religion. Therefore, the king of Judaea, at the time that the messiah was born, though Edomite by descent was Jewish by religion. This fact symbolizes the general merger of the Judahites and Edomites of Idumaea during this and subsequent periods. Though up until the first century C.E. the Judahites and Edomites could distinguish between themselves, foreigners classed them all as Jews. In time even their own ability to distinguish one from the other had passed away.

In religious matters the Idumaeans were generally in alliance with the Zealots, one of the strictest religious sects in ancient Judaism.<sup>58</sup> The Idumaeen Jews attended the major religious feasts at Jerusalem and were also a bulwark in the First Revolt against the Romans (66–70 C.E.).<sup>59</sup>

## Conclusion

There can be no doubt. The Idumaeans of the first century C.E. were not only Jews by religion but were living in the Holy Land—and not in just any part of the Holy Land but in that portion which had historically belonged to the tribe of Judah. Under Jewish domination they were required to adhere to the Jewish faith or else be forced to abandon the country. At the same time, the Idumaeans were in close alliance with the Zealots, a strict Jewish sect, and demonstrated their loyalty to their faith in the Jewish war against Rome.

With these details we are compelled to the conclusion that the Edomites living in southern Judaea were strict adherents to Jewish law. If they had not been, an alliance with the Zealots would have been impossible and the other Jews would have found grounds to expel them from the country.

These facts force us to conclude that when Simon invaded the country of Idumaea in the winter of 68/69 C.E.—an act itself not committed in a sabbath year—there was no possible way that these Idumaeen Jews would have avoided the sabbath year laws. But since they did cultivate their fields, we are presented with clear evidence that the winter of 68/69 B.C.E. was not part of a sabbath year. Further, since the crops of this planting season would normally be harvested after the beginning of the next year (69/70 C.E., Nisan reckoning), we have evidence that this next year was also not a sabbath.

The attack on Jerusalem by the Jewish factional leader Simon ben Gioras and the crops grown in Idumaea during the winter of 68/69 C.E. eliminates the cycles of both systems “B” and “D” from consideration (see Chart A). System “C” retains the problem of beginning with a Tishri year. Therefore, by default, the sabbath year cycle once again conforms to system “A.” We are left with the conclusion that 70/71 C.E., Nisan reckoning, the year that Jerusalem was destroyed by the Romans, was a sabbath year (see Charts A & B).

---

high priest Hyrcanus (Jos., *Wars*, 1:12:3, 1:17:8, *Antiq.*, 14:12:1, 14:15:14). The second Mariamme was the “daughter of Simon the high priest” (Jos., *Antiq.*, 15:9:3, 18:5:4). Cleopatra is also called “a native of Jerusalem.” On the ten wives of Herod the Great see Jos., *Antiq.*, 17:1:1–3; *Wars*, 1:24:2, 1:28:4; HJP, 1, pp. 320f.

<sup>57</sup> *Ibid.*

<sup>58</sup> E.g. Jos., *Antiq.*, 4:4:1–4:5:2.

<sup>59</sup> E.g. Jos., *Antiq.*, 17:10:2, *Wars*, 2:3:2, 5:6:1, 6:8:2.