

FLACCUS AND THE JEWS OF ASIA  
(CICERO *PRO FLACCO* 28.67–69)

ANTHONY J. MARSHALL

OUR MOST VIVID AND RELIABLE piece of literary evidence concerning the Jewish community of Republican Rome is to be found in a dramatic passage of Cicero's oration *Pro L. Flacco*. Having dealt with the complaints of the cities of Asia, Cicero pauses briefly before proceeding to the accusations of the Roman residents of the province in order to defend his client L. Valerius Flaccus against *auri illa invidia Iudaici*. This involves the allegation that Flaccus had acted improperly during his governorship of Asia in 62 B.C. in withdrawing from the Jews of his province their freedom to send the annual tribute-money to the Temple in Jerusalem.<sup>1</sup> Cicero first appeals to the jurors' sense of humour by a pun which relates the *aurum* of the charge to the *gradus Aurelii* close by the scene of the trial and to their political sensibilities by the claim that this venue had been chosen by the prosecution in order to facilitate demonstrations by Jewish mobs. Then he stagily places his finger on his lips in feigned apprehension, lowers his voice, and proceeds to give some detail of the charge.<sup>2</sup>

Unlike his treatment of the charges concerning improper exactions from the Asian cities, which he had rejected as entirely false, Cicero is ready in this instance to admit the facts as alleged by the prosecution.

<sup>1</sup>For the half-shekel tribute (equivalent to two Attic drachmae or two Roman denarii) incumbent upon all adult male Jews, see Schürer 314–315, Juster 1.377–385, Smallwood 237 f.

The following works are referred to by author's name: T. R. S. Broughton, *The Magistrates of the Roman Republic* (New York 1952); V. Chapot, *La Province romaine Proconsulaire d'Asie* (Paris 1904); (various authors), *ESAR — An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore 1933–1938); S. L. Guterman, *Religious Toleration and Persecution in Ancient Rome* (London 1951); E. G. Hardy, *Studies in Roman History* (London 1910); J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain* (Paris 1914); G. La Piana, "Foreign Groups in Rome during the First Centuries of the Empire," *HTR* 20 (1927) 183–403; H. J. Leon, *The Jews of Ancient Rome* (Philadelphia 1960); D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor* (Princeton 1950); M. Radin, *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans* (Philadelphia 1915); Th. Reinach, *Textes d'Auteurs Grecs et Romains relatifs au Judaïsme* (Paris 1895); M. Rostovtzeff, *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford 1941); E. Schürer, *Geschichte des Jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi* 2<sup>a</sup>, 3<sup>a</sup> (Leipzig 1907, 1909); E. M. Smallwood (ed.), *Philonis Alexandrini Legatio ad Gaium* (Leiden 1961); H. Vogelstein, *The Jews of Rome* (tr. Moses Hadas, Philadelphia 1940).

<sup>2</sup>*Sic submissa voce agam tantum ut iudices audiant*. For the rhetorical structure of this passage, see T. B. L. Webster, *M. Tulli Ciceronis Pro L. Flacco Oratio* (Oxford 1931) xiii, xvii. Cf. Cic. *Cluentio* 34.93 for harassment of a defence counsel by a mob at the Aurelian steps.

But he claims to be able to demonstrate that these facts reflect credit rather than discredit upon his client.<sup>3</sup> According to Cicero's version, which he claims to be commonly agreed by the prosecution, the central features of the episode are as follows. After Flaccus had issued an edict forbidding the export of gold from his province, gold collected by the Asian Jews and intended for the Jerusalem Temple was confiscated through the agency of the governor's subordinate officers in the four cities of Apamea, Laodicea, Adramyttium, and Pergamum. Flaccus duly entered the amounts in his accounts and deposited them with the *aerarium*.<sup>4</sup> In order to engage the jurors' sympathies, Cicero concludes with some scornful remarks about the Jewish religion and the significance for the Jewish people of the capture of Jerusalem in 63 B.C., remarks which suggest that the prosecution had laid great stress on the historic sanctity of the Temple in order to represent Flaccus' action as high-handed. It is also evident that the prosecution's general plan of establishing that friction had existed between Flaccus and Pompey and of unfavorably contrasting Flaccus' official acts with those of the great conqueror had led them to point the contrast with Pompey's notable restraint in leaving the Temple treasures untouched in 63 B.C.<sup>5</sup>

This passage, which constitutes our first contemporary literary evidence for an abiding Jewish community in Rome, has naturally attracted interest mostly because of the light which it casts on the size, location, and political awareness of that community. In particular, it has been noticed that it discredits the version offered by Philo Judaeus, who asserts that this community had its origin in the Jewish prisoners brought back to Rome by Pompey. For the flourishing, well organized, and vocal community which Cicero affects to fear as a disruptive force in 59 B.C. can hardly have been built up so rapidly from Palestinian slaves.<sup>6</sup> Recent studies have also rejected as apocryphal the expulsion of the Jews from Rome which Valerius Maximus assigns to the year 139 B.C. and recognized in Cicero's remarks our first reliable evidence for

<sup>3</sup>Cf. *Flacco* 29.70, *Quam ob rem quoniam, quod crimen esse voluisti, id totum vides in laudem esse conversum* . . . . The only other charge for which this technique is used concerns the ship-tax (12.27 f.). For the usual technique of flat denial, see 9.20-21; 10.23; 15.34; 19.43-44; 36.90. Cf. E. Costa, *Cicerone Giureconsulto* (Bologna 1927) 2<sup>a</sup> 109 f.

<sup>4</sup>For the named agents of Flaccus, see Broughton, *MRR* 2.177-178. The Sextus Caesius who operated in Apamea and is described as an *equus* should also be listed as a *praefectus*.

<sup>5</sup>See *Flacco* 6.14; 12.28-29.

<sup>6</sup>See Philo *Leg. ad Gaium* 23.155, which is followed by Reinach, 238; Hardy, 15; Vogelstein, 10 f. For a convincing refutation of Philo's version, see Radin, 227-230; also Schürer, 3<sup>a</sup> 57 f.; La Piana 341 f.; S. Collon, "Remarques sur les Quartiers Juifs de la Rome antique," *Mélanges d'Arch. et d'Hist. de l'École Franç.* 57 (1940) 72-94, at 77 f.; Leon, 5 f.

a stable Jewish community in Rome.<sup>7</sup> Unfortunately, discussion of this evidence in the standard reference works on Jewish history is often marred by an anachronistic concept of the Roman political system. It is one thing to state, on the basis of Cicero's claim that the Roman Jews could be incited *in me atque in optimum quemque* that they supported the *populares*. But it is wholly misleading to maintain that these *populares* were the "radical," "democratic," or "popular" party.<sup>8</sup> Another unsatisfactory feature of such discussions is their assumption that the Jews whom Cicero describes as making their presence felt in *contiones* must have been Roman citizens and so can mostly be classed as freedmen.<sup>9</sup>

This passage has also attracted attention because of the evidence it is supposed to provide for Cicero's personal prejudices. Some scholars, indeed, have roundly condemned Cicero for anti-semitism on the ground of his hostile characterization of the Jewish religion as a *barbara superstitio* abhorrent to Roman *gravitas* and *mos maiorum*. Some debate has ensued as to which of Cicero's Greek mentors, Posidonius or Apollonius son of Molon, transmitted this infection. Most recently, L. Herrmann has indicted Posidonius as the baleful influence, while contending also that Cicero's attitude was calculated to please the *equites* who were currently concerned to disarm opposition to the methods used by the *publicani* to exploit Judaea.<sup>10</sup> Such theories, however, do not recognize that the purpose of Cicero's invective against the Jews was not so much to disclose personal opinion as to work upon the *jurors'* feelings in order to secure an acquittal. The arousal of hostile feelings was, of course, an easier goal in the case of a freshly conquered people.<sup>11</sup> It should also be realized that the sketching of crude national caricatures was a standard rhetorical

<sup>7</sup>See Val. Max. 1.3.3, which is accepted by Vogelstein, 10 f. and by Guterman, 39. La Piana, 344, is sceptical. S. Alessandri, "La presunta cacciata dei Giudei da Roma nel 139 a.Cr.," *Studi Class. e Orient.* 17 (1968) 187-198, argues that such an expulsion would have suited Cicero's purpose so ideally in defending Flaccus that he would surely have referred to it in the speech had it been authentic.

<sup>8</sup>For use of such anachronistic terminology, see Vogelstein, 20; Radin, 231; Leon, 8. Cf. Suet. *Div. Iul.* 84.5.

<sup>9</sup>*Flacco* 28.66, *scis quanta sit manus, quanta concordia, quantum valeat in contionibus*; 28.67, *multitudinem Iudaeorum flagrantem non numquam in contionibus*. For assumptions about citizenship, see, e.g., Leon, 8. But Smallwood notes that non-citizens could attend *contiones* (235).

<sup>10</sup>See Plut. *Cic.* 4.4 and Jos. *Contra Apion.* 2.7 (79), with Reinach, 241; L. Herrmann, "Cicéron et les Juifs," *Atti del I Congresso Internazionale di Studi Ciceroniani* 1 (Rome 1961) 113-117. But the clash between Gabinius and the *publicani* over Judaea, on which Herrmann rests his argument (*op. cit.* 116) occurred two years after the date of the *Pro Flacco* (see Broughton, *MRR* 2.203). This argument therefore remains unsupported.

<sup>11</sup>For Cicero's own warning that his orations should be read as an actor's script which does not necessarily represent personal conviction, see *Cluentio* 50.139; *Off.* 2.14.51.

technique employed in defence speeches at extortion trials in order to discredit provincial witnesses. Since the defence counsel in such trials regularly resorted to the sweeping claim that all the charges were false, the most obvious supportive technique was to impugn the reliability of non-Roman witnesses by using national caricature.<sup>12</sup> In view of this calculation of effect, the most one can safely conclude is that Cicero counted on arousing anti-Jewish prejudice in the jurors' minds to colour their consideration of the charges against Flaccus.

If we turn to discussions which relate this passage to the history of Rome's provincial administration, we encounter a general assumption of the guilt of Flaccus in this episode. Indeed, his treatment of the Asian Jews is to be found listed as one count in some notable indictments of the Republican provincial regime.<sup>13</sup> Such presentations make little or no attempt to allow for the notorious use of the *repetundae* court in factional politics or, in particular, for the political implications of the prosecution of Flaccus in the turbulent year 59 B.C. But the three-year delay in the bringing of the indictment suggests that its timing and purpose were, as Cicero contends, essentially political. It was probably calculated to bring added pressure on Cicero for his actions in 63 B.C., actions which Flaccus had supported as praetor, and to destroy the latter's hopes for the consulship of 58 B.C. Old personal scores were also being paid off.<sup>14</sup> The relevance of such factors to the validity of the actual charges is difficult to estimate, but it is surprising to find how regularly one passage in Macrobius has been cited as if it conclusively established the guilt of Flaccus.<sup>15</sup> A glance

<sup>12</sup>For an explicit recommendation of the technique of claiming in all *repetundae* cases that the charges are false, see *De Orat.* 2.25.105. Use of this technique does not, therefore, amount to a confession of the client's guilt. For use of national caricature to discredit provincial witnesses, see *Font.* 10.21; 13.30-14.31; 16.36; *Scauro* 17.38-19.44.

<sup>13</sup>Chapot, 46 f., forgets his own warning that the *Pro Flacco* requires careful critical evaluation (42) and turns his discussion into a mere diatribe against Rome. The guilt of Flaccus is flatly asserted also by R. O. Jolliffe, *Phases of Corruption in Roman Administration* (Menasha 1919) 35 f.; Vogelstein, 20 f.; Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW* 963. Magie, 379, actually treats the charges contested by Cicero in his defence as a check-list of indisputable crimes.

<sup>14</sup>The *honor* stated in *Flacco* 1.1 to have been anticipated for Flaccus is generally taken to be the consulship of 58 B.C. See Webster, *Pro L. Flacco Oratio* (above, note 2) 51; H. Hill, *The Roman Middle Class* (Oxford 1952) 175. For the political and personal background to the trial, see Hill, 174 f.; E. Badian, "P. Decius P.f. Subulo," *JRS* 46 (1956) 91-96; E. S. Gruen, *Roman Politics and the Criminal Courts 149-78 B.C.* (Cambridge, Mass. 1968) 189 f. For the significance of the timing of the trial, see *Flacco* 2.4-5, with S. I. Oost, "The date of the Lex Julia de Repetundis," *AJP* 77 (1956) 19-28, at 28. Cf. Gruen, *The Last Generation of the Roman Republic* (Berkeley and Los Angeles 1974) 289-291, who offers no comment on the significant timing of the prosecution but insinuates, without argument, that Flaccus was guilty.

<sup>15</sup>*Sat.* 2.1.13, *atque ego, ni longum esset, referrem in quibus causis, cum nocentissimos reos tueretur, victoriam iocis adeptus sit; ut ecce pro L.Flacco, quem repetundarum reum ioci*

at this much over-worked "proof" will show that the statement of Flaccus' guilt is presented merely as an opinion put into the mouth of Symmachus, one of the characters of the *Saturnalia*. Since no extraneous evidence is offered, we are presumably to understand this as an opinion based simply on a reading of Cicero's defence speech. Even though the judgement of Symmachus may reflect a *communis opinio* of the day, it cannot in itself be taken as proving anything.

Flaccus also appears as a villain in more specialized studies of Jewish history. During the course of their sympathetic reviews of the Jewish people's struggle to preserve religious customs under foreign domination, such studies have naturally tended to represent the episode of 62 B.C. as a wholly unjustifiable interference with those customs. Despite Cicero's explicit statement that the prosecution conceded that the confiscated gold was accounted for and deposited in the *aerarium*, one distinguished historian has gone so far as to accuse Flaccus of pocketing the gold himself.<sup>16</sup> But the inquiry should be more strictly focussed, since the point at issue here is not so much the confiscation of the gold as the edictal ban which led up to it. For if Flaccus cannot be shown to be corruptly self-seeking in this matter, his judgement in issuing the edict may properly be debated. Cicero clearly tells us that Flaccus first issued his edictal ban and only proceeded to the confiscation of the tribute-money because the Asian Jews had been caught in an attempt to send it in deliberate defiance of that standing edict.<sup>17</sup> The Jews who persisted in obeying their own religious laws were caught red-handed in their attempt to defy Roman law, and their detection in flagrant violation of the edict is vividly expressed in Cicero's description of the gold as *manifesto comprehensum*.<sup>18</sup>

*opportunitate de manifestissimis criminibus exemit.* The archetypal claim that this passage convicts Flaccus seems to have been made by F. Münzer, *De gente Valeriana* (Oppeln 1891) 43-44, "quamquam ex huius oratione colligi potest, id quod etiam aliunde comprobatur (Macrob. 2.1.13), manifesta apertaue rei crimina fuisse, tamen absolutus est." See also Juster, 1.379; Jolliffe, *Phases of Corruption* (above, note 13) 35; Radin, 223; Magie, 380.

<sup>16</sup>See Vogelstein, 20. Cf. *Flacco* 28.68, *Ubi igitur crimen est, quoniam quidem furtum nusquam reprehendis*; 28. 69, *Auri ratio constat, aurum in aerario est; furtum non reprehenditur, invidia quaeritur*.

<sup>17</sup>It is possible that the *edictum* was not just an *ad hoc* ruling of the kind illustrated by *Verr.* 2.3.14.36 (*exoritur peculiare edictum repentinum*) but was included in the standing *edictum perpetuum* issued on entry into office. Cf. *Att.* 6.1.15 for the known content of the Cilician edict relating to the cities' financial affairs. Vogelstein, 21, followed by Leon, 5, holds that the edictal ban was still in effect and was being tested by the trial of 59 B.C. But unless Q. Cicero chose to reintroduce the ban in his own Asian edict in 61 B.C. it would only have had force while Flaccus retained *imperium* in Asia. Cf. *Verr.* 2.1.42.109, *Qui plurimum tribuunt edicto, praetoris edictum legem annuam dicunt esse*. Cicero, however, would surely mention any such reaffirmation of the ban as supporting his client's judgement.

<sup>18</sup>Webster, *Pro L. Flacco Oratio* (above, note 2) 91, well translates "Seized as it was

Although confiscation may have featured in the edict as a supportive sanction, it was hardly the primary feature of the decree but would, rather, be implemented by Flaccus only as a response to an act of disobedience. Since, moreover, we have no reason to suppose that if the Jews had acquiesced in the ruling any confiscation would have ensued, we must presume that his overall intention was to stop the sending of the tribute-money rather than to seize it. The very disobedience of the Asian Jews suggests that they viewed the edict as an intolerable interference with their religious customs, and it is true that we know of no precedent for the seizure of Jewish sacred funds by a Roman official. Pompey, humorously dubbed *Hierosolymarius* in Cicero's letters, had carefully refrained from touching the Temple treasury in 63 B.C., although Crassus was to have no such scruples when preparing for his Parthian campaign.<sup>19</sup> However, it is the issue of the edictal ban itself which we must consider, since the confiscation may be seen as consequential upon and as a predictable Roman response to deliberate disregard of the ban.<sup>20</sup>

The distinguished historian Jean Juster has confused this issue by denouncing Flaccus in strongly emotional terms for revoking a formally guaranteed right to unmolested payment of the tribute-money. In his criticism, Juster even accuses Flaccus of violating Roman law by depriving the Asian Jews of this privilege.<sup>21</sup> But his discussion presupposes the existence by 62 B.C. of a formal grant to the Jews of the Diaspora of the right to send the tribute-money, and this supposed legal privilege finds no support in the evidence. No such guarantee is attested before the grant

---

being exported." For the implication of detected guilt conveyed by *manifesto*, cf. *Cat.* 3.2.4, *ut . . . tota res non solum a me sed etiam a senatu et a vobis manifesto deprenderetur*; *Cluent.* 7.20, *cum manifesto venenum deprehendisset quod vir matris Oppianicus ei paravisset, et res non coniectura sed oculis et manibus teneretur*; *Cluent.* 14.43, *exponam vobis Oppianici facinus manifesto compertum atque depresum*. This full sense is missed in the translations of Reinach, 239; Radin, 225. A. Boulanger, *Cicéron, Discours Tome XII* (Paris 1947) 120, translates "aux yeux de tous . . . ont été saisies."

<sup>19</sup>For Pompey, see *Att.* 2.9.1; *Flacco* 28.67; *Jos. A.ŷ.* 14.4.4 (72); *B.ŷ.* 1.7.6 (153). Cassius Dio 37.16.4 is clearly mistaken in saying that the Temple was looted in 63 B.C. Cf. V. Burr, "Rom und Judäa im 1. Jahrhundert v. Chr.," *Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt* (ed. H. Temporini) I.1 (Berlin and New York 1972) 875–886, at 879. Pompey's restraint was more probably due to shrewd policy than to the *pudor* alleged by Cicero or the *εὐσέβεια* alleged by Josephus. For the depredations of Crassus and later governors, see *Jos. A.ŷ.* 14.7.1 (105); *B.ŷ.* 1.8.8 (179); Juster, 1.384. Cf. *Fam.* 7.13.1 for humorous comment on senators who corruptly "gilded" themselves with Gallic gold.

<sup>20</sup>In the confiscation Flaccus presumably acted by virtue of his discretionary powers of *coercitio*. Cf. Th. Mommsen, *Römisches Strafrecht* (Leipzig 1898) 48 f.

<sup>21</sup>1.379 f. Juster even advances the argument that the illegality of Flaccus' decree is proved by the fact that the accusation was laid against him (379)! He does not explain why the gold, if illegally confiscated, was sent to the *aerarium*, an act which suggests the concurrence of the central authorities.

of Julius Caesar, and the total silence of Philo and Josephus about any prior grant would be inexplicable had one been made.<sup>22</sup> Juster bases his position in part on the fact that Cicero discloses that the sending of the tribute-money had continued as an annual and universal custom throughout the empire despite the issuing of a succession of *senatus consulta*, the most recent in 63 B.C., which forbade the export of gold and silver.<sup>23</sup> Cicero adduces these decrees to show that his client had been implementing a general senatorial policy, but Juster contends that the continuation of the temple-tribute rather shows that Jews throughout the Roman world must have been granted an exemption to their terms, an exemption which Flaccus could not properly overrule in 62 B.C. However, the frequent repetition of the *senatus consulta* is in itself significant and calls for explanation. For repeated decrees cannot all have functioned as comprehensive, effective, and enduring prohibitions.

Three possible explanations may be suggested. Firstly, the successive decrees may have been to some degree ineffectual, and so could be simply evaded by the Jews of the Diaspora. Secondly, the decrees themselves may have been intended to have a limited application in respect of time, area, or type of organization covered, and so were not enforced as universal bans without exceptions. Thirdly, and most probably, the decrees may have constituted admonitions rather than general bans, addressed in broad terms to successive governors and so dependent for their implementation on the interpretation and discretion of those officials. Any of these explanations obviates the need to assume that the Jews required an explicit exemption. It may also be significant that Cicero describes the sending of the tribute-money as a customary practice only. The verb used (*soleret*) does not imply the existence of any legal right and gives us no reason to suppose that the practice rested as yet on any firmer basis than the customary tolerance of the Roman authorities. It would seem safer to conclude that the export of these offerings continued *de facto* through the tolerance or indifference of the Roman officials, and so could at any time be stopped if some special reason was seen for enforcing the

<sup>22</sup>See the evidence listed by Juster himself, 1.381 note 4, 409, 425. See also Schürer, 3.4 108 f. Smallwood, 205, 238, also appears to assume that an explicit guarantee had been granted. For the final withdrawal of Roman protective legislation, with the banning of *aurum coronarium* in the fifth century, see J. E. Seaver, *Persecution of the Jews in the Roman Empire* (Lawrence, Kansas 1952) 57, 72.

<sup>23</sup>*Flacco* 28.67, *Exportari aurum non oportere cum saepe antea senatus tum me consule gravissime iudicavit*. Cf. *Vat.* 5.12. The "decision" which Cicero declares the prosecution to have acknowledged when he states *iudicatum fateris* (*Flacco* 28.68) is also probably the *senatus consultum* of 63 B.C., as the repetition of the verb suggests. It is less likely to be some previously unmentioned judicial decision of Flaccus himself in Asia, as is implied in the translations of Reinach, 239; Radin, 224; Herrmann, "Cicéron et les Juifs" (above, note 10) 115.

*senatus consulta* in this particular case.<sup>24</sup> It remains to be considered why Flaccus did choose to exercise his discretion by applying the senate's rulings to the tribute-money in Asia.

Among the scanty factual clues which Cicero furnishes are the sums which were weighed out in confiscated gold in the named Asian cities. These amounts are given as *auri pondo c paulo minus* at Apamea, *xx pondo paulo amplius* at Laodicea, possibly another hundred pounds at Adramyttium,<sup>25</sup> and at Pergamum an amount described only as *non multum* and so presumably less than at either Apamea or Laodicea. Since we are able to estimate the exchange-value of gold at this period, these figures might be thought to provide a solid clue as to the number of the contributors.<sup>26</sup> But some scholars have judged the sums listed, especially the high figure for Apamea, to be quite excessive for a single year's tribute-money from the Jewish community of any Asian city at this period, made up as it would be from contributions of only two drachmae or denarii from each adult male.<sup>27</sup> A major difficulty in assessing the significance of the figures is, of course, our lack of even approximate totals for the size of the Jewish communities of Asia, although they were certainly large in major Asian cities in the first century of our era and Phrygia, a very rich area of the province, would especially attract settlers.<sup>28</sup> It must also be borne in mind that additional gifts of gold for the Jerusalem Temple would occasionally be collected and forwarded together with the temple-tribute.<sup>29</sup>

<sup>24</sup>Radin, 226, reasonably conjectures that the senate had been concerned to stop commercial export of gold and that previous governors had exempted religious contributions from its regulations by a customary interpretation. Possibly the Jews themselves simply assumed that they had an agreed exemption, by virtue of their generally accepted claim to the privilege of living under their ancestral law.

<sup>25</sup>The figure for Adramyttium was supplied by A. C. Clark in his Oxford Classical Text (1909). L. Fruechtel in his Teubner edition (Leipzig 1932) and the Budé editor A. Boulanger (above, note 18) show better judgement in retaining the lacuna.

<sup>26</sup>M. W. Frederiksen, "Caesar, Cicero and the Problem of Debt," *JRS* 56 (1966) 128-141, at 132, estimates the value at 6,000 sesterces per pound. Cf. Suet. *Div. Iul.* 54.2, which implies that Caesar's price of 3,000 sesterces per pound for his glut of Gallic gold was well below the current rate.

<sup>27</sup>See Reinach, 240, who computes the Apamea total at over 75,000 Athenian drachmae. Radin, 226, accepts this equivalence and argues that this figure is quite impossible for one year's tribute-money since it would imply a total Jewish population for Apamea of some 170,000. But Reinach's figure is far too low. The true figure would surely be closer to ca 135,000 denarii/drachmae.

<sup>28</sup>For the numbers of the Asian Jews, see Jos. *A.ŷ.* 16.2.3 (27); Philo *Leg. ad Gaium* 33.245. Cf. Chapot, 182-186; Shürer, 3.<sup>4</sup> 312-321. For their temple-tribute, cf. Jos. *A.ŷ.* 14.7.2 (110). For the Jews of Phrygia, see W. M. Ramsay, *The Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* 1.2 (Oxford 1897) 667-676. For the Jewish communities of the four cities listed by Cicero, see Jos. *A.ŷ.* 14.10.20 (241), 14.10.22 (247), with Shürer, 3.<sup>4</sup> 13, 17, 18. For the commercial vitality of Apamea, see Strabo 12.8.15 (577) and A. H. M. Jones, *The Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces*<sup>2</sup> (Oxford 1971) 69 f.

<sup>29</sup>See, e.g., Jos. *A.ŷ.* 18.9.1 (312); *B.ŷ.* 5.5.3 (205). Cf. Juster, 1.378.



However, it remains possible that the figures given by Cicero represent either the sum of several years' accumulated temple-tribute or the yield of a punitive confiscation which extended to the entire common funds of the Jewish communities in the four cities.

Very relevant to this inquiry is the military and political situation of Judaea itself. For it is conceivable that the annual despatch of gold to Jerusalem had been interrupted for several years prior to 62 B.C. because of the disturbed conditions there. Jerusalem had witnessed the civil war, commencing in 67 B.C., between Hyrcanus and Aristobulus, the siege by Aretas in 65–64 B.C., the operations of M. Aemilius Scaurus, and the culminating three-month siege of the Temple Mount itself by Pompey in 63 B.C. To the north, Syria had been in anarchy since the expulsion of Tigranes, and made insecure by robber-bands inland and by pirate forts along its coast.<sup>30</sup> With Jerusalem itself a center of warfare, the Asian Jews may well have held back their tribute for several years and then, with Judaea reduced to order by Pompey, made ready for shipment in 62 B.C. an unusually large sum. If so, the equally unusual interest of Flaccus may find some explanation.

It is unfortunate that the only other figure known for a seizure of Jewish funds in Asia under the Republic does not provide any independent basis for comparison. Josephus cites Strabo's account of the seizure by Mithridates in 88 B.C. of eight hundred talents of Jewish money on the island of Cos. Although Strabo had implied that this money originated with the Jews of Egypt, Josephus prefers to identify it as sacred funds of the Asian Jews who had sent it to Cos for safekeeping.<sup>31</sup> But the controversy over the significance of this sum has continued, since Reinach has rejected the interpretation of Josephus and proposed in turn that the money comprised the private fortunes of Jewish merchants of Asia<sup>32</sup>. But since Reinach reaches his conclusion mainly by employing the figures of the *Pro Flacco* to show the approximate annual temple-tribute from the four Asian cities, it is impossible to base any interpretation of those figures on his theory.<sup>33</sup>

Reinach does not consider the obvious possibility that the Asian Jews

<sup>30</sup>See W. D. Morrison, *The Jews under Roman Rule*<sup>4</sup> (New York and London 1895) 33–42; *Cambridge Ancient History* 9 (1932) 381 f. (H. A. Ormerod), 402 f. (E. R. Bevan); Burr, "Rom und Judäa im 1. Jahrhundert v. Chr." (above, note 19) 875–879. For dating of the operations in Judaea, see Broughton, *MRR* 2.159, 163, 165 note 7.

<sup>31</sup>Jos. *A. J.* 14.7.2 (111–113). Cf. Juster, 1.379 note 1; Chapot, 27 f., 185; Magie, 1103 note 38.

<sup>32</sup>See Th. Reinach, "Mithridate et les Juifs," *REJ* 16 (1888) 204–210. Reinach does allow that a small fraction of the sum may have been tribute-money. His theory is reviewed and endorsed by J. Cohen, *Judaica et Aegyptiaca. De Maccabaeorum Libro III Quaestiones Historicae* (Groningen 1941) 59–64. Shürer, 3.<sup>4</sup> 56, 112, accepts that the money was temple-tribute, but does not rule out Reinach's explanation.

<sup>33</sup>Radin, 226, makes the same assumption about the *Pro Flacco* figures, thereby arriving at his "impossible" figure for the Apamean Jews.

had sent their entire community funds for safekeeping on Cos, not just their collections for the Temple. Moreover, since the four cities listed by Cicero were certainly major centers, it is unnecessary to follow Reinach in assuming that the sums of gold given in the *Pro Flacco* represent funds collected strictly within those cities. It is more probable that these sums represent a collection made from the large surrounding areas for which the named cities served as natural centers.<sup>34</sup> Whether the collecting was done by the Jewish communities themselves or by agents of the Roman confiscation we are not told. But it may be significant that the four cities in question were all Roman assize-centers, a fact which conveniently allowed Flaccus to inspect the gold in person and enter the figures in his accounts while travelling "on circuit" through his province.<sup>35</sup> Cicero states that the gold was weighed out before Flaccus in the forum of Apamea, where the governor would set up his tribunal, by the agency of a subordinate official (*per Sex. Caesium*). Since the use of the preposition *per* is repeated to indicate the agents for the weighing out of the gold at Laodicea and Adramyttium, Cicero implies that in these cities also the governor was present at the tally. It is therefore possible that it was Roman officials who seized and collected the gold from the Jewish communities within each *conventus*, or assize-district, and brought it into the respective administrative centers to await the arrival of the governor on his assize-circuit.<sup>36</sup> The assize-districts of the cities in question were certainly extensive enough to draw in a number of Jewish communities.<sup>37</sup>

Whatever explanation we accept for the figures recorded by Cicero, we should take account of contemporary developments which could well have had an adverse affect upon the status of the Asian Jews and made them more vulnerable to an attack on their religious customs. The Greek municipal authorities could always be counted on to favour and abet such an attack. We have ample evidence that their petty persecution extended in Asia at this period to persistent attempts to seize the temple-tribute, which they viewed as an unfair drain on their cities' economies,

<sup>34</sup>Ramsay, *Cities and Bishoprics of Phrygia* (above, note 28) 1.2.667, more reasonably contends that the Apamea total was collected from the large Jewish population of Phrygia generally, and notes that Jews were far more numerous in that area than in other parts of Asia.

<sup>35</sup>For the location of the Asian assize-centers, see L. Robert, "Le Culte de Caligula," *Hellenica* 7 (1949) 223-238; A. J. Marshall, "Governors on the Move," *Phoenix* 20 (1966) 231-246.

<sup>36</sup>For Roman use of the *conventus* centers for administrative purposes other than jurisdiction, see, e.g., R. K. Sherck, *Roman Documents from the Greek East* (Baltimore 1969) nos. 52 and 65 (dissemination of letters and decrees).

<sup>37</sup>See Pliny *Nat. Hist.* 5.28.105-29.106; 5.30.122-123; 5.30.126. Cf. Robert, (above, note 35) 224-225; W. M. Ramsay, *The Hitorical Geography of Asia Minor* (London 1890) 119; Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (above, note 28) 69 f.

or divert it to civic liturgies. At a later period, Josephus attests the continuing need for Roman directives to the Asian cities in order to safeguard these offerings.<sup>38</sup> During the year 62 B.C., when the Asian cities were made subject by the governor to special levies, a curtailment of this unpopular custom would have been especially gratifying to the Greeks, and it is possible that Flaccus saw that it would be astute policy to appease the burdened cities in this way.<sup>39</sup> If an unusual sum in tribute-money had accumulated in Asia because of the disturbed condition of Judaea, the jealous notice of the city officials may have been attracted to it, and it is not unlikely that these officials played some role in detecting the attempt to disobey the export ban of 62 B.C. and in collecting the confiscated gold. The armed resistance of Jerusalem to Rome, the storming of the Temple Mount, and the imposition of tribute on Judaea will all have tended to create a climate of opinion less tolerant of the religious prerogatives of the Jews of the Diaspora.<sup>40</sup> The Romans themselves may have felt some reluctance to allow large sums in gold to flow into the treasury of a city which they had recently subdued after a difficult siege, and might well wonder if they were funding a rebellion.<sup>41</sup>

The legal status of the Asian Jews may also have been recently undermined. A *senatus consultum* of 64 B.C. had dissolved the *collegia*, and since there is no evidence that Jewish organizations were exempted from this decree, Jews in the provinces may theoretically have lost their right to hold a common fund and with it their right to send communal payments to Jerusalem.<sup>42</sup> The question whether Jewish synagogues constituted *collegia* in Roman eyes has, it is true, been much debated. In particular, Juster contended vigorously that they were quite unique in their legal character.<sup>43</sup> But most scholars, while allowing that substantial differences can be found between synagogues and other *collegia*, have concluded that

<sup>38</sup>See Jos. *A.J.* 16.2.3 (28); 16.2.4 (45); 16.6.1 (160); 16.6.2 (164); 16.6.3 (166); 16.6.4 (167); 16.6.5 (169); Philo *Leg. ad Gaium* 40.313 and 315. Cf. Juster, 1.380 f.; Chapot, 183 f.; A. N. Sherwin-White, *Racial Prejudice in Imperial Rome* (Cambridge 1967) 86–101.

<sup>39</sup>For the special levies, see *Flacco* 12.27 f.

<sup>40</sup>For the imposition of tribute, see Jos. *B.J.* 1.7.6 (154); Cic. *Flacco* 28.69. Cf. Morri-son, *Jews under Roman Rule* (above, note 30) 33 f.

<sup>41</sup>For a hint of this suspicion, see Jos. *B.J.* 6.6.2 (335).

<sup>42</sup>See Cic. *Sest.* 25.55; *Mur.* 34.71; *Pis.* 4.8; Ascon. *In Pisonem* 8 (Clark, *OCT* p. 8); *In Cornel.* 67 (Clark, *OCT* p. 75). The exceptions to the decree listed by Asconius in the last passage cited are given as *pauca atque certa quae utilitas civitatis desiderasset, sicut fabrorum fictorumque*. This does not envisage religious *collegia*. Cf. E. Kornemann, "Collegium," *RE* 4 (1901) 405 f.; P. W. Duff, *Personality in Roman Private Law* (Cambridge 1938) 95 f. For the termination of the common funds of *collegia* which were dissolved under the Empire, see *Digest* 47.22.3.

<sup>43</sup>1.418 f. For a summary of the controversy, see La Piana, 349; Leon, 167 f.

synagogues nevertheless constituted religious *collegia* under Roman law.<sup>44</sup> It is also not clear whether the decree of 64 B.C. applied to *collegia* outside Rome, but both Julius Caesar and Augustus classified provincial Jewish communities as bodies which required exemption from current bans on *collegia*. We have, moreover, no evidence that synagogues were ever formally exempted from legislation affecting the *collegia* before the concession granted by the former.<sup>45</sup> It would, of course, have been impossible to dissolve the synagogues in any real sense under the decree of 64 B.C., which was in any case aimed primarily at political clubs, and they presumably continued their technically unauthorized activities. But if for any reason they attracted the adverse notice of Roman authority, their maintenance of a common fund might cease to be tolerated.<sup>46</sup>

The decree of 64 B.C., by creating a formal weakness in the claim of the Jews to have a communal fund, may have influenced Flaccus in his decision two years later. But if the primary purpose of his edict had been to deal with unauthorized *collegia*, Cicero would surely have used this fact as a strong argument in his defence. As it is, he relates the edict to a series of *senatus consulta*, the latest issued in 63 B.C., which forbade the export of silver and gold, and presents this as the area of immediate concern.<sup>47</sup> The reasons for the *senatus consultum* of 63 B.C. may be readily surmised. It was not, of course, aimed solely at the Jews resident in Italy, although they were under the same obligation to send the temple-tribute as the Asian Jews.<sup>48</sup> The scope of this decree was clearly much wider, and it can plausibly be attributed to the economic troubles caused by the wars against Sertorius, Mithridates, and the pirates. The widespread indebtedness, which the Catilinarian conspiracy dramatized, was com-

<sup>44</sup>See especially Guterman, 130–150, who rebuts Juster's arguments in order. The synagogues are held to be *collegia* also by La Piana, 347 f.; Seaver, *Persecution of the Jews* (above, note 22) 5; Smallwood, 205; Z. Yavetz, *Plebs and Princeps* (Oxford 1969) 45.

<sup>45</sup>See Suet. *Div. Iul.* 42.3; Jos. *A.J.* 14.10.8 (213–216), 16.6.2 (163); Philo *Leg. ad Gaium* 23.156–157, 40.311–316. Cf. Juster, 1.409, 2.110 f.; Hardy, 18 f.; Leon, 10; Duff, (above, note 42) 108.

<sup>46</sup>If the entire community chests were seized in this way in 62 B.C., the high sums listed for Apamea and (?) Adramyttium would find an explanation. Cf. above, note 27. See Hardy, 135 f., and Duff, *op. cit.* 117 f., for the important distinction between duly authorized *collegia* and unlicensed *collegia* which were tolerated *de facto* so long as they appeared harmless.

<sup>47</sup>Flacco 28.67, *Quis est, iudices, qui hoc non vere laudare possit? Exportari aurum non oportere cum saepe antea senatus tum me consule gravissime iudicavit.* Cf. above, note 23. Despite Cicero's hostile tone, *Vat.* 5.12 suggests that Vatinius as quaestor in 63 B.C. searched warehouses and ships, and interrogated merchants at Puteoli in order to implement the decree of 63 B.C.

<sup>48</sup>Guterman, 117, implausibly holds that the decree was directed at the Jews of Italy alone. For the sending of temple-tribute from Italy, see Flacco 28.67 *init.*; Philo *Leg. ad Gaium* 23.156.

plicated by a severe shortage of coin. In that same year of 63 B.C., an attempt had been made to promulgate a scheme for land-allotment and a remission of debts.<sup>49</sup>

An interesting attempt has been made to demonstrate a closer link between this crisis in Italy and the edictal ban of Flaccus by reference to the cessation of the annual issues of silver cistophori in Asia between the years 67 and 58 B.C. It is suggested that the minting of these coins was stopped on the instructions of the Roman government, which intervened to hold supplies of precious metals in Italy at its own disposal. Since Flaccus delivered the gold which he confiscated to the *aerarium*, the theory continues, his edict should be seen as an implementation of this general policy of the senate.<sup>50</sup> However, it is not easy to see how such a policy of conserving precious metals in Italy was served by an edict which aimed simply to prevent gold from leaving Asia. Unless we are prepared to allow the dubious speculation that Flaccus had some devious plan of provoking the Jews into an act of defiance which would enable him to confiscate their funds and send them to Rome, it is difficult to accept that his ban on sending gold out of the province would in itself place any gold at the disposal of the Roman treasury. The gold, once confiscated, was forfeit to the *aerarium*, but if the motive behind the edict was to retain gold in Asia, it is to conditions in Asia that we must look for an explanation.

A satisfactory explanation for the intermission of the cistophori may be suggested which does relate this phenomenon directly to the economic situation of the Asian cities themselves. It surely cannot be coincidence that the terrible burden of the Sullan debt was paid off by these cities precisely by the year 67 B.C.<sup>51</sup> The cities had resorted to a series of special municipal levies in order to achieve this deliverance, and it is

<sup>49</sup>See Cic. *Att.* 2.1.11; *Fam.* 5.6.2; *Off.* 2.24.84; Cassius Dio 37.25.4, with the illuminating discussion of Frederiksen, *JRS* 56 (above, note 26) 128 f. Frederiksen describes the situation in 63 B.C. as a "money famine."

<sup>50</sup>See T. R. S. Broughton, "A Significant Break in the Cistophoric Coinage of Asia," *AJA* 41 (1937) 248-249, summarized in *ESAR* 4. 556. Broughton also suggests that the vast expenses voted to Pompey in 67 B.C. under the Lex Gabinia added to the shortage of precious metals. His theory was rejected by Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW* 1564 note 31, as "based on very slight evidence," but was accepted as a possibility by Magie, 381, 1243 note 9. Cf. T. Frank, *ESAR* 1.347, who contends that a decrease in mine-production created the scarcity of precious metals. Rome did not regularly coin in gold at this period, but gold was stored in the *aerarium* as a reserve. See Pliny *Hist. Nat.* 19.15.40, with Frank *op. cit.* 348 and F. Millar, "The Aerarium and its Officials under the Empire," *JRS* 54 (1964) 33-40.

<sup>51</sup>The Lucullan program for clearing the debt began in 71/70 B.C. See Broughton, *MRR* 2.123 and *ESAR* 4.567. Plutarch, *Luc.* 20, tells us that the debt was cleared in less than four years. See also Broughton, *ESAR* 4.545; J. Van Ooteghem, *Lucius Licinius Lucullus* (Brussels 1959) 107 f.

possible that they had been coining the silver which these levies yielded in order to meet the repayment deadlines. Such an effort could not be kept up indefinitely, and the cities will have allowed their economies a period of recuperation once the debt was cleared.<sup>52</sup> But by 62 B.C. the Asian cities were once again in financial difficulties. Their debts required the attention of Quintus Cicero, successor to Flaccus as governor, who supervised their local tax systems in an effort to help them get clear.<sup>53</sup> At such a time, not only the regularly hostile city officials but the governor also would look with disfavour on the annual shipment of gold out of the cities and see it as a drain on their resources. For the governor was well aware that the regular collection of the province's taxes for Rome depended upon the health of the cities' economies, and it was probably the unexpectedly slow recovery of those economies after the final Mithridatic war which led to the famous overbid by the publicani for the Asian tax contract in 61 B.C.<sup>54</sup> If Flaccus sought to stop the export of gold, his concern was surely to stop the immediate drain on the gold held in the cities rather than directly to aid the central treasury in Rome.

Although Asia was not included among his provinces, it is possible that Pompey contributed to the drain on its resources which prompted Flaccus' edict. The vast booty which Pompey amassed to take back to Rome in 62 B.C. included very large sums in *cistophori*, coins which were the standard silver currency of Asia and had, apparently, a local circulation within the province.<sup>55</sup> Since large amounts of *cistophori Pompeiani* were still to be found in the Roman *aerarium* in 59 B.C., earmarked for the expenses of the current Asian governor, Pompey must have withdrawn a considerable

<sup>52</sup>For the special levies and taxes, see App. *Mithr.* 83, with Rostovtzeff, *SEHWW* 954. For further documentation of the *cistophori* of this period and the gap noticed by Broughton, see P. R. Franke, *Kleinasien zur Römerzeit, Griechisches Leben im Spiegel der Münzen* (Munich 1968) 32–35, 66–68; F. S. Kleiner, "The Dated *Cistophori* of Ephesus," *Museum Notes* (of the American Numismatic Society) 18 (1972) 17–32, at 23 f.

<sup>53</sup>Cf. Flacco 9.20, *In aerario nihil habent civitates, nihil in vectigalibus*; *Q.Fr.* 1.1.8.25, *nullum aes alienum novum contrahi civitatibus, vetere autem magno et gravi multas abs te esse liberatas . . . sumptus et tributa civitatum ab omnibus qui earum civitatum fines incolant tolerari aequaliter*.

<sup>54</sup>Cf. J. P. V. D. Balsdon, "Roman History, 65–50 B.C.: Five Problems," *JRS* 52 (1962) 134–141, at 135 f.; Chapot, 41 f. For the governor's duty to balance the demands of Roman taxation with local economic needs, see Cic. *Q.Fr.* 1.1.11.32–33, 12.35–36. For governors' concern to keep city expenditure within bounds, see Cic. *Att.* 5.21.7, 6.2.5; *Fam.* 3.7.2, 3.8.2–4, 3.10.6–7; *Q.Fr.* 1.1.9.26, 1.2.4.14; Pliny *Ep.* 10.37, 43, 44. Such attention need not, of course, imply humanitarian concern. Asia, even if exploited as "la vache à lait de la république" (Reinach's phrase), still required prudent tending. For the importance of the Asian revenues to Rome, see Cic. *Imp. Pomp.* 6.14. Cf. Th. Reinach, *Mithridate Eupator, Roi de Pont* (Paris 1890) 83.

<sup>55</sup>For the date of Pompey's return, see Broughton, *MRR* 2.176. For his booty, see Frank, *ESAR* 1.296 f., 324 f. For the unique weight-standard and restricted circulation of *cistophori*, see Kleiner, *Museum Notes* 18 (above, note 52) 17, 32.

quantity of these coins from circulation in Asia between 66 and 62 B.C.<sup>56</sup> Yet the supply of precious metals available within Asia itself for minting coins was limited.<sup>57</sup> The source of Pompey's *cistophori* may be inferred from a clause in the Lex Gabinia which had authorized him to draw at need upon the local *fisci*, as well as the publicans' reserves, in any province where he operated.<sup>58</sup> Although this power is not attested in the terms of the Lex Manilia of 66 B.C., Pompey's powers and expenditures continued to be so extraordinary that it is likely that he also continued to use this expedient at need to maintain his forces. Of the provinces which he directly held, some, such as Cilicia, would be too poor and others, such as Bithynia-Pontus or Syria, would be too recently established to contain sizeable cash reserves in their *fisci* or their local publicans' accounts. Asia, by contrast, probably had such reserves, and these had presumably been Pompey's main eastern source of funds in 67 B.C. Nor should we overlook the possibility that Pompey drew on the limited reserves of gold in Asia in order to issue *aurei* in 62 B.C. as a celebration of his victory over Mithridates. These *aurei*, military coinage of the kind issued by Roman commanders in the provinces, were dated by H. A. Grueber to 61 B.C., but if they relate to the victory over Mithridates they were more probably issued before Pompey's departure from the East in 62 B.C.<sup>59</sup> The coins may have been minted from booty taken in the war, but the possibility remains that Pompey drew upon the stored bullion of Asia.<sup>60</sup> If he had been draining the Asian supply of silver currency and bullion, we have a

<sup>56</sup>The *cistophori Pompeiani* referred to in Cic. *Att.* 2.6.2, 2.16.4; *Q. Fr.* 1.3.7 were clearly deposited in the central *aerarium*, since they were available for Cicero to draw on in Rome. Broughton, *AJA* 41 (above, note 50) 249 note 4 and *ESAR* 4. 556, is mistaken in stating that they were left in Asia. Cf. D. R. Shackleton-Bailey, *Cicero's Letters to Atticus* 1 (Cambridge 1965) 364; Millar, *JRS* 54 (above, note 50) 37.

<sup>57</sup>See Broughton, *ESAR* 4.557, 620 f., 882; Frank, *ESAR* 1.347.

<sup>58</sup>See Plut. *Pomp.* 25.3, ἐκ τῶν ταμείων καὶ παρὰ τῶν τελωνῶν. The phrase ἐκ τῶν ταμείων is identified as a reference to provincial *fisci* by A. H. M. Jones, "The Aerarium and the Fiscus," *JRS* 40 (1950) 22–29, at 23, and P. A. Brunt, "The 'Fiscus' and its Development," *JRS* 56 (1966) 75–91, at 76. For the practice of allowing governors to cash drafts on publicans' funds, cf. Cic. *Fam.* 3.5.4, *Verr.* 2.3.70.165; Caesar, *Bell. Civ.* 3.31.2.

<sup>59</sup>See H. A. Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic in the British Museum* 2 (London 1910) 446, 464–466, who himself concludes (466) that these *aurei* were struck in the East. Broughton, *ESAR* 4.557, also dates the issue to 62–61 B.C. G. F. Hill, *Historical Roman Coins* (London 1909) 94–98, dates the coins to 76–72 B.C. and holds that they were struck in Spain. M. V. Bahrfeldt, *Die römische Goldmünzenprägung während der Republik und unter Augustus* (Halle 1923) 28–29, dates them to 81 B.C., but his argumentation is very superficial. For the limited supply of gold within Asia itself, see above, note 57.

<sup>60</sup>Grueber, *Coins of the Roman Republic* (above, note 59) 466, conjectures that Pompey's *aurei* were struck from booty in Ephesus. For the use of booty to issue coins in provinces, see Cic. *Prov. Cons.* 11.28. Cf. I. Shatzman, "The Roman General's Authority over Booty," *Historia* 21 (1972) 177–205, at 204.

further reason of policy for the edictal ban of 62 B.C. The province's reserves needed to recover after the special effort to support Pompey's armies.

The propriety of Flaccus' action in summarily suspending Jewish religious custom remains open to question. But I hope to have shown that it should not be so readily categorized as a simple act of corruption or vindictive racism. If it is set in a wider frame of economic and administrative requirement, it may be seen to touch upon matters of genuine concern for Roman policy in Asia.

QUEEN'S UNIVERSITY, KINGSTON