

§ 4 RELIGIOUS CRISIS AND REVOLUTION 175-164 B.C.

Sources

- 1 Maccabees 1-4; 2 Maccabees 4-11. Ed., comm. and French translation by F.-M. Abel, *Les livres des Maccabées* (1949); cf. S. Tedesche, S. Zeitlin, *The First Book of the Maccabees* (1950); *The Second Book of the Maccabees* (1954). Josephus *H.J.* i 1, 1-4 (31-40); *Ant.* xii 5-7 (227-326); *c. Ap.* I 7-8 (79-102). Daniel 8:23-6; 9:24-7; 11:21-45 and Jerome's commentary *ad loc.* (CCL LXXVA), pp. 865-89; 914-35. Megillath Taanith, ed. H. Lichtenstein, 'Die Fastenrolle', HUFA 8-9 (1931-32), pp. 257-351.

For a fuller discussion and bibliography of these works and of the Scroll of Antiochus, see the general section on sources above.

Bibliography

- This list contains only the essential general works relating to §§ 4-7. References to individual points are given in the relevant footnotes. For a fuller bibliography, see O. Eissfeldt, *Introduction*, pp. 576-80; A. Momigliano, *Tradizione maccabaica* (1968), pp. 73-87.
- Derenbourg, J., *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine* (1867), pp. 53 ff.
- Graetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden* II, 2 (1902), pp. 246 ff.
- Wellhausen, J., *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (1958), pp. 213 ff.
- Willrich, H., *Juden und Griechen vor der makkabäischen Erhebung* (1895).
- Eüchler, A., *Die Tobitiden und die Oniaden im II. Makkabäerbuche* (1899).
- Niese, B., *Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher* (1900).
- Meyer, E., *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums II*. (1921), pp. 121 ff.
- Kugler, F. X., *Von Moses bis Paulus* (1922), ch. VII.
- Abel, F.-M., 'Topographie des campagnes machabéennes', *RB* 32 (1923), pp. 495-521; 33 (1924), pp. 201-17, 371-87; 34 (1925), pp. 195-216; 35 (1926), pp. 102-22, 510-33.
- Kolbe, W., *Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte. Kritische Untersuchungen zur Seleukidenliste und zu den beiden ersten Makkabäerbüchern* (1926).
- Bousset, W., Gressmann, H., *Die Religion des Judentums im späthellenistischen Zeitalter* (1926, 1965).
- Ginsburg, M. S., *Rome et la Judée* (1928), pp. 1-64.
- Rankin, O. R., *The Origin of the Festival of Hanukkah* (1930).
- Momigliano, A., *Prime linee di storia della tradizione maccabaica* (1930, 1968).
- Momigliano, A., 'I Tobiadi nella preistoria del moto maccabaico', *ARAST* 67 (1931/2), pp. 165-200.
- Bickerman, E., 'La charte séleucide de Jérusalem', *REJ* 100 (1935), pp. 4-35.
- Bickerman, E., 'Un document relatif à la persécution d'Antiochus IV Epiphane', *RHR* 115 (1937), pp. 188-223.
- Bickermann, E., *Der Gott der Makkabäer* (1937).
- Zeitlin, S., 'Hanukkah', *JQR* 29 (1938-39), pp. 1-36.
- Atel, F.-M., 'La fête de Hanoucca', *EB* 53 (1946), pp. 538-45.
- Atel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine I* (1952), pp. 109 ff.
- Schunck, K.-D., *Die Quellen des I. und II. Makkabäerbuches* (1954).

- Baer, Y. F., *Israel among the Nations* (1955), pp. 26-80 (in Hebrew).
 Farmer, W. R., *Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus* (1956).
 Plöger, W., 'Die Feldzüge der Selenkiden gegen den Makkabäer Judas', ZDPV 74 (1958), pp. 158-88.
 Tcherikover, V., *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (1959).
 Bickerman, E., *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees* (1962).
 Zeitlin, S., *The Rise and Fall of the Judean State I* (1962).
 Hanhart, R., 'Zur Zeitrechnung des I und II Makkabäerbücher', in A. Jepsen, R. Hanhart, *Untersuchungen zur israelitisch-jüdischen Chronologie* (1964), pp. 49-96.
 Zambelli, M., 'La composizione del secondo libro dei Maccabei e la nuova cronologia di Antioco IV Epifane', *Misc. greca e romana I* (1965), pp. 195-299.
 Mörholm, O., *Antiochus IV of Syria* (1966), esp. ch. VIII.
 Hengel, M., *Judentum und Hellenismus* (1969) esp. pp. 486-564.
 Jeremias, J., *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (1969), pp. 182-91.
 Bunge, J. G., *Untersuchungen zum Zweiten Makkabäerbuch* (Diss. Bonn, 1971).

Since the conquests by the Assyrians and Babylonians, the Jewish nation had lost its political independence. The northern kingdom of the ten tribes fell to the Assyrians, and the southern kingdom of Judah to the Babylonians. From these, the power passed to the Persians, and after two hundred years, to Alexander the Great.¹ During the stormy times of the Diadochi, Palestine constituted the main bone of contention between Ptolemy Lagus and his adversaries and therefore belonged sometimes to the one, sometimes to the other. During the third century, with brief interruptions, it formed part of the kingdom of the Ptolemies. At the beginning of the second century, however, Antiochus the Great was able to secure permanent possession of Phoenicia and Palestine. In place of the Ptolemies, the Seleucids became overlords of the Jews.² Already at the beginning of Persian rule, the Jews were permitted

1. According to Josephus *Ant.* xi 8, 4-5 (326-36), Alexander offered sacrifices in Jerusalem. The story is largely unhistorical. See H. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen* (1895), pp. 1-13; A. Büchler, 'La relation de Joseph concernant Alexandre le Grand', *REJ* 36 (1898), pp. 1-26; F.-M. Abel, 'Alexandre le Grand en Syrie et en Palestine', *RB* 43 (1934), pp. 528-45; 44 (1935), pp. 42-61. There are also later legends of Jewish origin concerning Alexander. See I. Levi, 'Les traductions hébraïques de l'histoire légendaire d'Alexandre', *REJ* 3 (1881), pp. 238-75; 'La légende d'Alexandre dans le Talmud', *REJ* 2 (1881), pp. 293-300; 'La légende d'Alexandre dans le Talmud et le Midrash', *REJ* 7 (1883), pp. 78-93; 'Le voyage d'Alexandre au Paradis', *REJ* 12 (1886), pp. 117 f.; 'La dispute entre les Egyptiens et les Juifs', *REJ* 63 (1912), pp. 211-15; G. Radet, *Alexandre le Grand* (1931), pp. 130-6; R. Marcus, *Josephus* (Loeb) VI, App. C (Alexander the Great and the Jews), pp. 512-32. For the Alexander romance and Yosippon, see above p. 117.
 2. See for details the works on the history of Syria listed on pp. 125-6. From the battle of Panias in 200 B.C., Phoenicia and Palestine remained permanently in the possession of the Seleucids. Cf. Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine I* (1952), pp. 84 ff.; E. Will, *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique II* (1967), pp. 101-2; note the important series of documents of this period on an inscription from near Scythopolis, Y. H. Landau, 'A Greek Inscription found near Hefzibah', *IEJ* 16 (1966), pp. 54-70; cf. *BE* 1970, no. 627.

to organise themselves as a religious and political community. But the form in which the political system was restored after the exile was essentially different from that which existed before. The predominating authority was in the hands of the priests, at least from the time of Ezra. Indeed, a priest was the leader of the political community, too. For the so-called High Priest was by no means merely in command of religious affairs; he was at the same time head of the state, unless sovereignty was exercised by the king and his officers. The rank of High Priest was held for life and was hereditary.³ At his side—presumably already during the Persian period but in any case from the beginning of Greek rule—stood a council of elders, the *gerousia*, whose head and executive he was. To what extent administration and jurisdiction lay in the hands of this native governing body, and how far it was carried out by the Persian or Greek overlords, cannot now be determined. Under

3. See the list of the High Priests from Joshua, the contemporary of Zerubbabel, to Jaddua in *Neh.* 12:10-11. Jaddua was a contemporary of Alexander the Great, *Jos. Ant.* xi 7, 2 (302); 8, 7 (347). According to Josephus, the successors of Jaddua were:

Onias I son of Jaddua, *Ant.* xi 8, 7 (347); according to 1 *Mac.* 12:7-8, 20, a contemporary of King Areus of Sparta 309-265 B.C.;
 Simon the Just son of Onias I, *Ant.* xii 2, 4 (43); according to Aristeas, a contemporary of Ptolemy II Philadelphus, 283-46 B.C.;
 Manasse uncle of Simon I, *Ant.* xii 4, 1 (147);
 Onias II son of Simon the Just, *Ant.* xii 4, 1-2 (156-66), a contemporary of Ptolemy III Euergetes 246-21 B.C.; but a detailed description of this Ptolemy is lacking in some of the better manuscripts of *Ant.* xii 4, 1 (158); see also the following notes;
 Simon II son of Onias II, *Ant.* xii 4, 10 (224); cf. *Sir.* 50:1 ff.; 3 *Mac.* 2:1;
 Onias III son of Simon II, *Ant.* xii 4, 10 (225), at the time of Seleucus IV and Antiochus Epiphanes, 175 B.C., and therefore mentioned in the introduction to the history of the Maccabean rising, 2 *Mac.* 3-4; *Jos. Ant.* xii 5, 1 (237).
 The High Priest Ezekias referred to by Ps.-Hecataeus in *Jos. c. Ap.* I 22 (87), cf. *FGh* 264 F21 and commentary, as a contemporary of Ptolemy Lagus, is not mentioned by Josephus in his historical narrative. On a coin possibly giving his name, see O. R. Sellers, *Citadel of Beth Zur* (1933), pp. 73 ff. Cf. also Marcus, *Josephus* (Loeb) VII, p. 6, n. 6; and Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), p. 36. A critical examination of the whole list is made by Willrich, *op. cit.*, pp. 107 ff. Christian historians (Euseb., *Demonstr. evang.* viii 2, 62-72; *Chron.* ed. Schoene II, pp. 114-24; *Chronicon paschale* ed. Dindorf I, pp. 302-39, 356 f., 390 f.) devote particular attention to these High Priests and fix the exact dates for each of them. But it is obvious from their statements that Josephus was the only source at their disposal. Their calculations are, therefore, quite arbitrary. H. Gelzer, *Julius Africanus* (1885), II, pp. 170-6, gives a detailed critical account of the list of the High Priests compiled by the Byzantine chroniclers. See in general H. Graetz, 'Zur Geschichte der nachexilischen Hohepriester', *MGWJ* 30 (1881), pp. 49-64, 97-112; E. R. Bevan, *Jerusalem under the High-Priests* (1904). On the development of the High Priesthood see R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (1961), pp. 397-403. For the inter-Testamental period, see esp. J. Jeremias, *Jerusalem in the Time of Jesus* (1969), pp. 147-98, 377-8; see also M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus* (1969), pp. 44-7.

the Greeks; the political autonomy of the Jewish community will have been not less but greater than before (cf. in general § 23, iii). The most important issue was, without doubt, the payment of taxes: Until the reign of Onias II, they are said to have been paid by the High Priest personally (ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων) in a lump sum of twenty talents, but to have been leased out later to a tax-farmer.⁴

The extent of this relatively autonomous Jewish state was probably limited to Judaea proper, i.e. the province south of Samaria—corresponding approximately to the former kingdom of Judah. Excluded from it were all the coastal towns which, with their predominantly Gentile populations, constituted self-governing city-states (see vol. II, § 23, i). How far into the interior these territories reached, becomes evident from the fact that Ekron and Gazara were not part of Judaea. Ekron was not united to Jewish territory and Judaised until the time of Jonathan (1 Mac. 10:88–9); and Gazara, not until that of Simon (1 Mac. 13:43–8). On the sites of these places, see below § 6 and 7. Furthermore, none of the land east of the Jordan belonged to Jewish territory either. Some Hellenistic cities were located there (see vol. II, § 23, i), and some independent tribes under their own leaders.⁵ In the

4. Jos. *Ant.* xii 4, 1–10 (154–224). The name of the tax-farmer was Joseph son of Tobias. According to the transmitted text of *Ant.* xii 4, 1 (158), his lease began during the time of Ptolemy III Euergetes, but in several reliable manuscripts the surname of the king is missing and is probably an interpolation; for (a) Josephus has previously mentioned the marriage of Ptolemy V Epiphanes with Cleopatra, the daughter of Antiochus the Great of Syria; (b) the king's spouse throughout the entire story of Joseph's tax-farming is referred to as Cleopatra, *Ant.* xii 4, 3 (167); 4, 5 (185); 4, 8 (204); 4, 9 (217). But there was no queen of Egypt by that name before the marriage of Ptolemy V in 194/3 B.C., H. L. Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer* (1897), pp. 183, 196; cf. RE s.v. 'Kleopatra' (14). Accordingly, Joseph's whole taxation lease, which lasted for twenty-two years, *Ant.* xii 4, 6 (186) and 4, 10 (224), would fall during the period when Palestine already belonged to Syria and Cleopatra merely drew certain revenues from these as dowry (see above note 2), whereas the narrative presupposes that Palestine belonged to Egypt. The historical background of the story is therefore impossible, and its details are also obviously legendary. In so far as historical facts underlie it, they are to be situated in the period before 200 B.C. (the conquest of Palestine by Antiochus the Great). In fact, the textual variant τὸν Εὐεργέτην ὃς ἦν πατήρ τοῦ Φιλοπάτορος may be a deliberate insertion by a scribe aware of the chronological inconsistencies of Josephus's narrative (so Marcus, Loeb text. *ad. loc.*). More recent scholars generally accept that the activity of Joseph fell in the period of Ptolemy Euergetes, 246–21 B.C. See B. Mazar, 'The Tobiads', *IEJ* 7 (1957), pp. 137–45, 229–38; Tcherikover, *op. cit.*, pp. 128–30; Hengel, *op. cit.*, pp. 51–3, 489–90.

5. One of these seems to have been Timotheus, the ἡγεμόνως of the Ammonites against whom Judas Maccabaeus fought (1 Mac. 5:6, 11, 34, 37, 40). For in view of the independence of these tribes, clearly illustrated by the account in 1 Mac. 9:35–42, the suggestion that he was a military commander placed by the king of Syria over the Ammonites is unlikely. Aretas, the ἡγεμόνως of the Nabataeans (2 Mac. 5:8) was also one of these native dynasts. See below, pp. 576–7.

areas west of the Jordan 'Judaea' and 'Samaria' formed, towards the end of the third and the beginning of the second century, a specific administrative district alongside 'Coele-Syria' and 'Phoenicia'.⁶ Galilee is not mentioned as such; it therefore belonged to one of the four districts mentioned, though scarcely to Judaea, from which it was geographically separated. Pseudo-Hecataeus maintains that Alexander the Great bestowed Samaria on the Jews as a tax-free zone.⁷ But even if this statement were more reliable than it is, it would no longer apply to the era of Seleucid domination, for under the Maccabean High Priest Jonathan it is mentioned as a special favour granted by king Demetrius II that three *νομοί* were detached from Samaria and united to Judaea, and this whole region was transferred to the Jews tax-free.⁸ Traditionally, therefore, the authority of the Jewish High Priest extended only to Judaea, and indeed to Judaea in the narrower sense (without Galilee), for this is apparently the meaning of the passages cited in Maccabees.⁹

6. See Jos. *Ant.* xii 4, 1 (154) and xii 4, 4 (175), where these territories are mentioned separately in exactly the same terms. But for the full complexity of local administrative sub-divisions in early Seleucid times see M. Avi-Yonah, *The Holy Land* (1966), ch. III.

7. Ps.-Hecataeus in Jos. *c. Ap.* II 4 (43) = FGxH 264 F22, τὴν Σαμαρείην χῶραν προσέθηκεν ἔχειν αὐτοῖς ἀφορολόγητον.

8. 1 Mac. 11:34, 'We have, therefore, settled on them the lands of Judaea and the three districts of Aphaerema, Lydda and Ramathaim' (τοὺς τρεῖς νομούς Ἀφαιρέμα καὶ Λυδδα καὶ Ῥαμαθαίμ) (these were added to Judaea from the district of Samaria). Cf. 11:28. This gift was promised once before but not implemented (1 Mac. 10:30, 38); it was confirmed by Antiochus VI (1 Mac. 11:57). Cf. Avi-Yonah, *op. cit.*, pp. 55–6.

9. 'Judaea' side by side with 'Samaria' can only be Judaea in the narrower sense, i.e., the southern province. This corresponds to the linguistic usage of 1 Maccabees, where γῆ Ἰουδα or Ἰουδαία is apparently always Judaea proper (e.g. 1 Mac. 12:46–52). The prevailing usage in Josephus, the New Testament and the Mishnah, which distinguishes between 'Judaea', 'Samaria' and 'Galilee' as three separate districts (see vol. II, § 22, 1), was, in consequence, already firmly established in the Maccabean era. If, however, it is acknowledged that Judaea in the narrower sense is meant in the passages quoted (1 Mac. 10:30, 38; 11:28, 34), then it follows that the district of Galilee lay outside the jurisdiction of the Jewish High Priest, not only before the beginning of the Maccabean rising, but even under Jonathan and Simon. For it is always simply a question of Judaea and the three *νομοί* of Samaria added to it. Only in 1 Mac. 10:30 do we read that three *νομοί* of 'Samaria and Galilee' were to be united to Judaea. But on the one hand, this was not realised at that time and, on the other, according to other corresponding passages only three *νομοί* in Southern Samaria can be meant. In consequence, either the word *Γαλιλαίας* is just an interpolation, or 'Samaria and Galilee' is used as a comprehensive geographical term for the province of Samaria. Cf. Avi-Yonah, *op. cit.*, p. 48, who takes this passage as evidence that Galilee was included in the eparchy of Samaria. It was only by the conquests of John Hyrcanus and his successor that Galilee, as well as Samaria and Sythopolis, were joined politically to Jewish territory. (Cf. pp. 207, 217–18 below.)

Maccab
1 Mac

The boundaries of the Jewish population did not coincide with those of Judaea in the political sense. Even the fact that in the time of the Maccabees it was considered of value that the three southern districts of Samaria—Aphaerema, Lydda and Ramathaim—should be united to Judaea, gives ground to assume that the population of these areas was predominantly Jewish; that, in other words, they did not offer sacrifice with the schismatic Samaritans on Mount Gerizim, but in Jerusalem, in religious fellowship with the Jews living there.¹⁰ But in Galilee too, as well as in Gilead—east of Jordan therefore—there must, at the beginning of the second century B.C., have been a considerable number of Jews living in religious communion with Jerusalem; one of the first acts of the Maccabees after the restoration of the cult was to bring help to their fellow-Jews in Galilee and Gilead who were oppressed by the heathens, Simon going to Galilee and Judas to Gilead (1 Mac. 5:9-54). Yet the way in which they brought aid demonstrates that there were not yet any compact masses of Jewish population there, for neither Simon nor Judas brought these regions as such under Jewish protection. Simon, after defeating the Gentiles in Galilee, led all the Jews, with their wives, children and belongings, out of Galilee and Arbatta to Judaea, to shelter them in safety there (1 Mac. 5:23).¹¹ Judas proceeded in the same way with the Jews living in Gilead after he had defeated the heathens there (1 Mac. 5:45-54). It is thus clearly evident that the Jews in Galilee and Gilead still formed a Diaspora among the Gentiles; and the early Maccabees by no means set out to Judaize those regions, but on the contrary, withdrew their Jewish population.

Only a general sketch can be given of the inner development of Judaism from the time of Ezra to the Maccabean period, or even to the beginning of the talmudic era. The point of departure is known more exactly—the promulgation of biblical laws by Ezra—and also the end—the codification of Jewish legal customs in the Mishnah (about A.D. 200). Between these two limits lies an interval of about six centuries. What stage of development had Judaism reached at the outbreak of the Maccabean uprising? It seems that it was already on the way towards the results completed in the Mishnah; and the Maccabean era was the time of greatest crisis which Judaism had to endure during this entire period. An attempt was made to destroy the groundwork of earlier development and to convert the Jews to

¹⁰. Note especially in 1 Mac. 5:23 that the offering of sacrifice in Jerusalem is the distinguishing characteristic of those exempted from taxes.

¹¹. Jos. *Ant.* xii 8, 2 (334) speaks of Jews held captive by the Gentiles. But 1 Mac. 5:23 probably refers to all who wished to emigrate to Judaea. This is proved by the more explicit parallel narrative on the procedure of Judas in Gilead (1 Mac. 5:45-54). The location of Arbatta is uncertain; it may be identical with the district of 'Narbata', inland from the future Caesarea. See Abel, *ad. loc.*

heathen worship. The outcome was a consolidation of the foundations laid by Ezra, a sedulous continuation of work on the theoretical elaboration of the law and on its practical application. The reform introduced by Ezra was fundamentally ritual. It fixed the religion of Israel within firm legal forms in order to safeguard it against heathen influence. The Jew was told, in the form of a divinely given law, how he should behave as a true servant of God: which feasts he should celebrate, which sacrifices he should offer, which dues he should pay to the celebrant priests, and in general which ceremonies he should observe. The conscientiousness of his observance of all these precepts became from now on an indication of his piety. And in order to render such conscientiousness feasible, an authentic interpretation of the Torah was provided. Experts—'scribes'—devoted themselves professionally to the study and ever more subtle exposition of Scripture, and the devout saw their highest merit to consist in a zealous fulfilment of the law thus expounded. The history of the Maccabean rebellion itself shows that the Jews had already made substantial progress along this path by the second century B.C. There were circles (the Assidaeans or Hasidim) in which the Sabbath commandment was interpreted so strictly that they would rather be cut down without a struggle rather than transgress the law by wielding the sword (1 Mac. 2:32-8). It was also part of the ideal of piety held up at that time by the author of the Book of Daniel that his co-religionists should not defile themselves by eating heathen food (Dan. 1).

But along with this tendency towards legal piety went, from the time of Alexander the Great, influences and aspirations of quite another kind, and the longer they existed, the more clearly they proved to be its most dangerous enemy: namely, the inclination towards Hellenism. It was the grandiose plan of Alexander the Great to found a world empire that would be held together, not only by unity of government, but also by a unity of language, customs and culture. For this reason, he saw to it that Greek colonists followed everywhere in the steps of his armies. New cities were founded inhabited only by Greeks, and old cities were provided with Greeks too. In this way a net of Greek culture was spread over half of Asia, the purpose of which was to bring all the intervening areas within its sphere of influence. Alexander's successors continued his work, and it is a brilliant testimony to the power of Greek culture that it fulfilled, in very large measure, the mission assigned to it by Alexander. The whole of the Near East—if not among the broader masses of the population then in the higher levels of society—became Hellenized. In Palestine, too, this process was in full operation at about the beginning of the second century B.C. It cannot, admittedly, be proved that every one of the cities known as Greek under the Roman empire (see vol. II, § 22, ii and 23, i) was already Hellenized at the

beginning of the Maccabean era, but most of them certainly were. Greek civilisation was advancing everywhere.¹² Gaza, as its coins testify, enjoyed lively trade relations with Greece already in pre-Hellenistic times; from the time of its conquest by Alexander it was a Macedonian garrison town, and Josephus calls it a πόλις Ἑλληνίς.¹³ Anthedon betrays its Greek origin through its name. In Ascalon, coins of Alexander the Great were minted;¹⁴ Joppa is the seat of the myth of Perseus and Andromeda, and in the age of the Diadochi was a Macedonian garrison town. But the Tower of Straton, in spite of its Greek name, was probably a Sidonian foundation. Dora, too, had been a dependency of Sidon, but was now a Greek city. In Acre, later Ptolemais, a Greek trading settlement existed as early as the time of Isaeus and Demosthenes; the coins of Alexander minted there are very numerous. It was an important garrison town in the period of the Diadochi; its Hellenisation proper, and refounding as Ptolemais, was the work of Ptolemy II. Philadelphus. To these coastal towns must be added a number of inland cities. Samaria was colonised by Alexander the Great, or (more probably) Perdiccas.¹⁵ Scythopolis appears under this Greek name already in the third century, and the Paneion just as early (the grotto-sanctuary of Pan at the source of the Jordan). Together with Scythopolis, Polybius (V 70, 3-4) mentions, in the time of Antiochus the Great (218 B.C.), the important town, not otherwise known under this name, of Philoteria on the Lake of Gennesaret, which like the similarly named town in Upper Egypt, was probably called after a sister of Ptolemy II Philadelphus.¹⁶ Of the cities east of the Jordan, Hippus and Gadara are distinctly described as πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες.¹⁷ Pella and Diom are named after towns in Macedonia, and both were probably founded during the period of the Diadochi. The derivation of the name Gerasa from the γέροντες (veterans) of Alexander the Great is admittedly only an etymological absurdity. It is, however, certain that the ancient capital of the Ammonites was hellenised by Ptolemy II Philadelphus under the name of Philadelphia. Finally, 2 Maccabees speaks in general of the πόλεις Ἑλληνίδες in the neighbourhood of Judaea (2 Mac. 6:8).

12. See the evidence in § 22, ii and § 23, i. On the cities founded by Alexander the Great and his successors cf. A. H. M. Jones, *Cities of the Eastern Roman Provinces* (1937; 1971); *The Greek City* (1940), ch. I.

13. Jos. B.J. ii 6, 3 (97). Cf. vol. II, § 23, i.

14. For the evidence see vol. II, § 23, i.

15. For recent archaeological evidence on the question see F. M. Cross, 'Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dāliyah', *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*, ed. D. N. Freedman, J. C. Greenfield (Anchor, 1971), pp. 45-69.

16. On Philoteria of Upper Egypt (spelled without the 'i') see Strabo, xvi 4, 5 (769). Philoteria on the Sea of Galilee is now identified with Beth Yerah, near the outflow of the Jordan, see Abel, *Géog. Pal.*, p. 284; RB 1956, pp. 89-90.

17. Jos. B.J. ii 6, 3 (97).

Encircled by these Hellenistic towns, little Judaea could naturally not escape the influence of Greek customs and ways. They began to encroach on it more and more. Even the needs of daily life made it necessary to acquire Greek, the universal language; otherwise intercourse and trade with foreign lands would have been impossible. With the language went also the habits, and indeed the entire culture of Greece. At the beginning of the second century B.C., the progress of Hellenism in Palestine must have already been considerable. For only thus is it possible to explain the fact that part of the nation, the aristocratic and educated classes in particular, willingly consented to the Hellenising programme of Antiochus Epiphanes, and indeed promoted it.¹⁸ If this process had been allowed to continue peacefully, presumably Judaism in Palestine would in time have become barely recognisable, and at least as syncretistic as that of Philo. For it is part of the essence of Hellenism to take over an alien religious cult and clothe it in Greek dress. This was the case in Syria as well as in Egypt. The same would most likely have happened in Judaea if things had taken their course. Needless to say, the more completely conservative Judaism and Hellenism had permitted their respective natures to develop, the more acute would the conflict between them have become. Two opposing parties came into being within the Jewish people itself: that of the Hellenists, and that of the 'Devout' (Ἄσινδαῖοι ἡττοῖν, 1 Mac. 2:42, 7:13) who held fast to the strict ideal of the scribes. But it appears likely from the history prior to the Maccabean uprising that the former already had the upper hand. All was well on the way towards the acceptance and establishment of Hellenism. For the Devout there seemed no alternative but to become a sect. And then a reversal occurred which culminated in orders from Antiochus Epiphanes by which Jewish worship was to be totally abolished and purely Greek rites introduced. It was this radical attempt that saved Judaism. Now, not only the strict party of the Hasidim rose in defence of the ancient faith, but also the mass of the people,

18. On the dissemination of Greek culture in Palestine at the time of the Maccabees, even among loyal Jews, see, among older works, J. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor* (1875), pp. 127-9. Freudenthal drew special attention to the following facts: (1) the *Letter of Aristeus* takes for granted that the Palestinian scholars who were summoned to Alexandria for the translation of the Pentateuch had full command of the Greek language. (2) The grandson of Jesus ben Sira, who translated his sayings into Greek, was a Palestinian by birth. (3) The Greek translator of the Book of Esther was, according to the sub-title of the book in the Septuagint, also a Palestinian. But in particular, the Jewish Hellenist Eupolemus, fragments of whose works are still extant (see vol. III, § 33, 3, 2) appears to be identical with the Palestinian Eupolemus whom Judas Maccabaeus sent to Rome as head of a Jewish delegation (1 Mac. 8:17; 2 Mac. 4:11). The fullest discussion of Jewish Hellenism in the period up to the Maccabees is now M. Hengel, *op. cit.*

with the result that Hellenism, in its religious aspect at least, was wholly dislodged from Jewish soil. So far as is known, this is the only example of an eastern religion resisting by force the influence of Hellenism.¹⁹

Antiochus IV Epiphanes, the son of Antiochus the Great, succeeded his brother Seleucus IV after he was murdered by his minister, Heliodorus. He reigned over Syria from 175-164 B.C.²⁰ He was by nature a genuine despot, eccentric and unpredictable, at one moment lavishly generous, affectedly fraternising with the common people, and then again, ferocious and tyrannical, as his treatment of Judaea demonstrates. The characteristics outlined by Polybius portray the more pleasant aspect of his personality.²¹

Sometimes he would slip away from the palace, unnoticed by his servants, appearing in the city at one time here, at another time there, sauntering along in the company of one or two others. Very frequently he could be seen in the workshops of the silversmiths and goldsmiths, where he would chat with the moulders and other workmen and seek to impress them with his love of art. Then he would condescend to engage in familiar conversation with any of the common people he happened to meet, and carouse with strangers of the lowest rank whom he stumbled upon by chance. On learning, however, that somewhere young people were holding a drinking-bout, he would march in unannounced with horn and bagpipe, so that most of them, being frightened by this strange sight, would take to flight. Quite often he would exchange his royal robes for a toga, go to the forum and apply as a candidate for an office. He would then seize some people by the hand and embrace others, asking them to give him their vote, sometimes as if for the office of aedile and sometimes as if for that of tribune. If he succeeded in obtaining the office and was seated according to Roman custom in an ivory chair, he would take note of the contracts signed in the forum and give his decisions in a serious and conscientious manner. Reasonable folk, therefore, did not know what to make of him. Some regarded him as a simple and modest man, while others said that he was mad. He acted in a similar fashion when he distributed gifts. To some he gave dice made of bone, to others dates, whilst another group received gold. When he happened to meet someone whom he had never seen before, he would bestow upon him unexpected presents. With regard to the sacrifices which he ordered to be offered in the cities and the honours to be shown to the gods, he outshone all other kings.

19. For a comparative study see S. K. Eddy, *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism* 334-31 B.C. (1961).

20. On Antiochus see now O. Mørkholm, *Antiochus IV of Syria* (1966); ch. II deals with the evidence for his accession.

21. Polyb. xxvi 1, 1-14.

As evidence we may point to the temple of Zeus at Athens and the statues around the altar at Delos. He used to frequent the public baths when they were quite full of ordinary citizens, and had vessels with precious perfumes brought to him. When somebody once said to him, "You kings are fortunate to have such ointments of exquisite fragrance", he went the next day, without saying anything to the man, to the place where he bathed, and had a large vessel of the most precious ointment, called *stacte*, poured over his head; whereupon everyone rose and rushed forward to receive a share of this aromatic perfume. But because of the slippery state of the floor, many fell over, amid shouts of laughter, the king himself joining in the mirth. So Polybius; Diodorus and Livy give similar reports. They also emphasise his love of luxury and his munificence. Brilliant spectacles, magnificent buildings, regal presents, these were his chief delights.²² But in everything he inclined towards senseless extremes, so that Polybius spoke of him as *ἐπιμανής* rather than *ἐπιφανής*.²³

The policies and motives of Antiochus remain a matter of controversy. But it may be that Tacitus judged him correctly when he said that Antiochus wished to take from the Jews their superstitions and to teach them Greek customs, but that he was prevented by the Parthian war from rendering 'the detestable nation' more civilised.²⁴ He en-

22. Cf. in general also Polybius xxviii 22; xxix 24; xxx 25, 1-26, 9. Diodorus xxix 32; xxxi 16. Livy xli 20. Ptolemy viii Euergetes, FGrH 234 F3; Heliodorus, FGrH 373 F8.

23. Athenaeus x 439a = Polybius xxvi 1a (10) reads Πολύβιος δ' ἐν τῇ ἔκτῃ καὶ εἰκοστῇ τῶν Ἱστοριῶν καλεῖ αὐτὸν Ἐπιμανῆ καὶ οὐκ Ἐπιφανῆ διὰ τὰς πράξεις. The surname Ἐπιφανής is in fact an abbreviation of Θεὸς Ἐπιφανής, which Antiochus applies to himself on his coins and which means, 'the god who manifests and reveals himself'. In Egyptian texts it is rendered as 'the god who emerges, who comes out' as the morning sun, Horus, on the horizon (Wilcken in Droysen's *Kleine Schriften* (1894) II, p. 440). This epithet, therefore, identifies the king with the young Horus making his appearance as a victorious god; but cf. Mørkholm, *op. cit.*, pp. 132-3. The first monarch with this soubriquet was Ptolemy V of Egypt and after him Antiochus IV of Syria. Subsequently, the name occurred frequently among the Seleucids. It can be authenticated in the cases of Alexander Balas, Antiochus VI, VIII, IX, XII, Seleucus VI and Philip; it also is found among the kings of Commagene, Antiochus I and IV, see H. Dörrie, *Der Königskult des Antiochus von Kommagene im Lichte neuer Inschriften-Funde* (1964), pp. 29 f. Gutschmid, *op. cit.* 108 f., points out that the earliest bearers of this surname 'are merely kings who by ascending their throne brought to an end a prevailing state of distress or were able to pretend to do so'. He explains it therefore as, 'the god bringing visible help'. On the soubriquets of the Hellenistic kings see also Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer* (1897), pp. 110-45. Cf. in general L. Cerfaux, J. Tondriaux, *Le culte des souverains dans la civilisation gréco-romaine* (1957), pp. 240 ff.

24. Tacit. *Hist.* V 8, 'rex Antiochus demere superstitionem et mores Graecorum dare, adnisis, quominus taeterrimam gentem in melius mutaret, Parthorum bello prohibitus est'. Tacitus may be guilty of some confusion here, see Mørkholm, *op. cit.*, pp. 175-6.

H.J.P.—6*

deavoured to promote the splendour of Greek culture everywhere. In doing this in Judaea, he met with the co-operation, and even the positive initiative, of a certain party of the people. Needless to say, he supported that party and entrusted the government to it. But when the Jews opposed some of these efforts, this merely roused the despot's ill-humour. The obstinate nation was first of all disciplined through the looting of the rich treasures of the Temple, which must in any case have been very tempting to the king with his need for money. Then, since resistance continued, Jewish worship was abolished and an attempt was made to introduce total Hellenisation by force.

When Antiochus Epiphanes ascended the throne, the hereditary High Priesthood was held by Onias III, a 'zealot for the laws' (2 Mac. 4:2). The leader of the pro-Greek faction was his own brother Jesus, or, as he preferred a Greek name, Jason.²⁵ The tendency to favour things Greek was already so strong that the pro-Greek faction could venture to seize power and attain their aims by force. Jason promised the king great sums of money (whether in the form of a single gift or as a regular tribute is not very clear) if he would transfer the High Priesthood to him, permit him to erect a gymnasium, establish a corps of ephebes, and finally, consent to 'the inscription of the inhabitants of Jerusalem as Antiochenes', *τοὺς ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις Ἀντιοχεῖς ἀναγράψαι*, i.e. (probably) transform Jerusalem into a Greek *polis* called Antioch and draw up a list of its citizens.²⁶ Antiochus readily agreed to everything. Onias was deposed and Jason appointed as High Priest.²⁷ The process of Hellenisation was now set vigorously in motion. It is important to note, however, that there is as yet no mention of any interference with the Jewish religion. For the rest, 'lawful institutions' were abolished and 'new usages contrary to the Law' introduced (2 Mac. 4:11). A gymnasium was erected below the citadel and the young men of Jerusalem practised the athletic skills of the Greeks. Even the priests left their service at the altar and took part in the games held in the palaestra. The contempt for Jewish customs went so far that many removed their circumcision

25. Jos. *Ant.* xii 5, 1 (239).

26. 2 Mac. 4:9. The meaning of this passage is not certain and various interpretations have been advanced, see Abel *ad loc.* The view followed here is that of Tcherikover, *op. cit.*, pp. 161-9; see the valuable discussion in G. Le Rider, *Suse* (1965), pp. 410-11.

27. 2 Mac. 4:7-10. Josephus tells the story differently. Whereas according to 2 Maccabees Onias was deposed, and, when Jason was deprived of the High-Priestly office in his turn, later murdered (2 Mac. 4:33-4), Josephus simply records that after the death of Onias, his brother Jesus was given the dignity of High Priest, *Ant.* xii 5, 1 (237); *ἀποθανόντος καὶ Ὀνίου τοῦ ἀρχιερέως τῷ ἀδελφῷ αὐτοῦ Ἰησοῦ τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην Ἀντίοχος δίδωσιν*. But Josephus's narrative is obviously summary and vague, and that of 2 Maccabees is confirmed by Dan. 9:26; 11:22, inasmuch as these passages probably refer to Onias III.

artificially.²⁸ With true Hellenistic broadmindedness, Jason even sent a contribution to the sacrifices in honour of Heracles on the occasion of the quadrennial games at Tyre; this was so offensive to the Jews delivering it that they requested that the money should be used to build ships.²⁹

Jason held office in this way for three years (probably from 174 to 171 B.C.). He then fell, as a result of the intrigues of a rival who continued his work in a manner that was even worse. A certain Menelaus (according to 2 Mac. 4:23, cf. 3:4, probably of the tribe of Benjamin and thus not of priestly descent), succeeded, by promising still larger sums of money, in having Jason expelled, and the High Priesthood transferred to himself.³⁰ He particularly aroused the bitter animosity of the people by profaning the Temple vessels. He also caused the

28. See in general 2 Mac. 4:11-17; 1 Mac. 1:11-15; Jos. *Ant.* xii 5, 1 (241). The purpose of disguising circumcision (1 Mac. 1:15, *ἐποίησαν ἑαυτοῖς ἀκροβυστίας*) was to avoid mockery in public baths and wrestling-schools. According to many reports, it seems also to have happened in later times. See esp. 1 Cor. 7:18; mAb. 3:11; tShab. 15:9; yPea 166; yYeb. 9a; bYeb. 72 ab; Gen.R. 46:13; Epiphanius, *De mensuris et ponderibus* 16 (PG xlili, col. 264). Jerome is mistaken in denying that the operation is possible: *adv. Jovinian.* I 21=Migne PL xxiii, col. 239; *comm. in Isa.* 52, 1=CCL lxxiiiA, pp. 574-5. See JE IV, p. 397; J. Juster, *Les Juifs dans l'Empire romain* II (1914), p. 284; Hengel, *op. cit.*, p. 137, n. 135. See also commentaries on 1 Cor. 7:18; and Str.-B. IV, pp. 33-4. The practice of *epispasm* appears to have been so common during the Hadrianic persecution that the rabbis introduced the rule of the *peri'ah* (laying bare of the *glans penis*) in the ceremony of circumcision, thus preventing the obliteration of the 'sign of the covenant with Abraham' (see Gen.R. 46:13).

29. 2 Mac. 4:18-20. Jason's conduct calls to mind that of a certain Nicetas son of Jason *Ἱεροσολυμίτης*, living in Iasus on the coast of Caria between Miletus and Halicarnassus around the middle of the second century B.C., who supported the celebration of Dionysia with a contribution of money (Le Bas and Waddington, *Inscriptions* III n. 294=Frey CIJ II 749). He may even have been a son of Jason, the brother of Onias III.

30. 2 Mac. 4:23-7. According to Jos. *Ant.* xii 5, 1 (239); cf. xv 3, 1 (41); xix 6, 2 (298); xx 10, 3 (235), the true name of Menelaus was Onias and he was a brother of Jason. But if the first statement is correct, the second is very improbable, for in that case there would have been two brothers called Onias. So 2 Maccabees must be right in regard to Menelaus's descent. See H. H. Rowley, 'Menelaus and the Abomination of Desolation', *Studia Orientalia J. Pedersen . . . dicata* (1953), pp. 303-9. It remains in dispute whether the original text of 2 Mac. 3:4 referred to the tribe of Benjamin, or to the priestly family 'Bilqa', see Abel, *ad. loc.* and Hengel, *op. cit.*, pp. 508-9. According to Jos. *Ant.* xii 5, 1 (239) the 'sons of Tobias' sided with Menelaus. Yet it does not follow from this that he was himself a 'Tobiad', as some writers suggest. On the contrary, the manner in which Josephus refers to 'the sons of Tobias' with Menelaus excludes such an assumption. According to *Ant.* xii 4, 2 (160), Tobias, the father of Joseph the tax-farmer (above), married a sister of the High Priest Onias II. They were therefore related to the old High Priestly family ousted by Menelaus. Also Onias III was kindly disposed towards a certain Hyrcanus son of Tobias' who had deposited money in the Temple (2 Mac. 3:11). But now 'the sons of Tobias' belong to the extreme pro-

he would like to consider the matter, Popilius gave him the famous brief ultimatum by drawing a circle round him with his staff and ordering him formally *ἐνταῦθα βουλευέου* (make up your mind in here). Antiochus was obliged willy-nilly to fall in with the demands of the Romans.³⁵ To the author of Daniel (11:30) there seemed to be a connexion between the failure of his Egyptian plans and the fact that Antiochus undertook at that precise time a war of extermination against the Jewish religion. Since he could no longer achieve anything in Egypt, he would carry out his plans in Judaea with all the more vigour. In 167 B.C. a chief tax collector was despatched by him to Judaea (his name is not given in 1 Mac. 1:29, but in 2 Mac. 5:24 he is called Apollonius); this man began the process of massacre, pillage and destruction in Jerusalem.³⁶ The precise sequence of events which led to this drastic step, the identity of the person, or persons, from whom the initiative came, and their motives, remain a matter of controversy.³⁷ The Jewish population which refused to yield was exterminated: the men were murdered and the women and children sold into slavery. All who were

[Text continues on page 154

35. Polyb. xxix 27, 1-8; Diodorus xxxi 2; Livy xlv 12, 1-8; Appian *Syr.* 66/350-2; Justin xxxiv 3, 1-3. Cf. Dan. 11:29 f. See Broughton, MRR I, p. 430.

36. According to 1 Mac. 1:29 compared with 1:20 and 1:54, this Apollonius was sent on his mission in the year 145 of the Seleucid era = spring 167-spring 166 B.C. On the term *μισάρχης* see now A. Mittwoch, 'Tribute and Land-tax in Seleucid Judaea', *Bibl.* 36 (1955), pp. 352-61.

37. Only the essentials of the acutely controversial question of the chronology of these events can be given here, and no attempt is made to provide a complete bibliographical account. The reconstruction offered takes the view that Antiochus visited Jerusalem only once in the 160s, viz. in the autumn of 169 B.C., and that it was on this occasion that the despoliation of the Temple took place; hence the looting described in 1 Mac. 1:20-3 is identical with that in 2 Mac. 5:11-21, and referred to in *Jos. B.J.* i 1, 1 (32); the account in *Ant.* xii 5, 2-4 (242-50) is inextricably confused (see below).

There are three reasons for supposing that Antiochus visited Jerusalem twice. The first, it is claimed (Tcherikover, *op. cit.*, p. 186), is that 'the Book of Daniel speaks explicitly of two visits'. But this does not appear to be so. Dan. 11:28-31 runs as follows: 'He (Antiochus) will return (from Egypt, 169 B.C.) greatly enriched to his own country, his heart set against the holy covenant; he will take action (*וַעֲשֶׂה*); in Greek just *καὶ ποιήσει*), and next go home. In due time he will make his way southwards again, but this time the outcome will not be as before. The ships of Kittim (Rome, 168 B.C.) will oppose him and he will be worsted. He will retire and take furious action against the holy covenant and, as before, will favour those who forsake it. Forces of his will come and profane the sanctuary citadel; they will abolish the perpetual sacrifice (167 B.C.), and install the disastrous abomination there.' Thus Daniel clearly refers to two phases of action, one after the campaign of 169 B.C., and one subsequent to that of 168; but he does not explicitly and concretely refer to the presence of Antiochus in Jerusalem on either occasion.

Secondly, 1 Mac. and 2 Mac. each mention one visit by the king after an Egyptian campaign, but have been thought to speak of different visits, in 169

and 168 B.C. 1 Mac. 1:20 dates the journey in the Seleucid year 143 (spring 169-spring 168 B.C.). Its chronology is consistent. 1 Mac. 1:29 has the arrival of the *μισάρχης* 'μετὰ δύο ἔτη'. Then there follows the Abomination of Desolation on 25 Kislev of the Seleucid year 145, spring 167-spring 166 (1 Mac. 1:54), and the restoration of the cult on 25 Kislev of 148, i.e. December 164 B.C. (1 Mac. 4:52).

2 Mac. gives no datings by Seleucid years for these events. But 4:38 mentions the execution of Andronicus, which will date to 170 B.C. (see above), followed by a couple of paragraphs on events in Jerusalem. Then 5:1 reads *περὶ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον τὴν δευτέραν ἀφοδὸν ὁ Ἀντίοχος εἰς Αἴγυπτον ἐστράτευσεν*. Since it is known that Antiochus invaded Egypt in both 169 and 168 B.C., it is natural to take this as a reference to that of 168, even though 2 Mac. contains no mention of the 'first' campaign. But the account of the despoliation of the Temple, 5:11-21, is markedly similar to that of 1 Mac. 1:20-3; and, as has been seen (pp. 128-9) it is possible to take *τὴν δευτέραν ἀφοδὸν* as a reference to the second phase (169 B.C.) of the campaign of 170/69 B.C.

The only source that speaks explicitly of two visits by Antiochus to Jerusalem is *Jos. Ant.* xii 5, 2-4 (242-50). But his narrative is filled with confusions; apparently resulting from an over-hasty conflation of earlier documents. (1) Like 1 Mac., he places the arrival of Antiochus in Jerusalem, on his return from Egypt, in the Seleucid year 143 (169 B.C.), but attributes this return, 5, 3 (246) to the fear of the Romans (168 B.C.). (2) He then borrows from 1 Mac. the interval *μετὰ δύο ἔτη* and the date 25 Kislev of the Seleucid year 145; 5, 4 (248), but applies these to a second visit of Antiochus, which he makes the occasion of the looting of the Temple treasures. Josephus's evidence has therefore no independent value.

In consequence, it must be concluded that Antiochus visited Jerusalem in 169 B.C., and that the attempted coup by Jason took place previously in that year. There is no reason to doubt that the 'Mysarch', Apollonius (the name is given in 2 Mac. 5:24), arrived in 167 B.C.

If this reconstruction is correct, there is a further ground (cf. Hengel, *op. cit.*, pp. 508 f.) for rejecting the hypothesis of Tcherikover, *op. cit.*, pp. 188-9, that Jason's intervention (in 168 B.C.) was followed by a temporary military victory of the orthodox party, then suppressed by Antiochus. This is the starting-point of his theory (pp. 188-98) that continuous armed resistance by the conservatives is the explanation of the decrees of 167 B.C. abolishing both the Temple cult and the observation of the Torah.

Similarly, as pointed out in n. 32 above, Hengel's own interpretation relies essentially on the references to the Tobiads in the brief and confused accounts of Josephus, and is therefore unacceptable.

In fact, there is no reliable account of the actual series of events leading to the persecution proper, and the student is reduced to hypotheses based on his knowledge of the general situation. At this level there is of course abundant evidence that the imposition of Gentile cults was welcomed or accepted by a substantial section of the Jewish population, cf. Hengel, *op. cit.*, pp. 532 f. The possibility of an actual initiative on their part is suggested by the parallel case of the Samaritan request (made, however, after the inception of the persecution) to have their temple dedicated to Zeus Hellenios, *Jos. Ant.* xii 5, 5 (257-64); cf. 2 Mac. 6:2, which has Zeus Xenios. For the significance of this evidence, see Bickerman, *op. cit.*, pp. 90 f. and his article, 'Un document relatif à la persécution d'Antiochus IV Epiphane', *RHR* 115 (1937), pp. 188-223. See also Y. Baer, 'The Persecution of Monotheistic Religion by Antiochus Epiphanes', *Zion* 33 (1968), pp. 101-24 (in Hebrew with an English summary).

able to do so, left the city.³⁸ To ensure that these measures would be permanently implemented, the walls of the city were torn down. The old Davidic city, however, was re-fortified and converted into a powerful stronghold (the 'Akra', on which see below) occupied from then on by a pagan garrison. 'He will use the people of an alien god to defend the fortress', as the author of Daniel 11:39 wrote; or in the words of 1 Mac. 1:34, *ἔθηκαν ἐκεῖ ἔθνος ἀμαρτωλόν, ἄνδρας παρονόμους, καὶ ἐνίσχυσαν ἐν αὐτῇ* (cf. 1 Mac. 3:45, *υἱοὶ ἀλλογενῶν ἐν τῇ Ἀκρα*). This was, as Tcherikover states, *op. cit.*, p. 189, a military *cleruchy* or *κατοικία*. The word is in fact used of them in 1 Mac. 1:38, *καὶ ἐγένετο κατοικία ἀλλοτρίων*. This force remained in control of the citadel during all the subsequent successes of the Maccabees and maintained the supremacy of the Syrian kings through every vicissitude. It was not until twenty-six years later that Simon, in 142/1 B.C., was able to gain possession of the citadel and thereby seal the independence of the Jews.³⁹

38. 1 Mac. 1:29-30; 2 Mac. 23-26; Jos. *Ant.* xii 4, 4 (251). It seems from 1 Mac. 1:38 compared with 1 Mac. 1:30-2 and 2 Mac. 5:24, that one aim was the annihilation of the Jewish population and the settlement of the city by Greek or Hellenized inhabitants. It was therefore exactly the same process as that adopted by the Jews themselves at a later period in Joppa and Gazara (1 Mac. 13:11 and 43-8). On the consequences of these measures, see 1 Mac. 2:18; 3:35, 45.

39. An *ἀκρόπολις* of Jerusalem is often mentioned in preceding years (2 Mac. 4:12, 27; 5:5). But this cannot be identical with the fortress built by Antiochus Epiphanes. The 'Acropolis' of 2 Maccabees is more likely to be the castle close to the north side of the Temple known already from Neh. 2:8; 7:2. It is also probably that referred to in the *Letter of Aristeas*, 100-4, and in the history of Antiochus the Great, Jos. *Ant.* xii 3, 3 (133, 138). It was later rebuilt by the Hasmonaeans, and then again by Herod, who called it Antonia, *Ant.* xv 11, 4 (403), xviii 4, 3 (91). So this citadel near the Temple is distinct from the fortress built by Antiochus (1 Mac. 1:33-6; Jos. *Ant.* xii 5, 4 (252)) when the walls of the city were demolished (1 Mac. 1:31). On the capture of the Akra by Simon, see 1 Mac. 13:49-52. It is often mentioned in 1 Mac. (2:31; 3:45; 4:2, 41; 6:18-21, 26, 32; 7:32; 9:52-3; 10:32; 11:20-1, 41; 12:36; 13:21). The site of this Akra is one of the most controversial questions in the topography of Jerusalem. It is probable that it lay on the southern spur of the eastern hill; south; that is to say, of the Temple mount. There can be little doubt that it was built on the site of the ancient Davidic city (1 Mac. 1:33; 2:31; 7:32; 14:36). But the city of David, according to Neh. 3:15, obviously stood in the vicinity of Shiloh, south of the Temple, and thus not on the great western hill on which the main part of the city lies even today, but on a separate elevation of the eastern chain of hills, i.e., of the Temple mount. For the archaeological evidence confirming that the Jerusalem of the Old Testament was situated on the southern spur of the eastern ridge see K. M. Kenyon, *Jerusalem* (1967), ch. 2-6. The Zion on which David's city lay (2 Sam. 5:7; 1 Kg. 8:1) is not, as later Christian tradition claims, the western hill, but the same chain on which the Temple stood; the eastern hill therefore. This is confirmed by the literary usage of 1 Maccabees in which 'Zion' and 'Temple mount' are identical concepts (see 1 Mac. 4:37-60; 5:54; 6:48-62; 7:33). This view remains the most probable, though definitive archaeological evidence is still lacking. For a full

Both 1 Maccabees (1:41-51) and 2 Maccabees (6:1-2) mark as a new phase the arrival of instructions from Antiochus for the abolition of the Temple cult and of the observance of the Law, and the substitution of pagan cults. The observance of all Jewish ordinances, in particular those relating to the Sabbath and circumcision, was prohibited on pain of death. In every town in Judaea sacrifice was to be offered to the heathen gods. Overseers were sent everywhere to see that the royal command was carried out. Where the people did not comply willingly, they were obliged to do so by force. Once a month a check was made, and whoever was found with a scroll of the Torah or had had a child circumcised, was put to death. On 15 Kislev of the Seleucid year 145 = December 167 B.C., a heathen altar was built in Jerusalem on the great altar of burnt-offering, and on 25 Kislev the first heathen sacrifice was offered on it (1 Mac. 1:54, 59); this is 'the abomination of desolation', the *מַשְׁמֵה וּפְקֻדָּה* or *שִׁמְשֵׁם וּפְקֻדָּה* LXX: *βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως* to which the Book of Daniel refers (Dan. 11:31, 12:11). The sacrifice, according to 2 Maccabees, was offered to Olympian Zeus, to whom the Temple in Jerusalem had been dedicated.⁴⁰ On the feast of Dionysus, the Jews were compelled to walk in bacchanalian procession with their heads crowned with ivy.⁴¹

2 Maccabees has wonderful stories of the glad courage with which some of the people defended their ancient faith at that time. It describes at length how a ninety-year-old man called Eleazar was put to death, and how seven brothers suffered martyrdom one after another before the eyes of their mother, she too finally dying for her

discussion of the archaeological and literary evidence, see J. Simons, *Jerusalem in the Old Testament: Researches and Theories* (1952), pp. 144-57. He concludes that the term designated the entire fortified city on the south-east hill, rather than a fortress within it. L.-H. Vincent and M.-A. Stève, *Jerusalem de l'Ancien Testament* (1954), pp. 175-92, argue that the Akra was situated on a spur of the south-west hill, opposite the Temple. This view is adequately disproved by W. A. Shotwell, 'The Problem of the Syrian Akra', *BASOR* 176 (Dec. 1964), pp. 10-19; but his own contention that the identification of a Maccabaeae tower (i.e. a tower of the Maccabaeae period) on the eastern side of the south-east hill shows that this area must have lain outside the Akra, is a logical confusion. Kenyon, *op. cit.*, p. 113, suggests that the Akra may have stood on the upper western ridge.

40. E. R. Bevan, 'A Note on Antiochus Epiphanes', *JHS* 20 (1900), pp. 26-30, suggested that the cult was actually intended for Antiochus himself, on the grounds that coins showed portraits of Antiochus impersonating Zeus Olympios. But this view is in fact mistaken. See O. Mørholm, *op. cit.*, pp. 130-1.

41. See in general 1 Mac. 1:41-64; 2 Mac. 6:1-11. Jos. *Ant.* xii 5, 4 (253); Dan. 7:25; 8:11 ff.; 11:31 ff.; 12:11. According to 2 Mac. 6:17, the Jews were also forced to participate in the sacrificial meal at the monthly celebration of the royal birthday. On the monthly birthday festivities, see ZNW (1901), pp. 48-52.

faith.⁴² The details must remain uncertain. But the fact is that, despite all the violence, a wide circle of the people stayed loyal to the faith and customs of their forefathers. To strengthen their resolve, an unknown writer published at that time under the pseudonym of Daniel an exhortation in which he set before his co-religionists, stories of earlier days to admonish and encourage them, and foretold with bold confidence the impending downfall of heathen rule and the transfer of world-government to the people of God (see vol. III, § 32, 5, 1). The effect of this work can be easily imagined.

Passive resistance was soon accompanied by open insurrection—a most foolhardy undertaking, seen from the practical point of view. For how could the small Jewish nation permanently defy the power of the king? But religious enthusiasm does not inquire whether success is possible. Incitement to rebellion was instigated by a priest of the order of Joarib called Mattathias, together with his five sons—John, Simon, Eleazar, Judas and Jonathan—in the town of Modein.⁴³ When the king's officer arrived there to demand the offering of heathen sacrifice, Mattathias refused to obey the command. 'Though all the nations in the king's realm lapse from the religion of their fathers, yet will I, with my sons and brothers, walk in the covenant of our fathers.

42. 2 Mac. 6:18–7:42. The story also forms the theme of 4 Maccabees (cf. vol. III, § 33, 5, 4), and is introduced into subsequent Jewish literature. Cf. G. D. Cohen, 'The Story of Hannah and her seven Sons in Hebrew Literature', *M. M. Kaplan Jubilee Volume*, Hebrew Section (1953), pp. 109–22.

43. 1 Mac. 2:1, 15. Jos. *Ant.* xii 6, 1 (265). The family did not move to Modein just then, as might appear from 2:1, but had lived there already for some considerable time, 13:25. The name of the place is given in 1 Maccabees, according to the great majority of the Mss., as *Μωδεῖν* or *Μωδεῖν*. Other forms also occur, e.g., *Μωδεεῖν* in Jos. *Ant.* xii 6, 1 (265) (Niese gives *ἐν Μωδαῖ*); 6, 2 (268) *τὴν Μωδαῖν*; 6, 4 (285), *ἐν Μωδαῖ*; 11, 2 (432) *τὴν Μωδεῖν*; xiii, 6, 5 (210) *ἐν Μωδεεῖ*; *B. J.* i, 1, 3 (36) *ἀπὸ κάμης Μωδεῖν ὄνομα*. In Eusebius's *Onomasticon* we find *Μηδεεῖν*: Jerome has Modeim. The plural is sometimes found in the Hebrew, sometimes in the Aramaic, and sometimes elided. In mPes. 9:2 and mḤag. 3:15 the reading varies between *מוריעים* and *מוריעית* in such a way that the latter form predominates in both. A surprising confirmation of it is to be found in the nomenclature of the mosaic map of Madaba: *Μωδεεῖν ἢ νὺν Μωδιθα*, see M. Avi-Yonah, *The Madaba Mosaic Map* (1954), p. 58; cf. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 391. A man from Modein is called in mAb. 3:11 *המוריעי*. For the establishment of the exact location it is important to take into account: (a) the fact that the splendid monument built there by Simon for his parents and brothers was visible from the sea, 1 Mac. 13:27–30, *εἰς τὸ θεωρεῖσθαι ὑπὸ παντῶν τῶν πλεόντων τὴν θάλασσαν*; and (b) its mention by Eusebius, who still knew the place, *Onomast.* ed. Klosterrmann, p. 132, *Μηδεεῖν κώμη πλησίον Διοσπόλεως, ὅθεν ἦσαν οἱ Μακκαβαῖοι, ὧν καὶ τὰ μνημεῖα εἰς ἔτι νῦν δέικνυται*. Jerome, *Onomast.* ad. loc. gives the same: 'Modeim vicus juxta Diospolim unde fuerunt Maccabaei, quorum hodieque ibidem sepulchra monstrantur'. It lay, therefore, in the vicinity of Lydda (Diospolis), on higher ground, i.e., in the direction of the hills. It can now be taken as settled that the modern Arab village of el-Medieh east of Lydda, at the entrance to the hills, marks the position of ancient Modein. Cf. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 391.

May God preserve us from abandoning the law and the commandments! Seeing a Jew about to offer sacrifice, he struck him down at the altar. He also killed the king's officer—and destroyed the altar.⁴⁴

He then fled with his sons into the mountains. Numerous like-minded people had also withdrawn to hiding-places in the desert. There they were hunted out by a detachment of the Syrian garrison of Jerusalem, attacked on the Sabbath, and because they offered no resistance, were massacred together with their wives and children.⁴⁵ A martyrdom of this order seemed to the energetic Mattathias to be a poor way of serving God's cause. He and his people resolved to take action, and not to shirk fighting even on the Sabbath if it were necessary. They were joined now by the 'Devout' (*Ἀσιδαῖοι* = *חסידים*), i.e. those faithful to the Torah who had hitherto shown their steadfastness only in patient endurance.⁴⁶ Mattathias now gathered together all those who

44. 1 Mac. 2:15–26. Jos. *Ant.* xii 6, 2 (268–71). On Josephus's account of Mattathias see A. Büchler, REJ 34 (1897), pp. 69–76; Niese, *op. cit.*, p. 100. Mattathias is not mentioned in 2 Maccabees. Niese was therefore inclined to doubt his existence, *op. cit.*, pp. 44–7; in general, he gave greater weight to 2 Maccabees compared with 1 Maccabees (see *op. cit.*, p. 94). He saw in 1 Maccabees, in so far as it coincides with 2 Maccabees (chapters 1–7), merely a tendentious adaptation, formulated in the interest of the dynasty, of the same source as that which forms the basis of 2 Maccabees, namely that of Jason of Cyrene (*op. cit.*, p. 94). It does not seem possible to explain the pronounced differences between 1 and 2 Maccabees in this way. They are comprehensible only on the premise that they are largely independent of one another. For the fullest modern discussion of their sources see Momigliano, *Prime Linee* . . . (1931), with Seunck, *op. cit.* (1954) and Bunge, *op. cit.* (1971).

45. 1 Mac., 2:27–38; Jos. *Ant.* xii 6, 2 (272–5).

46. That the Asidaeans were not identical with the circle of Mattathias was stressed in particular by J. Wellhausen in *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, pp. 78–86. They certainly made common cause with the Maccabees, but later (1 Mac. 7:13) parted company with them. Cf. R. Meyer, *Tradition und Neuschöpfung im antiken Judentum*, SAW, Phil.-hist. Kl. 110/2 (1965), pp. 16–17. The word *חסידים* occurs frequently in the OT (e.g. Ps. 30:5; 31:24; 37:28), and means simply 'the devout'; but it signifies in particular those who took their piety, that is their faithful observance of the Torah, seriously. For a recent treatment of the Hasidim see J. Morgenstern, 'The HASIDIM—Who were They?', HUCA 38 (1967), pp. 59–73.

For a comprehensive, though not always historically perspicacious, survey of the later stages of ancient Hasidism, see A. Büchler, *Types of Jewish-Palestinian Piety from 70 B.C.E. to 70 C.E. The Ancient Pious Men* (1922). According to this author, the rabbinic concept of the *hasid* includes both strict legal observance and a deeply charitable attitude towards people. Büchler rejects all basic distinction between the Hasidim and the Pharisees/rabbis. A more accurate picture is offered by S. Safrai, namely that in some respects (e.g. Sabbath observances) Hasidic halakhah was more rigid than the common Pharisaic kind but, at the same time, it was less concerned with questions of ritual cleanness and uncleanness; see 'The Teaching of Pietists in Mishnaic Literature', JJS 16 (1965), pp. 15–33. See also G. B. Safatti, 'Pious Men, Men of Deeds and the Early Prophets' Tarbiz 26 (1956–57), pp. 126–53 (in Hebrew), and G. Vermes, 'Ḥanina ben Dosa', JJS 23 (1972), pp. 37–9.

were fit and willing to fight for their faith and travelled with them up and down the country destroying altars, killing lapsed Jews, circumcising the children, and encouraging everyone to offer open resistance to their heathen persecutors.⁴⁷

He was not able to pursue this work for long. Soon after the beginning of the uprising, in the Seleucid year 146, i.e. spring 166–spring 165 B.C. (1 Mac. 2:70), Mattathias died, after exhorting his sons to continue, and recommending Simon as their adviser and Judas as their battle commander. Amid deep mourning, he was buried at Modein.⁴⁸

Judas thus took over the leadership of the movement. His surname δ *Μακκαβαίος*, from which the whole party has received the name of Maccabees, is often interpreted as meaning a warrior quick to strike (מקבה = hammer).⁴⁹ 'In his deeds he was like a lion, and like a lion's whelp roaring after prey.' In 1 Maccabees 3:4 he is depicted as a chivalrous hero, bold and eager, not weighing the possibilities of success but staking his all for the sake of the great cause.⁵⁰ With his forces so outnumbered, his successes could, of course, only be temporary ones. The cause he represented must certainly have been lost if it had depended only on the sword.

At first all went very well with the uprising. With blow after blow Judas won decisive victories and even succeeded in restoring Jewish worship on Mount Zion. He defeated a Syrian force under the command of Apollonius (probably identical with the person mentioned earlier on

47. 1 Mac. 2:39–48; Jos. *Ant.* xii 6, 2 (276–8).

48. 1 Mac. 2:49–70; Jos. *Ant.* xii 6, 3–4 (279–86).

49. The etymology of the name is still disputed. *Μακκαβαίος* (on the vocalisation see G. Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 178, n. 3) is usually derived from מקבה. S. I. Curtiss objected to this interpretation, *The Name Machabee* (1876), on the grounds that in the O.T. (e.g. 1 Kg. 6:7; Isa. 44:12; Jer. 10:4) it does not refer to the large club or battle mace, but to the ordinary hammer. It has also been remarked that the nickname 'Maccabee' is unconnected with military feats but appears to have distinguished Judas from his childhood from other persons bearing the same common name. Hence the interpretation suggested by Dalman (*Grammatik*, p. 178, n.3) that 'Maccabee' like מקבן (mBekh. 7:1; bBekh. 43b) indicates a peculiarity of the body, viz., a hammer-shaped head, or, if one is to rely on the Syriac with F. Perles (JQR 17 (1926/7), pp. 403–6), a man with unusual nostrils. Another derivation advanced by A. A. Bevan (JThSt 30 (1929), pp. 191–2) and adopted by Abel (*op. cit.*, p. III) is from וקב (to name, designate). *Makkabai* would then be a contraction from Makkabiah, i.e. 'designation by the Lord.' The latest theory put forward by R. Marcus, viz. that the basis of Maccabee is the Hebrew מקוה 'source of hope' ('The Name *Makkabaios*', *Joshua Starr Memorial Vol.* (1953), pp. 59–66), is unconvincing. Apropos of the interpretation 'hammer-shaped', it should be noted that a nickname originally indicating a bodily peculiarity could easily have acquired, in changed circumstances, the meaning 'hammer (of God)'.

50. Cf. in general the description in 1 Mac. 3:3–9.

p. 152) in a battle in which Apollonius himself was slain, and from then on used Apollonius's sword in all his fighting.⁵¹ A second Syrian army, led by Seron, the 'commander-in-chief of the Syrian forces', was also repulsed by Judas at Beth-horon, north-west of Jerusalem.⁵²

The king realized that he would have to adopt stringent measures to put down the revolt in Judaea. While he himself undertook in 165 B.C. (1 Mac. 3:37, Seleucid year 147) a campaign against the Parthians,⁵³ he left Lysias in Syria as imperial vice-regent and tutor to the minor Antiochus V, and charged him with the task of sending a large army to Judaea for the purpose of exterminating the rebellious Jews.⁵⁴ Lysias despatched three generals, Ptolemy, Nicanor and Gorgias, with a large contingent of troops, to Judaea. The defeat of the Jews seemed so certain that foreign merchants were already in the Syrian camp ready to buy the expected Jewish slaves.⁵⁵

In the meantime, Judas and his followers were not inactive either. Since Jerusalem was occupied by the Gentiles, he assembled his fighting forces in Mizpah.⁵⁶ It was now no longer a small band of enthusiastic warriors, but a regular, organised Jewish army; he appointed as leaders of the people 'commanders of every Thousand, Hundred, Fifty and Ten'. They prepared for the unequal struggle with prayer and fasting. In the region of Emmaus, west of Jerusalem, the two armies confronted one another.⁵⁷

While the main body of the Syrian army remained encamped near Emmaus, Gorgias, with a strong detachment of troops, went in search

51. 1 Mac. 3:10–12; Jos. *Ant.* xii 7, 1 (287).

52. 1 Mac. 3:13–26. Jos. *Ant.* xii 7, 1 (289), *Βαθωρον* is the OT בית חורון, according to Eusebius, *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 46, twelve miles north-west of Jerusalem, and consequently identical with modern Beit-ur. Cf. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 274–5.

53. 1 Mac. 3:31; Tac. *Hist.* V 8.

54. 1 Mac. 3:27–37; Jos. *Ant.* xii 7, 2 (293–7). 2 Mac. 10:9–11, 12, places the appointment of Lysias and the subsequent campaigns in the reign of Antiochus V Eupator. See below. The problems presented by the evidence are not appreciated in the sketch by O. Plöger, 'Die Feldzüge der Seleukiden gegen den Makkabäer Judas', ZDPV 74 (1958), pp. 158–88.

55. 1 Mac. 3:38–41; Jos. *Ant.* xii 7, 3 (298–9). 2 Mac. 8:8–11. According to 2 Maccabees, Ptolemy was the governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia who delegated the military operations to Nicanor and Gorgias. During the following years, Jewish slaves were in fact sold as far away as Greece; see vol. III, § 31, 1.

56. The *Μασιφά* of 1 Mac. 3:46 is ancient Mizpah. Mizpah was the religious and political centre of Israel during the period of the Judges (Jg. 20–1; 1 Sam. 7:5 ff.; 10:17 ff.); see R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (1961), pp. 304–5. According to 1 Mac. 3:46, it was situated *κατέναντι Ἱερουσαλήμ*, not far, therefore, from Jerusalem. Its location is not certain, but may well be Tell en Nasbeh, 13 km. north of Jerusalem, see Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 388–90.

57. 1 Mac. 3:42–60. Jos. *Ant.* xii 7, 3 (298). *Ἐμμαούμ*, 1 Mac. 3:40, 57, in Roman times capital of a toparchy, exists today under the name of 'Amwas (the Emmaus of the NT is probably another place nearer to Jerusalem). See vol. II, § 23, ii.

of the Jewish army. When Judas heard of this, he evaded him and attacked the main force at Emmaus. His address to the Jews stimulated them to such bravery that the Syrian army was completely routed. When the detachment under Gorgias returned, the camp was already in flames and the Jews ready to resume battle with them, but they fled instead to Philistia. The Jews had won a total victory (166/5 B.C.).⁵⁸

In the following year (165/4 B.C.), according to the account in 1 Maccabees 4:28-35, condensed in *Ant.* xii 7, 5 (313-15), Lysias himself led a fresh attack against Judaea with a still more powerful army. But there is some doubt as to whether this campaign actually occurred.⁵⁹ According to the narrative, he did not launch the assault directly from the north, but approached from Idumaea in the south (1 Mac. 4:29). He must therefore have made a detour round Judaea either to the east round the Dead Sea, or as seems more likely, to the west, by marching along the Philistine coast and round the hills. The

58. 1 Mac. 4:1-25; 2 Mac. 8:12-36; *Jos. Ant.* xii 7, 4 (305-12). The evidence for the chronology of these events is as follows. 1 Mac. 3:37 dates the departure of Antiochus on his Parthian campaign to 147 of the Seleucid era. The author will here be using the Greek Seleucid era, from autumn 312 B.C., see Mørkholm, *op. cit.*, p. 161, so 166/5 B.C. Antiochus will presumably have left in fact in the spring of 165 B.C., *ibid.*, p. 166. Then 1 Mac. 4:28 reads, after the account of the victory at Emmaus, *καὶ ἐν τῷ ἐρχομένῳ* (or *ἐχομένῳ*) *ἐναντῶν* introducing Lysias's campaign. This will be 165/4 B.C., as is shown by the dating of the consequent restoration of the Temple cult to 25 Kislev of the Seleucid year 148, 1 Mac. 4:52, i.e. December 164 B.C., using the era starting in the spring of 311 B.C. But the historicity of Lysias's campaign is disputed. (see below). 1 Mac. mentions only Gorgias as enemy commander, and 2 Mac. only Nicanor, both possibly being correct in so far as Gorgias commanded the raiding force and Nicanor the main army. On other differences between 1 and 2 Mac. regarding this expedition, see Niese, *op. cit.*, pp. 53-5.

59. The arguments against the historicity of this campaign are given by Kolbe, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-81, and extended by Mørkholm, *op. cit.*, pp. 152-4. (1) The brief account of the campaign in 1 Mac. 4:28-35 could well be a doublet of the longer account in 1 Mac. 6:20-49 of the campaign by Lysias and Antiochus Eupator in 163 B.C., which however ended with the capitulation of Beth-Zur; similarly 2 Mac. 11:5-12 (placed under Antiochus Eupator and after the rededication of the Temple, see below) could be a doublet of the second campaign, 2 Mac. 13:1-22. Josephus also gives two campaigns, *Ant.* xii 2, 5 (313-15) and 9, 4-7 (375-83). (2) The battle at Beth-Zur is more intelligible after the fortification of the place by Judas, 1 Mac. 4:61, and raids into Idumaea by him, 1 Mac. 5:3-8, 65-8. But 1 Mac. 4 says only that Judas advanced to meet Lysias at Beth-Zur. (3) It is unlikely that the campaign will have been started in the autumn of 165 B.C. (but this may equally account for the fact that a relatively slight defeat brought it to an end). If it began in the spring of 164 B.C. it is difficult to relate it chronologically to the amnesty-letter issued by Antiochus Epiphanes on 15 Xanthicus in the year 148 of the Seleucid era = about March 164 B.C., 2 Mac. 11:22-33 (see below).

None of the objections to the historicity of the first campaign seems conclusive.

armies met near Beth-Zur, south of Jerusalem, on the road to Hebron.⁶⁰ Although the Syrian army was far superior, Judas once again gained a total victory and Lysias was obliged to return to Antioch to collect reinforcements.⁶¹

This victory may have occurred as early as the autumn of 165 B.C.

60. *Βαθούρα* (*ἡ* and *τά*) 1 Mac. 4: 29, 61; 6:7, 26, 31, 49, 50; 9:52; 10:14; 11:65; 14:7, 33, is also frequently mentioned in the OT as *בֵּית צֹרֵר*. Euseb. *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 52, places it twenty Roman miles south of Jerusalem in the direction of Hebron (*καὶ ἔστι νῦν κόμη Βηθσοῦρᾶ ἀπὸν τῶν ἀπὸ Αἰτίας εἰς Χεβρών. ἐν κ' σημεῖῳ*); approximately confirmed by the position of the modern Beit-Sur. The distance of four plus two plus fourteen Roman miles is also given by the pilgrim of Bordeaux, *Itinera Hierosol.* ed. Geyer (1898), p. 25 = CCL clxxv, p. 20. He names the place *Bethasora*; on the mosaic map of Madaba it is [*ΒΕΘ*] *ΩΡΑ*, see M. Avi-Yonah, *The Madaba Mosaic Map* (1954), p. 61. For excavations there, with extensive finds of the Maccabæan period, see O. R. Sellers, *The Citadel of Beth-Zur* (1933); cf. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 283, and now O. R. Sellers *et al.*, *The 1957 Excavation at Beth-Zur*, AASOR XXXVIII (1968).

61. 1 Mac. 4:26-35; 2 Mac. 11:1-15; *Jos. Ant.* xii 7, 5 (313-15). The identity of 2 Mac. 11:1-15 with 1 Mac. 4:26-35 cannot really be in doubt. Cf. Abel, *in loc.* None the less, the reports diverge noticeably in two main points: (a) 1 Maccabees knows nothing of the peace treaty which followed this campaign according to 2 Maccabees, which provides as documentary evidence four letters (from Lysias, the king and the Roman ambassadors), 2 Mac. 11:16-38. Their authenticity, and with it the historicity of this account, is defended by Niese (*op. cit.*, pp. 63 ff. = *Hermes* 35 (1908), pp. 476 ff., 489). (b) 2 Maccabees places this expedition of Lysias considerably later, i.e., after the re-dedication of the Temple, and also presents the events which followed in another order. The divergences of the two narratives are illustrated by Niese, *op. cit.*, 56 = *Hermes* 35 (1900), p. 469, in the following paradigm:

1 Mac. 4 ff.	2 Mac. 8 ff.
Victory over Gorgias and Nicanor.	Victory over Gorgias and Nicanor.
1. Campaign of Lysias.	Occupation of Jerusalem.
Occupation of Jerusalem.	Death of Epiphanes (9).
Purification of the Temple.	Purification of the Temple (10).
Border warfare (5).	Accession of Eupator.
Death of Epiphanes.	Border warfare.
Accession of Eupator (6).	1. Campaign of Lysias and peace (11).
2. Campaign of Lysias with Eupator.	New border warfare (12).
Peace with the Jews.	2. Campaign of Lysias with Eupator.
	Peace with the Jews.

The divergence in the sequence of events can be traced, according to Niese, *op. cit.*, p. 60, in the main to (a) the smaller military expeditions against neighbouring tribes, which in 2 Maccabees are spread over various points of time but in 1 Maccabees, chapter 5, are collected together; (b) the death of Antiochus Epiphanes in 1 Maccabees occurs a year later than in the second book; (c) the first attack of Lysias is antedated by approximately the same time, so these two events, the death of Antiochus and the campaign of Lysias more or less change places in 1 and 2 Maccabees. On all three points, Niese prefers 2 Maccabees. His attempt to explain the divergencies of 1 Maccabees as having been deliberately brought about by the author's inflexible views, p. 55-63 = *Hermes* 35, 468-76, may be correct, but only in the sense that chronological conflation came about for literary reasons.

(see n. 59). This possibility depends, however, on the apparent identity of the present campaign with that of Lysias in 2 Mac. 11:1-12, placed after the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, and on the genuineness of the four documents given there (11:16-38); it is important to note that three of them carry a dating to the Seleucid year 148 = 165/4 B.C. On the hypothesis that these documents are genuine, or at least go back to genuine originals, there is evidence here for two important stages of the Maccabaeen victory not reflected in 1 Mac., which passes straight from the victory over Lysias to the restoration of the Temple cult. The first is represented by the letter of Lysias to the Jews (11:16-21) dated Διοσκόρου/Διοσκοριωθίου εικοστή τετάρτη of the Seleucid year 148. The most probable of several amendments (see Abel, *ad loc.*) is the Macedonian month Dios (November). The letter, in which Lysias says that he has granted various requests made by Jewish envoys and passed others on to the king, could then date after his brief and unsuccessful campaign in autumn 165 B.C. Subsequent to this is the letter of the king himself (11:27-33), in which he offers amnesty to all Jews who return to their homes before the end of the month Xanthicus (April) and allows them χρῆσθαι . . . τοῖς ἐαυτῶν δαπανήμασι καὶ νόμοις καθὰ καὶ τὸ πρότερον. The letter is dated, exactly like that of two Roman *legati* which follows (11:34-8)⁶², in the year 148—Ἐαμβικοῦ πέμπτη καὶ δεκάτη. This seems to indicate an impossibly short time for the fulfilment of the terms of the amnesty, and is perhaps a doublet from the letter of the *legati*. But the letter itself may well be a genuine document of the early part of 164 B.C. If so, it marks a significant stage in the abandonment of active persecution in the face of Jewish resistance.

After these successes, Judas again took Jerusalem and directed his attention to restoring the Temple cult. The Akra was still occupied by Syrian troops, but Judas kept them continually in check so that work in the Temple could proceed without interruption. Everything impure was removed. The altar of burnt-offering, defiled by heathen sacrifice, was demolished, and a new one erected in its place.⁶³ The

62. There is good evidence that two Roman *legati* were in the East in 164 B.C., and heard complaints against Antiochus IV. See Broughton, MRR I, pp. 439-40, and J. Briscoe, 'Eastern Policy and Senatorial Politics 168-146 B.C.', *Historia* 18 (1969), pp. 49-70, on p. 53. However, the authenticity of the document has often been questioned. For the latest discussion and bibliography see Th. Liebmann-Frankfort, 'Romé et le conflit judéo-syrien (164-161 avant notre ère)', *Antiquité Classique* 38 (1969), pp. 101-20, who dates it to 163 B.C.

63. The stones of the pagan sacrificial altar (or perhaps of several such altars) were carried to 'an unclean place', i.e. removed from the Temple precincts (1 Mac. 4:43), and the stones of the former Jewish altar of burnt-offering were laid in a suitable place on the Temple mount, 'until a prophet should arise to show what would be done with them' (1 Mac. 4:46). According to mMid. 1:6, the stones of the Jewish altar were deposited in a chamber within the bounds of the inner court, but

sacred vessels were replaced by new ones and when everything was completed, the Temple was re-dedicated amidst splendid celebrations. This occurred (according to 1 Maccabees 4:52) on 25 Kislev, in the Seleucid year 148 = December 164 B.C., on the same day on which, three years previously, the altar had first been profaned by heathen sacrifice.⁶⁴ The festivities lasted for eight days, and it was resolved that they should be renewed yearly as a reminder of these events.⁶⁵

The re-dedication of the Temple constituted the first phase in the history of the Maccabaeen revolt. Until this point, the struggles of the Jews were crowned with success. Judas had led his followers from victory to victory. The future was now to show whether their strength was sufficient and their enthusiasm enduring enough for them to keep permanent hold of what they had so rapidly won.

no longer on 'holy' ground. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 60-1, combining 1 Mac. 4:43 and 46 with two obscure passages in Megillath Taanith (§ 17 and 20; cf. ed. Lichtenstein, pp. 337, 339), advanced the highly questionable theory that the stones of the Jewish altar (סִימָנוֹת) were removed on 23 Marḥeshwan (November) and those of the heathen altar (סִימָנוֹתָא) some time later, on 3 Kislev (December). But since סִימָנָא means 'sign', 'standard' (σημεῖον = signum), the latter event is perhaps more likely to refer to the removal of the Roman emblems under Pontius Pilate, *B.J.* ii 9, 2-3 (169-74); *Ant.* xviii 3, 1 (55-9). Cf. Abel, *op. cit.*, p. 80; Lichtenstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 299-300.

64. The date of 25 Kislev as the day of the dedication of the Temple is confirmed by the Megillath Taanith § 23. See Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 62; Lichtenstein, *op. cit.*, pp. 275-6; Abel, *op. cit.*, p. 85.

65. Cf. in general 1 Mac. 4:36-59; 2 Mac. 10:1-8; *Jos. Ant.* xii 7, 6-7 (316-26). This is the origin of the 'Feast of the Dedication of the Temple', τὰ ἐγκαίνια, *Jn.* 10:22. Cf. *Jos. Ant.* xii 7, 7 (325) καὶ ἐξ ἐκείνου μέχρι τοῦ δεῦρο τὴν ἑορτὴν ἄγομεν, καλοῦντές αὐτὴν φάτα, (because during the festival it was the custom to light lamps, see mB.K. 6:6). According to 2 Maccabees 10:6 it was celebrated in the manner of the Feast of Tabernacles, and is therefore actually called in 2 Mac. 1:9 'The Feast of Tabernacles in the month Kislev'. This expression comes from one of two letters preserved at the beginning of 2 Maccabees, in which the Jews of Egypt are invited to celebrate this Feast, cf. vol. III, § 31, 1. In Hebrew it is called Hanukkah (חֲנוּכָּה), and is celebrated for eight days. Cf. mBik. 1:6; mR.Sh. 1:3; mTaan. 2:10; mMg. 3:4, 6; mM.K. 3:9; mB.K. 6:6; Meg. Taan. § 23. A complete description of the festival in post-talmudic times is given by Maimonides, *Hilkhoth Megillah wa-Hanukkah* 3-4 in *Mishneh Torah, Sefer Zemanim* (ed. M. D. Rabinowitz) V (1916), pp. 545-65; E.T. in *Yale Judaica Series XIV, Code of Maimonides, Book 3, The Book of Seasons* (1961), pp. 453-71. At the service in the synagogue Num. 7 was read (mMeg. 3:6) and the festal psalm was Ps. 30 (Soferim 18:2). Hence Ps. 30 bears the title שִׁיר הַחֲנוּכָּה הַבֵּית. Cf. in general S. Krauss, 'La fête de Hanoucca', *REJ* 30 (1895), pp. 24-43, 204-19; I. Levi, *ibid.*, pp. 220-31; 31 (1895), pp. 119 f. Krauss, *ibid.* 32 (1896), pp. 39-50; S. Zeitlin, *JQR* 29 (1938/9), pp. 1-36; F.-M. Abel, 'La fête de Hanoucca', *RB* 53 (1946), pp. 538-46; S. Stein, 'The Liturgy of Hanukkah and the First Two Books of the Maccabees', *JJS* 5 (1954), pp. 100-6, 148-55. See O. S. Rankin, *The Origins of the Festival of Hanukkah* (1930); R. de Vaux, *Ancient Israel* (1961), pp. 510-14, 552; M. D. Herr, 'Hanukkah', *Enc. Jüd.* 7 (1971), cols. 1080-88.