

§ 5 JUDAS MACCABAEUS 164-161 B.C.

Sources

1 Maccabees 5-9:22; 2 Maccabees 12-15.
Josephus *Ant.* xii 8-11 (327-434).
Megillath Taanith § 30; cf. H. Lichtenstein, *HUCA* 8-9 (1931-2), p. 346; cf. pp. 279-80.

Bibliography.

Cf. § 4 on pp. 137-8 above.

During the period after the rededication of the Temple to the summer of 162 B.C., Judas remained master of Judaea. The central government of Syria took no interest in its affairs because of its pre-occupations elsewhere. Moreover, 2 Mac. 11:22-6 contains what appears to be a letter of Antiochus V Eupator to Lysias, written soon after his accession, guaranteeing the right of the Jews to their Temple and the observance of the Law.¹ Judas could therefore concentrate on the strengthening of his position. The Temple mount was equipped with strong fortifications. Beth-Zur, on the southern frontier and the key to Judaea, was similarly fortified and garrisoned with Jewish troops.² But in particular, military raids were made on neighbouring territories, partly to protect the Jews living there, and partly to consolidate Judas's own power. One after another, the Edomites, the sons of Baean and the Ammonites, all of whom had shown their hostility, were punished.³

Soon, complaints came from Gilead (east of Jordan) and Galilee of the persecutions to which the Jews living there were being subjected by the Gentiles. It was decided to send assistance to both places. Simon marched to Galilee with three thousand men, and Judas to Gilead with eight thousand.⁴ In neither case was there any intention

1. The letter contains no date and is given along with three letters from the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, on which see p. 162 above. But the phrase *τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν εἰς θεοῦ μεταστροφῆς* clearly indicates that the death of Antiochus was recent.

2. 1 Mac. 4:60-1; Jos. *Ant.* xii 7, 7 (326). Beth-Zur is frequently mentioned in subsequent history as an important place. See the references quoted above on p. 161.

3. 1 Mac. 5:1-8. Jos. *Ant.* xii 8, 1 (327-31). The Edomite province of Akrobatene (1 Mac. 5:3) probably owes its name to the mountain range Akrabbin, Num. 34:4; Jos. 15:3; Jg. 1:36, and is not to be confused with the better-known toparchy of Akrobatene. See vol. II, § 23 ii.

4. 1 Mac. 5:9-20; Jos. *Ant.* xii 8, 1-2 (330-4).

of conquering these provinces permanently. After 'many battles' against the Gentiles in Galilee, Simon took the Jews, with their wives and children and all their belongings, and led them amid great jubilation to Judaea, where they were sheltered in safety.⁵ Judaea acted similarly in Gilead. In a series of successful engagements, especially in the north of the area east of Jordan, he subdued the native tribes, whose leader seems to have been a certain Timotheus. He then assembled all the Israelites in Gilead, great and small, women and children, with all their possessions, and after having to force his way near Ephron (a town east of Jordan), led them safe and sound through Bethshean (Scythopolis) to Judaea.⁶

While Judas and Simon were absent from Judaea, the leadership there was entrusted to Joseph son of Zechariah, and Azariah. Against the express instructions of Judas, these two launched a campaign against Jamnia, but were repulsed with considerable losses by Gorgias (who had therefore remained in Philistia since his defeat at Emmaus). 1 Maccabees does not neglect this opportunity to point out that it was the family of the Maccabees 'by whose hand deliverance was to be wrought for Israel'.⁷

Judas, however, continued his military exploits. He marched once more against the Edomites, and besieged and destroyed Hebron. He then advanced through Marisa (this, not 'Samaria', is the correct reading in 1 Mac. 5:66) into the land of the Philistines, overran Ashdod, destroyed the altars there and the idols, and returned to Judaea with rich booty.⁸ It was quite clearly no longer a matter of protecting the Jewish faith but of consolidating and extending Jewish power.

Meanwhile circumstances had also altered in Syria. Antiochus Epiphanes had met with as little good fortune in the east of his empire as his generals had in Judaea. He had advanced as far as the province of Elymais, but after trying in vain to appropriate the rich treasures of the temple of Artemis, he was compelled to withdraw to Babylon and died on the way in the Persian town of Tabae in the autumn of

5. 1 Mac. 5:21-3; Jos. *Ant.* xii 8, 2 (334). 1 Mac. 5:23, cf. above p. 142.

6. 1 Mac. 5:24-54; 2 Mac. 12:10-31; Jos. *Ant.* xii 8, 3-5 (335-49). On the geography, see Abel, *in loc.* Ephron is probably identical with the *Γεφροῦς* or *Γεφρούν* (Polyb. V 70, 12) conquered by Alexander the Great, situated at et-Taiyibeh. See Abel, *op. cit.*, p. 102; *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 318-19.

7. 1 Mac. 5:18-19, 55-62. Jos. *Ant.* xii 8, 6 (350-2). On Jamnia, see vol. II, § 23, 1.

8. 1 Mac. 5:63-8. Instead of *Σαμάρειαν* 1 Mac. 5:66, Jos. *Ant.* xii 8, 6 (353) reads *Μάρισσαν*, as do also the best Latin manuscripts; see Abel, *in loc.* Cf. also 2 Mac. 12:35. Marisa, in the OT Mareshah, is a well-known town in southern Judaea, at that time under Edomite rule, *Ant.* xiii 9, 1 (257) and lying, according to Eusebius, *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 130, in the vicinity of Eleutheropolis, i.e. between Hebron and Ashdod. Cf. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* I, p. 379.

164 B.C. (1 Mac. 6:16: in the Seleucid year 149=164/3 B.C.).⁹ Before he died, he appointed one of his generals, Philip, to be imperial vice-regent and tutor to his son Antiochus V Eupator. But Lysias seized the person of the young king instead, and assumed supreme power.¹⁰

It might have been some time before steps were taken against the disloyal Jews had not urgent requests for such measures reached Antioch direct from Judaea. Judas now besieged the Syrian garrison in the citadel of Jerusalem, the date being the Seleucid year 150 (1 Mac. 6:20), that is, either autumn 163–autumn 162 B.C., or spring 162–spring 161 B.C. Some of the garrison escaped despite the siege, and in company with representatives of the Jewish pro-Greek faction, went to the king to persuade him of the need for his intervention. The Jewish representatives in particular complained of how much they had to suffer from their hostile fellow countrymen, mentioning that many of them had been killed and robbed.¹¹

Only then did the government in Antioch decide to intervene. Lysias, accompanied by the young king, set off against Judaea at the head of a powerful army. He attacked once again from the south and first besieged Beth-Zur. Judas was obliged to raise the siege of the citadel of Jerusalem and to advance against the king. The two armies met at Beth-Zachariah, between Jerusalem and Beth-Zur.¹² It soon became evident that, faced with a serious onslaught by the Syrians, the Jews, in spite of all their bravery, were in the long run unable to secure a decisive victory. Courageously they threw themselves into the battle. Judas's own brother, Eleazar, distinguished himself more than any. Thinking that he had discovered the elephant carrying the young king, he pressed forward, stabbed it from below, and was crushed to death by the beast as it fell. His self-sacrifice and all the exertions of the Jews were however in vain. The Jewish army was beaten, and indeed so decisively that the king's army soon appeared before the walls of Jerusalem and laid siege to Zion, the Temple mount.¹³

9. 1 Mac. 6:1–16; Jos. *Ant.* xii 9, 1 (354–9); Polyb. xxxi 9 (11); Porphyry in Jerome on Daniel 11:44–5 (CCL lxxvA, pp. 931–2). In place of Artemis referred to by Polybius, Appian, *Syriaca* 66/352 names Aphrodite. On the chronology, cf. p. 128 above. The narratives of 2 Maccabees (1:13–16 and chapter 9) represent popular stories; see Abel, *in loc.*

10. 1 Mac. 6:14–17; Jos. *Ant.* xii 9, 2 (360–1).

11. 1 Mac. 6:18–24; Jos. *Ant.* xii 9, 3 (364–6).

12. *Βαθχαραία* (1 Mac. 6:32), according to Jos. *Ant.* xii 9, 4 (369) seventy stadia north of Beth-Zur, is the modern Beit-Zakaria. See Abel, *Geog. Pal.* II, p. 284.

13. 1 Mac. 6:28–48; 2 Mac. 13:1–17; Jos. *Ant.* xii 9, 3–5 (369–75); *B.J.* i 1, 5 (41–6). The defeat is very vaguely referred to in 1 Mac. 6:47, while in 2 Mac. 13:15–17 it is actually transformed into a victory!

Beth-Zur was also forced to surrender, and occupied by the Syrians. But those besieged on Mount Zion soon began to suffer from hunger; because it was a sabbatical year, no supplies were available.¹⁴ The complete submission of the Jews seemed imminent when suddenly Lysias found himself compelled, because of events in Syria, to make peace with them on lenient terms. The same Philip, in effect, whom Antiochus Epiphanes had appointed as imperial vice-regent and tutor to his son Antiochus V during his minority, had marched against Antioch in order to seize power for himself. To leave himself a free hand, Lysias conceded to the Jews the right for which they had been fighting: namely, the free exercise of their religion. From then on, they were to be permitted to 'walk in accordance with their ordinances as formerly'. On this condition, those besieged on Zion withdrew; its fortifications were demolished (contrary to the king's sworn promise). The Jews were once more subjugated, but they had attained the goal for which they had risen against Syrian rule five years earlier.¹⁵

The concession which Lysias and Antiochus V, in their own interests, made to the Jews, was not revoked by later kings. None of them reverted to the foolish idea of Antiochus Epiphanes of enforcing a Gentile culture on the Jews. The Israelite cult, which had been restored by Judas Maccabaeus, remained on the whole intact throughout all the vicissitudes of the ensuing years. This should be borne in mind if a correct estimate is to be made of the conflicts which followed. The aim of the struggle now became a different one from hitherto. It was no longer a question of preserving the Jewish religion, but—once before in the pre-history of the Maccabean uprising—of the domination within Jewry itself of the pro-Greek faction or the nationalists. It was essentially an internal struggle in which the Seleucid régime took part only in so far as they sometimes supported the one party and placed it in power, and sometimes the other. To a certain extent, of course, religious interests also came into consideration. For in their promotion of Greek culture, the pro-Greeks went further than seemed to their

14. 1 Mac. 6:49–54; 2 Mac. 13:18–22; Jos. *Ant.* xii 9, 5 (378). Mention of the Sabbatical year (1 Mac. 6:49: *ὅτι σάββατον ἦν τῆ γῆ* and 6:53: *διὰ τὸ ἑβδομῶν ἔτος εἶναι*) suggests that these events occurred in 162 B.C. For the Seleucid year 150 (in which they are placed, according to 1 Mac. 6:20, cf. 7:1) runs, according to the reckoning adopted in 1 Maccabees, either from autumn 163 to autumn 162 B.C., or from spring 162 to spring 161 B.C. The sabbatical year, however, always begins in the autumn (mR.Sh. 1:1), and this one seems to have fallen in 163/2 B.C. Since there was already a shortage of food, it must have been the second half of the sabbatical year, after the fields had been left uncultivated during the winter and spring: the summer, therefore, of 162 B.C. See also R. North, 'Maccabean Sabbath Years', *Bibl.* 34 (1953), pp. 501–15.

15. 1 Mac. 6:55–62; 2 Mac. 13:23–6; Jos. *Ant.* xii 9, 6–7 (379–83).

nationalist opponents to be compatible with the religion of Israel. Its basis, however, was no longer threatened.¹⁶

As a result of the events of the last few years, the pro-Greeks in Judaea had been removed from the leadership of affairs and even to a large extent oppressed. It was Judas who stood at the head of the Jewish people.¹⁷ As may well be imagined, the opposition party did not submit quietly to this arrangement but made strenuous efforts to regain power. This, however, did not come about until after another change of sovereign in Syria. Antiochus V and Lysias had defeated, after a short struggle, that same Philip who had contended with them for the supremacy.¹⁸ But they were themselves soon removed by a new pretender to the throne. Demetrius I—afterwards surnamed Soter—the son of Seleucus IV Philopator and therefore nephew of Antiochus Epiphanes and cousin of Antiochus Eupator, who had until then lived as a hostage in Rome and had tried in vain to obtain permission from the Roman senate to return home, managed to escape in secret and landed at Tripolis on the Phoenician coast.¹⁹ He was soon able to gain adherents;²⁰ indeed, King Antiochus's own forces surrendered him, and his guardian Lysias, to Demetrius. On the latter's command, both were murdered, and he became king, in 162 B.C.²¹ The Roman senate was at first greatly alarmed at Demetrius's flight; he was nevertheless soon able to procure their recognition of him as king.²²

Soon after his accession, the leaders of the pro-Greek party with at their head a certain Alcimus (or Yakim, his Hebrew name)²³, made

16. Cf. Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, p. 84.

17. The identity of the person who acted as High Priest after the restoration of the cult does not emerge from 1 Maccabees. Nominally, Menelaus was still High Priest, the man said to have been executed by Antiochus V Eupator for having been the cause of the rebellion 'by persuading the king's father to compel the Jews to abandon their ancestral religion', *Jos. Ant.* xii 9, 7 (383-5); cf. 2 Mac. 13:3-8. But Menelaus could not exercise the functions of High Priest while Judas was in power. Was the person in office at that time Onias IV son of Onias III? According to one of Josephus's versions, Onias IV was still a minor when his father died, *Ant.* xii 5, 1 (237) and went to Egypt straight afterwards because the High Priesthood was not transferred to him after Menelaus's execution, but to Alcimus, *Ant.* xii 9, 7 (385-7); but compare *B.J.* vii 10, 2 (423).

18. 1 Mac. 6:63; *Jos. Ant.* xii 9, 7 (386).

19. 2 Mac. 14:1; Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene I, p. 254 = Syncell. ed. Dindorf I, pp. 550-1; Jerome, *Chron.* ed. Helm, p. 141.

20. Justin xxxiv 3, 9, 'delatus in Syrian secundo favore omnium excipitur'.

21. 1 Mac. 7:1-4; 2 Mac. 14:1-2; *Jos. Ant.* xii 10, 1 (389-90); Livy *Epit.* xlv; *Appian Syr.* 47/242. On the chronology, see above pp. 129 f.

22. Polyb. xxxi 15 (23); 33 (xxxii 4).

23. *Jos. Ant.* xii 9, 7 (385) Ἀλκίμος ὁ καὶ Ἰάκιμος κληθείς. In the synopsis given in *Ant.* xx 10, 3 (235), Josephus refers to him as Ἰάκιμος. In the text of 1 Maccabees, 7:5, 12, 20-1, 23, 25 and 9:54-7, as well as 2 Mac. 14:3 various manuscripts have the addition, ὁ καὶ Ἰάκιμος.

representations to the king on account of their ill-treatment by the party of Judas. Judas and his brothers had just at that time killed the king's supporters or expelled them from the country. This factor naturally made an impact on Demetrius. Alcimus was appointed High Priest, and a Syrian army, under the command of Bacchides, was sent to Judaea to install Alcimus in office, if necessary by force.²⁴

The way in which matters developed from then on is characteristic of the Maccabean struggles. Resistance to Alcimus on the part of the strictly religious Jews was by no means general. As a result of his soothing promises, he was acknowledged as lawful High Priest descended from Aaron by the very representatives of the strictest branch of Jewry themselves—the scribes and the 'Devout' (Ἀσιδαιοί, 1 Mac. 7:13). Only Judas and his followers persisted in their opposition. They did not take Alcimus at his word, and believed that their religious interests would be secure only if they were in control.²⁵

In the event, they were shown to be right. One of the first acts of Alcimus was to order the execution of sixty men of the Asidaeans party. This, needless to say, created fear and alarm; but it also sharpened antagonism. Nevertheless, Bacchides judged his presence in Judaea to be no longer necessary. Leaving a military force for the protection of Alcimus, he himself returned to Syria. Thus Alcimus and Judas were in the main left to contend against each other by means of their own resources. But the open warfare which now began between the two parties seemed more and more to incline in favour of the Maccabees, and Alcimus found it necessary to go to the king and plead for further support.²⁶

Demetrius sent another general, Nicanor, with a large army against Judaea. Nicanor first tried to seize Judas by cunning, but the Jewish leader was informed of the plot and it misfired. An engagement then took place at Capharsalama²⁷ in which Nicanor suffered some losses. He then went to Jerusalem and vented his fury on the innocent priests, returning their respectful greetings with mockery and ridicule, and

24. 1 Mac. 7:5-9; 2 Mac. 14:3-10; *Jos. Ant.* xii 10:1-2 (391-3). According to *Ant.* xii 9, 7 (385), Alcimus had already been nominated High Priest by Antiochus V Eupator. According to 2 Mac. 14:3 ff. he had been High Priest once before. Cf. RE s.v. 'Alkimos' (15).

25. 1 Mac. 7:10-15; *Jos. Ant.* xii 10, 2 (395-6). 2 Mac. 14:6 wrongly identifies the Asidaeans with the party of Judas. Cf. Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, pp. 79 ff.; Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine I*, p. 158.

26. 1 Mac. 7:16-25; *Jos. Ant.* xii 10, 2-3 (396-49). On the place Beth-zaith mentioned in 1 Mac. 7:19, see Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 284.

27. 1 Mac. 7:31. The site of this place is uncertain. Abel, *ad loc.* suggests the village of Salem (Euseb. *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 153) west of Jerusalem and a kilometre north-west of el-Gib, now known as Khirbet Selma. This is to be preferred to Kafar Sallam in the Plain of Sharon mentioned by Arab geographers; see *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 293.

threatening them that if Judas and his army were not surrendered to him, he would on his triumphant return set fire to the Temple.²⁸

He marched off to the region of Beth-horon, north-west of Jerusalem, where he collected reinforcements from Syria. Judas was encamped opposite him near Adasa.²⁹ On 13 Adar 161 B.C., the decisive battle was fought which ended with the total defeat of the Syrians. Nicanor himself fell in the tumult. When his people saw this, they threw away their arms and fled. Pursuing them, the Jews surrounded and cut them down to the last man (so, at least, 1 Maccabees asserts). The victory must in any case have been striking and decisive. For from then on, 13 Adar (March) was celebrated annually as 'Nicanor's Day'.³⁰

Judas was thus once more master of the situation. Josephus dates to this time the death of Alcimus and the subsequent assumption of the High Priesthood by Judas. But according to 1 Maccabees, Alcimus died considerably later, and it is very improbable that Judas ever exercised the functions of High Priest.³¹

He was, nevertheless, as Josephus's statement correctly conveys,

28. 1 Mac. 7:26-38; 2 Mac. 14:11-36; Jos. *Ant.* xii 10, 4-5 (405-6).

29. 'Adasa (1 Mac. 7:40, 45), according to Jos. *Ant.* xii 10, 5 (408) thirty stadia from Beth-horon, is presumably identical with the 'Adasa in the vicinity of Gophna which was known to Eusebius (*Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 26, καὶ ἐστὶ νῦν κάμη ἐγγὺς Γουφνῶν). It therefore lay to the north-east of Beth-horon. It is to be distinguished from the similarly named Hadashah in the tribe of Judah (Jos. 15:37, mErub. 5:6) which, precisely because it belonged to the tribe of Judah, cannot have lain in the neighbourhood of Gophna, as was mistakenly assumed by Eusebius. Some scholars identify this Adasa with Khirbet 'Adaseh, 8 km. north of Jerusalem on the Beth-horon road, see Guérin, *Judée* III, pp. 5-6; Conder and Kitchener, *The Survey of Western Palestine*, III, pp. 30, 105 f. and Abel on 1 Mac. 7:40. The identification involves rejecting the evidence of Josephus, *loc. cit.* (above), since Khirbet 'Adaseh is situated sixty stadia from Beth-horon, and not in the direction of Gophna, but towards the south-east.

30. 1 Mac. 7:39-50; 2 Mac. 15:1-36; Jos. *Ant.* xii 10, 5 (408-12); Megillath Taanith § 30: יום נקנור. The year in which Nicanor's defeat occurred is not directly stated in 1 Maccabees. But by comparing 1 Mac. 7:1 (151 of the Seleucid era) with 9:3 (152), it seems clear that the month of the victory, Adar, roughly March, fell in 161 B.C. The year is certain if 1 Mac. 9:3, relating that the next expedition sent by Demetrius (see below) was encamped at Jerusalem in the first month of the year 152, is using the Macedonian era, as this date will then be autumn 161 B.C. It is also all but certain if the Babylonian era beginning the following spring is being used.

31. On the death of Alcimus, see 1 Mac. 9:54-6. On the High Priesthood of Judas, Jos. *Ant.* xii 10, 6 (414); 11, 2 (434). It is not in itself inconceivable that Judas also usurped the functions of the High Priest. But 1 Maccabees says nothing about it; in addition, a legitimate claimant was present in the person of Onias IV (see above, p. 168), who would probably be respected as such by Judas. Josephus himself in another place expressly states that after the death of Alcimus the High-Priestly office remained unoccupied for seven years, *Ant.* xx 10, 3 (237) διετέλεστο δ' αὐτὸν οὐδεὶς, ἀλλὰ διετέλεσαν ἡ πόλις ἐνιαυτοὺς ἑπτὰ χωρὶς ἀρχιερέως οὕσα.

the effective leader of the Jewish community, and it was his intention that he, or at least his party, should be permanently in this commanding position. Events had taught him, however, that this was only possible in complete separation from the Syrian empire. The Syrian king had meant to ensure by force of arms that power in Judaea should pass into the hands of the opposing party. It was imperative, therefore, to shake off the Syrian yoke. To achieve this, Judas turned for assistance to the Romans. These had taken the liveliest interest in events in Syria and kept a suspicious watch on them ever since the battles with Antiochus the Great (192-189 B.C.). They had repeatedly intervened in Syrian affairs.³² Any centrifugal pressures could count on their certain support. It was consequently very reasonable of Judas to try to ensure permanence for the briefly won freedom with the help of the Romans. 1 Maccabees gives a vivid description of how Judas heard of the deeds and might of the Romans and how this led him to seek their aid. The very inaccuracies of the narrative make clear the extent of what was known in Judaea about the Romans in those days. So Judas sent two men of his party, Eupolemus son of John, and Jason son of Eleazar, as emissaries to Rome (the former perhaps identical with the Eupolemus known as a Hellenistic writer, see vol. III, § 33, 3, 2). His object in doing so was the overthrow of Syrian domination (1 Mac. 8:18, τοῦ ἀραι τὸν ζυγὸν ἀπ' αὐτῶν). The Roman senate willingly granted an audience to the Jewish delegation, and a treaty of friendship was signed, the essential provisions of which were that Jews and Romans were to render each other mutual aid in the event of war, though not on identical terms, and in every instance 'as the circumstances demanded' (1 Mac. 8:25, 27: ὡς ἀν' ὁ καιρὸς ὑπογράφῃ αὐτοῖς). It rather depended, therefore, on the discretion of the Romans how far they wished to consider themselves bound by it.³³

Simultaneously with the conclusion of this treaty, the Romans sent a letter to Demetrius prohibiting all hostilities against the Jews as allies

[Text continues on page 173]

32. Thus Antiochus Epiphanes was compelled by Popilius Laenas to give up Egypt (see above pp. 151-2). After the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Roman senate demanded from Antiochus Eupator and his guardian Lysias a considerable reduction of the Syrian armed forces, Polyb. xxxi 2, 9-11; Appian *Syr.* 46/239.

33. 1 Mac. 8; Jos. *Ant.* xii 10, 6 (414-19). For similar documents known from epigraphic texts see R. K. Sherk, *Roman Documents from the Greek East: Senatus Consulta and Epistulae to the Age of Augustus* (1969), esp. no. 10 (*senatus consultum* and treaty with Astypalaea, 105 B.C.). For comment and criticism of 1 Mac. 8 cf. apart from the commentaries (e.g. Abel), especially Grimm, *ZWTh* (1874), 231-8 (with notes by Mommsen) and I. Mendelssohn, 'Senatus consulta Romanorum quae sunt in Josephi Antiquitatibus', *Acta societatis philologiae Lipsiensis* 5 (1875), pp. 91-100; H. Willrich, *Judaica* (1900), pp. 62-85; cf. *Urkundenfälschung in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur* (1924), pp. 44-50, repeating the same views; B. Niese, 'Eine Urkunde aus der Makkabäerzeit', *Oriental. Studien*, Th. Nöldeke

(1906), pp. 817-29; E. Täubler, *Imperium Romanum I* (1913), pp. 239-54; O. Roth, *Rom und die Hasmonäer*, Beitr. z. Wiss. vom AT 17 (1914), pp. 3-18; W. Kolbe, *op. cit.*, pp. 36-8; R. Laqueur, 'Griechische Urkunden in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur', Hist. Zeitschr. 136 (1927), pp. 229-52, esp. pp. 243 ff.; E. Meyer, *op. cit.*, pp. 246-7; M. S. Ginsburg, *Rome et la Judée* (1928), pp. 34-49; A. Momigliano, *Tradizione maccabaica*, pp. 159-62; M. Sordi, 'Il valore politico del trattato fra i Romani e i Giudei nel 161 a. C.', *Acme* 5 (1952), pp. 502-19; K.-D. Schunck, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-6; Th. Liebmann-Frankfort, *op. cit.*, p. 162; A. Giovannini, H. Müller, 'Die Beziehungen zw. Rom. u. den Juden im 2 Jh. v. Chr.', Mus. Helv. 28 (1971), pp. 156-71. The authenticity of the treaty (1 Mac. 8:23-30), questioned by Mommsen and Mendelssohn, was later flatly denied. Willrich went furthest in his radical criticism in that he struck out from history all diplomatic relations between the Jews and the Romans at the time of the three Maccabee brothers, Judas, Jonathan and Simon, and argued that they did not begin until the time of John Hyrcanus I, see *Judaica*, pp. 62-85. He deduced this from a remark in Caesar's decree, *Ant.* xiv 10, 6 (205), that the Jews possessed Joppa from the time that they stood in friendly relation with the Romans ('Ἰσππην τε πόλιν, ἣν ἀπ' ἀρχῆς ἔσχον οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι ποιούμενοι τὴν πρὸς Ῥωμαίους φιλίαν αὐτῶν εἶναι καθὼς καὶ τὸ πρότερον). It is true that Joppa did not come into Jewish possession until under Jonathan. But for this very reason, the argument is not applicable to the time of Simon. It is not applicable at all, in fact, for this passage merely proves that the Jews informed Caesar of their ancient and legitimate claim to Joppa. Caesar, the friend of the Jews, would have hardly carried out subtle historical investigations regarding the substance of their claim. On the other hand, the narrative of 1 Maccabees on the relations of Judas to the Romans corresponds so closely to the historical situation that there need be no doubt on this point. The historicity of the Jewish appeal to Rome may also be confirmed by Justin xxxvi 3, 9, and possibly by Diodorus xl 2. See AJP 77 (1956), pp. 413-4. Somewhat different is the question of the authenticity of the treaty itself (1 Mac. 8:23-30). It was, for instance, denied by Niese, who otherwise considered the relations between Judas and the Romans as historical (*op. cit.* p. 88 f. = *Hermes* 35 (1900), pp. 501 f.). Yet bearing in mind that a connecting link of a Hebrew translation is interposed between the original and the text now extant, it is not clear which reasons should decide against its authenticity. It ought, in particular, to be an argument in its favour that the treaty clauses are unequal to the disadvantage of the Jews (Grimm, ZWTh (1874), 234); but cf. Täubler, *op. cit.*, pp. 245 ff. Willrich considered the document authentic but placed it, because Josephus, *Ant.* xii 10, 6 (419) dates it by the 'High Priest Judas', in the time of Aristobulus I, also called Judas, *Judaica*, pp. 71 ff. This seems to lay too much weight on Josephus, who used here only 1 Maccabees.

The basic discussion of the text of the treaty, from which the general modern acceptance of its authenticity (see Schunck, *op. cit.*, pp. 32-4) derives, is that of Täubler *loc. cit.*, who shows (a) that making allowances for the successive re-translations mentioned above, the form of the document can be regarded as going back to a *senatus consultum* expressing the terms of a treaty, and (b) that there are no decisive historical objections to the possibility of such a treaty.

Niese, *op. cit.*, followed by Täubler, *op. cit.*, p. 249 and Kolbe, *op. cit.*, finds is further confirmation of the authenticity of this document in the letter given by Josephus *Ant.* xiv 10, 15 (233), addressed to Cos by Γάιος Φάνιος Γάλου υἱὸς στρατηγὸς ὑπάρτος and giving instructions for the same conduct of Jewish envoys returning home with *senatus consulta*. Niese suggested that the writer was to be identified with the consul of 161 B.C., C. Fannius Strabo, see Broughton, MRR I, p. 443.

of the Romans.³⁴ Their message came too late. Demetrius acted so swiftly and vigorously that Judas's catastrophe was complete before there could be any question of intervention by the Romans.³⁵ Immediately after receiving news of the death and defeat of Nicanor, he had sent a strong force under Bacchides to Judaea, which arrived in the vicinity of Jerusalem in the first month of the Seleucid year 152 (1 Mac. 9:3)—probably Autumn 161 B.C., some months after the fall of Nicanor.³⁶ Bacchides pitched camp near Berea (Beerzath or Berzetho), and Judas near Elasa (also written as Eleasa and Alasa).³⁷ The superiority of the Syrians was so conspicuous that in the ranks of Judas himself there was no longer any confidence in victory. His followers deserted in crowds. With the few who remained faithful he nevertheless threw himself fearlessly into the desperate struggle. The result was a foregone conclusion: Judas's band was wiped out and he himself fell in the battle. The only satisfaction remaining to his brothers Jonathan and Simon was that they were able to bury him in the grave of his forefathers at Modein.³⁸

The downfall of Judas offered final proof of the futility of any opposition by the nationalists to Syrian power. However brilliant the earlier achievements of Judas had been, he owed them primarily to the rashness and conceit of his opponents. Lasting military success was unthinkable so long as Syrian power remained to some degree united. In the following years there was not even a passing victory of the kind won by Judas. What the Maccabees finally achieved, they won through the voluntary concessions of the rival pretenders to the Syrian throne, and as a result of the internal disorganisation of the Syrian empire.

34. 1 Mac. 8:31-2.

35. From the narrative of 1 Maccabees it appears that Judas sent the embassy only after the victory over Nicanor. Assuming this was so, it is unlikely that he was alive when his ambassador returned, for his death occurred only a few months after Nicanor's defeat.

36. Nicanor fell in battle on 13 Adar, March (1 Mac. 7:43-9), and Bacchides appeared at the gates of Jerusalem 'in the first month' of the Seleucid year 152 (1 Mac. 9:3), i.e. probably in the autumn. See p. 170 above.

37. Neither place can be identified with certainty. Instead of Βερέαν some MSS. of 1 Mac. 9:4 have Βερεθ or Βερηζαθ, and Jos. *Ant.* xii 11, 1 (422) Βηρηθηθῶ, Βαρηθηθῶ, Βερηθηθῶ etc. It is therefore possible to consider an identification with Bir ez-Zeit near Gophna (north-west); see Guérin, *Judée* III, pp. 33-4; Conder and Kitchener, *The Survey of Western Palestine* III, p. 329. Alternatively, see Abel *ad loc.* and *Geog. Pal.* II, p. 262, it may be el-Bireh, 16 km. north of Jerusalem. In that case, Elasa could be the modern el-'Aššy, which lies less than a mile south-west of el-Bireh. Otherwise, it could be present-day Ilasa, in the north-west, near Beth-horon; the note in 1 Mac. 9:15 ἕως Ἀζώτου ὄρους offers no clue since it certainly does not refer to the well-known Azotus, but is probably a corruption of the text. Abel emends to ἕως ἀσηδωθ τοῦ ὄρους 'jusqu' aux dernières rampes de la montagne'. Jos. *Ant.* xii 11, 2 (429) gives μέγρι Ἀζᾶ (or Ἐζᾶ) ὄρους. For a discussion see Abel, RB 55 (1948), pp. 187-8.

38. 1 Mac. 9:5-21; Jos. *Ant.* xii 11, 1-2 (422-34).