

## §6 JONATHAN 161-143/2 B.C.

## Sources

- 1 Maccabees 9:23-13:30.  
Josephus *Ant.* xiii 1-6 (1-212).  
Megillath Taanith § 33; cf. H. Lichtenstein, HUCA 8-9 (1931-2), pp. 322, 347-8.

## Bibliography.

Cf. § 4 on pp. 137-8 above.

The defeat and death of Judas completely destroyed the effectiveness of the Jewish nationalists. The pro-Greek faction, with the High Priest Alcimus at their head, was able to exercise unopposed the authority conferred on it by the king. Whatever resistance still remained was suppressed by force. The friends of Judas were searched out and brought before Bacchides who 'took vengeance on them'. The 'unrighteous' and 'ungodly' (as they are described in 1 Maccabees) were now in command in Judaea.<sup>1</sup>

The friends of Judas were nevertheless not yet disposed to renounce their resistance altogether and elected Jonathan, the brother of Judas, as their new leader.<sup>2</sup> There was at first no question of any serious undertaking. They had instead to regain their strength and then await a favourable opportunity. The earliest incidents reported represent Jonathan's companions more as bandits than as members of a religious party. Since their possessions were not safe in Judaea, they sent them with John, a brother of Jonathan, to the friendly Nabataeans. On the way there, John and his baggage train were attacked near Medeba (east of Jordan) by a tribe of brigands known as the 'sons of Jambri', carried off and killed.<sup>3</sup> To avenge his death, Jonathan and Simon crossed the Jordan and attacked the sons of Jambri whilst they were walking with great pageantry in a wedding procession. Many died, and the rest fled to the mountains. On their return, Jonathan and his men were met

1. 1 Mac. 9:23-7; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 1, 1 (1-4).
2. 1 Mac. 9:28-31; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 1, 1 (5-6).
3. Instead of *ἰοὶ Ἀμβρί*, which Fritzsche read in 1 Mac. 9:36-7 and Josephus (*οἱ Ἀμαράτου παῖδες*), the form *ἰοὶ Ἰαμβρί* is probably to be retained on the basis of A (*Ἰαμβρέων, Ἰαμβρέων*), Ven. (*Ἰαμβρέι, Ἰαμβρέι*) and Sin. (*Ἀμβρέι, Ἰαμβρέι*). C. Clermont-Ganneau compared with it the name of the Nabataean *strategos* Ya'amru found in an inscription in the neighbourhood of Medeba, *Recueil d'archéologie orientale* II, pp. 207-15; cf. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 381-2.

by Bacchides and a Syrian force and found themselves heavily pressed, but they escaped by swimming across the Jordan.<sup>4</sup>

Bacchides meantime made arrangements to ensure the confirmation of Judaea's subjection to Syrian supremacy. He fortified the towns of Jericho, Emmaus, Beth-Horon, Bethel, Thammatha, Pharaton and Tephon, and furnished them with Syrian garrisons. He also strengthened the fortifications of Beth-Zur, Gazara and the fortress in Jerusalem. Finally, he took the sons of distinguished Jews as hostages and kept them in custody in the fortress in Jerusalem.<sup>5</sup>

About this time, in the second month of the Seleucid year 153 = May 160 B.C. (1 Mac. 9:54), the High Priest Alcimus gave offence to observant Jews. He demolished the walls of the inner court and thus 'destroyed the works of the prophets'. His death, which occurred shortly afterwards, was seen as God's righteous punishment for such an outrage.<sup>6</sup>

4. 1 Mac. 9:32-49; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 1, 3 (12-14). The battle against Bacchides took place on the eastern bank of the Jordan. For after the interpolated narrative of 1 Mac. 9:35-42, the report goes back again to the point reached 1 Mac. 9:34 (*Βακχίδης . . . ἦλθεν . . . πέραν τοῦ Ἰορδάνου*). So when Jonathan and his companions escaped by swimming across the Jordan, they reached the western bank and probably remained in the desert of Judaea (cf. 9:33).

5. 1 Mac. 9:50-3; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 1, 3 (15-17). Most of the towns mentioned are known from other evidence. On Emmaus see vol. II, § 23, ii; on Beth-horon cf. above p. 159. Bethel is the well-known ancient Israelite cult centre, twelve Roman miles north of Jerusalem according to Euseb. *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 40. Tamnatha is the Hebrew Timnatah or Timnah, the name of three localities in southern Palestine, see vol. II, § 23, 2. The best-known among them is Timnath Serah, where Joshua's grave was situated. See Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 481-2. According to the traditional texts of 1 Mac. 9:50, Tamnatha-Pharaton is one place-name. But Jos., Syr. and Vet.Lat. are probably correct in that they read *καί* between the two names. Pharaton is the Hebrew Pir'aton, a town of the tribe of Benjamin, Jg. 12:13, 15, and perhaps the modern Far'atha to the south-west of Nablus, Guérin, *Samarie* II, pp. 179 f.; Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 409. But this Pirathon as well as Timnath-Serah belonged to Samaria (1 Mac. 11:34). On Beth-Zur, see above p. 161; on Gazara below, p. 191.

6. 1 Mac. 9:54-6; Jos. *Ant.* xii 10, 6 (413); Josephus places the death of Alcimus prior to the death of Judas, see above p. 170). The demolition of the walls was, according to 1 Mac. 9:54, only partially carried out. The meaning of *τεῖχος τῆς αἰλῆς τῶν ἁγίων τῆς ἐσωτέρας* in 1 Mac. 9:54 is debatable. In the Temple of the Herodian period, the inner court (i.e. the 'forecourt' in the real and narrower sense) was first surrounded by a strong wall. Outside it ran a narrow terrace (the so-called *Hel*, cf. mMidd. 1:5), from which steps led down to the outer court. Below the steps ran another low parapet (the so-called *Soreg*) marking the boundary beyond which no Gentile was allowed. Since 1 Maccabees speaks of a *τεῖχος*, there seems to be no doubt that the real wall of the forecourt is meant. On the other hand, the Mishnah presents the tradition that the *Soreg* was demolished by the Greek kings (*מלכי יון*) at thirteen places, and that these thirteen 'breaches' (*פרצות*) were later closed, and that the thirteen bows towards it were ordered as a reminder of this (mMidd. 2:3). It seems reasonable to combine this tradition with the event under discussion, in which case *τεῖχος* should be con-

The High-Priestly office seems not to have been reoccupied for some time.<sup>7</sup>

Soon after the death of Alcimus, Bacchides, believing that he had ensured the subjugation of Judaea, returned to Syria.<sup>8</sup> There followed a period of seven years (160–53 B.C.) about which 1 Maccabees says almost nothing. Yet these seven years must have been of great significance for the reinvigoration of the Maccabaeen party. For at the end of this time it emerged as the one party really capable of governing, with Judaea in fact under its control. Its adherence was therefore eagerly sought by the rival Syrian kings in their struggles against each other. The obscurity of this interval is lightened by only one episode in the narrative of 1 Maccabees. Two years after the departure of Bacchides, in 158 B.C., the dominant pro-Greek faction among the Jews made pressing representations at the royal court concerning the restoration of the Maccabaeen party. As a result, Bacchides came back with an even larger military force to exterminate Jonathan and his followers. This force was, however, already so powerful that Bacchides found himself faced with no easy task. Some of them, under the leadership of Simon, entrenched themselves in Beth Bassi in the desert, where Bacchides besieged them unsuccessfully. Others, under Jonathan, raided the land. When Bacchides realised what difficulties confronted him, he was indignant at the pro-Greeks for having involved him in such embarrassment, and having made peace with Jonathan, returned again to Syria.<sup>9</sup>

The Jewish parties were now willing to tolerate each other. This

sidered as an inexact translation of ἵεροσολαίμ. But it is very questionable whether, in the simpler construction of the pre-Herodian temple, the wall and *Soreg* existed next to one another at all. At all events, Alcimus's offence consisted in removing the boundary between the 'holy' area of the forecourt and the 'unholy' outer area, thus making it possible for Gentiles to gain access to forbidden places. It is certainly a mistake to suggest that the 'inner court' was the so-called court of the priests, and that the *τεῖχος* was the barrier dividing, in the inner court itself, the area allotted to the priests from that of the Israelites; so e.g. Büchler, *JQR* 10 (1898), pp. 708 f. This barrier was no *τεῖχος*, but a *δρύφακτος*, *Ant.* xiii 13, 5 (373), or *γείσιον*, *B.J.* v 5, 6 (226); cf. *Ant.* viii 3, 9 (95), and probably did not even exist before the time of Alexander Jannaeus (*Ant.* xiii 13, 5 (373) is anyway far from clear). The *ἀλλή ἑσωτέρα* is undoubtedly Josephus's ἡ ἐνδον ἀλλή *B.J.* v 5, 6 (227); ὁ ἐνδοτέρως περίβολος *B.J.* v 1, 2 (7); ὁ ἐντὸς περίβολος *Ant.* xv 11, 5 (418); τὸ ἐνδοτέρω ἱερὸν *B.J.* iv 5, 1 (305); v 3, 1 (104); vi 1, 8 (82); τὸ ἐνδον ἱερὸν *B.J.* vi 4, 4 (248); τὸ εἰσὼ ἱερὸν *B.J.* vi 2, 7 (150); τὸ ἑσωθεν ἱερὸν *B.J.* vi 4, 1 (220), i.e., the forecourt in the real and strict sense, to which Israelites, but not gentiles, had access. Cf. also vol. II, § 24 iii, iv.

7. Cf. also *Jos. Ant.* xx 10, 3 (237) and p. 170 above.

8. 1 *Mac.* 9:57; *Jos. Ant.* xiii 1, 5 (22).

9. 1 *Mac.* 9:57–72; *Jos. Ant.* xiii 1, 5–6 (22–23). On Beth Bassi, see Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 269.

seems to have resulted in an increasing assumption of power by Jonathan. As 1 Maccabees remarks laconically of the next five years, 'The sword no longer hung over Israel, and Jonathan settled in Michmash, where he began to judge the people and to rid Israel of the godless'.<sup>10</sup> This can only mean that whereas the official Sanhedrin of Jerusalem still consisted of pro-Greeks, Jonathan established in Michmash a rival government which grew to be the chief influence in the country, to the extent that it could even venture to exterminate (*ἀφανίζειν*), the 'godless', i.e., the Hellenizing party. Pro-Hellenism had in fact no roots among the people. They were well aware that even though it allowed the religion of Israel to continue, it was incompatible with the ideal of the religious teachers. As soon, therefore, as the pressure from above was removed, the mass of the people turned to the aspirations of national Judaism defended by the Maccabees. And this is the reason why, in the struggles for the Syrian throne which began at this time, the rival claimants endeavoured to obtain Maccabean goodwill. The Syrian kings were no longer strong enough to impose a Hellenistic government on the people, but had to conciliate them and keep them in a favourable mood. This was only possible under Maccabaeen leadership. Needless to say, these favourable concessions simultaneously furthered the endeavours which in fact ended in separation from the Syrian empire.

In the Seleucid year 160=153–152 B.C. by the Macedonian era, 152–1 by the Babylonian (note that 1 *Mac.* 10:21 puts the Feast of Tabernacles in the seventh month of the same year), Alexander Balas, a young man of humble descent and merely an agent of the kings allied against Demetrius, opposed him as pretender to his throne.<sup>11</sup>

10. 1 *Mac.* 9:73; *Jos. Ant.* xiii 1, 6 (34). *Μαχμὰς*=Mikhmash is situated nine Roman miles north of Jerusalem in the neighbourhood of Rama according to Euseb. *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 132. Its modern Arabic name is still Mukhmas. See Guérin, *Judée* III, pp. 63–5; Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 386.

11. The details are as follows. In Smyrna lived a youth by the name of Balas (Justin) who strongly resembled Antiochus Eupator and claimed to be son of Antiochus Epiphanes, but who was in reality of lowly origin ('sortis extremae iuvenis'). Attalus II, king of Pergamum, ordered Balas to appear before him, placed on his head the royal diadem, named him Alexander, and set him up against Demetrius as pretender to the throne (Diodorus xxxi 32a; Justin xxxv 1, 6–7). Led by Heraclides, the former finance minister of Antiochus Epiphanes whom Demetrius had exiled, Appian *Syr.* 42/235, 47/242, Alexander went to Rome and sought recognition by the Roman Senate. Although the deception was obvious, the Senate complied and promised its support, Polybius xxxiii 15 (14), 1–2; 18 (16). In addition, Alexander was backed not only by Attalus II of Pergamum, but also by Ptolemy VI Philometor of Egypt, and Ariarathes V of Cappadocia, Justin xxxv 1, 6; Strabo xiii 4, 2 (624); Appian *Syr.* 67/354–5; Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene I, p. 255). The people in Syria itself also favoured the new pretender on account of Demetrius's arrogant and surly nature, Diodorus and Justin, *loc. cit.*

The despotic Demetrius was unloved in the country itself, so the danger threatened by the power of the confederate kings was all the greater. There was also the fear that the Jews might go over to his opponent if he allowed them to establish a national government. Demetrius tried to forestall this danger by granting concessions to Jonathan himself. He gave him full authority to assemble an army with which to support the king, and for this purpose agreed to surrender the Jewish hostages still detained in the fortress in Jerusalem. Invested with this authority, Jonathan went to Jerusalem. The hostages were surrendered and handed over to their parents. But Jonathan then formally occupied Jerusalem and fortified the city and the Temple mount. In addition, the Syrian garrisons of most of the strongholds erected by Bacchides were withdrawn. They remained only in Beth-Zur and the fortress in Jerusalem.<sup>12</sup>

Yet Demetrius had still not gone far enough in his concessions to Jonathan. Alexander Balas outbid him immediately by naming Jonathan High Priest of the Jews, and sending him, as a token of princely rank, the purple and the diadem. Jonathan was not slow to grasp these new favours. On the feast of Tabernacles in the Seleucid year 160 = the autumn of 153 or 152 B.C., he donned the sacred vestments.<sup>13</sup> He was now also formally head of the Jewish people. The pro-Greek faction was driven from government in Judaea and never returned. For Jonathan maintained his position even in the vicissitudes of the following years. In his case, circumstances favoured the objectives which Judas, with all his bravery, had been unable to attain.

When Demetrius heard that Jonathan had gone over to the party of Alexander Balas, he attempted by means of even bigger promises to win him back. The privileges assured him were incredible: taxes would be remitted, the fortress in Jerusalem would be transferred to the Jews, Jewish territory would be enlarged by the addition of three regions of Samaria, the Temple would be endowed with rich gifts and prerogatives, the building of the walls of Jerusalem would be paid for from the royal treasury.<sup>14</sup>

cf. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 2, 1 (35). Alexander thus started the war against Demetrius 'totius ferme orientis viribus succinctus' (Justin). It follows from this (cf. esp. Justin) that it is incorrect to consider 'Balas' as the surname of Alexander after Josephus, *Ant.* xiii 4, 8 (119): 'Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ Βάλας ἐπιλεγόμενος. Balas was his real name, τὸν Βάλαν Ἀλέξανδρον, as Strabo xvi 2, 8 (751) correctly calls him.

12. 1 Mac. 10: 1-14; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 2, 1 (37-42).

13. 1 Mac. 10:15-21; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 2, 2-3 (43-6).

14. 1 Mac. 10:22-45; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 2, 3 (47-57). Although it is in itself quite credible that Demetrius at that time made more promises than he contemplated keeping, nevertheless the concessions contained in the letter of 1 Mac. 10:25-45 exceed the bounds of probability: the release throughout Demetrius's entire

Jonathan was shrewd enough not to comply with Demetrius's proposals. It was likely that the king would succumb to his enemy's superior strength, but even if he emerged victorious from the struggle, it was not to be expected that he would keep such extensive promises. Jonathan, therefore, remained with Alexander Balas and was not to

kingdom of all the Jewish slaves captured in war (10:33), the gift of the town of Ptolemais to the Temple (10:39), a rich endowment of the Temple from royal funds (10:40), the renewal of the Temple edifice and the city walls at the royal expense (10:44-5). Noteworthy, also, is the parallel between 10:36-7 and the *Letter of Aristeas* 3 (13). Where the latter describes Ptolemy Lagus as employing 30,000 Jews to garrison his fortresses, Demetrius, *loc. cit.* promises to take 30,000 Jews (the same number!) into his army as troops of occupation. It is therefore possible that this statement originated from the pen of a Jewish author familiar with the *Letter of Aristeas*. It would follow that the character of the letter is similar to that of the speeches which ancient authors incorporated in historical works. The Jewish author makes Demetrius write what was appropriate to the situation at that time and of which he probably had some general knowledge. In this respect, Willrich's criticism, *Judaica* (1900), pp. 52-8 (Cf. *Urkunden-fälschung*, pp. 39 ff.), has some justification. By contrast, there seems to be no reason for considering the letters as a later interpolation into 1 Maccabees, or for regarding it as a forgery from Roman times, even placing it as late as the reign of Caligula; cf. Willrich, *op. cit.*, p. 56. According to Willrich, mention of the poll-tax (10:29) is decisive in marking it as a forgery from the Roman period, for it was not introduced until the time of Augustus; so Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka* I, pp. 245 f., is reported to have proved. The latter will apply to the Egyptian 'poll-tax', though Wilcken makes this assumption with great diffidence. But even if it is probable that there was no poll-tax in Ptolemaic Egypt, see V. Tcherikover, 'Synaxis and Laographia', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 4 (1950), pp. 179-207; this does not positively prove anything in relation to the conditions prevailing in Syria. 1 Mac. 10:29 has ἀφίτημι πάντας τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἀπὸ τῶν φόρων, and there is ample evidence of the φόρος on subject communities in the Seleucid empire, see E. Bickerman, *Institutions des Séleucides* (1938), pp. 106-11. Here, incidentally, the expression 'poll-tax' is not used at all; it appears only in the parallel account of Josephus, which Willrich erroneously considers to be the original, *Ant.* xiii 2, 3 (50) ὑπὲρ κεφαλῆς ἐκάστης ὃ ἔδει μοι δίδοσθαι. Nevertheless it seems probable on account of the parallel in a related passage in the letter of Antiochus the Great, Jos. *Ant.* xii 3, 5 (142), ὃν ὑπὲρ τῆς κεφαλῆς τελοῦσι, that by φόροι one should understand a head tax or poll-tax in that general sense. Some further evidence for a poll-tax in the Seleucid empire may be provided by [Aristotle], *Oeconomica* 1346a 4 ἢ ἀπὸ τῶν ἀνθρώπων, ἐπικεφάλαιον τε καὶ χειρωνάξιον προσαγορευομένη. This work probably dates to the last quarter of the fourth century B.C. See B. A. van Groningen, A. Wartelle, *Aristotle, Économique* (1968), p. xiii. Arguments from the possible mention of a poll-tax thus provide no evidence for the date of the letter. The mention of military service by the Jews also points more to the Hellenistic period (see the parallels by Abel, *ad loc.*), and does not support the notion of composition in the Roman period. If the references to military service by 30,000 Jews show any connection between 1 Mac. and the *Letter of Aristeas*, it is more likely that the latter derives from the former; so Momigliano, *Tradizione maccabaica*, pp. 163-5. Cf. O. Murray, 'Aristeas and Ptolemaic Kingship', *JThSt* 18 (1967), pp. 337-71, on pp. 338-40.

regret this decision. In 150 B.C., Demetrius was defeated by Alexander and lost his life in the battle. Alexander was crowned king.<sup>15</sup>

Very shortly afterwards, in the Seleucid year 162 (1 Mac. 10:57)=151/50 or 150/49 B.C., an occasion presented itself in which Jonathan was remembered by Alexander with the highest honours and distinctions. Alexander had asked King Ptolemy Philometor of Egypt for the hand of his daughter Cleopatra. Ptolemy had given his consent, and the two kings met in Ptolemais, where Ptolemy himself brought his daughter to Alexander, and the marriage was celebrated with great splendour. Alexander invited Jonathan there also, and received him with marked respect. Emissaries of the pro-Greek party in Judaea were present as well, with complaints against Jonathan, but the king granted them no audience, heaping Jonathan instead with even more distinctions. He made him sit at his side clothed in purple, and appointed him *στρατηγός* and *μεριδάρχης*, presumably for the province of Judaea, thus formally confirming the political powers which he in fact already exercised.<sup>16</sup>

During the next few years, Jonathan's position was in no danger from either side. The Hellenising party had been silenced. Alexander Balas was an incompetent ruler addicted only to sensual pleasures, and it never occurred to him to restrict the concessions made to the Jewish High Priest.<sup>17</sup> Syrian sovereignty, indeed, continued, but as Jonathan and his party ruled in Judaea, the aims of the Maccabees were in fact achieved. Nevertheless, the struggles for the Syrian throne soon brought fresh dangers, but at the same time a new opportunity to extend political power. Jonathan now appears as supporting sometimes one pretender and sometimes the other, shrewdly exploiting the weakness of the Syrian empire for the purpose of strengthening the Jewish

15. 1 Mac. 10:46-50; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 2, 4 (58-61); Polyb. iii 5, 3; Justin xxxv 1, 8-11; Appian *Syr.* 67/354-5. The death of Demetrius is narrated in greatest detail by Josephus, *loc. cit.* His account is corroborated by Justin, 'invicto animo inter confertissimos fortissime dimicans cecidit'.

16. 1 Mac. 10:51-66; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 4, 1-2 (80-5), *στρατηγός* and *μεριδάρχης* are more or less equivalent in meaning to a military and civil governor. For further details useful parallels are not available, see Bikerman, *op. cit.*, 198-9, except for the newly-discovered inscription of the correspondence of Ptolemaeus, *strategos* and *archiereus* of Coele Syria and Phoenicia under Antiochus III, cf. *Ant.* xii 3, 3 (138-44), see Y. Landau, 'A Greek Inscription Found near Hefzibah', *IEJ* 16 (1966), pp. 54-70. Incidentally it is worth noting that in spite of Jonathan's appointment as *στρατηγός*, a Syrian garrison still remained stationed in the fortress in Jerusalem.

17. On Alexander's character, see Diodorus xxxii 27, 9c; Livy *Epit.* 50, 'In Syria, quae eo tempore stirpe generis parem Macedonum regis, inertia socordiaque similem Prusiae regem habebat, iacente eo in ganea et lustris, Hammonius regnabat'; Justin xxxv 2, 2 '(Alexandrum) insperatae opes et alienae felicitatis ornamenta velut captum inter scortorum greges desidem in regia tenebant'.

position. Maccabean aspirations are once more set higher. It is no longer enough that Jonathan's party rules unopposed in internal affairs. The predicaments of the Syrian empire are used to extend Jewish territory partly through gifts, partly by force, and finally to work with tenacity and persistence for the total severance of the Jewish state from the Syrian empire.

In the Seleucid year 165 (1 Mac. 10:67)=148/7 or 147/6 B.C., Demetrius II, a son of Demetrius I, set himself up as a rival against the unworthy weakling, Alexander Balas. He was immediately joined by Apollonius, the governor of Coele-Syria, whilst Jonathan continued to support Alexander. Fighting broke out on this account between Apollonius and Jonathan, from which Jonathan emerged victor. He dislodged a garrison of Apollonius from Joppa, defeated an army under the command of Apollonius in the vicinity of Ashdod, destroyed the town itself and its temple of Dagon, and returned to Jerusalem with rich booty.<sup>18</sup> In gratitude for this assistance, Alexander Balas made him a gift of the city of Ekron and its surrounding territory.<sup>19</sup>

Jonathan, however, was alone in supporting Alexander against Demetrius. The inhabitants of Antioch, and Alexander's own soldiers, declared themselves in favour of Demetrius.<sup>20</sup> Even Ptolemy, his own father-in-law, sided with Demetrius. He took back Cleopatra from Alexander and gave her to the new pretender to the throne as his wife.<sup>21</sup> Ptolemy also led a strong force against Alexander and defeated him by the river Oenoparas on the plain of Antioch. Alexander fled to Arabia and met his end there at the hand of an assassin. Immediately afterwards, Ptolemy also died of wounds received in the battle.<sup>22</sup> Thus Demetrius became king in 145 B.C. (cf. p. 130 above).

As the ally of Alexander Balas, Jonathan had confronted Demetrius as an enemy. He now seems to have felt strong enough to attempt to break away by force from the Syrian empire. He laid siege to the fortress in Jerusalem, still occupied by Syrian troops. Once again, as so

18. 1 Mac. 10:67-87; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 4, 3-4 (86-102). Josephus misrepresents the affair so far as to indicate that Apollonius sided with Alexander Balas. On Joppa and Ashdod see vol. II § 23, 1.

19. 1 Mac. 10:88-9; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 4, 4 (102). Josephus sees the motive for this gift as being Alexander Balas's desire to make it appear as if his general, Apollonius, had launched the attack upon Jonathan against the king's will. *Ἀκκράων* is the ancient Philistine city of Ekron. Eusebius, *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 22, places it between Ashdod and Jamnia and to the East. It is therefore probably identical with modern 'Akir, east of Yavneh. See Guérin, *Judée* II, pp. 36-44; cf. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 319.

20. Justin xxxv 2, 3.

21. 1 Mac. 11:1-13; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 4, 5-7 (103-10); Diodorus xxxii 27, 9c; Livy *Epit.* 52.

22. 1 Mac. 11:14-19; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 4, 8 (116-19); Diodorus xxxii 27, 9d and 10, 1; Livy *Epit.* 52. The site of the battle is given by Strabo xvi 2, 8 (751).

frequently happened in similar cases, it was the opposition party among his own people (the *ἄνδρες παράνομοι* and *ἄνομοι* as they are called in 1 Mac. 11:21, 25) that drew the Syrian king's attention to his revolutionary moves. As a result, Demetrius summoned Jonathan to Ptolemais to account for his conduct. But Jonathan was audacious enough to extort concessions from Demetrius. He ordered that the siege should continue, travelled to Ptolemais with magnificent gifts, and demanded of Demetrius the cession to Judaea of three provinces of Samaria and exemption from taxation for the entire region. These were some of the essential points among the offers which Demetrius I had already made to Jonathan. Demetrius dared not refuse these demands. He authorised the union of the three Samaritan districts of Aphaerema, Lydda and Ramathaim with Judaea, ceded the whole to Jonathan free of tax, and confirmed him in all the titles which he had until then. Of the fortress in Jerusalem no mention was made. These concessions were obviously the price for which Jonathan agreed to raise the siege.<sup>23</sup>

Ten years earlier, such a retreat before Jewish demands on the part of the Syrian king would have been quite inconceivable. But now the power of the Seleucids was broken. From this time on, no king of Syria was sure of his throne, and Jonathan was able to exploit this weakness with good luck as well as skill. The next few years offered him ample opportunity to continue his policy of annexation. Demetrius had no sooner granted these concessions when he found himself forced into new

23. 1 Mac. 11:20-37; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 4, 9 (120-8). Confirmation of former dignities: 1 Mac. 11:27. The three districts: 11:34 (cf. 10:30, 38; 11:28, 57); freedom from tribute: 11:34-35. *Ἀφαίρεμα*, probably the Ephraim where Jesus is said to have withdrawn shortly before the Passover (Jn. 11:54), was situated, according to Jos. *B. J.* iv 9, 9 (551), in the neighbourhood of Bethel; according to Euseb. *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 86, twenty Roman miles north of Jerusalem (*καὶ ἔστι νῦν κώμη Ἐφραεὶμ μεγίστη περὶ τὰ βόρεια Ἀλίας ὡς ἀπὸ σημείων κ'*), and five Roman miles east of Bethel, Jerome in Euseb. *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 29, 'est et hodie vicus Efraim in quinto miliario Bethelis ad orientem respiciens'; the parallel Greek text of Eusebius, *loc. cit.*, is defective. Ephraim in 2 Sam. 13:23 and Ephron in 2 Chr. 13:19 are also undoubtedly the same place. For suggestions concerning its situation see Guérin, *Juḏée* III, pp. 45-51; F. Buhl, *Geogr. des alten Palästinas*, p. 177; Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 402. On Lydda, the modern Lod, see vol. II, § 23, 2. *Ραμαθάιμ* is certainly the town of Samuel, *רַמְתַּיִם*, 1 Sam. 1:1, elsewhere named *הַרְמַתָּה*. It is probably to be identified with Rentis north-east of Lod; see Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 428-9. According to 1 Sam. 1:1, it lay in the mountains of Ephraim. Eusebius locates it in the vicinity of Diospolis-Lydda. *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 32. *Ἀρμαθὲμ Σειφά* πόλις Ἐλκανὰ καὶ Σαμουήλ κείται δὲ αὐτῆι πλησίον Διοσπόλεως, ἔθεν ἦν Ἰωσήφ <δ> ἐν εὐαγγελίῳ ἀπὸ Ἀρμαθίας. In Jerome *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 33, the passage runs, 'Armathem Sofim civitas Elcanae et Samuelis in regione Thamnitica iuxta Diospolim, unde fuit Joseph, qui in evangelii de Arimathia scribitur'. The accuracy of this statement is supported by 1 Mac. 11:34, according to which the town belonged to Samaria until the time of Jonathan.

promises to Jonathan to obtain his assistance when he was in serious danger. A certain Diodotus of Apamea, called Tryphon,<sup>24</sup> a former general of Alexander Balas, succeeded in seizing Alexander's young son, Antiochus, who had been brought up by an Arab, Imalcue, and set him up as a rival to Demetrius.<sup>25</sup> The latter's situation became very critical, for his own troops deserted and the inhabitants of Antioch were hostile to him. In face of these perils, he promised to hand over the fortress in Jerusalem and the other strongholds of Judaea to Jonathan if he would provide him with auxiliary troops. Jonathan immediately sent three thousand men, who arrived just in time to give powerful support to the king in the insurrection in Antioch which was then breaking out. It was substantially due to their aid that the revolt was crushed. The Jewish troops retreated to Jerusalem with the king's thanks and rich spoils.<sup>26</sup>

Demetrius, however, did not keep his word. Also, it soon looked as though he were going to yield to the new pretender. Tryphon and Antiochus seized the capital, Antioch, with the help of his deserters, and thereby won control of the heart of the empire. They straightaway tried to win Jonathan over to their side, Antiochus confirming him in the possession of everything given him by Demetrius. His brother Simon was simultaneously appointed royal *strategos* from the Ladder of Tyre to the Egyptian border.<sup>27</sup>

Faced with Demetrius's treachery and weakness, Jonathan considered it justified as well as useful to go over to Antiochus, and in association with his brother, Simon, undertook the subjugation to the new pretender of the territories lying closest to Judaea. They first turned their attention to the regions over which Simon had been nominated *strategos*. Jonathan thus marched at the head of Jewish and Syrian troops against the towns of Ascalon and Gaza. The first sub-

24. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 1 (131), *Ἀπαμείν τὸ γένος*. Cf. Strabo xvi 2, 10 (752).

25. 1 Mac. 11:39-40, 54; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 1 and 3 (131-2, 144); Diodorus xxxiii 4a; Livy *Epit.* 52. Appian *Syr.* 68/357, mistakenly names the young king Alexander. The name of the Arab *Ἐιμαλκουαί* or *Ἰμαλκουέ* (1 Mac. 11:39) corresponds to *ימלכין* occurring in Palmyrene inscriptions; see Abel, *in loc.* Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 1 (131) reads here Malchus. Diodorus gives Iamblichus (for the equivalence of *ימלכין* and the Greek *Ἰάμλιχος*, see Waddington, *Inscr.* n.2614). Cf. also the Latin 'Iamlicus', CIL XIII 7040.

26. 1 Mac. 11:38, 41-52; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 2-3 (133-44).

27. 1 Mac. 11:53-9; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 3-4 (144-7). The *κλίμαξ Τύρου* or *Τυρίων* is; according to Jos. *B. J.* ii 10, 2 (188) a high hill one hundred stades north of Ptolemais. For the topography of the area see M. Dunand, R. Duru, *Oumm El-'Amed, une ville de l'époque hellénistique aux Echelles de Tyre* (1962), pp. 9-17. By his appointment as *στρατηγός* over the district named, Simon became a royal official of the highest rank, and at that, outside Judaea. The position must first, of course, have been obtained by him in opposition to the *Strategoi* of Demetrius.

mitted willingly to Antiochus; the second, only after Jonathan had used force. He compelled the city to hand over hostages and took them with him to Jerusalem.<sup>28</sup> After this, he advanced into northern Galilee and fought against Demetrius's *strategos* on the plain of Hazor. At first, the fight went against him, but it ended with his victory.<sup>29</sup> At the same time, Simon besieged the fortress of Beth-Zur in southern Judaea where the garrison was still loyal to Demetrius. After a long struggle, he forced the town to surrender and installed a Jewish garrison.<sup>30</sup>

Whilst consolidating his power in this way, Jonathan may have created for himself further support by means of diplomatic relations with foreign countries. 1 Maccabees and Josephus record that he sent two envoys, Numenius and Antipater, to Rome to renew the treaty of friendship with the Romans concluded during the time of Judas.<sup>31</sup> The same ambassadors also brought letters from the High Priest and the Jewish people to Sparta and other places, in order to establish and cultivate friendly relations with them.<sup>32</sup> These documents, if genuine, reveal that such relations between the Jews and foreign nations were not without example in earlier times. In his letter to the Spartans, Jonathan refers to the fact that King Areus of Sparta had directed a friendly message to the High Priest Onias.<sup>33</sup>

28. 1 Mac. 11:60-2; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 5 (148-53). On Ascalon and Gaza, see vol. II, § 23, 1. Note that Jonathan is regarded as a partisan of Antiochus and Tryphon. It was therefore not intended to unite these towns to Jewish territory, but only to compel them to join the party championed by Jonathan.

29. 1 Mac. 11:63-74; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 6-7 (154, 158-62). *Ἀσώρ* (1 Mac. 11:67) is *חַזוֹר*, cf. Jos. 11:11, 10-13; 12:19; 19:36; Jg. 4:2, 17; 1 Sam. 12:9; 1 Kg. 9:15; 2 Kg. 15:29. According to Jos. *Ant.* v 5, 1 (199) (cf. Jos. 11:5), it was situated not far from Lake Semachonitis or Merom (*ὑπέκκειται τῆς Σεμαχωνίτιδος λίμνης*), i.e., in the extreme north of Palestine. It has now been securely identified with Tell el-Qedah or Tell Waqqas, 5 km south-west of L. Huleh, see Y. Yadin *et al.*, *Hazor I* (1958), p. 3. The site has been extensively excavated.

30. 1 Mac. 11:65-6; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 6 (155-7). On the site see p. 161 above.

31. 1 Mac. 12:1-4; on the names of the ambassadors see 12:16. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 8 (163-70). Cf. Mendelssohn in *Acta Societatis philologae Lipsienis* 5 (1875), pp. 101-4. Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, pp. 53 f., and Momigliano, *Tradizione maccabaica*, pp. 148 f., argue that this embassy is unhistorical, being a doublet of that which was shortly afterwards sent to Rome by Simon (see below, p. 194). T. Fischer, *Untersuchungen zum Partherkrieg Antiochos' VII* (1970), pp. 96 ff., claims that the embassy set off under Jonathan and returned under Simon.

32. 1 Mac. 12:2, *πρὸς Σπαρτιάτας καὶ τόπους ἐτέροους*. The letter to the Spartans 1 Mac. 12:5-23; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 8 (166-70). The Spartan reply, 1 Mac. 14:16-23. The authenticity of the documents is subject to serious doubts, see e.g., Willrich, *Urkundenfälschung*, pp. 23-7; Momigliano, *Tradizione Maccabaica*, pp. 141-70. Cf., however, Abel, *op. cit.*, pp. 231-3.

33. 1 Mac. 12:7-8 (a reference in Jonathan's letter); 19-22 (text) = Jos. *Ant.* xii 4, 10 (226-7); cf. *Ant.* xiii 5, 8 (167), a reference in Josephus's version of Jonathan's letter. The name of the Spartan king is oddly mutilated in the manuscripts of 1 Maccabees. In 1 Mac. 12:7 it is given as *Λαπειός* and in 1 Mac. 12:20 as *Ἰονιάρης*

In the meanwhile, Jonathan's battles against Demetrius continued, and were conducted by him in such a way that he kept in view, not only the interests of Tryphon and Antiochus, but his own as well. Soon after Demetrius's troops were defeated on the plain of Hazor, he sent a new army against Jonathan. This time, the Jewish leader advanced much farther north to meet him; as far as the district of Hamath north of Lebanon. But no decisive battle was fought, for the Syrian army avoided contact.<sup>34</sup> Jonathan next turned his forces against the Arab tribe of the Zabadaeans, then towards Damascus, and from there southwards again. After his return to Jerusalem, he saw to the

(for which the Codex Sinaiticus has the better *ONIAAPHE*, i.e. *Ὀνιά Ἀπης*, for the rare name Oniades is formed only by contraction of the preceding name of Onias). Both texts, as may be confirmed by Jos. and Vet. Lat., originally read *Ἀπειός*. The more correct form is *Ἀρεός* (so on an inscription, SIG<sup>3</sup> 433). There were two Spartan kings by this name, Areus I, who according to Diodorus xx 29, reigned for forty-four years from 309-265 B.C., and Areus II, who reigned c. 255 B.C., but died as a child at the age of eight, see Pausanias iii 6, 6. On the Spartan kings see E. Manni, *Fasti ellenistici e romani* (1961), pp. 73-4; Niese in RE s.v. 'Areus' (1) and (2). As Onias II can hardly have been a contemporary of Areus II, Areus I and Onias I must be meant here (Josephus's combination, which places the letter in the period of Onias III, *Ant.* xii 4, 10 (225-7), is certainly mistaken). Relations between the two would therefore fall in the era of the Diadochi, when the Spartans, in conflict with Antigonos and his son Demetrius Poliorcetes, could perhaps have thought of creating difficulties for their enemies by stirring up trouble in the east. For a bibliography of the relations between Jews and Spartans see R. Marcus, *Josephus* (Loeb) VII, App. F, pp. 769 f. Hitzig's idea of looking for the Spartans in Asia Minor was an original one, ZDMG 9 (1855), pp. 731-7, as was that of A. Büchler that they were Greeks from Cyrenaica, see *Die Tobiaden und Oniaden*, p. 126 ff. The fiction of a relationship between Jews and Spartans, which constituted the Spartans' motive for writing their letter (1 Mac. 12:6-7, 21; cf. 2 Mac. 5:9) is not unprecedented in the Hellenistic period. Cf. Freudenthal, *Alexander Polyhistor*, p. 29, referring to Stephanus of Byzantium s.v. *Ἰουδαία . . . ὡς Κλαύδιος Ἰούλιος* (or *Ἰόλαος*), *ἀπὸ Οὐδαίου Σπάρτων ἐνὸς ἐκ Θήβης μετὰ Διονύσου ἐστρατευκότος*. Cf. Jacoby, FGrH 788 F4. In a decree of the Pergamenes, Jos. *Ant.* xiv 10, 22 (255) there is also mention of friendly relations between the Jews and the Pergamenes in the time of Abraham. For more recent views, see Momigliano, *loc. cit.*; M. S. Ginsburg, 'Sparta and Judaea', *Class. Philol.* 29 (1934), pp. 117-22; S. Schüller, 'Some Problems connected with the supposed Common Ancestry of Jews and Spartans', *JSS* 1 (1956), pp. 257-68; B. Cardauns, 'Juden und Spartaner: zur hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur', *Hermes* 95 (1967), pp. 317-24.

34. 1 Mac. 12:24-30; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 10 (174-8). Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 99-100 attempted to connect this and what follows with Megillath Taanith § 33: 'On 17 Adar, as the Gentiles rose against the remnant of the scribes in the districts of Chalcis and Zabadaea, deliverance came to the house of Israel'. This hypothetical combination has since been adopted by Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, p. 58, and Abel, *in loc.* Note, however, that Josephus refers to Jonathan's war against the Nabataeans in Arabia, *Ant.* xiii 5, 10 (179). See also the comment in H. Lichtenstein, 'Die Fastenrolle', *HUCA* 8-9 (1931-2), p. 293.

strengthening of the city's fortifications, and by erecting a high wall cut the communication between the Syrian garrison in the fortress and the town.<sup>35</sup> Simon had already installed a Jewish garrison at Joppa before Jonathan's return; he now also fortified Adida in the 'Shephelah', i.e. in the lowlands of western Judaea.<sup>36</sup>

All these operations were undertaken by Jonathan and Simon ostensibly in the interests of the young king Antiochus and his guardian Tryphon. But by now, Tryphon seems to have found the increase in Jewish power somewhat disquieting. And not without justification. For as it developed, the greater grew the danger of a total Jewish severance from the Syrian empire. It is therefore very understandable that as soon as Demetrius allowed him a free hand, Tryphon turned against Jonathan. According to 1 Maccabees, the reason for this was that Tryphon wished to wear the crown himself and Jonathan would not tolerate this. It may well have been so, but Jonathan's motives will have been not so much moral as political.<sup>37</sup>

Tryphon therefore marched with an army into Palestine in order to contain the disturbing increase of Jewish power. He found Jonathan near Beth-Shean (Scythopolis). The encounter was at first friendly, although Jonathan, like Tryphon, had a large army with him. Tryphon tried to remove Jonathan's suspicions by showering him with honours.

35. 1 Mac. 12:31-7; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 10-11 (179-83).

36. 1 Mac. 12:33-4, 38; cf. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 10 (180). *Σεφέλα* (thus also LXX Jer. 32:44; 33:13; Ob. 19; 2 Chr. 26:10) is the Hebrew *Shephelah*, the low-lying country west of the mountainous region of Judaea. In mSheb 9:2 a distinction is made between *לְיַד שְׁפֵלָה לְיַד* (lowlands near Lydda) and *שְׁפֵלַת הַדְרִימָה* (lowlands of the south). So, too, Jérôme *Com. in Abd.* 19 (CCL lxxvi, p. 370), 'qui autem habitabant in Sephela, id est in campestribus, Liddam et Emmaus, Diospolim scilicet, Nicopolimque significans. . . . Alii vero putant eam Sephelam, id est campestem regionem, quae circa Eleutheropolim est, repromitti' etc. Less definite, Eusebius, *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 162, *Σεφέλα* . . . και εις ετι νυν Σεφέλα καλεῖται. αὐτῆ ἐστὶν πᾶσα ἡ περὶ τὴν Ἐλευθερόπολιν πεδωγὴ χώρα πρὸς βορρᾶν και δυσμᾶς. In the present passage, the district of Lydda is meant. *Ἀδιδα*, 1 Mac. 12:38 and 13:13, is *Ḥadid*, Ezra 2:33; Neh. 7:37; 11:34. In mArak 9:6 *יְדִי* is mentioned as one of the ancient towns which were surrounded with walls as early as the time of Joshua. A R. Yakim of *Ḥadid* appears in mEdu. 7:5: The Greek forms *Ἀδιδα* or *Ἀδιδα* are also found in Jos. *Ant.* xiii 6, 5 (203); 15, 2 (392); B.J. iv 9, 1 (486). According to the last, it commanded the main road leading (from the west and therefore from Joppa) to Jerusalem. This is in agreement with Ezr. 2:24 and Neh. 7:37, where it is mentioned together with Lydda and Ono. Probably, therefore, it is identical with 'Aditha circa Diospolim quasi ad orientalem plagam respiciens' referred to by Jerome, *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 25, i.e. the modern *Ḥaditheh*, or *Ḥadid*, east of Lod. It appears as *Ἀδιαθημὴ ἡ νῦν Ἀδιδα* on the mosaic map of Madaba, M. Avi-Yonah, *The Madaba Mosaic Map* (1954), p. 61. See Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 340-1.

37. 1 Mac. 12:30-40; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 6, 1 (187).

He pointed out to him that a great army was superfluous since they were not at war with each other. If Jonathan would follow him with a small, select company to Ptolemais, he would hand over the town to him and 'the remaining fortresses and troops', probably meaning those between the Ladder of Tyre and the Egyptian border, over which Simon had been appointed *strategos*.<sup>38</sup> Jonathan actually allowed himself to be hoodwinked by these bland promises; he dismissed his army and followed Tryphon with only one thousand men to Ptolemais. But hardly had he arrived, when he was taken into custody and his force treacherously massacred.<sup>39</sup>

The news of this treachery on the part of Tryphon caused great consternation throughout Judaea. Simon, the only other survivor of the five Maccabee brothers, naturally took over the leadership. By the decree of an assembly of the people he was formally elected head. His first acts were to speed up work on the fortification of Jerusalem and to take definite possession of Joppa, which had never yet belonged to Jewish territory. He had already in his capacity as *strategos* of the coastal districts, placed a Jewish garrison there (see above p. 186). Now, the Gentile inhabitants were expelled from Joppa, and the town was Judaized and joined to Jewish territory.<sup>40</sup>

Tryphon, with Jonathan as his prisoner, came with an army to Judaea. Near Adida, Simon barred him with his troops from marching into the interior. Tryphon consequently sent envoys to Simon and let him know that he was keeping Jonathan prisoner only because he owed money for the official appointments conferred on him. If the money were paid, and as a guarantee of future loyalty the sons of Jonathan were handed over as hostages, he would free him. Although Simon sent everything that was demanded, Jonathan was nevertheless not released. On the contrary, Tryphon endeavoured, by making a detour round the mountains, to push towards Jerusalem from the south via Adora in Idumaea. When he was again prevented, this time by a heavy fall of snow, he marched his troops to Gilead (east of Jordan), ordered Jonathan to be murdered at Bascama, and returned to Syria.<sup>41</sup>

38. On Beth-shean or Scythopolis, and Ptolemais; see vol. II, § 23, 1.

39. 1 Mac. 12:41-53; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 6, 1-2 (188-92).

40. 1 Mac. 13:1-11; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 6, 3-4 (196-202). On Joppa see vol. II, § 23, 1.

41. 1 Mac. 13:12-24; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 6, 5-6 (203-12). Adora is an Idumaeen town, later conquered by John Hyrcanus I, *Ant.* xiii 9, 1 (257). See § 8 below. Bascama, which Josephus gives as Basca, appears to have been situated east of the Jordan. See, however, Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 261, suggesting hypothetically a place north-west of Lake Tiberias, el-Gummezeh ('the sycamore') from the interpretation of Bascama as *בֵּית שִׁקְמָה*, House of the Sycamore.

With this, Simon took the place of his brother as High Priest of the Jews. He brought Jonathan's bones from Bascama and buried him beside his parents and his three brothers in their native town of Modein. Over their common grave he later erected a magnificent memorial stone.<sup>42</sup>

42. 1 Mac. 13:25-30; *Jos. Ant.* xiii 6, 5 (210-12). The sepulchral monument at Modiim still existed at the time of Eusebius; see above p. 156. On the Hellenistic features of the monument see C. Watzinger, *Denkmäler Palästinas II* (1935), pp. 22-3.

The identification of the 'Wicked Priest' in the Qumran texts with Jonathan and/or Simon Maccabee, has been advanced by G. Vermes, *Les manuscrits du désert de Juda* (1953), pp. 92-100; *Discovery in the Judean Desert* (1956), pp. 89-97; J. T. Milik, *Ten years of Discovery in the Wilderness of Judaea* (1959), pp. 84-7; F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran and Modern Biblical Studies* (1958), pp. 107-16; P. Winter, 'Two non-allegorical Expressions in the Dead Sea Scrolls', *PEQ* 91 (1959), pp. 38-46; R. de Vaux, *L'archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (1961), pp. 90-1; G. Vermes, *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (1968), pp. 61-5; F. M. Cross, 'The Early History of the Qumran Community', *New Directions in Biblical Archaeology*, ed. D. N. Freedman, J. C. Greenfield (Anchor, 1971), pp. 70-89.