

§ 7. SIMON 143/2-135/4 B.C.¹

Sources

1 Maccabees 13:31-16:22.
Josephus *Ant.* xiii 6-7 (213-29).
Megillath Taanith § 5-6, 15; cf. H. Lichtenstein, *HUCA* 8-9 (1931-2), pp. 319-20, 327, 336.

Bibliography

Cf. § 4 on pp. 137-8 above.

The original aims of the Maccabean party, the restoration of Temple worship and the free exercise of the Jewish religion, had been far surpassed through Jonathan's deeds. Judas, who achieved them, was already dissatisfied, and sought in addition control of the country's internal affairs. Under Jonathan, this target too was reached. With his appointment as High Priest, the powers of government were placed in the hands of the Maccabean party and the pro-Greek faction was ousted. Yet even this was no longer sufficient. The favourable circumstances and the weakness of the Syrian empire aroused the temptation to shake off its supremacy altogether. The last acts of Jonathan were already important moves in this direction. The significance of the reign of Simon is that he completed Jonathan's work and made the Jews totally independent of the Syrian empire.

In Syria, the confrontation continued between Demetrius II and Tryphon, the guardian of the youthful Antiochus VI. Tryphon, who until now had appeared only as the representative of his young protégé, dropped his mask at about this time, ordered the assassination of Antiochus VI, and set the crown on his own head.²

Following Tryphon's hostile behaviour, Simon naturally attached himself once more to Demetrius. But the price he demanded was Demetrius's recognition of Jewish freedom. Whilst proceeding assidu-

1. The year of Jonathan's death is not mentioned in 1 Maccabees (which gives no dates between 11:19 and 13:41). According to 13:41 and 14:27, the years of Simon's rule were reckoned from the Seleucid year 170 = 143/2 or 142/1 B.C. 1 Mac. 13:22 asserts that Jonathan died in the winter. This will be 143/2 or 142/1 B.C., probably the former in view of Josephus's statement that Simon reigned for eight years, *Ant.* xiii 7, 4 (228), so from 142 to 135 or 134 B.C. (the Seleucid year 177, 1 Mac. 16:14). The statement in *Ant.* xiii 6, 5 (212) that Jonathan was High Priest for four years is erroneous. Equally mistaken is the reference to seven years in *Ant.* xx 10, 3 (238).

2. 1 Mac. 13:31-2; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 7, 1 (218-22); Diodorus xxxiii 26; Livy *Ephit.* 55; Appian *Syr.* 68/357; Justin xxxvi 1, 7. The murder was committed by surgeons. Cf. Livy, 'Alexandri filius, rex Syriae, decem annos admodum habens, a Diodoto, qui Tryphon cognominabatur, tutore suo, per frandem occisus est

ously to build Judaea's fortresses, he sent an embassy to Demetrius 'to secure for his country exemption from tribute'. As Demetrius in fact no longer possessed control over the south of the empire, it was in his interest to play a magnanimous role and grant the Jews all their requests. He therefore consented not only to a remission of their tax arrears, but also to a complete exemption from future tribute.³ With this, the political independence of Judaea was acknowledged. 'The yoke of the Gentile', as 1 Maccabees expresses it, 'was taken from Israel'. In recognition of the fact, the Jews began in the Seleucid year 170 = 143/2 B.C. to employ their own chronology. Documents and treaties were dated according to the years of Simon, High Priest and Prince of the Jews.⁴

It was once usual to combine this statement from 1 Maccabees with numismatic data, and to ascribe Jewish shekels and half-shekels dated from Year 1 to Year 5 to the time of Simon. But today it is clear that the shekels, half-shekels and quarter-shekels in question were struck during the First War against Rome (A.D. 66-70).⁵ The recent excavations at Masada produced three groups of such silver coins of the Years 1 to 5, in an archaeological context which is indubitably that of the First Revolt.⁶ On the other hand, the exploration of Simon's fortress at Beth-Zur revealed none of these.⁷ It is to be recognised, therefore, that Simon did not issue coins at all: the grant made by Antiochus

corruptis medicis, qui illum calculi dolore consumi ad populum mentiti, dum secant, occiderunt'. Josephus reads, τὸν μὲν ὡς χειριζόμενος ἀποθάνου διαγγελεῖν. Josephus and the non-Jewish sources place the murder of Antiochus a little later, after the capture of Demetrius II by the Parthians. 1 Mac. mentions it in the above context, still prior to Demetrius's campaign against the Parthians. The coins, in particular, support this version. Cf. on this difference, p. 131 above.

3. Graetz, *Geschichte der Juden* III (1905-6), p. 52; Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 69 and Abel, *in loc.* refer to Megillath Taanith § 6. According to this document, 27 Iyyar (=May) was the day when the crown-tax (כִּלְיָא) was abolished in Judaea and Jerusalem. Cf. Lichtenstein, *HUCA* 8-9 (1931-2), p. 286.

4. 1 Mac. 13:33-42; cf. 14:27; *Jos. Ant.* xiii 6, 6 (214). Justin, in his extract from Pompeius Trogus, dates the freedom of the Jews from the time of Demetrius I. He says of Antiochus VII Sidetes, xxxvi 1, 10, 'Iudaeos quoque, qui a Macedonico imperio sub Demetrio patre armis se in libertatem vindicaverant, subigit'. Cf. xxxvi 3, 9, 'A Demetrio cum descivissent, amicitia Romanorum petita primum omnium ex Orientalibus libertatem acceperunt, facile tunc Romanis de alieno largientibus'. The relevant statement in 1 Mac. 13:42 reads, καὶ ἤρξατο ὁ λαὸς γράφειν ἐν ταῖς στήλαις καὶ συναλλάγμασιν 'Ἐτους πρώτου ἐπὶ Σίμωνος ἀρχιερέως μεγάλου καὶ στρατηγῶν καὶ ἡγουμένων Ἰουδαίων.

5. For the latest discussions of the issue, cf. B. Kanael, 'Altjüdische Münzen', *Jahrb. f. Numism. u. Geldgesch.* 17 (1967), pp. 165-7; Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), pp. 41-2; A. Ben-David, *PEQ* 104 (1972), pp. 93-103.

6. See Y. Yadin, *IEJ* 15 (1965), pp. 80-1; *Masada* (1966), pp. 108-9.

7. For Beth-Zur see O. R. Sellers, *The Citadel of Beth-Zur* (1933); cf. p. 161 above.

(1 Mac. 15:6) was, if historical, evidently withdrawn as soon as he was in a strong enough position to do so. The date of the origin of Hasmonaean coinage remains controversial (see below and App. IV), but it can be taken as certain that it was later than the period of Simon.

The charter of Demetrius conferred privileges which, in reality, he was in no position to grant. In the face of Tryphon's more dangerous power, Simon made it his business to give them substance. To consolidate his position, he sought above all to seize two important fortified places, the town of Gazara and the fortress in Jerusalem, in both cases with success. Gazara, the ancient Gezer, not far from Emmaus-Nicopolis in a westerly direction, at the foot of the mountains, had been until then a Gentile city. Its possession was of importance to the Jews because it was one of the places which dominated the mountain passes and, in consequence, communications between Jerusalem and the port of Joppa annexed by the Jews. Simon besieged the city skilfully, conquered it, expelled its Gentile inhabitants, and replaced them by 'men who observed the law'.⁸ His son John was appointed governor.⁹

8. 1 Mac. 13:43-8; cf. 14:34; *Jos. Ant.* xiii 6, 7 (215); Strabo xvi 2, 29 (759) ἐν δὲ τῇ μεταξὺ καὶ ἡ Γαζαρίσ· ἔστιν, ἣν καὶ αὐτὴν ἐξιδίασαντο οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι (Strabo's Gadaris is identical with Gazara). The manuscripts of 1 Mac. 13:73 all have Γάζαν. That Γάζαρι should be read instead, is proved not only by the parallel text of Josephus, but also by the text of 1 Mac. in the parallel passages (1 Mac. 13:53; 14:7, 34; 15:28, 35; 16:1; 19:21). It is the Gezer of the Old Testament, an important Canaanite town, concerning which Eusebius remarks, *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 66, καὶ νῦν καλεῖται Γαζάρα κώμη Νικοπόλεως ἀπέχουσα σημείοις δ' ἐν βορείοις. This information has been corroborated by later research. For Tel Jazer, discovered by Clermont-Ganneau in 1873, lies four Roman miles from Emmaus-Nicopolis, though more in a westerly than a northern direction. The data given in the Old Testament and 1 Maccabees accord with this site, in particular 1 Mac. 4:15, but also 1 Mac. 7:45 (a day's journey from Adasa) and 1 Mac. 14:34 (τὴν Γαζάραν τὴν ἐπὶ τῶν ὀρίων Ἀζώτου), that the territory of Gazara bordered on that of Ashdod is very possible, considering the great spread of these city territories. Finally, several inscriptions bearing the name of גַּזְרָא were discovered in the neighbourhood, probably indicating the town's Sabbath boundaries. (1) Clermont-Ganneau discovered in 1874 two Hebrew-Greek inscriptions גַּזְרָא אֶלְקִיּוֹν/Ἀλκίου, and one in Hebrew alone, all three close together, approximately 800 metres east of Tel-Jazer (the reading of the Hebrew inscription is uncertain). (2) In 1881 Clermont-Ganneau found a third Hebrew-Greek inscription not far from the others. (3) In 1898 Lagrange came across a fourth Hebrew-Greek inscription, with the same wording as the others, but at approximately the same distance south of Tel-Jazer as the others were east of it. A fifth was published by Macalister, *The Excavation of Gezer* I (1912), pp. 33-41, and a sixth by W. R. Taylor, *BASOR* 41 (1931), pp. 28 f.; see Frey, *CIJ* II no. 1183. גַּזְרָא אֶלְקִיּוֹν can only mean, 'boundary of Gezer'; Ἀλκίος (possibly a Hellenistic form of Helkias) is perhaps the name of the official who ordered the inscription. Cf. Clermont-Ganneau, *CRAI*, 1874, pp. 201, 213 f.; *PEFQS* (1873), pp. 78 f.; (1874), pp. 56, 276 ff.; (1875), pp. 5, 74 ff. *Archaeological Researches in Palestine* II (1896), pp. 224-75. Cf. Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 332-3.

9. 1 Mac. 13:53; 16:1; 19:21.

Soon after the conquest of Gazara, Simon also forced the Syrian garrison of the fortress in Jerusalem to capitulate through famine. The nationalist aspirations of the Maccabees had long been directed towards this aim, for whilst the fortress was in the hands of the Syrian kings, the Jews remained subject to them. Simon now succeeded in conquering this bulwark also. On the 23rd day of the second month of the Seleucid year 171 = early June 141 B.C., he entered the fortress with great pomp and ceremony.¹⁰

As the Syrian kings were unable to pay much attention to events in Judaea, the next few years were ones of undisturbed prosperity and peace for the Jews. The period of Simon's rule is on the whole characterized as such a time in 1 Maccabees. His chief merits are represented there as having been the acquisition of Joppa as a port, and the conquest of Gazara, Beth-Zur and the fortress in Jerusalem.¹¹ There is also particular praise for his care for the spiritual and material well-being of the country, for his strict administration of justice, and for his implementation of Jewish law. 'They farmed their land in peace, the land gave its produce, the trees of the plain their fruit. The elders sat at ease in the streets, all their talk was of their prosperity; the young men wore finery and armour. He kept the towns supplied with provisions and furnished them with fortifications, so that his fame resounded to the ends of the earth. He established peace in the land, and Israel knew

10. 1 Mac. 13:14-52; cf. 14:7, 36-7; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 6, 7 (215-17). The date of 23 Iyyar (the second month) is given not only in 1 Mac. 13:51, but also in Megillath Taanith § 5. Cf. Graetz, *Gesch. der Juden* III (1905-6), p. 54; Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 67; Abel, *in loc.*; Lichtenstein, HUCA 8-9 (1931-2), pp. 286-7. 'On 23 Iyyar the occupants of Akra left Jerusalem', נפקין בני זוקריא מירושלם. If the conjecture is correct that 1 Mac. follows here the Babylonian Seleucid era, i.e. that the year begins in the spring (Nisan), then Iyyar 171 = May-June 141 B.C. To the story of the conquest of the fortress, Josephus, *Ant.* xiii 6, 7 (217), cf. *B.J.* V 4, 1 (139), is joined the remarkable statement that not only the fortress was destroyed; the entire hill on which it stood was levelled by the people during three years of uninterrupted labour, so that the site of the Temple should be higher than that where the earlier fortress once was. As 1 Mac. says nothing of this, but on the contrary asserts that Simon fortified the place and installed a Jewish garrison, 1 Mac. 14:36-7, cf. also 15:28, the levelling cannot have taken place in this time. In the parallel account of *B.J.* v 4, 1 (139), it is also only generally referred to as the work of the Hasmonaeans. In this form, the statement has more chance of being correct, for the south-easterly hill is now in fact almost level, whereas if it was the site of the Akra, one would expect a different configuration. Certainly unhistorical, therefore, is only the assertion by Josephus in *Ant.* xiii 6, 7 (217) that the levelling occurred under Simon. This, according to 1 Mac. 14:36-7 and 15:28 is not possible. But cf. on this whole question the literature cited above pp. 154-5.

11. 1 Mac. 14:33-7. Cf. also the theme of the ode in 1 Mac. 14:4-15. Both passages summarise events recounted previously in the narrative of 1 Mac. Cf. on Beth-Zur, 1 Mac. 11:65 f.; on Joppa, 1 Mac. 12:33 f., 13:11; on Gazara and the citadel, 13:43-52.

great joy. Each man sat under his own vine and his own fig tree, and there was no one to make them afraid. No enemy was left in the land to fight them, and the kings in those days were crushed. He gave strength to all the humble among his people and did away with every lawless and wicked man. He observed the Law, and gave new splendour to the Temple, replenishing it with sacred vessels.¹²

These words from 1 Maccabees express the feeling of satisfaction experienced by the majority of the people under Simon's rule. The final object of Maccabaeon aspiration was attained. Government was in the hands of the national party, and the country was independent of Syrian hegemony. So now Simon also reaped the last fruit of their common labours: the formal legitimization of his family by the people as the ruling High-Priestly family. The sons of Mattathias had obtained power by an act of usurpation. Until the outbreak of the Maccabaeon revolt, the office of High Priest had been hereditary in another family. In the course of events, that family had been displaced. The Maccabee brothers had taken over the leadership of the nationalist party and the Syrian kings had conferred upon them High-Priestly rank. It was of the greatest importance to the continuance of Simon's rule that the legitimacy of his government for himself and his descendants should be expressly recognised by a popular decree. Such an act was passed in the third year of Simon's rule. On 18 Elul of the Seleucid year 172 = September 140 B.C., it was resolved in a great assembly of 'the priests and the people and the princes of the people and the elders of the land', that Simon should be High Priest, military commander and ethnarch of the Jews (ἀρχιερεύς, στρατηγός and ἐθνάρχης), and that he should be 'their leader and High Priest for ever until a trustworthy prophet should arise' (1 Mac. 14:41).¹³ The implication of this formula was that the people's decree was to remain valid until God decreed otherwise. Until then, Simon's dignities were to be 'for ever', i.e., hereditary.

12. 1 Mac. 14:8-15. On the severe measures taken by Simon against apostates, see Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 68 f., who refers to Megillath Taanith § 15. 'On 22 Elul we came back to kill the wicked', תבוא ליקטלא רשיעיא. Cf. Lichtenstein, HUCA 8-9 (1931-2), pp. 305-6.

13. See in general 1 Mac. 14:25-49. The content of the decree (14:41-6) is made dependent on a *ὅτι* in 14:41 from the preceding *ἡκούσθη* in 14:40. Commentators have normally taken the view that the *ὅτι* should be eliminated; but see Abel, *ad loc.* Simon's full title is a triple one, as may be seen from the following essentially similar passages: 1 Mac. 13:42 ἐπὶ Σίμωνος ἀρχιερέως μεγάλου καὶ στρατηγοῦ καὶ ἡγουμένου Ἰουδαίων. 1 Mac. 14:41-2; τοῦ εἶναι αὐτῶν Σίμωνα ἡγουμένου καὶ ἀρχιερέα . . . καὶ τοῦ εἶναι ἐπ' αὐτῶν στρατηγόν. 1 Mac. 14:47; ἀρχιερατεύειν καὶ εἶναι στρατηγός καὶ ἐθνάρχης τῶν Ἰουδαίων καὶ ἱερέων. A little less complete is 1 Mac. 15:1; ἱερεὶ καὶ ἐθνάρχη τῶν Ἰουδαίων; 15:2, ἱερεὶ μεγάλῳ καὶ ἐθνάρχη. Also in 1 Mac. 14:27 ἐπὶ Σίμωνος ἀρχιερέως ἐνσαραμελ. The mysterious words ἐνσαραμελ or ἐνασαραμελ have been interpreted as part of the titlature; see

Thus was founded a new High-Priestly and princely dynasty, that of the Hasmonaeans.¹⁴ The terms of the decree were engraved on bronze tablets which were displayed in the Temple.¹⁵

Legitimization by the people was soon followed by recognition by the Romans. At about the time of the popular decree, Simon sent a delegation to Rome under the leadership of Numenius. These men handed over the gift of a gold shield weighing one thousand *minae* and requested the renewal of the alliance. The embassy was courteously received by the Senate, and obtained a *senatus consultum* guaranteeing to the Jews undisputed possession of their territory. According to 1 Mac. 15:16-24, the kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamum, Cappadocia and Parthia, and of several independent smaller states and communes in Greece and Asia Minor, were informed of this, and at the same time instructed to surrender to the Jewish High Priest any evil-doers who had fled to them from Palestine. But the authenticity of the last clause, and of the letter of 'Lucius, consul of the Romans', to Ptolemy

Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 450-1. *σαραμειλ*, presumably *אֵל עַם אֱלֹהִים* = *ἐθνάρχη*. But the *ev* preceding it remains a puzzle. Possibly *σενει* = *סֵנַן* stood here originally, corresponding to the Greek *στρατηγός* (cf. vol. II, § 24, 3). See R. H. Charles, *Apost.* I, p. 119. Abel, *in loc.*, sees in the phrase a geographical expression *הַצֵּר עַם אֱלֹהִים* 'Courtyard of the People of God'. For a full discussion, see now Schalit, *op. cit.*, Anhang XIV, although his own theory, *ev* *σαραμειλ* = *ἐν ασαρῆ* (= *עֶזְרָה*) *μεγάλη*, 'in the great Temple courtyard', seems far fetched.

14. The family name of the dynasty is *οἱ Ἀσαμωναίου παῖδες*, Jos. *Vita* 1 (2, 4); *Ant.* xx 8, 11 (190), xx 10, 3 (247) *τὸ Ἀσαμωνάων γένος*, *Ant.* xv 11, 4 (403), *οἱ Ἀσαμωνάοι*, *B. J.* ii 16, 3 (344); v 4, 1 (139), after the ancestor *Ἀσαμωνάος*, mentioned in 1 Mac. 15:16, 22-3 (265); xiv 16, 4 (490-1); xvi 7, 1 (187). In mMid. 1:6 they are *בְּנֵי הַשְּׂמוֹנִי* or *בְּנֵי הַשְּׂמוֹנִי* (the latter form in the Cambridge manuscript, edited by Lowe); in the Targum to 1 Sam. 2:4, *בֵּית הַשְּׂמוֹנִי*; for other rabbinic passages see Levy, *Chald. Wörterb.* and *Neuhebr. Wörterb.*, and Jastrow, *Dictionary*, s.v. *הַשְּׂמוֹנִי*—Wellhausen, *Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, p. 94 (n.) suggested that Hasmon was the grandfather of Mattathias, and that in 1 Mac. 2:1 Ben Hashmon stood in place of *τοῦ Συμεών*.

15. 1 Mac. 14:27, 48-9. The text of the document given in 1 Maccabees 14:27-45 is represented as an *ἀντίγραφον* of the authentic text (14:27). Nevertheless, the remark in 14:38-40 is to be noted, namely that Demetrius confirmed Simon in the office of High Priest because he heard that the Romans had received his delegation honourably. Demetrius's charter for the Jews, 1 Mac. 13:36-40; cf. above p. 190, is probably to be dated some years before Simon's embassy to the Romans, which may not (see below) have set off until around the time of the decree, and returned still later. Therefore, if the facts in the rest of the narrative of 1 Mac. are correct, the circumstance stated cannot be right, and in consequence the wording of the people's decree cannot be authentic in all its details. It would then be a free rendering, rather than a diplomatically exact duplicate. However, the assumption that it was merely inserted by a later interpolator, see e.g. Willrich, *Juden und Griechen*, p. 69 f., cf. *Urkundenfälschung*, p. 42, appears to be without foundation.

(VIII Euergetes) quoted in 15:16-21, is very dubious.¹⁶ The terms of the senate's resolution are probably reproduced in the *senatus consultum* given by Josephus, *Ant.* xiv 8, 5 (145-8), and assigned by him to the time of Hyrcanus II. The circumstances described in this document are precisely the same as those of 1 Mac. 14:24 and 15:15-24: Jewish ambassadors, one of them named Numenius, took with them a gift of a gold shield and requested a renewal of the alliance, and the senate, as a result of this, resolved to instruct the autonomous cities and kings to respect the integrity of Jewish territory. According to Josephus, the relevant session of Senate took place *εἰδοῖς Δεκεμβρίου* = 13 December, under the presidency of *Λεύκιος Ουαλέριος Λευκίου υἱὸς στρατηγός* (i.e. praetor). He is possibly identical with the *Λεύκιος ὕπατος Ῥωμαίων* (i.e. consul) who according to 1 Mac. 15:16 despatched the circular letter to the kings and cities. It was previously thought that Calpurnius Piso, consul of 139 B.C., had the *praenomen* 'Lucius' (see Val. Max. I 3, 2)¹⁷; but the Oxyrhynchus papyrus text of Livy, *Per.* liv, and the

[Text continues on page 197]

16. Cf. in general, 1 Mac. 14:24, 15:15-24. 1 Mac. 14:16-18 seems to imply that the Romans had already, of their own accord, addressed a letter to the Jews concerning the renewal of the alliance (though only the letter from Sparta is actually given, 14:20-3). This is scarcely historical. From 1 Mac. 14:24, cf. 14:40, it should be assumed that the embassy left before the decree of 18 Elul of the Seleucid year 172 = September 140 B.C. It did not return, however, before the Seleucid year 174 = 139-8 or 138-7 B.C. (1 Mac. 15:10, 15). Perhaps the author inserted the report of the departure of the embassy before that of the people's decree because he was misled by an error in the transmitted text of the decree (1 Mac. 14:40) into thinking that it occurred previously. It should furthermore be noted that the list of states to which the Roman circular letter was addressed (1 Mac. 15:16, 22-3) corresponds exactly to the circumstances prevailing at that time. For almost all the minor states and cities mentioned with the kings of Egypt, Syria, Pergamum, Cappadocia and Parthia were at that time in fact not subject, either to the Romans, or to any of these kings. Cf. Marquardt, *Römische Staatsverwaltung* I (21881), pp. 333 ff.; Mommsen, *Römisches Staatsrecht* III, 1 (21887), pp. 670 ff. Willrich, *Judaica*, p. 76, cf. *Urkundenfälschung*, p. 58 f., raised two objections against this list: (a) Demetrius of Syria, to whom the letter was also addressed, according to 1 Mac. 15:22, was by then a prisoner of the Parthians; (b) Cyprus and Cyrene, mentioned with the king of Egypt, belonged to Egypt at that time. The first point cannot be substantiated however (cf. pp. 130-1 above), and there is nothing remarkable about the second, since the Romans could certainly write separately to the Egyptian governors of Cyprus and Cyrene. Cf. G. F. Unger, *loc. cit.*, and now de Sanctis, *Storia dei Romani* IV, 3 (1964), p. 195, n. 77.

17. Thus F. Ritschl, 'Römische Senatusconsulte bei Josephus', *Rhein. Mus.* 29 (1874), pp. 337 ff.; 30 (1875), pp. 428 ff. Cf. also Abel, *in loc.* The identity of the *senatus consultum* in *Ant.* xiv 8, 5 (144-8) with that in response to Simon's embassy was assumed by H. Ewald, *Gesch. des Volkes Israel* IV, p. 438, and W. Grimm, *Exeget. Handb. zu 1. Mak.*, p. 226 f. Independently of them, Mendelssohn came to the same conclusion and substantiated it in more detail. Through his enquiries into this question and others connected with it, a whole body of literature emerged in the late nineteenth century. L. Mendelssohn, 'Senati consulta Romanorum

quae sunt in Josephi Antiquitatibus', Act. Soc. Philol. Lips. 5 (1875), pp. 87-288; D. Ritschl, 'Eine Berichtigung der republikanischen Consularfasten', Rhein. Mus. 28 (1873), pp. 586-614; Grimm, 'Ueber I Makk. 8 und 15:16-21 nach Mommsen's und Ritschl's Forschungen', ZWTh (1874), p. 231-8; Mommsen, 'Der Senatsbeschluss Josephus Ant. XIV, 8, 5', Hermes 9 (1875), pp. 281-91; K. Wieseler, ThStKr (1875), pp. 524 ff.; W. Judeich, *Cäsar im Orient* (1885), pp. 129-36; P. Viereck, *Sermo Graecus; quo senatus populusque Romanus etc. usi sunt* (1888), pp. 103-6; Unger, SAM, 1895, pp. 553-75; Willrich, *Juden und Griechen* (1895), p. 71 f., cf. *Urkundenfälschung*, p. 60 f. After giving the text of the *senatus consultum*, Josephus remarks in *Ant.* xiv 8, 5 (148) ταῦτα ἐγένετο ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ ἐν τῷ ἐνάτῳ μνησὶ Πανέμου. By this he means Hyrcanus II. It was on the strength of this that Mommsen, and after him Judeich, dated the *senatus consultum* to 47 B.C., when Caesar was settling affairs in Syria; and Willrich wrote that he was sure that Mommsen had proved irrefutably that the document belonged to the period of Hyrcanus II. In fact, Mommsen's view is untenable because 47 B.C. was not the ninth year of Hyrcanus II, either as ἀρχιερέως or as ἐθνάρχης. He had been High Priest since 63 B.C., and only became ethnarch through Caesar. (Mommsen's dating from the decrees of Gabinus onward is impossible, for nothing was given to Hyrcanus through Gabinus, but all his political power was taken away, see Mendelssohn, Rhein. Mus. 30 (1875), pp. 424 f.; 32 (1877), p. 256. Furthermore, the security of their 'harbours' could not be guaranteed to the Jews in 47 B.C., as happens in the S.C., because since Pompey they no longer possessed any (it was only after 47 B.C. that they reacquired Joppa through Caesar's favour). Far more weight, therefore, is to be given to the opinion of Scaliger and earlier scholars, which was supported by Viereck and Unger, that the ninth year of Hyrcanus I is meant. Cf. Marcus, *ad loc.* (Loeb text), supporting attribution to Hyrcanus I but suggesting that the date applies to the following document, from Athens. The similarity of circumstances in 1 Mac. 15:16-21 and Jos. *Ant.* xiv 8, 5 (145-8) is so noticeable that the probability of identity cannot be denied. The question should therefore be whether, in respect to the dating, 1 Mac. is to be preferred, which mentions Simon's name in the document itself (15:17), or Josephus. But if this is so, the authority of the latter seems too weak to supplant that of the former. It is also an argument in favour of the era of Simon that the *senatus consultum* which belongs to the early period of Hyrcanus, *Ant.* xiii 9, 2 (260-4), probably refers back to this S.C. Against its dating to 139 B.C., Mommsen raised the point as a decisive objection that the relevant session of the senate took place, according to Josephus, in the temple of Concordia (ἐν τῷ τῆς Ὁμονοίας ναῷ), whereas this temple, in which sessions of the senate were later held, was not constructed until 121 B.C. But Mommsen himself mentioned another temple of Concordia, built in 366 B.C. by M. Furius Camillus (Plutarch, *Cam.* 42) and restored in 121 B.C. and under Augustus (Ovid, *Fasti* I, 639-48; see Frazer's commentary *ad loc.* and Platner and Ashby, *Topographical Dictionary of Ancient Rome*, pp. 138-40) and Ritschl argued that it was very suitable for a session of the senate, Rhein. Mus. 30 (1875), pp. 428-32. Cf. also Excursus III in Abel, *op. cit.*, pp. 275-6. For doubts about the fourth-century temple of Concordia see K. Latte, *Römische Religionsgeschichte* (1960), p. 237, n. 8. But Livy xxvi 23, 4, mentions it under 211 B.C.

For further discussion of the authenticity and dating of both documents see e.g. Ginsburg, *op. cit.*, pp. 59-64; Momigliano, *Prime Linee*, pp. 151-7; T. Fischer, *Untersuchungen zum Partherkrieg Antiochos VII* (1970), pp. 97-101; A. Giovannini, H. Müller, 'Die Beziehungen zw. Rom und den Juden im 2 Jh. v. Chr.', *Museum Helveticum* 28 (1971), pp. 156-71.

Fasti Antiates (*Ins. Italiae* XIII, 1, p. 161) show that his *praenomen* was Gnaeus. It is not easy to find another Lucius holding an appropriate office in this period, unless it is L. Caecilius Metellus Calvus, the consul of 142 B.C.¹⁸ But the envoys seem to have returned to Palestine in the Seleucid year 174 = 139-8 or 138-7 B.C. (1 Mac. 15:10 and 15). However, L. Valerius Flaccus, consul in 131 B.C., may have been praetor about this time. The presence of the envoys has often been hypothetically linked with the beginnings of Jewish propaganda in Rome in 139 B.C., known from a report by Valerius Maximus.¹⁹

Meanwhile, the government of Simon was not destined to progress as peacefully as it had done hitherto. He, too, became involved once more in Syrian affairs. At about this time, Demetrius II disappeared temporarily from the scene. He had allowed himself to become embroiled in a protracted war with Mithridates I, king of the Parthians, which ended with his capture by the Parthians in 140/39 B.C.²⁰ In place of Demetrius, his brother Antiochus VII Sidetes now took over the struggle against Tryphon. Like all the Syrian pretenders, who had first to conquer their thrones, Antiochus hastened also to heap favours on the Jews. He had heard in Rhodes of the capture of Demetrius. Before landing on the Syro-Phoenician coast ('from the islands of the sea'),²¹ he sent a letter to Simon confirming all the privileges conferred on him by former kings, and granting him, in particular, the right to mint his own coinage.²² Soon afterwards, still in the Seleucid year 174 = 139-8 (or 138-7) B.C. (1 Mac. 15:10), Antiochus landed in Syria and

18. See Broughton MRR I, pp. 474 and 476, n. 1. In this case, it would have to be accepted that there is a basic chronological confusion in the narrative. This would, however, remove one difficulty: the reference to Roman favour to Simon in 1 Mac. 14:38-40, see n. 15 above.

19. Valerius Maximus I, 3, 2, 'Idem'—the praetor, Cn. Cornelius Scipio Hispanus (for the correct form of the name see Broughton, MRR I, p. 482)—Iudaeos, qui Sabazi Iovis cultu Romanos inficere mores conati erant, repetere domos suas coegit'. Cf. vol. III, § 31, 1. The Jewish proselytizers expelled by the praetor cannot, of course, have been the envoys themselves, but probably members of their retinue.

20. 1 Mac. 14:1-3; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 5, 11 (184-6); Appian, *Syr.* 67/356; Justin xxxvi 1, 1-6; xxxviii 9, 2; Euseb. *Chron.*, ed. Schoene I, pp. 255 f.; Syncellus, ed. Dindorf I, p. 554. On the chronology, see above p. 130. Almost all sources refer to the king of the Parthians as Arsaces, the name, according to Strabo xv 1, 36 (702) and Justin xli 5, 6, common to all the Parthian kings. According to Justin xxxviii 9, 2-10, however, Demetrius was taken prisoner by the predecessor of the Phraates who later set him at liberty. But the predecessor of Phraates was Mithridates. Cf., in general, J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia* I (1965), pp. 20-5.

21. 1 Mac. 15:1-9: ἀπὸ τῶν νήσων τῆς θαλάσσης is explained by Appian, *Syr.* 68/358: πυθόμενος ἐν Ῥόδῳ περὶ τῆς αἰχμαλωσίας.

22. 1 Mac. 15:10-14; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 7, 1-2. On the coins erroneously attributed to Simon, see above, pp. 190-1. On Dora see vol. ii, § 21, 1.

quickly gained the upper hand over Tryphon, who was forced to withdraw to Dora, the powerful fortress on the Phoenician coast. There Antiochus besieged him. Tryphon managed to escape and fled to Apamea by way of Ptolemais²³ and Orthosias.²⁴ But here he was besieged once more and in the fighting lost his life.²⁵

As soon as Antiochus had obtained a few successes over Tryphon, he adopted a different attitude towards the Jews. During the siege of Dora, Simon sent him two thousand auxiliary troops together with silver, gold and weapons. Antiochus, however, rejected the offerings, revoked all his earlier concessions, and sent one of his friends, Athenobius, to Jerusalem to demand from Simon the surrender of the conquered towns of Joppa, Gazara and the fortress in Jerusalem, as well as all the places outside Judaea possessed by the Jews. If he were unwilling to return them, he was to pay the sum of one thousand talents for them (as a single sum of indemnity). The demands were definitely justified, for the Jews could make no valid claim to their conquest. But Simon refused to comply; he declared that he was ready to pay only one hundred talents. With this answer Athenobius returned to the king.²⁶

Antiochus was resolved to enforce his demands. While he himself was still dealing with Tryphon, he handed over the campaign against Simon to his general Cendebaeus. Cendebaeus set up his headquarters at Jamnia, fortified Cedron (probably modern Katra near Jamnia), and launched assaults on Judaea.²⁷ Simon was prevented by age from personally taking to the field once more. He therefore sent his sons Judas and John with an army against Cendebaeus. Both of them justified the confidence placed in them by their father. In a decisive engagement Cendebaeus was completely routed. As Judas was wounded,

23. Charax in Steph. Byz., s.v. *Δῶρος* = Jacoby, FGrH 103 F 29.

24. 1 Mac. 15:37. Orthosias lies north of Tripoli on the Phoenician coast. See RE s.v. 'Orthosia' (3).

25. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 7, 2 (224). Cf. also Appian, *Syr.* 68/358, and Strabo xiv 5, 2 (668).

26. 1 Mac. 15:25-36; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 7, 2-3 (223-5). The sum of one thousand talents asked for can only have been intended as a single-payment of indemnity. Withdrawal from individual towns in exchange for large sums of money happened also elsewhere (cf. the inscription of Eshmunazar on the transfer of Joppa and Dora to the Sidonians, vol. II, § 23 i, 7, 10). A permanent tribute of thousand talents for a few towns would have been beyond all proportion, considering that later, for instance, the entire territory of Archelaus, which was far more extensive than that of Simon, yielded only six hundred talents a year, *Ant.* xvii 11, 4 (320).

27. 1 Mac. 15:38-41; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 7, 3 (225). On Cedron, see Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 296. *Κενδεβαίος* is, perhaps equivalent to *Κανδυβαίος*, a name taken from the town of *Κανδυβα* in Lycia, Steph. Byz. s.v.; Pliny *NH* v 28/101. Cf. RE s.v. 'Kandyba'.

John took over the pursuit of the enemy as far as Cedron and the territory of Ashdod. He returned to Jerusalem as conqueror.²⁸

While Simon lived, the attack by Antiochus was not repeated.

It seemed therefore that Simon was destined to spend his last days in peace. But this was not to be so. Like all his brothers he, too, died a violent death. His own son-in-law, Ptolemy, who was *strategos* over the plain of Jericho, had ambitious plans. He wished to seize power for himself and plotted to rid himself of Simon and his sons by cunning. He therefore gave a great banquet when Simon, who was on a tour of inspection through the cities of the land in the month of Shebat of the Seleucid year 177 = February 135 or 134 B.C. (1 Mac. 16:14), visited him in the fortress of Dok near Jericho.²⁹ And in the course of it, he caused Simon and his two sons Mattathias and Judas, who were all drunk, to be assassinated.³⁰

28. 1 Mac. 16:1-10; Jos. *loc. cit.*

29. 1 Mac. 16:11-17; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 7, 4 (228). The *Δόκ* of 1 Mac. 16:15 is identical with the *Δαγών* of Jos. *Ant.* xiii 8, 1 (230); *B.J.* i 2, 3 (56). The name is still preserved in that of the spring Ain Duk, north of Jericho, on the fringe of the mountains, at a place eminently suitable for the site of a fortress. See Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 307. As elsewhere, the dating by the Seleucid year 177 in 1 Mac. 16:14 is ambiguous as between 135 and 134 B.C. The latter would be supported by the reference to Simon's eight-year rule in *Ant.* xiii 7, 4 (228).

30. For the identification of Simon as the 'Wicked Priest' in the Qumran scrolls, or one of the two 'Wicked Priests'—the other being Jonathan—see the works by Vermes, Cross and de Vaux quoted on p. 188, n. 42 above.