

Gazara, was his lawful successor.² It was therefore against him that

§ 8 JOHN HYRCANUS I 135/4-104 B.C.¹

Sources

1 Maccabees 16:23-4 (but the annals mentioned there have not been preserved). Josephus *Ant.* xiii 8-10 (230-300); *B.J.* i 2, 3-8 (55-69).
Mishnah Ma'aser Sheni 5:15; Soṭah 9:10. Cf. also Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 70-82; S. Lieberman, *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (1950), pp. 139-43.
On the disputed question of whether any coinage is to be attributed to the reign of Hyrcanus I see below pp. 210-11.

Bibliography

Gräetz, H., *Geschichte der Juden* III (1905-6), pp. 79-116.
Derenbourg, J., *Essai sur l'histoire et la géographie de la Palestine* (1867), pp. 70-82.
Otto, W., 'Hyrcanos' RE IX, cols. 527-34.
Bickermann, E., 'Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr. (II Macc. i 1-9)', ZNW 32 (1933), pp. 233-54.
Abel, F.-M., *Histoire de la Palestine* I (1952), pp. 206-23.
Stern, M., 'The Relations between Judaea and Rome during the Rule of John Hyrcanus', Zion 26 (1961), pp. 1-22 (in Hebrew with Engl. summary).

As Simon's titles of High Priest and Prince had been declared hereditary, his third surviving son, John Hyrcanus, governor of

1. On the chronology of the Hasmonaeans, cf. Niese, *Hermes* 28 (1893), pp. 216-28; Unger, SMA (1896), pp. 357-82. Josephus gives the regnal periods of the rulers from John Hyrcanus I to Alexandra inclusive as follows:

John Hyrcanus	31 years, <i>Ant.</i> xiii 10, 7 (299).
Aristobulus I	1 year, <i>Ant.</i> xiii 11, 3 (318).
Alexander Jannaeus	27 years, <i>Ant.</i> xiii 15, 5 (404).
Alexandra	9 years, <i>Ant.</i> xiii 16, 6 (430).

The same figures are given by Josephus in two other passages: *Ant.* xx 10, 3-4 (240-2) and *B.J.* i 2, 8 (68), 3, 6 (84), 4, 8 (106), 5, 4 (119). The only difference is to be found in *B.J.* i 2, 8 (68), where the MSS give the length of Hyrcanus's reign as 33 years. But this too may be only a slip of the pen, for the Latin version of Hegesippus has *trigesimo et primo anno* (ed. Ussani I, 1, 10). See Niese, *op. cit.*, p. 217, and compare his edition of *B.J.*, Proleg., p. lxxii. In any case, 31 is the correct number, for Josephus, if he wrote 33 at all, corrected it in *Antiquities* on the basis of better information.

The following points are well established: (1) the death of Simon in the month Shebat of the Seleucid year 177 = February 135 or 134 B.C. (1 Mac. 16:14); (2) the start of the fratricidal war between Aristobulus II and Hyrcanus II immediately after the death of Alexandra, in the third year of the 177th Olympiad according to Josephus *Ant.* xiv 1, 2 (4), under the consuls Q. Hortensius (Hortalus) and Q. (Caecilius) Metellus Creticus, i.e., in 69 B.C. Accordingly, this war started, and Alexandra died, in the first half of 69 B.C. But there are only 66 or 65 years from

135 or 134 B.C. to 69 B.C., whereas addition of the above regnal years results in 68. One possible solution might be that Josephus, in reckoning from the time of accession without regard to the calendar year, always counted the last fraction of the year as a whole one, so in fact a certain fraction of the year should be deducted from every reign. Nevertheless, this does not correspond to the method of reckoning employed by the ancient historians and chronographers, who count full years in such a way that the calendar year during which a change of government has taken place is assigned in its entirety either to the departing ruler, or to the new one (cf. pp. 126-7, the lists of Porphyry and Eusebius). For this reason, Niese *loc. cit.* thought that the regnal years given by Josephus should simply be added, and that accordingly, Alexandra's death took place in 67 B.C. He found confirmation for this in the fact that Alexandra must have survived the departure of Tigranes from Syria (69 B.C.) for some time, and also in that Josephus reckons only 3 years and 9 months altogether for Alexandra's successors, Hyrcanus II and Aristobulus II—Hyrcanus II, 3 months, *Ant.* xv 6, 4 (180); Aristobulus, 3 years 6 months, *Ant.* xiv 6, 1 (97)—this then corresponding to the interval between Alexandra's death and Aristobulus's dismissal by Pompey (67-3 B.C.). These estimates are, of course, contradicted by the information concerning the Olympic and consular year in *Ant.* xiv 1, 2 (4). But this objection must not be regarded as decisive. Josephus is not always accurate in his synchronisations, which he perhaps derives from a chronographic handbook, possibly that of Castor (see above p. 43); he is definitely wrong, for instance, in placing the first year of John Hyrcanus during the 162nd Olympiad = 132-128 B.C. Thus the synchronisation to 69 B.C. also seems to rest on an mistaken combination, perhaps that of identifying Alexandra's death with the defeat of Tigranes by Lucullus in 69 B.C. The chronology of the Hasmonaeans is therefore as follows:

John Hyrcanus	135/4-104 B.C.
Aristobulus	104-103 B.C.
Alexander Jannaeus	103-76 B.C.
Alexandra	76-67 B.C.

Instead of the calculation of regnal years suggested here, another is admittedly possible. Taking the calendar year as a basis, they could be counted in such a way that the fraction of a calendar year at the beginning and end of a reign is always counted as a full year. Josephus seems to reckon, for example the regnal years of Herod according to this method (see the remarks at the end of § 15). But then, in order to arrive by addition at the correct final figure, one year would have to be subtracted from each reign; and in order to reach the date of 69 B.C. indicated by Josephus it would be necessary to attach the figure of thirty-three years to John Hyrcanus, as in *B.J.* i 2, 8 (28). This was Unger's choice. But the very preference given to *B.J.* is risky. What is more, Unger had to change the 3½ years given for Aristobulus to 6½ years by emending the text in order to rescue all Josephus's statements. This amounts to an admission that the problem cannot be resolved without rejecting one or other of them. Niese's solution therefore seems preferable.

2. Eusebius and others explain the sobriquet 'Hyrcanus' by saying that John conquered the Hyrcanians, Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene II, pp. 130-1; in Greek, in Syncellus, I, p. 548 'Υρκανός νικησας 'Υρκανός ἀνομάσθη; in Latin in Jerome, *ad. loc.* 'adversum Hyrcanos bellum gerens Hyrcani nomen accepit'; cf. Sulpicius Severus ii, 26, 'qui cum adversum Hyrcanos, gentem validissimam, egregie pugnasset,

the pretender Ptolemy, who had murdered his father and two brothers, directed his next ventures. Immediately after that deed, he sent assassins to Gazara to do away with John, but warned by friendly messengers, John had the murderers killed as soon as they entered the town. Then he hurried to Jerusalem and was fortunate enough to anticipate Ptolemy here too. When the latter arrived, he found the city already in Hyrcanus's power.³

Ptolemy then marched to the fortress of Dagon (identical with Dok) in the neighbourhood of Jericho. There Hyrcanus besieged him, and would undoubtedly soon have conquered the town and handed over the murderer to the fate he deserved had he not been impeded by consideration for his mother. She was in Ptolemy's power and whenever Hyrcanus threatened to storm the fortress, Ptolemy ordered her to be brought out onto the walls and threatened to throw her down if Hyrcanus did not desist. This crippled his advance. The siege was prolonged until it finally had to be abandoned on account of the Sabbatical year. Ptolemy was thereby freed, but he nevertheless killed the mother of Hyrcanus, and then fled.⁴

Through Ptolemy, Hyrcanus had thus lost parents and brothers without having succeeded in avenging them.

Worse awaited him, however. For reasons unknown, but presumably because affairs in Syria claimed his attention, Antiochus VII Sidetes had made no further move against Judaea. But it was not his intention to forego the demands made earlier on Simon. He invaded Judaea in the first year of Hyrcanus's reign (135/4 B.C.), devastated the whole country, and finally besieged Hyrcanus in his capital, Jerusalem.⁵ He

Hyrcani cognomen accepit'. In support of this explanation it can be said that John actually did participate in the campaign of Antiochus VII Sidetes against the Parthians (see below). But it founders on the fact that the name 'Hyrcanus' appears in Jewish circles long before John Hyrcanus, Jos. *Ant.* xii 4, 6-11 (186-236); 2 Mac. 3:11. It is therefore presumably to be explained according to the analogy of Yaddua *הַבְּלִי* (mB.M. 7:9); Nahum *הַמְדִי* (mShab. 2:1; mNaz. 5:4; mB.B. 5:2). Hyrcania was the place to which Jews were deported, particularly by Artaxerxes Ochus (see vol. III, § 31, 1). A Jew from there who settled in Palestine would at first be called 'δ'Υρκανός'. And in this way, the name became generally adopted. cf. 1Q Gen. Ap. 20:8, 21, 24 where *וְיִרְקָנוֹשׁ* is the name of one of Pharaoh's princes. Cf. J. A. Fitzmyer, *The Genesis Apocryphon of Qumran Cave I* (1966), pp. 111-12.

3. 1 Mac. 16:19-22. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 7, 4 (228-9).

4. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 8, 1 (230-5); *B.J.* i 2, 3-4 (59-60). On the Sabbatical year cf. above p. 19.

5. The sources do not agree in regard to the date. According to Jos. *Ant.* xiii 8, 2 (236), the invasion by Antiochus took place *τετάρτῳ μὲν ἔτει τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ, πρώτη δὲ τῆς Ὑρκανοῦ ἀρχῆς, ὀλυμπιάδι ἑκατοστῇ καὶ ἑξηκαστῇ καὶ δευτέρῃ*. The fourth year of Antiochus and the first of Hyrcanus are both 135/4 B.C.; the 162nd Olympiad, by contrast, is 132-128 B.C. Porphyry gives the

encircled the entire city with a rampart and a ditch, and cut off its supplies. Hyrcanus, for his part, tried to harass the besiegers, and, to make the provisions last longer, sent all those who were incapable of fighting out of the town. But Antiochus would not let them pass through and drove them back again, so they were obliged to wander between the city and its besiegers and many of them died of hunger. It was not till the Feast of Tabernacles that Hyrcanus allowed them in again. He also requested a truce of seven days for this feast, and Antiochus not only complied, but even sent sacrificial gifts to be offered in the Temple. This indulgent behaviour encouraged Hyrcanus and he now hoped that his eventual capitulation would meet with favourable terms. He therefore sent a deputation to Antiochus to enquire about them. After much deliberation a settlement was reached. According to this, the Jews were to surrender their arms, pay tribute for Joppa and the other towns outside Judaea which they had conquered, give hostages, and in addition pay a further five hundred talents. The terms were certainly oppressive. But in the circumstances, Hyrcanus must nevertheless have been happy, even at this price, to

date for the capture of Jerusalem by Antiochus by this last reckoning, i.e., Ol. 162, 3=130-129 B.C., Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene I, p. 255: 'Judaeosque hic subegit, per obsidionem muros urbis evertebat, atque electissimos ipsorum trucidabat anno tertio CLXII olympiadis'. It is only possible to combine these statements by assuming that the war dragged on for four years, which seems improbable. But it must be accepted as having lasted for more than one year, for the siege of Jerusalem alone appears to have continued for longer than that. For at the beginning of it Josephus mentions the setting of the Pleiades, *Ant.* xiii 8, 2 (237), *δυσμένης πλειάδος*, which occurs in November (Pliny *N.H.* ii 47/125 'post id aequinoctium diebus fere quattuor et quadraginta Vergiliarum occasus hiemen inchoat, quod tempus in III. idus Novembres incidere consuevit'. And the siege was still not lifted by the following Feast of Tabernacles, i.e. in October, *Ant.* xiii 8, 2 (241). Sieges of a year are not rare in the history of those times, see Samaria, *Ant.* xiii 10, 3 (281); Gaza, *Ant.* xiii 13, 3 (364); Gadara, ten months, *Ant.* xiii 13, 3 (356). The agreement between Josephus and Porphyry in regard to 162nd Olympiad may suggest that this date has some foundation. On the other hand, its intrinsic probability argues in favour of the first year of Hyrcanus (it is difficult to believe that Antiochus did not proceed against the Jews until 130 B.C., i.e. eight years after his accession to the throne), as well as the fact that the correct identification of Hyrcanus's first year with Antiochus's fourth year must stem from a reliable source. In addition, Porphyry's 130-129 B.C. would place the siege of Jerusalem in the same year in which Antiochus's campaign against the Parthians most likely took place (see above p. 132). It is therefore probable that the Olympic year 162, 3 transmitted only through the unreliable Armenian text of Eusebius, should be rejected. On the other hand it is possible that the war lasted from 134 to 132 B.C., i.e., until the beginning of the 162nd Olympiad. All in all, it is more likely that either Josephus made a mistake in referring to the Olympic year, or that there is an early corruption in the MSS which influenced Porphyry.

have secured the raising of the siege and the departure of the Syrian army. The city walls were also demolished.⁶

It is possible that the decree of the Roman senate reported by Josephus in *Ant.* xiii 9, 2 (260-6) should be attributed to the time of this war. It suggests that a king Antiochus had, contrary to the will of the senate, seized from the Jews the towns of Joppa, Gazara and other places (πολεμῶν ἔλαβεν Ἀντίοχος παρὰ τὸ τῆς συγκλήτου δόγμα), and that because of this a Jewish embassy (ὑπὸ δῆμου τοῦ Ἰουδαίων) had been sent to Rome with the request that the senate might effect a return of the cities taken from them by Antiochus. The senate decreed a renewal of *φιλία* and *συμμαχία* with the Jews, but postponed making a decision on their request until time could be spared from attending to its own affairs (ὅταν ἀπὸ τῶν ἰδίων ἢ συγκλήτος εὐσυχολήσῃ). As the Jews had not possessed Joppa and Gazara under an earlier Antiochus, and as the surrender of both towns constituted the chief demand made by Antiochus VII to the Jews during the time of Simon (1 Mac. 15:28), there can be little doubt that it is he who is meant in the decree of senate referred to. He must therefore, as is inherently likely, have begun the war with the seizure of these towns; and the Jews sought the support of the Romans while the war was still in progress by appealing to the decree of the senate issued in the time of Simon. Considering that the Romans, in spite of the promised *φιλία* and *συμμαχία*, left the Jews at first to their own devices, it is rather remarkable that when peace was concluded Antiochus handed back the towns he had captured against payment of tribute. Perhaps this relative disclaimer may be explained by the fact that the Romans had intervened beforehand. It seems in fact that another decree of the senate, reported by Josephus in *Ant.* xiv 10, 22 (248-50) and inserted (probably by mistake) in a decree of the people of Pergamum, should be attributed to this time. This *senatus consultum* was occasioned by a deputation sent by 'the nation of the Jews and the High Priest Hyrcanus'; and states that

6. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 8, 2-3 (236-48). Diodorus xxxiv/v 1-5; Porphyry in Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene I, p. 255; Justin xxxvi, 1 'Iudaeos quoque, qui in Macedonia imperio sub Demetrio patre armis se in libertatem vindicaverant, subigit'. Several scholars (e.g. Graetz, *Gesch.* III (1905-6), pp. 67 f.) have taken the words of Josephus *καθεῖλε δὲ καὶ τὴν στεφάνην τῆς πόλεως* as referring not to the destruction of the entire wall but only of the top of the wall, in which case his account would diverge from those of Diodorus and Porphyry. But such an interpretation is not necessary. In any case, according to Diodorus and Porphyry the wall itself was demolished. Among the praiseworthy actions of John Hyrcanus, 1 Mac. 16:23 especially emphasizes its reconstruction. Hyrcanus is said to have obtained the sum demanded by Antiochus by extracting three thousand talents from the tomb of David, so Jos. *Ant.* vii 15, 3 (393), whereas *Ant.* xiii 8, 4 (249) merely recounts that Hyrcanus employed stolen money to pay his mercenaries). On David's tomb, cf. Neh. 3:16; Jos. *Ant.* xvi 7, 1 (179); Acts 2:29. According to Neh. 3:15-16, it lay to the south of the city, not far from the Pool of Shelah.

King Antiochus, the son of Antiochus, must return to the Jews the fortresses, ports and land which he had taken from them; and that no-one must export anything tax-free from Jewish territory except King Ptolemy, the ally and friend of the Romans, and that the garrison must be removed from Joppa (τὴν ἐν Ἰόππῃ φρουρὰν ἐκβαλεῖν). Since the seizure of Jewish towns and ports by an Antiochus is mentioned here too, and Joppa is a principal bone of contention, it is reasonable to suppose that this decree of the senate relates to the same circumstances as the previous one. It would explain why Antiochus returned to the Jews, against payment of tribute, towns that he had already conquered. It would admittedly be necessary to accept that a textual corruption exists in regard to the name, for Antiochus VII Sidetes was a son not of Antiochus but of Demetrius. This intrinsically precarious assumption is not inadmissible because none of the later Seleucids (it could only be a question of Antiochus IX Cyzicenus) confronted the Jews with such a display of force as is ascribed to the Antiochus mentioned here. The statements, in so far as they emanate from Josephus, fit only Antiochus VII. All the same, the text as transmitted permits no definite decision. If both decrees of the senate are to be attributed to the period of the war between Antiochus VII and Hyrcanus I, it must have lasted for some time.⁷

7. The above hypothesis, according to which both these *senatus consulta* are to be attributed to the period of this war, was advanced by Mendelssohn in *Acta societatis philologiae Lipsiensis* 5 (1875), pp. 123-58; cf. also Mendelssohn, *Rhein. Museum* 30 (1875), pp. 118 f. Compare M. S. Ginsburg, *Rome et la Judée* (1928), pp. 65-77. On the emendations of the names in *Ant.* xiii 9, 2 (260-4), see Th. Mommsen's observations on the decree of the council of Adramyttium, *Ephemeris Epigr.* IV, p. 217. Mendelssohn's conclusions have not invariably been accepted by those who have since occupied themselves with these two *senatus consulta*. See Gutschmid, *Kleine Schriften* II, pp. 303-15; Viereck, *Sermo graecus, quo senatus populusque Romanus etc. usi sunt* (1888), pp. 93-6; A. Kuhn, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Seleukiden* (1891), pp. 3-14; J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (1958), pp. 259, 261; Unger, *SMA* (1895), pp. 575-604; Th. Reinach, 'Antiochus Cyzicène et les Juifs', *REJ* 38 (1899), pp. 161-71; H. Willrich, *Judaica* (1900), pp. 69-71; *idem*, *Urkundenfälschung in der hellenistisch-jüdischen Literatur* (1924), pp. 63-4. On the geographical references in *Ant.* xiii 9, 2 (261) see also J. Levy, 'Λιμένες et Πηγαί', *REJ* 41 (1900), pp. 176-80. Many scholars relate only *Ant.* xiii 9, 2 (260-6) to Antiochus VII Sidetes, and *Ant.* xiv 10, 22 (248-50) to Antiochus IX Cyzicenus; Reinach and Willrich associate both *senatus consulta* with the last-named. In regard to *Ant.* xiii 9, 2 (260-2), the majority do not link it to the actual period of the war, but to that following it. Said to be decisive in this respect is the fact that the Jewish envoys wished to have τὰ κατὰ τὸν πόλεμον ἐκείνον ψηφισθέντα ὑπὸ Ἀντίοχου revoked. But instead of ψηφισθέντα a number of manuscripts have the difficult ψηλαφηθέντα ('handled' or 'touched' = 'attempted'; cf. Nah. 3:1 LXX), which may perhaps be accepted (the old Latin text has *gesta*). The choice of a period subsequent to the conclusion of peace is contradicted by the fact that by the signing of the treaty the Jews were given back Joppa and the other towns on payment of tribute, whereas they were in the hands of Antiochus at the time

The conflicts of these early years under Hyrcanus showed once more that the small Jewish state could only remain free from Syrian domination as long as the Syrian empire was itself weak. With the first forceful moves by Antiochus, the freedom won by Simon was lost once again. Hyrcanus's dependence on Antiochus VII also obliged him to participate in the Syrian monarch's campaign against the Parthians in 130/29 B.C. But he escaped the disaster that overtook Antiochus.⁸

when the Jewish delegation complained to the Senate. Gutschmid, *op. cit.*, and Schlatter, *Topographie*, pp. 3-14, therefore assumed that Antiochus did not surrender them at all, which is dubious in view of his famous ἐνοβεία. The *senatus consultum* seems to fit into the war period provided that it is accepted that the war had already lasted for some time before Jerusalem was besieged. If, on the other hand, the Φάνιος named as praetor in xiii 9, 2 (260) is C. Fannius, the consul of 122 B.C., his praetorship would be expected to have been later than this, say about 126 B.C., so Broughton, *MRR II*, pp. 508-9. But the evidence on the Fannii known from this period is confused. It remains possible that one was praetor in 132 B.C., so *RE VI*, cols. 1988-9.

It is much more difficult to reach a decision in regard to *Ant.* xiv 10, 22 (248-50). The designation of the king as 'Antiochus son of Antiochus' is a forceful argument against Mendelssohn's conclusion. If the description is correct, it can in fact only mean Antiochus IX Cyzicenus (for Antiochus VII Sidetes was a son of Demetrius I, and Antiochus VII Grypus a son of Demetrius II). But it is said of this Antiochus that he 'wrested fortresses; ports and territory' from the Jews, *Ant.* xiv 10, 22 (249-50), φρούρια καὶ λιμένας καὶ χώραν καὶ εἴ τι ἄλλο ἀπέλετο αὐτῶν, and in particular that he was in possession of Joppa. If one wished to dissociate, with Gutschmid, this last-mentioned fact also from the time of Antiochus VII, Antiochus IX must himself have made considerable conquests in Palestine and have appeared so powerful that the Jews felt obliged to enlist Roman support. Yet this contradicts all that is known of Antiochus IX. Josephus emphasises most strongly that he was unable to do anything against John Hyrcanus. When Antiochus wished to undertake some aggressive move, 'Hyrcanus disclosed his own will' and despised Antiochus IX as he did his brother Antiochus VIII, *Ant.* xiii 10, 1 (274). It is true that with Egyptian support Antiochus devastated Hyrcanus's territory with acts of brigandage, but he did not dare to fight him openly because he was too weak, *Ant.* xiii 10, 2 (278). Presumably, this was not Josephus's own account but one found in his sources. But can what appears in the *senatus consultum* be accepted of such a ruler? It is also improbable that Hyrcanus sought the legal protection of the Romans for the preservation of the *status quo* against the conquests of Antiochus IX, whilst he himself was engaged in making conquests. The dating of this document remains controversial. M. Stern, 'The Relations between Judaea and Rome during the Rule of John Hyrcanus', *Zion* 26 (1961), pp. 1-22 (in Hebrew with an Engl. summary), explains *Ant.* xiii 9, 2 (260-6) against the background of political events of the years 128-5 B.C., and places *Ant.* xiv 10, 22 (248-50) in 113-12 B.C.

See also T. Fischer, *Untersuchungen zum Partherkrieg Antiochos' VII* (Diss. Tübingen, 1970), who dates the first document to 126/5 B.C. (pp. 64-73), and the second to 114-104 B.C. (pp. 73-82), and A. Giovannini, H. Müller, 'Die Beziehungen zwischen Rom und den Juden im 2 Jh. v. Chr.', *Museum Helveticum* 28 (1971), pp. 156-71, dating both to the reign of Antiochus IX.

8. *Ant.* xiii 8, 4 (250-1) quoting Nicolaus of Damascus (= Jacoby *FGrH* 90 F 92). Cf. J. Neusner, *A History of the Jews in Babylonia I* (1965), pp. 24-5.

For Hyrcanus, Antiochus's death in the Parthian campaign in 129 B.C. was providential.⁹ His place on the Syrian throne was taken for the second time by the weak Demetrius II, previously released from captivity by the Parthians.¹⁰ He was immediately involved in internal struggles which prevented him from attending to the Jews.

Hyrcanus at once set out to benefit from the altered circumstances. Disregarding Demetrius, he began to appropriate considerable territories in the vicinity of Judaea, to the east, north and south. First he marched into Transjordan and conquered Medeba after siege of six months.¹¹ Then he turned towards the north and captured Shechem and Mount Gerizim, subdued the Samaritans, and destroyed their temple. Finally, he marched southward, took the Idumaeae towns of Adora and Marissa and forced the Idumaeans to submit to circumcision and to accept the Jewish law.¹² The policy of conquest begun by Jonathan and Simon was thus vigorously continued by Hyrcanus. But the purely secular nature of his policy is revealed by the fact that he no longer fought these wars with a Jewish army, but was the first of the Jewish princes to hire mercenaries.¹³

This independent behaviour on the part of Hyrcanus was made possible by Syria's internal weakness. Soon after his re-accession to the throne, Demetrius II committed the folly of going to war against

9. On the campaign and death of Antiochus, compare Justin xxxviii 10, xxxix, 1, 1; Diodorus xxxiv/v, 15-17; Livy *Epit.* lix; Appian, *Syr.* 68/359; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 8, 4 (250-3); Porphyry in Eusebius *Chron.* ed. Schoene I, p. 255. On the chronology, cf. above p. 132.

10. On Demetrius II see Justin xxxvi 1, 1, 'Demetrius, et ipse rerum successu corruptus, vitiis adolescentiae in segnitiam labitur tantumque contemptum apud omnes inertiae, quantum odium ex superbia pater habuerat, contraxit'. On the other hand, Justin xxxix 1, 3, also speaks of a 'superbia regis, quae conversatione Parthicae crudelitatis intolerabilis facta erat'. On the actions and fortunes of Demetrius during his captivity, and his ultimate release, see Justin xxxvi 1; xxxviii 9-10; Appian, *Syr.* 67/355-6, 68/360; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 8, 4 (253); Porphyry in Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene I; p. 255.

11. Medeba, already mentioned in the Mesha inscription, is a well-known town in Transjordan, south of Heshbon, the name and ruins of which have survived. Cf. Num. 21:30; Jos. 13:9, 16; Isa. 15:2; 1 Chr. 19:7. Cf. 1 Mac. 9:36; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 1, 2 (11); 15, 4 (397); xiv 1, 4 (18); Ptolemy v 17, 6; viii 20, 20. mMikw. 7:1; Euseb. *Onomast.* ed. Klostermann, p. 128; *The Survey of Eastern Palestine I* (1889), pp. 178-83; Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, pp. 381-2. On the mosaic map found at Medeba, see M. Avi-Yonah, *The Madaba Mosaic Map* (1954).

12. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 9, 1 (255-8); *B.J.* i 2, 6 (63). Cf. *Ant.* xv 7, 9 (254). Adora is modern Dura, west-south-west of Hebron; see Abel, *Géog. Pal.* II, p. 239. On Marissa see above p. 165 (1 Mac. 5:66). As a result of the Judaization by John Hyrcanus, the Idumaeans later regarded themselves as wholly Jewish, *B.J.* iv 4, 4 (270-84). To the Jewish aristocracy, they counted only as ἡμιουδαῖοι and for this reason the Idumaeae Herod was regarded as an inferior, *Ant.* xiv 15, 2 (403) Ἡρώδης . . . ἰδιώτη τε ὄντι καὶ Ἰδουμαίῳ, τούτῳστιν ἡμιουδαίῳ.

13. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 8, 4 (249).

Ptolemy VII Physcon of Egypt. In return, the Egyptian monarch nominated a rival pretender to Demetrius's throne in the person of a young Egyptian whom he presented, according to some, as an adopted son of Antiochus Sidetes, and according to others, as a son of Alexander Balas,¹⁴ naming him Alexander (the Syrians gave him the nickname Zebinas, i.e., 'the bought one').¹⁵ Defeated by Alexander near Damascus, Demetrius was obliged to flee to Ptolemais and from there by ship to Tyre, and was murdered there just as he was about to land, in 125 B.C.¹⁶

Alexander Zebinas, for his part, had to struggle once more for the throne against Demetrius's son, Antiochus VIII Grypus. He was therefore obliged to live in peace and friendship with Hyrcanus.¹⁷

After several years, in about 123/2 B.C., Alexander Zebinas was defeated by his adversary, Antiochus VIII Grypus, and executed; according to others, he poisoned himself (see above, p. 133). A period of quiet then ensued, during which Antiochus VIII Grypus wielded undisputed authority in Syria.¹⁸ None the less he, too, took no action against John Hyrcanus. He no longer entertained any ambition to restore the old Syrian frontiers. He was deposed in 113 B.C. by his cousin and step-brother, Antiochus IX Cyzicenus, who governed the whole of Syria for two years, and then, when Antiochus Grypus re-

14. The first according to Justin, xxxix 1-4; the second according to Porphyry in Eusebius *Chron.* ed. Schoene I, pp. 257 f.

15. Porphyry in Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene I, p. 258 correctly interprets the nickname Zebinas (Ezr. 10:43 also has זבנא) by ἀγοραστός. The orthography varies between Ζεβινᾶς, Jos. *Ant.* xiii 9, 3 (268), and Ζαβινᾶς, Diodorus xxxiv/v 22; Porphyry in Euseb. *loc. cit.*; inscription in Letronne, *Recueil des inscriptions grecques et latines de l'Égypte* II, p. 61 = Bernand, *Inscriptions grecques de Philae* I (1969), no. 31. 'Zabbinæus' in Justin *Prolog.* xxxix. See in general Letronne *op. cit.* II, pp. 62 f., and Bernand, *op. cit.*, p. 235.

16. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 9, 3 (268); Justin xxxix 1, 7-8; Porphyry in Euseb. *Chron.* ed. Schoene I, pp. 257 f. On his death see especially Justin, *loc. cit.* 'Cum Tyrum religione se templi defensurus petisset, navi egrediens praefecti iussu interficitur.' According to Appian, *Syr.* 68/360, his wife Cleopatra was the instigator of the murder. Cf. Livy *Epi.* lx 'motus quoque Syriae referentur, in quibus Cleopatra Demetrium virum suum . . . interemit'.

17. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 9, 3 (269) φίλιαν ποιῆται πρὸς τὸν ἀρχιερέα.

18. Justin xxxix 2, 9, 'Parta igitur regni securitate Grypos octo annis quietem et ipse habuit et regno suo praestitit'. Immediately before this Justin mentions the forced death of Cleopatra, the mother and hitherto co-regent of Antiochus VIII (121-120 B.C., see above p. 133). By eight years he means, therefore, the period from then until the displacement of Antiochus VIII by Antiochus IX (i.e., 113 B.C.). This, however, was not entirely an era of peace, for Antiochus IX was in opposition to his brother already some time prior to 113 B.C. (see above p. 134 A. Kuhn, *Beiträge zur Gesch. der Seleukiden*, p. 19; Wilcken RE I, 2481). But Josephus is not correct in saying of Antiochus VIII that he had to fight against his brother Antiochus IX during the whole period, *Ant.* xiii 10, 1 (270-2).

possessed the greater portion of the country, stood his ground in just that part that adjoins Palestine, namely Coele-Syria.¹⁹

Diodorus gives the following description of Antiochus IX Cyzicenus, ruler of Coele-Syria from 113-95 B.C. 'No sooner had Antiochus obtained the throne than he lapsed into drunkenness and unworthy debauchery, and into pursuits quite unfitting in a king. He had a liking, that is to say, for mimes and comedians, and for conjurers in general, and endeavoured to learn their skills. He also practised puppetry assiduously and took pains to make the silver and gold animals, five cubits high, that moved automatically, and other clever gadgets. He failed, on the other hand, to make the battering-rams and engines of war which would have brought him renown and considerable advantage. But unfortunately, he was also passionately fond of adventurous hunting expeditions, and without telling his friends, frequently went off by night with two or three servants into the country to hunt lion, panthers and boars. In doing so, he often exposed himself to extreme danger by engaging in foolhardy encounters with wild animals.'²⁰

The portrait given here is a debased version of that of an earlier Antiochus, Epiphanes. Hyrcanus had nothing to fear from a ruler interested in such things as these. So in fact, after the death of Antiochus Sidetes in 129 B.C., Judaea was completely independent of Syria once more. The tributes imposed by Antiochus Sidetes were paid to none of the following kings. Hyrcanus 'no longer furnished them with anything, neither as a subject, nor as a friend.'²¹

During the last years of his reign, Hyrcanus once more launched invasions into neighbouring territories. Having subdued the district around Shechem and Mount Gerizim, he now directed his attacks against the town of Samaria, whose inhabitants had given him cause for complaint. He surrounded it with a rampart and a ditch and entrusted the conduct of the siege to his sons Antigonos and Aristobulus. The hard-pressed Samaritans called for help to Antiochus Cyzicenus, who came willingly but was driven back by the Jews. Appealed to for support a second time, Antiochus brought up Egyptian military forces supplied by Ptolemy Lathyrus, and with their assistance ravaged Jewish territory, but without achieving any decisive result. After heavy

19. Porphyry, *loc. cit.*, I, p. 260; Jos. *Ant.* xiii 10, 1 (273-4); Justin xxxix 2, 10-3, 12; Appian, *Syr.* 69/314. See above p. 134.

20. Diodorus xxxiv/v 34.

21. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 10, 1 (273) οὔτε ὡς ὑπήκοος οὔτε ὡς φίλος αὐτοῖς οὐδὲν ἐπιπαρήχεν. Another picture would emerge if the confiscation of Jewish fortresses and ports associated with an Antiochus in the *senatus consultum* in *Ant.* xiv 10, 22 (249), was due to Antiochus IX. He must then have used similar force towards the Jews as did his father, Antiochus VII. Cf. on this point p. 206 above.

losses, Antiochus withdrew from the scene of battle and left the continuation of the campaign to his generals, Callimandrus and Epicrates. Of these, one was defeated by the Jews and lost his life, and the other, Epicrates, accomplished nothing either; indeed he treacherously surrendered Scythopolis to the Jews. Samaria thus fell into the hands of the Jews after a year-long siege, and was completely razed to the ground.²² Jewish legends relate that on the day of the decisive victory of Antigonus and Aristobulus over Antiochus Cyzicenus, the event was made known to Hyrcanus by a voice from heaven as he was presenting a burnt-offering in the Temple.²³

Nothing more is known of the external events in what seems to have been the brilliant rule of Hyrcanus. It is little enough. But reliable information relating to internal circumstances is still more meagre. A certain amount may probably be gathered from numismatic sources.²⁴

22. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 10, 2-3 (275-81). *B.J.* i 2, 7 (65). *B.J.* names, not Antiochus Cyzicenus, but Antiochus Aspendus, i.e. Grypus, as the one to whom the Samaritans called for aid. These events must then have taken place earlier, during the time when Antiochus Grypus still ruled unopposed throughout the whole of Syria. But the statements concerning Ptolemy Lathyrus do not fit into this picture (see below). According to *B.J.*, Scythopolis was not surrendered to the Jews by treachery, but was conquered by them (cf. on this important city vol. II, § 23, 1). Megillath Taanith § 8 also seems to refer to the seizure of Scythopolis by the Jews on 15 and 16 Siwan. Cf. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 72 ff.; Lichtenstein, *HUCA* 8-9 (1931-2), pp. 288-9. The date of the conquest of Samaria was, according to Megillath Taanith, 25 Marḥeshwan (= November). See Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 72-3; Lichtenstein, *ibid.*, p. 289. The year may be approximately fixed from the fact that, on the one hand, Antiochus Cyzicenus was already in undisputed possession of Coele-Syria (since 111 B.C.), and on the other, Ptolemy Lathyrus was still co-regent with his mother Cleopatra (till 107 B.C.); see H. L. Strack, *Die Dynastie der Ptolemäer* (1897), pp. 185, 202 f.; cf. T. C. Skeat, *The Reigns of the Ptolemies* (1954), pp. 15-16. The conquest of Samaria therefore occurred, in any case between 111-107 B.C., and probably not long before 107 B.C., for Cleopatra was so enraged at Ptolemy for assisting Antiochus that she 'very nearly' dispossessed him of power, see Jos. *Ant.* xiii 10, 2 (278) *ἄσπον οὕτω τῆς ἀρχῆς αὐτὸν ἐκβεβλήκυσας*. There is some archaeological evidence of the destruction of Samaria at this moment, see J. W. Crowfoot, K. M. Kenyon, E. L. Sukehnik, *The Buildings at Samaria* (1942), p. 121, and G. A. Reisner, C. S. Fisher, D. G. Lyon, *Harvard Excavations at Samaria I* (1924), pp. 50-8. For the historical and religious significance of the destruction in the light of recent evidence see F. M. Cross, 'Aspects of Samaritan and Jewish History in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times', *HThR* 59 (1966), pp. 201-11; 'Papyri of the Fourth Century B.C. from Dāliyah', *New Directions in Bibl. Arch.*, ed. D. N. Freedman, J. C. Greenfield (Anchor, 1971), pp. 45-69.

23. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 10, 3 (282-3). For the rabbinic passages (tSoṭ. 13:5; ySoṭ 24b; bSoṭ 33a) see Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 74; E. E. Urbach, 'When did Prophecy end?', *Tarbiz* 17 (1946/7), pp. 1-11 (in Hebrew with an Engl. summary).

24. Contrary to the opinion of earlier numismatists, the majority, or even the totality, of the Yehohanan coins are ascribed today to Hyrcanus II (see below, Appendix IV, p. 604). Y. Meshorer, *Jewish Coins of the Second Temple Period* (1967), pp. 41-5, argues that Hyrcanus I issued no coins at all. It seems, however,

The coins attributed to Hyrcanus bear the following inscription:

יהוחנן הכהן הגדל וחבר היהודים

The meaning of the penultimate word, much disputed by earlier scholars, is now generally accepted to be 'congregation', i.e. the *γερουσία* of the Jewish nation known from later documents as the Sanhedrin. The inscription would therefore run: 'John the High Priest and the Congregation of the Jews'.²⁵ This official title shows that John Hyrcanus still regarded himself first and foremost as a priest. As in pre-Maccabean Jewry, the Hasmonaean state was administered by priests. The ruling chief priest was, however, not an autocrat, but governed his people and issued coins in conjunction with the 'congregation of the Jews', i.e. the national assembly. Nevertheless, the very fact that he stamped his name on his coins seems to reveal that John was increasingly aware of himself as a prince. In addition to the numismatic evidence reflecting, possibly, the constitution of the Jewish state under Hyrcanus I, the letter prefacing 2 Maccabees testifies to a religious custom in his time. This was addressed in 124 B.C. to the Jewish community in Egypt and urged them to observe the festival of Hanukkah.²⁶

With regard to the internal policy adopted by Hyrcanus during his thirty years' reign, one very important fact is well established at least: his breach with the Pharisees and dependence on the Sadducees. The two parties now appear on the stage of history for the first time under

safer to assign to him, with B. Kanael, *IEJ* 2 (1952), pp. 170-5, and A. Kindler, *ibid.*, 4 (1954), Pl. 14, a limited number of the standard coinage, probably minted during the last years of his reign (c. 110 B.C.). Cf. Appendix IV, p. 603. See now also A. Ben-David, 'When did the Maccabees begin to strike their first Coins?', *PEQ* 124 (1972), pp. 93-103.

25. For nineteenth-century views concerning the sense of *חבר*, see F. W. Madden, *Coins of the Jews*, p. 77 f. Since then substantial agreement has been achieved on explaining the term as 'congregation', designating either the whole Jewish community (so Schürer), or the senate of the Jews (e.g. Geiger, *Urschrift*, pp. 121-2; Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 83; Wellhausen, *Isr. u. jüd. Gesch.* (1958), p. 269; J. Klausner, *Historiyah shel ha-Bayit ha-sheni* III (1952), p. 97; B. Kanael, 'Altjüd. Münzen', *Jahrb. f. Numism. u. Geldgesch.* 17 (1967), p. 167; Meshorer, *op. cit.*, p. 49. A linguistic parallel appears in *CIS* 12:8, where *חבר/חבור* describes an authoritative body within Jewry. Cf. Ç. Rabin, *The Zadokite Documents* (1954), pp. 60-1. The Phoenician phrase attested in *CIS* I 165, 'the two suffets and *חברונם* = their colleagues' has been understood by most scholars since Renan as alluding either to a senate, or its executive committee. See G. A. Cooke, *A Text-Book of North-Semitic Inscriptions* (1903), p. 116; H. Donner-W. Röllig, *Kanaanäische u. aramäische Inschriften* II (1968), p. 84. It has also been argued that the expression *חבר העיר* can mean 'council of the city community', e.g. in *bMeg.* 27b; see R. Meyer, *Tradition und Neuschöpfung* (1965), pp. 25-6.

26. 2 Mac. 1:19. It encapsulates (7-8) a quotation from a previous letter written in the Seleucid year 169 (143/2 B.C.) with the same object. See Abel, *ad loc.* and *Excursus* IV (pp. 299-302); E. Bickermann, 'Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr.', *ZNW* 32 (1933), pp. 233-54.

these names. Their beginnings reach far back into the past, but their consolidation seems to have been a consequence of the Maccabean movement.²⁷ The Pharisees were simply the party of the strict observers of the Law; they belonged in essence to the same circles as those encountered at the start of the Maccabean movement under the name of the 'Devout', or Hasidim. At that time, their extreme opposites were the pro-Greeks who co-operated so thoroughly with the aspirations of Antiochus Epiphanes that they not only opened the gates to Hellenism within the field of civil life, but also within that of religious worship. These phil-Hellenes, who were drawn in particular from the upper ranks of the priesthood, were swept away in the turmoil of the Maccabean movement. Voices of this kind were no longer allowed to make themselves heard in the Jewish community. Nevertheless, the base from which the tendency had sprung still remained, namely, the essentially worldly spirit, antipathetic to any religious enthusiasm, of the high-ranking priesthood. They doubtless intended to abide by the Law of Moses, but whatever went beyond its letter they rejected with cool superiority. Their real interests were concerned more with this life and the present than with the life to come and the future. This tendency, which was mainly represented by the higher priests, the 'Sons of Zadok', was now called that of the Zadokites or Sadducees.²⁸

Originally, the Maccabees belonged neither to the Pharisees nor the Sadducees. The zeal for the Law which had pressed their swords into their hands bound them to the Hasidim, who in the beginning had also participated in the struggle for independence. But soon they both went their divided ways, more beside one another than with one another.

27. Josephus mentions them first, together with the Essenes, during the period of Jonathan, *Ant.* xiii 5, 9 (171-3).

28. For further details concerning the nature and origin of the Pharisees and Sadducees, see § 26. On the Essenes, see § 30.

The origin of the Qumran community and its relation to the Essenes will also be discussed fully in § 30. But in order to provide a more complete picture of the religious parties under John Hyrcanus, it seems appropriate to outline here a few basic data on which there is substantial agreement among experts.

The beginnings of the Qumran sect are connected generally with the emergence and subsequent disintegration of the Hasidic movement. Unlike those Hasidim (the Pharisees) who until John Hyrcanus collaborated with the Maccabees, another group with priestly members and Zadokite loyalties broke away from the new rulers, probably at the time of Jonathan's acceptance from Alexander Balas of the High Priesthood. Whether the Hasmonaean enemy of the sect is to be identified with Jonathan, or Simon, or both (4Q Testimonia, DJD V, no. 175, p. 58 speaks of 'two instruments of violence'), it can be accepted as certain on archaeological grounds that the sectarian establishment at Qumran existed during the time of Hyrcanus I, or even perhaps that of Simon. According to R. de Vaux, Period I of the site's occupation falls into two parts, the second of which (Ib) corresponds, on numismatic evidence, to the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103-

The Hasidim were not concerned with political supremacy or political freedom. For the Maccabees, these were points of vital importance. They did not of course abandon their original aim, the preservation of the religion of their fathers. But as time wore on, it became increasingly bound up with quite other political aims. And it was precisely these that brought them into closer relation with the Sadducees. As political parvenus, the Maccabees dared not ignore the influential Sadducean nobility. It may be taken for granted that in the *γερονσία* of the Maccabean period the 'Sadducees' were also represented. Despite all this, however, in religious matters the Maccabees were originally closer to the Pharisees than to the Sadducees. They were the guardians of the ancestral faith and the ancestral law. In the case of Hyrcanus, it is definitely assumed that in the early years of his reign he followed the observances of the Pharisees. For it was his abrogation of Pharisaic precepts that constituted the chief accusation leveled against him by the more strictly observant Jews.²⁹

This dual position of the Maccabees explains the swing which occurred during Hyrcanus's reign. The more his political interests came to the fore, the more those concerned with religion receded into the background. But he was correspondingly obliged to move away from the Pharisees and closer to the Sadducees. For in view of the distinctly worldly character of his policies, no sincere association with the Pharisees was in the long run possible. It is therefore not surprising that he broke openly with the Pharisees and adopted unreservedly the Sadducean outlook.

The ostensible occasion of the breach between Hyrcanus and the Pharisees is described by Josephus and the Talmud as follows. Once, when a number of Pharisees were in his home as guests, Hyrcanus asked them, if they observed him doing anything unlawful, to call his attention to it and point out the right way to him. All those present were full of his praises. But one of them, Eleazar, stood up and said: 'As you wish to hear the truth, then know that if you seek to be

76 B.C.). In consequence, Period Ia, beginning with the foundation of the communal settlement, must have preceded Jannaeus by several decades, and may go back to the middle of the second century B.C. See R. de Vaux, *L'archéologie et les manuscrits de la Mer Morte* (1961), pp. 3-4, 15. Cf. also G. Vermès, *Discovery*, pp. 12-18; *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English*, pp. 53-4; F. M. Cross, *The Ancient Library of Qumran*, pp. 42-4; J. T. Milik, *Ten Years of Discovery*, p. 51; 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. 71-2 [the Qumran site was founded between 150-100 B.C., more probably between 140-120 B.C.].

29. Josephus even says in *Ant.* xiii 10, 5. (289): *μαθητῆς δ' αὐτῶν καὶ Ἰρκανὸς ἐλεγόνει καὶ σφόδρα ὑπ' αὐτῶν ἠγαπᾶτο.*

righteous, lay down the office of High Priest and content yourself with ruling the nation'. When Hyrcanus asked for the reason, the other replied: 'Because we hear from our elders that your mother was taken captive under King Antiochus Epiphanes'. This allegation being incorrect, Hyrcanus flew into a rage. When he then enquired of the Pharisees what punishment Eleazar deserved, they said, 'stripes and chains'. Hyrcanus, who believed that death was the fitting consequence of such abuse, became even more furious and thought Eleazar had spoken with the approval of his party. From then on, he dissociated himself entirely from the Pharisees, forbade on pain of punishment all observance of the laws drawn up by them, and joined the ranks of the Sadducees.³⁰

In its anecdotal form, the story certainly bears the stamp of a legend and it was probably derived by Josephus solely from an oral tradition. Nevertheless, it may be considered as a fact that Hyrcanus unquestionably turned away from the Pharisees and abolished their ordinances. For Alexandra's reintroduction of Pharisaic laws was a conscious reaction against the policy pursued from the time of Hyrcanus.³¹ A few ordinances set aside by Hyrcanus are mentioned in the Mishnah. But in view of Hyrcanus's total opposition to everything Pharisaic, the cases cited in the Mishnah are to be regarded merely as details selected at random.³²

Reviewing Hyrcanus's period of rule, Josephus judges him fortunate to have been 'thought worthy by God of three of the greatest things: government of his people, the priestly honour, and the gift of

30. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 10, 5-6 (288-98). For the rabbinic tradition, see Graetz, *Gesch.* III (1905-6), pp. 687-9; Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, pp. 79-80. Note that bKidd. 66a confuses John Hyrcanus with his son Alexander Jannaeus (יואי המלך). But the Babylonian teacher who told the story (Abayye) asserted elsewhere (bBer. 29a) the identity of יואי and יוחנן. See below p. 223, n. 16. Cf. in general Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und Sadducäer*, pp. 89-95. R. Marcus, 'The Pharisees in the Light of Modern Scholarship', *Journ. of Rel.* 23 (1952), pp. 153-64; L. Finkelstein, *The Pharisees* (1962), pp. 762-3; A. Michel, J. Le Moyne, 'Pharisiens', *DB Suppl.* (1964), cols. 1022-1115.

31. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 16, 2 (408).

32. See mM.Sh. 5:15=mSoḥ. 9:10, 'Yohanan, the High Priest, abolished confession concerning the Second Tithe. He also abolished the singing of the verse "Awake" (Ps. 44:24) and the stunning of the sacrificial victim. Until his time, the hammer was in use in Jerusalem (on intermediary days between the first and the last day of a festival season). In his time, no man needed to enquire concerning Demai (i.e. whether tithes had been paid on the corn bought).' See W. Bunte, *Maaserot/Maaser Scheni* (1962), pp. 243-5; H. Bietenhard, *Sota* (1956), pp. 157-60. Cf. Derenbourg, *op. cit.*, p. 71. On confession relative to tithing, see Dt. 26:12-15; Jos. *Ant.* iv 8, 22 (242-3); mM.Sh. 5:6-15. See also mPar. 3:5 mentioning Yohanan among the High Priests under whom, according to the law in Num. 19, a red heifer was burnt. See also S. Zeitlin, 'Johanan the High Priest's Abrogations and Decrees', *Studies and Essays in Honor of A. A. Neuman* (1962), pp. 569-79.

prophecy'.³³ His reign appears to the Jewish historian to have been a pre-eminently happy one.³⁴ He is right if political power is regarded as the measure of prosperity. Following his ancestors' advancement of Jewish territory as far as the sea by means of the acquisition of Joppa and Gazara and other conquests in the west, Hyrcanus had, by new conquests in the east, south and north, and by ensuring his independence of Syria, created a Jewish state such as had not existed since the dispersal of the ten tribes, and perhaps not since the partition of the kingdom after the death of Solomon.

Among the great sepulchral monuments in the vicinity of Jerusalem, Josephus frequently mentions in the *Jewish War* that of the 'High Priest John'.³⁵

33. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 10, 7 (299-300). An Aramaic echo of the belief in the prophetic character of Hyrcanus I may be detected in a pro-Hasmonaean relic surviving in Tg. Ps. Jon. on Dt. 33:11 (the blessing of Levi): 'Bless o Lord the sacrifices of the House of Levi, those who give the tenth from the tithe, and receive with pleasure the oblation from the hand of Elijah the priest which he offered on Mount Carmel. Break the loins of Ahab, his enemy, and the neck of the false prophets who rose against him. As for the enemies of John the High Priest, may they have no foot to stand on.' The exegesis underlying this Targum passage associates Elijah, the model of the true prophet opposed by false teachers, with John Hyrcanus, hated by his enemies (the Pharisees). See A. Geiger, *Urschrift*, p. 479; P. Kahle, *The Cairo Geniza* (1959), pp. 202-3; R. Meyer, 'Elijah und Ahab', *Abraham unser Vater, Festschr. O. Michel* (1963), pp. 356-68; R. Le Déaut, *Introduction*, pp. 92-3. See also J. Bassfreund, *MGWJ* 44 (1900), pp. 481-6; G. Dalman, *Grammatik*, p. 30; *Die Worte Jesu* (1930), pp. 68-9.

34. Jos. *Ant.* xiii 10, 7 (299).

35. Jos. *B.J.* v 6, 2 (259); 7, 3 (304); 9, 2 (356); 11, 4 (468); vi 2, 10 (169). For an identification of John Hyrcanus as one of 'the last Priests of Jerusalem' in IQpHab., see G. Vermes, *Discovery in the Judean Desert* (1956), p. 79; *The Dead Sea Scrolls in English* (1968), p. 65.