

The Impact of a Change in Political Constitution on Early Palestinian Judaism during the period 175- 161 B.C.E.

by

M.E. Molyneaux

Thesis presented as partial fulfilment for the
degree

MASTER OF ARTS (M.A.)

(Ancient Near Eastern Studies)

At the University of Stellenbosch

Pectora cadunt cultus recti

Department of Ancient Studies

February

2002

Supervisor: Prof. Johann Cook

I, Mary Eleanor Molyneaux, the undersigned, hereby declare that the work contained in this thesis is my own original work and that I have not previously in its entirety or in part submitted it at any university for a degree.

Signature:

Date: 4 February 2002

M.E.Molyneaux (Student number): 12675067 - 1996

ABSTRACT

This study looks at a watershed period in the history of Judaism. In 175 B.C.E. a group of Jews sought to break Judaea out of the isolation in which it had stood since the Persian period. They wished to develop closer ties with their neighbours in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia and the Greek world in general. Since the Persian period the people of Judaea had been governed by high priests according to the 'ancestral laws' i.e. the Torah and its interpretation by Ezra. This 'ancestral law' had been confirmed as binding on all Jews by Antiochus III in his decree of 198 B.C.E. In order to move beyond the restrictions placed on contact between Jews and other peoples, it would be necessary to have the political status of Judaea changed. A change of political status could only be brought about by the king or one of his successors.

In 175 B.C.E. a group of Jews requested Antiochus IV to permit them to transform Judaea from an ethnos into a polis. He agreed and the transformation was begun. It is these events of 175 B.C.E. that form the base of this study. The writer uses the model of Cultural Anthropology to form a framework in which these and subsequent events can be analysed. In this way we can get a better understanding of how events progressed. How a political reform ended in a religious suppression and persecution and finally a successful revolt against the Seleucid kingdom.

The Torah and its interpretation stood at the center of Jewish life. Each group interpreted the law in their own way and understood events in relation to this interpretation. Therefore no analysis of this period can be undertaken without taking the law and its various interpretations into account. The law is the thread that holds all facets of this work together.

OPSOMMING

Hierdie studie handel oor 'n tydperk van waterskeiding in die geskiedenis van die Judaïsme. In 175 vC. wou 'n groep Jode in Palestina wegbreek uit die isolasie waarin hulle hulleself bevind het sedert die oornome deur die Persiese ryk. Hulle wou graag nouer bande met hulle buurstate en die Griekse wêreld aanknoop. Sedert die Persiese tydperk is die mense van Juda deur hōepriesters regeer, volgens die 'voorvaderlike wette', dws die Torah en sy vertolking volgens Esra. Alle Jode was gebind deur hierdie 'voorvaderlike wette' deur Antiogus III se dekreet van 198 vC. Indien die mense die beperkings teen kontak met ander volke sou wou ophef, sou dit nodig wees om die politieke status van Juda te verander. Net die koning of een van sy opvolgers kon die politieke status van Juda verander.

In 175 vC. word Antiogus IV deur 'n groep Jode gevra om verlof om Jerusalem in 'n Griekse polis te omskep. Hy het ingestem en die omskepping het begin. Hierdie gebeurtenisse van 175 vC. vorm die basis van hierdie studie. Die skrywer gebruik die kultuur-antropologiese teoretiese model as raamwerk vir die ontleding van hierdie en opvolgende gebeurtenisse. Hierdie model stel ons in staat om die ontwikkelinge in Juda beter te verstaan en meer spesifiek 'n antwoord op die volgende vraag te kry: "Hoekom het politieke hervorming tot godsdienstige verdrukking en vervolging aanleiding gegee en in die finale instansie tot 'n suksesvolle opstand teen die Seleukied koninkryk gelei?"

Die Torah en sy vertolking het die sentrum van die Joodse lewe gevorm. Elke groep in Juda het die 'wet' op sy eie manier vertolk en ontwikkelinge in verband daarmee probeer verstaan. Daarom is dit nie moontlik om hierdie tydperk te bestudeer sonder 'n erkenning van die waarde van die 'wet' en sy verskillende vertolkings nie. Die 'wet' is die goue draad wat hierdie studie byeen hou.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

A number of people and institutions have been helpful in bringing this thesis to fruition. The writer is most grateful to all those who helped, in whatever capacity, to turn an idea into a completed reality. There are however certain individuals and institutions who deserve special mention.

I wish to thank Prof. Cook for accepting the idea in the first place and seeing its potential. Prof. Cook has been supportive of this work throughout the lengthy research stage and final writing. I especially wish to thank Prof. Cook for his encouragement during the final stage of writing up. This was most helpful. I would also like to thank the other members of the Department of Ancient Near Eastern Studies at Stellenbosch University for their help and assistance over the years, especially Mrs. Huismann.

I wish to thank the librarians, circulation staff and inter-library loan staff of the J S Gericke Library, Stellenbosch; the Theology Library, Stellenbosch and Rhodes University Library for all their assistance in obtaining the sources needed to complete this work. A special thank you to Neil Hendriksz of the J S Gericke Library who was most helpful in the initial research phase of this thesis.

I wish to thank my family and friends for all the support, whether material, emotional or spiritual, they have given me during the researching and writing of this thesis. I especially wish to thank my father and Mrs. Inseal of Grahamstown with whom I have lived for most of the time it has taken to complete this thesis. They have shown great understanding, love and support throughout, even in the most trying circumstances. God bless you all.

The financial assistance of the National Research Foundation towards this research is hereby acknowledged. Opinions expressed and conclusions arrived at, are those of the author and are not necessarily to be attributed to the NRF.

CONTENTS

1. INTRODUCTION	1
1.1 Setting the problem	1
1.2 Methodological Considerations	4
1.2.1 The classical period	4
1.2.2 The Renaissance	5
1.2.3 The Enlightenment	6
1.2.3.1 Rationalism	6
1.2.3.2 Idealism	6
1.2.3.3 Romanticism	7
1.2.4 The modern period	7
1.2.4.1 Historicism	8
1.2.5. Post-modernism	10
1.2.6. Conclusion	11
1.3 The Political Situation in the Ancient Near East from Alexander the Great to the fall of the Hellenistic Monarchies	12
1.3.1 Alexander the Great	13
1.3.2 The Diadochi	14
1.3.3 The Ptolemies	16
1.3.4 The Seleucids	21
1.3.5 The Romans	25

2.	SOURCES FOR THIS PERIOD IN EARLY	
	JUDAISM	28
2.1	Non – Literary Sources	28
2.1.1	Geographical Sources	28
2.1.2	Archaeology	29
2.2	The Literary Sources	30
2.2.1	The Primary Sources	31
2.2.1.1	I Maccabees	33
2.2.1.2	II Maccabees	35
2.2.1.3	Josephus	37
2.2.1.3.1	The War of the Jews	38
2.2.1.3.2	The Antiquities of the Jews	39
2.2.2	The Secondary Sources	40
3.	PALESTINIAN JUDAISM DURING	
	THE PERIOD 332 TO 175 B.C.E.	41
3.1	Palestinian Judaism under Alexander the Great and the Diadochi	43
3.2	Palestinian Judaism under the Ptolemies	46
3.2.1	The Tobiads	48
3.2.2	Jewish Literature in Greek	52
3.3	Palestinian Judaism under the Seleucids	53
3.3.1	Palestinian Judaism under Antiochus III	53
3.3.2	Palestinian Judaism under Seleucus IV	55

4.	PALESTINIAN JUDAISM DURING THE REIGN OF ANTIOCHUS IV EPI- PHANES 175 TO 164 B.C.E.	59
4.1	The Events of the Year 175 B.C.E.	60
4.2	Palestinian Judaism during the high priesthood of Jason	62
4.3	Palestinian Judaism during the high priesthood of Menelaus	68
4.3.1	The Egyptian Campaigns of Antiochus IV	70
4.3.1.1	The First Egyptian Campaign of Antiochus IV 170- 169 B.C.E. and its Effect on Palestinian Judaism	71
4.3.1.2	The Second Egyptian Campaign of Antiochus IV and its impact on Palestinian Judaism	72
4.3.1.2.1	Jason's Revolt in Judaea	72
4.3.2	The Expedition of Apollonius to Judaea	73
4.3.3	The Suppression of Judaism and the Religious Persecution	76
4.3.3.1	Why was a suppression of the Jewish religion undertaken by the Seleucid authorities?	77
4.3.3.2	What form did the religious suppression take?	79
4.3.4	The Maccabean Revolt up to the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes	81
4.3.4.1	The taking of Jerusalem and the Purification of the Temple by the Forces of Judas	85
4.3.4.2	The death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes	86

5.	THE EFFECTS OF CHANGES IN REGIME ON PALESTINIAN JUDAISM DURING THE PERIOD 163 TO 161 B.C.E.	88
5.1	The Campaigns of Judas among the neighbouring peoples	89
5.2	The Campaign of Antiochus V and Lysias in Judaea in 163 B.C.E.	89
5.2.1	The Peace Terms between Antiochus V and the Jewish People	90
5.3	Judas continues the fight from the Gophna Hills	92
5.4	The relations between Demetrius I and the Jewish People	92
5.4.1	The Campaigns of Nicanor in Judaea	94
5.4.2	The Second Campaign of Bacchides in Judaea and the death of Judas	94
6.	CONCLUSION	96
	BIBLIOGRAPHY	110

1. INTRODUCTION

The post-exilic and classical periods were the formative periods in the development of Early Judaism. This period began with the return from exile of a group of Jews whose brief was to rebuild their homeland and ended with the destruction of the temple in 70 C.E. and the crushing of the Bar-Kochba Revolt in 135 C.E. The result of these latter events was the ending of Judaea as a political entity. Although Judaea ceased to exist as an independent political entity, Judaism survived these events.

How was it possible for Judaism to survive when Judaea had ceased to exist as an independent political entity and many of the Jews were exiled from their homeland? It is possible in the study of the events which overtook Judaea and Judaism, especially under the Hellenistic monarchies and Rome, to trace the lines of development which resulted in the survival of Judaism.

During these periods, change and formation was not only taking place in Judaea and Judaism but throughout the known world. Dynasties came and went. Empires and Kingdoms rose and fell. These events often touched on Judaism. Ancient peoples were being influenced by the new ways which Greek and later Roman Hellenism presented to them. Some were engulfed by these new ways and lost touch with their ancient heritage and became fully part of the Hellenistic world. Others fought these changes and attempted to hold onto the old ways. This study will look at Judaism at a period when some sought to bring it into line with the forms of Greek Hellenism, while others vehemently opposed such moves.

1.1 SETTING THE PROBLEM

The period 175-161 B.C.E. can be seen as a watershed in the development of Judaism. The events of this period were to have a lasting influence on Judaism during the Greek and Roman periods and even into our own times. The survival of modern day Judaism is the result of the accommodating approach of the Pharisees in the wake of Roman suppression (Otzen 1990:125).

Since the return from exile in Babylon the people of Judaea had lived isolated from the mainstream of society in the hills of Judaea. Judaea had become a temple state centred on the temple in Jerusalem and governed by the high priest. This government and

all aspects of Jewish life were regulated by the 'ancestral laws' i.e. the Torah of Moses and its interpretation by Ezra and the scribes who followed him. These 'ancestral laws' and their interpretations severely restricted those who wished for closer ties with the outside world. From the time of Alexander the Great's conquest of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia those opposed to the restrictions placed on contact with the outside world grew in number. It was mainly the members of the aristocracy, who had greater dealings with the new Greek kingdoms, who saw the advantages Judaea would gain by a more open approach to the Hellenistic kingdoms and the greater Hellenistic world in general. This group within Judaism felt that one could still retain one's identity as a Jew if one took a more liberal approach to the Torah of Moses. Those who opposed this view felt that it was only possible to retain one's Jewish identity by strict adherence to the Torah of Moses and its interpretation by Ezra and isolation from the outside world with all its pagan influences. When Antiochus III conquered Coele-Syria and Phoenicia in 200 B.C.E. he issued decrees and proclamations concerning Judaea and its status within the Seleucid kingdom. He confirmed the right of the Jewish *ethnos* to live according to the 'ancestral laws'. This then made the 'ancestral laws' and their conservative interpretation binding on all Jews. It effectively reinforced the policy of the isolation of Judaea from its neighbours and the outside world. This policy could only be changed by a decree of the king or one of his successors.

During this period the form of political constitution in Judaea was changed. From being an *ethnos*, Judaea changed its form of government to that of a *polis*. This change was requested by members of the priestly and lay aristocracy when Antiochus IV acceded to the Seleucid throne. The question to be asked is how did a political reform lead to a religious suppression and persecution in Judaea and ultimately to a successful revolt against the Seleucid kingdom? When answering this question it is necessary to take into account the different ways in which the 'ancestral laws' were interpreted by different groups within Palestinian Judaism. The characters and motives of the various protagonists and antagonists involved in the events in Judaea of this period need to be analysed. It is also necessary to understand how international events impacted on Judaism at this time. The writer has chosen to look at this question by placing a framework around this period based on the model of Cultural Anthropology. This framework works on the

premise that a change in one cultural domain will result in changes to the other cultural domains making up the community under study. It is the hypothesis of the writer that the change in the form of political constitution in Judaea at this time led to the changes and problems experienced in the other cultural domains which made up Early Palestinian Judaism. This study will therefore use the change in political status of Judaea as a base from which to analyse the developments that occurred in Judaea at this time in particular the problems that developed in the religious sphere. The place of the 'ancestral laws' in Judaea will supply the thread which holds the different events that occurred in Judaea during this period together.

In order to clarify the impact of this change in political constitution on Early Judaism, this work will be structured in the following way. The first chapter will be primarily devoted to the methodological considerations involved in analyzing this period in Early Judaism. It will also give a brief account of the political situation in the Ancient Near East from the time of Alexander the Great to the period under study.

The second chapter will involve an in-depth look at the major sources for this period. These sources will be enumerated, their uses and problems discussed, then each of the major sources will be individually analyzed.

In the third chapter, the period from the conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great to the death of Seleucus IV in 175 B.C.E. will be addressed. This will form the background to the main area of study, as it will show trends in Judaea and the outside world which led to the events which are of prime importance for this study. Of prime importance during this period will be the decree of Antiochus III 'the Great' confirming the Torah i.e. the ancestral laws as the constitution of Judaea. This decree also confirmed the special status of the Jews as an *ethnos*.

Chapter four will focus on an analysis of the events which occurred in Judaea during the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The events of this period are particularly important for an understanding of later developments in Judaea and Judaism during the Greek and Roman periods. In this chapter the focus will be on the political and religious domains, especially the results which the change in political constitution from *ethnos* to *polis* had on the other aspects of Early Judaism at this time.

The death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 164 B.C.E saw a change in leadership of the Seleucid Empire. Chapter five will look at how the change in Seleucid leadership affected the situation in Judaea during the period 163-161 B.C.E. It will show a return to the constitutional situation as confirmed by Antiochus III 'the Great' in his decree of 198 B.C.E. Although the constitution returned to what it had been previously, the general political situation in Judaea was still unstable due to the events which had occurred in the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Chapter six will be in the form of a conclusion, which will show how changes in one cultural domain eg. the political will result in changes occurring in other cultural domains eg. religion, social, economic, environment. It will also highlight the role of individual people on the way in which cultural change of whatever sort affects the general community which is undergoing the changes.

1.2 METHODOLOGICAL CONSIDERATIONS

In order to effectively deal with a period so far removed from our own late twentieth century, it is essential for the student to be aware of the limitations which their own culture places on their ability to 'truly' understand what went on in another culture especially events which occurred so long ago. For any methodology to further the goals of historical and cultural scholarship it must take into account the present, the past and the gap which separates the two. In attempting to acknowledge these differences and bridge the gap, various problems emerge especially those of anachronistic reporting and relativity.

1.2.1 The classical period

The study of history itself and its status as an academic and scientific discipline has been exercised by scholars and philosophers since the first recorded histories of the Greeks Herodotus and Thucydides. Since the time of Aristotle's Poetics, in which he describes the value and relevance of poetry over history as a useful tool in understanding reality, there has been a constant fight by historians to have their craft recognised as a useful discipline. For Aristotle poetry was superior to history in that it allowed one by means of imaginative understanding and interpretative flair to derive general principles from the

particular whereas history was only able to record the particular in a mechanical way (Southgate 1996:15).

1.2.2 The Renaissance

In the period prior to the Renaissance the world was understood in the universal categories of Aristotle's logic. However, Aristotle's logic and all aspects of life were also understood and given meaning through the precepts of the Bible. All thinking was God-centred. History during this period was viewed from the perspective of Aristotle's Poetics, which sought to arrive at universal values rather than at mere description of what had happened in the past. Generally, history of this period focussed on the recent past and the lives of famous persons, both religious and secular. By means of allegory universal values and human virtues could be extracted from the past to teach people in the present how to live (Deist 1987:11).

During the course of the Renaissance with its fascination for the past, especially the classical periods of Greek and Rome, scholars and philosophers began to look at the world anew. This resurgence in studies of the past should have enhanced the place of history in the scholarly world but the world was changing and the new ways in which the world was understood put even greater pressure on history as an academic and scientific discipline. Although most scholars remained God-fearing, they began to look more closely at the natural world around them and found that the Aristotelian/Bible view of the world did not satisfactorily answer their questions concerning how man, the world and the universe worked and fitted together. Instead of the categories of Aristotle, they now looked to the mechanics of the natural order to explain the world. This change in focus was to impact directly on how the past was studied and understood.

Whereas under the old system one could only understand the world in logical and rational terms, with the rise of the natural sciences it became evident that the world in all its facets could only be explained in terms of mathematical and mechanical laws (Deist 1987:11). This change in world view, which saw the world being understood as a mechanism which operated according to fixed laws, meant that history also had to be studied in the light of this new thinking. The purpose of history now changed and the aim was to discover the laws which governed human existence. If the universe and history were governed by fixed laws, it would seem that the notion of the past as unique and

unrepeatable could not stand, as the idea of fixed laws as understood in the natural sciences implied repeatability. This problem of the significance and value of the particular over the general in the study of the past has led over the centuries to history being denigrated as non-scientific and having little value for an understanding of the present. It was a Cinderella discipline.

1.2.3 The Enlightenment

The move away from Aristotelian logic to naturalism as the way of understanding the world during the Renaissance and Enlightenment was not without opposition. The first major challenge to the thinking of the naturalists came from Kant and those who maintained that the natural laws governing nature were not reality itself but only categories of thought by which we talk about reality. These scholars maintained that knowledge and understanding had their foundation in *Rationalism*.

1.2.3.1 Rationalism

It is the inherent mental categories of the human mind which sorts the jumble of impressions with which humans come into contact in the natural world into lawlike systems (Deist 1987:12). This meant that although one could talk about history in terms of universal laws, these laws were only ways of making history comprehensible. They were not inherent in the historical events themselves (Deist 1987:12). Unlike the naturalists, the rationalists believed that humans by their free will could choose which path to take and their actions could not therefore be the result of fixed natural laws. This idea was developed by Fichte who worked out a theory in which the human mind was part of a universal spirit which was the ground of all reality (Deist 1987:14). In order to understand reality one had to write a history of the spirit. The past studied in this way would show the different ways in which the absolute spirit manifests itself. This development of Fichte's resulted in the philosophy of *idealism*, which saw spirit supplanting nature as the primary source of reality.

1.2.3.2 Idealism

Developing on Fichte's work Hegel came up with a formula which could be used to show how the absolute spirit manifested itself in an evolutionary way throughout human history. His formula of thesis, antithesis and synthesis would provide historians with a

helpful conceptual scheme for understanding and studying the past. This formula was to become the successful cornerstone on which Marx was to base his system of dialectical materialism.

1.2.3.3 Romanticism

The Enlightenment also produced a third reaction, that of Romanticism. The central idea of Romanticism was that of man as a free, unique being. This freedom of man was in opposition to the naturalist view in which everything, including man, was governed by natural laws. It was a response to the problem of determinism which *naturalism* had placed on history and human studies. The romanticists held to the naturalists view that there was a world in itself which was independent of our knowledge of reality (Deist 1987:12). It was the central view of the Romanticists that every person, place and period was free, unique and individual which was to influence the course of historical knowledge, understanding and study from this period. The purpose of historical study was no longer to abstract generalities, the laws governing the past or universal features, but rather to find that which was unique, unrepeatable and individual in nations, periods and people (Deist 1987:13). This was how Leopold von Ranke saw the task of the historian. By intensive and critical study of the sources, the historian was to so immerse himself in that period that he would be able to "...emphathise with and understand what was individual, unrepeatable and unique in the person, nation or period concerned: not in terms of abstract generalities, but 'as it really was'" (Deist 1987:13).

These then were the three movements which developed in the period of the Enlightenment. Modern historiography was to develop in tandem with developments and debates within and between these three movements. How history was to be studied on the ground was also influenced by how one understood history in the light of these disparate understandings of reality. The critical study of sources was to be the ground in which all theories of history were to develop in future.

1.2.4 The modern period

During the seventeenth and eighteenth centuries there was a major resurgence in ancient studies. In their study of the minutiae of the past the antiquarians developed techniques which were to be important for the study of history. The role of the antiquarians was

often maligned by scholars who could see no point in their indepth study of artefacts. It was, however their groundwork in the sifting of the non-literary remains of the past, which enabled historians to get closer to how things ‘really were’ in the past. Although the antiquarians opened up new sources for historians, their general purpose as collectors and cataloguers of the past were to cause problems in how other scholars saw the endeavours of historians. Increasingly history was seen as a discipline which had no relevance for everyday life. It could give us an idea of how things were in the past but it could not translate this information into guidelines for how to live the present.

There was still a battle raging as to how to understand humanity. Were nature and humanity to be seen as belonging to the same categories in which case the methods of the natural sciences could be used to explain man and his artifacts? If they were not seen as belonging to the same categories then new methods would have to be found which could understand man and his artefacts both past and present. This resulted in the development of the social sciences i.e. psychology, sociology, anthropology. Those who followed the naturalist school attempted to understand humanity by applying the techniques of science to their study. They attempted to develop laws by which they could study human actions. This is particularly so in the positivist school which is grounded in naturalism and seeks to work with the positive data which presents itself in the sources both literary and non-literary. Auguste Comte developed the positivist school of thought in response to the very real dangers of extreme relativism which seemed inherent in romanticism and the newly developing historicism. He wanted historians to get back to the concrete data which showed itself so as to explain human behaviour (Deist 1987:17). There are problems with this particular approach as there is often insufficient evidence in the sources to enable one to apply the covering laws over time and in different periods (Deist 1993:388-390). This means that it is difficult to generalise on humanity and human reactions to sets of circumstances.

1.2.4.1 Historicism

Those historians who followed the notion that humanity and nature are different and cannot be studied using the same methods, tended to develop the Romanticist view of history. This led to historicism, which took over much of what the Romanticists stood for and carried it further. The historicists were particularly ardent in a critical sifting of

the sources. They sought the best sources, dividing them into primary and secondary sources in order to ‘truly understand’ what was free and unique about the period under study. As with the rationalists before them they saw the importance of the human mind for creating coherence within the complexity of human experience. They viewed individual cultures in the light of Leibniz’s monadism, which saw every “foreign time, place and culture,... as a windowless monad constructed around a unique idea that gave expression to the essential nature of that particular culture” (Deist 1993:385). This approach to the past lead to epistemological problems in that there was no longer any continuity between the past and the present and between cultures. If each culture and time was encased in its own monad it would be impossible for anyone outside the monad to know that time and culture.

These then were the problems which twentieth century historians and philosophers had to grapple with. They needed to develop schemata which would make the past intelligible and relevant to the present. In developing these schemata they were able to draw on the social sciences but all the while keeping in mind the problems which use of these human sciences could bring to a study of the past.

Dilthey in his hermeneutical approach to the understanding of history sought to overcome the difficulties of the gap between past and present by substituting ‘historical reason’ for ‘critical reason’. He based his ‘historical reason’ on the assumption of the “... universal (psychological) structure of human experience.” (Deist 1993:386). It was thereby possible to comprehend the motivations for past actions in the present. This approach to the past was not without its problems. A study of the sources will reveal that persons in the past did not necessarily apply the same logic, to circumstances which they faced, as modern day strategists. In this way modern historians are in danger of imposing their own intentions and goals on the players of the past. There is also a danger of reducing the flow of history into the goals, actions and intentions of a few characters from the past. This approach does not take sufficient account of the interplay of the number of different natural and cultural factors which influence the course of historical events (Deist 1993:387).

1.2.5. Post-modernism

The last quarter of the twentieth century has seen further developments in the study of philosophy and history. This period is becoming known as the post-modern era. The movement which is of most concern here is that of neo-historicism also referred to as narrativism. As the name suggests this approach to history is founded in historicism. With historicism it requires that one empirically ascertains the reliability of facts and views the past as being different from the present and that it must be understood in its otherness (Deist 1993:390). However, their concept of understanding the past differs from that of the historicists. They do not understand the past 'from within' but take into account the present especially that of the historian with his/her prejudices, experiences and conceptions when studying the past. Together with Gadamer they seek to construct coherence among the available facts by "... assigning to them a function in a narrative about the time and place of their occurrence." (Deist 1993:391). In order to establish coherence among a number of disparate facts, Mink came up with the concept of configurational coherence, whereby the facts are ordered with reference to their context of occurrence. Walsh was to call this concept colligation. This concept goes counter to the positivist view that we understand historical events by the use of general laws. It also counters the idealist view that we can understand the facts in their essence or from within (Deist 1993:391). Instead we understand historical facts in terms of their place and function in a complicated network of inter-connected events. To create a narrative of the past the historian by a study of the facts must come up with a concept which will become the point of coherence among the facts. A narrative is then constructed around this colligatory concept. The narrative will seek to describe the past in all its complexity. It could be argued that such an approach to history must by its nature be subjective and the history that it produces is not certain (the problem which has dogged history since the time of the Enlightenment). Although the selection of a colligatory concept is based on the judgement of the historian, the narrative which is produced around such a concept must be seen to make narrative sense, to take into account all the relevant facts. Different scholars will arrive at different colligatory concepts when confronted with the same set of facts. As long as the narratives they produce meet the requirements of a sound narrative in which the facts used can be accounted for by other scholars, they can be accepted as

reliable knowledge. In this way we can broaden our knowledge of past times while realising that there are a number of stories which every past can reveal (Deist 1993:392-395).

1.2.6. Conclusion

Through the above the writer has sought to give a brief overview of the most important currents which have affected historical thought and understanding since the time of the Renaissance. It is now necessary for the writer to state which epistemology and methodology are to be used in this study. The author does not hold to an idealist view which sees all reality as being centred in the categories of the mind/spirit. Rather the writer understands reality in terms of an objective reality, consisting of the material and immaterial, which is external to the person. Unlike earlier naïve realists the writer does not believe that this objective reality presents itself to us ‘as it is found’ but rather through the perceptions of the person’s mind. Although there is an objective reality it can only be perceived through the culturally conditioned mind of the student. This form of *critical realism* allows us to understand the universe as an objective reality outside the minds of humanity, while acknowledging that we do not encounter it outside our own subjective minds.

This way of understanding reality has implications for how we see and understand the past. It acknowledges that there is an objective reality in the past but unlike the von Rankean view we cannot access this reality ‘as it really was’. The information both literary and non-literary about the past with which historians work has to be filtered through the mind of the historian.

The author also understands reality in a holistic way. Reality consists of both the material and spiritual. Any attempt to understand the present and the past must take into account both the material realities and the spiritual realities which go to make up the present and past. Narrativism is at present the best approach for taking into account all aspects that go to make up any past event, as well as acknowledging the reality which the scholar brings to bear on this past reality. After studying the literary sources for the period of this study, the writer feels that there is one underlying motif which sums up the entire period of the study (and in fact Early Judaism from the post-Exilic period to the end of the antique period) that is the Law, the ‘Torah’. It is not only what the Law

consists of but how it is to be understood and interpreted. There appear to be a number of Jewish groups during this period and they all see the Law in different ways- some have an elastic approach to it whereas others are more rigid. The entire post-Exilic period in Judaism seems to be centred on what it means to be a Jew and how the 'ancestral laws' are to be understood and applied in all aspects of the daily life of the people. The concept of the Law includes all aspects of Jewish life, so any changes involving the law will automatically result in changes to the daily life of the people.

During this period changes were made to the political constitution of Judaea. In order to explain how these changes in the political sphere influenced other aspects of Early Palestinian Judaism it is possible to draw on models from the social sciences. One such model, which will take a holistic approach to the study of human communities is supplied by cultural anthropology. Cultural anthropology sees reality as a complex set of interdependent and interacting cultural domains eg. political, religious, social, environmental, technological, geographical, environmental etc (Rosman & Rubel 1981:9). As a result of the interconnectedness of these various cultural domains it follows that if change occurs in one domain it will cause a ripple effect throughout the cultural system (Rosman & Rubel 1981:322). The application of this model to a study of past cultures helps us to understand the past in a more holistic way. We no longer only see the past as governed by the political, religious, economic or social domains but in its complexity. This model fits in well with a narrativist study of the past as it takes into account all relevant aspects of past communities. This study will therefore make use of the model of cultural anthropology in order to create a narrative of the period from the available sources.

1.3 THE POLITICAL SITUATION IN THE ANCIENT NEAR EAST FROM ALEXANDER THE GREAT TO THE FALL OF THE HELLENISTIC MONARCHIES

The thirteen years from 336 to 323 which constituted the reign of Alexander the Great issued in a new era in the Ancient Near East. It was the beginning of a period which saw the cultures of the East and the West meeting (this meeting of course commenced much earlier during the Bronze age already). This period was later to be known as the

Hellenistic period. This meeting of East and West was not always amicable and much of the conflict and unrest during this period was a result of clashes between them.

1.3.1 ALEXANDER THE GREAT

On the death of his father, Philip of Macedon in 336 B.C.E., Alexander succeeded to the throne of Macedonia. He was immediately accepted by the generals, Antipater and Parmenion and the army. In the space of a year he proved his worth as a leader by bringing the Greek states firmly under his control. (Grabbe 1992:205). This freed him to turn his attention to the vast Persian empire to the east. Philip had also been looking to this rich territory but had only been able to make preliminary arrangements for a sortie into Persia when he was assassinated. The task of launching an attack on the Persians fell to Alexander, his generals and the small but well trained Macedonian army. In 334 B.C.E. Alexander with a force of about thirty five thousand including five thousand cavalry met a Persian force at the Granicus River in northern Asia Minor. The small Persian force in this surprise encounter was defeated. Alexander progressed through Asia Minor rapidly, meeting opposition in very few centres. Opposition was experienced in the cities of Miletus, Caria and Halicarnassus but Alexander triumphed in each of these cases. Most of the cities in Asia Minor were Greek and sided with Alexander against their Persian appointed leaders, setting up democratic governments after the Greek style and welcoming Alexander (Grabbe 1992:205).

In 333 Alexander met Darius, king of Persia at Issus. Although Darius had a far greater force and had initially surprised Alexander from the rear he was unable to hold onto this advantage. The terrain which was narrow and hilly favoured the smaller force of Alexander. Darius was soundly defeated but managed to escape (Tcherikover 1959:3). This opened the way for Alexander to march into Syria and the lands of Phoenicia and Egypt. Once again he was welcomed by most of the cities on his route to Egypt. Only Tyre which was built on an island and Gaza opposed him. They both fell to Alexander after sieges of seven and two months respectively. Tyre was levelled. Once Alexander had the cities of Phoenicia and Palestine under his control, he advanced on Egypt and acquired it without any bloodshed (Grabbe 1992:206-207; Tcherikover 1955:3-4). This was in late 332. Alexander spent the winter in Egypt, founding the city of Alexandria, the

first of many cities founded by Alexander and the later Hellenistic Monarchies. After this brief respite Alexander again moved east to meet Darius. Alexander defeated Darius and his large force at Gaugamela on 1 October 331. Again Darius fled but Alexander did not follow him immediately. He first subdued the great Persian cities of Babylon, Susa, Persepolis and Pasargadai (Tcherikover 1959:4). In 330 while attempting to raise a new army Darius was assassinated by his own satraps.

On the death of Darius, Alexander formally succeeded him as ruler of Persia. He took on the trappings of an Oriental monarch and this caused dissent amongst his own forces. They were not used to the forms in which the Persians honoured and adulated their kings. This can be seen as the first negative encounter between the cultures of the Ancient Orient and Greece. In the years that followed, Alexander subdued the rest of the vast Persian Empire going as far as India. It was at this stage that his forces threatened rebellion if they did not turn for home. In the last year of his life Alexander set about creating his capital at Babylon. He also worked at restoring the economic value of the country. In his quest to bring the two peoples closer together he held a great wedding ceremony in Susa where he married off eighty of his top men to Persian noblewomen. He also encouraged his troops to marry foreign wives (Tcherikover 1959:6-7). He himself married the Persian princess, Roxanne. Certain of his actions such as appointing Persian satraps and acquiring Persian mercenaries for his personal bodyguard alienated some of his men but they were unable to dissuade him from such policies. In the summer of 323 Alexander died suddenly in Babylon. Although he died at the young age of thirty three, after only thirteen years rule his legacy was to live on for the next few centuries.

1.3.2 THE DIADOCHI

At his death there were no direct heirs to assume control of Alexander's vast domains. His Persian wife, the princess Roxane, was pregnant and it was agreed that if she gave birth to a son he would eventually rule jointly with Philip III of Macedon, Alexander's half-brother (Grabbe 1992:209). Philip III had been proclaimed king by the army over the general Perdikkas who had been Alexander's confidant and was a capable leader. Some of Alexander's generals became viceroys over the various regions comprising Alexander's kingdom. They increasingly saw these regions as their own personal

inheritances of Alexander's domains (Tcherikover 1959:7-8). The generals were assigned to the following regions: Antipater was in charge of Macedon, Antigonus held over Phrygia, Lysimachus over Thrace, Ptolemy over Egypt, Seleucus over the elite guard, Perdiccas held the position of regent (Grabbe 1992:209).

Revolts broke out in many areas. Perdiccas found that he could not count on the support of the other generals in dealing with the conflicts that broke out during this initial period after the death of Alexander. They were more interested in consolidating their own positions. This led to fighting amongst themselves and Perdiccas was murdered by Seleucus and his companions after he had attacked Ptolemy in 321. He had sought to hold the whole of Alexander's territory together and further Alexander's aims with regard to building bonds between the Macedonians and the conquered peoples of the East. On his death most of the generals divorced their Persian wives (Seleucus was an exception) and began comporting themselves as the victors and treating the Oriental peoples as subordinates and inferiors (Tcherikover 1959:8-9). After these battles Seleucus was given Babylon, Ptolemy held on to Egypt, Antipater and Antigonus held Asia. Roxane gave birth to a son Alexander. They were both killed in 310 by Cassander who was Alexander's regent in Macedon (Grabbe 1992:210).

During the years from 321 to 301 there was much fighting over the territories comprising Alexander's kingdom. Regional power shifted from one general to the next. The most important players in these wars were Antigonus and his sons on one side and a coalition headed by Seleucus and Ptolemy on the other. It was during this period in 312 that Seleucus was able to return to his territory in Babylon, following the victory of Ptolemy over Demetrius, son of Antigonus, at Gaza. It was from this date that the Seleucid era, which became the standard era in much of the Near East, was counted (Grabbe 1992:210). Antigonus was killed at the battle of Ipsus in 302. The territory was divided up as follows: Cassander had Greece, Lysimachus had the rest of Asia and Thrace, Seleucus was given Armenia, Syria and retained Babylon, Ptolemy retained Egypt but seized southern Syria and Palestine which were allotted to Seleucus. This was to result in a century of conflict between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids for this disputed territory. After most of these generals had died, the territory of Alexander's kingdom was finally split three ways in 280. Greece and Macedonia fell to the Antigonids, Syria and

Mesopotamia to the Seleucids and Egypt to the Ptolemies. These divisions stayed until the period of the Roman Conquests. Of these three kingdoms, the kingdoms of the Seleucids and the Ptolemies are of particular interest for the study of Palestinian Judaism, as the territory of Palestine fell within each kingdom at various times. We will therefore look at the general political situation of these two kingdoms.

1.3.3. THE PTOLEMIES

On the death of Alexander the Great, Ptolemy was given control of Egypt. He enhanced his position by stealing the body of Alexander to bury him in Alexandria, the first great city founded by Alexander. This action gave Perdiccas the impetus in his thrust to bring the other Macedonian generals into line. As noted above Perdiccas was murdered before he could carry out his plans for a united kingdom such as Alexander had planned for.

Although Ptolemy assisted others of the generals in their wars of accession especially taking up Seleucus' fight against Antigonus and his son Demetrius, he was not above acquiring territory belonging to them. His acquisition of southern Syria and Palestine was to cause enmity between himself and his heirs and Seleucus and his heirs. The century from 301 to 200 was marked by the so-called Syrian Wars between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids for the territory of Coele-Syria. Besides these territories, Ptolemy also controlled Cyprus, Cyrenaica, the Cycladic Islands and some cities on the coast of western Asia Minor (Gruen 1984:672).

Ptolemaic political and economic policy was strongly influenced by the geographical structure of Egypt which formed the centre of their kingdom. For many centuries the Egyptian people had known a strongly centralised system of government. This was possible as the bulk of the people lived and worked on the banks of the river Nile. The river Nile with its regular inundations supplied the rich soil and water required to sustain life in an otherwise harsh environment. All life centred on the Nile. The deserts to the east and west and the mountains surrounding these acted as natural barriers between the Egyptians and their neighbours. This resulted in a homogenous society. These factors aided the Ptolemies in controlling this kingdom which had been 'won by the spear'. The Ptolemies continued the pharaonic practice of a strongly centralised government. They continued to administer the kingdom in the traditional manner of the

pharaohs. The country was divided into *nomes* under a *nomarch*, *toparchies* under a *toparch* and villages under a *komarch*. This political structure was paralleled in the economic sphere where there was a three level structure consisting of a *dioiketes*, under him an *oikonomos* and under him a hierarchical system of tax collectors and auditors. Next to the king, the highest official in the Ptolemaic kingdom was the minister of finance, the *dioiketes*

All land in Egypt was owned by the king and leased out to various groups eg. temple lands to the priests, royal lands to the peasants who worked them and gift lands to certain officials and ‘friends’ of the king. As this land was ‘won by the spear’, land was also allotted to military settlers from Greece and Macedonia. These cleruchies were used as a means to pay war veterans and also for strategic reasons. The presence of the cleruchs in their midst would deter the native population from acts of rebellion against the state. As there was a shortage of arable land in Egypt, the Ptolemies used irrigation technology to drain and reclaim a large area in the Fayuum. This reclaimed land was partly distributed to military settlers and partly used as pasturage for the war horses which the Ptolemies introduced into Egypt (Cary 1963:291). Irrigation technology was also used to increase crop yields especially that of corn which was the staple food of the people. New seed varieties were introduced to provide better crops and crop yields.

All crop production was controlled by the state, which decided which crops were to be grown where and when and in what quantities. The government had a monopoly on the most important raw materials eg. grain, oil, linen. Export and import of goods was tightly controlled by the finance ministry. Although Egypt was reasonably self-sufficient, there were certain commodities which could not be produced in Egypt. One of these necessary commodities was wood which was especially needed for the construction of ships. The best source of wood in the region was Lebanon in Coele-Syria. This was one of the main reasons why it was necessary for the Ptolemies to control Coele-Syria and Palestine.

The acquisition of the territories of Cyrenaica, Cyprus, Coele-Syria and coastal cities in western Asia Minor by the Ptolemies was important for both strategic and economic reasons. Control of Cyrenaica created a buffer zone between Egypt and the lands to the west. Besides being a major source of wood for building ships (which were

necessary for purposes of trade and defence) the province of Coele-Syria and Palestine was important as a buffer, a glacis between Egypt and Syria (Heinen 1984:440-441). Whoever controlled Coele-Syria and Palestine also controlled the important coastal cities of Tyre, Sidon, Ake and Gaza. These cities were centres of eastern Mediterranean trade. Much of the trade between the *Hinterland* and the coastal lands passed through these cities. They were therefore useful as lucrative sources of taxes on the goods which moved to and from them. Cyprus was also strategically useful in that it protected Egypt from maritime attacks and was situated in such a way that it was the gateway to the coastal cities and lands of the eastern Mediterranean. It controlled all maritime activity between Egypt in the south and Asia Minor in the north. The coastal cities of western Asia Minor were useful to the Ptolemies as sources of commodities and by their proximity to the Greek mainland. This latter was helpful as it kept the Ptolemies in contact with their original homeland (Heinen 1984:445).

The Ptolemies sought to govern those captured territories closest to Egypt in the same manner as they governed Egypt. These areas were divided into various administrative units with the *hyparchy* being the equivalent of the Egyptian *nomoi*. A *strategos* was the political and military head of the *hyparchy*. Alongside the *strategos* was an *oikonomos* who was in charge of economic and fiscal administration. As in Egypt the major work of the administration seemed to be in the economic sphere especially the collection of taxes (Schäfer 1995:14-15). The smallest economic unit was the village. A *komomisthotes* was responsible for the gathering of taxes from the population who leased plots of land from the king. Although all land was technically owned by the king who had 'won it by the spear', it would appear that the situation in the occupied territories was somewhat different to that in Egypt. These territories lacked the homogeneity of Egypt consisting as they did of various ethnic peoples, the Phoenician coastal cities and the large cities of the coastal plain. Cleruchies had also been established which had their own constitutions. Even though all the land belonged to the king it appears that the large cities were permitted to govern themselves with a measure of autonomy but they still fell under the ministry of finance and had to pay the king taxes. All taxes in the Ptolemaic kingdom were farmed out to tax farmers who collected the taxes on behalf of the *dioiketes*. It is hard to tell from the sources whether the Jewish *ethnos* in Judaea was granted a special

semi-autonomous status. We do know that Judaea was seen as a temple state with a high priest at its head. An *epistates* who was not necessarily the high priest was responsible for the fiscal administration of the state including the collection of taxes due to the king.

During the period 274 to 168 B.C.E. the Ptolemies were involved in a series of wars against the Seleucids known as the Syrian-Egyptian Wars. Besides these wars the Ptolemies also had to deal with internal unrest and dynastic squabbles at various times. Although the control of Coele-Syria was at the root of the Syrian-Egyptian Wars, the first three Syrian-Egyptian Wars mainly took place in Cyrenaica, Cyprus and Asia Minor. The First Syrian War (274-271 B.C.E.) resulted from a revolt by Magas, the son-in-law of Antiochus I who was governor of Cyrenaica, against Ptolemy II Philadelphus, King of Egypt. This war resulted in the independence of Cyrenaica under Magas for the next twenty five years. After the Second Syrian War (260-253 B.C.E.), Ptolemy II was able to regain Cyrenaica by arranging a marriage between his son and Magas' daughter. However, during this war he lost territory in Asia Minor to Antiochus II, the king of Macedonia and Rhodes (Grabbe 1992:213). At about the time of the peace settlement after the Second Syrian War Antiochus II took Berenice, the daughter of Ptolemy II as his wife and put aside his first wife Laodice. This method was often used to seal peace treaties and to aid in reconciliation between the warring parties. However, in this instance the dynastic marriage was to cause problems later on when Antiochus II died in 246 B.C.E. On his death bed he is claimed to have reinstated his son Seleucus II, the child of his first wife Laodice, as his heir. This resulted in two claimants for the Seleucid throne. Seleucus II was accepted in Asia Minor but Berenice had her son proclaimed king and asked her brother Ptolemy III of Egypt to help her uphold the claim of her son as heir to the Seleucid throne. Ptolemy came to her aid and was able to advance into Syria and on to Mesopotamia. Berenice and her son were murdered but Ptolemy kept this information secret. However, before consolidating his gains Ptolemy III had to return to Egypt to put down an uprising in 245 B.C.E. Seleucus II was able to have himself acknowledged in Babylonia. He then set about securing his power in Syria and the east. Although facts are scant we know that Ptolemy III held on to Seleucia-in-Pieria the port of the Seleucid capital Antioch-on-the-Orontes. Although these three wars were between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids it would appear that there was no fighting in Coele-Syria and Palestine.

It is probable that this province felt these wars indirectly by increase in demand for raw materials and produce by Egypt. Additional troops were probably also required and some of these could have been drawn from the populations of this province.

The later Syrian-Egyptian Wars were all fought on the territory of Coele-Syria and Palestine. This must have entailed much hardship for the people of this region. The situation in Egypt at the beginning of the Fourth Syrian War was far from stable, Ptolemy III had died in 221 B.C.E. and was succeeded by Ptolemy IV. Ptolemy IV was initially strongly under the influence of the generals Sosibius and Agathocles. To consolidate their influence they had the king's brother and mother assassinated. This chaos in the Ptolemaic court was seen by Antiochus III, who had ascended the Seleucid throne in 223 B.C.E., as a good opportunity for him to attack Coele-Syria (Heinen 1984:435). Initially he met with some success and was able to regain Seleucia, the port for the Seleucid capital of Antioch. However, it seems that the Ptolemaic government must have enjoyed the support of much of the population of the area. Antiochus III progressed slowly through the territory as many of the cities only submitted after sieges. The Ptolemaic army finally defeated that of Antiochus III at Raphia in southern Palestine in 217 B.C.E. Ptolemy had succeeded in holding on to Coele-Syria and Palestine. For the first time he had made use of native Egyptians to bolster his forces. Many scholars believe that this use and training of native Egyptians as soldiers had a direct link to the Egyptian uprisings in the Thebiad in 207/206 B.C.E. These uprisings led to upper Egypt being ruled by a rebel king from 205 B.C.E. on (Heinen 1984:438).

When Ptolemy IV died in 204/203 B.C.E. he was succeeded by the five year old Ptolemy V Epiphanes. Egypt itself was in turmoil with the secession of upper Egypt. The advisors of Ptolemy V realised that the kingdom would be vulnerable to attack from Antiochus III and sought to strengthen the kingdom by means of a marriage alliance with Philip V of Macedonia. Antiochus III had already made a pact with Philip V who would not intervene in any conflict between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies (Gruen 1984:614). In 202 B.C.E. Antiochus III attacked Coele-Syria. By 198 B.C.E. all Coele-Syria and Palestine were under Seleucid control. This was to be the end of Ptolemaic rule in the region. However, in 170/169 the Ptolemies planned to launch an attack on Coele-Syria and Palestine. This was thwarted by Antiochus IV Epiphanes who marched into Egypt

and declared himself the protector of Ptolemy VI. Ptolemy's brother Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II and his sister Cleopatra were recognised as the rulers of Egypt in Alexandria. Antiochus IV withdrew to deal with other problems but returned in 168 B.C.E. and was on the point of taking Alexandria when the Romans intervened. Egypt was to stay more or less under Ptolemaic rule until 30 B.C.E. when it became a Roman province.

1.3.4 THE SELEUCIDS

The territory of the Seleucids was vast stretching from the Indus Valley in the east to western Asia Minor. It was made up of a number of different nations, ethnic groups and cities. Each of these had their own political, economic and religious traditions. This lack of homogeneity meant that the Seleucids could not have a highly centralised administration such as that of the Ptolemies in Egypt. They had to fit their administration to the local situation. The Seleucid kingdom was divided into twenty large provinces or *strategiae*. Each *strategi* was subdivided into three or four *eparchies*, which in turn were divided into a number of *hyparchies* (Cary 1963:257).

There were three forms of local political structure within the Seleucid kingdom:- the *ethnos*, the *polis* and the *dynastes*. A *dynastes* referred to a territory over which a local monarch ruled. After the Seleucid occupation these monarchs would continue ruling their territory. However, they would be subject to the king and when the need arose they might be required to provide the king with troops and money (Goldstein 1976:196-197). An *ethnos* was the name given to people of an ethnic group living together on tribal land and according to traditional laws and customs. Such a political structure would have a level of autonomy with regard to the ruling power. By its very nature an *ethnos* tended towards isolationism. It would not be to the fore in building contact with other groups in the kingdom in the political, social or economic spheres (cf. Tcherikover 1966:168). The usual form of government of an *ethnos* was aristocratic, with the heads of the leading families forming a council of elders. This council together with its leader would represent the interests of the people before the representatives of the ruling power. As long as the required tribute and taxes were forthcoming from such a group they would be left in comparative peace. They would be expected to support the ruling power against possible

rivals. This support could take the form of material assistance and/or in supplying men for military purposes.

The form of local government and administration most favoured by the Seleucids was that of the *polis* (the Greek city). As noted above Alexandria was the first of these Greek cities established by the Hellenistic monarchies in the East. These cities were seen as a means of upholding Greek civilization and values in the areas conquered by the Hellenistic monarchies. They had the form of political and social organization of Greek cities. The political system of these cities was generally democratic in form, although some of the old Phoenician coastal cities maintained an aristocratic form of government even after taking on the status of a *polis*. Initially the citizen bodies were made up of Greeks and Graeco-Macedonians many of whom had come to the east as soldiers, government officials (especially officials of the finance ministries) and entrepreneurs. Over time members of the local elite were permitted to acquire citizenship in these cities. During the later portion of the 3rd century B.C.E. and the 2nd century B.C.E. the Seleucids permitted existing oriental cities to convert from their traditional forms to those of Greek *poleis*. This was done for a variety of reasons the prime ones being economic and internal security and stability (Hengel 1980:64). These cities helped secure loyalty to the Seleucid state from the many peoples within its vast domain. This policy brought benefits to the citizens of these cities and the territories they ruled. On the whole they were allowed a large measure of autonomy especially in internal matters. However, they were not permitted to have a foreign policy which opposed that of the ruling kingdom. They were allowed to strike their own bronze coins, which was a great boost to the local economy. All Greek cities in the Hellenistic kingdoms were united through shared social and cultural values. This unity was expressed by participation in the regular Games which were held in various parts of the Hellenistic world. Participation in the pan-Hellenic Games also brought to the fore the economic possibilities and benefits which membership of a Greek *polis* gave the members of an Oriental city. In order to equip the citizens of these oriental *poleis* for membership in the union of Greek cities, it was necessary for the educational structures of the *polis* ie. the *ephebian* and the *gymnasium* to be set up in these cities. These structures would educate the sons of citizens of the *polis* in all aspects of Greek language, culture and athletics. In this way they would be taught what it means

to be a citizen of a Greek *polis*. Their education would give them the necessary skills to become full citizens in due course and eligible to participate in the games and other cultural and economic activities of the Hellenistic world. The development of these cities in the Seleucid kingdom therefore brought benefits to the ruling kingdom and to the individual cities.

Although each of these three forms of local political structure in the Seleucid kingdom had a measure of self-autonomy, they were not completely autonomous. Each of the provinces had a governor who was responsible for the political and military stability of his area. As in the Ptolemaic kingdom the officials of the finance ministry were to be found throughout the kingdom. Taxes and tolls of various kinds were levied on property, goods and peoples. The vast domains of the Seleucid kingdom were rich in natural and mineral resources. Syria and Mesopotamia, the core of the Seleucid kingdom were fertile lands. The Seleucid economy was mainly based on agrarian production. The territories of Asia Minor particularly the Taurian region were rich in silver deposits, a most useful commodity especially for the minting of coins and the manufacture of luxury goods. The royalties of these mines was a major source of income for the Seleucid kingdom (Cary 1963:257-258).

Keeping this vast kingdom in tact was to prove exceedingly difficult for the kings of the Seleucid kingdom. By the middle of the 3rd century B.C.E. the far eastern reaches of the kingdom i.e. Bactria and the Indus Valley had been lost. However, friendly relations with these areas were maintained by the Seleucid kings and trade with these areas continued (Musti 1984:211). During the course of the 3rd century B.C.E. Seleucid control over northern Iran was seriously challenged by the Parthians and Armenians. The activities of Antiochus III during the period 227-204 B.C.E. saw much Iranian territory again falling under Seleucid control. He was not able to reconquer Parthia and Armenia but he was able to stop the Parthian advance into western Iran (Musti 1984:213).

The peripheral areas of the Seleucid kingdom were most open to challenge by the other Hellenistic kingdoms, invaders from the north and east and even the governors set over them by the Seleucid kings. Asia Minor, Iran and Coele-Syria and Palestine were the areas most contested. These clashes which continued throughout the period of this study were a great drain on the resources of the Seleucid kingdom. It was the dream of the

Seleucid kings to control the entire area conquered by Alexander the Great (Gruen 1984:611). After the battle of Ipsus in 301 B.C.E. the territory of Coele-Syria and Palestine was awarded to Seleucus I by the victors. However, Ptolemy I had already occupied this territory. As noted above the period from 274 to 168 B.C.E. saw six wars between the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms over this and other disputed territories (especially areas of Asia Minor and the Aegean Islands). It was only in the reign of Antiochus III 'the Great' (223-187 B.C.E.) that the Seleucids were able to wrest control of this valuable region from the Ptolemies. They defeated the Ptolemaic army at the battle of Paneion in 200 B.C.E. Egypt at that time was experiencing difficulties with a new young king on the throne. The Seleucids had also signed a pact with Philip V of Macedon, thereby ensuring that he would not come to the aid of Ptolemy V when they launched their attack on Coele-Syria and Palestine.

The 3rd century B.C.E. also saw the Seleucids having to defend the northern parts of their kingdom against the Celtic invasions of the Galatians. Although Antiochus I defeated them in 270 B.C.E. in the elephant battle, they were to continue being a thorn in the side of the Seleucids (Heinen 1984:416). At various stages during this century the Seleucids faced serious internal conflict between rival claimants to the throne. This problem was to be exacerbated in the 2nd century B.C.E. by the assumption of the Seleucid throne by Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175-164 B.C.E.) ahead of his nephew Demetrius I Soter (162-150 B.C.E.). In the period after the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes to the fall of the Seleucid kingdom to the Romans in 65 B.C.E. there were always at least two claimants to the Seleucid throne (Grabbe 1992:270). These internal quarrels affected Seleucid rule and saw many areas slipping out of Seleucid control. Much of Asia Minor came to be ruled by local chieftains. Pergamum in western Asia Minor was to play an important part in confining the movements of the Galatian tribes in Asia Minor. The Pergamene rulers were also vital in the wars which took place between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids and between the various claimants to the Seleucid throne (Heinen 1984:413-414).

The general situation in the Seleucid kingdom was to be profoundly affected by the defeat of Antiochus III and his allies by the Romans at the battle of Magnesia in 190 B.C.E. In 188 B.C.E. the Seleucids agreed to the terms of the Peace of Apamea. These

terms were particularly hard on the Seleucids. They had to relinquish all claims in Asia Minor beyond the Taurus Mountains. Rhodes and Pergamum were allotted various of the Seleucid territories in Asia Minor by the Romans in exchange for maintaining the status quo (Habicht 1989:324). Hostages including Antiochus III's younger son Antiochus were sent to Rome. There was also a large war indemnity of 15000 talents which had to be paid to the Romans. Collecting funds to repay this indemnity was to exercise the Seleucid kings for the following twelve years. These additional funds which were required by the state probably put an enormous strain on the populations of the territories controlled by the Seleucids. The deaths of two Seleucid kings, Antiochus III and Antiochus IV, are connected to the attempted robberies of temple treasuries in their domains. Much of Antiochus III's gains in Asia Minor were lost to the Seleucid kingdom after the Peace of Apamea. His gains in the Iranian territories underwent strong pressure after his death. Antiochus IV Epiphanes not wanting to alienate the Romans sought to strengthen the northern and eastern parts of his kingdom, especially the areas which were under constant threat from the advancing Parthians. He was working his way through Persia, solidifying his position when he died in late 164 B.C.E. After his death the final disintegration of the Seleucid kingdom began. There was so much internal fighting that it was not possible for the various claimants to the throne to secure the lands they sought to rule.

1.3.5. THE ROMANS

The Roman influence in the east was manifested indirectly for much of the 3rd century B.C.E. During this period Rome was more interested in consolidating her position in Italy and the western Mediterranean. Although Rome was more concerned at this time with building a strong state amongst the many groups to be found in Italy, she also saw the value of developing friendly relations with Greece and the Hellenistic monarchies. In this way she would be securing her back while she consolidated her territories in northern Italy, Spain and North Africa. Friendship pacts involving exchange of gifts and ambassadors were entered into with the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms during the middle and late period of the 3rd century B.C.E. (Gruen 1984:612; 673). As she gained in strength and renown, many of the eastern Mediterranean states sought to maintain

friendly relations with their western neighbour. It was useful when threatened by a neighbouring state to be able to say that you had a friendship pact with Rome.

Roman intervention in Greece and the states of the Eastern Mediterranean during this period was limited to maintaining the status quo. She had no desire to occupy territory in this region realising that it would consume too much manpower and expense, both of which were required in her wars with Carthage (the Punic Wars), Gallic and Ligurian groups in northern Italy and Spain (Grabbe 1992:271; Gruen 1984:723). Rome was not keen for any of the Hellenistic kingdoms to grow too strong as this could endanger the security of Rome and Italy and interfere with trade between different parts of the Mediterranean. The military interventions of Rome against the Macedonians and Seleucids at the beginning of the 2nd century B.C.E. should be seen in this light. It would not be in the interests of Rome for either Philip V of Macedon or Antiochus III of Syria to gain too much power in the eastern Mediterranean especially not in Greece, which was only a short distance from Italy itself. These interventions especially that against Antiochus III was to affect the entire Seleucid kingdom for more than a decade because of the severity of the peace terms. After finally defeating the Macedonians at Pydna in 178 B.C.E. it seemed in the best interests of Rome to intervene in Egypt where Antiochus IV was on the verge of taking Alexandria and becoming ruler. He had already acquired Cyprus. Not wishing to become involved in a war against Rome Antiochus IV withdrew his forces from Egypt and his fleet from Cyprus. Many of the smaller nations and peoples of the East were keen to have friendship pacts with the Romans. The Jews of Judaea were one such group. These friendship pacts which saw both parties involved swearing to uphold the interests of the other, were of a different nature to the treaties which Rome signed with other groups in Italy. The former were loose friendly arrangements whereas the latter were formal treaties which involved tight obligations concerning military commitments, loyalty to Rome and collaboration with Roman enterprises (Gruen 1984:724).

Roman involvement in the East became greater when she was bequeathed the state of Pergamum in 133 B.C.E. (Grabbe 1992:271). This acquisition became the first Roman province in Asia. After undergoing many upheavels in her own domains during the latter half of the 2nd century B.C.E. and the first half of the 1st century B.C.E. Rome

began her conquests of the remaining Hellenistic states. The Seleucid kingdom fell in 65 B.C.E. and Egypt in 63 B.C.E. The Romans appear to have allowed local peoples to govern themselves internally in much the same way as the Seleucids had. They did however keep garrisons in all of their provinces to maintain stability and security. As under the Hellenistic kingdoms they had a well developed system of taxation which was enforced throughout their empire. As the 1st century B.C.E. progressed Rome was to play an increasingly more active role in the affairs of Judaea, climaxing in the annexation of Judaea by Rome. It is however the Roman interventions during the reigns of Antiochus III and Antiochus IV which most affect the period of this study.

2. SOURCES FOR THIS PERIOD IN EARLY JUDAISM

The sources for this period in Early Judaism can be divided into two categories: the literary and the non-literary sources. To get a better understanding of Early Judaism at this time, it is necessary to take into account the information which both of these source types give us. However, we need to realise that all our sources for this period come with their own inherent difficulties. This work is primarily based on a study of the literary sources. Where necessary, data supplied by the non-literary sources is used to give a fuller picture of the period and to clarify difficulties that occur in the texts.

2.1 NON- LITERARY SOURCES

There are two major forms of non-literary sources for our period: geographical sources and archaeological sources. Within each of these categories we find a number of subdivisions which help us to draw up a picture of the past.

2.1.1 GEOGRAPHICAL SOURCES

As people live in time and space, knowledge of Geography, which is the study of spatial relationships within the biosphere, can be useful when building a picture of the past. Geography involves study of the relationships between climate and the physical environment, the physical environment and agricultural practice, humanity and its needs and all the other elements of the biosphere. Knowledge of the physical environment and climatic conditions of the region under study will give one clues as to which forms of agricultural practice and industry were possible. These factors would also influence where people could live and their forms of habitation. Forms of civil administration and religious expression may reflect geographical conditions. (May 1987: 9-11)

Geographically, Palestine formed the buffer between Syria and Egypt. It stretched from the Negev Desert in the south to the Anti-Lebanon Mountains in the north. The Mediterranean Sea was the western boundary and the Trans-Jordan area the eastern boundary. This area has a predominantly Mediterranean climate i.e. wet winters and dry summers. The coastal plain and Galilee in the north are the most fertile areas. The further

east and south one goes the drier the landscape becomes until it reverts to desert. There are four natural regions in Palestine:- the coastal plain; the central highlands; the rift valley and the eastern highlands. Climatic conditions are affected by the proximity of these regions to the Mediterranean and the desert. Those areas closest to the Mediterranean or with a westerly outlook are most likely to benefit from the rains that come from the west and north. Crops grown in this area were:- grain, barley, figs, grapes, dates, olives (important for the production of oil) and pomegranates. Other commodities produced were:- purple dye in the Phoenician coastal cities; asphalt and salt in the Dead Sea area; copper in the Etzion Geber area of the Sinai Peninsula. There was an extensive fishing and drying industry centred on the Sea of Galilee.

Although, Palestine as a whole is of great importance in the development of Early Judaism, the area of Judaea itself is of prime importance. At the beginning of the period under study Judaea consisted of Jerusalem and the surrounding area to a distance of 20 to 30 kilometres (cf. Otzen 1990: 12). This area was not as fertile as the north of Palestine or the coastal plain. However, one was able to grow grain in the western area and sheep could graze in the hills. Jericho was a flourishing centre where figs and dates were grown. Olives also grew well in this area. The asphalt and salt industries of the Dead Sea were also in Judaea.

Topography is an important element when studying any region. The type of terrain will dictate where roads, cities and villages can be built. Judaea consists mainly of a series of hills composed of rocky limestone which are cut off from the limestone hills of the Shephelah by a layer of easily eroded chalk (cf. CHJ 1989: 4). To the east this series of limestone hills gives way to the Rift valley with the Dead Sea at its lowest point. A knowledge of topography is particularly useful when studying the course of the Maccabean Revolt. This knowledge helps one understand the effectiveness of the Maccabean campaign against apostates in the villages and organized armed forces sent by the Syrian authorities to deal with the problems in Judaea.

2.1.2 ARCHAEOLOGY

Archaeology is the study of the material remains of human cultures. By studying the material remains of past cultures it is possible to draw up a picture of life in other times.

Most of our knowledge of the Ancient Near East has come to us as the result of archaeological excavations. The artefacts found during archaeological projects can be both literary and non-literary. These artefacts have to be analysed and interpreted by scholars using a wide variety of scientific methods. Dating of material objects is an important aspect of archaeological work. A variety of scientific techniques have been developed to gain a reasonably accurate date span for objects uncovered. By studying the different levels at an archaeological site it is possible to ascertain such things as the type of building materials used and types of destruction at the site.

For our period a knowledge of numismatics is also useful. The figures or wording on coins can tell us a great deal about the policies of the individual rulers eg. do coins of the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes feature the god Zeus or Apollo. Coins are also useful in that they change with each new regime. They can also inform us of the status of different places, if they were allowed to mint their own bronze coins they probably had *polis* status.

Inscriptions and ostraca of various kinds are also useful in forming a picture of the past. They help us follow trends in language and bilingualism especially in the conquered territories. The information contained on such artefacts especially ostraca are intended for the time they were written and as such are invaluable to give us insight into daily life. Inscriptions can be found in many contexts eg. formal monuments, at burial sites. The former usually give us information pertaining to successes of rulers while the latter are of a more personal nature and can tell us a great deal about the deceased person and their views especially on the afterlife. Sometimes policies of kings for specific communities are recorded on inscriptions kept in a public place. These inscriptions show us the relationship between two parties at a given time (Ahlström 1991:122).

2.2 THE LITERARY SOURCES

The literary sources can be divided into two groups: primary sources and secondary sources. The primary sources are those which are closest to or contemporary with the period under study. While the secondary sources are those works written subsequently (Black and Macrauld 1997:88).

2.2.1 THE PRIMARY SOURCES

For this period we are fortunate to have a number of primary sources. The major primary sources are: I Maccabees; II Maccabees; Josephus' *The Jewish War* and Josephus' *The Antiquities of the Jews*. Besides these sources there are other possible primary sources, for example:- Daniel 7-12; I Enoch 83-105; the Book of Jubilees; The Testament of Moses; Judith; Nicolaus of Damascus and various fragments by Jewish authors in Greek. Those scholars who believe that the earliest of the Dead Sea Scroll writings refer to the situation in Judaea during the reform and its aftermath, would also consider these writings as primary sources. However, these writings are contentious and provide us with more problems than they answer. Therefore they have not been utilised by the writer for this work. For the period after the Seleucid conquest the *Wisdom of Ben Sira* is useful as it gives us a good picture of the social background to the developments taking place in Palestinian Judaism. There are also a variety of Greek sources for the general period under study. These include, Strabo; Livy; Appian and Cassius Dio (Grabbe, 1992: 239-240). This study has as its basis the four main sources mentioned above. Although the other sources mentioned can be of assistance in drawing up a possible picture of the period, they are problematic. The nature and language of many of the Jewish sources, which are written in the Apocalyptic genre, make it difficult to pinpoint actual historical events. Dating of these works is difficult as the events they allude to could be from any time in the Greek period. As this study uses the political history of Early Palestinian Judaism as its starting point, the writer has chosen not to include the book of Daniel as one of the primary sources for an indepth study of this period. The general consensus among scholars is that the book of Daniel or at least chapters 7-12 were written during the persecution under Antiochus IV Epiphanes. However, the style of writing and the purpose of the book are not particularly helpful for obtaining a clear historical picture of the period under study especially the political aspect. Where useful information on the general period is attested to by the secondary sources and derived from the book of Daniel it will be included in the analysis of the period.

It is not possible to just read the sources and draw up a history based on that reading. Various factors need to be taken into account when using any literary source. It is necessary to know who was writing, why they were writing, the intended audience of

the work, the sources that the author used. These factors can be difficult to assess in modern works. When studying literary sources from such distant periods these difficulties are exacerbated by distance and culture. However, it is essential to work out answers to these questions if we wish to obtain a better knowledge of past events and their importance for the culture which produced them. Without doing this we are in danger of imposing our own answers to these questions based on our own cultural suppositions.

Although we have the four major sources cited above for this period, they provide us not only with information on the events of the time but with different versions of these events. Not only does information on the events differ, but also the dating of events and the names of the participants in certain instances. This is a major problem which students of this period in Early Jewish History have to acknowledge and deal with. It would be easy to discount certain of the sources as unreliable or to attempt to reconcile the various versions by deleting some information and adding other information to obtain a unified picture. To take either of these routes would lead to a distortion of the events and the meaning they had for the writers and their audiences. Therefore it is necessary to look at each of these sources individually, answering the questions mentioned above and thereby arriving at a probable course of events based on all the information at our disposal.

Before proceeding with a closer look at the primary sources, it will be necessary to give a brief outline of the chronologies used during this period. Understanding these chronologies can be of assistance when faced with apparent discrepancies in the various narratives.

Dates in many of the documents from the Early Jewish period are based on the Seleucid era. The Seleucid era was a common dating system introduced by Seleucus I. It was calculated to begin with his retaking of Babylon in 312 B.C.E. after the defeat of Antigonus at Gaza in the summer of 312 B.C.E. (Grabbe, 1991:59).

There is a problem with this dating system as different calendars, calculated in different ways were used in the different parts of the Seleucid empire. The two main calendrical systems in use were:- the Babylonian and the Syro-Macedonian. The Babylonian calendar counted the year 1 Seleucid Era (S.E.) as beginning with Nisan (spring) 311 B.C.E. Whereas the Syro-Macedonian calendar began year 1 S.E. with Tishri (autumn) 312 B.C.E. (Grabbe, 1991:60). Judaea followed the Babylonian calendar

system, although it was not always identical with it because of errors or omissions in the calculation of intercalary months (cf. Goldstein 1976:544).

When studying the documents of this period it is important to know which form of the Seleucid Era is being used. This knowledge can be useful especially where the chronological data in the texts seems contradictory.

2.2.1.1 I MACCABEES

The first book of Maccabees covers the period 175 to 135 B.C.E. It is usually considered to be the most reliable of the sources we have for this period. This is because of the straightforward style of writing, which lacks recourse to supernatural intervention in the recording of the events of the period as happens in other sources including II Maccabees (Grabbe 1992: 223). The application of this criteria of trustworthiness to the various sources is now being questioned by scholars, many of whom now see this straightforwardness in I Maccabees as one of the techniques used by the author to get his message across in an acceptable way (Grabbe 1992: 223).

It is an anonymous work which was originally written in Hebrew but for which we only have a Greek version extant. In form it is modelled on the historical books of the Bible, especially Judges, I and II Samuel, I and II Kings. By following in the footsteps of these earlier writings the author is showing that God is still in control of history even in the Seleucid age (Delcor 1989: 461). The general consensus among scholars at present is that it is an official history of the Hasmonean dynasty to the death of Simon in 135 B.C.E. Various reasons gleaned from the text itself seem to support this idea. Very little space is accorded to the events prior to the appearance of Mattathias, a priest of the line of Joarib, who left Jerusalem for Modein, during the period of the reform attempt and persecution (I Macc 2: 1-14). Once Mattathias and his sons join the movement opposed to the reform and persecution, they are portrayed as the heroes chosen by the Almighty to lead the people back to a life lived in accordance with the Law of the Lord. When others not chosen by God try to emulate the actions of Judah and his brothers they meet with failure as in the case of Joseph son of Zechariah and Azariah who with their forces were defeated at Jamnia (I Macc 5: 55-62). The likening of Mattathias to Phineas, the priest whose actions on behalf of the Law at Peor saw Yahweh granting to him and his

descendants the everlasting priesthood (Numbers 25: 1-13), would seem to back up the position of his descendants who now hold the office of the high priest. They have been granted this position because of their zeal for the Law of the Lord just as Phineas had been at Peor.

There is no unanimity as to when this book was written. It could not be before 135 B.C.E. when Simon died, as it refers to his death and the succession of his son John Hyrcanus. I Maccabees 16: 23-24, refers to the annals of the pontificate of John's priesthood. These verses are ambiguous and do not tell us whether John is still living or dead. It is possible therefore that the book was written either during the reign of John Hyrcanus (135-104 B.C.E.) or that of Alexander Janneus (103-76 B.C.E.). The fact that the narrative is sympathetic to the Romans suggests that it was written before the conquest of Judaea by Pompey in 63 B.C.E. The style and content of the book which seeks to show the Hasmoneans as the family chosen by God to rule His people, suggests that it was written at a time of opposition to or discontent with the Hasmonean dynasty. During the reigns of both John Hyrcanus and Alexander Janneus there were periods of internal unrest and civil war.

It is clear from the text of this book that the author made use of various sources in compiling his history of the early Hasmoneans. He uses two kinds of sources:- personal reminiscences and written documents (Delcor 1989: 459). Grabbe together with other scholars including Neuhaus suggest a more cautious approach to attempting to identify multiple sources in I Maccabees (Grabbe 1992: 223). This is in contrast to Schunck who gives a detailed source analysis of I Maccabees (cf. Attridge 1986: 317).

We are informed at I Macc 14:49 that there was an official archive in the treasury where copies of all official documents were kept. The documents in this archive probably consisted of both internal Jewish documents and the communications between various external nations and the Jewish organs of authority. Examples of these latter communications are found at various places in the narrative. Most of these letters from foreign sources are now considered by scholars to be genuine. There is still debate regarding the treaty with Rome during the time of Judah (I Macc 8:23-32) and the letter from the king of Sparta (I Macc 12:20-23). We know from II Maccabees 11: 34-38 that there was a Roman legation in Syria and Palestine during the time of Judah. This legation

was prepared to speak on behalf of the Jewish people before Lysias in Antioch. The degree of formality which existed between Rome and the Jewish people at this stage is not certain.

A further indication that different sources were used is the fact that different forms of the Seleucid Era are used in the book. For many years controversy raged over the date of the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. In I Maccabees it occurs after the purification of the temple whereas in II Maccabees it occurs before the purification of the Temple. This problem was solved by Bickerman in 1937 when he realised that two calendrical systems were being used in I Maccabees. Dates referring to royal Seleucid history are given according to the Seleucid Macedonian calendar that dates events from autumn 312. The dates for Jewish history are given according to the Babylonian Seleucid calendar that dates events from spring 311. Therefore the date of 149 S.E. given for the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in I Maccabees does not contradict the date of 148 S.E. given for his death in II Maccabees. We know from a cuneiform king list from Babylon that news of the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes was received in Babylon in the 9th month 148 Sel. Bab. i.e. November/December, just after the beginning of the year 149 Sel. Mac. in October 164 B.C.E. .

The accuracy with which the author describes the geography of Palestine and events especially during the campaigns of Judah suggests that he was using eyewitness accounts of these events. His knowledge and precision in descriptions of the topography especially the sites of important battles and events suggest that he was a resident in Palestine probably in Jerusalem itself (cf. Delcor 1989: 459; Goldstein 1983: 12). There have been attempts by various scholars to pinpoint who might have been the source of these eyewitness accounts but no consensus has been reached. It is probably best to acknowledge that certain sections of this book, especially those concerned with the campaigns of Judah appear to be eyewitness accounts but to accept that we cannot at this stage identify the exact source.

2.2.1.2 II MACCABEES

The Second book of Maccabees is an abridgement of a five volume work by Jason of Cyrene. Unlike I Maccabees it only covers the period from about 180-161 B.C.E. It is our

primary source for the events that occurred in Judaea prior to the reform and persecution under Antiochus IV Epiphanes. In the eighteenth and nineteenth centuries C.E. this work was considered in a negative light by scholars who saw it as "... a tendentious work of a Pharisee who sought to give a religious account of the events of the time..." (Tcherikover 1966:381), thereby having little relevance as a source for a political and historical understanding of the period. In 1900 Niese challenged this view in his study of the two books. He showed that II Maccabees is indeed a valuable historical source for the period under question.

It is a complex literary work that has evoked much controversy. Not only is it the abridgement of a much longer work but it is also prefixed by two letters to the Jews in Egypt. These letters are meant to encourage the Jews in Egypt to celebrate the Feast of the Purification of the Temple in the month of Kislev. For this reason it appears that the text has the form of a festal scroll. Dating of this work is usually worked around the dating of the letters. As the first letter is dated 124 B.C.E. it seems unlikely that the text was written much after that – it would not make sense to append an old letter to such a document (Schurer 1986: 532; Tcherikover 1966: 382-383). Most scholars put the work by Jason at around 160 B.C.E. because it does not go beyond the life of Judas (Tcherikover 1966: 384). Delcor and Sievers do not agree with this early date for Jason's work preferring a date between 155 and 124 B.C.E. The reason for this is that at II Macc 2: 19 we are told that Jason's history related to Judas and his brothers (Delcor 1989: 443). The religious content of the work is also important for dating purposes as II Maccabees refers to the resurrection of the dead which is a new idea in Jewish theology of the time.

There is a strong emphasis on the place and holiness of the temple in II Maccabees. This has prompted many scholars to think that the book was written to counteract other temples which had sprung up especially the one at Leontopolis which Onias IV built after leaving Judaea. Doran takes this idea to a new level and sees the work as a city history with the emphasis being on the power and holiness of its temple. He shows that the author uses good Greek style in the organization of his story. The structure of the book effectively proclaims "...the greatness of the God of Israel, who protects the temple at Jerusalem" (Doran 1981: 52).

II Maccabees also contains a number of original documents which help us to build a picture of the history of Judaea during this period. They are valuable as they often do not confirm what is in the text around them. This is particularly so in the letter of Antiochus IV Epiphanes at II Macc 9: 19 –27. In this letter he is writing to the Jews of Judaea to inform them of his illness and to recommend his son to them as co-regent in his place. He wishes for them to co-operate with his son in future. In the context the writer of II Maccabees is claiming that the king is acknowledging his sins against Israel and appealing to them to think well of him and his son. The other letters found in chapter 11 of this work are all connected to the revolt which took place in Judaea when the Jewish religion was proscribed. Their order is incorrect but most scholars have now agreed on the sequence of the letters and the situations in which they arose. The sequence of the letters helps us draw up a clearer picture of the development of events during the revolt. The letter from Antiochus to emissary of Menelaus is now seen as the first letter. This is followed by letters number 3 and 4 which refer to negotiations between Lysias and the Jews. Letter number 2 from Antiochus V to Lysias is the last of these letters as it refers to the death of Antiochus IV so must be dated after the end of 164 B.C.E. There is debate as to whether this last letter should be dated to the campaign of Antiochus V and Lysias in Judaea in 163 B.C.E. or 162 B.C.E. As yet no consensus has been reached on this issue.

Used carefully and in conjunction with other sources II Maccabees supplies us with much useful information on this period in Early Judaism. It is our main source for certain areas especially those concerning the situation in Judaea prior to the Hellenistic Reform attempt.

2.2.1.3 JOSEPHUS

Josephus was born c.38 C.E. into a Jewish priestly family with possible connections to the Hasmonean family and died c.100 C.E. in Rome (Thackeray 1926: vii, x). He lived in Judaea until the fall of Jerusalem in 70 C.E. Thereafter, following in the train of the victorious Titus, he made his home in Rome. It was in this latter period of his life that he wrote the four works by which he is known. Although he lived in Rome and wrote in Greek all four of his works are concerned with Judaism. Two of his works, *The Jewish War* and *The Antiquities of the Jews*, are of particular interest for the topic of this study.

Although he makes reference to the period under study in *Contra Apion*, none of what he says in this source is additional to the information given in the abovementioned works. His other known work, *The Life*, deals primarily with the author's life and his part in the early phases of the war with Rome.

Josephus covers most of Jewish history in his four extant works. However, these works are not without their difficulties and must be approached with care by modern historians and scholars. The accounts of the period under study are often confused and give conflicting information to that supplied by other primary sources. For this reason it is necessary to weigh up the information supplied by Josephus against what we know from other sources. For the Ptolemaic and early Seleucid period in Judaea for which Josephus is our main source we need to use our knowledge of the general political, economic, social and religious situation of the time to build up a context in which to assess his contribution. This information is available to us in histories of the Hellenistic kingdoms, various papyri, inscriptions and archaeological evidence.

2.2.1.3.1 THE WAR OF THE JEWS

The Jewish War was completed between 75 and 79 C.E. It could not have been after 79 C.E. as it was presented to Vespasian and Titus and Vespasian died in 79 C.E. (Grabbe 1992: 7 ; Sievers 1990: 11). Its purpose was to describe the war with Rome. The account begins at about 170 B.C.E. This is possibly to show that in the time of Judah relations between the Jews and Romans were good (Sievers 1990: 11). In this work Josephus employs the literary style of Polybius to write a pragmatic military and political history of the Jews and Rome (Schürer 1986: 327; Sievers 1990: 11). The section of this work which is of most use to the topic under study is:- Book I. 31-47. This covers the reign of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and ends with the death of Judas Maccabeus. The information contained in this section is not without difficulties. There are a number of contradictions between the passage War I. 31-33 and the account of events as presented in II Maccabees. For this reason many scholars reject the account in Josephus. Tcherikover in an attempt to overcome these differences develops a theory whereby Jason fights the Tobiads twice, once in 171 B.C.E. and again in 168 B.C.E. From II Maccabees we know that Jason fought in Jerusalem in 168 B.C.E. but no mention is made in this source of the

Tobiads being expelled from Jerusalem. It is possible that Jason fought the Tobiads soon after Menelaus acquired the high priesthood in 172/171 B.C.E. The account in Josephus is generally confused for this period. However, he does emphasize the connection between the Hellenizers and the Tobiads which our other sources do not (Tcherikover 1966: 393-396). He does not seem to use any sources for the period prior to Judah which could account for the confusion and vagueness of the account. He corrects many of his errors in the *Antiquities of the Jews*.

2.2.1.3.2 THE ANTIQUITIES OF THE JEWS

The *Antiquities of the Jews* was first published in about 94 C.E. The purpose of this work was very different to that of the *Jewish War*. Its main aim was to present a history of the Jewish people which would be acceptable to educated Greeks and Romans (Grabbe 1992: 8). In this work he uses the patterns of rhetorical historiography as exemplified by the Roman *Antiquities* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (Attridge 1986: 327). Books 12 to 14 describe the events from the death of Alexander the Great to that of the last Hasmonean ruler Antigonus. He uses a number of sources in this work which he tends to paraphrase although he does take liberties with the details and supplies his own interpretation of events (Sievers 1990: 11-13).

Where differences occur between the accounts in the *Jewish War* and the *Antiquities of the Jews*, these can be explained by changes in his own outlook, the different intended audiences of the two works, use of different sources and the different religious and political situations at the time of writing (Sievers 1990: 12).

This is the only source we have for the Ptolemaic period in Judaea. Most of the information on this period is given in the report on the Tobiad family. Although much of this report is legendary in character we can find a basis for it in the Zenon papyri and the archaeological investigations at Araq el Emir (Hengel 1974: 268-269). It is from this sources that we obtain a background of the conflict between the mighty families of Judaea for power. This confirms what we know from II Maccabees of the period preceding the Hellenistic Reform (Tcherikover 1976: 117). For the period from Judah on Josephus generally paraphrases I Maccabees. We can therefore weigh up his information with that contained in I and II Maccabees for this period.

2.2.2 THE SECONDARY SOURCES

There are a number of secondary sources available to us for the period under study. Those secondary sources which have been consulted by the writer for this work are listed in the bibliography. When using secondary sources the same criteria apply as when using primary sources. It is important to know where the author is coming from, the reason for writing, the context and audience the author is writing for.

The writer has chosen to use works which were written in the second half of the twentieth century. The secondary sources can be divided into different categories. There are the general histories of the period such as *The Cambridge Ancient History*. Specifically dealing with Jewish history are: *The Cambridge Jewish History*, *The History of the Jewish People in the Period of the Second Temple*. There are a number of works; books and articles, which look at Judaism during the period of the Second Temple. These give information on the period under study in varying detail. The most useful of these to the present writer is the two volume work by L.L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyprus to Hadrian*, volumes 1 and 2. This work draws a synthesis of the period from the main primary sources and secondary sources available to the late 1980's of the last century. It is also useful in that it provides a jumping off point for further research with its detailed bibliographical details.

There are also works which deal specifically with the period under question. Of these the writer has made use of the following works: Bickerman, E. *The God of the Maccabees*, Goldstein, J. *I and II Maccabees*, Harrington, D.J. *The Maccabean Revolt*, Hengel, M. *Judaism and Hellenism*, Tcherikover, V.A. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Other works on the period by these and other authors were also consulted. As noted above these secondary sources need to be used as carefully as the primary sources and the biases of the authors taken into account.

3. PALESTINIAN JUDAISM DURING THE PERIOD 332 TO 175 B.C.E.

The conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great in 332 B.C.E. issued in a new era in the history of the province. Our sources seem to suggest that it took a lengthy period before the new ways of the Greek and Macedonian conquerors were felt by the general populace of Palestine. This can probably be explained to a great extent by the turmoil into which the Ancient Near East was thrown on the death of Alexander the Great in 323 B.C.E. It was only after the peace of Ipsus in 301 B.C.E. that any degree of stability was restored to the lands conquered by Alexander the Great. Although at the peace of Ipsus, Seleucus was granted the province of Coele-Syria and Palestine, Ptolemy I Soter took control of this province. This action of Ptolemy was to result in more than a century of conflict between the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms over this valuable and strategic region.

The conquest of Judah, the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple and the deportation of its leading citizens in 587 B.C.E. by the forces of Nebuchadnezzar marked a watershed in the development of Early Judaism. These events saw the end of the Davidic monarchy in Judah. In the period following Cyrus' conquest of Babylon in 539 B.C.E. he allowed a group of Jews to return to Jerusalem. Our sources for this early period of post-exilic Judaea are meager and it is only with the missions of Ezra and Nehemiah during the reign of Artaxerxes I (465-424 B.C.E.) that we get any real idea of conditions in Judaea. As these sources have a strong theological bias it is necessary to be careful in drawing conclusions about conditions in Judaea and the surrounding areas from them. Where extra-biblical sources exist they should be consulted to build a clearer picture (Grabbe 1992: 134-135).

We are able to ascertain certain information concerning Judaea during the Persian period i.e. the period from 539 B.C.E. to 332 B.C.E. from the meager sources to hand. The territorial extent of Judaea after the exile was much reduced. The southern part of Judaea had fallen into the hands of the Edomites (it now formed part of Idumaea) and the Shephelah was no longer part of Judaea. Judaea now consisted mainly of the Judean hill country and that part of the Rift Valley that included the Dead Sea. This meant that the

type of crops that could be successfully cultivated was reduced. The hill country of Judaea is best suited to the cultivation of olives and grapes. As these crops were in demand they could be readily sold for cash. The meager information we have on the Persian tax system suggests that the Persians preferred tax payments to be made in cash. In this way they were able to accumulate vast stocks of precious metals. Although this area is less suited to the cultivation of grain, a staple of the people, it is possible that the farmers chose to put more land down to olives and grapes as it could be sold for cash (Grabbe 1992: 121). However, Judaea also included Jericho which was renowned for its balsam and dates. The Dead Sea was a major source of asphalt and salt.

When the kingdom of Judah was conquered by the Neo-Babylonians a number of the people were sent into exile in Babylon. The bulk of these exiles were from the leading aristocratic and priestly families. They were the people that the Babylonians considered most likely to undermine and promote revolt against the new regime in Jerusalem. This suggests that Judah was not depopulated in 586 B.C.E. and the years following as appears to be the case in certain of our sources, such as, II Chronicles 36:20-23 and Ezra 1: 1-4. It is quite likely that the bulk of the peasant population remained in Judaea. As the Babylonians did not import foreign peoples into Judaea, we must assume that those Judeans not transported to Babylon continued to live and work on the land. This was to cause problems when the Persian kings permitted the leaders of the people to return to Judaea. Those who returned under the auspices of the Persian authorities to rebuild the temple at Jerusalem considered themselves to be the true people of Israel, the remnant that was now returning to their homeland. They saw those Judeans who had remained in Judaea and their form of Judaism as tainted.

Those Judeans who returned to Judaea under various Persian kings were given the task of rebuilding the temple at Jerusalem. Further they were required to set up the organisation of a temple state centred on the rebuilt temple at Jerusalem. Our sources show that this enterprise was not without its difficulties. There appears to have been much dissent between those returning from exile and those who remained behind in the land. In the early stages of the return it seems that the local governor in Samaria attempted to be placatory to both sides. Initially those who had remained in the land held the upper hand and the activities of those returning was severely hampered. This situation

changed with the coming of Nehemiah in the time of Artaxerxes I. Under his authority the walls of Jerusalem were finally completed. This was not without serious opposition by the governor in Samaria and the local people.

Besides the reconstruction of the temple and the walls of Jerusalem, the activities of Ezra were to have a lasting effect on Early Judaism. The ancestral Law as expounded and propagated by Ezra was made binding on all Jews in the Trans-Euphrates province, which included Judaea, by a decree of Artaxerxes I (Goldstein 1976: 200).

3.1 PALESTINIAN JUDAISM UNDER ALEXANDER THE GREAT AND THE DIADOCHI

We are fortunate in having detailed information on the campaigns of Alexander the Great including his conquest of Palestine and Egypt in 332-331 B.C.E. Unfortunately our sources for Alexander the Great and Judaea are meager consisting mainly of the account given at Antiquities XI: 2-7:314-347. There are other later Jewish sources which contain similar stories concerning Alexander and the Jews to those found in the Antiquities (Marcus 1951: 467 note f). All of these stories have Alexander personally coming up to Jerusalem to meet the high priest and the leaders of the people. Not only does Alexander meet these representatives of the Jews but he prostrates himself before the high priest. After the official welcome Alexander is led into the city and going up to the temple makes a sacrifice to God under the direction of the high priest. Before leaving Jerusalem Alexander decreed that the Jews be permitted to observe their country's laws and be exempt from tribute in the seventh year. At the request of the high priest he also decreed that the Jews living in Babylon and Persia be permitted to live according to their own laws (Jos. Ant. XI: 329-339). Scholars generally regard the stories relating to Alexander's visit to Jerusalem as fictitious and of a legendary character. They bear a close resemblance to other legendary accounts referring to Alexander and his visits to important shrines in the Near East. It seems that important details of these legends can be traced to the visit of Alexander to the shrine of Sarapis at Ammon in Egypt (Marcus 1951: 522-523).

As can be seen from the above much of what we know about Alexander's relations with the Jews comes in legendary form. The information given in these Jewish

sources is not repeated in any of the non-Jewish sources about Alexander. In order to arrive at what can reasonably be assumed to have happened between the Jews of Judaea and Alexander we need to look at how he treated other conquered peoples and compare this with the information we have in Josephus and other Jewish sources.

We know that it was accepted practice for subject cities and peoples to decide which of two contending foreign forces they would support. It need not be for the current occupying kingdom. When making decisions of this kind the local administration needed to weigh up the interests of their own people and decide which of the contesting groups would be more sympathetic to the needs and aspirations of their people. Their decision on which foreign force to throw in their lot with would also be dictated to by the reputation of the contesting forces. It was generally accepted that those who supported the victor would be left in relative peace and be granted various concessions. Those who supported the losing power were likely to be punished severely, possibly losing their territory and being sold into slavery.

For the Jewish people there was an additional factor to be considered when such a choice was to be made. Since the time of the exile it was a widely held belief that the kingdom of Judah had been defeated and its people subjugated by various kingdoms as punishment for the sins of the people. As a result of this view it was considered a sin to advocate revolt from the ruling powers of the day. They had been sent by God to subjugate the people as punishment for their sins against God. It was possible to support a new regime as opposed to the existing occupying force. A change in occupying power was a sign that the old power was now being punished for their sins. However, until God intervened in the life of the Jewish people and restored them fully, they were to accept the yoke of subjugation and not attempt revolt. The only thing that would permit revolt against a ruling power would be if they forced the Jewish people to abandon their ancestral laws and belief in God. As the polytheistic kingdoms generally did not interfere in the religious practices of their subject peoples this eventuality was not likely to occur (Goldstein 1989: 292-293).

We know from Josephus and non-Jewish sources that as Alexander proceeded through Coele-Syria and Phoenicia only two cities went against him, Tyre and Gaza. These two cities were destroyed, many people killed and sold into slavery, then they were

reconstituted as military colonies. The remaining cities and peoples received Alexander and his army and their constitutional rights were reconfirmed. In the period Alexander was in the region it would not have been possible for him to travel into the interior to Jerusalem as stated in Josephus. However, it is most likely that the high priest and a delegation from the temple state of Judaea journeyed to the coast to give their allegiance to Alexander. Among other things they would have requested that he reconfirm the status of Judaea as a temple state governed according to the ancestral laws of the Jews. This he would most likely have complied with as he gave this right to various other peoples and cities eg. the Ionian cities, the Lydians, the Indians and the Arabians (Hengel 1980: 8). It is probable that a certain measure of tax relief would also be granted to those who willingly accepted him as overlord. Therefore the statement in Josephus that the Jews were also exempted from taxes in the seventh year would have a basis in fact.

It is most likely that when Alexander left the region to continue his campaigns in the east he would have left officials to monitor the region for signs of unrest and to set up structures for the general maintenance of the captured territories and the collection of taxes. These officials would likely have been supported by groups of soldiers. In this way the first military settlements in the conquered territories would have emerged. We know that Alexander wished to improve on the financial governance of the areas which now formed his kingdom. In order to do this he began introducing a uniform coinage based on the Attic standard. The introduction of a uniform coinage would further economic development throughout his kingdom. He also planned a more efficient system of taxation (Hengel 1980: 10-11). As Alexander spent the rest of his life conquering and consolidating his territorial gains, it is unlikely that he would have had the time to set up a new administrative system in the conquered territories which now made up his kingdom. Life for the people of Judaea would have gone on much as it had under Persian rule. The main difference would have been the nationality and language of the new conquerors. There would have been little change in the method of tax collection by the new rulers or in the way Judaea was administered.

The death of Alexander in 323 B.C.E. issued in a period of great instability in the Near East and Greece. As the successors to Alexander's vast empire fought amongst themselves to secure as much territory in their own hands as they could, the lot of the

conquered peoples in whose territories they fought would have been intolerable. With reference to Judaea and Syria during this period, Josephus informs us that, "...the result was that continual and prolonged wars arose, and the cities suffered through their struggles and lost many of their inhabitants,..." (Jos. Ant.XII, I.1.3). We know from other sources that much fighting took place in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia and that the land was occupied many times during this period. Although actual details of the circumstances of the people during this period are scarce we can concur with Josephus that much suffering took place. The contending armies would expect the local people to feed, water and billet their soldiers and care for their livestock, horses etc. This was a burden on the local population even in times of peace and prosperity. How much more so it would be in times of continual conflict. The constant fighting would negatively impact on the farmers ability to plant and harvest crops successfully. In Judaea these difficulties would have been exacerbated by the Sabbath Year, during which time no planting or reaping could take place. After the Battle of Ipsus in 301 B.C.E. Coele-Syria and Phoenicia was officially declared the territory of Seleucus I. However, Ptolemy I Soter took possession of this territory which was so important as a buffer between Egypt and Syria and as a source of raw materials.

It was during this period, especially in the time of Antigonos, that the first Greek cities, *poleis*, were founded. The founding and development of these *poleis* was to strongly influence the cities and peoples of the Ancient Near East.

3.2 PALESTINIAN JUDAISM UNDER THE PTOLEMIES

The Ptolemies held Coele-Syria and Phoenicia from 301 to 200 B.C.E. This was a period of relative peace during which we see the beginnings of the impact of the Greek way on the peoples of this region. Josephus, quoting Agartharchides of Cnidus, informs us that Ptolemy I was able to capture Jerusalem by attacking on the Sabbath when the inhabitants would not take up arms because of their 'superstition'. He further informs us that many Jews were transported to Egypt, some to be trained as soldiers others as slaves. This move was to result in the large Jewish population in Egypt. A population which was to have much influence on the development of Judaism during the Hellenistic period.

We don't hear much of Judaea during the early period of Ptolemaic rule. We must suppose that the Ptolemies were setting up their governing apparatus during this period. The exact form the administration took in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia is not known with certainty. It is likely that the province was administered in a similar way to that used in Egypt itself. There would be modifications as the local ruling classes and forms of government would need to be taken account of. This province was not as homogenous as Egypt and the susceptibilities of the local ruling classes needed to be taken account of when organizing the administration. The coastal cities of the Phoenicians were allowed to maintain semi-independence and many opted to take the form of Greek foundations i.e. *poleis*. The local rulers in the rest of the province were recognized by the state. In this way the Ptolemies hoped to maintain peace. It was also useful to the ruling power to have the support of the local rulers.

The actual organization of the province is not known but it is probable that Coele-Syria and Phoenicia was a *hyparchy*. We know that the finance ministry played a large role in the Ptolemaic administration. It is certain that there was an *oikonomos* (finance minister) in the province who oversaw the collection of taxes and other business of the finance ministry. Whether there was a military or other governor the sources don't enlighten us. The smallest unit of government was the village. Each village was headed by a *komarches* (mayor), who would have been a local person. Besides the *komarches* there would also be royal officials especially those connected to the finance ministry to ensure that everything was being done to ensure the maximum revenue returns for the state (Grabbe 1992:191). All these government officials present in the villages would have been the first members of the new Hellenistic kingdoms with which the villagers came into contact. In this way the ways of the Greeks would be present throughout the region. To what extent their presence influenced the country people is not recorded but the general attitude of the country people to Hellenistic ways during Seleucid rule suggests very little influence.

In Judaea the high priest was acknowledged as the local civil and religious leader by the state. This meant that Judaea had a semi-autonomous status that allowed it to pursue its own form of local civil government and religious practices. Besides the high priest we know that there was also a *gerousia* or council of elders. This body which was

made up of members of the local lay and priestly aristocracy assisted the high priest in an advisory capacity. How much influence this body exerted on affairs in Judaea we do not know, but we do know that by the end of the Ptolemaic period it was acknowledged by the ruling power. On Antiochus III's conquest of the region he acknowledges this body. The later Seleucid rulers always refer to the *gerousia* of the Jews in their formal communications with Judaea. The emphasis put on the role of the high priest by writers of this period shows us that the form of local government in Judaea continued to be that of a theocracy. Unlike earlier Persian times there does not appear to be a governor over the high priest. It was the high priest who was responsible for the payment of the annual tribute to the Ptolemies.

The coming of the Ptolemies does not initially seem to have had much impact on the way the people lived and on their religious and other practices. We are aware from archaeological and other sources that the Ptolemies did introduce improved farming methods into this province (cf. Klausner 1976: 180). The reasons for this were undoubtedly to boost productivity and thereby income. It was during this period that the development of *cleruchies* and *poleis* expanded in this province. This resulted in closer contact between Greek and local people. Members of *cleruchies* often married local women. In this way the local people felt the influence of Greek culture, language and norms. It was however a reciprocal relationship with the *cleruchs* being influenced by the local culture.

3.2.1 THE TOBIADS

The sources for this period draw our attention to the family of the Tobiads. They were influential members of the Jewish aristocracy although their lands were in the Ammonitis in Trans-Jordan. There was a *cleruchy* of mixed Jewish and Greek soldiers on their land in the time of Ptolemy II Philadelphus. They seem to have been prosperous landowners who were closely connected to the ruling classes in Jerusalem. Although they are mentioned in the book of Nehemiah, the first mention we have of them for our period is in the Zenon papyri. These documents refer to a journey made by members of the ministry of finance into Coele-Syria and Phoenicia during the year 259 B.C.E. During this visit Zenon and his entourage were accommodated by Tobias on his estate. This

suggests that Tobias was an influential man of means in the region. The correspondence between Zenon and Tobias gives us many clues as to the position of Tobias in the Judean hierarchy and the influence of the Hellenistic world on this man of affairs. The fact that the correspondence between Zenon and Tobias is conducted in Greek suggests that Tobias had a knowledge of this language. We know that he had a Greek secretary who would have written the actual letters. This does not mean that Tobias was ignorant of the language. He would need some knowledge of it to communicate with the *cleruchs* on his land and to be a suitable host for Zenon. The content of this correspondence is also enlightening as it shows Tobias to be a man who is comfortable with Greek ways. Although it is the secretary who writes the letters Tobias seems tolerant of the use of the conventional Greek phrase, “many thanks to the gods”, in this correspondence (Grabbe 1992: 196). Much of the correspondence deals with the trade in slaves including Hebrew slaves. The selling of Hebrew slaves to non-Jews was prohibited by the Jewish Law. This trade particularly the forced enslavement of free peasants was against both Jewish and Ptolemaic law. Ptolemy II Philadelphus had to battle against this activity and sets many slaves free including some of those enslaved by his father Ptolemy I Soter (Jos. Ant. XII: 24 – 33). These texts show us how a man in Tobias position could be influenced by the Greek way of doing things.

Our only other source for this period is the Antiquities of the Jews by Josephus. Once again Josephus highlights the role of the Tobiad family in the affairs of Judaea. At Antiquities XII: 160-222 Josephus gives an account of the Tobiad Joseph and his sons especially Hyrcanus. Although Josephus places these events in the time of Ptolemy V Epiphanes (ca. 204-180 B.C.E.) it is generally agreed that the information they contain is far more suited to the period of Ptolemy III Euergetes (246-221 B.C.E.). Josephus’ account of Joseph Tobiad and his sons is useful for our knowledge of developments in Judaea and Judaism from the middle of the third century on.

The story begins with a crisis in Judaea, the high priest of the time Onias II is refusing to pay the annual tribute due to the Ptolemaic kingdom. Refusal to pay tribute was looked on in a severe light by the ruling kingdoms of the day. It suggested that the client people were rebelling against the ruling kingdom. The king was threatening to confiscate the land of Judaea and turn it into a settlement for his soldiers. This distressed

the people greatly. In his account Josephus tells us that the reason for the withholding of the tribute was due to the meanness of the high priest. This is not a likely possibility. The most likely scenario for this story is against the backdrop of the Third Syrian War between Ptolemy III and Seleucus II (246-241 B.C.E.). The high priest was probably hoping for a change of regime and holding onto the tribute with that eventuality in mind. We are not supplied with any reasons for this but the attitude of the Ptolemies to their subject peoples and their lands is a possible reason. The Ptolemies only saw the conquered territories in terms of finances.

It is at this point in the story that Joseph ben Tobiah appears. He goes to his uncle, the high priest Onias II, and asks why he is endangering the very existence of his people in this manner. Eventually he convinces Onias II to allow him to go to Egypt as the representative of the Jewish people of Judaea. Before going he calls a meeting of the people and tells them of the agreement he has made with the high priest on behalf of the people. The people accept his proposal and he becomes the official envoy of the Jewish people to the Ptolemaic court. In this way he erodes the political power of the high priest. We see in all of this the first split occurring within the leading families of Judaea based on different perceptions of international politics. This passage is also useful in that it shows us the close relationship that existed between the Oniad and Tobiad families. They were related through the marriage of Tobias to the daughter of the high priest Onias. At no point in our sources are the Tobiads shown to be members of the priestly class. As the high priestly families tended to endogamous marriages this must be one of the exceptions where they were prepared to allow marriage with members of the lay aristocracy.

There is some interesting information that can be garnered from the account of Joseph's rise to power as an agent of the Ptolemaic regime. He is obviously on friendly terms with Samaritans. This friendship of the Tobiads with the Samaritans goes back to the time of Nehemiah (Marcus 1951: 89). The Samaritans were generally viewed by the people of Judaea with suspicion. They were considered to have fallen under the influence of foreign cults and been tainted by intermarriage with other peoples. Although they were viewed with suspicion at this time by pious Jews it was only during the period of the Hasmoneans that the final break came between Jews and Samaritans. Joseph went to Egypt and appeared before the king and queen impressing them to such a degree that they

agreed to sell him the rights to farm the taxes for the entire province of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. In order to do this we must assume that he was well grounded in Greek and the methods of Greek court protocol. From the above we know that his father knew Greek and employed a Greek secretary. It is highly likely that he also employed Greek tutors for the education of his sons, thereby equipping them to deal with the Hellenistic powers and their envoys.

Joseph held this position for twenty two years. During this time his power and influence in the region including Judaea would have increased enormously. He kept a house and large sums of money in Alexandria. In Alexandria he had a steward Arion who looked after all his affairs including paying the annual tribute for Coele-Syria and Phoenicia to the king. When in Alexandria he mixed with high ranking Jews and the members of the Ptolemaic court (cf. *Jos. Ant.* XII. 184-187). As the political representative of the Jews to the Ptolemaic court his power in Jerusalem would have been substantial. We have no sources which tell us what the situation in Judaea was at this time. Therefore we can only assume that all was quiet. We can surmise that Joseph and his sons were regular visitors to Jerusalem. They had a chamber in the temple and probably other property in the city. On their regular visits to Jerusalem they would have brought much information on life in Alexandria and the rest of the province. Their presence and lifestyle would attract the attention of the other high born families resident in Jerusalem. It is likely that Greek education on a private basis was introduced into Jerusalem at this time. The need for such knowledge would seem imperative to ambitious members of the aristocracy when they observed the power and influence that the Tobiads enjoyed in the province and Egypt.

At some point toward the end of Joseph's period as tax farmer for the province of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia his youngest son Hyrcanus went to Egypt as his representative on the birth of a Ptolemaic prince. Through lavish spending Hyrcanus was able to influence the royal couple and their senior courtiers. As a result of this he acquired his father's position as tax farmer for the province of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. This move caused a serious rift in the Tobiad family that was to influence later developments in Judaea. For whatever reason it seems that the Tobiads, with the exception of Hyrcanus, had now moved into a position of support for the Seleucid kingdom. The Seleucids now

had a strong king in the person of Antiochus III. In Jerusalem there was a strong, new high priest, Simon II 'the just', who supported the Seleucid kingdom.

3.2.2. JEWISH LITERATURE IN GREEK

It was during the Ptolemaic period that a Jewish literature in Greek began to develop. This mainly took place in Egypt where there was a large Greek speaking Jewish community. Most of the literature that came out of Egypt was concerned with Jewish life, history and religion. The most important work to be undertaken during this period was the translation of the Pentateuch from Hebrew to Greek. Josephus gives us a highly coloured account of how this translation came to take place. He says it was carried out on the instructions of Ptolemy II Philadelphus who wished to have a copy of the Jewish sacred writings in the library he was developing at Alexandria. This seems most unlikely as the Greeks were generally not interested in the writings of the native peoples (Grabbe 1992: 200) A much more probable scenario is the need of the Greek speaking Jews of Egypt for a copy of their sacred writings in a language they could understand. As the Jewish writer Demetrius used the Septuagint as the basis for his exegesis it must have been translated before 200 B.C.E. The rest of the Jewish canon would have been translated prior to 100 B.C.E. (Grabbe 1992: 200).

The Septuagint set the trend for the writing of Jewish works in Greek. Many of the works we know of emanated from Egypt but some also came out of Palestine. The most common works in Greek were histories that were aimed at making Jewish history available to Greek and Roman readers. In their works the Jewish writers sought to make Judaism seem rational to those who felt it was barbaric. They also sought to show the antiquity of the Jewish people and their belief structure to the gentile world.

The development of a Jewish literature in Greek was to be a major source of infiltration of Greek ideas and concepts into Judaism. It was not possible to write in Greek without using Greek words, ideas and thought structures. Jewish ideas had to be translated into Greek concepts to make sense to Greek writers. This had an effect on Jewish theology. New ideas developed because of the need to put them into understandable Greek. These translations and original writings of the Jews in Greek would change how Jewish people saw their history and religion. Greek ideas were

already having an influence on the Jerusalem aristocracy by the introduction of Greek secretaries and tutors into their homes.

3.3 PALESTINIAN JUDAISM UNDER THE SELEUCIDS

“The Seleucid assumption of power in Palestine introduced a phase in the history of Judaism which, in terms of drama and tumultuous events, stood in shattering contrast to the previous peaceful centuries under the Persians and Ptolemies.” (Otzen 1990: 16). This statement indeed sums up the general difference between the Seleucid rule in Judaea and that of the Persians and Ptolemies. Initially Seleucid rule brought many benefits to the people of Judaea but as internal and external developments took place the situation changed.

3.3.1 PALESTINIAN JUDAISM UNDER ANTIOCHUS III

During the Fifth Syrian War the Jewish *ethnos* under the leadership of the high priest Simon II ‘the Just’ came out openly on the side of Antiochus III against Ptolemy V. This led to much upheaval and destruction in Jerusalem as the rival forces fought for supremacy in the area. The people of Jerusalem together with some Seleucid troops were able to oust the Ptolemaic garrison from the Citadel in Jerusalem. When Antiochus III finally defeated the forces of Ptolemy V and acquired the province of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia he rewarded the Jewish *ethnos* for its assistance to him and his forces.

We read of the concessions Antiochus III made to the Jewish *ethnos* in Josephus’ Antiquities of the Jews XII: 138-153. The most important of these is the first decree to Ptolemy son of Thraseas, governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. In this document Antiochus III granted various rights and concessions to the Jewish people. He granted tax concessions for three years to the entire city and exemption of certain taxes to various members of the priestly hierarchy. Further he ordered assistance to be given for the restoration of the Temple and city which had been damaged in the war with the Ptolemies. As a result of the war the city needed to be repopled and Antiochus ordered this to be done by bringing back Jews who were resident in other places. A tax incentive was to be given to those who returned to Jerusalem (Jos. Ant. XII. 139). The Seleucid authorities were also going to help with the costs of the Temple sacrifices. The most important part of this decree for the purposes of this work is to be found in Jos. Ant. XII.

142, “And all the members of the nation shall have a form of government in accordance with the laws of their country,...”. It is this part of the decree that defines the form of political structure that Judaea will have in respect of the Seleucid kingdom. They have been given the right to live according to their ancestral laws by a royal mandate. This mandate is binding on the Jewish *ethnos* until such time as it is revoked or changed by the king or one of his successors (Bickermann 1979: 33).

Antiochus III also issued a proclamation confirming the sanctity of the temple in Jerusalem. In this proclamation he declared that it was unlawful for foreigners to enter specified parts of the temple as is stated in the Jewish laws. He further declared that the flesh and skins of various animals are not to be brought into the city. This prohibition has been debated by scholars who find it unusual. The eating of the flesh of those animals mentioned was certainly forbidden. However, mules and asses were used to transport goods to and from the city and within the city. It is possible that this prohibition refers to these animals, their flesh and their skins being in the temple precinct rather than prohibiting them from the entire city.

Josephus further tells us that Antiochus III wrote to his governor, Zeuxis, in Lydia commending the Jews to him for their loyalty. As there had been revolts in Phrygia and Lydia he tells Zeuxis to move two thousand Jewish families and their possessions from Babylonia to the fortresses and towns in these regions (Jos. Ant. XII:147-153). We know from the Ptolemaic period that Jewish soldiers were sought after and used by the Ptolemies in Egypt. That Antiochus III would also use Jewish soldiers to form communities in problem areas of his realm is therefore probable. It is possible that members of these military communities were later sent to Jerusalem during the Hellenistic Reform attempt and its aftermath. It is an interesting idea but one that cannot be proved by the sources we have at our disposal.

This is all the information our main source for the period of the rule of Antiochus has to give us. We can obtain a good idea of what life in Jerusalem was like during this time from the Wisdom of Ben Sira a work written around 190 B.C.E. Ben Sira has much to say about the high priest Simon the Just. For him Simon is the epitome of what a high priest should be. Simon is a strong leader and also a traditionalist when it comes to the Jewish Law. He obtained a number of concessions for the people of Jerusalem and

Judaea from the king Antiochus III, including the formal right to live according to their ancestral laws. We can also see the hand of Simon in the proclamation to keep the purity of the temple and Jerusalem intact. This proclamation is interesting and suggests that Simon saw a possible threat to the future purity of the temple from groups within Jerusalem. The royal proclamation would be a deterrent to future violations of ritual purity. From the way in which the texts are worded it would appear that Simon was once again the political representative of the Jewish *ethnos*. We can also see his hand in obtaining assistance from Antiochus III with the reconstruction work of the temple and the city. Ben Sira particularly refers to Simon's work of restoring the damage to the temple and the city (Ben Sira: 50). This book also informs us of the ever widening gap between the rich and the poor. It alerts us to the influence of foreign ways coming into the city especially among the wealthy. He alludes to unrest but advocates against it. Ben Sira is grateful that he was able to see Jerusalem restored under a strong high priest.

3.3.2. PALESTINIAN JUDAISM UNDER SELEUCUS IV

On his death Antiochus III was succeeded by his older son Seleucus IV. We don't know much about Seleucus from the sources. He had the unenviable task of meeting the annual repayments of the reparations to Rome as a result of the Peace of Apamea. This put a heavy burden on the conquered territories that had to help meet these expenses of the Seleucid kingdom. It is probable that Seleucus maintained friendly relations with other states and tried to create a stable environment in which to acquire the needed revenues from the occupied territories.

During the life of Antiochus we do not hear of problems in Judaea except for those of a social nature alluded to in the Wisdom of Ben Sira. By the time Seleucus IV acceded to the Seleucid throne Simon II the Jewish high priest had died and his son Onias III now held the post. Our main source for the reign of Seleucus IV is the Second book of Maccabees chapters 3 – 4. It seems that initially all was well between the high priest and the Seleucid authorities.

There were however internal problems in the Jewish *ethnos*. We hear of one Simon, administrator of the temple, who is in conflict with the high priest over the regulation of the city markets. This Simon does not get his way and resorts to the

Seleucid governor of the province for assistance. He informs the governor that there is untold wealth in the temple treasury. Apollonius the governor duly informs the king of this treasure which is being amassed in the Jerusalem temple. As the king is in need of funds he sends his chancellor Heliodorus to Jerusalem to confiscate this wealth. Onias and the people are shocked when Heliodorus arrives to take the wealth from the temple. It is explained to him that some of the wealth belongs to Hyrcanus who has entrusted it to the care of the temple, while some is for the widows and orphans. Heliodorus insists on taking the wealth from the temple but for some reason is stopped from doing so. He returns empty handed to the king. Simon is still not happy and begins to slander the high priest and insinuating that Onias III had treated Heliodorus badly. As a result of this enmity between Simon and Onias III the city is thrown into chaos with murders being committed. At this point Onias III leaves for Antioch to petition the king personally and clear his name.

We are not sure exactly what caused the problems in Jerusalem that broke out during the high priesthood of Onias III. From the information that we have we need to work out what occurred in Jerusalem at this time as it has a direct bearing on later events. To some extent the Tobiads are involved in what was going on. This information we get from the rather confused account in Josephus War. They had lost the supreme political office of *prostates* to the high priest Simon II. They were however able to exert their influence over the Jewish *ethnos* through their close associates who held top positions in the temple, especially the members of the Bilga family (Tcherikover 1966: 155-157). Simon, the temple administrator, is the first time we hear mention of members of the priestly family of Bilga. Members of this family are to feature prominently in the Hellenistic Reform at Jerusalem. They seem to have been connected closely to the Tobiads but we are not sure how.

The initial problem seems to centre around the regulation of the city markets (II Macc.3: 4). We know from the above that there was a royal proclamation in place which regulated certain aspects of the Jerusalem market. These regulations would impact negatively on trade in the market especially foreign trade. It is possible that Simon wished to do away with some of these restrictions and open the markets for economic

reasons. As a conservative high priest Onias rejected these moves by Simon. He saw them as a danger to the ritual purity of the market (Jagersma 1985: 41).

The fact that Hyrcanus had funds lodged in the temple treasury is of interest. Towards the end of Ptolemaic rule in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia a rift had developed within the Tobiad family. Hyrcanus had acquired the rights to collect the taxes for the Ptolemaic kingdom in the province. At a time when the balance of power was under pressure he put in his lot with the Ptolemies. However, his brothers together with Simon II the new high priest were now siding with the Seleucids. When Antiochus III came to power in the region, Hyrcanus was forced to take up residence in the Tobiad stronghold in Trans-Jordan. From there he collected taxes from the Arab tribes and kept them under subjection. At the beginning of Seleucid rule in Judaea the high priest and the influential Tobiad family were pro-Seleucid whereas Hyrcanus was pro-Ptolemaic. We now find a situation where the Jewish high priest Onias III is on friendly terms with the pro-Ptolemaic Hyrcanus, even to keeping his funds in the Jerusalem temple. It looks as if Onias III is moving away from the close relations which his father had developed with the Seleucid kingdom. No reason for this change of attitude on the part of Onias III is given in the sources. We can conjecture on the possible reasons. The change in circumstances within the Seleucid kingdom after the Peace of Apamea could be part of the motive. The tax concessions granted to the priestly aristocracy of Jerusalem by Antiochus III were probably removed by Seleucus IV who needed all the money he could get to pay the Romans. Onias III saw the danger posed to traditional Judaism by the Tobiads and their supporters. As they were supporters of the Seleucids and had the ear of important office holders in the Seleucid government he possibly saw the Ptolemies as potential allies for the cause of traditional Judaism. These are all possible reasons for a change in the attitude of Onias III to the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kingdoms. Whatever his reasons for changing direction it gave the Tobiads and their supporters including the high priests brother Jason a case to bring against him to the Seleucid authorities. A possible change of allegiance by the high priest of the Jewish *ethnos* was a serious matter to the Seleucid authorities. This was a frontier province and needed to be kept firmly under the control of the Seleucids. Seleucus IV accordingly sent a high ranking official to Jerusalem to look into the matter. As stated above we are not sure what happened in

Jerusalem but Heliodorus returned to Antioch without the funds from the temple. He obviously did not think the situation in Jerusalem required direct interference by the Seleucid government. Simon and his supporters were not happy with the outcome of Heliodorus' visit and persisted in spreading rumours against Onias III. This split in the Jerusalem aristocracy became violent with much unrest and bloodshed. At this point Onias III went to Antioch to state his case before the king.

4. PALESTINIAN JUDAISM DURING THE REIGN OF ANTIOCHUS IV EPIPHANES: 175 TO 164 B.C.E.

The ascent of Antiochus IV Epiphanes to the Seleucid throne on the assassination of his brother Seleucus IV was to have a lasting impact on both the Seleucid kingdom and Early Palestinian Judaism. By assuming the throne ahead of his nephew Demetrius, who was being held as a hostage in Rome, Antiochus IV was creating a dual claim on the Seleucid crown. After his death in 164 B.C.E. there were always at least two claimants for the Seleucid throne. This led to internal instability and helped speed up the demise of the Seleucid kingdom. The accession of Antiochus IV to the Seleucid throne had an immediate impact on the Jews of Judaea. Before looking more closely at the effect of Antiochus IV's accession on Judaea, it will be useful to draw a brief picture of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Antiochus IV Epiphanes was the younger son of Antiochus III 'the Great'. He was sent to Rome as part of the peace terms agreed by Antiochus III and the Romans at the Peace of Apamea in 188 B.C.E. The Seleucid kingdom was still feeling the effects of this harsh peace treaty with Rome when Antiochus IV ascended the Seleucid throne in late 175 B.C.E. As Antiochus III died in the year following the Peace of Apamea, it was his eldest son Seleucus IV who had to bear the burden of finding the annual reparations required by Rome. It is quite likely that one of the ways in which he acquired these funds was to repeal the tax concessions which his father, Antiochus III, had granted to the leading priests of the temple and Jerusalem. General increases in taxation of the occupied territories was another way of raising funds.

In 176 B.C.E. Antiochus IV was replaced as a hostage by Demetrius the son of Seleucus IV. As heir to the throne the Romans would have considered Demetrius a more valuable hostage than his uncle Antiochus. Goldstein feels that the twelve year period that Antiochus spent in Rome was to directly influence his actions when he acceded to the Seleucid throne (Goldstein 1976: 104-116). While in Rome Antiochus was able to observe the political, religious and social systems used by the Romans. During the period of his stay he noted how Rome extended Roman citizenship to self-governing and non-Roman towns and founded new self-governing towns. This policy was to develop a

strong Roman state that had the support of the Roman citizens in these self-governing towns throughout Italy. Goldstein sees this Roman policy as the model for the Antiochene communities that Antiochus set up in his kingdom (Goldstein 1976: 109). During his time in Rome, Antiochus would have seen how the Romans suppressed various religions and philosophies for political purposes. His methods of dealing with the Jewish resistance that grew up after Menelaus was appointed high priest show parallels with Roman practices (Goldstein 1976: 125-131).

It is often said that we must look to Antiochus' character to understand what happened in Judaea during his reign. One of our earliest sources for Antiochus' character is Polybius. Polybius acknowledges that Antiochus was a good statesman. However, he also informs us that Antiochus was considered eccentric by many of his subjects, this is often put down to his stay in Rome by modern scholars including Goldstein. There was a pun on his name in ancient times that called Antiochus *epimanes* (mad) instead of Epiphanes (Grabbe 1992: 248).

It is often posited that Antiochus practiced a doctrine of unification. This unification covered all aspects of life eg. the political, setting up Greek *poleis* throughout his kingdom and cultural. It is claimed that he wished for the establishment of one religion for all. The evidence does not agree with such an option. Although Antiochus preferred the worship of Zeus Olympias over that of Apollo, we find coins even in Judaea during the period 168 – 163 B.C.E. with head of Apollo on the one side. It does not seem likely that Antiochus was a religious ideologue.

4.1 THE EVENTS OF THE YEAR 175 B.C.E.

The events of the year 175 B.C.E. were to have a lasting impact on both the Seleucid Empire and Early Judaism. It is therefore necessary to look more closely at what occurred in this year.

As noted above the situation in Judaea, especially Jerusalem, had deteriorated badly. The fighting for power among the various aristocratic and priestly factions had accelerated to such an extent that murders were now being committed (II Macc. IV:3). In response to this worsening situation Onias III, left Jerusalem to have a personal audience with the king Seleucus IV. He hoped by this means to show his loyalty to the king and to

get assistance from the king in dealing with the problems in Judaea so that orderly government could resume in that province (II Macc. IV: 4 – 6). Unfortunately before he was able to see Seleucus IV, the latter was murdered by his minister Heliodorus. This untimely death was to set in place a set of events which were to have a lasting impact on the Seleucid Empire and Early Judaism.

Demetrius the legitimate successor was being held hostage in Rome at the time of his father's death. Before he could make any plans his uncle Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who was in Athens at the time of Seleucus IV death, made his way to Antioch and declared himself the new king of the Seleucid Empire. As noted above Antiochus IV was an enigmatic character. Whilst acknowledged as an astute ruler and military campaigner his years as a hostage in Rome had influenced his outlook often making it difficult for his own people to understand all his actions. This action of Antiochus IV in succeeding to the Seleucid throne ahead of the rightful heir Demetrius was to weaken and ultimately destroy the Seleucid kingdom as there were always at least two contenders for the throne after the death of Antiochus IV in 164 B.C.E.

It is unclear from the sources whether Onias III, the Judean High priest, had a personal meeting with Antiochus IV on his accession to the Seleucid throne. We do know that he stayed on in Antioch after the death of Seleucus IV, presumably to state his case before the new ruler and to be formerly recognised as the leader of the people of Judaea. The arrival of his brother Jason with a delegation from Jerusalem must have surprised him greatly. Jason presented himself to the king as the representative of the people of Judaea. He offered Antiochus the sum of four hundred and forty talents to have himself declared the high priest and formal representative of the Jewish people to the Seleucid court. This was a most unusual way of acquiring the status of high priest. The office of high priest was up to this time a hereditary office passed down from father to son along certain family lines. As Onias III was still alive at this time it was most irregular for the post of high priest to be given to another, albeit a family member, in exchange for silver. Not being aware of the Jewish traditional approach to the high priesthood, Antiochus IV was unaware of the problems he was creating within Judaism by his actions. In Antiochus' understanding the office of high priest in a Greek city was one which changed hands on a regular basis being bought as all other municipal offices were bought. The

buying of the office of high priest by Jason was to influence how foreign rulers dealt with this office until the fall of Judaea and the temple in 70 C.E. It also set a precedent with regard to the appointment of future high priests as Jason found to his own cost.

Not only did Jason buy the office of high priest from Antiochus but he offered him a further one hundred and fifty talents to be given the right to establish a gymnasium and ephebeum in Jerusalem and enrol men of Jerusalem into an Antiochene community ie. a Greek style *polis*. In this way Jason was requesting that the political constitution of Jerusalem be changed from that of an *ethnos* to that of a *polis*. It was necessary for Jason to apply to Antiochus in this way to change the constitution, as Antiochus III had officially confirmed the right of the Jewish people to live according to their ancestral laws. The only person who could change such an official confirmation was the king himself or one of his successors.

Antiochus IV realised the unifying potential for his kingdom of the establishment of *poleis* among his subject peoples. Soon after his accession to the throne Antiochus issued a decree offering the status of Antiochene citizenship to those inhabitants of his empire who were ready to take up the Greek way of life (Nickelsburg 1981: 71). This policy of his made sound sense from both a political and economic stance. Politically the establishment of *poleis* would give the king a greater support base in his far flung and heterogeneous kingdom. Unlike the original Greek foundations of the first Seleucids, those founded by Antiochus IV were usually done so at the request of the local people and they paid handsomely into the imperial coffers for the privilege of obtaining the status of a Greek *polis*.

4.2 PALESTINIAN JUDAISM DURING THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF JASON

There are a number of questions we must ask concerning the high priesthood of Jason. We need to know what prompted Jason to take the most unusual step of applying to purchase the position of high priest of the Jewish people from the new king Antiochus IV Epiphanes while his brother still held the post. Further we need to know why he applied to have the political status of Judaea changed from that of an *ethnos* to that of a *polis*.

There are a number of possible answers to these questions. The political situation prevailing in Jerusalem under Onias III is a good starting point for finding answers to these questions. As mentioned above the conflict between various factions in Jerusalem prior to the departure of Onias III to Antioch had reached serious levels. From our sources it would appear that Onias III looked favourably on Hyrcanus Tobiad a known supporter of the Ptolemaic regime in Egypt. Relations between the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms were strained at this time. To have a high priest who openly had cordial relations with a supporter of a rival regime could result in misunderstandings between the occupying power of the day, the Seleucids, and the *ethnos* of the Jews. Such a situation had occurred during the high priesthood of Onias II. At that time Judaea was under the control of the Ptolemies and Onias II was leaning towards the Seleucids. A major crisis was averted by Joseph son of Tobias who took over as *prostates* i.e. political representative of the Jewish people to the Ptolemaic court. Onias III by holding the funds of Hyrcanus in the Temple Treasury was leaving himself and the entire *ethnos* of the Jews open to suspicion by the Seleucid authorities. Judaea was a border territory and it was necessary for the ruling Seleucids to feel secure in this region. This could only be done if they could trust the Jewish high priest who was their representative in Judaea.

Fearing the wrath of the new king should Judaea under Onias III become more openly supportive of the Ptolemaic regime, the *gerousia* of the Jewish *ethnos* needed to find a solution to this problem. Not only was Onias III open to supporters of the Ptolemaic regime but he did not have the support of some powerful members of the Jewish aristocracy and this had resulted in the rising tensions and bloodshed in Jerusalem just prior to his departure for Antioch. The solution that they appear to have reached on these problems concerning the high priesthood of Onias III, was to have his brother Jason declared the legitimate high priest of the Jewish *ethnos* by Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Although this was an unorthodox step they would still be keeping the high priesthood in the Oniad family which was traditional. We must assume that Jason himself was not averse to this proposal as he went in person to Antioch to see the king regarding this and other matters. It is most likely that Jason and the delegation from Jerusalem informed Antiochus of their loyalty to the Seleucid crown. This would be in contrast to the image presented by Onias III of one who while acknowledging Seleucid rule was openly

friendly to enemies of the Seleucid state. As an astute politician Antiochus IV Epiphanes naturally saw the wisdom of appointing Jason as high priest of the Jewish *ethnos*. Judaea was a border region and as such the king needed to feel that his back was secure should the Ptolemies decide to attack.

Besides paying more for the high priesthood, Jason also offered one hundred and fifty talents to have the status of Jerusalem changed from an *ethnos* to a *polis*. From what we know of the policies of Antiochus IV Epiphanes this request would naturally have met with his approval. The creation of a *polis* loyal to the Seleucid crown in this border region would solidify his control of the area. The money would also prove useful to the royal treasury that still needed to pay the last of the reparations to Rome. What is of specific interest to the theme of this work is why the high priest and the governing body of the Jewish *ethnos* should have made this request to change the traditional political constitution of Judaea.

The *polis* as a form of political institution had a special place in the development of the Hellenistic monarchies in the Near East. It was a form of government that derived its origins in the motherland of Greece. In the distant lands that had been conquered by Alexander the Great and his successors, the *polis* kept the conquerors in touch with their roots. The *polis* was a centre where Greek language and culture were maintained and fostered in the midst of alien peoples. It was also useful in that it provided a home for soldiers of the Hellenistic kingdoms after their tour of duty and was a base for merchants and tradesmen from the home countries. Unlike the *dynastes* and *ethnoi* of the kingdoms all *poleis* were linked by a common heritage and the Greek language and culture. Wherever they were to be found the *poleis* were connected to one another by various means, for example, they formed trade blocks with beneficial trade agreements and they were all invited to the Games that were held in various *poleis* throughout the kingdoms. These Games were a show of Greek unity. They were also used for the purpose of trade and discussion of matters pertaining to the federal council of *poleis*. Having an Antiochene constitution brought with it certain rights; member cities were able to put forward motions to the federal council and send participants to the federal councils in proportion to the number of citizens in the *polis* (Goldstein 1976: 119). To be a *polis* therefore brought with it many benefits in the Hellenistic kingdoms. Judaea as an *ethnos*

was largely removed from developments that were taking place elsewhere in the kingdom. Geographically they were isolated in the hills of Palestine. The constitution which was ratified by Antiochus III in 198 B.C.E. was geared to keeping the Jewish *ethnos* separated from the neighbouring peoples and from the influence of the Greek *poleis* which had sprung up in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia during the Ptolemaic period.

This official policy of separation was seen by some members of the Jewish *ethnos* as being a severe obstacle to the development of Judaea. They could see the enormous possibilities for development that existed in the *poleis* surrounding Judaea. Such development would also be to their own economic advantage. The possible economic advantages were also factors in getting the support of social classes other than the aristocracy for a more open policy towards the Hellenistic world (Tcherikover 1966).

These groups particularly the Hellenistically inclined aristocracy could see the goal they wished to achieve, a more open society with all the possibilities which that promised and a more liberal approach to the Jewish Law. They would also have realised the importance of selecting the right person to carry through these policies while at the same time not alienating the general populace. Jason would be a good choice from both perspectives. As brother to the high priest Onias III and therefore a member of the correct family from which the high priest could be chosen, Jason would meet the requirements of the traditional members of the community for selection to the position of high priest of the Jewish *ethnos*. The use of the name Jason instead of the Hebrew Yeshua suggests that he was hellenistically inclined unlike his brother Onias III. From a reading of the texts especially Josephus' *Antiquities*, it is clear that he was well disposed towards the members of the Tobiad family who had been closely associated with the hellenistic monarchies since the time of Joseph ben Tobiah. It is this family who appear to be the motivating force in the move to closer links with the surrounding hellenistic world. Jason met the requirements needed to lead the Jewish people from obscurity to a place in the open hellenistic world.

After appearing before Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Antioch and receiving the office of high priest from him and the right to establish an Antiochene community in Jerusalem and set in place a *gymnasium* and *ephebion* Jason returned to Jerusalem. He immediately proceeded to establish the educational infrastructure required to transform

Jerusalem from an *ethnos* to a *polis*. The founding of these institutions was important for the future development of the *polis*. It was from the ranks of those who graduated from these institutions that the future population of the *polis* was to be maintained. These institutions would also foster a greater knowledge of Greek and Greek culture. Our sources inform us that Jason established a *gymnasium* at the foot of the Temple citadel shortly after returning to Jerusalem. The rapidity of the establishment of the *gymnasium* presupposes that there already existed a private school in Jerusalem where members of the upper classes were taught Greek and Greek literature (cf. Hengel 1980: 116). The establishment of these formal educational institutions would have widened the gap between the different social classes in Jerusalem. Only those who attended these institutions could become citizens of the *polis* and accrue all the benefits which went with such citizenship.

Jason was also given the task of drawing up the first list of citizens of the new Antiochene community which was to be established in Jerusalem to take the place of the traditional *ethnos*. In drawing up this list he would only include those who were hellenistically inclined. The drawing up of this list of citizens was a way in which the governing apparatus of Judaea could legally drop from positions of power all those who were conservative traditionalists. Up to this point these conservatives held sway and implemented policies which maintained the isolation of the Jewish *ethnos* from their neighbours and the greater hellenistic world. Our sources do not tell us how this new policy impacted on those of the priestly and other classes who lost their rights of citizenship and authority as a result of being omitted from the list of Antiochene citizens. It is possible that some left for their rural seats in disgust at what was going on in Jerusalem. In none of our primary sources do we hear of any active opposition to what Jason was doing in Jerusalem. Unlike during the latter part of the high priesthood of Onias III when unrest and violence were the order of the day, the high priesthood of Jason appears remarkably peaceful. We must assume then that the majority of those in the upper classes agreed with the new policies of Jason and that members of the other classes were not completely averse to these policies. Although 2 Maccabees 4: 12-17 suggests that the Temple services were being neglected by priests who were more interested in the activities going on in the *gymnasium*, this is probably only to be

attributed to the conservative stance of the writer of this work and his sources. We do not hear in the sources of any infringement of the traditional Temple worship or ceremonies. As there were a large number of priests present in Jerusalem at any time it is likely that those who were not required to officiate in the Temple took part in the activities of the *gymnasium* either as participants or spectators. They were not shirking their duties in the Temple. What these passages do tell us is that the *gymnasium* had taken the place of the Temple as the centre of the social life of Jerusalem. This was to be expected as the new constitution which Jason was introducing into Jerusalem that was going to sever the close ties which existed between the religious domain and the other cultural domains especially the political, economic and social domains of Early Palestinian Judaism. It was only by removing the strict restraints of conservative religion from the other spheres of life that Judaea would be able to hold its own in the wider world.

The advantages of the changes taking place in Jerusalem are outlined for us in II Maccabees 4: 18-20. In this passage we find an official delegation of Antiochenes from Jerusalem attending the quinquennial games at Tyre in the presence of the king. It appears that they were attending the games as observers not participants. As is customary at such functions they have brought a large financial subscription. It is said in this passage that the money is for the sacrifice to Hercules but that the delegates from Jerusalem having religious scruples over this eventually used the money to fit out triremes. This does not seem likely and it has been suggested by scholars that the money was intended to fit out triremes from the start (Grabbe 1979: 279). Up till this time Jason had been careful not to interfere with the traditional religion and religious views of Judaism. This is probably propaganda to present Jason in a negative light. The king himself was at these games and would have been pleased to see members of his newest foundation present after such a short time. It was after these games, about two and a half years after Jason acquired the right to set up an Antiochene community in Jerusalem that Antiochus IV Epiphanes paid a visit to Jerusalem. He was received lavishly by the Jerusalem community. It has been suggested that this trip to Jerusalem was by way of the official founding of the Antiochene community in Jerusalem (Tcherikover 1966: 165). It would have taken Jason a while to draw up the list of the citizens of this community and set up the council which would govern such a community. The setting up of the council

and other offices of the community would herald the end of the ruling structures of traditional Judaism according to the ancestral laws. This then would be the final step in the reform introduced by Jason.

4.3 PALESTINIAN JUDAISM DURING THE HIGH PRIESTHOOD OF MENELAUS

After three years as high priest Jason sent Menelaus to Antioch to pay the annual tribute to the king and deal with various matters of state. Menelaus took this opportunity to offer the king three hundred talents more in tribute than what Jason was giving in exchange for the high priesthood. Antiochus was obviously impressed by Menelaus and the offer of more money sealed the deal. Menelaus' accession to the high priesthood signalled a complete break in the traditional way of obtaining the Jewish high priesthood. Not only had Menelaus bought the post but he was not even a member of the Zadokite line of which the high priest usually was a member. Menelaus therefore brought something new to the office of Jewish high priest. It was no longer a traditional hereditary post but an official post of the Seleucid kingdom. II Maccabees and Josephus the only sources which refer to Menelaus, do not give us much useful information on who Menelaus was and why he should make such a break in traditional practice. We know that he was the brother of Simon, the administrator of the temple, in the time of the high priesthood of Onias III. Josephus also connects him closely to the activities of the Tobiads in the events which overtook Jerusalem and the Jewish people. Although Menelaus is often referred to as an extreme Hellenizer by scholars this does not come through clearly in the sources (cf. Tcherikover 1966: 170-171 contra Grabbe 1992: 280). The impression one gets of Menelaus is that he was an opportunistic power seeker. His period as Jewish high priest saw many tumultuous events take place in Judaea.

The appointment of Menelaus as high priest by Antiochus IV Epiphanes in late 172 B.C.E. was not popular with the people of Jerusalem. They saw it as a serious breach of Jewish traditional law. The sum of money which Menelaus had promised Antiochus IV for the position of high priest was extremely large exceeding eight hundred talents. Antiochus IV needed this money for the campaigns and expansion he was envisaging for the eastern part of his empire. As Judaea was a poor, hilly country it is uncertain where

Menelaus hoped to acquire such monies to give to the king. It was soon apparent to the king that Menelaus was reneging on his part of the deal. Neither Menelaus nor Sostratus, the Seleucid commander of the citadel in Jerusalem and official in charge of collecting revenues, were able to send any money to Antiochus IV. For this lapse they were summoned to appear before the king in Antioch (II Macc 4: 27-29). It was at this point that Menelaus started removing vessels from the temple.

The removal of items from the temple by Menelaus and his brother Lysimachus to meet payments to the king and to pay bribes to various Seleucid officials was the turning point in the relations between the Jewish people of Judaea and the Seleucid authorities. Up till that point the people of Judaea tolerated the reforms which had been introduced by Jason. The reforms of Jason brought political and social change but they had not changed any element of the religious aspect of Judaism. However, when they learnt that Menelaus and his brother Lysimachus were removing items from the temple they were moved to anger and violent demonstrations. The fabric of their religious heritage was being tampered with and this could not go unanswered. During the course of the demonstrations Lysimachus put together a force of three thousand men to control the violent outbreaks. It is suggested that these three thousand men belonged to those over eighteen who had been registered by Jason as Antiochene citizens (Tcherikover 1966: 16). The anger of the citizens of Jerusalem was fierce and they killed Lysimachus and some of the others who came against them.

These events in Jerusalem had repercussions in Antioch where Menelaus was due to have an audience with the king. News of the happenings in Jerusalem had reached the ears of the deposed Jewish high priest Onias III who was still residing in Antioch. He lodged a formal complaint against Menelaus with the Seleucid authorities. As the king was away dealing with other problems in his realm this complaint was pending his return to Antioch. At the connivance of Menelaus, the chancellor, Andronicus had Onias III slain. In both accounts of these events in Josephus, Onias III dies from natural causes. As the events surrounding Onias III's death are blurred in the sources one must make a choice as to which seems more plausible. The present writer will go along with the story as it appears in II Maccabees 4: 34. This account seems to fit into what we know of Menelaus and his desire to keep power in his hands. These actions, both the murder of

Onias III and the stealing of the temple treasures, brought a delegation from the *gerousia* in Jerusalem to lodge complaints against Menelaus. The *gerousia* in Jerusalem at this time would have been those selected for these positions by Jason during his reform of the political system (cf. Grabbe 1992: 281). When Antiochus IV returned to Antioch Menelaus by using bribes was able to regain the support of the king. Instead of disciplining Menelaus, Antiochus IV had the three delegates of the Jerusalem *gerousia* executed. At first glance this seems a strange thing to do. However, it probably made political and financial sense to Antiochus IV. Menelaus was his personal representative among the Jewish people, appointed by him. When he had granted the high priesthood to Menelaus, Jason had fled to the Ammonitis (the stronghold of the Ptolemaic supporter, Hyrcanus Tobiad). It would possibly seem to the king that any Jewish leaders selected by Jason would be politically suspect. He knew Menelaus was his supporter and would do what he could to maintain this position and keep the Jewish people in the Seleucid kingdom. As Menelaus had brought some gold with him he was able to pay part of what Judaea owed to Antiochus IV. This show of financial goodwill on the part of Menelaus would seal the relationship of Judaea to its ruler Antiochus IV. At this time the relationship between Seleucid Syria and Ptolemaic Egypt was tense. Antiochus IV needed to know he had the support of the leader of the Jewish people, as Judaea was in the border region with Egypt.

4.3.1 THE EGYPTIAN CAMPAIGNS OF ANTIOCHUS IV

The Egyptian campaigns of Antiochus IV in 170/169 B.C.E. and 168 B.C.E. were to have a major impact on developments in Judaea. It is from this point on that we have information in all our major sources. However, there are serious discrepancies between the various sources as to what exactly happened and when. It is useful to use information from non-Jewish sources to get some clarity on this period (Grabbe 1992: 282-283). The sources tend to only use the details which are appropriate to their line of argument. They often telescope multiple events into one, eg. I Maccabees records only one invasion of Egypt (I Macc. I: 17-20). II Maccabees refers to the second Egyptian campaign in chapter five. However, the information contained in this chapter includes what occurred in Jerusalem after the first and second campaigns. All this information needs to be carefully

analysed in order to arrive at a possible cause and order of events for the period. All the major secondary studies for this period develop their own sequence of events based on their readings of the texts.

4.3.1.1 THE FIRST EGYPTIAN CAMPAIGN OF ANTIOCHUS IV 170-169 B.C.E. AND ITS EFFECT ON PALESTINIAN JUDAISM.

In 170 B.C.E. Ptolemy VI entered the southern part of the province of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. Antiochus IV who wished to include Egypt in his kingdom took this opportunity to launch a major offensive against the Ptolemaic army. He defeated Ptolemy VI and proclaimed himself regent for the young king. To cement the gains he had made he gave his daughter in marriage to Ptolemy VI.

After this victorious campaign he visited Jerusalem. There would have been a number of motives for this visit. He was the patron of the Antiochene community of Jerusalem and would like to see how his city was getting on. As there had been trouble concerning the position of Menelaus as high priest he would need to check up on the situation. This would also be a convenient time to collect the overdue revenues still owed to him. He had been triumphant in Egypt and by returning via Jerusalem could show the population of Jerusalem his power thereby discouraging any further potential unrest from the people of Judaea.

On arrival in Jerusalem he was warmly welcomed by Menelaus. When he requested the funds due to him in tribute, Menelaus took him into the temple and he proceeded to take vessels and gold from the temple. He took eighteen hundred talents from the temple (II Macc. 5: 15-16, 21). This probably amounted to the tribute owed to him by Menelaus for the previous three years (Hengel 1974: 280; Mørkholm 198: 284). These actions of Antiochus IV and Menelaus caused much unhappiness among the people of Jerusalem who saw Antiochus IV's presence in the temple as an act of sacrilege. It should be noted here that although Antiochus IV went into the temple and took various items he did not interfere with the running of the temple or the temple cult itself (Grabbe 1992: 283). It was these actions which resulted in the break of goodwill that the people of Jerusalem felt towards the Seleucid government. Although the anger of the people was heightened by these acts they did not openly revolt against Seleucid rule. This was as a result of the

recent triumphs of Antiochus IV in Egypt. Antiochus IV's presence and actions in Jerusalem confirmed Menelaus in his position as high priest and leader of the Jewish people to the Seleucid court.

4.3.1.2 THE SECOND EGYPTIAN CAMPAIGN OF ANTIOCHUS IV AND ITS IMPACT ON PALESTINIAN JUDAISM.

After Antiochus' return to Antioch there were various developments in Egypt. The brother and sister of Ptolemy VI declared themselves the rulers of Egypt. Ptolemy VI came to an agreement with his siblings and threw off the status of being a regent king to Antiochus IV (Gruen 1984:654). This displeased Antiochus who again set forth for Egypt in spring of 168 B.C.E. As before he advanced steadily through Egypt and was on the point of taking Alexandria when the Romans intervened. He was given an ultimatum by the Roman Legate Popillius to withdraw or incur the enmity of Rome. As he was aware of the Romans recent victory at Pydnus and knew of their strength from his long stay in Rome as a hostage he withdrew (Gruen 1984: 621). Our sources tell us he was most angry at being thwarted in this way and returned home in great anger.

4.3.1.2.1 JASON'S REVOLT IN JUDAEA

This second Egyptian campaign was to have serious consequences in Judaea. While Antiochus IV was campaigning in Egypt a rumour circulated that he had been killed. Jason who had been deposed as high priest by Menelaus and subsequently went to live in the Ammonitis with his cousin Hyrcanus, an agent of the Ptolemaic government, saw this as an opportunity to regain the position of high priest of the Jewish people. If the king was indeed dead as rumour had it then the position of high priest was open until a candidate was confirmed in the office by the new king. Although we are not given details in the sources it seems probable that Jason hoped to be reconfirmed in the office of high priest by a Ptolemaic king (Goldstein 1989: 294).

Jason took this opportunity to muster a force of one thousand men and attack Jerusalem (II Macc. 5:5). From our sources it would appear that Jason was initially successful in this enterprise and Menelaus and his followers were driven into the citadel. Much fighting took place in Jerusalem and Jason slayed many of his fellow countryman.

It is unclear from the sources why Jason did not get control of the government and fled back to Ammon. Tcherikover (1966:11) developed a theory based on taking all information in II Maccabees and Josephus into account. As Menelaus had fled into the citadel and Jason was still fighting, Tcherikover asked the question who was he fighting. In answer to this question, he named the Hasidim as the Jewish opponents of Jason in Jerusalem. Although attractive this theory relies on too much conjecture. It is unlikely that the sources especially II Maccabees would have been silent on the matter of the opponents of Jason if they had been members of the Hasidim. Whoever Jason was fighting in Jerusalem they were Jewish. As the fighting ceased after the retreat of Jason it is likely that his opponents were either supporters of the Seleucids or Jews who had no desire to fight the Seleucids. The fighting seems to be an internal Jewish matter, undertaken by various factions over the position of high priest. The most probable reason for the flight of Jason would have been the receipt of news that Antiochus was still alive and about to return to Antioch with his armies.

4.3.2 THE EXPEDITION OF APOLLONIUS TO JUDAEA

While in Egypt Antiochus IV heard news of revolts and rebellions from a number of cities in the province of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. This angered him greatly particularly after the ultimatum he had received from the Romans as he was about to take Alexandria. He was now in a vulnerable position with Ptolemaic supporters wishing to take over some of his cities in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. These revolts needed to be put down quickly and effectively if he was to ensure this territory for the Seleucid crown. The news of Jason's revolt in Jerusalem had by this time reached him. Although it appears to us from the sources, to be a civil war between various feuding factions within Judaism for the position of high priest, Antiochus IV saw it as a political revolt between Seleucid and Ptolemaic groups within Judaism.

It was impossible for Antiochus IV to deal with all these revolts himself. Although our sources have Antiochus IV himself coming up to Jerusalem after his second Egyptian campaign this seems unlikely. It is much more likely that he took the major coast road from Egypt to Syria and dealt with the powerful cities along this route that had gone into revolt at this time. We can then have Apollonius the Mysarch coming up to

Jerusalem to deal with the unrest there, while Antiochus IV proceeds along the coast road. By doing this we make more sense of the information supplied in the sources on the aftermath of the revolt by Jason. It does not make sense to have Antiochus IV himself coming up to Jerusalem and sacking the city and killing many of the inhabitants and enslaving the rest, then for Apollonius to come later and do the same.

It is at this point that we need to decide on the way in which we are going to date and order the events that occurred in Judaea during this period. There are two schools of thought on the dating of these events. Since Bickermann's work, *The God of the Maccabees*, in the 1937, the main consensus is to date the religious persecution in Judaea from 167 to 164 B.C.E. Prior to this the generally accepted dates of the persecution were 168 to 165 B.C.E. Modern scholars such as Bringmann and Grabbe are also inclined towards the dates 168 to 165 B.C.E. (Grabbe 1992: 265-266). There are a number of compelling reasons advanced from a study of the sources for both of these viewpoints. Certain conflicting information in the sources has to also be satisfactorily fitted into the dating scheme. One obvious fact is that Judas and his brothers could not have brought the refugees from other parts of Palestine to Jerusalem and the temple prior to the taking of Jerusalem by Judas and his forces and the purification of the temple. Placing the letters that appear in II Maccabees 11 can also impact on which dating system one chooses to employ. Letters one and three are best suited to a time before the taking of the Jerusalem temple by Judas and its purification. The letter to the Romans seems to fit with these two letters. The second letter written by Antiochus V would be better after Judas purified the temple. Related to these letters are the campaigns of Lysias and Antiochus V in Judaea. These campaigns took place after Antiochus IV had left on his trip to the eastern satrapies of the kingdom some time in late 166 B.C.E. (Grabbe 1992: 277) or early 165 B.C.E. (Mørkholm 1989: 287). After a careful study of the sources and the arguments advanced by Grabbe, the writer has decided to opt for the current view that dates the persecution to 167 to 164 B.C.E.

We are informed in the sources that Apollonius took Jerusalem by guile, appearing to be friendly to the people then assailing them on the Sabbath. When Apollonius and his force arrived in Jerusalem they found the city peaceful. However, he had instructions from Antiochus IV to subdue and punish the city. This he duly did,

killing and enslaving many of the people of the city. In order to truly subdue the city and its people there were other measures that he also put in place. The city walls of Jerusalem were razed, thereby reducing the political status of Jerusalem from a city to a village under the control of another walled place. Simultaneously he proceeded to enclose the City of David with a high, strong wall and strong towers. There is some controversy as to where this enclosed area was situated in Jerusalem. Some say it was to the south of the temple and others put it to the north of the temple. The sources all say it was the City of David. We do know from later events that it overlooked the temple and the garrison in it were a continual nuisance to the people of Israel (I Macc. I: 36).

This enclosed area became the new seat of the Antiochene community of Jerusalem. In our sources this new *polis* was known as the Akra. Menelaus still held the position of high priest of the Jewish people. He resided with the other Antiochene citizens in the Akra. The rest of Jerusalem and all its lands were now subject to this new city. The temple at Jerusalem now became the religious centre of the new *polis*, the Akra. Every *polis* had a temple at its centre and the local deities were worshipped in this temple. Since the political reform of Jason the Jerusalem temple had been the religious centre of the Antiochene community and the non-citizen members of the Jewish people. Worship had continued as usual at the Jerusalem temple. If anything had changed in the cult our sources, which were negative towards the reform, would have indicated such changes.

Once Apollonius the governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia had completed the job of subduing the Jewish people and securing the Akra for the Antiochene community of Jerusalem he could depart. It is probable that a new system of taxation was introduced into Judaea. We last hear of the annual tribute in 170 B.C.E. Due to the increased tensions in Jerusalem after the visit of Antiochus IV in 169 B.C.E., it was not possible for Menelaus to collect the annual tribute from the people. The tribute was replaced by a proportional land tax levied directly on agricultural production and collected by royal agents. In 153 B.C.E. this land tax amounted to one third of grain production and one half of fruit production. These are very severe taxes and if they were introduced by Antiochus IV they can be seen as a further punitive measure intended to curb the resistance to the king and his high priest in Judaea (Mørkholm 1989: 285). As the Antiochene community

seemed to have problems in dealing with the rest of the Jewish population a commissioner, Philip the Phrygian, was sent to Jerusalem with a garrison. From later events it would seem that this garrison was not large. Its main purpose was to ensure the safety of the Antiochene community under the leadership of Menelaus. The sources do not make it clear where the soldiers who now came to reside in the Akra came from or which religion they were affiliated to. Goldstein believes that some of these soldiers belonged to the Jewish *cleruchies* that were set up by Antiochus III in Phrygia and Lydia after revolts in those areas (cf. Jos. Ant. XII. 147-152). This can not be confirmed although others also think that some members of this garrison were polytheistic Jews from Egypt or Asia Minor. What is of importance for this study is that the members of the military garrison were also considered citizens of the Akra *polis*. This membership of the *polis* gave them the right to worship in the Jerusalem temple. In the pagan cultures of the time it was considered important to worship both your own gods and those of the places you visited or lived in.

This created a problem for the Jewish people and religion. If non-Jews or Jewish apostates could worship in the temple, the ritual purity of the temple would be severely compromised or destroyed. We do not hear of any active resistance towards the Akra community by the general population of Jerusalem. There could be a number of reasons for this. As a result of the expedition of Apollonius a number of the people of Jerusalem had been slain or enslaved. When certain of the people saw that the temple cult was gravely compromised they would have ceased to worship there and left for the country. The arrival of Philip and his garrison of soldiers would mean that some of the city land would now be allotted to these newcomers (Goldstein 1976: 124). It is probable that the original owners of the land had fled into the country or the desert (I Macc. 1:40). The situation in Jerusalem would have been tense.

4.3.3 THE SUPPRESSION OF JUDAISM AND THE RELIGIOUS PERSECUTION

Some time after the arrival of Philip and his garrison, an elderly Athenian was sent to Jerusalem with instructions to suppress the Jewish religion (II Macc. 6:1-2). It is this suppression of the Jewish religion and subsequent religious persecution that is so difficult

for us to understand. In the ancient world where polytheism was the order of the day the suppression of a particular religion was most unusual. We could understand the adherents of a monotheistic religion suppressing other religions but it does not make sense the other way around. The information in our sources up to this point shows us that Judaea was plagued by political and social upheaval. Events as we know them were of a political nature. The expedition of Apollonius was in response to a perceived political revolt in Judaea. All measures taken up to the arrival of Philip the Phrygian are of a political nature. We need to ask ourselves what happened in Jerusalem between the arrival of Philip and that of the Athenian.

4.3.3.1 WHY WAS A SUPPRESSION OF THE JEWISH RELIGION UNDERTAKEN BY THE SELEUCID AUTHORITIES?

This question has taxed scholars from the earliest days and with the limited sources available to us no hard and fast answers have been found that adequately explain how a political crisis ended in a religious suppression and persecution. The reasons given in our main sources are unsatisfactory. In I Maccabees the implication is that this is the work of pagans and apostates and therefore does not need an explanation. The answer given in II Maccabees is theological in nature – the people of Israel have sinned and introduced sinful practices into the temple therefore God is punishing them. Tacitus gives the view that Antiochus IV was “... desirous of converting the Jews from their barbarism and exclusivistic religion to more enlightened and liberal views (Tacitus, Hist. 5.8)” (Grabbe 1992: 248). This view of Tacitus has found many adherents up to the present day.

Each of the major scholars of this period has worked out their own set of reasons but none completely answers the question. Tcherikover (1966:191) sees the suppression as the result of the actions of the Hasidim at the time of Jason’s revolt. He believes the Hasidim had developed into a fighting force by this time and were responsible for Jason’s flight. As each further step was taken by the Seleucid authorities the Hasidim continued to resist violently. This prompted the Seleucid authorities to see the Jewish religion as the source of the continued resistance. Therefore this religion needed to be suppressed in order to create stability in Jerusalem. There is a lot to be said for aspects of this theory, especially the role of those who strictly adhered to the Torah. Hengel (1974), Goldstein

(1976 & 1983) and Bickerman (1979) all seem to acknowledge that the resistance offered by the devout had a bearing on the eventual implementation of the religious suppression and persecution. They however advance their own theories for the full reasons for the suppression.

Bickerman sees Menelaus and his group as the main driving force in getting the Seleucid authorities to impose the suppression of the Jewish religion and set up a new form of religion in its place. He argues his point by showing that the persecution was territorially restricted. Therefore it seems reasonable to suppose that it originated with the local authorities (cf. II Macc. 13:4) (Schäfer 1995: 42-43). There are some merits in this theory. Menelaus realised it was the religious outlook of the people which compelled them to resist him as high priest. To cement his position as the Jewish representative to the Seleucid court he needed to have the support of the people. He realised that this would not happen while the people followed the strict teachings of the Torah as expounded by the scribes. The writer feels that Bickerman places too much emphasis on the idea that Menelaus was driven to create the new religion because of his own religious zeal. It is more probable that he helped introduce the new religion for political reasons.

Goldstein in his 1976 work on I Maccabees places more of the emphasis on the impact of Antiochus IV's stay in Rome. While in Rome, Antiochus IV saw the suppression of a variety of cults by the Republican government. These cults and philosophies were seen by the Romans as a threat to the wellbeing of the state and the people of Rome. They were ruthlessly suppressed and the members forced to enter the mainstream of Roman thought and religious practice. Antiochus IV would have realised that the opposition to himself, his government and his representative in Jerusalem, the high priest Menelaus, was rooted in the religion of the Jews. Therefore to create stability the religion of the Jewish people needed to be suppressed. As the previous standpoints this theory has some good points and also acknowledges the role of strict Jews in the unrest which persisted in Jerusalem and Judaea. Goldstein further feels that the members of the garrison in the Akra were partly responsible for the type of religion which was thrust upon the Jewish people by the decrees of the king.

4.3.3.2 WHAT FORM DID THE RELIGIOUS SUPPRESSION TAKE?

There were a number of measures that were set in place to change the religion of Judaea. The first of these concerned the temple in Jerusalem. From this time the temple was to be dedicated to Olympian Zeus. Similarly the Samaritan temple on Mt. Gerizim was to be dedicated to Zeus the God of Hospitality. This latter was done at the request of the local people (II Macc. 6: 2; Jos. Ant. XII: 257-264). The dedication of these temples did not mean that a new god was being worshipped. It was meeting the Greek requirement that all temples and gods have names. Up to this point the God of the Jews was nameless. The name Olympian Zeus means the God of the Heavens which was how the pagan people understood the Jewish God. This change of name did not therefore necessarily imply a change in the form of worship conducted in the temple. On Mt. Gerizim the God of Abraham, Isaac and Jacob continued to be worshipped in the traditional way. The Samaritans also continued their religious practices including, circumcision, keeping the sabbath, only eating those meats which were considered ritually pure. The situation in Jerusalem was different, the form of worship in the temple was changed. The whole-offerings and drink-offerings were forbidden. A pagan altar stone was placed on the altar in the temple and previously forbidden offerings were made on this altar. Temple prostitution was also conducted in the sacred precincts. Every month there were offerings made for the king's birthday and the Jewish people were forced to eat the entrails which were forbidden by the Law. The people were also compelled to participate in the processions that marked the feast of Dioysius. (cf. I Macc.1: 41-64; II Macc. 6: 1-7) These then were the changes that were imposed on the temple.

There were additional changes made in the religious life of those who lived in the towns and villages of Judaea. Altars were erected in the towns and villages so that the people in these places could also make the monthly offerings to the king and participate in the Dionysian rites. They were also compelled to offer incense at the doors of the houses and in the streets (I Macc. 1: 54-55). In this way the new religion could be practiced by all the people of Judaea.

There were additional prohibitions on the practice of the Jewish religion which were applied to all the people. Keeping the sabbath, circumcising boys, having in ones possession copies of the Law were all prohibited in Judaea. Should one be found guilty of

breaking any of these prohibitions the penalty was death. All scrolls of the Law were to be burned, in this way the Jewish religion would be unable to be passed on to future generations. The people were also expected to eat the flesh of pigs and other unclean animals. These animals were to be used in the sacrifices on the altar in Jerusalem and on the altars set up in the market places of the towns and villages of Judaea (I Macc.2: 15-28). The sources mention ritual meals that were had where the people were to eat the flesh of unclean animals (II Macc. 6: 18-31). There were royal officials who went throughout the towns and villages of Judaea to ensure that the people were obeying the new laws (Bickerman 1979:53).

When looked at from our vantage point the form that the religious suppression took and the form of the new cult in Jerusalem and Judaea add to the general puzzle of these acts. The religion that was being promoted in Jerusalem was not a Greek religion. The new name of the God of the temple was indeed Greek but it was the Greek name for the Semitic God of the Heavens. We are not told of any major changes to the structure of the temple. This implies that it was not a Greek form of religion that was being forced onto the Jewish people. Each type of religion requires its own form of sacred space. The form of a Greek temple was very different from that of a Semitic temple and wherever they went the Greeks always built Greek style temples for their own worship (Bickerman 1979: 64-67). Although we are informed of an altar stone placed on the altar of burnt offerings in the Jerusalem temple there is no mention of idols. This is another pointer that we need to look somewhere other than Greece for the form of the new cult in Jerusalem. The Greeks always thought of their gods in visual, human terms. The use of a stone on the altar suggests a Syro-Phoenician base for the new religion (Bickerman 1979: 69-70). The erection of altars in all the towns and villages of Judaea suggests that an attempt is being made to decentralize the cult of the God of Israel. To return it to what it had been before the cultic reforms of king Josiah in 621 B.C.E. (Bickerman 1979: 71-72). All of these facts suggest that the form of religion being imposed by the Seleucid authorities in Jerusalem and Judaea had its roots in the Semitic world. There are however some problems with this notion. The religions of Syro-Phoenicia also practiced circumcision and forbade the eating of pork. The religious decrees seem aimed at doing away with the exclusivity and particularity of the Jewish religion. This is one of the main arguments put

forward by scholars who see Menelaus and his group as the authors of the decrees of religious suppression and persecution. It is unlikely that Antiochus IV would have involved himself in creating a religion for the Jews which was not his own. The probability that some Jews were involved in the creation of the new religion is very high. It is also possible that Goldstein's theory that some of the troops stationed in the Akra were syncretistic Jews who were also involved with Menelaus in setting up the new religion. This suppression and persecution of the Jewish religion under Antiochus IV is indeed a puzzle and until we have more definite evidence we can only build up possible reasons why it occurred and the form it took.

4.3.4 THE MACCABEAN REVOLT UP TO THE DEATH OF ANTIOCHUS IV EPIPHANES

The response of the Jewish people to the religious decrees and persecution were varied. There were those like Menelaus and his associates who actively collaborated with the Seleucid authorities in the fulfillment of the new religious decrees. They would probably also have informed on anyone not complying with the new religion. Another group would be those who complied with the new religion voluntarily but were not actively involved with its implementation. A larger number would have complied but under duress. Some would have been so stunned by what was occurring that they did nothing actively. Others would have attempted to evade the authorities and having to comply with the new laws. These and those who practiced passive non-violent resistance to the decrees would have fled into the desert or the dense hilly terrain of the area. Lastly there were those who chose to resist the new religion by the use of violence (Sievers 1990: 21). Our sources refer to all of these responses to the dilemma of the religious suppression and persecution. From the sources it seems that initially the largest group would be those who complied with the new regulations as a result of coercion.

Once the implementation of these decrees was under way we hear of the beginning of a violent reaction. According to I Maccabees this reaction began with Mattathias and his sons in the village of Modin. They killed a Jew who was going to partake of the unclean sacrifice and the Seleucid official who was overseeing the sacrifice and its observance by the people. They fled into the hills near their village and set up a

guerrilla camp. From this base they went throughout the villages punishing the apostates and enlisting recruits for their campaigns. They were not the only group hiding out in the hills and the desert. There were also those who practiced passive resistance and the Hasidim who were ready to fight for their faith but not on the sabbath. The Maccabees and the Hasidim joined forces in the fight against the apostates. This would have been an uneasy partnership for some as Mattathias had introduced the concept of defensive fighting on the sabbath. The introduction of defensive fighting on the sabbath was seen as essential to Mattathias. It was common knowledge among foreign peoples that the Jews did not fight on the sabbath. This was used to good effect by many who wished to conquer or subdue the Jewish people. They knew that if they attacked on the sabbath they would meet with no response. Some of those hiding out in the desert had been burned to death in their caves by the forces of Philip the Phrygian because they would not defend themselves (I Macc. 29-38). If the Jewish people wished to survive they would have to fight to defend themselves on the sabbath. In II Maccabees Judas and his forces are always portrayed as not fighting on the sabbath. It is possible that the writer of II Maccabees was of the opinion that it was never permissible to fight on the sabbath. This would explain why Judas is exalted as a hero but we don't hear much of the rest of his family in this source.

Throughout the early part of the Maccabean campaigns the focus was on chastising Jewish apostates. They were not concerned with fighting the Seleucid authorities although those who were going throughout Judaea enforcing the implementation of the religious decrees would be possible targets. As the Jewish resistance knew the topography of the region so well they were able to descend on towns and villages often after dark to enlist new recruits, get food and other supplies and deal with any apostates. Their reputation grew among the people as did their support. The actions of these bands of guerrillas had a negative effect on the implementation of the religious decrees. Although our sources don't tell us how long it took for the Maccabean and other resistance groups to merge and develop into an effective fighting force we must surmise that it took a fair length of time.

After creating a broad base of operations in the country and getting many of the villages to support them the Maccabean bands began sorties on apostates and government

officials attempting to enforce implementation of the decrees in the vicinity of Jerusalem. This proximity of the armed bands to Jerusalem resulted in an effective blockade of Jerusalem. At this point the authorities in the Akra requested help from the governor in Samaria. Apollonius the governor in Samaria sent out a force to deal with the problem in Judaea. This force was defeated. This was the start of a series of campaigns by the local Seleucid authorities to deal with the armed resistance that had developed in Judaea. Many of these incursions were repelled by Judas and the army he had built up. Grabbe points out that most of these forces were either the same size or smaller than those of Judas. They were also not the elite forces of the Seleucid army but local forces and mercenaries (Grabbe 1992: 273). By the time Antiochus IV left for his campaigns in the eastern part of the kingdom in 165 B.C.E. the guerrilla forces of Judas had had many successes fighting off the local Seleucid forces sent against them.

Antiochus IV left the western half of his kingdom under the control of his young son Antiochus V with Lysias as regent. News of Judas' various campaigns in Judaea and the way in which he was hampering the Seleucid officials in their tasks in Judaea reached Lysias in Antioch. As the situation in Judaea had deteriorated and the local Seleucid forces in Coele-Syria were unable to deal with it effectively, Lysias decided to send a large force under the governor of Coele-Syria, Ptolemais son of Dorymenes, with the generals Nicanor and Gorgias to Judaea. In one of those rare quirks of fate Judas and his men were able to defeat a part of this large force near Emmaus. When the rest of the force saw what had occurred they fled. In this way the forces of Judas were able to acquire much needed arms and money (Grabbe 1992: 292). While all of this fighting was going on Menelaus and those living in the Akra were getting desperate, they could not leave the Akra without being harassed by the Maccabean forces.

They again sent word to Lysias who decided to deal with the problem in Judaea himself. In early 164 B.C.E. Lysias with a large force marched on Judaea. Unlike earlier attempts at controlling the situation in Judaea he approached Jerusalem from a better position, having learnt of the terrain and the tactics used by Judas. The two forces met at Beth Zur. Although our sources claim a victory for Judas' forces here this seems unlikely. Lysias had lost five thousand men and then decided to withdraw. It is at this point that we can start placing the letters that appear in II Maccabees 11 in their correct context. It

would seem that some members of the Jewish nation had requested negotiations. As Lysias did not want a protracted war in Judaea he was more than happy to consider terms. At this time the Jewish high priest, Menelaus, went to see Antiochus IV. By this stage it must have occurred to Menelaus that the implementation of the new religious policy in Judaea was a failure and it would be better if some concessions could be made to the pious observers of the Law. A positive response was received from Antiochus IV (II Macc. 11: 27-33). On condition that the Jewish resistance lay down their arms Antiochus IV would grant them full amnesty and they may return to their homes. They would be permitted to follow their own food laws once again and would not be victimized for any past offences. At II Macc. 11: 16-23, we find Lysias response to the Jews who approached him after the battle at Beth Zur. This is also a positive response to the Jewish delegation. We are not certain whether the group negotiating with Lysias is that of Judas or some other group of Jews. The names of the Jewish representatives, John and Absalom suggest that it might be Judas' group as in I Macc. 8: 17, one of the two Jewish emissaries to Rome was Eupolemus the son of John. In this letter we find Lysias meeting some of the demands of the negotiators on condition they maintain goodwill towards the Seleucid government. Other demands he forwards to the king for his response. A delegation from Rome was also in the area at the time and wrote to inform the Jews that they would forward any further requests of theirs to the Seleucid authorities in Antioch. This letter from the Romans suggests that the passage in I Macc. 8 concerning the treaty between the Romans and the Jewish could have a basis in fact. These negotiations created a less tense atmosphere in Judaea and returned some of the former religious rights to the Jewish people. They did not however return the temple to the Jewish people for the worship of the true Jewish religion. The temple was still the place of worship for all of those dwelling in the Akra – apostate Jews and pagans alike. They also did not return the constitution of Judaea to that which had prevailed in the period prior to the political reform of Jason in 175 B.C.E.

4.3.4.1 THE TAKING OF JERUSALEM AND THE PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE BY THE FORCES OF JUDAS

Although Judaea was now experiencing a period of peace those who had been fighting for the return of the full right to live according to their ancestral laws were not happy with the state of affairs in Judaea. It was in this breathing space that Judas and his forces were able to take Jerusalem and purify the temple. The purification of the temple took place at the end of the year 164 B.C.E. This means that there was a period of at least six months between the negotiations with Lysias and the continuation of the fighting by the forces of Judas. Some scholars eg. Bringmann, Schunck and Grabbe (1992:285), place Judas' fight against the neighbouring peoples in this time slot. They operate on the time system that has Judas taking Jerusalem and purifying the temple in December 165 B.C.E. rather than December 164 B.C.E. In his works on I and II Maccabees, Goldstein (1976:26) sees this gap of time as one in which different groups within Judas forces were waiting to see if God would send a prophet or restore Jerusalem and the temple himself. When it became apparent that this was not going to happen, Judas mobilized his forces and they took Jerusalem. While the priests were removing the altar and the altar stone which was on it, armed members of Judas forces were holding the forces in the Akra in check so that they could not interfere with the purification of the temple. Our sources show us that Judas was meticulous in the way in which the temple was purified and restored. This was so that later generations would not be able to reproach them (I Macc. 4: 44-46). From what the sources say it would seem that the temple had not been used for a while as the grounds were unkept and full of weeds. Various repairs were undertaken in the temple to prepare it to be used once again as a ritually clean place for the worship of the one true God of Israel. The first sacrifice offered on the new altar took place on the twenty-fifth day of the ninth month, Kislev, in the year 148, i.e. December 164 B.C.E. exactly three years after the altar stone was placed on the altar of burnt offering.

The occupation of Jerusalem and the purification of the temple were periods of great joy for Judas, his supporters and all who followed the true Jewish religion. In order to keep these events alive for following generations of the Jewish people, Judas together with the congregation of Israel decreed that the purification of the temple and the dedication of the altar be observed as a joyful feast for a period of eight days starting on

the twenty-fifth day of Kislev every year. This feast known as Hanukkah is still celebrated by the Jewish people up to the present. The fact that Judas and an assembly of the people decreed that this day should become a permanent feast in the Jewish calendar was an innovation. Up till this time all feasts had been decreed by God. It was at this time that Judas and his forces built defensive walls and towers around Mount Zion to prevent the gentiles and apostates from taking it again. He also had the town of Beth Zur fortified and set up a garrison there. We are not sure when the news of the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes would have reached the people of Judaea. Therefore it is uncertain whether it was news of this event that prompted Judas' actions in Jerusalem in late 164 B.C.E.

4.3.4.2 THE DEATH OF ANTIOCHUS IV EPIPHANES

All our sources give an account of the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. These accounts all vary as to the place and cause of death. Doran in his work on II Maccabees informs us that it was usual in ancient times for many differing versions of the deaths of famous people to exist. It was however unusual to have different versions of these events in the same work as occurs in II Maccabees. (Doran 1981: 6) From Jewish and other sources it is clear that Antiochus IV was in Asia Minor when he died. It also seems that his death was in some way connected to the robbery or attempted robbery of a temple. The manner of his death as described in the sources makes use of general literary styles of the day. He was known as a temple robber and the nature of his illness is that used to describe a person who has angered the gods. It is said that he suffered acute bowel pains and that worms ate his flesh while he was still alive (II Macc. 9: 5,6, 9).

We are given different information concerning the date of his death in I and II Maccabees. In I Maccabees it occurs after the purification of the temple whereas in II Maccabees it is before the purification of the temple. From a cuneiform king list from Babylon published by A.J. Sachs and D.J. Wiseman in 1954 we know that Antiochus IV died in Sel.Bab. 148. The news of his death reached Babylon in the ninth month of that year i.e. November-December 164 B.C.E. This means that he died shortly before this at the beginning of Sel.Mac. 149 i.e. October 164 B.C.E. As I and II Maccabees use

different forms of dating this information can help to explain the divergent accounts.
(Attridge 1986: 319)

5. THE EFFECTS OF CHANGES IN REGIME ON PALESTINIAN JUDAISM DURING THE PERIOD 163 TO 161 B.C.E.

The death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in Persia in late 164 B.C.E. was to usher in a period of instability in the Seleucid kingdom. On his death his son Antiochus V Eupator was only nine years old. Prior to his death Antiochus IV had sent a letter to the different cities and peoples in his kingdom asking them to accept his son as ruler and give him their allegiance while he was away and in the event of his death. A version of this letter has come down to us in II Maccabees chapter 9. This is the standard form of letter that a king would write to his subjects while away campaigning. The aim is to ensure the support of his subjects for his choice of successor. It is also to create stability in the kingdom by announcing his official successor thereby minimizing the possibility of pretenders to the throne in the event of his death.

On hearing of the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Lysias had Antiochus V Eupator declared king with himself as regent until the new king came of age. We are not sure when word of Antiochus IV's death would have reached Antioch. We know it reached Babylon in November-December 164 B.C.E. It is uncertain whether Lysias knew of Antiochus IV's change of heart regarding him as regent of the country. On his deathbed Antiochus IV named his general and companion Philip as the new regent of the kingdom (I Macc. 6: 14-15). It was important at this time for Lysias to consolidate his position as regent and that of Antiochus V as king. There were other claimants to the throne and regency. Although Demetrius I was still being held as a hostage in Rome he had a major claim on the Seleucid throne. As stated above Philip was the deceased king's choice of regent for the country while Antiochus V was still underage. These factors concerning the Seleucid state were of much help to Judas and his supporters in their campaigns against the apostate Jews and their allies in the Akra and in the rest of Coele-Syria.

5.1 THE CAMPAIGNS OF JUDAS AMONG THE NEIGHBOURING PEOPLES

After Judas and his forces had purified the temple and made Mount Zion and Beth Zur secure from attacks by their enemies they embarked on a series of campaigns against the neighbouring peoples. It would seem from the sources that the neighbouring peoples and cities were persecuting the Jews within their midst (I Macc. 5; II Macc. 12). Judas and his brothers set out for the territories of Idumea, Galilee and Transjordan. They fought many battles. An interesting passage is found at II Macc. 12: 36-45. In this passage a number of Judas' men had been killed in battle. When Judas and the rest of his men went to collect in the bodies for burial they discovered that the dead men were all wearing amulets to idols of Jamnia under their tunics. Such objects were forbidden to Jews by the law. This the people thought was why these men had died in the battle. Judas took a contribution from each man and sent two thousand drachmas to Jerusalem for a sin-offering to be made to atone for the sins of the dead thereby freeing them from their sin. This is the first time that we find the concept of the resurrection of the dead and the possibility that praying for the dead could help atone for their sins. During the campaigns in the neighbouring territories, Judas and his men rescued many Jews and brought them back to Judaea. While all these campaigns were going on and after them Judas and his men kept up a steady blockade of those residing in the Akra. The situation of those in the Akra was becoming desperate so they sent Menelaus to Antioch to request help.

5.2 THE CAMPAIGN OF ANTIOCHUS V AND LYSIAS IN JUDAEA IN 163 B.C.E.

As affairs in Antioch were stable Antiochus V and Lysias set off for Judaea with a large force including war elephants. While they were *en route* Menelaus attempted to ingratiate himself to the new king. Lysias however had had enough of Menelaus. Our sources say that Lysias had received information which lay the blame for all the troubles in Judaea at Menelaus' door (II Macc.13:3-4). It is this passage in particular that those who see Menelaus as the author of the religious suppression, use to justify their position. As it also appears in Josephus' Antiquities of the Jews (Jos.Ant. XII: 384-385) it must have been a current view in antiquity. Although Antiochus V and Lysias took Menelaus with

them to Judaea they realized that he would have to be executed if there was to be peace among the Jews. On his return to Antioch, Antiochus V ordered Menelaus to be taken to Beroea, to be executed in the ash tower there. This ash tower was specially reserved for the executions of those guilty of sacrilege and other heinous crimes (II Macc. 13: 4-8). So it was that Menelaus whose sole aim appeared to be political power met an ignominious death. Alcimus was appointed high priest by Antiochus V. Alcimus is referred to at both I Macc. 7: 5 and II Macc. 14: 3-13.

Antiochus V continued his steady march to Judaea. As in his previous campaign against Judaea, Lysias marched to Beth Zur avoiding the mountainous routes that favoured the Jewish forces of Judas. As stated above, in the quiet after Lysias' first campaign Judas had fortified Beth Zur. Beth Zur was in a strategic position for the defence of Judaea and Jerusalem. Antiochus V and Lysias laid siege to Beth Zur.

At this time Judas was laying siege to the Akra in Jerusalem. He held a meeting with the elders of the people to discuss strategy to meet the challenge of Antiochus V and Lysias and their army. Judas always made use of the traditional method of consulting with the elders of the people or the people themselves when major decisions involving the nation were to be made (cf. II Macc. 10: 8; II Macc. 13: 13). The decision taken at this meeting was for Judas and his troops to leave off the siege of the Akra and go to meet the Seleucid force at Beth Zecharia. According to I Maccabees 6: 47, Judas and his force were defeated at this battle. II Maccabees gives the impression that Judas had a success in this battle but actually does not state the outcome, only that terms were agreed on. Judas and some of his forces seem to have taken to the hills at this point. Part of Judas' forces were in Jerusalem to hold Mount Zion and the temple.

5.2.1 THE PEACE TERMS BETWEEN ANTIOCHUS V AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE

As it was a sabbatical year there was a shortage of food in the land especially in those towns that were under siege. This shortage of food was aggravated by the additional people who needed to be fed—all those that Judas and his brothers had brought to Judaea from the neighbouring countries. A portion of the royal army went up to Jerusalem to lay siege to those who were holding Mount Zion. The situation of the defenders in both Beth Zur and Jerusalem was extreme. They were few in number and their food supplies were

low. Eventually the defenders and people of Beth Zur agreed to the terms of Lysias and opened the town to the king. The king was now able to concentrate all his forces on Jerusalem. The outcome looked settled but news from Antioch prompted Antiochus V and Lysias to negotiate with the Jews. Philip, the general of Antiochus IV had arrived in Antioch with the late king's expeditionary force and was seeking to take over the government.

This was a great reprieve for the Jewish people. There had only been a few defenders on the temple mount and they were in dire straits for lack of food. We know the terms that were agreed upon between the king and the Jewish people as letter number two in II Maccabees 11 is the official decision of the king to his regent regarding Judaea and the Jewish people at this time.

Realising that the problem in Judaea revolved around the change in status of the Jewish *ethnos* since the time of his father Antiochus IV, Antiochus V repealed the act that had turned Jerusalem into a *polis*. He decreed that in future the Jewish people were to live in accordance with their ancestral laws as had been the situation prior to Antiochus IV. The Torah was once again binding on all Jews. He officially returned the temple to the Jewish people. It had been in the hands of Judas and his followers since late 164 B.C.E. so this was legalizing the position that prevailed at the time of the negotiations. This policy effectively cancelled the status of the Akra as a *polis*. The inhabitants of the Akra no longer had access to the Jewish temple on Mount Zion. Jerusalem was now independent of the polis, Akra (Bickerman 1979: 57-58).

What this agreement did not do was disband the garrison dwelling in the Akra. It did not return Judaea to the same political status as under Antiochus III and Seleucus IV. We are not told of any tax concessions so must assume that the punitive taxes of Antiochus IV were still in place. Concessions were only made to the tax structure in 153 B.C.E. under Demetrius.

Peace descended on the land of Judaea. From the sources it would seem that many of Judas' supporters were happy that the religious laws and traditional way of life had been restored in Judaea. They saw no reason to continue fighting the Seleucid government. As far as they were concerned what they had been fighting for, the freedom to live according to their ancestral laws and observe their traditional religion, had been

attained. The appointment of Alcimus to the high priesthood was also acceptable to the Hasidim. We are not given much information on Alcimus in the sources. In I Macc. 7: 14, it says that Alcimus was a priest of the family of Aaron therefore acceptable to the Hasidim. This suggests that he was not of the Zadokite line, which was the traditional prerequisite for the high priest. Although all Jewish priests were of the line of Aaron regardless of which family line they were members of (Marcus 1957: 201 n.i.) Grabbe suggests that the study by Sievers gives one reason to think that Alcimus was a member of the Oniad family. Whether one accepts this or not Alcimus was acceptable as high priest to many Jews including the Hasidim (Grabbe 1992: 289-290). One result of the appointment of Alcimus as high priest of the Jewish people was that Onias IV, the son of deposed and murdered Onias III, left for Egypt where he is said to have built a temple similar to that in Jerusalem at Leontopolis (Jos.Ant. XII.387-388).

5.3 JUDAS CONTINUES THE FIGHT FROM THE GOPHNA HILLS

The loss of many of his supporters was a blow to the plans of Judas. He could see the inherent danger in the subjugation of the Jewish people by foreign, pagan kingdoms. Although the Jewish people were now able to live in the way they had always done and practice their traditional religion, these rights were accorded them by a foreign power that could cancel these rights at any time. For most Jews the issue they had fought for was religious freedom. When this was granted to them and an acceptable high priest appointed they were prepared to leave the resistance forces and live in peace under their Seleucid overlords (Grabbe 1992: 290). Judas, his brothers and some others continued the fight against the Seleucid authorities and those Jews still residing in the Akra. These actions of the Maccabean group were conducted in guerrilla style from the Maccabean base in the Gophna mountains. Their actions were obviously successful as Alcimus and other Jews went to Antioch to complain of the Maccabean actions against them (Jos. Ant. XII: 391-392; I Macc. 7: 5; II Macc.14: 6-7).

5.4 RELATIONS BETWEEN DEMETRIUS I AND THE JEWISH PEOPLE UP TO THE DEATH OF JUDAS IN 161 B.C.E.

Demetrius I was finally able to escape from Rome in the latter half of the year 162 B.C.E. He arrived on the coast of Syria with a few friends before the Mediterranean Sea closed for the winter on 3 November 162 B.C.E. (Jos.Ant. XII: 389). He then launched his claim

for the Seleucid throne that should have come to him on the death of his father Seleucus IV in 175 B.C.E. It is not clear why the Romans refused to allow him to travel to Syria and claim his crown. Perhaps they were already thinking that it would be better to have a Seleucid house in Syria that was divided among itself. Demetrius was able to get the army on his side and had Antiochus V and Lysias executed. This left him free to carry out his own policies and not fear a split among his army and people.

Shortly after Demetrius I ascended the throne Alcimus went to Antioch to be confirmed as high priest of the Jewish people. He also used this opportunity to inform Demetrius of the ongoing guerrilla activities of Judas and his supporters. It was clear from what he told Demetrius I that he would need military support to maintain his position as high priest of the Jewish people and representative of the Seleucid throne in Jerusalem and Judaea. An army under the leadership of Bacchides the king's deputy accompanied Alcimus back to Judaea to address the problems there (Grabbe 1992: 289). The account in II Maccabees does not record this visit of Bacchides to Judaea. It only tells the story of the campaign of Nicanor in Judaea. This is probably because the writer wishes to end his account of Judas on a high note.

From I Maccabees and Josephus we have accounts of two visits by Bacchides and one of Nicanor between the visits of Bacchides. The first of these accounts was when Bacchides escorted Alcimus back to Jerusalem after he had been reconfirmed in his position of Jewish high priest. When Alcimus arrived in Jerusalem with a large Seleucid force the Hasideans sought peace. They acknowledged Alcimus as a legitimate high priest and wished to live in peace. In I Macc. 7: 12-18 it is stated that after gaining the confidence of the Hasidim, sixty of them were arrested and executed by Bacchides. As Grabbe points out this does not make good sense from the point of the Seleucid authorities or Alcimus as high priest. It would be against the self-interest of the state to provoke a section of the population that was prepared to accept his orders (Grabbe 1992: 290). From our sources it is uncertain whether the Hasidim returned to Judas' camp after the visit of Bacchides. In I Macc. 7: 20-22 it would appear that in general the Jewish people were willing to recognize Alcimus as high priest and accept Seleucid rule in return for freedom of religion (Grabbe 1992: 290). Bacchides returned to Antioch leaving Alcimus in Jerusalem as high priest.

5.4.1 THE CAMPAIGNS OF NICANOR IN JUDAEA

Judas continued his fight against the Seleucid authorities and those who supported them such as Alcimus. Alcimus was again compelled to go to Antioch and seek assistance. This time the governor of Judaea, Nicanor was sent to deal with the situation. Once again our two main sources give divergent accounts of all that occurred during the campaigns of Nicanor in Judaea. In II Maccabees friendly diplomacy between Nicanor and Judas is recounted whereas I Maccabees has Nicanor pretending to be friendly so as to trap Judas and kill him. The former seems more likely as there was a period of peace for a while. This peace did not last and a showdown between the forces of Nicanor and Judas became inevitable. Judas seems to have mustered a large force at this time and decisively defeated Nicanor whose head and hand were brought to Jerusalem and put on display. It is possible that some of the Hasidim rejoined Judas for this battle in anger at the blasphemies spoken by Nicanor against the temple. The defeat of Nicanor was seen as an occasion for great jubilation and Judas issued a decree that every year the Day of Nicanor should be celebrated on the thirteenth day of Adar (I Macc. 7: 48-49). This was the second such decree issued by Judas, the first being the celebration of the purification of the temple. This is where II Maccabees finishes. It ends on a glorious note for Judas.

5.4.2 THE SECOND CAMPAIGN OF BACCHIDES IN JUDAEA AND THE DEATH OF JUDAS

There appears to have been a period of peace after the battle with Nicanor. During this time I Maccabees claims that Judas made a treaty of friendship and alliance with the Romans. This treaty is often disputed. It is however not impossible if we consider the letter of the Romans to the Jewish people at the time of negotiations between Lysias and some Jews early in 164 B.C.E. There were Roman envoys in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, Syria and Egypt. To obtain a letter of friendship from the Romans would be very useful to Judas and the Jewish people. It would help to establish his group's claims of leadership over the jurisdiction of the Jewish people (Grabbe 1992: 291).

The peace did not last long and Demetrius I sent Alcimus and Bacchides back to Judaea with a large force. Judas was able to muster a force of three thousand well trained troops. This is a lot less than he was able to muster on other occasions. When he had his full forces he could muster ten to eleven thousand well trained men. The lack of fighting

men for Judas suggests that the Hasidim were no longer part of his group. It is possible that other members of his former forces also felt that the need to continue fighting the Seleucid authorities was unnecessary as they had obtained all that they previously enjoyed under foreign rule. For Judas and his stalwarts this was not good enough. They saw the need for full political independence. It was only with full independence that the ancestral laws could be guaranteed. At this stage this was obviously a minority viewpoint. The majority of the population must have still held to the view that the pagan kingdoms were put over Judaea by God and only when a suitable prophet came would this circumstance change. Until then they should submit to foreign rule so long as the foreigner ruler does not interfere with the ancestral laws and religion of the Jewish people.

The two forces met near Alasa. On seeing the large Seleucid force many of Judas' followers left his camp. Eventually he was left with eight hundred fighting men. They tried to dissuade Judas from entering combat with such a large force. It would be better to retreat to the mountains and be able to fight another day than be slaughtered. Judas would not hear of this and went into battle with his eight hundred men. During the battle he was killed and the rest of his men fled. His body was retrieved by his brothers Jonathan and Simon who took him back to the family tomb at Modin for burial (I Macc. 9:17-20).

The death of Judas marked the end of one phase of the Jewish fight for political and religious freedom. His great importance was in the development of a well-trained fighting force. It was not a permanent army as the troops went home to their farms between engagements. He was also important in that he was able to hold together a force of men with vastly differing viewpoints during the worst days of the religious suppression and persecution. It was only after religious freedom had been gained that he could not hold these varying groups together. For many religious freedom was the goal not political freedom from the Seleucid state. After his death his brothers and their supporters had to resort to guerrilla tactics again. It was in the time of his brother Simon that full independence was obtained.

6. CONCLUSION

The period 175 to 161 B.C.E. was a watershed period in the history and development of Early Palestinian Judaism. This period saw the political constitution of Early Palestinian Judaism change from that of an *ethnos* to that of a *polis* then back to an *ethnos*. These changes in political status had an impact on all other cultural domains within Early Palestinian Judaism. By using cultural anthropology as a model it has been possible to draw up a picture of how the changes in political constitution impacted on all other aspects of life of the Palestinian Jewish community during this period. In order to draw together the different cultural domains of Early Palestinian Judaism a suitable colligatory concept was required to give cohesion to all the known facts. The writer chose to use the concept of the 'ancestral laws' i.e. the Torah and its official interpretation to give cohesion and understanding to all the available data.

Although the writer looked at the period prior to Alexander the Great and the Hellenistic monarchies this was to show the place of the 'ancestral laws' in the life of Early Palestinian Judaism. The Jewish community that returned to Judah from Babylon on the instructions of Cyrus and other Persian kings after 538 B.C.E. was centred around the temple. A theocratic state was developed in Judah with a constitution based on the Law of Moses. This 'Law of Moses' covered all aspects of life of the Jewish community. It dealt with the religious life, political life, social life and economic life of the community. There were some who rebelled against the strict and rigid interpretation of these laws. The laws concerning intermarriage and separation from the other peoples in the area were seen as being negatively isolationist (Grabbe 1992: 134). This conflict over the interpretation of the Law was to persist throughout the Antique period (Cook 1999). It should be noted that even though there were contending views over the interpretation of the Law, the basic concept of the Law was upheld by all members of the Jewish community and those living in Samaria.

The conquest of Palestine by Alexander the Great was to usher in a period of change for the entire Ancient Near East. Our only source of information relating to Alexander and his relations with the Jewish people is to be found in Josephus', *The Antiquities of the Jews*. As discussed above many of the elements of Josephus account

are improbable. However, it is most likely that Alexander confirmed the right of the Jews to live according to their 'ancestral laws' as he did for other peoples in the conquered territories. After his death in 323 B.C.E. the province of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia suffered a number of years of occupations by various of his generals. Eventually in 301 B.C.E. this province was annexed by the Ptolemaic king of Egypt.

The Ptolemaic conquest of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia was to usher in a period of relative stability for the cities and peoples of this province. It was during this period that Hellenism started making an impact on the lives of the local peoples. The influence of Greek culture and ways initially came in the form of the military colonies (*cleruchies*) that were set up at strategic points in the conquered territories. We know from our sources that there was a mixed *cleruchy* based on the land of the Jew Tobias in the Ammonitis. Besides these military colonies, the new rulers also established Greek style cities (*poleis*) throughout the region. These were characterized by Greek forms of political structure and culture. The inhabitants of these cities were initially Greeks and Macedonians. Later members of the local aristocracy and ruling classes were permitted to join. It was also possible for local cities or people by an act of the royal government to establish themselves into *poleis*. At the center of every *polis* were to be found the Greek cultural institutions of the *gymnasium* and *ephebion*. These institutions formed the future citizens of the *polis*. Only those youths who had been through these institutions could become full citizens of the *polis*. The *gymnasium* was particularly important as it formed the center of the social life for citizens of the *polis*.

The *poleis* throughout the Greek world were all connected by their Greek culture and form of government. Contacts between the various *poleis* were well maintained. They all participated in the regular Greek Games that were held in the different *poleis*. Having the status of a *polis* was beneficial to local communities for a variety of reasons. The *polies* were well looked upon by the ruling kingdoms. Citizens of the various *poleis* could meet one another at the Games. Although they might initially be from different peoples the Greek culture and education they had obtained put them on the same social level. These Games were also venues where business deals could be brokered between members of the various *poleis*. It is probable that favourable conditions existed for trade between the various *poleis* in the region existed. There was the possibility that citizens of

the various *poleis* could attend the federal council meetings of the state and vote on issues affecting the *poleis* proportionally according to the number of citizens in the *polis*. To acquire the status of a *polis* was therefore beneficial in a number of respects for local peoples and cities. The *polis* also had a religious aspect having its city god or gods. The *gymnasium* also had its gods. As in the case of all ancient cultures worship and respect of the city gods was a vital part of city life. Religion was central to the well being of every city and people.

We have very few sources on Judaea and the Jewish people for the period of Ptolemaic rule. Our major sources for this period are the Zenon papyri and the account of the Tobiad family in Josephus. For our purposes the account of the Tobiads at Jos. Ant. XII. 157-236 is vitally important. The Tobiads were members of the Jewish aristocracy who had large estates in the Ammonitis. They were closely related to the Jewish high priestly family, the Oniads, through the marriage of Tobias to the sister of Onias II. During the Ptolemaic period a *cleruchy* of mixed soldiers was based on their land. When a crisis occurred between the Jewish high priest and the Ptolemaic authorities it was Joseph the son of Tobias who resolved it. This crisis revolved around the payment of the annual tribute to the Ptolemies. The high priest was refusing to pay and the Ptolemaic authorities were threatening to subdue Judaea. Although our source claims that it was as a result of the meanness of the high priest that he was refusing to pay the tribute, this is unlikely. As the Third Syrian War was in progress at the time it is more likely that the high priest was hoping for a Seleucid victory. Joseph calling together a meeting of the people said that he would in future represent the people at the Ptolemaic court and take the tribute owing to Egypt. The people accepted Joseph as the *prostates* of the Jewish people to the Ptolemaic court. Joseph had diverted a disaster falling upon the people of Judaea. This is the first time we come across a split in the Jewish aristocracy concerning relations with the Greek kingdoms. The divisions within the ruling classes of Judaea with respect to support of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid was to grow over the years and influence much of what happened during Seleucid rule. Joseph ben Tobiah became a powerful agent for the Ptolemaic government from this time. He was awarded the rights to collect the taxes for the state from the entire province of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. This increased his status in Judaea, the region and the Ptolemaic court. He set up a house in

Alexandria and employed a steward to look after all his affairs including keeping large sums of money. The influence of life in the Greek city of Alexandria was to permeate through the family of Joseph. Joseph could see the advantages of the Hellenistic culture. As a Jew he seems to have been less rigid in his interpretation of the Law than those in authority in Jerusalem. He had Samaritan friends and attended functions in pagan surroundings in Alexandria. His father was, among other ventures, involved in the slave trade between Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. We know from the Zenon papyri that he sold Hebrew slaves as well as gentiles. This was prohibited in the Law. From the Zenon papyri we know that Tobias had a Greek secretary. It is likely that he also employed Greek tutors to teach his sons. He could see that a good knowledge of Greek was essential to get on in the world especially in business and in contacts with members of the Greek cities. As Joseph ben Tobiah was the official representative of the Jewish people to the Ptolemaic court he would have to spend time in Jerusalem. It appears from sources such as Ben Sira that there was a growing Greek influence among the aristocracy of Jerusalem toward the end of the Ptolemaic period and the beginning of the Seleucid period.

When Antiochus III conquered Coele-Syria and Phoenicia in 200-198 B.C.E. the Jewish people under the conservative high priest Simon II 'the Just', supported him against the Ptolemaic forces. It would seem that the sons of Joseph, excepting Hyrcanus, also supported the Seleucids at this time. The arrival of the Seleucids in Judaea was to be of major importance for the development of Judaism.

As a reward for all their help in his campaign against the Ptolemies, Antiochus granted the Jewish people a number of concessions. In his decree of 198 B.C.E. he confirmed their right to live according to their 'ancestral laws'. This confirmation was to provide the legal basis for the Torah and its official interpretation as the law governing the Jewish people. The Torah was not only a religious law but a law which governed every aspect of Jewish life. In the Torah the guidelines were given for how to conduct oneself, socially, economically, politically and religiously. There were of course differing interpretations of these guidelines as was apparent in the time after the return from exile and by the actions of Tobias and his son Joseph. The Torah and its interpretation that became the Seleucid constitution in Judaea after 198 B.C.E. was that of the more

conservative group within Judaism led by the high priest, Simon the Just. Antiochus also granted tax concessions to the entire nation for three years because of the suffering and destruction that had occurred as a result of the war between the Seleucids and the Ptolemies. Tax concessions were also granted to various ranks of the temple hierarchy. A proclamation was also issued by Antiochus III prohibiting the selling and presence of various unclean animals and their skins in the temple area of Jerusalem. The decrees and proclamations of Antiochus III guaranteed that the Jewish *ethnos* would be able to continue to live in isolation and ritual purity in the hills of Judaea. His decree on the political status of Jerusalem as an *ethnos* was a royal edict and therefore binding unless the king himself or his successors should rescind it. Simon II had managed to keep out the Greek influence which was pervasive in Jerusalem at this time.

These decrees of Antiochus III were obviously not welcomed by those who had been influenced by Greek thought and culture. They could see how Judaea could take its place among the other nations. This however would be difficult with all the prohibitions in place especially those involving trade. In order to grow economically Judaea needed to be less rigid in its interpretation of the law. Those who thought in this way saw themselves as good Jews, as they interpreted the law.

A clash between these two groups of Jews occurred during the high priesthood of Onias III. It was concerned with the administration of the city markets. We are not sure what the administration of the markets entailed. It probably involved policing the markets to check that ritual purity, correct weights and prices among other things were maintained. The outcome was that head of the temple treasury, Simon Bilga, accused Onias III of keeping vast sums of money in the temple treasury far too much for the cost of the sacrifices. Apollonius the governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia informed the authorities in Antioch of this. Seleucus IV who had succeeded Antiochus III as king of Syria was in need of vast sums of money to pay the reparations owed to Rome after the peace of Apamea in 188 B.C.E. He duly sent his chancellor Heliodorus to Jerusalem to seize the funds held there. Heliodorus attempted to acquire the temple funds but was unable to do so. It did come to light however that Onias III held monies belonging to Hyrcanus Tobiad in the temple. This implies that the high priest had pro-Ptolemaic tendencies as Hyrcanus was a Ptolemaic official. We now find that the ruling classes are

divided into various groups: those who support the Seleucids, those who support the Ptolemies, those who are inclined towards Greek ways and those who are conservative in their outlook. The way in which the ruling classes deal with all these contrasts will influence the further development of Judaism. Our sources don't tell us much about the other classes in Judaea at this time. We do get an idea of tensions between the wealthy and the poor from Ben Sira. He also shows the tensions between those who adhere to a strict interpretation of the law and those who wish for closer ties with the outside world especially the Greek world of the Ancient Near East. These tensions come to a head in 175 B.C.E. when Onias III goes to Antioch to state his case before the king but the king is murdered while he is there.

Antiochus IV, an enigmatic character who had spent twelve years as a hostage in Rome takes the Seleucid throne ahead of his nephew Demetrius I who is a hostage in Rome. The coming of this unusual king to the Seleucid throne was to bring to the fore all the complexities plaguing the Jewish *ethnos* at this time. We don't know whether Onias III had an audience with Antiochus IV. Shortly after his accession to the throne a delegation from Jerusalem arrived in Antioch headed by Jason the brother of Onias III. They were granted an audience with the king and Jason offered the king a greater sum of money than the usual tribute from Judaea in exchange for the position of high priest of the Jews and official Jewish representative of the Seleucid government in Judaea. Antiochus IV who needed money was happy to acquiesce to this request. He did not realize that this was contrary to the Jewish law on high priestly succession. Jason also offered him one hundred and fifty talents if he could change the status of Jerusalem to that of a *polis*. As Antiochus IV believed that the presence of *poleis* in his kingdom would strengthen it he was all for the establishment of foundations in his kingdom. To have Jerusalem as a *polis* with a special loyalty to him would secure his position in the border region with Egypt. This action of Antiochus IV nullified the royal decrees of his father Antiochus III which guaranteed that the Jewish *ethnos* could live according to their 'ancestral laws'. It also meant that the prohibitions on various forms of trade in the Jerusalem could now be overruled.

As stated above the Jewish 'ancestral law' included every aspect of the lives of the Jewish people not only the religious. Jason was now introducing a new political

constitution to replace the *ethnos* of the Jews. This new political constitution was to be based on a Greek model alien to the people of Judaea. The ‘ancestral laws’ of the Jewish people had lost their legal grounding. It was not necessary for the leaders of the new foundation in Jerusalem to totally repudiate all aspects of the ‘ancestral laws’. They would only make changes that would permit Judaea to open up more to the outside world and take its place in the Hellenistic world. It would not make sense for them to change the temple cult as this was their main source of income. Jason would also draw up a list of citizens of this new foundation. In this way those who were very traditional and conservative in outlook would not acquire citizenship in the new foundation. These acts of Jason would cause further polarization of the aristocracy of Jerusalem.

The first sign of the new status of Jerusalem was the building of a *gymnasium*. This *gymnasium* soon became the centre of the social life of Jerusalem. In this it displaced the temple as the centre of Jewish life. However, it did not cause the cult to suffer. The temple continued as the religious centre of Jerusalem and Judaea. We hear of no gods being worshipped in the *gymnasium* so we must assume that the leaders of the new political dispensation in Jerusalem did not wish to offend the religious sensibilities of the people of Jerusalem. Soon after this Jason sent an observer delegation to the quinquennial Games in Tyre. II Maccabees informs us that he gave them a financial contribution to offer to Tyrean Hercules, the god of Tyre and the Games. This would be in direct opposition to the ‘ancestral laws’ regarding pagan gods. It is generally agreed by scholars that this was probably not the case and that the eventual destination of the monies to outfit triremes was the original intention of Jason and the council of elders in Jerusalem. Being at the Games was of course important for the new foundation for economic reasons. The delegation could organize trade deals with a greater number of cities than before.

Although changes were taking place the daily life of the ordinary people of Jerusalem would have continued unchanged. They would not be citizens of the new *polis* but then they probably never had much political say in the affairs of the *ethnos*. The temple and temple cult which were the centre of their lives had not changed. Three years after the changes were introduced Menelaus the brother of Simon Bilga went to Antioch to pay the annual tribute and deal with other matters of state. While in Antioch he offered

the king three hundred talents more in tribute if he could have the position of Jewish high priest. Antiochus agreed and Menelaus returned to Jerusalem as the new high priest. Jason fled to the Ammonitis probably to the fortress of Hyrcanus. This would automatically make him appear pro-Ptolemaic. The people of Jerusalem were not happy with the accession of Menelaus to the position of high priest. He was not a member of the Oniad family from which the high priest traditionally came. Soon it became apparent that he could not pay the tribute he had promised the king. This led to him and his brother Lysimachus stealing vessels from the temple. When word of this got out the people were very angry. As Menelaus was in Antioch at the time to explain to the king why the tribute had not been paid, he left his brother Lysimachus in charge in Jerusalem. The people in Jerusalem rioted against this sacrilege. In the violence that ensued Lysimachus and some of his supporters were killed by the people. Onias III had heard of this in Antioch and wanted to bring a case against Menelaus. Menelaus using temple vessels bribed Andronicus who had Onias III murdered. The *gerousia* seeing what Menelaus' policies were doing to the Jewish nation and hearing of the murder of Onias III sent a delegation to the king to bring charges against Menelaus. Using bribes Menelaus was able to get off and instead the delegates from Jerusalem were executed for treason.

Menelaus returned to Jerusalem but the trouble continued. It was exacerbated when Antiochus IV visited Jerusalem after his first Egyptian campaign in 169 B.C.E. As he was still owed a large sum of money he entered the temple with Menelaus and proceeded to take temple treasures to the value of eighteen hundred talents. This amount probably was the outstanding tribute. Antiochus IV would have seen no problem in taking the money due to him from the temple. As head of state and patron of the *polis* at Jerusalem the temple was his property. The people of Jerusalem did not see things in the same way. Antiochus IV and Menelaus had desecrated the holiness and purity of the temple. In this we can see how the change in status of the 'ancestral laws' impacted on the religious consciousness of the people. The religious aspects of the law were no longer protected by royal law.

During the Antiochus' second campaign in Egypt a rumour went around that he had been killed. This prompted revolts of many of the cities in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. Jason took this opportunity to attack Jerusalem. He defeated Menelaus who

took refuge in the citadel of Jerusalem. On hearing news that Antiochus IV was alive and returning Jason fled back to the Ammonitis. Antiochus IV sent Apollonius to put down the revolt in Jerusalem while he dealt with the coastal cities. By this time Jerusalem was quiet but Apollonius subdued the city and set in place a number of measures that changed the political status of Jerusalem. He razed the city walls, thereby turning Jerusalem into a village which was dependent on another walled place. Punitive tax measures were also put in place to subdue the people of Judaea. A strong wall and towers was built around the City of David. This walled citadel had the status of a *polis* and was known as the Akra. The citizens of Jerusalem no longer had any political rights, they were subordinated to the leaders of the Akra. Menelaus still held the position of high priest and dwelt in the Akra. When Apollonius left he was replaced by Philip the Phrygian with a garrison of soldiers. This garrison was there to protect Menelaus and his supporters and maintain order in the city. The nationality of these soldiers is not known but it is thought that some of them were syncretistic Jews. As members of the Akra these soldiers had the right to worship in the Jerusalem temple.

The fact that foreigners were now able to worship in the temple angered the people of Jerusalem and Judaea. It is probable that some people left Jerusalem at this time for the country. We aren't sure of what happened in Jerusalem at this time. In 167 B.C.E. an elderly Athenian arrived to introduce a new religion to the Jewish people. At this stage the Jewish religion was prohibited. It was against the law to circumcise boys and to keep the Sabbath day. The meat prohibitions of Judaism were lifted and it became necessary for all Jews to eat the meat of pigs and other formerly prohibited animals. All copies of the law were to be destroyed so that the teachings of Judaism could not be learned by future generations. Those who did not comply with these new laws were to be executed. The cult in Jerusalem and Judaea was also changed. The form the cult took was Semitic not Greek. An altar stone was placed on the altar of burnt-offering, temple prostitution was practiced and no cult idols are reported in our sources. Throughout Judaea altars were set up in the market places and incense offered in the doorways. This suppression of the Jewish religion is a puzzle to us. Why would a political revolt result in a religious suppression and persecution. As stated above there are many theories on this topic but none is fully convincing.

The suppression of Judaism galvanized the people into various forms of action. The various reactions related to how different groups of people interpreted the law. Some chose passive resistance and fled into the mountains and the desert, others chose active resistance. Of those who chose active resistance some were prepared to fight defensively on the Sabbath while others were not. Judas the son of Mattathias, a priest of the family of Joarib from Modin, was able to get a force together and trained them in guerrilla techniques. These groups went around usually at night and dealt with all apostates to the law in the villages and towns of Judaea. They also recruited men from the villages. The Hasidim a group of pious men who were prepared to fight for their religion also joined Judas. These men of Judas were able to disrupt life in Jerusalem and Judaea to such an extent that Philip had to request help from the governor of Samaria and later the governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia. A number of battles were fought with Judas often winning. These wins were useful as they supplied the forces of Judas with additional weapons and money taken as booty. In 165 B.C.E. Antiochus IV left Antioch to campaign in the eastern part of his kingdom. His young son Antiochus V under the regent Lysias was left in charge of the western half of the kingdom.

The actions of Judas and his force had reached such a point that in late 165 early 164 B.C.E. Lysias set off for Judaea with a large force. An inconclusive battle was fought and Lysias decided when some Jews asked for negotiations that this would be the better course. In these negotiations, in which Menelaus seems to have played some part, the suppression of the Jewish religion was revoked. The Jewish people were again able to worship in the traditional way and keep all the traditional practices. However, the temple was not returned to them, it still remained the property of the *polis*, the Akra. A period of peace followed. At the end of the year 164 B.C.E. Judas and his forces took Jerusalem and the temple. They fortified the temple mount and the town of Beth Zur. The temple was cleared of all traces of the syncretistic religion practiced there, the polluted altar was removed and replaced with a new altar. After this purification of the temple the offerings resumed amidst great joy and Judas after consultation with the people decreed that from then on the purification of the temple would be remembered every year for eight days in the month of Kislev. Hanukkah is still celebrated by Jewish people today. Judas declaring

a religious feast was an innovation in Judaism-prior to that all festivals were decreed by God.

At about the time of the purification of the temple Antiochus IV died in Persia. On his deathbed Antiochus named Philip as regent over the entire kingdom while Antiochus V was underage. Lysias declared Antiochus V king and himself regent on receipt of the news of Antiochus IV's death. While they consolidated their position in Antioch, Judas and his brothers campaigned among the neighbouring countries where some persecution of the Jewish population was occurring. They brought many Jews back to Judaea and Jerusalem from Galilee, Idumea and Trans-Jordan. As the people in the Akra were seen as a menace to the temple Judas and his men laid siege against the Akra. Menelaus was sent by the people in the Akra to get help from the king. Antiochus V and Lysias with a large force including war elephants marched on Judaea. It would seem that Judas was defeated in a battle at Beth Zacharia and fled to the Gophna Hills. The force of Antiochus V laid siege to Beth Zur eventually convincing the residents to open the gates in exchange for free passage. The rest of the royal force was besieging the temple mount in Jerusalem. As it was a sabbatical year food was scarce and those defending Mount Zion were in dire straits. The victory of the Seleucid force was assured. However, news came from Antioch that Philip had arrived and set himself up in government. Antiochus V and Lysias had to return. They offered terms to the Jewish people. The status of Jerusalem was restored to what it was prior to 175 B.C.E. The 'ancestral laws' were reconfirmed as the political constitution of the Jewish people. The temple was returned officially to the Jewish people even though they had been in possession of it since late 164 B.C.E. The status of the Akra was changed. No longer could the people of the Akra use the Jerusalem temple for their worship. On the instructions of the king Menelaus was executed. Alcimus was appointed to the position of high priest. He was acceptable to many of the Jewish people including the Hasidim.

These concessions and return to the old constitution were not acceptable to Judas and some of his force. They realized that the 'ancestral laws' would always be in danger while the Jews were ruled by pagan kings. Judas and his close followers were now looking at freeing Judaea from the yoke of foreign rule. Most of the Jewish people including the Hasidim were happy so long as they were able to practice their religion

freely. It took many years for Judaea to free herself from foreign domination. This finally occurred in 141 B.C.E. under Judas' brother Simon.

From the above it can be seen that the change in political status of Jerusalem did indeed impact on the other domains of Early Palestinian Judaism. Within Judaism at the time there were many factions each with its own understanding of the law. While the law had the official status of being royal law it was difficult to make changes of any sort to any of the cultural domains. However, when this official status was lifted changes could be made. Economically the changes under Jason would have been beneficial. He only changed certain things leaving the religious aspects of the 'ancestral laws' intact. The change to a *polis* also affected the social domain within Judaism-some conservative members of the aristocracy would have lost their political rights as they were not included in the citizen body of the new foundation. The urban and rural middle and lower classes would have lost any political rights that they may have had. However, the circumstances changed when Menelaus acquired the position of head priest. He had no scruples about taking the temple vessels and selling them. By his actions he had upset the religious sensibilities of large portions of the Jerusalem population. The situation was aggravated by international events. Eventually in punishment for offences committed Antiochus IV changed Jerusalem into a village subservient to the *polis*, the Akra. The temple became the common property of Jews and non-Jews. The purity of the temple was polluted. Later he ordered the Jewish religion to be suppressed. It was only in the time of Antiochus V that the status quo was returned to what it had been in 175 B.C.E. Judas realized that to ensure the status of the 'ancestral laws' the Jewish people needed to be completely free of foreign political rule. As can be seen the thread running through all the events of this turbulent period of Early Palestinian Judaism was the 'ancestral laws'. What it meant to be a Jew and how this was to be self-understood occupied the Jewish people in antiquity. It was the law that defined the Jew but there were many interpretations of the law-some political and others purely religious.

From the above it will be clear that that saying "no man is an island" applies equally well to countries and communities. Although the change in political constitution caused changes in other spheres of Jewish life, these changes were also to an extent brought about or exacerbated by international events. When the ruling power was at war

what happened in the subject lands could affect the future behaviour of the ruler to the subject peoples. The roles of individual people also play a role in what changes occur, this can particularly be seen by looking at the roles of Jason, Menelaus, Antiochus IV and Judas in the events that occurred in Judaea at this time.

It follows from the above that any country, state or community that experiences a change in political constitution will also experience changes in other political domains. The last two decades of the twentieth century saw many countries and people experiencing political change. In all cases the change in political status impacted on other cultural domains within these countries. The U.S.S.R. and all its satellite states in Eastern Europe and the Balkans changed to more democratic forms of government. This impacted on the economic reality within these countries. Denationalizing state assets and businesses to make them more profitable has resulted in increased unemployment and the social problems that go with unemployment. The religious domain that had been dormant for many years has seen a revival since the change of political system in most of these countries. However, in certain of these countries particularly in the Balkans region religion, language and ethnicity have caused wars and persecutions since the lifting of communism. Before these countries were subjected to communism they had been divided into smaller political units based on religion, language and ethnicity. Under communism they were made into larger political units and religion, language and ethnicity were suppressed. On attaining freedom from communism these larger political entities have had to deal with the problems of divergent religious, linguistic and ethnic communities being under one roof. Splitting of these communities into smaller political units has helped stem some of these problems.

South Africa also experienced a change to its political constitution in 1994. From a national socialist type political system South Africa now has a democratic political constitution with an advanced Bill of Rights. This change in political constitution has also had an impact on the other cultural domains making up the South African community. The change over to a new constitution has been largely peaceful. However, South Africa is made up of many different ethnic, language and religious groups. The needs and aspirations of all these groups need to be considered when political laws are being introduced and implemented. If this is not done problems could develop. This seems to be

particularly true with regard to the role and function of traditional leaders and traditional law in the rural areas. The needs of the people in these areas need to be ascertained so that the central government departments can involve the traditional leaders in how best to implement reforms in these areas.

Changes as a result of the political constitution can be seen particularly in the social sphere. People are now free to live and associate with whoever they wish. This has led to an openness to learn about other cultures. As people of different cultural groups come to live in the same areas learning about others develops. This can of course lead to problems where different cultural practices not acceptable to all in the area manifest themselves. To cope with such problems will need patience and tact on the part of political officials and the people concerned.

A further promising change has been in the sphere of education. Equality is being introduced into the education system that will ultimately benefit all communities within the country. This process is slow and appears to stall at times but with perseverance it will succeed and bear fruit.

The writer will not go into all the changes that have occurred in South Africa as a result of the change in political constitution. From what has gone before it is clear that a new constitution in South Africa is a positive step in the history of South Africa. However, the ethnic, linguistic and religious sensibilities of all groups have to be considered when laws are promulgated. Should this not happen it is possible that people will feel their traditions are so threatened that violent reaction is their only recourse to preserve their identities.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Ahlström, GW 1991. The Role of Archaeological and Literary Remains in Reconstructing Israel's History in: Edelman, D (ed), *The Fabric of History: Text, Artifact and Israel's Past*. Sheffield: JSOT, pp.116-141.
- Appelbaum, S 1989. *Judaea in Hellenistic and Roman Times*. Leiden: E J Brill.
- Attridge, HW 1986. Jewish Historiography, in: Kraft, RA & Nickelsburg, GWE (eds), *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, pp. 311-343.
- Avi-Yonah, M 1976. The Hasmonean Revolt and Judas Maccabee's War against the Syrians, in: Schalit, A (ed), *The World History of the Jewish People*, Vol 6: *The Hellenistic Age*. London: W H Allen, pp.147-182.
- Baly, Denis 1989. The Geography of Palestine and the Levant in Relation to its History, in: Davies, WD and Finkelstein, L (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Vol I: *Introduction: The Persian Period*. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 1-24.
- Ben-Sasson, HH (ed) 1976. *A History of the Jewish People*. London: Weidenfeld & Nicholson.
- Bickerman, E 1962. *From Ezra to the Last of the Maccabees*. New York: Schocken Books.
- Bickerman, E 1979. *The God of the Maccabees*. Leiden: E.J.Brill.
- Bickerman, EJ 1989. Calendars and Chronology, in: Davies, W.D. and Finkelstein, L (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Vol. I: *Introduction: The Persian Period*. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 60-69.
- Black, J & Macraill, DM 1997. *Studying History*. London: Macmillan.
- Barbour, IG 1976. *Myths, Models and Paradigms: The Nature of Scientific and Religious Language*. London: SCM Press.
- Cary, M 1963. *The Greek World from 323 to 146 B.C.* 2nd ed. London: Methuen.
- Cohen, SJD 1987. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Philadelphia: The Westminster Press.
- Cohen, SJD 1990. Religion, Ethnicity, and 'Hellenism' in the Emergence of Jewish Identity in Maccabean Palestine, in: Bilde, P (ed), *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom*. Aarhus Denmark: Aarhus University Press, pp. 204-223.

- Collins, JJ 1977. *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*. Montana: Scholars Press.
- Cook, J 1999. The Law of Moses in Septuagint Proverbs. *Vetus Testamentum* 49/4 (1999), 448-461.
- Daniel in: *The New Jerusalem Bible* 1990. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Davies, J K 1989. Cultural, Social and Economic Features of the Hellenistic World, in: Astin, A E *et al.* (eds), *Cambridge Ancient History*², Vol 8: *Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 B.C.E.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 257-320.
- Deist, F E 1993. The Nature of Historical Understanding. *Old Testament Essays* 6, 384-398.
- Deist, F E & Le Roux, J H 1987. *Revolution and Reinterpretation*. Cape Town: Tafelberg.
- Delcor, M 1989. The Apocrypha and the Pseudepigrapha of the Hellenistic Period in: Davies, W D & Finkelstein, L (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Vol 2: The Hellenistic Age. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 409-503.
- Doran, R 1981. *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*. Washington: The Catholic Biblical Association of America.
- Ecclesiasticus in: *The New Jerusalem Bible* 1990. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Edelman, D 1991. Doing History in Biblical Studies in: Edelman, D (ed), *The Fabric of History: Text, Artifact and Israel's Past*. Sheffield: JSOT, pp. 13-25.
- Finkelstein, L 1989. The Men of the Great Synagogue (circa 400 170 BCE) in: Davies, W D & Finkelstein, L (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*. Vol 2: The Hellenistic Age. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 229-244.
- Grabbe, L L 1991. Maccabean Chronology: 167-164 or 168 165 BCE 59-74. *Journal of Biblical Literature* Vol 110, No. 1 Spring 1991, pp. 59-74.
- Grabbe, L L 1992. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*. Minneapolis: Fortress.
- Goldstein, J A 1976. *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday.
- Goldstein, J A 1983. *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. New York: Doubleday.

- Goldstein, J A 1989. The Hasmonean revolt and the Hasmonean Dynasty, in: Davies, WD & Finkelstein, L (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Vol 2: The Hellenistic Age. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 292-351.
- Gruen, ES 1984. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*. Berkeley: University of California Press.
- Haas, P 1981. The Maccabean Struggle to Define Judaism, in: Sanders, P (ed), *Jewish and Christian Self-Definition*, Vol 2. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, pp. 49-65.
- Habicht, C 1989. The Seleucids and their Rivals, in: Astin, A E *et al.* (eds), *Cambridge Ancient History*², Vol 8: *Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 B.C.E.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 324-387.
- Harrington, DJ 1988. *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution*. Delaware: Michael Glazer.
- Heinen, H 1984. The Syrian Egyptian Wars and the New Kingdoms of Asia Minor, in: Walbank, F W *et al.* (eds), *Cambridge Ancient History*², Vol 7.1: *The Hellenistic Age*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 412-445.
- Hengel, M 1974. *Judaism and Hellenism*. London: SCM Press.
- Hengel, M 1980. *Jews, Greeks and Barbarians*. London: SCM Press.
- Hengel, M 1989. The Interpretation of Judaism and Hellenism in the pre-Maccabean Period in: Davies, W D & Finkelstein, L (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Vol 2: The Hellenistic Age. London: Cambridge University Press, pp.167-228.
- Jagersma, H 1985. *A History of Israel from Alexander the Great to Bar Kochba*. London: SCM Press.
- Klausner, J 1975. The Economy of Judaea in the Period of the Second Temple, in: Avi-Yonah, M (ed), *The World History of the Jewish People*, Vol 7: The Herodian Period. London. W H Allen, pp. 180-206.
- Knauf, E A 1991. From History to Interpretation, in: Edelman, D (ed), *The Fabric of History: Text, Artifact and Israel's Past*. Sheffield: JSOT, pp. 26-64.
- Kohlenberger, JR III (ed) 1997. *The Parallel Apocrypha*. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Kraft, RA & Nickelsburg, GWE (eds) 1986. *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.

- Krentz, E 1975. *The Historical Critical Method*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press.
- I Maccabees in: *The New Jerusalem Bible* 1990. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- II Maccabees in: *The New Jerusalem Bible* 1990. London: Darton, Longman & Todd.
- Mantel, HD 1975. The High Priesthood and the Sanhedrin in the time of the Second Temple, in: Avi-Yonah, M (ed), *The World History of the Jewish People*, Vol 7. The Herodian Period. London: W H Allen, pp. 264-269.
- Marcus, R (trans) 1957. *Josephus' Jewish Antiquities*. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- May, HG (ed) 1987. *Oxford Bible Atlas* Third Edition. Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- McCullough, WS 1975. *The History and Literature of the Palestinian Jews from Cyrus to Herod 550 BC to 4 BC*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.
- Meyers, EM & Kraabel, AT 1986. Archaeology, Iconography and Nonliterary Written Remains, in: Kraft, Robert A & Nickelsburg, George W E (eds), *Early Judaism and its Modern Interpreters*. Philadelphia: Fortress Press, pp. 175-210.
- Mittwoch, A 1955. Tribute and Land Tax in Seleucid Judaea. *Biblica* 36, 352-361.
- Mohan, RP & Wilke, AS (eds) 1980. *Critical Realism and Sociological Theory*. New Delhi: Concept Publishing Company.
- Morkholm, O 1989. Antiochus IV, in: Davies, W D & Finkelstein, L (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism*, Vol 2: The Hellenistic Age. London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 278-291.
- Musti, D 1989. Syria and the East, in: Astin, A E *et al.* (eds), *Cambridge Ancient History*², Vol 8: *Rome and the Mediterranean to 133 B.C.E.* Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, pp. 175-220.
- Neusner, J *et al.* (eds) 1990. *New Perspectives on Ancient Israel*, Vol 1: Religion, Literature and Society in Ancient Israel, Formative Christianity and Judaism. Atlanta Georgia: Scholars Press, pp. 42-55; 96-105; 287-319.
- Nickelsburg, GWE 1981. *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah*. London: SCM Press.
- Otzen, B 1990. *Judaism in Antiquity*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.
- Pearlman, M 1973. *The Maccabees*. London: Weidenfeld and Nicholson.

- Rappaport, U 1989. Numismatics in: Davies, WD and Finkelstein, L (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism* Vol I: London: Cambridge University Press, pp. 25-59.
- Rosman, A & Rubel, PG 1995. *The Tapestry of Culture. An introduction to Cultural Anthropology*. New York: McGraw.
- Rostovtzeff, M 1941. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*, Vol 1. Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Safrai, S 1975. The Temple and the Divine Service in: Avi-Yonah, M (ed), *The World History of the Jewish People*. Vol 7: The Herodian Period. London: W H Allen, pp. 282-337.
- Schäfer, P 1995. *The History of the Jews in Antiquity*. Luxembourg: Harwood Academic Press.
- Schürer, E revised & ed. by Vermes & Black 1986. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. A.D. 135)* Vol III, part I. Edinburgh: T & T Clark Ltd.
- Sievers, J 1990. *The Hasmoneans and their Supporters*. Atlanta Georgia: Scholars Press.
- Southgate, B 1996. *History: What and Why? Ancient, Modern and Postmodern Perspectives*. London: Routledge.
- Stanford, M 1986. *The Nature of Historical Knowledge*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.
- Tcherikover, V 1966. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America.
- Tcherikover, V 1976. The Cultural Background, in: Schalit, A (ed), *The World History of the Jewish People*, Vol 6: The Hellenistic Age. London: W H Allen, pp. 33-50.
- Tcherikover, V 1976. The Political Background in: Schalit, A (ed), *The World History of the Jewish People*, Vol 6: The Hellenistic Age. London: W H Allen, pp. 53-86.
- Tcherikover, V 1976. Social Conditions in: Schalit, A (ed), *The World History of the Jewish People*, Vol 6: The Hellenistic Age. London: W H Allen, pp. 88-114.
- Tcherikover, V 1976. The Hellenistic Movement in Jerusalem and Antiochus' Persecution in: Schalit, A (ed), *The world History of the Jewish People*, Vol 6: The Hellenistic Age. London: W H Allen, pp.115-144.
- Thackeray, H St.J (trans) 1927. *Josephus' The Jewish War*, Book 1: 31 47. Loeb Classical Library. London: William Heinemann Ltd.
- Veese, H A 1989. *The New Historicism*. New York: Routledge.