

T  
485

THE HELLENIZATION POLICY OF ANTIOCHUS IV IN PALESTINE

by

Christos N. Christodoulides

"Submitted in partial fulfillment for the requirements  
of the degree of Master of Arts  
in the History Department of the  
American University of Beirut  
Beirut, Lebanon" 1963

**THE HELLENIZATION POLICY OF ANTIOCHUS IV IN PALESTINE**

**Ch. N. Christodoulides**

#### ACKNOWLEDGMENT

The author wishes to express a debt of gratitude to Dr. Burton Thurston, Professor of History, of the History Department, American University of Beirut. Dr. Thurston has not only served as advisor for this work, but also has given invaluable encouragement, and skilled counsel, making this thesis possible.

## INTRODUCTION

The primary intention of this thesis is to try to modify the traditional view held by many scholars in the past that Antiochus<sup>1</sup> policy in Palestine was one of systematic and laborious Hellenization, and that in order to achieve cultural amalgamation throughout his empire he sought to exterminate the Jewish faith. The attempt is an ambitious one and I do not claim to have contributed anything substantially new. The original credit belongs to E. Bickermann, F. M. Abel, J. C. Dancy and others whose views I have followed and amended whenever necessary. I only wish to point out that all interpretations, except those previously held by others, are totally personal and probably not in agreement with the traditional views. The desirable clarity in ancient history is too often unattainable. An effort sometimes may fail but the challenge is always there for those who live in the hope of achieving something new.

The tradition has brought down to us all that is known about Antiochus Epiphanes with emphasis on his wickedness and what he did to the Jews. On the rest of his activity little is known and much is based on conjecture. Our sources are a few scattered accounts collected from here and there, but everything which connects Antiochus with the Jews seems at first glance to be more familiar. A lot is thought to be known because there is a relative sufficiency of evidence from Jewish records. The historiographers of Jewish history

during this period are the authors of the two books of the Maccabees, the author of the book of Daniel and Josephus. All four of them were endowed with a patriotic zeal of rare experience in world historiography. But Hebrew historians have a peculiar type of universalism. Of course there are not many miracles and the Jews do not always win in the two Maccabees but one can still see that this is theocratic history embellished with ethnogenic legend.<sup>1</sup> It is their argument from the provincial to the universal, which has created the wrong impression about Antiochus. It is derived from the belief that their God is the divine head of all mankind and consequently whatever is happening to the Jews is of universal importance and value. Statements such as, "he wrote to his whole kingdom"<sup>2</sup> or "and there went out a decree to the neighbouring Greek cities",<sup>3</sup> are too often used. Hence, our Jewish sources are not real history but quasi-history and too unreliable to depend on. Antiochus then should not be viewed as the Jews perceived him but as a real person with an empire to rule. In this thesis an attempt will be made to depict Antiochus Epiphanes as a hellenistic ruler and not simply as an antagonist of the Jews.

---

<sup>1</sup>R. G. Collingwood, The Idea of History (New York: Oxford University Press, 1956), p. 17.

<sup>2</sup>1Macc.1:41 and 51.      <sup>3</sup>2Macc.6:8.

TABLE OF CONTENTS

	Page
INTRODUCTION . . . . .	ii
 Chapter	
I. CONDITION OF THE JEWS IN THE HELLENISTIC WORLD . . . . .	1
Their settlement in the various Hellenistic cities	
The Jews as a "quasi-autonomous unit within the Greek communities"	
The attitude of the early Hellenistic rulers towards the Jews (before Antiochus III)	
Antiochus III and his extension of privileges to the Jews of Judea	
II. ANTIOCHUS IV EPIPHANES KING OF THE SELEUCID EMPIRE . . . . .	43
Ascendancy to the throne	
His policy	
Antiochus' early attitude towards the Jews and his interference in the office of the high-priest	
III. THE SACK OF JERUSALEM AND THE PROSCRIPTION OF JUDAISM BY ANTIOCHUS AS A RESULT OF THE INTERNAL JEWISH STRUGGLE IN THE CITY . . . . .	68
The Oniad and Tobiad families in relation to the pro-Ptolemaic and pro-Seleucid parties in Jerusalem	
The Progressive take-over in the city of Jerusalem which followed upon Antiochus' return from Egypt	
IV. THE JERUSALEM ISSUE . . . . .	84
BIBLIOGRAPHY . . . . .	104

## CHAPTER I

### CONDITION OF THE JEWS IN THE HELLENISTIC WORLD

#### Their settlement in the various Hellenistic cities

Jewish immigration into the various newly founded Hellenistic cities, or ancient towns transformed under a new name,<sup>1</sup> whether voluntary or forced, was not a phenomenon of the Hellenistic period. Long before, the Assyrians and Babylonians had carried with them, in 734 and 722 B.C., many inhabitants of Northern Israel and Samaria.<sup>2</sup> However, the term diaspora acquired its real character after the year 597 B.C., when Nebuchadnezzar deported 4,600 men from Judea with their wives and families, to Babylon.<sup>3</sup> It is almost certain that very few of the above deported inhabitants returned to their original homes in Judea.<sup>4</sup> In 586 many Jews immigrated to Egypt, after Jerusalem had been captured by Nebuchadnezzar.<sup>5</sup> By the time of Alexander's conquests the

---

<sup>1</sup>M. Rostovtzeff, "Syria and the East," The Cambridge Ancient History, ed. S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock, and M.P. Charlesworth (London: Cambridge University Press, 1928), VII, 158.

<sup>2</sup>Josephus Antiq.XI.5.2. For details see Robert H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times (London: Adam and Charles Black, n.d.), p. 168; or Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, trans. Sophia Taylor and Rev. Peter Christie (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1885), Division II, II, 221-224.

<sup>3</sup>Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 169. <sup>4</sup>Josephus Antiq. XI.3.10.

<sup>5</sup>Pierre Jouguet, Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East, trans. M. R. Dobie (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1928), p. 269.

diaspora Jews were mainly settled in Mesopotamia, Media, and Babylon.<sup>6</sup> In reference to this Josephus<sup>7</sup> mentions the various representatives of the Jews, from these areas, who gathered in Jerusalem and brought presents to king Xerxes. Finally, between 7th and 6th B.C., there was at Elephantine a community of Jews who formed a military colony around a temple of Jehovah.<sup>8</sup>

Jewish immigration into the Hellenistic cities becomes more extensive with the conquests of Alexander the Great. Before we consider the statements which Josephus makes on Jewish immigration, I would like to refer to the various passages, which he relates in connection with the favourable treatment of Alexander the Great towards the Jews.

It is thus stated in Antiq.XI.8.3ff that Alexander during the siege of Tyre, January to July 332, sent a letter to the high priest of the Jews. In addition, Alexander is shown, in Josephus' narration, as visiting Jerusalem after the seige of Gaza and as sacrificing in the Temple of Jerusalem. Ralph Marcus<sup>9</sup> has shown that the above mentioned claims of Josephus belong to legend. Marcus gives all the possible sources which Josephus probably used in writing the legend. Pseudo-Callisthenes comes first. He represents Alexander as saying to the priests of the Jews, who came over to meet him, "As servants of the true God go in peace, go. For your God shall be my God".<sup>10</sup> In another

<sup>6</sup>Schürer, op. cit., p. 223. <sup>7</sup>Antiq. XI.5.2.

<sup>8</sup>Emil G. Kraeling The Brooklyn Museum Aramaic Papyri (Brooklyn: Yale University Press, 1953), pp.42-43.

<sup>9</sup>Ralph Marcus, "Appendix C," Josephus: Jewish Antiquities (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961), VI, 512-532.

<sup>10</sup>Ibid., p. 515.



passage of similar origin as Pseudo-Callisthenes, Alexander is represented as founding Alexandria and especially the Sarapis cult, after his inspiration from the temple of Jerusalem.<sup>11</sup> Finally, Marcus cites the rabbinic story found in the scholion of the Megillat Taanit. The story is completely discredited by its anachronisms. For one thing, the high priest who meets Alexander is said to be Simon the Just, which is impossible because he held his office around 200 B.C. Accordingly, the meeting place with Alexander is recorded to be Antipatris and not Sapheim as Josephus mentions. Marcus points out that Antipatris was first named as such during the reign of Herod the Great. Finally, the anachronism made as to the destruction of the Samaritan temple at Mount Gerizim, during the reign of Alexander, is enough evidence to prove the legendary character of the Megillat Taanit. Marcus,<sup>12</sup> however, mentions that the destruction took place around 110 B. C., while Zeitlin<sup>13</sup> places it in the year 128 B.C. It is obvious, from all the above, that the possible sources of Josephus' account of Alexander are totally apologetic. As Marcus puts it best, "the purpose of these Jewish interpolations was to support the claims of Alexandrian Jews to equality of civic rights by representing the great Macedonian conqueror as a friend of the Jewish God".<sup>14</sup>

Turning now, to Alexander's supposed visit to Jerusalem, we do

---

<sup>11</sup>Ibid., p. 516

<sup>12</sup>Ibid., p. 518

<sup>13</sup>Solomon Zeitlin, Megillat Taanit as a Source for Jewish Chronology and History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods (Philadelphia: n.n., 1922), p. 85.

<sup>14</sup>Marcus, op. cit., pp. 513-514

not find any reference to it in the Greek or Roman historians. All the accounts of Alexander's conquests in Syria and Palestine clearly state that Alexander, after the fall of Gaza, almost immediately started for Egypt. Even after his return from Egypt Alexander went back to Tyre. Tarn on this point states, "The story that he (Alexander) visited Jerusalem and sacrificed in the Temple belongs to legend".<sup>15</sup> We can, therefore, safely assume that Alexander most probably did not visit Jerusalem.

Alexander, according to Josephus,<sup>16</sup> is recorded as having ordered the Samaritan soldiers of Sanaballetes to follow him into Egypt where he settled them in the Thebaid and gave them allotments of land. This statement is supported by the fact that there was a village in the Fayum called Samaria.<sup>17</sup> Nevertheless, the first real instance of mass settlement of Jews and Samaritans in Egypt during the Hellenistic period, occurred after Ptolemy's I Lagos capture of Jerusalem.<sup>18</sup> The date of this enforced settlement is difficult to determine. Jouguet, Marcus and Pfeiffer place it in 312 B.C., following the battle of Gaza with Demetrius Poliorcetes.<sup>19</sup> Professor Charles Guignebert,<sup>20</sup> on the

---

<sup>15</sup>W.W. Tarn, Alexander the Great (Cambridge: University Press, 1948), I, 41.

<sup>16</sup>Antiq.XI. 8.6.

<sup>17</sup>Marcus, op. cit., p. 481; Jouguet, loc. cit.

<sup>18</sup>Josephus Antiq.XII.1.1; Appian Syrian Wars 50.

<sup>19</sup>Jouguet, loc. cit.; Marcus, op. cit., VII, 5; Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 173.

<sup>20</sup>Charles Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, trans. n.n. (New York: University Books, 1959), p. 212.

other hand, has reasons to believe that the date of the capture of Jerusalem by Soter was in 319 B.C. These Jews were mainly used as mercenaries and were assigned to many of his garrisons.<sup>21</sup> Later, it is implied in Josephus that the successors of Alexander, probably Ptolemy Soter, assigned a particular section of the town of Alexandria to the Jews, "in order that, through mixing less with aliens, they might be free to observe their rules more strictly".<sup>22</sup> However, the Jews did not limit themselves to this particular section. They spread over all the five sections of the city.<sup>23</sup> As Philo points out, these five sections were named after the first five letters of the alphabet, but two of them were called Jewish because the Jews were predominant.<sup>24</sup>

In addition to the settlement of Jews all over Egypt, Ptolemy Soter established a great number of them in Cyrene.<sup>25</sup> According to Strabo<sup>26</sup> the Jews of Cyrene formed, during the time of Sulla (c. 87/6 B.C.), one of the four distinct classes in that city. This settlement Ptolemy Soter undertook for the same reasons as in Egypt. The Jews were most probably used as mercenary soldiers in the various strongholds of Cyrene.<sup>27</sup>

In contrast with the Jewish immigration to Egypt and Cyrene, soon

<sup>21</sup>Josephus Antiq.XII.1.1.

<sup>22</sup>Josephus, The Jewish War, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, II (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961), p. 513 (War II.18.7.). See also Josephus Antiq.XIV.7.2.

<sup>23</sup>Philo Flaccus VIII.      <sup>24</sup>Ibid.

<sup>25</sup>Josephus Ag. Apion II.5.

<sup>26</sup>Quoted by Josephus Antiq.XIV.7.2.

<sup>27</sup>Josephus Ag. Apion II.5.

after 300 B.C., the Jews in Syria and Asia attained importance after 200 B.C. The Jews were attracted in the various Hellenistic centers of Syria and Asia Minor long after the alleged settlement of Seleucus Nicator in Antioch.<sup>28</sup> Seleucus probably on the founding of Antioch, May 300 B.C.,<sup>29</sup> settled retired mercenaries in the city, among them many Jews, but it is very unlikely that he granted rights of citizenship to them. However, the statements of Josephus are suspected again of apologetic character and are thus to be placed under careful consideration. It is doubtful that Seleucus would have paid so much attention to the Jews of Antioch since they did not form a numerous community.<sup>30</sup> Moreover, Ralph Marcus refutes the statement of Josephus concerning the permission which Seleucus gave to the Jews, not to use the foreign oil, but instead ordered the gymnasiarchs to give them a certain amount of money in order to pay for their own kind of oil.<sup>31</sup> This privilege Marcus tends to attribute to Antiochus III rather than to Seleucus. He finds it rather improbable that the Jews of Seleucid Syria were ever granted special privileges before the time of Antiochus.<sup>32</sup> In support of this Marcus cites the following passage from Josephus: "But it was at Antioch that they specially congregated, partly owing to the greatness of that city, but mainly because the kings after Antiochus

---

<sup>28</sup>Josephus Antiq. XII.3; Ag. Apion II.4

<sup>29</sup>Glanville Downey, A History of Antioch in Syria (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1961), p.57.

<sup>30</sup>Ralph Marcus, "Appendix C," Josephus: Jewish Antiquities (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961), VII, 739.

<sup>31</sup>Antiq.XII.3.      <sup>32</sup>Marcus, op. cit., pp. 741-742.

had enabled them to live there in security. For although Antiochus surnamed Epiphanes sacked Jerusalem and plundered the temple, his successors on the throne restored to the Jews of Antioch all such votive offerings as were made of bronze, to be laid up in their synagogue, and moreover, granted them citizen rights on an equality with the Greeks".<sup>33</sup> In this passage no mention is made of Seleucus Nicator and the Antiochus mentioned is most probably Antiochus III. "An Antiochus without surname", Marcus states, "is much more likely to be the well known Antiochus III, the Great, than the obscure Antiochus I".<sup>34</sup> Furthermore it is obvious that Josephus is speaking of the good treatment which the Jews received from all the Seleucids after Antiochus III with the only exception being Antiochus Epiphanes. Schürer in connection with this takes for granted the privileges bestowed upon the Jews by Seleucus I but states that they "also continued to enjoy their rights of citizenship there at a later period, not only under the Seleucidae after Antiochus Epiphanes, but under the Romans as well".<sup>35</sup> Indeed it is with great reluctance that we would accept the statements of Josephus concerning the civic rights and privileges of the Jews in Seleucid Syria before the time of Antiochus III. This is so, because the various communities, if many, lacked the importance and organization of the later Jewish communities in Antioch and of the already significant ones in Alex-

---

<sup>33</sup>Josephus, The Jewish War, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, III (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1957), pp. 517-519 (War VIII.3.3).

<sup>34</sup>Marcus, op. cit., p. 739.

<sup>35</sup>Schürer, op. cit., p. 271

andria and Cyrene. The earlier development of the communities would not have been important enough to concern Seleucus I.

The widespread dispersion of the Jews in Asia Minor and in all the Seleucid Empire began after 200 B.C. Accordingly, Antiochus III ordered the transportation of 2,000 Jewish families from Mesopotamia and Babylon to Lydia and Phrygia (c. 215 B.C.).<sup>36</sup> These families after they had settled and prospered in any Hellenistic city attracted other immigrants. By the first century B.C. the Jews were spread all over Asia Minor, the Aegean, the Greek mainland, and in Rome.<sup>37</sup> Strabo quoted by Josephus mentions that, "This people has already made its way into every city, and it is not easy to find any place in the habitable world which has not received this nation and in which it has not made its power felt".<sup>38</sup> The prosperity of the Jews is attested by Mithridates' plunder of 800 talents at Cos which had been amassed by the Jews of Asia Minor and had been deposited there in fear of Mithridates.<sup>39</sup>

The expansion of the Jewish diaspora during the second century is also attested in the first book of the Maccabees.<sup>40</sup> In this narrative a letter is dispatched by consul Lucius, probably L. Calpurnius

<sup>36</sup>Josephus Antiq.XII.4. It is beside the point to attempt to reject the genuineness of the letter of Antiochus III to Zeuxis since it is in accordance with the Seleucid procedure of settling a military colony.

<sup>37</sup>William Tarn and G. T. Griffith, Hellenistic Civilisation (London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1959), p. 219.

<sup>38</sup>Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, trans. Ralph Marcus, VII (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961), p. 507 (Antiq.XIV.7.2).

<sup>39</sup>Josephus Antiq.XIV.7.2.      <sup>40</sup>1Macc.15:16-24.

Piso,<sup>41</sup> consul in 139 B.C., to the kings Ptolemy Euergetes II of Egypt, Demetrius II of Syria, Attalus II of Pergamum, Ariarathes V of Cappadocia and Arsaces VI (Mithridates I) of Parthia.<sup>42</sup> The letter asked or rather instructed the above mentioned kings to abstain from engaging in hostilities with the Jews, because they were now the allies of Rome. Similar letters were also sent to the following city states: Sampsamus (Samsoun), Sparta, Delos, Myndos, Sicyon, Caria, Samos, Pamphylia, Lycia, Halicarnassus, Rhodes, Phaselis, Cos, Side, Aradus, Gortyna, Cnidus and Cyrene.<sup>43</sup> The Romans obviously sent the above mentioned letter to all those cities because they knew that Jewish communities existed in each one of them. In addition to the first book of the Maccabees Philo also gives evidence of the magnitude of the Jewish diaspora.

"I must now make some important points about the Holy City. As I have said, it is my home, and it is the capital not of the single country of Judaea but of most other countries also, because of the colonies which it has sent out from time to time to the neighbouring lands of Egypt, Phoenicia, and Syria (the so-called Coele Syria as well as Syria proper), to the distant countries of Pamphylia, Cilicia, most of Asia as far as Bithynia and the remote corners of Pontus, and in the same way to Europe, to Thessaly, Boeotia, Macedonia, Aetolia, Attica, Argos, Corinth, and most of the best parts of the Peloponnese. It is not only the continents that are full of Jewish colonies. So are the best known of the islands, Euboea, Cyprus, and Crete. I say nothing about the regions beyond the Euphrates. With the exception of a small district, all of them, Babylon and those of the other satrapies which have fertile land around them, have Jewish settlers."<sup>44</sup>

---

<sup>41</sup>W. Fairweather and J. Sutherland Black (ed.), The First Book of Maccabees (Cambridge: University Press, 1908), p. 253.

<sup>42</sup>Ibid., p. 254.      <sup>43</sup>1Macc.15:23-24

<sup>44</sup> Philo, Legatio ad Gaium, trans. E. Mary Smallwood (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1961), p.124 (Leg.36).

That the Jews did not simply consist of scattered settlers in all the above mentioned colonies is justified by the figures which Philo provides. In Flaccus 6 it is stated that in all Egypt, together with the country extending from Libya to Ethiopia, there were a million Jews. However, it is difficult to believe the exaggeration which he makes in the Legation 31, "He also had in mind the vast numerical size of the Jewish nation, which is not confined, as every other nation is, within the borders of the one country assigned for its sole occupation, but occupies almost the whole world. For it has overflowed across every continent and island, so that it scarcely seems to be outnumbered by the native inhabitants". Baron<sup>45</sup> in estimating the Jewish diaspora assumes that there were at least four million Jews living within the Roman Empire during the time of Claudius. In addition to this we must include another two and a half million Jews living in Palestine and at least one million more in Babylon.<sup>46</sup> He concludes that a Jewish population of eight million all over the world is "fully within the range of probability".<sup>47</sup> Finally his statement that, "every fifth 'Hellenistic' inhabitant of the eastern Mediterranean world was a Jew",<sup>48</sup> is possibly an exaggeration.

---

<sup>45</sup>Salo Wittmayer Baron, A Social and Religious History of the Jews (New York: Columbia University Press, 1937), I, p. 132.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

<sup>47</sup>Ibid., pp. 132-133.

<sup>48</sup>Ibid., p. 133.



The Jews as a "quasi-autonomous  
unit within the Greek communities"<sup>1</sup>

The various Jewish groups which settled in any Hellenistic center preserved their identity and held fast to their religion by establishing places of worship. These they called synagogues and considered them as the center of their community.<sup>2</sup> Each synagogue was administered by an archisynagogos and his subordinates who assisted him in the performance of his duties.<sup>3</sup>

In addition to the ritual services held in the synagogues, discussions and classes were also conducted together with trials, since the synagogue was used as a court-room as well.<sup>4</sup> These synagogue groups can be identified with the wards or parishes of a modern city. The Jews of these small communities settled their disputes among themselves by submitting them to their own archisynagogos, in order to be judged according to their own Law.<sup>5</sup> This necessitated

---

<sup>1</sup>Glanville Downey, A History of Antioch in Syria (Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1961), p. 107.

<sup>2</sup>Charles Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, trans. n.n. (New York: University Books, 1959), p. 218.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid. On the functions of the archisynagogos see Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, trans. Sophia Taylor and Rev. Peter Christie (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1885) Division II, II, 251-252.

<sup>4</sup>Guignebert, loc. cit.

<sup>5</sup>William Tarn and G. T. Griffith, Hellenistic Civilisation (London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1959), p. 220.

the official recognition of the State, because the Jews preferred to go to their own courts. Moreover, the early Hellenistic rulers were willing to grant to the Jews such privileges and finally, after the third century,<sup>6</sup> the matter passed from private law into public law.<sup>7</sup>

This, however, was usually the arrangement of the relatively small communities. In the cities, when the communities grew more numerous, they formed a colony which was subject to a more centralized administration. In Alexandria, for instance, the Jews were directed to form one of the relatively privileged politeumata. These politeumata were mostly connected with the army<sup>8</sup> and were designated to maintain the association of the various ethnic groups. As H. S. Jones defined it, politeuma in Hellenistic times meant "a corporation formed by the members of a race or community domiciled in a foreign state".<sup>9</sup> For example the Phrygians formed a politeuma at Alexandria.<sup>10</sup> There is also considerable evidence of other existing politeumata in Egypt,<sup>11</sup> such as of Cretans, Boeotians, Achaeans, Thracians, Cilicians, Mysians, Idumaeans, Persians, as well as Jews;<sup>12</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>Ibid., p. 186.      <sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 220.

<sup>8</sup>M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), I, 324.

<sup>9</sup>H. Stuart Jones, "Claudius and the Jewish Question at Alexandria," Journal of Roman Studies, XVI(1926), 28.

<sup>10</sup>Wilhelmus Dittenberger, Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (Lipsiae: Apud S. Hirzel, 1905), II, 367, Inscription 658.

<sup>11</sup>Pierre Jouguet, Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East, trans. M. R. Dobie (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1928), p. 332.

<sup>12</sup>Ibid.

"most of these are not Greek communities, as the names show, but that is probably due to the chances of our evidence".<sup>13</sup>

That the Jews formed a politeuma in Alexandria is evident from the various references made in Josephus.<sup>14</sup> As Glanville Downey expressed it they "were organized in a politeuma which made them a quasi-autonomous unit within the Greek communities".<sup>15</sup> The Alexandrian-Jewish politeuma was organized in one political corporation under an ethnarch<sup>16</sup> or genarch.<sup>17</sup> According to Philo,<sup>18</sup> Augustus (c. 11 A.D.), after the death of the genarch, appointed a gerousia to administer the Jewish affairs. The gerousia, however, may have existed before Augustus' time because the mere presence of officials denotes that a Council or Assembly must have existed in order to elect them.<sup>19</sup> What Augustus probably did was to transfer the duties of the ethnarch to the Committee of the gerousia, called the archons, without suspending the office itself.<sup>20</sup> This is a very possible explanation to the contradictory statement made by Josephus in the cited edict of Claudius.<sup>21</sup> In this edict the Emperor states that Augustus did not hinder the appointment of ethnarchs. We can deduce therefore, that the ethnarch after Augustus simply presided over the gerousia while the archons

---

<sup>13</sup>Ibid.      <sup>14</sup>Antiq. XIV.7.2; XII.2.13; Aristeas 310.

<sup>15</sup>Downey, op. cit., p. 107.

<sup>16</sup>Josephus Antiq.XIV.7.2; XIX.5.2.

<sup>17</sup>Philo Flaccus 10.      <sup>18</sup>Ibid.

<sup>19</sup>E. Mary Smallwood, "Introduction," Philo: Legatio ad Gaium (Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961), p. 6.

<sup>20</sup>Ibid.      <sup>21</sup>Antiq.XIX.5.2.

were the executive officers of the gerousia. We do not know how many constituted the gerousia or for how long they held the office. They may have been elected for one year or for life.<sup>22</sup>

The various synagogue communities, which I previously mentioned, were all subjected in Alexandria to the central gerousia. This was also the case with Jewry in Cyrene. Strabo<sup>23</sup> quoted by Josephus mentions that there were four classes in Cyrene namely the citizens, the farmers, the resident aliens and the Jews. Another Jewish politeuma is found in Berenice of Cyrenaica where an inscription was discovered relating to the Jews.<sup>24</sup> This inscription, dated 13 B.C.,<sup>25</sup> clearly shows that the Jews were organized in a politeuma which was governed by nine archons. We can assume, therefore, that most of the Jewish diaspora of the Hellenistic cities was subjected to its central politeuma with its gerousia and its archons. Nevertheless, this was by no means the case in Rome. As Schürer<sup>26</sup> mentions there is no evidence that the synagogue Jewish communities in Rome were subjected to a central gerousia or that they formed a corporate state within Rome.

In connection with the long existing controversy on the status of the Jews in Alexandria, I feel inclined to examine the matter before I pass to the Jewish community of Antioch. The problem has been variously discussed and the question is whether the Jews in Alexandria,

<sup>22</sup>Schürer, op. cit., p. 250. This gerousia was probably identical to those mentioned in 1Macc. 7:33; 2Macc.1:10, 4:44 and Aristaeas 310.

<sup>23</sup>Antiq.XIV.7.2; XVI.6.2. <sup>24</sup>Cited by Schürer, op. cit., p. 246.

<sup>25</sup>Ibid.; Tarn and Griffith, op. cit., p. 221.

<sup>26</sup>Schürer, op. cit., p. 247.

N.B.

as a whole, enjoyed the Hellenic citizenship <sup>for</sup> not. The issue is of a very perplexed nature due to lack of clarity in our sources and the divided opinion among modern historians. Schürer, for example, maintains that the Jews in Alexandria enjoyed citizenship as stated in Josephus. He has accepted Josephus' statements at face value and has failed to discern any possible exaggerations. However, the recently discovered London Papyrus, No. 1912<sup>27</sup> has discredited his theory, although it has not succeeded in settling the problem conclusively. We have to bear in mind that most of our Jewish sources were written in a period of forgery and are apologetic in nature.

The question of Jewish citizenship in Alexandria arises primarily from the various statements in Josephus. For example he mentions that Alexander gave to the Jews of Alexandria "equal civic rights with the Macedonians".<sup>28</sup> In another passage he states that Alexander "granted them (the Jews), as a reward for their assistance, permission to reside in the city (Alexandria) on terms of equality with the Greeks".<sup>29</sup> Josephus seems to be quite concerned with the Jewish position in all the Hellenistic cities and constantly advocates that they held Hellenic citizenship or equal rights with the Hellenes.<sup>30</sup> In order to support or reject his statements we have to

---

<sup>27</sup>H. Idris Bell, Jews and Christians in Egypt (London: Oxford University Press, 1924).

<sup>28</sup>Josephus Antiq.XII.1.1.

<sup>29</sup>Josephus War II.18.7.

<sup>30</sup>Similar statements are in Josephus Antiq.XII.3.1; XII.3.2; XIV.10; XIX.5.2; War VII.3.3; VII.5.2; Ag. Apion II.4.

N.B. This term is used arbitrarily to indicate the people of Greek and Macedonian ethnic origin.

explain and define the actual position of the Jews in Alexandria as compared with that of the Hellenes.

To begin with, Alexandria was a Hellenic city, founded by Alexander, and had most, if not all aspects of life found in a Hellenic city on the analogy of Athens. As we previously discussed it was a collection of politeumata on top of which the Hellenic politeuma stood. The Hellenic politeuma was divided into tribes<sup>31</sup> and subdivided into demes.<sup>32</sup> In the demes were enrolled only the Hellenes who formed the enfranchised body of citizens.<sup>33</sup> The indispensable prelude to deme membership was participation in the ephebeia.<sup>34</sup> The ephebeia were connected with the gymnasiums, in which the young men, of fourteen years or older, had their athletic exercise and probably part of their education.<sup>35</sup> Hence, H. S. Jones rightly concludes<sup>36</sup> that the ephebeia "was the necessary avenue to full citizenship". Moreover, Alexandria was called an ἀστὴ, as opposed to ἡ χώρα, its citizens were called ἀστικοί and were enrolled in demes, and all were subject to the ἀστικοὶ νόμοι.<sup>37</sup> However, the term πολῖται may be applied to the ἀστικοί, though it can also refer to a citizen of a πολίτευμα in Alexandria.<sup>38</sup> Among the Hellenes, the Macedonians

---

<sup>31</sup>Tarn and Griffith, op. cit., p. 185.

<sup>32</sup>S. Davis, Race-Relations in Ancient Egypt (London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1953), p. 93.

<sup>33</sup>Tarn and Griffith, op. cit., p. 221. <sup>34</sup>Smallwood, op. cit., p. 8.

<sup>35</sup>Jouguet, op. cit., p. 322. <sup>36</sup>Jones, op. cit., p. 28.

<sup>37</sup>Ibid. Jones identifies the primary sources.

<sup>38</sup>Lidell and Scott, "πολίτης," Greek-English Lexicon (London: Oxford University Press, 1958), p. 571; Jones, op. cit., pp. 28ff.

probably held a special position.<sup>39</sup> Many scholars<sup>40</sup> refer to Schubart's theory that the Macedonians did not possess the citizenship but formed their own class which was also the most privileged among all the inhabitants of Alexandria. The Hellenes had their own civic organization with an Assembly and its magistrates. It is disputable whether they had a Council or Senate. Jouguet<sup>41</sup> suggests that they probably had a Council during the third century B.C., but later they lost it due to the fact that the kings became more autocratic. Rostovtzeff is among the few scholars who maintain that Alexandria had a City Council.<sup>42</sup> S. Davis<sup>43</sup> believes that it had a Council but lost it by the time of Augustus. Finally Bell, H. S. Jones, Schürer and Tarn<sup>44</sup> hold the negative view point.

On the other side of the privileged Macedonians stood the natives called *ἰαοί* who were registered in the *ἰαογραφία* and were thus subject to the *εὐνταξίς* (poll-tax).<sup>45</sup> The natives did not have any civic organization but formed an exploited class which was mainly confined in the *χώρα*.<sup>46</sup> As has been mentioned the Jews formed their own quasi-autonomous politeuma with their own Senate, and the

<sup>39</sup>Jouguet, op. cit., p. 325.

<sup>40</sup>Smallwood, op. cit., p. 9; Bell, op. cit., p. 13; Davis, op. cit., p. 105; Jouguet, op. cit., pp. 325-326.

<sup>41</sup>Jouguet, op. cit., p. 345.      <sup>42</sup>Rostovtzeff, op. cit., p. 418

<sup>43</sup>Davis, op. cit., pp. 95 and 110.

<sup>44</sup>Bell, op. cit., p. 12; Jones, loc. cit.; Schürer, op. cit., p. 244; Tarn and Griffith, op. cit., p. 185. Primary sources are also identified.

<sup>45</sup>Jouguet, op. cit., p. 310.

<sup>46</sup>Ibid.

right of being judged by their own magistrates (after the third century B.C.).<sup>47</sup> Moreover, Bell<sup>48</sup> refers to the evidence of a papyrus in which it is shown that the Jews held their own record-office or register (τοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀρχείου ) in contrast with the πολιτικὸν ἀρχεῖον of the Hellenic citizens. Hence, the Jewish politeuma was not part of the citizen body of the Hellenes. Furthermore, the Jews were subject to the πολιτικοὶ νόμοι<sup>49</sup> and not to the ἀστικοὶ νόμοι,<sup>50</sup> which was exclusively for the full citizens. This seems to be a considerable indication that Josephus may be wrong in declaring that the Jews were citizens of Alexandria.<sup>51</sup> It is difficult to believe that the Jews were allowed to enjoy all these separate privileges and yet be citizens of Alexandria on a par with the Hellenes.

The Jews therefore were actually citizens not of Alexandria but of the Jewish politeuma. If this then be the case, M. Smallwood is right in stating that they held an intermediate<sup>52</sup> position which was higher than that of the λαοὶ but lower than that of the ἀστοί. According to a passage in Philo<sup>53</sup> the ζένοι or μέτοικοι were a little higher, in status, than the αὐτόχθονες (natives) and a little lower than the πολιῖται. However, Philo continues, both the ζένοι or μέτοικοι aim at achieving equal status with the

<sup>47</sup>See p. 12 supra.

<sup>48</sup>Bell, op. cit., p. 12.

<sup>49</sup>Jones, op. cit., pp. 28ff.

<sup>50</sup>See p. 16 supra.

<sup>51</sup>Antiq. XIV.10.

<sup>52</sup>Smallwood, op. cit., p. 9.

<sup>53</sup>De Vita Mosis I.35.



ἄγτοί . Hence, the πολῖται were not on a par with the ἄγτοί and differed only little from the ζέροι or μέτοικοι . Flaccus, in Philo's work,<sup>54</sup> calls the Jews aliens and foreigners and denies them the title of κάτοικοι . We have to assume therefore, that according to Philo the Jews were κάτοικοι or as Juster<sup>55</sup> calls them πάροικοι . Both terms mean: domiciled aliens and designate the Jewish social position in Alexandria. With all the above in mind we can now draw the pyramid of the social classes in Alexandria.

- (a) The Μακεδόνες<sup>56</sup> who probably formed a distinct class and were the élite, so to speak, of the Ptolemaic kingdom.
- (b) The ἄγτοί , who constituted the citizen body of Alexandria.
- (c) The κάτοικοι or πάροικοι , who were all the foreign elements with the right to settle permanently in the city. In this class probably belonged all the politeumata of Alexandria among which that of the Jews.<sup>57</sup>
- (d) Μέτοικοι or ζέροι , who again formed a class of foreigners with the right of residence, but who, most probably, were not allowed to be organized into the relatively privileged politeumata.
- (e) The λαοί , αὐτόχθονες, or ἐπιχώριοι ,<sup>58</sup> who were the suppressed native Egyptians.

<sup>54</sup>ll. 53-54. <sup>55</sup>Quoted by Bell, op. cit., p. 13.

<sup>56</sup>See p. 17 supra.

<sup>57</sup>Here we must probably include those τῆς ἐπιχώρας . They were the offspring of the soldiers with the right to domicile in Egypt. See Jouguet, op. cit., pp. 330 and 332.

<sup>58</sup>Josephus War II.18.7.

Many scholars refer to the various statements of Josephus and Philo in which the Jews are described as citizens and as Macedonians, Alexandrians, or Antiochenes. In Contra Apion II.4 for example, Josephus points out these rights. "In fact, however, it was presented to them as their residence by Alexander, and they obtained privileges on a par with those of the Macedonians."<sup>59</sup> Later on, "Down to the present time their local tribe bore the name of 'Macedonians'."<sup>60</sup> In l. 38 he goes on, "His astonishment at the idea of Jews being called Alexandrians betrays similar stupidity."<sup>61</sup> Finally in l. 39 he states, "our Jewish residents in Antioch are called Antiochenes, having being granted rights of citizenship by its founder, Seleucus".<sup>62</sup>

There is no doubt that there were Jews<sup>63</sup> who actually enjoyed these rights, but a misunderstanding can very easily arise when the terms are loosely applied, because not all the Jews were Macedonians, Alexandrians or Antiochenes. As has been previously stated Schubart<sup>64</sup> holds the opinion that the Macedonians were not members of the actual citizen body. Therefore, he concludes, if the Jews were Macedonians then they were not citizens as such either. Nevertheless, the Macedonians were on the top of all citizens and the inference may well suggest that the Jews enjoyed the same status which is impossible.

Jouguet,<sup>65</sup> on the other hand, states that the Macedonians were

<sup>59</sup>Josephus, Against Apion, trans. H. St. J. Thackeray, I (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961), p. 306.

<sup>60</sup>Ibid., p. 307.      <sup>61</sup>Ibid.

<sup>62</sup>Ibid.      <sup>63</sup>Davis, op. cit., pp.97 and 109 identifies the primary sources.

<sup>64</sup>See p. 17 supra.      <sup>65</sup>Jouguet, op. cit., p. 326.

stationed at the Court and "seem to have played a part in the proclamation of the kings, copied from that of the Assembly of the army in Alexander's time".<sup>66</sup> In this case it is difficult to assume that the Jews, if Macedonians, had played substantial part in the proclamation of the kings. Of course we know that Ptolemy VI, Philopator employed Jewish generals (Onias and Dositheus)<sup>67</sup> and Cleopatra III while fighting against her son Ptolemy Lathyros in Palestine, appointed two Jewish generals (Chelkias and Ananias),<sup>68</sup> but we cannot consider this as an indication that the Jews actually assisted in the proclamation of kings. Therefore, from this stand-point we have to drop the idea that the Jews were in fact Macedonians.

The second of the rights which Josephus<sup>69</sup> and Philo<sup>70</sup> attribute to the Jews is the claim that they were Alexandrians. It must be noted here that the term can be applied as a geographical expression. Any person residing in Alexandria could be called an inhabitant of Alexandria and the term *Ἀλεξανδρεὺς* would be applied to him, without necessarily meaning that he was a citizen of Alexandria. However, the explanation in the application of these terms lies in Josephus<sup>71</sup> himself, when he accounts how the Jews came to acquire these names. "His (Apion's) astonishment at the idea of Jews being called Alexandrians

<sup>66</sup>Jouguet, *op. cit.*, p. 47. As reference to this Jouguet gives the incident of Agathocles, the murderer of Arsinoe the daughter of Berenice, and his intention to usurp the throne of the Ptolemies in 205 B.C. The incident is narrated by Polybius in XV.26.1.

<sup>67</sup>Josephus *Ag. Apion* II.5.

<sup>68</sup>Josephus *Antiq.* XIII.10.4

<sup>69</sup>*Antiq.* XIX.5.2.

<sup>70</sup>*Legation* 28.

<sup>71</sup>*Ag. Apion* II.4.

called Alexandrians betrays similar stupidity. All persons invited to join a colony, however different their nationality, take the name of the founders." This is probably decisive in discrediting the inferences that the Jews, being called Macedonians or Alexandrians, enjoyed the Hellenic citizenship.

In connection with the civic rights of the Jews another problem arises, namely, the claim to isopolity which is attested again in Josephus.<sup>72</sup> If we accept the reliability of such statements we would find them again inconsistent with the social reality of Alexandria. Of course the Jews were given privileges, such as of being beaten by blades,<sup>73</sup> like the Hellenes, but they could not participate in all the activities of the city exactly as the Hellenes.<sup>74</sup> To begin with the Jews could not participate in the ephebeia because nudity was involved. Besides this, Claudius, in his letter to the Alexandrines, openly forbids them to participate in the athletic contests.<sup>75</sup> Then, "participation in government and legal administration, entailed worship of the city gods, which to a Jew meant apostasy".<sup>76</sup> "Jews", Tarn goes on, "as a rule, Hellenizers or otherwise, held fast to their religion". Apostasy, on the other hand, according to the Jewish Law, was punished by lynching in Egypt.<sup>77</sup>

<sup>72</sup>See the quotation cited in p. 15 supra.

<sup>73</sup>Philo Flaccus 80. <sup>74</sup>Tarn and Griffith, op. cit., p. 221.

<sup>75</sup>ll. 92ff. See p. 16 supra for ephebeia.

<sup>76</sup>Tarn and Griffith, loc. cit.

<sup>77</sup>Erwin R. Goodenough, The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt (New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929), p. 36.

Consequently, it was difficult for a Jew to apostatize and thus be initiated into full citizenship.

A Jew could not become a full-fledged Hellene because of his religion. Even if we follow Isocrates' idea that it was not blood, but ΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΙΣ that made a Hellene,<sup>78</sup> or the inscription on the Genadeion in Athens that, "Ἕλληνας καλοῦνται οἱ τῆς παιδείας τῆς ἡμετέρας πετέχοντες", again we would have to include the institutions of the ephebeia and religion as indigenous parts of Hellenic ΠΑΙΔΕΥΣΙΣ .

Isopolity therefore was potential citizenship<sup>79</sup> which meant that, "a Jew could become a citizen on demand, provided of course that he apostatised by worshipping the city gods". We have the example of Alexander, the alabarch (customs official), the brother of Philo, who held the office during the reign of Gaius.<sup>80</sup> His son Tiberius Alexander rose as a high official in the Roman army at the expense of losing his Jewish faith.<sup>81</sup>

The London Papyrus No. 1912, which is published by H. I. Bell, I consider to be the most considerable evidence against Jewish citizenship in Alexandria. Its authenticity is undisputed, but new problems have arisen due to the fact that Josephus also cites another letter of similar nature.

<sup>78</sup>Isocrates Panegyricus 50.

<sup>79</sup>Tarn and Griffith, op. cit., p. 222.

<sup>80</sup>Josephus Antiq.XIX.5.1.

<sup>81</sup>Josephus Antiq.XX.5.2.

The London Papyrus No. 1912 contains an epistle sent by Emperor Claudius to the Alexandrines, during the first year of his reign (41 A.D.). It put an end to the disturbances in Alexandria which had started in 38 A.D., during Gaius' reign, and had reappeared immediately after his death. The first part of the disturbances is described in detail by Philo in his work Flaccus. Flaccus, prefect<sup>82</sup> of the province of Egypt, allowed the long existing hatred of the Hellenes against the Jews to materialize. As a result an ugly pogrom broke out in Alexandria. The Jews were persecuted and were forced to move back into their original ghetto. Later, after the arrest and final exile of Flaccus, the Jews sent an embassy to Gaius in order to plead their cause. The Greeks also sent their own embassy. The whole affair is treated again in full by Philo (leader of the Jewish embassy) in his work Legatio ad Gaium.

The Jewish embassy failed in its purpose because Gaius did not approve of the Jewish policy not to worship him as a god. Finally, immediately after Gaius' death, in 41 A.D., the Jews this time became the aggressors and took their revenge against the Hellenes. The renewal of the disturbances is described briefly this time by Josephus.<sup>83</sup>

"Now about this time there was a sedition between the Jews and the Greeks, at the city of Alexandria; for when Gaius was dead, the nation of the Jews, which had been very much

<sup>82</sup>Jones, op. cit., p. 23

<sup>83</sup>Antiq.XIX.5.2.

mortified under the reign of Gaius, and reduced to very great distress by the people of Alexandria, recovered itself, and immediately took up their arms to fight for themselves. So Cladius sent an order to the president of Egypt to quiet that tumult; he also sent an edict, at the requests of king Agrippa and king Herod, both to Alexandria and to Syria, whose contents were as follows:"<sup>84</sup>

At this point begins the edict of Claudius to the Alexandrians in Josephus, which is inconsistent with the letter in Papyrus No. 1912. Here, also lies the mystery of the two contradictory edicts; the one in Josephus stating that the Jews were Alexandrian citizens, the other one in the papyrus implying that they were not. I will first cite the edict in Josephus<sup>85</sup> and then I will discuss the letter in the papyrus:

"Tiberius Claudius Caesar Augustus Germanicus, high priest, and tribune of the people, ordains thus: Since I am assured that the Jews of Alexandria, called Alexandrians, have been joint inhabitants in the earliest times with the Alexandrians, and have obtained from their kings equal privileges with them, as is evident by the public records that are in their possession, and the edicts themselves; and that after Alexandria had been subjected to our empire by Augustus, their rights and privileges have been preserved by those presidents who have at diverse times been sent thither: and that no dispute had been raised about those rights and privileges, even when Aquila was governor of Alexandria; and that when the Jewish ethnarch was dead Augustus did not prohibit the making such ethnarchs, as willing that all men should be so subject to the Romans, as to continue in the observation of their own customs, and not be forced to transgress the rules of their own country religion; but that, in the time of Gaius, the Alexandrians became insolent towards the Jews that were among them, which Gaius, out of his great madness and want of understanding, reduced the nation of the Jews very low, because they would not transgress the religious worship of their country, and call him a god. I will therefore, that the nation of the Jews be not deprived of their rights and privileges, on account of the madness of Gaius; but that those rights and privileges which they formerly enjoyed be

---

<sup>84</sup>The Works of Josephus, trans. n.n. (Whiston) (n.p.: n.d.), p. 578.

<sup>85</sup>Antiq.XIX.5.2.

preserved to them and that they may continue in their own customs. And I charge both parties to take very great care that no troubles may arise after the promulgation of this edict."<sup>86</sup>

The London Papyrus 1912 is a reply to an address of congratulations sent to Claudius through a new Jewish embassy,<sup>87</sup> which was dispatched at his accession on the throne. The letter deals first with the honors and then proceeds to denounce the recent riots and settle the disputes. However, Bell maintains that the present papyrus implies another more significant claim of the Jews which Philo and Josephus have intentionally evaded. Behind this disorder, Bell<sup>88</sup> assumes, lies a movement on the part of the Jews to enlarge to full citizenship the special privileges which they enjoyed, and for this the Hellenes rose up against them.

Bell's arguments are as follows: "After deploring the στάσις, Claudius calls upon both parties to amend their ways, Ἀλεξανδρείαις μὲν... καὶ Ἰουδαίοις δέ (ll. 82, 88). Could there be a clearer indication that in the eyes of Claudius the Jews were not Ἀλεξανδρείαις, i.e. Alexandrian citizens? Lower down (l.95) he speaks of the Jews as living ἐν ἄλλοτρίᾳ πόλει. This should be decisive. It is perhaps possible that their enemies, in a time of strained relations, should speak of Jewish citizens as aliens and as living ἐν ἄλλοτρίᾳ πόλει, but is it conceivable that the Emperor himself, in a letter carefully calculated to hold the balance even, should do the same?"<sup>89</sup>

---

<sup>86</sup>The Works of Josephus, loc. cit.

<sup>87</sup>Davis, op. cit., p. 108.

<sup>88</sup>Bell, op. cit., p. 16.

<sup>89</sup>Ibid., p. 14.



Further on in l. 92 Claudius forbids the Jews to "intrude themselves into"<sup>90</sup> the athletic contests organized by the gymnasiarchs or cosmetes. But as has been explained<sup>91</sup> the athletic contests were associated with the ephebeia. Hence, how is it possible that they would become citizens when they were not allowed to participate in the ephebeia? Davis<sup>92</sup> maintains that they could be excluded and yet be citizens. I do not think that the constitutions of the Hellenistic monarchies would have been so flexible as to allow such exceptions.

The Jews are also asked in the letter of Claudius to be content with their existing privileges.<sup>93</sup> "I bid the Jews not to busy themselves about anything beyond what they have held hitherto."<sup>94</sup> Finally Claudius<sup>95</sup> asks the Jews and the Alexandrians not to send in the future two embassies, as if they were living in two cities. This is a clear indication that the Jews formed a separate politeuma, distinct from the Alexandrian citizens. Because if they were Alexandrians they could not have sent a separate embassy.

The edict of Claudius cited in Josephus<sup>96</sup> is totally the

<sup>90</sup>Jones, op. cit., p. 26.      <sup>91</sup> See pp. 16 and 22 supra.

<sup>92</sup>Davis, op. cit., p. 106.

<sup>93</sup>London Papyrus 1912 ll. 88-90.

<sup>94</sup>Claudius, Letter to the Alexandrines (Papyrus 1912), trans. H. Idris Bell (London: Oxford University Press, 1924), p. 29.

<sup>95</sup>l. 50.

<sup>96</sup>See pp. 25-26 supra.

reverse of what is concluded in the letter of the London Papyrus No. 1912. Nevertheless, it is obvious that although it is inconsistent with that in the papyrus it is not impartial. As has been rightly observed "these edicts were issued at the request of Herod and Agrippa, and not at the result of an inquiry into the charges and counter-charges of Jews and Alexandrians, which probably took place after the restoration of order in Alexandria".<sup>97</sup>

In view of the fact that the authenticity of the letter in the papyrus cannot possibly be disputed, we are obliged to explain the confusion by speculation. Josephus has proved to be rather unreliable over Hellenistic affairs and this forces us to accept possible exaggeration. Bell<sup>98</sup> suggests that the letters, which were both written in the beginning of Claudius' reign, were issued in successive stages. Josephus' letter was dispatched first, when the Emperor thought that the Jews were citizens, and the second when he discovered that they were not, after investigation. But the inference does not seem to be a very plausible one. If this was the case, why is it then that Josephus cites only the first letter and ignores the second? We can assume that the second one was not available to him. Usually he makes use of documents which support his point of view. Again, one cannot accept that the reverse happened, namely that Claudius first issued the letter in the Papyrus and then the one in Josephus, after discovering that the Jews were actually citizens. If Claudius had

---

<sup>97</sup>Jones, op. cit., p. 25.

<sup>98</sup>Bell, op. cit., p. 15.

ever made such a mistake Josephus would have been the first one to proclaim his fault and cite it as an evidence that the Jews were citizens. There was no reason to fear anything, because he was writing in Vespasian's time and this was something which dealt with the Julio-Claudians! Hence, we are driven to suspect interpolation on the part of Josephus, which seems to be very plausible.

In this connection, Bell<sup>99</sup> makes another remark concerning the letter in Josephus which is worth quoting. For one thing, "Claudius twice distinguishes between the Jews and the Ἰεραρχεῖς,<sup>100</sup> and he refers to the former as 'called Ἰεραρχεῖς'. Why 'called', if they were Ἰεραρχεῖς in the technical sense?"

I think that it is useless to cite more evidence, for and against, Hellenic citizenship of the Jews in Alexandria. The Jewish position was such as has been already described. They formed a quasi-autonomous politeuma which enjoyed certain privileges but their politeuma was by no means on a par with the Hellenes.

In Antioch on the other hand, the status of the Jews was more or less similar to that in Alexandria. The Jewish community, Josephus<sup>101</sup> claims, was established on foundation of the city in 300 B.C.<sup>102</sup> However, we can only conclude that as early as that many Jews were probably attracted to the new capital because of the promising opportunities that it offered. Antioch came to be considered by Palestinian and Babylonian Jewry as the most important

<sup>99</sup>Ibid., pp. 15-16.

<sup>100</sup>Josephus Antiq.XIX.5.2.

<sup>101</sup>Antiq.XII.3.1. See also p. 6 supra.

<sup>102</sup>Downey, op. cit., p. 57.

city, even more important than Alexandria.<sup>103</sup> Hence, we can assume that the size of the city was a strong incentive for a business-wise Jew to come and settle seeking security and status.

The administration of the community lay again in the hands of the archons,<sup>104</sup> or Council of Elders, exactly as in Alexandria, but at the head of it, our sources mention, a πρόστατος.<sup>105</sup> It should not be considered that the duties of the prostates differed from those of an ethnarch or genarch.<sup>106</sup> It is not excessive then to suppose that the Jews were organized in one of the fairly privileged politeumata. Citizenship rights again were similar to those in Alexandria. Despite the assertions of Josephus<sup>107</sup> that the Jews were granted the citizenship by Seleucus Nicator it is only possible that, "from the foundation of the city,..., individual Jews, as ex-soldiers, could be enrolled in the citizen lists, and that after the middle of the second century B.C. a special place was found for Jews as such in the constitution of the polis".<sup>108</sup> In other words Kraeling is convinced that the Jewish community as a whole was allowed to be organized in a politeuma even later than Antiochus III. In any case the politeuma of the Jews must have secured for them the recognition of the State and enabled them to preserve their own religious autonomy.

<sup>103</sup>Carl H. Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," Journal of Biblical Literature, LI(1932), 132.

<sup>104</sup>Josephus War VII.3.3.

<sup>105</sup>Kraeling, op. cit., p. 137 (Chrysostom Adv. Jud. Orat. V.3.).

<sup>106</sup>See p. 14 supra.

<sup>107</sup>Antiq.XII.3.1; War VII.3.3; Ag. Apion II.4.

<sup>108</sup>Kraeling, op. cit., p. 138.

The attitude of the early Hellenistic  
rulers towards the Jews (before Antiochus III)

In Polybius<sup>1</sup> words the Jews of Jerusalem in Hellenistic times were known as τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀπὸ τὸ φόρον τὸ προβαγορευόμενον ἱεροσόλυμα κατοικοῦντες (those Jews who live near the temple of Jerusalem). Judea ranked as a Temple State and played a prominent role in the history of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. As in most Temple States the government was in the hands of the aristocracy.<sup>2</sup> The head of the State was the High Priest whose duties were not only religious but political as well. He thus presided over the gerousia<sup>3</sup> or Council of the Elders which was the chief administrative body and was recruited from both the lay and the priestly nobility of the Jews.<sup>4</sup> This gerousia corresponds to the later Sanhedrin. Next to the Elders were the priests who took care of the political, religious, social and judicial affairs of the Jews. Finally came the Scribes, or as Professor Guignebert refers to them, the Doctors of the Law.<sup>5</sup> Their concern was the interpretation of the Law as it applied in the various cases of religious jurisprudence. However, the High Priest maintained complete power over all

---

<sup>1</sup>XVI.39.

<sup>2</sup>Josephus Antiq.XX.10.

<sup>3</sup>Josephus Antiq.XII.3.3.

<sup>4</sup>Charles Guignebert, The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus, trans. n.n. (New York: University Books, 1959), p. 50.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid., p. 51.

bodies and subjects particularly after the Seleucid conquest of Judea. His office was hereditary although the appointment of Menelaus as High Priest in 171 B.C. upset the pattern of hereditary descent.

The history of the Jews in the period that elapsed between the capture of Jerusalem in 312 B.C. and the ascendancy to the Seleucid throne of Antiochus III is difficult to trace. The scanty references in our sources do not help to establish a precise line of events. We again rely totally on the evidence given by Jewish sources such as the book of Daniel, First Maccabees, the Epistle of Aristeas and Josephus. However, all the above mentioned sources do not give adequate information on this period. This is probably because the Jews were in a state of submission and carried on their cultural developments as quietly as possible. In addition one can sense a reluctance on their part to elaborate in general on the whole history of the period. For example, the first book of the Maccabees mentions briefly only about Alexander and then jumps 130 years after his death in order to give an account of Antiochus IV and his persecution of the Jews. Of course there is an expediency behind it in that it wishes to show most impressively the policy and innovations of Antiochus IV. But it may also be an indication that the Jews were living a relatively obscure life under the early Hellenistic rulers during the whole period of 130 years that elapsed. It is almost certain that they enjoyed peace and tranquility under the Ptolemaic rule despite the many wars of the rival states of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids.

Although the Ptolemies had repeatedly exchanged places with

Antigonus in the period 312 to 301 B.C. their exclusive control over Palestine begins after 301. Their later clashes with the Seleucids over that area resulted in the numerous Syrian Wars. The Ptolemies held Palestine for a century until they lost control following their defeat at Panion, in 200 B.C.<sup>6</sup> The main object of their policy in Palestine, as it was in Egypt, was economic exploitation. The country was divided into nomes and toparchies exactly as it was in Egypt.<sup>7</sup> This is made evident in first Maccabees<sup>8</sup> where the divisions still persisted in Jonathan's time. The Jews were obliged to pay an annual tribute in the form of taxation which was probably fixed at 300 talents.<sup>9</sup> The reference in the first Maccabees is made in relation to the promise of Jonathan to pay an annual tribute of 300 talents to Demetrius II in 145 B.C. It has been assumed, therefore, that this was the same sum paid by the Jews to the Ptolemies and later to the Seleucids. However, the sum paid to the Ptolemies must have been more than that paid to the early Seleucids because Antiochus III on capture of Palestine relieved the Jews from one third of their previous annual tribute.<sup>10</sup>

---

<sup>6</sup>M. Rostovtzeff, "Syria and the East," The Cambridge Ancient History, ed. S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock, and M.P. Charlesworth (London: Cambridge University Press, 1928), VII, 190.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid., "Ptolemaic Egypt," p. 123; Pierre Jouguet, Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East, trans. M. R. Dobie (London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., Ltd., 1928), p. 301.

<sup>8</sup>1Macc. 10:30; 11:28 and 34.

<sup>9</sup>1Macc. 11:29; 2Macc. 4:8.

<sup>10</sup>Josephus Antiq. XII.3.3.

Nevertheless, it is remarkable that all Jewish sources do not mention anything against the Ptolemies but seem to side with them in their struggles with the Seleucids. This was certainly the case with the common people as it is indicated in an appropriate statement by Polybius.<sup>11</sup> The same inference can be drawn from Daniel's eleventh chapter as well as the first Maccabees.<sup>12</sup> The book of the Maccabees mentions that Alexander divided his kingdom among his generals (servants) before his death.<sup>13</sup> This false distinction is not made in Daniel. The author of this last book is better informed about Hellenistic matters of the period. In the Epistle of Aristeas too, the Jews seem to be contented with the Ptolemies.<sup>14</sup> In particular it is mentioned<sup>15</sup> that Ptolemy Philadelphus (283-246 B.C.) freed 100,000 Jewish captives by buying them from their owners. It is generally believed today that this Epistle was written sometime between 140 and 100 B.C.<sup>16</sup> Hence, the author is not a contemporary of Philadelphus and has most probably made an exaggeration. Whatever the exaggeration may be, it is another indication that the Jews were well treated. We know that they observed the Sabbath and held fast to their religion when Ptolemy Lagos captured Jerusalem,<sup>17</sup> probably in 312 B.C.<sup>18</sup> It is almost certain

---

<sup>11</sup>V.86.10.      <sup>12</sup>1Macc. 1:6-10.

<sup>13</sup>1Macc. 1:6.      <sup>14</sup>Aristeas 36-37.

<sup>15</sup>Ibid., 37

<sup>16</sup>C. K. Barrett, The New Testament Background: Selected Documents (London: S.P.C.K., 1961), p. 210.

<sup>17</sup>Josephus Ag. Apion I.22.      <sup>18</sup>For the date see pp. 4-5 supra.



that they were allowed complete religious freedom and observance of their own laws throughout the third century B.C.

In the beginning of the Ptolemaic era the Jews were mainly used for military purposes.<sup>19</sup> Their significance as a commercial people is attested much later in Alexandria during the second half of the first century B.C. and the beginning of the Christian period. In any event, no anti-Semitic riots are reported anywhere in our sources. In fact, the Jews of Judea had not attained sufficient importance in the Hellenistic period 200 B.C. to cause public disturbance and concern by the government.

According to the Epistle of Aristeas, Ptolemy Philadelphus took care of translating the Jewish Bible into Greek. This was probably necessitated by the increasing number of Jews in Alexandria, who could no longer read the Bible in their own mother tongue. The impact of Hellenism was strongly felt in the Jewish diaspora and the translation of the Septuagint sought to remedy the Jews' neglect of their own customs and religion. In addition to Philadelphus as benefactor of the Jews, Josephus<sup>20</sup> mentions Ptolemy III, Euergetes (247-222 B.C.) as having sacrificed in Jerusalem, instead of in Egypt, following his military success in Syria. Euergetes is the last of the early Ptolemies to consider in their friendly disposition towards the Jews before Antiochus III.

Judea under Seleucid rule was more or less administered in the

---

<sup>19</sup>See p. 5 supra.

<sup>20</sup>Ag. Apion II.5.

same manner. The social conditions still persisted while the Jews paid an annual tribute and were left undisturbed. Now Hellenism began to make sharp advances in Judea and the Sadducees were foremost in favour of the movement. However, penetration was relatively peaceful in the beginning of Seleucid domination.

In reference to the early Seleucids and their disposition towards the Jews, our sources mention only two. I have already referred to Seleucus I and his connection with the Jews.<sup>21</sup> Josephus ascribes to him many of the civic rights and privileges of the Jews in Syria and particularly in Antioch. But it is generally believed today that he did not bestow upon them such favours. They are more likely to be attributed to Antiochus III rather than to Seleucus. The same inference can be drawn about Antiochus II, Theos (262-247 B.C.).<sup>22</sup> Josephus<sup>23</sup> claims that Theos had granted the Jews of Ionia citizenship rights and privileges. These rights, the Greeks of Ionia sought to revoke at the time of Marcus Agrippa (16-13 B.C.). However, as Ralph Marcus<sup>24</sup> rightly points out, these civic rights were only edicts of toleration which the Romans had granted to the Jews, at the time of Julius Caesar,<sup>25</sup> and not the Seleucids. This is obvious

---

<sup>21</sup>See pp. 6-7 supra.

<sup>22</sup>On the restoration of freedom by Antiochus II to the Ionian cities see Wilhelmus Dittenberger, Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (Lipsiae: Apud S. Hirzel, 1905), I, Inscription 226.

<sup>23</sup>Antiq.XII.3.2.

<sup>24</sup>Ralph Marcus, "Appendix C," Josephus: Jewish Antiquities (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961), VII, 741-742.

<sup>25</sup>Josephus Antiq.XIV.10.2ff.

in another passage which Josephus<sup>26</sup> relates in connection with the aforementioned agitation of the Greeks against the Jews. It is thus stated that Nicolas of Damascus, the representative of the Jews, pleaded their cause in front of Marcus Agrippa and Herod the Great. In his speech Nicolas makes no mention of Antiochus II nor does he make any claim that he had granted them any citizenship rights. On the contrary, it is plainly stated that the rights he is now defending are those that the Romans had bestowed upon them.

"This is therefore what we implore from thee, most excellent Agrippa, that we may not be ill-treated; that we may not be abused; that we may not be hindered from making use of our own customs, nor be despoiled of our goods, nor be forced by these men to do what we ourselves force nobody to do; for these privileges of ours are not only according to justice, but have formerly been granted us by you."<sup>27</sup>

From the above statement it is clear that Nicolas is primarily defending the grants of religious freedom. Moreover, he emphasizes that these rights were given to them by the Romans. Consequently, this discredits Josephus' previous statement in connection with Antiochus, Theos and the Jewish rights of citizenship. It also throws light on what Josephus claims to be a Seleucid act when it was Roman act. Probably Josephus refers to the democratic constitution set up in the cities of Asia by Antiochus II as shown in Dittenberger's inscription 226. Schürer,<sup>28</sup> on the other hand, takes for granted the statement in Josephus and supports the view that the Jews did actually enjoy citizenship rights in Ionia granted to them by Antiochus II.

<sup>26</sup> Antiq.XVI.2.3-5.

<sup>27</sup> Josephus Antiq.XVI.2.3.

<sup>28</sup> Emil Schürer, A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ, trans. Sophia Taylor and Rev. Peter Christie (Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1885), Division II, II, 273.

Antiochus III and his extension  
of privileges to the Jews of Judea

The defeat of the Ptolemaic general Scopas at Panion was a great blow to Ptolemy V, Epiphanes because it involved the territorial loss of Palestine. Thus, Antiochus III came out victorious in the long struggle for the possession of Palestine which lasted more than a century. Apparently the Jewish majority in Judea sided with the Seleucids and assisted them materially during the struggle. The Jews were encouraged to assist Antiochus III primarily by the fact that the Seleucids ruled over many national groups.

Antiochus III in return rewarded the Jews for their assistance by granting them various concessions, primarily of financial benefit, which will later be discussed. His intention was to ensure the possession of the recently acquired territory. Therefore, the act was purely political, because it was not in accordance with Seleucid practice to grant financial concessions to newly acquired states. The only thing that was usually reassured, on conquest of a new territory, was continuation of the old way of life.

The privileges which Antiochus III granted to the Jews of Judea are recorded in a letter which the king dispatched to his governor of Coelo-Syria and Phoenicia Ptolemy, son of Thraseas.<sup>1</sup> The letter is

---

<sup>1</sup>Edwyn R. Bevan, "Appendix E," The House of Seleucus (London: Edward Arnold, 1902), II, 296-297.

cited by Josephus<sup>2</sup> and because it is not elsewhere preserved it has been subject to harsh criticism.<sup>3</sup> However, it is beside the point here to attempt to reject the genuineness of the document since it is generally agreed that Antiochus III was in favour of bestowing such privileges upon the Jews. Bevan<sup>4</sup> then rightly observes, "that Antiochus should in such circumstances have shown some favours to the Jews and made presents to the Temple is in itself extremely likely". One may be reluctant to accept the letter reproduced by Josephus as exactly the one that Antiochus wrote, but the content is very likely to be correct. Despite the relative agreement among scholars that the letter is in conformity with Hellenistic letter writing it must also be observed that Josephus is an apologetic historian and forgeries have been identified in his cited documents. Nevertheless, in view of the favourable disposition of Antiochus III towards the Jews the content of the letter appears to be quite in agreement with the circumstances and the period.

The epistle begins by praising the Jewish attitude and help during the war and then proceeds to list the various privileges which the king is now bestowing upon them. The form is carefully drawn because it touches all the sensitive aspects of Jewish life.

---

<sup>2</sup>Antiq.XII.3.3.

<sup>3</sup>See Ralph Marcus, "Appendix D," Josephus: Jewish Antiquities (London: William Heinemann Ltd.), 1961, VII, 743-766 for all divergent opinions.

<sup>4</sup>Bevan, loc. cit.

First it proposed to repair the city, which had been damaged from the recent war, and to repatriate those Jews who were scattered during the course of events. The restoration of the Temple and its porticoes is to be made by timber which would be specially brought from Judea and Lebanon and would be free of taxation. Antiochus also gave to the Temple, in the form of donation, money and kind for sacrifices. Accordingly, he instructed Ptolemy to allow the Jews to have their own kind of government and be free to live their own kind of life conformably with the laws of their ancestors. In addition the elders, priests, scribes and temple-singers were exempted from various forms of taxation. This point is particularly important because it shows the eagerness of the king to satisfy the Temple nobility. As the government was in the hands of the aristocracy the king took care to please them and enlist them in his own service. Furthermore, in order to induce all war prisoners and scattered people to return back to Jerusalem, before the end of the current year, he promised to abolish for them the taxation for three years. He also offered to relieve all Jews from one third of their future annual tribute. Finally he declared free all those Jews who were driven away from the city and were forced into slavery.

As a pledge to all the above grants and concessions Antiochus published a proclamation<sup>5</sup> regarding the prohibition of Gentiles from entering the enclosure of the Temple and from bringing into the city unclean animals. This proclamation, again has suspiciously been ex-

---

<sup>5</sup>Josephus Antiq.XII.3.4.

amined by modern scholars in an effort to decide whether it is a forgery or not. Josephus makes a blunder in the beginning by stating that the present proclamation was published throughout the kingdom. Almost all historians fail to see the validity of such an unrealistic statement. But the decree as such could very probably have been issued. Moreover, the mere presence of a careless exaggeration does not completely discredit the decree in view of the political expediency that it served. By this act Antiochus publicly proclaimed his reverence toward Jewish religion and customs. Indeed, if this decree were to be put up in Jerusalem, it would have served as a guarantee for Jewish religious independence and would have once more induced the Jews to be contented with Seleucid rule. That Antiochus III, therefore, issued such a proclamation does not sound unreasonable. After all such interdictions existed also during Roman times.<sup>6</sup>

The proclamation becomes confusing when it comes to list the unclean animals. It mentions that such animals as mules, asses, leopards, foxes, hares and others were not allowed to be brought into the city. At first glance it seems comical because the Jews neither used to eat such animals nor did they sacrifice them. Some of them were used as beasts of burden. The wrong list of animals is considered by Marcus<sup>7</sup> to be an indication that the proclamation is not a Jewish forgery, because otherwise no mistake would have been committed.

---

<sup>6</sup>Marcus, op. cit., p. 762.

<sup>7</sup>Ibid.

Apparently either Josephus's source was wrong or the copyist of Josephus purposely amended the text in order to confuse subsequent readers and ridicule Jewish customs. Marcus<sup>8</sup> however introduces another solution. "My suggestion", he states,

"is that Antiochus gave orders to the official in charge of such matters to draw up a statement protecting the sanctity of the temple, as he had presumably been requested to do by some of the Jewish leaders in touch with the Seleucid court; but this official, being ignorant of the exact nature of Jewish ritual, simply chose a formula that was in use for the protection of the cults of various Hellenistic and Syrian cities, and slightly altered it to make it apply to Jerusalem in spite of the fact that it did not wholly fit the requirements of the Jews".

But if such a statement was originally drawn wrongly, which is highly improbable, then the Jews would have protested and probably corrected the proclamation before putting it up in Jerusalem. The inference therefore is not satisfactory and I venture to say that the first explanation seems to be more plausible.

Antiochus III, besides being the first Seleucid to rule over Judea, is also considered to be the first Seleucid to recognize the Jews and grant them concessions. I have already referred to Josephus' statements concerning the Jews of Antioch and Ionia who were, according to Josephus, granted citizenship rights by Seleucus Nicator and Antiochus Theos respectively.<sup>9</sup> But the good relations between Seleucids and Jews were not destined to ripen further than that. The disastrous defeat at Magnesia in 190 B.C. by the Romans had crippling effects on Seleucid strength and eventual downfall. Thus Antiochus III's successors were faced with the problem of averting disintegration and financial dependence on Rome.

---

<sup>8</sup>Ibid., p. 763

<sup>9</sup>See pp. 6-7 and 36-37 supra.



## CHAPTER II

### ANTIOCHUS IV EPIPHANES KING OF THE SELEUCID EMPIRE (175-163 B.C.)

#### Ascendancy to the throne

Antiochus IV was the younger son of Antiochus the Great and according to the terms of the treaty of Apamea<sup>1</sup> he was sent as a hostage to Rome in 188 B.C. In Rome he spent about eleven or twelve years and was able to study and see all that the Eternal City and the Romans could offer. Apparently he was well treated there because in 173 B.C., we learn from Livy,<sup>2</sup> that he had sent Apollonius of Tarsus, his trusted minister, to pay off the last instalment of the indemnity he owed to the Romans, under the treaty of Apamea. The emissary reminded the Senate of the years his king had spent there and delivered the personal gratitude of Antiochus for being 'treated as a prince more than as a hostage'. In 177 B.C. his brother, the king Seleucus IV, exchanged his younger son Demetrius for Antiochus.<sup>3</sup> From Rome Antiochus went

---

<sup>1</sup> Polybius XXI.17; Appian Syrian Wars XXXIX. <sup>2</sup> XLII.6.

<sup>3</sup> E.R. Bevan and G. Downey are probably wrong in considering Demetrius as the elder son of Seleucus IV. Seleucus IV would not have sent to Rome the legitimate heir of the Seleucid throne. His other son called Antiochus must have been the elder son of Seleucus because the Seleucids maintained their dynastic order at least until Demetrius I came to the throne. See E.R. Bevan "Syria and the Jews," The Cambridge Ancient History, ed. S.A. Cook, F.E. Adcock, and M.P. Charlesworth (London: Cambridge University Press, 1928), VIII, 497; and Glanville Downey, A History of Antioch in Syria (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 1961), p. 95, Note 42. Cf. William Tarn and G. T. Griffith, Hellenistic Civilization (London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1959), p. 30.

to Athens where he obviously enjoyed great popularity among the Athenians. So much was he gratified that he undertook to continue the temple of Zeus Olympius which had been started by Peisistratus.<sup>4</sup> While still in Athens he heard the news of the assassination of Seleucus IV by Heliodorus.<sup>5</sup> Heliodorus probably intended to proclaim the elder son of the dead Seleucus, named Antiochus, as king and make himself regent. His plans, however, were to be foiled by the prompt intervention of the child's uncle. Antiochus IV was unable in the beginning to overthrow the usurper and take over the regency, because he had no means of enforcing his will. At this point, king Eumenes II, of Pergamum came to his aid and supplied him with money and military force. Heliodorus, being informed of Antiochus' approach, fled. Thus Antiochus entered Antioch and was proclaimed regent and joint-king. The events of the venture are recorded in an inscription<sup>6</sup> of thanks to Eumenes, his brother Attalus, and the royal family of Pergamum. It was discovered at Pergamum and was thought to be a decree of the Senate and people of Antioch. Scholars<sup>7</sup> today believe that it was actually a decree passed by the Athenian people.

---

<sup>4</sup>Livy XLI.20.    <sup>5</sup>Appian Syrian Wars 45.

<sup>6</sup>Published by S. R. Driver, "Appendix," The Book of Daniel (Cambridge: University Press, 1905), pp. 207-208. The accession of Antiochus is also found in 1Macc.1:10; 2Macc.4:7 and Daniel 11:21.

<sup>7</sup>See Bevan, loc. cit.; Downey, loc. cit. and Wilhelmus Dittenberger, Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (Lipsiae: Apud S. Hirzel, 1905), Inscription 248, who considers it as an Athenian decree.

On ascendancy Antiochus married his brother's widow and his own sister, Laodice, in order to secure the boy's succession as Antigonos Doseon had married Philip V's mother, Phthia-Chryseis, in 229 B.C.<sup>8</sup> It is not clear why Eumenes II installed Antiochus on the Seleucid throne. It may be because he wanted to have a well disposed king in his neighbouring kingdom, in case he fell out of favour with Rome, or because Rome had instructed him to do so. At any rate Antiochus proved to be very shrewd in the management of internal problems with which he was faced. Most of all he managed to appease the opposing elements by not disposing of the young king Antiochus, who should actually have been called the "IV" instead of his uncle. In the beginning he reigned simply as "king Antiochus," jointly with his nephew, and did not add to his name the title 'God Manifest' until the boy was murdered by a certain Andronicus<sup>9</sup> in 169 B.C. Later in 167 B.C. he added to his previous title the epithet Nikephoros, 'The Victorious'.<sup>10</sup> The evidence, though inconclusive, is generally accepted today, but it is not certain whether Antiochus ordered the boy's execution as John of Antioch claims.<sup>11</sup> Andronicus was put to death by Antiochus the same year he committed the murder. He seems to be the same

---

<sup>8</sup>W. W. Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India (Cambridge: University Press, 1951), p. 185.

<sup>9</sup>Diodorus XXX.7.2-3. <sup>10</sup>Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria..., p. 194.

<sup>11</sup>Carolus Müllerus, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum (Parisiis: Editoribus Firmin-Didot et Sociis, 1885), IV, frag. 58, p. 558. The evidence for Seleucus' son is summed up by E. R. Bevan, "Note 5: The Son of Seleucus IV," The Cambridge Ancient History, ed. S.A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, and M. P. Charlesworth (London: Cambridge University Press, 1928), VIII, 713-714. See also Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria..., p. 185.

person who murdered Onias III, the former Jewish high-priest, at Daphne at the instigation of Menelaus.<sup>12</sup> The murder took place about the same time as that of the boy-king Antiochus and it is generally believed today that it was the boy's murder which caused Andronicus' execution rather than that of the high-priest, which the second book of the Maccabees suggests.

There is much to be desired and less to be expected of Antiochus IV's description of character. If one avoids all Hellenistic gossip about the king he may be able to draw a fairly good picture of him. Undoubtedly he meant to do good and it is definite that he achieved a lot. He was by general acceptance the last great man of the wounded Seleucid empire. Historical justice has mainly confined itself to his deeds and dealings with the Jews and has condemned him before his trial. The truth will probably never be revealed but his actions will be reconsidered in the hope that some valuable judgement be achieved. He dreamed of restoring Alexander's empire in Asia. That was a great undertaking and his presence in Babylon<sup>13</sup> after 166 B.C. indicates that he was preparing for a great campaign in the East. In Babylon he is depicted as the 'Saviour of Asia'<sup>14</sup> which undoubtedly means that he had met some kind of success in what he was doing. A dreamer therefore Antiochus was a combination of ambition and impetuous courage of versatility and brilliance. Polybius<sup>15</sup> says some harsh things about him, which

---

<sup>12</sup>2Macc.4:34.

<sup>13</sup>Wilhelmus Dittenberger, Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (Lipsiae: Apud S. Hirzel, 1905), I, Inscription 253.

<sup>14</sup>Ibid.    <sup>15</sup>XXVI.1.

However are aimed at his personal conduct rather than at his policy. None the less, in another passage <sup>16</sup> he portrays him differently: "King Antiochus was a man of ability in the field and daring design, and showed himself worthy of the royal name, except in regard to his manoeuvres at Pelusium...".

His schemes were innovations in the Hellenistic world and he has been considered as an innovator. Not only then was his personal behaviour unusual but his policy as well. The cause of all this extravagance was the environment in which he was brought up. Rome was his second country and the nourishing mother of the 'bohemian reveler'. Much of what he saw and learned in Rome, about its political and military organization, he later introduced into his country. How much of an innovation this kind of reform was is difficult to tell; I would prefer to call it a far-sighted attempt to redress what was already crippled. The Roman historian Livy<sup>17</sup> is more lenient in his criticisms. He says that in Rome he "would administer justice and adjudge disputes on the most trifling matters". He also, more or less, attributes to him the same bohemian tendencies that Polybius ascribes when referring to his conduct in Antioch. No matter how dishonorable this may seem, Antiochus probably gained great popularity among his subjects through the absence of any exclusiveness.

---

<sup>16</sup>Polybius XXVIII.18.

<sup>17</sup>XLI.20. See also Diodorus XXIX.32.

### His policy

Some scholars, when referring to Antiochus' policy, prefer not to commit themselves on his statesmanship. Tarn<sup>1</sup> for example simply chooses to declare "that he had ideas". But his actions, more or less, confirm the notion that he was a policy maker. The wide scale reorganization and rehabilitation which he undertook far exceeds the limits of casual and mediocre policy making. He immediately understood that Rome was the appalling threat to the very existence of his empire. The consequences which emanated from the treaty of Apamea played a peremptory role in the direction of policy which he was to follow. All aspects of social, religious, military as well as foreign policy were directed to remedy the danger left by Apamea. It was no accident that Antiochus sought to establish a unifying force as a means of resisting Rome. Therefore, each of the policies which he undertook, whether domestic or foreign, should appropriately be explained in order to comprehend the enormous importance of his role as a policy maker.

The Seleucid empire in 175 B.C. embraced Cilicia, Syria, Coelo-Syria, Phoenicia, Mesopotamia, Babylonia and Media. The national groups which constituted the population of the empire varied from territory to territory. It was by general acceptance the most heterogeneous compact realm which formed the greatest Hellenic empire

---

<sup>1</sup>W. W. Tarn, The Greeks in Bactria and India (Cambridge: University Press, 1951), p. 184.

since Alexander's. Antiochus understood the weakness inherent in his kingdom and saw the need for a new social program to face the danger of final disintegration. The most important matter was to strengthen the Greek element in his empire.<sup>2</sup> In order to meet this end he first exhibited an enormous possession of wealth through his munificence in the various cities of continental Greece and Asia Minor.<sup>3</sup> For instance, he partly paid the cost of the city-wall at Megalopolis in Arcadia; he restored the temple of Zeus Olympius in Athens; he presented gold vessels to the Prytaneum at Cyzicus and beautified Delos with altars and statues. In Antioch he made many improvements and also at Daphne, in the temple of Apollo where he put a gold and ivory statue of Zeus Olympius which was an imitation of the statue made by Pheidias at Olympia.<sup>4</sup> He also constructed a temple to Jupiter Capitolinus.<sup>5</sup> All this display of wealth probably attracted many Greeks who were seeking a better fortune. Then he adopted the scheme of allowing more municipal autonomy in the cities of his kingdom. This he encouraged by conceding the right to mint royal coins to eighteen cities of his empire.<sup>6</sup> Finally, he further increased the inflow of Greek settlers, probably to use them as mercenaries, by founding fifteen new cities.<sup>7</sup> It has also been suggested that

<sup>2</sup>Ibid., p. 186.      <sup>3</sup>Livy XLI.20.

<sup>4</sup>Tarn, op. cit., p. 191.      <sup>5</sup>Livy XLI.20.

<sup>6</sup>M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), III, 1400.

<sup>7</sup>G. T. Griffith, The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World (Cambridge: University Press, 1935), p. 152. Apparently he devised this in order to bring mercenary soldiers into his domain. Since the treaty of Apamea (Polybius XXI.43.15; Livy XXXVIII.38; Appian Syrian Wars 39)

that Antiochus went even further in his social policy by improving the status of the natives and possibly granting them rights of citizenship.<sup>8</sup> Moreover, he granted city-status to the old-established oriental towns of Epiphaneia (Hamath) and Babylon<sup>9</sup> as well as the Temple cities of Hierapolis (Bambyce) in Syria and Hierapolis on the Pyramus (Castabala in Cilicia) without settling immigrants from Greece.<sup>10</sup> Thus he attempted to strengthen what he probably considered the leading minority and at the same time gave more freedom to the natives. His concern was to achieve a more homogeneous whole at any cost or as Professor Rostovtzeff<sup>11</sup> wrote "to legalize a process of amalgamation between Orientals and Greeks". Of course these measures afforded a certain degree of hellenization which however aimed only at introducing Greek manners in the empire and not at curbing oriental customs.

But Antiochus' real intention to unify the Greeks and Orientals is manifested primarily in his religious policy. Feeling that centralization was the reason behind Rome's success he attempted to achieve

---

did not allow him to recruit mercenaries, he decided to bring over cleruchs who were liable to military service and thus avoided the danger of violating the terms of the treaty (Tarn, op. cit., pp. 186-187.). The presence of 25,000 heavy infantry men (Griffith, op. cit., p. 146) at the review at Daphne, which constituted the phalanx and was recruited only by Greeks, is explained only through this.

<sup>8</sup>J. C. Dancy, A Commentary on I Maccabees (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), p. 46.

<sup>9</sup>Wilhelmus Dittenberger, Orientalis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae (Lipsiae: Apud S. Hirzel, 1905), I, Inscription 253.

<sup>10</sup>Dancy, loc. cit.

<sup>11</sup>Rostovtzeff, op. cit., v. II, p. 703.



the same end through a different process. Centralization he thought could also be attained if religion was brought into uniformity.<sup>12</sup> He intensified the worship of a Greek deity, with syncretistic tendencies, by substituting the already existing supreme worship of Apollo with that of Zeus Olympius. But he went even further than that; he identified himself with Zeus Olympius, thus associating the deity with the ruler cult. In this manner Antiochus as the living king was Zeus; a concept totally new in the Seleucid religion. The evidence is conclusive by the coinage which he put out after 169 B.C. The old coins of the Apollo type appeared with the head of Antiochus diademed on the obverse side and Apollo seated on the omphalos, holding an arrow and bow on the reverse.<sup>13</sup> The inscription was that "of king Antiochus" without any epithets accompanying his name. In 169<sup>14</sup> the coins that circulated were totally different. On the obverse side there was the head of Antiochus, and on the reverse Zeus Olympius, seated on a throne, holding Nike. The inscription changed to "of king Antiochus-God Manifest". His divine nature must have occurred to him even before 169 B.C. because many coins of the old type bear the two streamers of his diadem ending in stars.<sup>15</sup> This is an indication that he always had

---

<sup>12</sup>Tarn, op. cit., p. 190.

<sup>13</sup>Edward T. Newel, The Seleucid Mint of Antioch (New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1918), pp. 16-23.

<sup>14</sup>The dates of the issue of the coins are the same followed by Newel, ibid., pp. 16-32.

<sup>15</sup>Tarn, op. cit., p. 191 associates this only with his Zeus type of coins. Cf. Percy Gardner, Catalogue of Greek Coins: The Seleucid Kings of Syria (London: n.n., 1878), pp. 34-35; and S.R. Driver, The Book of Daniel (Cambridge: University Press, 1905), p. 191 who give the description of the Apollo type of coins with the star.

a tendency to emphasize his divinity. The Zeus type of coins which Antiochus issued were the same as those of Alexander the Great but the eagle was substituted with Nike, exactly as Seleucus I and Antiochus I had done.<sup>16</sup> Later in 167 B.C. Antiochus issued his third series of commemorative coins adding on the inscription of the previous issue the epithet "Nikeforos".<sup>17</sup> The coinage together with the edifices that Antiochus built in honor of Zeus Olympius at Antioch and Athens<sup>18</sup> illustrate his policy to stress the importance of the Greek deity manifested in himself.

Yet, Zeus Olympius "was worshipped in semi-oriental temples, was represented in semi-oriental dress and with semi-oriental attributes and was as much the Pansemitic Baalshamin as the Greek Zeus".<sup>19</sup> The conviction that Zeus Olympius had syncretistic qualities is further supported by the statement made by Philo of Byblus,<sup>20</sup> "Τοῦτον γὰρ, φησὶ, θεὸν ἐνομήϊον μόνον οὐρανοῦ κύριον, βεβησάντων καλοῦντες, ὃ ἐστὶ παρὰ Φοίνιξι κύριος οὐρανοῦ, Ζεὺς δὲ παρ' Ἑλλήσι".

In this respect the ruler cult came to be identified not only with Zeus Olympius but also with the Canaanite deity Baalshamin, the Syrian Hadad or any other Semitic god. It has rightly therefore been suggested<sup>21</sup> that Antiochus, when he wedded himself with the Syrian goddess

<sup>16</sup>Tarn, op. cit., p. 191.      <sup>17</sup>Newel, op. cit., p. 28.

<sup>18</sup>See p. 49 supra.

<sup>19</sup>Rostovtzeff, op. cit., v.II, p. 704.

<sup>20</sup>Carolus Müllerus, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum (Parisiis: Editoribus Firmin-Didot et Sociis, 1883), III, p. 566, fr. 5.

<sup>21</sup>Tarn, op. cit., p. 193.

Atargatis,<sup>22</sup> did it only out of political expediency, and not as an excuse to rob the temple treasure at Bambyce. Since he could be identified with Hadad too, her consort, he could then wed himself to her, thus supporting the native religions. Hence, the religious policy of Antiochus IV did not intend to Hellenize, as it is commonly advocated, but to unify; not to transplant Hellenism in itself, only to spread the spirit of it in the heterogeneous masses of the vast Seleucid empire.

The third considerable reform which Antiochus introduced into his empire was the reorganization of his military forces. Hindered by the terms of the treaty of Apamea<sup>23</sup> he devised various methods<sup>24</sup> in order to recruit his forces with mercenaries from the Roman sphere of influence. His primary concern was to raise a phalanx of twice as many Macedonians as had been used at the battles of Raphia and Magnesia. He realized that the reason for the Seleucid defeat at Magnesia was the collapse of the phalanx.<sup>25</sup> At the review at Daphne, in 166 B.C., the phalanx numbered 25,000<sup>26</sup> heavy armed foot soldiers, and 5,000 legionaries armed in the Roman fashion. We do not know whether these Roman armed infantry soldiers were recruited from the Macedonians, but if they were, then the phalanx of Macedonians at Daphne was almost twice as much as that at

---

<sup>22</sup>Granius Licinianus preserved only in fragments by Macrobius. The exact evidence is identified in Tarn, *op. cit.*, p. 193 and Dancy, *op. cit.*, p. 47.

<sup>23</sup>Polybius XXI.42; Appian Syrian Wars 38 and 39; Livy XXXVIII.38.

<sup>24</sup>See p. 49 and n. 7 supra. <sup>25</sup>Appian Syrian Wars 35.

<sup>26</sup>Polybius XXX.25.

Magnesia.<sup>27</sup> The military reform however did not only lie in that he doubled his phalanx; it extended in the new corps which he added to the legionaries which so far were exclusively used in Roman military practice. Then he probably rebuilt his navy considerably because the first book of the Maccabees<sup>28</sup> refers to it when relating the Egyptian campaign of 169 B.C. The terms of the treaty of Apamea again allowed him to have only ten<sup>29</sup> (twelve according to Appian) manned decked ships in order to use them for any contingency against his subjects, but he was allowed to have more if he were attacked first by any foreign power. Egypt did declare war first<sup>30</sup> against him in 169, but he was the first to cross the Egyptian border and his naval victory off Pelusium<sup>31</sup> denotes that he was reconstructing his fleet a long time before that. Antiochus defied the Romans and went on with his military reorganization. He even developed his army with elephants, which were forbidden again according to the terms of the treaty, and used them for his invasion into Egypt<sup>32</sup> and also in the Festival at Daphne where he paraded forty-two of them.<sup>33</sup> It is no wonder then that Diodorus considered Antiochus' army a formidable one.<sup>34</sup>

At the Festival of Daphne among other things we witness the

<sup>27</sup>For details see Griffith, *op. cit.*, pp. 143-146

<sup>28</sup>1:18. <sup>29</sup>Polybius XXI.42; Appian Syrian Wars 39.

<sup>30</sup>Diodorus XXX.15. <sup>31</sup>Livy XLIV.19.9.

<sup>32</sup>1Macc.1:17. <sup>33</sup>Polybius XXX.25.

<sup>34</sup>Diodorus XXX.15.

economic recovery of the Seleucid Empire. It must be explained here that the celebration was put up by Antiochus as a counter-attraction festival to those previously held by Ptolemy II in Alexandria<sup>35</sup> and the Roman general Aemilius Paullus at Amphipolis in 167 B.C.<sup>36</sup> As Polybius points out "all the display and outlay was provided by the robberies he had committed in Egypt when he treacherously attacked king Philometor, while yet a child, and by contributions from his friends. He had also sacrilegiously despoiled most of the temples."<sup>37</sup> The evidence provided by all our sources to this effect has more or less asserted that most of Antiochus' revenue came from these temple robberies. Indeed we know that he robbed the temple of Jerusalem,<sup>38</sup> in 169 B.C., and took away 1,800 talents. It is also certain that temples were regarded by the Seleucids, especially after Magnesia, as a source of income. Antiochus III met his death in 187 B.C. while attacking the temple of Bel in Elymais.<sup>39</sup> His son Seleucus IV attempted a similar feat in Jerusalem but was successfully repulsed.<sup>40</sup> It is not certain whether the other two attempts at Elymais<sup>41</sup> and Persepolis<sup>42</sup> by Antiochus IV represent an historical fact. Tarn<sup>43</sup> has

<sup>35</sup>Athenaeus V.197.    <sup>36</sup>Polybius XXX.25.

<sup>37</sup>XXX.26.9.    <sup>38</sup>1Macc.1:23; 2Macc.5:21; Daniel 11:28.

<sup>39</sup>Justin XXXII.2.1-2; Diodorus XXVIII.3; XXIX.15; Strabo XVI.744. Tarn and Griffith, *op. cit.*, p. 140, n. 9 maintain that Antiochus III at Elymais was raiding enemy territory.

<sup>40</sup>2Macc.3.

<sup>41</sup>Polybius XXXI.9; 1Macc.6:1-4; 2Macc.1:13ff; 9:2ff; Josephus *Antiq.* XII.9.1; Appian *Syrian Wars* 66; Porphyry fr. 53 in *Frag. of Greek History*.

<sup>42</sup>1Macc.6:4    <sup>43</sup>Tarn, *The Greeks in Bactria...*, pp. 463-466.

most ingeniously shown that both incidents are not historical. If then, this is the case with many of the robberies he has been accused of, it appears that Antiochus<sup>44</sup> revenue did not come mainly from the temples or from the booty of Egypt, but from another source. The wide-scale minting of coins during his reign (124 different coins) points to the conclusion that commercial activity probably reached its height at that period.<sup>44</sup> It is therefore more reasonable to assume that most of the income of the empire came from taxation and trade rather than from looting.

Antiochus<sup>45</sup> foreign policy, in general, was directed to bring into some kind of an equilibrium the Seleucid empire and Rome. The king knew that there must be no severance of the friendly relations with Rome, because if any of the detectable clauses of the treaty of Apamea were violated then he would be in danger. The terms<sup>45</sup> forbade him to wage an offensive war while they allowed him to place himself on the defensive if he was attacked first. Antiochus always avoided giving Rome a pretext for complaint. He cautiously observed the international affairs and never thought of advancing towards the West. He also kept good relations with Pergamum and Cappadocia; thus forming a kind of triple alliance in the East.<sup>46</sup> But his peaceful disposition towards the West was interrupted by the developments in Egypt. In 181 B.C. king Ptolemy Epiphanes of Egypt died<sup>47</sup> leaving as heir his

---

<sup>44</sup>Dancy, *op. cit.*, p. 137.    <sup>45</sup>Polybius XXI.42.

<sup>46</sup>Edwyn R. Bevan, The House of Seleucus (London: Edward Arnold, 1902), II, 133.

<sup>47</sup>Polybius XXIV.6.

young son Ptolemy Philometor and the boy's mother Cleopatra I, sister of Antiochus IV, as regent. The regency however passed in 173 B.C., after Cleopatra's death, into the hands of the ministers Eulaeus and Linaeus,<sup>48</sup> who declared war against Antiochus for the recovery of Coele-Syria, alleging that it had been assigned as a dowry by Antiochus III to the late Cleopatra I.<sup>49</sup> Antiochus Epiphanes had sent Apollonius the son of Menestheus<sup>50</sup> to Alexandria to represent him at the ceremony for the coming of age of Ptolemy Philometor,<sup>51</sup> and he had been informed by him about the ill-feeling of the court of Alexandria. He therefore anticipated that he would be attacked and immediately advanced by sea to Joppa and then visited Jerusalem where he was warmly received by Jason and the people.<sup>52</sup> Realising that there was no immediate danger he retired into Phoenicia. In the meantime he dispatched Meleager to Rome as an envoy to plead his case before the Senate.<sup>53</sup> The Senate being fully engaged with Perseus in the third Macedonian War (171-168 B.C.), which had newly started, did not wish to commit itself.

Later in 169 B.C., when hostilities were actually beginning, both parties sent embassies to Rome trying to enlist the support of the Senate for their cause.<sup>54</sup> Meleager, who was in charge again of

<sup>48</sup>Diodorus XXX.15.    <sup>49</sup>Polybius XXVIII.20.9.

<sup>50</sup>2Macc.4:21.

<sup>51</sup>Called Protoclesia in the Maccabees or anacleteria by Polybius XXVIII.12.

<sup>52</sup>2Macc.4:21-23.    <sup>53</sup>Polybius XXVII.19.

<sup>54</sup>Polybius XXVIII.1.

the Seleucid embassy, tried to put the blame of the war on the opponents and accused them of being the invaders. The Senate again refused to give a definite answer because it probably feared lest an alliance would arise between Perseus and the Seleucids, if she openly sided with the Ptolemies. Antiochus on the other hand understood that this was an opportunity for victory and decided to take his chances. He defeated the two generals of Ptolemy Philometor in the battle of Pelusium<sup>55</sup> and took possession of the frontier fort. Now that Egypt lay open in front of him he advanced inwards and occupied Memphis.<sup>56</sup> In Alexandria Ptolemy was persuaded by Eulaeus to abandon Egypt immediately and retire to Samothrace.<sup>57</sup> While he was trying to escape he was caught on the way by Antiochus' ships and was brought to Memphis. Antiochus treated him very honorably and appeared to come to terms with him.

When the news reached Alexandria the people promptly elected Philometor's younger brother, Ptolemy Physcon, as king and prepared for siege.<sup>58</sup> Now Antiochus felt that his stay in Egypt was more secure because he could pose as the protector of the legitimate king.<sup>59</sup> Perhaps it was at this time that the thought of incorporating Egypt into his empire. His exceptionally good treatment of the defeated Egyptian soldiers at Pelusium<sup>60</sup> as well as his munificence to the

---

<sup>55</sup>Macc.1:17; Livy XLV.11.   <sup>56</sup>Diodorus XXX.14.

<sup>57</sup>Polybius XXVIII.21.   <sup>58</sup>Polybius XXIX.23.4.

<sup>59</sup>Diodorus XXXI.1. Cf. Polybius XXVIII.18.

<sup>60</sup>Diodorus XXX.14; Daniel 11:26.



people of Naucratis<sup>61</sup> indicates that he had notions of gaining the popular support of the Egyptians. Declaring therefore that he was only interested in re-installing the elder Ptolemy on the throne he moved to attack Alexandria.<sup>62</sup> There came to him various embassies from Greece, acting as mediators, and attempting to establish peace.<sup>63</sup> Antiochus insisted that he would not leave Egypt unless Philometor was invited again to Alexandria as the rightful king of Egypt. Later, in 169 B.C., he abandoned the siege<sup>64</sup> and withdrew into Syria leaving Philometor as king at Memphis and Physcon as king in Alexandria. His sudden departure from Egypt is one of the mysteries of history.

As soon as Antiochus was out of Egypt the two brothers were reconciled and Philometor was admitted to Alexandria as joint-king.<sup>65</sup> This was grave news for Antiochus because his plans for dominating Egypt were about to be foiled. He immediately considered a new invasion of Egypt, which he carried out after a short hesitation. The only fear was Rome; but he felt that she was still too preoccupied with Perseus. Therefore, he advanced through the same route into Egypt and in 168 B.C. entered Memphis for the second time. There he had himself crowned king of Egypt by the priests of Ptah.<sup>66</sup> Afterwards he came up to Alexandria and began

<sup>61</sup>Polybius XXVIII.20.11.    <sup>62</sup>Ibid.

<sup>63</sup>Ibid.    <sup>64</sup>Polybius XXVIII.22.

<sup>65</sup>Livy XLV.11.3.

<sup>66</sup>Porphyry fr. 7 cited in Mullerus, op. cit., p. 720. For the date of the coronation see Dancy, op. cit., p.69.

the siege.<sup>67</sup> Unfortunately things worked out badly for him this time.<sup>68</sup> First of all, Perseus, on whose strength Antiochus depended, was defeated in the battle of Pydna by Aemilius Paullus. Now that the Macedonian fear ceased to exist the Romans acted openly and with great speed. They dispatched at once Popilius Laenas from Delos, who was specially waiting there for this purpose. When the outcome of the war with Perseus was clear he was to deliver to Antiochus a senatorial decree ordering him to evacuate Egypt.<sup>69</sup> The episode that followed at Eleusis, four miles from Alexandria, is one of the most shocking incidents of human history. It proves once again that what Professor Toynbee calls the 'intoxication of victory' can actually make a people reach a stage of paranoia. As Antiochus saw Popilius approaching he extended his hand to greet the Roman. Popilius instead handed him the ultimatum of the Roman Senate. The king after he had read it said that he would consult his advisors and friends and then answer. At this point Popilius drew a line with a stick around Antiochus and gave his famous "ἐνταῦθα βασιλεύου".<sup>70</sup> Antiochus was probably amazed at the impudence but after a minute's deliberation he replied that he would do as the Senate desired. The Egyptian affair was now over and Antiochus returned with his army into Syria. Polybius commenting on the outcome of the war states the following:

---

<sup>67</sup>Polybius XXIX.23.    <sup>68</sup>Daniel 11:29.

<sup>69</sup>Polybius XXIX.27; Livy XLV.12; Diodorus XXXI.2; Appian Syrian Wars 66; Justin XXXIV.3.lf.

<sup>70</sup>Appian Syrian Wars 66

"Fortune having so directed the matter of Perseus and Macedonia that when the position of Alexandria and the whole of Egypt was almost desperate, all was again set right simply owing to the fact that the fate of Perseus had been decided. For had this not been so, and had not Antiochus been certain of it, he would never, I think, have obeyed the Roman behests".<sup>71</sup>

After Egypt Antiochus confined his foreign policy to the recovery of the East. Tarn<sup>72</sup> suggests that what was actually celebrated at Daphne was Eucratides' victory over Demetrius of Bactria. That province had become independent in 258 B.C. and now at its restoration again under Seleucid rule, special celebrations were held, as in Babylon (166 B.C.), where Antiochus is depicted as the "saviour of Asia". This was probably because he had saved the Seleucid empire from the menace of Demetrius.<sup>74</sup> It follows, too, that the charisteria<sup>75</sup> celebration during the same year at Babylon, was also a thanksgiving for the same reason.

Before going to Babylon Antiochus made an expedition to Armenia and reduced its king Artaxias into a vassal.<sup>76</sup> After Armenia he went to Babylon and then to Chaldea at the head of the Persian Gulf.<sup>77</sup> The route that he followed next clearly shows that he was heading to attack Parthia which threatened his Median frontier. It is almost certain that he went to Susa then to Persepolis and finally into Gabae (modern Isfahan) where he died in 163 B.C. The cause of his premature death is found in Appian<sup>78</sup> who states that he died of

<sup>71</sup>Polybius XXIX.27.12-13.

<sup>72</sup>Tarn, op.cit., pp. 195 and 528.

<sup>73</sup>Dittenberger, loc. cit.

<sup>74</sup>Cf. Justin XLI.6.3.

<sup>75</sup>Dittenberger, loc. cit.

<sup>76</sup>Appian Syrian Wars 45 and 66.

<sup>77</sup>Tarn, op. cit., p. 213.

<sup>78</sup>Appian Syrian Wars 66.

phthisis (consumption). This sounds more reasonable than the claim of the author of the second book of the Maccabees<sup>79</sup> who maintains that he was "eaten by worms". Antiochus' death deprived the Seleucid empire of its last energetic king. If he had lived five more years he would have probably been able to re-establish Alexander's Empire in the East.

---

<sup>79</sup>2Macc.9:9; cf. 1Macc. 6:1-16.

Antiochus' early attitude towards the Jews and  
his interference in the office of the high-priest

Judea, during Antiochus' reign held an important geographical position because it lay on the frontier between Syria and Egypt. In examining, therefore, the king's policy towards that area we would naturally tend to think that he was primarily concerned in maintaining Seleucid suzerainty over that territory. This was the policy of his father, Antiochus III, as well as his brother Seleucus IV. They all followed the same pattern of non-interference with the internal affairs of the Jews. Antiochus IV did not change this policy during the first years of his reign.

When he came to the throne the office of the high-priest in Jerusalem was held by Onias III,<sup>1</sup> a member of the Oniad high-priestly family and son of the late high-priest Simon II, who had died in 180 B.C. Onias allowed himself to be entangled in a domestic dispute with the prostates of the Temple, Simon<sup>2</sup> of the tribe of Benjamin, over the management of the city market.<sup>3</sup> He obviously did not show a strong hand and fell victim to the intrigues of Simon, who informed the Seleucid governor of Coelo-Syria, Apollonius, about

---

<sup>1</sup>2Macc.3:1

<sup>2</sup>2Macc.3:4. About the disputed origin of Simon and his brother Menelaus (2Macc.4:23) see H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952), p. 67, n. 7.

<sup>3</sup>Ibid.

the treasury of the Temple.<sup>4</sup> Then followed the unsuccessful raid on the Temple treasury by Heliodorus. This resulted in the coming of Onias to Antioch to plead his case before the king. He was confronted with the increasing lawlessness in Jerusalem and the slanders which Simon had spread against him.<sup>5</sup>

While Onias was at Antioch, Seleucus IV was assassinated and Antiochus Epiphanes succeeded him. Epiphanes now was approached by Jason, the brother of Onias, who was actually called Jesus but preferred to call himself by the name the Greeks had for him. Jason solicited him to appoint him to the pontificate instead of his brother Onias.<sup>6</sup> He accomplished this by means of money after promising to pay a hundred and forty talents above the regular annual tribute of three hundred. He also agreed to raise another a hundred and fifty if he would be allowed to build a gymnasium and ephebeum in Jerusalem, for athletic exercise; and register the inhabitants of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch.<sup>7</sup> Antiochus agreed to all these things and thus interfered in the internal affairs of the Jews and in the office of the high-priest. From now on the position ceased to be hereditary and the appointment of each high-priest depended on the approval of the Seleucid sovereign.

Jason carried out his plans immediately. He introduced the so called 'ordinances of the Gentiles'<sup>8</sup> into the city thus teaching

<sup>4</sup>2Macc.3:5-7.      <sup>5</sup>2Macc.4:1-6

<sup>6</sup>2Macc.4:7      <sup>7</sup>2Macc.4:9-10; Josephus Antiq.XII.5.1.

<sup>8</sup>1Macc.1:13; 2Macc.4:10.

Hellenic practices to all the susceptible elements of Jerusalem. The gymnasium was constructed under the citadel and was flooded by young men and priests who found it more interesting to pursue Greek athletic exercise in the palaestra than serve and sacrifice in the temple.<sup>9</sup> They made it a habit to wear the Greek petases, they exercised nude in the athletic field,<sup>10</sup> and made themselves uncircumcised,<sup>11</sup> as they cared for the beauty of the body now and did not wish to expose themselves mutilated. All these practices were totally resented by the Semitic people at this time; needless to say that uncircumcision was considered by Jewish faith as an act of treason.

As I previously explained<sup>12</sup> the gymnasium was one of the indispensable aspects of Greek paideia and was closely associated with the ephebeia. These two institutions bound together exerted much influence on Greek youth because they combined cultural as well as physical training. The system, therefore, offered new educational horizons to the youth of the Jews, who previously had confined their education to the knowledge of their own Law. Furthermore, a great number of these men were probably happy to be relieved of the superstitious observance of the Law.

Nevertheless, the Hellenizing elements of the Jews, who probably formed the upper classes of Jerusalem, did not fully profane themselves as it is claimed from many Jewish sources. It must be remembered

<sup>9</sup>2Macc.4:14-15.    <sup>10</sup>2Macc.4:12.

<sup>11</sup>1Macc.1:15.    <sup>12</sup>See p. 16 supra.

that when Jason sent an embassy of hellenizers into the Quinquennial games<sup>13</sup> in honor of Melkart at Tyre,<sup>14</sup> with three hundred drachmas for the sacrifice of Hercules, the members of the embassy were unwilling to contribute the money for the sacrifice and diverted the donation for the equipment of the Seleucid fleet.<sup>15</sup>

Antiochus is nowhere depicted, during this period of time, as being hostile to the Jews. We know that when he visited Jerusalem in 172 B.C.<sup>16</sup> he was brought into the city with torches and shoutings. His motives for interfering in the office of the high-priest are nowhere clearly stated. We again rely entirely on speculation. The dominant view is that his act was primarily political. He realized that Judea was a "politically unreliable border province"<sup>17</sup> and needed to be maintained at any cost. Interference for Antiochus meant political domination rather than hellenization. Besides this he thought that this was a chance of raising the tribute paid by Judea, to its former Ptolemaic higher standards. Finally, he got rid of Onias, a man who was difficult to deal with in money matters, as we can deduce from his refusal to hand over to Heliodorus the temple treasury. He also

---

<sup>13</sup>F.M. Abel, Le Livres des Maccabées (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1961), p. 55.

<sup>14</sup>2Macc.4:18-19.

<sup>15</sup>2Macc.4:20.

<sup>16</sup> See p. 57 supra.

<sup>17</sup> J. C. Dancy, A Commentary on I Maccabees (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), p. 61.



proved to be unable to maintain order in Jerusalem during Simon's manipulations. Beyond all these we can discern another more important factor which largely contributed to bringing about the king's interference. That was the conviction held by Antiochus that Judea was divided into two political factions which endangered Seleucid rule over Palestine. But this will be discussed in the first part of our next chapter.

### CHAPTER III

#### THE SACK OF JERUSALEM AND THE PROSCRIPTION OF JUDAISM BY ANTI- OCHUS AS A RESULT OF THE INTERNAL JEWISH STRUGGLE IN THE CITY

##### The Oniad and Tobiad families in relation to the pro-Ptolemaic and pro-Seleucid parties in Jerusalem

The schism which existed between the Oniad and Tobiad families in Jerusalem, is of paramount importance to us, because it more clearly depicts Jewish dissension at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. The two opposing parties tried to enlist the support of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid governments respectively thus willingly accepting foreign interference and causing extension of the sphere of conflict. In the time of Antiochus Epiphanes the rupture took a different course as the Tobiads, who were pro-Seleucid, became champions of hellenization while the Oniads remained the adherents of orthodox Judaism. In this manner the Jewish leaders altered the whole nature of the conflict by transferring it from personal strife to one of culture and religion. These rivalries caused the people of Jerusalem to be divided into two opposing camps, the masses being with the champions of Jewish orthodoxy. This brought about the inevitable violent settlement by Antiochus Epiphanes.

It is well known that the Oniads had been the ruling family in Judea since the time of Alexander the Great. Josephus<sup>1</sup> informs us

---

<sup>1</sup>Antiq.XI.8:7.

that Onias I succeeded his father Jaddua, a contemporary of Alexander, sometime after 323 B.C. Then followed another six high-priests, who all belonged to the same family, until the year 174 B.C., when Jason was appointed to the pontificate. The appointment of Jason, though unconstitutional, did not really upset the Jews because the new high-priest belonged to the ruling family.

The Tobiads never did ascend as high as the Oniads. They were powerful rivals because they dominated financially in Judea, especially after 220 B.C., when Joseph was appointed by Ptolemy Philopator as collector of the taxes of Palestine. Their origin can be traced back to the time of Nehemiah, about 440 B.C. The book of Nehemiah mentions a certain Tobiah, from the Ammonite province, as one of the chiefs who collaborated with the Samaritans to prevent the construction of the walls of Jerusalem which were rebuilt under the supervision of Nehemiah.<sup>2</sup> In 432 B.C., when Nehemiah came back from Babylon, he found out that the high-priest Eliashib had reserved a chamber in the Temple for the Ammonite chief Tobiah, and immediately cast him out of it.<sup>3</sup> His action can hardly be condemned because Tobiah was not only opposed to Nehemiah's reforms, but, as Herbert Ryle suggested in his commentary, was not even a Jew.<sup>4</sup> Yet, his connection with the Jewish aristocracy in Jerusalem, during the subsequent stages of his intercourse with the Jews, must have induced him to

---

<sup>2</sup>Nehemiah 4:7. <sup>3</sup>Nehemiah 13:4.

<sup>4</sup>Herbert Edward Ryle, The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah (Cambridge: University Press, 1907), p. 310.

become a half-Jew.<sup>5</sup>

The Tobiads appear again on the scene at the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus. The Zeno papyri disclose that the local chief of Ammanitis (Hebrew Ammonite), Tobias, had been appointed by Philadelphus commander of the cavalry corps of the Ptolemaic military colony.<sup>7</sup>

In a letter cited by Bevan the cavalry commander addresses the king as if he were writing to a friend of his. Apparently the chief held an important local position and felt that he was writing to someone of equal rank. It is generally believed that Tobias of the time of Philadelphus was a descendant of Tobiah of the book of Nehemiah.

The story of the Tobiads from this stage is told to us by Josephus,<sup>8</sup> who in many instances appears to be confused. It is beyond the purpose of this thesis to try to show all the evidence for the views that have been adopted. Nevertheless, a small effort will be made to simplify whatever appears to be the most confusing.

It happened that around 220 B.C.<sup>9</sup> the high-priest Onias II, failed to pay the tribute owed to Ptolemy Philopator.<sup>10</sup> The king immediately sent an envoy demanding an explanation. At this point

<sup>5</sup>Edwyn Bevan, A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty (London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1927), pp. 72-73.

<sup>6</sup>Ibid. where sources are identified. <sup>7</sup>Ibid., p. 72.

<sup>8</sup>Antiq. XII.4.1-11.

<sup>9</sup>For the date see Ralph Marcus, Josephus: Jewish Antiquities (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961), VII, 82-83, n.c.

<sup>10</sup>Josephus Antiq.XII.4.1.

appeared Joseph, the son of Tobias the cavalry commander,<sup>11</sup> who undertook to go to Ptolemy and arrange the matter. On his arrival at Alexandria he solicited and got the office of collector of the taxes of Palestine by promising to pay higher tribute to the Ptolemaic Government.<sup>12</sup> Joseph held this office for twenty-two years,<sup>13</sup> in the course of which he prospered enormously and became the father of eight sons, the youngest of all being Hyrcanus.<sup>14</sup> In the meantime Palestine passed into Seleucid hands after 200 B.C. and it appears from the story that all the Tobiads sided with the Seleucids, except Hyrcanus, who about 187 B.C. went to Alexandria and allied himself with Ptolemy Epiphanes.<sup>15</sup> A quarrel had already begun among Joseph's sons and now that Hyrcanus gave them a pretext they all decided to meet him in battle. This marks the beginning of hostilities between the two parties.<sup>16</sup> The brothers, aided by the high-priest Simon II and the people of Jerusalem, fought against the pro-Ptolemaic Hyrcanus and forced him to retire to Jordan, most probably at Ammanitis.<sup>17</sup>

Here two things are worth noticing. First that his father Joseph supported his elder sons and second that at this instance most of the leaders as well as the people of Jerusalem were pro-

<sup>11</sup> Josephus Antiq.XII.4.2 states that his mother was the sister of Onias II.

<sup>12</sup> Josephus Antiq.XII.4.4. The sums represented here are very large, mainly because the story is fictitious.

<sup>13</sup> Josephus Antiq. XII.4.6 and 10. <sup>14</sup>Ibid.

<sup>15</sup> Josephus Antiq.XII.4.7-9. <sup>16</sup> Josephus Antiq.XII.4.11.

<sup>17</sup>Ibid.

Seleucid. It has been suggested<sup>18</sup> that Joseph was hostile to his son Hyrcanus, because the latter had obtained from Ptolemy Epiphanes all the privileges that he had previously acquired from Ptolemy Philopator. Josephus also mentions that at Jordan Hyrcanus built a fortress.<sup>19</sup> Its ruins are believed to have been found today at Arak el - Emir near Heshbon,<sup>20</sup> but Momigliano, quoted by Marcus,<sup>21</sup> suggests that the fortress existed from the time of Ptolemy Philadelphus. Hyrcanus lived there until Antiochus Epiphanes came on the Seleucid throne, when he suddenly committed suicide out of fear that he might be avenged by the king for the raids he had conducted against the Arabs.<sup>22</sup>

As it has been previously discussed the raid of Heliodorus, at the Temple treasury, had met with failure.<sup>23</sup> The second book of the Maccabees<sup>24</sup> mentions that among the moneys of the treasure, which had been deposited there for safety, were some which belonged to Hyrcanus. These moneys were kept by the high-priest Onias III who refused to hand them over to the Seleucid minister. It follows, therefore, that the new high-priest was allied with Hyrcanus. Furthermore, if we believe the statement made by Josephus<sup>25</sup> that Onias "cast the sons of Tobias out of the city", then we can conclude that he had visibly joined the pro-Ptolemaic party and had therefore

<sup>18</sup>By Marcus, op. cit., p.112, n. a.

<sup>19</sup>Antiq.XII.4.11. <sup>20</sup>Marcus, op. cit., p. 117, n. c.

<sup>21</sup>Ibid. <sup>22</sup>Josephus Antiq.XII.4.11.

<sup>23</sup>See 67 - 68 supra. <sup>24</sup>3:11.

<sup>25</sup>War I.1.1.

placed himself in a precarious position. It must not then be surprising why Antiochus replaced him in 174 B.C. with his brother Jason.

But the struggle for power in Jerusalem does not stop here. In 171/170 B.C. a certain Menelaus, brother of Simon the prostates<sup>26</sup> of the Benjamin tribe, was sent by Jason to Antioch to pay the tribute owed to Antiochus Epiphanes.<sup>27</sup> Menelaus took advantage of the occasion and outbid Jason by promising to pay three hundred talents more.<sup>28</sup> This was probably the greatest mistake that Antiochus made, because Menelaus was not even from the high-priestly family and did not enjoy the least popularity in Jerusalem. It seems that he underestimated the importance of Judea and its people and was probably not well informed about the existing conditions in the province. After the intrigue of Menelaus, Jason fled into the Ammonite stronghold of Hyrcanus<sup>29</sup> where he must have turned into a passionate enemy of Antiochus and one willing to conspire against the Seleucid rule.

In this new strife for power the pro-Seleucid Tobiads sided with Menelaus while the majority of the people changed sides and allied with Jason.<sup>30</sup> Propaganda now began to play a prominent role in Jerusalem. It was used to excite the spirits of the masses and convert them into fanatic followers of their leaders. In addition to that religion was made the vehicle of propaganda by means of which

<sup>26</sup>See p. 63 supra. <sup>27</sup>2Macc.4:23

<sup>28</sup>2Macc.4:24. <sup>29</sup>2Macc.4:26

<sup>30</sup>Josephus Antiq.XII.5.1.

the people exerted their active opposition. As a result of all this, hellenism, which had actually co-existed with the Jews for more than twenty years, was condemned and its followers were considered as enemies. Antiochus therefore should not be held wholly responsible for what happened later in Jerusalem. It was not his fault that the Jewish leaders were corrupt and were continuously fighting each other. It was inevitable to resort to force after the Jewish leaders had first used force against each other, thus, challenging the royal authority.



The Progressive take-over in the city  
of Jerusalem which followed upon Antiochus'  
return from Egypt

The evidence on Antiochus' new policy towards the Jews is totally derived from the two books of the Maccabees, Daniel and in part from Josephus. The inconsistency with which these accounts are characterized, has created many problems both chronological and historical. Despite the enormous work that has been done on this period it has been impossible to reach a unanimous agreement on all points. Before proceeding with the historical analysis a small supplementary chronological exegesis will be provided in order to comprehend better the views which have been adopted.

It is generally believed that the Seleucid era began in the year 312 B.C. That date signifies the coming into power of Seleucus I immediately after his restoration by Ptolemy I in Babylon. Official records, then, were kept according to 312 and as first day of the year was considered to be the first of October (Dios in Greek or Tishri in Hebrew). On the other hand the Jews, following Babylonian practice, which they brought on their return from exile, reckoned their years from the first day of the month of April (Artemisios in Greek or Nisan in Hebrew). But instead of counting from the first of April 312 they dated the Seleucid era from April 1, 311.<sup>1</sup>

---

<sup>1</sup>This is the theory of E. Bickermann which has been followed by Robert H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times (London: Adam

The first book of the Maccabees follows the same procedure by considering Nisan 311 as the beginning of the era for events in Jewish history.<sup>2</sup> On the other hand the second book counts according to the Macedonian era taking Tishri 312 as the beginning of the historical era.<sup>3</sup> Moreover, the discrepancy that occurred in the Jewish calendar every three years, between the lunar and the solar years, was corrected by intercalating at the end of the third year one extra month called Adar II.

The long existing controversy on the differences found in the two books of the Maccabees has not been satisfactorily settled. The problem arises primarily from the fact that the first book gives mainly an account of the spoliation of the temple of Jerusalem by Antiochus, after his return from the first Egyptian campaign, while the other book narrates the events after his 'second' return from Egypt. There is no doubt that Antiochus made two expeditions against Egypt,<sup>4</sup> but it is not certain whether he personally visited Jerusalem

---

and Charles Black, 1949), p. 13; Ralph Marcus, Josephus: Jewish Antiquities (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961), VII, p. 123; J.C. Dancy, A Commentary on I Maccabees (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), pp.48-51. The theory appears to have been established before Bickermann by Solomon Zeitlin, Megillat Taanit: As a Source for Jewish Chronology and History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods (Philadelphia, n.n., 1922), pp. VII, 15, 36, though erroneously applied on the historical facts. Oesterley is probably wrong in supposing that the Jews reckoned from Nisan 1, 312. See his commentary in R. H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (London: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1913), I. p. 68.

<sup>2</sup>Zeitlin, op. cit., p. VII.      <sup>3</sup>Ibid.

<sup>4</sup>See pp.57-61 supra.

twice. Many scholars, including Tarn, Driver, and Bevan<sup>5</sup> have considered the account of the second book of the Maccabees<sup>6</sup> to refer strictly to the events followed by Antiochus' first return from Egypt. In this manner the statement that, "about this time Antiochus made his second inroad into Egypt"<sup>7</sup>, has been interpreted to have no relation to the actual second invasion into Egypt, but only to his second march. It would be remembered that Antiochus, anticipating a declaration of war by Egypt, marched as far as Joppa and then retired into Phoenicia without actually carrying the invasion to a conclusion.<sup>8</sup> Hence, the word 'second', according to the aforementioned scholars, refers to his first real invasion into Egypt and not to his second. But Dancy and Pfeiffer<sup>9</sup> have pointed out that only vv. 15-23 of the fifth chapter of the second book of the Maccabees belong to the events after the king's return from the first expedition. They also argue, that the rest of the narrative, in that same chapter, is actually a description of what took place after Antiochus' second return.

The arguments for and against these suppositions, though plausible, do not seem to be totally convincing. Again it is a matter of speculation. But a conflation of the accounts of the two books of the

---

<sup>5</sup>William Tarn and G. T. Griffith, Hellenistic Civilization (London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1959), pp. 214-215; S. R. Driver, The Book of Daniel (Cambridge: University Press, 1905), p. 178; E. R. Bevan, "Syria and the Jews," The Cambridge Ancient History, ed. S. A. Cook, F. E. Adcock, and M. P. Charlesworth (London: Cambridge University Press, 1930), VIII, pp. 506-507.

<sup>6</sup>2Macc. 5:5-23.    <sup>7</sup>2Macc.5:1.

<sup>8</sup>See p.61 supra.

<sup>9</sup>Dancy, op. cit., p. 70; Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 12.

Maccabees seems to be rather undesirable, primarily because one single account out of these two will be too confusing, unless much of it is omitted. In addition to this the similarity between 2Macc.5:15-21 and 1Macc.1:20-29 is most striking. It is then very probable that the story of the second Maccabees is not a supplement of that of the first but the real account of events after Antiochus' second return from Egypt.

In the best possible sequence of occurrences the history of the Jews in Judea, between 169 and 167 B.C., will appear to be as follows. In the 143rd<sup>10</sup> year of the Seleucid era, which extended between October 170 and October 169 B.C.,<sup>11</sup> Antiochus returning from his first Egyptian campaign made a detour by way of Jerusalem and plundered the Temple.<sup>12</sup> He was guided into the Temple by Menelaus himself who gladly allowed him to take anything he wanted. Among the valuable objects that he stole were many sacred vessels and one thousand and eight hundred talents.<sup>13</sup> This marked the beginning of hostilities between Antiochus and the Jews of Judea. It actually did Antiochus no good because it exasperated the Jews and broadened the gap between the Tobiads and Oniads in the city.

In the 145th<sup>14</sup> year of the Seleucid era Antiochus was again in Egypt when suddenly he received news that Judea was in revolt.

<sup>10</sup> 1Macc.1:20.

<sup>11</sup> Evidence points to the conclusion that it was in autumn 169 B.C. that Antiochus entered Jerusalem. See Dancy, *op. cit.*, p. 67.

<sup>12</sup> 1Macc.1:21-23; 2Macc.5:15-21; Daniel 11:28.

<sup>13</sup> 2Macc.5:21. <sup>14</sup> Josephus *Antiq.*XII.5.4.

In connection with this the first book of the Maccabees mentions that it was "two years later",<sup>15</sup> after the plunder of the Temple, that the following event took place. The expedition therefore falls between October 168 and October 167 B.C., according to Macedonian estimations. However, we know that the battle of Pydna took place in the summer of 168 B.C. and that Antiochus was asked to evacuate Egypt one or two weeks later. Hence, the second attack of Antiochus on Jerusalem must have taken place sometime in August 168 B.C.

It happened that while Antiochus was in Egypt a false rumour spread in Jerusalem that he had been killed.<sup>16</sup> Jason, who was probably waiting for a chance to return to power, took one thousand men and attacked the city.<sup>17</sup> Menelaus escaped promptly into the citadel but many of his partisans were slaughtered by Jason and his men.<sup>18</sup> It seems that among them many innocent fell and Jason became very unpopular. Finally, when he discovered that his efforts to seize the office of the high-priest were thwarted and that he was greatly resented by the people, he escaped again into Ammanitis.<sup>19</sup> Later he fled into Egypt and from there into Sparta, where he finally died.<sup>20</sup>

The attempt of Jason made Antiochus believe that Judea had revolted in favour of the Ptolemies.<sup>21</sup> Having lost all hope about

<sup>15</sup>1Macc.1:29.    <sup>16</sup>2Macc.5:5.    <sup>17</sup>Ibid.

<sup>18</sup>2Macc.5:6.    <sup>19</sup>2Macc.5:7.    <sup>20</sup>2Macc.5:8-9.

<sup>21</sup>Josephus War I.1.1.

Egypt, after the Roman ultimatum, he advanced in the summer of 168 B.C. and invested Jerusalem by force. Its gates were opened to him by the followers of Menelaus and the Tobiads.<sup>22</sup> Here again it is not certain whether Antiochus directed the assault upon the city personally. Josephus and the second book of the Maccabees<sup>23</sup> state that he did, but first Maccabees<sup>24</sup> as well as vv. 24-26 of the second book specify that he sent Apollonius, the commander of the Mysian guard,<sup>25</sup> with 22,000 men to conduct the operation for him.<sup>26</sup> But the most probable is that he came first against the city and later he sent Apollonius to build the Acra. Whatever the case maybe, Antiochus or Apollonius entered the city treacherously on a sabbath day and "slew a large number of Ptolemy's followers".<sup>27</sup> Apparently Antiochus executed all those who stood for a philoptolemaic policy, and as the majority of the people now were pro-Ptolemaic, he must have executed a large number of them as traitors. The severity with which he struck is partly justified by his conviction that the Jews had revolted against him. He also reduced to ruins the city walls and many houses of the city.<sup>28</sup> This was the usual penalty inflicted upon

---

<sup>22</sup> Josephus Antiq.XII.5.3.      <sup>23</sup> 2Macc.5:11-14.

<sup>24</sup> 1Macc.1:29-41.

<sup>25</sup>The "chief tribute-collector" mentioned in 1Macc.1:29 is obviously a wrong translation into Greek from the original Hebrew because the words of chief collector and Mysarch in Hebrew are identical. See Marcus, op. cit., p. 127, n.e.

<sup>26</sup> 2Macc. 5:24.      <sup>27</sup> Josephus War I.1.1.

<sup>28</sup> 1Macc.1:30; Josephus Antiq.XII.5.4.

revolted cities in ancient times.<sup>29</sup> Apollonius is mentioned as having built on the eastern hill, south of the Temple,<sup>30</sup> the famous Acra<sup>31</sup> in which lived "a sinful nation, transgressors of the law".<sup>32</sup> By 'sinful nation' was meant the Seleucid soldiers, and 'transgressors of the law', the hellenizing Jews followers of Menelaus and the Tobiads.<sup>33</sup> The installation of the Acra was an unbearable thing to the Jews because it constantly checked their moves and prevented them from any successful uprising. Not until 142 B.C. were the Jews rid of its presence and its garrison.

But not long after this,<sup>34</sup> probably in 167 B.C.,<sup>35</sup> Antiochus understood that Jewish political resistance was rooted in religion. Now it was more obvious to him that the antithesis lay not so much in the institutions of Hellenism and Judaism in general as in the framework which supported these institutions. He, thus, reacted correspondingly with the intention of abolishing all those items of the Jewish Law which stood against his will. According to the first Maccabees<sup>36</sup> he sent edicts of prohibition into Jerusalem and the cities of Judah declaring that the Jews should abstain in the future from observing such customs as sacrifices,<sup>37</sup> celebration of the sabbath

<sup>29</sup>Dancy, op. cit., p. 72.      <sup>30</sup>Marcus, op. cit., p.128, n. d.

<sup>31</sup>1Macc.1:33; Josephus Antiq.XII.5.4; Daniel 11:39.

<sup>32</sup>1Macc.1:34.      <sup>33</sup>Josephus Antiq.XII.5.4.      <sup>34</sup>2Macc.6:1.

<sup>35</sup>Pfeiffer, op. cit., p. 13; Dancy, op. cit., p. 78.

<sup>36</sup>1Macc.1:44.      <sup>37</sup>1Macc.1:45; Josephus Antiq.XII.5.4.

and other feasts,<sup>38</sup> circumcision,<sup>39</sup> and every other item of Jewish religious practice. Moreover, all sacred books were to be burnt and destroyed and anyone found in possession of such books would be executed.<sup>40</sup> In order to enforce these prohibitions Antiochus appointed epistatas<sup>41</sup> or episcopous.<sup>42</sup> In Jerusalem he established Philip the Phrygian and at Gerizim, for the Samaritans, Andronicus. Finally, we are told, that, "on the fifteenth day of Chislew, in the hundred and forty and fifth year, they built an abomination of desolation upon the altar, and in the cities of Judah on every side they builded idol altars".<sup>43</sup> Chislew corresponds to December, but as there existed a difference of a few days between the Babylonian and Jewish calendars.<sup>44</sup> It is estimated that the aforementioned date of the book of the Maccabees does not fall exactly on the fifteenth but a little earlier.

The abomination of desolation has been considered as the most extravagant act of Antiochus' persecution of the Jewish Law. The second book of the Maccabees mentions that the "abomination of desolation" was actually the rededication of the sanctuary in Jerusalem to Zeus Olympius,<sup>45</sup> probably followed by the erection of an altar or

---

<sup>38</sup>Ibid.; 2Macc.6:6.

<sup>39</sup>1Macc.1:48 and 60; Josephus Antiq.XII.5.4; 2Macc.6:10.

<sup>40</sup>1Macc.1:56. <sup>41</sup>2Macc.5:22. <sup>42</sup>1Macc.1:51.

<sup>43</sup>1Macc.1:54; Cf. Daniel 11:31. <sup>44</sup>See Dancy, op. cit., p. 49

<sup>45</sup>2Macc.6:2.



stone-shrine upon the Temple altar.<sup>46</sup> Likewise, the Samaritan Temple at Gerizim was named in honor of Zeus Xenios<sup>47</sup> or Hellenios according to Josephus.<sup>48</sup>

Ten days<sup>49</sup> after the erection of the abomination of desolation, a pig was offered for sacrifice on the newly constructed pagan altar and the people were forced to eat its meat.<sup>50</sup> This was probably on the king's birthday and the same sacrifice was repeated once every month.<sup>51</sup>

The Jews now appeared to be more united under the bond of persecution and common suffering. In spite of that the majority seems to have conformed with the king's orders. Others, like the Hasidim, chose to disobey by offering passive resistance and became voluntarily the first martyrs.<sup>52</sup> Many took to the mountains and under the leadership of Mattathias and his sons were organized into military units offering armed resistance. The famous Maccabean revolt marks the beginning of Jewish military opposition to the Seleucid yoke.

<sup>46</sup> Josephus Antiq. XII.5.4. The problems arising from Antiochus' profanation of the Temple will be discussed in the last chapter of this work.

<sup>47</sup> 2Macc.6:2.

<sup>48</sup> Josephus Antiq. XII.5.5. The name Xenios is generally accepted. See Marcus, op. cit., p. 134, n. c.

<sup>49</sup> 1Macc.1:59.    <sup>50</sup> 2Macc.6:7.    <sup>51</sup> Ibid.

<sup>52</sup> 2Macc.6:19 and 7:1.

## CHAPTER IV

### THE JERUSALEM ISSUE

In reviewing the persecution of the Jews by Antiochus one may ask himself the following question: Why did Antiochus curb the religion of the Jews when his problem with that Temple state was purely political? We know that in a theocratic state such as Judea there was no politics in the strict sense of the word. There was only domination as derived from the Jewish Law or Torah. The separation between politics and religion was non-existent primarily because the two were fused in a theocracy. For example political parties were understood only on the basis of their religious conviction. We recall of course the struggle between the Oniads and the Tobiads. The former were supporters of Jewish orthodoxy and politically oriented towards the Ptolemies while the latter were against orthodoxy and were political supporters of the Seleucids. Thus, Judea will be better understood if reviewed from the politico-religious point of view. Antiochus, in order to safeguard the border province of Judea, decided to put an end to the various disturbances, but the Jews gave him very little choice in the course of action that he had to follow. If politics was dominated by religion then that religion would have to be abolished. In other words Antiochus tried to eradicate the evil at its root. But it must not be misunderstood that his scheme was directed primarily against the

recalcitrant Jews. It was only intended to repress "the corpus of the Law that was followed by a group of rebels, including the ex high-priest Jason".<sup>1</sup> Antiochus then, irrespectively of whether this absolves him from his actions or not, was not purely a religious persecutor as tradition has pictured him.

In addition to this Antiochus has been alleged to be an ardent Hellenizer and that among other things he attempted to force hellenization upon the Jews. It is true that hellenization had penetrated, though among limited circles, into Judea but its course was not<sup>as</sup> systematic as it is generally believed. Emphasis should be made here on the fact that the initiative for the attempted hellenization was taken by Jason and the hellenizers and not by Antiochus. Yet, the best way to show that Antiochus' hellenization in Judea was not systematic and Semantically oriented is by examining the nature of the Hellenization which he tried to impose.

Much controversy has arisen over the institutions of the gymnasium and ephebeum that Jason established in Jerusalem. Special importance has been laid on the statement, "καὶ τοὺς ἐν Ἱερουσαλήμοις Ἀντιοχεῖς ἀναγεῖναι"<sup>2</sup> which appears to be more polemical than the rest in this connection. The meaning of this phrase is, "and register the Antiochians in Jerusalem", referring to the citizens of Jerusalem. It must not be thought that Jason requested to register

---

<sup>1</sup>Samuel K. Eddy, The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334-31 B.C. (Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961), p. 213.

<sup>2</sup>2Macc. 4:9.

the Antiochians who resided in Jerusalem and who probably already possessed the Greek citizenship. It is absurd to believe that Jason would have paid money for the reason of only organizing the Antiochians. We know that there were no Greek settlements in Judea at that time,<sup>3</sup> except probably a few officials. Consequently the aforementioned statement refers only to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and nobody else. Nevertheless, the problem is more serious than that. The opinion among scholars is divided over whether the request to register the Antiochians applied to all the people of Jerusalem or not. It is even thought that Jerusalem was renamed into an Antioch. Taking things into reverse order we will start with the second problem and then go into the first.

Abel, who is the most concerned about the renaming of Jerusalem into an Antioch after Antiochus, furnishes us with the names of the various cities which received the name of Antiochus during the period of 175-163 B.C.<sup>4</sup> The cities thus renamed were the following: Antioch-in-Mygdonia (Nisibis), Antioch-on-the-Kallirhoe (Edessa), Antioch-on-Sarus (Adana in Cilicia) and Antioch in Ptolemais.<sup>5</sup> This evidence Abel derives from the coinage that was issued by the above cities. Antiochus obviously gave the right to mint coins to

---

<sup>3</sup>M. Rostovtzeff, The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941), I, 348.

<sup>4</sup>F. M. Abel, Les Livres des Maccabées (Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1961), p. 55. See also Victor Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews, trans. S. Applebaum (Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1961) p. 164.

<sup>5</sup>Ibid.

All the above mentioned cities, but in the case of Ptolemais it is not certain whether the city was renamed as such, because the second addition to its new name remains the same, while in the other cities their dynastic names are followed by the province or the river that designates their locality.<sup>6</sup> The same is the case with Jerusalem. We never hear of Jerusalem called Antioch and its second derivative remains the same. Abel also considers the evidence in the second book of the Maccabees,<sup>7</sup> in connection with the embassy which Jason sent to Tyre for the games in honor of Melkart, to have the same value as the coinage. Therefore, "being Antiochians of Jerusalem" actually implies, according to Abel, that Jerusalem was renamed, because this is parallel to the inscription found on the coins of Ptolemais. But Ptolemais could have dedicated its coins to Antiochus for the privilege he had bestowed upon her without necessarily carrying the same name. In addition to that, the evidence in the case of Ptolemais is more decisive, than that of Jerusalem, because it has been identified on its coins. Jerusalem, on the other hand, received the right to mint coins much later, at the time of Antiochus VII (139-129 B.C.)<sup>8</sup>. It is rather improbable then that Jerusalem received a Greek dynastic name.

Did the request of Jason apply to all the inhabitants of Jerusalem or to a portion of the population? The answer to this, despite the apparent ambiguity of the statement, is more easy to solve. We know that Jason petitioned to construct a gymnasium and an ephebeum.

---

<sup>6</sup>J.C. Dancy, A Commentary on I Maccabees (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), p. 60.

<sup>7</sup>2Macc.4:19,

<sup>8</sup>George Francis Hill, Catalogue of the Greek Coins of Palestine in the British Museum (London: Longmans and Co., 1914), p.XCIII. See also 1 Macc.15:6.

As has already been explained, in the first chapter,<sup>9</sup> these two institutions were attached to the Hellenic politeuma and formed the indispensable prelude to deme membership. In the ephebeia all the young men who expected to receive the Hellenic citizenship participated. It was as H. S. Jones<sup>10</sup> put it "the necessary avenue to full citizenship". Hence, there is no doubt that Jason was requesting to organize into demes and then into one politeuma those inhabitants of Jerusalem who participated in the ephebeia. If the statement in the Maccabees referred only to the construction of a gymnasium, then there would have been no question of citizenship and few would have shown willingness to participate because there would not have been any other benefit except physical exercise. But the ephebeia specifically denotes that only a certain part of the people participated and that those people were looking forward to acquiring the Hellenic citizenship. What we gather from the description of the second Maccabees seems to imply that not all the inhabitants participated in the ephebeia; only the hellenizing young men and the priests. Of course that does not mean that all young men or all priests took part in the ephebeum. Most probably only those belonging to the wealthier families; not the children of the poor orthodox Jews. If we now assume that the population of Jerusalem was 120,000<sup>11</sup> and that one fifth participated in the ephebeia, then

---

<sup>9</sup>See p. 16 supra. <sup>10</sup>See p. 16 supra for reference.

<sup>11</sup>Eddy, op. cit., p. 210.

only 24,000 people must have been involved in the gymnasium and ephebeum.

We have witnessed in the first chapter the great eagerness of the Jews of Alexandria and Antioch to be admitted in the Greek circles so that they may be able to acquire the Hellenic citizenship. Antiochus' policy in this respect is considered to be lenient. He generally granted rights of citizenship more easily than his predecessors. Jason knew this and decided to buy Greek citizenship for those who wanted it. The kind of citizenship that Antiochus probably offered was that of isopolity. It was relatively common in the Hellenistic world and meant potential citizenship for any Jew who consented to apostatize. We have no doubt that the followers of Jason would have readily yielded to anything that the situation demanded. Still one may wonder why did Jason need the citizenship so badly? The answer to this is provided by Tcherikover<sup>12</sup> who maintains that Jason and the Hellenizers wished to obtain the Hellenic citizenship in order to secure economic privileges for the Jewish bourgeoisie. As many of the Hellenistic cities enjoyed privileges of financial benefit, such as the right to mint coins, which helped them to expand their economy, it is probable that Jason aimed at the same thing.

Tcherikover,<sup>13</sup> in connection with the two Hellenic institutions which Jason established in Jerusalem, argues that in fact they constituted the transformation of theocratic Jerusalem into a polis. Jason, whom he portrays as a benevolent social reformer and not as a renegade, in fact attempted to organize the Jews into a polis, as

---

<sup>12</sup>Tcherikover, op. cit., p. 169.    <sup>13</sup>Ibid., pp. 163-169.

distinct from the detestable Jewish ethnos, by trying to secure for them "entry into the commonwealth of Hellenic people". In this manner, he goes on, a new constitution was set up in Jerusalem which aimed at abolishing the old way of life.

"The abolition of the former constitution based on the Mosaic Law did not mean the automatic abolition of the Law itself. The reform said only one thing, that from now on the polis, the citizen body organized as an urban demos, was the supreme arbiter and maker of decisions in religious matter, just as it was the arbiter in every other matter. The demos had the authority to abolish the Mosaic Law, but no clause of the new constitution obliged it to do so. The introduction of foreign customs such as athletic games and physical exercises, though alien to the national spirit, was not a religious offense in the exact sense of the term: the Law of Moses had never forbidden them explicitly. The petasos was, indeed, the hat of the god Hermes, but it is questionable whether his statue or that of any other Greek god stood in the gymnasium building, as was customary in Greece, and even if they did, this offense against the commandment "Though shalt not make unto thee any graven image or any likeness..." was not yet real paganism, for the statues standing in the gymnasium (that is, not in a place consecrated by the local religious tradition) had no special cult significance."<sup>14</sup>

If we bear in mind that this was not a large scale reformation and that it applied only to limited circles in Jerusalem we can accept Tcherikover's suppositions as perfectly legitimate.

In fact, as we have shown, the hellenization of Judea and Jerusalem in particular was not systematic. But still Antiochus is known to have desecrated the Temple of Jerusalem and this act would totally justify the theories that he was attempting a forcible hellenization upon the Jews. The decisive argument in this connection is the rededication of the Temple of Jerusalem to Zeus Olympius instead

---

<sup>14</sup>Ibid., p. 166.



of the Yahweh. This clearly indicates that Antiochus imposed the Greek religion upon the Jews. The Jewish sources have shown their repugnance to this event by calling it the 'abomination of desolation'.<sup>15</sup> The analysis of this cardinal clause will lead us to the solution of the mystery which has caused so much controversy and argument. It will also make us understand the nature of the religion that Antiochus tried to impose upon the Jews.

The  $\beta\omicron\epsilon\lambda\upsilon\gamma\mu\alpha$  τῆς ἐρημώσεως of the first book of the Maccabees is derived from Daniel<sup>16</sup> and "is not a possible rendering of the Hebrew"<sup>17</sup> equivalent. But the Hebrew equivalent of the "abomination that causeth desolation or appalment", found in Daniel,<sup>18</sup> is a possible rendering of the Hebrew equivalent "and if correct, must imply that the heathen emblem standing in the court of the Temple was regarded as bringing with it the desertion and desolation of the sanctuary".<sup>19</sup> The corresponding Hebrew version found in Daniel is hashshiqquš m's homēm<sup>20</sup> or shiqquš shomēm.<sup>21</sup> The first word of this clause, namely abomination (shiqquš) was "almost exclusively confined in usage to objects connected with idolatry and was a contemptuous designation of a heathen god or idol".<sup>22</sup> Hence, it is clear now that abomination

<sup>15</sup> 1Macc.1:54. <sup>16</sup> Daniel 11:3;. Cf. 12:11, 9:27 and 8:13.

<sup>17</sup> S.R. Driver, The Book of Daniel (Cambridge: University Press, 1905), p. 188, n. 2.

<sup>18</sup> 11:31. <sup>19</sup> Driver, loc. cit. <sup>20</sup> 11:31

<sup>21</sup> Daniel 12:11.

<sup>22</sup> S.R. Driver, "Abomination of Desolation," Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, I (1898), p. 12.

was actually the altar or idol that was placed upon the sanctuary of the Temple by Antiochus in 167 B.C.

The second component of the abomination of desolation is more difficult to trace. Desolation (m<sup>e</sup>shomēm or shomēm) appears to be a deliberate perversion of the Phoenician word shamim which meant "heaven" and was applied to Baal shamim the Canaanite god of the sky.<sup>23</sup> The word shamim (Hebrew shamayim) was later pronounced as shamēm.<sup>24</sup> Therefore a distortion of the divine name shamim appears in the mysterious m<sup>e</sup>shomēm of Daniel or the variant shomēm.<sup>25</sup> Such intentional distortions were very common in Biblical or rabbinical Hebrew literature. For example Beth-el (House of El) was converted into Beth-Aven (house of iniquity),<sup>26</sup> Beelzebul (lord of dung)<sup>27</sup> into Beelzebub (lord of flies), Beth Galya (house of revelation) into Beth Karya (house of concealment),<sup>28</sup> En Kol (the all-seeing eye) into En Koz (the eye of a thorn)<sup>29</sup> and others. In reference to the intentional perversion of the heathen cults, it is mentioned in the Tosefta of the Talmud<sup>30</sup> that the Jewish rule required the renaming of all idol cults whose names were attached to a shrine.

Consequently the abomination of desolation was actually the abomination of Baal shamim, and as we have shown above<sup>31</sup> his equiv-

<sup>23</sup>Abel, op. cit., p. 68.    <sup>24</sup>Ibid.    <sup>25</sup>Ibid.

<sup>26</sup>Stanley A. Cook, The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology (London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1930), p. 189, n. 4.

<sup>27</sup>Mark 3:22.    <sup>28</sup>Abodah Zarah 46a.    <sup>29</sup>Ibid.

<sup>30</sup>Abodah Zarah 45b.    <sup>31</sup>See p.52 supra.

alent in the Greek pantheon was Zeus Olympius. The second book of the Maccabees<sup>32</sup> has indeed the Abomination of desolation as Zeus Olympius but the Syriac version of the same passage of the second Maccabees has been found to be the abomination (altar) of Baal of heaven.<sup>33</sup> Here again the Jewish epitomist of the second book of the Maccabees has used the Greek equivalent of Baal shamin because it would be better understood by his Greek readers. No doubt therefore it must be held that the abomination of desolation was actually the altar of Baal shamin. This decisively disproves all theories that Antiochus introduced into Jerusalem a Greek deity. He introduced a Semitic deity which was more easily identified by his subjects. It has also been suggested that the deity of Baal shamin "was more readily accepted by the Jews of the Diaspora".<sup>34</sup> This is very plausible, and if correct, then Antiochus had one more reason for introducing the Semitic cult into the Temple of Jerusalem.

But more controversy has arisen over the object that was placed upon the altar of the sanctuary of the Temple. The older view supported by Driver,<sup>35</sup> Bevan,<sup>36</sup> H.H. Rowley,<sup>37</sup> and others maintains that a statue or image of Antiochus was erected on the altar of the

---

<sup>32</sup>Macc.6:2.

<sup>33</sup>Driver, "Abomination of Desolation," Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, p. 13.

<sup>34</sup>Cook, op. cit., p. 189. <sup>35</sup>Driver, op. cit., p. 13.

<sup>36</sup>Edwyn Bevan, "A Note on Antiochus Epiphanes," Journal of Hellenic Studies, XX(1900), 26-30.

<sup>37</sup>H. H. Rowley, The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952), p. 74, n. 5.

Temple with the features of the king. Bickermann,<sup>38</sup> on the other hand, claims that there was no statue placed on the altar of burnt-offering but that the stones themselves of the heathen altar that was put up were given sacred qualities similar to the litholatric rites of the Arabs. Finally Abel,<sup>39</sup> Pfeiffer<sup>40</sup> and others support the statement made by Josephus<sup>41</sup> that "the king built an altar upon the altar of the Temple" without attributing any sacred qualities to the stone that was put on it.

The issue is confusingly complex in nature and needs careful consideration. Circumstantial evidence has led to the conclusion that the image of Antiochus was placed on the altar. It is mentioned in first Maccabees<sup>42</sup> that Antiochus ordered the construction of "altars, and temples and idols". Actually this is the only evidence for the construction of idols in the book of the Maccabees, and it is not certain whether it refers to the Temple of Jerusalem or to the surrounding cities. The other references<sup>43</sup> in the same book do not at all imply the same thing. It also can be added that the author in 1:47 wishes to place an emphasis on the measures imposed by Antiochus because the whole passage runs like a dirge rather than like a royal decree.

But more decisive than that is the evidence from Eusebius, Jerome

<sup>38</sup>Quoted by Dancy, op. cit., p. 79.    <sup>39</sup>Abel, op. cit., p. 68.

<sup>40</sup>Robert H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1949), p. 13.

<sup>41</sup>Josephus Antiq.XII.5.4.    <sup>42</sup>1Macc.1:47.

<sup>43</sup>1Macc.1:54, 59; 4:43 and 47.

and the Mishnah. Eusebius states that Antiochus "καὶ τὸν ναὸν βεβηγῶν  
 Διὸς Ὀλυμπίου βδέλυγμα ἀναστηώσας ἐν αὐτῷ".<sup>44</sup> But this can  
 hardly mean anything more than that "they built an abomination of  
 desolation upon the altar",<sup>45</sup> which is mentioned in the first  
 Maccabees. Ἀναστηώσας indeed points to something standing but a stone  
 can also be standing on the altar and be dedicated to Zeus. What is  
 actually meant here is that Antiochus "profaned the Temple by erecting  
 there the abomination of Zeus Olympius". Also it must be held in  
 mind that Eusebius was writing in the beginning of the fourth  
 century A. D. and did not take into account the Jewish literary distortions.

Jerome's commentary on Daniel<sup>46</sup> reproduces a reference by Porphyry  
 to this effect: "qui ab Antiocho missi sunt ut... in tempo Jerusalem  
 Jovis Olympii simulacrum et Antiochi statuas ponerent, quas nunc Abomi-  
 nationem vocat"<sup>47</sup> (Those who were sent by Antiochus to... place a cult-  
 image and the statues of Antiochus at the Temple of Zeus Olympius  
 in Jerusalem, which (statuas) one now calls abomination). As Abel<sup>48</sup>  
 has shown quas is an accusative plural which modifies the noun statuas  
 and not simulacrum. It appears, therefore, that Jerome understood a  
 cult of Antiochus represented by his statues and calls these statues  
 'abomination'. But the word abomination is reserved in usage only for  
 Zeus Olympius. Since the abomination is Baal shamin, then the statues  
 of Antiochus placed at the Temple are Jerome's own addition.

---

<sup>44</sup>Cited by Driver, The Book of Daniel, p. 188.

<sup>45</sup>1Macc.1:54. <sup>46</sup>11:31.

<sup>47</sup>Cited by Dancy, op. cit., p. 80. <sup>48</sup>Abel, op. cit., p. 67.

Finally in the Mishnah<sup>49</sup> it is mentioned that "On the 17th of Tammuz the Tables (of the Ten Commandments) were broken, and the Daily Whole-offering ceased, and the city was breached, and Apostomus burnt the (Scrolls of the) Law, and an idol was set up". Dancy is probably right in considering the evidence inadequate because of the difference in the date. In addition to this Apostomus is not known in Jewish history except that he was a Syrian general.<sup>50</sup> It has also been suggested that he may be Antiochus Epiphanes<sup>51</sup> himself, but that is purely hypothetical. The episode can very well be associated with other instances such as the incident described by Josephus in which one Roman soldier tore the Laws of Moses in one of the villages in Judea.<sup>52</sup> Or it may be connected with Hadrian's time,<sup>53</sup> or the Roman siege of Jerusalem, or even with Nebuchadnezzar.<sup>54</sup> The evidence provided is not entirely trustworthy because the Mishnah was written much later than the period under discussion, namely during the second century and the beginning of the third century A.D.

But the testimony on what was put as abomination of desolation on the altar of the Temple points in another direction. It is

<sup>49</sup>Taanith 4:6.

<sup>50</sup>Herbert Danby, The Mishnah (London: Oxford University Press, 1954), p. 200, n. 17.

<sup>51</sup>Louis Ginzberg, "Apostomus," The Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. Isidore Singer, II(1902), 21.

<sup>52</sup>Josephus Antiq.XX.5.4. <sup>53</sup>Ginzeberg, loc. cit.

<sup>54</sup>Danby, op. cit., p. 200, n. 15.

difficult to reject the statements made in 1:54 and 1:59 of the first Maccabees as well as in Josephus.<sup>55</sup> All three of them point out that an altar was put up on the sanctuary without any indication that there was a statue of Antiochus or a cult-image of Zeus with the king's characteristics. Antiochus was more intelligent than that and surely did not wish to impose upon the Jews a self-deification on the same grounds as Caligula attempted in 40 A.D. His choice of Baal shamin was a good one, because as we pointed out, it was more readily accepted by the Jewish diaspora and all the Semites in general.

On the other hand, a statue would have been too alien to the Jews. We must therefore reconsider the view that an altar was placed in Jerusalem. IMacc.1.54 which describes the abomination of desolation, mentions that altars were also to be placed in the surrounding cities of Judah. It follows that Jerusalem would be no exception. This again is supported by 1:59 where it is clearly stated that they sacrificed on the altar which was on the altar.

A more convincing proof can be found in a consideration of the construction of the altar. An altar as such was usually built out of heaps of earth or stone.<sup>56</sup> The Jewish altar of burnt-offering was made out of unhewn stone as the Law required.<sup>57</sup> The altar which Antiochus placed over the Jewish altar must have also been

---

<sup>55</sup>Antiq.XII.5.4.

<sup>56</sup>"Altar," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th ed., vol. I.

<sup>57</sup>André Parrot, The Temple of Jerusalem (London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957), p. 74.

made out of stones as it is indicated in the first Maccabees.<sup>58</sup> It is clearly stated that on the purification, in 164 B.C., the Jews "cleansed the holy place, and bare out the stones of defilement into an unclean place". This obviously shows that there was no cult-image or statue over the altar of burnt-offering but only an altar built out of stones. After the demolition of the heathen altar the Jews pulled down their own altar as well because it was considered unclean. "And they pulled down the altar, and laid up the stones in the mountain... and they took whole stones according to the Law, and built a new altar after the fashion of the former."<sup>59</sup>

But the difference of opinions arises now over the stones themselves. It is currently held by Bickermann that litholatric qualities were attached to the altar-stones that were placed there. These stones were known as baetyl and stood for a god thus becoming subject to worship. In other words Bickermann is trying to modify the traditional view and is introducing bomolatriy into the subject.<sup>60</sup> Bomolatriy he identifies with the altar that was erected over the altar of burnt-offering without any additional sacred object placed on top of it. In this manner the altar itself symbolised the god and the sacredness of the stones that were used to build it. As Dancy points out bomolatriy as well as litholatriy still persisted in the Semitic world during this period but Jewish stone (massebah) worship had disappeared from Palestine a long time before.<sup>61</sup> He also argues that there are very few cases known.

---

<sup>58</sup> 1Macc.4:43.      <sup>59</sup> 1Macc.4:46-47.

<sup>60</sup> See Dancy, op. cit., pp. 79-81.

<sup>61</sup> Ibid.



Nevertheless Bickermann's theory is not totally unjustified. I venture to add here one more point, in support of his theory, which may help us look a little deeper into the subject. Philo of Byblos, in connection with the Canaanite god of heaven Baal shamin, relates a passage in which the baetyls appear to be closely associated with the deity. "Ἐτι δὲ, φησὶν, ἔπειθ' ἔβηθε θεὸς οὐρανὸς βαρυμία, ἡθεὸς ἐφυλάχουσι ψυχὰν σάμενος."<sup>62</sup> It follows then that if as we have shown, Baal shamin was introduced into Jerusalem, it is possible that the worship of baetyls, which accompanies his cult, was also introduced. Litholatry was not strange among the Semites and since Antiochus introduced into Jerusalem a Semitic god it is very probable that he intended to go all the way with it. At any rate, it is hoped that in the future more decisive evidence will be found to solve the mystery.

To sum things up and return to the original argument, Antiochus introduced into Jerusalem a Semitic god and there is no support for the theories that he attempted to impose a Hellenic religion upon the Jews. His intention was to bring about a Semito-Hellenic amalgamation among the people of his empire and circumstances made it necessary for him to include the Jews in this ambitious scheme. This conviction is further supported by other considerations which have been pointed out. It is held that the architectural style of the Temple was not touched and therefore continued to bear Semitic characteristics.<sup>63</sup> Furthermore it is advocated that Antiochus forced the Jews to participate in the

---

<sup>62</sup> Carolus Müllerus, Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum (Parisiis: Editoribus Firmin - Didot et Sociis, 1883), III, 568, fragment 19.

<sup>63</sup> Bickermann quoted by Dancy, op. cit., p. 81.

Dionysiac festival.<sup>64</sup> Whatever the reliability of this statement may be the mere association of the festival rites with temple prostitution,<sup>65</sup> which was a purely Semitic practice, denotes that there was no pure Hellenization in the process.

On the other hand the sacrifice of swine on the altar, during the king's birthday,<sup>66</sup> should not be taken as an indication that Hellenization was carried out to the fullest extent. The sacrifice was undoubtedly held without Antiochus' full knowledge of that minor incident. The Syrian soldiers wishing to gratify their king thought of sacrificing swine on the new altar as a repercussion measure against the Jews. The exclusiveness obviously exasperated them and they reacted by doing something 'abominable' to them.

In addition to the previous theories it is also argued that Antiochus abolished Judaism and proscribed its practice throughout his empire. The disagreement arises over the passage in which it is mentioned that, "king Antiochus wrote to his whole people that all should be one people and that each should forsake his own laws".<sup>67</sup> But Antiochus, as we know,<sup>68</sup> dealt with his subjects with moderate liberality and tolerance. It is then naive to believe that he would have turned his whole empire upside down and would have imposed despotic social changes when they were only needed in Judea. The wrong impression which the previous statement may have created is

<sup>64</sup>2Macc.6:7.    <sup>65</sup>2Macc.6:4

<sup>66</sup>1Macc.1:59; 2Macc.6:7.    <sup>67</sup>1Macc.1:41. See introduction

<sup>68</sup>See p. 50    supra.

refuted by another passage which clearly indicates that Antiochus sent edicts only to Jerusalem and to Judah.<sup>69</sup> Moreover, the evidence in support of the theory that Antiochus denounced the Jewish religion in his whole empire, is entirely against it.

We never hear of any persecution against the Jews of the diaspora such as those in Babylon, Antioch, or Cilicia during Antiochus' period. Of course it is assumed that their brethren in the aforementioned places would have sympathised with them but it is not known of any occasion where they actively protested. Jewish prisoners of war were brought to Antioch during the Maccabean revolt<sup>70</sup> but this did not cause the extension of the persecution into the Seleucid capital.

Somewhat more convincing than this would be found if we examine the evidence concerning the Samaritans who were people akin to the Jews. "For we worship God no less than they (the Jews) and pray fervently to Him."<sup>71</sup> Indeed they observed the Torah and celebrated the Sabbath but were not really Jews. On the whole they were traditionally hostile towards their neighbours, or as Josephus<sup>72</sup> claims they acted in accordance with matters which were of political and economic importance to them. If the Jews were in good standing they sought to co-operate with them but if they were not they denounced any alliance or relationship with them. The same thing happened when the prohibition edict was sent to

<sup>69</sup>1Macc.1:44.

<sup>70</sup>Carl H. Kraeling, "The Jewish Community at Antioch," Journal of Biblical Literature, LI(1932), 134-135.

<sup>71</sup>Josephus Antiq.XI.4.3.    <sup>72</sup>Antiq.IX.14.3.

Judea and epistates were appointed by Antiochus in Jerusalem and Samaria.<sup>73</sup> However, the persecution did not spread to the Samaritans. At any rate they hastened to reaffirm their loyalty to Antiochus and sent envoys with the following letter:

"To king Antiochus Theos Epiphanes, a memorial from the Sidonians in Shechem. Our forefathers because of certain droughts in their country, and following a certain ancient superstition, made it a custom to observe the day which is called the Sabbath by the Jews, and they erected a temple without a name, on the mountain called Garizein, and there offered the appropriate sacrifices. Now you have dealt with the Jews as their wickedness deserves, but the king's officers, in the belief that we follow the same practices as they, through kinship with them, are involving us in similar charges, whereas we are Sidonians by origin, as is evident from our state documents. We therefore petition you as our benefactor and saviour to command Apollonius, the governor of the district, and Nicanor, the royal agent, not to molest us in any way by attaching to us the charges of which the Jews are guilty, since we are distinct from them both in race and in customs, and we ask that the temple without a name be known as that of Zeus Hellenios. For if this be done, we shall cease to be molested, and by applying ourselves to our work in security, we shall make your revenues greater."<sup>74</sup>

In reply to this letter Antiochus instructed Nicanor to allow the Samaritans to live according to their own tradition and permitted them to name their temple in honor of Zeus Hellenios.<sup>75</sup> In this manner the Sabbath was not forbidden nor were any other traditional

<sup>73</sup> See p. 82 supra.

<sup>74</sup> Josephus, Jewish Antiquities, trans. Ralph Marcus, VII (London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961), pp. 134-135. (Antiq.XII.5.5.)

<sup>75</sup> Josephus Antiq.XII.5.5. In 2Macc.6:2 it is mentioned that their temple was dedicated to Zeus Xenios which is generally held to be the correct naming. "The epithet Hellenios would be the probable choice only if the Samaritans were stressing their Greek sympathies while Xenios would be suitable whether they thought primarily of their Greek sympathies or their Phoenician origin." See Marcus, op. cit., p. 134, n. c.

practices which probably were derived from the Torah. Hence, the persecution against the Jews was confined to Judea and the practice of Judaism was allowed to continue in the rest of the Seleucid kingdom. After all many customs, such as circumcision, and refraining from eating pork, which were forbidden in Judea, were widely exercised by the other Semites.<sup>76</sup> "Antiochus behaved as the Spartans had towards Athens in 404: they abolished the democracy which had fought them by abolishing its constitution."<sup>77</sup> The measures were entirely political and aimed at achieving peace in the turbulent province of Judea.

---

<sup>76</sup>Dancy, op. cit., p. 74.

<sup>77</sup>Eddy, op. cit., p. 213.

## BIBLIOGRAPHY

### Ancient Sources

- Appian. Roman History. Translated by Horace White. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1955.
- Aristeas. The Letter of Aristeas. Translated by Andrews in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. Vol. II. Edited by R. H. Charles. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Athenaeus. The Deipnosophists. Translated by Charles Burton Gulick. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1928.
- Claudius. Letter to the Alexandrines. Translated by H. Idris Bell in his book Jews and Christians in Egypt. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.
- Daniel. The Book of Daniel. Edited by Rev. S. R. Driver. (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges) Cambridge: University Press, 1905.
- Diodorus. Diodorus of Sicily. Translated by Francis R. Walton. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1957.
- Isocrates. Panegyricus. Translated by Georges Mathieu and Emile Brémont. (Collection des Universités de France) Paris: Société d'Édition "Les Belles Lettres".
- John of Antioch. Edited in fragments by Carolus Mullerus in his work Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Vol. IV. Paris: Editoribus Firmin-Didot et Sociis, 1885.
- Josephus, Flavius. Against Apion. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Jewish Antiquities. Translated by Ralph Marcus. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Jewish War. Translated by H. St. J. Thackeray. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961.

- Justin. Abrégé des Histoires Philippiques des Trogue Pompée. Translated by E. Chambry and L. Thély - Chambry. (Classiques Garnier) Paris: Librairie Garnier Frères.
- Livy. Vol. XI. Translated by Evan T. Sage. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1949.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Vol. XII. Translated by Evan T. Sage and Alfred C. Schlesinger. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Vol. XIII. Translated by Alfred C. Schlesinger. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1951.
- 1 Maccabees. The First Book of Maccabees. Edited by Rev. W. Fairweather and J. Sutherland Black. (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges) Cambridge: University Press, 1908.
- 2 Maccabees. The Apocrypha. Translated out of the Greek and Latin Tongues. (Nelson's series) New York: Thomas Nelson and Sons, 1894.
- The Mishnah. Translated by Herbert Danby. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Nehemiah. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Edited by Herbert Edward Ryle. (The Cambridge Bible for Schools and Colleges) Cambridge: University Press, 1907.
- Philo of Alexandria. Flaccus. Translated by F. H. Colson. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1960.
- \_\_\_\_\_. De Vita Mosis. Translated by F. H. Colson. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1959.
- \_\_\_\_\_. Legatio ad Gaium. Translated by E. Mary Smallwood. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
- Philo of Byblos. Edited in fragments by Carolus Mullerus in his work Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Vol. III. Parisiis: Editoribus Firmin-Didot et Sociis, 1883.
- Polybius. The Histories. Translated by W. R. Paton. (The Loeb Classical Library) London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1954.
- Porphry. Edited in fragments by Carolus Mullerus in his work Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Vol. III. Parisiis: Editoribus Firmin-Didot et Sociis, 1883.
- Strabo. The Geography of Strabo. Translated by Horace Leonard Jones. (The Loeb Classical Library) Cambridge: Harvard University Press, 1954.

Modern Works

- Abel, F. M. Le Livres des Maccabées. Paris: Les Editions du Cerf, 1961.
- Baron, Salo Wittmayer. A Social and Religious History of the Jews. New York: Columbia University Press, 1937.
- Barrett, C. K. The New Testament Background: Selected Documents. London: S.P.C.K., 1961.
- Bell, H. Idris. Jews and Christians in Egypt. London: Oxford University Press, 1924.
- Bevan, Edwyn R. "Appendix E," The House of Seleucus. London: Edward Arnold, 1902.
- \_\_\_\_\_. A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty. London: Methuen and Co., Ltd., 1927.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The House of Seleucus. London: Edward Arnold, 1902.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Note 5: The Son of Seleucus IV," The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. VIII. London: Cambridge University Press, 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Syria and the Jews," The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. VIII. London: Cambridge University Press, 1928.
- Charles, R. H. The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament. London: Oxford Clarendon Press, 1913.
- Collingwood, R. G. The Idea of History. New York: Oxford University Press, 1956.
- Cook, Stanley A. The Religion of Ancient Palestine in the Light of Archaeology. London: Humphrey Milford, Oxford University Press, 1930.
- Danby, Herbert. The Mishnah. London: Oxford University Press, 1954.
- Dancy, J. C. A Commentary on I Maccabees. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1964.
- Davis, S. Race-Relations in Ancient Egypt. London: Methuen and Co. Ltd., 1953.



- Dittenberger, Wilhelmus. Orientis Graeci Inscriptiones Selectae. Lipsiae: Apud S. Hirzel, 1905.
- Downey, Glanville. A History of Antioch in Syria. Princeton, New Jersey: Princeton University Press, 1961.
- Driver, S. R. The Book of Daniel. Cambridge: University Press, 1905.
- Eddy, Samuel K. The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334 - 31 B.C. Lincoln: University of Nebraska Press, 1961.
- Fairweather, W., and Black, J. Sutherland. The First Book of Maccabees. Cambridge: University Press, 1908.
- Gardner, Percy. Catalogue of Greek Coins: The Seleucid Kings of Syria. London: n.n., 1878.
- Goodenough, Erwin R. The Jurisprudence of the Jewish Courts in Egypt. New Haven: Yale University Press, 1929.
- Griffith, G. T. The Mercenaries of the Hellenistic World. Cambridge: University Press, 1935.
- Guignebert, Charles. The Jewish World in the Time of Jesus. New York: University Books, 1959.
- Jouguet, Pierre. Macedonian Imperialism and the Hellenization of the East. Translated by M. R. Dobie. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trubner and Co., 1928.
- Marcus, Ralph. "Appendix C," Josephus: Jewish Antiquities. Vol. VI. London: William Heinemann Ltd., 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Appendix C," Josephus: Jewish Antiquities. Vol. VII. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1961.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Appendix D," Josephus: Jewish Antiquities. Vol. VII. London: William Heinemann, Ltd., 1961.
- Mullerus, Carolus. Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum. Vols. III and IV. Parisiis: Editoribus Firmin-Didot et Sociis, 1883-1885.
- Newel, Edward T. The Seleucid Mint of Antioch. New York: The American Numismatic Society, 1918.
- Parrot, André. The Temple of Jerusalem. London: SCM Press Ltd., 1957.

- Pfeiffer, Robert H. History of New Testament Times. London: Adam and Charles Black, n.d.
- Rostovtzeff, M. "Ptolemaic Egypt," The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. VII. London: Cambridge University Press, 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. "Syria and the East," The Cambridge Ancient History. Vol. VII. London: Cambridge University Press, 1928.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1941.
- Rowley, H. H. The Zadokite Fragments and the Dead Sea Scrolls. Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1952.
- Ryle, Herbert Edward. The Books of Ezra and Nehemiah. Cambridge: University Press, 1907.
- Schurer, Emil. A History of the Jewish People in the Time of Jesus Christ. Translated by Sophia Taylor and Rev. Peter Christie. Division II, vol. II. Edinburgh: T. and T. Clark, 1885.
- Smallwood, E. Mary. "Introduction," Philo: Legatio ad Caium. Leiden: E. J. Brill, 1961.
- Tarn, W. W. Alexander the Great. Cambridge: University Press, 1948.
- \_\_\_\_\_. The Greeks in Bactria and India. Cambridge: University Press, 1951.
- \_\_\_\_\_, and Griffith, G. T. Hellenistic Civilisation. 3rd ed. revised. London: Edward Arnold Ltd., 1959.
- Tcherikover, Victor. Hellenistic Civilisation and the Jews. Translated by S. Applebaum. Philadelphia: The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1961.
- Zeitlin, Solomon. Megillat Taanit as a Source for Jewish Chronology and History in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods. Philadelphia: n.n., 1922.

#### Periodicals

- Bevan, Edwyn. "A Note on Antiochus Epiphanes," Journal of Hellenic Studies, XX (1900), 26-30.
- Jones, H. Stuart, "Claudius and the Jewish Question at Alexandria," Journal of Roman Studies, XVI (1926), 17-35.

Kraeling, Carl H. "The Jewish Community at Antioch," Journal of Biblical Literature. LI (1932), 130-160.

Dictionaries and Encyclopaedias

Driver, S. R. "Abomination of Desolation," Hastings Dictionary of the Bible, I (1898), 12-13.

"Altar," Encyclopaedia Britannica, 14th ed., vol. I.

Ginzberg, Louis. "Apostomus," The Jewish Encyclopedia, ed. Isidore Singer, II (1902), 21.

Lidell and Scott. "ἄλτῆς," Greek-English Lexicon. London: Oxford University Press, 1958.