

A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period

Volume 2

The Coming of the Greeks: The Early Hellenistic Period (335–175 BCE)

Lester L. Grabbe



LIBRARY OF SECOND TEMPLE STUDIES

68

formerly the Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha Supplement Series

Editor

Lester L. Grabbe

Editorial Board

Randall D. Chesnutt, Philip R. Davies, Jan Willem van Henten,
Judith M. Lieu, Steven Mason, James R. Mueller, Loren T. Stuckenbruck,
James C. VanderKam

Founding Editor

James H. Charlesworth

To my girls

Heather
Claudia
Allegra

A History of the Jews And Judaism
in the Second Temple Period
Volume 2

The Early Hellenistic Period (335–175 BCE)

Lester L. Grabbe



Arts & Humanities
Research Council



t & t clark

Published by T&T Clark *A Continuum imprint*
The Tower Building, 11 York Road, London SE1 7NX
80 Maiden Lane, Suite 704, New York, NY 10038

www.continuumbooks.com

All rights reserved. No part of this publication may be reproduced or transmitted in any form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying, recording or any information storage or retrieval system, without permission in writing from the publishers.

Copyright © Lester L. Grabbe, 2008

Lester L. Grabbe has asserted his right under the Copyright, Designs and Patents Act, 1988, to be identified as Author of this work.

British Library Cataloguing-in-Publication Data
A catalogue record for this book is available from the British Library

ISBN-10: HB: 0-567-03396-1
ISBN-13: HB: 978-0-567-03396-3

Typeset by Data Standards Ltd, Frome, Somerset
Printed on acid-free paper in Great Britain by Biddles Ltd, King's Lynn, Norfolk

CONTENTS

Preface	xii
List of Abbreviations	xiv

Part I INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1	
INTRODUCTION: PRINCIPLES AND METHOD	2
1.1 Aims	2
1.2 The Basis for the Chronology of the Early Hellenistic Period	2
1.3 Diaspora	3
1.4 The Relevance of Post-Colonial Theory	5
1.5 History Writing in the Ancient World	8
1.5.1 The Question of Definitions	9
1.5.2 Greek Historical Writing	11
1.5.3 Did the Graeco-Roman Historians Aim for Historical Accuracy?	16
1.5.4 Critical Historical Thinking among the Jews	18
1.5.5 Conclusions	21
1.6 Writing a History of the Early Greek Period: Principles Assumed in this Book	23
1.7 Terminology and Other Technical Matters	24

Part II SOURCES

Chapter 2	
ARCHAEOLOGY	27
2.1 Individual Sites	27
2.1.1 Tel Dan	27
2.1.2 Tel Anafa	28
2.1.3 Ptolemais/Akko (Tell Fukhar)	28
2.1.4 Shiqmona	29
2.1.5 Philoteria (Beth Yerah, Khirbet el-Kerak)	29
2.1.6 Beth-Shean/Scythopolis	29

2.1.7 Tel Dor	30
2.1.8 Tel Mevorakh	30
2.1.9 Tel Dothan	31
2.1.10 Samaria	31
2.1.11 Shechem (Tell Balâtah)	32
2.1.12 Apollonia (Arsuf; Tell Arshaf)	33
2.1.13 Tel Michal (Makmish)	33
2.1.14 Jaffa (Joppo)	34
2.1.15 Gezer (Tell Jezer)	34
2.1.16 Bethel	35
2.1.17 Tell es-Sultan (Jericho)	35
2.1.18 Jerusalem and Vicinity	35
2.1.19 Qalandiyeh	36
2.1.20 Ashdod (Azotus)	37
2.1.21 Ashkelon (Ascalon)	37
2.1.22 Tell el-Hesi	37
2.1.23 Beth-Zur	38
2.1.24 En-gedi (Tel Goren, Tell el-Jurn)	38
2.1.25 Tel Maresha (Tell eş-Şandaḥanna)	39
2.1.26 Lachish	40
2.1.27 Tell Jemmeh	40
2.1.28 Arad	41
2.1.29 Beersheba (Tel Sheva, Tell es-Sabaʿ)	41
2.1.30 ʿIraq al-Amir	41
2.1.31 Rabbath-Ammon (Philadelphia)	43
2.1.32 Gadara (Umm Qeis)	43
2.1.33 Pella (Tabaqat Fahl)	43
2.2 Surveys and Synthesis	44
2.2.1 Introductory Comments	44
2.2.2 The Galilee, Samaria, Idumaea and Transjordan	46
2.2.3 Judah	48

Chapter 3

PAPYRI, INSCRIPTIONS AND COINS	51
3.1 Papyri, Inscriptions and Ostraca from Egypt and Elsewhere	51
3.1.1 Elephantine Papyri	51
3.1.2 Zenon Papyri	52
3.1.3 Papyri of the Jewish Politeuma at Heracleopolis	53
3.1.4 Papyri Relating to the Village of Samareia	53
3.1.5 Other Collections of Texts	54
3.2 Papyri, Inscriptions and Ostraca from Palestine	55
3.2.1 Decree of Ptolemy II	55
3.2.2 Hefzibah Inscription (Antiochus III and <i>Stratēgos</i> Ptolemy son of Thraseas)	56
3.2.3 Heliodorus Stela	57
3.2.4 Seleucid Inscription of Ptolemy V	58

3.2.5 Khirbet el-Kom Ostraca	58
3.2.6 Maresha Inscriptions and Ostraca	59
3.2.7 Other Texts	59
3.3 Coins and Weights	60
3.4 Seals	62
Chapter 4	
JEWISH LITERARY SOURCES	65
4.1 The Greek Translation of the Bible	65
4.2 Josephus	68
4.2.1 Aids to Using Josephus	69
4.2.2 Josephus' Writings	70
4.2.3 Evaluation of Josephus as a Historian	73
4.2.4 Using Josephus as a Historical Source for the Early Greek Period	74
4.3 Story of the Tobiads	75
4.4 Qohelet (Ecclesiastes)	78
4.5 <i>Ethiopic Enoch</i> (<i>1 Enoch</i>) and the Book of Giants	81
4.6 Fragmentary Jewish Writings in Greek	84
4.6.1 Demetrius the Chronographer	85
4.6.2 Eupolemus and Pseudo-Eupolemus	86
4.6.3 Artapanus	89
4.6.4 Ezekiel the Dramatist	90
4.6.5 Aristobulus	92
4.6.6 Philo the Epic Poet	93
4.6.7 Theodotus	94
4.7 Tobit	94
4.8 <i>Third Maccabees</i>	96
4.9 <i>Aramaic Levi Document</i>	98
4.10 Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus)	100
4.11 Daniel	102
4.12 The Sibylline Oracles	107
4.13 <i>First Baruch</i>	110
Chapter 5	
GREEK AND LATIN WRITERS	111
5.1 The Alexander Historians	111
5.2 Hecataeus of Abdera	113
5.2.1 Introduction	114
5.2.2 Is Diodorus 40.3 Authentic Hecataeus?	114
5.2.3 Conclusions	117
5.3 Diodorus Siculus	119
5.4 Polybius	120
5.5 Porphyry	121
5.6 Appian	121
5.7 Plutarch	121

5.8 Berossus	122
5.9 Manetho	122

Part III

SOCIETY AND INSTITUTIONS

Chapter 6

HELLENISM AND JEWISH IDENTITY	125
6.1 The Problem: Hellenization, the Jews and the Ancient Near East	125
6.2 History of the Discussion	126
6.2.1 Earlier Discussion	126
6.2.1.1 The 'Old View'	126
6.2.1.2 E.J. Bickerman	127
6.2.1.3 V.A. Tcherikover	127
6.2.2 Hengel and his Critics	128
6.2.2.1 Martin Hengel	128
6.2.2.2 Louis H. Feldman	130
6.2.2.3 Arnaldo Momigliano	131
6.2.2.4 Fergus Millar	132
6.2.2.5 Conclusions with Regard to Hengel	132
6.2.3 Recent Discussions	133
6.2.3.1 Morton Smith	133
6.2.3.2 Amélie Kuhrt, Susan Sherwin-White and Pierre Briant	134
6.2.3.3 Lester Grabbe	135
6.2.3.4 Erich Gruen	135
6.2.3.5 Rabbinic Connections	135
6.3 Hellenism in the Ancient Near East	136
6.3.1 Selected Examples	136
6.3.1.1 Egypt	136
6.3.1.2 Babylonia	137
6.3.1.3 Phoenicia	138
6.3.1.4 Pergamum	139
6.3.1.5 Nabataeans	140
6.3.2 Features of Hellenism	140
6.3.2.1 The Transplanted Greek <i>Polis</i>	141
6.3.2.2 Language	142
6.3.2.3 Jewish Names	144
6.3.2.4 Religion	146
6.3.2.5 Art and Architecture	147
6.3.2.6 The Archaeology of Palestine	148
6.3.3 Resistance to Hellenism	149
6.4 Hellenism and the Jews: The Question of Jewish Identity	151
6.4.1 The Theory of Ethnic Identity	151
6.4.2 Who was a <i>Ioudaios</i> ?	153
6.4.3 Jewish Views about Hellenism in Pre-Hasmonaeon Times	155
6.4.3.1 Examples	155

6.4.3.2 Objections	156
6.4.3.3 Conclusions	158
6.5 Synthesis	159
6.5.1 Hellenization in General	159
6.5.2 The Jews in Particular	163
 Chapter 7	
ADMINISTRATION	166
7.1 Administration in the Hellenistic Empires	166
7.1.1 Ptolemaic Government and Administration	166
7.1.2 Seleucid Government and Administration	170
7.1.3 Coele-Syria	173
7.1.3.1 General Comments	173
7.1.3.2 The Galilee, Samaria and Idumaea	176
7.1.3.3 Transjordan	180
7.2 Government and Administration among the Jews	181
7.2.1 Jews in Egypt, Syria and Asia Minor: The Question of <i>Politeumata</i>	181
7.2.2 The Administration of Judah	185
7.3 Conclusions	191
 Chapter 8	
SOCIETY AND DAILY LIFE	193
8.1 Introduction	193
8.2 Occupations, Class and Everyday Life	195
8.3 The Legal Sphere	197
8.3.1 The Ptolemaic Legal System	198
8.3.2 The Jews in Legal Documents	199
8.3.3 Jewish Women in Legal Documents	202
8.4 Summary	203
 Chapter 9	
ECONOMY	205
9.1 Current Debate on the Ancient Economy	205
9.2 The Economy in Ptolemaic Egypt	208
9.3 The Seleucid Economy	213
9.4 The Economy in Palestine	214
9.5 The Economy in Relation to the Jews	218
9.5.1 Jewish Settlers in Egypt	219
9.5.2 Economic Developments in Judah	219
9.5.2.1 Participation in the Military	221
9.5.2.2 Contribution of the Tobiads	222
9.5.2.3 Jerusalem Amphorae	223
9.5.2.4 Summary	224

Chapter 10	
RELIGION I: TEMPLE, CULT AND PRACTICE	225
10.1 The High Priest	225
10.2 The Question of 'the Sanhedrin'	229
10.3 Synagogues and Prayer	234
10.4 Zadokite versus Enochic Judaism?	238
10.5 Summary	243
Chapter 11	
RELIGION II: LAW, SCRIPTURE AND BELIEF	245
11.1 The Development of 'Scripture'	245
11.1.1 Growth of the 'Canon'	245
11.1.2 The Biblical Text	247
11.2 The Septuagint Translation of the Bible	253
11.3 Beliefs	254
11.3.1 The Deity	255
11.3.2 Angelic Beings	256
11.3.3 Eschatology	258
11.3.4 Messiah	259
11.3.5 Sceptical Wisdom	260
11.4 Prophecy and Apocalyptic	260
11.5 Summary	262
Part IV	
HISTORICAL SYNTHESIS	
Chapter 12	
TIME OF ALEXANDER AND THE DIADOCHI (335–280 BCE)	267
12.1 Background History	267
12.1.1 Alexander and his Conquests (336–323 BCE)	268
12.1.2 The Diadochi (323–281 BCE)	271
12.1.3 Ptolemy I Soter (323–282 BCE)	274
12.2 Alexander the Great and the Jews	274
12.3 Judah during the 'Wars of the Successors'	278
12.3.1 First Phase of Fighting (323–318 BCE)	278
12.3.2 Second Phase, to the Battle of Gaza (317–312 BCE)	279
12.3.3 The Final Stages, to the Battle of Ipsus and Beyond (311–281 BCE)	280
12.4 Ptolemy I and the Jews	281
12.5 Hecataeus of Abdera on the Jews	283
12.6 Summary	286
Chapter 13	
THE PTOLEMAIC PERIOD (280–205 BCE)	288
13.1 Background History	288
13.1.1 Overview	288

13.1.2 Ptolemy II Philadelphus (282–246 BCE)	289
13.1.3 Ptolemy III Euergetes I (246–221 BCE)	290
13.1.4 Ptolemy IV Philopator (221–204 BCE)	291
13.2 Jews under the Ptolemies	291
13.3 Tobiads and Oniads	293
13.4 Fourth Syrian War (219–217 BCE)	298
13.5 Daily Life	302
13.5.1 In Egypt	302
13.5.2 In Palestine	303
13.6 Religious Developments in the Third Century	303
13.6.1 Development of ‘Scripture’	303
13.6.2 Translation of the Septuagint	305
13.6.3 The ‘Mantic’ versus the ‘Sceptical’ World-view	306
13.6.4 Historiography: A Continuing Jewish Literary Tradition	311
13.7 Summary and Conclusions	313
Chapter 14	
EARLY SELEUCID RULE (205–175 BCE)	316
14.1 Background History	316
14.1.1 Philip V of Macedonia (238–179 BCE)	317
14.1.2 Antiochus III ‘the Great’ (223–187 BCE)	317
14.1.3 Ptolemy V Theos Epiphanes (204–180 BCE)	319
14.1.4 Seleucus IV Philopator (187–175 BCE)	319
14.2 Fifth Syrian War (c.202–199 BCE): Palestine Becomes Seleucid	319
14.3 Judah after the Seleucid Conquest	322
14.3.1 Overview	323
14.3.2 Edict of Antiochus III regarding Jerusalem	324
14.3.3 Antiochus III’s Decree on the Hefzibah Stela (<i>SEG</i> 29.1613)	326
14.3.4 Letter of Antiochus III to Zeuxis	327
14.3.5 Heliodorus and the Incident in the Jerusalem Temple	328
14.4 Summary	328
Part V	
CONCLUSIONS	
Chapter 15	
THE EARLY HELLENISTIC PERIOD – A HOLISTIC PERSPECTIVE	331
Bibliography	337
Indexes	397
Names and subjects	397
Citations	416
Modern scholars	427

PREFACE

This is the second of four projected volumes on the history of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple period. If we thought we had problems with our knowledge of the Persian period, the early Hellenistic period exceeds them, I believe. This has certainly been a harder book to write than Volume 1. Yet there is a great deal of new work being done. I completed the manuscript of *JCH* in 1990. Of the thousand (approximately) items in the bibliography, I calculate that a good half are from 1990 or later.

It was possible to write this book because of a semester's study leave granted to me by the University of Hull and a matching semester funded by the Arts and Humanities Research Council (www.ahrc.ac.uk) of the UK. Professor John Rogerson of the University of Sheffield once again kindly acted as a referee for my grant application to the AHRC (as he had with regard to *HJJSTP* 1). Also very beneficial to me in the last stages of finishing this book was the conference, 'Judah in Transition: From the Late Persian to the Early Hellenistic Period', that Oded Lipschits and I organized in Tel Aviv in April 2007. I learned a great deal from the papers and, especially, from private conversations with individuals at that conference. I wish to thank the Academic Study Group for Israel and the Middle East (executive director John Levy) and the AHRC for help with funding to attend this conference.

In any work of this sort the author owes a great debt of gratitude to many people who have helped in some way. At the risk of omitting one or more obvious individuals – to whom I apologize in advance – I would like to thank the following who sent me offprints or books, discussed the topic with me, or otherwise made a contribution: Pierre Briant, George Brooke, Shaye J.D. Cohen, Hannah Cotton, Philip R. Davies, Kristin De Troyer, Esther and Hanan Eshel, Alexander Fantalkin, Dov Gera, Martin Goodman, Eric Gruen, Sylvie Honigman, Pieter van der Horst, Amos Kloner, Michael Knibb, Amélie Kuhrt, Armin Lange, André Lemaire, Oded Lipschits, Doran Mendels, Eric Meyers, Menahem Mor, Jacob Neusner, George Nickelsburg, Bezalel Porten, Jonathan Price, Tessa Rajak, John Ray, Ronnie Reich, Stefan Reif, Deborah Rooke, Daniel Schwartz, Ilan Sharon, Joseph Sievers, Ephraim Stern, Michael Stone, Loren Stuckenbruck, Oren Tal, Shemaryahu Talmon, Emanuel Tov, Eugene Ulrich, David Ussishkin, James VanderKam, John Wevers, Benjamin Wright. I would also like to thank Andrew Wilson,

Professor of Archaeology in the Roman World at the University of Oxford, with whom I had a number of discussions about the ancient economy.

Finally, this book is dedicated to ‘my girls’: my daughter Dr Heather M.C. Grabbe and my granddaughters Claudia Elizabeth Grabbe Wilson and Allegra Francesca Christina Wilson.

Kingston-upon-Hull
5 November 2007

ABBREVIATIONS

AASOR	Annual of the American Schools of Oriental Research
AAWG	Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen
AB	Anchor Bible
ABD	David Noel Freedman (ed.) (1992) <i>Anchor Bible Dictionary</i>
AfO	<i>Archiv für Orientforschung</i>
AGAJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AIEJL	T.C. Vriezen and A.S. van der Woude (2005) <i>Ancient Israelite and Early Jewish Literature</i>
AJA	<i>American Journal of Archaeology</i>
AJAH	<i>American Journal of Ancient History</i>
AJBA	<i>Australian Journal of Biblical Archaeology</i>
AJP	<i>American Journal of Philology</i>
AJS Review	<i>American Jewish Studies Review</i>
AJSL	<i>American Journal of Semitic Languages</i>
ALD	<i>Aramaic Levi Document</i>
ALGHJ	<i>Arbeiten zur Literatur und Geschichte des hellenistischen Judentums</i>
A.M.	<i>anno mundi</i> , a dating system which begins with the supposed date of the world's creation
AnBib	<i>Analecta biblica</i>
AncSoc	<i>Ancient Society</i>
ANET	J. B. Pritchard (ed.) <i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament</i>
AnOr	<i>Analecta orientalia</i>
ANRW	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt</i>
Ant.	Josephus, <i>Antiquities of the Jews</i>
AP	A. Cowley (1923) <i>Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.</i>
ARAV	R. Arav (1989) <i>Hellenistic Palestine: Settlement Patterns and City Planning, 337–31 B.C.E.</i>
ASORAR	American Schools of Oriental Research Archaeological Reports
ASTI	<i>Annual of the Swedish Theological Institute</i>

<i>ATR</i>	<i>Anglican Theological Review</i>
<i>AUSS</i>	<i>Andrews University Seminary Studies</i>
AUSTIN	M.M. Austin (2006) <i>The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation</i>
b.	son of (Hebrew <i>ben</i> ; Aramaic <i>bar</i>)
<i>BA</i>	<i>Biblical Archeologist</i>
BAGNALL/DEROW	R.S. Bagnall and P. Derow (eds) (2004) <i>The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation</i>
<i>BAR</i>	<i>Biblical Archaeology Review</i>
<i>BASOR</i>	<i>Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research</i>
BCE	Before the Common Era (= BC)
<i>BCH</i>	<i>Bulletin de Correspondance Hellénique</i>
BETL	<i>Bibliotheca Ephemeridum Theologicarum Lovaniensium</i>
<i>BHS</i>	<i>Biblia Hebraica Stuttgartensis</i>
<i>Bib</i>	<i>Biblica</i>
BibOr	<i>Biblica et orientalia</i>
<i>BJRL</i>	<i>Bulletin of the John Rylands Library</i>
BJS	<i>Brown Judaic Studies</i>
<i>BO</i>	<i>Bibliotheca Orientalis</i>
<i>BSOAS</i>	<i>Bulletin of the School of Oriental and African Study</i>
<i>BTB</i>	<i>Biblical Theology Bulletin</i>
BURSTEIN	S.M. Burstein (1985) <i>The Hellenistic Age from the Battle of Ipsus to the Death of Kleopatra VII</i>
<i>BZ</i>	<i>Biblische Zeitschrift</i>
BZAW	Beihefte zur <i>ZAW</i>
BZNW	Beihefte zur <i>ZNW</i>
<i>CAH</i>	<i>Cambridge Ancient History</i>
<i>CBQ</i>	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly</i>
CBQMS	<i>Catholic Biblical Quarterly Monograph Series</i>
CCL	<i>Corpus Christianorum Latina</i>
CE	Common Era (= AD)
CEJL	<i>Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature</i>
<i>CHCL</i>	P.E. Easterling et al. (eds) (1982–85) <i>Cambridge History of Classical Literature</i>
<i>CHI</i>	<i>Cambridge History of Iran</i>
<i>CHJ</i>	W.D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds) (1984–) <i>Cambridge History of Judaism</i>
ConBOT	<i>Conjectanea biblica, Old Testament</i>
<i>CP</i>	<i>Classical Philology</i>
<i>CPJ</i>	V.A. Tcherikover et al. (1957–64) <i>Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum</i>
<i>CQ</i>	<i>Classical Quarterly</i>
<i>CR: BS</i>	<i>Currents in Research: Biblical Studies</i>
<i>CRAIBL</i>	<i>Comptes rendus de l'Académie des inscriptions et belles-lettres</i>

CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSCT	Columbia Studies in Classical Texts
DDD/DDD ²	K. van der Toorn, B. Becking, and P.W. van der Horst (eds) <i>Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible</i> (1st edn, 1995 = DDD; 2nd edn, 1999 = DDD ²)
DJD	Discoveries in the Judaean Desert
DSD	<i>Dead Sea Discoveries</i>
DURAND	X. Durand (1997) <i>Des Grecs en Palestine au III^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ: Le dossier syrien des archives de Zénon de Caunos (261–252)</i>
EI	<i>Eretz-Israel</i>
ESHM	European Seminar in Historical Methodology
ET	English translation
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
FGH	Felix Jacoby (1926–58) <i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i>
FoSub	Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam pertinentes
FOTL	Forms of Old Testament Literature
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments
FS	Festschrift
GCS	Griechische christliche Schriftsteller
GLAJJ	M. Stern, <i>Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism</i>
GRBS	<i>Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies</i>
HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HCS	Hellenistic Culture and Society
HdA	Handbuch der Archäologie
HdO	Handbuch der Orientalistik
HJJSTP 1	L.L. Grabbe (2004) <i>A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 1: Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah</i>
HJJSTP 2	The current volume
HJJSTP 3	Forthcoming volume on the Maccabean period
HJJSTP 4	Forthcoming volume on the Roman period
HR	<i>History of Religions</i>
HSCP	<i>Harvard Studies in Classical Philology</i>
HSM	Harvard Semitic Monographs
HSS	Harvard Semitic Studies
HTR	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
HUCA	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
IAA	Israel Antiquities Authority
ICC	International Critical Commentary
IDB	G.A. Buttrick (ed.) (1962) <i>Interpreter's Dictionary of the Bible</i>
IDBSup	Supplementary volume to IDB (1976)
IEJ	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>

<i>INJ</i>	<i>Israel Numismatic Journal</i>
<i>INR</i>	<i>Israel Numismatic Research</i>
<i>Int</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
<i>IOS</i>	<i>Israel Oriental Studies</i>
<i>ITQ</i>	<i>Irish Theological Quarterly</i>
<i>JAAR</i>	<i>Journal of the American Academy of Religion</i>
<i>JANES</i>	<i>Journal of the Ancient Near Eastern Society of Columbia University</i>
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JCH</i>	L.L. Grabbe (1992) <i>Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian</i> , 2 vols with continuous pagination
<i>JCS</i>	<i>Journal of Cuneiform Studies</i>
<i>JEA</i>	<i>Journal of Egyptian Archaeology</i>
<i>JES</i>	<i>Journal of Ecumenical Studies</i>
<i>JHS</i>	<i>Journal of Hellenic Studies</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JLBM</i>	G.W.E. Nickelsburg (2005) <i>Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
<i>JR</i>	<i>Journal of Religion</i>
<i>JRS</i>	<i>Journal of Roman Studies</i>
<i>JRSTP</i>	L.L. Grabbe (2000) <i>Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period</i>
<i>JSHRZ</i>	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSJSup</i>	Supplements to <i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
<i>JSNT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the New Testament</i>
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
<i>JSOTSup</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament – Supplementary Series</i>
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSPSup</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha – Supplementary Series</i>
<i>JSS</i>	<i>Journal of Semitic Studies</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
<i>JWSTP</i>	M.E. Stone (ed.) (1984) <i>Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period</i>
<i>KAI</i>	H. Donner and W. Röllig <i>Kanaanäische und aramäische Inschriften</i>
<i>KAT</i>	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>KTU</i>	M. Dietrich, O. Loretz and J. Sanmartin (eds) (1976) <i>Die keilalphabetischen Texte aus Ugarit</i>
<i>LCL</i>	Loeb Classical Library
<i>LHBOTS</i>	Library of Hebrew Bible/Old Testament Studies

LSTS	Library of Second Temple Studies
LXX	Septuagint translation of the OT
MGWJ	<i>Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>
ms(s)	manuscript(s)
MT	Masoretic textual tradition (only the consonantal text is in mind when reference is made to pre-mediaeval mss)
NEA	<i>Near Eastern Archaeology</i>
NEAEHL	E. Stern (ed.) (1993) <i>The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land</i>
NIGTC	New International Greek Testament Commentary
NovT	<i>Novum Testamentum</i>
NovTSup	Novum Testamentum, Supplements
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
NTS	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OBO	Orbis Biblicus et Orientalis
OCD	S. Hornblower and A. Spawforth (eds) (1996) <i>The Oxford Classical Dictionary</i> (3rd edn)
OEANE	E.M. Meyers (ed.) (1997) <i>The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East</i>
OGIS	W. Dittenberger (1903–1905) <i>Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae</i>
OLA	Orientalia Lovaniensia Analecta
OT	Old Testament/Hebrew Bible
OTG	Old Testament Guides
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTP 1, 2	J. H. Charlesworth (ed.) (1983–85) <i>Old Testament Pseudepigrapha</i>
OTS	<i>Oudtestamentische Studiën</i>
PAAJR	<i>Proceedings of the American Academy of Jewish Research</i>
P. Col. Zen. 1	W.L. Westermann and E.S. Hasenoehtl (eds) (1934) <i>Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century before Christ dealing with Palestine and Egypt I</i>
P. Col. Zen. 2	W. L. Westermann, C.W. Keyes and E.S. Hasenoehtl (eds) (1940) <i>Zenon Papyri: Business Papers of the Third Century before Christ dealing with Palestine and Egypt II</i>
PCZ	[= <i>P. Cairo Zenon</i>] C.C. Edgar (ed.) (1925–40) <i>Zenon Papyri I–V</i>
PEQ	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
P. Lond.	T.C. Skeat (1974) <i>Greek Papyri in the British Museum (now in the British Library): VII The Zenon Archive</i>
P. Polit. Iud.	J.M.S. Cowey and K. Maresch (eds) (2001) <i>Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Herakleopolis (144/3–133/2 v. Chr.)</i>
PSI 4–9	G. Vitelli (ed.) (1917–29) <i>Papiri Greci e Latini</i>

<i>P. Teb.</i>	Tebtunis Papyri (B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt and J.G. Smyly [eds] [1902] <i>The Tebtunis Papyri, Part I</i> ; B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt [eds] [1907] <i>The Tebtunis Papyri, Part II</i> ; A.S. Hunt and J.G. Smyly [eds] [1933] <i>The Tebtunis Papyri, Volume III, Part I</i> and A.S. Hunt, J.G. Smyly and C.C. Edgar [eds] [1938] <i>The Tebtunis Papyri, Volume III, Part II</i> ; J.G. Keenan and J.C. Shelton [eds] [1976] <i>The Tebtunis Papyri, Volume IV</i>)
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti graece
<i>PW</i>	Georg Wissowa and Wilhelm Kroll (eds) (1894–1972) <i>Pauly's Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft</i>
<i>PWSup</i>	Supplement to <i>PW</i>
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>
<i>RC</i>	C.B. Welles (1934) <i>Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy</i>
REB	Revised English Bible
<i>REG</i>	<i>Revue des études grecs</i>
<i>REJ</i>	<i>Revue des études juives</i>
<i>RevQ</i>	<i>Revue de Qumran</i>
<i>RSR</i>	<i>Religious Studies Review</i>
RSV	Revised Standard Version
SANE	Studies on the Ancient Near East
<i>SAWH</i>	<i>Sitzungsbericht der Akademie der Wissenschaften zu Heidelberg</i>
<i>SB</i>	F. Preisigke et al. (1915–) <i>Sammelbuch griechischen Urkunden aus Ägypten.</i>
SBL	Society of Biblical Literature
SBLASP	SBL Abstracts and Seminar Papers
SBLBMI	SBL Bible and its Modern Interpreters
SBLDS	SBL Dissertation Series
SBLEJL	SBL Early Judaism and its Literature
SBLMS	SBL Monograph Series
SBLSBS	SBL Sources for Biblical Study
SBLSCS	SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSPS	SBL Seminar Papers Series
SBLTT	SBL Texts and Translations
SC	Sources chrétiennes
SCHÜRER	E. Schürer (1973–87) <i>The Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ</i> (rev. G. Vermes et al.)
<i>SCI</i>	<i>Scripta Classica Israelica</i>
<i>ScrHier</i>	<i>Scripta Hierosolymitana</i>
<i>SEG</i>	<i>Supplementum epigraphicum graecum</i>
<i>Sel. Pap. 1, 2</i>	A.S. Hunt and C.C. Edgar (eds) (1932) <i>Select Papyri 1: Private Affairs</i> ; (1934); <i>Select Papyri 2: Official Documents</i> ; cited by text number

SFSHJ	South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism
SFSJH	South Florida Studies in Jewish History
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SJOT</i>	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SJLA	Studies in Judaism in Late Antiquity
<i>SHAJ</i>	<i>Studies in the History and Archaeology of Jordan</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies Monograph Series
SP	Samaritan Pentateuch
<i>SPA</i>	<i>Studia Philonica Annual</i>
SPB	Studia postbiblica
<i>SR</i>	<i>Studies in Religion/Sciences religieuses</i>
SSAW	Sitzungsbericht der sächsischen Akademie der Wissenschaften
STDJ	Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah
SUNT	Studien zur Umwelt des Neuen Testaments
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigrapha
<i>TAD</i> 1–4	Bezalel Porten and Ada Yardeni (1986–99) <i>Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt: 1–4</i>
<i>TAPA</i>	<i>Transactions of the American Philological Association</i>
<i>TDNT</i>	G. Kittel and G. Friedrich (eds) (1964–76) <i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i>
<i>TLZ</i>	<i>Theologische Literaturzeitung</i>
<i>Trans</i>	<i>Transeuphratène</i>
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
<i>TSSI</i>	J.C.L. Gibson (1971–87) <i>Textbook of Syrian Semitic Inscriptions</i>
TT	Texts and Translations
TU	Texte und Untersuchungen
<i>TWAT</i>	G.J. Botterweck and H. Ringgren (eds) (1970–) <i>Theologische Wörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i>
<i>VC</i>	<i>Vigiliae Christianae</i>
<i>VT</i>	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Vetus Testamentum, Supplements
WBC	Word Bible Commentary
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
<i>YCS</i>	<i>Yale Classical Studies</i>
<i>ZA</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Assyriologie</i>
<i>ZAW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZDMG</i>	<i>Zeitschrift der Deutschen Morganländischen Gesellschaft</i>
<i>ZDPV</i>	<i>Zeitschrift des Deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
<i>ZNW</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für die Neutestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
<i>ZPE</i>	<i>Zeitschrift für Papyrologie und Epigraphik</i>

§	Cross reference to numbered section or sub-section elsewhere in the book; in a citation from Josephus, it refers to paragraph numbers in the text

This page intentionally left blank

Part I

INTRODUCTION

Chapter 1

INTRODUCTION: PRINCIPLES AND METHOD

1.1 *Aims*

The aims given in *HJJSTP* 1 (2–3) remain essentially the same for the present volume, except that they apply to the early Hellenistic period and apply to a situation in which a significant Jewish diaspora is known: These are:

1. to survey comprehensively the sources available to us for constructing the history of Judah and the Jewish people
2. to attempt to analyse and evaluate the sources and discriminate between them as to their value, problems, uncertainties and relative merits for providing usable historical data
3. to summarize the main debates relating to the history of the period
4. to catalogue the bulk of the recent secondary studies on the period
5. to provide my own historical synthesis of the period, clearly indicating the basis for it (including why it may differ at various points from that of other scholars)
6. to establish a firm basis on which further work can be done by other researchers in a variety of areas of scholarship, not only historians but also those more interested in literature and theology and other aspects of study relating to Second Temple Judaism

1.2 *The Basis for the Chronology of the Early Hellenistic Period*

L.L. Grabbe (1991) 'Maccabean Chronology: 167–164 or 168–165 BCE?' *JBL* 110: 59–74; **M. Holleaux** (1942) *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques: Tome III Lagides et Séleucides*; **P.W. Pestman** (1967) *Chronologie égyptienne d'après les textes démotiques (332 av. J.-C.–453 ap. J.-C.)*; **A.J. Sachs and D.J. Wiseman** (1954) 'A Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period', *Iraq* 16: 202–12; **A.E. Samuel** (1962) *Ptolemaic Chronology*.

Non-specialists who read scholarly literature from the early Hellenistic period will often be disconcerted by finding different dates for certain events in the various secondary sources. To take one frequent example, Seleucid control of Syria/Palestine is often said to date from 198 BCE, especially in older sources, but from 200 BCE in others (usually more recent ones). In the present state of knowledge, some events of the third century are still poorly

dated, but others have been accurately established, thanks to recently available primary sources and studies.

In the past, chronological reconstruction often depended on literary sources, which were not always reliable. This is still the case with some events known only from Greek (occasionally Latin) writings, but reference to many events has now been found in primary sources such as inscriptions and papyri. One of the main sources of information is the collection of Egyptian papyri by Pestman (1967). The cuneiform list published by Sachs and Wiseman (1954) is important for Seleucid chronology (cf. also Grabbe 1991). An inscriptional source is the *Marmur Parium* or Parium Marble (*FGH* 239 B §§1–26; AUSTIN #1). M. Holleaux (1942) has some important studies on chronology; also Samuel (1962). Coins also make a valuable contribution to chronology (see §3.3).

1.3 Diaspora

J.M.G. Barclay (1996) *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*; **J.M.G. Barclay (ed.)** (2004) *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire*; **R.P. Carroll** (1998) 'Exile! What Exile? Deportation and the Discourses of Diaspora', in L.L. Grabbe (ed.), *Leading Captivity Captive: 'The Exile' as History and Ideology*: 62–79; **S.J.D. Cohen and E.S. Frerichs (eds)** (1993) *Diasporas in Antiquity*; **J.J. Collins** (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*; **I.M. Gafni** (1997) *Land, Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity*; **L.L. Grabbe (ed.)** (1998) *Leading Captivity Captive: 'The Exile' as History and Ideology*; **J.M. Modrzejewski** (1995) *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian*; **J.J. Price** (1994) 'The Jewish Diaspora of the Graeco-Roman Period', *SCI* 13: 169–86; **L.V. Rutgers** (1995) *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora*; (1998) *The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism*; **S. Schwartz** (1999) 'The Patriarchs and the Diaspora', *JJS* 50: 208–222; **J.M. Scott (ed.)** (1997) *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions*; **P.R. Trebilco** (1991) *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor*; **W.C. van Unnik** (1993) *Das Selbstverständnis der jüdischen Diaspora in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit*; **M.H. Williams** (1998) *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans: A Diaspora Handbook*.

A characteristic of Judaism from the early Hellenistic period is the large number of Jews living outside the homeland of Judah. A Jewish diaspora was already in existence from the late seventh century: Jews had been deported to the Babylonian area at least as early as 597, and Jeremiah 52 speaks of two more deportations, in 587/586 and about 582 BCE. The exact number taken out of the homeland is a matter of dispute, but it appears that these deportees developed as a community in the Babylonian area during the sixth century and later (*HJJSTP* 1: 316–18). As for Egypt, at least one colony existed at Elephantine, probably from the seventh century. This continued, with Jews emigrating or being forcibly taken to Egypt in the period of the Diadochi (for details, see §12.3). The result is that by the early Hellenistic period a

considerable Jewish diaspora existed, with Jews living in Egypt and Mesopotamia and later in Asia Minor, as well as Syria and Palestine. The people bore the name of 'Jews' (Greek 'Iουδαῖοι) after their ancestral homeland of Judah (Greek 'Iούδα). The question of identity is discussed below (Ch. 6).

As a result of this Jewish diaspora, any discussion of the Jews and Judaism has to consider not only the community in the Judean homeland but also those elsewhere. A survey of the history was given by J.M.G. Barclay (1996), and of much of the literature by J.J. Collins (2000, though he omits Philo and Josephus) and M.H. Williams (1998). A number of books in recent years have also focused specifically on the diaspora Jews (e.g., Barclay [ed.] 2004; Cohen and Frerichs [ed.] 1993; Gafni 1997; Rutgers 1998; Schwartz 1999), while others have been devoted to the Jews in specific localities, such as Egypt (e.g., Modrzejewski 1995) or Asia Minor (Trebilco 1991). The present book will include all Jews, as far as we know anything about them, not just those in Judah. In fact, in some cases we know more about Jews outside Judah than those within. This is especially true with the early Hellenistic period where our knowledge of Judah is often lacking.

The significance of 'diaspora' in Second Temple Jewish studies is a moot one (see the summary in Price 1994). A.T. Kraabel has challenged views that 'Diaspora Jews were syncretistic, zealous missionaries, self-conscious aliens and lower class, and that the strongest element in their identity was religious' (Price 1994: 169–70), although, as Price points out, Kraabel has his own unexamined assumptions, including the view that there was a significant difference between Jews and Judaism in the diaspora and in Palestine (Price 1994: 169–70). We use the term 'diaspora' for convenience, but there are dangers if we make too many assumptions about characteristics common to all diaspora Jews or to diaspora Jews in contrast to those living in Judah:

Neither the word διασπορά nor any other general expression was used by Jewish authors writing in Greek. Christian authors . . . are the first to start using the term regularly for the dispersion of the Jews, with obvious theological tendencies. The modern assumption is similar to the early Christian one: everything outside 'Palestine' or 'the Holy Land' or 'Eretz-Israel' was 'Diaspora', and Jews in the Diaspora lands can be spoken of as a single entity because they experienced similar problems of inferior political (and usually social) status, threats of both assimilation and open hostility from non-Jewish culture, and so forth. (Price 1994: 170)

It is interesting that two of our major writers, Josephus and Philo, make no issue of the existence of a diaspora or give special significance to the land. Nevertheless, other writers have given special prominence to the land, and a theology of the land seems to have developed quite early (cf. *JRSTP* 297–300). Some circles held the view that to reside outside the Land of Israel was a type of punishment, or at least an inferior form of existence. But the evidence does not suggest that all Jews held this view; on the contrary, it was probably

confined to a fairly narrow circle or circles. The experience of individual Jews was widely diverse, whether living in the diaspora or in Judah. Price (1994: 174–79) suggests several considerations that should guide any investigation into the Jewish diaspora:

1. The diaspora during the Graeco-Roman period was voluntary, not a forced exile.
2. The Jews living in the various empires of the biblical and Second Temple period had little incentive (whether religious or political) to move away from their home communities, whether to Palestine or elsewhere.
3. No blanket statement can be made concerning the success or not of the Jews in the diaspora.
4. Although the various imperial powers seem to have regarded the Jews as an *ethnos*, administrative measures with regard to them were usually specific to a particular region rather than applying to Jews as a whole.
5. Although most Jews shared a certain core of religious beliefs – sabbath, circumcision, food and other purity laws – the differences in life and worship between the various communities should not be disregarded.
6. There was no such thing as a ‘diaspora culture’, no literary, political, social or religious uniformity.
7. The extent to which Jewish communities influenced each other in religious matters remains an open question. This applies to the question of rabbinic influence, whether expressed positively or negatively.

1.4 The Relevance of Post-Colonial Theory

B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths and H. Tiffin (1998) *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies*; **B. Ashcroft, G. Griffiths and H. Tiffin** (eds) (1989) *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures*; (1995) *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader*; **R.S. Bagnall** (1997) ‘Decolonizing Ptolemaic Egypt’, in P. Cartledge, P. Garnsey and E. Gruen (eds), *Hellenistic Constructs*, 225–41; **R.A. Billows** (1995) *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism*; **R. Irwin** (2006) *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies*; **A.L. Macfie** (2002) *Orientalism*; **J. McLeod** (2000) *Beginning Postcolonialism*; **B. J. Moore-Gilbert** (1997) *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics*; **E.W. Said** (2003) *Orientalism*; **H. Schwarz and S. Ray** (eds) (2000) *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies*; **G.C. Spivak** (1988) ‘Can the Subaltern Speak?’ in C. Nelson and L. Grossberg (eds.) *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture*, 271–313; **K. W. Whitelam** (1996) *The Invention of Ancient Israel*; **É. Will** (1985) ‘Pour une “Anthropologie Coloniale” du Monde Hellénistique’, in J.W. Eadie and J. Ober (eds) *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr*: 273–301; **K. Windschuttle** (1996) *The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists Are Murdering our Past*; **R. Young** (1995) *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race*.

An area that has become popular in recent years – at least, in biblical scholarship – is the one of post-colonialism. It has been used in particular of the aftermath of World War II resulting from the dismantling of European empires. As an academic discipline, it was originally found mostly in departments of literature, though more recently it has established a place in sociology and history and related disciplines (see examples in Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin [eds] 1989; 1995). As has been the trend in the past two or three decades, the academic study of religion has latched onto other disciplines as relevant to a better understanding of their own, and post-colonialism has been one such subject.

Post-colonialism includes an inquiry into the related phenomena of colonialism and imperialism:

'Post-colonialism/postcolonialism' is now used in wide and diverse ways to include the study and analysis of European territorial conquests, the various institutions of European colonialisms, the discursive operations of empire, the subtleties of subject construction in colonial discourse and the resistance of those subjects, and, most importantly perhaps, the differing responses to such incursions and their contemporary colonial legacies in both pre- and post-independence nations and communities. (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1998: 187)

Treatments of the subject often speak of the 'holy trinity' of scholars who particularly have shaped the field (after Young 1995: 163): Edward W. Said, Homi K. Bhabha and Gayatri C. Spivak. One should keep in mind the extensive influence from post-structuralism on these and other key players, such as Foucault on Said and Derrida on Spivak (Ashcroft, Griffiths and Tiffin 1998: 187; on post-structuralism, see *HJJSTP* 1: 6–10). Of particular importance is E.W. Said whose work on 'Orientalism' would easily seem to encompass the fields of biblical studies and Hellenism. Although his work has been tightly embraced (e.g., Whitelam 1996), it has also been heavily criticized from a number of angles. The general reaction has been that it made an important point but its specific argumentation is often flawed or contradictory.

Since post-colonialism is tied up in particular with European empires in Africa, Asia and South America, one can ask whether the topic is relevant to research on empires of the ancient world. Some biblical scholars have given a definite affirmative answer, and a number of essay collections and other works with 'postcolonial' in their titles have appeared. The question is not new for classical studies, however, having been raised acutely by Édouard Will (1985), though he points to others before his time who had already made statements on the subject. The recent essay by R.S. Bagnall (1997) is a response to Will and lays out the issues very well. He notes that two main differences between the modern colonial regimes and the ancient Greek empires were, first, the absence of systematic racism and, secondly, the fact that the 'capital metropolis' was not outside the country. What Bagnall

illustrates is that much more profitable and complex analysis arises if one does not focus narrowly on colonialism:

But all of the reservations offered here suggest at least that focusing on colonialism per se may be less rewarding than thinking about colonialism in conjunction with the larger phenomenon of imperialism and hierarchical systems in general . . . that those power relationships that are distinctive to colonialism are only a subset of those that can help us understand the societies of the Hellenistic world. (Bagnall 1997: 233, 241).

A major point has not been considered in this discussion, however, one that does not apply to most of the conquered people under Greek rule but does apply to the Jews: this is that the Jews were eventually the winners. Although initially oppressed, it was the Jews who ultimately wrote the story. Far from the oppressors dictating terms, the Jews themselves ended up winning the engagement and writing the history. We can summarize the main comments on the use of post-colonial theory as follows:

- The Jews were part of those ruled over by a succession of empires in the ancient Near East: Assyrians, Babylonians, Persians, Greeks (Ptolemies and Seleucids) and Romans.
- At times the Jews had a traumatic experience of imperial rule, such as under Antiochus IV when attempts were made to suppress Judaism; at other times, they suffered the more mundane oppression of being under an outside ruling power.
- A study of inequality of power relations and hierarchical subordination will no doubt reveal many things about life in such a society and will go beyond an analysis that depends mainly on a colonial model.
- On the other hand, contrary to many of those subject to imperialism, the Jews wrote their history and were able to give their side of things, which included a good deal of propaganda.
- Scholars of Judaica have not needed the rise of post-colonialism to make the Jewish version the basis of their history. The Jewish version of events has long been propagated and even slavishly repeated uncritically.
- What is needed is not only to try to dig out the version of the oppressed and the minority people but also to treat the Jewish accounts critically and to recognize that the writers have often included a good deal of self-serving material and attitudes in their writings.
- A number of scholars are now starting to buck the trend of Graeco-Roman centrism. Even though the most abundant information has often come from Greek and Latin literary accounts, scholars are attempting to recognize the Greek and Roman bias and to treat history from the point of view of the Oriental peoples, such as the Persians.

For evidence of resistance literature and movements, see below (§6.3.3).

1.5 History Writing in the Ancient World

B. Albrektson (1967) *History and the Gods: An Essay on the Idea of Historical Events as Divine Manifestations in the Ancient Near East and In Israel*; **J.M. Balcer** (1987) *Herodotus & Bisitun: Problems in Ancient Persian Historiography*; **J. Barr** (1966) *Old and New in Interpretation*; (1976) 'Story and History in Biblical Theology', *JR* 56: 1–17; **T.S. Brown** (1973) *The Greek Historians*; **I.A.F. Bruce** (1967) *An Historical Commentary on the 'Hellenica Oxyrhynchia'*; **P.A. Brunt** (1980) 'Cicero and Historiography', *Miscellanea Manni*: 311–40; **B.S. Childs** (1970) *Biblical Theology in Crisis*; **J.J. Collins** (1979) 'The "Historical" Character of the Old Testament in Recent Biblical Theology', *CBQ* 41: 185–204; **P. Derow** (1994) 'Historical Explanation: Polybius and his Predecessors', in S. Hornblower (ed.) *Greek Historiography*: 73–90; **R. Drews** (1973) *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History*; **C.W. Fornara** (1983) *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome*; **L.L. Grabbe** (2001a) 'Who Were the First Real Historians? On the Origins of Critical Historiography', in idem. (ed.), *Did Moses Speak Attic?*: 156–81; (2003e) 'Of Mice and Dead Men: Herodotus 2.141 and Sennacherib's Campaign in 701 BCE', in idem. (ed.), *'Like a Bird in a Cage'*: 119–40; **S. Hornblower** (1987) *Thucydides*; **J. Huizinga** (1936) 'A Definition of the Concept of History', in R. Klibansky and H.J. Paton (eds), *Philosophy and History*: 1–10.; **F.W. König** (1972) *Die Persika des Ktesias von Knidos*; **A. Lesky** (1966) *A History of Greek Literature*; **J. Marincola** (1997) *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography*; **K.-E. Petzold** (1972) 'Cicero und Historie', *Chiron* 2: 253–76; **J.J. M. Roberts** (1976) 'Myth Versus History: Relaying the Comparative Foundations', *CBQ* 38: 1–13; **O. Spengler** (1918) *Der Untergang des Abendlandes*; **J. Van Seters** (1983) *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History*; **W.G. Waddell** (1940) *Manetho*; **R. Warner** (trans.) (1954) *Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War*.

In *HJJSTP* 1 (3–13) the perspectives of modern historiography and historical method were surveyed. The question to be addressed here is, how did historiography and history writing develop in antiquity? How useful are the histories of antiquity as historical sources? Many readers will be biblical scholars and will have grown up with the assumption that the Jews (or Israelites) were the first to write history. The fact is that the question of who the 'first historians' were has been exercising biblical scholars for some time. Part of this interest arises out of the old Biblical Theology Movement in which 'taking history seriously' was an important feature of theology itself (Childs 1970; Barr 1966: 65–102; 1976; Collins 1979). But the demise of the Biblical Theology Movement did not bring an end to the question, and the matter is still debated from a variety of points of view, whether theology or the history of Israel (Albrektson 1967; Roberts 1976).

There are a number of hints that theological concerns are subtly underpinning a number of the studies which are ostensibly about the history of the Jews. Perhaps they affect the Hellenistic period less than 'biblical' periods such as pre-exilic times or the Persian period, but they are not absent

even here. However, my concern in this section is not the place of history in theology but, rather, the question of *critical* historical writing and its relevance for reconstructing the history of the Jews. Where did critical historical thinking originate and how do we evaluate the ancient historians? (For a lengthier discussion of many of the issues raised in this section, see Grabbe 2001a and 2003e.)

1.5.1 The Question of Definitions

The first problem we face is that of defining 'history', for different definitions have been used in discussions about historicity. Unfortunately, the question has been partly determined by the particular definition one uses for 'history' and can quickly bypass any useful debate on the essential issues. There is no doubt that the most influential recent work on the definition of history is John Van Seters' *In Search of History* (1983). He draws heavily on Johan Huizinga's now classical statement, 'History is the intellectual form in which a civilization renders account to itself of its past' (1936). Van Seters isolates the following characteristics of history writing: (1) a specific form of tradition in its own right; (2) not primarily the accurate reporting of past events but also the reason for recalling the past and the significance given to past events; (3) examination of the causes of present conditions and circumstances; (4) national or corporate in character (the reporting of the deeds of the king may be only biographical unless these are viewed as part of the national history: toward the end of the book, Van Seters states that 'to communicate through this story of the people's past a sense of their identity . . . is the *sine qua non* of history writing' [1983: 359]); (5) part of the literary tradition and plays a significant role in the corporate tradition of the people (Van Seters 1983: 4–5).

The problem with this definition and these characteristics is that they do not always characterize what contemporary historians do, and any definition that excludes the work of modern historians cannot be acceptable in the debate. Although Van Seters specifically draws on Huizinga's definition and claims that his criteria are in keeping with Huizinga's definition, it seems that his own formulation actually goes against Huizinga at various points. For one thing, Van Seters seems to see history writing as a single genre, whereas Huizinga is referring to history as a total enterprise. Huizinga also clearly includes writings as history that Van Seters would exclude:

It comprises every form of historical record; that of the annalist, the writer of memoirs, the historical philosopher, and the scholarly researcher. It comprehends the smallest antiquarian monograph in the same sense as the vastest conception of world history. (Huizinga 1936: 10)

Huizinga's statement is not primarily an attempt to tell whether to categorize a particular work as history, but that is precisely what Van Seters is seeking. Huizinga has often been misquoted, because people evidently have not read

his essay. He is not giving a definition of history – despite the fact that he is often quoted as if this was his aim – but making a statement about how history functions. Van Seters, like so many others, has mistakenly taken this as a definition.

Contrary to Huizinga, Van Seters wants to exclude annalists as historians. He also wants to exclude descriptions of the king's deeds; indeed, he strangely excludes biography as a historical work, whereas most historians would include biography as a form of history writing. Especially problematic is that Van Seters wants to exclude anything that is not national or corporate in character. But few modern historians would see their work as national or corporate, nor do most modern historians of ancient history feel that they must of necessity examine the causes of present conditions and circumstances. Most would argue that although their historical writing represents an interpretation, that interpretation is still based on certain methodological principles of critical argument, evidence and falsifiable hypotheses. Another example is Van Seters' statement that tradition does not become history until it deals with the people as a whole. Thus, he states that a catalogue of the king's deeds is not history (Van Seters 1983: 2). By this criterion we would have to exclude Arrian's history of Alexander's conquests because it is by and large about Alexander. Any criterion which excluded a work like Arrian's or Caesar's *Gallic War* must be seen as absurd *ab initio*. Here are my principles of working:

1. A variety of valid definitions can be advanced, depending on the perspective from which one approaches the subject. I would simply argue that whatever definition is used, it must not exclude any of the writers of antiquity agreed to be 'historians' by common consent, and it certainly must not exclude the work of modern historians.
2. My aim here is to ask about *critical* historical writing. If someone wishes to define 'history' as anything showing 'antiquarian interest', that might be legitimate and fully justifiable in some contexts, but not here. In spite of attempts to find history writing in the Bible, the first to write history from a critical perspective were the Greeks. By 'critical historical writing' I do not mean a particular 'positivistic' form of writing. I have reference to the term 'critical' as used in a wide sense in modern scholarship to refer to an attitude or approach which does not take things at face value but shows a certain scepticism, asks questions about epistemology and rational explanation, is most concerned about human causation, and wants to test the evidence.

1.5.2 Greek Historical Writing

The development of historical writing among the Greeks is well documented. What might be called the beginnings of historiography can be traced in the myths of origin found in such writers as Hesiod who attempted to synthesize

traditional myths into some sort of coherent system. Epic poetry was also a factor in that it consolidated certain traditions that had some elements of actual history into a narrative sequence of events, thus making Homer in some sense 'the father of history' (Lesky 1966: 216–19). The dramatic tradition also seems to be important to the development of historical writing and has left its marks even on some of the more scientific writers such as Polybius (Fornara 1983: 171–72). However, the real impetus for writing history arose out of the 'Ionian enlightenment', the same movement from which sprang philosophy and science as exemplified in the pre-Socratic philosophers. It was here that we first have attested the important critical attitudes that led to scientific inquiry:

The will toward critical examination and comprehension of truth and actuality embodies itself in a way of approach to certainty through the testing and rejection of hypotheses – an entirely new form of intellectual procedure which has been the basis of all subsequent advance in the sciences. (Lesky 1966: 217)

The same attitudes were essential to the development of the true historical method.

In the fifth century BCE a writer such as Hellanicus of Lesbos used the traditional mythological genealogies to develop a historical chronological system (Brown 1973: 14–18). Unfortunately, the links between the old literary traditions containing much myth and legend and the rise of history writing is not well documented. The result is that Hecataeus of Miletus is one of the first about whom we know anything extensive, even if his work has not been preserved intact, and some have even suggested that he is the true 'father of history'. This last designation can probably now be rejected since it seems unlikely that he wrote an actual historical narrative as such (Drews 1973: 11–15). However, we do have indications that he championed the principle so important to subsequent Greek historians, that of *autopsy*. Not having his work preserved creates problems of interpretation, but some of his comments show a critical spirit of mind:

Hecataeus the Milesian speaks so: I write the things that follow as they seem to me to be true. For the stories of the Greeks are both many and, as they appear to me, ridiculous.

Aegyptus did not himself go to Argos, but his sons did – fifty of them in Hesiod's story, but as I reckon not even twenty. (translation from Derow 1994: 74)

With all the excavations and new finds, Herodotus remains the 'father of history'. In his writing we can see the historian at work and are able to make explicit deductions about the process of critical historiography. Herodotus contains all sorts of material, to the point that some would see him as more of a travel writer than a historian. But a number of points arise from study of his work, some explicit and some implicit:

- Herodotus accepts reports of events and forms of causation that would not be entertained by modern historians. For example, 'prodigies' such as a cow giving birth to a lamb are seen as signs presaging certain significant events. Divine causation is also taken for granted. On the other hand, we should not be too patronizing about this. Acceptance of divine causation is not all that different from metaphysical causes that some modern historians have adumbrated with great seriousness. Some modern historians have seen such intangible drivers of history as an organicistic development of nations (Spengler 1918: birth, youth, maturity, senility, death).
- Herodotus himself shows a critical spirit in a number of explicit examples. For example, he critiques the standard story of the Trojan war and gives reasons why another version is more likely to be correct (2.118–20). He points to a tradition (obtained from the Egyptian priests) at some variance with that found in the Homeric poems, a rather bold criticism since the Homeric poems had a quasi-canonical status in the Greek world. This version says that when the Greeks came, the Trojans swore to them that Helen was no longer there but had already absconded to North Africa. With wonderful critical acumen Herodotus notes that this was likely to be true since no nation would allow itself to be besieged for ten years for the sake of a mere woman, queen though she might be. He also questions stories that he has heard but records them nevertheless, such as the position of the sun in the circumnavigation of Africa (4.42). In this he does not differ in kind from a modern historian who collects data and then attempts to evaluate it critically. The fact that Herodotus happened to have been wrong about the incident of the sun is irrelevant; after all, complete accuracy in judgment is also hardly a trait of modern historical study.
- We have a fair amount of indirect evidence that Herodotus used good sources for important aspects of his history. His account of Darius I's taking of the throne is consonant with and complementary to the information we have from Darius's own inscription at Behistun (3.61–87; Balcer 1987). Although he does not name his informants in this particular case, he has evidently consulted members of the Persian aristocracy. The ability to choose and interrogate good sources is part of the critical historical work.
- Herodotus' qualitative advance over his predecessors can be seen by comparing him with Hellanicus of Lesbos whose attempts to bring some chronological order into the heroic traditions look primitive beside Herodotus, yet Hellanicus is a contemporary of Herodotus and actually wrote some of his works after the great historian.

Herodotus was quickly followed by Thucydides whose methodological innovations still meet the standards of modern historical research

(Hornblower 1987). Thucydides tells us about some of the criteria he applied in his work (1.20–22):

In investigating past history, and in forming the conclusions which I have formed, it must be admitted that one cannot rely on every detail which has come down to us by way of tradition. People are inclined to accept all stories of ancient times in an uncritical way – even when these stories concern their own native countries. . . .

However, I do not think that one will be far wrong in accepting the conclusions I have reached from the evidence which I have put forward. It is better evidence than that of the poets, who exaggerate the importance of their themes, or of the prose chroniclers, who are less interested in telling the truth than in catching the attention of their public, whose authorities cannot be checked, and whose subject-matter, owing to the passage of time, is mostly lost in the unreliable streams of mythology. We may claim instead to have used only the plainest evidence and to have reached conclusions which are reasonably accurate, considering that we have been dealing with ancient history. (1.21.1, trans. Warner)

And with regard to my factual reporting of the events of the war I have made it a principle not to write down the first story that came my way, and not even to be guided by my own general impressions; either I was present myself at the events which I have described or else I heard of them from eye-witnesses whose reports I have checked with as much thoroughness as possible. Not that even so the truth was easy to discover: different eye-witnesses give different accounts of the same events, speaking out of partiality for one side or the other or else from imperfect memories. And it may well be that my history will seem less easy to read because of the absence in it of a romantic element. (1.22.2–4, trans. Warner)

Thucydides ‘pursued an indubitably “scientific” purpose. No other historian of antiquity treasured *akribeia*, strict accuracy, so much as he, and he is unique in estimating the factual detail as important for its own sake’ (Fornara 1983: 105). Some of the principles used by Thucydides include the following (though some of these are already to be found among his predecessors):

- Rejection of the traditions about the early history of Greece as untrustworthy, to be given no credence.
- The interrogation of eyewitnesses and the collection of a variety of eyewitness and other accounts. Although Thucydides unfortunately tells only of the account that he finds most trustworthy, from all we can tell he does appear to have followed his own rule.
- A critical judgment made on the various accounts to select the one that appears to be most credible according to common-sense criteria.
- The establishment of a chronological framework which dates all events to within six months.

These are important rules and are still applied in some form or other by most modern historians. Thucydides was by common consent the pinnacle of history writers in antiquity, and his successors did not rise to quite the same

heights. Xenophon, who continued his history of the Peloponnesian War, was not of the same calibre. Yet Xenophon wrote an important account of his own adventures in Persia during the attempt to take the throne by Cyrus the Younger in 401 BCE (the *Anabasis*). On the other hand, most modern scholars consider the *Cyropaedia*, which ostensibly gives a life of Cyrus the founder of the Persian empire, as unreliable on the whole and to be used only cautiously and critically for information about Persian history (*HJJSTP* 1: 124–25). The anonymous writer known as the Oxyrhynchus Historian is thought to give a quite accurate portrayal of a few years of the Peloponnesian War; unfortunately, the author of this work is unidentified, and the principles on which it was written have yet to be determined (Bruce 1967).

One of the most notorious writers among the Greeks was Ctesias of Cnidus (Brown 1973: 77–86; König 1972). He wrote about the same time as Xenophon and is thus a successor of the great historians. After being captured by the Persians, he was court physician to Artaxerxes II, for 17 years according to his own statement, which would mean that he must have begun his duties under Darius II since he left Persia in 398 BCE. Whether such a position would have given him access to historical information is doubtful, despite his claim to have read ‘the royal records, in which the Persians in accordance with a certain law of theirs kept an account of their ancient affairs’ (Diodorus 2.32.4). In any case, he compiled a farrago of legends, inventions and gossip that was already denounced in antiquity (e.g., Plutarch, *Artaxerxes* 1.4). This is not to say that genuine historical data cannot be found in his account, but he shows little interest in distinguishing the historical from the romantic. Ctesias seems to be the origin of a number of stories about oriental heroes and heroines, such as Ninus and Semiramis, that circulated widely in later literature (see further Grabbe 2003e: 121–25).

Probably the second place in the ranks of ancient historians – after Thucydides – is held by Polybius (who will be important in the present volume). He was a key historian of this period who wrote not only about contemporary events that he witnessed himself but also about Roman history from the First Punic War, more than a century before his own time. Perhaps more than any other ancient historian Polybius discusses the principles guiding him in the writing of his history. Some of the points he makes are the following:

- The historian cannot show favouritism. He points out that one expects to favour one’s friends and country, but:

He who assumes the character of a historian must ignore everything of the sort, and often, if their actions demand this, speak good of his enemies and honour them with the highest praises while criticizing and even reproaching roundly his closest friends, should the errors of their conduct impose this duty on him. For just as a living creature which has lost its eyesight is wholly incapacitated, so if History is stripped of her truth all that is left is but an idle tale. (1.14)

- It is the duty of the historian not just to narrate or assemble ‘facts’ but to explain the cause (*aitia*) of and connections between events. The historian must explain the ‘how, why, and whence’ (3.7.5: πῶς καὶ διὰ τί καὶ πόθεν), or the ‘when, how, and for what reason’ (4.28.4: πότε καὶ πῶς καὶ δι’ ὧς αἰτίας) with regard to events.
- Although it had become conventional from Thucydides on to include speeches in historical works, many of his successors ignored his principles and concentrated on exercising rhetorical skills. Polybius insists that speeches must reflect what was actually said: ‘nor is it the proper part of a historian to practise on his readers and make a display of his ability to them, but rather to find out by the most diligent inquiry and report to them what was actually said’ (36.1.7). The duty of the historian is not to create great speeches but to be faithful to the words uttered at the time:

A historical author should not ... like a tragic poet, try to imagine the probable utterances of his characters or reckon up all the consequences probably incidental to the occurrences with which he deals, but simply record what really happened and what really was said, however commonplace. (2.56.10)

The peculiar function of history is to discover, in the first place, the words actually spoken, whatever they were, and next to ascertain the reason why what was done or spoken led to failure or success. (12.25b.1).

- He emphasizes his own efforts to travel and question witnesses (3.57–59; 12.25g–25i; 12.26d–28a). Polybius is scathing of the ‘arm-chair historians’, among whom he especially identifies Timaeus of Tauromenium (entire book 12).

This is not to suggest that all Greek ‘historians’ from Herodotus on are examples of critical historians. On the contrary, many of them fall well short of even minimum standards as exemplified in Herodotus and Thucydides. Perhaps the nadir to Thucydides’s zenith is Ctesias of Cnidus, already mentioned above, and most writers fell between those two. An example of the mixed nature of our sources – even within the same writer – is illustrated by Diodorus Siculus (§5.3). Although more of a compiler than a critical historian, his work is sometimes the main source for the history of certain periods. His story of Alexander’s conquests is not the best account, but is a useful supplement to Arrian. On the other hand, he provides the only real account of the Diadochi, apparently based on the reliable history of Hieronymus of Cardia. For the third century where we frequently lack information, his account is important, in spite of its problems (not least the fragmentary nature of it), since such better-quality writers as Polybius are often lost to us.

Also, we need to keep in mind the fact that the Greeks were infamous for their distortion of the culture and history of Near Eastern peoples. Although

this was not necessarily a habit peculiar to the Greeks – how many peoples in history have given a fair description of alien cultures? – we have it firmly described because the Greeks were conquerors. Berossus (§5.8) complained that the Greeks told false stories about the history of the Babylonians:

Such is the account given by Berossus of this king [Nebuchadnezzar II], besides much more in the third book of his *History of Chaldaea*, where he censures the Greek historians for their deluded belief that Babylon was founded by the Assyrian Semiramis and their erroneous statement that its marvellous buildings were her creation. On these matters the Chaldaean account must surely be accepted. Moreover, statements in accordance with those of Berossus are found in the Phoenician archives, which relate how the king of Babylon subdued Syria and the whole of Phoenicia. To the same effect writes Philostratus in his *History*, where he mentions the siege of Tyre, and Megasthenes in the fourth book of his *History of India*, where he attempts to prove that this king of Babylon, who according to this writer subdued the greater part of Libya and Iberia, was in courage and in the grandeur of his exploits more than a match for Heracles. (*apud* Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.20 §§142–44)

Berossus's contemporary in Egypt Manetho (§5.9) similarly complained about Herodotus:

I will begin with Egyptian documents. These I cannot indeed set before you in their ancient form; but in Manetho we have a native Egyptian who was manifestly imbued with Greek culture. He wrote in Greek the history of his nation, translated, as he himself tells us, from sacred tablets; and on many points of Egyptian history he convicts Herodotus of having erred through ignorance. (*apud* Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.14 §§73–92)

Manetho is alleged specifically to have written 'criticisms of Herodotus', perhaps even a separate work; if so, it unfortunately has not survived (Waddell 1940: 204–207).

1.5.3 Did the Graeco-Roman Historians Aim for Historical Accuracy?

Following this brief survey, there are now several questions to be answered about the Greek and Roman historians. Was history only a branch of rhetoric? Was their concern more in teaching moral lessons or offering examples to emulate or even more in entertainment than in accuracy? Did their historiographic methods differ essentially from those of modern historians?

Let us begin by asking whether the ancient historians intended to be accurate. A recent study has explored the various devices used by historians in support of their work, and these devices show a great concern to give the impression of care with the facts and evidence of accuracy (Marincola 1997). For example, one important theme found widely through historical works is that of 'autopsy' (αὐτοψία) and 'inquiry', which is the origin of the term 'history' (ἱστορία: Herodotus 1.1; 2.99; 7.96). Either the writer himself had witnessed the things described (autopsy) or had searched out persons who

witnessed the events or used sources that had direct evidence of them (inquiry). Whether the historians rose to the standards alleged can be discussed with regard to particular writers, but as a genre historical works make a point of drawing the reader's attention to the reasons why their author was well qualified to write the work in question. It was a commonplace expectation that the historian's first concern was faithfulness to the data and accuracy in presenting them, even if it was generally anticipated that he would also write an interesting and elevating account. As Fornara expresses it:

At his most ambitious, the historian was an artist seeking by means of his art, but in fidelity to the truth, to be the teacher or the conscience of his people, or both . . . Of the various principles laid down by the ancients, none is more fundamental than the honest and impartial presentation of the facts, and it is entirely consistent with their clarity of vision and intellectual emancipation that the Greeks gave it to the world. The principle was a natural, indeed, reflexive inheritance from the ethnographic-scientific Ionian school: *historia*, unless accurate, is a contradiction in terms. (Fornara 1983: 99)

There were dangers to the impartiality of the historian, especially considering that many of them, the Roman historians in particular, were politicians or were writing about matters in which they themselves had some sort of direct interest. Some of the ancients accuse their fellow writers of succumbing to the temptation to be partial or praise them for not doing so. Fornara comments:

Now although it is reasonable to doubt that Asellio, Sallust, Livy, Pollio, Tacitus, Ammianus, and others succeeded in transcending their enmities and loyalties, no evidence whatever suggests that they or their fellows intended to write propaganda; on the contrary, we have every reason to believe that the dictates of convention and the assumption of the *persona* of the historian made the contemporary writers strive to be the impartial analysts of their recent past. (Fornara 1983: 101)

We come to the important question of the judgement sometimes made that for the Greeks and Romans, history was only a branch of rhetoric. There is truth in this assertion in that history was often treated alongside rhetoric, but one must be careful about drawing the conclusion that only oratory and rhetoric counted in history writing. Cicero is alleged to have taken this view, for example, but this seems not to be the case (Brunt 1980; Petzold 1972). For the orator and politician, historical examples were used primarily for their rhetorical effect, and the important thing was plausibility rather than actual historical truth: see the comments made by Cicero, *Orator* 120; *De Oratore* 1.5.17–18; 1.14.60; 2.82.337; *De Partitione Oratoria* 9.32; 25.90; *De Inventione* 1.21.29 (see also the *Rhetorica ad Herennium* 1.16, generally thought now to be pseudo-Cicero).

We can also find examples of historians and writers who concentrated on the rhetorical at the expense of accuracy. For example, Polybius complains about those whose concern was to create sensational images and invent

details for dramatic purposes (e.g., 2.56; 3.20.3-5; 3.47.6–48.9). In Cicero's dialogue *Brutus* the example is cited in which the historian Clitarchus and the orator Stratocles invented a spectacular death for Themistocles, contrary to the testimony of Thucydides (11.42–43). Nevertheless, neither the main historians themselves nor Cicero took the view that history was only rhetoric or to be subordinated to rhetoric. For them the real essence of history is its truth, voiced by 'Antonius' in the dialogue in *De Oratore*:

For who does not know history's first law to be that an author must not dare to tell anything but the truth? And its second that he must make bold to tell the whole truth? That there must be no suggestion of partiality anywhere in his writings? Nor of malice? (Cicero, *De Oratore* 2.15.62)

To summarize, the quality of historical writing in Graeco-Roman antiquity varied enormously (though this statement would apply equally to today), and there was an inevitable division between theory and practice. Yet the best historical work rose to modern standards, including such writers as Thucydides, the Oxyrhynchus Historian, and Polybius, and perhaps even other writers such as Hieronymus of Cardia and the Alexander history of Ptolemy I (which was used centuries later as the basis of Arrian's history of Alexander's conquests). Most scholars of classical historiography would be in no doubt that critical historiography had developed in the Graeco-Roman historical tradition.

1.5.4 Critical Historical Thinking among the Jews

B. Bar-Kochva (1989) *Judas Maccabaeus*; **L.L. Grabbe** (1979) 'Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography', in P.J. Achtemeier (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*: 2: 43–68; **L.L. Grabbe** (ed.) (1998) *Leading Captivity Captive: 'The Exile' as History and Ideology*; **B. Halpern** (1988) *The First Historians*; **S.R. Johnson** (2004) *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in its Cultural Context*; **S. Schwartz** (1991) 'Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion', *JJS* 42: 16–38; **P. Veyne** (1988) *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths?*

Whether history writing can already be found in the Hebrew Bible is a debated point. As noted at the beginning of this section, a lot depends on one's definition of 'history'. There seems no doubt that the biblical writers had 'antiquarian interests' in some cases (Halpern 1988: 216), and some writers also made use of sources; however, these are not the main issue. Unless the writer completely invented everything, he must have used sources: legends, tales, hearsay, oral tradition, court stories. The real question is how the writer worked: what was his aim and did he exercise critical judgement? The inquiry into all sources of information, the critical evaluation of sources, the testing for bias and ideological colouring, the scepticism toward explanations contrary to normal experience are all elements within modern historical study and reconstruction.

The question is, is the biblical use of earlier legendary traditions any different from the Greek historians who made use of the early Greek mythical and legendary traditions? Did the Greek historians believe in their own myths? (cf. Veyne 1988). The attitude of the Greek historical writers to their past seems to have been rather different from that of the biblical writers. The matter is complex and cannot be discussed at length here. However, their approach to their traditional myths was not the same as the Israelites' view of their past. The Greeks questioned their myths and traditions in a way for which we have no evidence among Jewish historians (with possibly one or two exceptions noted below).

We know that critical history writing developed among the Jews. Indeed, the true critical spirit seems to be attested in only one Jewish writer of antiquity: Qohelet (§4.4). Some have accused Qohelet of atheism; in any case, he was apparently willing to question even the sacred tradition in a way not exhibited by any other Jewish writers known to me. A good case can be made that he is only displaying the spirit of the Hellenistic age and thus gained his critical spirit from the Greeks. On the other hand, a good case can also be made that he owes his roots to the ancient Near Eastern traditions and not to Greek influence. In any event, his scepticism looks sufficient to have been willing to challenge the biblical tradition itself. No other Jewish writer questions the tradition as acutely as he does.

The first Jewish writer to consider from the early Hellenistic period is Demetrius the Chronographer (§4.6.1). He is probably the earliest of the Fragmentary Historical Writers in Greek, thought to be the late third century BCE. Of the fragments preserved, a number of them clearly have as at least one of their aims the reconciliation of apparently contradictory data in the biblical text. For example, he attempts to explain how it is that, as newly released slaves, the Israelites had weapons when they went out of Egypt. He does this by the simple but ingenious argument that they picked up the weapons washed ashore from the Egyptian army that drowned in the Red Sea (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.29.16). Another question concerns the 'Ethiopian woman' who came to Moses and claimed to be his wife (Num. 12.1). For Moses to have married a foreigner was an embarrassment. Demetrius resolves the problem by claiming that this woman was none other than Zipporah, the wife taken by Moses when he fled Egypt (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.29.1–3). She was not an Israelite, of course, but Demetrius makes her a descendant of Abraham from Keturah. But if she was a descendant of Abraham, can she be shown to be Moses' contemporary by means of the genealogical record, since Zipporah is only six generations from Abraham and Moses is seven? Demetrius solves the problem by showing that Abraham was 140 years old when he took Keturah, whereas he had fathered Isaac at age 100. This is 40 years earlier – a complete generation – hence, the difference in the number of generations from the same ancestor (for a further discussion, see Grabbe 1979: 45–48).

Another writer who evidently produced a history of the Jews making use of

the biblical narratives was Eupolemus (§4.6.2). He is generally identified with the Eupolemus, son of John, mentioned in 1 Macc. 8.17 and 2 Macc. 4.11. He evidently had a Greek education and even seems to have made use of Herodotus and Ctesias in his book. Yet it is difficult to find anything suggesting a critical spirit in the preserved fragments. We find the exaggerated apologetic well known from other Jewish sources, such as the view that Moses gave the alphabet to the Jews, and everyone got it from them, or the magnificence of Solomon's temple. His embellishment of the biblical account may in some cases come from the exercise of rationalization or the use of other sources of information, and he attempts to sort out some chronological problems. Overall, though, the spirit of critical examination seems to have bypassed him.

With regard to the books of Maccabees, there is no question that these books contain valuable historical data. What we need to know is whether they show critical judgement. No statements are made as to any historiographical principles, and we find none of the questioning or discrimination between reports that the better Greek historians show. If the author of either of these works gathered diverse sources of information, judged them critically, and then reported only that which seemed to pass muster, he says nothing about it. It has been argued that some battle descriptions are by eyewitnesses (Bar-Kochva 1989: 158–62), but this view has been challenged (Schwartz 1991: 37 n. 64). 2 Maccabees has made use of certain sources, in particular the letters in chapter 11 (*JCH* 259–63; *HJJSTP* 3). Beside this must be set the presence of martyr legends in Chapter 7, the bias toward Judas Maccabee, and the strong prejudice against Jason. If the writer has selected his material on the basis of historical judgement, we have little indication of this. Perhaps we know too little to be sure at this point, but it seems doubtful that true critical investigation is found in either 1 or 2 Maccabees.

Another of the Fragmentary Historians in Greek is Artapanus who probably wrote in the second century BCE (§4.6.3). He contains some of the Jewish apologetic known from other sources, such as that Abraham taught astrology to the Egyptians or that Joseph was the first to divide Egypt into allotments. Artapanus has clearly interpreted the biblical story in light of Greek history and culture, as a number of other earlier Hellenistic commentators do. There is a certain rationalizing principle at work here and there; for example, the Nile is not turned to blood but simply overflows; it begins to stink when the water becomes stagnant (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.27.28). This may be an embryonic example of some critical thinking, though it is rather muted.

We now come to our main example of a Jewish critical historian in antiquity, Josephus (§4.2). Someone such as Justus of Tiberias may also have been another example; unfortunately, Josephus is the only Jewish historian preserved more or less intact. If it were not for his writings, our knowledge of Jewish history – especially in the Greek and Roman periods – would be

dreadfully impoverished. Yet this should not blind us to his shortcomings as a historian. One of the most fundamental mistakes made by students of this period is to take Josephus' account uncritically at face value. On the positive side, he sometimes has good sources, and he was an eyewitness to events in the middle of the first century CE and during the Jewish war against Rome. On the negative side, his account has gaps, biases, questionable data, and there is the fact that he frequently cannot be checked. Anything that affected him personally has to be queried, his relentless apologetic on behalf of the Jews causes distortions, and some of his sources are dubious or even downright worthless. He seems to me to be a typical Hellenistic historian – worse than some but better than others.

Apart from Josephus, Demetrius especially but perhaps also some of the other writers show the beginnings of the critical spirit among the Jews. Yet even they are not fully fledged examples of critical historians. A writer such as Herodotus, however much he might use older traditions, is willing to say that some traditions are wrong; it is difficult to find quite that attitude in any of the Jewish writers when it comes to the biblical text. Josephus shows some critical spirit, but even he does not appear to query the biblical text as such, regardless of the vast amount of reworking, reorganizing and rewriting he does with it. His critical acumen is exercised with other sources, but with the sacred tradition he seems to have been as uncritical as his predecessors among the Fragmentary Writers.

Apart from Josephus (historian), the books of Maccabees (historiography) and Demetrius (biblical commentator), most of the writers of the Greek period are examples of what S.R. Johnson has called 'historical fiction' (2004). These are writings that give the appearance of describing the history of the Jews at a particular time, and may even contain detailed historical data, but are overall fictions; this includes such works as *3 Maccabees*, *Daniel*, *Letter of Aristeas*, *Esther* and *Judith*. The dominance of such writings suggests that this sort of literature was seen as a more suitable vehicle to express what was important, which was Jewish identity in the Hellenistic world. One can appreciate the importance of the community's expressing its identity in the situation, but it should alert modern readers to the fact that history writing was not a major endeavour on the part of Jewish writers at this time.

1.5.5 *Conclusions*

A. Momigliano (1990) *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*.

This has been of necessity a rapid survey of a complex subject. One could easily devote a book to the topic, as several scholars have done. Nevertheless, I think several points have been established even in this brief study:

1. One may legitimately use a variety of definitions for determining what is 'history' or 'history writing' in antiquity. Yet the definition

chosen may go a long way toward determining one's conclusions; at least the particular definition used will limit the possible conclusions. Therefore, any definition chosen must not exclude important works from antiquity that have long been considered examples of history writing, and it certainly must not exclude the work of modern historians.

2. In the light of all the information currently available to us, the first to engage in critical historical writing were the Greeks, beginning at least as early as Herodotus. Although most Greek and Roman historians dealt with contemporary history, we have examples of those who tried to write about ancient history (from their point of view) and who made a credible job of it. As so often, A. Momigliano has put his finger succinctly on the real issues:

Each Greek historian is of course different from the others, but all Greek historians deal with a limited subject which they consider important, and all are concerned with the reliability of the evidence they are going to use. Greek historians never claim to tell all the facts of history from the origins of the world, and never believe that they can tell their tale without *historia*, without research . . . The point, however, is that he had to claim to be a trustworthy researcher in order to be respectable. (Momigliano 1990: 18)

When we turn to the Jews, however, we do not generally find this critical spirit of inquiry and research. Josephus is the best and the one who can take his place alongside other Hellenistic historians. But his faults are often the faults of his predecessors:

Thus to the Hebrew historian historiography soon became a narration of events from the beginning of the world such as no Greek historian ever conceived. The criteria of reliability were also different. Jews have always been supremely concerned with truth. The Hebrew God is the God of Truth . . . Consequently reliability in Jewish terms coincides with the truthfulness of the transmitters and with the ultimate truth of God in whom the transmitters believe . . . What Josephus seems to have missed is that the Greeks had criteria by which to judge the relative merits of various versions which the Jewish historians had not . . . In Hebrew historiography the collective memory about past events could never be verified according to objective criteria. If priests forged records . . . the Hebrew historian did not possess the critical instrument to discover the forgery. In so far as modern historiography is a critical one, it is a Greek, not a Jewish, product. (Momigliano 1990: 19–20)

3. My concern in this section has been to ascertain the development of critical historical writing, a somewhat narrower preoccupation than some other writers on the subject of history in antiquity. Although the work of modern historians shows certain differences in comparison with historians of antiquity, I do not agree that a

sharp distinction can necessarily be made. Even though the run-of-the-mill Hellenistic historian falls below modern standards, there are many examples of critical historical writing in antiquity, with a few comparing quite favourably with the products of historians in the last couple of centuries.

1.6 *Writing a History of the Early Greek Period: Principles Assumed in this Book*

The historical principles on which this history is based were laid in *HJJSTP* 1 (13–16). They apply here as well and can be summarized as follows:

1. *Historical knowledge is possible, but our access to the past is only indirect.*
2. *All our historical knowledge is contingent and provisional.*
3. *Although objectivity in the scientific sense is not possible, 'qualified objectivity' or some similar position is still possible in historical study.*
4. *The ultimate goal is a total history, which takes into account all aspects of the past.*
5. *We must use all potential sources.*

A further point can be added. It applies to the early Hellenistic period because of the nature of our evidence, though it could be used wherever the necessary conditions are present:

6. *'Triangulation' may be necessary when we have no direct information on a period or a topic.* This refers primarily to two different sorts of historical arguments. First, there is the use of later sources to ascertain knowledge about a topic. For example, many Egyptian institutions persisted over the three centuries of Ptolemaic rule. Thus, later papyri or other later sources of information might be used for evidence – in this case – of the early Hellenistic period. This might apply to legal practices, cultural norms, fiscal or administrative arrangements, or the place of Jews in society. This has to be done carefully and with relevant argument, because we also know that there were changes over those centuries of the Ptolemaic dynasty. Secondly, we can sometimes compare the situation at an earlier period (such as under the Persians) with that at a later time, such as in the later Greek or the Roman period, to see developments over time. This might allow us to suggest the state of things at a particular point between the two documented periods, even though there is no direct information for that time. The early Hellenistic period is one where triangulation might be possible and where our knowledge is often lacking.

The work of the historian of ancient history is a fraught one. Historians of more recent times take the abundance of primary sources for granted, while their fellows in ancient history can only be envious of what can be written

with proper records. But this is one of the hazards of the trade. If we want to say anything about the ancient Near East in general and about the Jews in particular, we have to make do with what we have, not what we would like to have. This should not cause us to take over any potentially useful bit of data uncritically; on the contrary, the state of the sources should make us recognize the limits of our knowledge and the need to scrutinize all sources carefully. On the other hand, the paucity of information means that no potential source should be dismissed without careful analysis.

1.7 Terminology and Other Technical Matters

The transliteration of Hebrew will be clear to scholars who work in that language, generally following the standard forms; however, I have used *v* and *f* for the non-dageshed forms of *bet* and *pe*, while *w* is always used for *waw* (or *vav*, even though now pronounced *v* by most modern users of Hebrew). Proper names generally follow the conventional forms used in English Bibles.

This study is based as far as possible on original sources. These sources, along with their published editions and other scholarship, are catalogued in Chapters 2–5 below. Where original sources are quoted, however, this is normally done in English translation. For the classical writers, this is usually the LCL translation; otherwise, the source of the translation is explicitly given.

I use a number of words for convenience as purely descriptive terms. They have no significance beyond trying to convey precise information to readers and are not meant to carry any political or sectarian weight:

- The terms ‘apocalyptic’ and ‘apocalypticism’ are used interchangeably here; some North American scholars object to ‘apocalyptic’ as a noun, but it has a long and respectable history of such usage and is still so used on this side of the Atlantic.
- ‘Edom’ is used for the old area of Edom to the east of the Dead Sea, while the territory that later came to be inhabited by Edomites on the west side of the Dead Sea will be referred to as ‘Idumaea’, which is the name used in the Greek period.
- Whenever the term ‘the exile’ is mentioned, it is both a convenient chronological benchmark to refer to the watershed between the monarchy/First Temple period and the Second Temple period and also a means of referring to the deportations from Judah that took place in the early sixth century BCE, regardless of their number or scope (cf. the discussion and essays in Grabbe [ed.] 1998).
- The term ‘Jew’ is used interchangeably with ‘Judaean’ or ‘Judahite’, where the Semitic texts have *Yēhūdī*/*Yēhūdīm* (in Hebrew) or *Yēhūdīn*/*Yēhūdāyā* (in Aramaic). Some modern scholars wish to limit ‘Jew’ to members of a particular religion and prefer ‘Judaicans’ or ‘Judahites’ or some similar term for the geographical connota-

tion. That might be justified for a later period, but as will be argued below (§6.4.2), such a distinction does not seem applicable to the early Hellenistic period. Of course, the English word ‘Jew’ comes ultimately from the Hebrew *Yēhūdī* and thus from a purely etymological point of view is a perfectly good translation for any context. More significant, though, is the fact that the original sources make no such distinction.

- ‘Old Testament’ (OT) and ‘Hebrew Bible’ are normally used interchangeably to mean the collection of writings found in the present Hebrew canon. However, if I am referring to the Septuagint version or any other which includes the deuterо-canonical books, I shall use ‘OT’ (or ‘Septuagint’ [LXX] when that is the specific reference).
- ‘Palestine’ is purely a geographical term, used because it has been widely accepted for many years and because it is difficult to find a suitable substitute.
- *Yehud* (an Aramaic term) is sometimes used to refer to the province of Judah and has no other connotation, but more often ‘Judah’ or ‘Judea’ is used. The Hebrew term ‘Judah’ applied to the territory or province of any period; naturally, the boundaries of this territory varied (sometimes considerably) from time to time.
- The divine name for the God of Israel is written as ‘Yhwh’. Although often vocalized as ‘Yahweh’, the precise pronunciation is in fact unknown. The short form at Elephantine is usually written as ‘Yhw’ (probably something like *Yahu*).

Part II

SOURCES

Chapter 2

ARCHAEOLOGY

A.M. Berlin (1997) 'Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period', *BA* 60: 2–51; **G.M. Cohen** (2005) *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa*; **M.-C. Halpern-Zylberstein** (1989) 'The Archeology of Hellenistic Palestine', *CHJ* 2: 1–34; **H.-P. Kuhnen** (1990) *Palästina in griechisch-römischer Zeit*; **O. Lipschits and O. Tal** (2007) 'The Settlement Archaeology of the Province of Judah', in O. Lipschits et al. (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, 33–52.

The standard studies on the subject are now those of Kuhnen (1990) and ARAV (unfortunately, Halpern-Zylberstein's article [1989] was already 15 years out of date when published). Two important, short, but recent, studies are Berlin (1997) and Lipschits and Tal (2007). Although the recent study by G.M. Cohen (2005) synthesizes information on individual cities from a variety of sources, he often has information from artefacts and excavations and provides important background to any archaeological interpretation. The discussion below is often short because it deals only with the pre-Hasmonaean period where often little or nothing has been found.

2.1 Individual Sites

2.1.1 Tel Dan

ARAV 166; **A. Biran** (1994) *Biblical Dan*; **A. Biran (ed.)** (1996) *Dan I: A Chronicle of the Excavations, the Pottery Neolithic, the Early Bronze Age and the Middle Bronze Age Tombs*; (2002) *Dan II: A Chronicle of the Excavations and the Late Bronze Age 'Mycenaean' Tomb*; *NEAEHL* 1: 323–32; *OEANE* 2: 107–12.

This site in the Huleh Valley was inhabited from the Neolithic to mediaeval times. It seems to have had a large cultic site from an early time: a large raised stone platform of ashlar construction, about 19m square, was built as early as the tenth or ninth century (stratum IV, area T). The layout of the site seems to have remained the same into the Hellenistic period, though there was extensive additional construction at that time, in at least two phases. The top of the high place was enlarged, and a large basin (1.5m × 1.5m × 1.1m) was installed, presumably with a cultic function. Coins of Ptolemy I, Ptolemy II

and Antiochus III were found. Of particular value is the bilingual inscription in Greek and Aramaic (§3.2.7) which mentions the 'god of Dan'.

2.1.2 *Tel Anafa*

ARAV 100–102; S.C. Herbert (ed.) (1994) *Tel Anafa I, i and ii: Final Report on Ten Years of Excavation at a Hellenistic and Roman Settlement in Northern Israel*; (1997) *Tel Anafa II, i: The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery: The Plain Wares and the Fine Wares*; *NEAEHL* 1: 58–61; *OEANE* 1: 117–18.

Tel Anafa is a valuable site because it has extensive Hellenistic remains that have been well excavated; unfortunately, most of these relate to the 'Late Hellenistic era', with little architectural remains from the 'Early Hellenistic' (Herbert [ed.] 1994: 10, 12). This includes a few structures with walls underlying late second-century buildings (mainly scattered boulder walls and pebble floor), as well as Ptolemaic and early Seleucid coins (Herbert [ed.] 1994: 13–14). The city seems to represent a poor rural community at this time:

In general, all the earlier Hellenistic deposits, whether Seleucid or possibly Ptolemaic, contained very little imported material and would seem to represent relatively poor and insular communities. The faunal evidence suggests a community involved in intensive agriculture, rearing cattle and goats locally . . . The insularity of the settlement of this time may be a consequence of diminished Tyrian contact. (Herbert [ed.] 1994: 14)

This 'diminished Tyrian contact' is explained as the separation of Palestine from Phoenician control under the Ptolemies. The extensive Phoenician masonry techniques in the late Hellenistic suggest that the region came back under Tyrian control and may have had primarily Phoenician inhabitants.

2.1.3 *Ptolemais/Akko (Tell Fukhar)*

ARAV 16–20; *NEAEHL* 1: 16–31; *OEANE* 1: 54–55.

After a destruction usually put in the Assyrian period, the town seems to have recovered in the Persian period, with evidence for a port and perhaps an administrative centre. From the Hellenistic period, excavations found the remains of some walls (city walls) and a round tower (with arrowheads and catapult lead shots: part of the fortifications?), a temple and buildings that have been interpreted as the agora. An inscription of Antiochus VII to Zeus Soter suggests that this was the deity of the temple. Judging from the remains of the mediaeval city, the Hellenistic city was laid out in a regular pattern. Apparently, a new port was constructed, in place of the Persian installation that was previously being used. The port layout is reminiscent of the port facilities at Hellenistic Tyre and Sidon.

2.1.4 *Shiqmona*

ARAV 28–30; *NEAEHL* 4: 1373–78; *OEANE* 5: 36–37.

A destruction of the town in the early fifth century BCE (perhaps by an earthquake) led to the central mound being abandoned for a time, with the town apparently rebuilt in the surrounding fields. At first the excavator argued for a Seleucid camp on the mound in the mid-second century BCE (ARAV 29), but more recently he writes (*OEANE* 5: 36) that a fortress was erected on the mound in the late Persian period but destroyed (perhaps during the fighting of the Diadochi), followed by another in the Greek period (the destruction date of about 132 BCE indicated by a dated seal impression). ARAV (29) suggested a residential quarter in the Hippodamian pattern; in any case, the quality of the building was not great. Finds from the site suggest it was under Phoenician control during the Persian and Hellenistic periods.

2.1.5 *Philoteria (Beth Yerah, Khirbet el-Kerak)*

ARAV 97–98; *NEAEHL* 1: 255–59; *OEANE* 1: 312–14.

Founded on an islet at the junction of the Jordan river and the Sea of Galilee, the Hellenistic city of Philoteria was built by Ptolemy II (cf. Polybius 5.70.3–4) apparently on the ruins of ancient Beth-Yerah (after a settlement gap of many centuries). A good portion of the 1,600m long city wall has been preserved and excavated. The Hellenistic wall was in part constructed by making use of the remains of the wall from the Early Bronze Age. It had alternating round and square towers built along it as part of the defences. On the southern side of the mound portions of houses along a street have been uncovered, including one large house built around a pebble-paved central courtyard. One house had apparently been decorated with marble in colours of green, red, white and black, and also in plaster imitating marble. In spite of its important location, Philoteria never grew to a large size and was destroyed at the end of the second century.

2.1.6 *Beth-Shean/Scythopolis*

ARAV 99–100; A. Mazar (2006) *Excavations at Tel Beth-Shean 1989–1996: Volume I, From the Late Bronze Age IIB to the Medieval Period*; *NEAEHL* 1: 214–35; *OEANE* 1: 305–9.

Lying at the junction of five different routes and with fertile surrounding countryside, this city was in a position to play a pivotal role. In spite of a long period of habitation from the Neolithic to the Middle Ages, the Hellenistic period is rather sparsely attested at Beth-Shean (or Nysa or Scythopolis as it was then called). Scholarly opinion differs on the growth of the town, from the conventional view that settlement spread down the mound during the Persian period (in the later periods the settlement was around the base of the

mound) to the view that Scythopolis should be identified with nearby Tell Iṣ-ṭaba with its extensive Hellenistic remains (ARAV 99–100). A. Mazar points out that coins and pottery indicate that the mound was inhabited continually from the third to the mid-first century BCE (2006: 39). Regardless of this theory of misidentification, the site of Beth-Shean shows evidence of Hellenistic remains in stratum III. Apparently, the city was refounded after an occupation gap of almost half a millennium. A hoard of 18 Ptolemy II tetradrachmas, about 50 stamped Rhodian amphora handles dated from the third to the first century BCE, and a dedicatory inscription from a priest with regard to a cult of Zeus and a dynastic cult are among the finds. At Tell Iṣ-ṭaba evidence of a Hellenistic residential quarter (of uncertain size) was found, along with 19 Ptolemy II coins and about 300 stamped Rhodian jar handles. It ended in an extensive conflagration dated to the end of the second century.

2.1.7 *Tel Dor*

ARAV 12–15; A.M. Berlin (1997) 'Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period', *BA* 60: 2–51; *NEAEHL* 1: 357–72; *OEANE* 2: 168–70; E. Stern (1994) *Dor, Ruler of the Seas*; E. Stern (ed.) (1995a) *Excavations at Dor, Final Report*: vol. I A, *Areas A and C: Introduction and Stratigraphy*; (1995b) *Excavations at Dor, Final Report*: vol. I B, *Areas A and C: The Finds*.

Hellenistic Dor was a Phoenician site. Although it no longer served as a base for attacking Egypt as it had in the Persian period, it was a well-fortified city with a formidable wall – Antiochus III failed to take 'Doura' in 219 BCE (Polybius 5.66). The fortifications seem to have been rebuilt under Ptolemy II (partially dated by a coin): there is lack of evidence for military action or destruction that would have required rebuilding. The new fortifications represented the Greek mode of building, and the archaeology in general demonstrates Hellenistic culture. Its harbour was probably built in the Persian period but continued to serve the city. There are remains of a shipyard which seems to have functioned in the Hellenistic period (though it may have originated in an earlier period). One building excavated showed remains suggesting that it contained a dyeing installation. Fishhooks and lead weights for nets attest to a thriving fishing industry. There was a large affluent residential district (Berlin 1997: 5). The plan of the city continued much as it had been during the Persian period (Hippodamian pattern). The remains of three temples apparently all date to the Hellenistic period (though they continued to be used into the Roman period). Coins of Philip II, Alexander, Ptolemy I, Ptolemy II and Antiochus III have been found.

2.1.8 *Tel Mevorakh*

ARAV 27–28; *NEAEHL* 3: 1031–35; E. Stern (ed.) (1978) *Excavations at Tel Mevorakh (1973–1976) Part One: From the Iron Age to the Roman Period*.

The site seems to have been abandoned for about a century after the end of the Persian period (stratum IV), being renewed only in the second century BCE. Stratum III, with the Hellenistic period remains, suffered erosion damage, obscuring the settlement plan. This stratum seems to have two phases. The earlier phase (IIIb), dated by the editor to 201–80 BCE (Stern [ed.] 1978: 85), contains a number of walls, with apparently a single large building. Incorporated into one of the walls was a limestone block originally interpreted as a dye vat (Stern [ed.] 1978: 24–25), but was more likely the remains of an olive press (ARAV 28). Stratum IIIa contained five partially preserved walls, one of which contained a basalt millstone. The construction in both the Persian and Hellenistic periods exhibits architectural elements of Phoenician style. The excavator interpreted the buildings in the stratum as the remains of an agricultural estate.

2.1.9 *Tel Dothan*

ARAV 94–96; D.M. Master et al. (eds) (2005) *Dothan I: Remains from the Tell (1953–1964)*; NEAEHL 1: 372–74.

The recent publication of the Dothan excavations (Master et al. 2005) gives fascinating background information on the dig. The original excavator of Dothan was Joseph Free, an evangelical whose stated primary aim was to confirm the Bible from archaeology. Originally a specialist in modern French, he shifted into archaeology while teaching at Wheaton College. He had gained a couple of years' field experience when he began excavating at Dothan in 1953. This publication represents an attempt, using modern methods, to make sense of a dig that seems not always to have been conducted according to the accepted standards of the time.

After a settlement gap since the seventh century, Dothan was resettled in the Hellenistic period. It was initially only a small site on the summit of the mound. Several Hellenistic occupation levels have been identified. A large building in the north-western corner of area A (on the south side of the mound) might be a family dwelling. Adjacent is an *insula* (area of several dwellings). Among the finds were a number of bread ovens, several silos, a coin of 'Antiochus the king' (probably Antiochus VII) and a group of 16 Rhodian stamp seals.

2.1.10 *Samaria*

ARAV 88–91; J.W. Crowfoot, K.M. Kenyon and E.L. Sukenik (eds) (1942) *The Buildings at Samaria*; J.W. Crowfoot, G.M. Crowfoot and K.M. Kenyon (eds) (1957) *The Objects from Samaria*; NEAEHL 4: 1300–310; OEANE 4: 463–67; G. A. Reisner, C.S. Fisher and D.G. Lyon (eds) (1924) *Harvard Excavations at Samaria 1908–1910*.

Samaria was the only Greek city in the region of Samaria. The Hellenistic city (period IX) covered the entire mound, being divided into the acropolis and the lower city. With regard to the acropolis, the first phase is probably to be identified with the Macedonian city supposedly settled by Alexander in the wake of the Samaritan revolt (§12.2). The city plan is not clear from the preserved remains, though three round towers from this phase were dated to the third century, and the Israelite walls were still being used. As for the lower city, portions of a massive wall and two square towers were excavated, though they have been dated to the Late Hellenistic period. A street running from the western (Roman) gate probably followed the same path as the later Roman street. Finds include numbers of Megarian bowls, third-century Ptolemaic and second-century Seleucid coins, and the remains of thousands of Rhodian stamped jars.

2.1.11 Shechem (Tell Balātah)

ARAV 92–94; E.F. Campbell (1991) *Shechem II: The Shechem Regional Survey*; E. F. Campbell and G.R.H. Wright (2002) *Shechem III: The Stratigraphy and Architecture of Shechem/Tell Balātah*; Y. Magen (2007) 'The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim in Light of the Archaeological Evidence', in O. Lipschits et al. (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, 157–211; Y. Magen, H. Misgav, and L. Tsfania (2004) *Mount Gerizim Excavations: vol. I, The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions*; NEAEHL 2: 484–92; OEANE 4: 407–409, 469–72; E. Stern and Y. Magen (2002) 'Archaeological Evidence for the First Stage of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim', IEJ 52: 49–57; G.E. Wright (1964) *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City*.

The Hellenistic settlement came after a gap of 150 years. The period 325–110 BCE can be divided into four strata, IV–I, according to Campbell and Wright (2002: 1: 311). Our concern is with strata IV and III (325–190 BCE). The city was cleared to expose the Middle Bronze levels which were used in fortifying the city again, and earth was brought in to provide level foundations for houses. The reused East Gate was replaced by a Hellenistic tower about the middle of the third century. The Hellenistic occupation covered the entire mound. Although a complete plan of the city is not reconstructable, it seems to have been built on a regular pattern. Stratum III contains wealthy houses. It has been suggested that a destruction separates stratum III from stratum II, perhaps the result of the Fifth Syrian War (ARAV 94), but the destruction might not be the result of battle (Campbell and Wright 2002: 1: 313). Evidence of burning and destruction in Field I might be related to the collapse of fortifications, but this could be either at the end of stratum IV or at the end of stratum III. Coins in the two strata are all Ptolemaic, including a horde of 15 Ptolemy I tetradrachmas and one of 35 silver tetradrachmas from the reigns of Ptolemy I–V, the latest date apparently 193 BCE (Campbell and Wright 2002: 1: 329). Since Stratum II contains mainly Seleucid coins,

the change to Seleucid rule could be around 190 BCE. The fortifications were not rebuilt, which further suggests that stratum III ended at the beginning of the second century.

With regard to Mt Gerizim, there has been a considerable debate in recent years (*HJJSTP* 1: 31–32). There now seems to be agreement among archaeologists that a temple was built on the summit during the Persian period, perhaps as early as the fifth century BCE (cf. Magen 2007: 162–64; 176–83; Stern and Magen 2002). In spite of the rebellion in Samaria in 331 BCE, the Persian-period temple on Gerizim continued to exist until the end of Ptolemaic rule, as indicated by both pottery and coins (Magen 2007: 182–83). A Hellenistic city, with residential quarters, was built around the sacred precinct. The temple and enclosure were then rebuilt in the early second century, perhaps in the reign of Antiochus III.

2.1.12 *Apollonia (Arsuf; Tell Arshaf)*

ARAV 32–34; *NEAEHL* 1: 72–75; I. Roll and O. Tal (1999) *Apollonia-Arsuf, Final Report of the Excavations*: vol. 1, *The Persian and Hellenistic Periods*.

The Hellenistic settlement covered much the same area as the Persian, less than 20 dunams. After a destruction in the late Persian period (ascribed to the ‘Tennes rebellion’ by some, but see *HJJSTP* 1: 346–49 questioning this as an explanation), the settlement was renewed about the time of the Greek conquest. The continued presence of murex shells has been interpreted to mean that the dyeing industry continued on the site, though they could have been for food, as was the high concentration of sheep, goat and cattle remains. A ‘straightened reef’ (apparently dating from the Hellenistic period) appears to have served as a breakwater for a harbour, which enhanced the town’s position as a trading site (as did the presence of the Via Maris which passed close by). It (along with Tel Michal) seems to have served as a central settlement for the region, with a number of satellite settlements in the area.

2.1.13 *Tel Michal (Makmish)*

ARAV 31–32; Z. Herzog, G. Rapp, Jr and O. Negbi (eds) (1989) *Excavations at Tel Michal, Israel*; *NEAEHL* 3: 1036–41; *OEANE* 4: 20–22.

The plan of the site suggests that the settlement had a different purpose from that in the Persian period. Architectural remains of a fortress on the central mound, along with a few domestic buildings, indicates an administrative function. A large winepress from the early Hellenistic period occupied the northern hill (in place of the Persian-period settlement). An open structure on the north-eastern hill has been interpreted as a cult place. A considerable number of coins from the early Hellenistic period were found, including Alexander the Great, Ptolemy I–III and Antiochus III. Stamped jar handles indicate the commercial links of the settlement with trade centres elsewhere.

It (along with Apollonius) seems to have served as a central settlement for the region, with a focus on the military, and a number of satellite settlements in the area.

2.1.14 Jaffa (Joppo)

ARAV 38–41; **J. Kaplan** (1972) 'The Archaeology and History of Tel Aviv-Jaffa', *BA* 35: 66–95; *NEAEHL* 2: 655–59; *OEANE* 3: 206–207.

Jaffa seems to mark the most southern extent of Phoenician control. (Some of excavator J. Kaplan's interpretations, including his chronology, are considered problematic, according to J.P. Dessel [*OEANE* 3: 207].) The Hellenistic city was found in level I, with remains of walls set on top of Persian-period walls and built of ashlar blocks set on their narrow ends. This apparently included the corner of a third-century fortress. A 2.4m-square altar of field stones set in a small room was identified. A catacomb seems to date from the third century (though ARAV [40] makes it 'late in the Hellenistic period'), and a monumental building of ashlar construction might be the Hellenistic agora (market place). Five round floors, each containing a small stone basin, have been interpreted as some sort of an industrial complex. An inscription with the name of Ptolemy IV might be indicative of a temple on the site.

2.1.15 Gezer (Tell Jezer)

ARAV 41–43; **W.G. Dever** (ed.) (1974) *Gezer II: Report of the 1967–70 Seasons in Fields I and II*; **W.G. Dever, H.D. Lance and G.E. Wright** (1970) *Gezer I: Preliminary Report of the 1964–66 Seasons*; **W.G. Dever et al.** (1971) 'Further Excavations at Gezer, 1967–1971', *BA* 34: 94–132; **S. Gitin** (1990) *Gezer III: A Ceramic Typology of the Late Iron II, Persian and Hellenistic Periods at Tell Gezer*; *NEAEHL* 2: 496–506; *OEANE* 2: 396–400.

The data published in the first two volumes of the Hebrew Union College excavation (Dever, Lance and Wright 1970; Dever [ed.] 1974) were given a considered interpretation by S. Gitin (1990). The Hellenistic finds took a while to sort out, apparently. The manner of excavating by R.A.S. Macalister in the first campaign unfortunately was very unsatisfactory and destroyed or confused a great deal. Stratum III was finally associated with the early Hellenistic period but there were few remains: a coin associated with Ptolemy II or III, Rhodian stamped jar handles (including a group with the name 'Nikasagoras'), and (from Macalister's dig) *Yhd/Yhwd* and *Yršlm* seal impressions. The Iron Age walls were apparently reused in constructing the Hellenistic fortifications.

2.1.16 Bethel

W.F. Albright and J.L. Kelso (eds) (1968) *The Excavation of Bethel (1934–1960)*; *NEAEHL* 1: 192–94; *OEANE* 1: 300–301.

The problematic nature of the excavators' final report was noted in *HJJSTP* 1 (22–23). ARAV does not even include Bethel in his list of sites for the Hellenistic period. Yet according to the final report (Albright and Kelso 1968: 38–39), Hellenistic remains were found in Area II in the 1934 campaign (though little from Area I). The later campaigns found no Hellenistic layers, explained as being due to later agricultural activity and robbing of stone from the site. The bases of some walls, a floor and a drain seem to have been uncovered, partly dated by coins of Alexander the Great and the early Ptolemies; however, a number of the coins were apparently not found in stratified deposits. It is not very much.

2.1.17 Tell es-Sultan (Jericho)

ARAV 75–78; *NEAEHL* 2: 674–81; *OEANE* 3: 220–24.

Hellenistic and Roman Jericho seems to have centred on Tulul Abu el-ʿAlayiq, a different site (about 2km away) from the Tell es-Sultan of the Israelite and Canaanite city. It appears, however, that during the Hellenistic period residences were found up and down the Jericho valley, while fortifications occupied the hilltops. Most of our information is from the Hasmonaean and Roman periods; indeed, it is not clear that anything earlier than the Hasmonaean period has been found.

2.1.18 Jerusalem and Vicinity

ARAV 71–75; D.T. Ariel (ed.) (1990) *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. II; (2000a) *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. V; (2000b) *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. VI; D.T. Ariel and A. De Groot (eds) (1996) *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*, vol. IV; A.M. Berlin (1997) 'Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period', *BA* 60: 2–51; A. De Groot and D. T. Ariel (eds) (1992) *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. III; H. Geva (ed.) (1994) *Ancient Jerusalem Revealed*; (2000) *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem Conducted by Nahman Avigad, 1969–1982*: vol. I, *Architecture and Stratigraphy: Areas A, W and X-2 Final Report*; (2003) Vol. II, *The Finds from Areas A, W and X-2 Final Report*; O. Lipschits and O. Tal (2007) 'The Settlement Archaeology of the Province of Judah', in O. Lipschits et al. (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*: 33–52; *NEAEHL* 2: 698–804, esp. 717–29; *OEANE* 3: 224–38; R. Reich and E. Shukron (2007) 'The Yehud Stamp Impressions from the 1995–2005 City of David Excavations', *TA* 34: 59–65.

For the third century, it seems that we have little identifiable evidence (*NEAEHL* 2: 719). Unfortunately, most ‘archaeological’ discussions repeat literary evidence (some of it of dubious historical value), but the actual archaeological data seem to be very sparse. It is generally believed that in this period settlement was confined to the south-eastern hill (Berlin 1997: 8; Lipschits and Tal 2007: 34). R. Reich and E. Shukron provide evidence for this conclusion: they note that access to the Gihon Spring was found only on the southern side of the hill in the Persian and early Hellenistic period, which is confirmed by the distribution of *Yehud* stamp impressions (2007: 64). No building construction or monumental architecture remains have been discovered so far. It has been proposed that evidence for repair of the city wall in the time of Simon (Sir. 50.1-3) might have been preserved. On the eastern Temple Mount wall, north of the ‘seam’, the wall is built from ashlar in a technique different from the construction south of the ‘seam’ (which is Herodian). This is conceivably from this time, though other explanations are possible (*NEAEHL* 2: 743). Otherwise, the main finds are a few dozen *Yehud* seals, a large number of Rhodian stamped handles (§3.4), and part of a building with a third-century assemblage of pottery vessels on the floor (*NEAEHL* 2: 723).

It is likely that settlement had begun to expand onto the south-western hill by the second century BCE, though Lipschits and Tal have indicated their opposition to the idea that settlement might have begun there in the Persian period (2007: 34 n. 2). Although the excavations in the Jewish Quarter produced hardly any early Hellenistic finds, only those from the Hasmonaean period or later (Geva [ed.] 2000: 24), some small finds indicate a settlement. These early finds included no architectural remains but a few sherds, coins, and stamped Rhodian jar handles.

2.1.19 *Qalandiyeh*

NEAEHL 4: 1197–1200.

Qalandiyeh is an estate 8km northwest of Jerusalem, excavated by I. Magen in 1978 and 1981. It seems to have been founded in the third century as a farmstead. Judging from the remains its main business was winemaking, with six winepresses and a further beam-and-weight press for grapeskins. A further winepress, built with innovative technology, was found outside the farm to the east. A variety of farm buildings and tombs were discovered. Near a cistern but not connected to it was a plastered rock-cut bath, interpreted as a ritual bath. Hundreds of coins and the remains of many amphora were also apparently unearthed and help to date the establishment of the farm. Farming activity seems to have reached its peak in the second century BCE but came to an end in the first century CE, though quarrying seems to have gone on.

2.1.20 *Ashdod (Azotus)*

ARAV 37–38; *NEAEHL* 1: 93–102; *OEANE* 1: 219–20.

The Greek name for Ashdod was Azotus, and it has a rich history in the Maccabean period (*HJJSTP* 3). The lack of remains indicates a diminished population in the late fourth and early third centuries, but this changed in the last half of the third century. The Hellenistic city is found in strata 3 and 4 and was laid out according to a regular grid plan. A large building, with many Rhodian-type jars, is thought to be the town's agora or civic centre. It contained an altar in one corner. A destruction toward the end of the second century has been ascribed to the Hasmonaeans.

2.1.21 *Ashkelon (Ascalon)*

ARAV 45–47; *NEAEHL* 1: 103–12; *OEANE* 1: 220–23.

Ashkelon was destroyed about 300 BCE. The excavations by Garstag in the 1920s produced little from the Hellenistic period. They identified a 'double row of columns' from the original city plan, perhaps leading to a theatre, but this interpretation is 'doubtful' (ARAV 47). A number of what have been identified as large blocks of private villas covering three *insulae* (city blocks) were built in the early Hellenistic period where warehouses had stood. One of these contains a second-century cistern which held Rhodian and Italic amphorae and other ceramics from Greece and elsewhere.

2.1.22 *Tell el-Hesi*

J.W. Betlyon (1991) 'Archaeological Evidence of Military Operations in Southern Judah during the Early Hellenistic Period', *BA* 54: 36–43; *NEAEHL* 2: 630–34; *OEANE* 3: 22.

During the Persian period the site seems to have been a centre for grain production, with threshing floors and storage pits (as indicated by stratum V). There is no detectable disruption between stratum V and the Hellenistic stratum IV, or late Persian/early Hellenistic according to Betlyon (1991: 41), since stratum IV seems to continue the Persian stratum. A single building, remodelled two or three times, and storage pits and threshing floors show that the town continued as a source of grain for the military. The contents of the refuse pits suggest the remains of a military encampment. The site seems to have been abandoned in the late fourth or early third century, perhaps because of competition from the nearby coastal cities such as Gaza.

2.1.23 Beth-Zur

ARAV 67–71; C.E. Carter (1999) *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period*; *NEAEHL* 1: 259–61; *OEANE* 1: 314; R. Reich (1992) ‘The Beth-Zur Citadel II: A Persian Residency?’ *TA* 19: 113–23; O.R. Sellers (1933) *The Citadel at Beth-Zur*; (1958) ‘The 1957 Campaign at Beth-Zur’, *BA* 21: 71–76; O.R. Sellers (ed.) (1968) *The 1957 Excavation at Beth-Zur*.

Beth-Zur has excited a variety of different interpretations (ARAV 67–71). The main post-exilic structure was a citadel which formed the main structure of the town. This exhibited three phases of construction, though excavators have not agreed as to when these occurred. Opinion has gone mainly with that of R. Funk who put phase 1 of the citadel in the third century BCE (*NEAEHL* 1: 261), while most have agreed that phase 3 was carried out by the Syrian general Bacchides (1 Macc. 9.52). However, R. Reich (1992) has recently argued that the citadel was the residence of the provincial governor in the Persian period, though this identification has been opposed by C.E. Carter (1999: 154–55). Fifty-six Ptolemaic coins were found, 35 dated to Ptolemy II, and 29 stamped Rhodian jar handles.

2.1.24 En-gedi (Tel Goren, Tell el-Jurn)

ARAV 83–85; O. Lipschits and O. Tal (2007) ‘The Settlement Archaeology of the Province of Judah’, in O. Lipschits et al. (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, 33–52; B. Mazar, T. Dothan and I. Dunayevsky (1966) *En-Gedi: The First and Second Seasons of Excavations 1961–1962*; *NEAEHL* 2: 399–409; *OEANE* 2: 222–23.

Stratum III is associated with the pre-Hasmonaeon Hellenistic period (Mazar, Dothan and Dunayevsky 1966: 39–44). According to ARAV the remains of an extensive fortification system across the top of the mound were to be dated to the Ptolemaic period, with their function assumed to be protection of royal estates in the region; B. Mazar originally seemed to agree with this (Mazar, Dothan and Dunayevsky 1966: 42–43). Later, however, he states that only a few coins and sherds were found dating to the early Hellenistic period and seems to assign the fortifications to the Hasmonaeon period (*NEAEHL* 2: 403–404); E. Stern agrees with this interpretation (*OEANE* 2: 222). Lipschits and Tal (2007: 43 n. 8) argue that, ‘given the site and the region’s character, it is safe to assume that the fort of Stratum III is of Early Hasmonaeon date (John Hyrcanus?)’. If so, we seem to have little from the Ptolemaic period for this site. A cistern was assigned to stratum III, though it continued to be used during stratum II, which was associated with the later Herodian rulers.

2.1.25 Tel Maresha (Tell es-Şandahanna)

ABD 4: 523–25; **ARAV** 52–57; **G. Horowitz** (1980) 'Town Planning of Hellenistic Marisa: A Reappraisal of the Excavations after Eighty Years', *PEQ* 112: 93–111; **A. Kloner (ed.)** (2003) *Maresha Excavations Final Report I: Subterranean Complexes* 21, 44, 70; **NEAEHL** 3: 948–57; **OEANE** 3: 412–13; **E.D. Oren and U. Rappaport** (1984) 'The Necropolis of Maresha–Beth Govrin', *IEJ* 34: 114–53; **N. Sagiv and A. Kloner** (1996) 'Maresha: Underground Olive Oil Production in the Hellenistic Period', in D. Eitam and M. Heltzer (eds), *Olive Oil in Antiquity*, pp. 255–92.

As noted in *HJJSTP* 1 (43), the city of Maresha was especially important in the Hellenistic period, and much of the archaeological evidence dates from that period. The original site consisted of a central mound or upper city, surrounded by a lower city. The Hellenistic city was on the mound, about 150m by 160m (24 dunams) and laid out in a Hippodamian pattern with a wall and a number of square towers. Two Hellenistic strata have been identified. Surrounding it was the lower city, partially walled, with residential houses, shops and public buildings. Associated with the latter were caves (mostly man-made) that were used for a variety of purposes.

The nature of the region's geology (limestone crust over chalk [Kloner (ed.) 2003: 4]) means that the inhabitants were able to cut out safe and durable rooms in the bedrock under their houses. These underground chambers were used for a variety of functions, usually as a means of livelihood for the inhabitants. One of the favourite uses was as columbaria, connected to the surface through shafts that ended in entry blocks for the doves to fly in and out. It is estimated that as many as 50,000 niches for dove breeding were in use there. Other householders set up olive presses underground. Some of the caves were evidently cut as early as the Persian period, but the evidence for olive-oil production and the raising of doves dates mainly to the Hellenistic period. Evidence of other forms of industry, such as leather tanning or cloth dyeing, also occurs. What seem to be ritual baths (*miqva'ot*) have also been discovered. A variety of inscriptions and ostraca were found (§3.2.6); also 16 lead figurines which appear to be execration objects. They seem to have been used in the ritual cursing of one's enemies, and most of them are bound with wire in some form or other. A similar use seems to have been the intent of some 51 limestone tablets, some with Greek writing. Of 950 coins found, 135 are Ptolemaic (with only two pre-Ptolemaic), 116 dated from Ptolemy I to Ptolemy VIII (c.305–117 BCE). Of these, 12 were from Ptolemy I (about 10%) and 78 were from Ptolemy II (about two-thirds of the total). This suggests, not surprisingly, that almost all of their trade was conducted with Egyptian possessions (cf. §9.4).

Further out, also in a ring around the city, was the necropolis in three main groups of caves. The burial tombs also all seem to date to the third and second centuries. These tombs provide some of the most spectacular visual representations, especially in Tomb 551, with pictures of animals (some

imaginary) and Greek inscriptions. These burial caves show striking resemblances to some known from Alexandria at approximately the same time. There is evidence of primary burial in the Hellenistic period. The tombs were also used for secondary burial, though this seems to be at a later time.

2.1.26 *Lachish*

Y. Aharoni (1975) *Investigations at Lachish: The Sanctuary and the Residency (Lachish V)*; **ARAV** 57–58; **A. Fantalkin and O. Tal** (2004) ‘Chapter 30: The Persian and Hellenistic Pottery of Level I’, in D. Ussishkin (ed.), *The Renewed Archaeological Excavations at Lachish (1973–1994)*: 4: 2174–94; **OEANE** 3: 317–23; **D. Ussishkin (ed.)** (2004) *The Renewed Archaeological Excavations at Lachish (1973–1994)*.

With level I as the Persian layer, finding Hellenistic remains was not a simple matter. Much of the debate has centred on the ‘solar shrine’, a structure oriented east–west with a limestone altar in its court, recovered in the 1930s. It was dated to the Persian period by the original excavators, but Y. Aharoni (1975: 3–11) argued for a Hellenistic dating (fourth to third centuries). The renewed excavations have securely dated level I to the early fourth century (Fantalkin and Tal 2004: 2191), but the same clarity has not come to the Hellenistic layer, though they accept Aharoni’s dating of the ‘solar shrine’ (Persian and Hellenistic sherds below the temple floors support this dating). However, D. Ussishkin himself backs the original dating of J.L. Starkey that puts it in the Persian period (Ussishkin [ed.] 2004: 1: 96–97). The ‘residency’, on the other hand, seems to be agreed by all to be late Persian, without Hellenistic use.

2.1.27 *Tell Jemmeh*

ARAV 44–45; **NEAEHL** 2: 667–74; **OEANE** 3: 213–15; **E. Stern** (2001) *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible*, vol. II: *The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods (732–332 B.C.E.)*

The excavators found a series of 12 round mud-brick granaries, which were dispersed all over the site, suggesting there was no longer any settlement as such on the mound and that the site had become a grain depot. The granaries were dated to the Persian period by F. Petrie, the original excavator, and by E. Stern (2001: 413), though G. Van Beek, the later excavator, dated them to the Ptolemaic period (**NEAEHL** 2: 272–73; **OEANE** 3: 214). Ostraca found in the granary area indicate that the grain was collected as part of the taxation system. Van Beek also argued that the site was a station for caravan trade in frankincense and myrrh, pointing to a good deal of Attic pottery (including a large red-figured *lekythos*) but also a jar apparently with a South Arabian inscription (*ʿbm* a name known from Sabaeen and Minaean inscriptions).

2.1.28 Arad

ARAV 61–62; *NEAEHL* 1: 82–87; *OEANE* 1: 174–76.

Arad has a long archaeological history and also a long history of disputes about its archaeology in academic discussion (see the summary in *OEANE* 1: 174–76). Persian-period remains had been found in stratum V but this was mainly contained in 20 pits, because construction in the Hellenistic period had apparently destroyed the remains of the buildings. The Hellenistic phase of the third and second centuries was excavated in stratum IV. It was dominated by a massive tower on top of the mound, with its foundations dug down to bedrock. The tower was the central stronghold of the garrison and stood until the middle of the second century when it was destroyed, presumably by the Hasmonaeans.

2.1.29 Beersheba (*Tel Sheva*, *Tell es-Saba'*)

Y. Aharoni (ed.) (1973) *Beer-Sheba I: Excavations at Tel Beer-Sheba 1969–1971 Seasons*; H.-P. Kuhnen (1990) *Palästina in griechisch-römischer Zeit*; *NEAEHL* 1: 167–73; *OEANE* 1: 287–91.

Beersheba was always a key site in the defence of Judah's southern border, and it seems to have fulfilled a similar role in the Hellenistic period. The city was destroyed late in Iron II, with a gap in settlement until about 400 BCE. Most of the Persian-period finds are from storage pits, without *in situ* remains of the settlement. The Hellenistic occupation may have been more intensive than even the Roman (Aharoni [ed.] 1973: 7–8). A Hellenistic fortress was constructed by first bringing in a large amount of fill material to level the site. The remains of two broad parallel walls, found under the Roman fortress, were probably external walls of the fortress. With three distinct floor levels, the fortress may have been founded as early as the Persian period, continuing to the early Roman. Evidence of large courtyards, grain silos, ovens and the like occurred nearby. A temple seems to have been built in the third century BCE (Kuhnen 1990: 58).

2.1.30 'Iraq al-Amir

ARAV 106–10; J.M. Dentzer, F. Villeneuve and F. Larché (1982) 'Iraq el Amir: Excavations at the Monumental Gateway', *SHAJ* 1: 201–207; C.-H. Ji and J.K. Lee (2004) 'From the Tobiads to the Hasmoneans: The Hellenistic Pottery, Coins, and History in the Regions of 'Irāq al-Amīr and the Wādī Hisbān', *SHAJ* 8: 177–88; N.L. Lapp (ed.) (1983) *The Excavations at Araq el-Emir*: vol. 1; C.C. McCown (1957) 'The 'Araq el-Emir and the Tobiads', *BA* 20: 63–76; B. Mazar (1957) 'The Tobiads', *IEJ* 7: 137–45, 229–38; *NEAEHL* 2: 646–49; *OEANE* 3: 177–81; É. Will (1982) 'Un Monument Hellénistique de Jordanie: Le Qasr el 'abd d'Iraq al Amir', *SHAJ* 1: 197–200; É. Will and F. Larché (eds) (1991) *'Iraq al Amir: Le Château du Tobiade Hyrcan*.

Located almost exactly half-way between the Jordan and Amman (about 20km west of Amman), on the Wadi as-Sir, 'Iraq al-Amir was the residence and centre of the Tobiad family. Two tiers of caves, cut out of the cliff face, seem to mark an earlier settlement which might have continued to be used at various times. On the façades of these caves are two inscriptions of the name 'Tobiah' (טוביה *twbyh*). These have been variously dated, from as late as the third to the second century (*NEAEHL* 2: 647) to even as early as the fifth century BCE (Mazar 1957: 141–42; cf. *OEANE* 3: 177). Little from the Persian period was found. A large tell at the base of the cliffs is covered by a village today. Of the six strata uncovered in soundings, stratum III was dated to the second century BCE, following the eleventh century stratum IV, which meant a gap of 900 years. There are also some other buildings, such as the Plaster Building, the Byzantine 'Square Building', and there were some defensive walls and the monumental gateway.

The focus of the settlement is the Qaşr al-ʿAbd which is a *bit-ḥilani*-style monumental building with pillars topped by Corinthian capitals and life-motif decorations. It has two storeys, the second storey apparently meant as residential quarters. There is a considerable debate about the function of the structure called the Qaşr el-ʿAbd. One problem with determining its function is that it was never finished. While P. Lapp (*NEAEHL* 2: 648) and others definitely think it a temple (cf. *ARAV* 107–10), this view has not commanded a consensus among archaeologists. The most recent excavations and interpretations seem to go against the temple idea and see it as a residential building (Will 1982: 199–200; *OEANE* 3: 178–80; Lapp [ed.] 1983: 151–53). It could date anywhere from late in the third century to the first half of the second century BCE.

Recent surveys and soundings in the area of 'Iraq al-Amir offer a new perspective on the problem (Ji and Lee 2004). In spite of some of the difficulties with distinguishing pottery (Ji and Lee 2004: 178), there seems to be good evidence for settlement in the early Hellenistic period. Pottery includes storage jars with thickened rims, Hellenistic fish plates, bowls with incurved rims, a repertoire generally dating from the fourth to the early second century; on the other hand, the later cooking pots with grooved rims and narrow short bevelled necks are lacking, as are storage jars with folded, flanged rims. The coins so far found at 'Iraq al-Amir contain a significant number from the third century (Lapp [ed.] 1983: 13–20; Ji and Lee 2004: 182). The material evidence leads Ji and Lee to conclude that the first phase of Hellenistic settlement consisted of 'flourishing settlements', including 'cities, villages, military fortresses, and watchtowers' (2004: 183); this phase came to an end early in the second quarter of the second century BCE.

The aim here is to deal only with what we can know from archaeology. The relationship of the archaeology to the literary account found in Josephus is addressed in another chapter (§13.3).

2.1.31 *Rabbath-Ammon (Philadelphia)*

ARAV 110–11; *NEAEHL* 4: 1243–52; *OEANE* 1: 98–102.

The ancient site of Rabbath-Ammon was refounded as Philadelphia by Ptolemy II about the middle of the third century; however, the name did not stick and both Zenon (*PCZ* 59009) and Polybius (5.71.4: *Rhabbatamana*) use 'Rabbath-Ammon'. Little of the early Hellenistic city survives. Remains of several Hellenistic structures have apparently been found: a cistern and water system at the north end of the acropolis, repair of the bastion in the south-eastern corner of the lower city, as well as pottery and coins. Dry construction of the acropolis walls with polygonal blocks is thought to be a building technique of the Hellenistic period.

2.1.32 *Gadara (Umm Qeis)*

A. Hoffmann (2001) 'Hellenistic Gadara', *SHAJ* 7: 391–97; *NEAEHL* 2: 565–73 (Hammam Gader only); *OEANE* 5: 281–82.

Ancient Gadara was sited on a plateau east of the Sea of Galilee, overlooking it and the Jordan river. It is identified with Umm Geis but is near to Hammam Gader on the Yarmuk river, which contained hot springs (Strabo 16.2.29, 45) used for baths during the Roman period. Gadara was a well-known city of the Decapolis and already existed in the third century BCE (Polybius 5.71.3). The archaeology suggests that it was refortified to a high technical level after the Seleucid conquest in 200 BCE (Hoffmann 2001: 392). The Hellenistic city plan shows a orthogonal street system. Construction of a temple began in the early second century BCE but was finished much later. No altar has yet been found.

2.1.33 *Pella (Ṭabaqat Fahḷ)*

ARAV 112; *NEAEHL* 3: 1174–80; *OEANE* 4: 256–59; J. Tidmarsh (2004) 'How Hellenised Was Pella in Jordan in the Hellenistic Period?' *SHAJ* 8: 459–68.

The site of ancient Pella lies on the east side of the Jordan, overlooking the Jordan Valley, about 30km south of the Sea of Galilee. First described and mapped in the late nineteenth century, with a couple or so brief digs in the 1950s and 1960s, excavation was carried out by the College of Wooster, Ohio, in the period 1967 to 1985. The University of Sydney joined them in 1979 and continued to dig independently after 1985. It is mainly in the past few years that Hellenistic and early Roman remains have come to light. Much of the Hellenistic material relates to the second and early first centuries BCE, since the city expanded and grew throughout the second century, after coming under Seleucid rule.

Three stray coins of Ptolemy II are the main identifiable third-century finds on the main mound. Some domestic remains from the early second century

have been identified, though the construction technique seems to differ little from that of the Late Iron at Pella. Ceramic lamps and a bronze coin of Ptolemy IV suggest that a small fortress or garrison existed from no later than the third century on the Tall al-Huṣn mound (Tidmarsh 2004: 460). The lack of evidence for destruction on this mound points to continual habitation into the early Roman period. Remains of fortresses on the mounds of Jabal al-Ḥammah and Sarṭaba are, unfortunately, not certainly dated as yet. Elsewhere, especially on the main mound, there is evidence of a massive conflagration (usually ascribed to Alexander Jannaeus about 83 BCE [Josephus, *Ant.* 13.15.4 §§395–97]). A sculpture of a feline is dated to the late fourth century. The many stamped Rhodian amphora handles in locus 13 appear to date to the Hellenistic period but further precision is difficult.

2.2 *Surveys and Synthesis*

2.2.1 *Introductory Comments*

A.M. Berlin (1997) 'Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period', *BA* 60: 2–51; (2002) 'Power and its Afterlife: Tombs in Hellenistic Palestine', *NEA* 65: 138–48; **M.-C. Halpern-Zylberstein** (1989) 'The Archeology of Hellenistic Palestine', *CHJ* 2: 1–34; **C.-H. Ji and J.K. Lee** (2004) 'From the Tobiads to the Hasmonaeans: The Hellenistic Pottery, Coins, and History in the Regions of 'Irāq al-Amīr and the Wādī Hisbān', *SHAJ* 8: 177–88; **H.-P. Kuhnen** (1990) *Palästina in griechisch-römischer Zeit*; **R.H. Smith** (1990) 'The Southern Levant in the Hellenistic Period', *Levant* 22: 123–30.

It would no doubt be an understatement to say that the Hellenistic period has generally been neglected by archaeologists. In the past most of the sites mentioned here were excavated by 'biblical archaeologists', whose interests lay either in the Israelite period or the Roman period with its NT connections. But part of the problem is that the Hellenistic period is often poorly represented at sites, not least because of damage by later Roman builders. Also, precise dating of Hellenistic finds is difficult. It is not always simple to distinguish late Persian from early Hellenistic pottery, nor late Hellenistic from Roman, not to mention early Hellenistic from late Hellenistic (Kuhnen 1990: 40; ARAV 7–8; Ji and Lee 2004: 178). There is no clear break between the late Persian and the early Hellenistic period: as important as Alexander's conquest and the wars of the Diadochi were to history, they left little impression on the artefactual record (Kuhnen 1990: 38). The Ptolemaic period is sparsely documented in major excavations, the main site being Marisa in Idumaea (§2.1.25). Most of the other Hellenistic sites represent the Seleucid and Hasmonaeon periods (Samaria, Beth-Zur, Jerusalem) or have only sparse remains from the early Hellenistic period. Other sites in Palestine include Dor (§2.1.7) and Tel Dan (§2.1.1), but neither of these seems to have had Jewish inhabitants during this period.

This has led to a sharp difference in interpretation with regard to the

economic prosperity and general welfare of Syro-Palestine in the early Greek period, which can be illustrated from two recent studies. R.H. Smith (1990) points to the lacunae in the archaeological record and argues that they represent essentially a state of low economic status, depopulation in many areas, stagnant growth and drab existence in the region during the third century – basically the period of Ptolemaic rule. Smith attributes this shabby situation to Ptolemaic policy, among other causes. In his view, it was only with the coming of Seleucid rule that conditions began to change. A.M. Berlin, on the other hand, comments:

Looking outside of the historian's agonistic filter, the country appears to have been largely peaceful. Up until the end of this period, most residents became increasingly wealthy and cosmopolitan ... More impressive, however, is the almost immediate return to comfort and prosperity throughout this region. Commercial opportunities resumed, afforded by trade in imported goods and the products of local agriculture (including wheat and wine) and small industry (e.g., purple dye) ... At almost every site with Persian period settlement, occupation continued, uninterrupted in character, into the following century. Excavations have revealed material prosperity and broad trading connections. (Berlin 1997: 3–5)

My own survey (Ch. 9 below) suggests that Berlin is right and that the Ptolemies generally pursued policies that led to growing prosperity in Syro-Palestine, as well as in Egypt. It would be a mistake to ignore the complexities involved, however, and not recognize ups and downs over time and variations between regions. The region mainly had peace, but the Syrian war tended to drain resources. As will be noted below, Judah probably did continue to experience a lower standard of living through much of the third century than some other sections of the region.

The Hellenistic period brought a number of changes to aspects of the material culture, which are catalogued by ARAV (142–68). Two can be mentioned here: settlement plans and burials. The typical Greek pattern of a new settlement was to lay it out according to Hippodamian principles, with a regular grid shape, streets parallel or meeting at right angles, forming lots of regular size. Only some Palestinian sites show this amount of regularity: Samaria, Philoteria-Beth-Yerah, Marisa, Dor, Shiqmona and Ashdod (ARAV 147–50). Others show such a grid pattern only in the Roman period (e.g., Gaza, Jerusalem and Akko), while many sites have no indication that any such pattern was ever applied.

A variety of tomb types is recorded for Hellenistic Palestine (Berlin 2002). The better-known 'display tombs' of Jerusalem are in fact untypical of the period, being confined mainly to the period from the late second or early first century BCE to 70 CE. The Judahite tombs for the Hellenistic period were quite similar to the Phoenician tombs that dominated the Mediterranean coast and western Palestine during this period. The spectacular tombs in Maresha are good examples of Phoenician-style constructions. For the tombs in Judah, see below (§2.2.4).

2.2.2 The Galilee, Samaria, Idumaea and Transjordan

S. Applebaum (1986) 'The Settlement Pattern of Western Samaria from Hellenistic to Byzantine Times: A Historical Commentary', in S. Dar (ed.) *Landscape and Pattern*, 257–69; **A.M. Berlin** (1997) 'Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period', *BA* 60: 2–51; **S. Dar** (1986) *Landscape and Pattern: An Archaeological Survey of Samaria, 800 B.C.E.–636 C.E.*; **D.R. Edwards and C.T. McCollough** (eds) (1997) *Archaeology and the Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods*; **I. Finkelstein** (1988–89) 'The Land of Ephraim Survey 1980–1987: Preliminary Report', *TA* 15–16: 117–83; **I. Finkelstein and Z. Lederman** (eds.) (1997) *Highlands of Many Cultures: The Southern Samaria Survey: The Sites*; **G. Horowitz** (1980) 'Town Planning of Hellenistic Marisa: A Reappraisal of the Excavations after Eighty Years', *PEQ* 112: 93–111; **B. Isaac** (1991) 'A Seleucid Inscription from Jamnia-on-the-Sea: Antiochus V Eupator and the Sidonians', *IEJ* 41: 132–44; **C.-H. Ji** (2001) 'Irāq al-'Amir and the Hellenistic Settlements in Central and Northern Jordan', *SHAJ* 7: 379–89; **C.-H. Ji and J.K. Lee** (2004) 'From the Tobiads to the Hasmoneans: The Hellenistic Pottery, Coins, and History in the Regions of 'Irāq al-'Amir and the Wādi Hisbān', *SHAJ* 8: 177–88; **H.-P. Kuhnen** (1990) *Palästina in griechisch-römischer Zeit*; *NEAEHL* 4: 1311–18; **I. Roll and O. Tal** (1999) *Apollonia-Arsuf, Final Report of the Excavations: vol. I, The Persian and Hellenistic Periods*; **D.W. Roller** (1982) 'The Northern Plain of Sharon in the Hellenistic Period', *BASOR* 247: 43–52.

Settlement does not appear to have been heavy in the northern part of Israel at this time, meaning Jezreel and Beth-Shean valleys, the Hula valley and the Golan heights (Berlin 1997: 12–13). The few sites dated to the early Greek period seem to have been mainly agricultural villages, as seems to be confirmed by sites such as Tell Anafa, Tell Keisan and Tell Qiri. The founding of Philoteria and Scythopolis as *poleis* in the third century does not appear to have materially changed the situation.

Surveys of northern Samaria, southern Samaria and the area of 'Ephraim' have provided much useful information on the central highlands. After a period of intensive settlement in northern Samaria during the Persian period (cf. *HJJSTP* 1: 33), the population dropped considerably during the Hellenistic period (*NEAEHL* 4: 1312). About half the Persian sites (140 in all) show Hellenistic habitation. Exactly the opposite is found for southern Samaria: a sharp decline in the Persian period is then countered by a return to prosperity in the Hellenistic (*NEAEHL* 4: 1314). Whether there was an overall change in settlement patterns from the Persian to Hellenistic period is a moot point, in spite of regional shifts at different times and the decline in site numbers in the Hellenistic period (*NEAEHL* 4: 1317). What does seem to be the case is that in the early Hellenistic period (probably from Seleucid rule but possibly under Hasmonaean rule) the intensity of agrarian settlement increased considerably (*NEAEHL* 4: 1317). Examples include the six new farmsteads in southern Samaria from the early Seleucid period (Applebaum 1986: 260).

Settlements in the northern central hills from the early Hellenistic period

seem to be confined to Samaria and Shechem (including Gerizim) (Berlin 1997: 11). A feature of this region, however, is the small, stone field-towers, of which about 1,200 have been catalogued (Dar 1986: 88–125). They seem to have had a function primarily in wine production, which was the main product of this region. They served as temporary dwellings and also places of storage. It has been suggested that they are a mark of the ‘king’s land’ which has been identified with this region (see further at §7.1.3.2). Whatever the merits of the ‘king’s land’ arguments, these towers seem to be confined to a specific area of the northern hill country.

The Ephraim survey included the area between Shechem and Bethel, stretching from the Jordan Valley to the Shephelah (Finkelstein 1988–89). This area had dropped considerably in settlement by the fifth century in the Persian period, with only 92 sites (or possibly fewer) and perhaps 7,000 inhabitants. The problem of identifying specifically Hellenistic pottery applies here (as noted above), but about 100 sites have been identified (more are likely to be identified in the final report). The desert fringe and the southern central range had few inhabitants, with a possible decline in the northern area and the foothills generally. This contrasts with a large increase in the southern slopes, 70 per cent of the sites being in the southern part of Ephraim. Gophna (Jifna) was a centre in the region that was thriving at this time (Timnah is also mentioned, but this lies outside the survey area, if it refers to Tell Batash).

In the Hellenistic period the coast shows a division between continued Phoenician domination and Greek cultural influences. Just as in the Persian period, we still find a pattern of core settlements surrounded by dependent satellites (Roll and Tal 1999: 253–55). Core settlements include Apollonia-Arsuf, Tell Michal and Joppa, with satellite settlements reaching from the border with Idumaea to the Yarkon river to the river Poleg not far south of Carmel. Apollonia and Tel Michal seem quite close (only 4km apart) for both to be core settlements, but it may be that Apollonia was the civil settlement and Tel Michal the military one (though Apollonia was probably dominant overall). The Yarkon seems to have been the centre for many small settlements, both north and south, including urbanized settlements, farmsteads and military outposts.

A number of constructions were evidently intended for purposes of commerce, including depots, customs houses and storage at places as widely dispersed as Pelusium, Gaza, Maresha, Khirbet el-Qôm and Akko (Berlin 1997: 4–6), though some storehouse sites (such as Tell Jimmeh and Tell el-Hesi) decline through the third century. Signs of prosperity are indicated by affluent residences in towns such as Gaza, Ashkelon, Tel Mor (Ashdod) and Dor, about which A.M. Berlin waxes eloquent:

The city’s residents enjoyed a particularly rich material culture: their tables were set with fine imported dishes; their pantries were filled with wine amphoras from Rhodes and Knidos; and their personal effects included earrings and rings of

gold and silver and pendants of faience and bone in an Egypto-Phoenician style.
(Berlin 1997: 5)

While she is speaking specifically of Dor, her words might be extrapolated to some of the other residences noted above.

The question of whether Idumaea/Idumaeans came from ancient Edom has been much debated (§7.5.3.4). In any case, this was widely assumed. More important, the Phoenician presence continued in the form of Sidonian settlements such as we find at Maresha and Jamnia (Isaac 1991). Settlements in this region also appear to have a border-defence function, at least in some cases. Some new settlements that also functioned as road stations were established on the northern border of the Negev (Berlin 1997: 6). But more explicit defences were organized across the southern border of the region (Berlin 1997: 7–8; Kuhnen 1990: 43–47). Maresha was at one end of a line that stretched to the Dead Sea, with other sites including Bet-Zur and Arad.

The Transjordanian region is now much better known for the archaeology than even two or three decades ago, with extensive excavation and survey work (see the summary in Ji 2001; Ji and Lee 2004). This has included a good deal of work in the Hellenistic period. Earlier reports had tended to see a gap in the early Hellenistic period (Ji 2001: 379; Ji and Lee 2004: 177), but now sufficient information on the early Hellenistic has become available to call this interpretation into question (Ji 2001: 379 and *passim*).

One of the main sites for this period is naturally 'Iraq al-Amir. There now seems evidence that the site was already inhabited in the early Hellenistic period, some time before the late third or early second century when Hyrcanus Tobiad was active. On the other hand, the Qaṣr al-'Abd could have been built in the late third century. There are problems with dating it because it was never finished, but an association with Hyrcanus seems possible in the light of present evidence. This assumes that it was a residence, a judgement with which not everyone agrees. For a further discussion, see §13.3. Apart from 'Iraq al-Amir archaeology of the Transjordan in the Hellenistic is dominated by the cities of the Decapolis (including Philadelphia-Amman, Pella, Gerasa-Jarash, Gadara). Rabbat-Ammon had continued through the Persian period and was made into the Greek foundation of Philadelphia by Ptolemy II (§2.1.31), but the archaeological remains of the other cities are very skimpy. For further information on the cities of the Decapolis, see §7.1.3.2. Settlement as a whole seems to have been scattered, with subsistence agriculture being the main means of surviving.

2.2.3 Judah

A.M. Berlin (1997) 'Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period', *BA* 60: 2–51; (2002) 'Power and its Afterlife: Tombs in Hellenistic Palestine', *NEA* 65: 138–48; **J.W. Betlyon** (1991) 'Archaeological Evidence of Military Operations in Southern Judah during the Early Hellenistic Period', *BA* 54: 36–43; **R. Harrison** (1994) 'Hellenization in Syria-Palestine: The Case of Judea in the

Third Century BCE', *BA* 57: 98–108; **H.-P. Kuhnen** (1990) *Palästina in griechisch-römischer Zeit*; **O. Lipschits and O. Tal** (2007) 'The Settlement Archaeology of the Province of Judah', in O. Lipschits et al. (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*, 33–52; **E.M. Meyers** (1994) 'Second Temple Studies in the Light of Recent Archaeology: Part I: The Persian and Hellenistic Periods', *CR: BS* 2: 25–42; **R. Reich and E. Shukron** (2007) 'The Yehud Stamp Impressions from the 1995–2005 City of David Excavations', *TA* 34: 59–65; **R.H. Smith** (1990) 'The Southern Levant in the Hellenistic Period', *Levant* 22: 123–30.

For Judah we do not yet have available a good archaeological synthesis for the early Hellenistic period (for a start, see especially Berlin 1997 and Lipschits and Tal 2007), but this seems to be partly due to the nature of the evidence available. By 'Judah' we mean primarily Jerusalem and its surroundings, since Jerusalem is the only large settlement in Judah in this period (Berlin 1997: 16; 2002: 141). Yet Jerusalem was evidently small and materially poor through the third century, with settlement confined to the south-eastern ridge (the old 'City of David') (Berlin 1997: 8; Lipschits and Tal 2007: 34; Reich and Shukron 2007). The question of the south-western hill is currently debated, but the general view is that it was settled no earlier than the second century BCE (though this could potentially put it in our period if it was early in the second century). It is argued below that the latter part of the third and the early second century saw a dramatic increase in the city's general prosperity, but this does not appear to be reflected in the material record until the later part of the third century and beginning of the second when many stamped Rhodian amphora handles are dated (§9.5.2.3).

By and large, the early Hellenistic period in Judah seems to be a continuation of the late Persian period (Lipschits and Tal 2007: 47). The Judean Hills Survey (*NEAEHL* 3: 816) covered an area of about 600km². It found that the decline of the Persian period changed to a period of intensive settlement over the entire area surveyed, including 91 sites with a total area of over 60 hectares (150 acres). Keeping in mind that Jerusalem lies outside the survey area, the main urban centres were Hebron, Ziph and Adoraim-Dura. The population density in the area was never very high, 60 hectares yielding probably no more than about 15,000 inhabitants. As noted above, there were few Jewish settlements in the early Hellenistic period, and the few there were tended to be around Jerusalem (Berlin 2002: 141). Several complexes have been dated to the late fourth century, including pit 484 in stratum IVB at Ramat Raḥel, cistern 361 of Tell en-Nasbe and grave goods from Bat-Yam (Kuhnen 1990: 40).

The study of Lipschits and Tal (2007) improves on this picture considerably. Drawing primarily on surveys of three areas (hill country of Benjamin; Jerusalem; Nes Harim and Deir Mar Saba) they found that the number of Hellenistic sites was roughly double the Persian-period ones (in some cases even as much as 200 per cent or more [2007: 38–44]). Most of this increase seems to have taken place in the Hasmonaean period, however, since only in Jerusalem was the attempt made to distinguish early Hellenistic from late

(Hasmonaean) Hellenistic. They conclude that late Persian and early Hellenistic Judah experienced a continuity in settlement pattern:

The archaeological evidence allows us to argue that during the early Hellenistic period Judah experienced a smooth shift from its Persian (Achaemenid) past ... In other words, late Persian period Judah as a political entity may be defined, according to data retrieved from both excavations and surveys, as a rural province with no more than half the number of settlements as the late Iron Age. (Lipschits and Tal 2007: 46–47)

In the early Hellenistic period Judah remained a rural province, with significant change coming only in the late third and early second century.

Relevant for Jerusalem is the estate of Qalandiyeh, which is about 8km northwest of the capital. Probably founded in the third century as a farmstead, there are signs that it was an important site of the early Hellenistic period dedicated to winemaking (as indicated by six winepresses, a further beam-and-weight press for grapeskins and an additional winepress with innovative technology outside the farm). If Jerusalem was starting to become a trading centre by this time, the products from Qalandiyeh would be an indication of the type of goods that would be readily exported.

Although tombs are an important artefact accessible to archaeology, we find no ‘identifiably Jewish tombs that date from the third to early second centuries’ (Berlin 2002: 141). Judging from grave goods in the tombs excavated in the vicinity of Jerusalem, the inhabitants of the area in some cases made use of tombs from the First Temple period (for example, at Ketef Hinnom). Jewish burials seem to have continued a number of the features known from the First Temple period bench tombs and also have much in common with the Phoenician tombs further west. But from about 100 BCE (or possibly earlier, if literary sources are taken into account), things began to change. Berlin emphasizes the following about Jewish burials:

During the later third and early second centuries BCE, Jews and Phoenicians maintained a common tradition of extended family and/or clan burial within subterranean tombs that were essentially invisible and were without regard to outward display. By the late second century BCE, however, differences between the two communities would have been far more noticeable than similarities. Most dramatically, Jewish tombs were transformed from architecturally invisible, essentially private structures into public monuments with showy façades, such as the well-known tombs in the Kidron Valley. (Berlin 2002: 144)

Perhaps one of the most interesting points is that ‘there is really very little archaeological support for the contention that Judaea was thoroughly Hellenized before the middle of the second century BCE’ (Harrison 1994: 106). See further at §6.3.2.6.

Chapter 3

PAPYRI, INSCRIPTIONS AND COINS

In contrast to the ‘unwritten archaeology’ in the previous chapter, this chapter contains the ‘written archaeology’ – those artefacts with writing discovered in excavations or presumed to have been found in such contexts. It is useful to divide this by region because of the light that these writings throw on people and situations of particular regions, with Judah especially in mind.

3.1 *Papyri, Inscriptions and Ostraca from Egypt and Elsewhere*

3.1.1 *Elephantine Papyri*

J. Harmatta (1959) ‘Irano-Aramaica (Zur Geschichte des frühhellenistischen Judentums in Ägypten)’, *Acta Antiqua* 7: 337–409; **B. Porten (ed.)** (1996) *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-Cultural Continuity and Change*.

On the Elephantine papyri in general, see the bibliography and discussion in *HJJSTP* 1 (54–55). The bulk of the Aramaic papyri (*TAD* 1–4; *AP*) are from the Persian period; however, some of the Aramaic texts, many of the Egyptian and most of the Greek texts (available in English translation in Porten [ed.] 1996) are from the time of Ptolemaic rule (some naturally later than the early Hellenistic period).

TAD C3.28 (*AP* #81: probably some sort of business account) is long but fragmentary and difficult. In the first publication, Cowley himself thought it might be from the Ptolemaic period because of the Greek names and put it about 300 BCE because of the palaeography. It has now been given a lengthy treatment and reconstruction by J. Harmatta (1959) who dates it to about 310 because (1) it seems to use two standards of coinage, which ceased after Ptolemy I became king in 306; (2) private individuals can still conduct trade, whereas it later became a royal monopoly; and (3) the price of wheat seems to fit what is known of this time. If so, this could be a valuable economic text apparently dating from the period of the Diadochi.

3.1.2 Zenon Papyri

CPJ; **DURAND**; **G.M. Harper, Jr** (1928) 'A Study in the Commercial Relations between Egypt and Syria in the Third Century Before Christ', *AJP* 49: 1–35; **C. Orrieux** (1983) *Les papyrus de Zénon: L'horizon d'un grec en Egypte au III^e siècle avant J. C.*; (1985) *Zénon de Caunos, parépidémos, et le destin grec*; **P. Col. Zen. 1**; **P. Col. Zen. 2**; **PCZ**; **P.W. Pestman** (ed.) (1980) *Greek and Demotic Texts from the Zenon Archive* (*P. L. Bat. 20*); (1981) *A Guide to the Zenon Archive* (*P. L. Bat. 21*); **P. Lond.**; **PSI 4–9**; **M. Rostovtzeff** (1922) *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.*; **Sel. Pap. 1–2**; **V.A. Tcherikover (Tscherikower)** (1937) 'Palestine under the Ptolemies (A Contribution to the Study of the Zenon Papyri)', *Mizraim* 4–5: 9–90; **L.H. Vincent** (1920) 'La Palestine dans les papyrus Ptolémaïques de Gerza', *RB* 29: 161–202.

The Zenon archive is a collection of papyri from among those discovered at Darb el-Gerza in the Fayum (ancient Philadelphia) in Egypt during the First World War. They constitute the archive of an individual who was the agent of Apollonius the finance minister (*diokētēs*) of Ptolemy II. In the year 259 BCE Apollonius sent Zenon on a lengthy tour of Palestine and southern Syria to take care of various sorts of business. After his return Zenon continued to correspond with certain individuals whom he had met in his travels. Thus, the archive contains documents not only from Egypt and Palestine for the year 259 but also for several years afterward. It contains what we might call official 'public' correspondence but also that relating to Zenon's (and Apollonius') private affairs; it was apparently not customary in that context to distinguish the two. The result is a wealth of material throwing light on the trade, administration, culture and (only to a certain extent) historical events in Palestine and Egypt for this period. It has taken several large collections to finish publication of the papyri (for some of the main publications, see *PCZ*; *P. Col. Zen. 1*; *P. Col. Zen. 2*; *PSI 4–9*; *P. Lond.*; Pestman [ed.] 1980), not to mention numerous individual studies.

A number of studies and collections give some of the main papyri in translation (and sometimes the text). The documents mentioning specifically the Jews have been published separately with commentary (*CPJ* 1.1–17 [pp. 115–46]). Many of the documents from the Zenon archive are conveniently available in English translation in Rostovtzeff (1922), Tcherikover (1937), and *Sel. Pap. 1–2*, and in French translation in DURAND and Orrieux (1983; 1985).

Some of the points arising from the Zenon papyri can be summarized as follows:

- Local figures such as Tobias (*CPJ* 1.1; 1.4) and Jeddous (*CPJ* 1.6) seem to have exercised considerable power and autonomy, whether in relation to the Ptolemaic government or to whatever provincial administration was exercised from Jerusalem.
- Information on Tobias can be fitted with other sources to reconstruct some of the history of what seems to be an important Jewish family dynasty in the Transjordanian region.

- The importance of the Greek language and the need for those in power to work in the Greek medium is indicated by these letters. Tobias clearly had a Greek secretary, and, if he did not already possess a Hellenistic education himself, the pressure to give such to his sons would have been very strong.
- There is no indication that Tobias was anything but a loyal Jew, but the letters suggest a person who was not bothered by a polytheistic greeting to the king (cf. *CPJ* 1.4).
- The many references to Jews show one of the variety of ethnic groups in Egypt carrying on its daily life much as the others. There is no indication that the Jews were singled out for special treatment (either positive or negative) or that they were less integrated into society than the other groups. Vis-à-vis the native Egyptians, however, the Jews were generally treated as Greeks.

3.1.3 *Papyri of the Jewish Politeuma at Heracleopolis*

J.M.S. Cowey and K. Maresch (eds) (2001) *Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Heracleopolis (144/3–133/2 v. Chr.)* (*P. Polit. Iud.*); **S. Honigman** (2002a) 'The Jewish *Politeuma* at Heracleopolis', *SCI* 21: 251–66; (2003) 'Politeumata and Ethnicity in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt', *AncSoc* 33: 61–102; **K. Maresch and J. M.S. Cowey** (2003) '"A Recurrent Inclination to Isolate the Case of the Jews from their Ptolemaic Environment"? Eine Antwort auf Sylvie Honigman', *AncSoc* 22: 307–10; **C. Zuckerman** (1985–88) 'Hellenistic *politeumata* and the Jews: A Reconsideration', *SCI* 8/9: 171–85.

One of the most significant papyrological archives for Jewish studies from Ptolemaic Egypt was published only recently (Cowey and Maresch [eds] 2001). These are documents relating to a Jewish *politeuma* at the city of Heracleopolis. The data from them clarify a number of moot points about the Jewish communities in Egypt, including organization and the place of the Jewish and Greek juridical traditions in Jewish life. Although these texts relate to the mid-second century BCE, the information contained in them speak to the earlier situation in the third century. This is why they are included in this volume rather than the next one. See further at §7.2.1.

3.1.4 *Papyri Relating to the Village of Samareia*

C. Kuhs (1996) *Das Dorf Samareia im griechisch-römischen Ägypten: eine papyrologische Untersuchung*.

The village of Samareia is of interest for two reasons: one is its name, which appears to be derived from the Palestinian site Samaria, and the other is the presence of a large proportion of Jewish settlers. The importance of the village has long been known (cf. *CPJ* 1.22; 1.28), and the texts of the archive have apparently all been published. But it is the study by Kuhs (a Heidelberg MA thesis published on the world wide web) that brings much of the relevant

material together, including an analysis of 41 texts. The texts span a period of time of more than 500 years, from 254 BCE to 289 CE, but the core collection is from the century between the middle of the third and the middle of the second century BCE. Of the 85 persons named in this core group of texts, more than half are Jewish and possibly as many as 75 per cent (up to 65 persons). This makes the village of Samareia a significant Jewish settlement for study (for further details see §8.1).

3.1.5 Other Collections of Texts

AUSTIN; BAGNALL/DEROW; **E.R. Bevan** (1927) *The House of Ptolemy: A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*; **E. Boswinkel and P.W. Pestman** (eds) (1978) *Textes grecs, démotiques et bilingues* (P. L. Bat. 19); **BURSTEIN; R. Duttenhöfer** (1994) *Ptolemäische Urkunden aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung* (P. Heid. VI); **I.F. Fikhman** (1996) 'Les Juifs d'Égypte à l'époque byzantine d'après les papyrus publiés depuis la parution du "Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum" III', *SCI* 15: 223–29; (1997) 'L'état des travaux au "Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum" IV', in B. Kramer et al. (eds), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.–19.8.1995*, 290–96; (1998) 'Liste des Rééditions et Traductions des Textes Publiés dans le *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*, Vols. I–III', *SCI* 17: 183–205; **B.P. Grenfell** (1896) *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*; **B.P. Grenfell and A.S. Hunt** (eds) (1906) *The Hibeh Papyri, Part I*; (1907) *The Tebtunis Papyri, Part II*; **B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt and J.G. Smyly** (eds) (1902) *The Tebtunis Papyri, Part I*; **G.R. Hughes and R. Jasnow** (1997) *Oriental Institute Hawara Papyri: Demotic and Greek Texts from an Egyptian Family Archive in the Fayum (Fourth to Third Century B.C.)*; **A.S. Hunt and J.G. Smyly** (eds) (1933) *The Tebtunis Papyri, Volume III, Part I*; **A.S. Hunt, J.G. Smyly and C.C. Edgar** (eds) (1938) *The Tebtunis Papyri, Volume III, Part II*; **J.G. Keenan and J.C. Shelton** (eds) (1976) *The Tebtunis Papyri, Volume IV*; **B.P. Muhs** (2005) *Tax Receipts, Taxpayers, and Taxes in Early Ptolemaic Thebes*; **OGIS; RC; Sel. Pap. I–2**; **H.-J. Thissen** (1966) *Studien zum Raphiadekret*; **E.G. Turner** (ed.) (1955) *The Hibeh Papyri, Part II*; **S.P. Vleeming** (1994) *Ostraka Varia: Tax Receipts and Legal Documents on Demotic, Greek, and Greek-Demotic Ostraka* (P. L. Bat. 26); **J.K. Winnicki** (1991) 'Militäroperationen von Ptolemaios I. und Seleukos I. in Syrien in den Jahren 312–311 v. Chr. (II)', *AncSoc* 22: 147–201.

In addition to the collections listed above, there are many relevant documents among the other papyri, though they relate mainly to Egypt proper rather than to the territories outside Egypt. Individual papyri touch on economic, administrative, judicial, political and historical matters. A full survey is impossible here (see <http://scriptorium.lib.duke.edu/papyrus/texts/clist_papyri.html> [accessed 1 Nov. 2007] for a full 'checklist'). The *Tebtunis* and the *Hibeh* papyri seem to have many documents of importance for understanding Ptolemaic Egypt, but individual texts in other papyri collections can be equally useful. As already noted, many of the papyri relating to Jews (not just those in the Zenon archive) are collected in *CPJ*, now with bibliographical supplements by I.F. Fikhman (1996; 1997; 1998).

Collections on particular themes include *RC*, *OGIS*, and Muhs (2005). Important documents are given in English translation (often with bibliography and commentary) in BURSTEIN, BAGNALL/DEROW, and AUSTIN. Individual documents of importance include the *Revenue Laws* (Grenfell 1896; for a recent English translation see BAGNALL/DEROW #114; for the central sections, AUSTIN ##296–297), the Raphia decree (Thissen 1966; AUSTIN #276), the Canopus decree (*OGIS* 56; AUSTIN #271; BAGNALL/DEROW #164), the Rosetta Stone (*OGIS* 90; BAGNALL/DEROW #196), and the Satraps' Stela (Bevan 1927: 28–32; Winnicki 1991: 164–85).

3.2 *Papyri, Inscriptions and Ostraca from Palestine*

3.2.1 *Decree of Ptolemy II*

BAGNALL/DEROW #64; R.S. Bagnall (1976) *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt*; M.-T. Lenger (1964) *Corpus des Ordonnances des Ptolémées*; H. Liebesny (1936) 'Ein Erlass des Königs Ptolemaios II Philadelphos über die Deklaration von Vieh und Sklaven in Syrien und Phonikien (PER Inv. Nr. 24.552 gr.)', *Aegyptus* 16: 257–91; M. Rostovtzeff (1941) *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*: 1: 340–51.

Among the Rainer papyri in Vienna is one with parts of two decrees by Ptolemy II Philadelphus issued about his 24th year (260 BCE) (now SB 8008 = Lenger 21–22; see also Liebesny 1936). The legible parts read as follows (BAGNALL/DEROW #64):

[Col. 1 = left col., lines 1–10] ... to the *oikonomos* assigned in each hyparchy [*hyparcheia*], within 60 days from the day on which the [ordinance] was proclaimed, the taxable and tax-free [livestock] ... and take a receipt. And if any [do not do as] has been written above, [they shall be deprived of] the livestock and shall be [subject to the penalties] in the schedule. [Whatever] of the livestock was unregistered up to the proclamation of [the ordinance shall be free of taxes] for former years, of the pasture tax and crown tax and the other penalties, but from the 2[5]th year they shall pay the sum owing by villages ... As for those ... who make a registration in the name of another, the king will judge concerning them and their belongings shall be confiscated. Likewise, ...

[Col. 1, lines 17–21] Those holding the tax contracts for the villages and the komarchs [*komarchas*] shall register at the same time the taxable and tax-free livestock in the villages, and their owners with fathers' names and place of origin, and by whom the livestock are managed. Likewise they shall declare whatever unregistered livestock they see up to Dystros of the 25th year in statements on royal oath.

[Col. 1, lines 23–28] And they shall make each year at the same time declarations and shall pay the sums due as it is set out in the letter from the king, in the proper months according to the schedule. If any do not carry out something of the aforesaid, they shall be liable to the same penalties as those registering their own cattle under other names.

[Col. 1, lines 29–32] Anyone who wishes may inform (on violations), in which case he shall receive a portion of the penalties exacted according to the schedule,

as is announced in the schedule, and of the goods confiscated to the crown he shall take a third part.

[Col. 1, line 33 – col. 2 = right col., line 11] By order of the king: If anyone in Syria and Phoenicia has bought a free native person or has seized and held one or acquired one in any other manner ... to the *oikonomos* in charge in each hyparchy within 20 days from the day of the proclamation of the ordinance. If anyone does not register or present him he shall be deprived of the slave and there shall in addition be exacted for the crown 6000 drachmas per head, and the king shall judge about him. To the informer shall be given ... drachmas per head. If they show that any of the registered and presented persons were already slaves when bought, they shall be returned to them. As for those persons purchased in royal auctions, even if one of them claims to be free, the sales shall be valid for the purchasers.

[Col. 2, lines 12–15] Whoever of the soldiers on active duty and the other military settlers in Syria and Phoenicia are living with native wives whom they have captured need not declare them.

[Col. 2, lines 16–26] And for the future no one shall be allowed to buy or accept as security native free persons on any pretext, except for those handed over by the superintendent of the revenues in Syria and Phoenicia for execution, for whom the execution is properly on the person, as it is written in the law governing farming contracts. If this is not done, (the guilty party) shall be liable to the same penalties, both those giving (security) and those receiving it. Informers shall be given 300 drachmas per head from the sums exacted.

For the implications of this decree for the history of Judah, see §13.2.

3.2.2 *Hefzibah Inscription (Antiochus III and Stratēgos Ptolemy son of Thraseas)*

AUSTIN #193; J.M. Bertrand (1982) 'Sur l'inscription d'Hefzibah', *ZPE* 46: 167–74; T. Fischer (1979) 'Zur Seleukideninschrift von Hefzibah', *ZPE* 33: 131–38; J.-D. Gauger (1977) *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik: Untersuchungen zur Authentizität von Urkunden bei Flavius Josephus und im I. Makkabäerbuch*; Y. H. Landau (1966) 'A Greek Inscription Found Near Hefzibah', *IEJ* 16: 54–70.

After the Seleucid takeover of Syro-Palestine in 200 BCE, we know that Ptolemy son of Thraseas was 'stratēgos and high priest over Coele-Syria and Phoenicia' (*OGIS* #230). He had been an official of Ptolemy V but had changed sides and gone over to Antiochus III (§14.3.1). One could infer that this Ptolemy already held the office of *stratēgos* over Coele-Syria and Phoenicia under Ptolemaic rule. It is a reasonable inference but not at all certain, since the post could well have been created by Antiochus as the best way to control the newly conquered region.

Ptolemy is also mentioned in an inscription found in Palestine in the city of Beth-shean (Landau 1966; Fischer 1979; Bertrand 1982; AUSTIN #193):

(D) To King [Antiochus (III)], memorandum from Ptolemy the *strategos* and high priest; [concerning any disputes that may arise]: I request that written instructions be sent [so that] disputes arising in [my] villages and involving

peasants [with] each other should be [settled] by my agents, but those arising with peasants from [the] other villages should be investigated by the *oikonomos* [and the official] in charge [of the district (*topos*)], and if/[they concern murder] or appear [to be] of greater significance they should be referred to the *strategos* in Syria [and] Phoenicia; the garrison commanders [and those] in charge of the districts (*topoi*) should not [ignore] in any way those who call for their [intervention]. The same letter to Heliodorus.

(F) To the Great King Antiochus (III) memorandum [from Ptolemy] the *strategos* [and] high priest. I request, King, if you so please, [to write] to [Cleon] and Heliodorus [the] *dioiketai* that as regards the villages which belong to my domain, crown property, and the villages which you instructed should be registered, no one should be permitted under any pretext to billet himself, nor to bring in others, nor to requisition property, nor to take away peasants. The same letter to Heliodorus.

(G) King Antiochus (III) to Marsyas, greetings. Ptolemy the *strategos* and high priest reported to us that many of those travelling/are forcibly billeting themselves in his villages [and] many other acts of injustice are committed as they ignore [the instructions] we sent about this. Do therefore make sure that not only are they prevented (from doing so) but also that they suffer tenfold punishment for the harm they have done . . . The same letter to [Lysanias], Leon, Dionicus. (AUSTEN #193)

This form of this inscription is conventional for Hellenistic inscriptions, for it is simply the publication of correspondence – without significant editing. Some of the points made by the decree are the following:

- A hierarchy of administrative offices is partially outlined, including a *stratēgos* in charge of Syro-Palestine (Ptolemy himself), the *dioikētai* Cleon and Heliodorus (also discussed in the next section, §3.2.3), the *oikonomos*, and those in charge of a *topos*.
- No reference is made to hyparchies (unlike the decree of Ptolemy II [§3.2.1]), but the *topos* or district is plainly mentioned, showing an administrative division apparently below the level of province.
- These proclamations are mainly for the protection of the local people, so that soldiers would not be billeted on them or they be ejected from their houses which would be given over to quartering soldiers.

3.2.3 *Heliodorus Stela*

H.M. Cotton and M. Wörle (2007) 'Seleukos IV to Heliodoros: A New Dossier of Royal Correspondence from Israel', *ZPE* 159: 191–205.

This recently published inscription adds to the precious few relating to Palestine in the early Hellenistic period and also helps to fill in some gaps in our knowledge of Judah in this period. The inscription is the record of an exchange of correspondence between Seleucus IV and his minister Heliodorus and the subsequent copying of Seleucus' letter to lower officials

in the region of 'Coele-Syria and Phoenicia'. The inscription is quoted below (§14.3.5).

3.2.4 Seleucid Inscription of Ptolemy V

B. Isaac (1991) 'A Seleucid Inscription from Jamnia-on-the-Sea: Antiochus V Eupator and the Sidonians', *IEJ* 41: 132–44.

Although this inscription appears well into the second century BCE (c.163 BCE), it relates to events of the early Hellenistic period, which is why it is given here. It mentions services given by the 'Sidonians of Jamnia' to Antiochus III. This shows a parallel settlement to that of the Sidonians at Maresha. The fact that they chose to write in Greek also corresponds to the Sidonian inscriptions at Maresha. The first section of the inscription is a letter accompanying a petition (which forms the second part of the inscription). The two texts read as follows (Isaac's translation, the square brackets being part of the translation):

[King An]tiochus to Nessos, greetings. The recorded petition was submitted by [the Sid]jonians [in the Port of Jamnia]. Since ... the ... referred to are [also] immune ... so that they will also enjoy the same privileges. Farewell. Loos 149. Petition to [King] Antiochus Eupator from the Sidonians in the [Port of Jamnia]. Since [their ancestors] rendered many services to his grandfather, promptly obeying [all] instructions regarding naval service ...

3.2.5 Khirbet el-Kom Ostraca

L.T. Geraty (1975) 'The Khirbet el-Kôm Bilingual Ostrakon', *BASOR* 220: 55–61; (1981) 'Recent Suggestions on the Bilingual Ostrakon from Khirbet el-Kôm', *AUSS* 19: 137–40; (1983) 'The Historical, Linguistic, and Biblical Significance of the Khirbet el-Kôm Ostraca', in C.L. Meyers and M. O'Connor (eds), *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth*, 545–48; **A. Skaist** (1978) 'A Note on the Bilingual Ostrakon from Khirbet el-Kôm', *IEJ* 28: 106–108.

Six ostraca found in 1971 in the area of Edom seem to have belonged to a moneylender. Four are in Northwest Semitic, one is Greek and one is bilingual. The bilingual is dated to 'year 6', probably the 6th year of Ptolemy II's reign, or 277 BCE. They show that Greek was already well established alongside the local language. The figure who borrowed money in the bilingual ostrakon had the Greek name Nikeratos; however, his patronymic was Sobbathos which seems to be a Grecized form of the Semitic name Shabbat. If so, a local Edomite had already adopted a Greek name and wanted to have his receipt for debt recorded in Greek as well as the native language. The exact identity of the Semitic language is uncertain. Much of the text could be either Hebrew or Aramaic; however, there are both Aramaic forms (a plural form ending in *-n*) and Hebrew forms (*ben* and the verb *ntn*, though both these readings have been disputed). This has led Geraty to label the language as Edomite, a not unreasonable identification, though it

requires the assumption that the Edomites had their own language rather than Aramaic at this time. The text of the bilingual reads as follows:

[Semitic text] On the 12th (day) of (month) Tammuz, year 6, Qôs-yada', son of Hanna', the moneylender, loaned to Niqeratos: zuz, 32.

[Greek text] Year 6, 12th (day), month of Panēmos, Nikēratos, (son) of Sabbathos, received from Kos-idē the moneylender: drachma 32. (Geraty 1975: 55)

3.2.6 *Maresha Inscriptions and Ostraca*

E. Eshel and A. Kloner (1996) 'An Aramaic Ostrakon of an Edomite Marriage Contract from Maresha, Dated 176 B.C.E.', *IEJ* 46: 1–22; **A. Kloner** (forthcoming) 'The Introduction of the Greek Language and Culture in the Third Century BCE: according to the Archaeological Evidence in Idumaea', in L.L. Grabbe and O. Lipschits (eds), *Judah in Transition: From the Late Persian to the Early Hellenistic Period*; **A. Kloner (ed.)** (2003) *Maresha Excavations Final Report I: Subterranean Complexes* 21, 44, 70; **A. Kloner, E. Eshel and H. Korzakova** (forthcoming) *Maresha Excavations Finds, Report II: Epigraphy*; **E.D. Oren and U. Rappaport** (1984) 'The Necropolis of Maresha–Beth Govrin', *IEJ* 34: 114–53.

The original excavations at the beginning of the twentieth century found three Greek inscriptions from the Hellenistic period. One of these is dedicated to Arsinoe II, wife of Ptolemy IV (Kloner [ed.] 2003: 9). One of the most interesting is an epitaph for Apolophanes who headed the Sidonian colony (quoted below in §7.1.3.2). In the tombs and underground rooms have been found inscriptions and ostraca in Greek, Aramaic and Hebrew/Idumaeen. Most of these have not yet been published; see the forthcoming volume, edited by Kloner and others, which will include 'Greek and Semitic ostraca, lead weights, lead sling bullets, astragali and inscriptions on altars' (Kloner [ed.] 2003: viii). Other finds with inscriptions included 328 Rhodian amphora handles, dating over the entire third and second centuries BCE; 51 limestone tablets contain Greek texts except for four in Hebrew and two in an unknown language, apparently with the purpose of appeal to the gods against one's enemies.

3.2.7 *Other Texts*

A. Biran (1977) 'Tel Dan', *RB* 84: 256–63; **F.M. Cross** (1981) 'An Aramaic Ostrakon of the Third Century B.C.E. from Excavations in Jerusalem', *EI* 15: *67–*69; **G.H.R. Horsley** (1981) *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*; **Y. Magen, H. Misgav and L. Tsfania** (2004) *Mount Gerizim Excavations*: vol. I, *The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions*.

Two miscellaneous items are interesting because of what they tell us about the linguistic situation during the Ptolemaic period. The first is the Aramaic ostrakon published by Cross. It is only a (tax?) list of commodities in Aramaic, but two of the six items of vocabulary are Greek borrowings. If the ostrakon is correctly dated to the mid-third century BCE, this is an example of

how quickly the Greek language was already penetrating the language of Jerusalem only a few decades after the Greek conquest (but cf. §6.3.2.2).

The Tel Dan inscription is bilingual in Greek and Aramaic dated around 300 BCE. The writer is evidently not Jewish because the inscription is a dedication 'to the god in Dan (plural)' (*theōi tōi en danois*). It is apparently the only formal Greek/Aramaic bilingual in the Syrian area before the Roman period (§6.3.2.2).

We also have the recent publication of inscriptions from Mt Gerizim. This is found in the first of five volumes publishing the result of excavations there (Magen, Misgav and Tsfania 2004). The inscriptions themselves are often those typical of penitents and seekers after divine favour in various places and periods in the ancient Near East. All the inscriptions are Semitic, in a variety of scripts: Neo-Hebrew, Aramaic, Samaritan, and all are said to date from the third to second centuries BCE. A number of the names of individuals are clearly Greek.

3.3 Coins and Weights

D.T. Ariel (1990b) 'Coins, Flans, and Flan Moulds', in idem (ed.), *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*, vol. II: 99–118; **D. Barag** (1994–99) 'The Coinage of Yehud and the Ptolemies', *INJ* 13: 27–37; **R. Barkay** (1992–93) 'The Marisa Hoard of Seleucid Tetradrachms Minted in Ascalon', *INJ* 12: 21–26; (2003–2006) 'Undated Coins from Hellenistic Marisa', *INJ* 15: 48–55; **N. Davis and C.M. Kraay** (1973) *The Hellenistic Kingdoms: Portrait Coins and History*; **R. Deutsch** (1994–99) 'Five Unrecorded "Yehud" Silver Coins', *INJ* 13: 25–26; **S.N. Gerson** (2000–2002) 'A Newly Discovered Ptolemaic Coin of Yehud', *INJ* 14: 43; (2003–2006) 'A Transitional Period Coin of Yehud: A Reflection of Three Cultures', *INJ* 15: 32–34; **H. Gitler and A. Kushnir-Stein** (1994–99) 'The Chronology of a Late Ptolemaic Bronze Coin-Type from Cyprus', *INJ* 13: 46–53; **H. Gitler and C. Lorber** (2000–2002) 'Small Silver Coins of Ptolemy I', *INJ* 14: 34–42; **A. Houghton** (1990–91) 'Two Late Seleucid Lead Issues from the Levant', *INJ* 11: 26–31; (2003–2006) 'Some Observations on Coordinated Bronze Currency Systems in Seleucid Syria and Phoenicia', *INJ* 15: 35–47; **A. Houghton and C. Lorber** (2000–2002) 'Antiochus III in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia', *INJ* 14: 44–58; **D. Jeselsohn** (1974) 'A New Coin Type with Hebrew Inscription', *IEJ* 24: 77–78; **A. Kindler** (1974) 'Silver Coins Bearing the Name of Judea from the Early Hellenistic Period', *IEJ* 24: 73–76; **G. Le Rider** (1995) 'La politique monétaire des Séleucides en Coelé Syrie et en Phénicie après 200', *BCH* 119: 391–404; **C.C. Lorber** (2006) 'The Last Ptolemaic Bronze Emission of Tyre', *INR* 1: 15–20; **Y. Meshorer** (1982) *Ancient Jewish Coinage*: vol. I, *Persian Period through Hasmonaeans*; (1990–91) 'Ancient Jewish Coinage: Addendum I', *INJ* 11: 104–32; **O. Mørkholm** (1991) *Early Hellenistic Coinage from the Accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336–188 B.C.)*; **C. Préaux** (1939) *L'économie royale des Lagides*; **M. Price** (1990–91) 'A Hoard of Tetradrachms from Jericho', *INJ* 11: 24–25; **S. Qedar** (1992–93) 'The Coins of Marisa: A New Mint', *INJ* 12: 27–33; **U. Rappaport** (1970) 'Gaza and Ascalon in the Persian and Hellenistic Periods in Relation to their Coins', *IEJ* 20: 75–80; **Y. Ronen** (1998) 'The Weight Standards of the Judean Coinage in the Late Persian

and Early Ptolemaic Period', *NEA* 61: 122–26; **O.R. Sellers** (1962) 'Coins of the 1960 Excavation at Shechem', *BA* 25: 87–95; **A. Spaer** (1977) 'Some More "Yehud" Coins', *IEJ* 27: 200–203; **D. Syon** (2006) 'Numismatic Evidence of Jewish Presence in Galilee before the Hasmonean Annexation', *JNR* 1: 21–24.

Coins are a valued find in excavations because they often bear information not found in relation to other artefacts, especially an indication of date in most cases. The Aegean was apparently the home of coinage, but minted silver and bronze and even gold were widely used in the Persian empire (*HJJSTP* 1: 64–65). Alexander produced coinage, as did the individual Diadochi. Alexander, as well as his successors in most areas of his former empire, adopted the Attic standard, which meant that coins were to a large extent interchangeable, regardless of who minted them. Although local coinage was allowed to continue for a time in the east, by the early third century it had been phased out in Babylonia, Susiana, Media and Bactria, leaving the Attic standard for most of the Seleucid empire (Houghton and Lorber 2000–2002: 55). In his realm, however, Ptolemy decided to adopt the lighter Phoenician weight standard, so that Ptolemaic coins were generally lighter than in the Seleucid and Macedonian empires (Préaux 1939: 269–70; *CAH* 7/1: 20). This suggests that the general Ptolemaic policy was to keep silver within Egypt as much as possible. Gold coins tended to be hoarded rather than freely circulated, but the Ptolemies also issued a good deal of bronze coinage for trade at the local level.

A number of things changed with the Fifth Syrian War (§14.2) and Antiochus III's subsequent control of Syro-Palestine. Soldiers generally received two sorts of payment: their regular wages (ὀψόνιον) and money for provisions (σιταρχία); the former possibly in silver but the latter usually in bronze (Houghton and Lorber 2000–2002: 52–54). Bronze had certain limitations as currency. Whereas silver could be valued by its weight, and regardless of the actual minting, bronze coins had little intrinsic value. They depended on the guarantee of the regime issuing them. It was common to mint special coins for a campaign and to issue those to soldiers to buy provisions. Those receiving payment in this coinage had a dilemma, however: if the issuing king was forced to withdraw from the territory, the new (or former) occupier would not recognize the bronze coinage. Thus, it was often the case that the conqueror would re-confirm the bronze coinage by overstriking it with a confirmation symbol after the campaign was over.

In his campaign to take Syro-Palestine, Antiochus apparently issued a good deal of bronze coins for the campaign (especially the so-called Apollo/elephant types), some of them with high face value (Houghton and Lorber 2000–2002). These were later countermarked to show that the regime continued to recognize and guarantee their value. Following the campaign, some bronze series seem to be in celebration of his victory over the Ptolemaic forces, though part of them became standard local coinage. Current evidence suggests that much of the minting took place in Syro-Palestine, including

Antioch and Tyre but also Ake-Ptolemais. Again, bronze coins tended to be used for daily transactions by the population. G. Le Rider (1995) has recently argued when Antiochus III took over Syro-Palestine, he did not convert it to the Attic standard for coinage as one might have expected. Evidently, he continued to mint on the Phoenician standard, as the Ptolemies had done (though he replaced the Ptolemaic coinage with his own). This meant that Syro-Palestine coins had a self-enclosed sphere of circulation, and the coin-exchange posts were taken over and continued to operate under Seleucid control. This would have saved Antiochus the expense of minting completely new coins and would have provided regular revenue from the commission on money changing at the frontier points.

An interesting phenomenon is the continuation of coinage for Judah during the early part of the Ptolemaic period, until about 269 BCE (Barag 1994–99). The small silver coinage that had been characteristic of the late Persian period soon ceased in the Egyptian realm after the death of Alexander, to be replaced by bronze coinage. Apparently Judah was the only region in which such currency was issued after 301 BCE (Barag 1994–99: 29). The coin types include:

- one with the head of Ptolemy I and *Yhdh* in Palaeo-Hebrew letters;
- another with the head of Ptolemy I and the legend *Yhd*;
- three variants with the head of Ptolemy I, the head of Berenice I, and *Yhd*;
- two variants with a young bare-headed man (the youthful head of Ptolemy II during his co-regency with Ptolemy I?) and *Yhd*; and
- a type with the heads of Ptolemy I and Berenice I on one side and Ptolemy II and Arsinoe II, with *Yhd*, on the other.

The reason why Judah retained its own right of coining during this period is unknown. There was no doubt strong central control over the mint, but equally this right of their own coinage also suggests a certain privilege on behalf of the Jews, perhaps as a reward of some sort or to encourage Judah to cooperate with the Ptolemies.

3.4 Seals

D.T. Ariel (1990a) 'Imported Stamped Amphora Handles', in idem (ed.), *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. II: 13–98; (2000) 'Imported Greek Stamped Amphora Handles', in H. Geva (ed.), *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem*: vol. I, 267–83; **D.T. Ariel and Y. Shoham** (2000) 'Locally Stamped Handles and Associated Body Fragments of the Persian and Hellenistic Periods', in D.T. Ariel (ed.), *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. VI, 137–71; **D.T. Ariel, I. Sharon, J. Gunneweg and I. Perlman** (1985) 'A Group of Stamped Hellenistic Storage-Jar Handles from Dor', *IEJ* 35: 135–52; **N. Avigad** (1951) 'A New Class of Yehud Stamps', *IEJ* 7: 146–53; **N. Avigad and B. Sass** (1997) *Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals*; **W.D.E. Coulson et al.** (1997)

'Stamped Amphora Handles from Tel Beersheba', *BASOR* 306: 47–62; **Y. Farhi** (2007) 'A Yehud Stamp Impression from North Jerusalem', *TA* 34: 90–91; **G. Finkielsztejn and S. Gibson** (2007) 'The Retrograde-F-Shaped *yh(d)* Monogram: Epigraphy and Dating', *TA* 34: 104–13; **H. Geva** (2007) 'A Chronological Reevaluation of Yehud Stamp Impressions in Palaeo-Hebrew Script, Based on Finds from Excavations in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem', *TA* 34: 92–103; **P.W. Lapp** (1963) 'Ptolemaic Stamped Handles from Judah', *BASOR* 172: 22–35; **O. Lipschits and D. Vanderhooft** (2007a) 'Yehud Stamp Impressions: History of Discovery and Newly-Published Impressions', *TA* 34: 3–11; (2007b) 'Summary Data of Yehud Stamp Impressions, Arranged by Type', *TA* 34: 114–20; **O. Lipschits, M. Oeming, Y. Gadot and D. Vanderhooft** (2007) 'Seventeen Newly-Excavated Yehud Stamp Impressions from Ramat Raḥel', *TA* 34: 74–89; **Y. Magen and B. Har-Even** (2007) 'Persian Period Stamp Impressions for Nebi Samwil', *TA* 34: 38–58; **R. Reich and E. Shukron** (2007) 'The Yehud Stamp Impressions from the 1995–2005 City of David Excavations', *TA* 34: 59–65; **E. Stern, O. Lipschits and D. Vanderhooft** (2007) 'New Yehud Seal Impressions from En Gedi', *TA* 34: 66–73; **D. Vanderhooft and O. Lipschits** (2007) 'A New Typology of the Yehud Stamp Impressions', *TA* 34: 12–37.

The *Yehud* stamps are a valuable element of the archaeological repertory because so many have turned up in a variety of sites over the years. As H. Geva states, 'they are important archaeological and historical indicators, particularly given the somewhat poor record of the material culture of these areas during these periods' (2007: 92). Unfortunately, many have been found in fills or have appeared on the antiquities market with no indication of their site, much less their original context. Without this excavation context, they still have value as the accumulation of seals in different categories may tell us something about them as a unit. It should be noted that the jars with these stamps are of 'local' manufacture. D. Vanderhooft and O. Lipschits have recently refined the typology of the *Yhwh* seals. They propose 17 different types, divided into three chronological groups. The first or 'Early Group' consists of 12 types, dated to the sixth to the fourth centuries or the late monarchy, the Babylonian, and the Persian periods; it will not be further considered here. The second or 'Middle Group' includes types 13–15 which is most of the *Yhd* and *Yh* seals and making up 53 per cent of the Yehud stamp impressions.

The third or 'Late Group' include type 16 (*yh* ligatured?) and type 17 (*yhd* plus *ṭ*). It looks as if those with Aramaic script are pre-Hellenistic, while the palaeo-Hebrew seals are Hellenistic (Ariel 1990a: 13–14). The *yh* ligatured(?) seem to be Hellenistic, even late second century, though the Persian period for at least some does not seem ruled out (Ariel and Shoham 2000: 152–54). Handles with the cross and *tet* symbol and those with palaeo-Hebrew *yhd-ṭ* seem to be more securely Hellenistic (Ariel and Shoham 2000: 156–61). Not included in Vanderhooft and Lipschits's classification, because they are not *yhd* stamps, but still relevant here are the 'wheel' stamps and those with palaeo-Hebrew *yršlm*. Only three 'wheel' stamps were found in Jerusalem but might be Hellenistic (Ariel and Shoham 2000: 155–56). In Jerusalem the *yhd-ṭ*

and the *yršlm* stamps tend to be found together and otherwise have the same geographical distribution pattern, at least in the City of David (Ariel and Shoham 2000: 160).

Unfortunately, the meaning of the *tet* is not certain, though it might refer to a volume or weight standard or be an assurance of the quality of the contents. P.W. Lapp (1963) argued that the palaeo-Hebrew *yhd* and the *yršlm* (with star) stamps were a part of the administration of Judah under the Ptolemies, both used on jars containing 'taxes in kind', that is, payment of goods such as oil, wine and grain. He argued that the *yhd* stamps were placed on jars containing taxes meant for the Ptolemaic government, while those with the star (a symbol associated with the high priest) and *yršlm* were intended for the temple. It is an ingenious solution, but we are far from knowing how the Ptolemaic or even the Jerusalem temple taxation system worked, and such suggestions can only be speculation in the present state of knowledge.

Also of interest are the 'non-local' amphorae, the Rhodian ware with Greek stamps (especially Ariel 1990a; 2000). Of the hundreds found in the Jerusalem area, about 95 per cent date to the period c.260–150 BCE. The fact that these many jars are confined to a period of only about a century seems likely to be significant, but the precise conclusions to be inferred are far from clear. It might be a matter of ritual purity with regard to the contents of the jars, but though possible this is considered uncertain (see Ariel and Strikovsky in Ariel 1990a: 25–28). In my view they are right to be cautious because projecting rabbinic regulations back well before 70 CE has to be argued rigorously. But other explanations are also possible but equally uncertain. The amphorae might have been imported for consumption, but they could equally have been brought in empty to be filled with local foodstuffs for export. Or they might be the remnants of trade goods that mainly passed through Jerusalem in transit. What does seem significant is that events of the Maccabean revolt and its aftermath affected the import of these jars.

Chapter 4

JEWISH LITERARY SOURCES

This chapter surveys the main Jewish literary sources. Because of the difficulties of precise dating with regard to much of this literature, some writings that might belong here have already been treated in *HJJSTP* 1 (§4), and others will be dealt with in *HJJSTP* 3. Generally, a full introduction and bibliography is given for a writing in only one place, even if portions of the writing are widely believed to be dated to a quite different time (usually later). For example, it is almost universally agreed that Daniel 7–12 dates from the Maccabaeen period, even within the very specific period of 168–164 BCE, but a consensus has developed in recent decades that Daniel 1–6 might be as much as a century or more earlier. It makes sense to treat Daniel as a whole in one place, even if a relevant part of the writing is also discussed elsewhere. This is done in the present chapter, even though Daniel 7–12 will probably be of most concern in *HJJSTP* 3. Likewise, the Jewish Fragmentary Writers in Greek would be dated over several centuries, and some may be discussed a second time in later volumes, but a general introduction is given to all of them in the present chapter. The same applies to the *Sibylline Oracles*.

4.1 *The Greek Translation of the Bible*

J. Barr (1979) 'The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations', *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 15: 275–325; **S.P. Brock** (1979) 'Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20: 69–87; (1996) *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel*; **S. P. Brock et al.** (1973) *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint*; **D.J.A. Clines** (1984) *The Esther Scroll: The Story of the Story*; **N. Collins** (1992) '281 BCE: the Year of the Translation of the Pentateuch into Greek under Ptolemy II', in G.J. Brooke and B. Lindars (eds), *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings*, 403–503; **J. Cook** (1997) *The Septuagint of Proverbs*; **F.M. Cross and S. Talmon** (eds) (1975) *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*; **K. De Troyer** (2000) *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8.1–17, LXX 8.1–17, and AT 7.14–41*; **J.M. Dines** (2004) *The Septuagint*; **C. Dogniez** (1995) *Bibliography of the Septuagint/Bibliographie de la Septante (1970–1993)*; **C.V. Dorothy** (1997) *The Books of Esther: Structure, Genre and Textual Integrity*; **N. Fernández Marcos** (2000) *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek*

Versions of the Bible; **L. Greenspoon** (1997) ‘“It’s All Greek to Me”: Septuagint Studies Since 1968’, *CR: BS* 5: 147–741; **R. Hanhart** (1999) *Studien zur Septuaginta und zum hellenistischen Judentum*; **E. Hatch and H.A. Redpath** (1897) *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books)*; **S.P. Jeansonne** (1988) *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12*; **S. Jellicoe** (1968) *The Septuagint and Modern Study*; **K.H. Jobes** (1996) *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text*; **K.H. Jobes and M. Silva** (2000) *Invitation to the Septuagint*; **A. Lacocque** (1999) ‘The Different Versions of Esther’, *BI* 7: 301–22; **J.A.L. Lee** (1983) *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*; **J. Lust, E. Eynikel and K. Hauspie** (2003) *Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint*; **T. McLay** (1996) *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*; **T.J. Meadowcroft** (1995) *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*; **T. Muraoka** (1998) *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint: Keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance*; (2002) *A Greek–English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets*; **H.M. Orlinsky** (1975) ‘The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators’, *HUCA* 46: 89–114; **J. Sanderson** (1986) *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^{fm} and the Samaritan Tradition*; **SCHÜRER** 3: 474–93; **P.W. Skehan, E. Ulrich and J.E. Sanderson** (eds) (1992) *Qumran Cave 4: IV Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts*; **H. Swete** (1914) *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*; **Z. Talshir** (1993) *The Alternative Story: 3 Kingdoms 12.24 A–Z*; **E. Tov** (1976) *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*; (1988) ‘The Septuagint’, in M.J. Mulder and H. Sysling (eds) *Mikra*: 161–88; (1997) *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*; (1999) *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*; (2001) *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*; **E.C. Ulrich** (1978) *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus*; **J.W. Wevers** (1992) *Text History of the Greek Exodus*; (1993) *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis*; (1995) *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*; (1997) *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus*; (1998) *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers*.

The Septuagint translation has been of great interest in recent years. With the enormous amount of work being done on it, only a brief survey can be presented here. For further information, the reader should consult recent handbooks, such as Dines (2004), Fernández Marcos (2000) or Jobes and Silva (2000); also Greenspoon (1997). Older works such as Jellicoe (1968) and Swete (1914) also still have value. The bibliography has multiplied enormously, as well, and only a fraction is listed here. For bibliographies, see Brock et al. (1973) and Dogniez (1995); these can be updated with the annual listing of publications in the *Bulletin of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. The basic concordance is still Hatch and Redpath (1897), supplemented by Muraoka (1998) for the Hebrew equivalents. Two dictionaries have appeared recently, a complete one by Lust, Eynikel and Hauspie (2003) and a partial one by Muraoka (2002).

According to the legendary *Letter of Aristeas* (to be discussed in *HJJSTP* 3) the Pentateuch was first translated into Greek in the reign of Ptolemy II. This account of how the Torah came to be translated is generally rejected by modern scholars (*pace* Collins 1992). One of the reasons is that the Demetrius

(of Phaleron) of *Aristeas*, who was alleged to be the head of the famous library, had been banished shortly after Ptolemy II came to the throne and disappears from history. Also, the Greeks were not generally interested in barbarian writings, and the scenario of the king (or his librarian) feeling that the library was incomplete without the Jewish writings looks like Jewish propaganda rather than Alexandrian reality. It is true that native traditions were sometimes rendered into Greek in some form or other, the two most famous examples being those of the Egyptian priest Manetho and the Babylonian priest Berossus. This raises the questions of when and how the Pentateuch was first translated into Greek, questions whose answer is closely bound up with the subject of the growth of the biblical text itself (*HJJSTP* 1: 331–43 and below [§11.2]). Since the Pentateuch was probably not put into its present form until well into the Persian period (*HJJSTP* 1: 331–43), the question of its translation would not have arisen immediately. Yet there are indications that the Pentateuch was translated into Greek already in the third century BCE, perhaps under Ptolemy II (282–246 BCE), just as *Aristeas* suggests. The reasons for this are the following:

- The translation was made before the writing of the *Letter of Aristeas*, which means before the end of the second century BCE according to the conventional dating of *Aristeas* (see *HJJSTP* 3).
- The Fragmentary Jewish Writer in Greek, Aristobulus, writing perhaps in the mid-second century BCE, states that the translation was done either under ‘Ptolemy son of Lagos’ (= Ptolemy I) or ‘Philadelphus’ (= Ptolemy II) (as quoted in Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 13.12.1; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.22.148).
- The grandson of Ben Sira translated his father’s Hebrew writing into Greek by about 132 BCE, yet his ‘preface’ to the text indicates that the ‘law and the prophets’ already existed in Greek (below §4.10).
- The writing of Demetrius the Chronographer (below §4.6.1) was most likely written before the end of the third century BCE, yet it appears to make use of the LXX translation.

Thus, even though the story of the translation in *Aristeas* is a fiction of the second century, the time of the translation (i.e., the reign of Ptolemy II) may well be correct (Orlinsky 1975). If so, this indicates that a need was being felt for a version of the Bible to be available to Greek-speaking Jews already fairly early in the Greek period. According to *Aristeas* (3, 144, 309) the first translation involved only the Pentateuch, which seems to be correct since these five books show a coherence in language not found elsewhere in the LXX (Lee 1983). As for the rest of the biblical books, it seems clear that different parts were translated at different times and places (for further discussion and bibliography, see the introductions of Dines 2004; Jobs and Silva 2000; Fernández Marcos 2000; Jellicoe 1968: 269–313).

Since the discovery of the Qumran scrolls, the text of the LXX has been part of a wider debate about the development of the biblical text. The text of

the LXX is generally parallel to that of the traditional Hebrew (MT), even where there are many differences of detail, but many of those books and passages where the LXX differs much more significantly from the Hebrew have been studied in recent years: 1 and 2 Samuel (Brock 1996), Esther (Clines 1984; Dorothy 1997; Jobes 1996; Lacocque 1999; De Troyer 2000), Daniel (Jeansonne 1988; Meadowcroft 1995; McLay 1996), 3 Kingdoms 12.24 (Talshir 1993).

On the text of the LXX and its place in the development of the biblical text as a whole, see below (§11.1.2). The significance of the LXX translation in Jewish history is discussed at §13.6.2.

4.2 *Josephus*

H.W. Attridge (1984) 'Josephus and his Works', *JWSTP*: 185–232; **J.M.G. Barclay** (2006) *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*: vol. 10, Against Apion; **C.T. Begg** (2004) *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*: vol. 4, Judean Antiquities 5–7; **C.T. Begg and P. Spilsbury** (2005) *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*: vol. 5, Judean Antiquities 8–10; **P. Bilde** (1988) *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome*; **S.J.D. Cohen** (1979) *Josephus in Galilee and Rome*; **L.H. Feldman** (1984) *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)*; (1998a) *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*; (1998b) *Josephus' Interpretation of the Bible*; (2001) *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*: vol. 3, Judean Antiquities 1–4; **L.H. Feldman and G. Hata (eds)** (1987) *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity*; (1989) *Josephus, the Bible, and History*; **L.H. Feldman and J.R. Levison (eds)** (1996) *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek*; **C. Gerber** (1997) *Ein Bild des Judentums für Nichtjuden von Flavius Josephus: Untersuchungen zu seiner Schrift Contra Apionem*; **L.L. Grabbe** (1990) 'Josephus', *Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation*: 365–68; (1999) 'Eschatology in Philo and Josephus', in A. Avery-Peck and J. Neusner (eds), *Judaism in Late Antiquity: Part 4 Death, Life-after-Death, Resurrection & the World-to-Come in the Judaisms of Antiquity*, 163–85; (2006c) 'Thus Spake the Prophet Josephus... The Jewish Historian on Prophets and Prophecy', in M.H. Floyd and R.D. Haak (eds), *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism*, 240–47; **E. Hansack** (1999) *Die altrussische Version des 'Jüdischen Krieges': Untersuchungen zur Integration der Namen*; **S.S. Kottke** (1995) *Medicine and Hygiene in the Works of Flavius Josephus*; **D.R. Lindsay** (1993) *Josephus and Faith: Pistis and Pisteuein as Faith Terminology in the Writings of Flavius Josephus and in the New Testament*; **G. Mader** (2000) *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum*; **S. Mason** (2001) *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*: vol. 9, Life of Josephus; (2005) 'Of Audience and Meaning: Reading Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* in the Context of a Flavian Audience', in J. Sievers and G. Lembi (eds), *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*, 71–100; **S. Mason (ed.)** (1998) *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives*; **H.R. Moehring** (1975) 'The *Acta pro Judaeis* in the *Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*: 3: 124–58; (1980) review of Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome*,

JJS 31: 240–42; (1984) ‘Joseph ben Matthia and Flavius Josephus: The Jewish Prophet and Roman Historian’, *ANRW II*: 21.2: 864–944; **F. Parente and J. Sievers** (eds) (1994) *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period*; **H. Petersen** (1958) ‘Real and Alleged Literary Projects of Josephus’, *AJP* 79: 259–74; **M. Pucci Ben Zeev** (1993) ‘The Reliability of Josephus Flavius: The Case of Hecataeus’ and Manetho’s Accounts of Jews and Judaism: Fifteen Years of Contemporary Research (1974–1990)’, *JSJ* 24: 215–34; **T. Rajak** (1983) *Josephus: The Historian and his Society*; **K.H. Rengstorf** (1973–83) *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus*; **H. Schreckenberg** (1968) *Bibliography zu Flavius Josephus*; (1979) *Supplementband mit Gesamtregister*; **B. Schröder** (1996) *Die ‘väterlichen Gesetze’: Flavius Josephus als Vermittler von Halachah an Griechen und Römer*; **S. Schwartz** (1986) ‘The Composition and Publication of Josephus’s “Bellum Judaicum” Book 7’, *HTR* 79: 373–86; (1990) *Josephus and Judean Politics*; **J. Sievers and G. Lembi** (eds) (2005) *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond*; **P. Spilsbury** (1998) *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus’ Paraphrase of the Bible*; **H.St.J. Thackeray et al.** (1926–65) *Josephus*; **P. Villalba i Varneda** (1986) *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus*.

4.2.1 Aids to Using Josephus

For a general introduction to Josephus and his writings (with an extensive bibliographical guide), and his value as a historian, see *JCH* (pp. 4–13). Unfortunately, such is the interest in Josephus at the present that that treatment is already well out of date in certain aspects (though I still stand by the methodological principles and cautions). For example, Mason (2005) has come forward with a new proposal for the context in which Josephus produced his works; whether he is right is beside the point here, only that new theories and insights are being produced on a regular basis. The brief bibliography here is likely to need supplementing even by the time it appears in print.

Students of early Jewish history are well supplied with the various scholarly tools for making use of Josephus’ works. The LCL has not only the excellent translation and useful textual edition produced by Thackeray and his successors (Ralph Marcus, Allen Wikgren, Louis Feldman) but many valuable notes and appendixes. The last volume also has one of the best indexes for any ancient work. The massive concordance to the Greek text has now been completed under Rengstorf’s editorship and forms an essential resource.

The secondary literature on Josephus is endless. The best shorter introduction to Josephus scholarship is the article of Attridge 1984 (cf. also Grabbe 1990). Bilde (1988) provides a more detailed overview which is especially valuable for its survey of current scholarship. Schreckenberg (1968; 1979) produced a chronological listing of publications since 1470, with symbols to indicate the subjects treated by the individual studies. Feldman (1984) has now come out with an annotated bibliography that not only summarizes much scholarship but also provides his own judgement on the merits of various studies (though one often finds occasion to disagree with

Feldman's evaluation). The volumes edited by him and Hata give a useful critical overview of many aspects of Josephus and his writings. For other editions of the Greek text, as well as translations into English and many other modern languages, see the relevant chapters in Schrekenberg and Feldman.

4.2.2 *Josephus' Writings*

Although Josephus refers to a number of literary works or projects in his writings, only four have come down to us. Whether any others were actually completed, apart from perhaps an earlier version of the *War*, is questionable; more likely, the references to other works represent only plans rather than actual completed writings.

The *War of the Jews* (*Bellum Judaicum*) was Josephus' first writing, produced basically during the 70's and presented to Titus and Vespasian (*Life* 65 §§361–63; *C. Ap.* 1.9 §50). Since Vespasian was still alive, this would put its completion before 79 CE; on the other hand, it was Titus who authorized publication, suggesting a date 79–81. Perhaps Vespasian was only shown earlier portions or drafts. There is also evidence that the last book of the work (Bk. 7) was not a part of this but was added rather later under Domitian (81–96 CE [Cohen 1979: 87–89]), though this might represent only a revision at that time (Schwartz 1986). Josephus undoubtedly had a number of reasons for writing the *War*, and it would be simplistic to assume that everything in it was subordinated to one or two aims. Nevertheless, there are several dominant themes which suggest the major aims of the *War* even if there may have been others:

- Rome is too strong militarily to be defeated. This should have been clear to the rebels before the war and certainly should deter any would-be rebels now. Such passages as Agrippa's speech (2.16.4 §§345–401) and the excursus on the Roman army (3.5.1–8 §§70–109) illustrate this.
- On the Roman side the revolt was caused by a few incompetent and greedy administrators, especially the governors sent after the death of Agrippa I. The Roman leadership was forced into the war and did not undertake it willingly.
- On the Jewish side most of the people, especially the chief priests and leading citizens, were against the war. The motivating force was a few hotheaded individuals who inflamed the rabble and forced the moderates to participate against their will.
- Glorification of Vespasian's family, especially Titus.

Josephus tells us that he wrote a version of the *War* in Aramaic which was circulated to the Jews, especially in Mesopotamia, apparently with the aim of making sure they were not tempted to revolt as well (1.Pref.1 §3). Since none of this has survived, there is no way to check his claim; however, it seems doubtful that such a work would have been as extensive as the present work in Greek. It is also plain that the surviving Greek writing is an original

composition and not a translation from a Semitic language, contrary to what he implies.

The bulk of the *War* is devoted to the events immediately preceding the war, the war itself, and the mopping-up operations afterward (including the taking of the fortress at Masada). After a few preliminaries, the narrative begins with the reign of Antiochus IV and the Maccabean revolt. Book 1 moves rapidly forward, ending with the death of Herod in 4 BCE. Book 2 covers the events of the first century to the defeat of Cestius and the preparations for war in Judaea and Galilee. Book 3 begins with the appointment of Vespasian to take charge of the war (winter 66–67) and goes to September 67, including the siege of Jotapata and the capture of Josephus. Book 4 finishes off the capture of Galilee, the investment of Jerusalem, the events in Rome after the death of Nero (November 68) and the declaration of Vespasian as emperor. The siege and fall of Jerusalem under Titus are described in Books 5–6. Book 7 details the subsequent events, especially the siege of Masada and its capture in 73 or 74 CE.

The *Antiquities of the Jews* (*Antiquitates Judaicae*), which appeared about 94 CE, had a rather different purpose from the *War*. It is very much an apology for the Jews. Although Josephus probably also had a number of reasons for writing it, the overriding aim was to present Jewish history, religion and people in a form which would be understood and admired by educated Greeks and Romans. He wanted to show that the Jewish religious customs, rather than being peculiar and misanthropic, are actually sensible, rational and in conformity with the highest ideals of Graeco-Roman thought. Further, the Jews have an ancient history which not only precedes that of the Greeks and Romans but even that of the Egyptians and Babylonians. Indeed, one of the ancestors of the Jews (Abraham) taught the Egyptians their knowledge of astrology and mathematics (*Ant.* 1.8.2 §§166–68), and he and other Jewish figures were the very model of the Hellenistic sage or hero (as shown by Feldman in a number of articles). Another point of emphasis in the later books is the extent to which Greek leaders, such as Alexander and Roman emperors such as Julius Caesar and Augustus, admired the Jews and/or conferred benefits on them.

Books 1–10 of the *Antiquities* are essentially a paraphrase of the OT narrative books, naturally omitting much of the prophetic, wisdom and poetic writings. But these books represent much more than just a summary of history as presented by the OT. Occasionally, extra-biblical traditions are included which give an extra boost to the importance of biblical figures such as Abraham and Moses. Embarrassing events are sometimes omitted (e.g., the episode of the golden calf). Above all, everything is interpreted in a way which would be understandable – and present a positive image – to one educated in Greek literature and values. Although Josephus' textual source is not always clear, there are times when he plainly uses a version of the LXX. There is little or no evidence that he worked from the original Hebrew text.

Once he had finished with the biblical material, Josephus seemed at a loss

for good sources for a lengthy period of time. The OT literature extends as far as the Persian period, and Josephus filled out his account of the Persian period with the Greek books of 1 Esdras and Esther. For these next two centuries and more, he seems to have had very little information, filling up the space with dubious legendary works along with a few bits and pieces of valuable material. It is only when he reached the second century and was able to draw on 1 Maccabees did he seem to have anything like a reliable connected source again. This means that most of his account of the Persian period, the conquest of Alexander and the Ptolemaic rule of Palestine is of little value, apart from a few kernels among the chaff.

When he had reached about 175 BCE, however, Josephus was able to draw on 1 Maccabees. After that, he had the histories of Nicolaus of Damascus and Strabo to the death of Herod. The early part of the first century CE represents another gap, with little recorded for the period from 6 to 26 CE. After this he used a variety of sources, including Roman ones, some of more value than others, but in many instances we have no idea. He finally ended this work on the eve of the revolt with the governorship of Florus. Thus, there is some overlap between the *War* and the *Antiquities*, and the narratives can be compared with profit (see the individual chapters below).

The *Life (Vita)* was issued as an appendix to the *Antiquities*, probably about 94/95 CE (Cohen 1979: 170–80). The occasion was the appearance of a history of the Jewish war by a rival, Justus of Tiberias. Unfortunately, most of what we know of Justus comes from Josephus' attack on him, ruling out any detailed knowledge of what Justus said, but it does seem clear that Justus disagreed with Josephus' account and perhaps even accused him of personal misdeeds. The *Life* is Josephus' defence of his actions, mainly those in Galilee from the time of his appointment as military governor (about November 66) to the arrival of Vespasian's army (May 67). Also included is an attack on Justus. Again, he may have had several purposes, but it seems to me that the attack of Justus was uppermost in his mind when writing (*contra* Bilde 1988: 110–13). Since most of the *Life* parallels a section of Book 2 of the *War*, a comparison of the two is very interesting and shows how the narrative changes, depending on Josephus' purpose.

Josephus' final work seems to have been *Against Apion (Contra Apionem)*. Apion was a Greek citizen of Alexandria and apparently one of the delegation which appeared before Claudius to accuse the Jews in 41 CE. He wrote an anti-Semitic tract, making all sorts of allegations about Jewish history and religion. *Against Apion* is Josephus' reply and represents the first in a long line of such defences in Judaeo-Christian tradition (cf., e.g., Origen's *Contra Celsum*). Although many of Josephus' own statements about the history and antiquity of the Jews cannot be taken at face value, the work is especially valuable for the quotations from Greek and Oriental writers otherwise lost (e.g., Manetho and Berossus). It also shows in detail the sorts of slanders levelled at the Jews in some of the anti-Semitic literature of the time.

4.2.3 Evaluation of Josephus as a Historian

Josephus is one of the most useful, as well as one of the most frustrating, sources for Jewish history. If it were not for his writings, our knowledge of Jewish history – especially in the Greek and Roman periods – would be drastically reduced. So much that we know of persons and events central to Jewish history comes from Josephus and is available in no other source. Even when other sources refer to the person or event in question, it is still usually Josephus who tells us the most. This makes his writings invaluable for much of the history of the Jews over the half millennium from about 400 BCE to almost 100 CE.

Yet for all this, Josephus is not necessarily a simple source to use. Indeed, one of the most fundamental mistakes made by students of this period is to take Josephus' account at face value and repeat it in light paraphrase. To do so ignores the gaps, the biases, the poor quality of some of his authorities and the fact that he frequently cannot be checked. One of the main reasons Josephus is so valuable is that his works are extant. If we had the writings of other contemporary Jewish writers (e.g., Justus of Tiberias), we might find that Josephus was decidedly inferior in quality. Even if not, we would at least have the matter described from another point of view and thus a means of evaluating and overcoming some of the prejudices of any one account. Even the best source sees things from a particular point of view and needs to be qualified and filled out by other sources – how much more Josephus, who is not always a good source.

If we compare the positions of such researchers as Mason, Rajak, Moehring, Bilde and Cohen, we find a rather diverse evaluation of Josephus' trustworthiness. One of the problems is making an *a priori* evaluation and then proceeding as if that applied to all passages in Josephus' works. Indeed, the sweeping, summary statement seems to be the bane of Josephan scholarship: Josephus is – or is not – reliable; he is – or is not – a good historian. He is – or is not – this, that or the other thing. But frequently no such evaluation is possible because it all depends on which part of him one has in mind. Josephus is perhaps typical of the Hellenistic historian, better than some and worse than others. But the main conclusion is that each section of his history must be examined on its own merits. Some sections will show him up extremely positively, while others would make historians hide their heads in shame. Therefore, in order to use Josephus effectively and critically, several general considerations should always be kept in mind:

1. Wherever there are parallel accounts, these should be compared and the differences carefully evaluated. It is not enough simply to synthesize them or take the one which suits the immediate purpose. On the contrary, his aims and biases in each case must be carefully examined.
2. His underlying sources must always be considered. In many cases, there is sadly no way of knowing what these are, but this is not

- always so. Even when the precise source is not known, its own characteristics may indicate its credibility.
3. The general characteristics of ancient historiography must be taken into account. For example, it was common practice for historians to invent speeches for their characters, and it would be foolish to assume that a speech represents what was actually or even approximately said on a particular occasion.
 4. Special care should be taken with passages clearly intended for apologetic purposes or which lend themselves to this use. In the *Antiquities* and *Against Apion* Josephus is out to present the Jews in as favourable a light as possible, not only using – and misusing – a variety of older works but also moulding his narrative according to the expectations of a Hellenistic audience. Thus, Jewish patriarchs become culture heroes, founders of civilizations and examples of Hellenistic sages; Jewish laws are rationalized according to Graeco-Roman sensibilities; and Jewish religion and custom are made the envy of the civilized world.
 5. All other relevant historical and literary sources must be used: Roman historians, the Qumran writings, other early Jewish literature, rabbinic literature, archaeology, epigraphy. This may seem banal, yet it is surprising how often Josephus is cited as a proof text for some point without considering the other sources available.

These are some of the general points which should be kept in mind; however, each particular section of Josephus has its own problems, uses, and tradition of scholarly interpretation. These will be examined in more detail in the individual chapters for the particular period in question.

More information will be given in *HJJSTP* 3 and 4 on the use of Josephus for later periods.

4.2.4 Using Josephus as a Historical Source for the Early Greek Period

Josephus is our main historical source for the history of the Jews during Hasmonaean and Roman times to about 75 CE. As with the later Persian period, however, Josephus has little information on the time from Alexander to Antiochus III. A fair amount of space is indeed devoted to this period, but the actual reliable historical content is limited. A section at the beginning of the period about Alexander (*Ant.* 11.8.1–6 §§304–45) is based mainly on the Alexander legend and is pure fiction (§12.2), though this has been mixed with anti-Samaritan material. The latter could have been transmitted as a part of the Jewish Alexander legend, but more likely Josephus had the Samaritan story separately and has himself combined it with the legend of Alexander's coming to Jerusalem. Another long section is only a close paraphrase of *The Letter of Aristeas* (*Ant.* 12.2.1–15 §§11–118); not only do we have the original extant but it is usually dated to the late second century BCE rather than the Ptolemaic period, making the information in it problematic for illustrating

Judah during Ptolemaic rule (to be discussed in *HJJSTP* 3). This is followed by a major section on the Tobiads (*Ant.* 12.4.1–11 §§157–236) which probably depends on some sort of family history or chronicle (§4.3). Although there is a large romantic element in this, it still has some useful information about a family which was very influential on Palestinian politics in the Ptolemaic and Seleucid periods; however, Josephus has probably dated this to the reign of the wrong Ptolemy (see next section, §4.3). Interspersed between these blocks of material are some bits and pieces about Alexander, the Diadochi and the Ptolemies, which Josephus had probably picked up from reading Hellenistic historians. For example, there is a quotation from Agatharchides of Cnidus about the taking of Jerusalem by Ptolemy I, an event otherwise unknown (*Ant.* 12.1.1 §6; given more extensively in *C. Ap.* 1.22 §§209–11). Several quotations (*C. Ap.* 1.22 §§183–204) are said to be from Hecataeus of Abdera, though this is disputed (§5.2). Also, of some interest is a letter to the Spartans which claims a distant kinship between them and the Jews (*Ant.* 12.4.10 §§225–27; see §10.1).

4.3 Story of the Tobiads

G. Fuks (2001) 'Josephus' Tobiads Again: A Cautionary Note', *JJS* 52: 354–56; **D. Gera** (1990) 'On the Credibility of the History of the Tobiads', in A. Kasher, U. Rappaport, and G. Fuks (eds), *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel: Collected Essays*: 21–38; (1998) *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.*; **J.A. Goldstein** (1975) 'The Tales of the Tobiads', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults*: 3: 85–123; **L.L. Grabbe** (2001b) 'Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period', in idem (ed.) *Did Moses Speak Attic?*: 129–55; **N.L. Lapp** (ed.) (1983) *The Excavations at Araq el-Emir*: vol. 1; **P. Lapp and N. Lapp** (1992) 'Iraq el-Emir', *NEAEHL* 2: 646–49; **A. Momigliano** (1931–32) 'I Tobiadi nella preistoria del Moto Maccabaico', *Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 67: 165–200; **W. Otto** (1916) '3) Hyrkanos, der Sohn des Joseph, der Tobiade', *PW* 9: 527–34; **D.R. Schwartz** (1998) 'Josephus' Tobiads: Back to the Second Century', in M. Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*: 47–61; (2002) 'Once Again on Tobiad Chronology: Should We Let a Stated Anomaly Be Anomalous? A Response to Gideon Fuks', *JJS* 53: 146–51; **É. Will** (1991) 'Iraq el-Amir: Le Chateau du Tobiade Hyrcan', *OANE* 3: 177–81.

A significant section of Josephus' treatment of the Ptolemaic period is taken up with the story of Joseph Tobiad and his sons (*Ant.* 12.4.1–11 §§154–236). Josephus discusses the exploits of individuals from the Tobiad family, primarily Joseph son of Tobias and his son Hyrcanus. According to Josephus' account, the high priest Onias (commonly designated Onias II) refused to pay a tribute of 20 talents. His nephew Joseph Tobiad enlisted support among the people, borrowed money from friends in Samaria and, by political skill and greasing palms, managed to obtain the tax-farming rights for Coele-Syria. Josephus dates this to the reign of Ptolemy V Epiphanes (204–180 BCE). Joseph retired after a career of some two decades, to be

replaced by his youngest son Hyrcanus. According to the story, Hyrcanus angered both his father and his brothers by using his father's money to obtain the tax authority which his father had possessed. They shut him out of Jerusalem, and he built a fortress in the Transjordan region. As soon as Antiochus III was victorious, there was little for Hyrcanus to do but retire to his fortress across the Jordan and maintain himself by raiding Arab territory. When Antiochus IV took the throne, however, he was afraid that he would be called to account and committed suicide.

This is the story as Josephus tells it. Although Josephus at no point mentions a specific source, it has long been accepted that he is closely following a written source or sources concerned with the Tobiad family. There are two major questions. (1) What is the nature of this source or these sources? (2) How reliable is it (are they) as history? On the first question, a number of scholars of an earlier generation (see the summary in Otto 1916; cf. also Momigliano 1931–32: 175–78) argued that Josephus made use of two but related sources, one legendary (in *Ant.* 12.4.2–9 §§160–222) and one more rational and consequently more reliable (in *Ant.* 12.4.10–11 §§223–24, 228–36). Such source analysis has been less than popular in recent times, and this specific argument has been rejected by several modern scholars (Gera 1990; 1998: 37–38; Schwartz 1998). Acceptance or rejection of the two-source hypothesis has implications for judging historicity of the passage (see below). The source(s) seem(s) to be pro-Joseph and pro-Hyrcanus and may well originate in a family chronicle or possibly oral account. Goldstein (1975) has argued that the Tobiad story is pro-Ptolemaic Jewish propaganda written by Onias IV. Although his suggestion is not unreasonable, it is tied up with his very speculative views about Josephus' aims and methods of writing history.

As for the second question, most scholars seem to have accepted that the story contains many novelistic and otherwise incredible elements (see especially Gera 1990; 1998: 36–58) but in outline is still usable as a historical source for the activities of the Tobiad family during this time. It is based on actual people and events, and the story is supported in its essential features by information from other sources (cf. Grabbe 2001b), which Gera does not seem to dispute. It seems inherently unlikely that Josephus had access to two separate accounts of the Tobiads. Also, the account we have is mainly in his own words (as is normally the case with Josephus' use of his sources). This would argue that §§221–22 and §§228–36 (cf. Momigliano 1931–32: 175–78) was a division into two separate sections. Yet this consideration could lead to the opposite conclusion: because Josephus is shaping his sources, it seems unlikely that he would repeat himself in such an obvious way in §§221–22 and §§228–36; therefore, he likely had two separate accounts before him that he has combined.

A major issue is that of chronology. Josephus dates the rise of Joseph Tobiad to the accession of Ptolemy V in 205 BCE. Since the Ptolemies lost Syro-Palestine soon after this, Joseph's career did not seem to correspond with historical reality; however, A. Momigliano's re-dating of the events to

the reign of Ptolemy IV has been widely accepted (1931–32: 178–80). D.R. Schwartz (1998) has now argued that Josephus was right about the arrangements between Antiochus III and Ptolemy V; that is, Antiochus did indeed give half the tax revenue from Syria–Palestine to Ptolemy V as a dowry for his daughter’s marriage. The region remained under Seleucid control, of course, and it is doubtful that the Ptolemaic government was involved in collecting the taxes from the region. Schwartz has, it seems, established that Josephus and other ancient writers were right about this arrangement, as opposed to the consensus of modern scholars. However, as G. Fuks (2001) has argued, this does not solve the question of Josephus’ dating. Schwartz certainly appears to be correct that the sum of 20 years for Joseph Tobiad’s career is Josephus’ calculation rather than a figure found in his source(s). Yet it also seems doubtful that we can date Joseph to the reign of Ptolemy V as Josephus has it, because Joseph could not have been bidding for tax-farming rights in Alexandria before the Ptolemaic king, as the story pictures it.

If we ignore Josephus’ framework and simply read the story, the setting is clearly Ptolemaic rule of Palestine. This makes it very difficult to move everything down to the reign of Ptolemy V. Thus, Schwartz’s response to Fuks has some weaknesses. It looks as if we have to put the beginning of Joseph’s activities before 200 BCE. Whether it might be as early as 220 BCE, as Momigliano (1931–32: 178–80) and most other modern scholars begin it, is a real question. With regard to Hyrcanus Tobiad, his career would apparently have been during the first quarter of the second century BCE. Some of the main historical points that arise from the story are the following:

- Two powerful local families with a long history emerge in both the Tobiad romance and other early sources: the high-priestly family of the Oniads and the noble family of the Tobiads. The activities of the Tobiads in the second half of the third century are not entirely undisputed, but the story that Joseph secured a Ptolemaic office (such as tax collecting at a regional level) fits all the data we have and also the position of the Tobiads in the early second century.
- The high priest of the Oniad family was the chief representative of the Jews to the Ptolemaic government, as well as being the head of the temple and cult (§10.1). This apparently included responsibility for tax collection (*Ant.* 12.4.1 §§158–59, though whether he had the formal office of *prostatēs* ‘leader, patron’ is debated).
- The Tobiad family evidently spoke Greek and was very much at home in the Greek world. Although they were wealthy and had to deal with the Greeks, the account illustrates the extent to which Greek culture had become a part of the ancient Near Eastern scene (though not displacing what was there beforehand).
- The Tobiads were intermarried with the high-priestly Oniads. A binary opposition of Tobiads versus Oniads is, therefore, likely to be

simplistic. The relations between the families were probably much more complicated.

- It is often alleged that the Tobiad family was itself split, probably between pro-Ptolemies and pro-Seleucids. This may be true, but the evidence is less secure than sometimes realized. During the reign of Seleucus IV, Hyrcanus Tobiad seems to have had good relations with the high priest Onias III, which goes against his image as anti-Seleucid.

4.4 *Qohelet (Ecclesiastes)*

AIEJL 457–62; **C.G. Bartholomew** (1998) *Reading Ecclesiastes: Old Testament Exegesis and Hermeneutical Theory*; **E.J. Bickerman** (1967) 'Kohēleth (Ecclesiastes) or The Philosophy of an Acquisitive Society', *Four Strange Books of the Bible*: 139–67; **R. Braun** (1973) *Kohēleth und die frühhellenistische Popularphilosophie*; **S. Burkes** (1999) *Death in Qoheleth and Egyptian Biographies of the Late Period*; **J. Crenshaw** (1988) *Ecclesiastes*; **A.A. Fischer** (1997) *Skepsis oder Furcht Gottes? Studien zur Komposition und Theologie des Buches Kohēleth*; **M.V. Fox** (1999) *A Time to Tear Down and a Time to Build Up: A Rereading of Ecclesiastes*; **Y.V. Koh** (2006) *Royal Autobiography in the Book of Qoheleth*; **T. Krüger** (2000) *Kohēleth (Prediger)* (BKAT); **E.P. Lee** (2005) *The Vitality of Enjoyment in Qoheleth's Theological Rhetoric*; **J.A. Loader** (1979) *Polar Structures in the Book of Kohēleth*; **N. Lohfink** (1998) *Studien zu Kohēleth*; (2003) *Qoheleth*; **O. Loretz** (1964) *Qoheleth und der alte Orient*; **D.B. Miller** (2002) *Symbol and Rhetoric in Ecclesiastes: The Place of Hebel in Qoheleth's Work*; **R.E. Murphy and E. Huwiler** (1999) *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs*; **S. Reif** (1981) review of C. Whitley, *Kohēleth*, *VT* 31: 120–26; **A. Schoors** (1992) *The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qoheleth: Part I*; (2004) *The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qoheleth: Part II Vocabulary*; **A. Schoors (ed.)** (1998) *Qoheleth in the Context of Wisdom*; **L. Schwienhorst-Schönberger (ed.)** (1997) *Das Buch Kohēleth: Studien zur Struktur, Geschichte, Rezeption und Theologie*; **C.-L. Seow** (1996) 'Linguistic Evidence and the Dating of Qoheleth', *JBL* 115: 643–66; (1997) *Ecclesiastes*; (1999) 'Qoheleth's Eschatological Poem', *JBL* 118: 209–34; **S. Talmon and Y. Yadin (eds)** (1999) *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports*; **C.F. Whitley** (1979) *Kohēleth: His Language and Thought* (1979); **R.N. Whybray** (1981) 'The Identification and Use of Quotations in Ecclesiastes', *Congress Volume: Vienna 1980*: 435–51; (1989a) *Ecclesiastes* (NCB); (1989b) *Ecclesiastes* (OTG).

The book of Qohelet is one of the most intriguing books to come out of ancient Jewish writing. It is often referred to as 'Ecclesiastes', on the assumption that the word *qōhelet* in the first verse of the book means 'preacher'. Although it cannot be dated precisely, the lateness of its Hebrew has led most scholars to place it about the third century BCE or the Ptolemaic period. Two dissenting opinions have arisen in recent times. The first, by C.F. Whitley, wants to put the book after Ben Sira in the second century (1979: 122–46), his argument being that Qohelet presupposes certain passages in

Ben Sira. Most scholars have generally argued that the influence is the other way round, and no one seems to have been convinced by Whitley's arguments so far (cf. Reif 1981). More substantial is the argument by C.-L. Seow (1996; 1997) who places the writing of the book in the Persian period, based partly on linguistic grounds and partly on the parallels of thought with literature from the Persian period. I do not find Seow's arguments ultimately convincing. The lack of borrowings of Greek words is not unusual because few Greek words can be found in any of the Hebrew or Aramaic writings of the early Greek period, while the alleged parallels with Persian period literature are no more convincing than those from Greek. But what Seow has done is draw attention to the difficulties in dating the book and the fact that a substantial case can be made for the Persian period, as well as the Ptolemaic. Although scholars have thought that they could find contemporary references in the text, there has been little agreement about what these are (cf. Whybray 1989a: 8–11); while there is nothing against a Ptolemaic background, most such suggestions assume we know more about the society and economy of Ptolemaic Palestine than we actually do. But ultimately the language of the book seems to be the strongest argument for putting the book in the third century.

In the light of this dating, Qohelet is a valuable source for the state of religion and ideology and their development in Judaea in this period. On the other hand, this book is in many respects unique in early Jewish literature in the way it challenges conventional thought. This seems true even despite the widely differing interpretations of the book (contrast Whybray 1989a with Crenshaw 1988). Indeed, the true critical spirit seems to be attested only in this one author and in the writer of Job. Some have accused Qohelet of atheism; although it is not necessary to interpret him in this way, he would seem to be willing to question even the sacred tradition in a way not exhibited by any other Jewish writers except Job. A good case can be made that he is only displaying the spirit of the Hellenistic age and thus gained his critical spirit from the Greeks (Bickerman 1967; Braun 1973). On the other hand, a good case can also be made that he owes his roots to the ancient Near Eastern traditions rather than to Greek influence (Seow 1997; Loretz 1964). What one can say is that the thought of Qohelet is fully compatible with the thought of the Hellenistic period without assuming a direct influence from Greek philosophy or literature (cf. Whybray 1989a: 5–13). In any event, Qohelet's scepticism looks sufficient to have been willing to challenge the biblical tradition itself. No other Jewish writer other than Job questions the tradition as acutely as he does. Thus, Qohelet may tell us more about one writer than about Judaism in general; yet even a 'voice crying in the wilderness' makes up a part of the total picture, and Qohelet is a valuable document.

How to understand the book as a whole depends to some extent on what one thinks its background is. Bickerman (1967: 139–67) has given an interesting interpretation of Qohelet on the assumption that it was written in

the Ptolemaic period and was influenced by Greek thought. One of the problems of interpretation is the existence of a number of apparently contradictory statements in the book, some of which appear extremely radical, whereas others express a more conventional piety. An older solution was to assume that the more traditional statements were made by a later editor trying to tone down the sceptical message. One can ask why a reader scandalized by the message would try to edit it rather than simply rejecting it – and why so many extreme statements were allowed to stand. Most recent studies have attempted to explain the book as all by one author (except Qoh. 12.9-14). The various attempts on how to reconcile some of the content has included an appeal to quotations (Whybray 1981), ‘polar structures’ (the writer deliberately explores both extremes by means of thesis and antithesis: Loader 1979), or the special meaning of *hevel* (often translated ‘vanity’ but the meaning is very much debated; see, e.g., Fox 1999) which occurs at key passages in the book (1.2, 14; 2.17, 19, 21, 23, 26; 4.4, 8, 16; 6.9; 11.8; 12.8). Here are some of the points made by the book:

- Qohelet (along with Job) is practically unique in early Jewish literature in expressing a sceptical position in reference to knowledge, including knowledge of the deity. This book is probably the closest of any Jewish writing to the inquiring mind first exhibited in the ‘Ionic Enlightenment’ of the Greeks.
- The book carries forward the earlier wisdom tradition but also questions it; it is an example of what is sometimes called the ‘crisis in wisdom’. It affirms the importance of wisdom (2.13-14) but also emphasizes its severe limitations (7.23-24; 8.16-17). Instead of the wise being in the know, their wisdom can go only so far and it has no ultimate advantage because all die (2.14-16; 8.5-8).
- The exact message of the book is debated by specialists. For example, Crenshaw sees it as ultimately negative (1988), whereas Whybray has seen a much more positive message (1989a; 1989b).
- The book is very much preoccupied with death but does not appear to see anything beyond it (2.16; 3.18-21). In that sense it is in the old tradition about death being the end of the individual.
- The language of the book is an important stage in trying to determine the history of the Hebrew language. Although clearly still Classical Hebrew, it already has many features known from later Mishnaic Hebrew. One can debate the origins of these features (e.g., natural language change or influence of Aramaic), but they suggest that linguistic features can help in dating various Hebrew writings of early Judaism.

4.5 Ethiopic Enoch (1 Enoch) and the Book of Giants

AIEJL 592–602; **R.A. Argall** (1995) *1 Enoch and Sirach*; **M. Black** (1970) *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece*; (1985) *The Book of Enoch or 1 Enoch*; **G. Boccaccini** (ed.) (2002) *The Origins of Enochic Judaism: Proceedings of the First Enoch Seminar*; (2005) *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*; (2007) *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables*; (forthcoming) *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees*; **R.H. Charles** (1913b) *The Book of Enoch*; **F. Dexinger** (1977) *Henochs Zehnwochenapokalypse und offene Probleme der Apokalyptikforschung*; **L.L. Grabbe** (2007) 'The Parables of Enoch in Second Temple Jewish Society', in G. Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man*: 386–402; *JLBM* 44–53, 83–86, 110–15, 248–56; *JWSTP* 395–406; **M.A. Knibb** (1978) *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch*; **H.S. Kvanvig** (1988) *Roots of Apocalyptic: the Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man*; **J.T. Milik** (1976) *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*; **G.W.E. Nickelsburg** (2001) *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108*; **A.A. Orlov** (2005) *The Enoch–Metatron Tradition*; **J.C. Reeves** (1992) *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions*; **SCHÜRER** 3: 250–68; **M.E. Stone** (1978) 'The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E.', *CBQ* 40: 479–92; **L.T. Stuckenbruck** (1997) *The Book of Giants from Qumran*; **D. W. Suter** (1979) *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch*; **P.A. Tillier** (1993) *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch*; **J.C. VanderKam** (1984) *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition*.

Study of *Ethiopic Enoch* or *1 Enoch* has been intense in recent years, with a great many studies appearing only recently. The four volumes edited by G. Boccaccini (2002; 2005; 2007; forthcoming), from the Enoch Seminar meetings, both give an indication of how much is being done and also make their own contribution to recent study. Only a brief indication of the present state of research can be given here, but the main bibliographical items offer a means of following up individual points. Later sections of *1 Enoch* will be discussed in more detail in *HJJSTP* 3 and 4.

In its present form *1 Enoch* is a complex book with five internal divisions, probably arising at different times. Recently published finds from Qumran suggest that certain parts of the book arose early in the Greek period, though the traditions lying behind the first literary efforts probably lie well back in the Persian period (cf. *HJJSTP* 1: 344–45), and some traditions are developments going back to Mesopotamian literature (VanderKam 1984). The Astronomical Book (*1 Enoch* 72–82) is probably the earliest section and most likely from early in the Hellenistic period. The Book of Watchers (chs 1–36) also forms a unit in the present book, though it probably had a complicated tradition history. The story of the fall of the angels (chs 6–11) in its present form centres around two angelic leaders Shemihazah and Asael; however, the Asael tradition is probably a later addition. This is paralleled by the *Book of Giants*, known from Qumran and in fragmentary form among the Manichaeans (Stuckenbruck 1997; Reeves 1992). Nickelsburg (*JLBM* 49) has suggested that the background of chs 6–11 is the Diadochi period when

'giants' with their armies continually marched through Palestine. If his analysis is correct, chs 1–36 and 72–82 were complete by about the end of the Ptolemaic period and would thus present the thinking of one section of Palestinian Judaism for this period.

The last section of *1 Enoch* is made up of two separate works. The first (chs 83–90) consists of two apocalypses: the Book of Dreams (chs 83–84) and the Animal Apocalypse (chs 85–90). The Book of Dreams is about visions experienced by Noah, warning him of the impending flood. No indication of date is found in it, but it seems to be a unit with the Animal Apocalypse which can be dated fairly precisely. This latter gives a review of Israel's history under the figures of various animals (sheep and oxen for Israelites; unclean animals for pagans). It culminates in an account of a large ram who is universally identified with Judas Maccabaeus (90.9–12), but the apocalypse must have been written before 161 BCE since there is no indication of Judas' death. The Animal Apocalypse is a useful indication of the events during the suppression of Judaism and the subsequent revolt, as well as of the attitudes of some of the contemporaries of the events.

1 Enoch 91–105 is in the form of an epistle. It begins with the Apocalypse of Weeks (91.1–10, 18–19; 92.1–93.10; 91.11–17) which surveys history as an *ex eventu* prophecy in a schematic framework of 10 weeks. The time of the end comes at the end of the seventh week. Most of the rest of the 'epistle' is made up of admonitions about moral and religious conduct with many parallels to OT passages. Although this section has been frequently dated to the Hasmonaean period, there are no clear historical allusions. The Apocalypse of Weeks has been thought to indicate the time of the end before the Maccabean revolt (SCHÜRER 3: 255–56), and there is no reason why it could not have arisen in the early second century rather than in later Hasmonaean times (*JLBM* 113–14).

The Similitudes or Parables of Enoch (chs 37–71) is very controversial. Although J.T. Milik had argued that the Parables was a late Christian work, this has been almost universally rejected by the rest of scholarship. Almost all agree that it is a Jewish work, and it seems to me that it is difficult to find any indication of Christian influence (Grabbe 2007). There is a recent tendency to date the work in the first century CE, though without agreement on whether before or after 70 CE. The reference to the Parthian invasion of 40 BCE has often been taken as a means of dating the work. The reference to the Parthians and Medes in 56.5–57.2 seems to suggest, however, that Jerusalem was not taken and that the invaders fought among themselves and were destroyed (56.7–8). In addition, a second invasion from the east seems to be envisaged (57.1–2). Needless to say, none of this happened. This suggests that the Parables was written either before the invasion of 40 BCE or a long time afterward. Whatever the historical reality, this passage as it presently stands seems to be a metaphor for an eschatological defeat of Jerusalem's enemies.

Some portions of the book are likely to have been written, or at least available as traditions, as early as the Ptolemaic period, namely the Book of

Watchers (chs 1–36) and the Astronomical Book (chs 72–82). This makes these works quite important for a history of this period. Despite the differences between the sections, there are several themes that cut through the different parts of the book: the fall of the Watchers; the fate of the righteous and the wicked; the place of angels; a concern for the movements of the cosmos and the calendar and the cosmic secrets in general. This could be an editorial consequence of combining the various sections, but it may be that the themes were already there and actually served to suggest bringing the individual writings together. Several points about Jewish history and religion emerge from *1 Enoch* 1–36 and 72–82 and the *Book of Giants*:

- These chapters and the book as a whole are one of the best examples of the development of apocalyptic (see §11.4 below).
- The myth of the fall of the Watchers, evidently a widespread myth in early Judaism, has its fullest exposition here. It is very important theologically because it presents an explanation of the present evil state of the world, and why humans sin, that differs from all other Jewish and Christian theologies (e.g., the fall of Adam and Eve or the existence of the two *yěšārîm* ‘tendencies’ in each individual).
- Eschatology is a significant theme, including interest in the future and the endtime and attempts to calculate it. The fate of all who live, whether good or evil, and the question of an afterlife are dealt with explicitly. The book is one of the first Jewish writings to exhibit the concept of a soul that survives death (§11.3.3).
- *1 Enoch* 72–82 demonstrates the importance of the calendar and the fact that more than one version seems to have been in use (see the discussion in *HJJSTP* 1: 185–88). The Astronomical Book apparently once contained a comparative table that reconciled the solar and the lunar cycles (Milik 1976: 274–77). The Ethiopic version shows the use of a solar calendar which seems to coincide with that known from the Qumran texts.
- Cosmic secrets, revealed through Enoch’s visions and heavenly journeys, are a feature of the book, especially in 17–36 and 72–82. Enoch has visions of or takes journeys to various exotic places: the dwelling of God in heaven (14.8–25), the workings of the earth and the underworld (17–19), the place of punishment for the fallen angels (21), the storehouses of the souls of the dead (22), the western extremes of the earth (23–25), the environs of (the later) Jerusalem and the ‘accursed valley’ (26–27), and the other extremities of the earth with their exotic sights (28–36). The Astronomical Book is entirely taken up with the workings of the cosmos.
- The extent to which angelology and demonology at this time had evolved is well indicated. No other early Jewish writing gives such details about the spirit world (cf. §11.3.2).
- The growth of authoritative scripture seems to have included the book, since *1 Enoch* had the status of scripture in some Jewish circles

(Jude 14–15 quotes 1.9; the number of copies at Qumran suggests the book's authority there).

4.6 Fragmentary Jewish Writers in Greek

AIEJL: 648–59; **H.W. Attridge** (1986) 'Jewish Historiography', *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters*: 311–43, esp. 311–16; **J.J. Collins** (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem*; **R. Doran** (1987) 'The Jewish Hellenistic Historians before Josephus', *ANRW II*: 20.1: 246–97; **L.L. Grabbe** (1979) 'Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography', in P.J. Achtemeier (ed.) *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*: 2: 43–68; (forthcoming a) 'Jewish Identity and Hellenism in the Fragmentary Jewish Writings in Greek', in G. O'Day and P. Gray (eds), *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity*; **C. R. Holladay** (1983) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. I, *Historians*; (1989) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. II, *Poets: The Epic Poets Theodotus and Philo and Ezekiel the Tragedian*; (1995) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. III, *Aristobulus*; (1996) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. IV, *Orphica*; *OTP* 2: 775–919; **SCHÜRER**: 3: 509–31, 543–45, 555–66, 579–87; **N. Walter** (1987) 'Jüdisch-hellenistische Literatur vor Philon von Alexandrien (unter Ausschluß der Historiker)', *ANRW II*: 20.1.67–120.

The Jewish writings in Greek preserved only in fragments are generally treated together as a collection even though there is no other particular common feature connecting them other than the accident of their preservation. Most of what is preserved has come from a collection of the first century BCE by Alexander Polyhistor, whose writing (now lost) was in turn drawn on by Eusebius, Clement of Alexandria and other Christian writers. These Jewish writings represent a diversity of literary genres and were probably produced over a wide period of time and geographical area. Most are likely to belong in the period of time from the late-third to mid-first century BCE, though the dating is often difficult. A number of them cannot be dated more specifically than between the conquest of Alexander and the time of Alexander Polyhistor. It is also often hard to be very certain about provenance. Because each writer is rather different, each tells us something different about Judaism. Holladay's invaluable edition (1983; 1989; 1995; 1996) is the basis for any research into these writers and gives much additional bibliography.

In addition to the writers listed below, there are also a number of verses and poetic fragments found in Jewish sources (or quoted in Christian writings) and ascribed to known Greek poets, but probably examples of Jewish pseudepigrapha. Only the *Orphica* have appeared in Holladay's edition, but see *OTP* (2: 821–30) for an English translation of the main ones.

4.6.1 Demetrius the Chronographer

E.J. Bickerman (1975) 'The Jewish Historian Demetrius', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults*: 3: 72–84; **J.J. Collins** (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem*: 33–37; **L. DiTommaso** (1998) 'A Note on Demetrius the Chronographer, Fr. 2.11 (= Eusebius, *PrEv* 9.21.11)', *JSJ* 29: 81–91; **L.L. Grabbe** (1979) 'Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography', in P.J. Achtemeier (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers*: 2: 43–68 **C.R. Holladay** (1983) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. 1, *Historians*: 51–91; *JWSTP* 161–62; **SCHÜRER** 3: 513–17.

Only a few fragments of this writer's work on chronography are preserved; however, one of them mentions 'Ptolemy the Fourth' (221–204 BCE). If this is correct (though many scribal errors have been attributed to these fragments), it would put Demetrius in the last part of the third century (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.21.141.1–2). Some have attempted to emend this to Ptolemy III. However, such emendation is based on attempts to reconcile Demetrius' data, whereas this may simply be impossible (see the discussion in Bickerman 1975). The only version of the Bible he seems to know is that of the LXX, indicating that this translation of the Pentateuch was already extant by his time (§4.1). The few bits of his work which survive show a rationalistic approach which attempts to sort out difficulties, especially as they relate to chronology. Thus, the 'chronology' of the life of Jacob is sorted out, including the time of birth of his various children (Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.21.1–13). A chronology of the patriarchs from Abraham to Moses is given, along with a reckoning of the time from Adam to Abraham (*Praep. ev.* 9.21.16–19). Finally, the time between the captivities of the Northern Kingdom and Jerusalem is reckoned, and then the time from these two captivities to the reign of Ptolemy IV (Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 1.21.141.1–2). His work fits the spirit of Hellenistic historiography in which traditions and legends were subjected to scrutiny and remoulded into history.

This appears to demonstrate two things about Jewish identity: first, it shows a self-conscious desire to maintain the integrity of Jewish scripture against possible criticism and scepticism from outsiders and puzzlement or disillusionment among fellow Jews. The second point is that this sort of defence makes sense only if the Jewish writing being dealt with (the book of Genesis) is conceived of as in some way authoritative or scripture. Jewish identity was already starting to include the presence of sacred writings, and the Jews were starting to become the people of a book. Also, at least some of the chronological data are taken from the biblical text, especially those relating to the births of Jacob's children. If the dating is correct, Demetrius becomes one of the first Jewish writers outside the biblical text itself to attest the scripture consciousness that became very evident at a later time.

The reason for Demetrius' concern about chronology can be explained in various ways. It might have been, at least in part, an intellectual exercise to better understand the text. In other words, it might have formed one of the

earliest commentaries on the biblical text. But calculations of the age of the world were often associated with eschatological expectations in the late Second Temple period (Grabbe 1979). Whether this was the case here is not indicated, but it would be interesting if it was found already this early. Apocalyptic certainly had its roots in the Persian period and was a full-blown reality by Demetrius' time (*HJJSTP* 1: 250–52). The following summarizes the main points arising from the preserved text:

- He attests to a conscientious developing of the concept of 'scripture' or authoritative writings for the Jews, which have to be protected against possible criticism from outsiders and disillusion among fellow Jews.
- The only version of the Bible Demetrius seems to know is that of the LXX. Thus, he is an important witness not only to the text of the LXX but also to the fact that it had already been translated before he wrote. There is good reason to date his writing before 200 BCE, which also puts the LXX about the mid-third century (Holladay 1983: 51–52).
- The few bits of Demetrius' work which survive show a rationalistic approach which attempts to sort out difficulties, especially as they relate to chronology. For example, he explains why it was no problem for Moses and Zipporah to be of two different generations (*apud* Eusebius, *Praep. ev.* 9.29.1–3) and how the Israelites leaving Egypt got their weapons (*Praep. ev.* 9.29.16).
- The core of his work is trying to develop a rational chronology of biblical events (cf. Grabbe 1979). Most of it is internal to the Bible, but there are some attempts to relate to external chronology.
- It is possible that this chronological interest was related in some way to eschatological expectations or apocalyptic speculation.

4.6.2 Eupolemus and Pseudo-Eupolemus

J.J. Collins (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 46–50; **L.L. Grabbe** (2001c) 'A Dan(iel) for All Seasons: For Whom Was Daniel Important?', in J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel*: 1: 229–46; **C.R. Holladay** (1983) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. 1, *Historians*, 93–187; *JWSTP* 161–62; **SCHÜRER** 3: 513–17; **B.Z. Wacholder** (1974) *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature*.

We may know more about Eupolemus than most of the other Jewish writers in this survey. There is a wide consensus that he was the Eupolemus, son of John, who was sent on a mission to establish relations with Rome and allegedly even spoke in the Roman senate (1 Macc. 8.17–20; 2 Macc. 4.11; Holladay 1983: 93). This would date the writing to about the middle of the second century BCE. He was of the priestly family of Hakkoz (הַקִּיֹּץ in Hebrew; variously Κῶς, Ακκῶς, Ακους, Ακῶς in Greek: 1 Chron. 24.10; Ezra 2.61; Neh. 3.4, 21; 7.63) and evidently had a Greek education. Thus, we

have a member of the Jerusalem aristocracy and temple with a Greek name and knowledge of Greek. The quality of the Greek has some lacks, suggesting that it is his second (or third) language after presumably Aramaic and Hebrew.

He composed a work apparently entitled *History of the Kings of Judah*. The preserved excerpts are all on the period of OT history and thus give no direct evidence about the history of his own times. On the other hand, they show how the OT account of Israel's early history was interpreted, cherished and used as a model for the ideals of many Jews during the rise of the Hasmonaean state. He even seems to have made use of Herodotus and Ctesias in his book (Holladay 1983: 95, 101 n. 16; Wacholder 1974: 13), though it is difficult to find anything suggesting a critical spirit in the preserved fragments.

From the remains of Eupolemus' writing, it appears that one of his aims was that evident from other 'rewritten Bible' productions: to clarify and amplify the biblical text. A number of his fragments seem to be a paraphrase of the biblical text but with new details and expansions in certain areas. The evidence suggests that he used both a Hebrew and a Greek text (Holladay 1983: 95, 100–101 nn. 14–15). The clarification and amplification looks very much like that seen elsewhere: to show how the Jews were equal or even superior to other nations and peoples. We find the exaggerated apologetic well known from other Jewish sources, such as the view that Moses gave the alphabet to the Jews and everyone got it from them, or the magnificence of Solomon's temple. David's conquests are made much greater and more glorious than in the Bible, and the help to build the temple that Solomon receives from the surrounding peoples is enormous, perhaps as a way of emphasizing what a glorious building the temple was. The accounts of both Kings and Chronicles are combined, but Chronicles with its greater detail seems to be emphasized. His embellishment of the biblical account may in some cases come from the exercise of rationalization or the use of other sources of information, and he attempts to sort out some chronological problems. His mention of a bird scarer on the temple is an addition to the text, but there is reason to suspect that a means of keeping birds off the roof was a feature of the second temple (cf. 11QT 46.1–4//11Q20 12.15–17). If so, Eupolemus is not deriving this particular feature from the biblical text but from his own knowledge of the contemporary temple. The tradition that Jeremiah took charge of the ark of the covenant after the temple was destroyed is also found in 2 Macc. 2.4–5. This was probably a way of mitigating the implications that God allowed the ark to be taken by the Babylonians as spoil.

Finally, Eupolemus also tries to calculate the age of the world, which might carry eschatological implications as already discussed. The final redactor of the book of Daniel was an educated individual who not only knew Greek but had access to writing about Hellenistic history – someone like Eupolemus (Grabbe 2001c). It would not be unusual for an educated Jew like Eupolemus

to have eschatological beliefs and expectations. Here are some of the main points from the fragments of his writing:

- Eupolemus' name and background indicate a knowledge of Greek culture and language. One would expect him to have been a part of Jason's new Hellenistic Jerusalem (though we do not know this for certain). In any case, his prominence in the new Hasmonaean regime shows the extent to which Hellenistic culture was as much a part of the new order as it had been of the Hellenistic reform.
- The preserved excerpts of Eupolemus are all on the period of OT history and thus give no direct evidence about the history of his own times. On the other hand, they show that the OT account of Israel's early history was interpreted, cherished and used as a model for the ideals of many Jews during the rise of the Hasmonaean state. For example, Moses is made the inventor of the alphabet. Eupolemus also attempts to integrate the information from both 1 Kings and 2 Chronicles, showing a conscious desire to interpret and rationalize (Holladay 1983: 102 n. 20).
- Eupolemus provides a good example of a 'rewritten Bible'. The author seems to be following the outline of the biblical text, but he adds many details not in the Bible, such as the correspondence between Solomon and the kings of Egypt and Tyre. The physical description of the temple differs as well.
- His work is another example of the use of the LXX form of the text, though he also seems to have known the Hebrew text (Holladay 1983: 100–101 nn. 14–15).
- As argued elsewhere (Grabbe 2001c), it is possible that Eupolemus was even the final author of Daniel. There are a number of arguments suggesting that a person like him compiled the final book. This would require Eupolemus to have been a member of a group calling themselves the *maskilim*. We have no evidence that he was, but there is also nothing to rule it out.

We now come to the rather vexed question of 'Pseudo-Eupolemus' (also known as the 'Anonymous Samaritan'). Two of the fragments found in Eusebius under the name of Eupolemus are generally thought not to be by him (*Praep. ev.* 9.17.2–9; 9.18.2). He has been identified as a Samaritan because his account of Abraham's meeting of Melchizedek, described in Genesis 14, does not take place at Salem (i.e., Jerusalem) but at *Argarizin*, the sacred temple of the Samaritans. The use of the name *Argarizin* instead of Gerizim is also often taken to be a sign of a Samaritan writer. The two surviving fragments have come through Alexander Polyhistor; this and other factors suggest a dating for the work in the early second century BCE. The fragments both focus on Abraham who was a hero to the Samaritans as well as the Jews. Among the things that these fragments teach is euhemerism, that Enoch (identified with Atlas) discovered astrology, and that Abraham taught

astrology and mathematics to the Phoenicians and Egyptians. He also mentions that the tower of Babel was founded by a race of giants, from whom Abraham was descended. Where the Hebrew text refers to ‘Canaan’, these fragments use the term ‘Phoenician’. Yet not everyone accepts that these belong to a different writer from Eupolemus. For example, R. Doran (in *OTP* 2: 873–81) argues that the author of the first fragment is not an anonymous Samaritan but Eupolemus himself. He thinks the second fragment is a ‘potpourri of traditions, most probably thrown together by Alexander Polyhistor out of disparate elements’ (2: 878).

4.6.3 Artapanus

J.J. Collins (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 37–46; **C.R. Holladay** (1983) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. I, *Historians*, 189–243; *JWSTP* 161–62; **SCHÜRER** 3: 513–17.

Nothing is known about Artapanus, but the fragments of his work indicate that he is one of the most curious Jewish writers of the Second Temple period. He could be as early as the third century BCE, but the reign of Ptolemy VI (180–145 BCE) is suggested as the most likely time (Holladay 1983: 189–90).

Artapanus is often seen as different from other Jewish writers in his apparent tolerance of paganism. Granted, he is not afraid to use pagan motifs, such as his making Moses responsible for creating the Egyptian gods and worship. Yet his aim appears to be the same as some of the others considered here: a special concern to make the Jews equal (or even superior) intellectually to others. Abraham, Joseph and Moses were all responsible for introducing some of the achievements and innovations that were traditionally assumed to be Egyptian inventions. Abraham taught astrology to the Egyptians (*Praep. ev.* 9.18.1), while Joseph was the first to divide the land of Egypt geometrically and provide boundaries (*Praep. ev.* 9.23.2). Moses himself is very much a heroic figure: a great general (he defeated the Ethiopians [*Praep. ev.* 9.27.7–12]) who is not only outstanding militarily but also arouses love even among his enemies, a cultural innovator (*Praep. ev.* 9.27.4), enjoying miracles performed on his behalf by God, and even the object of worship by the Egyptians (who set up a rod in every temple because Moses used his rod to produce frogs, locusts and fleas from the earth [*Praep. ev.* 9.27.32]). But it is not just Moses, outstanding as he is. For example, Moses’ father-in-law Raguel is not an insignificant figure living in the Sinai wilderness but a formidable power able to match strength with that of Pharaonic Egypt (*Praep. ev.* 9.27.19). All of this creates a heritage for the Jews of which they can be proud and hold up their heads even among the supposed oldest and most cultured of nations.

Many modern writers have had a problem with Artapanus because he seemed to compromise with paganism. But this charge – like so many modern

interpretations – is based on preconceived ideas about being a ‘proper Jew’. In fact, Artapanus is an example demonstrating the variety of approaches to Graeco-Roman culture by Jews. Holladay makes the important observation that Artapanus has a tendency toward ‘euhemerism’ (1983: 193). Euhemerus (c.300 BCE) wrote a story about a voyage to some islands with a utopian society, in which the local gods (with Greek names) were originally kings who were promoted to divine status and worshipped by the people after their death (Diodorus Siculus 6.1). Although the idea was not widespread among Greeks, the Jews latched on to it as an explanation for pagan worship, and it appears in a number of Jewish writings (e.g., *Aristeas* 135). Holladay seems to be right that Artapanus is actually downgrading the Egyptian deities by explaining their worship as having been a human invention – by no less than the one who led the Jews out of Egypt. Some of the main points that come from his work are the following:

- The biblical personages are magnified and turned into heroes by literary embellishments of biblical events. Thus, Abraham taught the Egyptians astrology, while Moses became an Egyptian general who conquered the Ethiopians and married the daughter of the Ethiopian king (incidentally providing an explanation for Moses’ ‘Ethiopian’ wife in Num. 12.1). One might label Artapanus’ account as ‘rewritten Bible, but it almost goes beyond that and could perhaps be called ‘para-biblical’.
- Israel’s history is accommodated to pagan customs and practices in a surprising way. For example, Moses is alleged to have appointed the particular gods to be worshipped by each nome in Egypt. This has led some scholars to argue that Artapanus was a pagan rather than a Jew, but this interpretation is generally rejected today. What his writings do show is the extent to which some Jews were ready to take a ‘broad-minded’ view toward the surrounding Greek culture.
- An interesting point is the power of God’s name, which causes the king to fall down speechless when Moses only whispers it into his ear and which kills an Egyptian priest who sees it written down.

4.6.4 *Ezekiel the Dramatist*

J. J. Collins (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 224–30; **N.L. Collins** (1991) ‘Ezekiel, the Author of the *Exagoge*: His Calendar and Home’, *JSJ* 22: 201–11; **C.R. Holladay** (1989) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. II, *Poets: The Epic Poets Theodotus and Philo and Ezekiel the Tragedian*, 301–529; **H. Jacobson** (1983) *The ‘Exagoge’ of Ezekiel*, *JWSTP* 161–66; **P. Lanfranchi** (2006) *L’Exagoge d’Ezéchiel le Tragique: Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire*; **SCHÜRER** 3: 513–17.

Ezekiel probably lived after 200 BCE but may have been as early as the third century. A recent study puts him between the middle of the third century and the middle of the first century BCE (Lanfranchi 2006: 10), not very exact but

recognizing the difficulties with any attempt at dating. The surviving fragments are all from the life of Moses and are said to be from a play on the exodus called the *Exagoge*, a most remarkable work (though he is alleged to have composed other tragedies, hence 'Ezekiel the Tragedian'). For the most part the work is a paraphrase of the account in the biblical book of Exodus. There are definite signs of use of a text like that of the Old Greek or Septuagint (Holladay 1989: 313, 326 nn. 37–38). At the end of the preserved extracts, there is a remarkable passage on the fabulous phoenix bird, a reference found in no extant biblical manuscript or version of Exodus.

It is unusual to find a Jewish author who has composed a Greek drama on a tragic theme as was traditional among Greek tragedians, and also showing a good command of the Greek language. In this case, though, instead of using a legend or an actual event from Hellenic history, he has chosen a Jewish theme, the exodus from Egypt. This would seem to make a lot of sense: why should not a Jewish writer use Jewish history or tradition for his play? After all, Aeschylus could write about an event of recent Greek history, the Persian wars, and not just traditional themes. Yet the *Exagoge* is in fact very unusual in the history of drama. What it shows is a Jewish self-confidence in the ancestral tradition but also a thorough knowledge of Greek language and forms, and a willingness to use them to express a Jewish subject, presumably for fellow Jews (but see below) who could understand the Greek language and Greek dramatic forms. Ezekiel is thoroughly familiar with Euripides, Aeschylus, Sophocles, Homer and Herodotus, and he is competent in metrification. He evidently had a good education in Greek (Holladay 1989: 303, 328–29 n. 44).

This raises a very interesting issue with regard to members of the Jewish community: attendance at theatres and public spectacles (Lanfranchi 2006: 39–56). Such activities are castigated by some Jewish writers, with the suggestion that they are un-Jewish and contrary to the law (e.g., Josephus, *Ant.* 15.8.1 §§268–76), yet such a pious and faithful Jew as Philo of Alexandria clearly attended such public entertainment (*Ebr.* 177; *Quod omnis probus* 141). The issue is somewhat difficult because the theatre and its productions had a religious context, but it seems evident that some Jews did not find this a problem. Also, it is possible that the Jews had their own theatre in some cases.

Ezekiel provides a number of interesting points about Judaism of the time:

- His drama on the exodus in Greek verse demonstrates how educated some Jews were in Greek culture and literature.
- Ezekiel's willingness to use a Greek literary form with a Jewish theme shows not only his integration into the surrounding Hellenistic culture but also willingness to be identified as a Jewish writer. There is no hint that Ezekiel was trying to hide his identity or pretend to be a non-Jewish writer.
- The text drawn on is the LXX, though whether he wrote in Alexandria or elsewhere is uncertain.

- He (along with Demetrius) is one of the earliest biblical interpreters to show an awareness of difficulties in the text and to attempt to resolve them.

4.6.5 Aristobulus

J.J. Collins (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 186–90; **L.L. Grabbe** (1988a) *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation: The Hebrew Names in Philo*; **C.R. Holladay** (1995) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. III, *Aristobulus*; (1996) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. IV, *Orphica*; **JWSTP** 161–62; **SCHÜRER** 3: 513–17; **N. Walter** (1964) *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulus*.

Aristobulus probably wrote in the second century BCE (the king Ptolemy to whom he dedicated his work is usually identified with Ptolemy VI, 180–145 BCE; see *OTP* 2: 832–33). We are told that Aristobulus was a Peripatetic, that is a follower of the Aristotelian school of philosophy. The preserved fragments are greatly reminiscent of Philo of Alexander. According to traditions preserved about him, he was the teacher of Ptolemy VI; this dating, if not some of the other allegations about him, has been widely accepted (Holladay 1995: 45–75). This would date him, like Artapanus, to the middle of the second century BCE.

Among the implications of Aristobulus' writing(s) are that the Jewish religious practices are universal: even the Sabbath was recognized by the Greeks, not least by early and important figures like Homer, Hesiod and Solon (*Praep. ev.* 13.12.13–16 // 13.13.34–35 // Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.14.107.1–4; 5.14.108.1; 6.16.144.3). Thus, by implication the Jews are right to maintain these traditions and reject any criticisms (keeping of the Sabbath was one of the most frequent negative comments made about Jews [e.g., Aristarchus of Cnidus, *apud* Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.22 §§210–11]). Also, Pythagoras, Socrates and Plato appear to have followed Moses (*Praep. ev.* 13.12.4 // 13.13.21 // Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 5.14.99.3). Another point is that allegory is an important way of understanding the scriptures. Although Aristobulus does not point out (and perhaps did not realize) that his allegory was likely to have been borrowed from the Greeks (cf. Grabbe 1988a: 49–87), it was clear that Jewish allegory of the Bible and Greek allegory of Homer were a shared intellectual activity. Our knowledge of Jewish allegorical interpretation of the Bible is best known from Philo of Alexandria (c.20 BCE – c.50 CE), but Aristobulus makes it clear that the practice was far older than Philo.

An interesting aspect of Aristobulus' is his citation of Greek writings. Some of these appear to have come via Jewish media such as the verses of Pseudo-Orpheus (on this Jewish writing, in several recensions, see Holladay 1996). One citation from Hesiod (first quote in *Praep. ev.* 13.12.13) is accurate, though he has misinterpreted it. A second quote from Hesiod (second quote in *Praep. ev.* 13.12.13) is not attested in the extant text of Hesiod, though it has 'Hesiodic echoes'. His quotations from Homer (*Praep.*

ev. 13.12.14) are more problematic: one appears to be based on the *Odyssey* (5.262), though Aristobulus has the number 'seven' where Homer seems to have had 'four'; the others are unknown in Homer but may not necessarily be Jewish inventions (Holladay 1995: 235–36 nn. 155–58). Also, Aristobulus quotes the beginning of Aratus' poem, *Phaenomena* (lines 1–18), again accurately (except for his acknowledged changing of 'Zeus' to 'God' [*theos*]). Although his knowledge of Greek literature should not be pressed (since he may have got some of it second-hand through Jewish sources), all the information that we have on Aristobulus suggests a well-educated man who had knowledge of Greek literature and culture. Whether he was literally the teacher of Ptolemy VI as alleged seems unlikely, but he may well have dedicated a work to the young Ptolemy that would give him the designation of 'teacher of the king' (Holladay 1995: 46, 75, 78 n. 4). Points arising from his work can be summarized as follows:

- He is said to have been an Aristotelian, and one long fragment explains how anthropomorphisms applied to the deity are only figurative. God could not have descended onto Mt Sinai because he is everywhere.
- In his opinion the Greek philosophers, including Socrates, Plato and Pythagoras, took many of their views from the Hebrews, via the Greek translation of the Bible.
- He is the first Jewish interpreter to use allegory to any major extent and forms a clear predecessor of Philo; he also seems to have been, like Philo, from Alexandria, suggesting there is an organic link with the giant of Jewish biblical interpretation.
- The sabbath is explained and defended as not being a day of idleness (as Graeco-Roman writers often alleged), and certain poetic passages are quoted to support his views (see next point).
- A number of alleged passages from Greek writers are quoted, but some are clearly Jewish forgeries (see below). Like the *Sibylline Oracles*, these illustrate how Jews with a good Hellenistic education nevertheless drew on their knowledge to create pseudepigraphic works in the defence of Judaism.

4.6.6 Philo the Epic Poet

J.J. Collins (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 54–57; **C.R. Holladay** (1989) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. II, *Poets: The Epic Poets Theodotus and Philo and Ezekiel the Tragedian*, 205–99; **JWSTP** 161–62; **SCHÜRER** 3: 513–17.

Not to be confused with Philo of Alexandria, Philo the epic poet apparently wrote a book, *Concerning Jerusalem*. The exact nature of this book is difficult to evaluate because of the fragmentary nature of what survives, but the

surviving fragments talk of Abraham and also describe the Jerusalem water system. The following points arise from the preserved text:

- Although the quality of his Greek is debated, it is generally accepted that Philo had a reasonable command of the language – possibly a good command. The problem is that his language is very difficult, which could equally be because he draws on obscure words and expressions or because of a lack of full command of the literary language. Recent studies have tended to evaluate his language positively. Philo is another example of a Jew educated in Greek.
- He apparently wrote of Abraham's aborted sacrifice of Isaac. This may be an example of a 'rewritten Bible', though it is so brief and oblique that one cannot be sure.
- His description of the Jerusalem water works (whether accurate or not) shows an interest in Jerusalem that goes so far as to make it a worthy subject of epic poetry.

4.6.7 *Theodotus*

J.J. Collins (1980) 'The Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans', *HTR* 73: 91–104; (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 57–60; **C.R. Holladay** (1989) *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*: vol. II, *Poets: The Epic Poets Theodotus and Philo and Ezekiel the Tragedian*, 51–204; *JWSTP* 161–62; **SCHÜRER** 3: 513–17.

Dating and provenance of the epic of Theodotus are difficult (cf. Holladay 1989: 68–72), but sometime in the second century BCE is a reasonable guess. It has long been argued that Theodotus was written by a Samaritan, mainly because of the focus on Shechem; recent studies have favoured Jewish authorship, however (e.g., Collins 1980). If the work is by a Jewish author, it tells us the following:

- The writer is clearly at home in Greek literature and language, since he makes use of Homeric poetic language.
- Yet the writer also opposed any sort of intermarriage between the 'Hebrews' and other peoples.
- Because the fragments are all confined to the story of the rape of Dinah and the subsequent destruction of the Shechemites (Gen. 34), it is hard to say what else (if anything) was included in his original story. Nevertheless, as it stands Theodotus gives us a good example of a 'rewritten Bible'.

4.7 *Tobit*

AIEJL 520–24; **M. Bredin** (ed.) (2006) *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach*; **J. Corley and V. Skemp** (eds) (2005) *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit*; **P. Deselaers** (1982) *Das Buch Tobit*; **J.A. Fitzmyer** (1995a) 'The Aramaic and Hebrew Fragments of Tobit from Cave 4', *CBQ* 57:

655–75; (1995b) ‘Tobit’, in J.C. VanderKam (ed.) *Qumran Cave 4: XIV Parabiblical Texts, Part 2*: 1–84; (2003) *Tobit* (CEJL); **J. Gamberoni** (1997) ‘Das “Gesetz des Mose” im Buch Tobias’, in G. Braulik (ed.) *Studien zu Pentateuch: Walter Kornfeld zum 60. Geburtstag*: 227–42; **L.L. Grabbe** (2003a) ‘Tobit’, in J.D.G. Dunn and J.W. Rogerson (eds), *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible*: 736–47; **R. Hanhart** (1983) *Tobit* (Septuaginta 8/5); *JLBM* 29–35, 38–39; *JWSTP* 40–46; **C.A. Moore** (1996) *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*; **M. Rabenau** (1994) *Studien zum Buch Tobit*; **SCHÜRER** 3: 222–32; **W. Soll** (1988) ‘Tobit and Folklore Studies, with Emphasis on Propp’s Morphology’, in D.J. Lull (ed.) *Society of Biblical Literature 1988 Seminar Papers*: 39–53; **R.A. Spencer** (1999) ‘The Book of Tobit in Recent Research’, *CR: BS* 7: 147–80; **J.D. Thomas** (1972) ‘The Greek Text of Tobit’, *JBL* 91: 463–71; **G. Toloni** (2004) *L’originale del libro di Tobia: Studio filologico-linguistico*; **S. Weeks et al.** (eds) (2004) *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions*; **L.M. Wills** (1995) *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*; **G. G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér** (eds) (2005) *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology*; **F. Zimmermann** (1958) *The Book of Tobit*.

This is the story of a pious Jew blinded during an act of charity, his son Tobias and a cousin named Sarah who also suffers until she is married by Tobias. The setting of the story is ostensibly the exile of the Northern Kingdom in the land of the Assyrians, which suggests that it most likely originated in the eastern Jewish diaspora. Its dating is uncertain, however, and cannot be put more exactly than the time between about 500 and 200 BCE. The reason for this period of time is that it presupposes the existence of the Second Temple (14.5), but seems not to know of the Maccabaeian revolt, and there are no certain historical allusions in the book. The third century is a reasonable estimate, but it is no more than a guess. Yet the work appears to be one of the earliest Jewish writings to deal with Jews in the diaspora.

The text of Tobit exists in two main major forms (see Hanhart 1983 for critical editions of both texts). It had been thought that the book was originally written in a Semitic language, and that the Greek text was only a translation. Most scholars have tended to see the longer Sinaiticus manuscript as more original (Fitzmyer 1995a). The shorter text of the Vaticanus is also in more elegant Greek and seems therefore to be a revision of a longer, Semiticized text similar to Sinaiticus (Thomas 1972). Among the Qumran scrolls are four manuscripts in Aramaic and one in Hebrew (Fitzmyer 1995b). It is not absolutely clear whether the original language was Hebrew or Aramaic, but scholars tend to favour Aramaic.

Tobit is one – perhaps the first – of a long line of works going under the heading of ‘Jewish novel’ (Soll 1988; Wills 1995: 68–92); it has some characteristics of the folktale but has been developed by the incorporation of didactic, hymnic and prophetic elements which are not usually found in a folktale. It also has characteristics in common with the Graeco-Roman novel or romance but differs in some respects (e.g., being shorter and de-emphasizing the erotic element). The book gives a number of insights into Judaism and its concerns for the period in which it was written:

- Tobit is one of the few books set in the diaspora, with one of its aims that of illustrating how Jews were to live in a hostile Gentile environment.
- The question of theodicy or why God allows innocent suffering is an important theme, one also addressed by the books of Job and Qohelet.
- The family is both a refuge from the outside world and an entity to which one owes various duties, such as help to relatives in times of trouble. It is important to marry relatives (though it is not entirely clear whether this is with fellow Israelites generally or within one's own tribe specifically). Although the family is a social matter, it cannot be separated from the practice of religion.
- Proper burial is important, not only for one's parents (4.3-4; 6.15; 14.11-13): burial of the anonymous Jews whose bodies are left in the streets (1.17-19; 2.3-8) has a significant place. One might think this was in some way related to an expectation of a resurrection or an afterlife, but neither of these is hinted at anywhere in the book.
- There is quite a bit of what many would call moral teaching. Almsgiving is a major theme (1.16-17; 2.14; 4.8-11; 12.8-9; 14.10-11). The 'negative Golden Rule' first occurs here, centuries before Jesus or Hillel (4.15). There may also be one of the first indications of an ascetic view of sex as being only for procreative purposes (cf. 8.7).
- What are often referred to as cultic or ritual instructions include the proper observance of the festivals (2.1-5), temple worship (1.4-6), the necessity for observing the food laws (1.11), and tithing (1.6-8).
- The book refers to the authority of the scriptures (the 'book of Moses' and the prophets are specifically mentioned [1.8; 2.6; 6.13; 7.11-13; 14.3]). Tobit seems to presuppose knowledge of the contents of our present Pentateuch (Gamberoni 1997).
- Angelology and demonology are mentioned (3.7-9, 17; 5.4-5; 12.6-21).
- Magical practices are referred to (8.1-3).

4.8 Third Maccabees

AIEJL 561-63; **J.J. Collins** (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 122-31; *CPJ* 1: 21-23; *JLBM* 199-202, 227; **S.R. Johnson** (2004) *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in its Cultural Context*; *JWSTP* 80-84; **F. Parente** (1988) 'The Third Book of Maccabees as Ideological Document and Historical Source', *Henoch* 10: 143-82; **SCHÜRER** 3: 537-42; **V. A. Tcherikover** (1961) 'The Third Book of Maccabees as a Historical Source of Augustus' Time', *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 7: 1-26.

Despite its title, *3 Maccabees* is ostensibly set during the reign of Ptolemy IV (221-204 BCE), half a century earlier than the Maccabean revolt. The first few verses (1.1-7) describe the battle of Raphia (217 BCE) in which Antiochus

III was defeated by the Egyptians and forced to retire from Coele-Syria (§13.4). The next section of the book (1.8–2.24) tells of how Ptolemy came to Jerusalem and attempted to enter the Holy of Holies but was refused. He then returned to Egypt and initiated a persecution of the Alexandrian Jews who were, however, miraculously delivered (2.25–6.22), and the king repented of his plan and acknowledged the God of heaven (6.23–29). The Jews were allowed a festival, and the king issued a decree in their favour (6.30–7.23).

Recent study has indicated that the work is itself later than the reign of Ptolemy IV. Opinion is divided between a composition late in the Ptolemaic period, probably the predominant opinion (Johnson 2004: 129–41), and in the early Roman period (Collins 2000: 124–26; Tcherikover 1961; Parente 1988); a Ptolemaic composition that was updated in the Roman period is one way of explaining the later references. In any case, it draws on some genuine Ptolemaic sources. Its account of the battle of Raphia, though brief, seems to have had a good source (Johnson 2004: 190–201; Tcherikover 1961: 2–3; Parente 1988: 147–48). The basis of the story about the persecution of the Jews may lie in actual events, but this is a moot point since there is no clear evidence of a Jewish persecution under Ptolemaic rule (Johnson 2004: 188). No doubt the persecutions of Antiochus IV would have been sufficient inspiration, though the assumption of threats to the Jewish community go back even before that, as the book of Esther indicates. Just as there is no evidence that the Jews were menaced under Persian rule, so the alleged persecutions under the Ptolemies seem fantasy. Although legendary in its present form (Tcherikover 1961: 7–8; *CPJ* 1: 21–23), the story, if given its final editing in the Augustan age, could also reflect the situation at that time (Parente 1988).

Third Maccabees has been characterized as a ‘historical fiction’, a work that is fictional but makes considerable use of historical details to give it verisimilitude (Johnson 2004: 2–6). As noted above, the narrative has gone to considerable lengths to give historical details, and the surface information seems to be accurate, but underneath the author has carefully and cleverly manipulated the data for non-historical purposes (Johnson 2004: 190–216). One explanation is that the author has deliberately mixed historical data in with fictional to create ‘suspension of disbelief’:

Their authors [of historical fiction in general] were neither careless nor uneducated; they did not aim to swindle their readers, nor were they much concerned about the chance that their elaborate frauds would be discovered. Rather, their goal was to communicate some deeper truth about the nature of Hellenistic Jewish identity as they understood it ... they created a far more meaningful imagined history for their audience and for their community. This was not history as it really happened but, in the readers’ minds, history as it should have been. (Johnson 2004: 216)

The main points about Judaism arising from *3 Maccabees* include:

- Brief but accurate information on the battle of Raphia is given (1.1-5; §13.4).
- The account that Ptolemy IV went around to various cities of Syro-Palestine (1.6-9) agrees with Polybius (5.87.5-7), and his visit to Jerusalem is likely to have substance behind it.
- It is one of the earliest Jewish ‘novels’ or ‘novellas’ or ‘romances’ (Johnson 2004).
- Dositheus son of Drimylus is named as one of the few individuals designated in history who are alleged to have abandoned their Judaism or Jewish identity (§6.4.2).
- The persecution of the Jews described here does not fit the reign of Ptolemy IV or the early Hellenistic period – if a historical event lies behind it, it would be at a later time, probably in the period after the Maccabean revolt.
- Keeping the law but mixing in Greek circles.
- Use of historical details in a fictional narrative to get message across.

4.9 Aramaic Levi Document

R.H. Charles (1908) *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*; **J.J. Collins** (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 174–83; **J.C. Greenfield and M.E. Stone** (1979) ‘Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza’, *RB* 86: 214–30; **J. C. Greenfield, M.E. Stone and E. Eshel** (2004) *The Aramaic Levi Document*; **JLBM** 159–65; **M. de Jonge** (1978) *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text*; **JWSTP** 331–44; **J. Kugel** (2007) ‘How Old Is the Aramaic Levi Document?’ *DSD* 14: 291–312; **R.A. Kugler** (1996) *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi*; **OTP** 1: 775–828; **SCHÜRER** 3: 767–81; **M.E. Stone** (1988) ‘Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins’, *JSJ* 19: 159–70; (2000) ‘Levi, Aramaic’, in L.H. Schiffman and J.C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls*: 486–88; **M.E. Stone and J.C. Greenfield** (1996) ‘A. Aramaic Levi Document’, in *Qumran Cave 4: XVII Parabiblical Texts, Part 3*: 1–72.

The *Aramaic Levi Document* (ALD) is clearly related to the later *Testament of Levi*. The growth of the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* in Greek has not really been resolved, but finds from the Qumran scrolls and the Cairo Genizah have complicated matters (on the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs*, see the discussion and bibliography in *HJJSTP* 4; a few items are listed there which include the *Testament of Levi*). With regard to the ALD specifically, much of it has been reconstructed by J.C. Greenfield, M.E. Stone and E. Eshel (2004), making use of the manuscripts from the Cairo Genizah, while the relevant material from Qumran (4QLevi^{a-f} ar [4Q213–214b]) is edited by Stone and Greenfield (1996), except for 1Q21 (which is found in *DJD* 1).

There is a considerable controversy about the dating of the work. A number of scholars want to put it in the third century or the early second century at the latest (Stone 2000; Greenfield, Stone and Eshel 2004; *JLBM*

164–65). This is based on the argument that the *ALD* is a source of *Jubilees* (which is often dated in the first half of the second century), the *ALD* is cited by the *Damascus Document* (late second century?), and makes use of a solar calendar (this last argument is not convincing; see below). This early dating has been strongly opposed by J. Kugel (2007) who argues that, on the contrary, *ALD* refers to *Jubilees* and is to be dated no later than the late second century BCE.

Although the Aramaic text has some relationship to the Greek text, there are also many differences (cf. Kugler 1996); however, the present Greek *Testament of Levi* probably incorporates material from or a reworking of something like the known Aramaic version. The *Testaments* as a whole show a definite Christian character and are a Christian composition in their present form. Yet the *Testament of Levi* contains much that shows primarily Jewish interests and does not fit a Christian context, even a Jewish-Christian one. The *ALD* tells us much about the Jews and Jewish religion of the time:

- The importance and place of the priesthood is a particular emphasis in the Levi material, with Levi chosen to be priest through a vision even in his own lifetime. The work may have been written by a member of the priesthood. If so, and if the eschatological section in the Greek version is original, it would show what has been argued extensively elsewhere: far from being opposed to eschatology and apocalyptic, some priests at least cultivated these traditions (see §11.3.3; §11.4 below). Fragment 5 of 4QLevi^a ar (4Q213) has been interpreted as criticizing the priesthood, and there is also a mention of Enoch. The text is very fragmentary, however, and we do not know whether the reference to Enoch has anything to do with the fallen angels myth, nor whether the criticism of the priesthood, if it is such, is by an outsider.
- The writer was quite concerned about the correct performance of the cult. Detailed regulations are laid down in the surviving fragments, including even the sorts of wood to be used and the need to reject that which has worms in it (4Q214b, frags 2–6, 1.2–6 // Cairo *T. Levi*, Bodleian col. c, 9–21).
- Like the book of *Jubilees*, the author gives chronological details of the lives of the patriarchs and the precise time when particular things happened to them. This suggests belief in a predetermined chronological scheme to history or at least a desire to calculate the various events of history with a view to understanding the future (cf. the Greek *T. Levi* 16–18).
- It has been proposed that the Cairo Genizah *Aramaic Levi* shows evidence of use of the solar calendar (Greenfield and Stone 1979), but this seems rather uncertain. The 364-day calendar as such is not actually mentioned; instead, use of the solar calendar is inferred from the births of Levi's children: the first is born in the 10th month; the second, on the 1st day of the 1st month; the third, in the 3rd

month; the fourth, on the 1st day of the 7th month. Since the 1st day of the 1st and the 7th months is a Wednesday in the solar calendar known from other sources, this might be significant, but the inference is rather precarious. The 1st, 4th, 7th and 10th months are all the same in the solar calendar, but the months in *Aramaic Levi* are the 1st, 3rd, 7th and 10th. To be born on the 1st day of the 1st month would be significant in any calendar. Similarly, the 7th month is an important one in the Jewish calendar, with the Festival of Trumpets, Yom ha-Kippurim and Sukkot, and to be born on the 1st day of the 7th month could be symbolic in any version of the calendar. So the 364-day calendar *may* be implied by these dates in the *Aramaic Levi*, but they are perfectly capable of being explained in other ways.

- The question of apocalyptic and eschatology is an intriguing one. The Aramaic fragments mention visions but nothing clearly eschatological; however, the Greek *Testament of Levi* (16–18) has a section with what some have seen as belief in an eschatological high priest (others see this as a Christian passage).

4.10 Ben Sira (Ecclesiasticus)

R.A. Argall (1995) *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment*; **P.C. Beentjes** (1997) *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts*; **P.C. Beentjes** (ed.) (1997) *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research*; **N. Calduch-Benages and J. Vermeylen** (eds) (1999) *Treasures of Wisdom: Studies in Ben Sira and the Book of Wisdom: Festschrift M. Gilbert*; **R.J. Coggins** (1998) *Sirach*; **J. Corley and V. Skemp** (eds) (2005) *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit*; **A. DiLella** (1966) *The Hebrew Texts of Sirach: A Text-Critical and Historical Study*; (1996) 'The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Resources and Recent Research', *CR: BS* 4: 161–81; **C.T.R. Hayward** (1992) 'The New Jerusalem in the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira', *SJOT* 6: 123–38; **JLBM** 53–63, 65; **JWSTP** 290–301; **J. Liesen** (2000) *Full of Praise: An Exegetical Study of Sir 39,12–35*; **B.L. Mack** (1985) *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers*; **T. Muraoka and J.F. Elwolde** (eds) (1997) *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira*; **J.T. Sanders** (1983) *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom*; **SCHÜRER** 3: 198–212; **P.W. Skehan and A.A. Di Lella** (1987) *The Wisdom of Ben Sira*; **H. Stadelmann** (1980) *Ben Sira also Schriftelehrter*; **S. Talmon and Y. Yadin** (eds) (1999) *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports: Hebrew Fragments; The Ben Sira Scroll*; **B.G. Wright** (1989) *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text*; **J. Ziegler** (1980) *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach*.

The book of Jesus (Joshua) ben Sira is one of the first books for which we have some explicit information about its author and when it was written. Often referred to by its Greek title of Ecclesiasticus, it can be approximately dated by the preface to the Greek translation made by the author's grandson

which is given as the '38th year of Euergetes' (Prologue, line 27). This is interpreted by most scholars as referring to Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II, which would make the date 132 BCE (dating from Euergetes' first year as joint ruler with Ptolemy VI and Cleopatra II in 170 BCE). The evidence of this colophon in the Greek text is confirmed by the existence of the Hebrew text which does not contain it. Information in the book itself indicates that it was finished after the conquest of Palestine by Antiochus III in 200 BCE. The book shows no knowledge of the 'abomination of desolation' set up in the temple about 168 BCE nor of the Maccabean revolt which followed, suggesting it was written before then. But it mentions Simon son of Onias and also war damage to the city, likely to have been caused by Antiochus III's taking of the city (50.1-24).

One of the reasons the book is important is that we have about two-thirds of it in its Hebrew original (Beentjes 1997), as well as in the Greek translation (Ziegler 1980). The question of how faithful the Greek is to the Hebrew is an important one since large sections of the text are extant only in Greek. The most recent studies suggest that the translation is faithful in conveying the thought but is not slavishly literal (Wright 1989: 249: 'These outlines, however do suggest that the grandson was not usually concerned to give a word-for-word translation of the Hebrew . . . Here was a translator concerned to give a *translation* of his grandfather's wisdom, not a mechanical *reproduction* of his grandfather's Hebrew' [italics in the original]). The textual history of the book is somewhat complicated, but there is a considerable consensus on how it should be evaluated (Di Lella 1966; Skehan and Di Lella 1987: 51-62; Wright 1989: 2-10).

Although the book itself was composed, or at least completed, in the Seleucid period, the overall situation which one gleans from it would seem to be that current during Ptolemaic rule. Thus, the book provides important information on such subjects as the administration and social structure of the country, the priesthood, religious beliefs and outlook, and the opinions of the 'scribal class' on a variety of subjects. Some of the main points relating to religion can be summarized here:

- Ben Sira is quite important for its insight into the priesthood of his time. Although evidently drawing on the biblical text for many of his comments, such passages as 7.29-31 (honour and support of the priests), 34.18-35.16 (offerings), 38.9-11 (cult and physicians) and 50.1-29 seem to reflect the priesthood known to him. It has even been suggested that he himself was a priest (Stadelmann 1980), though this is problematic because one cannot imagine his not mentioning what would to him have been a great honour; nevertheless, he shows close connections with the priesthood and certainly great sympathy for it.
- The book shows the continuity of the wisdom tradition, having much in common with Proverbs and the old wisdom tradition; however, it also exhibits many of the theological characteristics of

other traditions such as the book of Deuteronomy. It is often asserted (with good reason) that Ben Sira brings together the wisdom and the Deuteronomic traditions. On the other hand, the originality of Job and Qohelet have been left behind.

- Scribalism as an entity is first expounded in his book, especially at 38.24–39.11.
- The relationship of the book with eschatology and apocalypticism has been much debated. It seems to have no concept of an afterlife. Many think that it rejects the apocalyptic tradition such as exemplified in *1 Enoch*, a view supported by such passages as 34.1–7 that polemicize against dreams and divination; yet passages such as 36.20–21 and 39.1–3 on prophecy suggest some interest in the esoteric traditions, and Ben Sira even accepts that some visions can come from God (34.6). There is also the possibility that the book contains an allusion to messianic expectations (§11.3.4).
- Particularly important is the light thrown on the biblical text and content. What is obvious to a careful reader of the details is that Ben Sira has summarized in outline form much of the contents of the present Torah and Prophets sections of the Hebrew Bible (see the table in *HJJSTP* 1: 338–40). In almost all cases the details coincide with information in the present biblical text. This is more than just a collection of oral traditions or material derived from several sources. The Minor Prophets are already a unit, for example. He gives a close paraphrase – almost a quote – from a number of passages (e.g., Gen. 5.24; 6.9; 15.18; 1 Sam. 7.10; 12.3–4; Hag. 2.23; and Mal. 3.23–24). The most reasonable conclusion is that Ben Sira had essentially the present biblical text of the Pentateuch, Joshua to 2 Kings, 1–2 Chronicles and the Prophets in front of him.

4.11 Daniel

G.L. Archer (1958) *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*; **P.-A. Beaulieu** (1989) *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon 556–539 B.C.*; **J. Braverman** (1978) *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*; **A. Brenner (ed.)** (1995) *A Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna*; **J.G. Bunge** (1973) 'Der "Gott der Festungen" und der "Liebling der Frauen": Zur Identifizierung der Götter in Dan. 11,36–39', *JSJ* 4: 169–82; **R.H. Charles** (1929) *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*; **J.J. Collins** (1977) *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel*; (1993) *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*; **J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint (eds)** (2001) *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*; **P.R. Davies** (1985) *Daniel*; **L. DiTommaso** (2005) *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature*; **T. Fischer** (1980) *Seleukiden und Makkabäer*; **J.E. Goldingay** (1989) *Daniel*; **L.L. Grabbe** (1988b) 'Another Look at the Gestalt of "Darius the Mede"', *CBQ* 50: 198–213; (2001c) 'A Dan(iel) for All Seasons: For Whom Was Daniel Important?', in J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*: 1: 229–46; (2006d) 'Biblical Historiography in the Persian period: or How the Jews Took Over the Empire', in S.W. Holloway (ed.),

Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible: 400–414; **L.F. Hartman and A.A. Di Lella** (1978) *The Book of Daniel*; **Hieronymus (Jerome)** (1964) *Commentariorum in Daniele*; **W.L. Humphries** (1973) 'A Life-Style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel', *JBL* 92: 211–23; **S.P. Jeansonne** (1988) *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel* 7–12; *JLBM*: 19–30, 83–90; **K. Koch** (1995) *Die Reiche der Welt und der kommende Menschensohn: Studien zum Danielbuch*; (1997) *Europa, Rom und der Kaiser vor dem Hintergrund von zwei Jahrtausenden Rezeption des Buches Daniel*; (2005) *Daniel, 1. Teilband Dan 1–4*; **J.C.H. Lebram** (1974) 'Perspektiven der Gegenwärtigen Danielforschung', *JSJ* 5: 1–33; (1975) 'König Antiochus im Buch Daniel', *VT* 25: 737–72; **T. McLay** (1996) *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel*; **M. McNamara** (1970) 'Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel', *ITQ* 37: 131–49; **T.J. Meadowcroft** (1995) *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparison*; **J.A. Montgomery** (1927) *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*; **C.A. Moore** (1977) *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions*; **P.L. Redditt** (1999) *Daniel, Based on the New Revised Standard Version*; **H.H. Rowley** (1935) *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel*; **SCHÜRER** 3: 245–50; **W. von Soden** (1935) 'Eine babylonische Volksüberlieferung von Nabonid in den Danielerzählungen', *ZAW* 53: 81–89; **O.H. Steck, R.G. Kratz and I. Kottsieper (eds)** (1998) *Das Buch Baruch; Der Brief des Jeremia; Zusätze zu Ester und Daniel*; **J. Ziegler (ed.)** (1999) *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (2nd edn).

Critical scholarship is almost universally agreed that the final version of the Hebrew Daniel was compiled about 165 BCE, because of the clear references to the Maccabean revolt whose progress is relatively well documented. Yet it is now widely accepted that the first part of Daniel probably circulated in the previous century, perhaps as separate tales, before being brought together in the early Hasmonaean period (Collins 1977: 7–11). The present structure of the Hebrew/Aramaic Daniel exhibits a carefully designed plan but also shows some of the growth of the book over a century or more (Collins 1977; 1993). It probably grew up from a set of tales that lie at the core of the writing in chapters 2–6. These may well have circulated as a unit for a period of time, but the apocalyptic chapters 7–12 were eventually added, as well as probably chapter 1 to create a unit. Yet this only describes the Hebrew version, and we must keep in mind that other versions circulated, so far attested only in Greek (cf. Jeansonne 1988; Meadowcroft 1995; McLay 1996).

The 'tales of Daniel' (chs 1–6) show a structure similar to Esther and Tobit and also Ahiqar (which was probably only a late borrowing into Jewish circles). That is, they are tales about a heroic figure in an ancient Near Eastern court who is adviser to the king. They picture a series of contests and conflicts which demonstrate his wisdom and piety and, ultimately, serve as a model for Jews of the diaspora (Humphries 1973). They also exhibit a common structure or pattern of salvation that can be reconstructed along the following lines (Grabbe 2006d):

1. a low beginning state (in captivity, slavery or at least a state of subordination to a foreign power);
2. an initial measure of success or even elevation to a position of status;

3. a major setback, with perhaps even a threat to the person's life;
4. the threat overcome (divine help usually explicitly mentioned or strongly implied); and
5. the protagonist rewarded, often directly by the (non-Jewish) king or emperor, frequently with a high office in the government.

These mainly relate to (a) the person of Daniel but in part include (b) his three friends Hananiah, Azariah and Mishael, but (c) there is also the episode of Susanna known from the Greek Daniel:

1. (a) Daniel and (b) his friends are taken captive to Babylonia (Daniel 1).
2. (a) Daniel and (b) his friends are selected for training for the king's service, including service as 'magicians'.

First episode (Daniel 2):

1. The king threatens to put the 'magicians' to death, including (a) Daniel and (b) his friends.
2. (a) Daniel interprets Nebuchadnezzar's dream (with the meaning revealed by God), and all the wise men of Babylon are saved.
3. (a) Daniel is elevated to governor of Babylon and chief of the wise men and (b) the friends are made sub-administrators over Babylon.

Second episode (Daniel 3):

1. (b) Daniel's friends refuse to worship Nebuchadnezzar's image and are cast into the fiery furnace.
2. (b) The friends are saved from the furnace, with divine help strongly implied.
3. (b) The friends' God is acknowledged and they are promoted.

Third episode (Daniel 5):

- [1. It is implied that (a) Daniel has become obsolescent at the Babylonian court.]
2. (a) Daniel interprets the unseen writing when no one else can.
3. (a) Daniel is elevated to one of three just below the king.

Fourth episode (Daniel 6):

1. (a) Daniel is one of three ministers over the kingdom of 'Darius the Mede'.
2. The machinations of other ministers lead to (a) Daniel's being condemned and thrown into the lion's den.
3. An angel of God delivers (a) Daniel from being eaten or mauled by the lions.
4. (a) Daniel prospers during the reign of Darius and beyond.

Susanna episode:

1. (c) Susanna lives in the diaspora.
2. (c) She is the daughter of righteous parents and marries a rich husband.

3. (c) Her status and estate are threatened by two elders who wish to commit adultery with her but who then lie when she resists and tries to expose them.
4. (c) Her reputation is saved when Daniel uncovers the lies of the two elders.
- [5. (c) She resumes her position and status in society.]

Although the Maccabean author did not compose chapters 2–6 (probably also chapter 1) but simply took over earlier stories and added his material to them, this does not mean that the material in 1–6 is historical; on the contrary, much of it is manifestly legendary though often built around a historical core. Thus, there was a Nebuchadnezzar and Belshazzar (Beaulieu 1989), but the Nebuchadnezzar of Daniel 3 and 4 is probably a reflex of Nabonidus rather than the historical Nebuchadnezzar (von Soden 1935; McNamara 1970), while the Belshazzar of Daniel 5 was never king nor was he killed in the conquest of Babylon which actually fell without a battle. The ‘Darius the Mede’ of Daniel 6 (Eng. 5.30–6.28) is more problematic. It has often been thought that he represented mainly Darius I, with elements of Cyrus as well (Rowley 1935: 54–60). There are reasons why this is rather unlikely, so that ‘Darius the Mede’ is probably only a literary creation for theological purposes (Grabbe 1988b); the suggestion that he represents Cyrus’ general Gubaru is now almost certainly disproved.

As noted above, scholarship has long recognized that Daniel 7–12 was written during the Maccabean revolt but before the Jews retook the temple area, that is, about 166–165 BCE (Fischer [1980: 140] is a notable exception in arguing for *c.*160/159 BCE). Various elements within this section of the book clearly represent the period around the time of the Maccabean revolt, and Dan. 11.45 predicts the death of Antiochus IV in a way which did not actually occur, showing that it forms a genuine prediction which failed. The importance of the book is that it represents the view of a writer contemporary with the events. Where it can be checked, it seems to record them accurately (if briefly) and in the correct order. The problem is that the symbolic language of the book often makes it difficult to interpret its allusions and to determine the actual happenings behind the symbols. It is recognized, however, that any history of this important period of Jewish history must take these chapters of Daniel fully into account.

The importance of Daniel 11 is that it seems based on an accurate portrayal of the interactions between the Seleucid and Ptolemaic rulers, though given under the guise of prophecy. It is generally assumed that some sort of chronicle made during Ptolemaic times underlies this chapter. Although the historical description is in symbolic language, it is generally clear what event is being referred to; however, the value of the account is somewhat diminished in that it must be interpreted by information from other historical sources. Yet it still provides some useful information,

especially when used in conjunction with the lost account of Porphyry which is often quoted or paraphrased in Jerome's commentary on Daniel (§5.5).

Scholarly handbooks often assert that Daniel 7–12 owes its authorship to Hasidic circles. On the contrary, not only is not a lot known about the Hasidim (to be discussed in *HJJSTP* 3) but also some elements within the book of Daniel seem to be at variance with the views of this group. Especially important is its attitude toward active resistance to persecution. We know that the Hasidim were willing to fight against the Seleucids – indeed, they are referred to as 'mighty warriors' (1 Macc. 2.42) – but the author of Daniel believed in passive resistance only, with martyrdom being the way of fighting against the forces of evil. In this he has some affinities with the *Testament of Moses* (Collins 1977: 198–210). Some of the main points about Judaism found within Daniel are the following:

- The book is a significant source for certain events during the Maccabean revolt. It is, in fact, the only real contemporary source since even the books of Maccabees were written some decades later.
- Although not the earliest apocalypse, Daniel 7–12 is one of the best examples of the genre. The book forms a vital link in the development of apocalyptic in general, as well as serving as a source for later apocalyptic speculation.
- The book illustrates well the practice of *ex eventu* prophecy which serves to interpret the significance of the Maccabean period for at least one segment of the Jewish community. These prophecies also became a vehicle for reinterpretation and further attempts to discern the future in both subsequent Judaism and in Christianity. Attempting to present history as a series of kingdoms leading up to a final empire (the Greek, in this case) is one that became common in apocalyptic writings.
- Other eschatological aspects of the book include new developments, especially the idea of a resurrection (Dan. 12.1-3).
- Martyrdom is one theological theme, expressed as a means of resistance to the Greek oppression. This idea of passive resistance is different from the military stance taken in other books (such as 1 and 2 Maccabees) but parallel to that in the *Testament of Moses*.
- Daniel 1–6 provides a model of Jewish apologetic and self-identity. It even gives a model of how Jews in the diaspora were meant to conduct themselves among their Gentile neighbours: not that most Jews would have moved in royal circles, but it shows the proper attitude toward putting the Jewish law first even to the point of risking one's life.
- Wisdom is a key concept in the book, representing both the wisdom which comes from study and learning and the wisdom which is revealed by God, thus uniting what might be called 'proverbial wisdom' and 'mantic wisdom'. There is evidence that the author was an educated member of the upper classes in Jerusalem, probably

someone much like Eupolemus son of John, rather than a member of a disaffected sect (Grabbe 2001c).

4.12 The Sibylline Oracles

AIEJL 590–92; **R. Buitenwerf** (2003) *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its Social Setting: with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary*; **J.J. Collins** (1974a) *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism*; (1974b) 'The Place of the Fourth Sibyl in the Development of the Jewish Sibyllina', *JJS* 25: 356–80; (2000) *Between Athens and Jerusalem*, 83–97, 143–51, 160–67; **J. Geffcken** (1902) *Die Oracula Sibyllina*; **E. Gruen** (1998) *Heritage and Hellenism*, 268–91; *JLBM* 193–96 (Sibylline Oracle 3 only); *JWSTP* 357–81; **V. Nikiprowetzky** (1970) *La Troisième Sibylle*; (1987) 'La Sibylle juive et la "Troisième Livre" des "Pseudo-Oracles Sibyllins" depuis Charles Alexandre', *ANRW* 2.20.1: 460–542.; *OTP* 1: 317–472; **H.W. Parke** (1992) *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity*; *SCHÜRER* 3: 618–54; **T.H. Tobin** (1997) 'Philo and the Sibyl: Interpreting Philo's Eschatology', in D.T. Runia and G.E. Sterling (eds), *Wisdom and Logos*: 84–103.

The Jewish *Sibylline Oracles* are all later than the early Hellenistic period in their present form, but they contain some elements that probably date from as early as this; hence, it is convenient to include them here, though their main composition was later in each case. The original Sibylline Oracles were preserved by the Romans and consulted in times of crisis, though only a few fragments of these have survived (Parke 1992). Instead, Jews and Christians actively produced fake Sibylline Oracles for their own propaganda. Most of those extant are either Christian in origin or in their present form, though several of the latter were created by reworking an originally Jewish composition (Collins [in *OTP* 1: 317–472] deals with the Christian as well as the Jewish). Three of the oracles are commonly accepted as Jewish in their present form: *Sibylline Oracles* 3, 4 and 5.

With regard to the *Third Sibylline Oracle*, the original core (3.97–349, 489–829) has been ascribed to the second century BCE (Collins 1974a: 21–34; 2000: 83–97). A messianic figure in the form of the Egyptian king was apparently expected in the second century BCE, since 3.97–349 and 3.489–829 seem to refer to events of the second century BCE, with possible allusions to Antiochus IV (3.601–18). More important are references to the 'king from the sun' (3.652) who is also said to be the 'seventh' (3.193, 318, 3.608). It is generally agreed that the reference is to one of the Ptolemaic rulers, though Ptolemy VI (180–145 BCE), VII (co-ruler with Ptolemy VIII about 145–144 BCE) and VIII (145–116 BCE) are all possible candidates. Perhaps the most likely one is Ptolemy VI Philometor who had good relations with the Jews. As well as envisaging a messiah 3.489–829 also has various other eschatological passages; for example, 3.741–95 pictures a renewed form of life on earth, a type of golden age or millennium.

The oracles against various nations (3.350–488) include a reference to the 'mistress' (*despoina*), which appears to have Cleopatra VII in mind and to

associate her with the subjugation of Rome to Asia (3.350–80), suggesting that this section was written before her defeat at Actium and death shortly afterward in 31 BCE. A number of prophecies relate to the endtime: 3.46–63 and 3.75–92 indicate a period after the disappointment of Actium when hope in Cleopatra had failed. 3.46–63 predicts the destruction of Rome, while 3.75–92 speaks more generally of a universal conflagration (*ekpyrosis*). Verses 1–96 contain a reference to Nero *redivivus*, indicating a time not long after the fall of Jerusalem in 70. This *Sibylline Oracle* is also very supportive of the temple (3.286–94, 564–67, 715–19, 772–73). There may also be a positive reference to the temple at Leontopolis in Egypt (3.319–20). Various sins are denounced, as one would expect, but special emphasis is placed on sexual sins, homosexuality in particular (3.185–86, 595–607, 762–66). Of particular interest is the section on the Jews as a model of proper observance, including the avoidance of astrology and divination (3.213–64).

The *Fourth Sibylline Oracle* was composed about 80 CE. The core of it (4.40–114 seems to contain an old Hellenistic oracle (non-Jewish, from early in the Greek period?) which presented a schema of both four successive world kingdoms and also one of ten generations into which the time of their rule could be placed:

First kingdom:	Assyria, 6 generations
Second kingdom:	Media, 2 generations
Third kingdom:	Persia, 1 generation
Fourth kingdom:	Greece, 1 generation
– :	Rome, no generations

This illustrates how an original fourfold schema which initially ended with the Greeks was reinterpreted to apply to Rome. The fourfold, 10-generation model created to end with Greece was evidently updated with the rise of Rome, and Rome was added to it; however, since the 10 generations had all been used up, Rome follows afterward with no generations assigned to it (4.102–14). Also, the fourfold scheme of kingdoms ends with the Macedonians, and no attempt is made to fit Rome in.

An unusual feature of the book is its anti-temple polemic, perhaps unique in Jewish literature up to this time. It also places a good deal of store in the efficacy of washing in rivers (4.165). This and certain other theological points suggest its origin in a Jewish baptismal sect (cf. *JCH* 507–11), most likely in the Palestinian area (to be discussed further in *HJJSTP* 4). The book gives an eschatology that includes an *ekpyrosis* or universal conflagration because of wickedness (4.159–61, 171–78), followed by a resurrection and judgement of all, with the wicked assigned to Tartarus and Gehenna but the righteous living again on earth (4.179–92).

The *Fifth Sibylline Oracle* was composed about the time of the Bar Kokhba revolt, though probably in Egypt rather than Palestine. Even after the revolts under Trajan and Hadrian, at least in Egypt Jews still hoped for deliverance from God in the not-too-distant future. The book shows a different sort of

messianism (5.108–109, 155–61, 414–28). The attitude is openly hostile to Egypt (5.179–99), and hope is now placed in a messianic figure who comes from heaven. As in the *Third Sibylline Oracles*, there may be a positive reference to the temple at Leontopolis in Egypt (5.501–503).

To summarize some of the main points of interest from *Sibylline Oracles* 3–5:

- The *Sibylline Oracles* are of historical interest primarily because of their eschatology. The imminent expectation of the end seems to be part of the message of all three *Sib. Or.* 3, 4, 5, with some common themes and some differences. *Sib. Or.* 4 gives an eschatology that includes an *ekpyrosis* or universal conflagration because of wickedness (4.159–61, 171–78), followed by a resurrection and judgement of all, with the wicked assigned to Tartarus and Gehenna but the righteous living again on earth (4.179–92). *Sib. Or.* 5 also includes destruction by fire (5.155–61, 527–31).
- Not only do various passages describe and predict the endtime, but there is also a messianic figure who seems to be a Ptolemaic ruler. This demonstrates a remarkably positive view toward the dominant Graeco-Egyptian culture, at least in pre-Roman times, as well as indicating a form of eschatology somewhat different from that found in other Jewish writings of the period.
- *Sib. Or.* 3 and 5 are very supportive of the temple and sacrificial system, bemoaning its destruction (e.g., 3.624–34; 5.397–413). However, an unusual feature of *Sib. Or.* 4.4–30 is its anti-temple polemic, perhaps unique in Jewish literature up to this time. This is true even though the eruption of Vesuvius in 79 CE was said to be punishment for the conquest of Jerusalem (4.115–36). This fierce loyalty to the temple and its service in two of the oracles shows how Jews of the diaspora still looked to it as their religious focal point.
- The *Sibylline Oracles* in general function as a prime example of how the nations of the east attempted to resist their conquerors, in particular the Greeks and Romans. This resistance could take a literary form, as in this case, as well as physical resistance in the form of a revolt. All three of the Jewish oracles (*Sib. Or.* 3, 4, 5) are very anti-Roman and predict its destruction. *Sib. Or.* 5 also shows anti-Egyptian sentiment.
- Two of the oracles contain references to Nero *redivivus* (the assumption that Nero was not dead but would soon gather an army and invade Judaea: 3.1–96; 5.93–110, 137–54, 214–27, 361–80). According to *Sib. Or.* 3.63–74, Nero is to be identified with the demonic figure of Belial.
- *Sib. Or.* 5 shows hope in a messianic figure who comes from heaven (5.108–109, 155–61, 414–28) rather than one equated with the Egyptian king (indeed, hostility is openly expressed toward Egypt: 5.179–99). In spite of the revolts that had been put down under

Trajan and Hadrian, it seems that some Jews were still hoping for divine deliverance in the near future.

- There may be a positive reference to the temple at Leontopolis in Egypt (3.319–20; 5.501–503).

4.13 First Baruch

AIEJL 538–42; *JLBM* 94–97; *JWSTP* 140–46; **A. Kabasele Mukenge** (1998) *L'unité littéraire du livre de Baruch*; **C.A. Moore** (1977) *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions*; **SCHÜRER** 3: 734–43; **O.H. Steck** (1993) *Das apokryphe Baruchbuch: Studien zu Rezeption und Konzentration 'kanonischer' Überlieferung*; **O.H. Steck, R.G. Kratz and I. Kottsieper** (eds) (1998) *Das Buch Baruch; Der Brief des Jeremia; Zusätze zu Ester und Daniel*; **E. Tov** (1976) *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch*.

This work takes the form of a letter, written by Jeremiah's scribe Baruch in exile, to those remaining in Jerusalem. The exact purpose of the book is unclear since it seems to be made up of disparate sections on the situation of the exile (1.1–14), a prayer of confession over sins (1.15–3.8), the figure of Wisdom (3.9–4.4) and a poem on Zion (4.5–5.9). The precise dating is also uncertain. A number of scholars have seen Antiochus IV and the high priest Alcimus behind the images of Nebuchadnezzar and the high priest Jehoiakim (e.g., Kabasele Mukenge 1998); if so, that puts the book fairly precisely to about 150 BCE. However, this interpretation is by no means certain, and the dating of the book still remains unclear. Tov (1976) connects the book with the translation of the LXX Jeremiah which he argues was done about 116 BCE. Among points to be gleaned from the book are the following:

- The theme of exile and return is strong in the book. The 'letter' of Baruch should be compared with Jeremiah 24 (which compares the exiles to good figs and those remaining in the land to bad) and Jeremiah 29 (which contains a letter in the name of Jeremiah encouraging the exiles to settle and make the best of it). The focus of 1 Baruch is on the return from exile as a sort of second exodus (cf. Isa. 51.10–11).
- A good portion of the book is a prayer (1.15–3.8), apparently based on or having much in common with Dan. 9.4–19. Although a literary prayer, it may well tell us something of prayer of the time (§10.3).
- The image of Wisdom (3.9–4.4) is an indication of how the figure was being developed at the time (see *JRSTP* 225–30). Like Ben Sira 24, wisdom is equated with the Torah (4.1), though much of the poem seems to draw on Job 28.12–28 about the inaccessibility of wisdom.

Chapter 5

GREEK AND LATIN WRITINGS

Historians and some other writers in Greek and Latin provide us with valuable insights and data relating to the early Hellenistic period. Although in some cases the narratives are not contemporary with the events being described or referred to, some of the writers had good sources, while others had sources that at least provide useful supplementary data or alternative accounts that help to fill out our knowledge of the period. For convenience, these writers are cited from the LCL edition for text and translation where available; otherwise, the relevant edition and/or translation is listed in the bibliography. For further information on current scholarship relating to these writings, useful references include *CHCL* and the *OCD*. For specific references to the Jews and Jewish history in the Greek writers, see the extracts and commentary in *GLAJJ*.

5.1 *The Alexander Historians*

W. Jac. van Bakkum (1994) *A Hebrew Alexander Romance according to MS Hébr. 671.5 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale*; **A.B. Bosworth** (1975) 'Arrian and the Alexander Vulgate', in *Alexandre le Grand: Image et réalité*: 1–46; (1980) *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander: I*; (1988) *From Arrian to Alexander: Studies in Historical Interpretation*; (1995) *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander: II*; (1996) *Alexander and the East: The Tragedy of Triumph*; **P.A. Brunt (ed.)** (1976) *Arrian with an English Translation: I, Anabasis Alexandri, Books I–IV*; (1983) *Arrian: with an English Translation: II, Anabasis of Alexander, Books V–VII, Indica*; **FGH** ##117–53; **J.R. Hamilton** (1969) *Plutarch Alexander: A Commentary*; **N.G.L. Hammond** (1983) *Three Historians of Alexander the Great: The So-called Vulgate Authors, Diodorus, Justin and Curtius*; (1993) *Sources for Alexander the Great: An Analysis of Plutarch's Life and Arrian's Anabasis Alexandrou*; **S. Hornblower** (1983) *The Greek World 479–323 BC*; **I.J. Kazis** (1962) *The Book of the Gestis of Alexander of Macedon*; **L. Pearson** (1960) *The Lost Historians of Alexander the Great*; **J. Roisman** (2003) *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great*; **R. Stoneman** (1991) *The Greek Alexander Romance*.

A major source of information for the first part of the Greek period is the group of writers known collectively as the 'Alexander historians'. This

includes not only those that are extant but their sources who, in most cases, were themselves historians that are now lost (*FGH* ##117–53; Pearson 1960). In addition to the detailed investigation of Pearson, an up-to-date discussion about both ancient sources and modern secondary studies for Alexander the Great can be found in Hornblower (1983: 314–16). There are two main Alexander traditions: the first tradition is found in the *Anabasis* of Arrian (Bosworth 1988: 1–15; Hammond 1993) and also in Strabo. The ‘vulgate’ tradition (Bosworth 1975; 1988: 8–15; Hammond 1983; 1993: 153–54, 327–29) is an embellished and generally more populist stream of tradition found in such writers as Diodorus (§5.3), the Roman writer Quintus Curtius, and Pompeius Trogus/Justin (*HJJSTP* 1: 126), though Arrian himself sometimes quotes from it.

There is general agreement that Arrian represents a more reliable tradition on the whole. Lucius Flavius Arrianus (c.86–160 CE) wrote long after Alexander’s time, but his main sources were the accounts of Ptolemy I and Aristobulus of Cassandria (Arrian 1.Preface), both of whom were companions of Alexander and experienced at first hand some of the events recorded, especially Ptolemy. There is considerable disagreement, however, over whether Ptolemy had access to and used official diaries of the campaign (the so-called *Ephemerides* or *Royal Journal*): Hammond (1983: 4–11; 1993: 157–62, 321–22, and see the index) argues for the existence and use of such diaries, whereas Bosworth (especially 1988: 157–84) and others (e.g., Brunt [ed.] 1976: xxiv–xxvi) are much more sceptical. Arrian also used an account by Alexander’s admiral Nearchus which related mainly to events in India and the journey of the fleet from India through the Persian Gulf back to Babylon. Plutarch’s *Life of Alexander* (§5.7) seems to have drawn eclectically from a variety of sources (Hamilton 1969: xlix–lxii; Hammond 1993: 149–57), including Aristobulus (and/or Ptolemy) but also writers from the vulgate tradition.

The main preserved accounts in the ‘vulgate’ tradition are Diodorus (§5.3), Pompeius Trogus, in Justin’s summary (*HJJSTP* 1: 126), and Quintus Curtius, but it should be noted that this is not a unified tradition, and much of value can be found in their accounts to supplement and even correct Arrian. Quintus Curtius Rufus wrote possibly during the reign of Claudius (mid-first century CE). The surviving work in ten books covers the life of Alexander in a very rhetorical form; unfortunately, the first two books covering the period before 333 BCE have been lost. It is generally agreed that these all used as one of their main sources the account of Cleitarchus (Pearson 1960; Bosworth 1975; Hammond 1983; 1993: 153–54, 332–33). Cleitarchus wrote a sensationalized story of Alexander about 310 BCE. Although it is uncertain whether he was involved in Alexander’s campaigns, he was in a position to question some of the participants (Bosworth 1996: 32–33). Yet these writers also generally had other sources available and used them as well. In spite of the lesser reliability of the vulgate writers, they sometimes provide information not found elsewhere. For example, Quintus

Curtius was the only writer to mention the revolt of Samaria in 332/331 BCE (4.8.9-11; see further at §12.2.1).

The vulgate tradition also became the basis for a series of Alexander legends known as the Alexander Romance (see Stoneman 1991 for a discussion, sources and English translation). This legendary account of Alexander's conquests circulated widely in various forms, including Syriac, Armenian, Latin, Old French and Hebrew. The original seems to be a Greek version extant at least by the third century CE but probably developing over many centuries. Any historical features have been overlaid and spiced up with fantastic, magical and miraculous events. Since this version circulated (erroneously) in the name of Callisthenes, it is often referred to as *Pseudo-Callisthenes*. Especially interesting is a Jewish story found in some versions in which Alexander visits Jerusalem and bows to the high priest (Bekkum 1994; Kazis 1962), a story also found in Josephus (discussed at §12.2 below).

5.2 Hecataeus of Abdera

R. Albertz (2001) 'An End to the Confusion? Why the Old Testament Cannot Be a Hellenistic Book!' in L.L. Grabbe (ed.), *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period*: 30–46; **B. Bar-Kochva** (1996) *Pseudo-Hecataeus, On the Jews: Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora*; **K. Berthelot** (forthcoming) 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Jewish "Misanthropy"', *Bulletin du Centre de Recherche Français de Jérusalem*; **S.M. Burstein** (1992) 'Hecataeus of Abdera's History of Egypt', in J.H. Johnson (ed.), *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society*: 45–49; **M.O.B. Caspari** (1910) 'On the Ἡς Περίοδος of Hecataeus', *JHS* 30: 236–48; **F.H. Diamond** (1974) *Hecataeus of Abdera: A New Historical Approach*; (1980) 'Hecataeus of Abdera and the Mosaic Constitution', in S.M. Burstein and L.A. Okin (eds), *Panhellenica*: 77–95; **FGH** #264; **J.-D. Gauger** (1982) 'Zitate in der jüdischen Apologetik und die Authentizität der Hekataios-Passagen bei Flavius Josephus und im Ps. Aristeas-Brief', *JSJ* 13: 6–46; **GLAJJ** 1.20–44; **R.E. Gmirkin** (2006) *Berosus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic Histories and the Date of the Pentateuch*; **L.L. Grabbe** (forthcoming c) 'Hecataeus of Abdera and the Jewish Law: The Question of Authenticity'; **F. Jacoby** (1912) '4) Hekataios von Abdera', *PW* 7: 2750–69; **JWSTP** 169–71; **H. Lewy** (1932) 'Hekataios von Abdera περί Ἰουδαίων', *ZNW* 31: 117–32; **D. Mendels** (1983) 'Hecataeus of Abdera and a Jewish "patrios politeia" of the Persian Period (Diodorus Siculus XL, 3)', *ZAW* 95: 96–110; **O. Murray** (1970) 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship', *JEA* 56: 141–71; **C.H. Oldfather et al. (eds)** (1933–67) *Diodorus Siculus*; **M. Pucci Ben Zeev** (1993) 'The Reliability of Josephus Flavius: The Case of Hecataeus' and Manetho's Accounts of Jews and Judaism: Fifteen Years of Contemporary Research (1974–1990)', *JSJ* 24: 215–34; **D.W. Rooke** (2000) *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*; **B. Schaller** (1963) 'Hekataios von Abdera über die Juden: Zur Frage der Echtheit und der Datierung', *ZNW* 54: 15–31; **SCHÜRER** 3: 671–77; **D.R. Schwartz** (2003) 'Diodorus Siculus 40.3 – Hecataeus or Pseudo-Hecataeus?' in M. Mor, A. Oppenheimer, J. Pastor and D. R. Schwartz (eds), *Jews and Gentiles in the Holy Land in the Days of the Second Temple, the Mishnah and the Talmud*: 181–97; **G.**

E. Sterling (1992) *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography*; **M. Stern and O. Murray** (1973) 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Theophrastus on Jews and Egyptians', *JEA* 59: 159–68; **B.Z. Wacholder** (1974) *Eupolemus*, 85–96; **J. Wells** (1909) 'The Genuineness of the Γῆς περίοδος of Hecataeus', *JHS* 29: 41–52.

5.2.1 Introduction

Hecataeus of Abdera is extremely important because he seems to have one of the earliest descriptions of the Jews in Judah in a non-Jewish source. Writing about 300 BCE, his main work – and the one of interest here – was a history of Egypt. Although he drew on Herodotus' account (in Herodotus, Book 2), he corrected and supplemented it from personal knowledge based on his own enquiries made on a visit to Egypt (Burstein 1992). His information on Egypt is still unsatisfactory from a modern point of view, but it was probably as good as could be done by a Greek in antiquity. The work has not survived but was used as the main source of Diodorus Siculus in his account of ancient Egypt (Book 1; also *FGH* #264). His mention of the Jews appears to have been in his *Aegyptiaca* (see §12.2.3 for quotations in English). A survey of the most recent scholarship on the work is given by Bar-Kochva (1996: 7–43); see also the study by Diamond (1974) and commentary and discussion by M. Stern (*GLAJJ* 1: 20–46).

Before we can use Hecataeus' account as a historical source for the Jews, two central questions arise. (1) What is the source of Hecataeus' account of the Jewish nation and how reliable is it? (2) Are the fragments in Josephus genuinely the work of the Hecataeus quoted in Diodorus? The second question had been debated extensively without any assured conclusions (see *GLAJJ* 1: 20–46; Gauger 1982; earlier studies include Wells 1909; Caspari 1910; Jacoby 1912; Lewy 1932; Schaller 1963); however, a sort of consensus is beginning to develop as a result of Bar-Kochva's study: he argues that they are from a work of about 100 BCE, by a moderately conservative Jew living in Egypt who wrote to justify Jewish residence in that country (see *HJJSTP* 3 for a more detailed discussion).

5.2.2 Is Diodorus 40.3 Authentic Hecataeus?

The issue in this section is, therefore, about the first central question above: are the statements in Diodorus Siculus, especially the description in 40.3, from Hecataeus? If so, are they reliable? Until recently the answer to both questions was taken by most researchers as yes. This interpretation has now been challenged by two recent studies. Preceding these, however, D.R. Schwartz presented the initial challenge to the consensus in a paper first read in 1995 (though not published until 2003). Schwartz claimed a desire only to begin a debate, but he presented a number of points that seemed to call the Hecataean authorship into question.

The first of the studies to give a direct challenge to the value of Hecataeus'

account was by D.W. Rooke (2000: 246–50). She mainly argues that the narrative is wrong in several respects, such as that Moses did not found Jerusalem or the temple and that the Jews never had a king (2000: 247–48), and then asks the question of how it should be viewed in terms of historical data. Most would agree with the validity of her question, but her answer – which is simply to dismiss Hecataeus – fails to take account of her own statements: she substantially undermines her own argument by noting how Hecataeus correctly lists a number of points about the Jews. This is substantial information when we think about other Greek and Roman accounts of the Jews.

Like Rooke, Gmirkin's opposition constitutes a supporting argument for another thesis, which requires him to argue that Diodorus 40.3 is not from Hecataeus of Abdera or dated to the late fourth century. Thus, he takes over the main arguments laid down by Schwartz but extends them. Here are what seem to be the most relevant arguments presented by Schwartz and Gmirkin (though the listing and numeration are mine; for a more detailed discussion, see Grabbe forthcoming c):

- *Allegation: Diodorus Siculus' account of the Jews in 40.3 does not match the undoubted borrowing from Hecataeus in various passages in Book 1.* Reply: It is difficult to see how Diodorus 1.28.1–4 'seriously contradicts' the account in 40.3, as Gmirkin alleges. All Diodorus says in 1.28 is that a variety of nations, the Jews among them, originated from Egypt. In 40.3 the 'foreigners' are expelled because of a plague which is ascribed to neglecting the Egyptian gods for the deities of the foreigners. Among those expelled are Moses and those who go with him to Judaea but also Danaus and Cadmus who went to Greece. In both passages, the Jews and others are described as a 'colony' (ἀποικία), though in one they are Egyptians, while in the other they are 'foreigners'. F. Jacoby sees the difference as due to a different purpose in each case (*FGH* #264, commentary to 40.3.6; cf. Sterling 1992: 76). As K. Berthelot has noted, however, Hecataeus is not giving his accepted version in Diodorus 1.28 because he indicates that it is a quotation (λέγουσιν, φάσιν 'they say'). At Diodorus 1.29.5–6 Hecataeus actually dismisses the statement quoted earlier in 1.28 by the declaration that there is no proof. What this shows, as Berthelot has cogently argued, is that Hecataeus/Diodorus has drawn on two reports about colonizing, one in which the Egyptians initiated it and the other in which the foreigners were expelled. On the other hand, circumcision is not mentioned in 40.3, but why should it be? His description would not necessarily have included everything that Hecataeus said about the Jews. He could have shortened his account to include what he thought was important in the passage and omitted information that he included in Book 1. Hecataeus/Diodorus had traditions about the Jews because he mentions them three times in Book 1. Two are specifically in

connection with circumcision, which Graeco-Romans often commented on, but they were only one of a number of nations; the third has to do with Moses, the law and the god of the Jews called Iao (§12.5). Although this last passage is presumably from Hecataeus (according to the theoretical context), it gives different information from the previous two: they mention circumcision; it does not but gives other details. Is this a ‘contradiction’? Finally, Hecataeus/Diodorus gives information selectively according to his purpose; he does not feel compelled to say everything he knows about the topic in each case. Notice that at one point Hecataeus/Diodorus says that the famous Egyptian king Sesostriis (Sesoōsis) not only accomplished more deeds of war than any other Egyptian king but also (a) ‘organized the rules governing the warrior class’ and (b) ‘set in order all the regulations that have to do with military campaigns’ (1.94.4). In the earlier long section on Sesostriis (1.55–58) neither point a or b is mentioned, despite the detailed description of Sesostriis. Therefore, it would hardly be cause for comment if Hecataeus put information in his account in 40.3 that is not found in Book 1.

- *Allegation: The passage in Diodorus 40.3 is better ascribed to Theophanes who wrote about Pompey’s conquests in the east 250 years later.* Reply: Gmirkin’s argument that Diodorus 40.1–2 comes from Theophanes is guesswork since the authorship of the passage is not identified. It would be a reasonable hypothesis to ascribe this to Theophanes, but it would still be a hypothesis. Unfortunately, Gmirkin simply assumes this hypothesis rather than trying to prove it. But to ascribe 40.3 to Hecataeus is not a hypothesis: it is based on the plain statement within the passage itself that this is what ‘Hecataeus’ says. Granted, the writer is said to be ‘Hecataeus of Miletus’, but this is a natural mistake to make by a scribe (perhaps by Photius who preserves the passage or possibly even a slip of the pen by Diodorus himself). But it would be rather unlikely for an original Theophanes to be replaced by ‘Hecataeus of Miletus’ in the process of textual transmission. Apart from the ascription to Hecataeus in 40.3, however, there is an obvious objection to ascribing this passage of Diodorus to Theophanes. This is the statement in 40.3.5 that ‘the Jews never have a king’: Theophanes is hardly likely to have made such an assertion in the face of tumultuous actions by *two Jewish kings* who were also making representations to Pompey. The terms ‘king’ (βασιλεύς) and ‘kingship’ (βασιλεία) are found in reference to them (Diodorus 40.2). For the ‘ethnographic background’ that was often included in such narratives, Diodorus could have drawn on any convenient source. In this case, he tells us it was ‘Hecataeus’, not Theophanes or anyone else. As for the argument that Diodorus was incapable of

using more than one source at a time, this was already refuted long ago (e.g., C.H. Oldfather in Oldfather et al. [eds] 1933–67: 1: xvii).

- *Allegation: There was no room for such a long passage on the Jews in Hecataeus' Egyptian history.* Reply: How can one possibly assert this about a work we no longer possess? As noted in connection with the previous point, the work clearly contained all sorts of information about various peoples, sometimes briefly given and sometimes more extensively. There is no reason why Hecataeus might not have added a discursion on the Jews, especially since he mentions them in passing in several places. This appears to be only one of a number of minor ethnographies known from Hecataeus; he apparently did not regard them as very important (Bar-Kochva 1996: 40).
- *Allegation: Photius, who preserved the passage, had doubts about it.* Reply: Photius' castigations of Diodorus do not seem to cast doubt on this passage, as alleged. Photius himself assigns the passage to Diodorus' fortieth book and also asserts that Diodorus said that this was from Hecataeus. As Bar-Kochva notes, Photius is likely to be quoting Diodorus accurately (1996: 21).
- *Allegation: Since the exodus story is taken from the Septuagint, the account of the exodus in Diodorus is later than that translation (c.250 BCE), since no Greek translation preceded the Septuagint.* Reply: Gmirkin strangely argues that no one could refer to the exodus from Egypt without having read it in a Greek translation of Exodus, and no such translation preceded the LXX (2006: 38–39). He is almost certainly right that no Greek translation of the Pentateuch preceded the LXX, but why no one could have known of the Jewish tradition about the exodus from oral sources and hearsay is not explained. The exodus had apparently become an important part of the Jewish story of their past by the Hellenistic period. The passover was being celebrated in Egypt before 400 BCE, as shown by the 'Passover papyrus' among the Elephantine papyri (HJJSTP 1: 54–55, 211–12, 221).

5.2.3 Conclusions

In the end, the counter-arguments were not found convincing: in spite of some problems, there were not sufficient grounds to doubt the ascription of the information to Hecataeus; on the contrary, there were a number of cogent arguments in favour of authenticity. We can summarize the situation in three points:

1. The general description of Egypt in Hecataeus' *Aegyptiaca* (*On Egypt*) has deficiencies, but these are those characteristic of even the best Greek accounts of the time (Burstein 1992). His was probably better than that of Herodotus (Book 1). Only those with access to the native records could have written a proper history of Egypt, but

even with all its faults Hecataeus has things of value to tell us about Egypt. The most astonishing thing is probably that the writer got anything right rather than that he got much wrong or was incomplete.

2. In the same way, his description of the Jews (which is probably taken from his *Aegyptiaca*) has weaknesses. Just as he was not completely ignorant of the Egyptians, Hecataeus was not completely ignorant of Judaism. What we find is an account of the Jews by a Greek about 300 BCE, with all the prejudices, ignorance and misunderstandings of the writer. While his knowledge was clearly derived in part from common Egyptian views about the origins of the Jews, it is still a moot point as to the extent to which Jewish sources or informants might have been drawn on directly. Both F.H. Diamond (1974; 1980) and D. Mendels (1983) argue for a Jewish source of information rather than direct observation by Hecataeus. Others such as Murray (Stern and Murray 1973: 168) would suggest that Hecataeus consulted Jews, perhaps even priests. According to Mendels, Hecataeus' source represents a point of view widespread in certain priestly circles (hence the statement that the Jews had never had a king), a view basically in line with that taken in Ezra-Nehemiah. A number of the points relate to the post-exilic situation of the Jews (Bar-Kochva 1990: 27–28). This information might have been provided by Egyptian Jews, possibly those of priestly descent (Mendels 1983; Bar-Kochva 1996: 28; Berthelot forthcoming). This description was then assimilated to the Greek 'native constitution' (*patrios politeia*) pattern, which explains the Greek colouring of the account. Still, Mendels believes that the basic description of the situation in Judah is accurate for the time of its writing, probably the late fourth or early third century. Ultimately, though, what source or sources he used are unknown. Even if the information goes back to a native informant in one way or another, it still represents an outsider's interpretation. The picture given is, therefore, precisely what we would expect of someone in Hecataeus' position. In spite of some unflattering comments about the origins of the Jews, Hecataeus appears to have some authentic information about the Jewish community in Palestine:

- Hecataeus knows that they live in Judah and have Jerusalem as a main city;
- Moses was the leader of the Jews out of Egypt;
- a temple exists there with a priesthood headed by a high priest;
- the high priest traces his roots back to Moses;
- instead of a king, the Jews have a high priest who has authority over them;
- they have a written law going back to Moses; and

- they do not use images in their worship.
2. It would be simplistic to ignore this and take the view that it is a question of all or nothing (or as Rooke seems to see it, the choice between ‘taking it at face value’ and rejecting it entirely [2000: 247–48]). Indeed, with the exception of a misunderstanding or two, the account is remarkably accurate, especially considering that it comes from a non-Jew and one who has no special regard for the Jews. This suggests that his source of information (whatever it was) contained some authentic information – perhaps even a good deal of authentic information – on the Jews.
 3. These comments about authenticity relate only to the passages in Diodorus. The passages in Josephus – after much debate – now seem to be a later composition by a Jewish writer (Bar-Kochva 1996).

For a further discussion and quotation of the main passages in English, see §12.5.

5.3 Diodorus Siculus

A. Andrewes (1985) ‘Diodorus and Ephoros: One Source of Misunderstanding’, in J.W. Eadie and J. Ober (eds), *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr*: 189–95; **G.L. Barber** (1935) *The Historian Ephorus*; **J. M. Bigwood** (1980) ‘Diodorus and Ctesias’, *Phoenix* 34: 195–207; **R. Drews** (1963) ‘Diodorus and his Sources’, *AJP* 83: 383–92; **N.G.L. Hammond** (1983) *Three Historians of Alexander the Great: The So-called Vulgate Authors, Diodorus, Justin and Curtius*; **J. Hornblower** (1981) *Hieronymus of Cardia*; **C.H. Oldfather et al.** (eds) (1933–67) *Diodorus Siculus*; **E. Schwartz** (1957) ‘Diodoros’, *Griechische Geschichtschreiber*: 35–97.

Diodorus of Sicily (*fl.* c.60–30 BCE) wrote a universal history in 40 books up to the time of Caesar’s Gallic wars. He was not a critical historian but primarily only a compiler, though he probably supplemented and rewrote his sources more extensively than some scholars have allowed (Bigwood 1980). This means that his work varies according to the quality of those whom he copied. Recent study has tended to evaluate Diodorus more positively than in the past (Drews 1963; Bigwood 1980). The reason is that it is now recognized that Diodorus had good sources for portions of his narrative. The quality varies considerably, of course, depending on his source at any one time. He is especially important as general background for history in the Persian and Hellenistic periods.

For the Persian period his main sources were Ctesias, Ephorus and Thucydides. Ctesias was a dubious source (*HJJSTP* 1: 124), but Ephorus was much better (Barber 1935). Part of Ephorus’ narrative depends on Thucydides which we have in unmediated form, but in Books 13–14 the ultimate source (mediated through Ephorus) is the original work of which a fragment survives in the Oxyrhynchus Historian. Diodorus’ account of

Alexander (Book 17) depends on the ‘vulgate’ Alexandrian tradition (Hammond 1983). Although less reliable on the whole than Arrian, he provides an important supplement. With regard to the Diadochi, though, his is the only full account extant, and in his writings is preserved a detailed history of the Diadochi from 323 to 303 (Books 18–20). He probably drew on Hieronymus of Cardia, whose account tends to be quite reliable (Hornblower 1981) and Diyllus of Athens. Indeed, his is still the main source of information for a knowledge of the events of the third century and the early second century; however, after Book 20 his history is only partially preserved and the extant account is only a partial one.

Diodorus makes a number of references to Jews and Judaism, especially in Hasmonaean times and at the time of Pompey’s conquest. One of the most important is his general description at 40.3 (discussed below, §12.5). Unfortunately, it is often not possible to identify the source of his statements about the Jews. Some of them come from Hecataeus of Abdera (§5.2), but others are unidentified. He ascribes the origins of the Jews to colonizing by the Egyptians, pointing to the common practice of circumcision among them (1.28; cf. the negation in 1.29.5–6). Moses took his laws from the god known as Iao (1.94.2). The wonders of the Dead Sea are described (2.48.6–9; 19.98–99). He also relates the story that Antiochus IV, when he entered the temple, found a statue of a man seated on an ass with a book in his arms, a story which recurs in other writers (34/35.1.3).

5.4 Polybius

F.W. Walbank (1957–79) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*.

A Greek who spent many years in Rome as a hostage, Polybius (c.200 to post-118 BCE) wrote a history of the Hellenistic world and the rise of Rome from the First Punic War to the Roman conquest of Greece (264–146 BCE). In the opinion of many historians, the quality of his historical writing is second only to Thucydides among ancient historians (on his principles of writing history, see §1.5.2). It is thus unfortunate that just Books 1–5 are preserved intact while the rest survive only in fragments or extracts made by Byzantine writers. Where he is extant, though, Polybius is a very important source. With regard to the third century, he is a major source for the historical narrative of events. He describes many of the major occurrences in the eastern Mediterranean, including events in Syro-Palestine such as the battle of Raphia. Walbank’s commentary (1957–79) is a valuable resource on Polybius’ text.

5.5 Porphyry

G.L. Archer (1958) *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*; **J. Braverman** (1978) *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*; *FGH* 260; *GLAJJ* 2: 444–75; **Hieronymus (Jerome)** (1964) *Commentariorum in Daniele*.

The neo-Platonist philosopher Porphyry (c.234–305 CE) included a valuable commentary on Daniel 11 and other parts of Daniel in his work *Against the Christians*. Exactly what Porphyry's source was is uncertain, but it seems to have been basically a reliable one. Although the work as a whole has been lost, it is extensively cited and quoted by the church father Jerome or Hieronymus (c.342–420 CE) in his commentary on Daniel, giving us the important historical background to the supposed prophecy of Daniel 11 (Hieronymus 1964; *FGH* 260). A convenient English translation of Jerome's commentary is given by Archer (1958, using the old Migne text rather than the more reliable one in *CLL*; see also *GLAJJ* 2: 444–75). Porphyry's comments on Daniel 11 provide important information on the interaction between the Seleucids and Ptolemies in the third and second centuries BCE.

5.6 Appian

Appian (*fl.* 150 CE) was a Greek writer from Alexandria who worked in Rome. He produced a history of Rome down to Trajan. Only 18 of the 24 books survive complete, though fragments of the others are also extant. The section called the *Civil Wars* is extremely valuable for events during this period of time from the death of Julius Caesar to the eventual triumph of Augustus. This period was very important for Judaea from the end of Hasmonaean rule to the rise of Herod the Great. Of special importance for Jewish history is the *Syriakē* (Book 11) which describes events in the eastern Mediterranean. He mentions the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey, his procession in a chariot studded with gems, and the imprisonment of Aristobulus II. He knows of the special tribute required of Judaea and other eastern countries under Mark Antony. He mentions the same oracle of a ruler from the East that Josephus recorded. He refers to a special tax on the Jews of his own time, though the exact significance of this is disputed. He himself had to flee for his life during the Jewish revolt in Egypt under Trajan.

5.7 Plutarch

J.R. Hamilton (1969) *Plutarch, Alexander: A Commentary*; **D.A. Russell** (1972) *Plutarch*.

For purposes of history, Plutarch (c.50–120 CE) contributes two sets of works. His *Moralia* contains essays on a diversity of topics, some of them of considerable interest for religion in antiquity. This includes some references to the Jews (*GLAJJ* 1: 545–76). Of more direct value for political history are

his *Parallel Lives* of noble Greeks and Romans. The quality of his sources for these varies; nevertheless, in some cases they provide valuable information on certain individuals. His *Parallel Lives* includes the *Life of Alexander* which is valuable for using sources no longer extant but also problematic since the vulgate tradition is also drawn on (§5.1); still, it has important data that supplement the main histories of Alexander's conquests. Writings in his *Parallel Lives* that relate to the period of the Diadochi include the *Life of Eumenes* and the *Life of Demetrius*. He also has lives of various other individuals of the Hellenistic period.

5.8 *Berosus*

S.M. Burstein (1978) *The Babyloniaca of Berosus*; *FGH* #680; **A. Kuhrt** (1987) 'Berosus' *Babyloniaka* and Seleucid Rule in Babylonia', in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East*: 32–56; **P. Schnabel** (1923) *Berosos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur*.

Berosus was a Babylonian priest writing in Greek in the early Seleucid period, perhaps about 300 BCE. His *Babyloniaca* was a summary of Babylonian tradition, history and mythology. Where it can be compared with cuneiform sources, it has been shown to be very accurate (though sometimes it gives only one tradition when there was more than one). He evidently wrote with 'apologetic historiography' in mind. That is, he was trying to present the Babylonians in a good light to the Greeks who had only recently conquered the ancient Near East under Alexander, but also to counter inaccurate Greek accounts such as that of Ctesias. The major problem is that his work is known only from fragmentary quotations in later writers such as Josephus and Eusebius.

5.9 *Manetho*

FGH #609; **R. Laqueur** (1930) 'Manethon', *PW* 14: 1060–1101; **D.B. Redford** (1986) *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books: A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History*; **W.G. Waddell** (1940) *Manetho*.

Manetho was an Egyptian priest in Heliopolis who, during the reign of Ptolemy I about 300 BCE, wrote in Greek the *Aegyptiaca*, a work on Egyptian history which is still important for Egyptology, especially in listing the various dynasties and providing a framework for chronology. There are several complications with using Manetho's account. First, an *Epitome* was made of his work in antiquity, but we have neither the original *Aegyptiaca* nor the *Epitome*. Instead, what we have are excerpts in a number of later writings, primarily Josephus and the Christian writers Eusebius and Julius Africanus. Even then the versions of the last two writers come to us in Greek only as they are quoted by the fifth-century Byzantine writer Syncellus. Also,

some of these quotations seem to be taken from the *Epitome* rather than the longer original.

This makes it difficult to get a clear idea of Manetho. For example, Josephus quotes extensively from Manetho about the Hyksos, showing a lengthy section of narrative text, contrary to the bare king lists we often have from other sources. Yet some argue that Josephus did not have direct access to Manetho but might even have used a text worked over to give it an anti-Semitic tone which was absent from the original (for a discussion of this question, with sources, see M. Stern in *GLAJJ* 1: ##19–21); Stern himself concludes that the anti-Semitic material is original to Manetho, but others argue that Manetho did not mention the Jews. D.B. Redford characterizes Manetho's work as probably 'a king-list interspersed with narrative sections', and there seems to be some truth in the view that it is basically a king list that has been expanded by glosses and narratives (1986: 230).

Part III

SOCIETY AND INSTITUTIONS

Chapter 6

HELLENISM AND JEWISH IDENTITY

This chapter discusses two issues that are often treated separately: Hellenism, or the process of Hellenization, and the question of Jewish identity. In the context of the early Hellenistic period one cannot discuss Jewish identity without at least touching on Hellenism because Jewish identity is bound up – or at least thought to be bound up – with effects of the coming of the Greeks. Conversely, any discussion of the process of Hellenization has to take account of how the Jews related to it. Therefore, even though sections of this chapter might seem to focus on one topic or the other, the two are closely interrelated and each has to include a discussion of the other. The nature of the topics means that this chapter gives a wide sweep and takes a format slightly different from some of the others. The original sources for the data and evaluation of Hellenization are too extensive to be examined here; instead, account is taken primarily of the major secondary studies and their critics.

The so-called ‘Hellenistic reform’ that preceded the Maccabean revolt will be discussed in the next volume (*HJJSTP* 3). It has, however, often served as a catalyst for discussions about the Jews in relation to Greek culture and society. The nature of the subject requires that we ignore the general time barriers of the present volume, since the process of Hellenization continued for hundreds of years after the third century BCE. Thus, this chapter will touch on a variety of issues relating to *HJJSTP* 3 and even a few relating to *HJJSTP* 1 and 4.

6.1 *The Problem: Hellenization, the Jews and the Ancient Near East*

The question of Hellenization and the Jews has long been a major debate in scholarly study. This chapter addresses that issue by attempting to look at the process of Hellenization over a wide area of space and time. The only way to understand the effects of Hellenization on the Jews is to look at the broader context, of which they form a small part, rather than to focus on the Jews and their reactions exclusively. To concentrate on the Jews in isolation is to distort the picture, which indeed has been one of the major problems with understanding Judaism in certain periods.

As will become clear, the question of the Jews and Hellenism is not different from that of the ancient Near East in general and Hellenism. The Jews were only one of a number of peoples in the ancient Near East, and none of them particularly welcomed the Greeks. The Greeks came as conquerors, but then so had the Assyrians, Babylonians and Persians. The peoples of the various Near Eastern regions had had to accommodate overlords and adapt to their requirements for many centuries. The question is, were the Greeks any different? Did Greek culture affect people differently than the culture of the other masters who established their rule in the Orient? Was Hellenization different from 'Medism' or 'Assyrianization'? Were the Jews particularly averse to Greekness? Did they resist Hellenism, as is argued in a great many books and studies in the past century or so?

6.2 History of the Discussion

6.2.1 Earlier Discussion

6.2.1.1 The 'Old View'

W.W. Tarn and G.T. Griffith (1952) *Hellenistic Civilisation*; **F.W. Walbank** (1981) *The Hellenistic World*.

A classic account of Hellenization is that of Tarn and Griffith, though now somewhat dated. This older view emphasized the Greek influence on the original civilizations of the ancient Near East and the dominance of Greek institutions. The concept of a *Verschmelzung* or 'melting together' of cultures (going back to J.G. Droysen), with the Greek swallowing up the Oriental occurs in Tarn and Griffith (1952) and is also the prevalent view in the first edition of Volume 7 of the *Cambridge Ancient History* (though Rostovtzeff gives a more nuanced approach in his articles in that volume). Walbank's study is aimed at a popular audience but produced by a noted scholar in the field, with all his knowledge of the Hellenistic world; the study tends to emphasize the penetration of Greek institutions into Near Eastern society.

The common view was that the Jews had been different from the other Near Eastern peoples. They alone had resisted Hellenism, because Hellenism was antithetical to Judaism as a religion. A passage from 1 Maccabees seems to summarize the standard view of the situation: 'Then the king [Antiochus IV] wrote to his whole kingdom that all should be one people, and that all should give up their particular customs. All the Gentiles accepted the command of the king' (1.41-43). Although the passage goes on to say that some 'even from Israel' adopted the religion of Antiochus Epiphanes, the basic theme of 1 and 2 Maccabees (it has been argued) is that the Jews alone had resisted the Greek incursion into their culture and religion and threw off the yoke of Greek imposition of these onto the observant Jews.

6.2.1.2 E.J. Bickerman

E.J. Bickerman (2007a) *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including The God of the Maccabees*.

Bickerman is mentioned not primarily because he discussed the Jews and Hellenism as such but because of his influence on later writers, especially M. Hengel. Bickerman was knowledgeable of and made contributions to study in the wider Hellenistic world, but his discussion of the Jews was mainly on specific events, especially his discussion of the Maccabean revolt in his *God of the Maccabees*. He developed a theory about the so-called 'Hellenizers' that continues to have wide influence (viz., that they were attempting to develop an 'enlightened' Yahwism that would purify Judaism from its primitive and barbaric aspects). His views will be discussed and critiqued in detail in *HJJSTP* 3.

6.2.1.3 V.A. Tcherikover

CPJ 1; V.A. Tcherikover (Tscherikower) (1937) 'Palestine under the Ptolemies', *Mizraim* 4–5: 9–90; (1959) *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*.

In his 1959 volume, Tcherikover gives a lengthy description of the Hellenization process and a detailed history of the Jews in the Hellenistic period down to the Maccabean revolt. There is not the central focus that one finds in M. Hengel (see next section, §6.2.2), but many of the things which Hengel says were already said in some form or other by Tcherikover. (Indeed, Tcherikover develops another thesis about the cause of the religious persecution under Antiochus, a thesis which Hengel took scarce account of.) His more detailed studies (1937; *CPJ* 1) are a mine of information about various aspects of Ptolemaic Egypt which Hengel has also made use of.

Tcherikover himself argued in a somewhat conventional way about the aims of the Jewish 'Hellenizers'. He also saw the development of the Hasmonaean state as basically a class struggle between the masses (represented by the Pharisees) and the upper-class aristocracy and priests (represented by the Sadducees). He finally concluded that Judaea could not be a Hellenistic state without compromising its principles:

Their aim was to build a Hellenistic state on a Jewish national foundation. This, however, was to prove impossible. Judaism and Hellenism were, as forces, each too peculiar to itself to be able to compromise within one country. A Hellenistic state could not be founded on the Jerusalem theocracy. (1959: 264–65)

However, he made it clear that these conclusions concerned *political Hellenism*, not Hellenistic culture:

Power [under Herod's rule] was gathered in the hands of Greeks and Hellenizing Jews; but simultaneously Hellenism ceased to be a problem of inner Jewish history; Hellenization assumed an individual form and no single Jewish party or group sought to draw Jews from their religion or propagate Hellenism among

them by force. The political period of Hellenization had passed and gone for good, only the cultural influence of Hellenism remaining. Generations of proximity to the Greeks had not passed over the Jews of Palestine without leaving considerable traces in their literature, language, law and all other aspects of their civilization. (1959: 265)

6.2.2 Hengel and his Critics

6.2.2.1 Martin Hengel

M. Hengel (1974) *Judaism and Hellenism*; (1980) *Jews, Greeks and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the pre-Christian Period*; (1989) *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ*.

Hengel's *magnum opus*, which appeared in English in 1974, was a seminal work, even though it was without a doubt building on and influenced by earlier authors, especially E.J. Bickerman. Its treatment of the question of Judaism in its relationship to Hellenism made a decisive impact on the field. Although limiting himself formally to the period from Alexander to the Maccabean revolt, he discusses the later period in passing at many points. Further, his monographs of 1980 and 1989 fill in certain aspects of the post-Maccabean period. Hengel's major work is a highly concentrated book which cannot be easily summarized. His main thesis relates to the cause of the suppression of Judaism as a religion under Antiochus IV, and in this he comes out forcefully on the side of the proposal already advanced by Bickerman. But in reaching that conclusion he takes a close look at the whole process of Hellenization and concludes, among other things, that Judaism and Hellenism were not mutually exclusive entities (1974: 1: 2–3) and that from 'about the middle of the third century BCE *all Judaism* must really be designated '*Hellenistic Judaism* in the strict sense', so that one cannot separate Palestinian Judaism from Hellenistic Judaism (1974: 1: 103–106).

In order to demonstrate this thesis, Hengel does not just advance a series of arguments or proofs. Rather, by a thorough description of Judaism during this period and by setting out its context in the Hellenistic world of the time, he compels the conclusion that the Jews of Palestine were not successful in – indeed, did not particularly attempt – holding themselves aloof from the dominant culture. Judaea under the Ptolemies and Seleucids was a part of the wider Hellenistic world, and the Jews of Palestine were as much a part of this world as the other peoples of the ancient Near East. Thus, in order to disprove Hengel, one would have to give positive evidence that the Jews wanted to resist all aspects of the Hellenistic culture, that they were able to distinguish between 'Hellenistic' and 'native' elements, and that they were successful in their resistance. Hengel has successfully put the onus of proof on any who would challenge the view that Palestinian Judaism was a part of Hellenistic Judaism of the time. Hengel's major points and arguments seem to be essentially the following:

1. The Jews of Palestine, far from being isolated, were completely caught up in the events of their time, particularly the rivalry between

- the Ptolemaic and Seleucid kingdoms. Palestine itself was a disputed territory, claimed by the Seleucids with a certain legality on their side but nevertheless under Ptolemaic rule for the century before 200 BCE.
2. Ptolemaic (and later Seleucid) administration reached to the lowest levels of Jewish society. Every village was supervised by the Greek administration and had its officials seeing that the various sorts of taxes were paid. Although natives were often delegated as supervisors at the lower levels, Greeks and Greek-speaking natives were very much in evidence, especially at the higher levels.
 3. International trade was a feature of the Hellenistic world; indeed, trade with the Aegean had already brought many Greek influences to the Phoenician and Palestinian coasts long before the time of Alexander. Palestine itself was an important crossroads in the trade between north and south and between Egypt and Arabia.
 4. The language of trade and administration was Greek. The use of Greek for official purposes is well illustrated already by the mid-third century and its direct influence on the Jews can be deduced from a variety of sources.
 5. Greek education also had its influence on Jews and Jewish education.
 6. Greek influence on Jewish literature is already documented as early as Alexander's conquest and can be illustrated from literature in Hebrew and Aramaic as well as those works composed directly in Greek. Evidence of the influence of Greek philosophy occurs in such quintessentially Jewish circles as Qumran and writings such as *1 Enoch*.
 7. The 'anti-Greek' forces which followed on the Maccabean crisis did not succeed in erasing the pervasive Greek influence of the previous century and a half, and Jewish Palestine even as it gained basic independence under the Hasmonaeans still remained a part of the Hellenistic world.

In his later writings, Hengel's position overall has seemed to remain the same; however, he nuanced it somewhat to meet some of the criticisms made (see next section, §6.2.2.2). He recognized that in the period before 175 BCE, 'we only have very fragmentary and sporadic information about the Jews in Palestine and in the Diaspora' (1980: 51). He also accepted that Hellenization was perhaps a lengthier process than originally allowed for:

A more thorough 'Hellenization', which also included the lower classes, only became a complete reality in Syria and Palestine under the protection of Rome ... It was Rome which first helped 'Hellenism' to its real victory in the East. (1980: 53)

6.2.2.2 Louis H. Feldman

L.H. Feldman (1977) 'Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism* in Retrospect', *JBL* 96: 371–82; (1986) 'How Much Hellenism in Jewish Palestine?' *HUCA* 57: 83–111; **F. Millar** (1978) 'The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism*', *JJS* 29: 1–21; **A. Momigliano** (1970) Review of M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, *JTS* 21: 149–53.

Of the many reviews which have appeared – some of them by well-known specialists in the Hellenistic period and even in Hellenistic Judaism – the majority have been impressed by Hengel's breadth of learning and by his basic arguments about the Hellenizing of Judaism. Criticism has tended to focus on two areas: his support of Bickerman's thesis (see further in *HJJSTP* 3), and the extent of Hellenization in the pre-Maccabean period. The single major rejection of Hengel's thesis about Hellenization has come from Feldman (1977; 1986). In the earlier review he summarized Hengel's work in 22 points and then proceeded to attack each of them as invalid or not supporting Hengel's thesis in a significant way. His 1986 article covered some of the same ground but in a more diffuse way. There is no doubt that Feldman has some important criticisms and has drawn attention to areas where Hengel is weak or where the data do not give strong support to his argument. Unfortunately, he vitiates the impact of his arguments with two major flaws: first, there seems to be a strong, underlying assumption that being Hellenized means ceasing to be a proper Jew; secondly, his arguments against Hengel often depend on interpretations which would not be accepted by the majority of specialists.

With regard to the first point, the following quotations seem significant:

Even after the Maccabees the degree of Hellenization was hardly profound, and ... indeed, there were far more who were attracted to Judaism as proselytes than deviated from it through apostasy and intermarriage. (1986: 85)

But even in Lower Galilee, the people, as portrayed by Josephus, were deeply religious in theory and in practice, and presumably only minimally affected by Hellenism. (1986: 95)

Moreover, Hellenization could not have been truly profound, for we hear of few apostates. (1986: 105)

Feldman seems to be making the tacit assumption that Hellenization means apostasy and intermarriage, and that those who are deeply religious could have been only minimally Hellenized. Neither of these assumptions would be accepted by many scholars; indeed, they are blatantly contradicted by the prime example of Philo (see *HJJSTP* 4).

With regard to the second point, here are some examples from his 1977 contribution: in his point 1 Feldman states there is no evidence that Palestinian Jews served as mercenaries, but this seems unreasonable scepticism. Since we know that Jews did serve as mercenaries, and at times rose to high rank (§8.2), why should it be doubted that this included

Palestinian Jews? His point 5 states that ‘aside from the highly assimilated – and highly exceptional – family of the Tobiads’ there is little evidence of Greek commercial influence. Why should we assume that the Tobiads were exceptional, or that they were more assimilated than many other upper-class Jews? Such upper-class individuals were the exception in any society of the time, but why must the evidence be dismissed rather than used (within recognized parameters, of course)? In other cases, Feldman actually goes against the current scholarly consensus in order to challenge Hengel (e.g., in point 21 he dates *1 Enoch* 12–36 much later than is generally done, while at point 22 he doubts the identity of the Qumranites as Essenes). Other doubtful points occur in the later article, for example, that only Gentiles attended the various amphitheatres and sports stadia erected by Herod and others (1986: 104) or that the ossuary inscriptions in Greek were only to prevent non-Jews from molesting the graves (1986: 88).

Feldman does make a number of important points, the most valuable of which is probably to cast doubt on the speed with which Judaism was Hellenized. Other contributors have also noted this (cf. Hengel’s response noted above). Some criticisms are less central but no less valid for that. For example, many will agree with Feldman that Qohelet does not bear clear marks of Greek influence (cf. §4.4). But Feldman’s complete rejection of Hengel’s thesis seems unjustified. As already noted (§6.2.2.1), the major strength of Hengel’s work is that it sets out a context in which the Jews were bound to be influenced by Greek culture and in which Hellenization was inevitable, barring a strong conscious effort to reject all Greek influences. Therefore, Feldman must do more than just disprove certain individual points of Hengel or claim that specific arguments of Hengel are not proved beyond all doubt; instead, he needs positive proof that the Jews maintained consistent counter-measures, but this he does not advance. More problematic is what seems to be simply a reluctance to accept the idea of Palestinian Jews being Hellenized.

6.2.2.3 *Arnaldo Momigliano*

A. Momigliano (1970) Review of M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, *JTS* 21: 149–53; (1981) ‘Greek Culture and the Jews’, in M.I. Finley (ed.), *The Legacy of Greece: A New Appraisal*: 325–46; (1975) *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization*; (1990) *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography*

Momigliano, another noted classicist, has addressed himself to the issue of Hellenization, but especially the question of the Jews in the Hellenistic age, in a number of essays. His review of Hengel is not long, but it bears the weight of a vast knowledge of the Hellenistic world. While sympathetic to Hengel and with a good deal of praise for his collection of data and his knowledge of the period, Momigliano nevertheless sees some problems:

We can now see more clearly that there is something of a vicious circle in the

whole of Hengel's argument. He started from the assumption that Bickerman was right in attributing the role of first movers in the Antiochus IV crisis to Jewish Hellenizers. He therefore tried to confirm this assumption by collecting the evidence about the Hellenization of the previous century. Given the nature of the evidence (or at least his own treatment of it), Hengel was able to assess the amount of the previous Hellenization and its relevance to the Maccabean revolution only by reference to Bickerman's interpretation of the events under Antiochus IV. Unfortunately, Bickerman's interpretation of what happened between 175 and 164 B.C., however attractive, is not certain . . . Hengel, who is an eloquent, learned, and scrupulous witness to this transformation, has perhaps not entirely grasped the implications of it in terms of the study of the evidence. (1970: 152–53)

6.2.2.4 Fergus Millar

F. Millar (1978) 'The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel's Judaism and Hellenism', *JJS* 29: 1–21; (1983) 'The Phoenician Cities: A Case-Study of Hellenisation', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Association* 209: 55–71; (1987) 'The Problem of Hellenistic Syria', in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East*: 110–33.

Millar's 1978 article appears primarily directed against the thesis that the persecutions were initiated by the 'Hellenizing party' of the Jews and will not be discussed here (see *HJJSTP* 3). However, his attitude to the thesis about the Hellenizing process in Palestine is not completely clear. On the one hand, Millar states, 'only new evidence could improve Hengel's portrayal of Hellenism in Judaea itself' (1978: 3). On the other hand, he writes, 'it is precisely the nature of the first phase of the Hellenising movement after 175 B.C. . . . which shows how *un*-Greek Jerusalem had remained up to that moment' (1978: 9). In his conclusion, he alleges, 'the evidence shows how *un*-Greek in structure, customs, observance, literary culture, language and historical outlook the Jewish community had remained down to the earlier second century, and how basic to it the rules reimposed by Ezra and Nehemiah had remained' (1978: 20). Perhaps the problem is one of definition of terminology, for one could argue that the Jewish community was 'faithful' to its tradition while still undergoing the Hellenizing process which affected all other parts of the ancient Near East, but to be Hellenized does not necessarily mean to become Greek, as will be discussed in section §6.5.2.

6.2.2.5 Conclusions with Regard to Hengel

The major areas where Hengel is weakest or most controversial (aside from his thesis about the causes of the religious suppression in Jerusalem, to be examined in detail in *HJJSTP* 3) are the following:

1. While Greek influence on Jewish literature in Greek is easy to demonstrate, such is much more difficult with literature in the Semitic languages. For example, Hengel takes the view that Qohelet shows knowledge and terminology of Greek popular philosophy, a thesis developed at greater length by his pupil H. Braun; on the other

hand, scholars such as O. Loretz have argued that there is nothing in Qohelet which cannot be explained from pre-Hellenistic ancient Near Eastern tradition (§4.4). In other examples, one can show Greek parallels and make a cogent case for Greek influence yet without demonstrating that other potential sources are not equally possible. Thus, Hengel's arguments, which are generally quite strong with regard to Jewish literature in Greek, become much less certain and more likely to be disputed in the area of Hebrew and Aramaic literature.

2. Many of the examples which Hengel uses actually belong to the post-Maccabean period, partly because our knowledge of the Ptolemaic period is so problematic (Momigliano 1970). Of course, in many cases it seems legitimate to extrapolate to the earlier period (e.g., the evidence of the Qumran scrolls); also, it shows that the crisis which arose in Jerusalem was not primarily one of Hellenizing but of religious suppression. Yet Hengel is not always careful to make clear that Hellenization was a dynamic process so that some developments may have come about only in post-Maccabean times, while the exact path of Hellenization in Judaea during the Ptolemaic period may not be so clear as he implies.
3. In the way that examples are selected and presented, Hengel appears to exaggerate the place of Greek education and language in Palestine. The examples used go only so far; that is, they demonstrate that some Jews had a reasonable knowledge of Greek and many more had a smattering, but the actual number of Jews who could be considered monolingual or bilingual in Greek in Palestine was probably rather less than Hengel seems to conclude. In any case, the evidence is certainly not conclusive for a pervasive use of Greek throughout Jewish society in Palestine. As for the question of education, we simply have almost no information about education at all in Judaea at this time, much less education in Greek.

6.2.3 *Recent Discussions*

6.2.3.1 *Morton Smith*

M. Smith (1956) 'Palestinian Judaism in the First Century', in M. Davis (ed.), *Israel: Its Role in Civilization*: 67–81; (1987) *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament*.

In a concise but wide-ranging chapter (1987: ch. 3), M. Smith gave a cogent description of the ways in which the Hellenistic world differed from 'classical' Greek culture. This is an important distinction because many have used the term 'Hellenization' simply as a synonym for 'Greek' without considering the important changes made in the development of Hellenization. Further, these differences were not just in evidence in the Hellenistic empires of the Near

East but also applied equally to the Aegean and Greece itself. Smith notes that they are all characteristic of the Near Eastern empires (except #3) rather than classical Greek civilization:

1. Landholding in the Hellenistic period was primarily the large estate (usually of the king or his officials) rather than the small holding.
2. Government was primarily the monarchy governing a large territory or empire rather than the small city states. The Greek foundations preserved the myth but not the substance of independent rule (cf. §6.3.2.1).
3. Written laws rather than unwritten custom played a greater part during the Hellenistic period (cf. §8.3.1).
4. The cult of the city god(s) of the classical period gave way to the imperial cult plus a variety of local (but non-political) or individual cults.
5. Private citizens were much more important to the classical city state, tying individual endeavours in commerce, art and philosophy closely to politics. In the Hellenistic world, the individual (even the wealthy) was more concerned with private affairs than with politics.
6. Both the army and the administration tended to be the occupation of professionals in the Hellenistic world, rather than in the hands of amateurs as in classical Greece.
7. The arts and sciences of the Hellenistic period were also much more characterized by professional preoccupation and systemization. Hence, the large production of handbooks, collections and imitations of classical models.

6.2.3.2 *Amélie Kuhrt, Susan Sherwin-White and Pierre Briant*

P. Briant (1982) *Rois, tributs et paysans: Études sur les formations tributaire du Moyen-Orient ancien*; **A. Kuhrt** (1987) 'Berossus' *Babyloniaka* and Seleucid Rule in Babylonia', in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East*: 32–56; **A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds)** (1987) *Hellenism in the East*; **S. Sherwin-White** (1982) 'A Greek Ostrakon from Babylon of the Early Third Century B.C.', *ZPE* 47: 51–70; (1983) 'Ritual for a Seleucid King at Babylon?' *JHS* 103: 156–59; (1987) 'Seleucid Babylonia: a Case Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule', in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East*: 1–31; **S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt** (1993) *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*.

These three in particular, but there are also others, have given a new perspective on the Greeks and the Orient. Although classicists, like so many others who have written on the question, they have nevertheless recognized the need to see things from an Eastern perspective. P. Briant has written primarily on the Persian period and has already been discussed a good deal in the previous volume (see *HJJSTP* 1, index under Briant). A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White were also mentioned for their contribution to Persian studies,

but their 1993 book is a major re-evaluation of the Hellenistic period from a Near Eastern perspective. Their authored and edited work is often cited below. They show especially how Near Eastern culture continued to thrive even after the coming of the Greeks and helped to shape and condition the impact of Greek culture on the native peoples.

6.2.3.3 *Lester Grabbe*

L.L. Grabbe (1992) 'The Jews and Hellenization', in *JCH* 147–70; (2002b) 'The Jews and Hellenization: Hengel and his Critics', in P.R. Davies and J. Halligan (eds), *Second Temple Studies III*: 52–66.

The present chapter represents an updating and expansion of the earlier writings of 1992 and 2002.

6.2.3.4 *Erich Gruen*

E. Gruen (1998) *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*; (2002) *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*.

The complexity of Jews in the Hellenistic world has been well explored by E. Gruen. As he notes, the 'Jews needed both to establish their own secure place within a Hellenistic framework and also to avoid being swallowed up by the prevailing culture' (2002: 214). For example, the *Letter of Aristeas* has a Hellenistic king collaborate with the Jewish high priest to bring Jewish sages to Alexandria for a common project between Jews and Greeks. Yet the author of *Aristeas* has the high priest castigate those who worshipped many gods and revered images of wood and stone and 'declare that Moses quite properly fenced the Jews off with unbreakable barriers and iron walls to prevent any mingling' with other ethnic groups to maintain their purity (2002: 215). The relationship of the Jews to the Greek world was complex: they did not just 'face a choice of either assimilation or resistance to Greek culture' (1998: xiv). The surviving texts 'do not present a struggle for identity in an alien world' nor do they normally exhibit 'an antagonistic or adversarial quality' toward the surrounding culture; rather, they 'redefined themselves in the terms of a culture that they had now made their own but left intact the core of their ancestral legacy' (1998: 292–93).

6.2.3.5 *Rabbinic Connections*

H.A. Fischel (1973) *Rabbinic Literature and Greco-Roman Philosophy*; **H.A. Fischel** (ed.) (1977) *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature*; **S. Lieberman** (1962) *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine*; (1963) 'How Much Greek in Jewish Palestine?' in A. Altman (ed.), *Biblical and Other Studies*: 123–41; (1965) *Greek in Jewish Palestine*.

A rabbinic scholar of great renown, Saul Lieberman wrote several works about the Greek influences on that most Semitic environment, rabbinic

Judaism. In his 1962 book he investigated literature which he dated between the first century BCE and the fourth CE. Subjects looked at included literary editing and textual preservation, hermeneutical rules and specific statements about 'Greek wisdom'. His earlier pioneering work on *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (the 1965 publication is a second edition) looked mainly at the second to fourth centuries CE and concluded that there was enormous Greek influence on the rabbis.

Fischel follows very much in the footsteps of Lieberman. In addition to his PhD thesis investigating a specific aspect of rabbinic literature in relation to the Hellenistic world, his collection of essays (1977) is especially enhanced by an important prolegomenon and an annotated bibliography of works which have examined Greek influence on rabbinic literature. He also has a frank discussion about those who minimize the Greek impact on the world of the rabbis and the reasons for it. Fischel's approach seems quite in harmony with that of Hengel.

6.3 *Hellenism in the Ancient Near East*

6.3.1 *Selected Examples*

6.3.1.1 *Egypt*

G. Hölbl (2001) *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*; W. Huß (1976) *Untersuchungen zur Außenpolitik Ptolemaios IV*; (1994) *Der makedonische König und die ägyptischen Priester*; (2001) *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit: 332–30 v. Chr.*; C.G. Johnson (1995) 'Ptolemy V and the Rosetta Decree: The Egyptianization of the Ptolemaic Kingship', *AncSoc* 26: 145–55; E.G. Turner (1984) 'Chapter 5: Ptolemaic Egypt', in *CAH* 7/1: 118–74; C.B. Welles (1949) 'The Ptolemaic Administration in Egypt', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 3: 21–47.

Because much of the present volume discusses aspects of Ptolemaic rule, only a brief discussion can be given here. Focus will be on two points: first is the extent of the survival of culture, religion and administration from Pharaonic Egypt to Ptolemaic Egypt (Welles 1949; Turner 1984: 132–33). In some cases, this can only be inferred but not proved; nevertheless, the amount of coincidence between Pharaonic and Ptolemaic institutions is surely not accidental. Deciding whether a Ptolemaic institution was Greek in origin or a holdover from the days of native rule is not always easy:

For almost every aspect of Hellenistic government in Egypt there is a Pharaonic precedent as well as a Greek one. A historian must trace the tension between them and analyse the counterpoint of the *interpretatio Graeca* and the *interpretatio Aegyptiaca*. (Turner 1984: 132).

The second point mentioned here concerns the image of the Ptolemaic king. Ptolemaic kingship was assimilated to Pharaonic kingship, just as had happened under Persian rule, which began already with Alexander himself (Hölbl 2001: 77–123; cf. *HJJSTP* 1: 268). The priesthood were an important

vehicle for the Pharaonic image, since they translated the Greek version of kingship into the Egyptian, especially in the inscriptions where conventional Pharaonic titles were used of the Macedonian ruler (Huß 1994; 2001: 214–17). The relationship between the characteristics of Macedonian kingship and the Pharaonic image expected by the Egyptians was a complicated one. For example, it has been argued that Ptolemy I was already Egyptianizing the kingship, but this interpretation has been rejected (Turner 1984: 126–27; Huß 2001: 217–18). It is one thing to allow the priests to interpret Ptolemy I as Pharaoh and quite another for him to take on the actual trappings of a native king. At no point, did the Ptolemies cease to be very Greek and to run Greek-style courts.

Nevertheless, a connection was made between the Ptolemaic king and the ancient Egyptian rulers, not only by Egyptian priests but also by Greek poets. For example, Theocritus (early third century BCE) compares Ptolemy Philadelphus favourably to the heroes of old (*Idyll* 17). There were many parallels between the deified Pharaoh and the deified Ptolemy, and the ruler cult in Egypt owed much to both traditions. Serapis worship was given a considerable boost. This was a Greek god already worshipped by some old Greek communities in Egypt, but Serapis was also identified with Osiris and Apis by the Egyptians. The promotion of Serapis worship by the Ptolemies was another way of accommodating the native peoples of the country. Thus, Ptolemaic kingship itself shows the complex relationship between the native and the Greek that we see in other aspects of Hellenism.

6.3.1.2 *Babylonia*

T. Boiy (2004) *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon*; **A. Kuhrt** (1987) 'Berossus' *Babyloniaka* and Seleucid Rule in Babylonia', in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East*: 32–56; **G.K. Sarkisian** (1974) 'Greek Personal Names in Uruk and the *Graeco-Babyloniaca* Problem', *Acta Antiqua* 22: 495–503; **S. Sherwin-White** (1982) 'A Greek Ostrakon from Babylon of the Early Third Century B.C.', *ZPE* 47: 51–70; (1983) 'Ritual for a Seleucid King at Babylon?' *JHS* 103: 156–59; (1987) 'Seleucid Babylonia: a Case Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule', in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East*: 1–31; **R.J. van der Spek** (1987) 'The Babylonian City', in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East*: 57–74.

The cities of Babylon and Uruk provide useful evidence about Hellenization in Mesopotamia. Alexander originally made Babylon the capital of his empire. It has often been assumed that, with the founding of Seleucia-on-the-Tigris, Babylon declined to the point of desolation. The foundation of Seleucia was probably done deliberately to provide a new Hellenistic centre, but Babylon itself continued not only to survive but to thrive as well (Sherwin-White 1987: 18–20; van der Spek 1987: 65–66). The native tradition of kingship, in which the Seleucid ruler acted in the same capacity as the old native Babylonian kings, is attested as continuing and seriously supported by

at least some of the Seleucids (Sherwin-White 1983; 1987: 8–9, 28–29; Kuhrt 1987: 51–52, 55–56).

Neither Babylon nor Uruk are certainly known to have been *poleis* in the early Greek period, though evidently some Greeks were there (cf. Sherwin-White 1982; 1987: 20–21; van der Spek 1987: 66–70, 72–74). The Greek names found in cuneiform sources fall into four periods which seem to correspond well with the history of the city under Greek rule (Sarkasian 1974; van der Spek 1987: 60–74): First stage: Greek residents but no involvement with the native inhabitants (Greek names practically absent); second stage (223–187 BCE): Greeks begin to take part in civic life, with some intermarriage (limited Greek names among the Babylonians); third stage (middle of second century): influx of more Greeks, probably because of the policy of Antiochus IV (Greek names more frequent); fourth stage (after 140 BCE): the Arsacid conquest halts the Hellenization process (Greek names continue sporadically for a time but gradually die out).

6.3.1.3 *Phoenicia*

J. Barr (1974–75) ‘Philo of Byblos and his “Phoenician History”’, *BJRL* 57: 17–68; **M. Hengel** (1974) *Judaism and Hellenism*; (1980) *Jews, Greeks and Barbarians*; **A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds)** (1987) *Hellenism in the East*; **F. Millar** (1983) ‘The Phoenician Cities: A Case-Study of Hellenisation’, *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Association* 209: 55–71; (1987) ‘The Problem of Hellenistic Syria’, in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East*: 110–33.

The question of Hellenization with regard to Syria generally is very important since it formed Judaea’s immediate environment. Hengel has also emphasized the part played by Phoenicia and Philistia as intermediaries of Greek culture to Judaea (1974: 1: 32–35; 1980: 28). Millar has produced two seminal essays which address the question directly. One of his major points is that, perhaps apart from Phoenicia, it is difficult to draw general conclusions about Hellenization for the Syrian area simply because of the paucity of evidence (1987: esp. 111–13, 129–31). After extensive discussion, Millar concludes on a rather negative note, ‘The enigma of hellenistic Syria – of the wider Syrian region in the hellenistic period – remains’ (1987: 129). It is not just a question of the paucity of data for the Hellenistic period but also for the Achaemenid period: you cannot talk about changes after Alexander if you do not know what it was like before him.

This lack of remains can lead to widely differing interpretations of what little there is. To take one example, Hengel places a good deal of emphasis on the writers and philosophers who came from the Syrian region, including such individuals as Meleager of Gadara (1974: 1: 84–86; 1980: 118). Millar, on the other hand, comments with regard to Meleager: ‘there is nothing in the quite extensive corpus of his poetry to show that he had deeply absorbed any non-Greek culture in his native city’ (1987: 130).

This does not mean that only a negative conclusion can be drawn from Millar's study. As the editors note in their introduction, 'his careful examination of a scattered body of material is susceptible to a more positive interpretation than he himself allows' (Kuhrt and Sherwin-White [eds] 1987: x). One of the points which does emerge is the strong continuation of the native culture in that area, which was clearly not generally submerged by the Greek or absorbed into it. Millar has also produced evidence of changes under Hellenism which included the spread of Greek culture in certain ways.

Phoenicia is a useful example of how Hellenization could penetrate the culture yet not displace the native traditions. The influence of Greek culture actually began well before Alexander (Millar 1983: 67; Hengel 1974: 1: 32–35). Although the precise course of Hellenization is difficult to document (cf. Millar 1983: 60), the cities of the region gradually evolved into Greek *poleis* (Millar 1987: 123–24). Nevertheless, it is also clear that Phoenician culture continued at all levels, both in Phoenicia itself and in its colonies overseas. We find Phoenician names alongside Greek, some individuals having both sorts. Coins have both Greek and Phoenician writing. Philo of Byblos wrote a work (supposedly based on the work of the ancient author Sanchuniathon) which preserves many details of Canaanite religion from antiquity, yet Philo's work is itself thoroughly Greek in form (Barr 1974–75). One would have to say that the major Phoenician cities were Hellenized in some sense, yet they also remain Phoenician with a strong continuation of their past.

6.3.1.4 *Pergamum*

CAH 7/1: 426–32; E.V. Hansen (1971) *The Attalids of Pergamon*.

Pergamum is an interesting study in deliberate Hellenization. This already began with Philetaerus (282–263 BCE), the founder of the Attalid dynasty, and continued under his successors who became independent dynasts. Attalus I (241–197 BCE) attempted to turn Pergamum into the Athens of Asia. The kingdom was organized as a Greek city-state, and the capital of Pergamum became a showcase for Hellenistic building and art. This is exemplified in the famous altar celebrating the subjugation of the Gauls (Celts) which symbolized Pergamum as the champion of Hellenistic civilization against barbarism. An interesting illustration of this is the letter of Eumenes II (197–158 BCE) to the Ionian league in which he states, 'I . . . having revealed myself as the common benefactor [*euergetēs*] of the Greeks, undertook many great struggles against the barbarians' (BURSTEIN #88, lines 7–10). All in all, the Attalid dynasty was active in promoting the city as a Greek cultural and intellectual centre.

Yet the Greek façade is hardly the whole picture. Despite the appearance of being a Greek *polis*, Pergamum was governed by a king. Most of the countryside was treated as royal property, with the peasants no doubt continuing on with life as they had done for centuries. The tamed Gauls

(Galatians) were used in the army, while Hellenization of their upper classes came about only gradually. Thus, despite the active ‘missionizing’ for Greek culture, Pergamum seems in many ways to be a miniature of the contradictions of the Hellenization process, with the contrasts and the coexistence of the old and new side by side.

6.3.1.5 Nabataeans

D.F. Graf (1997b) ‘Nabateans’, *OEANE* 4: 82–85; **S.G. Schmid** (2001) ‘The “Hellenisation” of the Nabataeans: A New Approach’, *SHAJ* 7: 407–19.

The Nabataeans are an interesting case study in Hellenization. They lived east of the Dead Sea and first come to attention about 259 BCE, with a reference in the Zenon papyri (§7.1.3.4). A long discussion by Diodorus Siculus (19.94–99) indicates that they were still not generally a settled people around 300 BCE. It was apparently not until about 100 BCE that they made a significant mark in the material culture (Schmid 2001: 407–408). The explanation appears to be that with the decline of Seleucid control over the region and the establishment of Hasmonaean rule in Judah, the Nabataeans would have had reasonable inducement to establish permanent settlements and create a material culture (Schmid 2001: 415). The result was the following:

We therefore see that there is in fact no continuous process of ‘Hellenisation’, i.e. a step by step taking over of what is considered as Hellenistic art and culture, but rather the opposite. The Nabataeans took over at once an almost completely Hellenised culture around 100 BC. (Schmid 2001: 415–16)

Thus, for the Nabataeans the process of Hellenization was rather different from the conventional. The gradual or ‘step-by-step’ process did not take place because their material culture was created at a specific time. With no pre-existing material culture to mould, they seem to have ‘adopted a foreign one, taking over the cultural “*lingua franca*” of the region’ (Schmid 2001: 417). This example illustrates the complexity of the process leading to Hellenism and also the variegated nature of the Hellenistic world with its vast variety of cultures and cultural elements and great variation from region to region.

6.3.2 Features of Hellenism

G.M. Cohen (1995) *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*.

We have to keep in mind that there was no grand plan of bringing Hellenistic culture to the natives: ‘As best as one can see, the *purpose* of the various colonizing programs was military, economic, or political, not cultural’ (Cohen 1995: 69). Yet a variety of institutions served as conduits for the passage of Greek elements into the Near East. Certain customs, practices and

features were seen as specifically Greek and adoption of them an accommodation to the conqueror's world.

6.3.2.1 *The Transplanted Greek Polis*

G.G. Aperghis (2004) *The Seleukid Royal Economy*; **G.M. Cohen** (1978) *The Seleucid Colonies*; (1995) *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*; (2005) *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa*.

Beginning with Alexander himself and continuing with his successors, hundreds of Greek foundations on the model of the Greek *polis* were established in the conquered areas. In some cases, native cities were refounded as Greek cities, but in many cases the city was new. The basic function of such cities was practical. Most were settled by veterans of the Greek campaigns, rewarding them for their service and providing a means of making a living for themselves and their families. They might be placed strategically, for defensive purposes. It has long been accepted that some Greek foundations had a more economic function, being built along major trade routes, where they served for protection but also to provide services to travellers, merchants and government officials going about their duties. Now G.G. Aperghis has gone further and argued that the *main* purpose of most *poleis* founded by the Seleucids was economic (§8.2); in any case, the economic value of the city foundation was clear. Finally, a few were founded as (or on previously existing) religious centres, with cults and temples that drew pilgrims from wide distances.

Only a few *poleis* were established in Egypt, but many were set up in the Seleucid realm: Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, Persia and further east (Cohen 1978; 1995; 2005). In addition to their other functions, these cities had a cultural effect as well. They have sometimes been described as Greek islands in a 'barbarian' sea. In actual fact, the bulk of their inhabitants were usually non-Greeks who were not citizens (conventionally, only the Greeks and a few others were citizens). The city organization was along Greek lines, Greek institutions were the focus of their social activity, their sons were educated in the gymnasium and went through the initiation period of the *ephebate*, and they controlled their own affairs through the city assembly (ἐκκλησία), the election of officials (ἀρχόντες), the city council (βουλή), and traditional Greek law (cf. §7.2.2). A theatre and an agora provided regular entertainment. No attempt was made to impose their culture on non-Greeks; indeed, privileges were usually restricted to Greeks and a prize to be sought after by non-Greeks.

The cities did serve as a vehicle for bringing Hellenism to the Orient, but the Greek was a new element in the mix and did not displace the millennia-old cultures that already existed there. From the Greek point of view, the 'barbarians' could be said to be Hellenized by this spread of Greek settlements among them:

'Civilizing' or 'Hellenizing' was not, per se, the purpose of any of the Hellenistic kings in founding colonies. On the other hand, a number of ancient authors make clear that civilizing or Hellenizing was a *result* of colonization. (Cohen 1995: 66)

As a result, Greek culture and civic life made its way to the most remote parts of Asia. But the native culture was not eliminated and did not disappear, and the Greek was limited to certain spheres:

But they brought this [Greek culture] to the settlements, not the countryside, and probably never attempted to reach out to the native population beyond those living in the cities. In short the colonists remained an exclusive and exclusionary element in an essentially foreign environment. There *was* Hellenization among the native peoples. But it was probably limited mainly to the upper classes in the cities, and it was spontaneous. (Cohen 1995: 68)

6.3.2.2 *Language*

W. Clarysse (1993) 'Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek', *Chronique d'Égypte* 68: 186–201; **L.T. Doty** (1980) 'The Archive of the Nanā-Iddin Family from Uruk', *JCS* 30: 65–90; **M. Goodman** (1983) *State and Society in Roman Galilee, A.D. 132–212*; **M. Hengel** (1989) *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ*; **A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White** (eds) (1987) *Hellenism in the East*; **F. Millar** (1987) 'The Problem of Hellenistic Syria', in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East*: 110–33; **G. Pugliese Carratelli and G. Garbini** (1964) *A Bilingual Graeco-Aramaic Edict by Asoka*; **B. Rochette** (1996) 'Sur le bilinguisme dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine', *Chronique d'Égypte* 71: 153–68; **M. Rostovtzeff** (1932) 'Seleucid Babylonia: Bullae and Seals of Clay with Greek Inscriptions', *YCS* 3: 1–114; **A.E. Samuel** (1983) *From Athens to Alexandria: Hellenism and Social Goals in Ptolemaic Egypt*; **D.J. Thompson** (1992) 'Language and Literacy in Early Hellenistic Egypt', in P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad and J. Zahle (eds), *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt*: 39–52.

In the centuries after Alexander the Great 'Greek' came less and less to be an ethnic designation and more and more one of education, especially in good Greek style. There is clear evidence that many educated and upper-class Orientals were knowledgeable in the Greek language. The question is how far this knowledge penetrated. Although it is often asserted that Greek became the official language of the conquered territories, this seems an oversimplification (cf. Kuhrt and Sherwin-White [eds] 1987: 5–6, 23–25): the Seleucid empire was multilingual, with local languages continuing to be used in official documents (with perhaps a few exceptions; e.g., slave-sale documents after 275 BCE were issued only in Greek [Doty 1980: 85; Rostovtzeff 1932: 65–69]).

A similar situation obtained in Egypt (Samuel 1983: 105–17). Although Egypt is famous for its finds of papyri in Greek, the accumulating evidence suggests that at least as much material was produced in Demotic during the same period of time. There was a flourishing native literary tradition in all sorts of genres, not just temple literature, during this time. More significant, though, is the amount of Demotic papyri relating to the administration. The

native Egyptian legal system was still administered alongside Greek justice, but the Demotic documents embrace more than the legal sphere: they encompass bureaucratic activity up to a fairly high level. Contrary to a frequent assumption, Egyptians could and did rise to high positions in the administration. To advance in the Ptolemaic administration required a good knowledge of Greek; nevertheless, much of the work at the lower level of the bureaucracy, especially at the all-important village level, was done bilingually. In short, a great deal of business and everyday life was conducted in the Egyptian language by Egyptians at all levels of society. On the other hand, there was an increasing use of Greek in the administration as time went on (Thompson 1992). Most of the surviving documents from the first half-century of Ptolemaic rule were in Demotic (Thompson 1992: 46), but there seems to have been a widespread programme of education in the Greek language from the mid-third century BCE, including the incentive of exempting teachers of Greek from the salt tax (1992: 48–51).

A major question is one of interpretation. One can point to such examples as the Armenian king Artavasdes who cultivated Greek learning and even wrote Greek literature; at a birthday celebration, the *Bacchides* of Euripides was performed for his court (Plutarch, *Crassus* 33); or the Buddhist king Asoka who erected inscriptions in good Greek (as well as Aramaic) in the remote area of Kandahar (Pugliese Carratelli and Garbini 1964). But what conclusion should be drawn from this? How far can such examples be taken as typical? For instance, Hengel states, 'Galilee, completely encircled by the territories of the Hellenized cities ... will similarly have been largely bilingual' (1989: 14–15). Martin Goodman gives a more nuanced and somewhat less categorical view (1983: 64–68). While recognizing that Greek had its place in Galilee, he notes that it was not dominant, with Aramaic – not Greek – being the *lingua franca*: 'In Upper Galilee there is almost no evidence of Greek at all ... But in Upper Galilee and probably in the area around Lake Tiberias, Greek was only a thin strand in the linguistic cloth' (1983: 67–68). Was Galilee bilingual? Evidently not, if one means that Greek was widely used everywhere. The mere presence of some Greek usage does not necessarily deserve the term 'largely bilingual'.

Greek certainly did function as a *lingua franca* in many parts of the Hellenistic East, as Aramaic had done under the Assyrian, neo-Babylonian and Achaemenid empires. Royal inscriptions and many other sorts of documents were issued in Greek, yet there was no attempt to impose it as the sole language of administration. Traders no doubt found some acquaintance with Greek useful not only in dealing with officialdom but also for getting around in areas with a multitude of local languages. If the buyer or seller one was dealing with knew a second language, however, in many parts of the Seleucid empire it was more likely to be Aramaic than Greek.

The complexity of the penetration of the language is illustrated by some examples. An ostrakon in Aramaic from about the middle of the third century BCE already contains two Greek words (§3.2.7). Another ostrakon

from Khirbet el-Kom in the Idumean area, dated about 275 BCE, is a bilingual in both Greek and Aramaic (§3.2.5). On the other hand, there is only one formal bilingual inscription so far known in the entirety of Syria, that from Tel Dan about 200 BCE (§3.2.7; cf. Millar 1987: 132). Maresha inscriptions are all in Greek (§3.2.6). Thus, Hengel's demonstration of the widespread use of Greek in his various writings cannot be doubted, yet the significance of this fact is not so easily assessed. Apart from Greek settlers or their descendants, this use of Greek seems to have been confined to a certain segment of the population, especially the educated upper-class. To what extent it penetrated into the lives of the bulk of the population is more difficult to determine. The Jews in Egypt mostly seem to have had Greek as their first language; however, in Palestine the number of Jews (outside the Greek cities) who were fluent in Greek seems small.

6.3.2.3 *Jewish Names*

W. Clarysse (1985) 'Greeks and Egyptians in the Ptolemaic Army and Administration', *Aegyptus* 65: 57–66; (1994) 'Jews in Trikomia', in A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists, Copenhagen, 23–29 August, 1992*: 193–203; *CPJ* 1: 27–30; **N.G. Cohen** (1976) 'Jewish Names as Cultural Indicators in Antiquity', *JSJ* 7: 97–128; **T. Derda** (1997) 'Did the Jews Use the Name of Moses in Antiquity?' *ZPE* 115: 257–60; **S. Honigman** (2004) 'Abraham in Egypt: Hebrew and Jewish-Aramaic Names in Egypt and Judaea in Hellenistic and Early Roman Times', *ZPE* 146: 279–97; **M. H. Williams** (1995) 'Palestinian Jewish Personal Names in Acts', in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting* 4: 79–113; (1997a) 'The Meaning and Function of *Ioudaios* in Graeco-Roman Inscriptions', *ZPE* 116: 249–62; (1997b) 'Jewish Use of Moses as a Personal Name in Graeco-Roman Antiquity – A Note', *ZPE* 118: 274; (2002) 'The Case for Jewish Use of Moses as a Personal Name in Graeco-Roman Antiquity', *ZPE* 140: 279–83; (2007) 'The Use of Alternative Names by Diaspora Jews in Graeco-Roman Antiquity', *JSJ* 38: 307–27.

Names are often an indication of the cultural identity of those bearing them. Previous sections have noted how other Near East peoples adapted to the coming of the Greeks in the area of personal names. For example, **W. Clarysse** (1985) has attempted to demonstrate that figures in the Ptolemaic administration often bore names according to their function. Thus, the village scribe of Kerkeosiris (cf. §8.1) bore the Egyptian name of Menches, yet one document shows he also had a Greek name and even says that he was of Greek descent; in any case, the *epistates* of the village had a Greek name but was apparently the brother of Menches. The point is that the village scribe was expected to be Egyptian, just as the *epistates* was expected to be Greek. The names reflect these conventions, even though the individuals holding the offices were no longer of the expected ethnic group.

In this section, we focus on the Jews. In the Hebrew Bible we find all sorts of names for Jews. Most are Hebrew, but we find Egyptian names as

Aaron and Moses, and in the early Persian period Babylonian (e.g., Zerubbabel) and Persian names (e.g., Bagohi) occur. Thus, many examples of non-Hebrew names for Jews can be found in our sources. With the coming of Alexander we find the beginnings of a significant Jewish diaspora in Greek-speaking areas. The types of names varied, with many individuals having Hebrew or traditional names, at least in the first generation. But soon the vast majority of Jews that can be identified had Greek names. V.A. Tcherikover found that only about a quarter of the names in papyri relating to soldiers and military settlers in third- and second-century Egypt were Hebrew, the rest being Greek (*CPJ* 1: 28). A document from the end of the third century BCE has ten names of Jews, of which nine are Greek (*CPJ* 1.22).

Jewish names in Egypt fall into six basic categories (cf. *CPJ* 1: xvii–xix; 27–30; Clarysse 1994: 199–200):

1. Hebrew names. They appear in Graecized form in the documents, though whether they were pronounced the Hebrew way in the oral context is not known. These are a minority in number but include such names as Ananis (Ἀνάνης = אֲנָנִי, Hanan), Barrikas (Βαρρίκας = בָּרִיךְ, Baruch), Iōannas (Ἰωάννας = יְהוֹחָנָן, John), and Iōsēphis (Ἰωσήφης Joseph) (Clarysse 1994: 194–95); possibly also Salumis (Σαλῦμις = שְׁלֹמֹה Solomon), though this has been doubted, for good reason (Honigman 2004: 283–85).
2. Greek names phonetically close to a Hebrew name. One of the most frequent is the name Simon, a good Greek name but also close to the Greek pronunciation of Shim'on (שִׁמְעוֹן). Other frequent names were Mnaseas (Μνασέας, similar to מְנַשֶּׁה, Manasseh) and Jason (Ἰάσονος/Ἰάσων, reminding one of several Jewish names beginning with the element *Yēho-* or *Ya/Yō-*).
3. Greek translations of Hebrew names. A good example is the name Irene (Εἰρήνη 'peace'), which is a translation of the woman's name Salome (שָׁלוֹם-צִיּוֹן 'peace [of Zion]'). Another example is the name Doron (Δῶρον, for דָּתֵן 'give, gift').
4. This is perhaps a more specific example of no. 3, but is worth keeping separate. These are names with the theophoric element *theos* 'God'. Greeks would normally have the name of an actual deity. Examples that are often indicative of a Jewish identity are Theodotus, Theophilus and Dositheos.
5. Dynastic names. These were names taken from those of the ruling Ptolemaic family, such as Ptolemy (Πτολεμαῖος) or Cleopatra (Κλεοπάτρα). This was usually seen as a means of showing honour to the ruling family.
6. Names that are purely Greek, with no specific connection to the bearer's Jewish identity (Nicanor). In a few instances, these are theophoric names with a pagan divinity as a part of name (Demetrius, Dionysius, Apollonius). In some cases, those with the element *Zeus* might have been interpreted as the Greek equivalent of

Yhwh or the shortened form *Yēho-* or *Ya/Yô-* (Diocles, Zenodora). Yet judging from the papyri, Jews in Egypt apparently did not hesitate to give names associated with Greek or Egyptian gods to their children (*CPJ* 1: 29).

We know of many Jews in Palestine who bore Hebrew/Aramaic names and also a Greek one. Examples include the high priest Jason and a number of the Hasmonaean priests. Also, Egyptians not infrequently had an Egyptian and a Greek name. Contrary to conventional opinion, however, M.H. Williams (2007) has shown that it was uncommon for Jews in the diaspora to have two names, a Hebrew/Semitic one and a Greek one. Williams suggests that this is because Jews tended to want to fit in with their Hellenistic environment. In Palestine it would be useful to appeal to both the traditional circles and Hellenistic, but since most Jews were immigrants into Egypt, a Greek name would be sufficient.

6.3.2.4 Religion

M. Avi-Yonah (1959) 'Syrian Gods at Ptolemais-Accho', *IEJ* 9: 1–12; **BURSTEIN** #48; **J.G. Griffiths** (1987b) 'Hellenistic Religions', *The Encyclopedia of Religion*: 6: 252–66; **R.A. Oden** (1976a) *Studies in Lucian's De Syria Dea*; (1976b) 'The Persistence of Canaanite Religion', *BA* 39: 31–36; **J.Z. Smith** (1985) 'European Religions, Ancient: Hellenistic Religions', *Encyclopaedia Britannica: Macropaedia*: 18: 925–27; **J. Teixidor** (1977) *The Pagan God*; **H. Waldmann** (1973) *Die kommagenischen Kultreformen unter König Mithradates I. Kallinikos und seinem Sohne Antiochos I.*

Detailed information on the religions of Syria is skimpy except for the 'Syrian goddess' (*Syria Dea*) described by Lucian (Oden 1976a). Yet the data available do indicate that native cults of Syria and Phoenicia survived and thrived during the Hellenistic period – this amid strong Graeco-Roman cultural influence (Teixidor 1977). As Teixidor notes:

Near Eastern religions maintained their traditional character during the last centuries of the first millennium B.C. ... Popular religion must have remained practically unchanged in Greco-Roman times, for the inscriptions do not reflect the impact of new fashions. (1977: 5–6)

This is well illustrated by an inscription at Ptolemais dedicated to Hadad and Atargatis, two Syrian gods. The dedication is in Greek, the man who dedicated it has a Greek name ('Diodotos son of Neoptolemos') normally borne by ethnic Greeks, and the cult seems new to this area (Avi-Yonah 1959).

This basic continuity does not mean that there were no developments in the native religions. One of the main changes was the move from nationalistic cults (which became even more conservative in the homeland in some cases) to salvation religions in the wider Graeco-Roman world, with emphasis on personal conversion and individual salvation (Smith 1985). Isis worship was a

prime example of the change from a native Egyptian cult to a widespread personal religion drawing in many different nationalities in the Roman empire. In their homeland, though, the native cults were not suppressed or displaced by the Greek cults.

There was a certain amount of syncretism, but this should not be exaggerated since many of the changes were natural developments rather than a complete merging with Greek worship. What might at first look like syncretism often consisted only of the identification of native deities with Greek deities without a major change in the character of the Oriental cult (cf. Avi-Yonah 1959: 6). Where there was genuine syncretism, it was more likely to be in the Graeco-Roman 'diaspora' rather than in the homeland. However, an interesting position of deliberate syncretism is represented by the cult reform by Mithridates I and Antiochus I of Commagene. They claimed to trace their ancestry back to both Alexander the Great and Darius the Persian. Their new cult was an amalgam of the two traditions, Greek and Persian, which included worship of 'Zeus Oromasdes' (Zeus + Ahura Mazda) presided over by priests in Persian dress (Waldmann 1973: 59–79; BURSTEIN #48).

6.3.2.5 *Art and Architecture*

M. Colledge (1987) 'Greek and non-Greek Interaction in the Art and Architecture of the Hellenistic East', in A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East*: 134–62; **S. Hornblower** (1982) *Mausolus*; **A.E. Samuel** (1983) *From Athens to Alexandria: Hellenism and Social Goals in Ptolemaic Egypt*; **C.G. Starr** (1975) 'Greeks and Persians in the Fourth Century B.C.', *Iranica Antiqua* 11: 39–99; (1977) 'Greeks and Persians in the Fourth Century B.C.', *Iranica Antiqua* 12: 49–115.

Although architecture is a whole study in itself, the article by M. Colledge is an easily accessible example which illustrates the process of Hellenization. The Persians had a highly developed artistic culture which drew on a long Eastern tradition (Colledge 1987: 135–36; Starr 1977: 49–59). Greek influence already began in the Persian empire, partly because Greek artists were sometimes used, a prime example being the famous Mausoleum of the satrap Mausolus (Hornblower 1982: 223–74). (However, contrary to some assumptions the beauty of such places as Persepolis was not due solely or primarily to Greek artisans: Colledge 1987: 136; Starr 1977: 57). After Alexander's conquests, a 'mixed style' which combined both native and Greek elements developed with time and eventually became predominant; however, both pure native and Greek styles continued happily side by side with each other and with the mixed style long after it had developed. Such sites as Ai Khanum show fine examples of all three styles in juxtaposition. Of what did Greek influence consist? Was only the pure Greek style 'Hellenistic'? Or only the mixed style? As this shows, a static definition is difficult, yet one would have no trouble putting the whole *process* under the rubric of 'Hellenization'.

A.E. Samuel indicates a similar situation with art in Egypt (1983: 101–105). Apart from a few examples of sculpture produced by the ‘mixed school’, the Greek and Egyptian styles were kept separate. Egyptian art was very conservative. Some innovation occurred in the Greek sphere, but it too was conservative and did not generally borrow motifs from Egyptian style. Thus, art in Egypt during Ptolemaic rule was either purely Egyptian or purely Greek, with very little mixture of the two.

6.3.2.6 *The Archaeology of Palestine*

R. Harrison (1994) ‘Hellenization in Syria-Palestine: The Case of Judea in the Third Century BCE’, *BA* 57: 98–108; **O. Lipschits and O. Tal** (2007) ‘The Settlement Archaeology of the Province of Judah’, in O. Lipschits et al. (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*: 33–52; **E.M. Meyers** (1992) ‘The Challenge of Hellenism for Early Judaism and Christianity’, *BA* 55: 84–91; (1994) ‘Second Temple Studies in the Light of Recent Archaeology: Part I: The Persian and Hellenistic Periods’, *CR: BS* 2: 25–42; **I. Sharon** (1987) ‘Phoenician and Greek Ashlar Construction Techniques at Tel Dor, Israel’, *BASOR* 267: 21–42.

The one area where one might expect clear evidence of Hellenization would be that of the material culture. There is the complication that most people would have continued to live much as they had done in previous centuries, yet we already know of trade and cultural links with other parts of the Mediterranean and the Near East by the presence of imported pottery and other goods. On the whole, though, these tended to be luxury items, whereas the presence of Greek rule might be expected to show Greek artefacts of a more mundane nature. Coins are an example, and we do indeed find that Greek symbols are found on Jewish coins under Ptolemaic rule (§3.3). Yet the Jews ceased to mint their own coins about 270 BCE.

More important is probably the area of architecture. Yet even here there is a complication in that there are few third-century sites, and early Hellenistic remains as a whole are scarce (§2.2.1). What we do find, though, is that ‘there is really very little archaeological support for the contention that Judaea was thoroughly Hellenized before the middle of the second century BCE’ (Harrison 1994: 106). The monumental remains in the rest of Palestine support this view. Dor, which is on the coast and in the Phoenician sphere, had a new fortification system from about the middle of the third century (§2.1.7), but Greek monumental architecture became the dominant form only in the second century BCE (Sharon 1987): even the Hellenization of the architecture in Dor should not be exaggerated. In sum, the evidence from architecture generally is that Greek influence was slow in coming.

6.3.3 Resistance to Hellenism

A. Blasius and B.U. Schipper (eds) (2002) *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten*; **M. Boyce** (1984) 'On the Antiquity of Zoroastrian Apocalyptic', *BSOAS* 47: 57–75; **J.J. Collins (ed.)** (1979) *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*; **D. Devauchelle** (1995) 'Le sentiment anti-perses chez les anciens Égyptiens', *Trans* 9: 67–80; **F. Dunand** (1977) 'L'Oracle du Potier et la formation de l'apocalyptique en Égypte', in F. Raphaël et al. (eds), *L'Apocalyptique*: 41–67; **S.K. Eddy** (1961) *The King Is Dead*; **D. Flusser** (1982) 'Hystaspes and John of Patmos', in S. Shaked (ed.), *Irano-Judaica*: 12–75; **A.K. Grayson** (1975) *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*: 28–36; **J.R. Hinnells** (1973) 'The Zoroastrian Doctrine of Salvation in the Roman World', in E.J. Sharpe and J.R. Hinnells (eds), *Man and His Salvation*: 125–48. **A. Hultgård** (1983) 'Forms and Origins of Iranian Apocalypticism', in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*: 387–411; (1991) 'Bahman Yasht: A Persian Apocalypse', in J.J. Collins and J.H. Charlesworth (eds), *Mysteries and Revelations*: 114–34; (1999) 'Persian Apocalypticism', in J.J. Collins (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*: vol. 1, 39–83; **J.H. Johnson** (1974) 'The Demotic Chronicle as an Historical Source', *Enchoria* 4: 1–17; (1984) 'Is the Demotic Chronicle an Anti-Greek Tract?' in H.-J. Thissen and K.-T. Zauzich (eds), *Grammata Demotika: Festschrift für Erich Lüddeckens zum 15. Juni 1983*: 107–24; **L. Koenen** (1968) 'Die Prophezeiungen des "Töpfers"', *ZPE* 2: 178–209; (1970) 'The Prophecies of a Potter: A Prophecy of World Renewal Becomes an Apocalypse', in D.H. Samuel (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology*: 249–54; (1985) 'The Dream of Nektanebos', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 22: 171–94; **W. La Barre** (1971) 'Materials for a History of Studies of Crisis Cults: A Bibliographic Essay', *Current Anthropology* 12: 3–44; **A.B. Lloyd** (1982) 'Nationalist Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt', *Historia* 31: 33–55; **W. Peremans** (1978) 'Les révolutions égyptiennes sous les Lagides', in H. Maehler and V.M. Strocka (eds), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten*: 39–50; **H.-J. Thissen** (1998) '"Apocalypse Now!" Anmerkungen zum Lamm des Bokchoris', in W. Clarysse, A. Schoors and H. Willems (eds), *Egyptian Religion the Last Thousand Years*: 1043–53; **P. Worsley** (1957) *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of 'Cargo' Cults in Melanesia*.

The reactions to the Greek conquest were complex and diverse. The most obvious form of resistance was armed rebellion against Greek political domination and the attempt to restore native rule, but the Jews were by no means the only people to fight Greek rule. The Jewish state stands out in this because it successfully gained independence, whereas most other rebels met with failure; yet the Jews of Palestine were certainly not the only ones to aspire to independence or to attempt to gain it by force of arms. Among the Egyptians in particular, there were a number of uprisings, though none successful (cf. Peremans 1978). Although much of the evidence has no doubt disappeared, enough survives to show that there were anti-Greek moves of various sorts among a wide range of the Near Eastern peoples. The question is whether this opposition to Greek rule extended to Greek culture.

Even gaining independence from Greek rule did not necessarily mean the overthrow of Hellenistic culture or the rooting out of all Greek elements or

influences, as is made clear by the example of the Hasmonaean state which threw off the Seleucid yoke but made no attempt to eliminate the overt Greek elements in Palestinian culture (as discussed in *HJJSTP* 3). On the contrary, Judaea under Hasmonaean rule was typical of Hellenistic kingdoms of that general period. In this one may compare modern 'nativistic movements'. They often react against some cultural elements of colonial powers simply because they are symbolic of oppression (La Barre 1971: 20–22), yet many elements taken over from the colonizers will be accepted, either because they have become so well integrated that they are no longer recognized as foreign (cf. Worsley 1957: 23) or because they are useful or symbolically neutral to the movement.

Another sort of anti-Greek reaction was the production of anti-Greek propaganda, generally of a literary type. Apocalyptic in the early Greek period was not confined to Jewish circles; on the contrary, we find similar literary and mantic movements among Persians, Babylonians and Egyptians. It formed, at least in part, a kind of resistance literature that kept people's hopes alive for the overthrow of the Greek overlords and a restoration of native autonomy. A whole genre of such writings from the Hellenistic period, produced by a variety of peoples, often took the form of oracles or *ex eventu* prophecies. These writings containing predictions or apocalyptic perspectives are found from Persia to Egypt. From Mesopotamia was the *Dynasty Prophecy* (Grayson 1975: 28–36), mainly a listing of Mesopotamian rulers with *ex eventu* prophecies. The section of main interest is that relating to Alexander and Darius III (3.9–23) in which Darius renews his army and defeats the Greeks. One explanation is that the prophecy originally ended with a prediction of Darius' recovery but that the text was eventually extended to cover later Greek rulers (Neujahr 2005). If so, the text was written as propaganda to provide support for continued Persian resistance to the Greek invasion.

The *Oracle of Hystaspes* is often thought to be a Hellenistic Iranian oracle (Hultgård 1999: 74–78; Collins [ed.] 1979: 210; though Flusser [1982] argues that it is Jewish), but we know it only as quoted in several of the patristic writers (Justin, *Apol.* 1.44.12; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 6.43.1; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 7.15.19, 7.18.2). The *Bahman Yašt* is a late compilation but from earlier sources (Hultgård 1991; 1999: 43). A number of Iranian scholars are prepared to argue that the eschatological/apocalyptic ideas are found at an early time in Zoroastrianism (Boyce 1984; Hinnells 1973; Hultgård 1983; 1999). The Egyptian texts include the *Demotic Chronicle* (Johnson 1974; 1984; Devauchelle 1995; Blasius and Schipper [eds] 2002), the *Potter's Oracle* (Koenen 1968; 1970; Dunand 1977; Blasius and Schipper [eds] 2002), the *Egyptian Lamb of Boccharis* (Thissen 1998; Blasius and Schipper [eds] 2002) and the *Dream of Nectanebos* (Koenen 1985). Unlike an earlier generation of researchers, J.H. Johnson had argued that the *Demotic Chronicle* was not an 'anti-Greek' tract (1974). This has now been supported by arguments about all these texts (Blasius and Schipper [eds] 2002). This

literature itself was a way of kindling hope and venting frustration. What effect it had from a practical point of view is uncertain; probably little in most cases, though there may have been times when it served to inspire the native peoples to active resistance and revolt.

The Jewish apocalyptic texts, like the Egyptian texts, do not just contain specific predictions about the future but lay out a view of the cosmos and the actions of the deity in the past and now as well as in the future. They engage in a general commentary on events at the beginning of time, their implications for the present and future, and generally what God's plan is for the world and history. They are especially concerned with how God thinks about their specific group and its members, knowing that God has a special interest in them and will also eventually deal with their opponents and enemies in a special way. For example, the Jews produced fake *Sibylline Oracles* (§4.12) which talk in general terms about history and the future in language familiar from Greek oracles. The Jewish apocalyptic writings and speculations from the third century BCE seem less concerned with specific predictions and imminent events than some of those that can be dated to the second century and later. Rather, they appear to be concerned with giving a particular vision of history. For example, the Book of Watchers (§4.5) describes the world by telling what happened in *primaeval* times. The fall of the angels and the pre-flood activities determine how things are in the world. There are expectations for a future judgement and a paradisaal world for the righteous, but these seem to be far off. The nature of evil and warnings about certain knowledge taught by the fallen angels are important for the reader/student to grasp so that he or she will not be led astray, but it does not seem to be calling for a withdrawal from society or necessarily even a special lifestyle.

Yet much of this begs the question stated at the beginning of the section: to what extent are these protests against Greek culture, as opposed to Greek rule? As already noted, some cultural elements were symbolic of Greek domination and would have been opposed for that reason, but was there a conscious desire to expunge Greek culture from the Near East? It is not clear that the native peoples were even aware of what was Greek and what was Oriental, after several generations of Greek presence. This point will be further explored below.

6.4 *Hellenism and the Jews: The Question of Jewish Identity*

6.4.1 *The Theory of Ethnic Identity*

F. Barth (ed.) (1969) *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference*; **M.G. Brett (ed.)** (1996) *Ethnicity and the Bible*; **C. Geertz** (1973) *The Interpretation of Cultures*; **J.M. Hall** (1997) *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity*; **J. Hutchinson and A.D. Smith (eds)** (1996) *Ethnicity*; **S. Jones** (1997) *The Archaeology of Ethnicity*; **K.A. Kamp and N. Yoffee** (1980) 'Ethnicity in

Ancient Western Asia During the Early Second Millennium B.C.: Archaeological Assessments and Ethnoarchaeological Perspectives', *BASOR* 237: 85–104; **C.F. Keyes** (1997) 'Ethnic Groups, Ethnicity', in T. Barfield (ed.), *The Dictionary of Anthropology*: 152–54; **A.E. Killebrew** (2005) *Biblical Peoples and Ethnicity*; **R. Kletter** (2006) 'Can a Proto-Israelite Please Stand Up? Notes on the Ethnicity of Iron Age Israel and Judah', in A.M. Maeir and P. de Miroschedji (eds), *I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times*: 573–86; **S.J. Shennan** (ed.) (1989) *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity*; **S. Sokolovskii and V. Tishkov** (1996) 'Ethnicity', in A. Barnard and J. Spencer (eds), *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology*: 190–93; **K.L. Sparks** (1998) *Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Israel*.

The question of ethnicity has been much discussed in social anthropology in recent decades, and any discussion about the Jews has to take into account the theoretical insights gained from the social sciences. What does one mean by 'ethnic' or 'ethnicity'? At the most basic level, it has to do with the Greek word *ethnos* which is variously translated as 'people, nation, race'. But this only partially answers our question. A fundamental issue is that throughout the historical sources of the ancient world are the names of groups and peoples, including 'Israel/Israelites' and 'Judah/Judahites/Jews'. How do we characterize these groups? Do we think of them in social terms, kinship terms (lineal? segmental? tribal?), ethnic terms or what? In many cases, we have no information beyond the textual data.

When discussing the Jews, we need to keep in mind that biblical scholarship has generated its own discussion of ethnicity (Brett [ed.] 1996; Sparks 1998; Killebrew 2005: 8–16) but our concern is mainly with anthropological study (Shennan [ed.] 1989; Hutchinson and Smith [eds] 1996; Sokolovskii and Tishkov 1996; Keyes 1997). A view that ethnicity should be seen mainly in biological terms (i.e., that ethnic groups have a common ancestry or kinship or genetic pool) is widely rejected, but it draws attention to an important point: ethnic groups generally define themselves in kinship or quasi-kinship terms. Others have seen the question in terms of distinct cultures, but this is problematic in that cultural groups do not always develop an ethnic identity or group consciousness. The classic study is that of F. Barth (1969) who pointed to the importance of inter-group boundary mechanisms: ethnic groups define themselves in contrast with other groups ('self-ascription'), often by a minimum of explicit (even trivial) differences. He rejected unambiguously the use of an inventory of cultural traits (cf. Kletter 2006: 579). There is also often a 'primordial' quality to ethnic identity in which the group's distinctiveness – 'we/they' – is essential (Geertz 1973: 255–310; Keyes 1997). But there has been a good deal of discussion since Barth (Kamp and Yoffee 1980; Shennan [ed.] 1989; Hutchinson and Smith [eds] 1996; Jones 1997; Kletter 2006).

Trying to find a definition of an ethnic group is still not easy. Recent treatments tend to recognize the fluidity of ethnic identity (an insight from Barth), and any definition must recognize that. Kamp and Yoffee stated that

most sociologists and anthropologists see an ethnic group as 'a number of individuals who see themselves as being alike by virtue of a common ancestry, real or fictitious, and who are so regarded by others' (1980: 88). Kletter follows A.D. Smith in seeing an ethnic group as:

A group of people who share most – but not necessarily all – of the following: (1) a collective proper name; (2) a myth of common ancestry; (3) historical memories; (4) one or more differentiating elements of common culture; (5) an association with a specific homeland (which may be symbolic, without physical control of the homeland); and (6) a sense of solidarity among at least parts of the group. (Kletter 2006: 574)

Sokolovskii and Tishkov give a similar definition and suggest that it 'opens further avenues for integration of anthropological, political and psychological knowledge in understanding of ethnic phenomena' (1996: 192). Of particular interest is that self-identity may be strongly based on religion, myth and law, areas which have traditionally been studied with regard to ancient Judaism. Yet even such carefully thought-out definitions can be in danger of restricting the recognition of how complex the matter is in the real world. Politicians may mount a self-serving campaign to encourage their constituents to think of themselves as of a particular ethnic group. Individuals might adopt a particular ethnic identity for the sake of social or economic advantage or even as a strategy for survival.

6.4.2 *Who was a Ioudaios?*

G. Bohak (1997) 'Good Jews, Bad Jews, and Non-Jews in Greek Papyri and Inscriptions', in B. Kramer et al. (eds), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses*: 105–112; **W. Clarysse** (1994) 'Jews in Trikomia', in A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists*: 193–203; **CPJ** 1.127a–e; 2: pp. 188–98; **M.H. Williams** (1995) 'Palestinian Jewish Personal Names in Acts', in R. Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*: vol. 4, 79–113; (1997a) 'The Meaning and Function of *Ioudaios* in Graeco-Roman Inscriptions', *ZPE* 116: 249–62.

The meaning of Ἰουδαῖος (usually translated 'Jew', though this could be question-begging) has been the subject of recent discussion, not infrequently in the context of the rise of Christianity (see Williams 1997a for some earlier literature). Our immediate concern is what *Ioudaios* meant in the early Hellenistic period, without worrying about any possible later developments into the Roman period. The term is occasionally used as a personal name, though the form is usually *Ioudas* and *Ioudith* (Williams 1995; 1997a: 250–51). The Hebrew designation *Yehudi* (יְהוּדִי 'Judahite') arose as a reference to those from the area of *Yehuda* (יְהוּדָה 'Judah'). However, it is difficult to label it 'geographical' since it always seems to have had an ethnic connotation; that is, even those living outside Judah were still called 'Judahites'. Those deported from Judah by Nebuchadnezzar continued to be referred to as 'Jews/Judahites' (Jer. 40.11; 44.1; Est. 2.5; 3.6, etc.). The colony

at Elephantine continued to call its members *Yehudi*/*Yehudaiya* (יְהוּדִי/יְהוּדַיָּה) generations after the original settlers had left Judah to live in Egypt. In the papyri, identifying someone by *Ioudaios* is comparable to identifying someone as Macedonian, Thracian, Athenian or Persian. Some of these terms are debated and may not be ethnic designations in all contexts, but they are ethnic terms in at least some contexts.

Is it mainly a religious term, a reference to those who adopted the Jewish religion (*HJJSTP* 1.167–68)? Religion and ethnicity were often closely related in the ancient world. Yet in the early Hellenistic period, we have little or no evidence of converts to Judaism – certainly, nothing comparable to stories of conversions in the Roman period (cf. *JCH* 534–37). The overwhelming impression is that you were a *Ioudaios* if you were born one. In many of the later inscriptions, signs of the Jewish religion are evident, but some earlier inscriptions are hardly in the bounds of what came to be called ‘orthodox Judaism’ (Williams 1997a: 255). Ethnic identity naturally included religious peculiarities, and both insiders and outsiders regarded certain religious practices as characteristic of being a Jew. Yet Jewish identity was hardly exclusively a religious matter.

The definition can be in part clarified by considering those Jews who are reported to have abandoned their Judaism in antiquity. Only a few are known; we shall examine the two most prominent ones. First is Dositheus son of Drimylus in the third century BCE, ‘a Jew by birth [τὸ γένος Ἰουδαῖος] who later changed his religion [νόμιμα] and apostatized from the ancestral traditions [τῶν πατρίων δογματῶν]’ (*3 Macc.* 1.3). We now know from papyrological information that there was indeed an individual named Dositheus son of Drimylus (Δοσίθεος τοῦ Δριμύλου [*CPJ* 1.127a–e]). He was one of the two heads of the royal scribal system (ὁ ὑπομνηματογράφος [*CPJ* 1.127a line 24]) and also priest of ‘Alexander and the gods Adelphoi and the gods Euergetai’, that is, the deified Alexander and the current Ptolemy and his wife (*CPJ* 1.127d–e). He is nowhere identified as Jewish in the surviving documentation, but his name makes it highly probable, since few non-Jews bore the name ‘Dositheus’ (*CPJ* 1.231).

It is interesting that the author of *3 Maccabees*, in spite of his venomous antipathy to Dositheus, does not deny that he is a Jew. He seems to toy with the idea that Dositheus and those like him who had transgressed against God and the law were not really members of the Jewish people, but in the end he still calls them ‘Jews’ (*3 Macc.* 7.10: τοὺς ἐκ τοῦ γένους τῶν Ιουδαίων). The same applies to the second main example, Tiberius Julius Alexander, the son of the Alexandrian alabarch Alexander and nephew of Philo of Alexandria in the first century CE (*JCH* 438–39). Josephus states that the father was superior to his son in the matter of piety toward God (πρὸς τὸν θεὸν εὐσεβείᾳ), for the son was ‘not faithful to the ancestral customs’ (*Ant.* 20.5.2 §100: τοῖς πατρίοις οὐκ ἐνέμεινεν ἔθουσιν). We have a number of contemporary documents mentioning Tiberius Alexander (*CPJ* 2.188–98). None of them refers to Alexander as a Jew, but upper-class individuals seldom have

their ethnic identity realized. Josephus does not deny Alexander's identity as a Jew, but he does not use the term to refer to him.

These two examples are not definitive, but they suggest that abandoning the Jewish religion did not make them cease to be Jews. While religion was a part of ethnic identity, it was not the sole criterion, apparently, even among the Jews.

6.4.3 *Jewish Views about Hellenism in Pre-Hasmonaean Times*

L.L. Grabbe (2002a) 'The Hellenistic City of Jerusalem', in J.R. Bartlett (ed.), *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities*: 6–21; (2006d) 'Biblical Historiography in the Persian period: or How the Jews Took Over the Empire', in S.W. Holloway (ed.), *Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible*: 400–414; **S. Honigman** (2003) 'Politeumata and Ethnicity in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt', *AncSoc* 33: 61–102.

It still seems to be received wisdom that Jews were not comfortable under Greek rule. This is somewhat surprising, not only in light of discussion in recent years but also because of the recognition of Mesopotamian and Persian influence on Judaism (e.g., the influence of the Assyrian vassal treaty on Deuteronomy). A variety of religious cults flourished under the Persians (*HJSTP* 1: 256–61), but no one seems to assume that this posed a threat to Judaism. Yet for some reason, Judaism is seen as uniquely incompatible with Hellenism. The question is, how did the Jews see themselves in this new Hellenistic environment?

6.4.3.1 *Examples*

The discussion is complicated by the fact that there are Jews in Palestine and Jews outside Palestine, especially in Egypt. The situation in the Jewish homeland might have been different – or perceived as different – by those living there, as opposed to those living in diaspora communities where their minority status was self-evident. It is also useful to be reminded that many of our sources were written after the experience of the Jews under Antiochus IV in the mid-second century BCE. These later sources could have been – indeed, in many cases clearly were – influenced by views and feelings arising out of the experience of Antiochus' suppression of the Jewish religion.

The first example is the obvious one of Tobias, the Jewish head of a Ptolemaic cleruchy in the Transjordanian region (§13.3). Some will say that Tobias was not representative of the Jewish people as a whole. As so often, this is both true and untrue. Tobias was wealthy and had a position of some power and prestige. Most Jews were not like him in this respect, but is that all that is important? Why should we assume that the peasants and livestock-herders of Judah did not share many things with Tobias, including basic religious beliefs?

The *Letter of Aristeas* is an important document indicating a Jewish attitude toward the wider Ptolemaic rule (probably dated to the second

century BCE – see further in *HJJSTP* 3). It seems to have a number of aims. An obvious one is its support for the integrity of the Greek translation of the Pentateuch. The Septuagint was created for Jews whose home was the Hellenistic world and the Hellenistic language (§§4.1; 13.6.2). This shows that within 75 years of Alexander's death, a significant number of Jews had settled into a new linguistic and cultural environment. The *Letter of Aristeas* is, of course, a piece of propaganda, showing the Jews in a good light. But what it presents is a people to be admired for their culture, technology, wisdom and learning *by Greek standards*. The Torah is not defended on its own terms as the teachings of a native and exotic people with strange customs and practices; on the contrary, it is shown to be perfectly in tune with Greek sensibilities. It is rational, logical and philosophical according to the parameters of Greek thought. There was one exception of course: *Aristeas* is very much against polytheism and divine images. In a sense, though, they are turning Greek philosophical arguments back on the Greeks themselves.

Another example is the Jewish archive of Heracleopolis (§3.1.3). This seems to show that in most matters Jews fitted into the normal life of the society in which they lived. This needs a bit of clarification, since the Jews tended to live like the Greeks rather than like the native Egyptians (though even here there was not a rigid barrier between the two communities [§6.3.1.1]). But as S. Honigman had occasion to observe, Jews did not need to be formal members of a *politeuma* to be able to keep their religious traditions (2003: 93–94).

She went on to comment about the Jewish relationship with the Greek law in Egypt and its wider cultural implications:

This evolution of the Jewish '*patrios nomos*' in Ptolemaic Egypt, with its combined features of resistance and acculturation, suggests a spontaneous and largely unreflexive process, not a calculated strategy ... Thus, Tcherikover himself, and other scholars after him, distinguished between Jews faithful to their ancestral customs, living behind the protective boundaries of the *politeuma* framework on the one hand, and assimilated Jews living outside the *politeuma*, on the other. As *P. Polit. Iud.* 9 and 12 shows, the adoption of Greek law by Jews was perfectly compatible with a high awareness of their specific ethnic identity. We may go further: what we took until now for cases of assimilation in the legal practices of Jews documented in papyri from the Fayum and elsewhere could well have been, as in Heracleopolis, an *appropriation* of Greek legal practice, re-interpreted as 'Jewish law'. (Honigman 2003: 98)

6.4.3.2 *Objections*

One can think of various objections that might be offered to the interpretation just presented. Following are some further considerations or even possible counter-examples:

Like most native peoples, the Jews apparently regarded the Greeks as conquerors, colonial masters and oppressors (though we have little specific comment in the preserved sources). We also know of the later successful attempt to throw off Seleucid rule under the

Maccabees. The question, though, is whether their attitude was any different toward the Greeks than toward earlier conquerors. After all, a speech placed in the mouth of Ezra states that the Jews were slaves under the Persians (Ezra 9.9). A prayer in the book of Nehemiah makes the same claim (Neh. 9.36). The Greeks were by no means the first conquerors, masters or oppressors. We can also say that, in spite of Jewish propaganda, the Ptolemies had not treated the Jews differently and more favourably than other conquered peoples. But then neither did the Persians. The Greeks, like the Persians and others before them, often made use of local people in their administration and otherwise tried to accommodate the native population.

Greek language and administration replaced the pre-existing native language and administrative tradition. When Ptolemy I took over Egypt, he had a potential problem because Macedonians were trying to keep Egyptians in order who outnumbered them at least a hundred to one, and perhaps as many as a thousand to one. No attempt was made to suppress either the Egyptian culture or the Egyptian language – indeed, neither was this done by the Seleucids to those under their control. In addition to assimilating the Ptolemaic kingship to the Pharaonic image, the Ptolemies put the existing bureaucracy to good use. Many aspects of the previous administration from Saite and Persian rule were co-opted and perpetuated by the Ptolemies. Although Greek was the language of administration at the higher levels, local languages were often used alongside Greek for the lower levels of administration (see above, §6.3.2.2). Similarly, the Egyptian judicial system continued to operate, making use of traditional Egyptian law and the demotic legal tradition, alongside the new Greek judicial system.

Why would the Ptolemies have treated the Jews differently and more favourably than other conquered peoples? The answer is that there is no reason to think that they did. But, then, neither did the Persians, even though some scholars seem to have assumed that they did (see Grabbe 2006d). On the other hand, as noted above, the Ptolemies accommodated and used the existing institutions of the native people. There is thus good reason to think that Jewish tradition, custom and belief would have been accommodated as far as possible by the Ptolemaic government, whether in Palestine or among the diaspora communities in Egypt. Note the comments elsewhere about synagogues (§10.3). We do not have a lot of information explicitly about the Jews at this time, but they are not entirely invisible.

Were not the 'orthodox Jews' appalled at the 'Hellenistic reform'? The famous 'Hellenistic reform' in Jerusalem will be discussed in the next volume (*HJJSTP* 3) and can only be mentioned briefly

here (see Grabbe 2002a). It seems that the interpretation is correct that Jason requested and received permission from Antiochus to turn Jerusalem into a Greek *polis*. But as for the frequent statement to the effect that ‘the pious were appalled’, there is an unequivocal response: apart from the question-begging assumption about who was pious, this statement suffers from lack of any support. There is not one shred of evidence that anyone opposed Jason’s reforms. The only evidence is that some people – apparently quite a lot of them – approved of the reforms. We know this was the case because evidently quite a few inhabitants of Jerusalem agreed to join the new *polis* as citizens.

Knowing human nature we could expect that there was a variety of reactions to Jason’s measures. Many would have regarded him as holding the office of high priest illegally. Some people – perhaps some of those in the countryside who are traditionally conservative and opposed to change – would have reacted strongly against what was happening. Yet it is not clear that their views would have been very important at this point. The lack of any opposition *at the time* to the events in Jerusalem seems significant.

Jewish religion was incompatible with Greek polytheism. This is true, but it was also true of the polytheism of previous conquerors. It has even been alleged that the Jews were required to institute an Assyrian cult to acknowledge their submission to the god Ashur, which was how the Assyrians saw their conquests. This allegation has been strongly opposed, but in any case polytheism was a part of the scene under Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian rule. It would be incorrect to refer to the Persians as monotheists (cf. §11.3.1). In addition to the good god Ahura Mazda and the evil deity Angra Mainyu, the goddess Anihita was worshipped during part of the Persian period. In addition, the traditional Elamite and Babylonian gods were worshipped in the Persian heartland. Greek polytheism was no more threatening than that of their predecessors who subjugated Judah.

6.4.3.3 Conclusions

This has been only a brief survey, but it has not found any indication of special antipathy to Greek culture in pre-Maccabean times. The Jews did not like conquerors or overlords, but who does? But we have nothing in the sources to suggest that the Greeks were particularly different from other overlords. With most Jews it was a matter of replacing one ruler and tax collector by another. One still had to pay taxes; one still had to submit to whatever regulations were in force at the time. But Greeks do not seem to have acted differently from other conquerors.

In sum, for the first century and a half of Greek rule there is no evidence

that the Jews saw anything different or more threatening than they had under previous empires. The Greeks were just another conquering power, and until well into the second century BCE the Jews had no more problem with them than with the Persians, Babylonians or Assyrians. We know that this changed under Antiochus IV who attempted to suppress the Jewish religion. But the point is that this was a unique event in the ancient world – and it still remains to some extent inexplicable. Antiochus' actions traumatized the Jews, and later writers often used minor elements of Greek culture as symbolic of this threat to Judaism. But in the pre-Maccabean period no such views appear to be found among the surviving data.

6.5 *Synthesis*

P. Bernard (1967) 'Ai Khanum on the Oxus: A Hellenistic City in Central Asia', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 53: 71–95; **L.L. Grabbe** (1988a) *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation: The Hebrew Names in Philo*; **A. Kuhrt and S. Sherwin-White** (eds) (1987) *Hellenism in the East*; **C. Roueché and S.M. Sherwin-White** (1985) 'Some Aspects of the Seleucid Empire: The Greek Inscriptions from Failaka, in the Arabian Gulf', *Chiron* 15: 1–39; **S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt** (1993) *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*.

6.5.1 *Hellenization in General*

An older view emphasized the Greek influence on the original civilizations of the ancient Near East and the dominance of Greek institutions. It also presented the concept of *Verschmelzung*, as if the Greek and the Oriental had blended together into one giant cultural amalgam. The most recent work has recognized not only the Graeco-centric view of so much older scholarship but has found evidence in new discoveries as well as old that the earlier cultures were far from obliterated under Greek rule (Kuhrt and Sherwin-White [eds] 1987; Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993).

The spread of Greek institutions and culture to the remotest parts of the Greek empire can be seen in the Greek remains in such unlikely places as Ai Khanum (Bernard 1967), and the island of Failaka (ancient Icarus) in the Persian gulf (Roueché and Sherwin-White 1985). The presence of Greek communities, as indicated by inscriptions, architecture and literary remains shows that no region could escape some influence. The question is to what extent the Greek presence produced merging, adoption or change in the indigenous cultures. A 'mixed culture' (*Verschmelzung*) was slow in coming in most cases, if it ever occurred as such.

Hellenization was a long and complex phenomenon. It cannot be summarized in a word or a sentence. It was not just the adoption of Greek ways by the inhabitants of the ancient Near East or of Oriental ways by Greeks who settled in the East. Hellenistic civilization was *sui generis* and must be considered from a variety of points of view, for it concerned many different areas of life: language, custom, religion, commerce, architecture,

dress, government, literary and philosophical ideals. Hellenization represented a process as well as a description of a type of culture. Whatever Alexander's ideals may have been, his successors were highly Graeco-chauvinist. Pride of place in society was to go to Greeks alone, with the natives usually at the bottom of the pyramid. Greek ideals were preserved in the Greek foundations, with citizenship and membership of the gymnasium jealously guarded for the exclusive privilege of the Greek settlers. Orientals might live in the Greek cities but they were not citizens and were mostly barred from becoming so. There was no interest in cultural imperialism as such by the Greek rulers.

Over a period of a century or so after Alexander's death, however, things gradually began to change. Local nobles and chieftains were often of use in the Ptolemaic and Seleucid administrations, and they employed Greek secretaries. A good example of this is the Jewish noble Tobias for whom we have a number of letters in Greek from the Zenon archive (§§3.1.2; 13.3). These individuals were also likely to see the need to have their sons given a Greek education. Thus, already early in the Greek period, we find educated Orientals who have some knowledge of Greek. Individuals such as Manetho in Egypt and Berossus in Babylon were writing treatises in Greek as early as the end of the fourth century. In the Tobiad romance, Joseph and later his son Hyrcanus (second half of the third century) deal with the Ptolemaic court on an equal footing (§13.3); there is no indication that they have to communicate by translator or that their educational background is considered inferior. Even early in the Greek period there are already indications of the impact of the Greek language (e.g., the bilingual ostrakon from Khirbet el-Kom [§3.2.5]).

During this time a shift also took place in the definition of 'Hellene'. Originally, it referred to physical ancestry; however, many of the new settlers in the Orient were Macedonians and others who were looked down upon by the inhabitants of Athens. The criterion soon became not one of genealogy but one of education: a Greek was one who had a Greek education – a Greek was one who had a command of the niceties of the Greek language. This concept was extremely important in breaking down the barriers between the settlers and the natives, as the natives began to acquire a Greek education. It was a slow process, but gradually Orientals began to make their way into the exclusive ranks of the ephebate (candidature for citizenship) and citizenry. With a Greek education and the adoption of a Greek name, it would often have been difficult to tell who was a descendant of Alexander's soldiers and who was from the losing side.

There was also the phenomenon of Orientalization of the Greeks. This was equally a complicated process which affected different parts of the Hellenistic world differently. For example, in Egypt the Ptolemaic kingship was quickly assimilated to the Pharaonic tradition (§6.3.1.1). Each new ruler was considered a son of the sun god Re and given a variety of traditional Egyptian names and titles. In the hieroglyphic inscriptions no distinction is

made between the Ptolemies and the native Egyptian Pharaohs of previous generations. Yet the dealings of the Ptolemies with other states and with Greek cities was done in the normal Greek way, and the court was typically Hellenistic. Although the Seleucids perhaps did not have the same pressure to conform to Oriental models, they were treated as heirs of Nebuchadnezzar in the inscriptions and played their part in the traditional Babylonian ceremonies of kingship (§6.3.1.2). Hellenistic kingship as an institution owes much to the earlier Near Eastern monarchies and the traditions which had developed in relation to them.

The differences between the Ptolemaic and Seleucid empires and modes of administration were also reflected in the specific way in which the Jewish state was treated. The pressures of adapting to Greek ways were somewhat general and diffuse under the Ptolemies. Since the Seleucids put a good deal of emphasis on Greek foundations, however, there was now reason to do something more specific and more communal. Instead of just individuals making decisions to conform to Greek culture, it would be advantageous to make a collective decision which would affect a large group of Jews in one specific action, viz., for the Judean capital to elect to become a Greek foundation. This would not be a decision of an individual for the advantage of himself and his family alone but of a governing body (or national leader) to take a decision with consequences for a large group of people or even the entire nation. This was precisely what happened after a quarter century of Seleucid rule in Judaea.

The life of the average Near Eastern person was not strikingly affected by the coming of the Greeks. The poor peasant continued to work the land, only noting that he had a new landlord or had to pay taxes to a new regime. Yet in stating this, one must not forget that the day-to-day life of the bulk of the population in the Near East probably changed little in the five millennia between 3000 BCE and 1900 CE. The coming of the Greeks did not radically change their lives – but neither did the coming of the Assyrians, the Persians, the Romans, the Arabs, the Turks or the British. On the other hand, there were constant reminders of the new culture, most obviously in the language of administration and commerce. Certainly, anyone who wished to engage in trade would probably find it to their advantage to gain some acquaintance with Greek, and those who could afford it would be under pressure to provide some sort of Greek education for their offspring. Yet the native languages continued to be used in administration, and most people could get by quite well with little or no knowledge of Greek.

As an analogy, one might consider the Anglicization of India in the nineteenth century or the Westernization of Japan in the post-World War II era. Anglo-India was very much a complex synthesis of the two cultures, with administration and communication dominated by English culture and language, but the life of the ordinary Indian continuing much as it had been. Also, the influence worked both ways. Englishmen who lived in India soon adopted a way of life and cultural tradition which was often quite

different from that in Great Britain, and they came to occupy a sphere which was neither that of the average Indian nor of that of the home country. The reverse influence of India on Britain was less pronounced but significant, especially in such spheres as food and linguistic borrowing. One might compare modern India in which English is widely used, is generally the language of the bureaucracy (despite moves to oust it in favour of Hindi), and is spoken by many educated Indians. Yet the number of English-speakers has recently been estimated at the astonishing low figure of only 3 per cent. Similarly, the modern Japanese businessman is very Western in dress and mode of life when abroad, with English the most likely means of communication. Yet his conduct in the domestic sphere may in many ways be little different from that of 50 or 100 years ago (as Japanese feminists have complained). Japan has become very Westernized, but one could hardly conclude that the native customs and culture have been ousted or submerged.

Thus, the terms 'Hellenize/Hellenization/Hellenism' can refer to more than one thing. First is the general situation after Alexander. Much remained the same, at least for the time being, but there was a qualitative change overall. Greece, Asia Minor, Egypt and Mesopotamia now all fell under the rubric 'Hellenistic' – they made up the *Hellenistic world*. All Eastern peoples, the Jews included, were a part of this world.

Second is the cultural phenomenon, with its complex set of cultural elements derived from both Greek and Near Eastern sources. It was neither 'Greek' nor 'Oriental', but nor was it homogenized. There were some *loci* (regions, social and economic classes, institutions) which were almost purely Greek and others which remained unadulteratedly native, and there were mixtures of various sorts. However, the balance of the different elements and their relationships were not static but constantly changing and developing. Thus, Hellenistic culture can be adequately described only by recognizing it as a *process*. From this point of view, the Jews were Hellenized. There is no indication that the Jews were different from the other peoples within this world both in adopting certain Greek elements and practices and yet also preserving their own cultural heritage.

Third, there is the question of the individual, the extent to which specific Greek practices were adopted or conformed to. The Hellenistic world included far more than just the culture of classical Greece. But one could be said to be 'Hellenized' if an effort was made to adhere to Greek ideals and customs. From this point of view, individual Orientals – including individual Jews – might be more Hellenized than others. To illustrate this (including not only the Jews but other native peoples, we have an anecdote ascribed to Clearchus of Soli (said to be a pupil of Aristotle) in which Aristotle describes an encounter with a Jew in Asia Minor:

'Well,' he [Aristotle] replied, 'the man was a Jew of Coele-Syria. These people are descended from the Indian philosophers. The philosophers, they say, are in India called Calani, in Syria by the territorial name of Jews; for the district which they

inhabit is known as Judaea. Their city has a remarkably odd name; they call it Hierusaleme. Now this man, who was entertained by a large circle of friends and was on his way down from the interior to the coast, not only spoke Greek, but had the soul of a Greek.' (*De somno*, *apud* Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.22 §§179–80)

One was a Greek who spoke the language and had the 'Greek soul'. It had ceased to be a matter purely of descent.

This means that, on the one hand, Hellenization was a centuries-long process in which all were engaged and from which no one escaped; therefore, all peoples of the Near East, the Jews included, were part of the Hellenistic world, were included in this process, and were from this point of view Hellenized. On the other hand, one could also speak of degrees of Hellenization in the sense of how far one went in consciously imitating and adopting Greek ways. From such a perspective it would be legitimate to talk of a particular individual as being 'more Hellenized' or 'less Hellenized' than another and Hellenization in this sense represents a spectrum encompassing many shades of Greek influence from the limited to the intense. This means that it is important to make clear what is being referred to in each context, though many writers on the subject fail to make such distinctions and talk as if it were all or nothing – as if someone was Hellenized or was not.

6.5.2 *The Jews in Particular*

Although there are many points to be debated in current study, Hengel's dictum is becoming more and more accepted: one can no longer talk of Judaism versus Hellenism nor of Palestinian versus Hellenistic Judaism. To do so is to create an artificial binary opposition and to reduce an enormously complex picture to stark, unshaded black and white. It also treats a lengthy process as if it were a single undifferentiated event – as if conception, pregnancy, birth, childhood and adulthood could be simultaneous. At the risk of repeating points made in the previous section, the following points relate to the Jews specifically (further discussion of some of the points, as well as details of the examples, will be found in *HJJSTP* 3):

First, Hellenism was a culture whereas Judaism was a religion. Religion is, naturally, a cultural element, but the argument being made is that to counterpose the two is an illegitimate attempt to correlate two separate things. The point at issue is that many aspects of Hellenistic culture were irrelevant to Jewish religious views. Other aspects were viewed as irrelevant by some Jews but highly subversive by others. And from any point of view, certain aspects of Hellenistic culture, especially those in the religious sphere, had the potential to bring about major transformations of Judaism. The stark dichotomy of 'Hellenizers' and 'Judaizers' of 1 Maccabees has been used too simplistically and thus has caused gross distortion (see *HJJSTP* 3). It assumes a narrow, prejudicial definition of what it means to be a loyal Jew with no allowance

made for those of a different opinion. It is as if, to take a modern analogy, the only form of Judaism allowed to be 'Jewish' was Orthodox Judaism. This may indeed be the view of some Orthodox Jews, but it is hardly the perspective of Conservative, Reform, Liberal, Karaite, Falasha and other forms of Judaism. It is not the job of the historian to take sides or adopt the denominational prejudice of the sources.

Secondly, those called 'Judaizers' (or, misleadingly, 'orthodox' in some modern works) were not totally opposed to all aspects of Hellenistic culture. What they opposed were certain things affecting their religion, though this opposition sometimes used – or reacted to – cultural symbols as a means of expressing their loyalty to a particular form of Judaism. One might compare a common reaction among 'nativistic movements' in which overt elements of the colonial culture are attacked even though much has been absorbed without even recognizing it (§6.3.3).

Thirdly, the attitudes of those called 'Judaizers' seem to have covered a wide spectrum, including the Hasidim, the Maccabees, those who refused to defend themselves against their enemies, the partisans of Onias, and those who wrote Daniel 7–12; the same is true of the so-called 'Hellenizers'. As far as we know, none of them rejected the label 'Jew', even Menelaus and his followers whom many would regard as the most extreme of the Hellenizers. Nevertheless, to be 'Hellenized' did not mean to cease to be a Jew. Take for example Philo of Alexandria (see *HJJSTP* 4). Here was a man with a good Greek education, who wrote and thought in the Greek language (probably knowing no Hebrew: Grabbe 1988a), and lived a life which in many daily habits did not differ from the Greek citizens of Alexandria, yet who considered himself nothing less than a loyal and pious Jew. Or we might consider the message of the *Letter of Aristeas* which is that Jews can be a part of the Hellenistic world without necessarily compromising their Judaism. A final example is the Jason who became high priest; he evidently considered himself a full and faithful Jew, yet he was the one who obtained permission for Jerusalem to become a Greek foundation. The fact that some Jews may have judged him an apostate is irrelevant to the question of his own self-designation or Jewish identity.

Fourthly, the native cultures continued to thrive to a greater or lesser extent all over the Near East, not just in Judaea. Greek remained a minority language and did not displace the many local languages nor the old *lingua franca* of Aramaic (§6.3.2.2). Hellenization as a process – not just a static culture – continued with the coming of the Romans and the growth of their empire.

Fifthly, it is indeed true that Jews were unique and did not lose their identity – a fact with which some writers on the subject seem obsessed

– but one could also make the same statement about many of the native peoples. Each ethnic group was unique in its own way and was just as attached to its own identity, culture, native language and traditions as the Jews. This also in many cases included particular religious cults which were as important to them as Yahwism was to the Jews. One can readily accept the Hellenization of the Jews without denying their uniqueness, loyalty to religion, careful maintenance of tradition and custom, or continual contribution to Hebrew and Aramaic literature.

Sixthly, in accommodating to Hellenistic culture the Jews always maintained one area which could not be compromised without affecting their Judaism, that of religion. The Jews alone in the Graeco-Roman world refused honour to gods, shrines and cults other than their own. Thus, even those Jews who were most at home in the Hellenistic world, such as Philo or the author of the *Letter of Aristeas*, still found themselves marked out – and marked off – by this fact. For the vast majority, this was the final barrier which could not be crossed; we know of only a handful of examples from antiquity in which Jews abandoned their Judaism as such (§6.4.2). Thus, however Hellenized they might be, observant Jews could never be fully at home in the Greek world.

Chapter 7

ADMINISTRATION

The administration of Judah during the pre-Maccabean period has often been taken for granted, but older views have been recently contested. The goal of this chapter will be to make as much sense of the data about Judah as possible, but in order to do so we need to look at the wider administration in the Ptolemaic and Seleucid empires.

7.1 Administration in the Hellenistic Empires

7.1.1 Ptolemaic Government and Administration

AUSTIN ##278, 296–97, 319; BAGNALL-DEROW ##103, 114; R.S. Bagnall (1976) *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt*; B. Bar-Kochva (1976) *The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns*; H. Bengtson (1937) *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit: I*; (1944) *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit: II*; (1952) *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit: III*; W. Clarysse (1976) 'Harmachis, Agent of the Oikonomos: An Archive from the Time of Philopator', *AncSoc* 7: 185–207; (1993) 'Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek', *Chronique d'Égypte* 68: 186–201; J.A.S. Evans (1961) 'A Social and Economic History of an Egyptian Temple in the Greco-Roman Period', *YCS* 17: 143–283; M.R. Falivene (1991) 'Government, Management, Literacy: Aspects of Ptolemaic Administration in the Early Hellenistic Period', *AncSoc* 22: 203–27; R.B. Finnestad (1997) 'Temples of the Ptolemaic and Roman Periods: Ancient Traditions in New Contexts', in B.E. Shafer (ed.), *Temples of Ancient Egypt*: 185–37, 302–17; R.P. Grenfell (1896) *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus*; B.P. Grenfell, A.S. Hunt and J.G. Smyly (eds) (1902) *The Tebtunis Papyri*, Part I; (1933) *The Tebtunis Papyri*, Volume III, Part I; H. Hauben (1987) 'Philocles, King of the Sidonians and General of the Ptolemies', in E. Lipiński (ed.), *Phoenicia and the Eastern Mediterranean*: 413–27; (2004) 'A Phoenician King in the Service of the Ptolemies: Philocles of Sidon Revisited', *AncSoc* 34: 27–44; W. Huß (1994) *Der makedonische König und die ägyptischen Priester*; J. Quaegebeur (1989) 'Phritob comme titre d'un haut fonctionnaire ptolémaïque', *AncSoc* 20: 159–68; A.E. Samuel (1966) 'The Internal Organization of the Nomarch's Bureau in the Third Century B.C.', in *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles*: 213–29; (1970) 'The Greek Element in the Ptolemaic Bureaucracy', in D.H. Samuel (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology*: 443–53; S. Sauneron (2000) *The Priests of Ancient Egypt*; J.D. Thomas (1975) *The*

epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt: Part 1 The Ptolemaic epistrategos; (1978) 'Aspects of the Ptolemaic Civil Service: The Dioiketes and the Nomarch', in H. Maehler and V.M. Strocka (eds), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten*: 187–94; (1982) *The epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt: Part 2 The Roman epistrategos*; **D.J. Thompson** (1984a) 'The Idumaeans of Memphis and the Ptolemaic *Politeumata*', in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*: 3: 1069–75; (1989) *Memphis under the Ptolemies*; (1990) 'The High Priests of Memphis under Ptolemaic Rule', in M. Beard and J. North (eds), *Pagan Priest: Religion and Power in the Ancient World*: 95–116; **C.B. Welles** (1949) 'The Ptolemaic Administration in Egypt', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 3: 21–47.

A good summary of the Ptolemaic administration in Egypt is given by Bagnall (1976: 3–10). Egypt had been divided into nomes from an early period, and the nome continued to be the major administrative unit under the Ptolemies. Three officials of equal rank, answering directly to the financial minister (*dioikētēs*) in Alexandria, were put over each nome: the nomarch, who had responsibility for agricultural production; the *oikonomos*, responsible for finances; and the royal scribe (*basilikos grammateus*) who supervised the keeping of records. At first the military was an institution alongside the administrative but separate from it. It was generally organized around military colonies (*klēroi*) in the local areas, the settlers of which not only served in external wars but also carried out the necessary internal policing (cf. Bar-Kochva 1976: 20–47). Thus, in each nome there was a general (*stratēgos*) with military authority in addition to the three civil officials mentioned above. With time, however, the military commander began to take a greater hand in affairs of the nome and became the dominant official in it, even displacing the nomarch. This was probably not only because of his policing powers but also because there was originally no single civic official in charge.

We have most information about Egypt proper (Bagnall 1976: 3–5). Especially important as primary sources are the *Revenue Laws* of Ptolemy II (Grenfell 1896; for a recent English translation see BAGNALL-DEROW #114; AUSTIN ##296–97), *P. Tebtunis* 8 (Grenfell, Hunt and Smyly [eds] 1902: 66–69; AUSTIN #278), and *P. Tebtunis* 703 (Hunt and Smyly [eds] 1933: 66–102; BAGNALL-DEROW #103; AUSTIN #319). It has been argued that the Ptolemies had largely continued the system of Pharaonic rule (Welles 1949), though this is a complicated issue. We get some inkling of the various offices in a letter dated to about the middle of the second century BCE (my translation from the text in Manning 2003: 137):

To the *stratēgo[s]* of the Heracleopolite nome and the garrison commander and [t]he chief (*epistatēs*) [of p]olice and the n[omarch and the one over the revenue an]d the *oikonomos* [a]nd the royal scr[ibe (*basilikos grammateus*) and the controller (*antigraphus*) and the toparchs] and toparchy scri[bes] and village heads (*kōmarchai*) an[d village scribes (*kōmogrammateis*) and the village chief of poli]ce (*archiphylakitēs*) and police [a]nd farmers and [o]ther[s] engaged in royal business ...] (*P. Gen. inv.* 402 A + B, 1–5 = *P. Gen.* 111 132)

This list of officials to whom this letter was sent gives some idea of the main offices at various levels. A simplified model contains three levels (Thomas 1978: 188–89; Manning 2003: 137). At the very top (reporting to the king, of course) was the διοικητής (finance minister) who was responsible for much of the administration of the country because the arrangements were primarily aimed at securing sufficient and regular revenue. Over the *chora* (countryside) of Egypt was the ἐπιστράτηγος, an office that has been much debated (Thomas 1975; 1982). There was also the ὑπομνηματογράφος (recorder) and the ἐπιστολογράφος (registrar). At the next level, the basis of the administration was the nome. The country was divided up into forty-odd nomes. As already noted, each nome had a nomarch who was responsible for basic administration. Alongside him was the οἰκονόμος who had responsibility for finances. The third administrative officer in each nome was the βασιλικὸς γραμματεὺς (royal scribe). Because these were originally equal in authority, it gave a means of providing a check on the authority of each officer.

The στρατηγός, who originally held a military post, came to take on increased power and responsibility in the civic area until he became the chief administrator in each nome, a development that had begun already in the third century. At the bottom was the village administration, with the κωμάρχης (village headman) and the κωμογραμματεὺς (village scribe). Each of the higher officers had various officials reporting to him. For example, under the *dioikētēs* were ὑποδιοικηταί or subordinate finance officers and at the ‘ground level’ were other specialized officials, such as the γεννηματοφύλακες (guards over the threshing) and the σιτολόγοι (guards over the royal stored grain). In order to assure its revenues the government made use of tax-farmers; on these see §8.2.

One might think that we could simply transfer this system to Palestine, yet there are several reasons why one cannot. First, one of the indelible points arising out of Bagnall’s study (1976) is the variety of administrative arrangements under the Ptolemies, especially in the Ptolemaic possessions outside Egypt. For example, Philocles, king of Sidon, held a Ptolemaic office (Hauben 1987; 2004). A second reason has already been hinted at: the above system in Egypt is overly simplified. In fact, a rather less tidy and more complicated set of arrangements existed, at least part of the time and over at least part of Egypt. For example, it has been debated whether there was more than one *dioikētēs*, since some have interpreted one text (*SB* 7377) as showing several *dioikētai* over Egypt at the same time (Thomas 1978). If so, the suggestion that it was a short-lived set of arrangements is reasonable, but it illustrates our lack of certainty even in a basic area. We also know that not every nome was overseen by a nomarch; in some cases it was a toparch or even sometimes an *oikonomos* (Samuel 1966). Usually the toparch was subordinate to the nomarch but apparently not always. Also, the Thebaid was divided into several nomes, with the nomarch over all of them (Thomas 1978: 192–93). A further complication is that, as noted above, the *stratēgos*

gradually took over most of the powers of the nomarch who was reduced to the level of a minor financial officer by the middle of the second century BCE (Thomas 1978: 194).

A third reason relates to the language and ethnic situation of the bureaucracy. Although Greeks and the Greek language operated at the highest levels of the administration, Egyptians using Greek operated in the middle level, and Demotic was widely used at the lower levels. A number of sources indicate that the Egyptians formed a substantial part of the administrative apparatus already in the early Ptolemaic period. Drawing on the papyri from Hibeh, A.E. Samuel concluded with regard to the early Ptolemaic administration:

Indeed, not only does the opportunity to join seem to have been equal, but the opportunity to rise seems to have been there as well. I see no differentiation in the types of jobs held. Non-Greeks became nomarchs, basilikoi grammateis [royal scribes], and filled a variety of important offices. The ranks of the local bureaucracy seem to have been filled indifferently by Greeks or non-Greeks. (1970: 451)

Many examples can be found of Egyptians in relatively high administrative offices. One example is the *oikonomos* Horos and his assistant Harmachis (Clarysse 1976). Indeed, as M.R. Falivene (1991: 222) points out, Demotic documents suggest that the highest tax officials before Ptolemy II were not Greek. The only requirement for working in the bureaucracy was knowledge of the dominant language, Greek. Even this was not the barrier it might seem, since facility in the language did not necessarily mean fluency. Individuals who held official office had Greek scribes to produce letters in official epistolary style (Clarysse 1976: 206). On the other hand, many Egyptian scribes were fluent in Greek and made few or no mistakes (Clarysse 1993). As D.J. Thompson notes, the 'imposition of conformity on diverse ethnic communities was never an interest of the Ptolemaic state' (1984a: 1074), and although she was speaking specifically of ethnic communities in Egypt itself, how much more was it the case with ethnic communities in the Ptolemaic possessions?

The Lagids, as the Ptolemaic dynasty is often called, were pragmatic and opportunistic. Uniformity was not the aim but arrangements that worked and that provided the revenue expected by the crown. Where previous systems had existed, they might be continued, though possibly with some modification. The pragmatism is well illustrated by the variety of different internal arrangements even in Egypt itself and also by the use of native Egyptians and the Demotic language in the administration in Egypt.

The discussion so far has not touched on a major feature of the Ptolemaic realm that might be overlooked by exclusive focus on the political sphere. These are the temples, which constituted a major institution throughout Egyptian history. Under Persian rule they were taxed and had many of their privileges removed (see *HJSTP* 1: 209–16). The Ptolemies, however, ruled in

many ways like the earlier Pharaohs, with the temples allowed many privileges (Thompson 1990: esp. 107–10). The most important temple privilege was the power to own their own lands and gain revenue from them and other activities (though paying a tax to the king of roughly 10%). They in fact controlled a good deal of Egypt's land. Later on, though, they were allowed a royal subsidy to support the cultic expenses. The price they paid was the appointment of a royal official or officials in the temple to represent the monarchy's interests, from the time of Ptolemy III. These individuals (*epistatēs* in Greek; *pheritob* in Egyptian [cf. Quaegebeur 1989]) were not outsiders but Egyptians and even priests. These individuals seem to have interfered little with the normal activities of the temple and cult, but putting the temples under the ultimate direction of the financial branch of government was a significant assertion of Ptolemaic control.

The place of the temples in the administration of Egypt is potentially of great importance when we move on to the administration in Judah. Since the state of Judah could be called a 'temple state' (see below on this term), it is likely that the Egyptian government would have been inclined to deal with Judah as they dealt with other temples. The Egyptian temples occupied a major place in society (Finnestad 1997: 227–33). The king himself was the chief priest of Egypt and over all the temples, a role that he combined with his duties as ruler of the state. In the individual Egyptian temples, the high priest had an analogous role to that of the king, being head of the temple administration. Temple administration encompassed much more than maintenance of the cult and worship places. Egyptian temples functioned as key economic and civic institutions in society, administering great tracts of land and the associated activities of baking, brewing, manufacturing of wares for daily use, and even the production of goods for wider sale. They were in many ways a state within a state. During this time, as was common in earlier periods, priests often had other professions as well and might hold civic offices, depending on the local tradition (Sauneron 2000; Thompson 1989: 75–77, 206, 246–47). For the high priest in Jerusalem to act as civic as well as religious leader would have raised no eyebrows to those familiar with Egyptian temples.

7.1.2 *Seleucid Government and Administration*

G.G. Aperghis (2004) *The Seleucid Royal Economy*; **H. Bengtson** (1944) *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit: II*; **E.J. Bickerman (Bikerman)** (1938) *Institutions des Séleucides*; **G.M. Cohen** (1978) *The Seleucid Colonies*; **H. Klinkott** (2000) *Die Satrapienregister der Alexander- und Diadochenzeit*; **J. Pastor** (1997) *Land and Economy in Ancient Palestine*; **M. Sartre** (1989) 'Organisation du territoire et pouvoirs locaux dans la Syrie hellénistique et romaine', *Trans* 1: 119–28; **S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt** (1993) *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*.

The Seleucid administrative structure is not as well documented as the Ptolemaic, leaving many questions and differences of interpretation. Two comparisons need to be taken into account, the Achaemenid administration and the Ptolemaic. The Seleucid administration seems to have been heavily based on the Achaemenid, while it is likely to have had points in common with what was happening under the Ptolemies. Naturally, we cannot transfer the Ptolemaic system of Egypt, with its rather different environment, to Seleucid Asia which extended over huge distances and was made up of a wide variety of peoples. On the other hand, the better documented situation in Egypt might help us to understand the Seleucid offices and officials by analogy. Many of the same terms of office are used of the Seleucids as they are of the Ptolemies. The question is whether they meant the same thing; however, we should keep in mind that names of offices and officials were often common Greek vocabulary. Comparison with the Achaemenid system is important because many aspects of it seem to have been continued by the Seleucids.

The Seleucid empire appears to have remained divided into satrapies much as the Persian empire had been, at least under Alexander and the Diadochi (Klintott 2000). The term 'satrap' was evidently not widely used as a Seleucid administrative term, *stratēgos* ('general' or 'governor') apparently being the more normal usage (RC 64, 297). This is true even when the territory was called a 'satrapy'. In Seleucid usage, however, the term 'eparchy' was a widely used term for the main divisions of the empire. The term 'satrapy' was also occasionally used and continued to be found in a few sources, but 'eparchy' seems to have been the more standard usage (Bickerman 1938: 198–203). There is some variation in usage in the Hellenistic sources, but those designated eparchs tended to rule over fairly large territories. Diodorus Siculus (19.95.2; 19.98.1) equates the eparchy with the satrapy; however, elsewhere (19.44.4) he seems to make the eparchy a subdivision of the satrapy. It has been suggested that the Seleucid realm had abolished satrapies and retained only hyparchies in some cases, but this seems unlikely (Aperghis 2004: 280 n. 40). Some new divisions of satrapies under the Seleucids are attested (Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993: 44). Appian states that there were 72 satrapies under Seleucus I (*Syr.* 10.62), but literary writers did not always use terms in their technical sense: perhaps he meant 'hyparchies', though it may be that his information was simply wrong. The number was more like the 20 known from the Achaemenid empire (see the list in Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993: 45; cf. Bengtson 1944: 12–20).

What becomes clear, however, is that the Seleucid (as well as the Ptolemaic) system differed from the Achaemenid system in one important difference: the financial system seems to have been separate from the civil system (Aperghis 2004: 271–73). Unlike Persian administration, where the satrap was responsible for all aspects of administration in his satrapy including collecting taxes and tribute, it is believed that the Seleucid satrap did not have authority over the financial officials: the Seleucid financial

branch of administration reported up the line directly to the king. (The garrison commanders also seem to have reported directly to the king, but this was also the case under the Persians.) At the head of the finances in each satrapy was the *dioikētēs*. Notice the Hefzibah inscription which refers to these officials as if they were at the top of the hierarchy:

(F) To the Great King Antiochos (III) memorandum [from Ptolemy] the *strategos* [and] high priest. I request, King, if you so please, [to write] to [Cleon] and Heliodoros [the] *dioiketai* that as regards the villages which belong to my domain, crown property, and the villages which you registered, no one should be permitted under any pretext to billet himself, nor to bring in others, nor to requisition property, nor to take away peasants. (AUSTIN #193)

The main subdivision of the satrapy was the *hyparchy*, at least in Syro-Palestine, as suggested by the decree of Ptolemy II:

[Col. 1 = left col., lines 1–10] [The possessors of herds shall declare] to the *oikonomos* appointed in each *hyparchy*, within 60 days from the day on which the [ordinance] was published, the taxable and tax-free [livestock] ... and take a receipt. (BAGNALL/DEROW #64)

[Col. 1, line 33 – col. 2 = right col., line 11] By order of the king: If anyone in Syria and Phoenicia has bought a free native person or has seized and held one or acquired one in any other manner – to the *oikonomos* in charge in each *hyparchy* within 20 days from the day of the proclamation of the ordinance. (BAGNALL/DEROW #64)

There seem to have been further divisions of the satrapy and the *hyparchy*, at least in some cases. Some satrapies – not necessarily all – may have had an intermediate level known as *meridarchies*, but the evidence for these is not extensive (e.g., 1 Macc. 10.65). For further on Seleucid administration, especially as it applied to Coele-Syria, see the next section (§7.1.3).

The question of ownership and distribution of land was an important one (Aperghis 2004: 87–113). Some have emphasized the royal possession and control of Ptolemaic territory (e.g., Pastor 1997: 22–26), though recognizing the existence of private property. The problem is that we have no clear picture of the ratio of the two. Certainly the crown controlled a great deal of land, but did it control most of it? Or was private ownership the predominant mode of ownership? Regardless of the answer to this question, the crown certainly made money from the privately owned land, by taxing it, as well as taxing the crops grown by the lessees of the crown lands.

Although the king might be considered the owner of most or all the land, in practice a distinction was made between certain lands thought to be the personal possession of the king and land which was required to pay tribute to his government. When the king made grants of land to cities and temples, however, this might be from either royal land or tributary land. Many new foundations of Greek cities took place, beginning with Alexander and continuing under the Seleucids. No doubt this was for a variety of reasons – strategic, military, commercial, economic (emphasized by Aperghis 2004) –

but over the centuries many old eastern cities became *poleis* and others were founded on virgin sites (cf. §6.3.2.1). The king made many grants of estates to his family, his friends and those high officials who served him well. This was intended as a reward, but it was also usually in the king's interest: he no longer had to look after the land and its workers but he still collected taxes from it.

Finally, a certain number of military settlements are known from the Seleucid realm (Cohen 1978) as well as the Ptolemaic. The military colony was founded as a way of paying off debts to soldiers by grants of land but also to give protection to the local areas in strategic places. It already had a gymnasium and some other aspects of the *polis* apparatus. Many colonies went on to become Greek city foundations, but this was not automatic. Their first job was to provide a military reserve in case it was needed by the king, and many served this function over many generations and even centuries.

7.1.3 Coele-Syria

R.S. Bagnall (1976) *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt*; **H. Bengtson** (1944) *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit II*; (1952) *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit III*; **E.J. Bickerman (Bikerman)** (1938) *Institutions des Séleucides*; (1947) 'La Coelé-Syrie: notes de géographie historique', *RB* 54: 256–68; **G.M. Cohen** (2006) *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa*; **D. Gera** (1998) *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.*; **J.D. Grainger** (1990) *The Cities of Seleukid Syria*; (1991) *Hellenistic Phoenicia*; **M. Hengel** (1974) *Judaism and Hellenism*; **A. Jähne** (1974) 'Die "Syrische Frage"', *Seleukeia in Pierien und die Ptolemäer*, *Klio* 56: 501–19; **M. Rostovtzeff** (1941) *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*; **A. Schalit** (1954) 'Κοίλη Συρία from the Mid-Fourth Century to the Beginning of the Third Century B. C.', *SerHier* 1: 64–77. **V.A. Tcherikover (Tschirikower)** (1927) *Die hellenistischen Städtegründungen von Alexander dem Grossen bis auf die Römerzeit*; (1937) 'Palestine under the Ptolemies (A Contribution to the Study of the Zenon Papyri)', *Mizraim* 4–5: 9–90; (1959) *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*.

7.1.3.1 General Comments

Judah was part of the wider region of Syria or what was called in the third century 'Syria and Phoenicia' (Hefzibah inscription 1.33; 2.14, 19 [§3.2.2]; Polybius 5.87.6; Josephus, *Ant.* 11.2.1 §§21–22), or 'Coele-Syria and Phoenicia' (*OGIS* 230; 1 Esd. 2.13, 19, 22; Josephus, *Ant.* 11.2.1–2 §§25, 27). The name Κοίλη Συρία literally means 'hollow Syria', which has been explained as the result of much of it lying between the two mountain chains of the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon ranges. Yet the suggestion is widely accepted that the name actually derives from Aramaic for 'all Syria' (כל ארץ), which was then assimilated by the Greeks to a more usual pattern for place names (Bickerman 1947; Schalit 1954; Cohen 2006: 37–41). In spite of the epithet, 'Coele-Syria' was generally restricted to southern Syria, that is,

what we call Palestine (though where used without the addition of 'and Phoenicia', it sometimes seems to mean the whole of Syria south of the Eleutheros [Polybius 5.1.5; 5.29.8; 5.48.17; 5.59.2; Cohen 2006: 38]). The place of Judah in Coele-Syria was readily known in geographical writings. According to Strabo, Syria includes the following areas:

We set down as parts of Syria, beginning at Cilicia and Mt. Amanus, both Commagenê and the Seleucis of Syria . . . and then Coelê-Syria, and last, on the seaboard, Phoenicia, and, in the interior, Judaea. Some writers divide Syria as a whole into Coelo-Syrians and Syrians and Phoenicians, and say that four other tribes are mixed up with these, namely, Judaeans, Idumaeans, Gazaeans, and Azotians, and that they are partly farmers, as the Syrians and Coelo-Syrians, and partly merchants, as the Phoenicians. (Strabo 16.2.2, LCL)

Now the whole of the country above the territory of Seleuceia, extending approximately to Aegypt and Arabia, is called Coelê-Syria; but the country marked off by the Libanus and the Antilibanus is called by that name in a special sense. Of the remainder the seaboard from Orthosia to Pelusium is Phoenicia, which is a narrow country and lies flat along the sea, whereas the interior above Phoenicia, as far as the Arabians, between Gaza and Antilibanus, is called Judaea. (Strabo 16.2.21, LCL)

It is often said that the Ptolemies governed Palestine and Syria simply as another region of Egypt; nevertheless, it is debated as to whether there was a governor over the entire area. Tcherikover (1937: 38–39; 1959: 60–61) saw no evidence in the external sources, but others have argued that there was one (Bengtson 1952: 3: 166–71; Rostovtzeff 1941: 1: 344–45). Bagnall (1976: 219) notes that the first possible evidence for such a governor comes after the battle of Raphia (217 BCE) and suggests the likelihood that all major areas except Cyrenae had a *stratēgos* as governor by the reign of Ptolemy IV (222–205 BCE). The actual evidence (as opposed to analogy or speculation) for a governor comes from the late third century and relates to Ptolemy Thrasea. This individual is mentioned as an officer of the Ptolemaic empire (Polybius 5.65.3). At some point he apparently went over to Antiochus III; he was given the position of 'general and high priest of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia' (στρατηγός καὶ ἀρχιερεὺς Συρίας Κοίλας καὶ Φοινίκας [OGIS 230]). This same Ptolemy wrote a memorandum to Antiochus III, containing the same titles (SEG 29.1613; partial English translation at §14.3.3). The assumption seems to be that this was a title he already held under the Ptolemies (cf. Gera 1998: 10–11). Unfortunately, our evidence does not extend so far (Bagnall 1976: 15–16): no direct evidence for a single governor over Syro-Palestine under the Ptolemies has yet appeared in our sources. The silence seems strange if such an important post existed.

In Egypt proper the main division was the nome. The possessions of the Egyptian empire were divided into hyparchies (*hyparchiai*), though, the hyparchy being the primary administrative unit. However, we do not know the size of these (Bagnall 1976: 15); they may have corresponded more or less to the sub-divisions of satrapies (*mēdînôt*) of Persian times (cf. *HJJSTP* 1:

132–34), but this does not necessarily tell us much. It is possible that the entirety of Coele-Syria was regarded as a hyparchy, or it may have been divided into several such. An *oikonomos* was over the finances of a hyparchy (see the decree of Ptolemy II quoted §7.1.2); the function of the hyparch is more difficult to determine. *Hyparchos* meant only ‘subordinate officer’ in general and may not have been the title of the governor over the hyparchy (Bagnall 1976: 14–15).

The toparchy is a geographical designation found here and there in the Hellenistic sources. In the Ptolemaic administrative system the toparchy seems normally to have been a subdivision of the nome. The toparch was thus subordinate to the nomarch. In practice he also took orders from the financial officers such as the *dioikētēs* and the *oikonomos*. Outside Egypt the toparchy seems less clearly defined, sometimes being a subdivision of the eparchy/satrapy. In general, a variety of terms (not always clearly defined or differentiated) seems to be used in the Seleucid empire (Bickerman 1938: 203).

The basic administrative unit was the village (*komē*), however, and the Ptolemaic administration carefully supervised this level as well as the higher ones. Each village had a civil mayor (*komarches*) who was probably a local man, but there were also royal officials. As the Rainer papyrus of Ptolemy II’s decree indicates (quoted in §7.1.2), tax farming and other royal supervision was carried out at the village level as well as higher up. There were government officials in every city and village, so that the Egyptian government did not lack the means of control and supervision down to the lowest level. Thus, although it is not clear that there was a regional governor between Alexandria and the individual towns and villages as there was under the Persians, a financial minister (*oikonomos* [Rainer papyrus]) was responsible for overseeing the collection of revenues for the region. According to M. Hengel, if there was a regional administrative centre, it was probably in Akko (Hengel 1974: 1: 20), but evidence is lacking. The Zenon papyri do show a considerable amount of central administration being done from Alexandria, which suggests that – at least for certain things – Palestine was viewed merely as a part of Egypt and administered more or less as if it were another nome.

Whatever the theoretical point of view, the inhabitants of Palestine were not accustomed to unquestioning subservience as were the natives of Egypt (Tcherikover 1937: 54–57). To the masses of Egypt the Ptolemies were just more pharaohs to be served and obeyed, but Syria and Palestine were made up of different peoples with a variety of traditions and national aims. The Ptolemies were not able to carry out high-handedly anything they wished but had to make adjustments in their administrative policy to avoid alienating the people and creating serious opposition within their own borders. The coastal cities of both Phoenicia and Palestine had been traditionally under Phoenician control; under the Ptolemies they were allowed for the most part to incorporate as Greek foundations and keep an outward form of their historical semi-independence. The local rulers, princes and sheiks were also recognized and enlisted as allies of the administration. Yet they could still

sometimes be unruly and evidently had to be dealt with much more carefully than native Egyptians would have been.

The borders of the region are known in general, partly because they are mostly natural; however, the northern boundary separating the Ptolemaic from the Seleucid realm is not anywhere described in detail and may have shifted throughout the third century (Tcherikover 1937: 32–36; 1959: 423 n. 36; *GLAJJ* 1: 14 n. 2). Syria was bounded on the west by Egypt and the Mediterranean, on the south by desert and Egypt, on the east by the desert and (further north) the Anti-Lebanon mountains. The northern boundary of Syria was traditionally seen as the Taurus mountains (Strabo 16.2.2, quoted above; Cohen 2006: 22), but since northern Syria was occupied by both the Ptolemies and Seleucids, it remains to determine the actual frontier between the two. As just noted, the boundary may have moved around during Ptolemaic occupation of the region, but the frontier between Ptolemaic and Seleucid Syria seems generally to have been the Eleutherus river (Cohen 2006: 24).

Seleucus I evidently built Apamea as a defensive city across the main route from the Ptolemaic realm north to Seleucid cities such as Antioch (Grainger 1990: 58–59). The area of the Orontes was a major Seleucid region, with the cities of Seleucia-in-Pieria, Antioch and probably Apameia and Laodicea-by-the-Sea all founded not long after the battle of Ipsus in 301 BCE (Cohen 2006: 24). On the Ptolemaic side, the main defence sites were probably the fortresses of Gerrha (Chalchis) and Brochi set in a narrow pass between the Lebanon and Anti-Lebanon mountains (Polybius 5.46.1–4). The countryside in between appears to have been left unsettled as a ‘no-man’s land’ between the two realms (Grainger 1990: 59), but it also left open the possibility for the border to shift as one king or the other attempted to move north or south across the border.

The Zenon papyri give a picture of a region at peace under Ptolemaic rule. Cities in different parts of Coele-Syria are mentioned: on the coast, Joppa and Ptolemais (*PSI* 4 406 = DURAND #27); in Idumaea, Marisa and Adoreos (*PCZ* I 59006 = DURAND #9; *PCZ* I 59015 = DURAND #42; *PCZ* IV 59537 = DURAND #43); in Judah, Jerusalem and Jericho (*PCZ* I 59004 = DURAND #4); in southern Syria, Hauran (*PSI* IV 406 = DURAND #27; *PCZ* I 59008 = DURAND #16) and Damascus (*PCZ* I 59006 = DURAND #9); in Transjordan, the *Birta* (*CPJ* 1.1.3), which may be either ‘Iraq al-Amir or Ammon (cf. §2.1.30). The region (hyparchy?) of Ammonitis is mentioned (*PCZ* I 59003 = DURAND #3), as is the Galilee (*P. Col. Zen.* 2.18, 22 = DURAND #17), and even Syria itself (*PSI* IV 324 = DURAND #33; *PSI* IV 325 = DURAND #34).

7.1.3.2 *The Galilee, Samaria and Idumaea*

- J.R. Bartlett** (1999) ‘Edomites and Idumaeans’, *PEQ* 131: 102–14; **A.M. Berlin** (1997) ‘Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period’, *BA* 60: 2–51; **P. Bienkowski and L. Sedman** (2001) ‘Busayra and Judah: Stylistic Parallels in the

Material Culture', in A. Mazar (ed.), *Studies in the Archaeology of the Iron Age in Israel and Jordan*: 310–25; **S. Dar** (1986) *Landscape and Pattern: An Archaeological Survey of Samaria, 800 B.C.E.–636 C.E.*; **E. Eshel** (2007) 'The Onomasticon of Mareshah in the Persian and Hellenistic Periods', in Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers, and Rainer Albertz (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*: 145–56; **S. Freyne** (1980) *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian: A Study of Second Temple Judaism*; **A. Kloner** (forthcoming) 'The Introduction of the Greek Language and Culture in the Third Century BCE', in L.L. Grabbe and O. Lipschits (eds), *Judah in Transition*; **A. Kloner** (ed.) (2003) *Maresha Excavations Final Report I: Subterranean Complexes 21, 44, 70*; **A. Kloner, E. Eshel and H. Korzakova** (forthcoming) *Maresha Excavations Finds, Report II: Epigraphy*; **Y. Magen** (2007) 'The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim in Light of the Archaeological Evidence', in O. Lipschits et al. (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.*: 157–211; **Y. Magen, H. Misgav and L. Tsfania** (2004) *Mount Gerizim Excavations: vol. I, The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions*; **U. Rappaport** (1969) 'Les Iduméens en Egypte', *Revue de philologie, d'histoire et de littératures anciennes* 43: 73–82; **D.J. Thompson** (1984a) 'The Idumaeans of Memphis and the Ptolemaic Politeumata', in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*: III, 1069–75.

We have only episodic information about this region during the early Hellenistic period. We occasionally hear of armies marching through the area, usually to fight further north, in the vicinity of the border between the Ptolemaic and Seleucid realms (until the Seleucid takeover of the region, that is; see the survey in §§12.2; 13.2; 14.2). After its destruction and resettlement by Alexander (§12.2), Samaria (along with several other major cities) was destroyed by Ptolemy I in 312 BCE when he abandoned Syro-Palestine to Antigonos (Diodorus 19.93.7). A century later in 218 BCE Antiochus III stationed a garrison in the region of Samaria to protect the areas conquered (Polybius 5.71.11). He of course had to abandon the region after Raphia, but in 200 BCE he took the area on a permanent basis, the city of Samaria being one of the cities explicitly mentioned as being occupied (Polybius 16.39.3).

Archaeology suggests, however, that life continued on much as it had in previous centuries. The population in northern Palestine in both the Persian and early Hellenistic periods was sparse (Berlin 1997: 12). Nevertheless, this was a prime agricultural area, and the intensity of agrarian settlement of the region increased considerably in the early Hellenistic period, probably at the beginning of Seleucid rule but possibly not until the Hasmonaeans (*NEAEHL* 4: 1317). From the material evidence in Shechem the people of the region were mainly self-sufficient, making their own pottery and other instruments, with little indication of imports or even local industry (Berlin 1997: 10).

It has been argued that a large central section of Samaria was royal land, 'the Mountain of the King' (Dar and Applebaum in Dar 1986: 88–125, 257–69). The case is partially made but is hampered by the use of sources that are widely scattered in time and knowledge of the situation in Palestine; for

example, there might be a memory in late rabbinic literature (to which Applebaum appeals), but the data are hardly likely to be reliable or of good quality, especially such sources as the medieval scholia to the *Megillat Ta'anit* (cf. *JCH* 380). Thus, Applebaum's reconstruction of the territory of the 'King's Mountain' has to be taken with a grain of salt, though the material evidence of the field-towers is well documented and perhaps the strongest support for the hypothesis.

The cult site of Gerizim is an aspect of Samaria but should not be exaggerated: we should not assume that all those living in Samaria looked to it as their religious centre nor that civic leaders of Samaria were members of the Samaritan religious community. (Discussion of the Samaritan religion at Gerizim in the Hellenistic period will be given in a future volume of *HJJSTP*.) The first of five volumes publishing the results of excavations on Gerizim, on the inscriptions, has appeared (Magen, Misgav and Tsfania 2004). Although a certain presumption that these relate to the cult site of Gerizim is justified, the inscriptions themselves are often those typical of penitents and seekers after divine favour in various places and periods in the ancient Near East. They employ several different scripts, including Aramaic, Neo-Hebrew and Samaritan.

The question of Idumaea in relation to ancient Edom has been surprisingly controversial in recent years. The term 'Idumaea' is, of course, only the (Latinized) Greek form of 'Edom' (*Idumaia*). The original territory of Edom is almost universally agreed to have been the area east and south-east of the southern end of the Dead Sea. There has also been wide consensus that the Edomites migrated in the seventh to sixth century, or possibly even later, into the area of the Negev and Judahite territory southwest of the Dead Sea, but this has now been challenged. To summarize the points made in *HJJSTP* 1 (52–53; 165), it seems likely that there was some transfer of population. Although the critics are no doubt right that the matter is more complicated than usually presented, this region became known as *Idumaea* in Greek sources and was generally assumed to be separate from Judah and the Jews. It looks as if a number of different groups settled in Idumaea (including probably some Jews, as well). The names with the theophoric element 'Qos/Qaus' have usually been taken as an indication of an ethnic Edomite. This conclusion has been queried (Bienkowski in Bienkowski and Sedman 2001: 321), but up to the present, the element Qos/Qaus has been found only in names with an Edomite association.

The most prominent site in Idumaea is that of Maresha (Greek Marisa). The excavations there have given us a wealth of information not available for other sites, which may distort our description to some extent, but it is worth noting. At some point a Sidonian colony was established there. An epitaph reads:

Apollophanes, son of Sesmaios, thirty-three years chief of the Sidonians at

Marise, reputed to be the best and most kin-loving of all those of his time; he died, having lived seventy-four years. (Kloner [ed.] 2003: 23)

Marisa was on Zenon's itinerary in his tour of Coele-Syria in 259 BCE, where it is mentioned in several documents (*PCZ* 59006 = *DURAND* #9). Of particular interest is the incident over slaves purchased from two brothers at Marisa. The slaves subsequently escaped and returned to their former owners who demanded payment to return them (*PCZ* 59015 verso = *DURAND* #42; cf. *PCZ* 59537 = *DURAND* #43). Most of the names of individuals at Marisa addressed in this letter are Greek, but one of the defrauding brothers has the Arabic name of Zaidēlos (the name of the other being of somewhat uncertain origin). It was about the time of Zenon or shortly afterward, apparently, that a Sidonian colony was established at Marisa. The evidence for this is mainly archaeological, in the colourful tombs still preserved there (Kloner [ed.] 2003).

Recent finds at Maresha, which include a great many Aramaic ostraca presumed to be from the region, have been published (discussed in *HJJSTP* 1: 58–60); also, about 70 ostraca have been found in Maresha itself (Kloner, Eshel and Korzakova [forthcoming], summarized in Kloner [forthcoming]; Eshel 2007). According to Kloner, the names in the larger collection of ostraca show a mixed population in Idumaea at this time, with the following statistics: about 32 per cent Arabic names, 27 per cent Idumaeans names, 25 per cent northwest Semitic names, 10 per cent Judahite names and 5 percent Phoenician names. The ostraca from Maresha itself show a similar breakdown, though it must be kept in mind that many Idumaeans may have had Arabic and Nabataean names. These suggest that the Idumaeans had a particular relationship with the Nabataeans (Eshel 2007: 154); on the Nabataeans, see below (§7.1.3.4).

One point of considerable interest is the evidence for Greek language and Greek influence in art and culture in this area. We have evidence from Maresha itself and also Khirbet Zaʿaquqa, a village or farm house with a large tomb about 6km east of Maresha. This includes written material from the end of the fourth century and into the third, provided both by the inscriptions within the tombs and by the finds of coins. All the inscriptions in the burial chambers were written in Greek, none in Aramaic, Edomite or other Semitic languages (Kloner [forthcoming]). At Khirbet Zaʿaquqa about 20 separate graffiti were also found, all in Greek. These contained 33 personal Greek names, as well as one date (the 12th year of Ptolemy II, or c.272 BCE). Kloner notes that this is evidence of a Hellenized population in a rural rather than an urban centre. The names in these inscriptions are also all Greek with no Idumaeans, Arabic or Judahite names. He argues that they should be ascribed to Greek settlers who arrived in the early Hellenistic period, a date supported by the material remains. Kloner has found no evidence that, during the three or four generations the tomb was in use, there was any intermingling with local Semitic groups.

It may be that some Jews always remained living in the area of Idumaea and influenced the Edomites and others who settled there. It certainly seems that there was considerable Jewish influence – from whatever source – long before the activities of Hyrcanus I (discussed in *HJJSTP* 3).

7.1.3.3 Transjordan

J.R. Bartlett (1989) *Edom and the Edomites*; (1999) 'Edomites and Idumaeans', *PEQ* 131: 102–14; **P. Bienkowski** (1995) 'The Edomites: The Archaeological Evidence from Transjordan', in D.V. Edelman (ed.), *You Shall not Abhor an Edomite for he is your Brother*: 41–92; **I. Eph'al** (1982) *The Ancient Arabs*; **D.F. Graf** (1997a) 'Hellenisation and the Decapolis', in idem, *Rome and the Arabian Frontier: from the Nabataeans to the Saracens*: 1–48; (1997b) 'Nabateans', *OEANE* 4: 82–85; **S. Honigman** (2002b) 'Les divers sens de l'éthnique Ἀραβ dans les sources documentaires grecques d'Égypte', *AncSoc* 32: 43–72. **A. Kasher** (1988) *Jews, Idumaeans, and Ancient Arabs*; **B. MacDonald, R. Adams and P. Bienkowski** (eds) (2001) *The Archaeology of Jordan*; **S.T. Parker** (1997) 'Decapolis', *OEANE* 2: 127–30; **J.-P. Rey-Coquais** (1992) 'Decapolis', *ABD* 2: 116–21; **M.-J. Roche** (1994) 'Les débuts de l'implantation nabatéenne à Pétra', *Trans* 8: 35–46; **J. Starcky** (1955) 'The Nabataeans: A Historical Sketch', *BA* 18: 84–106; **R. Wenning** (1987) *Die Nabatäer–Denkmäler und Geschichte*; (1990) 'Das Nabatäerreich: seine archäologischen und historischen Hinterlassenschaften', in H. P. Kuhnen, *Palästina in griechisch-römischer Zeit*: 367–415.

During the Greek period, the Nabataeans became prominent in the old area of Edom, with Petra as their centre (Starcky 1955; Wenning 1987; 1990). They are believed to be an Arab tribe that migrated from the east in the Persian period (Roche 1994; Graf 1997b: 82). The Nabataeans appear once in the Zenon papyri (*PSI* 4: 406 = DURAND #27), the earliest extant Greek source to mention them. They were included among the Arabs (Honigman 2002b). An early episode in the period of the Diodochi in which Antigonos attempted to conquer them is described by Diodorus Siculus (19.94–99) who also gives some ethnographical data on the people. Diodorus says they are one among a number of desert Arab tribes but are much wealthier than the other tribes, though numbering only about ten thousand. Reference is made to a very secure 'rock' (πέτρα) which they used as refuge and where they left their families when attending an annual gathering for trade. This 'rock' has 'a single artificial approach' (μῆς ἀναβάσεως χειροποιήτου), a description which has not failed to evoke the site of Petra to many commentators (cf. also Diodorus 2.48.6). A combination of archaeology and literary sources indicates that a settlement existed in Petra about the beginning of the third century that might be called 'semi-sedentary' or 'semi-nomadic', with a combination of pastoralism, cultivation of orchards and trade (Roche 1994).

The northern part of the Transjordanian region was dominated by the towns referred to as the Decapolis (Rey-Coquais 1992; Parker 1997; Graf 1997a). This is often understood to refer to a group of ten towns that were given their independence by Pompey about 65 BCE. We do have lists in

various writers, but they do not always agree. The main towns are Scythopolis (the only town west of the Jordan), Pella, Philadelphia, Gerasa, Gadara, Hippos and Abila. Many scholars now dismiss the view that this collection of towns was organized into some sort of political unit in the time of Pompey. The only thing that unites them is their general Hellenistic character (though this took time to develop, as Graf [1997a] argues). A number of famous Greek literary types are alleged to have come from one of these cities, including the satirist Menippus, the poet Meleager, and the philosophers Philodemus (Epicurean), Oenomaos (Cynic) and Antiochus, all from Gadara. Some have suggested that there was a 'ten city' league from the Hellenistic period that served as a precursor, but archaeology has had trouble demonstrating that all these towns existed very early in the Hellenistic period. Since these cities were the main urban areas in northern Jordan in the later Hellenistic and Roman periods, this lent a particular character to this region and also put it on a later collision course with the Hasmonaean state. In the first century CE the Romans appear to have placed a single governor over them.

Otherwise, the main site is 'Iraq al-Amir. This was clearly a key site in the third and early second centuries BCE and is discussed in more detail in §13.3.

7.2 Government and Administration among the Jews

7.2.1 Jews in Egypt, Syria and Asia Minor: The Question of *Politeumata*

J.M.S. Cowey and K. Maresch (eds) (2001) *Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Herakleopolis (144/3–133/2 v. Chr.)* (P. Polit. Iud.); S. Honigman (2002a) 'The Jewish *Politeuma* at Heracleopolis', *SCI* 21: 251–66; (2003) '*Politeumata* and Ethnicity in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt', *AncSoc* 33: 61–102; A. Kasher (1985) *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights*; G. Lüderitz (1994) 'What is the *Politeuma*?' in J.W. van Henten and P.W. van der Horst (eds), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy*: 183–225; K. Maresch and J.M.S. Cowey (2003) '"A Recurrent Inclination to Isolate the Case of the Jews from their Ptolemaic Environment"? Eine Antwort auf Sylvie Honigman', *AncSoc* 22: 307–10; J. Roux and G. Roux (1949) 'Un décret du politeuma des Juifs de Béréniké en Cyrénaïque au Musée Lapidaire de Carpentras', *REG* 62: 281–96; V. A. Tcherikover (1959) *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*; D.J. Thompson (1984a) 'The Idumaeans of Memphis and the Ptolemaic *Politeumata*', in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, Volume Terzo, 1069–75; C. Zuckerman (1985–88) 'Hellenistic *politeumata* and the Jews: A Reconsideration', *SCI* 8/9: 171–85.

In recent decades the conventional interpretation has been to view the various Jewish communities in the diaspora as organized into *politeumata* (Tcherikover 1959; *CPJ* I: 6; Kasher 1985: ix; *JCH* 405–409). Tcherikover states the standard position:

As to the legal basis of Jewish communities in Egypt, there was no need for the Ptolemaic government to establish new principles of legislation, since many other

national groups had a similar legal status. The hellenistic world was accustomed to a political institution called a *politeuma* (πολίτευμα). The term had several meanings, but the most usual was an ethnic group from abroad enjoying certain rights and having its domicile inside a *polis* or country . . . Thus, in the eyes of the Ptolemaic government, in principle there was no difference between a Jewish community and a *politeuma* of Idumaeans or Lykians: the Jewish people fitted excellently into the framework of Hellenistic political law. (*CPJ* 1: p. 6)

Recent study has called this position into question, especially in light of new papyrological data. Until the past decade the only original evidence for a Jewish *politeuma* was the inscription from Berenice in Cyrenaica (Roux and Roux 1949; Zuckerman 1985–88: 179–80; Lüderitz 1994: 210–22). We now possess an important new archive (most of its documents previously unpublished) from the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis (Cowey and Maresch [eds] 2001; see the reviews of Honigman [2002a; 2003] and the reply by Maresch and Cowey 2003).

The Greek term *politeuma* has a variety of meanings. Several of these relate to a political or cultic association in a Greek city (Lüderitz 1994). Less frequently in the sources it refers to an ethnic association, though this is the meaning that has been emphasized in discussions about the Jews:

Though the word is not rare and has a rather broad variety of meanings (e.g. ‘political action’, ‘civic right’, ‘state’, ‘government’), it has also been used as a technical term to denote groups of people with various forms of organization. As a terminus technicus, however, *πολίτευμα* is not very common . . . It can stand for an institution within the political organisation of a Greek polis as well as for other groups of people – for example an organisation of aliens residing in a foreign city. (Lüderitz 1994: 183)

In the light of this new information, several points can be made in order to correct earlier views on the subject:

- *Politeuma* seems to be only one of a number of terms for voluntary associations, such as *sunodos* (σύνδοξ) and *koinon* (κοινόν) (Lüderitz 1994: 192, 201–202; Zuckerman 1985–88: 177–78). There is no evidence for distinctions between the groups (Lüderitz 1994: 201–204).
- All *politeumata* from the early Ptolemaic period appear to have originated in a military context: they were associations of soldiers (Thompson 1984a: 1072–74; Honigman 2003: 64; cf. Zuckerman 1985–88: 174–77). It should be noted, however, that we also know of associations of soldiers with a common *ethnos* that were not called *politeumata* (Lüderitz 1994: 200).
- No *politeumata* are known to have existed before Ptolemy VI (180–145 BCE: Honigman 2002a: 255; 2003: 67).
- The *politeuma* is governed by a *politarchēs* (πολιτάρχης) and *archontes* (ἄρχοντες, plural of ἄρχων). The *archontes* were elected for a year; the *politarchēs* is best explained as the leading *archōn*,

though how he was chosen and his exact duties are not indicated in the extant papyri (see *P. Polit. Iud.* 1.1; 2.1; 3.1; 6.1).

- The *archontes* had the same powers of jurisdiction as other Ptolemaic officials and also similar responsibilities, parallel to the powers of the commander (*phourarchos*) over the local fortresses (Cowey and Maresch [eds] 2001: 10–14; Honigman 2002a: 252; 2003: 94–95). That is, ‘they were entitled to enforce protective and executive measures, but not to take legal and judicial decisions involving a process of investigation of the kind operated’ by the courts (Honigman 2003: 63). This included jurisdiction over non-Jews as well as Jews: individuals subject to complaint are designated as ‘from the harbour quarter’ (*P. Polit. Iud.* 1.7–8; 10.4; 11.5: ἀπὸ τοῦ ὅρμου), but the petitioners expect the *archontes* to be able to act. An interesting parallel is found in a *politeuma* of Cretans mentioned in *P. Teb.* 32: the officials that it appointed had administrative duties over non-Cretan military settlers (Honigman 2003: 74). It should be noted in the case of the Heracleopolis *politeuma*, though, that none of the petitioners appear to be non-Jews.
- In addition to this one and the one in Berenice in Cyrenaica (see below), we know that there were at least two *politeumata* in the vicinity of Leontopolis (Honigman 2003: 65–66; cf. Lüderitz 1994: 208–10). Nevertheless, it is now clear that many Jews were not part of a *politeuma*; for example, in the Heracleopolis archive a number of Jews in outlying districts appeal to the *archontes* of the *politeuma* for help in enforcing the terms of their contracts (*P. Polit. Iud.* 3; 6; 8).
- Yet there is no indication that Jews had to apply through the *politeuma* for redress (Honigman 2003: 95–96). They had the same legal and administrative channels as other settlers; to appeal to the *archontes* of their local *politeuma* seems to have been mainly a matter of convenience.
- A member of the *politeuma* was called a *politēs* (πολίτης) ‘citizen’ (*P. Polit. Iud.* 1.17). A non-member was an *allophulos* (ἀλλόφυλος) ‘foreigner, outsider’, though it is not clear that this would have been applied to Jewish non-members; if non-members who were Jewish had a specific designation, it has not been preserved.

This brings up the issue of a Jewish *politeuma* in Alexandria. No original documentary sources bear on the question; however, we have the literary reference in *Aristeas* 308–10 which lists various groups present at the reading of the newly translated law, including ‘some from the *politeuma* and the elders of the people’. Several problems present themselves, not all of which have been fully resolved. First, what is the relation of ‘some from the *politeuma*’ to ‘the elders of the people’? A number of commentators have denied that the *politeuma* relates to the Jewish community in Alexandria

(Zuckerman 1985–88: 181–84; Lüderitz 1994: 204–208), but part of the argument seems to hinge on a scepticism toward the existence of a Jewish *politeuma* in Alexandria. In light of the new archive, Honigman (2003: 69) argues that *Aristeas* 310 must now be taken seriously. Her position seems to be that the *politeuma* of the passage is a body within the wider Jewish community, comparable to the *politeuma* in Berenice (which was a smaller body within the wider Jewish community called the *sunagogē* ‘assembly’).

Strabo appears to confirm some of this at a later time when he writes:

In Alexandria a great part of the city has been allocated to this nation. And an ethnarch [ἑθνάρχης] of their own has been installed, who governs the people and adjudicates suits and supervises contracts and ordinances, just as if he were the head of a sovereign state. (Strabo, as quoted in Josephus, *Ant.* 14.7.2 §117)

He does not mention a *politeuma*, but the functions of the ethnarch look somewhat similar to those exercised by the *archontes* in the Heracleopolis archive. The title ‘ethnarch’ (‘ruler over an *ethnos*’) might imply an office with wider jurisdiction than that of a local *archōn* or even *politarchēs*, but the general functions do not appear different in this brief description. The question remains as to why our two main Jewish authors, Philo of Alexandria and Josephus, make no mention of Jewish *politeumata*. Honigman plausibly suggests that to do so would give away their purpose, which was to suggest citizenship of the Greek cities where they resided (2003: 92–93). If Jews were seen to be members of a *politeuma*, though, this argument would be seriously undermined.

Zuckerman (1985–88) and Lüderitz (1994) gave a strong critique of the current view that Jews outside Palestine were organized into self-governing political units called *politeumata* (including Kashner’s view [1985] that it was such political rights that they wanted rather than actual citizenship). As Zuckerman expressed it:

The evidence surveyed presents a typical Ptolemaic *politeuma* as a cult association most commonly following the particular ancestral rite of its members, or just united on a ‘professional’ basis, as in the case of Alexandrian soldiers. There is nothing to indicate that *politeumata* enjoyed any official status, no evidence that they were established by a royal ‘charter’ or with royal approval, or that they possessed any judicial authority over their members or secured them any privileges; in short, no evidence that their status was preferential in any respect to that of other voluntary associations so widespread in Ptolemaic Egypt.

The new documents suggest that this was an important and necessary corrective but that its conclusion perhaps went a bit too far in the other direction. The Jewish *politeuma* was evidently not a vehicle for religious independence or self-governance; on the contrary, it tied the community strongly into Ptolemaic society, although there is no evidence that royal approval was needed to establish such an association (Zuckerman 1985–88: 173; Honigman 2003: 93–94). Religious and cultic freedom was there without forming a *politeuma* (Honigman 2003: 93–94); on the other hand, the officials

of the *politeuma* had a certain juridical authority, even over non-Jews, and could be useful to Jews who were not members of the *politeuma*. As discussed elsewhere (§§6.4; 6.5) the dichotomy of ‘true to the law’ versus assimilation to Greek culture is a false one, and Jews of the *politeuma* had incorporated much Ptolemaic law and convention into the Jewish *patrios nomos* (‘ancestral law’).

7.2.2 The Administration of Judah

G.G. Aperghis (2004) *The Seleukid Royal Economy*; **R.S. Bagnall** (1976) *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt*; **T.R.S. Broughton** (1938) ‘Roman Asia Minor’, in T. Frank (ed.), *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome*: 4: 499–918; (1951) ‘New Evidence on Temple-Estates in Asia Minor’, in P. R. Coleman-Norton et al. (eds), *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson*: 236–50; **V. Ehrenberg** (1969) *The Greek State*; **L. L. Grabbe** (forthcoming b) ‘The Gestalt of the High Priest in the Second Temple Period: An Anthropological Perspective’, in A. Hunt (ed.), *The Priesthood in the Second Temple Period*; **M.H. Hansen** (1999) *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles, and Ideology*; **H. Hauben** (1987) ‘Philocles, King of the Sidonians and General of the Ptolemies’, in E. Lipiński (ed.), *Phoenicia and the Eastern Mediterranean in the First Millennium B.C.*: 413–27; (2004) ‘A Phoenician King in the Service of the Ptolemies: Philocles of Sidon Revisited’, *AncSoc* 34: 27–44; **W. Huß** (1985) *Geschichte der Karthager*; (1994) *Der makedonische König und die ägyptischen Priester*; **A.H.M. Jones** (1940) *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*; **D. Magie** (1950) *Roman Rule in Asia Minor, to the End of the Third Century after Christ*; **J.G. Manning** (2003) *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt*; **O. Mulder** (2003) *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50*; **D. Musti** (1984) ‘Syria and the East’, *CAH* 7/1: 175–220; **P.J. Rhodes** (1972) *The Athenian Boule*; (1986) *The Greek City States: A Source Book*; **D.W. Rooke** (2000) *Zadok’s Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*; **M. Rostovtzeff** (Rostowzew) (1910) *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates*; **S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt** (1993) *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*; **J.C. VanderKam** (2004) *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*; **C. B. Welles** (1949) ‘The Ptolemaic Administration in Egypt’, *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 3: 21–47.

Some aspects of Judah (such as the question of borders) have already been discussed above in connection with Coele-Syria (7.1.3). Here the focus will be on the administration and local government. As noted above, the Syro-Palestinian region seems to have been divided into hyparchies. This suggests that Judah formed a hyparchy within the region. The chances are that the ‘hyparchy’ or province of Judah maintained somewhat the same borders as it had under the Persians (*HJJSTP* 1: 134–40). The question is whether it had a hyparch appointed to govern it. In actual fact, the only officer mentioned in this connection is the *oikonomos* who would have had mainly financial duties. We cannot assume that the Ptolemies appointed a governor over the province any more than that they had appointed one over the whole Syro-Palestinian region. A number of factors need to be considered.

The basic problem is that the sources are silent about administrative officials over Judah. We might assume that the province had a hyparch, an *oikonomos*, and so on separate from the temple. The question is, where do we find any evidence of their existence and activities? It might be that the problem is simply the poverty of our sources, but that seems a rather wilful position to take. The fact is that we have several sources that would be likely to mention administrative officers, especially the decree of Antiochus III (§14.3.2) and the Tobiad romance. The references to the high priest and the silence about other Ptolemaic officers has led to the view – long conventional in scholarship – that the high priest acted as the head and leader of Judah. D. W. Rooke has now questioned this, with the argument that the high priest was ‘an important cultic official, but the major powers of civil administration and government were in the hands of others, whether Ptolemaic officials or Jewish aristocrats’ (2000: 265). Thus, a fresh examination of the question is called for. The following are some of the main points for consideration:

- *The Ptolemies often allowed earlier administrative arrangements to continue.* Although the administration in Egypt is clear in outline (in spite of many questions about detail [§7.1.1]), it is a mistake to transfer that unchanged to the territories outside Egypt proper. Recent study has shown the importance of the local elite for the Ptolemies and their efforts to cultivate, control and make use of it from both an economic (raising revenue) and a political (governing the country) perspective (Manning 2003: 130–33). This includes the temples and priesthood, discussed below in more detail. The Ptolemies took over a system with its roots in ancient Egypt (cf. also Welles 1949). If the Ptolemies were willing to allow – indeed, to make use of – local administrative arrangements and local elites in Egypt itself, how much more in those areas outside Egypt where governance was likely to be more difficult?

As R.S. Bagnall (1976) has shown, a variety of administrative structures obtained in the Ptolemaic possessions elsewhere. These were often based on local arrangements that were allowed to continue from pre-Ptolemaic times. For example, a monarchy was allowed to continue in Sidon as long as the current holder of the throne, who had supported Ptolemy I and II, was alive, though no succession was allowed (Hauben 1987; 2004). Much remains to be determined about Syro-Palestine, but it seems that structures in place under the Persians were often allowed to continue. Although Judah seems to have been a ‘hyparchy’ (§7.1.3.1 above), no hyparch or other governor is mentioned in any of our sources. The province appears to have had an *oikonomos* responsible for finances (§7.1.3.1 above), but that could have been a Jew. Lack of any further reference would suggest that the high priest held the office.

- *Temples were important in Egypt and elsewhere and were respected by*

the Ptolemies; likewise by the Seleucids. The place of the temples in the administration of Egypt is potentially of great importance when we ask about administration in Judah. The Jerusalem temple was very similar to Egyptian temples, with many obvious features in common. It is likely that the Egyptian government would have been inclined to deal with Judah as they dealt with temples inside Egypt. The Ptolemies were cognisant of the power of the priesthood in Egypt and worked hard to keep it on their side, even if this did not always happen (Huß 1994). This gives a *prima facie* argument that temple control, such as in Judah, was permitted to persist as long as it delivered the required tribute. Ptolemaic officials were no doubt appointed to supervise certain aspects of the tax collection, but there is no reason why these could not have been local people, at least in part.

The Seleucids seem to have been no less respectful of temples. In spite of some statements in the past, there are no known examples in which a Seleucid ruler confiscated temple lands; on the contrary, the Seleucid kings actively curried their support, in some cases making donations of lands and other benefits to specific temples (Aperghis 2004: 108). A good example is the Baitokaike temple in northern Syria, to which a king by the name of Antiochus (which one is not known for certain) made a substantial grant:

Having been informed of the power of the god Zeus of Baitokaike, I have decided to grant to him for all time that from which the power of the god is derived, namely the village of Baitokaike, which Demetrios . . . formerly possessed in Tourgona (district) in the satrapy of Apameia, along with everything that goes with it and belongs to it within the existing boundaries, and also the harvests of the current year, so that the revenue from these be expended on the monthly sacrifices and the other things which contribute to the prosperity of the sanctuary by the priest of the sanctuary, as is habitual. And let festivals that are exempt from taxation be held each month. (RC 70; translation from Aperghis 2004: 331)

- *Judah can be compared with other 'temple states' in existence in the Hellenistic period.* A number of sources mention 'temple states'. The term is in quotation marks because the older designation of 'temple state' was probably inaccurate in many or most cases. For example, the argument that the early Sumerian states were 'temple states' is now refuted (Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993: 60). Also, temples in Babylonia were not independent but were attached to cities, as were many temples and temple estates in Asia Minor. It had been argued that many temple estates had been confiscated by the Seleucids, but this now seems incorrect – there is no evidence of any such confiscation (Aperghis 2004: 108; Broughton 1951: 242).

The state of Judah could be called a 'temple state' in the sense

simply that the priests were in charge of civil as well as cultic affairs. There are several analogous entities known from the ancient Near East; that is, we know of several temples that were more or less independent and in which the temple hierarchy was essentially the government of a mini-state (Rostovtzeff 1910: 269–78; Musti 1984: 196–98; Broughton 1938: 4: 641–46, 676–84; 1951; Sherwin-White and Kuhrt 1993: 60–61). Like Greek cities, these temples were under the authority of the king, whatever fictional facade of independence might have been maintained. Yet it was important to the king to keep the temples supportive of the regime. A number of potential ‘temple states’ appear in the sources; unfortunately, most of our information is from the Roman period and for most of them we have little detailed information. The fact that the information is from the Roman period is not a major problem because of evidence of continuity in many cases, but the lack of detail means that we cannot be sure about the specific internal structure. Yet we have some such listed in the sources, one of which is the temple of Zelitiss in Cappadocia:

As for Zelitiss, it has a city Zela, fortified on a mound of Semiramis, with the temple of Anaitis, who is also revered by the Armenians ... The large number of temple-servants and the honours of the priests were, in the time of the kings, of the same type as I have stated before, but at the present time everything is in the power of Pythodoris [the queen of the region]. Many persons had abused and reduced both the multitude of temple-servants and the rest of the resources of the temple ... for in early times the kings governed Zela, not as a city, but as a sacred precinct of the Persian gods, and the priest was the master of the whole thing. It was inhabited by the multitude of temple-servants, and by the priest, who had an abundance of resources; and the sacred territory as well as that of the priest was subject to him and his numerous attendants. Pompey added many provinces to the boundaries of Zelitiss. (Strabo 12.3.37, LCL)

The temple of Ma at Comana in Cappadocia similarly was governed by a powerful priest, with considerable territories (including a central city) in which the inhabitants (more than 6,000) were mostly temple-servants subject to the priest (Strabo 12.2.3). Another appears to have been the temple of Zeus Abrettene at the Comana in Pontus (Strabo 12.8.9). The temple of the Zeus of Olba also had a dynast priest (Strabo 14.5.10). In Syria we have documentation of a donation by a king Antiochus to the sanctuary of Zeus at Baetocaece (Baitokaike) (*RC* 70 = *OGIS* 262). See the quotation and discussion above. Some of these temple estates minted their own coins (Magie 1950: 2: 1019–20 nn. 65 and 66).

The interesting comparison is that the ‘temple state’ of Judah looked very similar to some of those known from Asia Minor and

elsewhere in the Hellenistic and Roman periods. The ‘temple states’ referred to here and there in Books 11–14 of Strabo seem to have had a similar structure: the high priest as dynast, a village or villages that served as economic centres, territory with agricultural land worked by temple-servants who were under the orders of the high priest. Whether the Jerusalem temple owned large amounts of land is a moot point, though it is clear that the high priest and other individual priests possessed land. But the temple had a regular and substantial income from donations and tithes of the people within the state of Judah. Judah apparently had a larger population than any of the ‘temple states’ known from elsewhere, which meant that the Judean high priest had more resources at his disposal and more power.

- *Other administrative arrangements with analogies to those proposed for Judah are attested.*

Our sources for the third and second century BCE agree that a *gerousia* (‘council of elders’, ‘senate’) was important in the leadership of Judah. This is made especially evident in the decree of Antiochus III, who refers to their government which seems to include ‘the senate [*gerousia*], the priests, the scribes of the temple, and the temple-singers’ (on this decree, see below and §14.3.2). This *gerousia*, otherwise often referred to as the Sanhedrin, was an important institution in Judah over many centuries (evidence for its existence is examined at §10.2 below). A *gerousia* was not the traditional governing body for Greek cities in the Hellenistic world. The conventional model followed by the Greek *poleis* was based on that of Athens (Hansen 1999; Rhodes 1986: 96–157; Ehrenberg 1969: 26–102). The constituent parts of city government were the popular assembly of citizens (known as the *ekklēsia*), a group of officials elected annually (the *archons*), and a *boulē* (sometimes called a *sunedrion*, a small council of elected citizens that took care of much day-to-day business and decided what matters were to come before the *ekklēsia* [cf. Rhodes 1972]).

The *gerousia* was traditional only for a few ancient cities: Sparta, Crete and Carthage (cf. Aristotle, *Polit.* 2.6–8 1269a–1273b), as well as the Roman Senate. The governments of these differed from each other. The Spartans had two hereditary kings, but the government was essentially in the hands of the five *ephors* elected each year and the *gerousia* of 28 nobles who advised them. There was also an assembly of citizens over 30 years of age, presided over by the *ephors*, but they could only vote on matters put before them and without discussion. The Cretan government was similar to the Spartan; indeed, Aristotle alleges that the Spartans copied theirs from Crete (*Pol.* 2.7.3–4 1271b–1272a). Perhaps of most interest is the Carthaginian form of government (Huß 1985: 458–66), since the

city originated from an Oriental context. They had a body of 104 magistrates (*archēn*), kings and a *gerousia*, all chosen 'by merit' (*aristindēn*), though exactly how this happened is not clear.

There is evidence that the Jewish high priest also had a *gerousia* at his disposal already in the third century, if not earlier (§10.2). As we shall see (*HJJSTP* 3), when the Jerusalem high priest Jason instituted the Hellenistic reform in 175 BCE, he seems to have continued a pre-existing Jewish body, even if he reconstituted it.

- *Several sources directly confirm the place of the high priest and gerosia.* One of the most important witnesses is Hecataeus of Abdera (§5.2). The attempt to deny Diodorus 40.3 to Hecataeus or to discount his testimony has been refuted. Whatever the difficulties in his account he has several important facts about the Jews that fit the historical situation as we know it. Therefore, his statement about the high priest is important, not by itself, but because of how it fits with other sources of the period. The most significant statement is, 'the Jews never have a king, and authority over the people is regularly vested in whichever priest is regarded as superior to his colleagues in wisdom and virtue' (Diodorus 40.3.5). It is clear in the context that the positions of king and high priest are being equated: instead of a king, they have a high priest; this high priest has 'authority' (προσστασία) over the people. Far from the high priest being confined to cultic matters, he has comparable authority – an analogous position – over the community to that of a king: he is a civil leader whose activities are not restricted to the temple.

When Antiochus III took over Judah, his decree to Ptolemy does not mention a governor over Judah but seems to see the leadership in the *gerousia* (see further at §14.3.2). The absence of the high priest in this list is curious, though there are a number of possible explanations. The essential point is the existence of the *gerousia* as an important administrative institution at this time. The place of the high priest is further indicated by Ben Sira, who was writing about Simon the high priest at a time apparently not long after Palestine passed into Seleucid control. He appears to refer to Simon's repair of damage done during the fight to take Jerusalem from the Ptolemies (on this, see further at §14.3.1). Finally, if VanderKam is correct that the Spartan king Areus wrote to Onias I at the end of the fourth or beginning of the third century BCE, one could conclude 'that a king of a Hellenistic city-state, and Sparta at that, would write to the Jewish high priest shows that the high priest was considered the leading government official in Jerusalem at the time' (2004: 137).

We have less than full information about Judah during the early Hellenistic period and this is quite frustrating. Nevertheless, unlike some other areas of Ptolemaic administration, we are not just making educated guesses. There is

evidence that the high priest was the main administrative figure in Judah and led not only the cultic functions of the temple but also the ‘civic’ administration of the province, at least much of the time. Indeed, it is probably unhelpful to talk about ‘civic administration’ because it is not clear that either the Ptolemies, the Seleucids or the Jews made a distinction between the running of the temple and the running of the province. As argued below (§10.2) a council (‘the Sanhedrin’) existed to support and advise the high priest; there were evidently times when it was more powerful and perhaps even dominated the high priest and times when it was less powerful and perhaps only rubber-stamped the high priest’s decisions. The council may have been in charge – for whatever reason – when Antiochus took Jerusalem from the Ptolemies, but the high priest Simon (II) was apparently providing strong leadership not long afterward. This would not be unusual, since temple administration staff were not replaced by Ptolemaic officials

When it comes to other Ptolemaic officials, we can expect the functions (such as that of *oikonomos*) to have been in place, but the specific arrangements may have differed from those in Egypt (where the administration also had certain variations from nome to nome). At this point, we can only make suggestions based on what we know of the system. But as Aperghis notes, the Seleucid temple supervisor may have functioned in the role of both hyparch and *oikonomos* (2004: 295). The temple personnel were separate from the state officials. It would hardly be surprising if the Ptolemies had appointed the high priest to act in the role of head of the Judaeian hyparchy and also its *oikonomos*, nor would it be strange if the Seleucids had then confirmed him in that role. This would be fully in keeping with all we know about the flexibility of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid administration and the willingness in both cases to continue local arrangements that previously existed. These two administrations should not be reduced to a simplistic system (such as done by Rooke [2000: 251–53]).

7.3 Conclusions

As a part of the Ptolemaic de facto policy of allowing local rulers to occupy positions of authority, the high priest in Jerusalem continued to maintain his nominal headship of the country, giving Judaea a certain amount of self-government as well as religious autonomy. Both the offices of civil and religious head were in the hands of the high priest; however, from an early time he was advised by – and perhaps shared authority with – a council made up of priests and leading individuals (*presbouteroi* ‘elders’) who formed the local aristocracy. This council bears the standard name of *gerousia* (‘council of elders’) in the Greek sources. Exactly when the *gerousia* became important in Judah’s history is not certain, though it may well go back to the Persian period. We know it was significant at the latest by the beginning of the second century because of the decree of Antiochus III.

The importance of the high priest for secular as well as religious oversight is indicated not only by Hecataeus of Abdera (§12.5) but by the actions of the high priest Onias II at the time of Joseph Tobiad (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.4.1 §§157–59), and by the comments of Ben Sira about the high priest Simon (Sir. 50.1–21). Hecataeus does not mention the council, but it is the major point of Antiochus III's decree. This indicates that Judaea at this time was a 'theocracy' or 'temple state', that is, ruled by priests. Although Hecataeus may well represent the views of a certain segment of the priesthood in the late fourth century, this seems to correspond to the picture of both Persian and early Seleucid times, suggesting that no major changes took place during this period of over two centuries. Judah was a priestly state under the Persians and remained so under the Ptolemies.

This does not mean that one cannot expect to find many small changes within this basic framework over the decades. While a Persian governor was in place over Judah during the early and middle Persian period, if not later, it is possible that this office was sometimes held by the high priest himself (*HJJSTP* 1: 148–49). The high priest was apparently responsible for handing over certain tribute (*Ant.* 12.4.1 §§157–59). Although Josephus' account makes it sound almost as if this was a tax on the private wealth of the high priest, it seems more likely that this payment was from public funds or rather collected taxes of one sort or another. Whatever the exact form of the local tax administrators, there was evidently still an overall payment of tribute for the country for which the high priest had the responsibility of collection. It may be that Joseph Tobiad was able to have some of the high priest's functions transferred to himself, but this would only show that the precise functions of the high priest varied at times while his basic position as head of Judaea remained. The situation under the later high priests suggests that any powers removed had reverted to him in the meantime.

Chapter 8

SOCIETY AND DAILY LIFE

As with other chapters in the present study, we know a fair amount about Jews in Egypt but little about those in Judah itself.

8.1 Introduction

W. Clarysse (1994) 'Jews in Trikomia', in A. Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists*: 193–203; **J.M.S. Cowey and K. Maresch** (eds) (2001) *Urkunden des Polituma der Juden von Herakleopolis*; **S. Honigman** (2004) 'Abraham in Egypt: Hebrew and Jewish-Aramaic Names in Egypt and Judaea in Hellenistic and Early Roman Times', *ZPE* 146: 279–97; **W. Horbury and D. Noy** (1992) *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt*; **C. Kuhs** (1996) *Das Dor Samareia im griechisch-römischen Ägypten: eine papyrologische Untersuchung*; **N. Lewis** (1986) *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt: Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenistic World*; **D.J. Thompson (Crawford)** (1971) *Kerkeosiris: An Egyptian Village in the Ptolemaic Period*; **A.M.F.W. Verhoogt** (1998) *Menches, Komogrammateus of Kerkeosiris: The Doings and Dealings of a Village Scribe in the Late Ptolemaic Period (120–110 B.C.)* (*P. L. Bat.* 29)

Because of the finds of papyri and other documents preserved in the favourable climate of Egypt, we probably know as much about the lives of individual people in Graeco-Roman Egypt as any other place in antiquity. A number of archives have been found that allow us to trace the lives of individuals and even families over several generations. A good example is the study by N. Lewis which gives us a perspective on the lives of eight or so individuals (1986). For example, one of these is the village scribe Menkhes for whom we have a whole archive of about 40 Greek and Demotic documents that allows us to reconstruct his life over a decade, from about 120 to 110 BCE (Verhoogt 1998; Lewis 1986: 104–23; Thompson 1971).

Jews are known in Egypt from at least the sixth century BCE at Elephantine in Upper Egypt (*HJJSTP* 1: 54–55, 318–19). The population seems to have increased greatly in the early Hellenistic period, with Jews apparently scattered in a variety of communities across Egypt. Precise figures are naturally impossible, but records from a number of local areas, as well as some literary sources, make it clear that many Jews had made Egypt their

home, probably from the reign of Ptolemy I. According to the *Letter of Aristeas* (4, 12–14), Ptolemy I brought many Jewish captives back to Egypt (see §12.2.2.2). Also, the high priest Ezekias (Hezekiah) is supposed to have decided to emigrate to Egypt and brought many Jews with him from Palestine (*C. Ap.* 1.22 §§187–89). At the same time, Josephus (*Ant.* 12.1.1 §§7, 10) suggests that many Samaritans had settled in Egypt as well. To what extent we can believe these sources, which are not always trustworthy (*Aristeas* is discussed in *HJJSTP* 3; see §4.2 for Josephus; on Ezekias the high priest, see §12.2.2.2), is a major question. But these statements seem to be supported by information from the papyri and other original sources.

We have mention of Jews in a number of papyri and other sources from the Ptolemaic period (some of these later than 200 BCE, of course [see §1.6]). There is a built-in bias in the literary sources: the lower social and economic classes are generally less well represented, and women are less visible than men. Archaeology might help remedy the situation, in that remains of female activities, burials and iconography are often as well preserved in the material culture as anything relating to males, but archaeology is problematic for Egypt proper. It is often in the legal context that women and lower status persons in general are part of the papyrological record (below, §8.3.2).

References to Jews are made in a number of papyri (see the main collection in *CPJ* 1) and inscriptions (Horbury and Noy 1992). In addition to scattered references we have Jewish communities linked to specific places, such as Edfu and Thebes, in Upper Egypt (Honigman 2004: 290–91); Trikomia (Clarysse 1994) Samareia (Kuhns 1996), Heracleopolis (Covey and Maresch [eds] 2001) and Boubastos (*CPJ* 1: 36–37), in Lower Egypt. From literary sources (*Aristeas* 308) we also know of a community in Alexandria – just as one would expect. There were no doubt other communities, and there may well have been Jewish individuals living in non-Jewish communities. There is no way to quantify the number of Jews living in Egypt, but the impression from the extant references is that the size of the population was not insignificant. As will be discussed in the next section (§8.2), a good portion of the Jews in the early Ptolemaic period seem to have been members of military units.

When we ask about the daily lives of Jews, the answer is not necessarily easy to give. The reason is that most documents are legal documents or relate to taxation. The result is a somewhat distorted picture, in which women are seldom mentioned (though they are not infrequent in legal documents) and the only aspect of daily life is that relating to the judicial or administrative system. But we see a number of occupations, and they give us some idea of the variegated types of lives that Jews lived in a multi-cultural society. We have little information on Judah itself, apart from a few sporadic references in the Zenon papyri and a few inscriptions and the like. Archaeology indicates, however, that there was a considerable continuity in daily life from previous centuries (cf. §2.2.3).

8.2 Occupations, Class and Everyday Life

L.H. Feldman (1977) 'Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism* in Retrospect', *JBL* 96: 371–82; **H. Hauben** (1979) 'A Jewish Shipowner in Third-Century Ptolemaic Egypt', *AncSoc* 10: 167–70; **S.B. Pomeroy** (1996) 'Families in Ptolemaic Egypt: Continuity, Change, and Coercion', in R.W. Wallace and E.M. Harris (eds), *Transitions to Empire*: 241–53; **M. Rostovtzeff** (1941) *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*; **D.J. Thompson (Crawford)** (1971) *Kerkeosiris: An Egyptian Village in the Ptolemaic Period*.

In Egypt itself a number of documents refer to Jews. Quite a few of those mentioned were agrarian workers, such as peasants (*CPJ* 1.37; 1.43), vinedressers (*CPJ* 1.13; 1.14; 1.15), field-hands (*CPJ* 1.36), sheep-breeders (*CPJ* 1.38) and owners of vineyards (*CPJ* 1.14; 1.41) and other property (*CPJ* 1.23; 1.47). But a variety of occupations is indicated in the papyri: we have business contractors (*CPJ* 1.24), brick-makers (*CPJ* 1.10), potters (*CPJ* 1.46), guards (*CPJ* 1.12) and even scribes (*CPJ* 1.137). A Jewish witness in a document is identified as a 'policeman' (*CPJ* 1.25). Some Jews are referred to as tax farmers (*CPJ* 1.90; 1.107), which would imply a minimum level of property to back up their bids. We even have reference to Jewish thieves – three Jews who broke into a vineyard and stripped the grapes from a number of vines (*CPJ* 1.21). They were members of a military unit, however, and this might have been a one-off case of drunken vandalism rather than a regular mode of life. Finally, one of the most unusual documents (from the third century) mentions a joint owner of a ship who is Jewish, judging by his name Dositheos (Hauben 1979). He might be the Dositheos son of Drimyllos, known from 3 *Maccabees* (so Hauben; on this individual see below, §6.4.2).

There is clear evidence that some Jews were a part of the military – indeed, this may have been the dominant profession among Jewish immigrants in the early days of Ptolemaic rule. Surprisingly, some modern scholars have denied that Jews could be soldiers (e.g., Feldman [1977: 376] stated that Palestinian Jews could not be mercenaries), yet the data to the contrary are abundant. The Tobias of the Zenon papyri was in charge of a cleruchy of soldiers which included cavalry (τῶν Τουβίου ἱππέων κληρούχος: *PCZ* 59003 = *CPJ* 1), though the actual settlers seem to have been a mixed group and not just Jews. In the papyri there are numerous references to two groups, members of active military units and members of the *epigonē* (ἐπιγονή) or the 'reserves'. Those apparently on active service included several examples from the Zenon papyri. In a deed of renunciation (*CPJ* 1.18) each of the parties is designated as a 'Jew', but one of them is a *dekanikos* in a military unit – probably a sort of cavalry officer (*CPJ* 1.18). Others refer to Jews who are *taktomisthos*, a military rank of some sort, perhaps with paymaster duties (*CPJ* 1.24; perhaps 1.22). One of the witnesses for the payment on a house is an individual named Iasibis, probably a Jewish name (יאִסִּיבִּי ?), who holds the rank of *epistatos* of a hipparchy (Ἰασίβιος ἐπιστάτου ἱππαρχίας), that is, an officer in a detachment of cavalry (*CPJ* 1.27).

We also have information on Jews who occupied a *klēros* or piece of land given to support military settlers. This refers to the general Hellenistic practice of, first, rewarding or paying off veterans but, secondly, of maintaining a military reserve by providing allotments of land to soldiers (Rostovtzeff 1941: 1: 284–87; Thompson 1971: 53–85; *CPJ* 1: pp. 12–13). These were usually in the form of a military colony in the Seleucid realm but might be individual plots in Egypt, though we have evidence of military settlements or ‘cleruchies’ under the Ptolemies (κληρουχίαι or κατοικίαι; the settler’s plot of land was a κλήρος; the individual settler was a κάτοικος). They served not only as a reserve to be drawn on in time of war but also as a local police force; hence, they were often settled in troubled areas as a way of bringing them under control. The Tobias of the Zenon papyri was the head of such a military cleruchy, as noted above. The soldier did not usually farm the plot himself but leased it to a native peasant who worked the land and provided the military family’s income through rents.

In some cases, the size of the land indicates that the individual was an officer. One Jewish settler has a house with courts and attached buildings, suggesting some wealth (*CPJ* 1.23). We have lists of military settlers that include many individuals identified as ‘Jews’, sometimes with plots of land listed and even the taxes on it (*CPJ* 1.29; 1.30; 1.31; 1.32). Other references just speak of individuals who are said to be ‘a Jew of the *epigonē*’, usually a party or sometimes just a witness in a document (*CPJ* 1.19; 1.20; 1.21; 1.23; 1.24; 1.26). Even the three Jewish thieves (noted above) had apparently been positively identified because they were members of the *epigonē*, though we do not know what happened to them (*CPJ* 1.21).

As so often, we have no way of knowing how many Jews served in the military, but it is certainly a part of the social picture. It is also part of the economic picture because the professions as a whole are part of this picture. Just as for any other young Hellenistic man who found he would receive no family property or was tired of following the plough, the military might be a convenient alternative. And, if he served as a veteran and survived, he might receive land as part of a cleruchy settlement and be better off than if he stayed at home and continued the family tradition. This was perhaps one of the small new opportunities available under Greek rule.

When it comes to practising their religion, we have a number of indications, though detailed descriptions are not generally available. The impression is that Jews generally avoided the pagan deities of the Greek and Egyptian communities around them. A few Jews seem to have borne names that had pagan theophoric elements, but for the most part they elected to use ‘neutral’ Greek names or Greek names that translated Hebrew names (see §6.3.2.3 for more details on Jewish names). A list relating to deliveries of bricks suggests that nothing was delivered on the sabbath, suggesting that the day was observed by the brickyard owners (*CPJ* 1.10). There is also clear evidence of synagogues operating as a normal part of the community (*CPJ* 1; §10.3).

For further information on the question of *politeumata* and the organization of the Jewish communities in Egypt, see §7.2.1.

When it comes to Judah itself, we are left with only sporadic data and what can be gleaned from archaeology. The majority of Jews in Palestine were probably engaged in agrarian activity. This had been traditionally the case, including under the Persian empire. Archaeological surveys and excavations indicate that most people continued to live by agriculture of some sort or other in the Hellenistic period as well. The material culture indicates that settlement flourished in the Hellenistic period (§9.4), but no indication of major changes in lifestyle or shift in population from rural to urban or vice versa. The majority of people worked small holdings: growing up, marrying, having children and growing old on the land. The Persian system of tax collection is not very well understood, but one has the impression that the provincial governor was responsible for seeing that sufficient tax was collected. The difference that apparently came about under Ptolemaic rule is that tax collection was supervised by government officials down to the lowest level. In this the local peoples were employed at village level and perhaps even higher to do the work of the ruling powers.

8.3 The Legal Sphere

S. Allam (1991) 'Egyptian Law Courts in Pharaonic and Hellenistic Times', *JEA* 77: 109–27; **J.M.S. Cowey and K. Maresch** (eds) (2001) *Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Herakleopolis* (144/3–133/2 v. Chr.); **P.M. Fraser** (1972) *Ptolemaic Alexandria*; **G. Hölbl** (2001) *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*; **S. Honigman** (2002a) 'The Jewish Politeuma at Heracleopolis', *SCI* 21: 251–66; (2003) 'Politeumata and Ethnicity in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt', *AncSoc* 33: 61–102; **G.R. Hughes and R. Jasnow** (1997) *Oriental Institute Hawara Papyri: Demotic and Greek Texts from an Egyptian Family Archive in the Fayum (Fourth to Third Century B.C.)*; **W. Huß** (2001) *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit*; **M. LeFebvre** (2006) *Collections, Codes, and Torah: The Re-characterization of Israel's Written Law*; **J.G. Manning** (2003) *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt: The Structure of Land Tenure*; **J. Modrzejewski** (1966) 'La règle de droit dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque (Etat des questions et perspectives de recherches)', in *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles*: 125–73; (1975) 'Chrēmatistes et laocrites', in J. Bingen, G. Cambier and G. Nachtergaele (eds), *Le monde grec: Hommages à Claire Préaux*: 699–708; (1995) *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian*; **E. Seidl** (1962) *Ptolemäische Rechtsgeschichte*; **E.G. Turner** (1984) 'Chapter 5: Ptolemaic Egypt', in *CAH* 7/1: 118–74; **H.J. Wolff** (1962) *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer*; (1966) 'Law in Ptolemaic Egypt', in *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles*: 67–77; (1978) *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens in der Zeit der Ptolemaer und des Prinzipats*: 2. Band.

The area of law and jurisprudence is especially important because this is an area where a good deal of information is available, at least for Egypt proper. Legal documents also often give us glimpses of the lives of ordinary people not mirrored in other documents. Women, members of the poorer social

classes and others without great power or influence cannot escape the forensic net.

8.3.1 The Ptolemaic Legal System

In spite of the number of legal and related papyri, the actual system of courts and legal proceedings is imperfectly known, with much inferred from fragmentary statements in the papyri. Treatments that give a full, schematic structure comparable to the modern court system (e.g., LeFebvre 2006: 154–60) are usually going beyond the evidence and ignoring the highly interpretative nature of secondary studies (cf. Fraser 1972: 1: 106–15). The structure of jurisprudence in Egypt was complicated, apparently with more than one system running in parallel (Wolff 1962; Seidl 1962: 69–84; Modrzejewski 1975; 1995: 107–10). Seidl (1962: 69–84) suggested that three systems existed: Greek courts (in the Greek cities such as Alexandria), Egyptian courts (with Egyptian priests as judges) and royal courts. Regardless of this, two separate court systems seem clear for much of Ptolemaic rule to the first century BCE. First was the Egyptian system with the courts known as *laokritai* (λαοκρίται); in theory, they dealt with cases involving Egyptians. Alongside this were the Greek courts *chrēmatistai* (χρηματισταί) handling cases involving Greeks. There seems to have been a certain amount of flexibility, with plaintiffs allowed to decide to which court to appeal in many cases. With the ‘Amnesty Decree’ of Ptolemy VIII in 118 BCE, however, the question of which system dealt with which cases seems to have been defined more explicitly, normally by the language of the documents filed in court:

And they have decreed concerning suits brought by Egyptians against Greeks, viz. by Greeks against Egyptians, or by Egyptians against Greeks, with regard to all categories of people except those cultivating royal land, the workers in government monopolies and the others who are involved with the revenues, that the Egyptians who have made contracts in Greek with Greeks shall give and receive satisfaction before the *chrēmatistai*, while the Greeks who have concluded contracts in Egyptian (i.e. with Egyptians) shall give satisfaction before the *laokritai* in accordance with the laws of the country (i.e., Egyptian laws). The suits of Egyptians against Egyptians shall not be taken by the *chrēmatistai* to their own courts, but they shall allow them to be decided before the *laokritai* in accordance with the laws of the country. (*P. Teb.* 5.208–20 = Lenger 1964: #53; English translation from AUSTIN #290)

In spite of this statement, questions remain (*CAH* 7: 155; Fraser 1972: 1: 106–15). Also, earlier editions and translations introduced no less than three emendations in this short passage, until the study of Modrzejewski (1975) suggested that the passage was understandable without these. One of the purposes of this decree may have been to support the existence of the *laokritai* which were being neglected in favour of the more prestigious Greek courts (though we in fact hear almost nothing of the *laokritai* after this,

suggesting that this supposed aim of the decree did not in fact work very well).

H.J. Wolff (1966) was convinced that the system was created by Ptolemy II. It is true that a number of important documents do seem to date to Ptolemy II's reign (e.g., the *Revenue Laws* [BAGNALL/DEROW #114]; the laws of Alexandria in *P. Halle 1* [*Sel. Pap.* ##201, 202, 207]), yet some recent scholars are less sanguine about his economic and legal reforms (cf. Turner 1984: 135, 148–49, 155, 159; note that neither Hölbl (2001) nor Huß (2001) ascribe legal reforms or innovations to Ptolemy II). A number of the 'laws' are now thought not to be laws in a modern sense. The fragmentary nature of our evidence is shown by a passage in a court ruling with regard to a lawsuit for personal abuse in public. One of the documents submitted to the court apparently contained the text of a royal ruling:

The code of regulations which was handed in by Herakleia among the justificatory documents directs us to give judgment in a . . . manner on all points which any person knows or shows us to have been dealt with in the regulations of king Ptolemy, in accordance with the regulations, and on all points which are not dealt with in the regulations, but in the civic laws [ἐν τοῖς πολιτικοῖς νόμοις], in accordance with the laws, and on all other points to follow the most equitable view. (*CPJ* 1.19)

This looks like commonsensical guidance on how judges should act, but if this was part of a royal decree, the original has not survived. We do not know the full text or the context. It would unwise to regard this as a rigid description of how all judges and all courts acted throughout the third century. We must keep the episodic nature of our evidence in mind.

8.3.2 *The Jews in Legal Documents*

Jews feature in many legal documents from Ptolemaic Egypt. These include complaints made against individuals identified as Jews. Three Jews broke into a vineyard and stole a quantity of grapes (*CPJ* 1.21). They were soldiers from the reserves and may have just been on a drunken spree rather than being habitual thieves, but we do not know for certain. A number of other complaints about property are preserved. A Jew promised to allow a party to a contract to shear some sheep, but he is alleged to have sheared them himself and made off with the wool (*CPJ* 1.38). A mare and carriage were supposed to be delivered by a Jew to a certain individual, but the latter claims in a letter that they have not shown up (*CPJ* 1.135). One person claims his cloak was stolen by a Jew of the same village who then fled to the synagogue with it (*CPJ* 1.129).

The question arises as to whether the Jews might have had their own laws and/or court system. The answer is that we hear nothing in the papyri of special Jewish courts (cf. *CPJ* 1: 32–36). When Jews are mentioned in a legal or juridical context, it is the Greek courts (or officials of the Greek administration) who are involved. As for the question of whether Jewish law

had a special place in court decisions, this has been suggested (Modrzejewski 1995: 99–119; LeFebvre 2006: 169–73). The issue is a complicated one. Of particular importance is the recently published archive edited by Cowey and Maresch (2001). Although Cowey and Maresch emphasize the special place of Jewish law (as do Modrzejewski and LeFebvre), it seems that only two examples can be found in which Jewish law might have been applied by the courts. As it happens, both relate to marriage.

The first relates to a woman who writes to the king, complaining that her husband has cast her out of his house and has refused to return her dowry (*CPJ* 1.128). The woman claims that she was the man's wife 'according to the civic law of the Jews' ([κατὰ τὸν νόμον πολιτικὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων]). It has been argued that Jewish law, based on Deut. 24.1, is being invoked here by the husband, at least by implication (Modrzejewski 1995: 111–12; LeFebvre 2006: 171–73). The first problem is that when it comes to the husband's actions no Jewish law is explicitly referred to. Although Jewish law allowed divorce (as did Greek and Egyptian law), there was no right for the husband to retain his wife's dowry; on the contrary, the dowry was the wife's possession and would be passed to her children, not to her husband (*JRSTP* 303–304). Further, we do not know the ethnicity of the wife: her name is Greek, but many Jews had Greek names (§6.3.2.3). Her husband is called a Jew but not the wife; however, the petition is in the first person, and she is unlikely to give herself ethnic labels ('I Helladote, a Jew'). Thus, there is no appeal to Jewish law in the petition to King Ptolemy. As far as I can see, this example tells us nothing about Jewish law one way or the other.

In their interpretation of the documents they published, Cowey and Maresch (2001: 23–29) seem to press the point that Jewish 'excessive particularity' is displayed in these documents, that Jews display differences in their practices in comparison with their Ptolemaic environment (Honigman 2002a: 259–66; 2003: 95–102). In her opposition to this interpretation S. Honigman makes the case that the only possible example of a specific Jewish legal practice is found in *P. Polit. Iud.* 4, in a case of Jewish family law. It has to do with the breaking of a betrothal: a Jewish father had promised his daughter to the petitioner but then gave her to another man without first providing a 'divorce certificate' (βιβλίον ἀποστασίου, spelled τὸ τοῦ ἀποστασίου βυβλίον in the document) to the original betrothed man. We know from later Jewish practice that not only a marriage but also a betrothal required a bill of divorce before it could be broken off officially (as discussed by the editors). It was not certain that such a practice could be projected back into Hellenistic times, but this document suggests that it may already have been a Jewish custom. Yet, as Honigman (2002a: 258–59) points out, no identification is made that either the father or the daughter are Jewish, which is rather surprising. In such a case, the petitioner is not appealing on the basis of Jewish law but rather on general principles of fairness and broken promises. This makes this case rather uncertain.

This brings up the issue of 'customary law' or 'ancestral law' (πολιτικὸς

νόμος or πάτριος νόμος). This has been used as evidence that Jewish law had official status in the court system (Modrzejewski 1966: 155; LeFebvre 2006: 169–73). In the documents published by Cowey and Maresch, a number of references are made to a letter containing ‘an ancestral oath’ (ὄρκος πάτριος: *P. Polit. Iud.* 9.7–8; 12.10; cf. 3.28–29). *P. Polit. Iud.* 9 has to do with failure to pay off a debt and the interest, which the petitioner states is a breach of ‘ancestral law’ (lines 28–29). This statement seems rather strange in light of the fact that Jewish ‘ancestral law’ actually forbade the imposition of interest (Deut. 23.20–21 [ET 23.19–20]). Honigman has pointed out the significant concept that this demonstrates:

In other words, what *we* may take to be Greek legal practice – money-lending at a rate of 24–25% – was considered by Berenikē [the petitioner] to be part of her *patrios nomos*, in this case, Jewish law. The situation documented by the Heracleopolis archive therefore suggests that what the Jews from Heracleopolis considered to be ‘Jewish law’ was in fact a blend of original practices in the realm of family law, and completely acculturated practices in other fields. (Honigman 2003: 97)

The example of lending at interest is a good one, because other contracts are known from Hellenistic Egypt in which Jews lent money to each other for the standard rate of interest (e.g., *CPJ* 1.20; 1.24). There is no indication that this was thought to breach Jewish law (Modrzejewski’s attempt to explain this away, based on much later rabbinic discussion, is far from convincing [1995: 113–19]; cf. *CPJ* 1 pp. 35–36).

We know little or nothing about the judicial system in Palestine at this time. M. LeFebvre (2006: 160–63) suggests that there may have been special Ptolemaic courts in Palestine, alongside ‘native law courts’ for Jews in Judaea. He points to the presence of ‘royal judges’ in some of the Zenon papyri (δικαστής: *PCZ* 59003 = *CPJ* 1.1 = DURAND #3.18; *PCZ* 59006 = DURAND #9.25), which he takes to be possible evidence of royal courts. This is of course not impossible, considering the paucity of evidence, but one swallow does not make a summer: these are the only reference in all the Zenon papyri, and since the name is not preserved in *PCZ* 59003, we have to accept that the same person may be mentioned in both passages (in addition, *PCZ* 59535 has the plural [ἄνδρες δικασταί] but may be a school exercise). We have no information on why he was in Zenon’s party or whether he had anything to do with Palestine on a permanent basis. Furthermore, as indicated above, we need to be careful about assuming that a fixed system of Ptolemaic jurisprudence was promulgated at a specific time (i.e., by Ptolemy II c.275 BCE) as LeFebvre does.

As noted elsewhere (§7.1.1), the external possessions of the Ptolemies seem to have maintained or adapted their local administration to Ptolemaic rule. Naturally, any royal decrees would have been accepted as law, to be ignored or disobeyed at one’s peril. Otherwise, it seems safest to assume that the situation from the past continued, in which local judges and magistrates did

most of the work of deciding on cases brought to them. Traditionally, village elders (זִקְנֵי הַכִּפּוּר) had a hand in deciding suits and other legal cases (Ruth 4.2-11; Ezra 10.14). Some of the documents published by Cowey and Maresch (2001: ##6.12; 19.1; 20.2) refer to village elders (πρεσβύτεροι) as implementing decisions of the *archontes* of the Jewish *politeuma* in Heracleopolis. If there were elders in Egyptian villages, it is surely likely that they continued in villages in Judah. Also, the ‘village head’ (κωμάρχης) seems to have an important place in the local scheme of things. Was the *kōmarchēs* a Ptolemaic invention? It seems to be unlikely but rather a continuation of an earlier office in Judah that also fitted the Greek way of doing things. Finally, Hecataeus of Abdera describes one of the responsibilities of priests as acting as judges in major disputes (δικαστὰς τῶν μεγίστων κρίσεων: Diodorus 40.3.5).

8.3.3 Jewish Women in Legal Documents

Legal documents seem to provide us with some of the most detailed information on women, since they are frequently omitted from other sorts of papyrus. Many of these relate to marriage or property, both areas where most women would have been involved in one way or another. Contrary to common assumption, women could and did inherit property. It was Egyptian practice to divide the property among all heirs, female as well as male (Manning 2003: 218–23). This sometimes caused resentment because it often led to fragmentation of family property. But Manning calculates that in sales of land in Demotic contracts in Upper Egypt, 22 per cent of vendors and 27 per cent of buyers were women (2003: 221). We do not seem to have any examples involving Jewish women, but quite a few naming Egyptian women have been published. One example is a document among the Hawara Papyri, in Demotic with a Greek docket, which records the sale of one-third of a house to an Egyptian woman:

2. [The god’s sealer and embalmer ḥ]h-mr-[wr], son of P3-ti-n3-ntr.w, whose mother is Ta-Rnn.t, [has declared] to the woman Hr-ḥnh, daughter of the god’s sealer and embalmer M3-Rḥ, whose mother is Nb.t-t3-hy(?): ‘You have caused my heart to agree to the money for my one-third share of this house which is built, it being provided with beam and door, which measures 19 god’s cubits from south to north and 18 god’s cubits from west to east

3. [and my one-third share] of my cell, above and below, which is on the north of my new home, which measures 20 god’s cubits from south to north and which measures 5 god’s cubits from west to east. (Hughes and Jasnow 1997: #9, square brackets part of the original)

Jewish women appear in a number of legal papyri. Two Jews, a man and a woman, filed countersuits against each other in a Greek court, the man accusing the woman of causing him to lose 200 drachmas and she claiming that he insulted her:

We have given judgment as below in the action brought by Dositheos against

Herakleia according to the following indictment:

‘Dositheos son of . . . , Jew of the Epigone, to Herakleia daughter of Disdotos, Jewess, [...] (I state) that on Peritios 22 of year 21, as I with other persons was entering the . . . of Apion [...] you came to that place with Kallippos the . . . and abused me saying that I had told certain persons that (you are a . . .) woman, and on my abusing you in return you not only spat on me but seizing the loop of my mantle [...] you ceased your insults . . . to which I have born witness. Wherefore I bring an action of assault against you for 200 drachmai, the assessment of damages [...]

Whereas this was the indictment, and Dositheos neither appeared in person nor put in a written statement nor was willing to plead his case, and whereas Herakleia appeared with her guardian [...] we have dismissed the case. (*CPJ* 1.19, ellipses part of original except where enclosed in square brackets)

The case was decided in her favour because the man failed to appear to defend his accusation.

In a suit from a wife claiming to be wronged by her former husband who divorced her but apparently refused to return her dowry, the man is clearly Jewish, though the woman’s ethnic identity is not certain (*CPJ* 1.128; see further above [§8.3.2]):

To King Ptolemy greeting from Helladote, daughter of Philonides. I am being wronged by Jonathas, the Jew . . . He has agreed in accordance with the law of the Jews to hold me as wife . . . Now he wants to withhold . . . hundred drachmai, and also the house . . . does not give me my due, and shuts me out of my house . . . and absolutely wrongs me in every respect. I beg you therefore, my king, to order Diophanes, the strategos, to write to . . . the epistates of Samareia not to let . . . to send Jonathas to Diophanes in order . . . (*CPJ* 1.128, ellipses part of the original)

The papyri contain a few other examples mentioning Jewish women. We have a divorce certificate involving a Jewish man and wife, but this is from the Roman period (*CPJ* 2.144). A Jew complains to the village scribe that his pregnant wife was assaulted by another Jewish woman and fears a miscarriage (*CPJ* 1.133).

8.4 *Summary*

Some of the points and conclusions arising from this chapter are the following:

- Individual Jews, as well as some of the Jewish communities in Egypt, are mentioned in a number of the papyri (catalogued primarily in *CPJ*).
- A great variety of occupations are listed in connection with the Jews, but a good portion of those individuals named in the papyri had a military connection.
- We have little explicit information about the inhabitants of Judah, but what little we know indicates that most lived by subsistence farming.

- The juridical system of Ptolemaic Egypt is still only imperfectly understood but included courts that operated in the Demotic language (drawing on traditional Egyptian legal custom) and those that operated in Greek and applied the Greek legal tradition.
- Jews mainly operated in the Greek legal sphere; in spite of suggestions there is little or no evidence that the Jews had a separate legal system or tradition. For example, Jews charged standard interest on loans to other Jews.
- As usual, we have little information on Judah, but it appears that the traditional legal system administered by the priests and village elders continued from the Persian period.
- Certain groups that tend to be invisible in the written record appear more proportionately in the legal papyri: women and those of the lower social classes.

Chapter 9

ECONOMY

Economics is an extremely important aspect of the history of the Jews in the Second Temple period. It was one of the drivers and determinants of how that history developed; unfortunately, textual scholars have been the main writers on this period, and the importance of the social sciences in general and economics in particular has tended to be overlooked.

9.1 Current Debate on the Ancient Economy

J. Andreau (2002) ‘Twenty Years after Moses I. Finley’s *The Ancient Economy*’, in W. Scheidel and S. von Reden (eds), *The Ancient Economy*: 33–49; **G.G. Aperghis** (2004) *The Seleukid Royal Economy*; **Z.H. Archibald, J. Davies and V. Gabrielsen** (eds) (2005) *Making, Moving and Managing: The New World of Ancient Economies*; **Z.H. Archibald, J. Davies, V. Gabrielsen and G. J. Oliver** (eds) (2001) *Hellenistic Economies*; **P. Cartledge** (1983) ‘“Trade and Politics” Revisited: Archaic Greece’, in P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins and C.R. Whittaker (eds), *Trade in the Ancient Economy*: 1–15; (2002) ‘The Economy (Economies) of Ancient Greece’, in W. Scheidel and S. von Reden (eds), *The Ancient Economy*: 11–32; **J.K. Davies** (1984) ‘Chapter 8: Cultural, Social and Economic Features of the Hellenistic World’, *CAH* 7/1: 257–320; (2001) ‘Hellenistic Economies in the Post-Finley Era’, in Z.H. Archibald, J. Davies, V. Gabrielsen and G.J. Oliver (eds), *Hellenistic Economies*: 11–62; (2006) ‘Hellenistic Economies’, in G.R. Bugh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World*: 73–92; **M.I. Finley** (1999) *The Ancient Economy*; **L.L. Grabbe** (2001d) ‘Sup-urbs or Only Hyp-urbs? Prophets and Populations in Ancient Israel and Socio-historical Method’, in L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak (eds), ‘Every City Shall Be Forsaken’: *Urbanism and Prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East*: 93–121; **K. Hopkins** (1983) ‘Introduction’, in P. Garnsey, K. Hopkins and C.R. Whittaker (eds), *Trade in the Ancient Economy*: ix–xxv; **J.G. Manning and I. Morris** (eds) (2005) *The Ancient Economy: Evidence and Models*; **I. Morris** (1999) ‘Foreword’, in M.I. Finley, *The Ancient Economy*: ix–xxxvi; **I. Morris and J.G. Manning** (2005) ‘Introduction’, in J.G. Manning and I. Morris (eds), *The Ancient Economy*: 1–44; **C.M. Reed** (2003) *Maritime Traders in the Ancient Greek World*; **W. Scheidel and S. von Reden** (eds) (2002) *The Ancient Economy*.

There has been a considerable controversy over the past number of decades about how to deal with the economy in the ancient world. This debate has its

roots in scholarly controversy at the end of the nineteenth and beginning of the twentieth century. We have the older ‘modernizers’ such as Eduard Meyer who saw ancient economics as just a version of modern economics (Cartledge 1983; Morris 1999). This ‘modernist’ position was objected to by K. Büchler but especially by Johannes Hasebroek. Few readers aside from specialists in the ancient economy are likely to have heard of Hasebroek, but it was Hasebroek’s position in essence that was taken forward by Moses Finley in his landmark, *The Ancient Economy* (first edition 1973). It is fair to say that Finley’s position dominated the field in the quarter of a century after the appearance of his book. Yet there has been protracted debate, with strong positions taken against some of his main propositions. No essay on the ancient economy can be written without acknowledging the controversy and also taking account of the arguments.

The original debate was between the ‘primitivists’ – ‘those who argue that the Greeks’ economy (or economies) differed wholesale from any modern (Western, capitalist) economy’ – and the ‘modernists’ – ‘those who discern in ancient Greece smaller-scale or inchoate versions of modern economic life and thought’ (Cartledge 2002: 13–14). Although Finley (and Hasebroek) had certain points in common with the ‘primitivist’ position, he moved the debate to a new arena. Finley took what is called the ‘substantivist’ position, as opposed to the ‘formalist’ position. These terms can be defined as follows:

For the formalists, the ancient economy was a functionally segregated and independently instituted sphere of activity with its own profit-maximizing, want-satisfying logic and rationality, less ‘developed’ no doubt than any modern economy but nevertheless recognizably similar in kind. Substantivists [including Finley], on the other hand, hold that the ancient economy was not merely less developed but socially embedded and politically overdetermined and so – by the standards of neoclassical economics – conspicuously conventional, irrational and status-ridden. (Cartledge 2002: 15)

It is important that the ‘substantivist’/‘formalist’ debate not be confused with the old ‘primitivist’/‘modernist’ controversy. The ‘substantivists’ were especially concerned about the place of politics in the ancient Greek outlook.

Finley’s views on the ancient economy can be summarized – at least in part – by the following elements (cf. Hopkins 1983: xi–xii; Andreau 2002: 34):

- the main support of the economy was agriculture;
- trade was only a minor contributor; likewise, manufacturing;
- the same major characteristics persisted from archaic Greece to late antiquity;
- the principal aim was *autarkeia* (self-sufficiency);
- overland transport still made use of primitive technology and was expensive;
- trade was mainly in luxury goods (which had only a small market), because of the expense of overland transport;
- traders and craft workers had low status;

- elites and would-be elites wanted to put their money into land rather than invest in commercial ventures; and
- urban areas were mostly ‘consumer cities’, not centres of commerce or manufacture.

As just noted, the last 20 or 30 years have seen contradiction – or at least questioning – of some of these concepts, though others are still widely accepted. But after considerable debate, the field is now moving on. The ‘modernist’ and ‘formalist’ positions have by no means triumphed, but most would feel that we have now advanced beyond Finley and see things from a different perspective. All seem to agree that agriculture was the primary basis of the economy in the ancient world, with 80–90 per cent of people engaged in agrarian activities of some sort, including pastoralism (Davies 1984: 271; Aperghis 2004: 59 n. 2).

The main debate has been around the place of trade and commerce in the economy. Here more recent study has to some extent gone beyond the old debate to recognize the truth and error on both sides of the previous dichotomy. It now seems to be accepted that Finley significantly underrated the amount of market activity in Greek and Roman antiquity (Scheidel and von Reden [eds] 2002: 3). For example, the recent study of maritime traders in relation to archaic and classical Athens by C.M. Reed (2003), on the one hand, confirms the low social and financial status of traders (they were usually foreigners) as Hasebroek and Finley suggested but, on the other hand, shows that ‘at Athens the civic dependence on imported food replaced considerations of social status in the minds of individual Athenians’ (2003: 61). The Athenians did all they could to encourage the traders (even though also still trying to control them), not because they considered commerce as such a good thing but because import of particular items (primarily foodstuffs) was in their interest. For Finley it tended to be all or nothing: either there was a market economy or there was not, but there might be a middle way: the lack of a market in a modern sense does not preclude partial markets that assumed a larger place than Finley allowed (cf. Andreau 2002: 36–37).

Another example is G.G. Aperghis’ recent study (2004); it takes its main thesis from Pseudo-Aristotle’s *Oeconomica*:

And after this [we must consider] which of the revenues that are not present at all can be made to exist, or that are now small can be increased, or which of the expenses that are now incurred should be cut and by how much without damaging the whole [administration]. (*Oecon.* 2: 7, trans. Aperghis 2004: 128)

Aperghis interprets this to mean, ‘increase income and cut expenditure’, that is, maximize profit (2004: 299). A number of considerations show that the Seleucid kings (or their advisers) understood some elementary economic principles: they recognized that too high a taxation would eventually damage the revenue-generating capacity of the system; they put in place temporary

measures of relief from taxation, evidently with the realization that such measures would lead to increased income in the long run; they gave a lot of land to their supporters rather than managing it themselves; they settled for steady, reliable income (by using tax farmers) over against a system that would be more profitable in the long term but would vary more from year to year. All of this might seem to make Aperghis a 'modernist', but he stresses that he is only talking about the priorities of the Seleucid state and is not pronouncing on the underlying economy (2004: 303).

Finally, for readers who are specialists in biblical studies, attention should be drawn to how detrimental to a proper study are those few 'economic' studies whose aim is really something else, usually ideological or theological. Unfortunately, for some biblical scholars, the entire issue of the ancient economy seems to be reduced to the 'exploitation of the poor'. Their reference to the upper classes or the wealthy or even the educated is invariably negative, with assumptions about modern 'capitalism' often lying in the background (cf. Grabbe 2001d). The 'plight of the poor' is of course a feature of the economy, but a proper economic discussion has to go beyond indignation over the oppression of the poor and seek to understand and describe. After all, the vast majority of people through history have lived in what – by modern standards – is dire poverty. This was not in this age or that age but every age. As scholars of ancient Judaica we have to probe beyond modern theological concerns and try to engage in a historical analysis of the economic situation in its complexity. Equally, we need to avoid popular but inappropriate models which tend to be characterized by anachronistic references, such as 'latifundia', 'agro-business', 'strategic government investment' and the like.

9.2 *The Economy in Ptolemaic Egypt*

G.G. Aperghis (2004) *The Seleukid Royal Economy*; **R.S. Bagnall** (1976) *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt*; **R.S. Bagnall and B.W. Frier** (1994) *The Demography of Roman Egypt*; **D. Barag** (1994–99) 'The Coinage of Yehud and the Ptolemies', *INJ* 13: 27–37; **R. Bogaert** (1998–99) 'Les opérations des banques de l'Égypte ptolémaïque', *AncSoc* 29: 49–145; **W. Clarysse and D.J. Thompson** (2006) *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt*: vol. 1, *Population Registers* (P. Count); vol. 2, *Historical Studies*; **J.K. Davies** (1984) 'Chapter 8: Cultural, Social and Economic Features of the Hellenistic World', *CAH* 7/1: 257–320; **G.M. Harper, Jr** (1934) 'Tax Contractors and their Relation to Tax Collection in Ptolemaic Egypt', *Aegyptus* 14: 47–64; **A. Houghton and C. Lorber** (2000–2002) 'Antiochus III in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia', *INJ* 14: 44–58; **M.C. McClellan** (1997) 'The Economy of Hellenistic Egypt and Syria: An Archeological Perspective', in B.B. Price (ed.), *Ancient Economic Thought*: vol. 1, 172–87; **J.G. Manning** (2003) *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt*; **B.P. Muhs** (2005) *Tax Receipts, Taxpayers, and Taxes in Early Ptolemaic Thebes*; **Z.M. Packman** (1968) *The Taxes in Grain in Ptolemaic Egypt: Granary Receipts from Diospolis Magna, 164–88 B.C.*; **J. Pastor** (1997) *Land and Economy in Ancient*

Palestine; C. Préaux (1939) *L'économie royale des Lagides*; M. Rostovtzeff (1941) *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*; V.A. Tcherikover (Tscherikower) (1937) 'Palestine under the Ptolemies (A Contribution to the Study of the Zenon Papyri)', *Mizraim* 4-5: 9-90; D.J. Thompson (1984b) 'Chapter 9c Agriculture', *CAH* 7/1: 363-70; E.G. Turner (1984) 'Chapter 5: Ptolemaic Egypt', in *CAH* 7/1: 118-74.

According to G.G. Aperghis (2004), the Diadochi had a common problem, which was to gain enough silver to pay their troops. It had become common under Alexander and the Diadochi for soldiers to be paid in coin. The Ptolemies seem to have solved the problem in two ways: 'a grain export drive to earn the silver they lacked and import restrictions to keep it in the country and, ultimately, in their possession' (Aperghis 2004: 30-31). This solution on the part of the Ptolemies is, of course, not new to scholarship. C. Préaux had already discussed these measures at length (1939: 148-52, 267-80; Bagnall 1976: 176-212). One of the Zenon papyri (*PCZ* 590021; translation in *AUSTIN* #299 and *Sel. Pap.* 2 #409) refers to re-minting gold coins and problems with their exchange.

The recent study by J.G. Manning (2003) argues that an understanding of Ptolemaic Egypt, including its economy, depends on understanding how the Greek administration related to that extant in Egypt on the Greek arrival. The Egyptians still lived in the Bronze Age when Alexander arrived (Turner 1984: 130). The Greeks needed to make changes, but these were not as drastic or as rapid as is sometimes presented. The old view, that the Greeks imposed a uniform order on the native population, now looks untenable. Many aspects of this system were to continue and regularize previous measures, such as the land survey, the use of tax farmers and the local tax collection system through the village scribes and local temples. Nevertheless, there were some Greek innovations which came as a controlling layer on top of the traditional bureaucracy. The economic aims of the Ptolemies were concentrated on gaining the maximum revenues; the main measures to do this appear to be the following (Manning 2003: 140-41):

- extend and increase cultivation where possible;
- sustain the existing land tenure patterns while collecting the agricultural taxes;
- extend taxes to cover the main industries;
- extend taxes to cover the main transactions, such as sales; and
- establish royal monopolies in certain industries.

Greek innovations included a more extensive requirement of payment in coin, the establishment of government (not private) banks to handle the tax revenue (Bogaert 1998-99) and military settlements (cleruchies) in key areas.

The economic basis of the Ptolemaic empire, as with most ancient empires, was agriculture (Thompson 1984b). According to one prominent analysis (Turner 1984: 149-55), two models of taxation operated. One involved the grain crop which was mostly grown on royal land. The sowing, growing and

harvesting were heavily overseen by government officials, and the taxes taken in kind. A partial picture of this aspect of the economy is found in a communication from a *dioiketes* to an *oikonomos* (*P. Teb.* 703). This lays out the various duties of the *oikonomos* and also gives a practical catalogue of the various areas for oversight and what he should be doing in each. In recent years, however, the opinion has shifted from viewing the document as a royally ordained bureaucratic requirement and seeing it as more of a moral exhortation (cf. AUSTIN 558; Manning 2003: 143). The section on the activities relating to the crops is as follows:

During your tour of inspection try as you [go] about to encourage everybody and make them feel happier; you should do this not only by words, but also should any of them have a complaint against the village scribes [*komogrammateis*] or the village chiefs (*komarchai*) about anything to do with agriculture, you should investigate the matter and as far as possible put an end to such incidents.

When the sowing has been completed, it would not be a bad thing if you made a careful tour of inspection; for in this way you will get a precise idea of the sprouting (of the crops), and you will easily see what has not been properly sown or left altogether unsown, and you will [know from] this those who are guilty of negligence, and it will be known to you [whether anyone] has used the seeds for other purposes.

You must consider it one of your most imperative duties to make sure that the nome is sown with the crops specified in the sowing schedule. (*P. Teb.* 703: 40–60; trans. AUSTIN 559)

The second model involved the taxes on other agricultural products and also on manufactured goods. In this case, the products were sold according to prices set by the government and the taxes paid in coin. The list of taxes that can be gleaned from the sources seems to go on and on (cf. the list in 2 Macc. 11.34–35). What we have to recognize, though, is that there was a limit on how far the system could be taxed. The Ptolemies wanted to maximize revenue, but they had to avoid bankrupting the economy. It has been argued, for example, that Ptolemy II, often presented as the height of culture and achievement, also brought the empire to the verge of bankruptcy (Turner 1984: 159); however, Manning has queried the extent to which central planning occurred or was even possible (2003: 135–46).

Essential to the operation of the tax system was a proper census. In theory, it should have been conducted every year, so that the appropriate level of tax could be set and collected. There is evidence that a census was conducted periodically, but it is clear that this did not happen every year. One of the main pieces of evidence for the census is the Karnak ostrakon, written in Demotic but apparently a translation from Greek:

Inventory of the royal domain. The inventory of which a written copy was ordered to be made so that it would be (possible) to conduct an audit. Everything connected with it was delivered to Phoinix (*P3njk*), the chief treasurer (*mr-ḥtm*), in the 28th year, in the month of Thoth, of the king who was victorious over the Philopersian king when he entered Syria. His scribes and district officials

compiled it, from [5] Elephantine to the Mediterranean, in detail nome by nome, altogether 36 provinces. They declared and reported concerning the water, (noting) when the basins (are full) and the flooded fields are green, enumerating their water sources and levees. A census of Egypt was ordered, specifying field by field, their irrigation possibilities, their location, their quality, their arable portions, their relation to the property of the protector gods, their (common) borders with the fields [10] of the benefices themselves and of the royal fields, specifying area by area, the size of the parcels and vineyards, noting when the fields of the area are dry – likewise the pastures – and the water channels, the fields that are free and vacant, the high fields and the fields that are (artificially) irrigated, their basins, and the embankments that are ploughed and cultivated, specifying orchard by orchard the trees with their fruits, the gardens, the high fields and the low parcels, their footpaths, the list of leased parcels with their equipment, the decisions concerning price in connection with them, the emoluments of the priests, the emoluments of the dependants of the reigning king, and, in addition, their taxes, the total of the expenditures for the welfare of Egypt and its sublime freedom, of the cities and of its temples. (BURSTEIN #97)

In order to assure its revenues the government made use of tax farmers (τελωνται) to act as underwriters by putting up private money to support the collection of the corn revenues (Rostovtzeff 1941: 2: 328–31; Harper 1934). At an annual auction tax farmers would bid for the right to guarantee the revenue for a particular region, whether large or small. They would put up sureties to support their bid. If the income fell short of the bid, they had to make it up from their own resources, but if it exceeded the bid, they kept the excess or at least a good portion of it. The tax farmers took a certain risk; for example, we have one document in which the tax farmer complains that he was arrested for failing to pay his surety because the crop was eaten by locusts (*P. Teb.* 772): evidently, the government officials were not sympathetic to his misfortunes. But it was clearly a lucrative enterprise in the long run: most years they would have made money, or there would be no point in taking part in the auction. From the Egyptian government's point of view, the tax farmers took the risk, while the government could operate in confidence that an assured level of income would be coming into the coffers. They could no doubt have gained a higher income over time if they had simply collected the taxes for themselves, but they traded this chance of a higher income for the security of a regular steady income.

The tax farmers were not normally tax collectors. The collection of taxes was the duty of the state agents (λογευταί, ὑπερεταί). This was probably to the long-term benefit of the state, since over-zealous collection by those with an interest in maximizing income would eventually wear the peasants down and reduce revenue in the long run. With their income assured the Egyptian officials could take a more equitable approach to the collection of the taxes. On the other hand, the tax farmers were not just passive bystanders, waiting to see whether the income would come in or not. They were intimately involved in overseeing the particular agricultural or industrial activity on which the tax was based and also in ensuring that the state officials did their

job in the collection of the tax in question (Harper 1934). The *Revenue Laws* of Ptolemy II gives an insight into how directly involved the tax farmer was, even to the point of being able to seize the crop if the land-owner/cultivator insisted on an assessment of the crop with which the tax farmer disagreed (*C. Ord. Ptol.* 17–18). The tax farmer in turn had his obligations and constraints on what he could do.

As noted above, one of the measures taken by the Ptolemies was in the area of coinage. The Ptolemies created their own monetary zone by using a different weight standard so that Ptolemaic coins could not be freely circulated in the other Greek empires (as indicated by *PCZ* 59021 = *Sel. Pap.* 2 #409). Rather than using the Attic standard, which was common in the Seleucid realm and elsewhere in the Greek world (with a tetradrachma of about 17g), the Ptolemies fixed on the Phoenician standard which was rather lighter at about 14.25g for a tetradrachma (Préaux 1939: 269–70; *CAH* 7/1: 20). This seems to have been a deliberate policy: the Attic standard was used by Egypt under the Persians in much of the fourth century. Whereas Seleucid coins minted on the Attic standard could be used interchangeably, regardless of point of issue, Ptolemaic coins would have been more difficult to evaluate.

Thus, the general policy seems to have been to keep silver within Egypt as much as possible. Gold coins tended to be hoarded rather than freely circulated, but the Ptolemies issued a good deal of bronze coinage for trade at the local level: small denominational silver coins had ceased to be used after the death of Alexander (Barag 1994–99: 29; except for Judah, see below). Some have concluded that those living in the Ptolemaic realm could not trade outside it, but this seems to be incorrect: the means of changing money was available at certain frontier posts. It has been argued that those coming into Egypt had to exchange Seleucid drachmas for an equal number of Egyptian drachmas – in spite of the lighter Egyptian weight – meaning that the Ptolemies gained almost 20 per cent on each drachma exchanged (Houghton and Lorber 2000–2002: 56–57). This would have been a very lucrative enterprise, in addition to helping to keep silver within Egypt.

We have some evidence that in Egypt an *artaba* of grain (approx. 56 litres) would sustain a single adult for about 36 days (Houghton and Lorber 2000–2002: 52–54). This quantity of wheat could be purchased for two drachmas; barley was cheaper at one drachma, two obols per *artaba*. Soldiers received two sorts of pay, one being the regular salary and another being money for provisions (§3.3.1). Each of these averaged three or four obols per day, which came to 15–20 drachmas per month. Except in times of inflation, two or three days of provision allowance would be sufficient to buy enough grain for a month.

Finally, we need to consider the population of the country (Bagnall and Frier 1994; Clarysse and Thompson 2006; Aperghis 2004: 54–55; Manning 2003: 47–49). In the past we have been dependent on population figures found in literary sources, such as Josephus' 7.5 million without Alexandria, in the first century CE (*War* 2.16.4 §385) or Diodorus Siculus' three million in

the first century BCE (1.31.8: the reading ‘three million’ for his own time is found in the mss but has often been emended in printed editions). We now have two studies that make use of census data. There are still many questions and uncertainties, but in spite of their limitations the data are much more reliable than vague statements in literary sources. For example, Bagnall and Frier (1994) draw on a compilation of about 300 actual family census records from the first three centuries of the Common Era. They estimate the total population of Egypt at that time as about four to five million (about half of Josephus’ figure). A conservative estimate for the third century BCE has been about three million (cf. Aperghis 2004: 54), but Clarysse and Thompson think it was probably more like 1.5 million (2006: 2.102).

9.3 *The Seleucid Economy*

G.G. Aperghis (2001) ‘Population – Production – Taxation – Coinage: A Model for the Seleucid Economy’, in Z.H. Archibald et al. (eds), *Hellenistic Economies*: 69–102; (2004) *The Seleucid Royal Economy*; (2005) ‘City Building and the Seleucid Royal Economy’, in Z.H. Archibald et al. (eds), *Making, Moving and Managing: The New World of Ancient Economies*: 27–43; **E.J. Bickerman** (1938) *Institutions des Séleucides*; **A. Houghton and C. Lorber** (2000–2002) ‘Antiochus III in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia’, *INJ* 14: 44–58; **H.G. Kippenberg** (1982) *Religion und Klassenbildung im antiken Judäa*, 78–110; **H. Kreissig** (1978) *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im Seleukidenreich*; **M.C. McClellan** (1997) ‘The Economy of Hellenistic Egypt and Syria: An Archeological Perspective’, in B.B. Price (ed.), *Ancient Economic Thought*: vol. 1: 172–87; **A. Mittwoch** (1955) ‘Tribute and Land-tax in Seleucid Judaea’, *Bib* 36: 352–61; **D. Musti** (1984) ‘Syria and the East’, *CAH* 7/1: 175–220.

As noted above (§9.2), the Seleucids and Ptolemies faced a similar financial problem: the need to pay their armies in silver. Because the situation in Egypt was quite different from that within the Seleucid empire, it was unlikely that the Ptolemaic solutions would be exactly the same as the Seleucid, but there were a number of parallels. G.G. Aperghis (2004: 31–32) seeks to demonstrate that the Seleucid rulers applied six commonsense measures to the problem of increasing silver revenue:

1. an increasing requirement that payment of taxes, especially agrarian dues, be made in coin;
2. the founding of cities in those less urbanized regions with rich agriculture potential;
3. ensuring an adequate supply of coinage by founding mints in most of the satrapies;
4. increasingly making administrative payments through the medium of coinage;
5. searching out every area where taxes could be applied; and
6. creating an efficient financial administration to collect and maintain the revenues.

The Seleucids had to some extent continued the Achaemenid system, which was mainly commodity-based: that is, taxes were generally collected in kind. But if a recent proposal is correct, there were some fundamental changes with the coming of the Greeks. We have several sources that appear to tell us about Seleucid Asia. One of these is the Pseudo-Aristotelian tractate *Oeconomica*. This was discussed with regard to the Persian period since many scholars have dated it to that time (*HJJSTP* 1: 127–28). An argument has been made, however, that it should be dated to the early Hellenistic period (Aperghis 2004: 117–35); in any case, the description seems to match the situation in the third century, even if it originally described the situation under Achaemenid rule.

The cost of feeding a person in Babylonia was similar to that in Egypt. A litre and a half of grain is attested as sufficient for a working man for a day (Aperghis 2001: 82–85). Ten *suts* of grain (approx. 60 litres) would sustain a single adult for about 40 days; this quantity could be purchased for a drachma (Houghton and Lorber 2000–2002: 52–54). As already noted, soldiers received two sorts of pay, one being the regular salary and another being money for provisions (§3.3.1). Each of these averaged three or four obols per day, which came to 15–20 drachmas per month. Except in times of inflation, two or three days of provision allowance would be sufficient to buy enough grain for a month. Grain tended to be about a quarter cheaper in Babylonia than in Egypt.

If estimating the population of Egypt was difficult, to put a figure on the population of the Seleucid empire is vastly more problematic. Nevertheless, some effort has been made toward finding a reasonable figure. Making use of Herodotus' tribute figures (3.89–95) and comparing them with survey data, Aperghis (2004: 56–58) comes to a total of 15–20 million persons. Only in the case of Cilicia does Herodotus' tribute amount show a deviance from the survey data. This figure would have changed drastically when the eastern part of the empire was lost to the Parthians about 130 BCE.

A further discussion of aspects of the Seleucid economy can be found at §7.1.2.

9.4 The Economy in Palestine

S. Dar (1986) *Landscape and Pattern: An Archaeological Survey of Samaria, 800 B.C.E.–636 C.E.*; **A. Kloner** (ed.) (2003) *Maresha Excavations Final Report I: Subterranean Complexes* 21, 44, 70; **V.A. Tcherikover (Tscherikower)** (1937) 'Palestine under the Ptolemies (A Contribution to the Study of the Zenon Papyri)', *Mizraim* 4–5: 9–90.

What we can be sure of is that careful supervision of taxes took place under the Ptolemies. What the evidence shows is that the Ptolemaic system supervised the collection of taxes in the most far-flung reaches of the empire. For example, *P. Teb.* 8 (AUSTIN #278) records a series of letters relating to

the payment of taxes from various places in Asia Minor and elsewhere in the distant parts of the Ptolemaic empire. Although we do not know the precise tax system operating in Palestine, we can be sure that officials were appointed to give close oversight to the collection of these taxes. We have one document (CPJ 1.6) that concerns the collection of a debt from a local village man (in Judah or Idumaea), with a Jewish name, by an agent of Zenon. This was not collection of a tax, but it illustrates that governmental officials reached down to the lowest level: the village.

An important document relating information on administration and taxation is the decree of Ptolemy II relating to Palestine (Rainer papyrus, SB 8008 [§3.2.1; §13.2]). Several points emerge from this document. The extension of the bureaucracy down to the lowest level, the village, is evident. All property was noted and records kept of it for tax purposes; there was also an incentive to report violators among one's neighbours since the informant received a portion of the penalties as well as one-third of any confiscated goods. One has a brief glimpse of the myriad of taxes in the passing reference to the 'pasture tax' and 'the crown tax', as well as to the role played by tax farmers in seeing that all was registered and the taxes collected. On the question of slaves, the promulgation of such a decree suggests a widespread practice of enslaving free individuals. This would naturally cause concern on the part of the government since illegal enslavement would reduce the available peasant population for working the royal estates and contributing to the tax revenues.

This inscription further tells us that Syria and Phoenicia were divided into hyparchies which seem to have been units for purposes of collecting revenue. Also, we know that *oikonomoi* or financial officers of the Ptolemaic government operated in Syria and Phoenicia. This had already been conjectured by Tcherikover (1937: 43). There is also a reference to the 'superintendent' (ὁ διοικῶν) of the revenues in Syria and Phoenicia (col. 2, lines 18–19), but it is not clear whether this person is different from the *dioikētēs* or chief financial officer of Egypt. There are references to the tax-farmers for the individual villages, who work with the village head (κωμάρχης) to collect the revenue. This suggests that some of the administrative apparatus in Egypt also operated in Syro-Palestine. Yet we cannot take the references here to the full panoply known from Egypt.

Our information on Palestine is episodic. For centuries subsistence agriculture was the basis of the economy for most peoples in the region. Archaeological surveys provide evidence that this state of affairs continued into the Hellenistic period, though the Hellenistic and Hasmonaean periods were evidently times of prosperity (Dar 1986: 253–54). The traditional crops in Palestine were grain, vines and olives. The hill country was especially suited for vines and olive trees. Further north the area of Samaria has been extensively surveyed in the past few decades (Dar 1986). The main surplus products were oil and wine: it is estimated that about half the production was exported (Dar 1986: 252–53), but this had been the case going back to the

time of the Israelite monarchy and beyond. The Judaeian highlands had never been as prosperous as the central highlands and northern valleys (*HJJSTP* 1: 198); nevertheless, wine and olive oil seem also to have been major exports for the region.

The products of Syria most important to Egypt were wheat, wine, oil and slaves: although Egypt produced some of the agricultural products herself, they were not always of such good quality. The Ptolemaic financial administration saw to it that most such products were strictly regulated and taxed; however, the papyri indicate that much of the trade was actually in government hands, with the merchants involved only as middle men (Tcherikover 1937: 20–23). Following are listed some of the main products of the region, as well as some further examples illustrating the economy of Palestine:

Grain. Grain seems to have been grown primarily for subsistence purposes, with little exported, partly because of difficulties with transport; however, we do have references to the export of grain ‘from Syria, Phoenicia and Cyprus’ (Canopus Decree: *OGIS* 56 line 17; AUSTIN #271). Grain was grown wherever it could be, but the northern area of Samaria was the best suited part of the country for wheat and barley and other grains. It appears that the bulk of the imported grain was from royal estates in Syria, which explains not only the ease with which the produce moved without restriction but also why it was imported even though Egypt produced a good deal of grain herself (cf. *PCZ* 59816; AUSTIN #303).

Oil. It is likely that oil production was a major endeavour since this had traditionally been the case under the Assyrians and Persians (*HJJSTP* 1: 202–203). It is actually here that Syro-Palestine seems to have come into its own, by being an important source of certain commodities which Egypt itself lacked. Egypt produced little or no oil of its own and needed to import it from this part of their empire. Oil was also a government monopoly even though merchants were allowed to handle the actual importing; once they got it into Egypt they had to sell it for a fixed price to the government (*Revenue Laws*, cols. 38–56; AUSTIN #297).

Wine. Vines were grown in Egypt itself and wine produced there, but the wine of Palestine and Syria seems to have been of better quality. One of the Zenon documents (*P. Lond.* 1948) mentions Apollonius’ vineyard of 80,000 vines at Beth Anath, and the wine was supposed to have been excellent. Unfortunately, we do not know where Beth Anath was, though Upper Galilee or possibly southern Lebanon are possibilities (DURAND 67–68). In Palestine much has been made of the so-called ‘mountain of the king’ (הַר הַמֶּלֶךְ). This was a territory known from literary sources but also identified archaeologically by the presence of many field-

towers in western Samaria (Dar 1986: 88–125). These towers existed as early as the Persian period and continued into the Roman period, but their concentration was evidently in the Hellenistic. They seem to have served as buildings to contain fermentation vats. The land associated with them has been interpreted as the land once possessed by the Israelite kings and then inherited by the Babylonian, Persian and Ptolemaic rulers. The argument is that this would have remained crown land. In any case, it was a major producer – exporter – of wine.

Transport. Wherever possible, trade and communication was usually by sea, and Palestine possessed important ports at Gaza, Jaffa, Ptolemais (Akko) and Strato's Tower (Caesarea). Much of the traffic between Syria and Egypt was carried on by Nile boats (Greek *kelētes*, *kubaiai*) rather than large sea-going vessels (Tcherikover 1937: 27–29). Since much still had to be carried by caravan, Palestine also served as a transit centre for overland routes from Phoenicia, Mesopotamia, and Arabia. For example, one papyrus contains a long list of such items as honey, wine, cheese, nuts and potter's earth brought from areas outside Syria (*P. Zen.* 59012); however, such items usually came from territories in Asia Minor and Cyprus which belonged to the Ptolemies.

Incense. The major item from Arabia was incense, for which Gaza served as the trade centre. Mendes in Egypt was a manufacturing centre for unguents, most of the raw materials evidently coming to it through Gaza (Tcherikover 1937: 25–27). This was also evidently a royal monopoly.

Slaves. Slaves are the Syrian export most often mentioned in the Zenon letters. They seem to have been in short supply in Egypt itself, judging from the high prices they fetched. The expectation of good profits would explain why the slave trade from Syria was so brisk. The slaves consisted primarily of children and young females, suggesting that they were not intended for hard labour in agriculture. Rather, their primary function seems to have been service in the households of the owners. Prostitution of female slaves is specifically mentioned in the papyri (e.g., *PSI* 406; *DURAND* #27), but boys may also have been imported for this purpose even though not referred to in the extant papyri. There is also an indication of their use in the wool industry (Tcherikover 1937: 18).

Example of Maresha. One area that is better known than most is the Hellenistic site of ancient Merisa – the Idumaeon site of Maresha, excavated most recently by Amos Kloner (2003). There is an extensive system of caves under the city which show evidence of being inhabited as early as the Persian period. Two important economic activities for the ancient city seem to have been olive

production and the raising of doves, the evidence for which is mainly from the Hellenistic period. According to Kloner's interpretation, the basis of both industry and marketing was the extended household. The owners preferred to process their olives on their own property, in this case in the caves under the houses. It is estimated that oil far in excess of the Maresha inhabitants' needs was produced. It would be poor method to extrapolate from Maresha to the entirety of Palestine or even Judah. But this suggests possibilities. With the importance of olive production in certain parts of the hill country, individual families may have produced their own oil rather than selling their olives to a press or sending them to a 'factory site' for processing, though judging from finds of the Assyrian period such as Timnah (Tell Batash) and Ekron (Tell Miqne), central mass processing sites might also have existed. This is where archaeologists need to be on the lookout for evidence of both models. There is also the question of evidence about who purchased the oil. More on Maresha is found at §§2.1.25; 7.1.3.2.

9.5 The Economy in Relation to the Jews

G.G. Aperghis (2001) 'Population – Production – Taxation – Coinage: A Model for the Seleukid Economy', in Z.H. Archibald et al. (eds), *Hellenistic Economies*: 69–102; (2004) *The Seleukid Royal Economy*; **D.T. Ariel** (2000) 'Imported Greek Stamped Amphora Handles', in H. Geva (ed.), *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem Conducted by Nahman Avigad, 1969–1982*: vol. I: 267–83; **D.T. Ariel** (ed.) (1990) *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. II, *Imported Stamped Amphora Handles, Coins, Worked Bone and Ivory, and Glass*; **R.S. Bagnall** (1976) *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt*; **D. Barag** (1994–99) 'The Coinage of Yehud and the Ptolemies', *INJ* 13: 27–37; **A.M. Berlin** (1997) 'Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period', *BA* 60: 2–51; **K. Bringmann** (1983) *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa*; **S. Dar** (1986) *Landscape and Pattern: An Archaeological Survey of Samaria, 800 B.C.E.–636 C.E.*; **O. Lipschits** (2003) 'Demographic Changes in Judah between the Seventh and the Fifth Centuries B. C.E.', in O. Lipschits and J. Blenkinsopp (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*: 323–76; **R. Marcus** (1943a) Notes and appendices in H.St.J. Thackeray et al. (eds), *Josephus*, vol. 7; **A. Momigliano** (1931–32) 'I Tobiadi nella preistoria del Moto Maccabaico', *Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 67: 165–200; **B.P. Muhs** (2005) *Tax Receipts, Taxpayers, and Taxes in Early Ptolemaic Thebes*; **R. Reich** (2003) 'Local Seal Impressions of the Hellenistic Period', in H. Geva (ed.), *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem Conducted by Nahman Avigad, 1969–1982*: vol. II: 256–62; **D.W. Rooke** (2000) *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*; **V.A. Tcherikover (Tscherikower)** (1937) 'Palestine under the Ptolemies (A Contribution to the Study of the Zenon Papyri)', *Mizraim* 4–5: 9–90.

The basic question is, to what extent did the economic situation change for the Jews during the early Hellenistic period? When we talk about the Jews, we have two sorts of community to consider: we have the Jews of Judah proper, along with the Jewish community living outside Judah but elsewhere in Palestine; then we have those living in Egypt and other parts of the diaspora. Thus, a look at the economy has to consider these different areas because Jews were living in each one.

9.5.1 *Jewish Settlers in Egypt*

The situation of the Jews in Judah does not seem to have differed essentially from that of other peoples classified as ‘Greek’. The native Egyptians were at the bottom of the financial pile and were the most exploited by taxes and tribute to the state. Yet all inhabitants were expected to pay their share, and the Greek settlers (including the Jews) had a substantial tax load assessed on their property and activities. Many of the Jews arrived in Egypt as part of the military, and it is clear that many of those individual Jews known from the papyri were part of the army or military settlements. Otherwise, though, a range of professions is attested, mostly suggesting a level of prosperity higher than that of the average Egyptian. The range of papyri mentioning the Jews specifically shows them well integrated into society, and they appear to have lived on the whole as the Greek settlers. Examples are cited in other chapters, which should be consulted for further information on the subject (§§8.2; 8.3; 13.2).

9.5.2 *Economic Developments in Judah*

We begin with the question of Jews in Palestine under Ptolemaic rule, meaning primarily the third century. One of the problems with determining the economy of Judah is that we do not know how the Ptolemaic government operated in Palestine (cf. §§7.1.3.1; 7.2.2). Was there a Judah as such? Or was Syro-Palestine administered as a single unit, with a governor over it? Or was this whole region treated only as a nome or perhaps several nomes within Egypt proper? We cannot easily discuss the economy of Judah when many questions about the administration remain, especially if the economy was determined by factors rather different from Yehud under the Achaemenids. In spite of the many questions still unanswered, however, we have some inkling of developments under Ptolemaic and the beginnings of Seleucid rule.

Most Jews were engaged in agricultural activity, and subsistence agriculture in a region not distinguished for its fertility meant that Judah remained in a rather poor state through much of the third century, judging from the archaeology (Berlin 1997: 8). From the little information we possess the economy of Judah had not changed for centuries. Agriculture – often marginal – remained the basis of the economy of the region. Judah was a poor province under the Persians, and we have no reason to think it improved under the Ptolemies. As noted above, Palestine was a centre of

trade, but this was not new. Trade through Gaza, for example, had been well established in the Persian period and even earlier. Of course, some areas of Palestine might have become much more prosperous in the Ptolemaic period because of this trade. By the early part of Seleucid rule, however, Judah seems to have increased its prosperity considerably, as indicated by the amount of tribute being paid to the ruling regime. This might have been the result of Seleucid reassessment of the tax revenue for the province, but the tax burden was not excessive as indicated by subsequent events (see *HJJSTP* 3). Evidence for this change of the tribute regime is seen by comparing the situation under Onias II in the mid-third century and that paid by the high priest Jason to Antiochus IV.

As discussed at greater length elsewhere (§13.3), Josephus gives us the figure of 20 talents that the high priest paid yearly to the Ptolemaic king about the middle of the third century (*Ant.* 12.4.1 §§158–59). It has often been assumed that this was simply the annual tribute for Judah in this period (e.g., Momigliano 1931–32: 612). Recently, it has been argued that this was a traditional payment by the high priest (‘some sort of Temple tax’) but was not connected with the taxation of Judah as such (Rooke 2000: 259). Is it only a matter of guesswork or is there any way to delineate the precise nature of this payment? The basic problem is that it occurs in a literary text. Literary texts often seem to be unreliable with numbers such as this. Also, such texts cannot usually be trusted *prima facie* to use terms in a proper technical sense. Josephus refers to the high priest Onias as having ‘the governorship of the people’ (τοῦ λαοῦ τὴν προστασίαν). This might suggest that the high priest held a formal office (*prostasia*) in the Ptolemaic administration, perhaps having to do with finance, and that this office was subsequently transferred to Joseph Tobiad (Momigliano 1931–32: 612; Marcus 1943: 84–85 n. d). The difficulty is that literary writers do not necessarily employ such terms in their technical senses; even Polybius is not consistent in the use of such terms (Bagnall 1976: 41–42; 213–15).

Yet recent study on the tax system of the Ptolemies may allow us to say more on the question. Although our sources give varying figures for the tax revenue of Ptolemaic Egypt, B.P. Muhs (2005: 10–11) has shown that the salt tax (a capitation tax) of about 250 BCE was 1.5 drachmas for a man and 1 drachma for a woman, and all inhabitants of the Ptolemaic empire seem to have paid it. Using Muhs’ figures, we would calculate a population of about 96,000 to pay 20 talents from this poll tax alone. This figure for the population of Judah at this time seems too high, considering that the population during the Persian period was probably only about 30,000 at its height (Lipschits 2003: 324–26, 355–60). But there were most likely other obligations. In Egypt proper these included *corvée* labour. Whether *corvée* applied in Judah is not clear, but that there were other taxes is likely. We should also consider that the tribute for the entire Transeuphrates (Syro-Palestine and Phoenicia) plus Cyprus during the Persian period was said to be 350 talents of silver (Herodotus 3.91). This suggests that Josephus’ 20 talents

paid annually by the high priest is a reasonable figure for the annual tax revenue expected from Judah at this time. This was the level that the rather poor and backward province of Judah could pay under the early Ptolemies.

With the coming of Seleucid rule, the basic requirement of the ruling power did not change. Antiochus III issued a temporary decree of tax relief, both to reward his Jewish supporters who helped him to oust the Ptolemies and also to help Jerusalem repair the damage suffered in the fighting. But while he was courting support from the priesthood and ruling classes, he was not granting special privileges to the Jews. On the contrary, as far as the 'fiscal authorities were concerned, however, Judaea seems to have been treated very much like any other province of the empire and Jerusalem like any other subject city' (Aperghis 2004: 167). There does not seem to have been any major change in the economic sphere initially, but the basic tribute was probably the same under the Seleucids as under the Ptolemies, which is implied in the decree of Antiochus III (§14.3.2). A similar conclusion can be drawn from later concessions made by Seleucid rulers to Hasmonaean leaders (1 Macc. 10.18-45; 11.30-37; 13.36-40). We get some idea of the annual tribute when we see the money offered by Jason for the high priesthood: the figure of 360 talents of silver (2 Macc. 4.8) was probably a raising of the normal annual tribute of about 300 talents (Bringmann 1983: 115).

The question is, what had changed in the economy of Jerusalem during the third century BCE to make this vast increase in tribute payment possible? From the little information we possess the economy of Judah had not changed for centuries. Yet, was Jerusalem suddenly ready to become a Greek *polis* in the early second century, without any change in wealth and fortune? It seems unlikely. So what altered the basic situation that seems to have remained more or less static for centuries? I have three suggestions: one relates to the number of Jews in the military, one relates to the Tobiads and the final one (suggested more tentatively) has to do with Jerusalem as a trade centre.

9.5.2.1 *Participation in the Military*

The sources leave no doubt that some Jews were attracted to the military (§8.2) – even though some modern scholars have denied that Jews could be soldiers. There is clear evidence, which is laid out in detail in §8.2. We have no way of knowing how many Jews served in the military, but it is certainly a part of the economic picture. For any young man who found he would receive no family property, the military might be a convenient alternative. Also, he might receive land as part of a cleruchy settlement and be better off than if he stayed at home and continued the family tradition. This also seems to have benefited the Judahite homeland.

For centuries most Jews made their living by farming, which required land. Agriculture was very labour intensive, and one of the advantages of many sons is that they could help out in the fields and vineyards. Yet when it came

time to pass the land on to the next generation, too many sons required dividing the property into small units. It was best to pass the land undivided to the eldest son and send the younger sons out of the local area. The Hellenistic armies would have been a good home for this excess population. Thus, the military provided new opportunities and new land to many Jews. It is also likely that many of them sent some money to their families back home, which provided a valuable injection of cash into the Judaeen economy, as well as the other benefits noted.

9.5.2.2 Contribution of the Tobiads

Now we come to the other contribution to wealth of the region: the Tobiads. We have to make it clear from the outset that this story of the Tobiads – known only from the account in Josephus – is problematic. It is not only a literary account but also a romantic tale, verging on soap opera at times. Yet when we look at independent accounts before and after the alleged time of Joseph Tobiad and his sons, they fit with the basic story of a wealthy and powerful family in the Palestinian area, with strong connections to Jerusalem. Likewise, the high priestly family of the Oniads is well attested. That a member of the Tobiads had managed to corner the tax-farming rights to the region for a couple of decades is not at all difficult to believe.

Although this story is not always easy to evaluate, there is much support for accepting its main outlines (§§13.3; 9.5.2.2). What were the implications of this for Judah and the Jewish community of Palestine? There are several ways to evaluate this. One way to read it is that the Tobiads were just a mafia family whose interests were entirely selfish and who did no good for their fellow countrymen. Another is to assume that having a Jewish family in a powerful position was bound to enhance the status and influence of the Jewish community with the Ptolemaic regime. The indication of 2 Macc. 3.11 is that Hyrcanus Tobiad had considerable wealth. The amount of money deposited in the temple, according to the text, was 400 talents of silver and 200 of gold. Since some of this money was said to belong to widows and orphans, it seems likely that most of it belonged to Hyrcanus; on the other hand, this was not likely to be his entire fortune but only what he might need for immediate needs when he was doing business in Jerusalem. The indication of 2 Maccabees 3 is that Hyrcanus Tobiad had good relations with the high priest and the temple. The Tobiads were also intermarried with the Oniad family, the traditional holders of the high priesthood. If so, it is hard to believe that the Tobiads would not occasionally have been useful to the high priest and to the city and region that was under the high priest's control.

What we do notice is that the 'Hellenistic reform' took place shortly after the alleged incident in 2 Maccabees 3 (see *HJJSTP* 3). At this time, it was evident that Jerusalem was prosperous and had a wealthy elite of citizens. Was it possibly the work of the Tobiads that produced enough surplus wealth for Jerusalem to put it in a position to move into the wider Hellenistic world?

I suggest that is was. In the ancient world, it was often the few wealthy and powerful individuals who were able to make things happen. Although the family land was in Transjordan, the Tobiads appear to have had a strong base in Jerusalem. This would help to explain the growing prosperity of the city: it was benefiting economically from the ‘Tobiad family enterprises’, the family’s need for goods (including luxury goods) and services for themselves and their entourage. Moderns are often suspicious of the wealthy and powerful, but that is our bias. Our task as historians, though, is to describe, not moralize. From an economic perspective, the Tobiads were not the villains they are often assumed to be.

9.5.2.3 *Jerusalem Amphorae*

Amphora handles, both stamped and unstamped, have been found at Jerusalem (§2.1.18). Some of these are of local manufacture, judging from the language used (e.g., Reich 2003; see further at §3.4), but more than 500 imported stamped handles have been found, the vast majority are Rhodian and dated to the period 260–150 BCE (Ariel [ed.] 1990: 13–98; Ariel 2000). This raises several interesting questions: what was the purpose of the jars and why did the number drop so drastically after 150 BCE? Several possibilities suggest themselves:

1. The jars contained foodstuffs imported to Jerusalem, especially by the Greeks and/or ‘Hellenized Jews’ living there. After the Hasmonaeans took control, such imports would have fallen off drastically. The jars are an indicator of Jerusalem’s prosperity but had no function in creating it.
2. The jars contained imported goods but were then reused to export goods from Judah; alternatively, the jars were brought in empty, to be filled with goods to be exported from Judah. The drop in numbers of pots could be due to a purely demographic cause: where people lived (cf. Ariel [ed.] 1990: 25).
3. The jars are an indication that Jerusalem functioned as a trading centre. In this case, Jerusalem was part of the broader mechanism that led to increased prosperity for Judah. The reduction in numbers could follow the situation after the Maccabean revolt when Jerusalem’s place in the region changed, but it could just be because of demographics.

Like all sources, material remains have to be interpreted. The significance of these imported jars, as indicated by their surviving handles, can go in more than one direction. It is unlikely that wine was being imported into Judah when plenty of wine was available from local sources; the same applies to oil. But amphorae were used for all sorts of foodstuffs. Perhaps the jars were only an indication of consumption, but we know there was an extensive coastal trade, with Syro-Palestine serving as an intermediary between the Aegean and areas north and Egypt (Ariel [ed.] 1990: 18). Jerusalem was far enough

from the sea that amphoras were not just passing through – they would have been taken there intentionally. Trade between Egypt and Arabia also came through Palestine. With the new wealth created by the Tobiads, Jerusalem might well have become developed as a useful centre for other activities, including trade and export. It might even have been a regional market place.

9.5.2.4 Summary

To reiterate some of the obvious points, subsistence agriculture was the main occupation of most of the people of Judah for many centuries. The coming of the Greeks did not change that. The parts of the country to the west and north had always been more prosperous than the Judaeen hill country and desert fringe which made up the bulk of Judaeen territory. As indicated by archaeology and literary sources, Judah remained one of the poorer and more backward areas of the region through much of the third century. By contrast, when we compare Judah of the Persian period with Judah at the beginning of the Hasmonaean period, it seems clear that the economy had improved drastically. The 350 silver talents that served as tribute for all of Syria, Phoenicia, Palestine and Cyprus in the Persian period meant that Judah paid only a small sum. The figure of 20 talents mentioned in connection with Onias II in the mid-third century looks about right and would also indicate that, at that time, Judah's economy was probably similar to what it had been under the Persians. Yet by 175 BCE the tribute looks more like 300 talents, a huge increase that has to be explained not just in raised taxes but also in a vastly expanded economy. What would have driven such an increase in wealth in the region?

I have suggested that there were two main causes plus a possible third, for all of which we have a reasonable amount of data: first, we have considerable evidence that many Jews were employed in the Ptolemaic military forces. This would have taken some pressure off land distribution in Judah, since many Jews were given land in Egypt, and it perhaps provided a certain flow of cash back to Judah from Egypt. A second economic driver was the Tobiad family and perhaps other family enterprises that we do not yet know about. Their new wealth seems to have been partly spent in Jerusalem, raising the general prosperity of the city. There may even have been economic developments in the city that boosted its affluence. There is also a third possible cause, though it seems to me much less certain than the other two: that Jerusalem had become a trading centre for the region, with quantities of goods moving through from north to south but also east to west, as well as Palestinian exports to Egypt and elsewhere.

Chapter 10

RELIGION I: TEMPLE, CULT AND PRACTICE

This is the first of two chapters specifically on religion among the Jews. Any division is somewhat arbitrary, since worship and religion is an integrated whole, but for practical reasons this chapter deals with the temple and cult and outward worship. One could say that it is focused on ‘praxis’. Yet this chapter also examines a number of controversial areas, including the high priesthood, the institution of the synagogue, the question of the Sanhedrin, and the topic of ‘Enochic Judaism’.

10.1 *High Priest*

M. Brutti (2006) *The Development of the High Priesthood during the pre-Hasmonean Period*; **JCH** 277–81; **R. Marcus** (1943b) ‘Appendix B: The Date of the High Priest Simon the Just (the Righteous)’, in H.St.J. Thackery et al. (eds), *Josephus* 7: 732–36; **O. Mulder** (2003) *Simon the High Priest in Sirach* 50; **J.C. VanderKam** (2004) *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*.

A general discussion of the development of the priesthood in the post-exilic period has already been given (*HJJSTP* 1: 224–35). By common consent the high priest was the chief religious figure of the Jews at this time and the leader in the Jerusalem temple cult. The main issue of discussion is not about the high priest’s religious place but whether he was also a political figure, a civil leader of the Jewish community in Palestine. Our sources say little directly about the priest as a whole under the Ptolemies, the one exception being the (somewhat problematic) account of Hecataeus of Abdera (§§5.2; 12.5). According to Hecataeus’ account (quoted in §12.5), the priests had a dual role: they carried out the cult in the temple but they also had a duty to act as judges (δικασταί) in major disputes and were entrusted with guardianship (φυλακή) over the laws (νόμοι) and customs (ἔθη). Ordinary priests are not particularly evident in the other few sources we have for the third century BCE. Ben Sira has some general references to the priests, but his one main description is of the high priest Simon II (see below).

Our knowledge of the high priests comes mainly from Josephus’ narrative. He does not provide a list; though he later implies that he has one of at least the post-Hasmonaean high priests, which he says number 28, a number

agreeing with his narrative (*Ant.* 20.10.5 §250). This raises the question of the source of his high priestly names between the Persian period and the Maccabean revolt: were they simply a part of the narrative and included for that reason, or did he have a separate list of high priests from which he sometimes extracted names to add to the narrative? This is a much disputed question (cf. Brutti 2006: 86–90), but the distinct impression is that he has a list available that he sometimes uses. The main reason for concluding this is that he includes the names of individuals about which he seems to know little. It is more reasonable that he has inserted their names from a bare list than that they were a part of his narrative sources. For example, the *Letter of Aristeas*, the Tobiad romance and 1 Maccabees are Josephus' sources for most of *Antiquities* 12; however, *Ant.* 12.3.1–4 §119–53 is made up of several letters that Josephus may have had separately but compiled into an additional section and inserted as a linking passage between his main sources.

There are also individual passages here and there that look as if they were added to his long sources; two of these are *Ant.* 12.2.5 §§43–44; 12.4.1 §57 which give the names of four high priests but hardly any information. It is hard to believe that Josephus would have omitted details if he had them; hence, he is almost certainly working from a list which he then interprets in such a way as to seem to say something beyond the mere name. The high priest Onias (I) is abruptly mentioned as having died (*Ant.* 12.2.5 §43), even though the only information previously given about him is that he had assumed the high priesthood after Jaddua (*Jaddous: Ant.* 11.7.7 §347). Josephus then says he was succeeded by Simon who was also called the Just. This cries out for further information, yet Josephus only makes the obvious statement that he was called the Just because he was pious and kindly toward other Jews. If Josephus had a list which simply contained the entry 'Simon the Just', this is precisely how he would have put him down. He then says that he was succeeded by his brother Eleazar (*Ant.* 12.2.5 §44). Possibly the name is only taken from *Aristeas*, but the information that Eleazar was Simon's brother and not his son could also have come from a list ('Eleazar the brother of Simon'). Likewise, the simple statement that Eleazar was succeeded by his uncle Manasses, and finally then Simon's son Onias (*Ant.* 12.4.1 §§157–58). This all looks like information from a simple list of high priests.

When we look at Josephus' narrative (including the passages just considered), we find the names of several high priests. The last high priest under the Persians he names as Jaddua, the father of Onias I (*Ant.* 11.7.2 §§302–303). I have already given arguments that this incident is actually a reflection of the episode in Neh. 13.28. If so, we cannot have confidence that the name of the high priest accurately reflects that of a high priest at the end of Persian rule (the actual name of the high priest is complicated by a textual variant and might reflect either יוֹיָדָע Joiada or יָדָע Jaddua). This leaves us with a blank for the last century of Persian rule, unless the few names recorded cover the whole Persian period (as discussed in *HJJSTP* 1: 230–34). We have the coin with the inscription 'Johanan the priest', which seems to

date from the fourth century, but it is not clear that ‘priest’ here means high priest. Whether Josephus’ list included the names of high priests in the Persian period is uncertain. If it did, it might be that his name of Jaddua (or Jehoida) for the priest at the time of Alexander might be reliable after all. Unfortunately, our uncertainty remains for the Persian period.

For Onias I we have no information other than that he assumed office toward the beginning of Greek rule (*Ant.* 11.7.7 §347; 12.2.5 §43). Josephus’ list evidently did not contain dates or lengths of terms of office, which means that he is probably exercising his own judgement as to where to insert them in the narrative. J.C. VanderKam (2004: 124–37) argues that it was under Onias I that Areus king of Sparta wrote to the Jews (to be discussed in *HJJSTP* 3).

In his *Contra Apionem* (1.22 §§187–91), Josephus also refers to the ἀρχιερεύς Hezekiah (Ezekias) who accompanied Ptolemy I back to Egypt after the battle of Gaza in 312 BCE. In this case, it looks as if the term should be translated ‘chief priest’, that is, a member of the high priest’s family. Josephus sometimes uses *archiereus* with this meaning, as do the NT writers. We do not otherwise know of such a high priest, and it seems unlikely that a high priest would have abandoned his place in the temple and migrated to Egypt without some comment in Jewish sources (see further at §12.2.2.2).

A good deal has been written about Simon I (Marcus 1943: 732–36; VanderKam 2004: 137–57; Brutti 2006: 80–84). Again, he is essentially a name, but he becomes interesting because he bears the epithet ‘the Just’. No explanation for this is given by Josephus (who simply seems to interpret the title by saying that Simon was pious and also well disposed toward his fellow Jews). Quite a debate has gone on as to whether Simon I is Simon the Just or if this title should go to Simon II. Granted, from what we know about Simon II, he would be a good candidate for being called ‘the Just’ (cf. Mulder 2003: 344–54). There are two arguments against this: first, we may have biased accounts of Simon II (for example, we do not have enough independent confirmation to know whether Ben Sira is completely objective in his high praise of Simon); secondly, our primary source of information, Josephus, clearly states that it was this high priest who is called ‘Simon the Just’. As suggested above, he probably took this information from a brief list that did not explain the title. But it seems difficult to find a reason why Josephus would be mistaken, or why his list was mistaken (which is also VanderKam’s conclusion, after considering the different arguments: 2004: 146–53). Of course, a copying error could have been made, but when weighed against statements in much later rabbinic literature, Josephus in this case seems more likely to be reliable. The debate seems to be a somewhat trivial one, however, as long as we do not know why the title ‘the Just’ was applied to whichever Simon it was applied to.

Josephus states that at Simon I’s death his son Onias was too young to take up the office and he was thus succeeded by Simon’s own brother Eleazar (*Ant.* 12.2.5 §44). This looks somewhat suspect, since Eleazar is also the priest named in the *Letter of Aristeas*. Yet even though the basic story of *Aristeas* is

fiction, it could still contain genuine pieces of data. If Josephus had a list of high priests which contained the name Eleazar, its presence would have facilitated fitting *Aristeas* into his story (and would also have supported his understanding of the writing as authentic). On balance, Eleazar was probably a name already on Josephus' list of high priests and not simply invented from *Aristeas*.

After Eleazar's death, Simon's son was apparently still too young, and Eleazar's uncle Manasseh (Manasses) took the office (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.4.1 §157). Again, we have no time frame, and Josephus is apparently working from his bare list of names (though it presumably gave Manasseh's relationship to Eleazar), but one suspects that Manasseh was not in the office for very long. Simon's son Onias (II) was now old enough and became high priest. It was he who played such an important part in the story of the Tobiads. His story and theirs is discussed below (§13.3). Onias' term of office probably came to an end toward the end of the third century BCE, since Simon II may have been high priest before Antiochus III started the Fourth Syrian War.

Simon II seems to have been a remarkable individual (Mulder 2003), much admired in writings still extant, such as Ben Sira. According to *3 Maccabees* (2.1), an individual named Simon was high priest in 217 BCE, at the time of the battle of Raphia. The information in *3 Maccabees* is not necessarily to be trusted, but many historical details can be verified as accurate (§4.8). For Simon to be in office by this time fits everything else we know about the high priests of the time. Simon was probably already anticipating a fight between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids that would involve Jerusalem. He prepared for this by strengthening certain of the city's fortifications. The exact aim of the 'reservoir' is not clear, but one explanation is that it would be useful in a siege. Ben Sira 50.1 has been explained as a statement about repairing damage to the city after fighting ceased, but the wording of both the Hebrew and Greek is not quite that clear: it could be repair of damage or it could refer to strengthening or maintaining. It does show Simon's concern about the city and not just the temple. For a further discussion of Ben Sira 50.1-4, see below (§14.3.1). Much of Ben Sira's poem is about Simon's duties as high priest in the temple. Here are extracts that cover both the building and the cultic activities:

- 1 Highly esteemed among his brothers and the glory of his people is Simon, the Son of Jochanan, the priest, since during his ministry the house [of God] was inspected and he, in his days, restored the temple.
- 2 Since, in his time, a reservoir was dug out, with a dividing wall therein on account of the water flow.
- 3 Moreover, in his days, a wall was built [with] fortress towers for a royal palace.
- 4 It is he who takes care of his people against robbery and he makes his city stronger than the enemy.

- 5 How glorious is he when he looks out of the tent
and comes out of the house of the veil,
6 as a luminous star in the midst of the clouds
as the full moon determining the festal days,
...
11 When he robes himself in a garment of eminence
and clothes himself in a vestment of glory,
when he ascends towards the raised altar
and bestows splendour on the walled enclosure of the sanctuary,
12 when he takes the portions from the hands of his brothers
then he is the one who presides at the order of worship
[of the sacrifice].
Around him a crown of sons,
as seedlings of the cedars in Lebanon
and they encircle him as willows from the river bank
13 all the sons of Aaron in their splendour
with burnt offerings for YHWH in their hands
in front of the whole assembly of Israel.
14 Until he has finished serving at the altar
and arranging the order of worship of the Most High. (Sir. 50.1-6, 11-14,
translation from Mulder 2003: 259–60)

While the work described by Ben Sira would make Simon II a prime candidate for the title ‘the Just’, we would know almost nothing about him from other sources. In Josephus he is only a name between Onias II and Onias III (*Ant.* 12.4.10 §§224–25). On the other hand, if we had more information on Simon I, we might agree that ‘the Just’ was applied to him with justice.

Onias III is associated with the reign of Seleucus IV (187–175 BCE) by Josephus (*Ant.* 12.4.10 §225). 2 Maccabees (3.1-3) states that under Onias, because he was ‘pious and a hater of evil’ (εὐσεβειᾶν τε καὶ μισοπονηρίαν), the temple was honoured with gifts from kings and even Seleucus ‘king of Asia’ paid all the expenses of the sacrificial cult from his own revenues. 2 Maccabees goes on to relate an incident in which the minister of Seleucus attempted to take the temple treasury but was prevented by the appearance of an angel on horseback. For a discussion of the historical reality behind this incident, see §14.3.5. The events relating to Onias III from the accession of Antiochus IV in 175 BCE will be discussed in *HJJSTP* 3 (see also *JCH* 277–81).

10.2 The Question of ‘the Sanhedrin’

J. Efron (1987) ‘The Great Sanhedrin in Vision and Reality’, in idem., *Studies on the Hasmonean Period*: 287–339; **D. Goodblatt** (1994) *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity*; **L.L. Grabbe** (2008) ‘Sanhedrin, Sanhedriyyot, or Mere Invention?’, *JSJ* 39: 1–19; **J. Neusner** (1979) ‘The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism: Yavneh (Jamnia) from A.D. 70 to 100’, *ANRW II*: 19.2.3–42; **V.A. Tcherikover** (1964) ‘Was Jerusalem a “Polis”?’ *IEJ* 14: 61–78.

One of the issues in current debate is the question of the Sanhedrin: did it exist or was it only the invention of the rabbis or even modern scholars? The evidence is examined in detail in Grabbe (2008), and only a summary is given here. We should first briefly consider terminology. It has become something of a convention in scholarship to refer to a 'Sanhedrin', based on the Hebrew word סנהדרין found in some late rabbinic sources but which is a borrowing of the Greek word συνέδριον 'council'. In the sources, however, a number of terms (all Greek) are used, but this would not be surprising if Greek writers were trying to find a term to fit a Jewish institution that did not precisely fit any Greek term. Some of the terms used are *gerousia* 'council of elders' or 'senate', a very frequent usage; *boulē* '(advisory) council', found in some references from the Roman period, and often used of city councils; *sunedrion*, often used in reference to ad hoc assemblies called to try cases, give advice or function as regional councils, but also a reference to a regular constituted council or senate.

The Sanhedrin first becomes an issue in the Persian period. The biblical text is not particularly helpful on the topic, but among the Elephantine papyri the letter from Jedaniah to Bagohi the governor of Judah, written in 410 BCE, is particularly relevant (*AP* ##30 and 31 = *TAD* A4.7 and A4.8; these are two copies of the same document with only slight differences). Within the letter is the following statement:

אנרה שלחן מראן ועל יהוחנן בהנא רבא ובנותה כהניא זי בירושלם ועל אוסתן
אחוייה זי ענני וחרי יהודיא אנרה חדה לא שלחו עלין

We sent a letter to our lord [Bagohi the governor] and to Yehohanan the high priest and his companions the priests who are in Jerusalem and to Ostan the brother of Anan and the nobles of the Jews. They did not send a single letter to us.

(my translation from the text in *TAD* A4.7.18-19)

According to this short passage, there was not only the Persian province of Judah with its governor Bagohi; there was a Jewish community having a leadership composed of the high priest and his fellow priests and the local nobility. No statement is made here of a formal council, and the question remains, how did the exercise of leadership actually function?

The most important early Greek source about the Jews is the account of Hecataeus of Abdera (§5.2). Writing about 300 BCE, Hecataeus had one of the few descriptions of the Jewish people in Palestine and one of the earliest in Greek (a full quotation of the account is given at §12.5). Hecataeus describes a Jewish ethnic and national community centred on Jerusalem in which the priests provide leadership and act as judges, as well as running the cult and teaching the law. Chief authority is invested in the high priest. In spite of the focus on the high priest, the passage recognizes that other priests were also in positions of authority, including being judges in major disputes.

According to Josephus, Antiochus III issued a decree which listed the temple personnel and relieved some of their taxes temporarily so the temple

could be repaired of war damage (see §14.3.2 for a full quotation of the passage). Antiochus mentions that the Jews ‘met us with their senate [μετὰ τῆς γερουσίας]’ and also decrees that ‘the senate [γερουσία], the priests, the scribes of the temple and the temple-singers shall be relieved from’ various taxes (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.3.3–4 §§138–46). The main problem is the failure to mention the high priest (who is usually thought to be Simon II at that time), though there are several possible explanations for this (for a further discussion, see §14.3.2). For example, the high priest might be included in the reference to the *gerousia* (‘council of elders’) which he would have headed. The important datum in this decree, though, is that the community was being led by this *gerousia*, which is another term for the Sanhedrin.

The books of Maccabees are extremely important because they give the most direct details about a ‘council of elders’ (*gerousia*). Such a body definitely functioned for the Hellenistic city established by Jason: for example, when charges were brought against Menelaus, ‘three men sent by the senate [ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας] presented the case before’ Antiochus IV (2 Macc. 4.43–50). This body was likely to have been an official body of the Greek *polis* of Jerusalem (see §7.2.2.4; §14.3.2). Other passages mention the *gerousia* as a governing body of the Jews (2 Macc. 11.27; 3 Macc. 1.6–8). Letters in 1 and 2 Maccabees associate the high priest with the *gerousia* (1 Macc. 12.5–6; 2 Macc. 1.10), as does the book of Judith (4.6–8; 11.14; 15.8).

As an important source for the different periods of Jewish history, the writings of Josephus need to be considered as a unit (§4.2). With regard to the *gerousia*, he has several passages giving it a governing role, sometimes in connection with the high priest. *Antiquities* 4.8.14 §218 states that hard cases which cannot be decided by the local judges are to go to the holy city for the high priest, the prophet and *gerousia* to judge. *Antiquities* 4.8.17 §224 adds that the king is to do nothing without the high priest and ‘the council of his senators’ (τῶν γερουσιαστών). *Antiquities* 5.1.4 §23 has the *gerousia* among those that make a circuit of the walls of Jericho.

Josephus also uses the term *sunedrion* (which was borrowed into Hebrew as *sanhedrin*), meaning ‘assembly’, ‘meeting’ or ‘council’. In *Ant.* 14.9.3–5 §§163–84 some complained of Herod’s actions as governor of Galilee, because he had executed certain brigands. The issue focused on the fact that he had done this without permission of ‘the council’ (ὑπὸ τοῦ συνεδρίου). He himself was called to answer before this council under the chairmanship of the high priest Hyrcanus II. Later on Herod is alleged to have executed many members of that body (*Ant.* 14.9.4 §175), giving the impression that ‘the council’ (τὸ συνεδρίον) is a pre-existing body, with a variety of prominent Jews as members and chaired by the high priest.

About the year 64 CE, the king Agrippa II was asked for a ruling on a priestly matter. The temple singers wanted permission to wear linen robes, up until then reserved for the priests. They called on Agrippa ‘to convene the Sanhedrin [συνέδριον] and get them permission’, and ‘the king, with the consent of those who attended the Sanhedrin [τῶν εἰς τὸ συνέδριον],

allowed' this (*Ant.* 20.9.6 §§216–17). The question is whether Agrippa was being asked to convene a pre-existing body or to appoint an ad hoc group to advise on the question. The first occurrence of the word *sunedrion* is without the definite article. Should the phrase be translated, 'to convene an (ad hoc) council'? The absence of the definite article does not necessarily imply a meaning which would require the indefinite article in English: the convening of an already existing group is grammatically possible, is implied by the context, and would certainly fit without any problem.

A number of passages use a new term: *boulē* (βουλή). The word is somewhat ambiguous, since it is often used for a body within a Greek city (usually a committee of the assembly that had responsibility for determining its business). For example, according to Josephus the emperor Claudius wrote a letter, addressed 'to the rulers, council, and people [ἄρχουσι βουλῇ δήμῳ] of Jerusalem and to the whole nation of the Jews' (*Ant.* 20.1.2 §§10–14). This could be an institute of the city, but it could also be a reference to a national body (Tcherikover 1964). Indications of a national body called the *boulē* is found in reference to the Roman governor Florus. He assembled 'the chief priests, the nobles, and the most eminent citizens' (*War* 2.14.8 §301), after which he sent for the 'chief priests and leading citizens' (*War* 2.15.3 §318). Finally, he called 'the chief priests and the council' (τοὺς ἀρχιερεῖς καὶ τὴν βουλήν) to tell them he was leaving the city, since it was they who were clearly responsible for civic order (*War* 2.15.6 §331; cf. 2.16.2 §336). Shortly afterward the Jewish king Agrippa II attempted to reduce the friction between the Romans and Jews by having 'the rulers and members of the council' (οἱ ἄρχοντες καὶ βουλευταί) go out and collect taxes to pay the arrears to the Romans (*War* 2.17.1 §§405, 407). This statement seems to relate to administration of the country rather than just the city. In addition, we later read of a building in which the *boulē* met (*War* 5.4.2 §144; 6.6.3 §354) and of the 'secretary of the council [ὁ γραμματεὺς τῆς βουλῆς]' (*War* 5.13.1 §532).

A number of passages in the New Testament refer to a 'council' (*gerousia* and *sunedrion* seem to be used interchangeably). A number of the passages in the Gospels suggest an existing body with the powers of judgement and under the control of the high priest or the chief priests (Mt. 5.22; Mk 14.55; 15.1//Mt. 26.59//Lk. 22.66; Jn 11.47). Joseph of Arimathea was alleged to have been a member of the council (βουλευτής; Mk 15.42–43//Lk. 23.50–51). The book of Acts seems to give the most direct information on how the council was supposed to have functioned. In Acts 4 and 5 the apostles Peter and John are pictured as being called before the council (*to sunedrion*) to account for their actions. Later, in Acts 22–23 the apostle Paul is brought before the council (*to sunedrion*) which includes the high priest, other priests, and Pharisees and Sadducees among its members.

We finally come to late rabbinic literature. The tractate *Sanhedrin* of the Mishnah presupposes several institutions that have often been drawn upon for the description of 'the Sanhedrin' in secondary sources. Up until recently

most treatments of the subject have begun with the rabbinic picture or at least gave considerable weight to that picture. On the surface, it appears quite plausible to accept the picture given by the Mishnah and other rabbinic writings, but there are reasons to be cautious (see *JCH* 13–16 and *JRSTP* 116–17, and especially the writings of Jacob Neusner cited there). One of the main reasons is that the Mishnah was written well after the Second Temple period and clearly presupposes the destruction of the temple in 70 CE. It also talks about the place of the king in legal judgement, which suggests not a reality but a theoretical position. Mishnah *Sanhedrin* 11.4 makes reference to the ‘court in Yavneh’; this alludes to the post-70 situation when the centre of Judaism had shifted from Jerusalem to Yavneh (Neusner 1979). Furthermore, all the descriptions of the Sanhedrin seem to be theoretical. As J. Efron notes:

Throughout all those generations, from the Zugot (‘Pairs’) to the end of the Second Temple, there is not one mention of a specific act of the Great Sanhedrin meeting in the Chamber of Hewn Stones. Its actual appearance is not interwoven in the variegated memories stored in the Eretz Israel talmudic tradition ... Its existence is not recognized or implied in the duties or activities of the Pharisee leaders, in the conduct or dicta of Rabban Gamaliel, the elder, and his son, nor in the company of Rabban Yoḥanan b. Zakkai and his disciples. Such a total void cannot be filled by contrived excuses, nor can its significance be ignored. (Efron 1987: 298–99)

Much more could be said, but as D. Goodblatt (1964), Efron and others have demonstrated, the Sanhedrin of rabbinic literature is an idealized creation of the rabbis. Once this is recognized, many of the difficulties with trying to find the historical Sanhedrin disappear.

What can we conclude about ‘the Sanhedrin’? The answer is closely related to the place of the high priest in Judah in the Second Temple period. Beginning in the Persian period, the high priest was the main leader of the Jewish community in Palestine for much of the Second Temple period. There was also a Persian governor part or all the time. Sometimes this governor was Jewish, in which case the high priest and the governor probably cooperated to a lesser or greater extent. In the Greek period, though, we have no indication of a governor, which made the high priest’s civic role even more important. (His powers were greatly circumscribed in the Roman period by the Herodian rulers and the Roman provincial government, but he continued to have a role even then.) He was assisted in his role of governor and leader by some sort of larger body, though its status and even its formal designation may well have varied over the centuries. The powers and influence of this body probably also varied, with the high priest sometimes more in control and sometimes less. The membership of this advisory body included other leading priests but also members of the non-priestly nobility. Exactly how this body functioned is uncertain though, once again, its exact functioning probably varied over time. Whether it had regular scheduled meetings with

an agenda or was only called together irregularly, whether there was a precise membership, how the membership was chosen, its precise jurisdiction – these are all questions that cannot be answered in the light of present knowledge. This body probably already existed as early as the Persian period and continued to the breakdown of traditional societal structures in the 66–70 CE war with Rome.

10.3 Synagogues and Prayer

S.E. Balentine (1993) *Prayer in the Hebrew Bible: The Drama of Divine-Human Dialogue*; **D.D. Binder** (1999) *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period*; **E.G. Chazon** (1992) 'Is Divrei ha-Me'orot a Sectarian Prayer?', in D. Dimant and U. Rappaport (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research*: 3–17; (1994) 'Prayers from Qumran and Their Historical Implications', *DSD* 1: 265–84; **J.H. Charlesworth et al. (ed.)** (1994) *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era*; **D. K. Falk** (1998) *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls*; **S. Fine** (1997) *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue during the Greco-Roman Period*; **S. Fine (ed.)** (1996) *Sacred Realm: The Emergence of the Synagogue in the Ancient World*; (1999) *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue*; **L.L. Grabbe** (1988c) 'Synagogues in Pre-70 Palestine: A Re-assessment', *JTS* 39: 401–10; **J.G. Griffiths** (1987a) 'Egypt and the Rise of the Synagogue', *JTS* 38: 1–15; **R. Hachlili** (1997) 'The Origin of the Synagogue: A Re-assessment', *JSJ* 28: 34–47; **J. Heinemann** (1977) *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns*; **L.A. Hoffman** (1995) 'Jewish Liturgy and Jewish Scholarship', in J. Neusner (ed.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity: Part I The Literary and Archaeological Sources*: 239–66; **W. Horbury and D. Noy** (1992) *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt*; **P. W. van der Horst** (1994) 'Silent Prayer', *Hellenism–Judaism–Christianity*: 252–77; (1998) 'Neglected Greek Evidence for Early Jewish Liturgical Prayer', *JSJ* 29: 278–96; (1999) 'Was the Synagogue a Place of Sabbath Worship before 70 CE?', in S. Fine (ed.), *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue*: 18–43; **P.W. van der Horst and G.E. Sterling** (2000) *Prayers from the Ancient World: Greco-Roman, Jewish and Christian Prayers*; **F. Hüttenmeister and G. Reeg** (1977) *Die antiken Synagogen in Israel*; *JWSTP*: 551–77; **M. Kiley et al.** (1997) *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology*; **L.I. Levine (ed.)** (1981) *Ancient Synagogues Revealed*; (1996) 'The Nature and Origin of the Palestinian Synagogue Reconsidered', *JBL* 115: 425–48; **H.A. McKay** (1994) *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism*; (1998) 'Ancient Synagogues: The Continuing Dialectic Between Two Major Views', *CR: BS* 6: 103–42; **O. Mulder** (2003) *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50*; **J.H. Newman** (1999) *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*; **C.A. Newsom** (1985) *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition*; **B. Nitzan** (1994) *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry*; **T. Rajak and D. Noy** (1993) 'Archisynagogoi: Office, Title and Social Status in the Greco-Jewish Synagogue', *JRS* 83: 75–93; **S.C. Reif** (1993) *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer*; **H. Tita** (2001) *Gelübde als Bekenntnis: Eine Studie zu den Gelübden im Alten Testament*; **D. Urman and P.V.M. Fleisher (eds)** (1995) *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery*; **R.A. Werline** (1998) *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism*.

The general development of the synagogue was discussed in *HJJSTP* 1 (236–37) and *JRSTP* (170–75). Part of the aim of that discussion was to demonstrate that the synagogue as an institution did not exist as early as the Persian period but rather came into existence in the third century BCE. The present section concentrates specifically on the situation in the early Hellenistic period and the evidence that emerges at that time.

The earliest evidence for the synagogue is in the mid-third century BCE in Egypt, that is, in the diaspora (Griffiths 1987a; Hachlili 1997). This is hardly surprising because Jewish communities in the areas far away from Palestine had no easy access to the Jerusalem temple. Jews in Palestine lived within a reasonable distance from the temple and were able to go there for sacrifice, worship and prayer on a fairly regular basis, most doing so during one of the annual festivals (cf. Lk. 2.41–42). But by the third century many Jews – probably the majority – now lived outside Palestine. We know that later on, pilgrims from the diaspora came each year in great numbers to worship at Jerusalem during the annual festivals. A wealthy Jew such as Philo of Alexandria mentions only once travelling to Jerusalem (*De Providentia* 2.64). Perhaps he went more than once in his lifetime, but the impression one has is that it was not very frequent. In any case, this practice of pilgrimage seems to have developed only later, mainly in the Roman period. Even at its height, it still involved only a small minority of Jews the world over. Thus, the diaspora communities would have felt a need for some means of expressing their religion in a community fashion.

Interestingly, the literary sources give us little help on the early development of the synagogue. Ben Sira, the first three books of Maccabees and the *Letter of Aristeas* are silent on the question of the synagogue. The first references to anything like synagogues in literature in fact come from the first century CE (in Philo and Josephus). However, we have evidence from inscriptions in Egypt from the third century BCE (Horbury and Noy 1992: ##9, 13, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 105, 117, 125, 126), and some references are found in contemporary documents as well. A plaque from a synagogue in Schedia (Nashwa [en Nashw] near Kafr ed-Dauwar), a customs post on the Nile about 14 miles from Alexandria, is dedicated to Ptolemy III Euergetes (246–221 BCE):

On behalf of king Ptolemy and queen Berenice his sister and wife and their children, the Jews (dedicated) the proseuche. (Horbury and Noy 1992: #22)

From a document in the late third century BCE, the synagogue is part of daily village life:

I have been wronged by Dorotheos, (a Jew who lives in the) same village. In the 5th year, according to the financial calendar, on Phamenoth ... (as I was talking to) my workmate, my cloak (which is worth ... drachmai) caught Dorotheos' eye, and he made off with it. When I saw him (he fled) to the Jewish synagogue [τῇ προσευχῇ τῶν Ἰουδαίων] (holding) the cloak, (while I called for help). Lezelmis, a holder of 100 arourai, came up to help (and gave) the cloak to

Nikomachos the synagogue verger [τῶι νακόρῳ] to keep till the case was tried.
(*CPJ* 1.129)

One person claims his cloak was stolen by a Jew of the same village who then fled to the synagogue with it. The *nakoros* or *neōkoros* ('warden') of the synagogue kept the cloak until the issue could be resolved. The interesting thing is that – ignoring for a moment the complaint – the two individuals are members of the same village, and the synagogue and its head are a part of the environment without any connotation of its being unusual or exotic. A land survey document of Arsinoe-Crocodilopolis (late second century BCE) mentions a 'Jewish synagogue' (προσευχή Ἰουδαίων) several times as a part of the town (*CPJ* 1.134). According to an inscription from the synagogue, it was also founded in the reign of Ptolemy III in the mid-third century BCE:

On behalf of king Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy, and queen Berenice his wife and sister and their children, the Jews in Crocodilopolis (dedicated) the proseuche.
(Horbury and Noy 1992: #117)

We have other references to synagogues in passing, as if they were a normal part of the architectural and cultic scene (*CPJ* 1.134). Another document seems to arise out of a meeting of members of a synagogue, though it is very fragmentary (*CPJ* 1.138).

The synagogue appears to have developed as a partial substitute for the temple, but not for the central cultic activity, which was animal sacrifice. Nothing could substitute for this, but there were other aspects to worship that the synagogue could accommodate. Yet the move to a community place of public worship took time. The early written sources that mention Jews' worshipping outside Jerusalem always picture them doing so in the privacy of their homes. In Tobit (2.1-3) prayer is conducted and the festivals celebrated in the home; there is no hint of a community institution. Both Daniel (6.11) and Judith (8.36–10.2) picture their protagonists as praying in their homes (cf. also Acts 1.13-14). The earliest synagogue inscriptions speak of the *proseuchē* (προσευχή or 'prayer house') of the Jews. This suggests that their foremost function was to serve as a place of prayer, an impression supported by a statement of Agatharchides of Cnidus (second century BCE):

The people known as Jews, who inhabit the most strongly fortified of cities, called by the natives Jerusalem, have a custom of abstaining from work every seventh day; on those occasions they neither bear arms nor take any agricultural operations in hand, nor engage in any other form of public service, but pray with outstretched hands in the temples [ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς] until the evening. (*apud* Josephus, *C. Ap.* 1.22 §209).

Although his focus is on the Jews of Jerusalem, Agatharchides is likely to be drawing on his experience of synagogues in Alexandria (where he lived most of his life) and elsewhere in the diaspora. It is natural that he as a non-Jew would refer to synagogues as 'temples'. In light of these data, it seems strange

that H. McKay (1994) has denied that synagogues were a place of prayer and worship at this time (see also the critique of van der Horst 1999: 23–37; Binder 1999: 404–15). We have evidence of scripture reading in synagogues at a later time, but whether it took place this early is not known.

It is generally assumed that the temple liturgy also included prayers and related liturgical forms such as hymns and singing. This is in spite of the statement of the *Letter of Aristeas* 95 that the temple ritual was carried out in complete silence (πᾶσα σιγή) – an interesting concept but one not taken seriously by most scholars. Important in this respect is Ben Sira (50.16–21) which describes the proceedings immediately following the sacrifices on the altar:

- 16 Then they blow, the sons of Aaron, the priests,
on the trumpets of hammered metal
and while they blow they sound a mighty flourish,
to summon the remembrance of the Most High.
- 17 All people together hurry along speedily
and they fall prostrate to the ground
to worship before the face of the Most High,
before the face of the Holy One of Israel.
- 18 And He raises his voice in the song [Greek text: And the singers joined in
harmoniously],
and above the thunderous noise they [all] esteem his light
- 19 and they rejoice, all the people of the land,
in prayer before the face of the Merciful One.
Until he [the high priest] is finished with the service of the altar,
and his prescriptions he brings to his goal.
- 20 Thereafter he descends and raises his hands
over the entire congregation of Israel,
the blessing of YHWH on his lips
and in the name of YHWH he reveals his glory.
- 21 And once again they fall down, a second time
[the blessed of God] before his face. (Sira 50.16–21, Hebrew text, translation
from Mulder 2003: 260)

Prayer – an address to the deity – is ubiquitous. The prayers in the Hebrew Bible have been very influential on subsequent Judaism and have been much studied (e.g., Balantine 1993; cf. Tita 2001); similarly, the prayers known from the rabbinic period and later (e.g., Reif 1993; Heinemann 1977). With all the interest in the Second Temple period, studies have started to appear on prayer and related activities (e.g., Werline 1998; Newman 1999; Kiley et al. 1997; van der Horst and Sterling 2000). But it is not surprising that much of the attention in the past few decades has focused on the Qumran texts (cf. Falk 1998; Nitzan 1994; Chazon 1994). These do indeed offer a rich collection, such as the *Thanksgiving Hymns* (1QH), the daily prayers (4Q507–509; 1Q34; 1Q34^{bis}), the festival prayers (4Q503), the *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice* (4QShirShabb^{a–h} = 4Q400–407, 11Q17; cf. Newsom 1985), *Divrei ha-Me'orot* (4QDibHam^{a–c} = 4Q504–506; cf. Chazon 1992). Yet there are

many other prayers scattered throughout the literature of the period. Some – perhaps most – of these are literary, but some of them might have arisen in either the synagogue or even the temple liturgy itself.

The question naturally arises about synagogues in Palestine at this time. The answer is that the synagogue did not spread to Palestine and Judah until after the Maccabean revolt and probably not until the first century BCE or even the first century CE (cf. Grabbe 1988c). It was unlikely that those with access to the temple would feel the need to put up synagogues as well at an early date. As the synagogue became better known, Jews even in Palestine may have started to think the synagogue had a function in their society, even though they made regular pilgrimages to the temple. But this is likely to have taken time and to have affected Jews in the more remote parts of Palestine, such as the Galilee. Thus, it was another two centuries or more after the origin of the synagogue in Egypt that the institution found its way to the Jewish heartland.

10.4 Zadokite versus Enochic Judaism?

G. Boccaccini (1991) *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.*; (1998) *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*; (2002) *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism*; **L.L. Grabbe** (2003d) 'Were the Pre-Maccabean High Priests "Zadokites"?', in J.C. Exum and H.G.M. Williamson (eds), *Reading from Right to Left*: 205–15; **D.R. Jackson** (2004) *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars*; **L.G. Perdue** (1977) *Wisdom and Cult*; **P. Sacchi** (1996) *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History*.

Who originated the concept of 'Enochic Judaism' is a bit difficult to say. It seems to be found in some of the writings of P. Sacchi (1996); however, it is the work of G. Boccaccini that has brought about the widespread use of the term, especially in English-speaking scholarship (esp. Boccaccini 1998; 2002). The term seems to be used in reference to the world view found not only in *1 Enoch* but also in *Jubilees*, the *Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs* and *4 Ezra*. Enochic Judaism was not originally a separate community from its opponents in Zadokite Judaism but only an opposition party within the temple elite. The fundamental difference between 'Zadokite' Judaism and 'Enochic' Judaism is in their view of evil: the Zadokites thought the present world was one of divine order that had developed from chaos, whereas the Enochians thought the present world was a corrupted one (caused by the sin of the fallen angels) from what was perfect in the beginning. The Enochic view of evil challenged the legitimacy of the Second Temple and its priesthood, eventually putting the two forms of Judaism at irreconcilable odds with one another, leading to the Essenes and the breakaway Qumran group.

Boccaccini states that the concept 'cannot be fit [*sic*] entirely into a unitary scheme or a univocal definition' but its generative idea 'can be identified in a

particular conception of evil' (1998: 12). Although Enochic Judaism is rooted in apocalyptic, it does not coincide with a history of Jewish apocalypses or apocalypticism, since there are apocalypses that are different from or even in opposition to it (e.g., Daniel, Revelation, 2 *Baruch*). The thesis of an 'Enochic Judaism' recognizes several points that are valuable in characterizing Second Temple Judaism:

- Judaism was not monolithic but embraced a variety of views and attitudes;
- Jewish texts differ in some basic theological concepts; and
- a cluster of Jewish texts contain ideas and concepts not generally anticipated in the Hebrew Bible. Especially important is *1 Enoch*, but some of its leading ideas can be found in other early Jewish texts.

The question, though, is whether we find only some texts with different ideas or an entirely different sort of Judaism. After all, the Hebrew Bible itself encompasses texts with a variety of viewpoints, some that would not have been anticipated if the reader were familiar only with the Deuteronomic literature and the book of Isaiah (e.g., Job, Song of Songs, Qohelet). But this is a wide-ranging thesis and needs to be considered as a whole. The ultimate test is its explanatory power for a whole spectrum of data from Second Temple Judaism. Ultimately, in my view, the thesis obscures more than it clarifies, as the following comments indicate.

Important for the concept of 'Enochic Judaism' is its contrast with 'Zadokite Judaism' and 'Sapiential Judaism' (Boccaccini 2002). Let us consider these latter entities. First, the term 'Zadokite Judaism': there is a certain amount of confusion over this term. Sometimes it seems important that it refers to a group claiming actual descent from Zadok ('the house of Zadok'), even though it is accepted that some of the chief priests in the First Temple period may not have claimed such descent (cf. Grabbe 2003d). At other times, it seems to be used as a generic way of referring to the Jerusalem temple establishment; nevertheless, it does not include Levites, even though the Levites were an important part of the temple establishment in the Second Temple period (whatever friction there was with the altar priests in an earlier period or even the Second Temple period (cf. *HJJSTP* 1: 224–30).

The use of the term 'Zadokite Judaism' is something of a misnomer, since the priests did not represent a particular 'Judaism' in the sense that Boccaccini uses it. Although the priests had to be united in how the temple cult was carried out – or there would be considerable confusion for worshippers – it is unlikely that they all shared the same precise beliefs and understandings of 'scripture'. The priesthood was a profession, not a sect. Surprisingly, Boccaccini distinguishes the Zadokites from the 'Aaronites'. It is true that the concept of the altar priests as 'sons of Aaron' seems to be a post-exilic development, as has long been postulated, but there is no text that distinguishes 'sons of Aaron' from 'sons of Zadok' – the two terms seem to be

interchangeable (cf. Grabbe 2003d). Yet despite the separation of the Zadokites from the Aaronites, we are still told:

Since the beginning the Zadokite oligarchic power had indeed an 'aristocratical character' as it so largely depended on the support of their fellow priests, the Aaronites ... What began with Ezekiel as a Zadokite revolution resulted in an Aaronite hegemony. (Boccaccini 2002: 72).

So who exactly are the Zadokites in this 'Aaronite hegemony' with an 'aristocratical character'? As shown in my study (Grabbe 2003d), there is no evidence for the view that the high priestly family in the Second Temple period was 'Zadokite' in opposition to other priests: 'sons of Zadok' appears to have applied to all altar priests, not just the high priestly family.

Unlike some later groups such as the Pharisees, Sadducees and Essenes, we do not anywhere have explicit descriptions of Zadokite Judaism or Enochic Judaism or Sapiential Judaism. What we have are a number of pieces of literature which seem to reflect particular views or even a cluster of views that is sometimes called a 'world view'. The problem is trying to hypothesize a social phenomenon from the literature alone. Boccaccini himself recognizes this with regard to apocalyptic literature when he notes that it does not necessarily represent a single social phenomenon (Boccaccini 2002: 31), so why should we assume that some of these other terms apply to a single social group? When it comes to a description of the Zadokite world view, the sources used include the P document, Ezekiel, Deuteronomy, and 1 and 2 Chronicles. The book of Ezekiel is of course the one writing that uses the term 'sons of Zadok' for the altar priests, but who is the author of P? How can we know that this is 'Zadokite' and not 'Aaronite' or even 'Levite'? If we ignore Deuteronomy, what distinguishes the Zadokite world view from the Aaronic world view or the general priestly world view? If we are going to postulate a 'Zadokite Judaism', we have to argue which sources to use and how they relate to a specific form of Judaism known as 'Zadokite'. This has not been done. It is difficult to find this 'Zadokite Judaism' clearly marked out in the sources.

To take one example, it is assumed that a significant difference between 'Zadokite' Judaism and 'Enochic' Judaism is the difference in the concept of the origin of evil. As noted above, Boccaccini considers this the fundamental area where 'Zadokite Judaism' differed from 'Enochic Judaism'. This is based on a series of documents, primarily the priestly document of the Pentateuch and the Book of Watchers. There is much to agree with in Boccaccini's discussion of the myth of the fallen angels. More difficult is the notion that they represent two different forms of Judaism – and opposing forms at that. It is admitted, after all, that 'both traditions share the same background' (Boccaccini 2002: 99). Boccaccini seems to be using 'Zadokite Judaism', 'Prophetic Judaism', 'Enochic Judaism' and 'Sapiential Judaism' as ideal types (though he does not use that term). Weberian ideal types can be useful heuristic devices in research but there are also dangers in using them. The

main danger is elevating an ideal type to the status of a hypostasis which can be read into texts as a fact, rather than as a hypothesis to be tested against the texts.

The starkly opposed positions might fit ideal types, but they do not fit the realities of the texts being used. The priestly texts do not draw only a picture of a perfect world. The place of evil as an integral part of the present world and the ability of humans to corrupt creation is fully recognized in those documents that are labelled 'Zadokite' by Boccaccini: for example, the P document is filled with examples of human failure and sin. One of the purposes of the cult was to deal with this continuous human failure. As was pointed out long ago, there are some remarkable parallels between the imprisonment of Asael in *1 Enoch* 10.4-6 and the scapegoat ceremony in the Day of Atonement ritual. One only needs to read Leviticus 26, to take one instance. Indeed, it is recognized even in the creation account itself when, in Gen. 3.16-19, the sin of Adam and Eve leads to a permanent change in nature: a curse on women and a curse on the very earth itself. On the other hand, the Enochic tradition indicates a constraint on the power of the fallen angels; for example, Asael is bound and imprisoned until the final judgement, and the illegitimate offspring are destroyed (*1 Enoch* 10). The final cleansing of the earth will not take place until the final judgement, of course, but the picture in *1 Enoch* 10 does not differ significantly from that found in some of the 'Zadokite' documents (e.g., Isa. 2.2-4). In short, there does not seem to be a fundamental difference between the Zadokite and the Enochic concepts of evil.

Particularly problematic is the statement: 'There is no room in the Zadokite worldview for extreme measures that would lead to the end of times and a new creation' (Boccaccini 2002: 76). It is not suggested on what texts such a view is based, but 'Zadokite' documents evidently embrace all biblical books except the 'later Esther and Daniel' (Boccaccini 2002: 68). If so, the lion lying down with the lamb and eating straw like an ox is a new creation (Isa. 11.7). A new covenant in which God's laws are written into the heart is a new creation (Jer. 31.31). The scenario of Zechariah 14 seems to envisage extreme measures, including some sort of eschaton with God's intervention to correct great wrongs and great evil, and the establishment of a new creation.

The next question is, what sort of social reality is reflected in these two theological positions? The assumption seems to be that we must have two separate, opposed movements. This is, of course, one possibility, but it is by no means the only one. They could be two different views held by members of the one priestly establishment in the temple – in other words, by priests who served side by side at the altar. For an interesting analogy, one needs to look no further than the established church in England. At the moment, the Church of England is divided into a least three different 'wings' – the evangelicals, the Anglo-Catholics, and the liberal wing – and these have fundamental disagreements on some important issues, while agreeing on

others. Thus, the Anglo-Catholics or ‘high church’ party and the evangelicals differ strongly on certain issues but unite against the liberals on other issues.

The matter is not simple, but there seems no reason why a Jerusalem temple priest could not have written the Book of Watchers. On the other hand, the Animal Apocalypse might be more of a problem since it seems to regard the Second Temple as having a polluted altar. To move on to another ‘opposition movement’, Sapiential Judaism is labelled lay and secular. It is generally believed that, more than 30 years ago, L.G. Perdue laid that characterization to rest (1977). The preserved Jewish wisdom texts are not secular – if indeed that term is appropriate at all to the ancient world. Again, we have an ideal type elevated to a social reality. In the neighbouring societies in Mesopotamia and Egypt wisdom was hardly secular. What was to prevent members of the temple establishment – priests, Levites, priestly scribes, who had the education and leisure to compose literature – from writing wisdom literature? This is not to assert that the preserved Jewish wisdom literature was composed by individuals from the temple, but this is certainly a possibility. What is unacceptable is an opposition between wisdom circles and priests; on the contrary, they are likely to have overlapped. Interestingly, Boccaccini recognizes that Ben Sira combines elements of wisdom and priestly tradition, so why see them as a development from two opposed forms of Judaism? The belief seems to be that any writing that does not talk a great deal about sacrifices, the temple, ritual purity or other ‘priestly’ concerns cannot have been written by a priest. To summarize:

- The concepts of ‘Zadokite Judaism’, ‘Sapiential Judaism’ and so on that contrast with ‘Enochic Judaism’ are problematic.
- The concern of temple priests was primarily about correct observance of the temple ritual – orthopraxis; there is no reason why they could not have held a variety of views on concepts such as the origin of evil.
- There is no evidence that priests viewed the creation as presently perfect and thus in complete contrast to the picture found in the Book of Watchers; on the contrary, the biblical texts see a great deal wrong with human beings, the spirit world and the natural world, though they do not blame God for this, anymore than *1 Enoch* blames God for the sin of the fallen angels.
- Some texts contain ideas that would have been opposed by the temple priesthood, such as the solar calendar (cf. *HJJSTP* 1: 185–88). But it is not at all clear that the texts lumped together as indicative of ‘Enochic Judaism’ have an origin in a common social group. The question of continuity even within the Enochic literature does not have an obvious answer. Can we be sure that the same group that wrote the Parables of Enoch was a direct continuity of the one that wrote the Book of Watchers?

10.5 Summary

What becomes especially evident in the Ptolemaic period is the importance of the high priest as the leader of the nation in the political sphere as well as the religious. This may well have been the case in the later Persian period as well, though the lack of proper documentation makes us uncertain. But Hecataeus of Abdera (§§5.2; 12.5) testifies to the priesthood in general and the high priest in particular as the governors of the people (under the Hellenistic ruler, of course). The high priest may have been given the specific Ptolemaic office of *prostasis* ‘governance, patronage’ or something similar (though this is disputed [§13.3]). A ‘Sanhedrin’ of some sort, probably made up of both priests and lay aristocracy, also assisted or advised him (§10.2). There was possibly a Ptolemaic governor over the region, though the evidence is against it (§7.1.3.1), but in essence the Jewish province was a theocracy (or hierocracy) under the control of the priestly establishment in Jerusalem. Although the province was subject to the government in Alexandria, this was mainly for taxation purposes. Indeed, it may be that the high priest was responsible for collecting taxes as well. For further on this question, see the discussion at §7.2.2.

We also have evidence that the diaspora Jews had finally developed an institution to substitute for the temple. They had perhaps felt the need for some time, but it is finally about the middle of the third century that we start to find evidence of the existence of the synagogue. We do not have any descriptions of the precise services conducted at this time, but the name of the institution (*proseuchē*) strongly suggests that prayer and similar types of worship were conducted. Yet the fact that the Pentateuch was translated into Greek, perhaps in the mid-third century – about the same time as the first synagogues are attested – may well indicate that some sort of study or scriptural reading was an early part of the synagogue services.

Finally, there is the question of whether other sorts of Judaism had developed. One major suggestion is that an ‘Enochic Judaism’ had developed in opposition to ‘Zadokite Judaism’. It is true that there was a temple establishment. Whether the term ‘Zadokite’ is appropriate, at least the intention to use it to refer to the priestly establishment is clear; however, it is also misleading in that it implies the priesthood formed a sect. On the contrary, the priests’ first duty was to carry out the temple ritual, which was done according to long-established custom. This did not require many particular beliefs, and theological discussion and speculation could have taken place, with considerable differences among the various altar priests. We know that certain sectarian groups developed who opposed the priestly establishment. For example, the group mentioned in the *Damascus Document* (CD 1.4-9) may have been in existence already by this time. Similarly, sections of *1 Enoch* which had already been written by 200 BCE suggest a group that used a solar calendar (*1 Enoch* 72–82), even though the calendar in

use by the temple at this time was likely to have been a solar–lunar calendar (*HJJSTP* 1: 185–88).

This may suggest a group who had actually broken away from the temple. Yet there is no reason why much of *I Enoch* could not have been written by a temple priest. The problem is not whether there were sects nor whether *I Enoch* was read and even cherished in some circles. But these did not necessarily have to have cut themselves off from the temple. The existence of a widespread form of Judaism called ‘Enochic Judaism’ is far from demonstrated.

Chapter 11

RELIGION II: LAW, SCRIPTURE AND BELIEF

In the early part of the Second Temple period, as in the monarchical period, worship for the inhabitants of Judah centred on the temple. A new factor had entered the religious scene, however: the existence of a significant diaspora of Judahites (§1.3). During the Persian period there was a large Jewish community in Mesopotamia, but our ignorance of it distorts our understanding of the development of Judaism to some extent. After Alexander, on the other hand, there was a large diaspora in Egypt, but one much better documented than previously. It becomes clear that in the early Hellenistic period – though no doubt beginning in the Persian period – some fundamental changes in the nature of Judaism as a religion began to take place. These were parallel to the temple focus of Judaism for much of the Second Temple period, but they became more insistent, especially in the diaspora, and prepared the Jews with a means of practising their religion after the destruction of the temple. This chapter concentrates on these aspects of Judaism.

11.1 *The Development of ‘Scripture’*

By the close of the Persian period, a great deal of what later became known as the Bible or ‘scripture’ had taken shape (*HJJSTP* 1: 331–43). Nevertheless, the assemblage of scriptural writings was still developing, and the text of some or all of the writings now collectively known as ‘Bible’ continued to develop and change for centuries. When we talk about the Bible’s ‘development’, two separate but related concepts are usually included: the growth of the canon and textual standardization.

11.1.1 *Growth of the ‘Canon’*

H.M. Barstad (2002) ‘Is the Hebrew Bible a Hellenistic Book? Or: Niels Peter Lemche, Herodotus, and the Persians’, *Trans* 23: 129–51; **G.J. Brooke** (2007) ‘“Canon” in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls’, in P.S. Alexander and J.-D. Kaestli (eds), *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition*: 81–98; **L. Grabbe** (2006a) ‘The Law, the Prophets, and the Rest: The State of the Bible in

Pre-Maccabean Times', *DSD* 13: 319–38; **L.L. Grabbe (ed.)** (2001) *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period*; **N.P. Lemche** (1993) 'The Old Testament – A Hellenistic Book?' *SJOT* 7: 163–93; **O. Lipschits** (2005) *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem: Judah under Babylonian Rule*; **M. A. O'Brien** (1989) *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment*.

In general, scholarship has concluded that most biblical literature grew up over a lengthy period of time, as communal literature to which different groups and institutions made a contribution. Some biblical writings may be pre-exilic, but the bulk of them seem to be exilic or post-exilic in their final compilation. There has been a considerable debate over the Deuteronomistic History (DtrH), with some wanting to put a first edition in the time of Josiah, but others are still convinced that Noth was right about the origin of the work in the exile (see the survey in O'Brien 1989; Lipschits 2005: 272–304). In any case, there is evidence of post-exilic references that require a further edition at that time. This has led some to argue for a composition entirely in the post-exilic period. The Pentateuch is a product of the Persian period (*HJJSTP* 1: 337–43). It is not likely to be earlier than that because the Jewish community at Elephantine does not appear to have known it, even though they clearly maintained many religious practices attested in the Pentateuch. For example, the name Moses and the word 'Torah' do not occur in the extensive set of documents which includes a variety of different sorts of writings from different contexts of the community's life. The Pentateuch was probably completed before the end of the Persian period, DtrH was probably more or less complete by the beginning of Persian rule (though some put it well into the Persian period), while some of the Writings were also finished before Alexander. As for the prophetic writings (Latter Prophets), it seems likely that most or all of them had a long and complicated period of growth, as did other compositions now in the 'Writings' section of the Hebrew canon.

In order to understand the development of 'scripture', we have to put the variety of Israelite and Judaic religious traditions once in existence at the forefront of our minds. Only some of these have been preserved for us. The tendency – probably often unconscious – is to see a central core of biblical texts from which everything else branches off. Despite the finds from Qumran and new recognition of the variety of Second Temple Jewish literature, scholars still think of the Bible as a given. The variety of Israelite and Judaic traditions needs to be recognized and not seen as if they derived from the Bible. Traditions parallel to the biblical ones – but independent – existed but did not happen to become canonical or even survive. Many of the writings called 'rewritten Bible' should rather be seen as 'para-biblical'; that is, they are parallel to the Bible but represent another version of the tradition and are not necessarily dependent on the biblical writings. They arose separately and independently of the Bible as such, though the developing Bible might have influenced them during their transmission. A good example is *I Enoch* which many have seen as arising from the interpretation of Genesis 5 and 6, but

more likely both it and Genesis are independent reflections of an earlier myth about fallen angels, and *1 Enoch* is not derivative from the Bible.

What then of Niels Peter Lemche's proposal that the Bible is a 'Hellenistic book' (1993)? All accept that some parts of it are Hellenistic: Daniel in particular. Most would accept that Qohelet is Hellenistic (§4.4), and a fair number would date the books of Chronicles to the Greek period. It is often assumed that the final editing of many of the prophetic books took place after the coming of Alexander. Nevertheless, there are good reasons to disagree with Lemche and conclude that the majority of the books that make up the present Hebrew canon were regarded as having religious authority by the end of the Persian period. In that sense, the Bible is a Persian book – though some parts no doubt existed already in the Babylonian period and perhaps even earlier in the Assyrian. The proposal that the bulk of the Hebrew Bible is Hellenistic has not gained widespread support (cf. Grabbe [ed.] 2001; Barstad 2002). Reasons for concluding this come from two datable sources: the writing of Ben Sira and the account of the Jews given by Hecataeus of Abdera.

First, Hecataeus of Abdera's description of the Jews (quoted in §12.5). For our present purposes, his most interesting statement is the following: 'Also in their laws it is written at the end that what Moses has heard from God (the god) he declares to the Jews' (Diodorus 40.3.6). The verb used here (προσέγραπται) implies a written book. If Ben Sira accepted the Pentateuch as authoritative a century later, it would have been unlikely if the 'book of the *torah* of Moses' was not complete by the time of Hecataeus. But Ben Sira is the main witness to the nature of 'scripture' in this period. In a long section of his writing, known as 'the praise of the fathers' (Sira 44–50), he surveys history from Adam to his own times and includes by name or implication many writings now known from the Hebrew Bible.

In sum, a good portion of what we know as the Hebrew Bible was in some way accepted as 'scripture' and with some sort of religious authority by the time of Alexander. Judging from Ben Sira's list, this would include the following: the five books of the Torah, the Former Prophets (Joshua to 2 Kings), the Latter Prophets (including the Twelve Minor Prophets as a unit), and several of the Writings: Job, possibly a form of Ezra (but not containing the Ezra tradition), Nehemiah, possibly the books of Chronicles, possibly the book of Proverbs.

11.1.2 The Biblical Text

J. Cook (1997) *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs?*; **F. M. Cross** (1964) 'The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert', *HTR* 57: 281–99; (1966) 'The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text', *IEJ* 16: 81–95; (1975) 'The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts', in F.M. Cross and S. Talmon (eds), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*: 306–20; **F.M. Cross and S. Talmon**

(eds) (1975) *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*; **K. De Troyer** (2000) *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther*; **L.L. Grabbe** (2006a) 'The Law, the Prophets, and the Rest: The State of the Bible in Pre-Maccabean Times', *DSD* 13: 319–38; **J. Neusner** (1996) 'German Scholarship on Rabbinic Judaism: The Goldberg-Schäfer School', in idem (ed.), *Ancient Judaism: Debates and Disputes: Fourth Series*: 133–44; **J. Sanderson** (1986) *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^m and the Samaritan Tradition*; **P. Schäfer** (1986) 'Research into Rabbinic Literature: An Attempt to Define the Status Questionis', *JJS* 37 (1986) 139–52; **S. Talmon** (1970) 'The Old Testament Text', in P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans (eds), *Cambridge History of the Bible*: vol. 1: 159–99; (1975) 'The Textual Study of the Bible – A New Outlook', in F.M. Cross and S. Talmon (eds), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text*: 321–400; **E. Tov** (2001) *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*, 181–83; **E.C. Ulrich** (1999) *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible*; **B.K. Waltke** (1965) *Prolegomena to the Samaritan Pentateuch*; (1970) 'The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Text of the Old Testament', in J.B. Payne (ed.), *New Perspectives on the Old Testament*: 212–39.

In only a few cases (e.g., perhaps Qohelet) was a book written by a single author, so that one could speak legitimately of an 'original writing'. Thus, the text remained fluid for centuries, sometimes many centuries. Being able to give a list of Jewish writings that were considered authoritative by the end of the Persian period, as was done above (§11.1.1) is a fairly major achievement, but this is only part of the story. The next question is, what form did these writings take? Did they have a fixed text or was this still fluid? Because of the publication of much early Jewish literature in the past few decades – including much of the material from Qumran – we can put our suggestions on a much firmer basis than before (for literature and discussion of the Qumran scrolls, see *HJJSTP* 3).

Still very influential on discussions about the text is the de Lagardian hypothesis (discussed in Tov 2001: 181–83) which postulates that there was an original text from which later recensions derived by normal scribal processes. A version of this thesis which argued for three basic text types was propagated by F.M. Cross (1964; 1966; 1975), though it was already queried by S. Talmon (1970). Although the MT, the LXX and the SP have long been known and seem to fit this hypothesis, many think that the Qumran scrolls show a more complex situation. The basic aim of textual criticism has been traditionally to restore an original text. The new data suggest, however, that for significant parts of the Hebrew Bible the concept of 'original text' is problematic. This may seem to be a strange assertion: surely *something* must have been written first. Indeed, but the first writing in many cases was not the later writing. It was only part of the material later incorporated into the book, but by the time the biblical book was in sufficient shape to be identified with the familiar biblical book, there were already several versions in existence.

This is why the de Lagardian hypothesis now appears simplistic, in view of the apparent chaos of textual reading coming from the new finds. For example, E. Tov has argued that the variant manuscripts should be

considered as separate texts rather than simply assimilated to three textual versions known before Qumran (2001: 160–63). Also, of fundamental importance is the observation made by S. Talmon who noted the problems with drawing a clear line between textual criticism and ‘literary’ (i.e., tradition-historical) criticism:

It is hoped that the foregoing discussion sufficiently illustrated the hypothesis that in ancient Hebrew literature no hard and fast lines can be drawn between authors’ conventions of style and tradents’ and copyists’ rules of reproduction and transmission. (Talmon 1975: 381; cf. also Tov 2001: 313–50).

Only a brief summary of data on the text for the Hellenistic period can be given here. Qumran scrolls will be cited (even though many of them are later than 175 BCE) because they frequently show earlier textual developments and provide an insight into the pre-Maccabaeen textual situation. As is widely known, the LXX text often seems to reflect a Hebrew text that differed from the MT (even if retroversion from the Greek to its presumed underlying Hebrew text is not always as simple as some textual critics seem to think). The LXX text-type is well represented at Qumran. There are a few fragments of the LXX Pentateuch in Greek (4Q119–122 = 4QLXXLev^{a,b}, 4QLXXNum, 4QDeut). Other manuscripts, although in Hebrew, show a text in line with that known from the LXX. The different order and text of the LXX Jeremiah, for example, are attested in 4QJer^a (4Q70). In other cases, readings known from the LXX have been found in texts that otherwise belong to another text-type. Thus, the scrolls have well established that readings unique to the LXX are in many cases due to the use of a different underlying Hebrew reading and not the product of the translator.

Examples of the SP text-type are also attested among the Qumran scrolls (4Q22 = 4QpaleoExod^m; Sanderson 1986). These are not specifically Samaritan because the unique sectarian readings (e.g., the extra addition to the Decalogue referring to Mt Gerizim) are not present (where these passages survive), suggesting that we have a stage of the SP before it was taken over and adapted by the Samaritan community. This leads to the conclusion that most of the peculiarities of the SP were not developed by the Samaritans themselves but had already originated in another (Jewish?) context and were then taken over by the Samaritan community for whatever reason. It is now agreed that the SP has a long history, going back to Second Temple times. More difficult is its relationship to the MT and the LXX. Its frequent agreement with the LXX has led some to suggest that it was the original on which the LXX was based, but this is a superficial judgement since the SP is actually closer to the MT than the LXX in its primary readings (Waltke 1965; 1970). Many SP passages indicate expansion from other sections of the text, which gives it greater bulk without increasing the amount of primary material (e.g., Exod. 32.10–11, expanded by an addition from Deut. 9.20). The SP resemblance to the LXX is caused by the secondary expansions that they share.

The exact relationship of the LXX to the MT was long debated since there are many differences between the two. In most books of the Bible the differences affect mainly individual words or phrases; however, in some books the LXX can be said to represent not just a different text-type but almost a different version of the book. For example, the LXX text is one-eighth shorter in Job and one-sixth shorter in Jeremiah, while the LXX in Proverbs is often different from the MT (cf. Cook 1997). The text of Qohelet appears to be one of the Minor Versions, that of Aquila or a similar version. Recent finds from Qumran and comparative textual study indicate that many of these differences between the LXX and the MT are due to a different Hebrew text's having been used by the LXX translators (see next section). Yet this is not the full story, for many differences can also be attributed to the translation techniques being used and the attempts to render a Semitic text into an Indo-European language. At any given point, either explanation for apparent textual differences is theoretically possible, and only careful study can show which is likely to be the correct explanation.

As discussed below, Judaism did not begin as a 'religion of the book' (§13.6.1; *JRSTP* 178–82). Attachment to written scripture as the basis of Judaic religion only gradually developed, and such concepts as authoritative scripture, canon and fixed text that later became standard were at the end of the process and not there in the beginning. Judaism was initially a temple-based religion and remained largely so until 70 CE. But religious writings began to become important no later than the Persian period (and probably at least to some extent earlier). It was in the diaspora, however, where the temple was inaccessible and Jewish identity centred around the local community that the written word took on a new significance. The synagogue as an institution seems to have originated in the diaspora, probably about the middle of the third century BCE in Egypt (§10.3). As the written word increased in importance, the need for a standardized collection of books and a standardized text is likely to have become more urgent; conversely, this need is likely to have been felt only late in the process, and up to then variety was not seen as a problem. Even Philo of Alexandria in the first century CE does not indicate awareness of the existence of different biblical texts, and Josephus freely uses Greek versions of books that differed considerably from the Hebrew texts of his own time.

Thus, the need for a standardized text – which we tend to take for granted – seems not to have been felt until toward the end of the Second Temple period. Instead, the text developed organically as scribes passed it on. We should not think, however, of scribes who saw their job as simply making faithful copies of the text before them. On the contrary, the process of scribal transmission combined both copying and editorial revision. Or to look at it another way, it involved both the processes assumed by traditio-historical criticism and those assumed by textual criticism – as was pointed out by Talmon (see the quote above).

Peter Schäfer (1986) has argued that we cannot talk about 'books' but only

individual manuscripts. That is, for many rabbinic writings there was not a permanent defined block of text but only a fluid body of writing, sections of which were found in individual manuscripts:

Work on the manuscripts must rid itself of the odium of the whimsical scholar constantly in quest of the 'better' reading and finally buried under his collection of variants. It is not a matter of variants of static texts, but rather of the documentation and description of a dynamic manuscript tradition. (Schäfer 1986: 151)

Whether his argument is convincing can be debated (see, for example, Neusner [1996] who opposed the idea) and in any case it is being applied to rabbinic literature in particular, but it makes a significant point that seems applicable to the biblical text: the written tradition during this period is rather more fluid than many of us realize.

The situation that we seem to find in the early Hellenistic period is that many different traditions were developing and being passed down. Some were closely related, others parallel but more distantly connected. Changes were occurring at both macro- and micro-level. Some of these traditions were eventually selected to be part of a collection of sacred writings, but in many cases similar, but somewhat different, traditions that had not been selected continued to exist alongside the 'biblical' ones. When we look at Second Temple Jewish literature in general, though, it is surprising the extent to which we have more than one version of a particular writing. For example, we have at least two versions of the book of Tobit; we have two or three versions of the book of *2 Enoch*; two versions of the *Testament of Abraham*; two versions of the *Life of Adam and Eve*. Considering that our knowledge of the full range of Second Temple literature is likely to be severely restricted, variant versions of many of the other writings might once have existed.

The biblical text shows a similar state of being: it is amazing how many biblical books exist in more than one version. It has long been known that in the Greek tradition there are different versions of Esther, 1 and 2 Samuel, Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Joshua, Proverbs, Job and Daniel. The Samaritan Pentateuch gives a significantly different text of the Pentateuch in many passages. The Qumran scrolls have turned up additional versions of Exodus, Numbers, Joshua, 1 and 2 Samuel and Psalms (as well as Jeremiah, and fragments of the Pentateuch that support the Samaritan version). How are we to characterize these different versions? Should we, like de Lagarde, see them as textual variants that branched off a pristine text? Should we, like the early palaeontologists when confronted by new forms, immediately cram all new texts into the tripartite scheme, which itself has been taken as axiomatic? Although the various texts often agree substantially with the MT, some passages are quite different – literarily different. As scholars we have had ingrained in us the difference between traditio-historical development and textual development. We have two separate critical methodologies to deal with them.

Yet in antiquity there did not exist two different sets of scribes doing two different things. There were simply scribes doing their job. First of all, they copied the texts that already existed. A good deal of scribal activity was probably just that: copying. This led to the errors and changes that have been so well documented by textual critics. But as *part of the same process* scribes added to, changed and developed the tradition. We are not dealing with two different processes but one complex process. Granted, eventually the various books that became the Hebrew Bible were stabilized into a limited number of texts, but when did this happen? It seems to have been at a rather late date. Some books may have reached a particular textual form or forms at an earlier date than others, but the idea of a fixed text seems to be a late idea.

What modern scholars refer to as different text-types are not different from each other simply because of the vicissitudes caused by copying a single original. The difference in many cases is more extensive than that. That is, the different texts represent different editions of the writing, not just different texts in the conventional sense. For example, the difference between the MT of Jeremiah and the LXX of Jeremiah is not just a textual one. They are two different writings, even though they share a great deal of text in common. We cannot speak categorically of the text of the entire Hebrew Bible, of course, since the situation is not at all uniform but differs from book to book.

We know that the text continued to develop in the Greek tradition until quite late. For example, if K. De Troyer (2000) is right, the long text found in Lucian Esther (called the 'alpha text' or 'L text') was added only in the first century CE. We cannot be sure that these developments were in the Greek tradition alone, but some of them probably were; nevertheless, they represent variant texts alongside those in Hebrew and other languages. The fact that one or more communities may have accepted a particular text as authoritative is irrelevant to the question of whether the text continued to develop or not. Many of the differences between MT, LXX and 4QSamuel fragments are best explained as textual development rather than 'textual corruption'. This is a complicated subject, discussed further with examples in Grabbe (2006a: 332–35).

To summarize, before the Maccabaeen revolt there is no evidence that a particular textual tradition was seen as being preferred. Indeed, there is no evidence that the existence of different texts was seen as an issue. Different versions of some books circulated alongside each other. *We* might classify them as sometimes being different textual recensions and at other times as different editions, but that is a modern distinction. Both textual and literary processes were still operating, and different versions of the same book were around. It is only later that we may find a conscious attempt to revise one tradition to bring it in line with another. It has often been argued that the Greek text was revised to bring it in line with the developing Hebrew text. For example, it is often assumed that the *kaige* recension is a revision of the Septuagint to bring it closer to the developing proto-MT. This interpretation has been doubted by E. Tov (2001: 190), with good reason, because the

evidence for a growing authority of the MT at an early time is skimpy. Yet eventually we find clear attempts to bring the Greek tradition into line with the proto-MT when it had become predominant in certain circles of Judaism.

If this process of preferring one textual version of a particular book (to the exclusion of others) was already underway by Maccabean times, we have little or no evidence of it. At most, it was being done only with certain books, not the entire biblical tradition.

11.2 The Septuagint Translation of the Bible

J. Barr (1979) 'The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations', *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 15: 275–325; **S.P. Brock** (1979) 'Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20: 69–87; **E. Tov** (1997) *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research*; (2001) *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*.

As discussed in the previous section (§11.1), the text of the Bible was not a static entity but rather a trajectory cutting a path through the early Hellenistic period rather than either starting or finishing there. Another event intersected with this trajectory, however. This was the decision – probably by the Jewish community in Alexandria – to take a version of the Hebrew scriptures (no doubt the one currently being used by them in Alexandria at this time) and render it into the vernacular of the community – Hellenistic Greek. This decision may not have seemed to be a momentous one, though it would have required some substantial resources by the community, but it turned out to be a momentous event in the history of Judaism. From the scattered data available to us, though by no means decisive, it appears likely that about the middle of the third century BCE (reign of Ptolemy II or Ptolemy III) the 'Law' (Greek νόμος) was translated into Greek (for details on the translation, see §4.1).

In the modern age when translation is routine and the rendering of the Bible into another new language, or a further translation into a language already well supplied, seems to take place on almost a daily basis, the Septuagint translation (LXX) might appear to be a rather mundane event. Not at all! First, there was little in the way of precedent for such an action. It was in many ways a historical innovation. Translation had often been a practical necessity in the multilingual environment of the ancient Near East, beginning in ancient Mesopotamia where Sumerian texts were often transferred into Akkadian. Under Assyrian, Babylonian and Persian rule the problem was often alleviated by using Aramaic as a *lingua franca*, but we have evidence of translation under the Persians (e.g., the text of the Behistun inscription was given in several languages, and we also know that an Aramaic version circulated [*HJJSTP* 1: 109–10]). After the Greek conquest, we know of *drogomans* (translators) who worked in the commercial environment, doing oral translation where required; such models may have been drawn on

by the LXX translators, since there was little other precedent for what they were doing (Barr 1979; Brock 1979). Reasons for the significance of the LXX translation are the following:

- The fact that a need was felt to have the ‘Law’ readily available in the local language is already testimony to innovations within diaspora Judaism. That is, the perceived need to translate the Bible emphasizes the important part that the written scriptures were now starting to play in the Jewish religion, especially for those worshippers too far from the temple to visit it regularly.
- The LXX made the biblical material available to the increasing number of Jews whose first language was Greek and who knew little or no Hebrew. The LXX became *the* Bible of the Greek-speaking Jews to the extent that its very letter was considered inspired and was used for detailed exegesis by such writers as Philo of Alexandria (*HJJSTP* 4).
- The LXX is testimony to the variety of biblical text circulating during the centuries before the fall of Jerusalem and to the continuing growth and development of the text, perhaps even to the very end of the Second Temple period. In some sections the LXX is quite different from the Masoretic text which became the standard Hebrew text of the OT (see above, §11.1).
- Here and there in the LXX is found evidence of interpretative traditions that circulated among the Jews during this period.

Just as the concept of a sacred collection of writings was starting to take hold, the core of this collection was made available in a new language and a new guise. Its importance is attested by the interpreter Demetrius (§4.6.1) who evidently made use of the new translation already within a few decades of its creation because it suited his purpose (whether he could use the Hebrew version with facility is not known). The significance of this simple act of translating the ‘Law of Moses’ into Greek can hardly be exaggerated.

11.3 Beliefs

Beliefs attested for the Persian period mostly continued after the Greek conquest, but already we see some new departures in the third century BCE. The precise changes are not always easy to determine for the simple reason that little of the relevant religious literature can be precisely dated, and in some cases we have no information until later. The following discussion contains mostly those beliefs that can be documented for the third century, but some are included which can be reconstructed for this period even though the sources occur (or are believed to occur) after 200 BCE.

11.3.1 *The Deity*

G. Howard (1977) 'The Tetragram and the New Testament', *JBL* 96: 63–83; **S. Jellicoe** (1968) *The Septuagint and Modern Study*; **A. Pietersma** (1984) 'Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original Septuagint', in A. Pietersma and C. Cox (eds) *De Septuaginta*: 85–101; **J.R. Royse** (1991) 'Philo, Κύριος, and the Tetragrammaton', in D.T. Runia, D.M. Hay and D. Winston (eds), *Heirs of the Septuagint*: 167–83.

It seems clear that monotheism as the term is normally defined (i.e., not only the exclusive worship of one God but the denial of the existence of other gods) had developed no later than the Persian period (*HJJSTP* 1: 240–43). We find generic terms in Persian-period sources, such as 'most high god' or 'god of heaven', that fit well this monotheistic usage. Jewish sources in Greek tend to use the generic 'God' (*theos*) rather than 'Yhwh' or even the translation 'Lord' (*kurios*) for the tetragrammaton (though this may be a development from the early usage: see below). What we see in the Greek period are several innovations:

- The tetragrammaton (the name Yhwh) becomes almost a mystical name for the true God, who is (naturally) the god of the Jews. At some point, this name ceases to be pronounced in normal usage, with *Adonai* substituted, but this might not have been until the second century BCE or later (the main documentation is found in the Qumran scrolls that seem to reflect copying from oral dictation). The pronunciation was not forgotten, and the original pronunciation may have continued even in common usage in some circles (e.g., it is from much later sources that we find evidence of the correct pronunciation [such as the transcription 'λαώ in Diodorus 1.94.2]). Its incorporation into theophoric names, though often in truncated form, also indicated pronunciation of Yhwh.
- This heightened status of the tetragrammaton was also demonstrated in writing: on the one hand, it ceased to be pronounced, at least in normal conversation; on the other hand, it was written differently from the surrounding words in sacred texts (cf. the summary of scholarship in Royse 1991: 167–73; Jellicoe 1968: 270–72). For example, 'Yhwh' is written in palaeo-Hebrew script in some of the Qumran manuscripts (e.g., 11QLev^b). Similarly, some LXX manuscripts apparently had the tetragrammaton written in palaeo-Hebrew script, which led to its writing with the Greek letters *pipi*, usually explained as a misreading by Greek scribes of 'Yhwh' of the Semitic letters (Howard 1977; Jellicoe 1968: 270–72). The matter continues to be debated, though, with arguments made against this interpretation (Pietersma 1984; cf. *DDD*² 494); however, J.R. Royse (1991) has made a case that Philo did in some cases have a biblical manuscript with the tetragrammaton in Hebrew letters. Both the non-pronunciation and the variant script were ways of showing

particular respect for the name; likewise, it was supposed to have great powers if pronounced in a magical context, where it clearly continued to be used.

- References to the deity became common in Jewish non-Hebrew literature, especially writings in Greek, including the LXX. This had a profound influence. Original divine names, which had already become identified as alternate names or even titles of Yhwh, became titles in Greek: for example, Shaddai (שַׁדַּי) became *hikanos* (ἱκανός) ‘(all) sufficient’, *pantokratōr* (παντοκράτωρ) ‘almighty’, while Elyon (עֶלְיֹן) was rendered as *hupsēlos* (ὑψηλός) and *hupsistos* (ὑψιστος) ‘most high’. The name Yhwh and also the more generic term Elohim was also translated, generally as *kurios* (κύριος) ‘Lord’ and *theos* (θεός) ‘God’ respectively. Perhaps already by the third century, but perhaps a bit later, the term ‘heaven’ comes to be used as a surrogate for the divine name (e.g., 1 Macc. 2.21; 3.18; cf. Matt. 4.17; 5.3).
- In some sources, generally Greek or Roman ones but sometimes Jewish (*DDD*² 441, 938–39), the Jewish God is referred to as ‘Zeus’ (Cornelius Labeo, *apud* Macrobius 1.18.18–21) or ‘Jove’ (Varro, *apud* Augustine, *De cons. Evang.* 1.22.30; 1.23.31; 1.27.42). Zeus was often referred to as ‘the most high’ (*DDD*² 439–40, 939). Some pagan sources identify the Jewish god with Dionysus (Plutarch, *Ques. conviv.* 6.2; Tacitus, *Hist.* 5.5), but this may have been offensive to Jews.
- With the development of a heavenly world peopled by angelic beings alongside the deity (see next section, §11.3.2), the concept of God began to undergo some further modifications. One crucial area was the existence of evil: some Jews evidently wanted to distance God from every possible taint of evil (cf. Isa. 45.7). Evil existed in the world, but God was not responsible for it: it entered the world through the sin of angels (§11.3.2).

11.3.2 Angelic Beings

P.L. Day (1988) *An Adversary in Heaven: šāṭān in the Hebrew Bible*; **L.L. Grabbe** (1987a) ‘The Scapegoat Ritual: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation’, *JSJ* 18: 152–67.

The concept of angels is pre-exilic, but much of the development of angelology in Judaism appears to have taken place in the Persian period (*HJJSTP* 1: 243–44; *JRSTP* 219–25). By the time we get to the Book of Watchers (*1 Enoch* 1–36) in the early Hellenistic period, we have evidence of an elaborate system of angels (at least, in some circles of Judaism). The Book of Watchers (probably dating from the third century BCE) is dominated by the myth of the fallen angels. The present form of the story centres on two angelic leaders called Asael and Shemihazah. The subordinate leaders of the

200 fallen angels are named, one of the first extensive lists of names of angelic beings (*1 Enoch* 6, 8). The Book of Watchers, the *Book of Giants*, and briefly *Jubilees* (5.1-10) recount what is probably a much older myth, that of the fallen angels who leave their heavenly estate to have intercourse with human women and produce offspring (cf. Gen. 6.1).

In addition, there are 'evil spirits', though these are not the fallen angels themselves but the product of the giants who were the offspring of the unions between the fallen angels and human women. When the giants died, their spirits became the evil spirits who tempted humans (7; 9.7-10; 15.8-12). The book seems to pay less attention to the good angels, but a number of these appear and several are an essential part of the story. However, many good angels are named, even if the story seems to ignore them in favour of the wicked ones. Most important are the (arch)angels, named as four initially (9.1; 10.1, 4, 9, 11: Michael, Gabriel, Raphael, Sariel) but later expanded to seven (19.1; 20), including Uriel who is important in the Astronomical Book (71.1, etc.). The Astronomical Book indicates that angels were associated with most or all the heavenly bodies (82.13-20).

The fallen angels myth reflected in *1 Enoch* is not the only version of the evil angels tradition. A 'devil' figure also developed, perhaps in parallel and even overlapping that of the fallen angels. The devil concept contains a variety of elements taken from different parts of the tradition. It included the heavenly prosecutor *ha-Satan* known from Job and other passages (cf. Day 1988), the fallen heavenly being of Isaiah 14 and Ezekiel 28 (the Satan-Lucifer stream), and even the Day of Atonement ritual or Azazel stream (Grabbe 1987a). Terms such as *beliar* and *beliel*, implying general wickedness, become personified to the point that a demonic figure called Beliel is frequent in the Qumran scrolls. The 'devil-Gestalt' eventually became fused with the fallen angels tradition (Grabbe 1987a).

Other early Jewish writings give some insight into Jewish angelology. In the book of Tobit (later Persian or Ptolemaic times), a central figure in the book is the angel (*ml'k'*) Raphael who carries out God's plans for Tobit and his family after Tobit prays for help or death. Raphael is brought in both to cure Tobit's blindness and to drive away a demon called Asmodaeus who is killing all of Sarah's husbands on the wedding night (3.7-9). Raphael instructs Tobias to save the liver, gall and heart of a fish they catch. Part of this is burned by Tobias and Sarah in the bridal chamber to drive away the demon who flees to Egypt where Raphael pursues him and binds him (8.1-3). Likewise, Ben Sira seems to accept the existence of angels, even if he shows no great interest in them. Ben Sira 17.32 and 24.2 refer to the host of the heavens. Ben Sira 17.7 says that each nation has its ruler but that Israel's portion is Yhwh, perhaps indicating angelic rulers of each nation. Ben Sira 42.17 refers to the Holy Ones who are the hosts of heaven, and 45.2 uses 'ēlōhîm in a way which could mean 'angel'.

An issue which was already of concern in writings as early as Ezekiel 18 and 33, and Jeremiah 18 is that of the origin of and responsibility for evil. If

God is sovereign over all, how is the presence of evil to be explained? Zoroastrianism had resolved the dilemma by positing two coeval spirits, one good and one evil. This concept certainly had its influence in various circles, but it was never taken over as a system. Isaiah 45.7 seems to make Yhwh responsible for evil, but the idea would no doubt have been abhorrent to many pious individuals. They would probably have found the myth of the fallen angels attractive because it makes them responsible for bringing evil into the world. The devil figure, in its own way, distanced God from wickedness, though it is difficult to say exactly when it developed. Also, the myth of the fallen angels eventually became united with it. Thus, even though God was the originator of all things, he was still not the author of sin which arose from a portion of his creation.

11.3.3 Eschatology

In the early Hellenistic period, several sorts of eschatology appear to have developed. The old Israelite idea of no personal afterlife, known from most of the biblical books, continued and can be found in Ben Sira. Qohelet seems to toy with the idea that the spirit of man might have a different fate but ultimately concludes that man is no different from the animals: both die and go to the same place, which is dust (Qoh. 3.17-21). It is a view that was strangely persistent, since the Sadducees supposedly continued to adhere to it (to be discussed in *HJJSTP* 3).

Alongside this is clearly another view, found already as early as the Book of Watchers (*1 Enoch* 1–36): the concept of the immortal soul which leaves the body at death to live independently. Especially relevant are such passages as *1 Enoch* 22. Several theories have been offered for the origin of the concept of the soul, including Persian ideas, native developments within Judaism itself and Greek influence (cf. *HJJSTP* 1: 364). Since one can make a case for each of these, it is a question of determining the balance of probability. The idea of the ‘soul’ could arise from ideas found already in the biblical text, such as the frequent word *nefeš* (נֶפֶשׁ: ‘soul, life, person’) or perhaps *něšāmāh* (נִשְׁמָה: ‘breath’); however, neither of these equates to ‘soul’ in the Platonic or Pythagorean sense that the soul is the person, which may or may not be attached to a body. What is clear is that just about the time of the establishment of Greek rule, an idea akin to the Platonic concept appears in the Book of Watchers. One could argue for native developments under Greek influence or even under both Greek and Iranian influence; however, the developed concept is so much like the Greek notion of the immortal soul that a Greek origin or heavy Greek influence seems the most likely explanation.

More complicated is the idea of a resurrection. It might already occur as early as the Persian period (depending on when one dates and how one interprets Isa. 26.19). The belief in resurrection of the body, which some have argued is so characteristic of Jewish eschatology, is not first clearly attested until in the mid-second century in Dan. 12.2. It would not be difficult to

project it back to the third century, but it is certainly no more characteristic of Judaism than immortality of the soul. Both concepts might be combined with the idea of a general judgement. Several passages in the Book of Watchers (*1 En.* 10.6, 12–22; 11; 22) assume a judgement which includes a final determination of the fate of the fallen angels and also of human beings. It appears to be the human souls that are judged, so that a resurrection of the body is apparently not envisaged (*1 En.* 22.4, 10–13).

11.3.4 Messiah

A. Caquot (1966) 'Ben Sira et le messianisme', *Semitica* 16: 43–68; **E. Jacob** (1958) 'L'histoire d'Israël vue par Ben Sira', in *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert*: 288–94; **J.D. Martin** (1986) 'Ben Sira's Hymn to the Fathers: A Messianic Perspective', *OTS* 24: 107–23; **R. Smend** (1906–1907) *Weisheit des Jesus Sirach*.

In ancient Israel, as represented in the Hebrew Bible, two figures were 'messiahs' (i.e., anointed to a specific office): the king and the high priest. The term was sometimes transferred (e.g., its application to the Persian king Cyrus in *Isa.* 45.1), but its main development was to be used for a future king in the image of David who would usher in an ideal age (*Ps.* 132.10–17; *Jer.* 23.5–6; 30.9). What we think of as messianism tends to be found in texts later than the period covered in this book (for a survey of messianism in the Second Temple period, see *JRSTP* 271–91; for Zerubbabel as a possible messianic figure in the Persian period, see *HJJSTP* 1: 86–87, 280–83). Nevertheless, it has been proposed that one text from the early Hellenistic period refers to a messiah. Surprisingly, this is Ben Sira. At least, several passages have excited conjecture on the subject, primarily 49.16 and 45.25. Already R. Smend (1906–1907: 476) had seen the exaltation of Adam, rooted in a messianic hope, in 49.16. Similarly, Jacob (1958) argued that 49.16 and other passages (e.g., 17.1–2; cf. *Job* 15.7) showed an original Adam glorified and perfected as wisdom itself; Ben Sira was seen as having abandoned a national eschatology for an 'adamic' one in a sapiential context.

This raises two questions: how developed was a 'nationalistic' eschatology by this time, and why the unusual 'adamic messiah' should be the one accepted this early? Another verse (*Sir.* 45.25) refers to the covenant with David and then states: 'the inheritance of ʾš (𐤔) is to his son alone'. The word can be read as ʾēš, the normal Hebrew word for 'fire', and has been taken to refer to the priestly inheritance of service at the altar; however, some scholars take the word as a defective spelling of ʾyš, to be read as ʾīš (𐤀𐤓: 'man'), perhaps even equivalent to king (cf. Martin 1986: 112–16). Caquot (1966) and others are sceptical that such a view is found in Ben Sira, but Martin compares the Animal Apocalypse (*1 Enoch* 89–90) in which the white-bull imagery applied to Adam ceases with Isaac but is then resumed at the end of the apocalypse, apparently in a reference to the messiah. This might suggest that the adamic imagery is messianic (Martin 1986: 118–19). If so, it

is not clear how this 'adamic messiah' fits into the eschatological speculation elsewhere at this time. The main flourishing of messianism will be dealt with in *HJJSTP* 3 and 4.

11.3.5 *Sceptical Wisdom*

J.L. Crenshaw (1980) 'The Birth of Skepticism in Ancient Israel', in J.L. Crenshaw and S. Sandmel (eds), *The Divine Helmsman*: 1–19.

What is often referred to as sceptical wisdom (Crenshaw 1980) has a long tradition in ancient Near Eastern literature. The book of Job is often included in this category, though it has been argued here that it was completed in the Persian period (*HJJSTP* 1: 102–104). But a prime representative of the genre, which probably should be dated to the third century, is the book of Qohelet or Ecclesiastes (§4.4). Whether or not the arguments about Greek influence on the book are accepted, it certainly represents a radically new element within Jewish literature with few parallels. It may be the masterpiece of a solitary genius, yet the elements it has in common with some other Near Eastern literature suggest the culmination of a tradition rather than a completely new departure. Depending on how radically one interprets the message, the book seems to fit an age under the spell of heady new influences and ideas, but one in which Judaism was not yet threatened by persecution. Nevertheless, the sceptical message is not repeated in the extant Jewish literature; indeed, the contrast between it and the conventional wisdom of the roughly contemporary Ben Sira is striking. Perhaps the experience of the Hellenistic reform and the Maccabaeen revolt (to be dealt with in *HJJSTP* 3) put an end to any environment which could nourish such religious questioning (see further at §13.6.3).

11.4 *Prophecy and Apocalyptic*

J.J. Collins (1998) *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*; **J.J. Collins (ed.)** (1999) *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism*: vol. 1, *The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity*; **L.L. Grabbe** (1989) 'The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism', *JSP* 4: 27–47; (1995) *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages*; (2003b) 'Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions – and New Thinking', in L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning*: 107–33; (2003c) 'Poets, Scribes, or Preachers? The Reality of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period', in L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning*: 192–215; (forthcoming d) 'Daniel: Sage, Seer ... and Prophet?' in L.L. Grabbe and M. Nissinen (eds), *Constructs of Prophecy in the Former and Latter Prophets and Daniel*.

A discussion of prophecy and apocalyptic, their relationship, and the situation in the Persian period was given in *HJJSTP* 1 (250–52) along with

relevant bibliography. This present section takes the discussion forward and addresses the situation in the early Hellenistic period.

To some it may seem mistaken – even outrageous – to link prophecy with apocalyptic. Yet I have argued, along with others, that apocalyptic can be seen as a form of prophecy, and prophecy as a form of divination (Grabbe 1995: 139–41; 2003b; 2003c; forthcoming d). If this is correct, they can be discussed together as different manifestations of the same sort of phenomenon. As historians and moderns, we tend to think of history in rational terms as the outcome of human and material movements and forces that can be discovered, analysed and catalogued. What this misses is that there was another dimension of reality to inhabitants of the ancient world (and to many moderns, even in civilized nations): the view that there were spiritual forces at work that could change events and shape history. For Jews this included the supreme being known as ‘God’ (though with various names, depending on one’s language or context) for whom Judaism possessed a special knowledge and access. Yet it also included powerful angelic forces, some of whom were supporters of the deity but others were his opponents, such as is indicated by Dan. 10.12–13, 20–21.

While the roots of apocalyptic literature definitely lie earlier than the Greek conquest, the first agreed-on Jewish apocalypses (parts of *1 Enoch*) seem to be from the early part of Greek rule (§4.5). The Greek period was a time when apocalypticism flourished, and not only among the Jews: it is evident that apocalyptic speculation took place and apocalyptic literature was produced under the Ptolemies. Thus, even if we find apocalyptic passages possibly already written under the Persian empire (e.g., Isaiah 24–27), it blossomed into a major tradition within Judaism in Hellenistic times. But if so, how do we fit apocalypticism into the structure of Judaism at this time? We face the difficulty that books which seem to be describing actual Jewish society (Ben Sira; the Zenon and other papyri, Hecataeus, later writers such as Josephus and perhaps even the *Letter of Aristeas*) are silent about apocalyptic movements – or even enthusiasms – among the people.

To answer this question, we need to put it in context. The context is that apocalyptic was developing in surrounding cultures as well. It has been argued that we already find evidence of Persian apocalypses by this time. The matter is a real problem because the early Persian literature we presently possess seems to have been handed down orally and committed to writing only in the early middle ages (see discussion and literature in *HJJSTP* 1: 361–64). Does this mean that the producers of such literature were only marginal, perhaps a disenfranchised ‘visionary’ party or peripheral conventicles (see the discussion of O. Plöger and P.D. Hanson [*HJJSTP* 1: 258–59])?

While this is one possibility, several considerations are against it. Apocalyptic interest and speculation is not limited to marginalized or revolutionary groups. On the contrary, it can have a full place in established society and religion without requiring overt action on the part of the believer (Grabbe 1989). As a subordinate people, the Jews were not likely to advertise

views about expectations that God was going to overthrow kings and make nations drink the cup of his wrath (cf. Jeremiah 25). Yet belief in such things no doubt sustained many Jews in the difficult Ptolemaic times as they have various peoples through the ages. Priests and elders were no less subject to such curiosities, and a strong priestly contribution to the writings and speculation during this time is very likely. Some may not have believed in it (Ben Sira?); others would not have taught it except perhaps in a circumspect manner. In any case, the execution of future judgement was usually thought to be in the hand of God, without requiring militant human action. Such an explanation would recognize the strong apocalyptic strands in Judaism at this time while also explaining why the life of the people does not seem to have been overly agitated by such ideas. For a further discussion of the place of apocalyptic and 'mantic' perspectives during the early Hellenistic period, see below (§13.6.3).

The evidence for prophecy during this time is less clear. Some of the content of biblical prophetic books may well have been written in the early Hellenistic period. Were there prophetic figures who prophesied in the tradition and manner of prophets as described in the books of Samuel and Kings or Isaiah, Jeremiah and Ezekiel? There may well have been (cf. Grabbe 2003c), but no description remains, or their traditions may have become part of the general traditions that informed the biblical prophetic literature. The writing likely to have arisen in the third century which describes a prophetic figure is Daniel 1–6 (§4.11). Many would object to calling Daniel a prophet, but there is no doubt that he is depicted in the *persona* of a prophet. He delivers messages, speaks in the name of Yhwh and interprets signs and events in the context of the royal court, just as did Elijah, Amos, Isaiah and Jeremiah. Few would see the book of Daniel as giving an accurate historical biography of a real individual, but an actual Jewish mantic figure in the Persian or the Seleucid court in Babylon might lie beyond the figure of Daniel in the biblical book.

This raises the question of how a prediction about the succession of Near Eastern empires such as is found in Daniel 2 or *Sibylline Oracle* 4 (§4.12) fitted into the Jewish community in the third century BCE. See further below (§13.6.3).

11.5 Summary

The question of how far the Hebrew Bible had developed before the Greek period has become an area of controversy in recent years. The position taken here is that some of the main documents had already reached more or less their present form by the end of the Persian period and were also seen as a collection. Our main source is Ben Sira, but his picture needs to be considered in the light of developments in the Persian period (*HJJSTP* 1: 331–43). The term 'canonical' may be too strong a word to use at this point, but it seems

clear that certain writings had become in some sense authoritative or sacred. This applies to Genesis to 2 Kings, the Major Prophets, all the Minor Prophets and Job; it is possible that one could add Psalms, Proverbs, Lamentations and Song of Songs. Granted this assessment, a good deal of scriptural activity still took place during the Greek period, including Qohelet, Daniel (completed under Seleucid rule) and the finalizing of a number of other works (probably Chronicles, Ezra-Nehemiah, Esther). The text also continued to develop for another century or so, with many of these works extant in more than one version, sometimes in versions considerably different from one another.

With the acceptance of certain writings as authoritative, biblical interpretation took its place as a religious activity. It was probably also during the Greek period that this began in earnest, even if its roots may lie earlier. As long as the text remained fluid, which it evidently did for several centuries, the process of interpreting and updating the tradition could be done simply by alteration of the text. Not much different from this, however, was the creation of new writings out of old traditions which then took their place alongside the sacred writing that incorporated the old tradition. 'Rewritten Bible' writings were much like updating the text except that it took the perhaps more radical step of creating a new, parallel writing. For example, a work like the *Exagoge* of Ezekiel the tragedian (§4.6.4) not only gave another version of the Exodus story but did so in a Greek literary form. But other forms of interpretation that gave greater weight to the authority of the text also developed, notably that of commentary. One of the earliest examples of this sort of biblical interpretation is by Demetrius the Chronographer (§4.6.1). Demetrius' desire to reconcile potential contradictions and problems is evidence that the tradition was seen as in some way becoming fixed; that is, problems could not be solved just by rewriting it. It was also important to resolve anything that might seem to call the validity of the 'scriptures' into question.

The text was far from being standardized, however. The LXX and textual finds such as the Qumran scrolls indicate the diversity of the text in all biblical books but also that two or even three different editions of some books existed. Indeed, there seems to have been no hard and fast division between what we call textual development and continued literary development. Yet the fluidity of the text was not generally seen as a problem. Several versions of many biblical books circulated with no evidence of causing difficulties. There was also strong continued activity in the realm of para-biblical works, meaning writings in some way parallel to or sharing content with biblical books but apparently independent. A number of writings labelled 'rewritten Bible' would be better described as 'para-biblical' in that they did not originate as a rewriting of a biblical book but developed in their own way from pre-existing traditions. In other words, they did not rise from the 'scriptural' writing but arose independently.

What is often not realized is how radical the idea of translating the Torah

into Greek was. Probably no other event was as significant in Second Temple Judaism. The idea that the scriptural writings could be translated into a foreign tongue was significant enough in itself, but the practical effects of the Greek translation on knowledge of the Bible and especially on the history of interpretation are enormous. If it had been preserved only in Hebrew (and some passages in Aramaic), it would have been primarily the preserve of a small core of Jews in Palestine who possessed the requisite knowledge to read it and the leisure to discuss and debate it. Now the vast population of Greek-speaking Jews had direct access to their biblical tradition, and they began to develop other institutions to exploit it, in particular the synagogue.

The whole question of how the Pentateuch first came to be translated, the precedents for it and whether the LXX was the first translation has exercised scholars a great deal. So far there is no evidence of any Greek translations before the LXX. Although generally rejecting the account in the *Letter of Aristeas*, scholarship still accepts the mid-third century as the most likely date for the Greek Pentateuch. The other books were translated later, perhaps in piecemeal fashion, but it is likely that most or all the Hebrew Bible had a Greek version by the end of the second century BCE.

Our sources do not mention prophetic figures in society, but this does not mean that they had ceased to exist. Prophecy had not ceased in this period, but written prophecy now took on the form of one of its sub-genres, that of apocalypses (§11.4). Apocalyptic had its roots in the Persian period, but it flourished in the Greek period with many extant examples of it. The earliest of these is certain sections of *1 Enoch*, most likely the Astronomical Book and the Book of Watchers. Priests may have cultivated the knowledge that feeds apocalyptic, and portions of *1 Enoch* could well be a priestly product. Yet the final form of the book is likely to have been at odds with the temple establishment. The main reason for saying this is that the solar calendar which is the basis for *1 Enoch* 72–82 was radically different from the solar–lunar calendar used in the temple at this time (*HJJSTP* 1: 185–88). The final version of the book may well be the product of a dissident priestly group, though given the smallness of the community at this time and the threat of Ptolemaic intervention, the group producing this ‘solar calendar’ form of *1 Enoch* may not actually have made any public break with the temple.

1 Enoch also provides considerable information to show how far angelology had developed by this time. The myth of the fallen angels, the lists of both obedient angels and fallen angels, and the evil spirits that came from the dead giants all show a lengthy period of speculation about the spirit world. By this time all our texts are monotheistic (at least in some sense of the word). Indeed, we find non-Jewish writers who comment on the monotheistic and aniconic nature of Jewish worship (e.g., Hecataeus of Abdera [§12.5]).

We should keep in mind that the counterpart of apocalyptic circles were those that cultivated ‘sceptical wisdom’. It may be a misnomer to talk about ‘circles’, since the number who participated in this may have been small. We have only two books that fit this category of sceptical wisdom, Qohelet and

Job. It is interesting that they appear at a particular time (probably the Persian period for Job), but then have no parallel in Judaism until Spinoza. Yet the critical spirit displayed by these books is the one evidence of the inquiring spirit that we know of from the 'Ionian Enlightenment'.

Part IV

HISTORICAL SYNTHESIS

Chapter 12

THE TIME OF ALEXANDER AND THE DIADOCHI (335–280 BCE)

This and the next two chapters bring together the topics and material explored in the earlier chapters and attempt to provide a synthesis. To some extent there is a reconstruction of the history of the Jews during this period but, unfortunately, the data are not extensive enough to provide the sort of full history that we would like. Thus, even these synthesis chapters are in part taken up with discussion about reconstruction, because the reconstruction is still a problem. In addition, they are episodic; that is, they cover only some of the elements of a proper history that we would like to write, because the full data for a history are missing. As well as demonstrating what we know, they also demonstrate well how much we do not know.

12.1 *Background History*

E.R. Bevan (1927) *The House of Ptolemy: A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*; **A.B. Bosworth** (1996) *Alexander and the East*; (2002) *The Legacy of Alexander*; **A.B. Bosworth and E.J. Baynham** (eds) (2000) *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction*; **A. Bouché-Leclercq** (1903–1907) *Histoire des Lagides*; **CAH** 7/1; 8; **M. Cary** (1963) *A History of the Greek World 323 to 146 BC*; **N. Davis and C.M. Kraay** (1973) *The Hellenistic Kingdoms: Portrait Coins and History*; **G. Hölbl** (2001) *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*; **W. Huß** (2001) *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit: 332–30 v. Chr.*; **M. Sartre** (2001) *D'Alexandre à Zénobie: Histoire du Levant antique, IV^e siècle avant J.-C., III^e siècle après J.-C.*; **S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt** (1993) *From Samarkhand to Sardis*; **É. Will** (1979) *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*: vol. 1.

The first part of the Hellenistic period is rather better known than that of Persian rule. The Alexander historians have left full accounts of Alexander's conquests, and the activities of the Diadochi are recorded in detail. When it comes to the third century and the Ptolemies and Seleucids, however, there are some large and exasperating gaps, though certain periods are reasonably well recorded.

Alexander's brief period of rule (336–323 BCE) was occupied mainly in conquest and military activity in general, leaving only the last couple of years to work on the organization problems of his new empire. There was no clear

succession at his death. The result was approximately 40 years of struggle between various of his generals (the Diadochi) for control of the vast territory from Macedonia to India. By about 300 BCE the division was a threefold one, which the events of the next 20 years did not significantly alter: Greece and Macedonia – ruled by the Antigonid dynasty; Asia Minor, northern Syria and the entire area to the east of the Euphrates – Seleucids; Egypt, Cyrenaica, Cyprus and some small areas in Asia Minor – Ptolemies. Much of the third century (c.280–200) was taken up with controversy between the Seleucids and Ptolemies over Coele-Syria (southern Syria and Palestine). In a treaty of 301, this region was assigned to Seleucus; however, Ptolemy had just seized it and refused to return it. Because Ptolemy had been very helpful to Seleucus in the past, the latter did not press his claim, but the Seleucid empire continued to regard the region as rightfully theirs. The result was the series of Syrian Wars in which the Seleucids attempted to take the territory back.

This forms the backdrop to the history of Judaea during the early Greek period. There are gaps in the history of the Hellenistic kingdoms for this time, but we still know a good deal of the broader picture. For Palestine specifically, however, we have probably even less information than for Achaemenid rule. There is a real question as to whether one can write a history of Judah under Ptolemaic rule since our knowledge of specific events for the century and a quarter between Alexander and Seleucid domination is so skimpy. It is not difficult to situate Judah into the general history of the Ptolemaic empire, both politically and economically, but to find a plausible background for the state is not the same as writing its history. Josephus is not of much help except with regard to the Tobiad family, and the valuable Zenon papyri tell us much about economic matters at a particular time but little about social developments or political events. Therefore, in some ways the Ptolemaic period is even less known than the Persian; all we have is a few fragments – a keyhole here and there for a brief glimpse into what is otherwise basically closed. One is attempting to reconstruct the mosaic of third-century Jewish history from a few odd pieces. One can try, but the cogency of the result remains a very subjective judgement.

12.1.1 *Alexander and his Conquests (336–323 BCE)*

Much has been written about the life of Alexander, and no attempt is made here to survey the many recent biographies (for a start, see Bosworth 1996; Bosworth and Baynham [eds] 2000; see also §5.1). Alexander was only 20 years old when his father Philip II was assassinated in 336 but was quickly acclaimed by Philip's trusted generals Antipater and Parmenion and by the army. His immediate concern was to secure Greece since the treaties imposed by Philip would not necessarily be accepted as continuing after his death. If there was any question about Alexander's leadership ability, it was soon silenced by his brilliant manoeuvres in swiftly quashing the anti-Macedonian developments in Thessaly and cowing the rest of Greece. Before 336 was out,

he had been formally elected head of the Corinthian League which included all the important states of Greece except Sparta.

By early 335 Alexander was already facing a variety of threats to his rule. The first was from Celtic tribes in Thrace. Then, the democratic party at Thebes seized power and was given the promise of support by Athens and other states. A Greek revolt seemed imminent. Alexander acted quickly and mercilessly: Thebes was taken and razed, and the inhabitants sold into slavery. The lesson was all too plain to the other Greek states who hastily fell into line. Thus, by the end of 335 Alexander was able to return to Macedonia and prepare for the invasion of Persia.

Alexander crossed the Dardanelles in the spring of 334 with a force of about 30,000 plus 5,000 cavalry. The first encounter with the Persians was at the crossing of the Granicus river. The Persian army was smaller than the exaggerated figures of later legend. The Greek invasion had in fact caught the Persians by surprise. Many of the cities of Asia Minor were Greek though with Persian-appointed tyrants or oligarchies. Because of Alexander's proclaimed policy of restoring democracy, popular uprisings in many of these cities established democratic governments which promptly declared for Alexander. As he advanced south through Ionia, it was only when he reached Miletus that he had to besiege a city. After this, Caria also resisted and the new Persian commander-in-chief Memnon held Halicarnassus; but Alexander took the latter city before the end of 334. In early 333 he marched to Ancyra and then turned south toward the Cilician Gates. If the Persians had properly secured this pass, they could have stopped him, yet once again Alexander pushed ahead of his main force and reached the Gates long before he would normally have been expected. He was able to take them and then cross the Tarsus before the Persians could mount a proper defence.

So far, Alexander had met little effective opposition from the Persians. One of their strengths should have been their fleet; however, Alexander decided on a strategy of ignoring it. Part of the reason was simply that he could not afford the cost of maintaining his own fleet. Instead, he concentrated on a policy of land conquest, though part of the strategy was to take away some of the important coastal bases. It would have been impossible to occupy all of them, of course, but there was little likelihood that the Persians could induce Greece to defect and impossible to cut off all communications from there to Alexander. Also, as Greek cities were liberated their ships quietly left the Persian fleet and went home. In the end Darius himself finished the job by taking away all but 1,500 men for the army he was gathering to oppose Alexander.

The crucial battle with Darius was at Issus in the autumn of 333. Alexander had set up camp in Issus and moved on south after leaving his sick and wounded there, assuming that Darius was at Sochi. His intelligence was wrong, however, and Darius attacked Issus in Alexander's rear and wiped out those he had left there, and then positioned his army to wait for Alexander. Although the Persians inflicted considerable damage on

Alexander's phalanx in the subsequent battle, the result was disastrous for Darius. He personally escaped, but his family – wife, mother, daughters – was captured and most of his Greek mercenaries left and made their way to Egypt.

Alexander continued south toward Phoenicia and Egypt. The Phoenician cities welcomed him, all except Tyre, and Damascus fell without a fight. This gave the Greeks Darius' war chest which had been sent to Damascus before the battle of Issus; Alexander's acute shortage of funds was finally resolved. Darius himself sent messengers with proposed terms for negotiation, but Alexander's reply was calculated to be unacceptable to the Persians. By taking Phoenicia Alexander would deliver the final blow to the Persian fleet. Tyre refused his request to offer a sacrifice in the temple of 'Hercules' (the city god Melqart), however, and required a siege of seven months to conquer. It fell in mid-summer of 332, and the Greek army moved on down the coast. The Jewish account of a visit to Jerusalem at this time is legendary (see §12.2 below and §4.2). Gaza also refused entry and had to be besieged.

Egypt submitted without resistance late in 332. Alexander spent the winter there, arranging the government of this valuable satrapy, founding the city of Alexandria, and visiting the famous oracle of Ammon in Siwa. In the spring of 331 he was back in Syria. A revolt in Samaria was put down (see §12.2 below), though this may have been after Alexander had already marched east. In any case, he quickly took his army across the Euphrates and Tigris toward the Persian heartland. Darius met him at Gaugamela on 1 October 331. Just as at Issus, Darius fled the scene at the first sign of Persian faltering, even though there was plenty of fight left in his troops, which initiated an unnecessary rout. The Persians had not lacked either military skill or formidable forces, but their weakness has often been thought to be Darius as commander-in-chief. If he had left the command to some of his most able satraps, things could have gone much harder for the Greek invaders. As it was, the fate of the Persian empire was now sealed, and it was only a matter of time until Darius himself was taken. Alexander went on to Babylon where he was welcomed and to Persepolis where he burned Xerxes' palace as a gesture of revenge for the invasion of Greece 150 years before (at least, according to one account). He reached Ecbatana in the middle of 330. Darius had fled there after Gaugamela but now had moved on eastward where he was attempting to raise a new army. Alexander pursued but found that the Persian king had already been assassinated by one of his own satraps.

With Darius dead, Alexander proceeded formally to succeed him. This was an important step because Alexander was not just the king of Macedonia who now also ruled over the Persians; rather, he took both the tiara and many of the customs of the Persian monarchy. This became a source of friction with his own men who were used to the Macedonian customs of kingship; some of them had already criticized Alexander at the time of his consultation of the oracle at Ammon. The main custom objected to was that of obeisance (*proskunēsis*) which the Greeks interpreted as prostration, an act

reserved for the gods. Alexander's actions not only went contrary to the rather egalitarian tradition of the Macedonians but, in the opinion of many, were bordering on impiety. Several individuals were later to pay with their lives for not showing sufficient enthusiasm for the new custom (e.g., Callisthenes).

In 329 Alexander moved on further into the eastern realms of the Persian empire, founding cities and subduing the natives, though some of the wild nomadic tribes were not easy to subjugate. The city foundations were partly to serve as a military presence in areas still far from tamed, though they had other functions (§6.3.2.1). In the summer of 329 Alexander caught up with Darius' slayer, the satrap Bessus, and had him executed. Bessus was succeeded by Spitamenes, and it took the Greeks another year and a half to defeat him. Northern India (modern Pakistan) was reached in 326 and Alexander began his conquest of this area; however, his soldiers mutinied at this point and refused to go any further, so it is still a question as to how successful he would have been in the invasion of India. In 325 he sent his fleet home via the Indus and Persian Gulf and himself marched with the army back through Beluchistan, a tactical error causing him to lose a good many men.

Back in Babylon he set about consolidating his rule. Whether he would have been as successful in peace as in war is debatable. Already in the brief remaining year or two of his life, there were mutinies and executions because of unhappiness among many Greeks who did not approve of his 'Orientalizing' policy or his manner of rule. One major issue was his requirement that the Greek cities deify him, though the exact nature of this is unclear; another was the order for the Greek cities to accept back their exiles. It all ended abruptly in 323 when Alexander died at Babylon at the age of only 32.

12.1.2 *The Diadochi (323–281 BCE)*

The four decades of the Diadochi (from Greek *diadochoi* 'successors') were ones of continual fighting and frequent change in territory and political situations. Only an outline will be given here which concentrates on some of the major personalities and particular situations at crucial points during the period. The main source is Diodorus Siculus, Books 18–21, who seems to be basing his account on Hieronymus of Cardia (§§5.3; 5.1; see also Bosworth 2002).

When Alexander died, his Persian princess Rhoxane was pregnant. Although Perdikkas was Alexander's confidant and most obvious successor, the army proclaimed Philip's half-wit son (Alexander's half-brother) as Philip III Arrhidaeus, with the proviso that if Rhoxane had a son, he would rule jointly with Philip. Antipater had been left in charge of Macedon, but had been recalled to Babylon just before Alexander died. Antigonos was over Phrygia, Lysimachus over Thrace, and Ptolemy over Egypt. Ptolemy

apparently had the prescience to foresee that the empire would not survive Alexander and had already begun surreptitiously carving out a kingdom there. Seleucus was over the elite guard.

The initial situation had altered drastically within a couple of years (322–321). Revolts broke out immediately, including a revolt of mercenaries in Bactria and the Lamnian war in Greece. Perdiccas set out to pacify the rest of Asia, but Antigonus refused to cooperate. Perdiccas' position was further weakened by Philip III's marriage (to Eurydice). When Perdiccas went against Antigonus to force obedience, the latter fled to Antipater and formed a coalition with him. Perdiccas began his campaign of bringing the others in line by an attack on Ptolemy, ostensibly over Alexander's body which Ptolemy had stolen and taken to Egypt. After strong resistance from the Egyptian satrap, Perdiccas' ambitions were brought to an abrupt halt when he was assassinated by Seleucus and some others of his companions. The situation by 321 was the following: Seleucus was given Babylon, while Ptolemy continued to hold Egypt. Antipater was now the leading figure with Antigonus his lieutenant in Asia. Rhoxane had by now borne a son, Alexander IV.

The next phase covered 321–317 BCE. Antipater himself died in 319, but instead of naming his son, Cassander, he passed on the succession to another of Alexander's former officers, Polyperchon. By this time Antigonus had basically established his rule over Asia. Cassander who had been left in charge of Greece and Macedonia made an alliance with Antigonus to defeat Polyperchon. Olympias (Alexander's mother) attempted to play politics by having Philip III and his wife killed, but she in turn met her end when her fortunes fell in the face of Cassander's successes. By 317, Cassander had control of Macedonia and Greece (with Rhoxane and her son in his hands) and Antigonus held Asia (although Seleucus remained in Babylon). Ptolemy continued to hold Egypt.

Another period of fighting occupied 317–311. Antigonus marched to Babylon for an accounting from Seleucus, who did not wait for him but fled to Egypt. With Ptolemy's help he organized a coalition against Antigonus. Much of the rest of the period of the Diadochi could be summarized as a contest between Antigonus (and later his son) on one side and a coalition headed by Seleucus and Ptolemy on the other. The allies drew up a division of territory and gave an ultimatum to Antigonus to accept it; when he refused, war was resumed. One of the important events was the battle of Gaza in the summer of 312 between Ptolemy and Antigonus' son Demetrius (§12.3.2 below). Ptolemy's victory paved the way for Seleucus to return to Babylon (which marked the start of the Seleucid era widely used in antiquity). Antigonus was able to turn most of Greece against Cassander, but his attempts to recapture Babylon ended only in stalemate. Finally, the treaty of 311 gave the following division of territory: Antigonus over Asia; Lysimachus, Thrace; Ptolemy, Egypt; Cassander regent over Macedonia

until Alexander came of age. Seleucus was ignored by the treaty, and remained at war with Antigonus, but had de facto possession of Babylon.

The next round of fighting (311–301) was important because it ended in a division of Alexander's empire which was often looked back to, as if it had been a formal static event (cf. Dan. 11.3–4). In 310 Cassander had Alexander IV and Rhoxane killed, but the next few years saw most of Greece fall to Antigonus and Demetrius. These two were also able to dislodge Ptolemy from Cyprus (306), but an offensive against Egypt itself failed. Antigonus took the title king in 306, followed by Ptolemy (305), then Cassander, Lysimachus and Seleucus. In 302 the alliance was reformed against Antigonus who was killed at the battle of Ipsus. The division of 301 was not the last word but significant: Cassander still had Greece (with his brother over Caria and Cilicia); Lysimachus, the rest of Asia and Thrace; Seleucus was given Armenia and Syria as well as Babylon; however, as well as holding onto Egypt, Ptolemy (excluded from the negotiations for not taking sufficient part in the battle) seized southern Syria and Palestine, even though the treaty assigned these to Seleucus. This was to remain the Ptolemaic kingdom for the next century.

The final round of fighting (301–280) came to an end with the death of the last of the Diadochi. Cassander died in 297 BCE, while the remaining Diadochi realigned themselves, Ptolemy siding with Lysimachus and Seleucus with Demetrius (Justin, *Hist. Phil.* 15.5.23–24; Plutarch, *Demetr.* 31–32). Cassander's son Philip did not live long, and Demetrius took the opportunity to seize the Macedonian throne, while Lysimachus came to terms with him (Justin, *Hist. Phil.* 16.1; Plutarch, *Demetr.* 36–37). In 295/294 BCE Ptolemy retook Cyprus, which was defended by Demetrius' wife (Phila, or his mother?), though he then sent her and her children to Demetrius with honours and without ransom (Plutarch, *Demetr.* 35.3; 38.1). Demetrius now followed in the footsteps of his father and made plans to conquer the whole of Asia, but he was again opposed by a coalition of Ptolemy, Seleucus and Lysimachus, joined this time by Pyrrhus of Epirus (Justin, *Hist. Phil.* 16.2.1–3, 6; Plutarch, *Demetr.* 43–52). Demetrius was defeated and surrendered to Seleucus, dying two years later in 283 BCE, while Pyrrhus took the Macedonian throne.

This left Lysimachus over the whole of Greece, a danger which Seleucus quickly countered. Seleucus intervened in Macedonian affairs and defeated and killed Lysimachus in 281 BCE in the battle of Cyrus. Seleucus now proclaimed himself king of Macedon but was killed by Keraunos, a disaffected son of Ptolemy, because he reneged on certain promises. Ptolemy seems to have been the only one of the Diadochi to have died peacefully (c.282 BCE). Keraunos now became king of Macedon; at his death the dynasty passed to Antigonus Gonatas, a son of Demetrius. Thus, despite his lack of success in his lifetime, Antigonus' memory was nevertheless perpetuated in the rule of the Antigonid dynasty over Greece. This basic threefold division of Alexander's empire remained for two centuries until it

was finally ended by the Romans: Greece and Macedonia under the Antigonids, Syria and Mesopotamia under the Seleucids, and Egypt under the Ptolemies.

12.1.3 Ptolemy I Soter (323–282 BCE)

Alexander's childhood companion Ptolemy was a worthy founder of the Ptolemaic dynasty. His father was Lagus, which is why the dynasty is sometimes referred to as the Lagids. Having become satrap of Egypt shortly after Alexander's death, he seems to have realized early on that Alexander's empire would not remain intact; at least he saw the importance of holding a base in Egypt and worked tirelessly to maintain his control over the country. One of the first things he did was to take charge of Alexander's body and use it to help bolster his position. Most of his life was taken up with fighting, first under Alexander, as commander and one of the king's personal bodyguards, and then during the period of the Diadochi. Yet he was a true polymath, not only being a general and strategist of considerable ability but also a statesman and a man of learning and culture. His history of Alexander's conquests served as the basis of the most reliable account extant, and he perhaps began the famous library of Alexandria (the Museon), though possibly this was done by his son. He aided Seleucus I in returning to Babylon in 312 BCE after the latter was driven out by Antigonus. This is why when Ptolemy seized southern Syria and Palestine after the battle of Ipsus in 301, Seleucus did not press his legitimate claim to the territory. Even the last fifteen years of Ptolemy's life were taken up with expansion. He retook Cyprus from Demetrius Poliorcetes in 295 BCE. From 291 he extended his influence over the Aegean League of the Cyclad Islands. He lived until about age 85 and was one of the few of Alexander's companions to die peacefully.

12.2 Alexander the Great and the Jews

W. Jac. van Bakkum (1994) *A Hebrew Alexander Romance according to MS Héb. 671.5 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale*; **A.B. Bosworth** (1974) 'The Government of Syria under Alexander the Great', *CQ* 24: 46–64; (1980) *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander: I*; **A. Büchler** (1898) 'La Relation de Josèphe concernant Alexandre le Grand', *REJ* 36: 1–26; **S.J.D. Cohen** (1982–83) 'Alexander the Great and Jaddus the High Priest according to Josephus', *AJS Review* 7–8: 41–68; **D. Flusser** (1978–80) *Sefer Yosippon*; **L.L. Grabbe** (1987b) 'Josephus and the Reconstruction of the Judean Restoration', *JBL* 106: 231–46; **R. Helm (ed.)** (1956) *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*; **R. Jasnow** (1997) 'The Greek Alexander Romance and Demotic Egyptian Literature', *JNES* 56: 95–103; **A. Kasher** (forthcoming) 'Further Revised Thoughts on Josephus' Report of Alexander's Campaign to Palestine (Ant. 11: 304–347)', in L.L. Grabbe and O. Lipschits (eds), *Judah in Transition: From the Late Persian to the Early Hellenistic Period*; **I.J. Kazis** (1962) *The Book of the Gestis of Alexander of Macedon*; **T.H. Kim** (2003) 'The Dream of Alexander in Josephus Ant. 11.325–39', *JSJ* 34: 425–42; **R. Marcus** (1934) 'Appendix C. Alexander the Great and the

Jews', *Josephus* 5.512–32; **A. Momigliano** (1979) 'Flavius Josephus and Alexander's Visit to Jerusalem', *Atheneum* 57: 442–48; **F. Pfister** (1914) *Eine jüdische Gründungsgeschichte Alexandrias*; **R. Stoneman** (1991) *The Greek Alexander Romance*; (1994) 'Jewish Traditions on Alexander the Great', *SPA* 6: 37–53; **V.A. Tcherikover** (1959) *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*.

Certain figures in history have tended to attract traditions and to become surrounded with an ever-growing body of legendary material, for example, King Arthur. Some of these figures in the ancient Near East produced bodies of literature which spread and proliferated to the point that multiple versions in diverse languages have come down to us; examples of this are Ahiqar and the Alexander legend. The Alexander romance has little to do with history, even though there is certainly a historical figure and a core of known events from Alexander's life underlying the legendary superstructure. This legend was generally given in the name of one of the genuine Alexander historians, Callisthenes, but this is a false ascription: Callisthenes was executed early during Alexander's campaign. However, the Pseudo-Callisthenes romance does not represent a unified tradition, and other legendary material is known whose relationship to Pseudo-Callisthenes is uncertain. Elements from a variety of sources seem to have been taken in (e.g., Egyptian Demotic [Jasnow 1997]); a complex of traditions in a variety of languages is known (Stoneman 1991).

Among the various recensions of the Alexander romance is a Jewish version (Stoneman 1994). The Jewish version does not differ from Pseudo-Callisthenes in much of its overall structure, but one episode, not present in the non-Jewish versions (except the late 'γ-text'), is found in certain Jewish sources without the rest of the Alexander legend. This is the story of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem which is known in at least the following sources: Josephus (*Ant.* 11.8.1–6 §§304–45), the Babylonian Talmud (*B. Yoma* 69a), Josippon 10 and the mediaeval Hebrew *Gests of Alexander* (van Bakkum 1994; Kazis 1962). Some of the later accounts could be based on Josephus, though certain differences suggest that these probably have to do with independent versions.

This incident bringing Alexander and the high priest together has long been doubted in modern scholarship. Exactly what happened in Judaea during Alexander's conquest is basically unknown. As noted above (§12.1.1), he marched rapidly south down the Mediterranean coast (though delayed by the sieges of Tyre and Gaza) with the object of reaching Egypt as soon as possible. In 331 he pushed north again toward the Euphrates and the Persian heartland. At no point did Alexander show interest in the interior of the country in his drive down and back up the coast. In the earliest extant source, Josephus gives the story that Alexander came to Jerusalem to punish Judaea for refusing assistance in the siege of Tyre, but instead ended up honouring the high priest.

As Tcherikover has pointed out, however, the itinerary of Alexander and

his timetable are known in detail from the extant Alexander historians (1959: 42–50). Not only is it very unlikely that they would have omitted a visit of Alexander to Jerusalem, but also there is simply no place in Alexander's advance down the Mediterranean coast to fit in such an event. Immediately after the fall of Tyre, he received messengers with an offer of terms from Darius. These he refused but went directly down the Phoenician coast to Gaza which he besieged because it refused entry to him (see further below). When it fell after a two-month siege, he went straight on to Egypt. If Alexander had visited Jerusalem, it would have been on his return from Egypt, yet Josephus states that the visit was right after the siege of Gaza. In any event, why would the Alexander historians have omitted a trip to Jerusalem? For Alexander to visit the holy places of other peoples was not unusual: his reason for besieging Tyre was that the city refused his request to worship at the temple of 'Hercules' (Melqart) there, while later he made a special effort to cross a stretch of desert to visit the Egyptian shrine in the oasis at Ammon. If the Alexandrian historians mentioned these events, they would have mentioned a visit to Jerusalem.

We have no indication that Alexander required the peoples of the interior of Syria-Palestine to help him besiege Tyre, much less a small community up in the remote hill country. Because some local attacks were hindering the conveyance of timber, Alexander made raids into the Lebanon (Arrian 2.20.4–5; 4.2.24–3.1). But this seems to be the extent of interference with the local people at this time, according to the extant sources. But then Arrian tells us directly after the siege and conquest of Tyre:

Alexander now determined to make his expedition to Egypt. Palestinian Syria (as it is called) [Παλαιστίνης καλουμένης Συρίας] had already come over to him, except for a eunuch named Batis, who was master of the city of Gaza. (*Anab.* 2.25.4)

This shows that the various provinces and groups in this region had submitted to Alexander's rule. Details were not thought important, and we do not know when, where or how the Jews formally accepted Greek rule, but Arrian's silence suggests that there was nothing exceptional about their submission. Alexander no doubt received the fealty of the Judaeae nation at this time, as he did that of other peoples, but representatives would have come to him (perhaps at Jamnia), not he to them in Jerusalem. Only Gaza held out; if the Jewish high priest had also done so, we would have heard about it.

The only event relating to the interior of Palestine from Alexander's time is the rebellion of Samaria. The Samaritans had submitted to the Macedonians as the other smaller nations of Syria had, but then Quintus Curtius mentions an episode while Alexander was in Egypt (4.8.9–11). In 331 Andromachus the governor appointed over Syria by Alexander was burnt alive by the Samaritans. Alexander appointed Menon (variant 'Memnon') in his place, and when the ones guilty of this act were delivered to him, he had them

executed. This is straightforward enough – except that Arrian says nothing about the episode and instead has a Menon son of Cerdimmas appointed governor of Syria in 332 BCE directly after the battle of Issus (2.13.7). Bosworth (1974; 1980: 224–25) has argued that the accounts can be reconciled. Further, we have the finds at Wadi Daliyeh which show that several hundred people from Samaria died in these caves about this time (*HJJSTP* 1: 55–56). The Wadi Daliyeh papyri were seen as the archives of individuals fleeing from the destruction of Samaria, who took refuge in caves near the Jordan but were nevertheless tracked down by the Greek soldiers and slaughtered there. The few citizens who escaped the destruction of Samaria were assumed to have moved to the area of ancient Shechem and settled there.

The question, though, is whether the archaeological finds match the literary account. Curtius' statement is the following:

[There came] news of the death of Andromachus, to whom he had given the charge of Syria; the Samaritans had burned him alive. To avenge his murder, he hastened to the spot with all possible speed, and on his arrival those who had been guilty of so great a crime were delivered to him. Then he put Menon in place of Andromachus and executed those who had slain his general. Certain tyrants, including Aristonicus and Stesilaus of Methymne, he handed over to their own subjects, who put them to death by torture because of their outrages. (Quintus Curtius 4.8.9–11, LCL)

Curtius mentions only that the guilty people were punished; he does not suggest that refugees were hunted down and slaughtered: is it reasonable that the hundreds of men, women and children slain in the caves near the Jordan had anything to do with the assassination of the Syrian governor?

Eusebius says that after the Samaritans killed Andromachus, their city was captured and resettled by Macedonians (*Chronicle* on Olympiad CXII [205F]: *Andromacho locorum custode dimisso, quem postea Samaritani interficiunt. Ob quae ab Aegypto reuersus Alexander magnis eos suppliciis adfcit et urbem eorum captam Macedonibus ad inhabitandum tradit* [Helm (ed.) 1956: 123]). This suggests a more widespread harsh treatment and even slaughter of the inhabitants of Samaria. Since Eusebius is writing centuries later, the value of his account is somewhat uncertain, yet he often had good sources. The Wadi Daliyeh massacre does seem to have taken place about this time. If it was not the events arising from the assassination of Andromachus, we do not seem to have a viable alternative context in the extant literary sources. Thus, it seems that associating the finds at Wadi Daliyeh with the passage in Quintus Curtius is a reasonable interpretation, if not completely certain. The act of the Samaritans may have been interpreted as a revolt, which would have been dealt with sternly by Alexander to set an example that those who submitted to him had better stay in line. To conquer the city, slaughter or sell into slavery the inhabitants, and then repopulate it with loyal subjects would have been normal treatment: this is what happened at Gaza (Arrian 2.27.7) and

Tyre (Arrian 2.24.5–6; Diodorus 17.46.6–47.6; Justin 18.3.18–19). Curtius' account would then have been a highly compressed version, since readers would be aware of the standard treatment of rebels.

To return to the story about Alexander and Jerusalem, this Jewish tradition appears to be modelled in part on Alexander's trip to Ammon (Pfister 1914: 20–30). Also, one version of the Alexander legend contains an account of a visit of Alexander to Rome which looks very much parallel to the Jerusalem episode: both have an ethnic capital, a high priest, the prostration of Alexander to that priest because of a dream, and having sacrifices offered for himself in the sanctuary (Büchler 1898). The account in the Jewish sources has clear signs of Jewish apology.

In sum, modern scholars are practically unanimous in dismissing Josephus' story of Alexander's visit to Jerusalem as pure imagination with no historical basis (Kasher has recently defended its authenticity [forthcoming] but offers no new arguments). Also, one should be leery of using details from the story, as if they may have substance despite the fictional nature of the account of the whole, especially since these details are not consistent in the various versions of the story (Grabbe 1987b: 242–43).

12.3 Judah during the 'Wars of the Successors'

M. Hadas (1951) *Aristeas to Philocrates*; R. Helm (ed.) (1956) *Die Chronik des Hieronymus*; J.K. Winnicki (1989) 'Militäroperationen von Ptolemaios I. und Seleukos I. in Syrien in den Jahren 312–311 v. Chr. (I)', *AncSoc* 20: 55–92; (1991) 'Militäroperationen von Ptolemaios I. und Seleukos I. in Syrien in den Jahren 312–311 v. Chr. (II)', *AncSoc* 22: 147–201.

12.3.1 First Phase of Fighting (323–318 BCE)

During the wars of the Diadochi Palestine was fought in and over many times. We have no details for the most part, but the fighting may at times have had a devastating effect on the population and economy of the country. It has been conjectured that the 'giants' (offspring of women and angels) who devastate the earth in *1 Enoch* are symbols of the Diadochi whose military activities seemed to threaten human life in the country (*JLBM* 48–49). This section will catalogue the various events during the Diadochi period when Judah was or might have been the scene of military activity. In most cases, we can only suggest what might have been the effect in Judah without being able to demonstrate it.

After Alexander's death, Perdiccas was accepted as the commander-in-chief. One of his first actions was to reassign the various satrapies of Alexander's empire to the chief officers. Ptolemy was assigned Egypt, and Laomedon of Mitylene, Syria (Diodorus 18.3.1). Perdiccas lasted only three years before he was killed by his own officers while attempting to attack Ptolemy in Egypt (Diodorus 18.33–36). After Antipater was elected guardian (ἐπιμελητήν), he reassigned satrapies. Ptolemy was confirmed in Egypt, and

Laomedon of Mitylene in Syria (Diodorus 18.39.5). This was to be the pattern for the rest of Ptolemy's rule: Egypt was his base, and he used it strategically, but he also attempted to extend his rule into frontier areas that would help to protect the core of his kingdom, the Egyptian homeland. Cyrene quickly came under Ptolemy's control (Diodorus 18.20–22). He then realized that Phoenicia and Coele-Syria could serve as a basis for the invasion of Egypt (Diodorus 18.43.1); about 320 BCE he therefore set out to incorporate those regions into his realm. Ptolemy sent one of his friends Nicanor to do the job. In a short campaign Nicanor took Laodemon captive and placed garrisons in the Phoenician cities (Diodorus 18.43.1–2; Appian, *Syr.* 9.52; Marmor Parium [FGH 239] B §12). In 318 BCE Eumenes attempted to retake Phoenicia from Ptolemy without success, but then marched through Coele-Syria east to Mesopotamia (Diodorus 18.63.6; 18.73.2).

12.3.2 Second Phase, to the Battle of Gaza (317–312 BCE)

In 316, Antigonus marched to Babylonia with an army and was welcomed by the satrap Seleucus; however, Antigonus demanded a financial accounting, which Seleucus regarded as possibly a prelude to arrest, so he fled to Ptolemy in Egypt (Diodorus 19.55.1–5; Appian, *Syr.* 9.53). Instigated by Seleucus, a coalition of Ptolemy, Lysimachus and Cassander gave an ultimatum to Antigonus to share lands and treasure with them, which he of course refused (Diodorus 19.57; Appian, *Syr.* 9.53). Antigonus' first goal in 316 BCE was to take Phoenicia, since he needed a navy if he was to oppose the coalition, which had a substantial one (Diodorus 19.58). After preparing a siege of Tyre, he took Joppa and Gaza, which had not submitted to him (Diodorus 19.59.1–3), and eventually took Tyre (19.61.5). However, in 314 BCE Antigonus was forced to leave his son Demetrius in charge of Syria and march into Asia to defend against Cassander (Diodorus 19.69). In the summer of 313 Cyrene revolted against Ptolemy, but the revolt was quickly suppressed (Diodorus 19.79). Ptolemy then moved against those kings on Cyprus who were not submitting. With these regions secure, he made a raid on 'Upper Syria', apparently to reward his army with booty. At this time Demetrius was still stationed in Coele-Syria, with the aim of intercepting the Egyptian army if Ptolemy should march out (Diodorus 19.69; 19.80), and Seleucus urged Ptolemy to engage with him.

The resulting 'Battle of Gaza' is extremely important for Hellenistic history (Diodorus 19.80–86, 90–93; Appian, *Syr.* 9.54; Justin, *Hist. Phil.* 15.1.5–9). In 312 BCE Ptolemy, accompanied by Seleucus, took a large army to Pelusium and then on to Gaza. It was there that Demetrius met him, with an inferior army, despite advice to avoid a conflict against such experienced generals as Ptolemy and Seleucus. The results were those expected: Demetrius was soundly beaten but personally escaped to Azotus (Ashdod). Ptolemy proceeded to take over the cities of Phoenicia, either by siege or negotiation (19.85.4; 19.86.1–2). He also gave aid to Seleucus who set out to re-establish

his rule over Babylonia. The latter had been a popular ruler of the region, and the people welcomed him. He defeated Nicanor, Antigonos' governor over Media, and took charge of the region (Diodorus 19.90–92). Ptolemy, hearing that Demetrius was encamped in northern Syria, sent an army to drive him out or destroy him, but Demetrius defeated Ptolemy's force and, having been joined by Antigonos, marched from Phrygia across the Taurus mountains (Diodorus 19.93.1–4). Fearing this combined force, Ptolemy abandoned Syro-Palestine, destroying such cities as Akē-Acco, Joppa, Samaria and Gaza (Diodorus 19.93.5–7), and Antigonos retook Syro-Palestine without a fight (19.94.1).

12.3.3 The Final Stages, to the Battle of Ipsus and Beyond (311–281 BCE)

In 311 BCE, Ptolemy, Cassander and Lysimachus came to an agreement with Antigonos about the division of the empire; shortly afterward Alexander the Great's Persian wife Roxane and her son Alexander IV were murdered, removing the last obvious heir to Alexander's legacy and leaving the 'successors' free to claim possession of their individual realms (Diodorus 19.105.1–4). For the next several years Ptolemy was occupied with Asia Minor and the Aegean (Diodorus 20.19, 27, 37), but after a major naval defeat at Salamis in 307 BCE, he abandoned Cyprus to Demetrius (Diodorus 20.53.1; Justin, *Hist. Phil.* 15.2.6–7). As a result, Antigonos and Demetrius took the title of 'king', but Ptolemy followed a year or so later (305–304), and Seleucus, Lysimachus, and Cassander did the same (Diodorus 20.53.2–4; Marmor Parium [FGH 239] B §23; Justin, *Hist. Phil.* 15.2.10–14). Antigonos decided to move against Egypt in 306 BCE (Diodorus 20.73–76; Plutarch, *Demetr.* 19.1–2). He led a large land force through Coele-Syria, while Demetrius took the fleet down the coast. The army camped at Gaza, though the ship pilots were concerned about continuing to sail at the time of year (beginning of November). After leaving Gaza, the fleet did indeed encounter adverse weather but managed to ride it out, while the army marched via Raphia through difficult wilderness conditions toward the Nile. Ptolemy had anticipated them, however, and placed garrisons and encampments at strategic points to prevent the fleet landing or the army crossing the Nile. Also, the weather continued to cause problems for the ships. Finally, Antigonos gave up the campaign and returned to northern Syria.

In 302 BCE Cassander attempted to come to terms with Antigonos; when the latter refused, he sought to enlist Lysimachus, Ptolemy and Seleucus into a coalition against Antigonos once more (Diodorus 20.106–13; Justin, *Hist. Phil.* 15.4.21–24). Cassander and Lysimachus began opening skirmishes against Demetrius and Antigonos. When Antigonos went into winter quarters in the Heraclea region of Anatolia, Demetrius joined him there from Greece. Seleucus also arrived from the east. During this time Ptolemy moved into Coele-Syria with a large army and proceeded to bring all the

cities under his control. While he was besieging Sidon, he received a false report that Antigonus had defeated Lysimachus and Seleucus and was marching into Syria. Ptolemy came to terms with Sidon, established garrisons in the cities he now controlled, and returned to Egypt. The actual battle of Ipsus is not described by Diodorus, whose text becomes fragmentary at this point, but we know of it from partial references in several sources (Plutarch, *Demetr.* 28–29; cf. also Diodorus 21. 4b; Appian, *Syr.* 9.55). Because Ptolemy had returned to Egypt, he was not at the battle in which Lysimachus, Cassander and Seleucus defeated Antigonus and finally brought his life to an end at the age of 80. In the settlement that followed, Syro-Palestine was assigned to Seleucus, a fact that was to have major consequences for the future history of the region: when Seleucus came to claim his territory, Ptolemy refused to cede it to him (Diodorus 21.5; Polybius 5.67). Because of his friendship with Ptolemy, Seleucus did not press his claim immediately, but he also did not give up his right to the territory. Plutarch indicates that Demetrius still maintained control of Tyre and Sidon for several more years, though exactly how this happened is not clear (*Demetr.* 32.4). More surprising, Eusebius has a note that Demetrius destroyed Samaria in 296–295 BCE (*Chron.* on Olympiad CXXI [209–10F]: *Demetrius rex Asiae cognomento Poliorcetes Samaritarum urbem uastat* [Helm (ed.) 1956: 127–28]).

12.4 *Ptolemy I and the Jews*

The only direct evidence about Judaea at this time is given in a single reference by Josephus, who states that Ptolemy I took Jerusalem on the sabbath by pretending to enter to sacrifice at the temple (*Ant.* 12.1.1 §§3–10; *C. Ap.* 1.22 §§209–12). The source is Agatharchides of Cnidus who is quoted as follows:

The people known as Jews, who inhabit the most strongly fortified of cities, called by the natives Jerusalem, have a custom of abstaining from work every seventh day; on those occasions they neither bear arms nor take any agricultural operations in hand, nor engage in any other form of public service, but pray with outstretched hands in the temples until the evening. Consequently, because the inhabitants, instead of protecting their city, persevered in their folly, Ptolemy, son of Lagus, was allowed to enter with his army; the country was thus given over to a cruel master, and the defect of a practice enjoined by law was exposed. That experience has taught the whole world, except that nation, the lesson not to resort to dreams and traditional fancies about the law, until its difficulties are such as to baffle human reason. (*C. Ap.* 1.22 §§209–11)

Josephus goes on to say that Ptolemy took many captives, not only from Judaea but also from Samaria, and settled them in Egypt. Also later, many other Jews were attracted by Egypt and emigrated there. This caused some rivalry between the Jews and Samaritans in Egypt over the question of which temple should receive their offerings. When Ptolemy captured Jerusalem and

why are not given in the brief information we have on the subject; however, possibilities are discussed below.

The Jewish nation alone still resisted, and Pompey conquered them [ἐξείλε κατὰ κράτος], sent their king, Aristobulus, to Rome, and destroyed [κατέσκαψεν] their greatest, and to them holiest, city, Jerusalem, as Ptolemy, the first king of Egypt, had formerly done. (Appian, *Syr.* 8.50)

There is one further source, though its reliability is very questionable. This is the *Letter of Aristeas* (for a discussion of this source, see *HJJSTP* 3), which states:

Now I thought was the opportune moment for proffering the matter concerning which I had often petitioned . . . namely, the emancipation of those who had been carried away from Judaea by the king's father [i.e., Ptolemy I]. He had overrun the whole of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia, exploiting his good fortune and prowess, and had transplanted some and made others captive, reducing all to subjection by terror; it was on this occasion that he transported more than a hundred thousand persons from the country of the Jews to Egypt. Of these he armed some thirty thousand chosen men and settled them in garrisons in the country. Previously many had come into the country along with the Persians, and even before this others had been sent out as auxiliaries to fight in the army of Psammetichus against the king of the Ethiopians; but these were not so numerous as Ptolemy son of Lagus transported. As has been said, then, he selected and armed those that were fittest in age and outstanding in ruggedness, but the remaining bulk, those too old and too young and also the women, he reduced to bondage. (*Aristeas* 12–14, trans. Hadas 1951)

We should normally be cautious about depending on *Aristeas* for historical statements. Yet although the numbers in *Aristeas* are questionable, the general point of Jews moved involuntarily from Palestine to Egypt is consistent with the statements in the source(s) used by Josephus and Appian. The dating of this transportation of Jews to Egypt is not clearly indicated in the sources. One possibility is early in the Diadochi period, about 320 BCE when Ptolemy first established control over Coele-Syria (see above, §11.2.2.1). Another would be about 312 BCE at the time of the battle of Gaza, when Ptolemy is said explicitly to have accepted a migration of Jews to Egypt; however, the story (whose authenticity is difficult to judge) implies that this movement of Jews to Egypt was a peaceful one, not one forced on prisoners by the Ptolemaic soldiers (see above, §11.2.2.3). Thus, if these reports of deportation of Jews to Egypt have any basis in fact, the most likely period of time that we know about would be about 320 BCE; yet there is much we do not know about this period of time, and another event between 320 and 312 BCE is always possible.

One further incident has been ascribed to Ptolemy, but it presents historical problems (already discussed in *HJJSTP* 1: 66, 149). In his *Contra Apionem* (1.22 §§187–91), Josephus refers to the ἀρχιερεύς Hezekiah (Ezekias) who asked Ptolemy I for permission to lead a group of Jews to settle in Egypt after

the battle of Gaza in 312 BCE. Josephus claims to be quoting Hecataeus of Abdera (§5.2):

Among these (he says) was Ezechias, a chief priest of the Jews, a man of about sixty-six years of age, highly esteemed by his countrymen, intellectual, and moreover an able speaker and unsurpassed as a man of business. Yet (he adds) the total number of Jewish priests who receive a tithe of the revenue and administer public affairs [τὰ κοινὰ διοικούντες] is about fifteen hundred. (*C. Ap.* 1.22 §§187–88)

This man, after obtaining this honour and having been closely in touch with us, assembled some of his friends and read to them [a statement showing] all the advantages [of emigration]; for he had in writing the conditions attaching to their settlement and political status. (*C. Ap.* 1.22 §§189, square brackets are part of the quotation from LCL)

It seems likely that *archiereus* in this context refers to a chief priest, not to the high priest in the temple (§12.4). Some have identified this individual with Hezekiah the governor of Judah, known from coins in the late Persian period, a possibility but no more than that (*HJJSTP* 1: 149). The problem is that the source of this quotation is likely to be a Jewish writer about 100 BCE rather than the genuine Hecataeus of Abdera (§5.2). This does not make the statement false, but it reduces its credibility.

12.5 *Hecataeus of Abdera on the Jews*

K. Berthelot (forthcoming) ‘Hecataeus of Abdera and Jewish “Misanthropy”’, *Bulletin du Centre de Recherche Français de Jérusalem*.

Hecataeus’ description of the Jews in the early Greek period has long been considered valuable, but it is not unproblematic. The authenticity of the passage has recently been questioned, but I have argued that on balance it seems to be genuinely the product of Hecataeus of Abdera (§5.2). The problem is that Hecataeus did not appear to know the Jews directly (though there are indications that he had Jewish sources and/or informants), and his account has probably been assimilated to certain Greek ideological concepts. Several passages in Book 1 refer to the Jews:

Now the Egyptians say that also after these events a great number of colonies were spread from Egypt over all the inhabited world. To Babylon, for instance, colonists were led by Belus ... They say also that those who set forth with Danaus, likewise from Egypt, settled what is practically the oldest city of Greece, Argos, and that the nation of the Colchi in Pontus and that of the Jews, which lies between Arabia and Syria, were founded as colonies by certain emigrants from their country; and this is the reason why it is a long-established institution among these two peoples to circumcise their male children, the custom having been brought over from Egypt. (Diodorus 1.28.1–4, LCL)

But then Hecataeus actually dismisses the statement quoted in 1.28 by the declaration in 1.29 that there is no proof. What this shows, as Berthelot

(forthcoming) has cogently argued, is that Hecataeus/Diodorus has drawn on two reports about colonizing, one in which the Egyptians initiated it and the other in which the foreigners were expelled.

In general, the Egyptians say that their ancestors sent forth numerous colonies to many parts of the inhabited world, by reason of the pre-eminence of their former kings and their excessive population; but since they offer no precise proof whatsoever for these statements, and since no historian worthy of credence testifies in their support, we have not thought that their accounts merited recording. (Diodorus 1.29.5–6, LCL)

One of the characteristics of the Jews – but not them alone – is circumcision:

And the proof which they offer of the Egyptian origin of this nation [the Colchi] is the fact that the Colchi practise circumcision even as the Egyptians do, the custom continuing among the colonists sent out from Egypt as it also did in the case of the Jews. (Diodorus 1.55.5, LCL)

On the other hand, circumcision is not mentioned in 40.3, but why should it be? His description would not necessarily have included everything that Hecataeus said about the Jews. He could have shortened his account to include what he thought was important in the passage and omitted information that he included in Book 1. A further passage shows knowledge of the name of the Jewish God:

We must speak also of the lawgivers who have arisen in Egypt and who instituted customs unusual and strange . . . Also among several other peoples tradition says that this kind of a device was used and was the cause of much good to such as believed it. Thus it is recorded that among the Arians Zathraustes claimed that the Good Spirit gave him his laws, among the people known as the Getae who represent themselves to be immortal Zalmoxis asserted the same of their common goddess Hestia, and among the Jews Moyses referred his laws to the god who is invoked as Iao. (Diodorus 1.94.1–2, LCL)

The most important passage is of course his long description of the Jews, as quoted by Diodorus of Sicily, which has come down to us through the mediaeval writer Photius (Diodorus 40.3.1–7):

(1) When in ancient times a pestilence arose in Egypt, the common people ascribed their troubles to the workings of a divine agency; for indeed with many strangers of all sorts dwelling in their midst and practising different rites of religion and sacrifice, their own traditional observances in honour of the gods had fallen into disuse. (2) Hence the natives of the land surmised that unless they removed the foreigners, their troubles would never be resolved. At once, therefore, the aliens were driven from the country, and the most outstanding and active among them banded together and, as some say, were cast ashore in Greece and certain other regions; their leaders were notable men, chief among them being Danaus and Cadmus. But the greater number were driven into what is now called Judaea, which is not far distant from Egypt and was at that time utterly uninhabited. (3) The colony was headed by a man called Moses, outstanding both for his wisdom and for his courage. On taking possession of the land he founded, besides other cities, one that is now the most renowned of all, called

Jerusalem. In addition he established the temple that they hold in chief veneration, instituted their forms of worship and ritual, drew up their laws and ordered their political institutions. He also divided them into twelve tribes, since this is regarded as the most perfect number and corresponds to the number of months that make up a year. (4) But he had no images whatsoever of the gods made for them, being of the opinion that God is not in human form; rather the Heaven that surrounds the earth is alone divine, and rules the universe. The sacrifices that he established differ from those of other nations, as does their way of living, for as a result of their own expulsion from Egypt he introduced an unsocial and intolerant mode of life. He picked out the men of most refinement and with the greatest ability to head the entire nation, and appointed them priests; and he ordained that they should occupy themselves with the temple and the honours and sacrifices offered to their god. (5) These same men he appointed to be judges in all major disputes, and entrusted to them the guardianship of the laws and customs. For this reason the Jews never have a king, and authority over the people is regularly vested in whichever priest is regarded as superior to his colleagues in wisdom and virtue. They call this man the high priest [*archiereus*], and believe that he acts as a messenger to them of God's commandments. (6) It is he, we are told, who in their assemblies and other gatherings announces what is ordained, and the Jews are so docile in such matters that straightway they fall to the ground and do reverence to the high priest when he expounds the commandments to them. And at the end of their laws there is even appended the statement: 'These are the words that Moses heard from God and declares unto the Jews.' (7) He [Moses] led out military expeditions against the neighbouring tribes, and after annexing much land apportioned it out, assigning equal allotments to private citizens and greater ones to the priests, in order that they, by virtue of receiving more ample revenues, might be undistracted and apply themselves continually to the worship of God.

The following insights are suggested by Hecataeus' account:

1. In addition to discussing the supposed origin of the Jews (expelled from Egypt under the leadership of Moses), Hecataeus describes a Jewish ethnic and national community centred on Jerusalem.
2. The priests provide leadership and act as judges, as well as running the cult and teaching the law. One rather interesting statement is that the priests possess land, at least collectively, which differs from the explicit statements of the Bible (Num. 18.24; Deut. 10.9; 12.12; 28.1). Coincidentally, this statement is more likely to match the reality of the Hellenistic period than the idealized portrait of the Pentateuch.
3. Chief authority is invested in the high priest who is chosen for his wisdom. This does not suggest a hereditary office. How seriously to take this implication is difficult to say: most other sources indicate that the office was passed from father to son, but it may be that this was no more than standard custom rather than a hard-and-fast rule; on the other hand, this may be a detail on which Hecataeus was not fully informed.
4. Hecataeus presents an aniconic and most likely a monotheistic temple-based religion.

5. He states that they have a written law and gives a quotation which closely parallels Lev. 27.34 and Num. 36.13.

12.6 Summary

Events immediately following Alexander's death set the stage for the 40 years of conflict between the Diadochi. Although Perdikkas was accepted as the commander-in-chief, it was soon clear that he was not going to be accepted as Alexander's successor. His appointments of satraps had far-reaching consequences, however: Ptolemy was assigned Egypt, and Laomedon of Mitylene, Syria (Diodorus 18.3.1). After Perdikkas' death, when Antipater reassigned satrapies, Ptolemy was confirmed in Egypt, and Laomedon of Mitylene in Syria (Diodorus 18.39.5). The pattern was set for Ptolemy's rule: Egypt was his base, and he used it strategically. Yet he also realized the need to protect the Egyptian heartland and attempted to extend his rule into frontier areas. Thus, Cyrene quickly came under Ptolemy's control (Diodorus 18.20-22), after which he turned to Phoenicia and Coele-Syria. These were also in a strategic position to serve for the invasion of Egypt, and he needed to hold these territories (Diodorus 18.43.1).

Because we have no details for Palestine for much of this period, the most part that we can say with certainty is that fighting affected the people considerably during this period; at times it may even have had a devastating effect on the population and economy of the country. It seems reasonable to suggest this without being able to demonstrate it by reference to specific events. The following are the main periods when Syro-Palestine was involved in fighting or conflict:

- About 320 BCE Ptolemy set out to incorporate those regions into his realm, sending one of his friends, Nicanor. In a short campaign Nicanor took Laodemon captive and placed garrisons in the Phoenician cities (Diodorus 18.43.1-2; Appian, *Syr.* 9.52; *Marmor Parium* [FGH 239] B §12).
- In 318 BCE Eumenes attempted to retake Phoenicia from Ptolemy without success, but then marched through Coele-Syria east to Mesopotamia (Diodorus 18.63.6; 18.73.2).
- After Seleucus fled to Ptolemy for protection in 316 (Diodorus 19.55.1-5; Appian, *Syr.* 9.53), a coalition of Ptolemy, Lysimachus and Cassander gave an ultimatum to Antigonus which he refused (Diodorus 19.57; Appian, *Syr.* 9.53). Antigonus then took Phoenicia, since he needed a navy if he was to oppose the coalition which had a substantial navy (Diodorus 19.58). After preparing a siege of Tyre, he took Joppa and Gaza, which had not submitted to him (Diodorus 19.59.1-3), and eventually took Tyre (19.61.5).
- In 314 BCE Antigonus was forced to leave his son Demetrius in charge of Syria, with the aim of intercepting the Egyptian army if Ptolemy should march out (Diodorus 19.69; 19.80). About 313

Ptolemy made a raid on 'Upper Syria', apparently to reward his army with booty, and Seleucus urged Ptolemy to engage with him. This resulted in the 'Battle of Gaza' in 312 BCE, an extremely important event for Hellenistic history (Diodorus 19.80–86, 90–93; Appian, *Syr.* 9.54; Justin, *Hist. Phil.* 15.1.5–9). Demetrius was defeated but personally escaped.

- Ptolemy proceeded to take over the cities of Phoenicia, either by siege or negotiation (Diodorus 19.85.4; 19.86.1–2). Hearing that Demetrius was encamped in northern Syria, Ptolemy sent an army to drive him out or destroy him, but Demetrius defeated Ptolemy's force and was soon joined by Antigonus. Fearing this combined force, Ptolemy abandoned Syro-Palestine, destroying such cities as Akē-Acco, Joppa, Samaria and Gaza (Diodorus 19.93.5–7), and Antigonus retook Syro-Palestine without a fight (19.94.1).
- In 306 BCE Antigonus decided to move against Egypt (Diodorus 20.73–76; Plutarch, *Demet.* 19.1–2). He took a large land force through Coele-Syria, while Demetrius took a fleet down the coast. After leaving Gaza, the fleet encountered adverse weather but managed to ride it out, while the army marched via Raphia. Ptolemy had anticipated them, however, and placed garrisons and encampments at strategic points to prevent the fleet landing or the army crossing the Nile. Also, the weather continued to cause problems for the ships. Finally, Antigonus gave up the campaign and returned to northern Syria.
- In 302 BCE a coalition of Cassander, Lysimachus, Ptolemy, and Seleucus moved against Antigonus once more (Diodorus 20.106–13; Justin, *Hist. Phil.* 15.4.21–24). With the opening skirmishes against Demetrius and Antigonus underway, Ptolemy moved into Coele-Syria with a large army and proceeded to bring all the cities under his control. While he was besieging Sidon, he received a false report that Antigonus had defeated Lysimachus and Seleucus and was marching into Syria. Ptolemy came to terms with Sidon, established garrisons in the cities he now controlled, and returned to Egypt.
- Because Ptolemy had returned to Egypt, he was not at the battle of Ipsus in which Antigonus ended his life. In the settlement that followed (301 BCE), Syro-Palestine was assigned to Seleucus, a fact that was to have major consequences for the future history of the region: when Seleucus came to claim his territory, Ptolemy refused to concede it to him (Diodorus 21.5; Polybius 5.67).
- Plutarch indicates that Demetrius still maintained control of Tyre and Sidon for several more years, though exactly how this happened is not clear (*Demetr.* 32.4). More surprising, Eusebius has a note that Demetrius destroyed Samaria in 296–295 BCE (*Chron.* on Olympiad CXXI [209–10F; Helm (ed.) 1956: 127–28]).

Chapter 13

THE PTOLEMAIC PERIOD (280–205 BCE)

This chapter covers the bulk of Ptolemaic rule after Ptolemy I, a period for which we have most information on the Jews in the early Greek period, and ends just before the Seleucid takeover of Syro-Palestine. It addresses a number of topics that cover the whole of the early Hellenistic period but cannot be dated more precisely.

13.1 *Background History*

E.R. Bevan (1902) *The House of Seleucus*; (1927) *The House of Ptolemy: A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*; *CAH* 7/1; 8; **M. Cary** (1963) *A History of the Greek World 323 to 146 BC*; **N. Davis and C.M. Kraay** (1973) *The Hellenistic Kingdoms: Portrait Coins and History*; **G. Hölbl** (2001) *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*; **W. Huß** (1976) *Untersuchungen zur Außenpolitik Ptolemaios' IV*; (2001) *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit: 332–30 v. Chr.*; **M. Sartre** (2001) *D'Alexandre à Zénobie: Histoire du Levant antique, IV^e siècle avant J.-C., III^e siècle après J.-C.*; **H.H. Schmitt** (1964) *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Grossen und seiner Zeit*; **S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt** (1993) *From Samarkhand to Sardis*; **E. Will** (1979) *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*: vol. 1; (1982) *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*: vol. 2.

13.1.1 *Overview*

The 40 years of fighting after Alexander's death finally came to an end with the death of the main protagonists by the year 280 BCE. Much of the third century BCE was dominated by the Syrian wars. These constituted an on-going conflict between the Ptolemaic and Seleucid empires over Syro-Palestine. As noted in the previous chapter (§12.3.3), the council of victors after the battle of Ipsus (301 BCE) had awarded this region to Seleucus because Ptolemy had not participated in the battle; however, Ptolemy occupied the area up to the Eleutherus river, north of Tripolis, and refused to concede the territory. Seleucus did not press the point because Ptolemy had aided him when he was driven from Babylon. Yet the following Seleucid rulers spent the next three-quarters of a century trying to regain what they viewed as rightfully theirs, but any successes were only temporary until the

Fifth Syrian War. As well as Syro-Palestine the Ptolemies controlled Cyprus, various cities on the coast of Asia Minor, some Aegean islands, and Cyrenaica. The Seleucid empire was much larger and more diffuse, and the threat of disintegration a continual problem. The eastern provinces were especially hard to keep under control.

This loss of the eastern part of the empire is usually ascribed to the Parthians. The Parthians originated among the Parni, a group of Iranian-speaking tribes that apparently originated in Central Asia. Much is still not known about the migration of the Parni into the region of Parthia. The earliest area occupied by the Parthians, under Arsaces I the founder of a new dynasty about 238 BCE, was in fact north of the Elburz and thus outside the Seleucid realm. Seleucus II led a campaign against them *c.*230 BCE, but had to break off and return to put down a revolt in Asia Minor. The Parthians made raids into Seleucid territory but occupation south of the Elburz did not take place until the middle of the second century. The Parthians were still vassals under Antiochus III (223–187 BCE) and seemed to recognize this status themselves. Also, because of Seleucid weakness, certain kingdoms in Asia Minor managed to rise and maintain themselves for shorter or longer periods (e.g., Pergamum, Pontus, and Cappadocia).

13.1.2 Ptolemy II Philadelphus (282–246 BCE)

Ptolemy II was both a long-lived and productive ruler who was already associated with his father on the throne in 285. He pursued cultural as well as political matters, which included building the famous lighthouse Pharos and bringing the library of Alexandria to completion, if he did not begin it. Yet his rule had its share of war as he tried to maintain the Ptolemaic empire in the Aegean and Asia Minor. Seleucus I was assassinated in 281; his successor Antiochus I (281–261 BCE) had difficulties in securing his throne in the so-called Syrian War of Succession (*c.*280–279 BCE). Ptolemy II naturally took advantage of this temporary weakness to extend his possessions. Antiochus was then confronted by the Celtic invasion of 278–277. He defeated the Gauls decisively in the ‘elephant battle’ sometime between 275 and 270, but they continued to cause difficulties. The First Syrian War (274–271 BCE) began with the revolt of Magas, the governor of Cyrenaica, against Egypt in which he involved his father-in-law Antiochus. We know little about it, except that the Seleucids withdrew, giving unexpected victory to the Egyptians. Although Magas was able to maintain independence for almost 25 years, the war seems to have caused little change with regard to Seleucid and Ptolemaic territories.

In the next decade Egypt was involved in the Chremonidean War (*c.*267–261 BCE) in trying to counter Macedonian influence in Greece. Ptolemy’s attempts to influence events in the Aegean area were thwarted by the Macedonian king Antigonus Gonatas in this conflict. Whether Antiochus also participated is uncertain, though the loss of Ephesus to Ptolemaic rule about 261 suggests that he was. Antiochus I died in 261 and his successor

Antiochus II (261–246 BCE) was the instigator of the Second Syrian War (c.260–253 BCE). The new Seleucid ruler actually gained territory in Asia Minor, and Ptolemy further lost land to the king of Macedonia and to Rhodes. A settlement between the two brought peace for the rest of the lives of both Ptolemy II and Antiochus II. Ptolemy obtained this peace with Antiochus by giving him his daughter Berenice Syra in marriage (which led to disastrous consequences for Antiochus' son Seleucus II). Ptolemy then divorced his first wife to marry his sister Arsinoe, a strong and independent woman, though her influence on her brother has often been exaggerated. He also established diplomatic relations with Rome, which was engaged in the First Punic War with Carthage (264–241 BCE). Ptolemy was also able to regain Cyrenaica by arranging for his son to marry Magas' daughter. Ptolemy's reign has regularly been interpreted in idyllic terms as one of economic prosperity as well as cultural achievement, but recent studies have suggested that his fiscal policies were in fact disastrous, spending more than the economy could sustain, which led to the financial crisis in his son's reign (§9.2). For scholars of Judaica, Ptolemy II is known most widely as the Ptolemy of the *Letter of Aristeas*, but much of that epistle is literary invention and probably tells us little about Jewish history (discussed in *HJSTP* 3).

13.1.3 Ptolemy III Euergetes I (246–221 BCE)

While still a crown prince, Ptolemy III had to put down a revolt in Cyrenaica. Then, shortly after taking the throne, he received an urgent message for help from his sister Berenice. She had married Antiochus II but after his death she was under siege from Antiochus' first wife. Ptolemy took an army to her aid but found she had already been killed. Thus, he initiated the Third Syrian War. The Third Syrian War or Laodicean War (246–241 BCE) originated over a rivalry between two sons of Antiochus II for the Seleucid throne. Antiochus' son by his first wife Laodice was recognized in Asia Minor as Seleucus II; however, a son (name unknown) by his second wife Berenice was accepted as the new ruler elsewhere, as well as being supported by the new Egyptian king Ptolemy III. Ptolemy advanced through Syria, apparently without opposition, first taking Antioch, then moving on eastward to occupy Babylon and Seleucia-on-the-Tigris. At some point during his advance, the unnamed Seleucid pretender and Berenice were murdered in circumstances now unknown. Seleucus II's claim to the throne was then recognized in Babylon, but he left western Asia Minor under his brother Antiochus Hierax as he moved to secure his throne in Syria and the east. A revolt in Egypt had forced Ptolemy IV to make peace with Seleucus II and return home. This revolt (the first of many in Ptolemaic history) was partly due to a number of low Nile floods that produced a famine. In the *Canopus Decree* Ptolemy III claims to have bought grain from abroad at great expense. The treaty ending the war left various territories in Ptolemaic hands, including parts of the southern and western coasts of Asia Minor and Seleuceia and Antioch.

The conclusion of the Third Syrian War was the beginning of the so-called War of the Brothers (c.241–236), between Antiochus Hierax and Seleucus II; after a quarrel with his brother, Antiochus proclaimed himself king over the Seleucid realms. To what extent he was supported in this by Ptolemy III is not clear, but he probably had Egyptian support. Antiochus defeated Seleucus in a battle near Ancyra (c.240–239), but peace was concluded (before 236) which allowed Antiochus to retain control over his territory. After further squabbles, Antiochus Hierax was murdered in 226 and Seleucus II died about the same time. Seleucus III (c.226–223 BCE) who succeeded to the throne wished to reassert Seleucid rule over Asia Minor. He attacked Attalus I, king of Pergamum (241–197) who had gained independence during the War of the Brothers, but was himself killed in a conspiracy during the campaign. He was succeeded by Antiochus III (see further at §14.1.2).

13.1.4 *Ptolemy IV Philopator (221–204 BCE)*

After a period of positive growth in the first part of Ptolemaic rule, a decline marked by dynastic crises began with the reign of Ptolemy IV. A negative evaluation of his reign was already found in the Greek historian Polybius. He is generally regarded as a weak ruler dominated by his palace functionaries, though some recent scholars have evaluated his reign more positively. His main achievement – the defeat of Antiochus III at the battle of Raphia in the Fourth Syrian War (219–217 BCE) – was vital, but it in fact produced only a defensive outcome. This was sufficient to allow him to reign at ease (he had a particular interest in literature), but he had achieved his success in part by using native Egyptian troops, which is thought by many to have laid the ground for future civil disorders since the Egyptians naturally expected some civic rights in return, though some recent scholars think this is exaggerated. Polybius tells us that after the battle of Raphia, Philopator lived a life of dissipation and became the slave of a well-known courtesan (14.11–12).

13.2 *Jews under the Ptolemies*

We have little explicit mention of Jews before the second half of the third century BCE, apart from a few references in the Zenon papyri and some other documents. But the little information we have is that much more precious. One important document from the Zenon archive (a slave sale) provides a variety of useful information, including the mention of Tobias:

In the 27th year of the reign of Ptolemy, son of Ptolemy, and of his son Ptolemy, the priest of Alexander and of the gods Adelphoi and the kanephoros [carrier of basket with sacred objects] of Arsinoe Philadelphos being those in office in Alexandria, in the month Xandikos, at Birta [the fortress?] of the Ammanitis. Nikanor son of Xenokles, Knidian, in the service of Toubias, sold to Zenon son of Agreophon, Kaunian, in the service of Apollonios the dioiketes, a Sidonian girl named Sphragis, about seven years of age, for fifty drachmai. Guarantor ...

son of Ananias, Persian, of the troop of Toubias, kleruch. Witnesses: [...] Polemon son of Straton, Macedonian, of the cavalymen of Toubias, kleruch [...] (CPJ 1.1, ellipses part of the original unless in square brackets)

Revealed to us in this document is a Jewish nobleman who occupies an important place in Palestinian society, being the head of a cleruchy of cavalry in the Transjordanian area. Tobias later writes to Apollonius with gifts and then even sends presents to the king, Ptolemy II himself, along with a letter (CPJ 1.4; 1.6).

Among the Rainer papyri in Vienna is one with parts of two decrees by Ptolemy II Philadelphus issued about his 24th year (260 BCE) (now SB 8008). A translation of the extant portions of the text is quoted at §3.2.1 (along with bibliography). Although the text does not mention the Jews explicitly, it provides some insights into society in Palestine at the time, which is basically the same time as Zenon was touring through the region (§3.1.2). Here are some of the things this papyrus tells us about Palestine at the time (English translations from BAGNALL/DEROW #64):

- The region is divided into *hyparchies*, and an *oikonomos* or financial officer has been appointed in each to deal with taxation: '[The possessors of herds shall declare] to the *oikonomos* appointed in each *hyparchy*, within 60 days'.
- The village is the basic unit of tax administration, with the village headman (*komarch*) playing an important role in the process: 'Those holding the tax contracts for the villages and the *komarchs* shall register at the same time the taxable and tax-free livestock in the villages'.
- Registration of property and payment of tax is a yearly event, with a variety of taxes: 'the pasture tax and crown tax and the other penalties ... And they shall make each year at the same time declarations and shall pay the sums due as it is set out in the letter from the king, in the proper months according to the schedule.'
- Slaves were an important economic possession, which meant that illegal enslavement of free individuals was a major problem for the region:

By order of the king: If anyone in Syria and Phoenicia has bought a free native person or has seized and held one or acquired one in any other manner – to the *oikonomos* in charge in each *hyparchy* within 20 days from the day of the proclamation of the ordinance ... Whoever of the soldiers on active duty and the other military settlers in Syria and Phoenicia are living with native wives whom they have captured need not declare them. And for the future no one shall be allowed to buy or accept as security native free persons on any pretext, except for those handed over by the superintendent of the revenues in Syria and Phoenicia for execution, for whom the execution is properly on the person, as it is written in the law governing farming contracts.

It is also about the middle of the third century that we first find references to synagogues (§10.3). Several inscriptions show that ‘prayer houses’ were dedicated to the reigning monarch and, incidentally, indicate for the first time that a special place of worship existed apart from the Jerusalem temple. Unfortunately, we have no further information about the services conducted or the organization of the synagogue. It also seems clear that they did not exist in Palestine itself for another couple of centuries at least (*HJJSTP* 1: 236–37).

The papyri contain many other citations of Jews in Egypt itself. We have quite a few references to individual Jews, both men and women. Some of these are cited or quoted below (§13.5) and provide complementary information to that in this section. Much of what we know about the Jews of Palestine at this time is found in the story of the Tobiads. This is discussed in the next section.

13.3 Tobiads and Oniads

J.M. Dentzer, F. Villeneuve and F. Larché (1982) ‘Iraq el Amir: Excavations at the Monumental Gateway’, *SHAJ* 1: 201–207; **G. Fuks** (2001) ‘Josephus’ Tobiads Again: A Cautionary Note’, *JJS* 52: 354–56; **D. Gera** (1998) *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.*; **L.L. Grabbe** (2001b) ‘Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period’, in idem (ed.) *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period*: 129–55; **C.-H. Ji and J.K. Lee** (2004) ‘From the Tobiads to the Hasmoneans: The Hellenistic Pottery, Coins, and History in the Regions of ‘Irāq al-Amir and the Wādī Ḥisbān’, *SHAJ* 8: 177–88; **N.L. Lapp (ed.)** (1983) *The Excavations at Araq el-Emir*: vol. 1; **A. Lemaire and H. Lozachmeur** (1987) ‘Birāh/birtā’ en Araméen’ *Syria* 64: 261–66; **C.C. McCown** (1957) ‘The ‘Araq el-Emir and the Tobiads’, *BA* 20: 63–76; **B. Mazar** (1957) ‘The Tobiads’, *IEJ* 7: 137–45, 229–38; *NEAEHL* 2: 646–49; *OEANE* 3: 177–81; **D.R. Schwartz** (1998) ‘Josephus’ Tobiads: Back to the Second Century?’ in M. Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World*: 47–61; (2002) ‘Once Again on Tobiad Chronology’, *JJS* 53: 146–51; **É. Will** (1987) ‘Qu’est-ce qu’une baris?’ *Syria* 64: 253–59; **E. Will and F. Larché (eds)** (1991) *‘Iraq al Amir: Le Château du Tobiade Hyrcan*.

A significant section of Josephus’ treatment of the Ptolemaic period is taken up with the story of Joseph Tobiad and his sons (*Ant.* 12.4.1–11 §§154–236; for a summary of the story, see §4.3). This story has often been called a ‘romance’ because it clearly contains novelistic elements. Exactly how much of it to believe has been a major question. The details are all to be treated with extreme caution, and Gera (1998: 36–58) has recently argued that, although the story of Joseph Tobiad and his sons is based on actual people and events, a number of the important elements in Josephus’ account are fiction. Nevertheless, the story is supported in its essential features by information from other sources (cf. Grabbe 2001b), which Gera does not seem to dispute.

The Tobiad family was already an established noble institution of some

wealth and power well before the third century (Mazar 1957). It is evident that the Tobias of the Zenon papyri held a position of control and influence in the Palestinian area (see the quotation in the previous section). According to the Tobiad romance, Joseph (probably the son of the Tobias of the Zenon papyri) gained the tax-farming rights of the entire region of Syro-Palestine and proceeded to double the tribute paid by the region. This seems unlikely or we would have some mention or evidence in the papyri or other original sources of the time. It also went against the general policy of the Ptolemaic government which was to avoid tax-revenue collections that would undermine the tax base in the long term (cf. §9.2). On the other hand, if Joseph was able to monopolize tax farming or tax collection over a section of Syro-Palestine, this would no doubt have brought plenty of opportunity to increase his wealth and position of influence in the region. The point is that the story of Joseph fits very well the history of the times and the few external data that we have.

According to the story, Joseph retired after a career of some two decades, to be replaced by his youngest son Hyrcanus; however, Hyrcanus angered both his father and his brothers by using his father's money to obtain the tax authority which his father had possessed. However, this probably represents a romantic interpretation of a situation very much governed by political circumstances. The exact period of time covered by Joseph's career and the occasion when he retired from public life are debated (see below). Since Joseph ended his career and Hyrcanus began his just before the Fifth Syrian War (c.202–199 BCE), it has been concluded that the family was split between pro-Ptolemaic advocates (Hyrcanus) and pro-Seleucid advocates (Joseph and his other sons). This is possible but much more uncertain than has sometimes been realized. After all, Hyrcanus kept money in the temple under Seleucid rule (2 Macc. 3.11), and we have no indication that there was any secret in this. The breach between Joseph and Hyrcanus may have been real, but it could just have been invented by the storyteller to add literary tension to the account. As for Hyrcanus' suicide when Antiochus IV came to the throne, this makes no sense, at least not from the data supplied in the story.

The rivalry between the high priest Onias II and Joseph Tobiad also looks real. We have two powerful families, one of which owes its power base to the temple and the hereditary office of priesthood, while the other took it from its noble inheritance of societal position and land. Rivalry and jockeying for position must have been endemic to Jewish society over the centuries. Yet they also had much in common and evidently intermarried (Onias was Joseph's maternal uncle, after all). Relationships came and went, waxed and waned over time with the individuals involved and the circumstances in which they found themselves. One has the impression that the high priest Onias III was on good terms with Hyrcanus Tobiad, showing that bitter rivalry was not the only option. These two influential families seem to have dominated the society of Judah, but they may not be the only ones: although our extant sources mention only them, there may have been others, since lost

with the destruction of sources. The situation in Palestine during the Ptolemaic period appears to have lent itself to mafia-style activity on the part of such families.

Of particular interest is the ancestral home of the Tobiads. The Zenon papyri quoted in the previous section (§13.2) indicate that the home of Tobias is 'at Birta of the Ammanitis'. The question is the location of 'Birta', which seems to be a transliteration of the Aramaic *birta* ('fortress, palace, temple'; cf. Lemaire and Lozachmeur 1987; Will 1987). It has often been assumed to be 'Iraq al-Amir, which has also been assumed to be the ancestral home of the Tobiads. But others think that it refers actually to a location in Philadelphia–Amman. A second question is whether 'Birta' is the same as Hyrcanus' 'Tyre', as Josephus' account gives it? It appears to be reasonable to assume that 'Iraq al-Amir was already the (or at least *a*) Tobiad residence at an early time. There is some evidence of a Persian settlement, as well as an early Hellenistic one (§2.1.30). Yet it is also possible that Josephus is correct in that the Qaşr al-ʿAbd might be the 'Tyre' which is the product of Hyrcanus Tobiad's efforts.

Josephus makes some statements about Hyrcanus' building activity in the Transjordanian area. He says that Hyrcanus did not dwell in Jerusalem as originally planned but settled across the Jordan:

And he built a strong fortress [*baris*], which was constructed entirely of white marble up to the very roof, and had beasts of gigantic size carved on it, and he enclosed it with a wide and deep moat. He also cut through the projecting rock opposite the mountain, and made caves many stades in length; then he made chambers in it, some for banqueting and others for sleeping and living, and he let into it an abundance of running water, which was both a delight and an ornament to his country-estate. The entrances of the caves, however, he made narrower, so that only one person and no more could enter at one time; and this arrangement he made deliberately for the sake of safety . . . In addition he also built enclosures remarkable for their size, and adorned them with vast parks. And when he had completed the place in this manner, he named it Tyre. (*Ant.* 12.4.11 §§230–33)

In this case, Josephus' statements have the potential of being corroborated or refuted by archaeological evidence. Some aspects of his description fit quite well the settlement site of 'Iraq al-Amir as described by archaeologists (§2.1.30). The rooms and chambers cut into the cliffside were remarkable, as portrayed by Josephus. Similarly, the *baris* of white marble might be identified with the building called the *Qaşr al-ʿAbd* 'the fortress of the servant' well known from 'Iraq al-Amir for the past two centuries. Nevertheless, there are some difficulties with this picture. The caves carved out of the cliffs were likely to be earlier than the time of Hyrcanus (the palaeographic dating of the name 'Tobiah' carved twice in the cliff façade is dated earlier than the second century by most [§2.1.30]). The function of the Qaşr al-ʿAbd is still debated, some arguing it was a temple, though others are certain that it was a residence (§2.1.30). But even if the question of function

could be answered decisively, that would still leave the question of date, which continues to be debated. Finally, a good deal of the site of 'Iraq al-Amir, including various buildings, is not found in Josephus' description of 'Tyre'.

Josephus may well have had a description of 'Iraq al-Amir that was reasonably accurate, at least for the details included (though much may have been omitted). Yet the assignment of the building to Hyrcanus might have been his own conclusion or might have been made by someone before him who mistakenly ascribed an earlier building to Hyrcanus. Once more we face the problems with the Tobiad story as told by Josephus. Some aspects of it are no doubt legendary; other details might have a core of truth but are grossly exaggerated. On the other hand, some parts of the story might be quite accurate, such as the physical description of Hyrcanus' residence. We await further archaeological study to help in sorting out this part of the question.

The recent surveys and soundings in the Transjordanian region have provided some suggestive interpretations (Ji and Lee 2004). The archaeology leads Ji and Lee to conclude that the first phase of Hellenistic settlement which was a flourishing one in the region and included a variety of settlements – in the Wadi as-Sir, the Wadi Kafrayn, and as far afield as Khirbat al-Maḥaṭṭa – stretched from the third century to the second quarter of the second century BCE. If so, this suggests that the death of Hyrcanus Tobiad (assuming Josephus is correct in placing it about 175 BCE) had a significant effect on the trade, economy and general stability of the region. The Tobiads continued to live in the general area but not at 'Iraq al-Amir (1 Macc. 5.1-68); rather, they moved to the new towns and settlements beginning to spring up in the Transjordanian plateau and the northern Jordan Valley.

An interesting suggestion made by Ji and Lee is the extent of the Tobiad domain. Khirbat as-Sur on the Wadi Kafrayn has long been associated with Hyrcanus; indeed, some have thought that Hyrcanus' fortress described by Josephus should be identified with Khirbat as-Sur. If so, there seems to be a close connection with Khirbat al-Maḥaṭṭa:

In view of new evidence, the authors suggest that in the early Hellenistic period, as-Sur and al-Maḥaṭṭa were probably the major military centers of the Tobiads. Beside the chronological and typological congruity in ceramic evidence, architectural remains of the two sites provide substantial support for this view ... In light of new data from al-Maḥaṭṭa, however, Tobiah's territory seems to have been slightly larger than previously suggested as it included al-Maḥaṭṭa and its vicinity south of the Wādi al-Kafrayn ... We should note, however, that the present analysis shows a heavy concentration of early Hellenistic sites only in the valleys along the Wādi as-Sir and the Wādi al-Kafrayn, not in the Wādi Hisbān region. (Ji and Lee 2004: 184–85)

The archaeology, then, suggests that the ‘land of the Tobiads’ – at least, under Hyrcanus – included the territory as far south as Khirbat al-Maḥaṭṭa, south of the Wadi Hesban.

To summarize, the situation in third-century Palestine gave an impetus to enterprising individuals to establish or strengthen a local power base, especially if they were willing to take some risks. The Oniads were a family from which the Jerusalem high priest traditionally arose. A certain authority was given to them by Jewish law, but a power vacuum apparently existed in that there is no evidence that the Ptolemies continued the governor system known from Persian rule. Instead, it appears that the Oniads stepped in to represent the province (hyparchy?) of Judah to the Ptolemaic government. This apparently – and logically – meant that the high priest was responsible for seeing that tribute/taxes were collected and sent to Alexandria. Yet the environment also encouraged others to find a niche within the power network. The Tobiad family was long established on the other side of the Jordan and seems to have had power and wealth already for several centuries. The Zenon papyri indicate that the Tobiads were at home in the Greek world, with perhaps even a Greek education already by the mid-third century.

The apparent rebellion of Onias II against Ptolemaic rule (for rebellion is what his refusal to pay tribute meant at its most basic) afforded Joseph Tobiad the chance to take a leadership position with the approval of many Judahites, and his diplomatic skills in dealing with the king gave success to his grab for power. Disaster was averted for the Jewish community, now that Joseph had paid the amount owed, and the latter obtained a Ptolemaic office or at least a source of potential revenue. He made sure that it paid and put his family in a position of influence head and shoulders above all other Jews in the region and perhaps most of the other native families of power. But although some of Joseph’s position came at the expense of the Oniads, it must not be forgotten that the high priest retained an important office. Also, the Oniads and Tobiads were intermarried, Joseph being Onias’ nephew. The two families were by no means irreconcilably opposed, since a few decades later the high priest Onias III seems to have had good relations with Hyrcanus Tobiad (2 Macc. 3.11). According to the Tobiad story, a breach developed between Joseph and his older sons, on the one side, and his youngest son Hyrcanus, on the other. This has been explained by the hypothesis that Joseph and his older sons were pro-Seleucid but Hyrcanus remained on the side of the Ptolemies. This is plausible and may be true, but it assumes that the Tobiad romance can be relied on, which is not necessarily the case. The inner-family quarrel is useful material for a storyteller to keep the audience on edge. Hyrcanus seems to have operated in Jerusalem in full view of the Seleucid government without hindrance, which goes against his image as anti-Seleucid.

13.4 Fourth Syrian War (219–217 BCE)

B. Bar-Kochva (1976) *The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns*; **E. Galili** (1976–77) ‘Raphia, 217 B.C.E., Revisited’, *SCI* 3: 52–126; **S. Honigman** (2002b) ‘Les divers sens de l’ethnique Ἀραψ dans les sources documentaires grecques d’Égypte’, *AncSoc* 32: 43–72; **S.R. Johnson** (2004) *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in its Cultural Context*; **H.-J. Thissen** (1966) *Studien zum Raphiadekret*; **F.W. Walbank** (1957) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius I*.

The sources are by and large silent about events relating to Judah for some decades after the Zenon papyri come to an end (apart from the Tobiad romance, discussed in the previous section). In the Third Syrian War (246–245 BCE) Ptolemy III invaded northern Syria and went on across the Euphrates into Mesopotamia (*OGIS* 54; Justin 27.1; *FGH* #160 [BURSTEIN #98]). There is no indication, however, that the Egyptian army had anything to do with Palestine. Thus, it appears that the region was spared major warfare for a number of decades.

The Fourth Syrian War, culminating in the battle of Raphia, was an important test for both the Seleucid and the Ptolemaic kings. For Antiochus III it could have been a chance to take the contested region of Syro-Palestine once and for all and bring to an end the dispute that had divided the two empires since the year 300. As soon as Antiochus III came to the throne, he seems to have had recovery of these domains, claimed by the Seleucids since Seleucus I, at the forefront of his strategy (an overview of Antiochus III’s life is given at §14.1.2). For Ptolemy IV it was a test of his leadership and whether he would continue to hold this important Egyptian province. For the inhabitants of the region, including the Jews of Judah, it would determine whether they were Ptolemaic or Seleucid subjects.

The main account is found in a long section in Polybius (5.30.8–87.8). It began shortly after Antiochus III came to the throne. According to Polybius, Antiochus was talked into invading Coele-Syria, partly because of a forged letter (5.40.4–42.9). He marched from Laodicea as far as Gerrha (Chalchis) between the Lebanon and anti-Lebanon ranges, where he came up against the defences of Theodotus, a Ptolemaic general (5.45.5–46.5). But the rebellion and successful advance of Molon in Media in 222 BCE required him to return and defeat this rebellious satrap (5.46.6–55.10). Next he cowed another rebel, Achaeus who ruled over Asia Minor and had taken the title of ‘king’ (5.57). This left Antiochus temporarily free to make plans to invade Syro-Palestine, but he first recaptured Seleucia-in-Pieria which had been in Ptolemaic hands since Ptolemy III took it in the Third Syrian War (5.58.1–61.2). At this point, he received a communication from Theodotus the ‘governor’ (τῆταρχος) over Coele-Syria who, having loyally served the king of Egypt but having received only a threat to his life instead of thanks, decided to deliver the region over to Antiochus III (Polybius 4.37.5; 5.40.1–3; 5.61.3–5; *OGIS* 9). He took control of Ptolemais and sent a subordinate to

take over Tyre. In 219 Antiochus delayed a further expedition against Achaeus and marched to Syro-Palestine, received the cities from Theodotus' hand, and proceeded to take the other cities of the region, either by persuasion or siege (5.61.6–62.6). Ptolemy's ministers conducted a delaying tactic by sending a mission to negotiate with Antiochus, while in the meantime gathering and training an army (5.62.7–65.11). While besieging Dura, Antiochus turned over Coele-Syria to Theodotus, agreed to a winter armistice with Ptolemy, and returned to Seleuceia, with negotiations continuing (5.66).

With the return of spring in 218, negotiations were getting nowhere, and Antiochus resumed his subjugation of Syro-Palestine, occupying Aradus, Berytus (Beirut), and breaking through the Ptolemaic defence forces at the Porphyriion Pass (Polybius 5.68–69). Antiochus then bypassed Sidon and took a series of towns in Palestine and Transjordan (5.70–71):

Philoteria (Tiberias?)
 Scythopolis
 Atabyrium (Mt Tabor)
 Pella
 Camus (in the Decapolis)
 Gephros (in the Decapolis)
 Galatis (Gilead)
 Abila (in the Decapolis)
 Gadara
 Rabbat Ammon (Philadelphia [modern Amman])

At this time, two further of Ptolemy's officers had deserted to Antiochus: Ceraeas and Hippolochus the Thessalian (5.70.10–11). Antiochus sent them with a force of foot soldiers to the district of Samaria to keep protective watch over the newly conquered regions and the troops left there. He marched with the rest of his army to Ptolemais for winter quarters (5.71.11–12; 5.29.8).

In the spring of 217 BCE both sides decided that the time for a reckoning had come, and their actions culminated in the battle of Raphia. A lot is known of the battle of Raphia because we have Polybius' account (5.79–87) and also a trilingual inscription written in honour of Ptolemy IV (Thissen 1966), as well as the brief account of Porphyry (quoted in Jerome, *Comm. in Dan.* 11.10–12 [FGH 260: 44] and Trogus/Justin (30.1). Polybius is the best source; the Raphia Inscription is distinctly pro-Ptolemy, and Porphyry seems to follow a similarly biased account. Exactly when the Fourth Syrian War began is a somewhat technical question, but the beginning is usually counted from Antiochus' retaking of Seleuceia-in-Pieria in 219 BCE, as discussed above, and the events preceding Raphia have already been recounted. The battle itself has been much discussed (Bar-Kochva 1976: 128–41; Galili 1976–77), but the details are not important for our purposes. Suffice it to say that although Antiochus was beaten and sustained heavy losses, there was not the

headlong rout that might have followed. But Antiochus had to think of the continuing threat from Achaeus as well. Therefore, as soon as he reached Antioch, Antiochus sent ambassadors to negotiate peace. The Egyptian army may have made an incursion into Seleucid territory (*Raphia Decree* 23–25; cf. Thissen 1966: 61–62). In any case, Ptolemy was apparently happy to come to terms, since he had succeeded beyond all expectations; in the end Ptolemy seems not to have struck the best deal he could have (cf. Dan. 11.12: ‘And he [Ptolemy] shall not prevail’).

The question is, how was Judah affected by the events surrounding the battle of Raphia? Some of the local ‘Arabs’ in the Transjordanian area went over to Antiochus (Polybius 5.71.1), and ‘Arabs’ formed part of his troops (5.85.4). It is not clear that Polybius is being excessively precise when he refers to ‘Arabs’ (for some connotations of the term, see Honigman 2002); that is, it might be that among the ‘Arabs’ are other local peoples of the region, including Jews. It is entirely possible that Antiochus’ army included some Jews, though we have no direct evidence one way or the other.

3 *Maccabees* 1.6–13 makes the following statement with regard to Ptolemy IV’s actions after he had defeated the Seleucids:

Now that he had foiled the plot, Ptolemy decided to visit the neighboring cities and encourage them. By doing this, and by endowing their sacred enclosures with gifts, he strengthened the morale of his subjects. Since the Jews had sent some of their council and elders to greet him, to bring him gifts of welcome, and to congratulate him on what had happened, he was all the more eager to visit them as soon as possible. After he had arrived in Jerusalem, he offered sacrifice to the supreme God and made thank-offerings and did what was fitting for the holy place. Then, upon entering the place and being impressed by its excellence and its beauty, he marveled at the good order of the temple, and conceived a desire to enter the sanctuary. When they said that this was not permitted, because not even members of their own nation were allowed to enter, not even all of the priests, but only the high priest who was pre-eminent overall – and he only once a year – the king was by no means persuaded. Even after the law had been read to him, he did not cease to maintain that he ought to enter, saying, ‘Even if those men are deprived of this honor, I ought not to be.’ And he inquired why, when he entered every other temple, no one there had stopped him. (NRSV)

This statement sounds rather suspect at first, because it so well fits Jewish propaganda. Yet a number of points within it match information we have from other sources relating to the aftermath of Raphia. Ptolemy seems to have toured around various towns in Syro-Palestine for several months after the battle:

Sending back Sosibius [his advisor] with the ambassadors to ratify the treaty, he [Ptolemy] remained himself for three months in Syria and Phoenicia establishing order in the towns, and then, leaving Andromachus behind as military governor of the whole district, he returned with his sister and his friends to Alexandria. (Polybius 5.87.5–7)

The Demotic text of the *Raphia Decree* gives further information:

Pharaoh made progress through the other regions which were in his kingdom. He went into the temples which were there. He offered burnt offerings and libations, and all the inhabitants who were in the cities received him with joyful hearts and celebrated feasts. They came to meet him with the shrines of the gods – in whose hearts is strength (?) – and they crowned themselves with crowns, and made burnt offerings and sacrifices. Many people brought him a gold crown, and announced that they would set up a royal statue in his honour and build him a temple, as the King was acting in a pious manner. (*Raphia Decree* 15–17, trans. AUSTIN pp. 482–83)

Polybius and the *Raphia Decree* together leave an image of Ptolemy's touring around Syro-Palestine, visiting various towns and offering sacrifices at the different temples in thanks to the gods for his victory. When Antiochus had marched south preceding the battle of Raphia, some towns had resisted, but others clearly opened their gates to him. But it seems that in either case the people quickly came back over to Ptolemy's side and welcomed him when he came. Polybius states that the people of the region generally favoured the Ptolemies over the Seleucids:

Ptolemy took without resistance Raphia and the other towns, each community endeavouring to anticipate its neighbours in going over to him and resuming its allegiance. Possibly all men at such times are more or less disposed to adapt themselves to the needs of the hour, and the natives of these parts are naturally more prone than others to bestow their affections at the bidding of circumstances. But at this juncture it was only to be expected that they should act so, as their affection for the Egyptian kings was of no recent growth; for the peoples of Coele-Syria have always been more attached to that house than to the Seleucidae. (Polybius 5.86.8–10)

It would, therefore, occasion no surprise if the people of Judah invited the king to visit their temple and city of Jerusalem, nor if the king had accepted the invitation. What looks like novelistic and theological invention, however, is the idea that he tried to force his way into the temple. The Ptolemies were very careful to respect the native temples, and this seems to have been the case with regard to temples outside Egypt as well as those within (§7.2.2). It is highly unlikely that Ptolemy would have done anything to cause religious offence. There is good evidence that there were no persecutions of the Alexandrian Jews under Ptolemaic rule (Johnson 2004: 188). Rather, the incident is probably modelled on Antiochus IV who was allowed to enter the temple by Menelaus, according to 2 Macc. 5.15–16, though it is not clear that he forced his way in (see further in *HJJSTP* 3). But Ptolemy IV may well have visited and offered sacrifice at the Jerusalem temple in 217 BCE, most likely at the invitation of the priests and the people of Jerusalem.

13.5 Daily Life

13.5.1 In Egypt

G.R. Hughes and R. Jasnow (1997) *Oriental Institute Hawara Papyri: Demotic and Greek Texts from an Egyptian Family Archive in the Fayum (Fourth to Third Century B.C.)*; **J.G. Manning** (2003) *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt: The Structure of Land Tenure*.

A variety of occupations is indicated in the papyri as being pursued by Jews. These include business contractors (*CPJ* 1.24), brick makers (*CPJ* 1.10), potters (*CPJ* 1.46), guards (*CPJ* 1.12), scribes (*CPJ* 1.137), policemen (*CPJ* 1.25) and even Jewish tax farmers (*CPJ* 1.90; 1.107). Although it is impossible to quantify the numbers of Jews in various professions, it seems likely that the largest proportion of the Jewish immigrants made a living through agrarian activity or the military. Soldiers in fact often combined the two, since the existence of land grants for military personnel meant that many soldiers gained their income from plots of land given to them by the state which they farmed themselves or (more frequently) rented out to local Egyptian farmers. In one document (*CPJ* 1.18), a 'Jew' is a *dekanikos* (cavalry officer) in a military unit. Others refer to Jews who are *taktomisthos*, a military rank of some sort (*CPJ* 1.24; perhaps 1.22). One of the witnesses in a document seems to have a Jewish name and holds the rank of *epistatos* in a detachment of cavalry (*CPJ* 1.27). Other documents just speak of individuals who are said to be 'a Jew of the *epigonē*', usually a party or witness in the legal proceedings (*CPJ* 1.19; 1.20; 1.21; 1.23; 1.24; 1.26). One of the most droll incidents concerns three Jewish thieves: they got into a vineyard and stripped the grapes from a number of vines; however, they were members of a military unit, and it was apparently only a case of drunken vandalism, though they also assaulted the guard when he tried to stop them (*CPJ* 1.21).

On the one hand, some Jews seem to have been fairly low in the class system. Three farmers (Jews, judging from their names) rented some farmland, only to complain that a portion of it could not be sown (*CPJ* 1.37). A farmer specifically labelled a Jew presents a petition protesting against a sharp rise in the amount of rent he was paying (*CPJ* 1.43). Two individuals (one a Jew by his name and possibly the other as well) complain to Zenon that he failed to provide the promised assistance to water the land they had rented from him (*CPJ* 1.13). Judging from the small size of the plots cultivated, they were poverty stricken. Some worked as field-hands (*CPJ* 1.36), shepherds (*CPJ* 1.38) or vinedressers (*CPJ* 1.14; 1.15). On the other hand, some Jews were evidently well off. To be a tax farmer required a minimum of means to back up the bid. Others owned vineyards (*CPJ* 1.41), livestock (*CPJ* 1.28) and other property (*CPJ* 1.36; 1.47). One Jewish settler had a house with courts and attached buildings (*CPJ* 1.23). We have lists of military settlers that include many individuals identified as 'Jew', sometimes

with plots of land listed and even the taxes on them (*CPJ* 1.29; 1.30; 1.31; 1.32).

It was Egyptian custom that women as well as men could inherit property. We have papyri with women named in sales of property though, unfortunately, none of them is Jewish (§8.3.2). Yet we do have Jewish women named in other documents. There is the case of a Jewish woman taken to court for public abuse of a Jewish man: indictment of ‘Dositheos son of . . . , Jew of the Epigone, to Herakleia daughter of Disdotos, Jewess’ (quoted more fully at §8.3.3). She presented her defence and won because he failed to appear. Another document contains the petition to the king by a wife (possibly but not certainly Jewish) against a Jewish husband. He has apparently shut her out of the house and refused to return her dowry (*CPJ* 1.128, quoted at §8.3.3).

13.5.2 *In Palestine*

The little we know about Jews in Palestine we mainly gain by inference. The following letter to Zenon concerns a Jewish individual:

[Alexan]dros to Oryas, greeting. I have received your letter, to which you added a copy of the letter written by Zenon to Jeddous saying that unless he gave the money to Straton, Zenon's man, we were to hand over his pledge to him (Straton). I happened to be unwell as a result of taking some medicine, so I sent a lad, a servant of mine, with Straton, and wrote a letter to Jeddous. When they returned they said that he had taken no notice of my letter, but had attacked them and thrown them out of the village. So I am writing to you (for your information). (*PCZ* 1.59018 = *CPJ* 1.6)

This interesting episode – and one not without its humorous side – seems clear in its basic outline, though many questions of detail remain. Sadly, we do not know where the incident took place but, judging from the name Jeddous (probably יַדְדִּי *Yaddi*^a) the person concerned was Jewish. Although it may have been in Judah itself, Jews presumably lived elsewhere in Palestine, which means we cannot be certain.

Most of what we know about the Jews of Palestine comes either from archaeology (§2.2.3) or from literary sources. The Tobiad story and other literary references are discussed or quoted earlier in this chapter.

13.6 *Religious Developments in the Third Century*

13.6.1 *Development of ‘Scripture’*

L.L. Grabbe (2006a) ‘The Law, the Prophets, and the Rest: The State of the Bible in Pre-Maccabean Times’, *DSD* 13: 319–38; E. Tov (2001) *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible*.

We need to realize that ‘Bible’ in the later sense of the term did not apply to the writings that had begun to gain authority among the Jews during the

Persian period. It is true that they were thought by many Jews to embody or at least contain the words of God, but they were not the focus of religious worship. The temple remained the religious centre and focus, even for Jews in the diaspora. There was no 'canon' of writings, such as later became standard. Apparently by the end of the Persian period, however, a substantial body of writings had taken on a special status for many or even most Jews. Judging from Ben Sira's list a century later (chs 44–49), this included the Pentateuch, the Former Prophets (Joshua to 2 Kings), the Latter Prophets (Isaiah, Jeremiah, Ezekiel and the Twelve) and some of the Writings (including possibly 1 and 2 Chronicles). Much of Daniel had yet to be written and the various traditions compiled. Traditions relating to Joshua and Zerubbabel and Nehemiah, and no doubt Ezra, circulated but were regarded differently by different people. Ben Sira himself did not know the Ezra tradition, or at least did not accept it as authoritative, and clearly did not know a book of Ezra-Nehemiah. Other writings (such as the book of Esther) were apparently not widely accepted until much later.

The text of these 'authoritative books' was still fluid, by all indications, with variation from manuscript to manuscript, sometimes considerable. A good perspective is given by the Greek Pentateuch which probably reflects a version of the Hebrew text extant in the third century BCE. More difficult is the SP which also differs from MT but often in what seem to be secondary developments; nevertheless, there are, here and there, significant differences in detail between the two (§11.1.2). Few if any of the Qumran scrolls are as early as our period, but the variety of texts among the scrolls no doubt reflects the earlier period as well as the time when the mss were actually copied. The later situation around the first century or so CE which tends to exhibit the use of a single text type (the 'proto-Masoretic') seems to represent the deliberate choice of one text type rather than an assimilation of the various text types to one another (see further the discussion in Grabbe 2006a). Thus, when we speak of authoritative books this does not imply a uniform text for all the copies available.

This fluidity was further reflected in a whole collection of 'para-biblical' writings that circulated alongside the books that eventually became canonical. These should not be confused with 'rewritten Bible' which are writings that originate from a biblical book or passage and generally paraphrase the biblical content (though some extra-biblical traditions may also be present). Para-biblical writers are those that have some characters or other structural elements in common with a biblical writing but are different in content. These are independent writings, with content and traditions that may be as old as (or even older than) those in the biblical books, nor are they necessarily inferior to the biblical ones. The fact that these para-biblical writings did not become part of 'scripture' may be entirely a matter of chance or even arbitrary decision. Unfortunately, because we do not know the precise process by which books became 'canonical', we cannot be sure why some writings became canonical and others did not. There is plenty of evidence of

lively para-biblical writings that were written – or at least flourished – in the early Hellenistic period but did not later become a part of the Jewish Bible (though some became part of other canons, for example, the book of *1 Enoch* that was accepted by some Jewish and Christian communities). These writings include *1 Enoch*, the *Aramaic Levi Document* (if dated to the third century), and the writing of Artapanus (if this early).

The concept of Bible and scripture as it later developed was still very much in process at this time. Yet it had advanced enough that writings were becoming important as a part of religion. This is shown by the desire to translate the Pentateuch into the vernacular for the Jewish community in Egypt, as discussed in the next section. It is also shown by the beginnings of biblical interpretation, in such works as the commentary of Demetrius on problems in the Pentateuch. Judaism was not yet a ‘religion of the book’, but the idea was developing.

13.6.2 *Translation of the Septuagint*

M. Hadas (1951) *Aristeas to Philocrates*.

It is easy to overlook one of the most significant events in the Ptolemaic period for the history of the Jews: the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek. The matter is complex because the Bible evidently did not yet assume a central place in Judaic religion. On the one hand, the importance of biblical developments are often exaggerated by textual scholars whose focus is naturally on the text of the Bible; on the other hand, even such specialists tend to discuss the LXX as one of several versions and its translation as just one more activity relating to the development of the text. In hindsight, we can say that it was one of the most significant events for Judaism as a religion.

The translation of the ‘Books of Moses’ into Greek is a singular event in the history of Judaism. It illustrates several things about Judaism at the time. First, it shows that the diaspora community felt a need to have the five ‘Books of Moses’ available to them in their own language (which was now Greek rather than Hebrew). Secondly, the very fact that having their own version of the ‘scriptures’ easily accessible was important to them shows the large place that ‘scripture’ had assumed in their religion. As noted above, the centre of worship remains the temple for most Jews at this time. This had clearly been the case in the Persian period, when the rebuilding of the temple assumed such a central urgent necessity for the Jewish community in Palestine, and we have no reason to think it had changed in the third century. Yet it would hardly be surprising if the significant size of the diaspora community under the Greeks had not started to create changes in perception about how to practise their religion when the temple was not easily available.

The LXX is the first example of Bible translation and one of the first examples of literary translation in the ancient world. Translation had often been a practical necessity in the multilingual environment of the ancient Near

East. After the Greek conquest, evidence exists that dragomans worked in the commercial environment, doing oral translation where required (§11.2). Such models may have been drawn on by the LXX translators, since there was little precedent for what they were doing. Yet the LXX translation was not just a practical rendering of the Hebrew into Greek. In some circles, at least, it had a significance that went beyond that of a translation. It was now conceived of as an authoritative work in its own right. The following quote demonstrates not only this but also the way in which the written word was starting to become the central religious focus in diaspora communities:

When the rolls had been read the priests and the elders of the translators and some of the corporate body and the leaders of the people rose up and said, 'Inasmuch as the translation has been well and piously made and is in every respect accurate, it is right that it should remain in its present form and that no revision of any sort take place.' When all had assented to what had been said, they bade that an imprecation be pronounced, according to their custom, upon any who should revise the text by adding or transposing anything whatever in what had been written down, or by making any excision; and in this they did well, so that the work might be preserved imperishable and unchanged always. (*Aristeas* 310–22, translation from Hadas 1951: 221, 223)

The text had not yet replaced the temple, nor did it really do so until the temple was destroyed in 70 CE. But from this time on we find an increasing concentration on the text until Judaism could be called a 'religion of the book', and the 'Law of Moses' (though this concept might be wider than the Pentateuch) was the heart of faith.

13.6.3 The 'Mantic' versus the 'Sceptical' World-view

A. Blasius and B.U. Schipper (eds) (2002) *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten*; **M. Boyce** (1984) 'On the Antiquity of Zoroastrian Apocalyptic', *BSOAS* 47: 57–75; **J.J. Collins (ed.)** (1979) *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre*; **D. Devauchelle** (1995) 'Le sentiment anti-perses chez les anciens Égyptiens', *Trans* 9: 67–80; **F. Dunand** (1977) 'L'Oracle du Potier et la formation de l'apocalyptique en Égypte', in F. Raphaël et al. (eds), *L'Apocalyptique*: 41–67; **D. Flusser** (1982) 'Hystaspes and John of Patmos', in S. Shaked (ed.), *Irano-Judaica*: 12–75; **L.L. Grabbe** (2003b) 'Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions – and New Thinking', in L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning*: 107–33; (2003c) 'Poets, Scribes, or Preachers? The Reality of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period', in L.L. Grabbe and R.D. Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning*: 192–215; **A.K. Grayson** (1975) *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts*: 28–36; **J.R. Hinnells** (1973) 'The Zoroastrian Doctrine of Salvation in the Roman World', in E.J. Sharpe and J.R. Hinnells (eds), *Man and His Salvation*: 125–48; **A. Hultgård** (1983) 'Forms and Origins of Iranian Apocalypticism', in D. Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East*: 387–411; (1991) 'Bahman Yasht: A Persian Apocalypse', in J.J. Collins and J.H. Charlesworth (eds), *Mysteries and Revelations*: 114–34; (1999) 'Persian Apocalypticism', in J.J. Collins (ed.), *The*

Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: vol. 1, 39–83. **W. Huß** (1994) *Der makedonische König und die ägyptischen Priester*; **J.H. Johnson** (1974) 'The Demotic Chronicle as an Historical Source', *Enchoria* 4: 1–17; (1984) 'Is the Demotic Chronicle an Anti-Greek Tract?' in H.-J. Thissen and K.-T. Zauzich (eds), *Grammata Demotika: Festschrift für Erich Lüddeckens zum 15. Juni 1983*: 107–24; **L. Kákosy** (1966) 'Prophecies of Ram Gods', *Acta Orientalia* 19: 341–56; **L. Koenen** (1968) 'Die Prophezeiungen des "Töpfers"', *ZPE* 2: 178–209; (1970) 'The Prophecies of a Potter: A Prophecy of World Renewal Becomes an Apocalypse', in D.H. Samuel (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology*: 249–54; (1985) 'The Dream of Nektanebos', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 22: 171–94; **M. Neujahr** (2005) 'When Darius Defeated Alexander: Composition and Redaction in the Dynastic Prophecy', *JNES* 64: 101–107; **H.-J. Thissen** (1998) '"Apocalypse Now!" Anmerkungen zum *Lamm des Bokchoris*', in W. Clarysse, A. Schoors and H. Willems (eds), *Egyptian Religion the Last Thousand Years*: 1043–53.

Already in the Persian period we saw evidence of the 'sceptical' wisdom tradition in the form of the book of Job (*HJJSTP* 1: 102–104, 345). One can argue that 'sceptical' might not be the correct way of characterizing Job, but it has an important way of looking at things in common with the book of Qohelet (§4.4) which more easily fits under the rubric of 'sceptical'. Within the Jewish literature that can reasonably be dated to the third century BCE, we have a range of views within intellectual circles. At one end of the spectrum is Qohelet who points to the inscrutability of the deity and his actions (Qoh. 7.13–14; 8.16–17). He denies an afterlife, or at least questions whether man has any advantage in this regard over the animal which dies (Qoh. 2.13–16; 3.17–21). His is basically an argument for our lack of knowledge about the future. Ben Sira represents a different view of wisdom. He also denies an afterlife (in line with most books of the Hebrew Bible), but his view of God is that he and his will are basically knowable, at least on the part of the righteous and the wise (Sir. 15.11–20; 16.26–17.19; 18.1–14; 24; 32.14–17; 38.34–39.11). Ben Sira sets himself against omens, dreams, divination and the like but, surprisingly, he is not against prophecy. On the contrary, he states of the ideal sage: 'He seeks out the wisdom of all the ancients, and is concerned with prophecies' (39.1–3). He calls on God to fulfil his prophecies (36.20–21). Isaiah is said to have seen the future and revealed what would occur at the end of time (48.24–25). He accepts the existence of angels but shows no great interest in them (Sir. 17.7, 32; 24.2; 42.17).

At the other end of the spectrum, we have books like the Book of Watchers (*1 Enoch* 1–36). Here the concentration is on the spirit world, primarily the fallen angels and their activities. One of their misdeeds is to impart forbidden knowledge to humans, including knowledge of metalwork and the forging of implements of war (*1 En.* 8.1) but also magic, incantations, healing arts and plants and astrology (*1 En.* 7.1; 8.3). Yet the Astronomical Book (*1 Enoch* 62–72) also contains information about the heavens and their workings. The Book of Watchers provides knowledge about primaeval events relating to

Adam and Eve and the pre-flood patriarchs, including heavenly journeys taken by Enoch. Among other things, it predicts a final judgement with the punishment of the Watchers (the fallen angels) and their offspring, but also a golden age for the righteous (*I Enoch* 10–11; 22).

Apart from *I Enoch* it is difficult to find evidence of the 'mantic' world-view for the third century BCE; however, we can extrapolate from the evidence in the Persian period (*HJJSTP* 1: 254–56) and the evidence in the second century BCE and later (*HJJSTP* 3; *JRSTP* 241–51). The general picture seems to have been consistent over the centuries: like people everywhere throughout history, many Jews wanted to know about their future and also how to control it. This ranged from the use of prayer to divination to magical rites to the interpretation of prophetic and apocalyptic texts. Some intellectuals such as Qohelet were sceptical of such means of discerning the divine will and/or the future; others such as Ben Sira accepted prophecy but rejected other means of gaining esoteric knowledge. The bulk of the people are likely to have accepted not only prophecy but some forms of divination and magic, without letting their lives be dominated by it. A few seem to have been obsessed with learning about the 'real' world of spirit beings (both good and bad) and what God was planning for the future.

It was a common belief in antiquity that there were spiritual forces at work that could change events and shape history. For polytheists this included the whole panoply of gods who did not necessarily see eye to eye on matters. For the Jews this of course included the supreme being for whom Judaism possessed a special knowledge and access; it also included thousands of angelic beings (§11.3.2). These angels were all supposed to be obedient to the will of God, but all of Judaism believed that there were evil spirits, bad angels who had left their heavenly estate and were now demonic figures. God (and his obedient angels) spoke not only through the priesthood and sacred writings but also through prophets and other mantic figures. It was possible to obtain secret information about the future, whether through prophets (a few of whom apparently continued to be active in society), esoteric writings of various sorts (including apocalyptic writings), and also through divinatory practices (which included magic, secret rites, consultation of the dead, astrology and the like) which were clearly extant in society, even though detailed information is not necessarily available.

Related to this sort of mantic knowledge were other sorts of esoteric knowledge of the heavens, the workings of the universe and ultimately the spirit world which ordered and controlled all these things. This knowledge could be obtained by study and instruction from qualified sages, but in certain cases it might well come by special revelation. Our sources seldom indicate the actual means by which the knowledge came about, and we are left guessing as to whether it came by teaching or by dreams, visions or other forms of revelation.

Dealing with apocalyptic and related phenomena is problematic because they are part of an esoteric tradition and by their very nature were usually

kept hidden and made available only within initiated circles. We have enough, however, whether in later literature that was evidently composed earlier or even some demonstrably early writings or references, to give us an indication of what was happening in certain circles of conquered people. As discussed above (§11.4), apocalyptic in the early Greek period was not confined to Jewish circles; on the contrary, we find similar literary and mantic movements among Persians, Babylonians and Egyptians – though here, too, the actual prophecies were usually kept secret. At least part of the time it formed a sort of resistance literature that maintained people's hopes alive for the overthrow of Greek rule and a restoration of native rule (§6.3.3). Yet it must be said that it was more complicated than that, sometimes envisaging nothing less than the creation of an ideal world – a 'golden age' – that had never existed or, at least, had not existed since the *primaeval* period of the earth's history.

Parallels to Jewish apocalyptic writings can be found elsewhere in the Hellenistic world. Unfortunately, it is often difficult to date these texts, and although they are Hellenistic, some are probably later (perhaps much later) than the third or early second century BCE. Some are certainly from the early Hellenistic period, however, and help to illustrate what was happening in some Jewish circles. These writings containing predictions or apocalyptic perspectives are found from Persia to Egypt. In Mesopotamia we have the *Dynasty Prophecy* (Grayson 1975: 28–36), mainly a listing of Mesopotamian rulers with *ex eventu* prophecies. It seems to have begun in the neo-Assyrian period and included the time down to Alexander's successors, a period of perhaps half a millennium, with the text itself compiled or completed in the third century. The section of main interest is that relating to Alexander and Darius III (3.9–23). After the Persian army was defeated by the Greeks, however, Darius renewed his army and defeated the Greeks. This of course did not happen, but the author of the text includes information on Alexander's successors, which means that he would have known that Darius did not do what is alleged. One explanation is that the prophecy originally ended with a prediction of Darius' recovery but that the text was eventually extended to cover later Greek rulers (Neujahr 2005). If so, the text was written as propaganda to provide support for continued Persian resistance to the Greek invasion.

The Egyptian texts are more complicated. These include the *Demotic Chronicle* (Johnson 1974; 1984; Devauchelle 1995; Blasius and Schipper [eds] 2002), the *Potter's Oracle* (Koenen 1968; 1970; Dunand 1977; Blasius and Schipper [eds] 2002), the *Egyptian Lamb of Boccharis* (Thissen 1998; Blasius and Schipper [eds] 2002), and the *Dream of Nectanebos* (Koenen 1985). Unlike an earlier generation of researchers, J.H. Johnson had argued that the *Demotic Chronicle* was not an 'anti-Greek' tract (1974). This has now been supported by the treatment of those dealing with all these texts in Blasius and Schipper. They draw on traditional Egyptian concerns about order (exemplified in *Maat*) and the threat of chaos. These texts are said not to be

apocalyptic texts because they do not contain *ex eventu* predictions but are more like prophetic or messianic texts in looking to a future earthly Egyptian king to restore order. Two observations can be made: (1) the idea of anti-Greek propaganda has by no means been abandoned by everyone (see the arguments in Huß [1994: 129–82] who believes that the views of the priesthood varied but were certainly anti-Greek at times); (2) it highlights the wider compass of Jewish apocalyptic and related traditions which were not simply predictors of the future but adumbrated a particular world-view (see §6.3.3). Much more is going on in most of them than simple prophecies after the fact (*vaticinia ex eventu*); in that sense the characterization of Jewish apocalyptic by Blasius and Schipper is itself simplistic.

The Iranian eschatological tradition is no less interesting but harder to deal with because of uncertainties about dating and about the state of the texts. The *Oracle of Hystaspes* is often thought to be a Hellenistic Iranian oracle (Hultgård 1999: 74–78; Collins [ed.] 1979: 210; though Flusser [1982] argues that it is Jewish), but we know it only as quoted in several of the patristic writers (Justin, *Apol.* 1.44.12; Clement of Alexandria, *Strom.* 6.43.1; Lactantius, *Div. Inst.* 7.15.19, 7.18.2). The *Bahman Yašt* is a late compilation but from earlier sources (Hultgård 1991; 1999: 43). A number of Iranian scholars are prepared to argue that the eschatological/apocalyptic ideas are found at an early time in Zoroastrianism (Boyce 1984; Hinnells 1973; Hultgård 1983; 1999), and M. Boyce for one is prepared to argue that it goes back to Zoroaster himself.

The Jewish apocalyptic texts, like the Egyptian ones, do not just contain specific predictions about the future but lay out a view of the cosmos and the actions of the deity in the past and present, as well as in the future. They engage in a general commentary on events at the beginning of time, their implications for the present and future, and generally what God's plan is for the world and history. They are especially concerned with how God thinks about their specific group and its members, knowing that God has a special interest in them and will also eventually deal with their opponents and enemies in a special way.

The apocalyptic writings and speculations from the third century BCE seem less exercised with specific predictions and imminent events than some of those that can be dated to the second century and later. Rather, they appear to be concerned with giving a particular vision of history. For example, the Book of Watchers describes the world by relating what happened in *primaeval* times. The fall of the angels and the pre-flood activities determine how things are in the world. There are expectations for a future judgement and a paradisaal world for the righteous, but these seem to be far off. The nature of evil and warnings about certain knowledge taught by the fallen angels are important for the reader/student to grasp so that he or she will not be led astray, but it does not seem to be calling for a withdrawal from society or necessarily even a special lifestyle.

It seems clear that there were different views about esoteric texts such as *I*

Enoch, and by no means were all (or probably even the majority) ready to embrace the apocalyptic outlook. But a mild form of the ‘mantic’ world-view seems to have been widespread among the Jewish people. They would accept traditional prophecy, perhaps some texts assumed to be anti-Greek tracts, certain forms of divination, good-luck charms and prayers for good luck. The sceptical view was probably confined to intellectual circles and may have been a historical blip, because we do not find Jewish texts comparable to Job and Qohelet again until the Enlightenment. Ben Sira’s book was probably closer to most members of wisdom circles and certainly more to the taste of the majority, judging by the number of copies preserved of it (compare the relatively few copies of Qohelet that circulated).

Unfortunately, the place of apocalyptic in Jewish society at this time is difficult to assess because we have many of the writings but no information on how they functioned. Some have postulated an ‘Enochic Judaism’ (§10.4), but few Jews seem to have been willing to reject the established temple or priesthood. Apocalyptic texts were certainly written and were available in some circles. But apocalyptic thought seems to have been mainly latent or at least confined to esoteric circles, coming to the surface in times of crisis such as the Maccabean period.

3.6.4 *Historiography: A Continuing Jewish Literary Tradition*

S.R. Johnson (2004) *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in its Cultural Context*.

It might seem strange to put historiography under ‘religious developments’, yet it seems evident that the historiographical writings known to us from the early Hellenistic period have primarily a religious function or aim. By this time there was some sort of development toward ‘scripture’, and the writings contained within this body influenced the developing Jewish literary tradition. Some of the ‘scriptural’ writings are most likely from the late fourth, third or early second century BCE, most notably Qohelet, but also possibly 1 and 2 Chronicles (*HJJSTP* 1: 97–99). If 1 and 2 Chronicles come from this time, it shows an interesting desire to develop the pre-existing writings of Samuel and Kings to tell a somewhat different story. A number of the Jewish writings from this period cannot in any sense be called ‘historiographical’, but several seem to have a history-like character. These take one of two forms: (1) an interest in interpreting the tradition of Israel’s past; (2) a story about a hero of the past, sometimes a figure already known from the biblical tradition but sometimes a figure coming onto the scene for the first time.

First, interpretation of the traditions about Israel’s past. A prime example of this is Demetrius the Chronographer. His concern is to reconcile the details within the patriarchal narratives and also within the story of Moses. It is clear that he regards the story as a portrayal of real events, and he wishes to bolster

this interpretation by showing that apparent contradictions and difficulties can be reconciled and resolved.

The second form of historiography is the telling of stories about the heroes and heroines of Israel. There are further stories about Moses (e.g., Artapanus, though it is not certain he is this early [§4.6.3]) and other patriarchs (the *Aramaic Levi Document*); although *I Enoch* is not in historiographical form, even if it is a story about a patriarch and his activities. But we also have new heroes. The story of Tobit embodies a great deal that is central to Jewish self-perception, with the law and obedience to God central to the actions of the participants. Likewise, the stories of Daniel 1–6 probably belong to this period and portray a hero of Israel whose faithfulness to God and the law are the main objective of his life. Historiography thus serves a religious purpose, by encouraging and exemplifying what the creators of the stories regard as that most important to Jews and Judaism. *3 Maccabees* also takes the form of a story about Jewish resistance to the sacrilege of a pagan king but is set in the context of a real piece of history, the battle of Raphia (above, §13.4). Finally, the Tobiad story is the story of a Jewish family that seems to have a significant impact on the history of Palestine. Despite its elements of romance, it is also historiography and shows the Jewish continuing interest in telling the story of their past. In this case, there seems to be a strong historical core to the story, in contrast to some of the others. But to many Jews encountering these stories at the time, they were equally real and true and told about real Jewish heroes.

What passes for historiography among the Jews at this time seems to be what S.R. Johnson calls ‘historical fiction’ (2004). It is true that these writings sometimes pay particular attention to historical data, which can be useful where it can be confirmed. But the author in each case is not intending to write history. The purpose of the historical information is to create an atmosphere of verisimilitude. According to Johnson, there was no intention to deceive the reader:

Rather, the historical setting is systematically manipulated and subordinated to serve the author’s didactic purpose: first, to produce a convincing illusion of authenticity; second, to help communicate the author’s message more effectively. This is not to say that the author sought deliberately to fool his audience, or even that he believed or expected that they would read his work as history. Rather, the anonymous author was primarily concerned with communicating moral and not historical truth. (2004: 217–18)

Johnson admits that it is not clear how audiences read these works (2004: 219). It seems evident that some readers assumed that the stories were – and were meant to be – true historically as well as morally. The interesting thing, though, is that the stories were not history. That is, while some in the Greek world were writing accounts that claimed to give historical truth and claimed to exhibit the necessary principles to write truly historical accounts, Jewish

writers had still not discovered history writing as a literary genre. It is only later that, in imitation of the Greeks, some Jewish writers adopt history as a mode of literary expression. Many Jewish writings contain historical information, of course, and are historiographical, but they are not histories as we think of them. Research and writing of history was a special sort of activity that did not exist as a native product.

13.7 *Summary and Conclusions*

In 301 BCE Ptolemy took Palestine once more and this time Egypt retained it for the next century, no doubt a welcome event for most Jews, at least initially, because it inaugurated a period of peace and stability. The Ptolemaic possessions in Palestine and Syria seem to have been governed as if they were only another province of Egypt, administered from Alexandria but with Egyptian agents in the various cities and villages to see that the appropriate taxes were paid and the Ptolemaic interests served (§7.2.2). Whether there was one governor over the entirety of Coele-Syria is debated, though there is no clear evidence (§7.1.3.1). There is some evidence that the region was divided into ‘hyparchies’, perhaps equivalent to the old Persian provinces. Each village had its officials and tax agents, bringing Ptolemaic supervision down to the lowest level of society and making it difficult to avoid the multitude of taxes which weighed on the individual.

Yet taxes were a part of every regime and tell only a partial story. In fact, there seems to have been a general rise in prosperity of the region through the third century, and Judah benefited significantly (§9.4). Even though much of the commercial activity was concentrated on the coast and in certain key centres, it raised the overall welfare of the whole area. It may well be that Jerusalem became more involved in trade activity than has been previously recognized, though this is difficult to determine. As the Tobiad family increased their own wealth – as they seem to have done, probably as tax farmers – some of this would have benefited the region, with supplies to purchase, staff to hire, wages to spend and benefactions undoubtedly made to the temple and perhaps other institutions in Jerusalem. There are indications that over half a century Jerusalem became much more affluent.

Josephus states that Ptolemy I found the Jews useful as soldiers and used them in his garrisons (*Ant.* 12.1.1 §8). Contemporary sources seem to confirm that many Jews served in the military under the Ptolemaic (as well as Seleucid) kings (§8.2). The basic means of providing defence of the country was by military colonies, usually organized as ‘cleruchies’. They served not only as a reserve to be drawn on in time of war but also as a local police force; hence, they were often settled in troubled areas as a way of bringing them under control (§8.1). The Tobias of the Zenon papyri was head of such a military cleruchy, though the actual settlers seem to have been a mixed group and not just Jews (see the document quoted above, §13.2). Yet Jews in Egypt

engaged in a wide variety of occupations, some evidently being low in income and social status, but others being prosperous and having considerable wealth. We have less direct information on the Jews of Palestine, but it seems likely from archaeology and past practice that the vast majority of Jews in Judah were engaged in agrarian activities.

Polybius gives some historical background, especially about the relations between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. Although extant only episodically, he gives information on the various Syrian Wars, culminating in the battle of Raphia in 217 BCE. This context is important for understanding the history of Palestine, even if detail about the Jews is lacking. For the Jews, the semi-legendary story of the Tobiads (§§4.3; 13.3) is about the only source of narrative history for this period. According to it, the high priest Onias (commonly designated Onias II) refused to pay a tribute of 20 talents. The reason for this act of rebellion – for that is what it amounted to – is uncertain, though the suggestion that he was expecting or hoping for a transfer of rule to the Seleucids is a plausible one. In any event, his nephew Joseph Tobiad enlisted support among the people, borrowed money from friends in Samaria and, by political skill and greasing palms, managed to pay the tribute and avoid a confrontation. In the process he gained a considerable increase in the traditional Tobiad power base (already established centuries before). It seems likely that he obtained some sort of office or source of income, such as local tax-farming rights (though unlikely for the whole of Coele-Syria, which looks like typical story-telling hyperbole). Modern scholarship would date this to the reign of Ptolemy III or IV (rather than Ptolemy V as Josephus' account has it, though a recent argument has been made in Josephus' favour). Whether there was a breach between Joseph and his son Hyrcanus is debatable; in any case, the view that Hyrcanus was pro-Ptolemy is belied by the later situation in which he seems to have operated openly in Seleucid Jerusalem. This incident also shows that there was no permanent gulf between the Tobiads and Oniads: both were powerful families, each with their own power base but also intermarried. The conditions in Ptolemaic Palestine seem to have lent themselves to mafia-style tactics on the part of enterprising individuals willing to take some risks.

How much Jewish literature was produced during this time is unknown, but some writings can be dated to the early Hellenistic period with relative certainty. Religious literature, including writings that eventually became a part of the 'Bible', was naturally important. A collection of 'scripture' had accumulated by the end of the Persian period and continued to develop in importance, though it by no means constituted a fixed canon or a fixed text. The translation of the Pentateuch into Greek was a milestone. It was not only a unique event in history up to that time, but it also demonstrated the way in which authoritative writings were beginning to be a central part of the Jewish religion, at least in the diaspora. The written word did not replace the temple until its destruction several centuries later, but the process had already begun for Judaism to be a 'religion of the book'.

This literature written in the third century in many cases fits the traditional genres known from earlier periods of Israel's history. Wisdom writings are much in evidence (see below). Other books which may have arisen during this time, such as Tobit, also seem to exemplify genres and elements known from the Hebrew tradition. The historiographical tradition was important in such works as *3 Maccabees*, though Jewish 'historical fiction' was not history, and history writing among the Jews did not come along until later. Particularly important is the prominence of apocalyptic in the literature of this period. Apocalyptic sections may already be found in some of the later prophets (e.g., Zechariah, in whole or in part; cf. *HJJSTP* 1: 250–52). Sections of *1 Enoch* may well mirror the horrors of the Diadochi wars (§4.5). But we find apocalyptic writings in Egyptian and Iranian literature from this period, suggesting that it was a Near Eastern-wide phenomenon. The Jews do not appear to have exhibited any overt forms of apocalyptic activity during this time, suggesting that it remained below the surface, perhaps confined to restricted circles, but was there ready to come into the open when conditions were right.

The wisdom tradition continued to thrive during the Ptolemaic period. Two of the major Hebrew wisdom books probably originated under Ptolemaic rule, Qohelet and Ben Sira. Qohelet is such an unusual book that it is hard to know how to relate it to the development of Jewish religious thought. No other Jewish writing apart from Job comes close to the 'sceptical thought' expressed in this work. Comparing Qohelet with Proverbs, Job and Ben Sira suggests that some – though not all – wisdom circles were experiencing a 'crisis in wisdom', perhaps already as early as the Persian period (cf. *HJJSTP* 1: 102–103). Yet this crisis was evidently not universal because there is no sign of it in Proverbs, some of which may be as late as the Persian period, nor in Ben Sira. Qohelet, like Job, shows the radical questioning of the wisdom tradition itself. Wisdom is ultimately reaffirmed as good – as definitely preferable to folly (Qoh. 2.13–14) – but it does not provide the certainties and security of existence that many wisdom writers seemed to find in it (Qoh. 7.23–24; 8.16–17). Whether Qohelet is influenced by Greek thought is very much a moot point: there are parallels, but he does not use the language of Greek philosophy (though this could be because Hebrew had not yet been adapted to express philosophical thought in his time). Certainly most of the content of the book can be understood as a logical development of the earlier Israelite wisdom tradition without any appeal to Greek influence. Similarly, the book of Ben Sira (completed in the early second century but much of it possibly belonging to the Ptolemaic period) shows no clear Greek influence even though this has been argued (§4.10).

Chapter 14

EARLY SELEUCID RULE (205–175 BCE)

This chapter begins a discussion of Seleucid rule. It could have been included in the next volume (*HJJSTP* 3), but the reign of Antiochus IV marks a new phase in the history of Judah and the Jews. The transfer of Syro-Palestine to Seleucid rule needs to be included in the present volume, in any case, as the early Seleucid period marks a transition between Ptolemaic rule and the next phase of Jewish history, the Maccabean period. Also, the story of Antiochus IV, the Maccabean revolt and Hasmonaean rule will provide more than enough material for a volume. Hence, the inclusion of the last part of Antiochus III's reign and also Seleucus IV's here.

14.1 *Background History*

E.R. Bevan (1902) *The House of Seleucus*; (1927) *The House of Ptolemy: A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty*; *CAH* 7/1; 8; **M. Cary** (1963) *A History of the Greek World 323 to 146 BC*; **N. Davis and C.M. Kraay** (1973) *The Hellenistic Kingdoms: Portrait Coins and History*; **G. Hölbl** (2001) *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*; **W. Huß** (2001) *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit: 332–30 v. Chr.*; **M. Sartre** (2001) *D'Alexandre à Zénobie: Histoire du Levant antique, IV^e siècle avant J.-C., III^e siècle après J.-C.*; **H.H. Schmitt** (1964) *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Grossen und seiner Zeit*; **S. Sherwin-White and A. Kuhrt** (1993) *From Samarkhand to Sardis*; **É. Will** (1982) *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*: vol. 2.

Three Greek rulers came to the throne at about the same time, all heirs of the Diadochi: the Seleucid Antiochus III, the Ptolemy Ptolemy IV (§13.1.4), and the Antigonid Philip V of Macedonia. Their interaction was to have major consequences for the history of the eastern Mediterranean, especially when they drew the attention and intervention of Rome in the region. For it was about the time that the three came to the throne that the Second Punic War began (218–201 BCE), which brought a major threat to Rome and led to her intrusion into the affairs of the powers further east.

14.1.1 *Philip V of Macedonia (238–179 BCE)*

Philip V established his reputation as a young ruler in the Social War (220–217 BCE) against the Aetolian League on the Greek mainland. He then sought to take advantage of Rome's problems with Hannibal, who was devastating Italy itself with the army that had crossed the Alps. In the first Macedonian War (215–205 BCE) Philip established a base on the west coast of the Adriatic (coast of Dalmatia) and even made a treaty with Hannibal. This was a distraction to Rome whose main concern was to defeat Hannibal, and they eventually signed the treaty of Phoenice with Philip. He had abandoned his designs on the Adriatic but now turned to extending his influence into the Aegean. He apparently signed a treaty with Antiochus III in regard to Egypt (see below, §14.2). Rhodes and Pergamum opposed him and called on Rome for help. Thus began the Second Macedonian War (200–196 BCE). When Philip was defeated, the Romans treated him somewhat leniently. He in turn aided them against his erstwhile ally Antiochus III some years later. They rewarded him but remained suspicious and kept a constant check on his activities for the rest of his reign.

14.1.2 *Antiochus III 'the Great' (223–187 BCE)*

The younger brother of Seleucus III became the new king, Antiochus III, later known as Antiochus the Great. His reign marked the shift in the balance of power which had been maintained for a century, but this did not take place immediately. Since Antiochus was only 20 at his accession, another member of the Seleucid family named Achaeus was general in Asia Minor, and an individual named Molon became governor over the eastern satrapies. It was not long before both these subordinates rebelled and created problems for Antiochus; however, the latter seemed to be more concerned with trying to take Coele-Syria in what became known as the Fourth Syrian War (221–217 BCE) against the new Egyptian king Ptolemy IV Euergetes (§13.1.4). Antiochus made little headway at first and instead returned to take personal command against Molon who had defeated the generals sent against him. Not only did Antiochus defeat Molon, but Achaeus had become quiet. When it became suspected by his troops that he was rising up against Antiochus, they became mutinous. Achaeus then pretended that he had never intended to become a rebel, and it was in Antiochus' interest to pretend to accept this fiction. This left him with a free hand to turn against Coele-Syria once more. Things seemed to go well for a time. From 220–218 the Seleucid armies pushed continually southward, delayed mainly by various diplomatic manoeuvres on the part of the Egyptians. Ptolemy used this period to assemble and train a large force. The decisive battle came in 217 at Raphia in Palestine, at which Antiochus was defeated and forced to vacate his gains in Coele-Syria (see further at §13.4).

Antiochus III demonstrated his mettle after the defeat at Raphia by gaining reasonably favourable terms in a treaty with Ptolemy IV. This might

seem strange since Antiochus apparently expected a follow-up invasion by the Ptolemaic army (Polybius 5.87.1-2). According to Polybius, Ptolemy, on the other hand, was too inclined to give generous terms because of his natural indolence (5.87.3). Although Ptolemy IV had won, his situation in Egypt was actually not very strong; indeed, there was a rebellion by Egyptians shortly afterward (Polybius 5.107.103). The appearance of being in a position to negotiate a tough treaty with Antiochus had been misleading. The border between the two kingdoms was returned basically to where it had been.

The next 15 years were marked by activities on the part of Antiochus to consolidate his empire. He first turned to deal with the rebel Achaëus. In 216 he made an agreement with Attalus I of Pergamum, Achaëus' erstwhile ally, that left him isolated. He then pushed Achaëus back into Sardis where he besieged him and eventually captured him by a stratagem in 213 and had him executed. Ptolemy IV died in 204, succeeded by Ptolemy V Epiphanes (§14.1.3). Antiochus III saw his chance and initiated the Fifth Syrian War (c.202–199 BCE). In spite of clever generalship on the part of Scopas the Egyptian commander, the Ptolemaic cause was lost at the battle of Panium in 200. Coele-Syria was now in Seleucid hands after a century of effort (for more on the Fifth Syrian War, see next section [§14.2]). Judaea had changed rulers, and the immediate result seemed favourable, though little actual difference in circumstance could be seen. The importance of the change in government was to come a quarter of a century later under Antiochus III's son, Antiochus IV.

With Philip V no longer a rival (§14.1.1), Antiochus took the opportunity to expand into Asia Minor and Thrace. He evidently planned to reconquer areas in Asia Minor which had once been part of the Seleucid realm but had since broken away. But his remarkable success was not to last: Rome was as suspicious of Antiochus' motives as they had been of Philip's. Their ultimatum was that he had to give up either Thrace or his hold on Asia Minor. Antiochus responded by diplomatic manoeuvres, but Rome was impatient and declared war in 192 BCE. Antiochus should have acquitted himself reasonably well, but Appian (*Syr.* 3.16) claims that he married a new young wife and neglected his army. The result was a decisive defeat at Magnesia, probably in early 189; the terms of the treaty ('the peace of Apamea') included not only a boundary of his kingdom at the Taurus mountains and his son Antiochus to be sent to Rome as hostage, plus the loss of most of his fleet and his war elephants, but also very stiff war reparations of 15,000 talents to the Romans. To meet this expense, Antiochus took to raiding and robbing temples; it was in the course of an attack on the temple at Elymais that he was killed in 187.

14.1.3 Ptolemy V Theos Epiphanes (204–180 BCE)

Only six years old when taking the throne, Ptolemy V was in no position to defend his realm, and Egypt suffered considerably. This included loss of most

territories in the Aegean and Asia Minor. The main event was the forfeiture of Palestine and southern Syria to Antiochus III in 200 BCE, during the Fifth Syrian War (c.202–199 BCE). An agreement was finally sealed with Ptolemy's marriage to Cleopatra I, a daughter of Antiochus (Appian, *Syr.* 1.5). The coronation of Ptolemy and his wife is the event described on the famous Rosetta Stone. It has recently been argued that the assertion that Coele-Syria's revenues were given as a dowry to Cleopatra (so Josephus, *Ant.* 12.4.1 §154) is not totally wrong (though perhaps only a portion). In any case, Ptolemy apparently planned to try to recapture the Syro-Palestinian possessions but was assassinated first by his generals.

14.1.4 Seleucus IV Philopator (187–175 BCE)

Seleucus IV was a weak ruler according to the ancient sources; however, this may be slander since he maintained a state of peace for his entire reign by astute dealings with Rome. Although Seleucus' rule seems a rather quiet one, this may be due to administrative skills rather than lack of ability or motivation. According to 2 Maccabees 3 Seleucus sent his officer Heliodorus to confiscate the treasure of the Jerusalem temple but, supposedly, an angel fought him off. The precise event behind this story is unclear, though Seleucus may have regarded the current high priest as disloyal since he was holding large funds in the temple, even though he received contributions toward sacrifices from the Seleucids (2 Macc. 3.6, 10–11). Seleucus was assassinated by Heliodorus not long after the Jerusalem incident, possibly as a direct result of it.

14.2 Fifth Syrian War (c.202–199 BCE): Palestine Becomes Seleucid

G.L. Archer (1958) *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*; **B. Bar-Kochva** (1976) *The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns*: 146–57; **D. Gera** (1987) 'Ptolemy son of Thraseas and the Fifth Syrian War', *AncSoc* 18: 63–73; (1998) *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.*: 19–34; **E.S. Gruen** (1984) *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome*; **M. Holleaux** (1942) 'La chronologie de la Cinquième Guerre de Syrie', in idem, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques: Tome III*: 317–35; **S. Honigman** (2002b) 'Les divers sens de l'ethnique Ἀραψ dans les sources documentaires grecques d'Égypte', *AncSoc* 32: 43–72; **W. Huß** (2001) *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit: 332–30 v. Chr.*; **F.W. Walbank** (1957) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius I*; (1967) *A Historical Commentary on Polybius II*; **É. Will** (1982) *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*: vol. 2.

The Fifth Syrian War returned Palestine to the Seleucids, which they had claimed since 301 BCE. Both the politics and the military action had a considerable effect on Judah, though some of this took decades to work itself out. Unfortunately, Polybius' account of events is preserved only in a few fragments, and we have to piece the events together from disparate sources and considerable extrapolation.

With Antiochus' return from his eastern expedition in 205, he and Philip V of Macedonia supposedly signed a treaty of alliance against Ptolemaic Egypt, now under the boy king Ptolemy V (Polybius 15.20.1–4; Justin 30.2.8). The terms of this alliance are not known (and some have even doubted its existence), but it matters little because it seems to have come to nothing (Will 1982: 114–18; Gera 1998: 21–22; Gruen 1984: 387–88), though if fully implemented, it could have had 'world historical consequences' (Huß 2001: 487). This did not affect Antiochus' plans to bring the Syro-Palestinian region back under Seleucid rule once and for all. The government of Ptolemy V was weakened by the machinations of his regents (Polybius 15.25–36; 16.21–22). The government of Ptolemy V sent a messenger to Antiochus, requesting that he honour the agreement made following the battle of Raphia (Polybius 15.25.13). There was little hope of this, since the Seleucids had maintained for the past century that they had a legitimate claim to the region. The important consideration was Rome. Rome had warned Philip V about his ambitions and had then declared war on him (Will 1982: 121–78; Gruen 1984: 101–102, 392–98). With his capitulation in 196 BCE, the question was their views about Antiochus. It seems that they were willing to turn a blind eye as long as he respected the integrity of Egypt itself (Will 1982: 120).

The exact course of the war is difficult to know because of the nature of our evidence, though some modern reconstructions are solidly based and argued (Holleaux 1942; Gera 1998: 20–35; Huß 2001: 489–92). It seems that the Ptolemaic regent Agathocles sent Scopas to Greece to hire mercenaries at an early stage, in anticipation of an invasion (Polybius 15.25.16–17). Antiochus III first took several towns in Asia Minor in the spring of 203 (Gera 1998: 21). Then came the secret treaty between Antiochus and Philip V in 203–202 BCE (Gera 1998: 22; Huß 2001: 487; Walbank 1967: 471–73). The invasion apparently began in the spring of 202 BCE (or spring 201 BCE, according to Gera [1998: 22–23]) with Antiochus' march into Syro-Palestine.

Most of the country apparently capitulated, as was normal. As was noted in the previous chapter, Polybius had recognized that the people of the region tended to change sides as conquerors came through, but suggested that the people favoured the Ptolemies (§13.4). There are indications that some peoples of the region seemed to be more willing to accept Seleucid rule. We do not have information relating specifically to the Fifth Syrian War, but we have some statements relating to the Fourth Syrian War. Preceding the battle of Raphia in 217 BCE, only certain towns are mentioned as having come under Antiochus III's control, mostly in Lebanon or the Transjordan region, but some of these had hostile garrisons and had to be taken by siege. The impression is that most of the others had come over to Antiochus of their own free will. Polybius notes that Arab tribes in the region of the Decapolis supported Antiochus III: 'The consequence of this series of successes was that the Arab tribes in the neighbourhood, inciting each other to this step, unanimously adhered to him' (Polybius 5.71.1). Also, 'Arabs' formed a part

of Antiochus' forces (5.85.4). Whether 'Arabs' in this context might have included Jews is uncertain but certainly possible (cf. Honigman 2002b).

An exception to this change of sides was Gaza. According to Polybius (16.22a), Gaza remained loyal to the Ptolemies and had to be besieged:

It seems to me both just and proper here to testify, as they merit, to the character of the people of Gaza. Although in war they display no more valour than the people of Coele-Syria in general, they are far superior as regards acting in unison and keeping their faith; and to put it shortly show a courage which is irresistible ... At the present time they acted similarly; for they left no possible means of resistance untried in their effort to keep their faith to Ptolemy. Therefore, just as it is our duty to make separate mention of brave men in writing history, so we should give due credit to such whole cities as are wont to act nobly by tradition and principle. (Polybius 16.22a)

Sometime after the fall of Gaza, the Egyptians seem to have counter-attacked under the general Scopas the Aetolian. This information apparently comes from Porphyry (as quoted by the patristic writer Jerome):

And while Antiochus held Judaea, a leader of the Ptolemaic party called Scopas Aetholus was sent against Antiochus, and after a bold campaign he took Judaea and took the aristocrats of Ptolemy's party back to Egypt with him on his return. (Porphyry, *apud* Hieronymus, *Comm. in Dan.* on Dan. 11.13-14 = *FGH* 260 F 45, trans. Archer 1958: 126)

Scopas appears to have retaken much or even all the country that had been conquered by Antiochus. It may be that Scopas left a garrison in Jerusalem (as well as other cities) at this time. Nevertheless, according to this statement, some of Ptolemy's adherents recognized that their time in the region was limited and took the opportunity to go live in Egypt.

The main battle was at Panium, in the Galilee near Mt Hermon. It is now known to have been in 200 BCE (Holleaux 1942: 321–26; not 198 as some older works put it). Unfortunately, Polybius' main account of the incident has been lost, but he has a section describing how the event was misdescribed by other historians (16.18.2). This gives us some insight into how the battle was fought (cf. the reconstruction of Bar-Kochva 1976: 146–57). After his defeat at Panium, Scopas fled to Sidon where he was once again besieged by Antiochus, finally surrendering after a long siege, probably in the year 199 BCE.

Purposing to retake Judaea and the many cities of Syria, Antiochus joined battle with Scopas, Ptolemy's general, near the sources of the Jordan near where the city now called Paneas was founded, and he put him to flight and besieged him in Sidon together with ten thousand of his soldiers. In order to free him, Ptolemy dispatched the famous generals, Eropus, Menocles and Damoxenus (Vulgate: Damoxeus). Yet he was unable to lift the siege, and finally Scopas, overcome by famine, had to surrender and was sent away with his associates, despoiled of all he had. And as for the statement, 'He shall cast up a mound,' [Dan. 11.15] this indicates that Antiochus is going to besiege the garrison of Scopas in the citadel of Jerusalem for a long time, while the Jews add their exertions as well. And he is

going to capture other cities which had formerly been held by the Ptolemaic faction in Syria, Cilicia and Lycia (variant: Lydia). (Porphyry, *apud* Hieronymus, *Comm. in Dan.* on Dan. 11.15-16 = FGH 260 F 46, translation from Archer 1958: 126)

After the defeat of Scopas, parts of Palestine evidently remained under Ptolemaic control, with Ptolemaic garrisons still to be found in various areas. These had to be taken, including Jerusalem. Josephus makes the following statement:

But not longer afterwards Antiochus defeated Scopas in a battle near the sources of the Jordan, and destroyed a great part of his army. And later, when Antiochus took possession of the cities in Coele-Syria which Scopas had held, and Samaria, the Jews of their own will went over to him and admitted him in their city and made abundant provision for his entire army and his elephants; and they readily joined his forces in besieging the garrison which had been left by Scopas in the citadel of Jerusalem. (*Ant.* 12.3.3 §§132–33).

We do not know Josephus' source at this point, though it was probably Polybius (Holleaux 1942: 325). In any case, Josephus also quotes Polybius directly:

Scopas, the general of Ptolemy, set out for the upper country and during the winter subdued the Jewish nation ... [After Scopas was defeated] Antiochus took Batanaia, Samaria, Abila and Gadara, and after a short time there also came over to him those Jews who live near the temple of Jerusalem, as it is called, concerning which we have more to say, especially concerning the renown of the temple, but we shall defer the account to another occasion. (Polybius 16.39 = Josephus, *Ant.* 12.3.3 §§135–36)

14.3 Judah after the Seleucid Conquest

G.G. Aperghis (2004) *The Seleucid Royal Economy*; **G.L. Archer** (1958) *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel*; **J.M. Bertrand** (1982) 'Sur l'inscription d'Hefzibah', *ZPE* 46: 167–74; **E.J. Bickerman** (2007b) 'A Question of Authenticity: The Jewish Privileges', in idem, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*: 295–314; (2007c) 'The Seleucid Charter for Jerusalem', in idem, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*: 315–56; (2007d) 'A Seleucid Proclamation concerning the Temple in Jerusalem', in idem, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*: 357–75; **G.M. Cohen** (1978) *The Seleucid Colonies*; **H.M. Cotton and M. Wörle** (2007) 'Seleukos IV to Heliodoros: A New Dossier of Royal Correspondence from Israel', *ZPE* 159: 191–205; **T. Fischer** (1979) 'Zur Seleukideninschrift von Hefzibah', *ZPE* 33: 131–38; **J.-D. Gauger** (1977) *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik*; **L.L. Grabbe** (2001b) 'Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period', in idem (ed.) *Did Moses Speak Attic?*: 129–55; (2006b) 'The "Persian Documents" in the Book of Ezra: Are They Authentic?', in Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*: 531–70; **M. Hengel** (1974) *Judaism and Hellenism*: vol. 1, 171–72; **Y.H. Landau** (1966) 'A Greek Inscription Found Near Hefzibah', *IEJ* 16: 54–70; **M.-T. Lenger** (1964) *Corpus des Ordonnances des Ptolémées*; **H. Liebesny** (1936) 'Ein Erlass des Königs Ptolemaios II Philadelphos

über die Deklaration von Vieh und Sklaven in Syrien und Phonikien (PER Inv. Nr. 24.552 gr.), *Aegyptus* 16: 257–91; **R. Marcus** (1943c) ‘Appendix D. Antiochus III and the Jews (*Ant.* xii. 129–153)’, in H.St.J. Thackeray (ed.), *Josephus*, vol. 7: 743–66; **A. Momigliano** (1982) review of Gauger, *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik*, *CP* 77: 258–61; **O. Mulder** (2003) *Simon the High Priest in Sirach* 50; **D.W. Rooke** (2000) *Zadok’s Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel*; **A. Schalit** (1959–60) ‘The Letter of Antiochus III to Zeuxis regarding the Establishment of Jewish Military Colonies in Phrygia and Lydia’, *JQR* 50: 289–318; **E. Taubler** (1946–47) ‘Jerusalem 201 to 199 B.C.E. on the History of a Messianic Movement’, *JQR* 37: 1–30, 125–37, 249–63; **V.A. Tcherikover** (1959) *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*; **É. Will** (1982) *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*: vol. 2.

14.3.1 Overview

We have several sources which give some idea of the situation immediately following the conquest of Syro-Palestine by Antiochus III. A number of issues needed to be attended to. One of these was to reconcile a divided community, for there is evidence of different factions among the Jews, with some supporters of the Seleucids and some of Ptolemaic rule. It has even been suggested that these internal divisions seem even to have led to some actual fighting among the Jews themselves (cf. Taubler 1946–47). The letter of Antiochus to his general Ptolemy (quoted below, §14.3.3) supports this interpretation that the Jews were divided among themselves. A similar statement is made by Porphyry:

During the conflict between Antiochus the Great and the generals of Ptolemy, Judaea, which lay between them, was rent into contrary factions, the one group favoring Antiochus, and the other favoring Ptolemy. (Porphyry, *apud* Jerome, *Comm. in Dan.* on Daniel 11.14b; trans. Archer 1958: 125)

A second problem that needed addressing was the physical damage caused by the fighting. Unsurprisingly, Jerusalem was damaged. If the Jews themselves were divided between the two sides, there would have been internal fighting and damage to the city. More concrete evidence for damage is found in the decree of Antiochus, contained in directions to his minister Ptolemy (quoted below, §14.3.3). Ptolemy had been an official of the Ptolemaic regime (Polybius 5.65.3) but betrayed his master by going over to Antiochus III. According to Josephus, Antiochus had come against Jerusalem in his advance south, and the city had opened its gates to him (*Ant.* 12.3.3 §§133, 138, quoted in the previous section, §14.2). But there had also been military activity at Jerusalem to take the Egyptian garrison left behind, and the temple had to be repaired at the direction of Simon the high priest.

Greatest among his brothers and the glory of his people was the high priest Simon son of Onias in whose lifetime the house was repaired, in whose days the temple was fortified. He laid the foundation for the high double wall, the high retaining wall of the temple precinct. In his day a reservoir was dug a cistern

broad as the sea. He was concerned to ward off disaster from his people and made the city strong against siege. (Ben Sira 50.1-4, REB)

Ben Sira's long section on Simon II (50.1-21) assigns duties that go beyond those of the high priest and temple administrator (*contra* Rooke 2000: 262–64). Especially important are the statements in 50.1-4 that describe Simon's activities as builder. He seems to have done the following: (1) generally repaired (if this is what פָּקַד means here; ὑπορράπτω in the Greek text does mean 'repair') and reinforced the temple (50.1); (2) dug a reservoir that served the entire city on a daily basis and would no doubt assist in a siege (50.2 Hebrew; 50.3 Greek); (3) built a wall and towers for the royal palace (50.3 Hebrew) or a wall for the temple enclosure (50.2 Greek); (4) strengthened the city against enemy attack or siege (50.4). There are some differences between the Hebrew and Greek texts (not infrequent in Ben Sira); in this case we need to keep in mind that the Greek translation was made after the Maccabean revolt and the rise of the Hasmonaean dynasty of rulers. The change from 'royal palace' (50.3 Hebrew) to 'temple enclosure wall' (50.2 Greek) may well reflect sensibilities arising from the changed situation (Mulder 2003: 284–85).

From the preserved accounts it seems that pro-Seleucid sentiment was by far the stronger, as indicated by Antiochus' statement that 'the Jews ... gave us a splendid reception and met us with their senate' (*Ant.* 12.3.3 §§138). Antiochus had received considerable aid, and not just free entry into Jerusalem, from those Jews who threw in their lot with his cause. He acknowledged this by a decree which expressed his gratitude for supplying him with provisions for his soldiers and war elephants, as well as for helping to take the citadel of the city from the Ptolemaic garrison. This decree requires a full discussion, which is given in the next section (§14.3.2).

14.3.2 Edict of Antiochus III regarding Jerusalem

After Antiochus III defeated Scopas at the battle of Panium in 200 BCE (§14.2), he issued a decree which listed the temple personnel and relieved some of their taxes temporarily so that the temple could be repaired of war damage, or so Josephus tells us, with an extensive quotation from the decree (the sections in square brackets are further discussed below):

King Antiochus to Ptolemy, greeting. Inasmuch as the Jews, from the very moment when we entered their country, showed their eagerness to serve us and, when we came to their city, gave us a splendid reception and met us with their senate and furnished an abundance of provisions to our soldiers and elephants, and also helped us to expel the Egyptian garrison in the citadel, we have seen fit on our part to requite them for these acts and to restore their city which has been destroyed by the hazards of war, and to repeople it by bringing back to it those who have been dispersed abroad. In the first place we have decided, on account of their piety, to furnish them for their sacrifices an allowance of sacrificial animals, wine, oil and frankincense to the value of twenty thousand pieces of silver, and sacred *artabae* of fine flour in accordance with their native law, and one thousand four hundred and sixty *medimni* of wheat and three hundred and seventy-five

medimni of salt.

[And it is my will that these things be made over to them as I have ordered, and that the work on the temple be completed, including the porticoes and any other part that it may be necessary to build.]

The timber, moreover, shall be brought from Judaea itself and from other nations and Lebanon without the imposition of a toll-charge. The like shall be done with the other materials needed for making the restoration of the temple more splendid. And all the members of the nation shall have a form of government in accordance with the laws of their country, and the senate, the priests, the scribes of the temple and the temple-singers shall be relieved from the poll-tax and the crown-tax and the salt-tax which they pay.

[And, in order that the city may be the more quickly inhabited, I grant both to the present inhabitants and to those who may return before the month of Hyperberetaios exemption from taxes for three years.]

We shall also relieve them in future from the third part of their tribute, so that their losses may be made good. And as for those who were carried off from the city and are slaves, we herewith set them free, both them and the children born to them, and order their property to be restored to them. (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.3.3–4 §§138–44)

This document has generally been taken as authentic, even if the supposed documents quoted in §§145–46 and §§148–153 are rejected (Gauger 1977: 19, 23–24, 61–63, 136–39; Bickerman 2007b; 2007c; 2007d; Marcus 1943c; Hengel 1974: 1: 171–72; Grabbe 2001b). We should expect such a decree from a conqueror, and a number of considerations argue for its existence. First, there is the statement in 2 Maccabees (4.11) about ‘the royal concessions to the Jews, secured through John the father of Eupolemus’, the only logical context being the time of Antiochus III’s conquest. Secondly, it fits the general situation in Syro-Palestine at the time. A subordinate people is often ready for a change, in hopes of bettering their condition, if ruled by a particular power for a long period of time. Thirdly, the last section of the decree fits the general approach of Ptolemy II’s decree in the Rainer papyrus (§13.2), suggesting not only a common administrative approach and style but also a common administrative policy toward those being governed. The basic agreement in style and content (accepted even by one so exacting as Gauger) with other Seleucid documents, such as the Rainer papyrus and the Hefzibah inscription (below, §14.3.3), has been well demonstrated, and the contents are not intrinsically unlikely. Antiochus also interacts with his minister Ptolemy, just as he does in the Hefzibah stela. Fourthly, there is little that looks like Jewish propaganda here, such as one finds in other documents (e.g., the Ezra decrees [cf. Grabbe 2006b]). Antiochus remits certain taxes temporarily to help in rebuilding the damaged city, as one might expect. He does not deliver fantastic sums of money nor treat the Jews in any special way, as one might expect in falsified letters (cf. Ezra 8.26–27).

These positive points do not remove all the problems. There are two difficulties which remain, despite the arguments in support: the first is that in contrast to the normal style of royal Seleucid documents, two sections (§§141

and 143) are in the first person singular, making them the most suspect (Gauger 1977: 19, 23–24, 61–63, 136–39; Bickerman's attempt to salvage the text at this point is ingenious but unconvincing). It is probably better to accept that these passages have been subject to scribal reworking and to set them off in square brackets, as is done above. The second is the failure to mention the high priest. There are several possible explanations for this: Antiochus may have wanted to concentrate on the institutions (the 'senate' [*gerousia*]) or groups rather than individuals; Simon may have opposed Antiochus (Will 1982: 119, but then why was he allowed to continue in office?); there was no high priest at the time of the invasion, or perhaps the high priest was killed in the fighting over Jerusalem, and Simon came to the office only after Antiochus had entered the city (this would go contrary to the variant text of *3 Macc.* 3.1). These are only suggestions, but lack of mention of Simon is not fatal to the decree's authenticity. We can summarize the implications of this decree as follows:

- The bulk of the Jews seem to have been pro-Seleucid at the time of Antiochus' invasion.
- The king provided a modest allowance for sacrifices, though it is not clear whether this is on a temporary basis or for a longer period.
- The temple personnel (including members of the *gerousia*) are relieved from certain taxes; however, the statement that all Jews are granted a tax exemption for three years is in a suspect part of the decree. In any case, this would be only a temporary exemption.
- Taxes for the entire population are reduced by one-third for an indefinite future.
- Those enslaved in the war are to be freed and have their property returned.

14.3.3 *Antiochus III's Decree on the Hefzibah Stela* (SEG 29.1613)

A stela found near Hefzibah in Israel contains several decrees issued by Antiochus III between the years 202 and 195 BCE (§3.2.2; Landau 1966; Fischer 1979; Bertrand 1982). From the stela we have original material illustrating the sorts of rulings made by Antiochus III during or shortly after conquering Palestine. The Jews are not mentioned directly in these, but there are parallels to points in the decree quoted by Josephus (see previous section, §14.3.2). The decrees make known the realities of the area in the time during and just after the Fifth Syrian War (above, §14.2). The section containing the memorandum from Ptolemy to Antiochus III is quoted below:

(F) To the Great King Antiochos (III) memorandum [from Ptolemy] the *strategos* [and] high priest. I request, King, if you so please, [to write] to [Cleon] and Heliodoros [the] *dioiketai* that as regards the villages which belong to my domain, crown property, and the villages which you registered, no one should be permitted under any pretext to billet himself, nor to bring in others, nor to requisition property, nor to take away peasants. The same letter to Heliodorus.

(G) King Antiochos (III) to Marsyas, greetings. Ptolemy the *strategos* and high priest reported to us that many of those travelling/are forcibly billeting themselves in his villages [and] many other acts of injustice are committed as they ignore [the instructions] we sent about this. Do therefore make sure that not only are they prevented (from doing so) but also that they suffer tenfold punishment for the harm they have done . . . The same letter to [Lysanias], Leon, Dionicus. (Trans. AUSTIN #193)

Antiochus is responding to Ptolemy's request, but it shows his concern to see that the local people have some sort of protection, so that soldiers would not be billeted on them or they be ejected from their houses which would then be given over to quartering soldiers. This suggests that such was a common practice.

14.3.4 Letter of Antiochus III to Zeuxis

According to Josephus (*Ant.* 12.3.4 §§148–53), Antiochus wrote a letter to his governor in Phrygia and Lydia to stop the revolutionary activities there by bringing in Jewish military colonists. The first part of the letter reads as follows:

King Antiochus to Zeuxis, his father, greeting. If you are in good health, it is well. I also am in sound health. Learning that the people in Lydia and Phrygia are revolting, I have come to consider this as requiring very serious attention on my part, and, on taking counsel with my friends as to what should be done, I determined to transport two thousand Jewish families with their effects from Mesopotamia and Babylonia to the fortresses and most important places. For I am convinced that they will be loyal guardians of our interests because of their piety to God, and I know that they have had the testimony of my forefathers to their good faith and eagerness to do as they are asked. (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.3.4 §§148–53)

This decree seems to show the king highly impressed by the Jews as a people and attests to their usefulness as military colonists. Not surprisingly there has been some question as to whether it is authentic or only another piece of Jewish propaganda (see Marcus for discussion and older bibliography). Nevertheless, its genuineness has been argued for by a number of important scholars (Schalit 1959–60; Bickerman 2007b; 2007c; 2007d; Tcherikover 1959: 287–88) and accepted by others as a usable historical source (e.g., Cohen 1978: 5–9), but in a detailed study Gauger has recently come out against it (1977: 3–151). He thinks that Josephus was not quoting a Greek author but saw the letter in a Jewish source. Momigliano (1982), though recognizing the quality of Gauger's study, did not find himself convinced.

14.3.5 Heliodorus and the Incident in the Jerusalem Temple

One of the most curious stories about events in Judah at this time is found in 2 Maccabees 3. Full analysis will be left to *HJJSTP* 3 because it requires discussion about the possible background of the individual called Simon and

the high priest Onias. For example, Aperghis (2004: 287–88) suggests that Simon may have been the king's representative in the Jerusalem temple. That may be the case, but it seems to be more complicated than that to me; a full discussion is called for. What we can say is that Heliodorus was a historical individual who seems to have held an office like that suggested by 2 Maccabees. A recently published inscription contains a letter of Seleucus IV to Heliodorus:

King Seleukos to Heliodoros his brother greetings. Taking the utmost consideration for the safety of our subjects, and thinking it to be of the greatest good for the affairs in our realm when those living in our kingdom manage their lives without fear, and at the same time realising that nothing can enjoy its fitting prosperity without the good will of the gods, from the outset we have made it our concern to ensure that the sanctuaries founded in the other satrapies receive the traditional honours with the care befitting them. But since the affairs in Koilē Syria and Phoinikē stand in need of appointing someone to take care of these (i.e. sanctuaries) ... Olympiodorus. (Cotton and Wörrle 2007: 193)

14.4 *Summary*

As with the previous two synthesis chapters, it has not been possible to write a narrative history of the Jews and Judaism in the first quarter of the second century BCE. We have only an overview of the general history of the region plus a few episodic events relating to Judah. The situation of the Jews in Egypt seems to have continued much as it had been. Antiochus himself was a good administrator as well as a capable and ambitious military leader, but the events of history intervened to frustrate him (§14.1.2). After his great success in finally bringing Syro-Palestine under Seleucid control, his good fortune seems to have deserted him. He came into conflict with Rome, who now had a major interest in the Greek East in the wake of the Second Punic War, and was defeated decisively at Magnesia in 189, and met his end in 187. One can say that his promise was greater than his fulfilment.

The immediate question is, what difference did Seleucid rule make for the inhabitants of Judah? What had changed? The differences in Seleucid administration (compared with the Ptolemaic) were to have their effect over time, but there was little initially to show that the native peoples were under a different regime. The native customs, laws and forms of administration were allowed to continue just as they had always done. As noted (§14.3.2), the Jews were allowed to retain their traditional customs and way of life. This was evidently negotiated with Antiochus, but we have no indication that he was adverse to such arrangements. Indeed, this arrangement seems to have applied to the other peoples of the region newly under Seleucid rule; the Jews were not unique.

Because the Jews were allowed to continue living as they had done, there is no indication of immediate change in the general circumstances of life in Judaea that we know of. Antiochus III was succeeded by his son Seleucus IV

(§14.1.4). Seleucus' rule seems a rather quiet one, and he evidently maintained good relations with Jerusalem (2 Macc. 3.2-3), with the exception of the incident involving his minister Heliodorus (§14.3.5). How we are to evaluate this curious event is difficult to say. It may well reflect a conflict over the temple treasury, which the king might have seen as growing at his expense. If so, the indignity expressed by the writer of 2 Maccabees may have been misplaced. Beyond this we hear nothing relating to Judaea until the reign of Antiochus IV which began in 175. At this point, Seleucid rule began to have major consequences.

Part V

CONCLUSIONS

Chapter 15

THE EARLY HELLENISTIC PERIOD – A HOLISTIC PERSPECTIVE

When Alexander crossed the Hellespont in 335 BCE, he began a process that was eventually to have major consequences for the ancient 'Orient'. The changes that came about as a result were different, more complicated and took longer than is often recognized in standard textbooks, and for the Jews the real dividing line was the neo-Babylonian period rather than the coming of the Greeks. Yet the introduction of Greek culture, Greek settlers, Greek administration and the Greek language began the process of 'Hellenization' of the ancient Near East. The new mixture of Greek, Persian and local cultures created the 'Hellenistic world' – a world that was neither Hellenic (classical Greek) nor Oriental but its own particular synthesis. Neither was it a *Verschelzung* or blending together of these different elements. Rather, the different aspects of culture often existed side by side, some Greek elements becoming more widespread and dominant than others, and different individuals adopting and adapting these elements in an individual way. For example, the upper echelon of administration was conducted in Greek, but at the grass-roots level where it most affected the bulk of the subjects, the local language might still maintain an important or even dominant role. Aramaic, Demotic Egyptian and cuneiform Akkadian continued to play an important role in general communication, administration, scribal, literary and even legal contexts (§6.3.2.2). An important factor was that of time: the various strands grew and developed at different rates and shifted their relationship to one another, and certain Greek elements became more or less important as time passed.

The eastern Mediterranean was divided into three zones or empires, centred on Egypt, the twin Seleucid regions of northern Syria (Antioch) and Babylonia and mainland Greece and Macedonia. The Ptolemaic empire especially, but also various areas in the Seleucid realm, contained a significant Jewish population. There was the Jewish homeland around Jerusalem, but the population there was probably a minority Jewish community by this time. A large population of Jews inhabited several areas of Egypt, and we know that in addition to the largely unknown Jewish settlement in Babylonia, Jews were eventually living in the main western cities of Seleucid Syria and Asia Minor. We do not hear a lot of them during the early Greek period, but later

evidence suggests that their settlement began in the third century. We even hear of a Jewish colony established under Zeuxis in Asia Minor by Antiochus III himself (§14.3.4).

One can argue that the Jewish diaspora began much earlier, in the neo-Babylonian period and continuing in the Persian, but it is in the early Hellenistic period that it starts to become a persistent feature of Jewish history. Not only were there many Jews living outside Judah, but it seems as if the Jews of Judah maintained a communication network with communities elsewhere. Jews apparently moved from one area to another, sometimes by compulsion but often by choice or personal decision to seek a better life. Life in Judah cannot have been easy for many Jews, whereas Egypt and other areas offered opportunities in the form of new land, greater agricultural fertility, a less precarious occupational existence, and a new career in the military. For the younger sons of a family, whose claim to the family inheritance might have been less secure, the chance to start a new life elsewhere could have been tempting.

We are fortunate in knowing a fair amount (relatively speaking) about the Jews in Egypt. We find a range of professions attested in the papyri. It is plain that some Jews were at the bottom of the socio-economic scale, only making enough to stay alive. Yet others were evidently owners of property and professionals who had a more than adequate income. What stands out, however, is the extent to which the Jewish settlers were associated with the military. Many of them clearly lived from the income from land given to them by the state, which meant that they remained in the military reserves even when they were not actively engaged in a campaign. Some of those mentioned in the papyri were officers, with a position of some rank and status. All in all, it appears that most Jews lived like, and had the same status as, the Greeks. The Jews seem to have made use of the Greek court system, and there is little evidence that the Jews had any special legal concessions or that they were able to apply Jewish law. On the contrary, some documents suggest that the Greek juridical tradition was seen as 'traditional law' to members of the Jewish community. For example, interest was collected by Jews from other Jews at the standard rate.

We have to distinguish those living in Egypt from those in Judah, though our direct knowledge of those in Judah is rather sparse. The administrative system in Egypt proper is reasonably well understood. Much of the energy of the state went into collecting a regular income from taxes and the produce and rents of state property. Much of this administration was done at local level, and the upper echelons of government were less involved in central planning than in seeing that the income collected at local level made its way into the state coffers. When we turn to Judah, there is some indication that the standard Ptolemaic system of administration was applied after a fashion but adapted to the local situation and tradition. All the evidence points to the high priest as the head of the province, which was run like a 'temple state'. That is, the priests seem to have been in administrative control, with the high

priest as the representative of the province to the Ptolemaic government. He seems to have been assisted (perhaps occasionally even dominated by) the ‘Sanhedrin’ or council of elders that appears prominently in several documents. There are also indications that the high priest had to collect taxes as well, suggesting that he might also have occupied the post of *oikonomos* for the province.

All the information available from archaeology and the limited literary sources indicates that most of the inhabitants of Judah made their living by subsistence agriculture, at least through much of the early Greek period. The region was not exactly wealthy or of a high status, and the tribute contribution seems to have been low, much what it had been under the Persians. There was, however, apparently a gradual improvement in the economy of Judah and Jerusalem through the third and early second centuries. We have the impression that little had altered over many centuries, but through the length of the early Greek period significant changes took place, at least in Jerusalem itself. Jerusalem became a consequential city in the region during this time, as is shown by the fact that it was able to be transformed into a Greek *polis* about 175 BCE. This suggests a major leap in sophistication as well as in the wealth of the city’s inhabitants. What drove these innovations that had not been there before? We can only guess, but three considerations present themselves: (1) a general rise in the level of prosperity for the entire region had taken place under the Ptolemies (§9.5.2), the Zenon papyri giving hints and even substantial information on the thriving economy of Palestine, but also the presence of many amphorae in Jerusalem seems also to be significant in some way; (2) the participation of many Jews in the military, especially in Egypt itself, which probably allowed some to send money back to families in Judah but also the opportunity for land and a better standard of living in Egypt; (3) the final contributing factor suggests itself from the story of Joseph Tobiad and his sons. The Tobiad family seems to have been able to accumulate a good deal of wealth, probably through tax farming and tax collecting as the story claims (§13.3; §9.5.2.2). Although the family estate was in Transjordan, the Tobiads appear to have had a strong base in Jerusalem and to have contributed to its growing prosperity by purchasing needed goods and services and perhaps even through acts of philanthropy to the temple and city.

When we look at Judaic religion in the early Hellenistic period, there is evidence that from the conquest of Alexander to the end of Ptolemaic rule – a period of less than one and a half centuries – enormous developments took place. These innovations on the religious side were not all new in that the seeds of many of them were evidently already well sown and even growing during Persian rule. Yet when we look at what is likely to have reached a significant level of progression during this time, we see monumental changes to the Jewish religion – changes in many ways in contrast to the little-altered lifestyle of the bulk of Jewish people. The trunk of Judaism had not changed,

but these innovations presaged much greater changes for a later time, and buds sprouted in new and unfamiliar directions.

Worship was still firmly temple centred, at least in theory. This was especially true in Judah itself. The religious situation led to two notable consequences. The first is that the priests and other temple personnel strongly controlled the official religious life (as well as serving as the backbone of the civil government, as indicated above). The Jerusalem temple had not become the sole place of worship without a struggle, and the temple establishment resisted any attempts to worship elsewhere (not necessarily with success). No doubt they regarded the Jews of the diaspora as a part of their flock, to be subjected to the same oversight as those nearer to home.

In practice, many Jews lived far from the temple and were not in a position to come there for worship, even on an annual basis. This situation in the growing diaspora led over time to a threefold substitute for the temple: one was prayer which could be offered up anywhere; a second was the written word – the Torah and the other books – which became a new focus for piety. The third was the newly evolved and established institution in the third century that allowed the exercise of the first two, the synagogue. In many diaspora communities, the synagogue became the community centre until by Roman times most Jewish quarters in cities had at least one; and larger urban settlements, several. But this took time: it seems that the synagogue as an institution did not reach Palestine until probably the first century BCE.

With regard to the second development (whether in Judah itself or in the diaspora), the committing of the Torah and other books to writing, what might have begun as a scribal exercise in the compilation of traditional writings ended up as a new religious core, rivalling the temple itself, though temple and Torah were not seen as mutually exclusive in most of the Jewish sources known to us from the period, and it was only with the destruction of the temple in 70 CE that prayer and Torah replaced it. This means, though, that the translation of the Torah into Greek, the Septuagint (probably about the mid-third century), had far-reaching implications for developing Judaism. By making it available in the vernacular, the translators enabled large numbers of Jews without regular access to the temple to see the written word as the focus of their religion. Judaism was probably already on the path toward becoming a ‘religion of the book’, but the LXX translation facilitated this journey enormously.

Although the focus of worship in Palestine was the temple and its cult, there is some evidence of para-temple religious activities among the people. Popular religion included a variety of practices not a part of temple worship. Some of these would have been widely acceptable, but others would have been officially proscribed. For example, there is evidence that divination (including even necromancy) and the esoteric arts were cultivated in some circles (*HJJSTP* 1: 252–56); this clearly continued into the Hellenistic period. Many of these activities would not have been written down by their

proponents nor have other remains been left for scholars to find; it is only through references by their enemies and some other hints that we have an inkling of their existence. More clearly documented through written sources is the existence of apocalyptic beliefs and speculation. It is often argued that apocalyptic is the product of times of crisis or oppression. Examples can be found of apocalyptic views arising from times of trauma, but they can also be found in times of peace and areas of prosperity. The reasons are complicated, but we know of apocalyptic writings and speculation during the Ptolemaic period when life for many Jews showed a distinct improvement and a number of decades of peaceful times.

Alongside this was a strong development in wisdom. There are many aspects of wisdom, one of which is mantic wisdom. This was a basis for the development of apocalyptic, and other esoteric arts were evidently cultivated in wisdom circles. But we also see a contrary current, one that rejected the view that the divine world could be understood and controlled. This was 'sceptical wisdom', and it has even been suggested that a crisis in wisdom developed at this time. The matter is complicated, because the best representatives of sceptical wisdom, the books of Job and Qohelet, may have been separated by a considerable period of time. But whether we should think of a general crisis or one that only affected some, it seems that a group (perhaps only a small group) began a radical questioning of traditional wisdom and traditional religious thought. They evidently did not get far. Even though their books survived, we do not find anything comparable in latter times until early modern times. But the presence of books like Job and Qohelet in the collection of authoritative books gave a leavening to Judaism that was very salutary.

The first evidence that the Jews had begun to think about history writing in a critical sense appears in the Greek period. Most Jewish historiography was not properly critical, however. Demetrius' discussions about problems in the tradition and how to resolve these, and his chronological frameworks worked out with considerable care, show that he was trying to rationalize biblical history. It is not critical history of the sophistication already developed by some Greek writers a century and more earlier, but it shows a historical consciousness not evident in Jewish writings up to this time. Much of the production along these lines was 'historical fiction', works that made use of historical details but whose aim was theological and moral. The historical data contained in them is often useful, but overall the works are fiction and cannot be used to reconstruct events of history, though it makes its contribution to the intellectual history of Judaism.

The Jews enjoyed a long peaceful period through much of the third and beginning of the second century. There may have been some military campaigns in Palestine even after the treaty resulting from Ipsus in 301 BCE. But the area seems to have been free from major conflict for many decades until the time of the Fourth Syrian War, around 220 BCE. A further interruption came a couple of decades later with the Seleucid conquest of

Syro-Palestine in 200 BCE. Jerusalem was definitely affected by fighting at this time. But then things calmed once more for a quarter of a century. It was with the coming of Antiochus IV to the throne in 175 BCE that a new crisis and a new era of history began.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Aharoni, Yohanan
 1975 *Investigations at Lachish: The Sanctuary and the Residency (Lachish V)* (Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University).
- Aharoni, Yohanan (ed.)
 1973 *Beer-Sheba I: Excavations at Tel Beer-Sheba 1969–1971 Seasons* (Publications of the Institute of Archaeology, 2; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University Institute of Archaeology).
- Albertz, Rainer
 1978 *Persönliche Frömmigkeit und offizielle Religion: Religionsinterner Pluralismus in Israel und Babylon* (Calwer Theologische Monographien, A9; Stuttgart: Calwer).
- 1994 *A History of Israelite Religion in the Old Testament Period* (2 vols; London: SCM); ET of *Geschichte der israelitischen Religion* (2 vols; Das Alte Testament Deutsch Ergänzungsreihe, 8; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1992).
- 2001 'An End to the Confusion? Why the Old Testament Cannot Be a Hellenistic Book!' in Lester L. Grabbe (ed.), *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period* (JSOTSup, 317; ESHM, 3; Sheffield Academic Press), pp. 30–46.
- Albrektson, Bertil
 1967 *History and the Gods: An Essay on the Idea of Historical Events as Divine Manifestations in the Ancient Near East and In Israel* (ConBOT, 1; Lund: Gleerup).
- Albright, William F. and James L. Kelso (eds)
 1968 *The Excavation of Bethel (1934–1960)* (AASOR, 39; Cambridge, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research).
- Alessandrini, Anthony C.
 2000 'Humanism in Question: Fanon and Said', in Henry Schwarz and Sangeeta Ray (eds), *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies* (Blackwell Companions in Cultural Studies; Oxford: Blackwells), pp. 431–50.
- Allam, S.
 1991 'Egyptian Law Courts in Pharaonic and Hellenistic Times', *JEA* 77: 109–27.
- Andreau, Jean
 2002 'Twenty Years after Moses I. Finley's *The Ancient Economy*', in Walter Scheidel and Sitta von Reden (eds), *The Ancient Economy* (Edinburgh Readings on the Ancient World; Edinburgh University Press), pp. 33–49; ET of 'Vingt ans d'après *L'économie antique* de Moses I. Finley', *Annales: Histoire, Sciences Sociales* 50 (1995): 947–60.

- Andrewes, Antony
1985 'Diodorus and Ephoros: One Source of Misunderstanding', in John W. Eadie and Josiah Ober (eds), *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr* (Lanham, NY: University Press of America), pp. 189–95.
- Aperghis, G.G. (Makis)
2001 'Population – Production – Taxation – Coinage: A Model for the Seleukid Economy', in Zofia H. Archibald, John Davies, Vincent Gabrielsen and G. J. Oliver (eds), *Hellenistic Economies* (London and New York: Routledge), pp. 69–102.
2004 *The Seleukid Royal Economy: The Finances and Financial Administration of the Seleukid Empire* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
2005 'City Building and the Seleukid Royal Economy', in Zofia H. Archibald, John Davies and Vincent Gabrielsen (eds), *Making, Moving and Managing: The New World of Ancient Economies, 323–31 BC* (Oxford: Oxbow Books), pp. 27–43.
- Applebaum, Shimon
1986 'The Settlement Pattern of Western Samaria from Hellenistic to Byzantine Times: A Historical Commentary', in Shimon Dar (ed.), *Landscape and Pattern: An Archaeological Survey of Samaria, 800 B.C.E.–636 C.E.* (Part i; BAR International Series, 308[i]; Oxford: British Archaeological Reports), pp. 257–69.
- Arav, Rami
1989 *Hellenistic Palestine: Settlement Patterns and City Planning, 337–31 B.C.E.* (BAR International Series, 485; Oxford: British Archaeological Reports).
- Archer Jr, Gleason L.
1958 *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker).
- Archibald, Zofia H., John Davies and Vincent Gabrielsen (eds)
2005 *Making, Moving and Managing: The New World of Ancient Economies, 323–31 BC* (Oxford: Oxbow Books).
- Archibald, Zofia H., John Davies, Vincent Gabrielsen and G.J. Oliver (eds)
2001 *Hellenistic Economies* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Argall, Randal A.
1995 *1 Enoch and Sirach: A Comparative Literary and Conceptual Analysis of the Themes of Revelation, Creation and Judgment* (SBLEJL, 8; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Ariel, Donald T.
1990a 'Imported Stamped Amphora Handles', in idem (ed.), *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. II, *Imported Stamped Amphora Handles, Coins, Worked Bone and Ivory, and Glass* (Qedem, 30; Jerusalem: Hebrew University), pp. 13–98.
1990b 'Coins, Flans, and Flan Moulds', in idem (ed.), *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. II, *Imported Stamped Amphora Handles, Coins, Worked Bone and Ivory, and Glass* (Qedem, 30; Jerusalem: Hebrew University), pp. 99–118.
2000 'Imported Greek Stamped Amphora Handles', in Hillel Geva (ed.), *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem Conducted by Nahman Avigad, 1969–1982*: vol. I, *Architecture and Stratigraphy: Areas A, W and X-2 Final Report* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp. 267–83.

- Ariel, Donald T. (ed.)
 1990 *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. II, *Imported Stamped Amphora Handles, Coins, Worked Bone and Ivory, and Glass* (Qedem, 30; Jerusalem: Hebrew University).
 2000a *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. V, *Extramural Areas* (Qedem, 40; Jerusalem: Hebrew University).
 2000b *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. VI, *Inscriptions* (Qedem, 41; Jerusalem: Hebrew University).
- Ariel, Donald T. and Alon De Groot (eds)
 1996 *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. IV, *Various Reports* (Qedem, 35; Jerusalem: Hebrew University).
- Ariel, Donald T. and Yair Shoham
 2000 'Locally Stamped Handles and Associated Body Fragments of the Persian and Hellenistic Periods', in Donald T. Ariel (ed.), *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. VI, *Inscriptions* (Qedem, 41; Jerusalem: Hebrew University), pp. 137–71.
- Ariel, Donald T., I. Sharon, J. Gunneweg and I. Perlman
 1985 'A Group of Stamped Hellenistic Storage-Jar Handles from Dor', *IEJ* 35: 135–52.
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin
 1998 *Key Concepts in Post-Colonial Studies* (Key Concepts Series; London and New York: Routledge).
- Ashcroft, Bill, Gareth Griffiths and Helen Tiffin (eds)
 1989 *The Empire Writes Back: Theory and Practice in Post-Colonial Literatures* (London and New York: Routledge).
 1995 *The Post-Colonial Studies Reader* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Athanassiadi, Polymnia and Michael Frede (eds)
 1999 *Pagan Monotheism in Late Antiquity* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Attridge, Harold W.
 1984 'Josephus and his Works', *JWSTP* 185–232.
 1986 'Jewish Historiography', in Robert A. Kraft and George W.E. Nickelsburg (eds), *Early Judaism and Its Modern Interpreters* (SBLBML, 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press), pp. 311–43.
- Austin, Michel M.
 1986 'Hellenistic Kings, War, and the Economy', *CQ* 36: 450–66.
 2006 *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 2nd edn).
- Avigad, Nahman
 1951 'A New Class of Yehud Stamps', *IEJ* 7: 146–53.
- Avigad, Nahman, revised and completed by Benjamin Sass
 1997 *Corpus of West Semitic Stamp Seals* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities/Israel Exploration Society).
- Avi-Yonah, Michael
 1959 'Syrian Gods at Ptolemais-Accho', *IEJ* 9: 1–12.
- Bagnall, Roger S.
 1976 *The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions Outside Egypt* (CSCT 4; Leiden: Brill).
 1997 'Decolonizing Ptolemaic Egypt', in Paul Cartledge, Peter Garnsey and Erich Gruen (eds), *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History, and*

- Historiography* (HCS, 26; Berkeley: University of California Press), pp. 225–41.
- Bagnall, Roger S. and Peter Derow (eds)
 2004 *The Hellenistic Period: Historical Sources in Translation* (Blackwell Sourcebooks in Ancient History, 1; Oxford: Blackwell; new edn).
- Bagnall, Roger S. and Bruce W. Frier
 1994 *The Demography of Roman Egypt* (Cambridge Studies in Population, Economy and Society in Past Time, 23; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Balcer, Jack Martin
 1987 *Herodotus and Bisitun: Problems in Ancient Persian Historiography* (Historia Einzelschriften, 49; Stuttgart: Steiner).
- Balentine, Samuel E.
 1993 *Prayer in the Hebrew Bible: The Drama of Divine–Human Dialogue* (Overtures to Biblical Theology; Minneapolis: Fortress).
- Barag, Dan
 1994–99 ‘The Coinage of Yehud and the Ptolemies’, *INJ* 13: 27–37.
- Barber, G.L.
 1935 *The Historian Ephorus* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Barclay, John M.G.
 1996 *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark).
 2006 *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*: vol. 10, Against Apion (Leiden: Brill).
- Barclay, John M.G. (ed.)
 2004 *Negotiating Diaspora: Jewish Strategies in the Roman Empire* (LSTS, 45; London and New York: T&T Clark International).
- Barkay, Rachel
 1992–93 ‘The Marisa Hoard of Seleucid Tetradrachms Minted in Ascalon’, *INJ* 12: 21–26.
 2003–2006 ‘Undated Coins from Hellenistic Marisa’, *INJ* 15: 48–55.
- Bar-Kochva, Bezalel
 1976 *The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns* (Cambridge Classical Studies; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
 1989 *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
 1996 *Pseudo-Hecataeus, On the Jews: Legitimizing the Jewish Diaspora* (HCS, 21; Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press).
- Barr, James
 1966 *Old and New in Interpretation: A Study of the Two Testaments* (London: SCM).
 1974–75 ‘Philo of Byblos and his “Phoenician History”’, *BJRL* 57: 17–68.
 1976 ‘Story and History in Biblical Theology’, *JR* 56: 1–17.
 1979 ‘The Typology of Literalism in Ancient Biblical Translations’, *Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens* 15 (= *Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. klasse, Nr. 11): 275–325.
- Barstad, Hans M.
 1997 ‘History and the Hebrew Bible’, in Lester L. Grabbe (ed.), *Can a ‘History of Israel’ Be Written?* (JSOTSup, 245; ESHM, 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp. 37–64.

- 2002 'Is the Hebrew Bible a Hellenistic Book? Or: Niels Peter Lemche, Herodotus, and the Persians', *Trans* 23: 129–51.
- Barth, Frederik (ed.)
1969 *Ethnic Groups and Boundaries: The Social Organization of Culture Difference* (Boston: Little, Brown & Company).
- Bartholomew, Craig G.
1998 *Reading Ecclesiastes: Old Testament Exegesis and Hermeneutical Theory* (AnBib, 139; Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute).
- Bartlett, John R.
1989 *Edom and the Edomites* (JSOTSup, 77; Sheffield: JSOT).
1999 'Edomites and Idumaeans', *PEQ* 131: 102–14.
- Barton, John
1997 *The Spirit and the Letter: Studies in the Biblical Canon* (London: SPCK) = *Holy Writings, Sacred Text: The Canon in Early Christianity* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox).
1997 *Making the Christian Bible* (London: Darton, Longman, and Todd) = *How the Bible Came to Be* (Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox).
- Beaulieu, Paul-Alain
1989 *The Reign of Nabonidus, King of Babylon 556–539 B.C.* (Yale Near Eastern Researches, 10; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press).
- Becking, Bob
1992 *The Fall of Samaria: An Historical and Archaeological Study* (Studies in the History of the Ancient Near East, 2; Leiden: Brill).
- Beentjes, Pancratius C.
1997 *The Book of Ben Sira in Hebrew: A Text Edition of all Extant Hebrew Manuscripts and a Synopsis of all Parallel Hebrew Ben Sira Texts* (VTSup, 68; Leiden: Brill).
- Beentjes, Pancratius C. (ed.)
1997 *The Book of Ben Sira in Modern Research* (BZAW, 255; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
- Begg, Christopher T.
2004 *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*: vol. 4, Judean Antiquities 5–7 (Leiden: Brill).
- Begg, Christopher T. and Paul Spilsbury
2005 *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*: vol. 5, Judean Antiquities 8–10 (Leiden: Brill).
- Bekkum, W. Jac. van
1994 *A Hebrew Alexander Romance according to MS Hébr. 671.5 Paris, Bibliothèque Nationale* (Hebrew Language and Literature Series, 1; Groningen: Styx).
- Bengston, Hermann
1937 *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit: Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht: I* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 26; Munich: Beck).
1944 *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit: Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht: II* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 32; Munich: Beck).
1952 *Die Strategie in der hellenistischen Zeit: Ein Beitrag zum antiken Staatsrecht: III* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 36; Munich: Beck).

- Berlin, Andrea M.
 1997 'Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period', *BA* 60: 2–51.
 2002 'Power and its Afterlife: Tombs in Hellenistic Palestine', *NEA* 65: 138–48.
- Berlin, Andrea M. and Kathleen Warner Slane
 1997 *Tel Anafa II, i: The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery: The Plain Wares and the Fine Wares* (Journal of Roman Archaeology Supplementary Series II.i; Ann Arbor, MI: Kelsey Museum).
- Bernard, P.
 1967 'Aī Khanum on the Oxus: A Hellenistic City in Central Asia', *Proceedings of the British Academy* 53: 71–95.
- Berthelot, Katell
 Forthcoming 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Jewish "Misanthropy"', *Bulletin du Centre de Recherche Français de Jérusalem*.
- Bertrand, J.M.
 1982 'Sur l'inscription d'Hefzibah', *ZPE* 46: 167–74.
- Betlyon, John W.
 1991 'Archaeological Evidence of Military Operations in Southern Judah during the Early Hellenistic Period', *BA* 54: 36–43.
- Bevan, Edwyn Robert
 1902 *The House of Seleucus* (2 vols; London: Edward Arnold; repr. London: Routledge & Kegan Paul, 1966).
 1927 *The House of Ptolemy: A History of Egypt under the Ptolemaic Dynasty* (repr. Chicago: Ares Publishers, 1985).
- Bickerman, Elias J.
 1938 (E. Bickerman) *Institutions des Séleucides* (Paris: Geuthner).
 1947 'La Coelé-Syrie: notes de géographie historique', *RB* 54: 256–68.
 1967 'Kohleth (Ecclesiastes) or The Philosophy of an Acquisitive Society', in *Four Strange Books of the Bible: Jonah/Daniel/Kohleth/Esther* (New York: Schocken), pp. 139–67.
 1975 'The Jewish Historian Demetrius', in Jacob Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism, and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (SJLA 12; Leiden: Brill) 3: 72–84.
 2007a *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including The God of the Maccabees* (2 vols; ed. Amram Tropper; introduced by Martin Hengel; Leiden: Brill).
 2007b 'A Question of Authenticity: The Jewish Privileges', in idem, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including The God of the Maccabees* (2 vols; ed. Amram Tropper; introduced by Martin Hengel; Leiden: Brill), pp. 295–314; ET of 'Une question d'authenticité les privilèges juifs', *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (AGAJU, 9/2; Leiden: Brill, 1980) 2: 24–43.
 2007c 'The Seleucid Charter for Jerusalem', in idem, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including The God of the Maccabees* (2 vols; ed. Amram Tropper; introduced by Martin Hengel; Leiden: Brill), pp. 315–56; ET of 'La charte séleucide de Jérusalem', *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (AGAJU 9/2; Leiden: Brill, 1980) 2: 44–85 (orig. *REJ* 100 [1935]).
 2007d 'A Seleucid Proclamation concerning the Temple in Jerusalem', in idem, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including The God of the Maccabees* (2 vols; ed. Amram Tropper; introduced by Martin Hengel; Leiden: Brill), pp. 357–75; 'Une proclamation séleucide

- relative au temple de Jérusalem', *Studies in Jewish and Christian History* (AGAJU 9/2; Leiden: Brill, 1980) 2: 86–104 (orig. *Syria* 25 [1946–48]).
- Bienkowski, Piotr
 1995 'The Edomites: The Archaeological Evidence from Transjordan', in Diana Vikander Edelman (ed.), *You Shall not Abhor an Edomite for he is your Brother: Edom and Seir in History and Tradition* (SBLABS 3; Atlanta: Scholars), pp. 41–92.
- Bienkowski, Piotr and Leonie Sedman
 2001 'Busayra and Judah: Stylistic Parallels in the Material Culture', in Amihai Mazar (ed.), *Studies in the Archaeology of the Iron Age in Israel and Jordan* (JSOTSup, 331; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp. 310–25.
- Bigwood, J.M.
 1980 'Diodorus and Ctesias', *Phoenix* 34: 195–207.
- Bikerman, E.J.: see Bickerman, Elias J.
- Bilde, Per
 1988 *Flavius Josephus between Jerusalem and Rome: His Life, his Works, and their Importance* (JSPSup, 2; Sheffield: JSOT).
- Billows, Richard A.
 1995 *Kings and Colonists: Aspects of Macedonian Imperialism* (CSCT, 22; Leiden: Brill).
- Binder, Donald D.
 1999 *Into the Temple Courts: The Place of the Synagogues in the Second Temple Period* (SBLDS, 169; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Biran, Avraham
 1977 'Tel Dan', *RB* 84: 256–63.
 1994 *Biblical Dan* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
- Biran, Avraham (ed.)
 1996 *Dan I: A Chronicle of the Excavations, the Pottery Neolithic, the Early Bronze Age and the Middle Bronze Age Tombs* (Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College).
 2002 *Dan II: A Chronicle of the Excavations and the Late Bronze Age 'Mycenaean' Tomb* (Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College).
- Black, Matthew
 1970 *Apocalypsis Henochi Graece* (Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti graece 3; Leiden: Brill).
 1985 *The Book of Enoch or I Enoch: A New English Edition with Commentary and Textual Notes* (SVTP, 7; Leiden: Brill, 1985).
- Blasius, Andreas and Bernd U. Schipper (eds)
 2002 *Apokalyptik und Ägypten: Eine kritische Analyse der relevanten Texte aus dem griechisch-römischen Ägypten* (OLA, 107; Leuven: Peeters).
- Boccaccini, Gabriele
 1991 *Middle Judaism: Jewish Thought, 300 B.C.E. to 200 C.E.* (Minneapolis: Fortress).
 1998 *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
 2002 *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History, from Ezekiel to Daniel* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Boccaccini, Gabriele (ed.)
 2002 *The Origins of Enochic Judaism: Proceedings of the First Enoch Seminar*,

- University of Michigan, Sesto Fiorentino, Italy, June 19–23, 2001* (Henoch, 24; Turin: Silvio Zamorani Editore).
- 2005 *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- 2007 *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Forthcoming *Enoch and the Mosaic Torah: The Evidence of Jubilees* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Bogaert, Raymond
1998–99 'Les opérations des banques de l'Égypte ptolémaïque', *AncSoc* 29: 49–145.
- Bohak, Gideon
1997 'Good Jews, Bad Jews, and Non-Jews in Greek Papyri and Inscriptions', in Bärbel Kramer et al. (eds), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.–19.8.1995* (Archiv für Papyrusforschung Beiheft, 3; Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner), pp. 105–12.
- Boiy, Tom
2000 'Dating Methods during the Early Hellenistic Period', *JCS* 52: 115–21.
2004 *Late Achaemenid and Hellenistic Babylon* (OLA 136; Leuven: Peeters).
- Boswinkel, E. and P.W. Pestman (eds)
1978 *Textes grecs, démotiques et bilingues (P. L. Bat. 19)* (Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 19; Leiden: Brill).
- Bosworth, A.B.
1974 'The Government of Syria under Alexander the Great', *CQ* 24: 46–64.
1975 'Arrian and the Alexander Vulgate', in *Alexandre le Grand: Image et réalité* (Entretiens sur l'Antiquité Classique, 22; Geneva: Foundation Hardt), pp. 1–46.
1980 *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander: I Commentary on Books I–III* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
1988 *From Arrian to Alexander: Studies in Historical Interpretation* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
1995 *A Historical Commentary on Arrian's History of Alexander: II Commentary on Books IV–V* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
1996 *Alexander and the East: The Tragedy of Triumph* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
2002 *The Legacy of Alexander: Politics, Warfare, and Propaganda under the Successors* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Bosworth, A.B. and E.J. Baynham (eds)
2000 *Alexander the Great in Fact and Fiction* (Oxford University Press).
- Bouché-Leclercq, Auguste
1903–1907 *Histoire des Lagides* (4 vols; Paris: Leroux).
- Bowman, Alan K. and Greg Woolf (eds)
1994 *Literacy and Power in the Ancient World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Boyce, Mary
1984 'On the Antiquity of Zoroastrian Apocalyptic', *BSOAS* 47: 57–75.
- Braun, R.
1973 *Koheleth und die frühhellenistische Popularphilosophie* (BZAW, 130; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
- Braverman, J.
1978 *Jerome's Commentary on Daniel: A Study of Comparative Jewish and*

Christian Interpretations of the Hebrew Bible (CBQMS, 7; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association).

- Bredin, Mark (ed.)
 2006 *Studies in the Book of Tobit: A Multidisciplinary Approach* (LSTS, 55; London and New York: T&T Clark International).
- Brenner, Athalya (ed.)
 1995 *A Feminist Companion to Esther, Judith and Susanna* (The Feminist Companion to the Bible, 7; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Brett, Mark G. (ed.)
 1996 *Ethnicity and the Bible* (BIS, 19; Leiden: Brill).
- Brewer, David Instone
 1992 *Techniques and Assumptions in Jewish Exegesis before 70 CE* (TSAJ, 30; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Briant, Pierre
 1982 *Rois, tributs et paysans: Etudes sur les formations tributaire du Moyen-Orient ancien* (Annales littéraires de l'Université de Besan, 269; Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne, 43; Paris: Les Belles Lettres).
- Bringmann, K.
 1983 *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa* (AAWG, Phil.-hist. Klasse, 3te Folge, Nr. 132; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Brock, Sebastian P.
 1979 'Aspects of Translation Technique in Antiquity', *Greek, Roman, and Byzantine Studies* 20: 69–87.
 1996 *The Recensions of the Septuagint Version of I Samuel* (with a foreword by Natalio Fernández Marcos; Quaderni di Henoch, 9; Torino: Silvio Zamorani Editore).
- Brock, Sebastian P. et al.
 1973 *A Classified Bibliography of the Septuagint* (ALGHJ, 6; Leiden: Brill).
- Brody, Robert
 1999 'Evidence for Divorce by Jewish Women?' *JJS* 50: 230–34.
- Brooke, George J.
 2007 '"Canon" in the Light of the Qumran Scrolls', in Philip S. Alexander and Jean-Daniel Kaestli (eds), *The Canon of Scripture in Jewish and Christian Tradition* (Publications de l'Institut romand des sciences bibliques, 4; Lausanne: Éditions du Zèbre), pp. 81–98.
- Broughton, T. Robert S.
 1938 'Roman Asia Minor', in Tenney Frank (ed.), *An Economic Survey of Ancient Rome* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins) 4: 499–918.
 1951 'New Evidence on Temple-Estates in Asia Minor', in P.R. Coleman-Norton et al. (eds), *Studies in Roman Economic and Social History in Honor of Allan Chester Johnson* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press), pp. 236–50.
- Brown, Truesdell S.
 1973 *The Greek Historians* (Civilization and Society; Lexington, MA: D.C. Heath).
- Bruce, I.A.F.
 1967 *An Historical Commentary on the 'Hellenica Oxyrhynchia'* (Cambridge Classical Studies; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Brunt, P.A.
 1980 'Cicero and Historiography', *Miscellanea Mani*: 311–40; repr. in idem,

- Studies in Greek History and Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1993), pp. 181–209.
- 1993 *Studies in Greek History and Thought* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Brunt, P.A. (ed.)
- 1976 *Arrian with an English Translation: I Anabasis Alexandri, Books I–IV* (LCL 236; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann).
- 1983 *Arrian with an English Translation: II Anabasis of Alexander, Books V–VII, Indica* (LCL 269; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann).
- Brutti, Maria
- 2006 *The Development of the High Priesthood during the Pre-Hasmonean Period: History, Ideology, Theology* (JSJSup, 108; Leiden: Brill).
- Büchler, A.
- 1898 ‘La Relation de Josèphe concernant Alexandre le Grand’, *REJ* 36: 1–26.
- Bugh, Glenn R. (ed.)
- 2006 *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Buitenwerf, Rieuwerd
- 2003 *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its Social Setting: with an Introduction, Translation and Commentary* (SVTP, 17; Leiden: Brill).
- Bunge, J.G.
- 1973 ‘Der “Gott der Festungen” und der “Liebling der Frauen”’: Zur Identifizierung der Götter in Dan. 11,36–39’, *JSJ* 4: 169–82.
- Burkes, Shannon
- 1999 *Death in Qoheleth and Egyptian Biographies of the Late Period* (SBLDS, 170; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Burstein, Stanley M.
- 1978 *The Babyloniaca of Berossus* (SANE, 1/5; Malibu: Undena).
- 1985 *The Hellenistic Age from the Battle of Ipsus to the Death of Kleopatra VII* (Translated Documents of Greece and Rome, 3; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- 1992 ‘Hecataeus of Abdera’s History of Egypt’, in Janet H. Johnson (ed.), *Life in a Multi-Cultural Society: Egypt from Cambyes to Constantine and Beyond* (Studies in Ancient Oriental Civilization, 51; Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago), pp. 45–49.
- Busink, T.A.
- 1980 *Der Tempel von Jerusalem von Salomo bis Herodes: Eine archäologisch-historische Studie unter Berücksichtigung des westsemitischen Tempelbaus: 2. Von Ezechiel bis Middot* (Leiden: Brill).
- Calduch-Benages, N. and J. Vermeylen (eds)
- 1999 *Treasures of Wisdom: Studies in Ben Sira and the Book of Wisdom: Festschrift M. Gilbert* (BETL, 143; Leuven: Peeters and Leuven University Press).
- Cameron, Averil, and Amélie Kuhrt (eds)
- 1993 *Images of Women in Antiquity* (London: Routledge, 2nd edn).
- Camp, Claudia V.
- 1991 ‘Understanding a Patriarchy: Women in Second Century Jerusalem Through the Eyes of Ben Sira’, in Amy-Jill Levine (ed.), *Women Like*

This': New Perspectives on Jewish Women in the Greco-Roman World (SBLEJL, 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press), pp. 1–39.

Campbell Jr, Edward F.

1991 *Shechem II: Portrait of a Hill Country Vale: The Shechem Regional Survey* (ASORAR, 2; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Campbell, Edward F. and G.R.H. Wright

2002 *Shechem III: The Stratigraphy and Architecture of Shechem/Tell Balāṭah* (2 vols; ASORAR, 6; Boston, MA: American Schools of Oriental Research).

Caquot, André

1966 'Ben Sira et le messianism', *Semitica* 16: 43–68.

Carroll, Robert P.

1998 'Exile! What Exile? Deportation and the Discourses of Diaspora', in Lester L. Grabbe (ed.), *Leading Captivity Captive: 'The Exile' as History and Ideology* (JSOTSup, 278; ESHM, 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), pp. 62–79.

Carter, Charles E.

1999 *The Emergence of Yehud in the Persian Period: A Social and Demographic Study* (JSOTSup, 294; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

Cartledge, Paul

1983 '“Trade and Politics” Revisited: Archaic Greece', in Peter Garnsey, Keith Hopkins and C. R. Whittaker (eds), *Trade in the Ancient Economy* (London: Chatto & Windus), pp. 1–15.

2002 'The Economy (Economies) of Ancient Greece', in Walter Scheidel and Sitta von Reden (eds), *The Ancient Economy* (Edinburgh Readings on the Ancient World; Edinburgh University Press), pp. 11–32.

Cartledge, Paul, Peter Garnsey and Erich Gruen (eds)

1997 *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography* (HCS, 26; Berkeley: University of California Press).

Cary, M.

1963 *A History of the Greek World 323 to 146 BC* (London: Methuen, 2nd edn, 1951; reprinted with new bibliography, 1963).

Caspari, M.O.B.

1910 'On the Γῆς Περίοδος of Hecataeus', *JHS* 30: 236–48.

Chamoux, François

2003 *Hellenistic Civilization* (trans. Michel Roussel; Oxford: Blackwell); ET of *La civilisation hellénistique* (Paris: Arthand, 1981).

Champion, Craige B.

2004 *Cultural Politics in Polybius's Histories* (HCS, 41; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).

Charles, R.H.

1929 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Oxford: Clarendon).

Charles, R.H. (ed.)

1908 *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, Translated . . . with Notes* (Oxford: Clarendon).

1913a *Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon).

1913b *The Book of Enoch* (Oxford: Clarendon).

Charlesworth, James H. (ed.)

1983–85 *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha* (2 vols; Garden City, NY: Doubleday).

- Charlesworth, James H. with Mark Harding and Mark Kiley (eds)
 1994 *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International).
- Chazon, Esther G.
 1992 'Is *Divrei ha-me'orot* a Sectarian Prayer?' in Devorah Dimant and Uriel Rappaport (eds), *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Forty Years of Research* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah, 10; Jerusalem: Magnes Press), pp. 3–17.
 1994 'Prayers from Qumran and Their Historical Implications', *DSD* 1: 265–84.
- Childs, Brevard S.
 1970 *Biblical Theology in Crisis* (Philadelphia: Westminster).
- Clarysse, Willy
 1976 'Harmachis, Agent of the Oikonomos: An Archive from the Time of Philopator', *Ancient Society* 7: 185–207.
 1985 'Greeks and Egyptians in the Ptolemaic Army and Administration', *Aegyptus* 65: 57–66.
 1993 'Egyptian Scribes Writing Greek', *Chronique d'Égypte* 68: 186–201.
 1994 'Jews in Trikomia', in Adam Bülow-Jacobsen (ed.), *Proceedings of the 20th International Congress of Papyrologists, Copenhagen, 23–29 August, 1992* (Copenhagen: Museum Tusculanum Press), pp. 193–203.
- Clarysse, Willy and Dorothy J. Thompson
 2006 *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt: vol. 1, Population Registers (P. Count); vol. 2, Historical Studies* (Cambridge Classical Studies; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Clines, David J.A.
 1984 *The Esther Scroll: The Story of the Story* (JSOTSup, 30; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Coggins, Richard J.
 1998 *Sirach* (Guides to Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Cohen, Getzel M.
 1978 *The Seleucid Colonies* (Historia Einzelschrift, 30; Wiesbaden: Steiner).
 1995 *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor* (HCS, 17; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).
 2006 *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, the Red Sea Basin, and North Africa* (HCS, 46; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).
- Cohen, Naomi G.
 1976 'Jewish Names as Cultural Indicators in Antiquity', *JSJ* 7: 97–128.
- Cohen, Shaye D.J.
 1979 *Josephus in Galilee and Rome: His Vita and Development as a Historian* (CSCT, 8; Leiden: Brill).
 1982–8 'Alexander the Great and Jaddus the High Priest according to Josephus', *AJS Review* 7–8: 41–68.
 1999 *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties* (HCS, 31; Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California Press).
- Cohen, Shaye J.D. and Ernest S. Frerichs (eds)
 1993 *Diaporas in Antiquity* (BJS, 288; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Colledge, Malcolm
 1987 'Greek and non-Greek Interaction in the Art and Architecture of the Hellenistic East', in Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East* (London: Duckworth), pp. 134–62.

Collins, John J.

- 1974a *The Sibylline Oracles of Egyptian Judaism* (SBLDS, 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 1974b 'The Place of the Fourth Sibyl in the Development of the Jewish Sibyllina', *JJS* 25: 365–80.
- 1977 *The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel* (HSM, 16; Atlanta: Scholars).
- 1979 'The "Historical" Character of the Old Testament in Recent Biblical Theology', *CBQ* 41: 185–204.
- 1980 'The Epic of Theodotus and the Hellenism of the Hasmoneans', *HTR* 73: 91–104.
- 1993 *A Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress).
- 1997 *Jewish Wisdom in the Hellenistic Age* (OTL; Edinburgh: T&T Clark; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox).
- 1998 *The Apocalyptic Imagination: An Introduction to Jewish Apocalyptic Literature* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2nd edn).
- 2000 *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (The Biblical Resource Series; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans; Livonia, MI: Dove Booksellers, 2nd edn).

Collins, John J. (ed.)

- 1979 *Apocalypse: The Morphology of a Genre* (Semeia, 14; Atlanta: Scholars).
- 1999 *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: vol. 1, The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum).

Collins, John J. and James H. Charlesworth (eds)

- 1991 *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (JSPSup, 9; Sheffield Academic Press).

Collins, John J. and Peter W. Flint (eds)

- 2001 *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (The Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature, 2; VTSup, 83; Leiden: Brill).

Collins, Nina L.

- 1991 'Ezekiel, the Author of the *Exagoge*: His Calendar and Home', *JSJ* 22: 201–11.
- 1992 '281 BCE: the Year of the Translation of the Pentateuch into Greek under Ptolemy II', in George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars (eds) *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings* (Manchester, 1990) (SBLSCS, 33; Atlanta: Scholars Press) 403–503.

Cook, Johann

- 1997 *The Septuagint of Proverbs: Jewish and/or Hellenistic Proverbs?: Concerning the Hellenistic Colouring of LXX Proverbs* (VTSup, 69; Leiden: Brill).

Cook, Stephen L.

- 1995 *Prophecy and Apocalypticism: The Postexilic Social Setting* (Minneapolis: Fortress).

Corley, Jeremy, and Vincent Skemp (eds)

- 2005 *Intertextual Studies in Ben Sira and Tobit* (CBQMS, 38; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America).

Cotton, Hannah M. and Michael Wörle

- 2007 'Seleukos IV to Heliodoros: A New Dossier of Royal Correspondence from Israel', *ZPE* 159: 191–205.

- Coulson, William D.E., Margaret S. Mook and James W. Rehard, with contributions by Virginia R. Grace
 1997 'Stamped Amphora Handles from Tel Beersheba', *BASOR* 306: 47–62.
- Cowey, James M. S. and Klaus Maresch (eds)
 2001 *Urkunden des Politeuma der Juden von Herakleopolis (144/3–133/2 v. Chr.) (P. Polit. Iud.)* (Abhandlungen der Nordrhein-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Papyrologica Coloniensia, 19; Wiesbaden: Westdeutscher Verlag).
- Cowley, A.
 1923 *Aramaic Papyri of the Fifth Century B.C.* (Oxford: Clarendon Press; repr. Osnabruck: Otto Zeller, 1967) = *AP*.
- Crawford, Dorothy J. (Thompson): see Thompson, Dorothy J.
- Crenshaw, James L.
 1980 'The Birth of Skepticism in Ancient Israel', in James L. Crenshaw and Samuel Sandmel (eds), *The Divine Helmsman: Studies on God's Control of Human Events, Presented to Lou H. Silberman* (New York: Ktav), pp. 1–19.
 1988 *Ecclesiastes* (OTL; London: SCM).
 1998 *Education in Ancient Israel: Across the Deadening Silence* (Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday).
- Cribiore, Raffaella
 1996 *Writing, Teachers, and Students in Graeco-Roman Egypt* (American Studies in Papyrology, 36; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Cross, Frank Moore
 1964 'The History of the Biblical Text in the Light of Discoveries in the Judean Desert', *HTR* 57: 281–99; repr. in Frank M. Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), pp. 117–95.
 1966 'The Contribution of the Qumran Discoveries to the Study of the Biblical Text', *IEJ* 16: 81–95; repr. in Frank M. Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), pp. 278–92.
 1975 'The Evolution of a Theory of Local Texts', in Frank M. Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), pp. 306–20.
 1981 'An Aramaic Ostrakon of the Third Century B.C.E. from Excavations in Jerusalem', *EI* 15: *67–*69.
 1998 *From Epic to Canon: History and Literature in Ancient Israel* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins).
- Cross, Frank M. and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds)
 1975 *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Crowfoot, J.W., G.M. Crowfoot and Kathleen M. Kenyon
 1957 *The Objects from Samaria* (Samaria-Sebaste: Reports of the Work of the Joint Expedition in 1931–1933 and of the British Expedition in 1935, no. 3; London: Palestine Exploration Fund).
- Crowfoot, J.W., Kathleen M. Kenyon and E.L. Sukenik
 1942 *The Buildings at Samaria* (Samaria-Sebaste: Reports of the Work of the Joint Expedition in 1931–1933 and of the British Expedition in 1935, no. 1; London: Palestine Exploration Fund).

- Cryer, Frederick H.
1987 'The 360-Day Calendar Year and Early Judaic Sectarianism', *SJOT* 1: 116–22.
- Dar, Shimon
1986 *Landscape and Pattern: An Archaeological Survey of Samaria, 800 B.C.E.–636 C.E.* (with a historical commentary by Shimon Applebaum; Part i; BAR International Series 308[i]; Oxford: British Archaeological Reports).
- Davies, J.K.
1984 'Chapter 8: Cultural, Social and Economic Features of the Hellenistic World', *CAH* 7/1: 257–320.
2001 'Hellenistic Economies in the Post-Finley Era', in Zofia H. Archibald, John Davies, Vincent Gabrielsen and G.J. Oliver (eds), *Hellenistic Economies* (London and New York: Routledge), pp. 11–62.
2006 'Hellenistic Economies', in Glenn R. Bugh (ed.), *The Cambridge Companion to the Hellenistic World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 73–92.
- Davies, Philip R.
1985 *Daniel* (OTG; Sheffield Academic Press).
1998 *Scribes and Schools: The Canonization of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Library of Ancient Israel; Louisville, KY: Westminster John Knox; London: SPCK).
- Davies, W.D. and Louis Finkelstein (eds)
1989 *The Cambridge History of Judaism*: vol. 2, *The Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Davis, Norman and Colin M. Kraay
1973 *The Hellenistic Kingdoms: Portrait Coins and History* (London: Thames and Hudson).
- Day, Peggy L.
1988 *An Adversary in Heaven: šāṭān in the Hebrew Bible* (HSM, 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- De Groot, Alon and Donald T. Ariel (eds)
1992 *Excavations at the City of David 1978–1985 Directed by Yigal Shiloh*: vol. III, *Stratigraphical, Environmental, and Other Reports* (Qedem, 33; Jerusalem: Hebrew University).
- Dentzer, J.M., F. Villeneuve and F. Larché
1982 'Iraq el Amir: Excavations at the Monumental Gateway', *SHAJ* 1: 201–207.
- Derda, Tomasz
1997 'Did the Jews Use the Name of Moses in Antiquity?' *ZPE* 115: 257–60.
- Derow, Peter
1994 'Historical Explanation: Polybius and his Predecessors', in Simon Hornblower (ed.), *Greek Historiography* (Oxford: Clarendon), pp. 73–90.
- Deselaers, P.
1982 *Das Buch Tobit: Studien zu seiner Entstehung, Komposition und Theologie* (OBO, 43; Freiburg: Universitätsverlag).
- De Troyer, Kristin
2000 *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8.1–17, LXX 8.1–17, and AT 7.14–41* (SBLSCS, 48; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature); ET of *Het einde van de Alpha-tekst van Ester: Vertaal- en verhaaltechniek van MT 8,1–17, LXX 8,1–17 en AT 7,14–41* (Leuven: Peeters, 1997).

- Deutsch, Robert
1994–99 ‘Five Unrecorded “Yehud” Silver Coins’, *INJ* 13: 25–26.
- Devauchelle, D.
1995 ‘Le sentiment anti-perses chez les anciens Égyptiens’, *Trans* 9: 67–80.
- Dever, William G. (ed.)
1974 *Gezer II: Report of the 1967–70 Seasons in Fields I and II* (Annual of the Hebrew Union College/Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology, 2; Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College).
- Dever, William G., H. Darrell Lance and G. Ernest Wright
1970 *Gezer I: Preliminary Report of the 1964–66 Seasons* (Annual of the Hebrew Union College Biblical and Archaeological School, 1; Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College).
- Dever, William G. et al.
1971 ‘Further Excavations at Gezer, 1967–1971’, *BA* 34: 94–132.
- Dexinger, Ferdinand
1977 *Henoche Zehnwochenapokalypse und offene Probleme der Apokalyptikforschung* (SPB, 29; Leiden: Brill).
- Diamond, Frances H.
1974 *Hecataeus of Abdera: A New Historical Approach* (PhD thesis, UCLA; available from Xerox University Microfilms).
1980 ‘Hecataeus of Abdera and the Mosaic Constitution’, in S.M. Burstein and L.A. Okin (eds), *Panhellenica: Essays in Ancient History and Historiography in Honor of Truesdell S. Brown* (Lawrence, KS: Coronado), pp. 77–95.
- Dihle, Albert
1974 ‘ $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$... A. $\psi\upsilon\chi\eta$ In the Greek World’ and ‘C. Judaism: I. Hellenistic Judaism’, in Gerhard Friedrich (ed.) *TDNT* 9: 608–17, 632–35.
- Di Lella, Alexander A.
1966 *The Hebrew Texts of Sirach: A Text-Critical and Historical Study* (Studies in Classical Literature; The Hague: Mouton).
1996 ‘The Wisdom of Ben Sira: Resources and Recent Research’, *CR: BS* 4: 161–81.
- Dines, Jennifer M.
2004 *The Septuagint* (Understanding the Bible and its World; London and New York: T&T Clark International).
- DiTommaso, Lorenzo
1998 ‘A Note on Demetrius the Chronographer, Fr. 2.11 (= Eusebius, *PrEv* 9.21.11)’, *JSJ* 29: 81–91.
2005 *The Book of Daniel and the Apocryphal Daniel Literature* (SVTP, 20; Leiden: Brill).
- Dittenberger, Wilhelm
1903–1905 *Orientis graeci inscriptiones selectae: Supplementum sylloges inscriptionum graecarum* (2 vols; Leipzig; reprinted Hildesheim: Olms, 1960).
- Dogniez, Cécile
1995 *Bibliography of the Septuagint/Bibliographie de la Septante (1970–1993)* (with a Preface by P.-M. Bogaert; VTSup, 60; Leiden: Brill).
- Doran, Robert
1987 ‘The Jewish Hellenistic Historians before Josephus’, *ANRW II*: 20.1: 246–97.

- Dorothy, Charles V.
1997 *The Books of Esther: Structure, Genre and Textual Integrity* (JSOTSup, 187; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Doty, L.T.
1980 'The Archive of the Nanâ-Iddin Family from Uruk', *JCS* 30: 65–90.
- Drews, Robert
1963 'Diodorus and his Sources', *AJP* 83: 383–92.
1973 *The Greek Accounts of Eastern History* (Publications of the Center for Hellenic Studies; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Due, B.
1989 *The Cyropaedia: Xenophon's Aims and Methods* (Aarhus University Press).
- Dunand, Françoise
1977 'L'Oracle du Potier et la formation de l'apocalyptique en Égypte', in F. Raphaël et al. (eds), *L'Apocalyptique* (Université des Sciences Humaines de Strasbourg, Études d'Histoire des Religions, 3; Paris: Paul Geuthner), pp. 41–67.
- Durand, Xavier
1997 *Des Grecs en Palestine au III^e siècle avant Jésus-Christ: Le dossier syrien des archives de Zénon de Caunos (261–252)* (Cahiers de la Revue Biblique, 38; Paris: Gabalda).
- Duttenhöfer, Ruth
1994 *Ptolemäische Urkunden aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung (P. Heid. VI)* (Veröffentlichungen aus der Heidelberger Papyrus-Sammlung, Neue Folge Nr. 7; Heidelberg: Universitätsverlag C. Winter).
- Easterling, P.E. and B.M.W. Knox (eds)
1985 *Cambridge History of Classical Literature: 1 Greek Literature* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Eckstein, Arthur M.
1995 *Moral Vision in The Histories of Polybius* (HCS, 16; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California).
- Eddy, Samuel K.
1961 *The King is Dead: Studies in the Near Eastern Resistance to Hellenism 334–31 B.C.* (Lincoln, NB: University of Nebraska Press).
- Edgar, Campell
1925–40 *Zenon Papyri I–V* (Catalogue général antiquités égyptiennes du Musée du Caire 79–84; Cairo: l'Institut Français d'Archéologie Orientale).
- Edwards, Douglas R. and C. Thomas McCollough (eds)
1997 *Archaeology and the Galilee: Texts and Contexts in the Graeco-Roman and Byzantine Periods* (SFSHJ, 143; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Efron, Joshua
1987 'The Great Sanhedrin in Vision and Reality', in *Studies on the Hasmonean Period* (SJLA, 31; Leiden: Brill), pp. 287–339.
- Ehrenberg, Victor
1969 *The Greek State* (London: Methuen, 2nd edn).
- Eph'al, Israel
1982 *The Ancient Arabs: Nomads on the Borders of the Fertile Crescent, 9th–5th Centuries B.C.* (Jerusalem: Magnes).
- Eshel, Esther
2007 'The Onomasticon of Mareshah in the Persian and Hellenistic Periods', in Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers and Rainer Albertz (eds), *Judah and the*

- Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), pp. 145–56.
- Eshel, Esther and Amos Kloner
 1996 'An Aramaic Ostrakon of an Edomite Marriage Contract from Maresha, Dated 176 B.C.E.', *IEJ* 46: 1–22.
- Evans, J.A.S.
 1961 'A Social and Economic History of an Egyptian Temple in the Greco-Roman Period', *YCS* 17: 143–283.
- Evans, Richard J.
 1997 *In Defence of History* (London: Granta Books).
- Falk, Daniel K.
 1998 *Daily, Sabbath, and Festival Prayers in the Dead Sea Scrolls* (STJD, 27; Leiden: Brill).
- Fantalkin, Alexander and Oren Tal
 2004 'Chapter 30 The Persian and Hellenistic Pottery of Level I', in David Ussishkin (ed.), *The Renewed Archaeological Excavations at Lachish (1973–1994)* (Tel Aviv University Ronia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology, Monograph Series, 22; Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology) 4: 2174–94.
- Farhi, Yoav
 2007 'A Yehud Stamp Impression from North Jerusalem', *TA* 34: 90–91.
- Falivene, Maria Rosaria
 1991 'Government, Management, Literacy: Aspects of Ptolemaic Administration in the Early Hellenistic Period', *AncSoc* 22: 203–27.
- Feldman, Louis H.
 1977 'Hengel's *Judaism and Hellenism* in Retrospect', *JBL* 96: 371–82.
 1984 *Josephus and Modern Scholarship (1937–1980)* (Berlin and London: de Gruyter).
 1986 'How Much Hellenism in Jewish Palestine?' *HUCA* 57: 83–111.
 1993 *Jew and Gentile in the Ancient World: Attitudes and Interactions from Alexander to Justinian* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
 1998a *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible* (JSJSup, 58; Leiden: Brill).
 1998b *Josephus's Interpretation of the Bible* (HCS, 27; Berkeley, Los Angeles and London: University of California).
 2001 *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*: vol. 3, *Judean Antiquities 1–4* (Leiden: Brill).
- Feldman, L.H. and G. Hata (eds)
 1987 *Josephus, Judaism, and Christianity* (Leiden: Brill).
 1989 *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (Leiden: Brill).
- Feldman, L.H. and J.R. Levison (eds)
 1996 *Josephus' Contra Apionem: Studies in its Character and Context with a Latin Concordance to the Portion Missing in Greek* (AGAJU, 34; Leiden: Brill).
- Fernández Marcos, Natalio
 2000 *The Septuagint in Context: Introduction to the Greek Versions of the Bible* (trans. W.G.E. Watson; Leiden: Brill).
- Fikhman, Isaak F.
 1996 'Les Juifs d'Égypte à l'époque byzantine d'après les papyrus publiés depuis la parution du "Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum" III', *SCI* 15: 223–29.
 1997 'L'état des travaux au "Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum" IV', in Bärbel

- Kramer et al. (eds), *Akten des 21. Internationalen Papyrologenkongresses, Berlin, 13.–19.8.1995* (Archiv für Papyrusforschung Beiheft, 3; Stuttgart and Leipzig: Teubner), pp. 290–96.
- 1998 'Liste des Rééditions et Traductions des Textes Publiés dans le *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum*: vols I–III', *SCI* 17: 183–205.
- Fine, Steven
- 1997 *This Holy Place: On the Sanctity of the Synagogue during the Greco-Roman Period* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, 11; Notre Dame, IN: University of Notre Dame Press).
- Fine, Steven (ed.)
- 1996 *Sacred Realm: The Emergence of the Synagogue in the Ancient World* (Oxford: Oxford University Press; New York: Yeshiva University Museum).
- 1999 *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue: Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period* (Baltimore Studies in the History of Judaism; London and New York: Routledge).
- Finkelstein, Israel
- 1988–89 'The Land of Ephraim Survey 1980–1987: Preliminary Report', *TA* 15–16: 117–83.
- Finkelstein, Israel and Zvi Lederman (eds)
- 1997 *Highlands of Many Cultures: The Southern Samaria Survey: The Sites* (2 vols; Institute of Archaeology Monograph Series, 14; Tel Aviv: Tel Aviv University).
- Finkielsztejn, Gerald and Shimon Gibson
- 2007 'The Retrograde-F-Shaped *yh(d)* Monogram: Epigraphy and Dating', *TA* 34: 104–13.
- Finley, Moses I.
- 1999 *The Ancient Economy* (updated with a new foreword by Ian Morris; Sather Classical Lectures, 43; Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Finnegan, Ruth
- 1988 *Literacy and Orality: Studies in the Technology of Communication* (Oxford: Blackwell).
- Finnestad, Ragnhild Bjerre
- 1997 'Temples of the Ptolemaic and Roman Periods: Ancient Traditions in New Contexts', in Byron E. Shafer (ed.), *Temples of Ancient Egypt* (Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press), pp. 185–37, 302–17.
- Fischel, H.A.
- 1973 *Rabbinic Literature and Greco-Roman Philosophy: A Study of Epicurea and Rhetorica in Early Midrashic Writings* (SPB, 21; Leiden: Brill).
- Fischel, H.A. (ed.)
- 1977 *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature* (Library of Biblical Studies; New York: Ktav).
- Fischer, Alexander A.
- 1997 *Skepsis oder Furcht Gottes? Studien zur Komposition und Theologie des Buches Kohelet* (BZAW, 247; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
- Fischer, T.
- 1979 'Zur Seleukideninschrift von Hefzibah', *ZPE* 33: 131–38.
- 1980 *Seleukiden und Makkabäer: Beiträge zur Seleukidengeschichte und zu den politischen Ereignissen in Judäa während der 1. Hälfte des 2. Jahrhunderts v. Chr.* (Bochum: Brockmeyer).

- Fitzmyer, Joseph A.
 1995a 'The Aramaic and Hebrew Fragments of Tobit from Cave 4', *CBQ* 57: 655–75.
 1995b 'Tobit', in James C. VanderKam (ed.) *Qumran Cave 4: XIV Parabiblical Texts, Part 2* (DJD, 19; Oxford: Clarendon), pp. 1–84.
 2003 *Tobit* (CEJL; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
- Fitzpatrick-McKinley, Anne
 1999 *The Transformation of Torah from Scribal Advice to Law* (JSOTSup, 287; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Flusser, David
 1978–80 *Sefer Yosippon* (2 vols.; Jerusalem: Bialik Institute).
 1982 'Hystaspes and John of Patmos', in Shaul Shaked (ed.), *Irano-Judaica: Studies Relating to Jewish Contacts with Persian Culture Throughout the Ages* (Jerusalem: Ben Zvi Institute), pp. 12–75; repr. in idem, *Judaism and the Origins of Christianity* (Jerusalem: Magnes, 1988), pp. 390–453.
- Fornara, Charles William
 1983 *The Nature of History in Ancient Greece and Rome* (Eidos; Berkeley/Los Angeles: University of California Press).
- Fox, Michael V.
 1999 *A Time to Tear Down and a Time to Build Up: A Rereading of Ecclesiastes* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Fraser, P.M.
 1972 *Ptolemaic Alexandria* (3 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Freedman, David Noel (ed.)
 1992 *Anchor Bible Dictionary* (6 vols; Garden City, NY: Doubleday).
- Freyne, Sean
 1980 *Galilee from Alexander the Great to Hadrian: A Study of Second Temple Judaism* (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 1980).
- Fuks, Gideon
 2001 'Josephus' Tobiads Again: A Cautionary Note', *JJS* 52: 354–56.
- Funck, Bernd (ed.)
 1996 *Hellenismus: Beiträge zur Erforschung von Akkulturation und politischer Ordnung in den Staaten des hellenistischen Zeitalters, Akten des Internationalen Hellenismus-Kolloquiums 9.–14. März 1994 in Berlin* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Gafni, Isaiah M.
 1997 *Land, Center and Diaspora: Jewish Constructs in Late Antiquity* (JSPSup, 21; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Galili, E.
 1976–77 'Raphia, 217 B.C.E., Revisited', *SCI* 3: 52–126.
- Gamberoni, Johann
 1997 'Das "Gesetz des Mose" im Buch Tobias', in Georg Braulik (ed.), *Studien zu Pentateuch: Walter Kornfeld zum 60 Geburtstag* (Vienna: Herder), pp. 227–42.
- Gandhi, Leela
 1998 *Postcolonial Theory: A Critical Introduction* (Edinburgh: Edinburgh University Press).
- Gauger, Jörg-Dieter
 1977 *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik: Untersuchungen zur Authentizität von*

- Urkunden bei Flavius Josephus und im I. Makkabäerbuch* (Bonner Biblische Beiträge, 49; Cologne and Bonn: Peter Hanstein).
- 1982 'Zitate in der jüdischen Apologetik und die Authentizität der Hekataios-Passagen bei Flavius Josephus und im Ps. Aristees-Brief', *JSJ* 13: 6–46.
- Geertz, Clifford
1973 *The Interpretation of Cultures* (New York: Basic Books).
- Geffcken, J.
1902 *Die Oracula Sibyllina* (GCS, 8; Leipzig: Hinrichs).
- Gera, Deborah Levine
1993 *Xenophon's Cyropaedia: Style, Genre, and Literary Technique* (Oxford Classical Monographs; Oxford: Clarendon).
- Gera, Dov
1987 'Ptolemy son of Thraseas and the Fifth Syrian War', *AncSoc* 18: 63–73.
1990 'On the Credibility of the History of the Tobiads', in A. Kasher, U. Rappaport and G. Fuks (eds), *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel: Collected Essays* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp. 21–38.
1998 *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.* (Brill's Series in Jewish Studies, 8; Leiden: Brill).
- Geraty, Lawrence T.
1975 'The Khirbet el-Kôm Bilingual Ostrakon', *BASOR* 220: 55–61.
1981 'Recent Suggestions on the Bilingual Ostrakon from Khirbet el-Kôm', *AUSS* 19: 137–40.
1983 'The Historical, Linguistic, and Biblical Significance of the Khirbet el-Kôm Ostraca', in Carol L. Meyers and M. O'Connor (eds), *The Word of the Lord Shall Go Forth: Essays in Honor of David Noel Freedman in Celebration of his Sixtieth Birthday* (ASOR, sp. vol. series 1; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), pp. 545–48.
- Gerber, Christine
1997 *Ein Bild des Judentums für Nichtjuden von Flavius Josephus: Untersuchungen zu seiner Schrift Contra Apionem* (AGAJU, 40; Leiden: Brill).
- Gerson, Stephen N.
2000–2002 'A Newly Discovered Ptolemaic Coin of Yehud', *INJ* 14: 43.
2003–2006 'A Transitional Period Coin of Yehud: A Reflection of Three Cultures', *INJ* 15: 32–34.
- Geva, Hillel
2007 'A Chronological Reevaluation of Yehud Stamp Impressions in Palaeo-Hebrew Script, Based on Finds from Excavations in the Jewish Quarter of the Old City of Jerusalem', *TA* 34: 92–103.
- Geva, Hillel (ed.)
1994 *Ancient Jerusalem Revealed* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society; Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society).
2000 *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem Conducted by Nahman Avigad, 1969–1982: vol. I, Architecture and Stratigraphy: Areas A, W and X-2 Final Report* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
2003 *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem Conducted by Nahman Avigad, 1969–1982: vol. II, The Finds from Areas A, W and X-2 Final Report* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
- Gitin, Seymour
1990 *Gezer III: A Ceramic Typology of the Late Iron II, Persian and Hellenistic*

- Periods at Tell Gezer* (vols 1–2; Annual of the Nelson Glueck School of Biblical Archaeology, 3; Jerusalem: Hebrew Union College).
- Gitler, Haim and Alla Kushnir-Stein
 1994–99 ‘The Chronology of a Late Ptolemaic Bronze Coin-Type from Cyprus’, *INJ* 13: 46–53.
- Gitler, Haim and Catharine Lorber
 2000–2002 ‘Small Silver Coins of Ptolemy I’, *INJ* 14: 34–42.
- Gmirkin, Russell E.
 2006 *Berosus and Genesis, Manetho and Exodus: Hellenistic Histories and the Date of the Pentateuch* (LHBOTS, 433; Copenhagen International Series, 15; New York and London: T&T Clark International).
- Goldingay, John E.
 1989 *Daniel* (WBC, 30; Dallas: Word).
- Goldstein, Jonathan A.
 1975 ‘The Tales of the Tobiads’, in Jacob Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (SJLA, 12; Leiden: Brill) 3: 85–123.
- Goodblatt, David
 1994 *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity* (TSAJ, 38; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
 2006 *Elements of Ancient Jewish Nationalism* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Goodman, Martin
 1983 *State and Society in Roman Galilee, A.D. 132–212* (Oxford Centre for Postgraduate Hebrew Studies; Totowa, NJ: Rowman & Allanheld).
- Grabbe, Lester L.
 1979 ‘Chronography in Hellenistic Jewish Historiography’, in P.J. Achtemeier (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1979 Seminar Papers* (SBLSPS, 17; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press) 2: 43–68.
 1987a ‘The Scapegoat Ritual: A Study in Early Jewish Interpretation’, *JSJ* 18: 152–67.
 1987b ‘Josephus and the Reconstruction of the Judaeen Restoration’, *JBL* 106: 231–46.
 1988a *Etymology in Early Jewish Interpretation: The Hebrew Names in Philo* (BJS, 115; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
 1988b ‘Another Look at the *Gestalt* of “Darius the Mede”’, *CBQ* 50: 198–213.
 1988c ‘Synagogues in Pre-70 Palestine: A Re-assessment’, *JTS* 39: 401–10.
 1989 ‘The Social Setting of Early Jewish Apocalypticism’, *JSP* 4: 27–47.
 1990 ‘Josephus’, in R.J. Coggins and J.L. Houlden (eds), *A Dictionary of Biblical Interpretation* (London: SCM), pp. 365–68.
 1991 ‘Maccabean Chronology: 167–164 or 168–165 BCE?’ *JBL* 110: 59–74.
 1992 *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*: vol. I, *Persian and Greek Periods*; vol. II, *Roman Period* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press; British edition in one volume London: SCM, 1994).
 1995 *Priests, Prophets, Diviners, Sages: A Socio-historical Study of Religious Specialists in Ancient Israel* (Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International).
 1999 ‘Eschatology in Philo and Josephus’, in Alan Avery-Peck and Jacob Neusner (eds), *Judaism in Late Antiquity*: vol. 4, *Special Topics: (1) Death and the Afterlife* (Handbuch der Orientalistik: Erste Abteilung, Der Nahe und Mittlere Osten, Bd. 17; Leiden: Brill), pp. 35–62.

- 2000 *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London and New York: Routledge).
- 2001a 'Who Were the First Real Historians? On the Origins of Critical Historiography', in idem (ed.), *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period* (JSOTSup, 317; ESHM, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp. 156–81.
- 2001b 'Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period', in idem (ed.), *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period* (JSOTSup, 317; ESHM, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press) 129–55.
- 2001c 'A Dan(iel) for All Seasons: For Whom Was Daniel Important?', in J.J. Collins and P.W. Flint (eds), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception* (The Formation and Interpretation of Old Testament Literature, 2; VTSup, 83; Leiden: Brill) 1.229–46.
- 2001d 'Sup-urbs or Only Hyp-urbs? Prophets and Populations in Ancient Israel and Socio-historical Method', in Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (eds), 'Every City Shall Be Forsaken': *Urbanism and Prophecy in Ancient Israel and the Near East* (JSOTSup, 330; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp. 93–121.
- 2002a 'The Hellenistic City of Jerusalem', in John R. Bartlett (ed.), *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities* (London: Routledge, 2002), pp. 6–21.
- 2002b 'The Jews and Hellenization: Hengel and his Critics', in Philip R. Davies and John Halligan (eds), *Second Temple Studies III: Studies in Politics, Class and Material Culture* (JSOTSup, 340; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp. 52–66.
- 2003a 'Tobit', in James D.G. Dunn and John W. Rogerson (eds), *Eerdmans Commentary on the Bible* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans), pp. 736–47.
- 2003b 'Prophetic and Apocalyptic: Time for New Definitions – and New Thinking', in Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and their Relationships* (JSPSup, 46; London and New York: T&T Clark International), pp. 107–33.
- 2003c 'Poets, Scribes, or Preachers? The Reality of Prophecy in the Second Temple Period', in Lester L. Grabbe and Robert D. Haak (eds), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic, and their Relationships* (JSPSup, 46; London and New York: T&T Clark International), pp. 192–215; earlier version published in *Society of Biblical Literature 1998 Seminar Papers* (SBLSPS, 37; Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press, 1998) 2.524–45.
- 2003d 'Were the Pre-Maccabean High Priests "Zadokites"?', in J. Cheryl Exum and H.G.M. Williamson (eds), *Reading from Right to Left: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honour of David J. A. Clines* (JSOTSup, 373; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp. 205–15.
- 2003e 'Of Mice and Dead Men: Herodotus 2.141 and Sennacherib's Campaign in 701 BCE', in idem (ed.), 'Like a Bird in a Cage': *The Invasion of Sennacherib in 701 BCE* (JSOTSup, 363; ESHM, 4; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp. 119–40.
- 2004 *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period 1: Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah* (London and New York: T&T Clark International) = *HJJSTP* 1.

- 2006a 'The Law, the Prophets, and the Rest: The State of the Bible in Pre-Maccabean Times', *DSD* 13: 319–38.
- 2006b 'The "Persian Documents" in the Book of Ezra: Are They Authentic?', in Oded Lipschits and Manfred Oeming (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), pp. 531–70.
- 2006c 'Thus Spake the Prophet Josephus...: The Jewish Historian on Prophets and Prophecy', in Michael H. Floyd and Robert D. Haak (eds), *Prophets, Prophecy, and Prophetic Texts in Second Temple Judaism* (LHBOTS, 427; New York and London: T&T Clark International), pp. 240–47.
- 2006d 'Biblical Historiography in the Persian period: Or How the Jews Took Over the Empire', in Steven W. Holloway (ed.), *Orientalism, Assyriology and the Bible* (Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press), pp. 400–14.
- 2007 'The Parables of Enoch in Second Temple Jewish Society', in Gabriele Boccaccini (ed.), *Enoch and the Messiah Son of Man: Revisiting the Book of Parables* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans), pp. 386–402.
- 2008 'Sanhedrin, Sanhedriyyot, or Mere Invention?', *JSJ* 39: 1–19.
- Forthcoming a 'Jewish Identity and Hellenism in the Jewish Fragmentary Writers in Greek', in Gail O'Day and Patrick Gray (eds), *Scripture and Traditions: Essays on Early Judaism and Christianity* (NovTSup ; Leiden: Brill).
- Forthcoming b 'The *Gestalt* of the High Priest in the Second Temple Period: An Anthropological Perspective', in Alice Hunt (ed.), *The Priesthood in the Second Temple Period* (LHBOTS; London and New York: T&T Clark International).
- Forthcoming c 'Hecataeus of Abdera and the Jewish Law: The Question of Authenticity'
- Forthcoming d 'Daniel: Sage, Seer ... and *Prophet*?' in L.L. Grabbe and M. Nissinen (eds), *Constructs of Prophecy in the Former and Latter Prophets and Daniel*.
- Grabbe, Lester L. (ed.)
- 1998 *Leading Captivity Captive: 'The Exile' as History and Ideology* (JSOTSup, 278; ESHM, 2; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- 2001 *Did Moses Speak Attic? Jewish Historiography and Scripture in the Hellenistic Period* (JSOTSup, 317; ESHM, 3; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Graf, David F.
- 1997a 'Hellenisation and the Decapolis', in idem, *Rome and the Arabian Frontier: From the Nabataeans to the Saracens* (Aldershot: Ashgate), pp. 1–48.
- 1997b 'Nabateans', *OEANE* 4: 82–85.
- Grainger, John D.
- 1990 *The Cities of Seleukid Syria* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- 1991 *Hellenistic Phoenicia* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- 1997 *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer* (Mnemosyne Supplement, 172; Leiden: Brill, 1997).
- Grayson, Andrew K.
- 1975 *Babylonian Historical-Literary Texts* (Toronto Semitic Texts and Studies; Toronto and Buffalo: University of Toronto Press).
- Greenfield, Jonas C. and Michael E. Stone
- 1979 'Remarks on the Aramaic Testament of Levi from the Geniza', *RB* 86: 214–30.
- Greenfield, Jonas C., Michael E. Stone and Esther Eshel
- 2004 *The Aramaic Levi Document: Edition, Translation, Commentary* (SVTP, 19; Leiden: Brill).

- Greenspoon, Leonard
1997 '“It's All Greek to Me”: Septuagint Studies Since 1968', *CR: BS* 5: 147–74.
- Grenfell, Bernard P.
1896 *Revenue Laws of Ptolemy Philadelphus, Edited from a Greek Papyrus in the Bodleian Library, with a Translation, Commentary, and Appendices* (with an Introduction by J.P. Mahaffy; Oxford: Clarendon).
- Grenfell, Bernard P. and Arthur S. Hunt (eds)
1906 *The Hibeh Papyri, Part I* (Egypt Exploration Fund, Graeco-Roman Branch; London: Egypt Exploration Society).
1907 *The Tebtunis Papyri, Part II* (University of California Publications, Graeco-Roman Archaeology Branch 2; London: Henry Frowde).
- Grenfell, Bernard P., Arthur S. Hunt and J. Gilbert Smyly (eds)
1902 *The Tebtunis Papyri, Part I* (University of California Publications, Graeco-Roman Archaeology Branch, 1; London: Henry Frowde).
- Griffiths, J. Gwyn
1987a 'Egypt and the Rise of the Synagogue', *JTS* 38: 1–15; repr. in Dan Urman and Paul V.M. Flesher (eds), *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery* (vols 1–2; SPB, 47; Leiden: Brill, 1995) 1: 3–16.
1987b 'Hellenistic Religions', *The Encyclopedia of Religion* (New York and London: Macmillan) 6: 252–66.
- Gruen, Erich S.
1984 *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (2 vols; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).
1996 'The Purported Jewish–Spartan Affiliation', in Robert W. Wallace and Edward M. Harris (eds), *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360–146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian* (Oklahoma Series in Classical Culture, 21; Norman: University of Oklahoma Press), pp. 254–69.
1997 'Fact and Fiction: Jewish Legends in a Hellenistic Context', in Paul Cartledge, Peter Garnsey and Erich Gruen (eds), *Hellenistic Constructs: Essays in Culture, History, and Historiography* (HCS, 26; Berkeley: University of California Press), pp. 72–88.
1998 *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (HCS, 30; Berkeley: University of California Press).
2001 'Jewish Perspectives on Greek Culture and Ethnicity', in Irad Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Center for Hellenic Studies; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), pp. 347–73.
2002 *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Haag, Ernst
2003 *Das hellenistische Zeitalter: Israel und die Bibel im 4. bis 1. Jahrhundert v. Chr.* (Biblische Enzyklopädie, 9; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).
- Hachlili, Rachel
1997 'The Origin of the Synagogue: A Re-assessment', *JSJ* 28: 34–47.
- Hadas, Moses
1951 *Aristeas to Philocrates* (Dropsie College Jewish Apocryphal Literature; New York: Harper; repr. New York: Ktav, 1973).
- Hall, Jonathan M.
1997 *Ethnic Identity in Greek Antiquity* (Cambridge: University of Cambridge Press).

- Halpern, Baruch
1988 *The First Historians: The Hebrew Bible and History* (San Francisco: Harper and Row).
- Halpern-Zylberstein, M.-C.
1989 'The Archeology of Hellenistic Palestine', *CHJ* 2: 1–34.
- Hamilton, J.R.
1969 *Plutarch Alexander: A Commentary* (Oxford: Clarendon).
- Hammond, N.G.L.
1983 *Three Historians of Alexander the Great: The So-called Vulgate Authors, Diodorus, Justin and Curtius* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
1993 *Sources for Alexander the Great: An Analysis of Plutarch's Life and Arrian's Anabasis Alexandrou* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Hanhart, Robert
1983 *Tobit* (Septuaginta, 8/5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
1999 *Studien zur Septuaginta und zum hellenistischen Judentum* (ed. Reinhard Gregor Kratz; FAT, 24; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Hansack, Ernst
1999 *Die altrussische Version des 'Jüdischen Krieges': Untersuchungen zur Integration der Namen* (Slavica, 1; Heidelberg: C. Winter).
- Hansen, E. V.
1971 *The Attalids of Pergamon* (Cornell Studies in Classical Philology, 36; Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press, 2nd edn).
- Hansen, Mogens Herman
1999 *The Athenian Democracy in the Age of Demosthenes: Structure, Principles, and Ideology* (London: Duckworth, 2nd edn).
- Harmatta, J.
1959 'Irano-Aramaica (Zur Geschichte des frühhellenistischen Judentums in Ägypten)', *Acta Antiqua* 7: 337–409.
- Harper Jr., G.M.
1928 'A Study in the Commercial Relations between Egypt and Syria in the Third Century Before Christ', *AJP* 49: 1–35.
1934 'Tax Contractors and their Relation to Tax Collection in Ptolemaic Egypt', *Aegyptus* 14: 47–64.
- Harrison, Robert
1994 'Hellenization in Syria-Palestine: The Case of Judea in the Third Century BCE', *BA* 57: 98–108.
- Hartman, L.F. and A.A. Di Lella
1978 *The Book of Daniel* (AB, 23; Garden City: Doubleday).
- Hatch, Edwin and Henry A. Redpath
1987 *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (including the Apocryphal Books)* (2 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press; repr. Graz: Akademische Druck, 1975).
- Hauben, Hans
1979 'A Jewish Shipowner in Third-Century Ptolemaic Egypt', *AncSoc* 10: 167–70.
1987 'Philocles, King of the Sidonians and General of the Ptolemies', in E. Lipiński (ed.), *Phoenicia and the Eastern Mediterranean in the First Millennium B.C.: Proceedings of the Conference Held in Leuven from the*

- 14th to the 16th of November 1985 (Studia Phoenicia, 5; OLA, 22; Leuven: Peeters), pp. 413–27.
- 2004 'A Phoenician King in the Service of the Ptolemies: Philocles of Sidon Revisited', *AncSoc* 34: 27–44.
- Hayward, C.T. Robert
- 1992 'The New Jerusalem in the Wisdom of Jesus ben Sira', *SJOT* 6: 123–38.
- Heinemann, Joseph
- 1977 *Prayer in the Talmud: Forms and Patterns* (Studia Judaica, 9; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
- Helm, Rudolf (ed.)
- 1956 *Die Chronik des Hieronymus* (Eusebius Werke, 7; GCS; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
- Hengel, Martin
- 1974 *Judaism and Hellenism* (2 vols; London: SCM; Philadelphia: Fortress); ET of *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zu ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur Mitte des 2 Jh.s v. Chr.* (WUNT 10; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2nd edn, 1973).
- 1980 *Jews, Greeks and Barbarians: Aspects of the Hellenization of Judaism in the pre-Christian Period* (Philadelphia: Fortress; London: SCM).
- 1989 *The 'Hellenization' of Judaea in the First Century after Christ* (London: SCM; Philadelphia: Trinity).
- Herbert, Sharon C. (ed.)
- 1994 *Tel Anafa I, i and ii: Final Report on Ten Years of Excavation at a Hellenistic and Roman Settlement in Northern Israel* (2 vols; Journal of Roman Archaeology, Supplementary Series 10 Part I, i–ii; Ann Arbor, MI: Kelsey Museum).
- 1997 *Tel Anafa II, i: The Hellenistic and Roman Pottery: The Plain Wares* (by Andrea Berlin) and *the Fine Wares* (by Kathleen Warner Slane) (Journal of Roman Archaeology, Supplementary Series 10 Part II, i; Ann Arbor, MI: Kelsey Museum).
- Herzog, Ze'ev, George Rapp, Jr and Ora Negbi (eds)
- 1989 *Excavations at Tel Michal, Israel* (Tel Aviv University Institute of Archaeology Publication, 8; Tel Aviv University; Minneapolis: University of Minneapolis).
- Hieronymus (Jerome)
- 1964 *S. Hieronymi Presbyteri Opera: Pars I, Opera Exegetica 5: Commentariorum in Daniele, Libri III (IV)* (Corpus Christianorum, Series Latina 75A; Turnholt: Brepols).
- Hinnells, John R.
- 1973 'The Zoroastrian Doctrine of Salvation in the Roman World', in E.J. Sharpe and John R. Hinnells (eds), *Man and His Salvation: Studies in Memory of S. G. F. Brandon* (Manchester University Press) 125–48; repr. in idem, *Zoroastrian and Parsi Studies: Selected Works of John R. Hinnells* (Aldershot: Ashgate, 2000).
- Hoffmann, Adolf
- 2001 'Hellenistic Gadara', *SHAJ* 7: 391–97.
- Hoffman, Lawrence A.
- 1995 'Jewish Liturgy and Jewish Scholarship', in Jacob Neusner (ed.), *Judaism in Late Antiquity: Part 1 The Literary and Archaeological Sources* (HdO: Erste Abteilung, der Nahe und Mittlere Osten 17/1; Leiden: Brill), pp. 239–66.

Hölbl, Günther

- 2001 *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire* (trans. Tina Saavedra; London: Routledge); ET of *Geschichte des Ptolemäerreiches: Politik, Ideologie und religiöse Kultur von Alexander dem Grossen bis zur römischen Eroberung* (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft, 1994).

Holladay, Carl R.

- 1983 *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. I, Historians* (TT, 20; Pseudepigrapha Series 10; Atlanta: Scholars Press)
- 1989 *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. II, Poets: The Epic Poets Theodotus and Philo and Ezekiel the Tragedian* (TT, 30; Pseudepigrapha Series 12; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 1995 *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. III, Aristobulus* (TT, 39; Pseudepigrapha Series 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 1996 *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors: vol. IV, Orphica* (TT, 40; Pseudepigrapha Series 14; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Holleaux, Maurice

- 1942 'La chronologie de la Cinquième Guerre de Syrie', in idem, *Études d'épigraphie et d'histoire grecques: Tome III Lagides et Séleucides* (L'Académie des Inscriptions et Belles-Lettres; Paris: E. de Boccard), pp. 317–35; originally published in *Klio* 8 (1908): 267–81.

Honigman, Sylvie

- 1993 'The Birth of a Diaspora: The Emergence of a Jewish Self-Definition in Ptolemaic Egypt in the Light of Onomastics', in Shaye J.D. Cohen and Ernest S. Frerichs (eds), *Diasporas in Antiquity* (BJS, 288; Atlanta: Scholars Press), pp. 93–127.
- 2002a 'The Jewish *Politeuma* at Heracleopolis', *SCI* 21: 251–66.
- 2002b 'Les divers sens de l'éthnique Ἀραψ dans les sources documentaires grecques d'Égypte', *AncSoc* 32: 43–72.
- 2003 '*Politeumata* and Ethnicity in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt', *AncSoc* 33: 61–102.
- 2004 'Abraham in Egypt: Hebrew and Jewish-Aramaic Names in Egypt and Judaea in Hellenistic and Early Roman Times', *ZPE* 146: 279–97.

Hopkins, Keith

- 1983 'Introduction', in Peter Garnsey, Keith Hopkins and C. R. Whittaker (eds), *Trade in the Ancient Economy* (London: Chatto & Windus), pp. ix–xxv.

Horbury, William and David Noy

- 1992 *Jewish Inscriptions of Graeco-Roman Egypt* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Hornblower, Jane

- 1981 *Hieronymus of Cardia* (Oxford Classical and Philosophical Monographs; Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Hornblower, Simon

- 1982 *Mausolus* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- 1983 *The Greek World 479–323 BC* (London and New York: Methuen).
- 1987 *Thucydides* (Baltimore: Johns Hopkins).

Hornblower, Simon (ed.)

- 1994 *Greek Historiography* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).

Hornblower, Simon and Antony Spawforth (eds)

- 1996 *The Oxford Classical Dictionary* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 3rd edn) = *OCD*

- Horowitz, G.
1980 'Town Planning of Hellenistic Marisa: A Reappraisal of the Excavations after Eighty Years', *PEQ* 112: 93–111.
- Horley, G.H.R.
1981 *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity: A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri Published in 1976* (Ancient History Documentary Research Centre; Sydney: Macquarie University).
- Horst, Pieter W. van der
1994 'Silent Prayer', in idem, *Hellenism – Judaism – Christianity: Essays on Their Interaction* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology, 8; Kampen: Kok), pp. 252–77; originally published in *Numen* 41 (1994).
1998 'Neglected Greek Evidence for Early Jewish Liturgical Prayer', *JSJ* 29: 278–96.
1999 'Was the Synagogue a Place of Sabbath Worship before 70 CE?', in Steven Fine (ed.), *Jews, Christians, and Polytheists in the Ancient Synagogue: Cultural Interaction during the Greco-Roman Period* (Baltimore Studies in the History of Judaism; London and New York: Routledge), pp. 18–43.
- Horst, Pieter W. van der and Gregory E. Sterling
2000 *Prayers from the Ancient World: Greco-Roman, Jewish and Christian Prayers* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity, 13; South Bend, IN: Notre Dame).
- Houghton, Arthur
1990–91 'Two Late Seleucid Lead Issues from the Levant', *INJ* 11: 26–31.
2003–2006 'Some Observations on Coordinated Bronze Currency Systems in Seleucid Syria and Phoenicia', *INJ* 15: 35–47.
- Houghton, Arthur and Catharine Lorber
2000–2002 'Antiochus III in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia', *INJ* 14: 44–58.
- Howard, George
1977 'The Tetragram and the New Testament', *JBL* 96: 63–83.
- Hughes, George R. and Richard Jasnow (with a contribution by James G. Keenan)
1997 *Oriental Institute Hawara Papyri: Demotic and Greek Texts from an Egyptian Family Archive in the Fayum (Fourth to Third Century B.C.)* (Oriental Institute Publication, 113; Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago).
- Huizinga, Johan
1936 'A Definition of the Concept of History', in Raymond Klibansky and H.J. Paton (eds), *Philosophy and History: Essays Presented to Ernst Cassirer* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp. 1–10.
- Hultgård, Anders
1983 'Forms and Origins of Iranian Apocalypticism', in David Hellholm (ed.), *Apocalypticism in the Mediterranean World and the Near East: Proceedings of the International Colloquium on Apocalypticism, Uppsala, August 12–17, 1979* (Tübingen: Mohr[Siebeck]), pp. 387–411.
1991 'Bahman Yasht: A Persian Apocalypse', in John J. Collins and James H. Charlesworth (eds), *Mysteries and Revelations: Apocalyptic Studies since the Uppsala Colloquium* (JSPSup, 9; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press), pp. 114–34.
1999 'Persian Apocalypticism', in John J. Collins (ed.), *The Encyclopedia of Apocalypticism: vol. 1, The Origins of Apocalypticism in Judaism and Christianity* (New York: Continuum), pp. 39–83.

- Humphries, W.L.
1973 'A Life-Style for Diaspora: A Study of the Tales of Esther and Daniel', *JBL* 92: 211–23.
- Hunt, Arthur S. and C.C. Edgar (eds)
1932 *Select Papyri 1: Private Affairs* (LCL, 266; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
1934 *Select Papyri 2: Official Documents* (LCL, 282; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Hunt, Arthur S. and J. Gilbert Smyly (eds)
1933 *The Tebtunis Papyri, Volume III, Part I* (University of California Publications, Graeco-Roman Archaeology, 3; Egyptian Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs, 23; London: Humphrey Milford).
- Hunt, Arthur S., J. Gilbert Smyly and C.C. Edgar (eds)
1938 *The Tebtunis Papyri, Volume III, Part II* (University of California Publications, Graeco-Roman Archaeology, 4; Egyptian Exploration Society, Graeco-Roman Memoirs, 25; London: Humphrey Milford).
- Huß, Werner
1976 *Untersuchungen zur Außenpolitik Ptolemaios' IV* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 69; Munich: Beck).
1985 *Geschichte der Karthager* (Handbuch der Altertumswissenschaft, 3/8; Munich: Beck).
1994 *Der makedonische König und die ägyptischen Priester: Studien zur Geschichte des ptolemäischen Ägypten* (Historia-Einzelschriften, 85; Stuttgart: Steiner).
2001 *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit: 332–30 v. Chr.* (Munich: Beck).
- Hutchinson, John, and Anthony D. Smith (eds)
1996 *Ethnicity* (Oxford Readers; Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Hüttenmeister, F. and G. Reeg
1977 *Die antiken Synagogen in Israel* (2 vols; Beihefte zum Tübinger Atlas des Vorderen Orients, Reihe B, Nr. 12; Wiesbaden: Reichert).
- Ilan, Tal
2002 *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity, Part I: Palestine 330 BCE–200 CE* (TSAJ, 91; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Irwin, Robert
2006 *For Lust of Knowing: The Orientalists and their Enemies* (London: Allen Lane).
- Isaac, Benjamin
1991 'A Seleucid Inscription from Jamnia-on-the-Sea: Antiochus V Eupator and the Sidonians', *IEJ* 41: 132–44.
- Jackson, David R.
2004 *Enochic Judaism: Three Defining Paradigm Exemplars* (LSTS, 49; London and New York: T&T Clark International).
- Jacob, Edmond
1958 'L'histoire d'Israël vue par Ben Sira', in *Mélanges bibliques rédigés en l'honneur de André Robert* (Travaux de l'Institut Catholique de Paris, 4; Paris: Bloud & Gay), pp. 288–94.
- Jacobson, Howard
1983 *The 'Exagoge' of Ezekiel* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
2006 'Artapanus Judaeus', *JJS* 57: 210–21.

- Jacoby, Felix
1912 '4) Hekataios von Abdera', *PW* 7: 2750–69; repr. in idem, *Griechische Historiker* (Stuttgart: Alfred Druckenmüller Verlag, 1956), pp. 227–37.
1926–58 *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker* (Parts 1–17; Berlin: Weidman) = *FGH*.
- Jähne, Armin
1974 'Die "Syrische Frage"', Seleukeia in Pierien und die Ptolemäer', *Klio* 56: 501–19.
- Jasnow, Richard
1997 'The Greek Alexander Romance and Demotic Egyptian Literature', *JNES* 56: 95–103.
- Jeansonne, S.P.
1988 *The Old Greek Translation of Daniel 7–12* (CBQMS 19; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association).
- Jellicoe, Sydney
1968 *The Septuagint and Modern Study* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Jeselson, D.
1974 'A New Coin Type with Hebrew Inscription', *IEJ* 24: 77–78.
- Ji, Chang-Ho C.
2001 'ʿIrāq al-ʿAmir and the Hellenistic Settlements in Central and Northern Jordan', *SHAJ* 7: 379–89.
- Ji, Chang-Ho and Jong Keun Lee
2004 'From the Tobiads to the Hasmoneans: The Hellenistic Pottery, Coins, and History in the Regions of ʿIrāq al-ʿAmir and the Wādī Ḥisbān', *SHAJ* 8: 177–88.
- Jobes, Karen H.
1996 *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text* (SBLDS, 153; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Jobes, Karen H. and Moisés Silva
2000 *Invitation to the Septuagint* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Books; Carlisle: Paternoster).
- Johnson, Carl G.
1995 'Ptolemy V and the Rosetta Decree: The Egyptianization of the Ptolemaic Kingship', *AncSoc* 26: 145–55.
- Johnson, Janet H.
1974 'The Demotic Chronicle as an Historical Source', *Enchoria* 4: 1–17.
1984 'Is the Demotic Chronicle an Anti-Greek Tract?' in H.-J. Thissen and K.-T. Zauzich (eds), *Grammata Demotika: Festschrift für Erich Lüddeckens zum 15. Juni 1983* (Würzburg: Zauzich), pp. 107–24.
- Johnson, Sara Raup
2004 *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in its Cultural Context* (HCS, 43; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).
- Jones, A.H.M.
1940 *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Jones, Christopher P. and Christian Habicht
1989 'A Hellenistic Inscription from Arsinoe in Cilicia', *Phoenix* 43: 317–46.
- Jones, Siân
1997 *The Archaeology of Ethnicity: Constructing Identities in the Past and Present* (London and New York: Routledge).

- Jonge, Marinus de with H.W. Hollander, H.J. de Jonge and T. Korteweg
 1978 *The Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: A Critical Edition of the Greek Text* (PVTG, 1.2; Leiden: Brill).
- Kabasele Mukenge, André
 1998 *L'unité littéraire du livre de Baruch* (Études bibliques, nouvelle série 38; Paris: Librairie Lecoivre, Gabalda).
- Kákosy, L.
 1966 'Prophecies of Ram Gods', *Acta Orientalia* 19: 341–56.
- Kamp, Kathryn A. and Norman Yoffee
 1980 'Ethnicity in Ancient Western Asia During the Early Second Millennium B. C.: Archaeological Assessments and Ethnoarchaeological Prospectives', *BASOR* 237: 85–104.
- Kaplan, J.
 1972 'The Archaeology and History of Tel Aviv-Jaffa', *BA* 35: 66–95.
- Kasher, Aryeh
 1985 *The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights* (TSAJ, 7; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
 1988 *Jews, Idumaeans, and Ancient Arabs: Relations of the Jews in Eretz-Israel with the Nations of the Frontier and the Desert during the Hellenistic and Roman Era (332 BCE–70 CE)* (TSAJ, 18; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Forthcoming 'Further Revised Thoughts on Josephus' Report of Alexander's Campaign to Palestine (Ant. 11: 304–347)', in Lester L. Grabbe and Oded Lipschits (eds), *Judah in Transition: From the Late Persian to the Early Hellenistic Period (Fourth to Second Century BCE)* (LSTS; London and New York: T&T Clark International).
- Kazis, I. J.
 1962 *The Book of the Gestes of Alexander of Macedon* (Cambridge, MA: Medieval Academy of America).
- Keenan, James G. and John C. Shelton (eds)
 1976 *The Tebtunis Papyri, Volume IV* (Graeco-Roman Memoirs, 64; London: Egypt Exploration Society).
- Kessler, John
 2007 'Diaspora and Homeland in the Early Achaemenid Period: Community, Geography and Demography in Zechariah 1–8', in Jon E. Berquist (ed.), *Approaching Yehud: New Approaches to the Study of the Persian Period* (SBLSS, 50; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature), pp. 137–66.
- Keyes, Charles F.
 1997 'Ethnic Groups, Ethnicity', in Thomas Barfield (ed.), *The Dictionary of Anthropology* (Oxford: Blackwell), pp. 152–54.
- Kiley, Mark et al.
 1997 *Prayer from Alexander to Constantine: A Critical Anthology* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Killebrew, Ann E.
 2005 *Biblical Peoples and Ethnicity: An Archaeological Study of Egyptians, Canaanites, Philistines, and Early Israel 1300–1000 B.C.E.* (SBLABS, 9; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
- Kippenberg, Hans G.
 1982 *Religion und Klassenbildung im antiken Judäa* (SUNT, 14; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd edn).

- Kim, Tae Hun
2003 'The Dream of Alexander in Josephus *Ant.* 11.325–39', *JSJ* 34: 425–42.
- Kim, Uriah Y.
2005 *Decolonizing Josiah: Toward a Postcolonial Reading of the Deuteronomistic History* (The Bible in the Modern World, 5; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix Press).
- Kindler, A.
1974 'Silver Coins Bearing the Name of Judea from the Early Hellenistic Period', *IEJ* 24: 73–76.
- Kletter, Raz
2006 'Can a Proto-Israelite Please Stand Up? Notes on the Ethnicity of Iron Age Israel and Judah', in Aren M. Maeir and Pierre de Miroschedji (eds), *I Will Speak the Riddles of Ancient Times': Archaeological and Historical Studies in Honor of Amihai Mazar on the Occasion of his Sixtieth Birthday* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), pp. 573–86.
- Klinkott, Hilmar
2000 *Die Satrapienregister der Alexander- und Diadochenzeit* (Historia-Einzelschriften, 145; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner Verlag).
- Kloner, Amos
2001 'The Economy of Hellenistic Maresha: Inferences Based on the City Plan and Archaeological Finds', in Z.H. Archibald, J. Davies, V. Gabrielsen and G.J. Oliver (eds), *Hellenistic Economies* (London and New York: Routledge), pp. 103–31.
- Forthcoming 'The Introduction of the Greek Language and Culture in the Third Century BCE: according to the Archaeological Evidence in Idumaea', in Lester L. Grabbe and Oded Lipschits (eds), *Judah in Transition: From the Late Persian to the Early Hellenistic Period (Fourth to Second Century BCE)* (LSTS; London and New York: T&T Clark International).
- Kloner, Amos (ed.)
2003 *Maresha Excavations Final Report I: Subterranean Complexes 21, 44, 70* (IAA Reports, 17; Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority).
- Kloner, Amos, Esther Eshel and H. Korzakova
Forthcoming *Maresha Excavations Finds, Report II: Epigraphy* (IAA Reports; Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority).
- Knibb, Michael A.
1978 *The Ethiopic Book of Enoch* (vols 1–2; Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Koch, Klaus
1995 *Die Reiche der Welt und der kommende Menschensohn: Studien zum Danielbuch (Gesammelte Aufsätze 2)* (ed. Martin Rösler; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).
- 1997 *Europa, Rom und der Kaiser vor dem Hintergrund von zwei Jahrtausenden Rezeption des Buches Daniel* (Berichte aus den Sitzungen der Joachim Jungius-Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften E.V. Hamburg, Jahrgang 15, Heft 1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- 2005 *Daniel, 1. Teilband Dan 1–4* (BKAT, 22/1; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).
- Koenen, Ludwig
1968 'Die Prophezeiungen des "Töpfers"', *ZPE* 2: 178–209.
- 1970 'The Prophecies of a Potter: A Prophecy of World Renewal Becomes an Apocalypse', in Deborah H. Samuel (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth*

- International Congress of Papyrology* (American Studies in Papyrology, 7; Toronto: A.M. Hakkert), pp. 249–54.
- 1985 'The Dream of Nektanebos', *Bulletin of the American Society of Papyrologists* 22: 171–94.
- Koh, Y.V.
2006 *Royal Autobiography in the Book of Qoheleth* (BZAW, 369; Berlin: de Gruyter).
- König, Friedrich Wilhelm
1972 *Die Persika des Ktesias von Knidos* (Archiv für Orientforschung Beiheft 18; Graz: Archiv für Orientforschung).
- Kottek, Samuel S.
1995 *Medicine and Hygiene in the Works of Flavius Josephus* (Studies in Ancient Medicine, 9; Leiden: Brill).
- Kreissig, H.
1978 *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im Seleukidenreich: Die Eigentums und die Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse* (Akademie der Wissenschaften, Schriften zur Geschichte und Kultur der Antike, 16; Berlin: Akademie).
- Krüger, Thomas
2000 *Kohelet (Prediger)* (BKAT, 19; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag).
- Kugel, James
2007 'How Old Is the Aramaic Levi Document?' *DSD* 14: 291–312.
- Kugler, Robert A.
1996 *From Patriarch to Priest: The Levi-Priestly Tradition from Aramaic Levi to Testament of Levi* (SBLEJL, 9; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Kunnen, Hans-Peter
1990 *Palästina in griechisch-römischer Zeit* (HdA, Vorderasien 2, Band 2; Munich: Beck).
- Kuhrt, Amélie
1987 'Berossus' *Babyloniaka* and Seleucid Rule in Babylonia', in Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East* (London: Duckworth), pp. 32–56.
- Kuhrt, Amélie and Susan Sherwin-White (eds)
1987 *Hellenism in the East* (London: Duckworth).
- Kuhs, Clemens
1996 *Das Dorf Samareia im griechisch-römischen Ägypten: eine papyrologische Untersuchung* (MA thesis: University of Heidelberg; Heidelberg: Institute für Papyrologie), available at <www.ub.uni-heidelberg.de/archiv/479/> (accessed 13 June 2007).
- Kushnir-Stern, Alla
2002 'New Hellenistic Lead Weights from Palestine and Phoenicia', *IEJ* 52: 225–30.
- Kvanvig, Helge S.
1988 *Roots of Apocalyptic: The Mesopotamian Background of the Enoch Figure and of the Son of Man* (WMANT, 61; Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener).
- La Barre, W.
1971 'Materials for a History of Studies of Crisis Cults: A Bibliographic Essay', *Current Anthropology* 12: 3–44.
- Lacocque, André
1999 'The Different Versions of Esther', *Biblical Interpretation* 7: 301–22.

- Landau, Y.H.
1966 'A Greek Inscription Found Near Hefzibah', *IEJ* 16: 54–70.
- Lanfranchi, Pierluigi
2006 *L'Exagoge d'Ezéchiel le Tragique: Introduction, texte, traduction et commentaire* (SVTP, 21; Leiden: Brill).
- Lapp, Nancy L. (ed.)
1983 *The Excavations at Araq el-Emir*: vol. 1 (AASOR, 47; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).
- Lapp, Paul W.
1963 'Ptolemaic Stamped Handles from Judah', *BASOR* 172: 22–35.
- Lapp, Paul and Nancy Lapp
1992 'Iraq el-Emir', *NEAEHL* 2: 646–49.
- Laqueur, R.
1930 'Manethon', *PW* 14: 1060–1101.
- Lebram, J.C.H.
1974 'Perspektiven der Gegenwärtigen Danielforschung', *JSJ* 5: 1–33.
- LeFebvre, Michael
2006 *Collections, Codes, and Torah: The Re-characterization of Israel's Written Law* (LHBOTS, 451; New York and London: T&T Clark International).
- Lee, Eunny P.
2005 *The Vitality of Enjoyment in Qohelet's Theological Rhetoric* (BZAW, 353; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
- Lee, J.A.L.
1983 *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (SBLSCS, 14; Chico, CA: Scholars Press).
- Lemaire, André and Hélène Lozachmeur
1987 'Biräh/birtā' en Araméen' *Syria* 64: 261–66.
- Lemche, Niels Peter
1993 'The Old Testament – A Hellenistic Book?' *SJOT* 7: 163–93.
- Lenger, Marie-Thérèse
1964 *Corpus des Ordonnances des Ptolémées* (Académie Royale de Belgique, Classe Des Lettres, Mémoires, 56/5; Brussels: Palais des Académies).
- Le Rider, G.
1995 'La politique monétaire des Séleucides en Coelé Syrie et en Phénicie après 200: Réflexions sur les monnaies d'argent Lagides et sur les monnaies d'argent Séleucides à l'aigle', *BCH* 119: 391–404.
- Lesky, Albin
1966 *A History of Greek Literature* (trans. J. Willis and C. de Heer; New York: Thomas Crowell), pp. 216–19; ET of *Geschichte der griechischen Literatur* (Bern: Francke, 1957–58).
- Levine, Lee I. (ed.)
1981 *Ancient Synagogues Revealed* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
- Lewis, Naphtali
1986 *Greeks in Ptolemaic Egypt: Case Studies in the Social History of the Hellenistic World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Lewy, Hans
1932 'Hekataios von Abdera', *ZNW* 31: 117–32.
- Lieberman, Saul
1962 *Hellenism in Jewish Palestine* (Texts and Studies of the Jewish Theological Seminary, 18; New York: Jewish Theological Seminary).

- 1963 'How Much Greek in Jewish Palestine?' in A. Altmann (ed.), *Biblical and Other Studies* (Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Studies and Texts, 1; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), pp. 123–41.
- 1965 *Greek in Jewish Palestine* (New York: P. Feldheim, 2nd edn).
- Liebesny, Herbert
- 1936 'Ein Erlass des Königs Ptolemaios II Philadelphos über die Deklaration von Vieh und Sklaven in Syrien und Phonikien (PER Inv. Nr. 24.552 gr.)', *Aegyptus* 16: 257–91.
- Liesen, Jan
- 2000 *Full of Praise: An Exegetical Study of Sir 39,12–35* (JSJSup, 64; Leiden: Brill).
- Lindsay, Dennis R.
- 1993 *Josephus and Faith: Pistis and Pisteuein as Faith Terminology in the Writings of Flavius Josephus and in the New Testament* (AGAJU, 19; Leiden: Brill).
- Lipschits, Oded
- 2003 'Demographic Changes in Judah between the Seventh and the Fifth Centuries B.C.E.', in Oded Lipschits and Joseph Blenkinsopp (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), pp. 323–76.
- 2005 *The Fall and Rise of Jerusalem: Judah under Babylonian Rule* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).
- Lipschits, Oded and Oren Tal
- 2007 'The Settlement Archaeology of the Province of Judah', in Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers and Rainer Albertz (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), pp. 33–52.
- Lipschits, Oded and David Vanderhooft
- 2007a 'Yehud Stamp Impressions: History of Discovery and Newly-Published Impressions', *TA* 34: 3–11.
- 2007b 'Summary Data of Yehud Stamp Impressions, Arranged by Type', *TA* 34: 114–20.
- Lipschits, Oded, Gary N. Knoppers and Rainer Albertz (eds)
- 2007 *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).
- Lipschits, Oded, Manfred Oeming, Yuval Gadot and David Vanderhooft
- 2007 'Seventeen Newly-Excavated Yehud Stamp Impressions from Ramat Rahel', *TA* 34: 74–89.
- Lloyd, A. B.
- 1982 'Nationalist Propaganda in Ptolemaic Egypt', *Historia* 31: 33–55.
- Loader, J. A.
- 1979 *Polar Structures in the Book of Kohelet* (BZAW, 152; Berlin: de Gruyter).
- Lohfink, Norbert
- 1998 *Studien zu Kohelet* (Stuttgarter Biblische Aufsatzbände, 26; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk).
- 2003 *Qoheleth* (trans. Sean McEvenue; Continental Commentary; Minneapolis: Fortress); ET and revision of *Kohelet* (Die neue Echter Bibel; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1980).
- Lorber, Catherine C.
- 2006 'The Last Ptolemaic Bronze Emission of Tyre', *INR* 1: 15–20.

- Loretz, Oswald
1964 *Qohelet und der alte Orient* (Freiburg: Herder).
- Lorton, David
1971 'The Supposed Expedition of Ptolemy II to Persia', *JEA* 57: 160–64.
- Lüderitz, Gert
1994 'What is the Politeuma?' in Jan Willem van Henten and Pieter Willem van der Horst (eds), *Studies in Early Jewish Epigraphy* (AGAJU, 21; Leiden: Brill), pp. 183–225.
- Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel and Katrin Hauspie
2003 *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft, 2nd edn).
- Ma, John
1999 *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- McClellan, Murray C.
1997 'The Economy of Hellenistic Egypt and Syria: An Archeological Perspective', in B.B. Price (ed.), *Ancient Economic Thought*: vol. 1 (Routledge Studies in the History of Economics; London and New York: Routledge), pp. 172–87.
- McCown, C.C.
1957 'The 'Araq el-Emir and the Tobiads', *BA* 20: 63–76.
- MacDonald, Burton, Russell Adams and Piotr Bienkowski (eds)
2001 *The Archaeology of Jordan* (Levantine Archaeology, 1; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Macfie, A.L.
2002 *Orientalism* (Edinburgh and London: Pearson Education).
- Mack, Burton L.
1985 *Wisdom and the Hebrew Epic: Ben Sira's Hymn in Praise of the Fathers* (Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism; Chicago and London: University of Chicago Press).
- McKay, Heather A.
1994 *Sabbath and Synagogue: The Question of Sabbath Worship in Ancient Judaism* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, 122; Leiden: Brill).
1998 'Ancient Synagogues: The Continuing Dialectic Between Two Major Views', *CR: BS* 6: 103–42.
- McLay, Tim
1996 *The OG and Th Versions of Daniel* (SBLSCS, 43; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- McLeod, John
2000 *Beginning Postcolonialism* (Beginnings; Manchester: Manchester University Press).
- McNamara, Martin
1970 'Nabonidus and the Book of Daniel', *ITQ* 37: 131–49.
- Mader, Gottfried
2000 *Josephus and the Politics of Historiography: Apologetic and Impression Management in the Bellum Judaicum* (Mnemosyne, 205; Leiden: Brill).
- Magen, Yitzhak
2007 'The Dating of the First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim in Light of the Archaeological Evidence', in Oded Lipschits, Gary N. Knoppers and Rainer Albertz (eds), *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century B.C.E.* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns), pp. 157–211.

- Magen, Yitzhak and Benny Har-Even
 2007 'Persian Period Stamp Impressions for Nebi Samwil', *TA* 34: 38–58.
- Magen, Yitzhak, Haggai Misgav and Levana Tsfania
 2004 *Mount Gerizim Excavations*: vol. I, *The Aramaic, Hebrew and Samaritan Inscriptions* (Judea and Samaria Publications, 2; Jerusalem: Israel Antiquities Authority).
- Magie, David
 1950 *Roman Rule in Asia Minor, to the End of the Third Century after Christ* (2 vols; Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Manning, Joseph G.
 2003 *Land and Power in Ptolemaic Egypt: The Structure of Land Tenure* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Manning, Joseph G. and Ian Morris (eds)
 2005 *The Ancient Economy: Evidence and Models* (Social Science History; Stanford: Stanford University Press).
- Marcus, Ralph
 1934 'Appendix C. Alexander the Great and the Jews', in Ralph Marcus (ed.), *Josephus*, vol. 6 (LCL; London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard), pp. 512–32.
 1937 Notes and appendices in H.St.J. Thackery et al. (eds), *Josephus*, vol. 6 (LCL; London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
 1943a Notes and appendices in H.St.J. Thackery et al. (eds), *Josephus*, vol. 7 (LCL; London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
 1943b 'Appendix B: The Date of the High Priest Simon the Just (the Righteous)', in H.St.J. Thackery et al. (eds) *Josephus*, vol. 7 (LCL; London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard), pp. 732–36.
 1943c 'Appendix D. Antiochus III and the Jews (*Ant.* xii. 129–153)', in H.St.J. Thackery et al. (eds), *Josephus*, vol. 7 (LCL; London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), pp. 743–66.
- Maresch, Klaus and James M.S. Cowey
 2003 '"A Recurrent Inclination to Isolate the Case of the Jews from their Ptolemaic Environment"? Eine Antwort auf Sylvie Honigman', *AncSoc* 22: 307–10.
- Marincola, John
 1997 *Authority and Tradition in Ancient Historiography* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Martin, James D.
 1986 'Ben Sira's Hymn to the Fathers: A Messianic Perspective', in A.S. van der Woude (ed.), *Crises and Perspectives* (OTS, 24; Leiden: Brill), pp. 107–23.
- Mason, Steve
 2001 *Flavius Josephus, Translation and Commentary*: vol 9, *Life of Josephus* (Leiden: Brill).
 2005 'Of Audience and Meaning: Reading Josephus' *Bellum Judaicum* in the Context of a Flavian Audience', in J. Sievers and G. Lembi (eds), *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (JSJSup, 104; Leiden: Brill), pp. 71–100.
- Mason, Steve (ed.)
 1998 *Understanding Josephus: Seven Perspectives* (JSPSup, 32; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).

- Master, Daniel M., John M. Monson, Egon H.E. Lass and George A. Pierce (eds), with contributions by Timothy Larsen, Gabriel Barkay, A. Asa Eger, Philip Johnston, Kyle H. Keimer and Blake Sawicky
 2005 *Dothan I: Remains from the Tell (1953–1964)* (The Excavations of Joseph P. Free at Dothan [1953–1964]; Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).
- Mazar, Amihai
 2006 *Excavations at Tel Beth-Shean 1989–1996: vol. I, From the Late Bronze Age IIB to the Medieval Period* (Hebrew University Institute of Archaeology, The Beth-Shean Valley Archaeological Project Publication, 1; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
- Mazar, Benjamin
 1957 'The Tobiards', *IEJ* 7: 137–45, 229–38 (revision of articles in *Tarbiz* 12 [1941]: 109–23 and *EI* 4 [1956]: 249–51).
- Mazar, Benjamin, Trude Dothan and I. Dunayevsky
 1966 *En-Gedi: The First and Second Seasons of Excavations 1961–1962* ('Atiqot, English Series, 5; Jerusalem: Department of Antiquities and Museums).
- Meadowcroft, T.J.
 1995 *Aramaic Daniel and Greek Daniel: A Literary Comparision* (JSOTSup, 198; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press).
- Mendels, Doran
 1983 'Hecataeus of Abdera and a Jewish "patrios politeia" of the Persian Period (Diodorus Siculus XL, 3)', *ZAW* 95: 96–110.
- Meshorer, Ya'kov
 1982 *Ancient Jewish Coinage: vol. I, Persian Period through Hasmonaeans; vol. II, Herod the Great through Bar Kokhba* (New York: Amphora).
 1990–91 'Ancient Jewish Coinage: Addendum I', *INJ* 11: 104–32.
- Meyers, Eric M.
 1992 'The Challenge of Hellenism for Early Judaism and Christianity', *BA* 55: 84–91.
 1994 'Second Temple Studies in the Light of Recent Archaeology: Part I: The Persian and Hellenistic Periods', *CR: BS* 2: 25–42.
- Milik, Josef T.
 1976 *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4* (Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Millar, Fergus
 1978 'The Background to the Maccabean Revolution: Reflections on Martin Hengel's Judaism and Hellenism', *JJS* 29: 1–21.
 1983 'The Phoenician Cities: A Case-Study of Hellenisation', *Proceedings of the Cambridge Philological Association* 209: 55–71.
 1987 'The Problem of Hellenistic Syria', in Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East* (London: Duckworth), pp. 110–33.
- Miller, Douglas B.
 2002 *Symbol and Rhetoric in Ecclesiastes: The Place of Hebel in Qohelet's Work* (SBL Academia Biblica, 2; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature).
- Mitchel, Larry A.
 1992 *Hellenistic and Roman Strata: A Study of the Stratigraphy of Tell Hesban from the 2nd Century B.C. to the 4th Century A.D.* (Hesban, 7; Berrien Springs, MI: Andrews University Press).
- Mittwoch, A.
 1955 'Tribute and Land-tax in Seleucid Judaea', *Bib* 36: 352–61.

Modrzejewski, Joseph Méléze

- 1966 'La règle de droit dans l'Égypte ptolémaïque (Etat des questions et perspectives de recherches)', in *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles* (American Studies in Papyrology, 1; New Haven, CT: American Society of Papyrologists), pp. 125–73.
- 1975 'Chrématistes et laocrites', in Jean Bingen, Guy Cambier and Georges Nachtergaele (eds), *Le monde grec: Hommages à Claire Préaux* (Université Libre de Bruxelles, Faculté de Philosophie et Lettres, 52; Brussels: Éditions de l'Université de Bruxelles), pp. 699–708.
- 1990 'L'image du Juif dans la pensée grecque vers 300 avant notre ère', in A. Kasher, U. Rappaport and G. Fuks (eds), *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel: Collected Essays* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp. 105–18.
- 1993 'How to be a Jew in Hellenistic Egypt?' in Shaye J. D. Cohen and Ernest S. Frerichs (eds), *Diasporas in Antiquity* (BJS, 288; Atlanta: Scholars Press), pp. 65–92.
- 1995 *The Jews of Egypt: From Rameses II to Emperor Hadrian* (trans. Robert Cornman; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society; Edinburgh: T&T Clark); ET of *Les Juifs d'Égypte, de Ramses II à Hadrien* (Paris: Editions Armand Colin, 1992).

Moehring, Horst R.

- 1975 'The *Acta pro Judaeis* in the *Antiquities* of Flavius Josephus', in Jacob Neusner (ed.), *Christianity, Judaism and Other Greco-Roman Cults* (vols 1–4; SJLA, 12; Leiden: Brill) 3: 124–58.
- 1980 Review of Cohen, *Josephus in Galilee and Rome*, *JJS* 31: 240–42.
- 1984 'Joseph ben Matthia and Flavius Josephus: The Jewish Prophet and Roman Historian', *ANRW II*: 21.2: 864–944.

Momigliano, Arnaldo

- 1931–32 'I Tobiadi nella preistoria del Moto Maccabaico', *Atti della Reale Accademia delle Scienze di Torino* 67: 165–200; repr. in idem, *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del mondo antico* (Storia et Letteratura 135; Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1975), pp. 597–628.
- 1970 Review of M. Hengel, *Judentum und Hellenismus*, *JTS* 21: 149–53; = *Quinto contributo alla storia degli studi classici e del Mondo Antico* (Storia e Letteratura, 136; Rome: Edizioni di Storia e Letteratura, 1975), pp. 931–36; = in H.A. Fischel (ed.), *Essays in Greco-Roman and Related Talmudic Literature* (Library of Biblical Studies; New York: Ktav, 1977), pp. 495–99.
- 1975 *Alien Wisdom: The Limits of Hellenization* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- 1979 'Flavius Josephus and Alexander's Visit to Jerusalem', *Athaeneum* 57: 442–48.
- 1981 'Greek Culture and the Jews', in Moses I. Finley (ed.), *The Legacy of Greece: A New Appraisal* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp. 325–46.
- 1982 Review of Gauger, *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik*, *CP* 77: 258–61.
- 1990 *The Classical Foundations of Modern Historiography* (with a foreword by Riccardo Di Donato; Sather Classical Lectures, 54; Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).

Montgomery, James A.

- 1927 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

- Moore, Carey A.
 1977 *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions* (AB, 44; Garden City, NY: Doubleday).
 1996 *Tobit: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 40a; New York: Doubleday).
- Moore-Gilbert, Bart J.
 1997 *Postcolonial Theory: Contexts, Practices, Politics* (London: Verso).
- Mooren, Leon
 1984 'On the Jurisdiction of the Nome Strategoi in Ptolemaic Egypt', in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia*, Volume Terzo (Naples: Centro Internazionale per lo Studio dei Papiri Ercolanesi), pp. 1217–25.
- Mørkholm, Otto
 1991 *Early Hellenistic Coinage from the Accession of Alexander to the Peace of Apamea (336–188 B.C.)* (ed. Philip Grierson and Ulla Westermark; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Morris, Ian
 1999 'Foreword', in Moses I. Finley, *The Ancient Economy* (updated with a new foreword; Sather Classical Lectures, 43; Berkeley: University of California Press), pp. ix–xxxvi.
- Morris, Ian and Joseph G. Manning
 2005 'Introduction', in Joseph G. Manning and Ian Morris (eds), *The Ancient Economy: Evidence and Models* (Social Science History; Stanford: Stanford University Press), pp. 1–44.
- al-Muheisen, Z.
 1994 'L'archéologie de la période hellénistique dans le nord de la Jordanie: problèmes et perspectives', *Trans* 8: 29–34.
- Muhs, Brian P.
 2005 *Tax Receipts, Taxpayers, and Taxes in Early Ptolemaic Thebes* (Oriental Institute Publications, 126; Chicago: Oriental Institute of the University of Chicago).
- Mulder, Otto
 2003 *Simon the High Priest in Sirach 50: An Exegetical Study of the Significance of Simon the High Priest as Climax to the Praise of the Fathers in Ben Sira's Concept of the History of Israel* (JSJSup, 78; Leiden: Brill).
- Muraoka, Takamitsu
 1998 *Hebrew/Aramaic Index to the Septuagint: Keyed to the Hatch-Redpath Concordance* (Grand Rapids, MI: Baker; Edinburgh: T&T Clark).
 2002 *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint, Chiefly of the Pentateuch and the Twelve Prophets* (Leuven: Peeters).
- Muraoka, T. and John F. Elwolde (eds)
 1997 *The Hebrew of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Ben Sira: Proceedings of a Symposium Held at Leiden University, 11–14 December 1995* (STDJ, 26; Leiden: Brill).
- Murphy, Roland E.
 1981 *Wisdom Literature: Job, Proverbs, Ruth, Canticles, Ecclesiastes, Esther* (FOTL; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Murphy, Roland E. and Elizabeth Huwiler
 1999 *Proverbs, Ecclesiastes, Song of Songs* (New International Biblical Commentary, Old Testament Series 12; Peabody, MA: Hendrickson; Carlisle: Paternoster).

- Murray, Oswyn
1970 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Pharaonic Kingship', *JEA* 56: 141–71.
- Musti, Domenico
1984 'Chapter 6: Syria and the East', *CAH* 7/1: 175–220.
- Neujahr, Matthew
2005 'When Darius Defeated Alexander: Composition and Redaction in the Dynastic Prophecy', *JNES* 64: 101–107.
- Neusner, Jacob
1979 'The Formation of Rabbinic Judaism: Yavneh (Jamnia) from A.D. 70 to 100', *ANRW II*: 19.2.3–42.
1996 'German Scholarship on Rabbinic Judaism: The Goldberg-Schäfer School', in idem (ed.), *Ancient Judaism: Debates and Disputes: Fourth Series* (SFSHJ, 132; Atlanta: Scholars Press), pp. 133–44.
- Newman, Judith H.
1999 *Praying by the Book: The Scripturalization of Prayer in Second Temple Judaism* (SBLEJL, 14; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Newsom, Carol A.
1985 *Songs of the Sabbath Sacrifice: A Critical Edition* (HSS, 27; Atlanta: Scholars).
- Nickelsburg, George W.E.
2001 *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36, 81–108* (Hermeneia; Minneapolis: Fortress).
2005 *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah: A Historical and Literary Introduction* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2nd edn with CD-ROM).
- Nikiprowetzky, Valentin
1970 *La Troisième Sibylle* (Études Juives, 9; Paris: Mouton).
1987 'La Sibylle juive et la "Troisième Livre" des "Pseudo-Oracles Sibyllins" depuis Charles Alexandre', *ANRW* 2.20.1: 460–542.
- Nitzan, Bilhah
1994 *Qumran Prayer and Religious Poetry* (STDJ, 12; Leiden: Brill).
- Oates, John F.
1963 'The Status Designation: ΠΕΡΣΗΣ, ΤΗΣ ΕΠΙΦΟΝΗΣ', *YCS* 18: 1–129.
- O'Brien, Mark A.
1989 *The Deuteronomistic History Hypothesis: A Reassessment* (OBO, 92; Freiburg [Schweiz]: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Oden, Robert A.
1976a *Studies in Lucian's De Syria Dea* (HSM, 15; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
1976b 'The Persistence of Canaanite Religion', *BA* 39: 31–36.
- Oldfather, C.H., Charles L. Sherman, Russel M. Geer, C. Bradford Welles and Francis R. Walton (eds)
1933–67 *Diodorus Siculus* (vols 1–12; LCL; London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Oren, Eliezer D. and Uriel Rappaport
1984 'The Necropolis of Maresha–Beth Govrin', *IEJ* 34: 114–53.
- Orlinsky, Harry M.
1975 'The Septuagint as Holy Writ and the Philosophy of the Translators', *HUCA* 46: 89–114.
- Orlov, Andrei A.
2005 *The Enoch–Metatron Tradition* (TSAJ, 107; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).

- Orrieux, Claude
 1983 *Les papyrus de Zénon: L'horizon d'un grec en Egypte au III^e siècle avant J. C.* (Preface by Édouard Will; Paris: Editions Macula).
 1985 *Zénon de Caunos, parépidémos, et le destin grec* (Centre de Recherches d'Histoire Ancienne, 64; Annales Littéraires de l'Université de Besançon Centre d'Histoire Ancienne, 320; Paris: Centre National de la Recherche Scientifique).
- Otto, Walter
 1916 '3) Hyrkano, der Sohn des Joseph, der Tobiade', *PW* 9: 527–34.
- Packman, Zola M.
 1968 *The Taxes in Grain in Ptolemaic Egypt: Granary Receipts from Diospolis Magna, 164–88 B.C.* (American Studies in Papyrology, 4; New Haven, CT: American Society of Papyrologists).
- Parente, Fausto
 1988 'The Third Book of Maccabees as Ideological Document and Historical Source', *Henoch* 10: 143–82.
- Parente, Fausto and Joseph Sievers (eds)
 1994 *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (SPB, 41; Leiden: Brill).
- Parke, H.W.
 1992 *Sibyls and Sibylline Prophecy in Classical Antiquity* (ed. B.C. McGing; London and New York: Routledge).
- Parker, S. Thomas
 1997 'Decapolis', *OEANE* 2: 127–30.
- Passoni Dell'Aequa, Anna
 1986 'Le testimonianze papirace relative alla "Siria e Fenicia" in eta tolemaica (i papiri di Zenone e le ordinanze reali)', *Rivista Biblica* 34: 233–83.
- Pastor, Jack
 1997 *Land and Economy in Ancient Palestine* (London and New York: Routledge).
- Paton, W. R.
 1922–27 *Polybius: The Histories, with an English Translation* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; London: William Heinemann).
- Pearson, Lionel
 1960 *The Lost Historians of Alexander the Great* (American Philological Association Monograph, 20; New York: American Philological Association; Oxford: Blackwell).
- Peremans, W.
 1978 'Les révolutions égyptiennes sous les Lagides', in H. Machler and V.M. Strocka (eds), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten: Akten des Internationalen Symposions 27.-29. September 1976 in Berlin* (Mainz: Zabern), pp. 39–50.
- Pestman, P.W.
 1967 *Chronologie égyptienne d'après les textes démotiques (332 av. J.-C.–453 ap. J.-C.)* (Papyrologica Lugduno Batava, 15; Leiden: Brill).
- Pestman, P.W. (ed.)
 1980 *Greek and Demotic Texts from the Zenon Archive (P. L. Bat. 20)* (2 vols; Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 20A, 20B; Leiden: Brill).
 1981 *A Guide to the Zenon Archive (P. L. Bat. 21)* (2 vols; Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava, 21A, 21B; Leiden: Brill).

- Petersen, H.
1958 'Real and Alleged Literary Projects of Josephus', *AJP* 79: 259–74.
- Petzold, Karl-Ernst
1972 'Cicero und Historie', *Chiron* 2: 253–76; repr. in idem, *Geschichtsdenken und Geschichtsschreibung* (1999), pp. 86–108.
1999 *Geschichtsdenken und Geschichtsschreibung: Kleine Schriften zur griechischen und römischen Geschichte* (Historia-Einzelschriften, 126; Stuttgart: Franz Steiner).
- Pfister, F.
1914 *Eine jüdische Gründungsgeschichte Alexandrias* (SHAW; Heidelberg: Carl Winters).
- Pietersma, Albert
1984 'Kyrios or Tetragram: A Renewed Quest for the Original Septuagint', in Albert Pietersma and Claude Cox (eds), *De Septuaginta: Studies in Honour of John William Wevers on his Sixty-Fifth Birthday* (Mississauga, Ontario: Benben Publications), pp. 85–101.
- Pomeroy, Sarah B.
1996 'Families in Ptolemaic Egypt: Continuity, Change, and Coercion', in Robert W. Wallace and Edward M. Harris (eds), *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco-Roman History, 360–146 B.C., in Honor of E. Badian* (Oklahoma Series in Classical Culture, 21; Norman, OK: University of Oklahoma Press), pp. 241–53.
- Porten, Bezael (ed.)
1996 *The Elephantine Papyri in English: Three Millennia of Cross-Cultural Continuity and Change* (Documenta et monumenta Orientis antiqui, 22; Leiden: Brill).
- Porten, Bezael and Ada Yardeni
1986–99 *Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt: 1–4* (Hebrew University, Department of the History of the Jewish People, Texts and Studies for Students; Jerusalem: Hebrew University) = *TAD* 1–4.
- Préaux, Claire
1939 *L'économie royale des Lagides* (Brussels: Fondation Égyptologique Reine Élisabeth).
- Price, Jonathan J.
1994 'The Jewish Diaspora of the Graeco-Roman Period', *SCI* 13: 169–86.
- Price, Martin
1990–91 'A Hoard of Tetradrachms from Jericho', *INJ* 11: 24–25.
- Pritchard, James B. (ed.)
1969 *Ancient Near Eastern Texts relating to the Old Testament* (Princeton: Princeton University Press, 3rd edn with Supplement).
- Pucci Ben Zeev, Miriam
1993 'The Reliability of Josephus Flavius: The Case of Hecataeus' and Manetho's Accounts of Jews and Judaism: Fifteen Years of Contemporary Research (1974–1990)', *JSJ* 24: 215–34.
1998 *Jewish Rights in the Roman World: The Greek and Roman Documents Quoted by Josephus Flavius* (TSAJ, 74; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Pugliese Carratelli, G. and Giovanni Garbini
1964 *A Bilingual Graeco-Aramaic Edict by Asoka: The First Greek Inscription Discovered in Afghanistan* (Serie Orientale Roma, 29; Rome: Istituto Italiano per il Medio ed Estremo Oriente, 1964).

- Perdue, Leo G.
1977 *Wisdom and Cult* (SBLDS; Chico, CA: Scholars Press).
- Qedar, Shraga
1992–93 'The Coins of Marisa: A New Mint', *INJ* 12: 27–33.
- Quaeghebeur, Jan
1979 'Documents égyptiens et rôle économique du clergé en Égypte hellénistique', in Edward Lipiński (ed.), *State and Temple Economy in the Ancient Near East* (2 vols; OLA, 5–6; Leuven: Departement Oriëntalistiek) 2: 707–29.
1989 'Phritob comme titre d'un haut fonctionnaire ptolémaïque', *AncSoc* 20: 159–68.
- Rabenau, Merten
1994 *Studien zum Buch Tobit* (BZAW, 220; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
- Rajak, Tessa
1983 *Josephus: The Historian and his Society* (London: Duckworth).
1986 'The Sense of History in Jewish Intertestamental Writing', in A.S. van der Woude (ed.), *Crises and Perspectives* (OTS, 24; Leiden: Brill), pp. 124–45.
1990 'The Hasmoneans and the Uses of Hellenism', in Philip R. Davies and R.T. White (eds), *A Tribute to Geza Vermes: Essays on Jewish and Christian Literature and History* (JSOTSup, 100; Sheffield: JSOT), pp. 261–80.
- Rajak, Tessa and David Noy
1993 'Archisynagogoi: Office, Title and Social Status in the Greco-Jewish Synagogue', *JRS* 83: 75–93.
- Rappaport, Uriel
1969 'Les Iduméens en Egypte', *Revue de philologie, d'histoire et de littératures anciennes*, 3rd series, 43: 73–82.
1970 'Gaza and Ascalon in the Persian and Hellenistic Periods in Relation to their Coins', *IEJ* 20: 75–80.
- Redditt, Paul L.
1999 *Daniel, Based on the New Revised Standard Version* (New Century Bible Commentary; Sheffield Academic Press).
- Redford, Donald B.
1986 *Pharaonic King-Lists, Annals and Day-Books: A Contribution to the Study of the Egyptian Sense of History* (Society for the Study of Egyptian Antiquities Publication, 4; Mississauga, Ontario: Benben Publications).
- Reed, C.M.
2003 *Maritime Traders in the Ancient Greek World* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Reeves, John C.
1992 *Jewish Lore in Manichaean Cosmogony: Studies in the Book of Giants Traditions* (Monographs of the Hebrew Union College, 14; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College Press).
- Reich, Ronny
1992 'The Beth-Zur Citadel II: A Persian Residency?' *TA* 19: 113–23.
2003 'Local Seal Impressions of the Hellenistic Period', in Hillel Geva (ed.), *Jewish Quarter Excavations in the Old City of Jerusalem Conducted by Nahman Avigad, 1969–1982: vol. II, The Finds from Areas A, W and X-2 Final Report* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society), pp. 256–62.

- Reich, Ronny and Eli Shukron
 2007 'The Yehud Stamp Impressions from the 1995–2005 City of David Excavations', *TA* 34: 59–65.
- Reif, Stefan
 1981 Review of C. Whitley, *Koheleth*, *VT* 31: 120–26.
 1993 *Judaism and Hebrew Prayer: New Perspectives on Jewish Liturgical History* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Reisner, G.A., C.S. Fisher and D.G. Lyon
 1924 *Harvard Excavations at Samaria 1908–1910* (2 vols; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Rengstorff, K.H.
 1973–83 *A Complete Concordance to Flavius Josephus* (4 vols; Leiden: Brill).
- Rey-Coquais, Jean-Paul
 1992 'Decapolis', *ABD* 2: 116–21.
- Rhodes, P.J.
 1972 *The Athenian Boule* (Oxford: Clarendon).
 1986 *The Greek City States: A Source Book* (London and Sydney: Croon Helm).
- Roberts, J.J.M.
 1976 'Myth Versus History: Relaying the Comparative Foundations', *CBQ* 38: 1–13.
- Roche, M.-J.
 1994 'Les débuts de l'implantation nabatéenne à Pétra', *Trans* 8: 35–46.
- Rochette, Bruno
 1996 'Sur le bilinguisme dans l'Égypte gréco-romaine', *Chronique d'Égypte* 71: 153–68.
- Roisman, Joseph (ed.)
 2003 *Brill's Companion to Alexander the Great* (Leiden: Brill).
- Roll, Israel and Oren Tal (eds)
 1999 *Apollonia-Arsuf, Final Report of the Excavations: vol. I, The Persian and Hellenistic Periods* (Institute of Archaeology Monograph, 16; Tel Aviv: Institute of Archaeology).
- Roller, Duane W.
 1982 'The Northern Plain of Sharon in the Hellenistic Period', *BASOR* 247: 43–52.
- Ronen, Yigal
 1998 'The Weight Standards of the Judean Coinage in the Late Persian and Early Ptolemaic Period', *NEA* 61: 122–26.
- Rooke, Deborah W.
 2000 *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the High Priesthood in Ancient Israel* (Oxford Theological Monographs; Oxford: Oxford University Press).
- Rostovtzeff, Michael
 1910 (M. Rostowzew) *Studien zur Geschichte des römischen Kolonates* (Beiheft zum Archiv für Papyrusforschung, 1; Leipzig: Teubner).
 1922 *A Large Estate in Egypt in the Third Century B.C.: A Study in Economic History* (Studies in the Social Sciences and History, 6; Madison, WI: University of Wisconsin).
 1932 'Seleucid Babylonia: Bullae and Seals of Clay with Greek Inscriptions', *YCS* 3: 1–114.
 1941 *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World* (3 vols; Oxford: Clarendon).

- Roueché, C. and Susan M. Sherwin-White
 1985 'Some Aspects of the Seleucid Empire: the Greek Inscriptions from Failaka, in the Arabian Gulf', *Chiron* 15: 1–39.
- Roux, Jeanne and Georges Roux
 1949 'Un décret du politeuma des Juifs de Bérénikè en Cyrénaïque au Musée Lapidaire de Carpentras', *REG* 62: 281–96.
- Rowley, H.H.
 1935 *Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel* (Cardiff: University of Wales Press).
- Royse, James R.
 1991 'Philo and the Tetragrammaton', in David T. Runia, David M. Hay and David Winston (eds), *Heirs of the Septuagint: Philo, Hellenistic Judaism and Early Christianity: Festschrift for Earle Hilgert* (SPA, 3; Atlanta: Scholars Press), pp. 167–83.
- Russell, D.A.
 1972 *Plutarch* (Classical Life and Letters; London: Duckworth).
- Rutgers, Leonard Victory
 1995 *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora* (Religions in the Graeco-Roman World, 126; Leiden: Brill).
 1998 *The Hidden Heritage of Diaspora Judaism* (Contributions to Biblical Exegesis and Theology, 20; Leuven: Peeters).
- Sacchi, Paolo
 1996 *Jewish Apocalyptic and its History* (trans. W.J. Short; JSPSup, 20; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press); ET of *L'apocalittica giudaica e la sua storia* (Brescia: Paideia Editrice, 1990).
- Sachs, A.J. and D.J. Wiseman
 1954 'A Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period', *Iraq* 16: 202–12.
- Sagiv, Nahum and Amos Kloner
 1996 'Maresha: Underground Olive Oil Production in the Hellenistic Period', in David Eitam and Michael Heltzer (eds), *Olive Oil in Antiquity: Israel and Neighbouring Countries from the Neolithic to the Early Arab Period* (History of the Ancient Near East Studies, 7; Padova: Sargon), pp. 255–92.
- Said, Edward W.
 1993 *Culture and Imperialism* (New York: Vintage).
 2003 *Orientalism* (reprinted with new Afterword [1995] and new Preface; London: Penguin Books; originally 1978).
- Samuel, Alan Edouard
 1962 *Ptolemaic Chronology* (Munich: Beck).
 1966 'The Internal Organization of the Nomarch's Bureau in the Third Century B.C.', in *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles* (American Studies in Papyrology, 1; New Haven, CT: American Society of Papyrologists), pp. 213–29.
 1970 'The Greek Element in the Ptolemaic Bureaucracy', in Deborah H. Samuel (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology* (American Studies in Papyrology, 7; Toronto: A.M. Hakkert), pp. 443–53.
 1983 *From Athens to Alexandria: Hellenism and Social Goals in Ptolemaic Egypt* (Studia Hellenistica, 26; Louvain: Imprimerie Orientaliste).
- Sanders, Jack T.
 1983 *Ben Sira and Demotic Wisdom* (SBLMS, 28; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

- Sanderson, Julia
1986 *An Exodus Scroll from Qumran: 4QpaleoExod^m and the Samaritan Tradition* (HSS, 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Sarkisian, G.K.
1974 'Greek Personal Names in Uruk and the *Graeco-Babyloniaca* Problem', *Acta Antiqua* 22: 495–503.
- Sartre, Maurice
1989 'Organisation du territoire et pouvoirs locaux dans la Syrie hellénistique et romaine', *Trans* 1: 119–28.
2001 *D'Alexandre à Zénobie: Histoire du Levant antique, IV^e siècle avant J.-C., III^e siècle après J.-C.* (Paris: Fayard).
- Sauneron, Serge
2000 *The Priests of Ancient Egypt* (new edn; trans. David Lorton; Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press); ET of *Prêtres de l'ancienne Égypte* (Paris: Éditions du Seuil, 1998).
- Schäfer, Peter
1986 'Research into Rabbinic Literature: An Attempt to Define the Status Questionis', *JJS* 37: 139–52.
- Schalit, Abraham (Avraham Shalit)
1954 'Κοίλη Συρία from the Mid-Fourth Century to the Beginning of the Third Century B.C.', in Richard Koebner (ed.), *Studies in Classics and Jewish Hellenism (ScrHier, 1; Jerusalem: Magnes Press)*, pp. 64–77.
1959–60 'The Letter of Antiochus III to Zeuxis regarding the Establishment of Jewish Military Colonies in Phrygia and Lydia', *JQR* 50: 289–318.
- Schaller, Berndt
1963 'Hekataios von Abdera über die Juden: Zur Frage der Echtheit und der Datierung', *ZNW* 54: 15–31.
- Scheidel, Walter and Sitta von Reden (eds)
2002 *The Ancient Economy* (Edinburgh Readings on the Ancient World; Edinburgh University Press).
- Schmid, Stephan G.
2001 'The "Hellenisation" of the Nabataeans: A New Approach', *SHAJ* 7: 407–19.
- Schmitt, Hatto H.
1964 *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Grossen und seiner Zeit* (Historia-Einzelschriften, 6; Wiesbaden: Steiner).
- Schnabel, Paul
1923 *Berosos und die babylonisch-hellenistische Literatur* (Leipzig: Teubner).
- Schoors, A.
1992 *The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qoheleth, Part I* (OLA, 41; Leuven: Peeters and Departement Oriëntalistiek, Leuven).
2004 *The Preacher Sought to Find Pleasing Words: A Study of the Language of Qoheleth: Part II Vocabulary* (OLA, 143; Leuven: Peeters and Departement Oriëntalistiek).
- Schoors, A. (ed.)
1998 *Qohelet in the Context of Wisdom* (BETL, 136; Leuven: Peeters and Leuven University Press).
- Schrekenberg, H.
1968 *Bibliography zu Flavius Josephus* (ALGHJ, 1; Leiden: Brill).

- 1979 *Bibliography zu Flavius Josephus: Supplementband mit Gesamtregister* (ALGHJ, 14; Leiden: Brill).
- Schröder, Bernd
 1996 *Die 'väterlichen Gesetze': Flavius Josephus als Vermittler von Halachah an Griechen und Römer* (TSAJ, 53; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Schürer, Emil
 1973–87 *The Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (revd and ed. Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar et al.; 3 vols in 4; Edinburgh: T&T Clark).
- Schwartz, Daniel R.
 1998 'Josephus' Tobiads: Back to the Second Century?' in Martin Goodman (ed.), *Jews in a Graeco-Roman World* (Oxford: Clarendon Press), pp. 47–61.
 2002 'Once Again on Tobiad Chronology: Should We Let a Stated Anomaly be Anomalous? A Response to Gideon Fuks', *JJS* 53: 146–51.
 2003 'Diodorus Siculus 40.3 – Hecataeus or Pseudo-Hecataeus?' in Menachem Mor, Aharon Oppenheimer, Jack Pastor and Daniel R. Schwartz (eds), *Jews and Gentiles in the Holy Land in the Days of the Second Temple, the Mishnah and the Talmud* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi Press), pp. 181–97.
- Schwartz, E.
 1885 'Hekataeos von Teos', *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 40: 223–62.
 1957 'Diodoros', in idem, *Griechische Geschichtschreiber* (Leipzig: Koehler & Amelang) 35–97 (repr. from *PW* 5: 663–704).
 1905 '38) Diodoros von Agyrion', *PW* 5: 663–704.
- Schwartz, Seth
 1986 'The Composition and Publication of Josephus's "Bellum Judaicum" Book 7', *HTR* 79: 373–86.
 1990 *Josephus and Judaeon Politics* (CSCT, 18; Leiden: Brill).
 1991 'Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion', *JJS* 42: 16–38.
 1999 'The Patriarchs and the Diaspora', *JJS* 50: 208–22.
- Schwarz, Henry and Sangeeta Ray (eds)
 2000 *A Companion to Postcolonial Studies* (Blackwell Companions in Cultural Studies; Oxford: Blackwells).
- Schwiehorst-Schönberger, Ludger (ed.)
 1997 *Das Buch Kohelet: Studien zur Struktur, Geschichte, Rezeption und Theologie* (BZAW, 254; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
- Scott, James M. (ed.)
 1997 *Exile: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Conceptions* (JSJSup, 56; Leiden: Brill).
- Seibert, Jakob
 1969 *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Ptolemaios' I.* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 56; Munich: Beck).
- Seidl, Erwin
 1962 *Ptolemäische Rechtsgeschichte* (Ägyptologische Forschungen, 22; Glückstadt: J.J. Augustin, 2nd revd edn).
- Sellers, Ovid R.
 1962 'Coins of the 1960 Excavation at Shechem', *BA* 25: 87–95.
- Seow, Choon-Leong
 1996 'Linguistic Evidence and the Dating of Qohelet', *JBL* 115: 643–66.
 1997 *Ecclesiastes: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB, 18C; New York: Doubleday).

- 1999 'Qohelet's Eschatological Poem', *JBL* 118: 209–34.
- Shalit, Avraham (Abraham Schalit)
- 1954 'Κοίλη Συρία from the Mid-Fourth Century to the Beginning of the Third Century B.C.', in Richard Koebner (ed.), *Studies in Classics and Jewish Hellenism* (*ScriHier*, 1; Jerusalem: Magnes Press), pp. 64–77.
- Sharon, Ilan
- 1987 'Phoenician and Greek Ashlar Construction Techniques at Tel Dor, Israel', *BASOR* 267: 21–42.
- Shennan, Stephen J. (ed.)
- 1989 *Archaeological Approaches to Cultural Identity* (One World Archaeology, 10; London and New York: Routledge).
- Sherwin-White, Susan
- 1982 'A Greek Ostrakon from Babylon of the Early Third Century B.C.', *ZPE* 47: 51–70.
- 1983 'Ritual for a Seleucid King at Babylon?', *JHS* 103: 156–59.
- 1987 'Seleucid Babylonia: A Case Study for the Installation and Development of Greek Rule', in Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East* (London: Duckworth), pp. 1–31.
- Sherwin-White, Susan and Amélie Kuhrt
- 1993 *From Samarkand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire* (London: Duckworth).
- Sievers, Joseph, and Gaia Lembi (eds)
- 2005 *Josephus and Jewish History in Flavian Rome and Beyond* (JSJSup, 104; Leiden: Brill).
- Skaist, A.
- 1978 'A Note on the Bilingual Ostrakon from Khirbet el-Kôm', *IEJ* 28: 106–108.
- Skeat, T.C.
- 1974 *Greek Papyri in the British Museum (now in the British Library): VII, The Zenon Archive* (London: British Museum Publications).
- Skehan, Patrick W. and A.A. Di Lella
- 1987 *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB, 39; Garden City: Doubleday).
- Skehan, Patrick W., Eugene Ulrich and Judith E. Sanderson (eds)
- 1992 *Qumran Cave 4: IV Palaeo-Hebrew and Greek Biblical Manuscripts* (DJD, 9; Oxford: Clarendon Press).
- Smend, Rudolph
- 1906–1907 *Weisheit des Jesus Sirach* (3 vols; Berlin: de Gruyter).
- Smith, Jonathan Z.
- 1985 'European Religions, Ancient: Hellenistic Religions', *Encyclopaedia Britannica* (Chicago: Encyclopaedia Britannica, 15th edn): *Macropaedia* 18: 925–27.
- Smith, Morton
- 1956 'Palestinian Judaism in the First Century', in Moshe Davis (ed.), *Israel: Its Role in Civilization* (New York: Harper), pp. 67–81.
- 1987 *Palestinian Parties and Politics That Shaped the Old Testament* (London: SCM; corrected repr. of New York: Columbia, 1971).
- Smith, Robert Houston
- 1990 'The Southern Levant in the Hellenistic Period', *Levant* 22: 123–30.
- Soden, W. von
- 1935 'Eine babylonische Volksüberlieferung von Nabonid in den Danielerzählungen', *ZAW* 53: 81–89.

- Sokolovskii, Sergey and Valery Tishkov
 1996 'Ethnicity', in Alan Barnard and Jonathan Spencer (eds), *Encyclopedia of Social and Cultural Anthropology* (London and New York: Routledge), pp. 190–93.
- Soll, William
 1988 'Tobit and Folklore Studies, with Emphasis on Propp's Morphology', in David J. Lull (ed.), *Society of Biblical Literature 1988 Seminar Papers* (SBLSPS, 27; Atlanta: Scholars Press), pp. 39–53.
- Sosin, Joshua D. and John F. Oates
 1997 'P. Duk. inv. 314: Agathis, Strategos and Hipparches of the Arsinoite Nome', *ZPE* 118: 251–58.
- Spaer, Arnold
 1977 'Some More "Yehud" Coins', *IEJ* 27: 200–203.
- Sparks, Kenton L.
 1998 *Ethnicity and Identity in Ancient Israel: Prolegomena to the Study of Ethnic Sentiments and their Expression in the Hebrew Bible* (Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns).
- Spek, R.J. van der
 1987 'The Babylonian City', in Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White (eds), *Hellenism in the East* (London: Duckworth), pp. 57–74.
- Spencer, Richard A.
 1999 'The Book of Tobit in Recent Research', *CR: BS* 7: 147–80.
- Spengler, Oswald
 1918 *Der Untergang des Abendlandes* (Vienna: Braumiller, 1918–22); *ET The Decline of the West* (London: George Allen & Unwin, 1926–28).
- Spilsbury, Paul
 1998 *The Image of the Jew in Flavius Josephus' Paraphrase of the Bible* (TSAJ, 69; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Spivak, Gayatri Chakravorty
 1988 'Can the Subaltern Speak?' in Cary Nelson and Lawrence Grossberg (eds), *Marxism and the Interpretation of Culture* (Communications and Culture; London: Macmillan Education), pp. 271–313.
- Stadelmann, H.
 1980 *Ben Sira also Schriftgelehrter: einer Untersuchung zum Berufsbild des vormakkabäischen Sofer unter Berücksichtigung seines Verhältnisses zu Priester-, Propheten- und Weisheitslehrertum* (WUNT, 2. Reihe, Nr. 6; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck).
- Stager, Lawrence E.
 1991 *Ashkelon Discovered: From Canaanites and Philistines to Romans and Moslems* (with a contribution by Paula Wapnish; Washington, DC: Biblical Archaeology Society).
- Starcky, Jean
 1955 'The Nabataeans: A Historical Sketch', *BA* 18: 84–106.
- Starr, Chester G.
 1975 'Greeks and Persians in the Fourth Century B.C.: A Study in Cultural Contacts before Alexander', *Iranica Antiqua* 11: 39–99.
 1977 'Greeks and Persians in the Fourth Century B.C.: A Study in Cultural Contacts before Alexander', *Iranica Antiqua* 12: 49–115.
- Steck, Odil Hannes
 1993 *Das apokryphe Baruchbuch: Studien zu Rezeption und Konzentration*

- 'kanonischer' Überlieferung (FRLANT, 160; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Steck, Odil Hannes, Reinhard G. Kratz and Ingo Kottsieper (eds)
 1998 *Das Buch Baruch; Der Brief des Jeremia; Zusätze zu Ester und Daniel* (Das Alte Testament Deutsch, Apokryphen, 5; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Sterling, Gregory E.
 1992 *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (NovTSup 64; Leiden: Brill).
- Stern, Ephraim
 1994 *Dor, Ruler of the Seas: Twelve Years of Excavations at the Israelite-Phoenician Harbor Town on the Carmel Coast* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
 2001 *Archaeology of the Land of the Bible: vol. II, The Assyrian, Babylonian, and Persian Periods (732–332 B.C.E.)* (Anchor Bible Reference Library; New York: Doubleday).
- Stern, Ephraim (ed.)
 1978 *Excavations at Tel Mevorakh (1973–1976) Part One: From the Iron Age to the Roman Period* (Qedem, 9; Jerusalem: Hebrew University).
 1995a *Excavations at Dor, Final Report: vol. I A, Areas A and C: Introduction and Stratigraphy* (Qedem Reports, 1; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
 1995b *Excavations at Dor, Final Report: vol. I B, Areas A and C: The Finds* (Qedem Reports, 2; Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
- Stern, Ephraim, Oded Lipschits and David Vanderhoof
 2007 'New Yehud Seal Impressions from En Gedi', *TA* 34: 66–73.
- Stern, Ephraim and Yitzhak Magen
 2002 'Archaeological Evidence for the First Stage of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim', *IEJ* 52: 49–57; ET of 'השלב הראשון של המקדש העברי הראשון: עדויות ארכאולוגיות חדשות [The First Phase of the Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim: New Archaeological Evidence]', *Qadmoniot* 33 (2000): 119–24.
- Stern, Menahem
 1974–84 *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (3 vols; Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Arts and Sciences).
- Stern, Menahem and Oswyn Murray
 1973 'Hecataeus of Abdera and Theophrastus on Jews and Egyptians', *JEA* 59: 159–68.
- Stone, Michael E.
 1978 'The Book of Enoch and Judaism in the Third Century B.C.E.', *CBQ* 40: 479–92.
 1988 'Enoch, Aramaic Levi and Sectarian Origins', *JSJ* 19: 159–70.
 2000 'Levi, Aramaic', in Lawrence H. Schiffman and James C. VanderKam (eds), *Encyclopedia of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Oxford: Oxford University Press), pp. 486–88.
- Stone, Michael E. and Jonas C. Greenfield (eds)
 1996 'A. Aramaic Levi Document', in James C. VanderKam (ed.), *Qumran Cave 4: XVII Parabiblical Texts, Part 3* (DJD, 22; Oxford: Clarendon), pp. 1–72.
- Stoneman, Richard
 1991 *The Greek Alexander Romance* (London: Harmondsworth).
 1994 'Jewish Traditions on Alexander the Great', *SPA* 6: 37–53.

- Stuckenbruck, Loren T.
1997 *The Book of Giants from Qumran: Texts, Translation, and Commentary* (TSAJ, 63; Tübingen: Mohr).
- Suter, David W.
1979 *Tradition and Composition in the Parables of Enoch* (Missoula, MT: Scholars Press).
- Swete, H.
1914 *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek* (revised by R.R. Ottley; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Syon, Danny
2006 'Numismatic Evidence of Jewish Presence in Galilee before the Hasmonean Annexation', *INR* 1: 21–24.
- Taeubler, E.
1946–47 'Jerusalem 201 to 199 B.C.E. on the History of a Messianic Movement', *JQR* 37: 1–30, 125–37, 249–63.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu
1970 'The Old Testament Text', in P.R. Ackroyd and C.F. Evans (eds), *Cambridge History of the Bible*: vol. 1, *From the Beginnings to Jerome* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press), pp. 159–99; repr. in Frank M. Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), pp. 1–41.
1975 'The Textual Study of the Bible – A New Outlook', in Frank M. Cross and Shemaryahu Talmon (eds), *Qumran and the History of the Biblical Text* (Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), pp. 321–400.
- Talmon, Shemaryahu and Yigael Yadin (eds)
1999 *Masada VI: Yigael Yadin Excavations 1963–1965, Final Reports: Hebrew Fragments; The Ben Sira Scroll* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society).
- Talshir, Zipora
1993 *The Alternative Story: 3 Kingdoms 12.24 A-Z* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies, 6; Jerusalem: Simor).
- Tarn, W.W. and G.T. Griffith
1952 *Hellenistic Civilisation* (London: Arnold, 3rd edn).
- Tatum, James
1989 *Xenophon's Imperial Fiction: On The Education of Cyrus* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Tcherikover (Tscharikower), Victor A.
1927 *Die hellenistischen Städtegründungen von Alexander dem Grossen bis auf die Römerzeit* (Philologus Supplementband, 19/1; Leipzig: Dietrich).
1937 'Palestine under the Ptolemies (A Contribution to the Study of the Zenon Papyri)', *Mizraim* 4–5: 9–90.
1959 *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (New York: Jewish Publication Society).
1961 'The Third Book of Maccabees as a Historical Source of Augustus' Time', *Scripta Hierosolymitana* 7: 1–26 (earlier Hebrew version in *Zion* 10 [1945]: 1–20).
1964 'Was Jerusalem a "Polis"?' *IEJ* 14: 61–78.
- Tcherikover, V.A., A. Fuks and M. Stern (eds)
1957–64 *Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* (3 vols; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press; Jerusalem: Magnes).

- Teixidor, Javier
1977 *The Pagan God: Popular Religion in the Greco-Roman Near East* (Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press).
- Thackeray, H.St.J. et al. (eds)
1926–65 *Josephus* (LCL; London: Heineman; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).
- Thissen, Heinz-Josef
1966 *Studien zum Raphiadekret* (Beiträge zur klassischen Philologie, 23; Neisenheim am Glan: Anton Hain).
1998 ‘“Apocalypse Now!” Anmerkungen zum *Lamm des Bokchoris*’, in Willy Clarysse, Antoon Schoors and Harco Willems (eds), *Egyptian Religion the Last Thousand Years: Studies Dedicated to the Memory of Jan Quaegebeur* (2 vols; OLA, 85; Leuven: Peeters), vol. 2, pp. 1043–53.
- Thomas, J. David
1975 *The Epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt: Part 1 The Ptolemaic Epistrategos* (Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Papyrologica Coloniensia, 6; Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag).
1978 ‘Aspects of the Ptolemaic Civil Service: The Dioiketes and the Nomarch’, in Herwig Maehler and Volker Michael Strocka (eds), *Das ptolemäische Ägypten: Akten des Internationalen Symposions 27.–29. September 1976 in Berlin* (Mainz: Zabern), pp. 187–94.
1982 *The Epistrategos in Ptolemaic and Roman Egypt: Part 2 The Roman Epistrategos* (Abhandlungen der Rheinisch-Westfälischen Akademie der Wissenschaften, Papyrologica Coloniensia, 6; Opladen: Westdeutscher Verlag).
- Thomas, J.D.
1972 ‘The Greek Text of Tobit’, *JBL* 91: 463–71.
- Thompson, Dorothy J. (Crawford)
1971 *Kerkeosiris: An Egyptian Village in the Ptolemaic Period* (Cambridge Classical Studies; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
1984a ‘The Idumaeans of Memphis and the Ptolemaic *Politeumata*’, in *Atti del XVII Congresso Internazionale di Papirologia* (Naples: Centro Internazionale per lo Studio dei Papiri Ercolanesi), vol. 3, pp. 1069–75.
1984b ‘Chapter 9: Hellenistic Science: Its Application in Peace and War, 9c Agriculture’, *CAH* 7/1: 363–70.
1990 ‘The High Priests of Memphis under Ptolemaic Rule’, in Mary Beard and John North (eds), *Pagan Priest: Religion and Power in the Ancient World* (London: Duckworth), pp. 95–116.
1992 ‘Language and Literacy in Early Hellenistic Egypt’, in Per Bilde, Troels Engberg-Pedersen, Lise Hannestad and Jan Zahle (eds), *Ethnicity in Hellenistic Egypt* (Studies in Hellenistic Civilization, 3; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press), pp. 39–52.
2001 ‘Hellenistic Hellenes: The Case of Ptolemaic Egypt’, in Irad Malkin (ed.), *Ancient Perceptions of Greek Ethnicity* (Center for Hellenic Studies; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press), pp. 301–22.
- Tidmarsh, John
2004 ‘How Hellenised Was Pella in Jordan in the Hellenistic Period?’ *SHAJ* 8: 459–68.

- Tiller, Patrick A.
1993 *A Commentary on the Animal Apocalypse of 1 Enoch* (SBLEJL, 4; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Tita, Hubert
2001 *Gelübde als Bekenntnis: Eine Studie zu den Gelübden im Alten Testament* (OBO, 181; Fribourg: University Press; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- Tobin, Thomas H., SJ
1997 'Philo and the Sibyl: Interpreting Philo's Eschatology', in David T. Runia and Gregory E. Sterling (eds), *Wisdom and Logos: Studies in Jewish Thought in Honor of David Winston* (SPA, 9; BJS, 312; Atlanta: Scholars Press), pp. 84–103.
- Toloni, Giancardo
2004 *L'originale del libro di Tobia: Studio filologico-linguistico* (Textos y Estudios <<Cardenal Cisneros>> de la Biblia Poliglota Matritense [TEEC], 71; Madrid: Instituto de Filología).
- Toorn, Karel van der, Bob Becking and Pieter W. van der Horst (eds)
1999 *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible* (Leiden: Brill; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans, 2nd revd edn).
- Tov, Emanuel
1976 *The Septuagint Translation of Jeremiah and Baruch: A Discussion of an Early Revision of the LXX of Jeremiah 29–52 and Baruch 1.1–38* (HSM, 8; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press).
1988 'The Septuagint', in Martin Jan Mulder and Harry Sysling (eds), *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity* (CRINT, 2/1; Assen and Maastricht: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress), pp. 161–88.
1997 *The Text-Critical Use of the Septuagint in Biblical Research* (Jerusalem Biblical Studies, 8; Jerusalem: Simor, 2nd revd edn).
1999 *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint* (VTSup, 72; Leiden: Brill).
2001 *Textual Criticism of the Hebrew Bible* (Assen: Van Gorcum; Minneapolis: Fortress, 2nd edn).
- Trebilco, Paul R.
1991 *Jewish Communities in Asia Minor* (SNTSMS, 69; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Turner, Eric G.
1984 'Chapter 5: Ptolemaic Egypt', *CAH* 7/1: 118–74.
- Turner, Eric G. (ed.) in collaboration with Marie-Thérèse Lenger
1955 *The Hibeh Papyri, Part II* (Egypt Exploration Fund, Greco-Roman Memoires, 32; London: Egypt Exploration Society).
- Ulrich, Eugene C.
1978 *The Qumran Text of Samuel and Josephus* (HSM, 19; Missoula, MT: Scholars Press).
1999 *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Origins of the Bible* (Studies in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Related Literature; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- Unnik, Willem Cornelis van
1993 *Das Selbstverständnis der jüdischen Diaspora in der hellenistisch-römischen Zeit* (AGAJU, 17; Leiden: Brill).

- Urman, Dan and Paul V.M. Flesher (eds)
 1995 *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archaeological Discovery* (vols 1–2; SPB, 47; Leiden: Brill).
- Ussishkin, David (ed.)
 2004 *The Renewed Archaeological Excavations at Lachish (1973–1994)* (vols 1–5; Tel Aviv University Ronia and Marco Nadler Institute of Archaeology, Monograph Series, 22; Tel Aviv: Emery and Claire Yass Publications in Archaeology).
- Vanderhooft, David and Oded Lipschits
 2007 'A New Typology of the Yehud Stamp Impressions', *TA* 34: 12–37.
- VanderKam, James C.
 1984 *Enoch and the Growth of an Apocalyptic Tradition* (CBQMS, 16; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association).
 2004 *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress; Assen: Van Gorcum).
- Van Seters, John
 1983 *In Search of History: Historiography in the Ancient World and the Origins of Biblical History* (New Haven and London: Yale University Press).
- Verhoogt, A.M.F.W.
 1998 *Menches, Komogrammateus of Kerkeosiris: The Doings and Dealings of a Village Scribe in the Late Ptolemaic Period (120–110 B.C.)* (*P. L. Bat.* 29) (*Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava*, 29; Leiden: Brill).
- Veyne, Paul
 1988 *Did the Greeks Believe in their Myths? An Essay on the Constitutive Imagination* (trans. Paula Wissing; Chicago and London: University of Chicago).
- Villalba i Varneda, P.
 1986 *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus* (ALGHJ, 19; Leiden: Brill).
- Vincent, L.H.
 1920 'La Palestine dans les papyrus Ptolémaïques de Gerza', *RB* 29: 161–202.
- Vitelli, G. (ed.)
 1917–29 *Papiri Greci e Latini*, vols 4–9 (Pubblicazioni della Società Italiana per la ricerca dei Papiri Greci e Latini in Egitto; Florence: Topografia Enrico Ariani).
- Vleeming, S.P.
 1994 *Ostraka Varia: Tax Receipts and Legal Documents on Demotic, Greek, and Greek-Demotic Ostraka, Chiefly of the Early Ptolemaic Period, from Various Collections* (*P. L. Bat.* 26) (*Papyrologica Lugduno-Batava*, 26; Leiden: Brill).
- Vriezen, T.C. and A.S. van der Woude
 2005 *Ancient Israelite and Early Jewish Literature* (trans. Brian Doyle; Leiden: Brill); ET of *Oud-Israëlitische en vroeg-joodse Literatuur* (Kampen: Kok Pharos, 2000).
- Wacholder, Ben Zion
 1974 *Eupolemus: A Study of Judaeo-Greek Literature* (HUC, Monograph 3; Cincinnati: Hebrew Union College).
- Waddell, W.G.
 1940 *Manetho* (LCL; London: Heinemann; Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press).

- Walbank, F.W.
 1957–79 *A Historical Commentary on Polybius* (3 vols; Oxford: Clarendon Press).
 1972 *Polybius* (Berkeley and Los Angeles: University of California Press).
 1981 *The Hellenistic World* (Fontana History of the Ancient World; London: Fontana).
 1991–92 'The Hellenistic World: New Trends and Directions', *SCI* 11: 90–113.
- Waldmann, H.
 1973 *Die kommagenischen Kultreformen unter König Mithradates I. Kallinikos und seinem Sohne Antiochos I.* (Études préliminaires aux religions orientales dans l'Empire romain, 34; Leiden: Brill).
- Walter, N.
 1964 *Der Thoraausleger Aristobulus* (TU, 86; Berlin: Akademie-Verlag).
 1987 'Jüdisch-hellenistische Literatur vor Philon von Alexandria (unter Ausschuß der Historiker)', *ANRW II*: 20.1: 67–120.
- Waltke, Bruce K.
 1965 *Prolegomena to the Samaritan Pentateuch* (unpublished PhD thesis: Harvard University).
 1970 'The Samaritan Pentateuch and the Text of the Old Testament', in J.B. Payne (ed.), *New Perspectives on the Old Testament* (Waco, TX: Word), pp. 212–39.
- Warner, Rex (trans.)
 1954 *Thucydides, History of the Peloponnesian War* (Penguin Classics; London: Penguin).
- Weeks, Stuart, Simon Gathercole and Loren Stuckenbruck (eds)
 2004 *The Book of Tobit: Texts from the Principal Ancient and Medieval Traditions, with Synopsis, Concordances, and Annotated Texts in Aramaic, Hebrew, Greek, Latin, and Syriac* (FoSub, 3; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).
- Welles, C. Bradford
 1934 *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy* (Studia Historica, 28; New Haven, CT: Yale University Press; repr. Chicago: Ares, 1974).
 1949 'The Ptolemaic Administration in Egypt', *Journal of Juristic Papyrology* 3: 21–47.
 1970 'The Role of the Egyptians under the First Ptolemies', in Deborah H. Samuel (ed.), *Proceedings of the Twelfth International Congress of Papyrology* (American Studies in Papyrology, 7; Toronto: A.M. Hakkert), pp. 505–10.
- Wells, J.
 1909 'The Genuineness of the Γῆς περίοδος of Hecataeus', *JHS* 29: 41–52.
- Wenning, Robert
 1987 *Die Nabatäer – Denkmäler und Geschichte: Eine Bestandesaufnahme des archäologischen Befundes* (NTOA, 3; Freiberg [Schweiz]: Universitätsverlag; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
 1990 'Das Nabatäerreich: seine archäologischen und historischen Hinterlassenschaften', in H.P. Kuhnen, *Palästina in griechisch-römischer Zeit* (HdA, Vorderasien 2, Band 2; Munich: Beck), pp. 367–415.
- Werline, Rodney Alan
 1998 *Penitential Prayer in Second Temple Judaism: The Development of a Religious Institution* (SBLEJL, 13; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Wevers, John William

- 1990 *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus* (SBLSCS, 30; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 1992 *Text History of the Greek Exodus* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, Dritte Folge, Nr. 192; Mitteilungen des Septuaginta-Unternehmens 21; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht).
- 1993 *Notes on the Greek Text of Genesis* (SBLSCS, 35; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 1995 *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy* (SBLSCS, 39; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 1997 *Notes on the Greek Text of Leviticus* (SBLSCS, 44; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- 1998 *Notes on the Greek Text of Numbers* (SBLSCS, 46; Atlanta: Scholars Press).

Whitelam, Keith W.

- 1996 *The Invention of Ancient Israel: The Silencing of Palestinian History* (London and New York: Routledge).

Whitley, C.F.

- 1979 *Kohleth: His Language and Thought* (BZAW, 148; Berlin and New York: de Gruyter).

Whybray, R.N.

- 1981 'The Identification and Use of Quotations in Ecclesiastes', in *Congress Volume: Vienna 1980* (VTSup, 32; Leiden: Brill), pp. 435–51.
- 1989a *Ecclesiastes* (NCB; London: Marshall Morgan and Scott; Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans).
- 1989b *Ecclesiastes* (OTG; Sheffield: JSOT Press).

Will, Édouard

- 1979 *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*: vol. 1, *De la mort d'Alexandre aux événements d'Antiochos III et de Philippe V* (Annales de l'Est, Mémoire, 30; Nancy: Publications de l'Université, 2nd revd edn).
- 1982 *Histoire politique du monde hellénistique (323–30 av. J.-C.)*: vol. 2, *Des événements d'Antiochos III et de Philippe V à la fin des Lagides* (Annales de l'Est, Mémoire, 32; Nancy: Publications de l'Université, 2nd revd edn).
- 1985 'Pour une "Anthropologie Coloniale" du Monde Hellénistique', in John W. Eadie and Josiah Ober (eds), *The Craft of the Ancient Historian: Essays in Honor of Chester G. Starr* (New York: University Press of America), pp. 273–301.

Will, Ernest

- 1982 'Un Monument Hellénistique de Jordanie: Le Qasr el 'abd d'Iraq al Amir', *SHAJ* 1: 197–200.
- 1987 'Qu'est-ce qu'une baris?' *Syria* 64: 253–59.

Will, Ernest and François Larché (eds)

- 1991 *Iraq al Amir: Le Château du Tobiade Hyrcan* (2 vols; Institut Français d'Archéologie du Proche-Orient, Bibliothèque Archéologique et Historique, 132; Paris: Librairie Orientaliste Paul Geuthner).

Williams, Margaret H.

- 1995 'Palestinian Jewish Personal Names in Acts', in Richard Bauckham (ed.), *The Book of Acts in its First Century Setting*: vol. 4, *The Book of Acts in Its Palestinian Setting* (Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans), pp. 79–113.
- 1997a 'The Meaning and Function of *Ioudaios* in Graeco-Roman Inscriptions', *ZPE* 116: 249–62.
- 1997b 'Jewish Use of Moses as a Personal Name in Graeco-Roman Antiquity – A Note', *ZPE* 118: 274.

- 1998 *The Jews among the Greeks and Romans: A Diaspora Handbook* (London: Duckworth).
- 2002 'The Case for Jewish Use of Moses as Personal Name in Graeco-Roman Antiquity', *ZPE* 140: 279–83.
- 2007 'The Use of Alternative Names by Diaspora Jews in Graeco-Roman Antiquity', *JSJ* 38: 307–27.
- Wills, Lawrence M.
1995 *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World* (Myth and Poetics; Ithaca and London: Cornell).
- Windschuttle, Keith
1996 *The Killing of History: How Literary Critics and Social Theorists Are Murdering our Past* (New York: The Free Press, revd and expanded edn).
- Winnicki, Jan Krzysztof
1989 'Militäroperationen von Ptolemaios I. und Seleukos I. in Syrien in den Jahren 312–311 v. Chr. (I)', *AncSoc* 20: 55–92.
1991 'Militäroperationen von Ptolemaios I. und Seleukos I. in Syrien in den Jahren 312–311 v. Chr. (II)', *AncSoc* 22: 147–201.
- Wissowa, Georg and Wilhelm Kroll (eds)
1894–1972 *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (Stuttgart: J.B. Metzlersche Verlagbuchhandlung) = *PW*.
- Wolff, Hans Julius
1960 'Plurality of Laws in Ptolemaic Egypt', *Revue Internationale des Droits de l'Antiquité* 7: 191–223.
1962 *Das Justizwesen der Ptolemäer* (Münchener Beiträge zur Papyrusforschung und antiken Rechtsgeschichte, 44; Munich: Beck).
1966 'Law in Ptolemaic Egypt', in *Essays in Honor of C. Bradford Welles* (American Studies in Papyrology, 1; New Haven, CT: American Society of Papyrologists), pp. 67–77.
1978 *Das Recht der griechischen Papyri Ägyptens in der Zeit der Ptolemaeer und des Prinzipats: 2. Band, Organisation und Kontrolle des privaten Rechtsverkehrs* (HdA, 10. Abteilung; Rechtsgeschichte des Altertums, 5/2; Munich: Beck).
- Worsley, Peter
1957 *The Trumpet Shall Sound: A Study of 'Cargo' Cults in Melanesia* (London: Macgibbon & Kee).
- Wright, Benjamin G.
1989 *No Small Difference: Sirach's Relationship to its Hebrew Parent Text* (SBLSCS, 26; Atlanta: Scholars Press).
- Wright, G. Ernest
1964 *Shechem: The Biography of a Biblical City* (New York and Toronto: McGraw-Hill).
- Wright, G.R.H.: see Campbell, Edward F.
- Xeravits, Géza G. and József Zsengellér (eds)
2005 *The Book of Tobit: Text, Tradition, Theology; Papers of the First International Conference on the Deuteronomical [sic] Books, Pépa, Hungary, 20–21 May, 2004* (JSJSup, 98; Leiden: Brill).
- Young, Robert
1995 *Colonial Desire: Hybridity in Theory, Culture and Race* (London and New York: Routledge).

Zayadine, Fawzi

1990 'La campagne d'Antiochos III le Grand en 219–217 et le siège de Rabbatamana', *RevB* 97: 68–84.

1997 'Iraq el-Amir', *OEANE* 3: 177–81.

Ziegler, Joseph

1980 *Sapientia Iesu Filii Sirach* (Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum, 12/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd edn).

1999 *Susanna, Daniel, Bel et Draco* (ed. Olivier Munnich; foreword by R. Smend; Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum 16/2; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2nd edn).

Zimmermann, F.

1958 *The Book of Tobit* (Dropsie College Jewish Apocryphal Literature; New York: Harper).

Zuckerman, Constantine

1985–88 'Hellenistic *politeumata* and the Jews: A Reconsideration', *SCI* 8/9: 171–85.

INDEX OF NAMES AND SUBJECTS

NB: Greek words and Hebrew words have their own indexes

- Aaron/ite 145, 228, 237, 239–40
 Abdera 75, 113–15, 120, 190–1, 202,
 225, 230, 243, 247, 264, 283
 Abila 180, 299, 322
 Abrettene 188
 Abu el-'Alayiq 35
 acculturation 156, 201
 Achaemenid 50, 137–8, 143, 171, 214,
 219, 268
 Achaeus 298–300, 317–18
 acropolis 32, 43
 Adam/adamic 83, 85, 241, 247, 251,
 259–60, 308
 Adelphoi 154, 291
 administration 52, 55, 64, 101, 129,
 134, 136, 143–4, 157, 161, 166–72,
 175, 181, 185–6, 190–1, 200–1, 207,
 209, 214–16, 218–20, 232, 292, 328,
 331–2
 Adonai 255
 Adoraim 49
 Adoreos 176
 Adriatic 317
 Adversary 256; *see also* Satan
 Aegean 61, 129, 134, 224, 274, 280,
 289, 317, 319
 Aetolian 317, 321
 Africa 6, 12, 27, 141, 173
 Africanus, Julius 122
 afterlife 44, 48, 83, 96, 102, 258, 307
 Agatharchides 75, 236, 281
 Agathocles 320
 agora 28, 34, 37, 141
 agrarian, agriculture 28, 31, 35, 45–6,
 48, 167, 177, 188, 195, 197, 206–7,
 209–11, 213, 215–17, 219, 222, 224,
 236, 281, 302, 314, 332–3
 Agreophon 292
 Agrippa 70, 231–2
 Ahikar 103, 275
 Ahura Mazda 147, 158
 Aī 147, 159
 Akkadian 253, 331
 Akko/Acco/Accho/Ake/Ptolemais
 28, 45, 47, 62, 146, 175–6, 217, 280,
 287, 299
 alabarch 154
 Alcimus 110
 Alexander 3, 10, 15, 18, 30, 32–3, 35,
 44, 60–2, 71–2, 74–5, 84, 88–9, 92,
 111–13, 119–22, 128–9, 136–9, 141–2,
 145, 147, 150, 154–6, 160, 162, 170–3,
 177, 185, 209, 212, 226, 234, 245–7,
 267–78, 280, 286, 288, 291, 307, 309,
 331, 333
 Alexandria/n 40, 67, 72, 77, 84–5,
 91–3, 97, 120–1, 135, 142, 147, 150,
 154, 164, 167, 175, 183–4, 194, 197–9,
 212, 235–6, 243, 250, 253–4, 270, 274,
 276, 289, 291, 297, 300–1, 310, 313
 allegorical 92–3
 allotments 20, 196, 285
 alphabet 20, 87–8
 altar 34, 37, 40, 43, 59, 139, 228, 237,
 239–43, 259
 Amanus 174
 Amman/Ammon 42, 48, 176, 270,
 276, 278, 295, 299
 Ammanitis 176, 291, 295
 Ammianus 17
 amphitheatres 131
 amphora/e 30, 36–7, 44, 47, 49, 59,
 62–4, 218, 223–4, 333
 Anabasis 14, 111–12
 Anafa, Tell 28, 46
 Anaïtis 188
 Anan 230
 Ananias 292
 Ananis 145
 Anath 216

- Anatolia 280
 Ancyra 269, 291
 Andromachus 276–7, 300
 angel/ology 81, 83, 96, 99, 104, 151, 229, 238, 240–2, 247, 256–9, 261, 264, 278, 307–8, 310, 319
 Angra Mainyu 158
 aniconic 264, 285
 Anihita 158
 annal/ist 9–10, 122
 annalists 10
 annals 122
 anthropology/anthropologist 5, 149, 152–3, 185
 Antigoniid/s 268, 273–4, 316
 Antigonus 177, 180, 271–4, 279–81, 286–7, 289
 Antilibanus 174
 Antioch 62, 176, 290–1, 300, 331
 Antiochus I 147, 289
 Antiochus II 290
 Antiochus III 28, 30, 33, 56–8, 60–2, 74, 76–7, 97, 101, 174, 177, 186, 189–92, 208, 213, 221, 227, 230, 289, 291, 298, 316–21, 323–7, 329, 332
 Antiochus IV 7, 71, 76, 97, 105, 107, 110, 120, 126, 128, 132, 138, 155, 159, 220, 229, 231, 294, 301, 316, 318, 329, 336
 Antiochus Hierax 290–1
 Antipater 268, 271–2, 279, 286
 Apamea 60, 176, 187, 318
 Apion 16, 68, 70, 72, 92, 163, 194, 203, 226, 236, 282–3
 apocalypse/apocalyptic 24, 81–2, 86, 99–100, 102–3, 106, 149–51, 238, 240, 242, 259–62, 264, 306–11, 315, 335
 apocalyptic 24, 81, 83, 86, 99–100, 102–3, 106, 149–51, 238, 240, 260–2, 264, 306–11, 315, 335
 Apollonia 33, 46–7
 Apollonius 34, 52, 145, 216, 292
 Apollophanes 59, 178
 Appian 121, 171, 279–80, 282, 286–7, 318–19
 Aquila 250
 Arabia/n 40, 76, 129, 159, 161, 174, 180, 217, 224, 283, 300, 320–1
 Arad 41, 48
 Aradus 299
 Aramaic 24–5, 28, 32, 51, 58–60, 63, 66, 70, 79–81, 87, 94–5, 98–100, 103, 129, 133, 142–4, 164–5, 173, 177–9, 193, 253, 264, 295, 305, 312, 331
 Araq; *see* Iraq al-Amir
 Aratus 93
 archaeology/ist 27, 30–46, 48–51, 59, 63, 74, 148, 151–2, 176–7, 179–81, 194, 197, 214–15, 217–19, 224, 234, 277, 295–7, 303, 314, 333
 archiereia, archiereus, archiphulakites, archisynagogoi, *see* Greek Words
 architecture 28, 31–3, 35–6, 50, 147–8, 159, 236, 296
 archive 16, 52–4, 142, 156, 160, 166, 182–4, 193, 197, 200–1, 277, 291, 302
 archon; *see* Greek Words
 Areus 190, 226
 Argarizin 88
 Argos 11, 283
 Arians 284
 Arimathea 232
 Aristeeas 21, 66–7, 75, 90, 113, 135, 155–6, 164–5, 183, 194, 226–7, 235, 237, 261, 264, 278, 282, 290, 305–6
 Aristobulus 67, 84, 92–3, 112, 121, 282
 aristocracy 12, 87, 127, 186, 191, 240, 243, 321
 Aristonicus 277
 Aristotle 93, 162, 189, 207, 214
 Armenia/n 113, 143, 188, 273
 army, armies 19, 70, 72, 82, 109, 134, 140, 144, 150, 166, 177, 213, 219, 222, 268–71, 279–82, 286–7, 290, 298–300, 309, 317–19, 322
 Arrhidaeus 271
 Arrian 10, 15, 18, 111–12, 120, 274, 276–8
 Arsaces, Arsacid 138, 289
 Arsinoe 59, 62, 236, 290–1
 Arsuf 33, 46–7
 artaba/e 212, 325
 Artapanus 20, 89–90, 92, 305, 312
 Artavasdes 143
 Artaxerxes 14
 Asael 81, 241, 256
 Ascalon, Ashkelon 37, 47, 60
 ascetic 96
 Asellio 17
 Ashdod 37, 45, 47, 174, 279
 ashlar 27, 34, 36, 148
 Ashur 158
 Asia 3–4, 6, 108, 139–42, 152, 159, 162, 171, 181, 185, 187–8, 214–15, 217, 229, 268–9, 272–3, 279–80, 289–91, 298, 317–20, 331–2
 Asmodaeus 257

- Asoka 143
 Assyria/n 7, 16, 28, 40, 95, 108, 126, 143, 155, 158–9, 161, 216, 218, 247, 253, 309
 astrology/astronomy 20, 71, 81, 83, 88–90, 108, 257, 264, 307–8
 Atabyrium 299
 Atargatis 146
 atheism 19
 Athens/Athenian 3, 84–6, 89–90, 92–4, 96, 98, 107, 120, 139, 142, 147, 154, 160, 185, 189, 207, 269
 Atlantic 24
 Atlas 88
 Attalus/Attalid 139, 291, 318
 Attic 8, 40, 61–2, 75, 113, 212, 246, 293, 322
 Augustine 256
 Augustus 71, 96, 121
 autarkeia; *see* Greek Words
 autopsy 11, 16
 Azariah 104
 Azazel 257
 Azotus; *see* Ashdod
- Babel 89
 Babylon/ia 16, 61, 102, 104–5, 112, 122, 134, 137–8, 142, 160, 187, 214, 262, 270–4, 279–80, 283, 288, 290, 327, 331
 Babylonian/s 2–3, 7, 16, 40, 63, 67, 71, 87, 104, 122, 126, 137, 138, 143, 145, 150, 158–9, 161, 217–18, 246–7, 253, 275, 309, 331–2
 Bacchides 38, 143
 Bactria 61, 272
 Baetocaece 187–8
 Bagohi 145, 230
Bahman Yasht 149–50, 306, 310
 Baitokaike; *see* Baetocaece
 Balātah, Tell 32
 bankruptcy 209–10, 228
baris; *see* Greek Words
 barley 212, 216
 Barrikas 145
 Baruch 66, 103, 110, 145, 238
 basilikos; *see* Greek Words 167, 169
 Batanaia 322
 Batash, Tell 47, 218
 Bat-Yam 49
 Beersheba 41, 63
 Behistun 12, 253
 Beirut 299
 Bel 103
 beliar 257
 belief/s 5, 16, 88, 99–101, 155, 157, 239, 242–3, 245, 254, 258, 262, 308, 335
 Beliel 109, 257
 Belshazzar 105
 Beluchistan 271
 Belus 283
 Ben Sira 36, 67, 81, 79, 94, 100–2, 110, 185, 190, 192, 225, 227–9, 234–5, 237, 242, 247, 257–62, 304, 307–8, 311, 315, 323–4
 Benages 100
 Berenica 62
 Berenice/Berenike 181–4, 201, 235–6, 290
 Berossus 16, 67, 73, 113, 122, 134, 137, 160
 Berytus 299
 Bessus 271
 Beth-Shean/Scythopolis 29–30, 46
 Beth-Yerah 29, 45
 Bethel 35, 47
 Bhabha 6
 Bible 8, 10, 18, 24–5, 27, 31–2, 40, 58, 65–9, 78, 84–8, 90, 92–5, 102–3, 135, 144, 151–2, 155, 234, 237, 239, 245–8, 250, 252–4, 256, 259, 262–4, 285, 303–5, 307, 314
 bibliography 65, 69, 111, 149, 274
 bids 77, 195, 211, 301–2
 bilingual 28, 58–60, 133, 142–4, 160
 Bīrāh/birtā; *see* Greek Words
bit-ḥilani-style 42
 Boccharis/Bokchoris 149, 150, 307, 309
 borders 41, 47–8, 175–7, 185, 211, 271, 318; *see* frontier
 Boubastos 194
 boule; *see* Greek Words
 brick/brickyard 40, 195–6, 302
 brigands 231
 Buddhist 143
 bullae 142
 bureau/cracy 143, 157, 162, 166, 169, 209–10, 215
 burial/s 39–40, 45, 50, 96, 179, 194
 Busayra 176
 Byblos 138–9
 Byzantine 42, 46, 65, 120, 122, 253
- Cadmus 115, 284
 Caesar, Julius 10, 71, 119, 121
 Caesarea 217

- Caiaphas 185, 225
 Cairo 98–9
 Calani 162
 calendar 83, 90, 99–100, 235, 242–4, 264
 Callisthenes 113, 271, 275
 Canaan/ite 35, 89, 139, 146
 canon/ical 12, 25, 245–7, 250, 262, 304, 314
 Canopus 55, 216, 290
 Cappadocia 188, 289
 Cardia 15, 18, 119–20, 271
 Caria 269, 273
 Carmel 47
 Carthage/Carthaginian 189, 290
 Cassander 272–3, 279–81, 286–7
 Cassandria 112
 Caunos 52
 Celt/s 139, 269, 289
 Ceraeas 299
 Cerdimmas 277
 Cestius 71
 Chalchis 176, 298
 Chaldaea/n 16
chrematistai 198
 Chremonidean 289
 Chrēmatistes 197
 chronographer 19, 67, 85, 263, 311
 chronography 18, 84–5
 chronological 3, 11–13, 20, 24, 63, 69, 85–7, 99, 296, 335
 chronologie 2, 319
 chronology 2–3, 34, 60, 75, 77, 85–6, 122, 293
 Cicero 8, 17–18
 Cilicia 174, 214, 273, 322
 Cilician 269
 circumcision 5, 115–16, 120, 284
 cistern 36–8, 43, 49, 324
 citadel 38, 322, 324
 citizen/ship 70, 72, 134, 141, 158, 160, 164, 183–4, 189, 223, 232, 277, 285
 class 4, 62, 101, 116, 127, 129, 131, 140, 142, 144, 154, 162, 194–5, 198, 204, 208, 221, 302
 classes 129, 140, 142, 162, 194, 198, 204, 208, 221
 Claudius 72, 112, 232
 Clearchus 162
 Cleitarchus 112
 Clement 67, 84–5, 92, 150, 310
 Cleon 57, 172, 327
 Cleopatra 101, 107–8, 145, 319
 cleruchy/cleruchies 155, 195–6, 209, 221, 292, 313
 Clitarchus 18
 Cnidus 14–15, 75, 92, 236, 281
 Coele-Syria 56, 58, 60, 76, 97, 162, 172–4, 176, 178, 185, 208, 213, 268, 279–80, 282, 286–7, 298–9, 301, 313–14, 317–19, 321–2
 coin/age 3, 27–8, 30–6, 38–9, 41–4, 46, 51, 60–2, 139, 148, 179, 188, 209–10, 212–13, 218, 226, 267, 283, 288, 293, 316
 Colchi 283–4
 colony/colonialism/postcolonialism 3, 5–7, 59, 115, 139, 141–2, 150, 156, 164, 167, 170, 173, 196, 283–4, 313, 322–3
 colophon 101
 columbaria 39
 Comana 188
 Commagene 147, 174
 commentary 20–1, 46, 52, 55, 68, 81, 86, 90, 95, 102–3, 106–7, 111, 114–15, 120–1, 151, 180, 183, 263, 269, 274, 298, 305, 310, 312, 319, 322, 331–2
 Companions 5, 102, 111, 205
 confiscation 187
 conflagration 30, 44, 108–9
 conquer/conquerer/conquest 6–7, 10, 15–16, 18, 33, 43–4, 56, 60–1, 72, 84, 90, 101, 105, 109, 113, 116, 120–2, 129, 138, 141–2, 147, 149, 157–9, 177, 180, 253–4, 261, 267–71, 273–4, 275–7, 282, 299, 306, 309, 321–3, 325–6, 333, 335
 Corinthian 42, 269
 corn 211
 Cornelius 256
 corvée 220
 cosmos/cosmogony 81, 83, 151, 310
 council 141, 189, 191–2, 230–2, 288, 300, 333
 court/s 14, 18, 40, 103–4, 137, 143, 160–1, 183, 196–202, 204, 233–4, 262, 302–3, 332
 courtesan 291
 covenant 87, 241, 259
 craftworkers 206
 Crassus 143
 Crete/Cretan 183, 189
 crisis in wisdom 80, 315, 335
 Crocodilopolis 236
 crop/s 172, 210–12, 215

- crown/s 55–7, 169, 172, 215, 217, 228,
 290, 292, 301, 325, 327
 Ctesias 8, 14–15, 20, 87, 119, 122
 cubits 202
 cult 27, 30, 33, 68, 75, 77, 85, 96, 99,
 101, 134, 137, 141, 144, 146–9, 155,
 158, 165, 170, 178, 182, 184, 186–7,
 190, 225, 228–30, 236, 238–9, 241,
 285, 334
 cultivate/cultivation 99, 143, 180, 186,
 198, 209, 211, 264, 302, 334–5
 culture 3–6, 15–16, 18 20, 23, 30, 45–
 7, 51–2, 59–60, 63, 74, 78, 88–91, 93,
 96, 109, 113, 125–8, 131–3, 135–6,
 138–42, 144, 146–53, 156–65, 176,
 179, 184, 194, 197, 205, 208, 210, 261,
 274, 289–90, 298, 311, 331
 cuneiform 3, 122, 138, 331
 currency; *see* coin/s
 Curtius; *see* Quintus
 Cyclad 274
 Cynic 181
 Cyprus 60, 216–17, 221, 224, 268,
 273–4, 279–80, 289
 Cyrene/Cyrenaica 174, 182–3, 268,
 279, 286, 289–90
 Cyrus 14, 105, 259, 273

 Daliyeh, Wadi 277
 Dalmatia 317
 Damascus 72, 99, 176, 243, 270
 Damoxenus 321
 Damoxeus 321
 Dan 27–8, 44, 59–60, 86, 102–3, 110,
 144, 258, 273, 299–300, 321–3
 Danaus 115, 283–4
 Daniel 21, 65–6, 68, 86–8, 102–6, 110,
 121, 164, 236, 238, 241, 247, 251,
 260–3, 304, 312, 319, 322–3
 Dardanelles 269
 Darius 12, 14, 102–5, 147, 150,
 269–71, 276, 307, 309
 dating 32–3, 38, 40, 42, 44, 48, 51, 59,
 63, 65, 67, 77–80, 82, 84–5, 88, 91–2,
 94–5, 98–9, 101, 110, 177, 256, 282,
 295, 310
 Dauwar 235
 David/city of David 35, 49, 60, 62–4,
 87, 218, 259
 dead/death 8, 12, 18, 24, 48, 62, 68,
 70–2, 78, 80, 82–3, 90, 98, 100, 104–5,
 108–9, 120–1, 140, 149, 156, 160, 178,
 212, 227, 234, 248, 257–8, 264, 268,
 270, 273–4, 277–8, 286, 288, 290, 296,
 308
 debt 58, 173, 201, 215
 Decapolis 43, 48, 180, 299, 320
 decree/s 55–7, 97, 136, 172, 175, 186,
 189–92, 198–9, 201, 215–16, 221,
 230–1, 290, 292, 300–1, 323–7
 defence/s 29, 41, 48, 72, 85, 93, 176,
 269, 298–9, 303, 313; *see also*
 fortifications
 deification 137, 154, 271
 Deir Mar Saba 49
 deity/deities 80, 90, 93, 115, 145, 147,
 151, 158, 196, 237, 255–6, 261, 307,
 310; *see also* god/s, goddess
 dekanikos; *see* Greek Words
 Demetrius 19, 21, 66–7, 85–6, 92, 122,
 145, 254, 263, 272–4, 279–81, 286–7,
 305, 311, 335
 democracy 185, 269
 demographics 208, 218, 223
 demon/ology 83, 96, 109, 257–8, 308
 Demosthenes 185
 Demotic 52, 54, 100, 142–3, 149–50,
 169, 193, 197, 202, 204, 210, 274–5,
 301–2, 307, 309, 331
 depopulation 45
 deportation 3, 24, 282
 Deuteronomy/Deuteronomic/
 Deuteronomistic 66, 102, 155, 239–
 40, 246
 devil: *see* demon/ology
 Diadochi 3, 15, 29, 44, 51, 61, 75, 81,
 120, 122, 171, 180, 209, 267–8, 271–4,
 278, 282, 286, 315–16
 diaspora 2–5, 95–6, 103–4, 106, 109,
 113, 129, 135, 144–7, 155, 157, 181,
 219, 235–6, 243, 245, 250, 254, 304–6,
 314, 332, 334
 Diocles 146
 Diodorus 14–15, 90, 111–17, 119–20,
 140, 171, 177, 180, 190, 202, 213, 247,
 255, 271, 278–81, 283–4, 286–7
 Diodotos 146
dioiketes; *see* Greek Words
 Dionicus 57, 327
 Dionysius 145
 Dionysus 256
 Diophanes 203
 Diospolis 209
 Disdotos 203, 303
 divination 102, 108, 261, 307–8, 311,
 334
 divorce 200, 203

- Diyllus 120
 document/s 16, 52–5, 59, 79, 96, 98–9,
 139, 142–5, 154–5, 169, 178, 182, 184,
 188, 193–202, 210–11, 215–16, 230,
 235–6, 240–1, 243, 246, 251, 254–5,
 262, 291–2, 302–3, 305, 312–13, 322,
 325–6, 332–3
 Domitian 70
 Dor 30, 44–5, 47–8, 62, 145, 148, 193
 Dorotheos 235
 Dositheus/Dositheos 98, 145, 154,
 195, 203, 303
 Dothan 31, 38
 Doura 30
 dove/s 39, 218
 dowry 77, 200, 203, 303, 319
 drachma/s 56, 59, 203, 212–14, 220,
 235, 292
 Draco 103
 dream/s 82, 102, 104, 149–50, 274,
 278, 281, 307–8, 309
 Drimylus/Drimylos 98, 154, 195
 drogomans 253, 306
 dunams 33, 39
 dyeing 30, 33, 39
 dynasty/dynasties 23, 52, 54, 122,
 139, 150, 169, 267–8, 273–4, 288–9,
 309, 316, 324
Dynasty Prophecy 150, 309
 Dystros 55

 earthquake 29
 East 7–8, 24, 32, 60, 111, 121–2,
 125–6, 128–9, 132, 134, 136–8, 140,
 142–4, 147–9, 151, 159, 161, 163–4,
 178, 187, 205, 213, 253, 267, 275, 306,
 328, 331
 Ecbatana 270
 Ecclesiastes: *see* Qohelet
 Ecclesiasticus *see* Ben Sira
 economy 45, 51, 54–5, 79, 140–1, 153,
 162, 166, 170, 172, 185–6, 188, 194–6,
 199, 205–10, 213–16, 218–24, 268,
 278, 286, 290, 292, 296, 322, 332–3
 Edfu 194
 Edom/ites 24, 48, 58–9, 176, 178–80
 education 20, 53, 86, 91, 93, 129, 133,
 142–3, 160–1, 164, 242, 297
 Egypt 3–5, 16, 19–20, 30, 45, 51–5,
 61, 86, 88–91, 97, 108–10, 113–15,
 117–18, 121, 127, 129, 136–7, 141–2,
 144–50, 154–7, 160, 162, 166–71,
 174–6, 181, 184–7, 191, 193–9, 201–4,
 208–9, 211–20, 224, 226–7, 234–5,
 238, 242, 245, 250, 257, 267–8, 270–6,
 278–90, 293, 298, 301–2, 305, 309,
 313, 316–21, 328, 331–3
 Egyptian/2 3, 12, 16, 19–20, 23, 39, 51,
 53–4, 62, 67, 71, 78, 89–90, 97, 107,
 109, 114–18, 118, 120, 122, 137,
 142–51, 156–7, 160–1, 166, 169–70,
 174–5, 186–7, 193, 195–8, 200, 202,
 204, 209, 211–12, 219, 272, 274–6,
 279, 283–4, 286, 289–91, 298, 300–2,
 307, 309–10, 313, 315, 317–18, 321,
 323–4, 331
 Egyptianization 136–7
 ekklesia; ekpyrosis; *see* Greek Words
 Ekron 218
 Elamite 158
 Elburz 289
 elder/s 105, 183, 189, 191, 202, 204,
 223, 230–1, 262, 300, 306, 333
 Eleazar 226–7
 elephant/s 289, 318, 322, 324
 Elephantine 3, 25, 51, 117, 154, 193,
 211, 230, 246
 Eleutherus/Eleutheros 174, 176, 288
 elite/s 186, 207, 223, 238, 272
 Elohim 256–7
 Elymais 318
 Elyon 256
 emigration 3, 283; *see also*
 immigrant/s
 Emir 41, 75, 293
 empire/s 3, 5–7, 14, 61, 102–3, 106,
 133–4, 136–7, 142–3, 147, 155, 159,
 161, 164, 166, 170–1, 174–5, 195, 197,
 209–10, 212–16, 220–1, 261–2, 267–8,
 270–4, 278, 280, 288–9, 298, 316, 318,
 331
 Enoch 81–3, 88, 98–100, 102, 129,
 131, 238–9, 241–4, 246–7, 251, 256–8,
 264, 278, 305, 307–8, 311–12, 315
 eparch/y 171, 175
 ephebate 141, 160
 Ephemerides 112
 Ephesus 289
 Ephorus/Ephoros 119
 ephors 189
 Ephraim 46–7
 Epicurean 181
 Epigone; *see* Greek Words
 Epiphanes 76, 126, 318–19
 Epirus 273
epistates 144, 167, 170, 203
epistrategos 167
 Eropus 321

- escatology/eschaton 241, 259
 estate/s 31, 36, 38, 50, 52, 105, 134,
 172, 185, 187–8, 215–16, 257, 295,
 308, 333
 Esther 21, 65–6, 68, 72, 97, 102–3,
 110, 153, 241, 251–2, 263, 304
 Ethiopian/s 19, 89–90
 ethnarch 184
 ethnic/ity 53, 135, 142, 144, 146,
 151–6, 165, 169, 178, 181–2, 197, 200,
 203, 230, 278, 285
 Euergetes 101, 154, 235, 290, 317
 euergetes: *see* Greek Words
 Euhemerus/euhemerism 88, 90
 Eumenes 122, 139, 279, 286
 eunuch 276
 Eupator 46, 58
 Euphrates 268, 270, 275, 298
 Eupolemus 20, 86–9, 107, 114, 325
 Euripides 91, 143
 Europe, Europeans 6, 103, 140–1,
 146, 250
 Eurydice 272
 Eusebius 19–20, 67, 84–6, 88, 122,
 277, 281, 287
Exagoge of Ezekiel 90–1, 263
 exile/s 3, 5, 24, 95, 110, 185, 225, 246,
 271
 Ezechias 283
 Ezekias/Ezekias 194, 226, 282–3
 Ezekiel 84, 90–1, 93–4, 240, 251, 257,
 262–3, 304

 faience 48
 Failaka 159
 Falasha 164
 Farhi 63
 farm/farmer/farmstead 36, 46–7, 50,
 56, 76–7, 167–8, 174–5, 179, 195–6,
 204, 208–9, 211–12, 215, 222, 293–4,
 302, 313–14, 333
 Fayum 52, 54, 156, 197, 302
 festivals 96–7, 100, 187, 234–7
 fiction 18, 21, 67, 74, 96–8, 188, 227,
 267, 278, 293, 298, 311–12, 315, 317,
 335
 Florus 72, 232
 folktale 95
 forgeries 22, 93
 fortifications/fortresses 28–30, 32–5,
 38, 41–2, 44, 71, 76, 148, 176, 183,
 228, 291, 295–6, 327; *see also* gar-
 rison/s
 frankincense 40, 325

 frontier 62, 176, 180, 212, 279, 286;
see also border/s

 Gabriel 257
 Gadara 43, 48, 138, 180–1, 299, 322
 Gader 43
 Galatians 140
 Galatis 299
 Galilee 29, 43, 46, 61, 68, 71–2, 130,
 142–3, 176–7, 216, 231, 238, 321
 Gamaliel 233
 garrison 41, 44, 57, 167, 171, 177,
 279–80, 282, 286–7, 313, 320, 321–4
 Gaugamela 270
 Gauls 139, 289
 Gaza 37, 45, 47, 60, 174, 217, 220,
 226, 270, 272, 275–7, 279–80, 282–3,
 286–7, 321
 Gazaeans 174
 Gehenna 108–9
 Genesis 66, 85, 88, 102, 113, 241,
 246–7, 263
 Genizah 98–9
 Gephirus 299
 Gerasa 48, 180
 Gerizim 32–3, 47, 59–60, 88, 177–8,
 249
gerousia; *see* Greek Words
 Gerrha 176, 298
 Gerza 52
Gests of Alexander 111, 274–5
 Getae 284
 Gezer 34
Giants, Book of 81, 83, 257
 giants 82, 89, 257, 264, 278
 Gideon 75
 Gihon 36
 Gilead 299
 god/s 8, 22, 25, 28, 59–60, 83, 87,
 89–90, 93, 96–7, 102, 104, 106, 108–9,
 115–16, 120, 127, 134–5, 137, 145–6,
 151, 154, 158, 160, 187, 202, 211, 228,
 237, 241–2, 247, 255–8, 261–2, 270–1,
 284–5, 291, 300–1, 304, 307–8, 310,
 312, 327;
 328; *see also* deity/deities
 goddess 146, 158, 284
 Golan 46
 gold 48, 61, 209, 212, 222, 301
 Gonatas 273, 289
 Gophna 47
 governors 70, 243
 Govrin 39, 59

- grain 37, 40–1, 64, 168, 178, 208–10, 212, 214–16, 290
grammateus; *see* Greek Words
 granary/granaries 40, 208
 Granicus 269
 grapes 195–6, 199, 302
 Greece 8, 13, 37, 75, 108, 115, 120, 131, 134, 162, 205–6, 268–70, 272–4, 280, 283–4, 289, 320, 331
 Gubar 105
 gymnasium 141, 160, 173

 Hadad 146
 Hadrian 3, 108–10, 177, 197
 Haggai 102
 Hakkoz 86
 Halicarnassus 269
 Hammat Gader 43
 Hanan 145
 Hananiah 104
 Hannibal 317
 Harmachis 166, 169
 harvest/s 187, 210
 Hasidim 106, 164
 Hasmonaeon/s 18, 27, 35–8, 41, 44, 46, 49–50, 60–1, 74, 82, 87–8, 94, 103, 120–1, 127, 129, 140, 146, 150, 155, 177, 181, 215, 221, 223–5, 229, 293, 316, 324
 Hawara 54, 197, 202, 302
 Heacleopolite 167
 heaven 83, 97, 108–9, 255–7, 285, 307–8
 Hebrew 18, 22, 24–5, 32, 34, 58–60, 62–4, 66–8, 72, 78–80, 86–9, 92, 94–5, 100–3, 111, 113, 129, 133, 144–5, 153, 159, 164–5, 177–8, 193, 196, 228, 230–1, 234, 237, 239, 245–50, 252–6, 259, 262, 264, 274–5, 303–7, 315, 324
 Hebron 49
 Hecataeus/Hekataios 11, 69, 75, 113–18, 120, 190–2, 202, 225, 230, 243, 247, 261, 264, 283–5
 hectares 49
 Hefzibah 56, 172–3, 322–3, 325–6
 Heliodorus/Heliodoros 57, 172, 319, 322, 327–9
 Heliopolis 122
 Helladote 200, 203
 Hellanicus 11–12
 Hellenistic 2–5, 7, 9, 18–23, 25, 27–51, 53, 55, 57–60, 62–3, 71, 73–5, 79, 81, 84–94, 96–8, 107–8, 111, 113, 117, 119–20, 122, 125–44, 146–50, 153–7, 159–66, 171, 173, 175–9, 181–2, 187–90, 193, 195–7, 200–1, 205, 208, 213–15, 217–19, 222–3, 231, 235, 243, 245–7, 249, 251, 253, 256, 258–62, 267–8, 274–5, 279, 285, 287–8, 293, 295–6, 298, 305, 309–11, 314, 316, 319, 322–3, 331–4
 Hellenism/Hellenization 6, 48, 50, 84, 94, 107, 122, 125–43, 147–9, 159–60, 162–5, 173, 179–80, 195, 223, 234, 323, 331
 Hellespont 331
 Heraclea 280
 Heracleopolis/Herakleopolis 53, 156, 181–4, 193–4, 197, 201–2
 Heracles 16
 Herakleia 199, 203, 303
 Hercules 270, 276
 herds/herders 155, 172, 292
 Herennium 17
 Hermon 321
 Herod 71–2, 121, 127, 131, 231
 Herodian 36, 38, 233
 Herodotus 8, 11–13, 15–6, 20–2, 87, 91, 114, 117, 214, 221, 245
 Heshbon/Hesban/Hisban 41, 44, 46, 293, 296–7
 Hesiod 11, 92
 Hestia 284
hevel 80
 Hezekiah 194, 226, 282–3
 Hibe 54, 169
 Hierax 290–1
 hierocracy 243
 hieroglyphic 160
 Hieronymus; *see* Jerome
 high priest 56–7, 64, 75, 77–8, 100, 110, 113, 118, 135, 146, 158, 164, 170, 172, 174, 185–6, 188–92, 194, 220–2, 225–8, 230–4, 237, 243, 259, 274–6, 278, 283, 285, 294, 297, 300, 314, 319, 323–4, 326–8, 332–3
hikanos; *see* Greek Words
 Hillel 96
 Hinnom 50
 hipparchy 195
 Hippodamian 29–30, 39, 45
 Hippolochus 299
 Hippos 180
 historiography 8, 11, 16, 18, 20–2, 68, 74–5, 84–5, 102, 113–14, 122, 131, 155, 246, 293, 311–13, 315, 322, 335
 history/historians 2–24, 34, 37, 41, 44–6, 52, 54–6, 60, 63, 65–9, 71–7,

- 80–3, 85, 87–8, 90–1, 97–9, 101,
105–6, 111–14, 117, 119–22, 126–7,
136, 138, 149, 151, 164, 166, 169, 185,
191, 193, 195, 197, 205, 208, 223, 231,
238, 246–9, 253, 261, 264, 267–8,
274–5, 279, 281, 284, 287–8, 290–1,
293–4, 305, 308–16, 321–3, 328, 332,
335–6
- Homer 11, 12, 91–4
- Horos 169
- Hula Valley 27, 46
- huparcheia, hupselos, hupsistos; see*
Greek Words
- Hyksos 123
- hymn/s 95, 100, 237, 259
- hyparch/hyparchy/hyparchies 55–7,
171–2, 174–6, 185–6, 191, 215, 292,
297, 313
- Hyperberetaios 325
- hypostasis 241
- Hyrchanus 38, 48, 75–8, 160, 179, 222,
231, 294–7, 314
- Hystaspes 149–50, 306, 310
- Iaddous 226
- Iao 116, 120, 284
- Iasibis 195
- Iberia 16
- Icarus 159
- iconography 194
- Idumaea/Idumaeans 24, 44, 46–8, 59,
167, 174, 176–82, 215, 217
- Iesu 100
- immigrant/s 146, 194–5, 281, 302; *see*
also emigration
- immortality 258–9, 284
- incantations 307
- incense 217
- India/n/s 16, 112, 161–2, 268, 271
- intermarriage 78, 94, 130, 138, 222,
294, 297, 314
- Ionian 11, 17, 139, 265, 269
- Ionic 80
- Ioudas 153
- Ioudith 153
- Ipsus 176, 273–4, 280, 287–8, 335
- Iranian 51, 147, 149–50, 258, 289,
306, 310, 315
- Iraq 2, 41–2, 48, 75, 176, 181, 293,
295–6
- Irāq al-Amir 41–2, 44, 46, 48, 75, 176,
181, 293, 295–6
- Isaiah 239, 241, 257–8, 261–2, 304,
307
- Isis 147
- Israel/ite 4–5, 8, 18, 19, 25, 28, 32–3,
35, 44, 46, 57, 75, 82, 86–8, 90, 96,
113, 126, 133, 152, 148, 152, 176, 185,
197, 205, 216–18, 228, 233–4, 237,
246, 257–60, 311–12, 315, 322–3, 326
- Issus 269–70, 277
- Istaba, Tell 30
- Italy 317
- Jabal al-Hammah 44
- Jaddua 226
- Jaddus 274
- Jamnia 46, 48, 58, 229, 276
- Jannaeus 44
- Jarash 48
- Jason 20, 88, 145–6, 158, 164, 190,
220–1, 231
- Jedaniah 230
- Jeddous 52, 303
- Jehoiakim 110
- Jehoida 226
- Jemmeh, Tell 40
- Jeremiah 3, 66, 87, 103, 110, 249–52,
257, 262, 304
- Jericho 35, 60, 176, 231
- Jerome 15, 18, 102–3, 106, 119–21,
274, 278, 299, 319, 321–3
- Jerusalem 3, 35–6, 44–5, 49–50, 52,
59–60, 62–4, 68, 71, 75–6, 82–90,
92–4, 96–8, 100, 106–10, 113, 115,
118, 121, 127, 132–3, 155, 157–8, 164,
170, 176, 186, 189–91, 218, 221–5,
228–33, 235–6, 239, 242–3, 246, 254,
270, 275–6, 278, 281–2, 284–5, 293,
295, 297, 300–1, 313–14, 319, 321–4,
326, 328–9, 331, 333–4, 336
- Jesus 96, 100, 259
- Jezer 34
- Jezreel 46
- Jimmeh 47
- Job 79–80, 96, 102, 110, 239, 247,
250–1, 257, 259–60, 263, 265, 307,
311, 315, 335
- Jochanan 228
- Johan 9
- Johanan 226
- Johannes 206
- John 9, 11, 20, 38, 47, 86, 107, 145,
149, 232, 306, 325
- Joiada 226
- Jonathas 203
- Joppa 47, 176, 279–80, 286–7

- Jordan 29, 42–3, 46–7, 76, 176, 180–1, 277, 295–7, 321–2
 Joseph 20, 31, 69, 75–7, 89, 145, 160, 191–2, 220, 222, 232, 293–4, 297, 314, 333
 Josephus 4, 16, 20–2, 42, 44, 56, 66, 68–77, 84, 91–2, 113–14, 119, 121–3, 130, 154–5, 163, 173, 184, 191–2, 194, 212–13, 218, 220–2, 225–7, 229–32, 235–6, 250, 261, 268, 274–6, 278, 281–3, 293, 295–6, 313–14, 319, 322–7
 Joshua 100, 102, 185, 225, 247, 251, 304
 Josiah 246
 Josippon 10, 275
 Jotapata 71
Jubilees 81, 99, 238, 257
 Judas 18, 20, 82
 Jude 84
 Judith 21, 102, 231, 236
 jurisprudence 53, 182–4, 197–9, 201, 204, 234, 332; *see also* law
 Justin 111–12, 119, 150, 273, 278–80, 287, 298–9, 310, 320
 Justinian 185
 Justus 20, 72–3

 Kafrayn, Wadi 296
kaige translation 252
 Kallinikos 146
 Kallippos 203
 Kandahar 143
 kanephoros 291
 Karaite 164
 Karnak 210
 Kaunian 292
keletes; *see* Greek Words
 Kerak 29
 Keraunos 273
 Kerkeosiris 144, 193, 195
 Keisan, Tell 46
 Ketef 50
 Keturah 19
 Khanum 147, 159
 Khirbat 296–7
 Khirbet 29, 47, 58, 144, 160, 179
 Kidron 50
 Kippurim 100
 Khirbat al-Mahatta 296
 kleroi 167
 kleros 196
 kleruch 292
 Kôm 58

 Knidian 291
 Knidos 8, 47
 Kohelet 78
 Koheleth 78
 Koile 328
 koinon 182
 Kom 58, 144, 160
 komarch 292
 komarchai 210
 komarchai 167
 komarchas 55
 komarches 175
 komarches 202
 komarchs 55, 292
 kome 175
 komogrammateis 210
 komogrammateis 167
komogrammateus; *see* Greek Words
 Kos 59
kubaiai; *see* Greek Words
kurios; *see* Greek Words
 Kyrios 255

 Lachish 40
 Lactantius 150, 310
 Lagardian 248
 Lagids 169, 274
 Lagos 67
 Lagus/Lagos/Lagids 67, 169, 274, 281–2
 Lamentations 263
 Lamnian 272
 Laodemon 279, 286
 Laodice 290
 Laodicea 176, 298
laokrites; *see* Greek Words
 Laomedon 278–9, 286
 latifundia 208
 Latin 3, 7, 68, 111, 113
 law/s 5, 14, 18, 54–6, 67, 74, 89, 91, 96, 98, 106, 113, 116, 118, 120, 128, 134, 141, 153–4, 156–7, 166–7, 182–5, 197–201, 203, 225, 230, 241, 245, 247–8, 253–4, 281, 284–6, 289, 293, 297, 300, 303, 306, 312, 325, 328, 332
 Lebanon 173, 176, 216, 228, 276, 298, 320, 325
 Leontopolis 108–10, 183
 Lesbos 11–12
 Levant 44, 49, 60, 267, 288, 316
 Levi/ite/s 98–100, 239–40, 242, 305, 312
 Leviticus 66, 241
 Libanus 174

- Libya 16
 Logos 107
 Loos 58
 Lucian 146, 252
 Lucifer 257
 Lucius 112
 Luke 114, 232, 235
 LXX; *see* Septuagint
 Lycia 322
 Lydia 322–3, 327
 Lysanias 57, 327
 Lysimachus 271–3, 279–80, 286–7

 Maat 309
 Maccabaeans 2, 18, 37, 20–1, 64–5,
 71–2, 82, 95–7, 98, 101, 103, 105–6,
 125–30, 132–3, 154, 157–9, 163–4,
 166, 222–3, 225–9, 231, 235, 238, 246,
 248–9, 252–3, 260, 298, 303, 311–12,
 315–16, 319, 324–5, 328–9
 Macedonia/n 5, 32, 61, 108, 137, 154,
 157, 160, 268–74, 272–4, 276–7, 289–
 90, 292, 316–17, 320, 331
 Macrobius 256
 Magas 289–90
 magic/ian 96, 104, 113, 256, 307–8
 magistrates 189, 202
 Magnesia 318, 328
 Mahatta 296–7
 Makmish 33
 Malachi 102
 Manasseh/Manasses 145, 226–7
 Manetho 8, 16, 67, 69, 73, 113, 122–3,
 160
 Manichaeans/s 81
 mantic 106, 150, 262, 306, 308–9, 311,
 335
 Maresha/Marisa 39, 44–8, 58–60,
 144, 176–9, 214, 217–18
 Marise 178
 Mark 121, 232
 Marmor 279–80, 286
Marmur Parium 3, 279–80, 286
 marriage 59, 77, 200, 202, 272, 290,
 319
 Marsyas 57, 327
 Masada 71, 78, 100
 Masoretic text 66, 254, 304
 Mausolus 147
 Medes/ 61, 82, 102–6, 108, 280, 298
 Mediterranean 3, 45, 75, 120–1,
 148–9, 166, 176, 185, 211, 276, 293,
 306, 316, 319, 331
mēdinôt; *see* Hebrew Words

 Megarian 32
 Megasthenes 16
Megillat Ta'anit 177
 Melanesia 149
 Melchizedek 88
 Meleager 138, 181
 Melqart 270, 276
 Memnon 269, 276
 Memphis 167, 177, 181
 Menches 144, 193
 Mendes 217
 Menelaus 164, 231, 301
 Menippus 181
 Menkhes 193
 Menocles 321
 Menon 276–7
 mercenaries 130, 195, 270, 272, 320
 merchants 141, 174, 216
 meridarchies 172
 Merisa 217
 Mesopotamia/n 4, 70, 81, 102, 107–9,
 137, 141, 150, 155, 162, 217, 242, 245,
 253, 274, 279, 286, 298, 309, 327
 messiah 81, 102, 107–9, 259–60, 310,
 323
 Metatron 81
 Methymne 277
 Migne 121
 migration 282, 289
 Milesian 11
 Miletus 11, 116, 269
 military 30, 34, 37, 42, 47–8, 56, 72,
 106, 116, 140, 145, 167–8, 172–3,
 182–3, 194–6, 203, 209, 219, 221–2,
 224, 267, 270–1, 278, 285, 292, 296,
 300, 302, 313, 319, 323, 327–8, 332–3,
 335
 Minaean 40
 Mique, Tell 218
miqva'ot; *see* Hebrew Words
 Mishaël 104
 Mishnah 113, 232–3
 Mithradates 146
 Mithridates 147
 Mitylene 278–9, 286
 Mizraim 52, 127, 173, 209, 214, 219
ml'k; *see* Hebrew Words
 Mnaseas 145
 Molon 298, 317
 money 58, 61–2, 76, 172, 201–2, 207,
 211–12, 214, 221–2, 294, 303, 314,
 326, 333; *see* coin/s
 moneylender 58–9
 Moses 8, 19–20, 71, 75, 85–92, 96,

- 106, 113, 115–6, 118, 120, 135, 144–5,
205–6, 246–7, 254, 284–5, 293, 305–6,
311–12, 322
- Moyses 284
- Mycenaean 27
- myrrh 40
- Nabataean/s 140, 179–80
- Nabonidus 102–3, 105
- nakoros* 236
- names 24, 51, 55, 60, 90, 92, 137–9,
144–6, 152–3, 159–60, 171, 173,
178–9, 193, 196, 200, 225–7, 255–7,
261, 302
- Nasbe, Tell en- 49
- Nashwa 235
- navy 279, 286
- nēšāmāh* 258
- Nearchus 112
- Nebuchadnezzar 16, 104–5, 110, 153,
161
- necromancy 334
- necropolis 39, 59
- Nectanebos 150, 309
- Negev 48, 178
- Nehemiah 118, 132, 157, 247, 263,
304
- Nektanebos 149, 307
- neokoros*: see Greek Words
- Neolithic 27, 29
- Neoptolemos 146
- Nero 71, 108–9
- Nes Harim 49
- Nessos 58
- Nicanor/Nikanor 145, 279–80, 286,
291
- Nicolaus 72
- Nikasagoras 34
- Nikeratos 58
- Nikeratos/Niqeratos 58–9
- Nikomachos 236
- Nile 20, 217, 235, 280, 287, 290
- Ninus 14
- Noah 82
- noble/s 77, 122, 160, 189, 230, 232,
292, 294
- nomarch/s 166–9, 175
- nome/s 90, 167–8, 174–5, 191,
210–11, 219
- nomos* 156, 185, 201
- novel/s 76, 95, 98, 293, 301; *see also*
romance/s
- Nysa 29
- obols 212, 214
- occupation/s 30–2, 41, 45, 134, 176,
194–5, 203, 302, 314 224, 289, 302,
314, 332
- oikonomos*; *see* Greek Words
- olive/s 31, 39, 215–16, 218
- Olympiad 277, 281, 287
- Olympias 272
- Olympiodorus 328
- Onias /Oniads 75–8, 101, 164, 190–1,
220, 222, 224, 226–7, 229, 293–4, 297,
314, 324, 328
- Onias II 75, 191, 220, 224, 227, 229,
294, 297, 314
- oracle/s 65, 93, 107–9, 121, 150–1,
262, 270, 309–10
- oral 18, 76, 102, 117, 145, 253, 255,
261, 306
- orchard 211
- orchards 180
- Orient/al 8, 14, 54, 72, 78, 126, 134,
141–2, 147, 151, 159, 160–2, 189, 197,
302, 331
- Orientalists/Orientalism 5–6, 103,
155, 160, 271
- Origen 72
- Oromasdes 147
- Orontes 176
- Orpheus/Orphica 84, 92
- Oryas 303
- Osiris 137
- ossuary 131
- Ostan 230
- ostrakon/ostraca 39–40, 51, 54–5,
58–9, 134, 137, 143–4, 179–80, 210
- Oxus 159
- Oxyrhynchus 14, 18, 119
- pagan/s/paganism 82, 89–90, 145–6,
167, 196, 256, 312
- Pakistan 271
- Paneas; *see* Panium
- Panemos 59
- Panium 318, 321, 324
- pantokrator*; *see* Greek Words
- parabiblical 90, 95, 98, 304
- Parables (*I Enoch*) 81–2, 242
- parépidēmos*; *see* Greek Words
- Parium marble; *see* *Marmur Parium*
- Parmenion 268
- Parni 289
- Parthia/n/s 82, 214, 289
- Passover 117
- pastoralism 180, 207

- Patmos 149, 306
patrios politeia; see Greek Words
patrios nomos; see Greek Words
 peasant/s 57, 139, 155, 161, 172, 195–6, 211, 215, 327
 Pella 43–4, 48, 180, 299
 Peloponnesian 8, 14
 Pelusium 47, 174, 279
 Pentateuch 65–7, 85, 95–6, 102, 113, 117, 156, 240, 243, 246–9, 251, 264, 285, 304–6, 314
 Perdiccas 271–2, 278, 286
 Pergamum/Pergamon 139–40, 289, 291, 317–18
 Peripatetic 92
 Peritios 203
 Persepolis 147, 270
 Petra 180
 phalanx 270
 Phaleron 67
 Phamenoth 235
 pharaoh 137, 161, 169, 175, 301
 Pharisee/s 127, 232–3, 240
 Pharos 289
pheritob 170
 Philadelphia 43, 48, 52, 180, 295, 299
 Philadelphus 54–5, 67, 137, 166, 289, 291–2, 323
 Philetaerus 139
 Philip 30, 268, 271–3, 316–18, 320
 Philistia 138
 Philo the Epic Poet 93
 Philo of Alexandria 4, 68, 84, 90–4, 107, 130, 138–9, 154, 159, 164–5, 184, 235, 250, 254–5
 Philocles 166, 168, 185
 Philocrates 278, 305
 Philodemus 181
 Philometor 107
 Philonides 203
 Philopator 166, 291, 319
 Philoprsian 211
 philosophy/philosopher/s 8–9, 11, 66, 78–9, 92–3, 121, 129, 132, 134–5, 138, 156, 160, 162, 181, 315
 Philostratus 16
 Philoteria 29, 45–6, 299
 Phoenicia 16, 29, 56–8, 60, 138–9, 146, 166, 172–5, 185, 208, 213, 215–17, 221, 224, 270, 279–80, 282, 286–7, 292–3, 300
 Phoenician/s 16, 28, 30–1, 34, 45, 47–8, 50, 61–2, 89, 129, 132, 138–9, 148, 166, 175, 179, 185, 212, 270, 276, 279, 286
 phoenix 91, 119
 Photius 116–17, 284
phourarchos; see Greek Words
 Phrygia 271, 280, 323, 327
 Pieria 176, 298–9
pipi 255
pisteuein; see Greek Words
pistis; see Greek Words
 Plato/onic 92–3, 121, 258
 Plutarch 14, 111–12, 121, 143, 256, 273, 280–1, 287
 Polemon 292
 police 167, 195–6, 302, 313
 Poliorcetes 274, 281
polis/poleis, politarches, polites, politeuma/ta; see Greek Words
 Pollio 17
 Polybius 8, 11, 14–15, 17–18, 29–30, 43, 98, 120, 173–4, 176–7, 220, 281, 287, 291, 298–301, 314, 318–23
 Polyhistor 84, 88–9
 Polyperchon 272
 polytheism/polytheist 156, 158, 234, 308
 Pompeius Trogus 112, 299
 Pompey 112, 116, 120–1, 180–1, 188, 282
 Pontus 188, 283, 289
 Porphyry Pass 299
 Porphyry 106, 121, 299, 321–3
 postcolonial; see colonial/ism
Potter, Oracle of 149–50, 307, 309
 prayer/s 110, 157, 234–8, 243, 293, 308, 311, 334
presbouteroi; see Greek Words
 price 3–5, 51, 60, 170, 208, 211, 213, 216
 prices 210, 217
 priest/s 12, 22, 30, 56–7, 64, 67, 70, 75, 77–8, 86, 90, 98–101, 110, 113, 118, 122, 127, 135, 136–7, 146–7, 154, 158, 164, 166–7, 170, 172, 174, 185–92, 194, 198, 202, 204, 211, 218, 220–2, 225–8, 230–4, 237–44, 259, 262, 264, 274–6, 278, 283, 285, 291, 294, 297, 300–1, 306–8, 310–11, 314, 319, 323–8, 332–4
 profession/s 134, 170, 184, 195–6, 219, 239, 302, 332; see also occupation/s
 prophet/prophecy/prophecies 68–9, 71, 82, 95–6, 102, 105–8, 121, 149–50,

- 205, 231, 240, 245–8, 260–3, 264,
303–4, 306–11, 315
proseuche; *see* Greek Words
proskunesis; *see* Greek Words
province 25, 27, 35, 38, 49–50, 57,
148, 185–6, 188, 190–1, 211, 220–1,
230, 243, 276, 289, 297–8, 313, 332–3
Psalms 251, 263
Psammetichus 282
Ptolemais; *see* Akko
Ptolemies 7, 28, 35, 45, 52, 60–2, 64,
75, 77–8, 97, 121, 127–8, 137, 157,
161, 166–9, 171, 173–6, 185–7, 190–2,
196, 201, 209–10, 212–14, 217–21,
225, 228, 261, 267–8, 274, 289, 291,
297, 301, 314, 320–1, 333
Ptolemy 18, 27, 29–30, 32–4, 38–9,
43–4, 48, 51–2, 54–62, 65–7, 75–7, 85,
89, 92–3, 96–8, 101, 107, 112, 122,
136–7, 145, 154, 157, 166–7, 169–70,
172, 174–5, 177, 179, 182, 186, 190,
194, 198–201, 203, 210, 212, 215, 226,
235–6, 253, 267–8, 271–4, 278–83,
286–92, 298–301, 313–14, 316–27
Ptolemy I 18, 27, 30, 32–3, 39, 51, 60,
62, 67, 75, 112, 122, 137, 157, 177,
186, 194, 226, 274, 281–3, 288, 313
Ptolemy II 27, 29–30, 34, 38–9, 43, 48,
52, 55, 57–8, 62, 65–7, 167, 169, 172,
175, 179, 199, 201, 210, 212, 215, 253,
289–90, 292, 325
Ptolemy III 85, 170, 235–6, 253,
290–1, 298, 314
Ptolemy IV 34, 44, 59, 77, 85, 96–8,
174, 290–1, 298–301, 316–18
Ptolemy V 56, 58, 76–7, 136, 314,
318–20
Ptolemy VI 89, 92–3, 101, 107, 182
Ptolemy VIII 39, 101, 107, 198
Punic 14, 120, 290, 316, 328
Pyrrhus 273
Pythagoras/Pythagorean 92–3, 258
Pythodorus 188

Qalandiyeh 36, 50
Qasr al-ʿAbd 41–2, 48, 295–6
Qedar 60
Qiri, Tell 46
Qôm, Khirbet el- 47
Qohelet 19, 78–80, 96, 102, 131–3,
239, 247–8, 250, 258, 260, 263–4,
307–8, 311, 315, 335
Qos/Qaus 59, 178
Quintus Curtius 111–13, 119, 276–8

Qumran 65–7, 74, 81, 83–4, 95, 98,
129, 131, 133, 234, 237–8, 245–51,
255, 257, 263, 304

Rabban 233
Rabbath-Ammon 43, 48, 299
rabbis/rabbinic 5, 64, 74, 135–6, 177,
201, 227, 229–30, 232–3, 237–8, 248,
251
Raguel 89
Ramat Rahel 49, 63
Rainer papyrus 175
Rameses 3, 197
Raphael 257
Raphia 55, 96–8, 120, 174, 177, 228,
280, 287, 291, 298–301, 312, 314, 317,
320
record/s 9, 12, 14–15, 19, 22, 24, 44–5,
49, 57–8, 63, 72, 105, 112, 117, 121,
167–8, 193–4, 202, 204, 213, 215, 226,
267, 284
religion 6, 24, 71–2, 74, 79, 83, 96, 99,
101, 121, 126–8, 136, 139, 146–7, 149,
153–5, 158–9, 163–5, 167, 178, 196,
213, 218, 225, 235, 245, 250, 254, 261,
284–5, 305–7, 314, 333–4
resistance 6, 8, 106, 109, 128, 135,
149–51, 156, 270, 272, 301, 309, 312,
321
resurrection 68, 96, 106, 108–9, 258–9
Revelation 100, 238
Revenue Laws 212
rewritten Bible 68, 87–8, 90, 94, 246,
263, 304
Rhabbatamana 43
Rhodes 47, 185, 189, 290, 317
Rhodian jars 30–2, 34, 36–8, 44, 49,
59, 64, 223
Rhoxane 271–3
ritual 36, 39, 64, 96, 134, 137, 237,
241–3, 256–7, 285
romance/s 77, 95, 98, 111, 113, 160,
186, 226, 274–5, 293–4, 297–8, 312;
see also novel/s
Rome 3, 8, 21, 68–71, 75, 86, 108,
120–1, 129, 180, 185, 234, 278, 282,
290, 316–20, 328
Rosetta 55, 136, 319
Roxane 280
Rufus 112
Ruth 202

Sabaʿ, Tell es- 41
Sabaeen 40

- sabbath 5, 92–3, 196, 234, 237, 281
sacred 16, 19, 21, 33, 79, 85, 88, 188,
234, 251, 254–5, 263, 291, 300, 308,
325
sacrifice/s 94, 187, 228, 234–7, 242,
270, 278, 281, 284–5, 300–1, 319,
325–6
Sadducees 127, 232, 240, 258
Saite 157
Salamis 280
Salem 88
Sallust 17
Salome 145
Salumis 145
Samareia 53–4, 193–4, 203
Samaria 31–3, 44–7, 53, 76, 113,
176–8, 214–18, 270, 276–7, 280–1,
287, 299, 314, 322
Samaritans 88, 194, 249, 276–7, 282
Samarkhand 134, 159, 170, 267, 288,
316
Samuel 2–3, 65–6, 68, 102, 142,
147–9, 166, 168–9, 251, 262, 307, 311
Sanchuniathon 139
sanctuary/sanctuaries 40, 187–8, 228,
278, 300, 328; *see also* temple/s
Sandahanna, Tell es- 39
Sanhedrin 189, 191, 225, 229–33, 243,
333
sapiential 239–40, 242, 259; *see also*
wisdom
Saracens 180
Sarah 95, 257
Sardis 134, 159, 170, 267, 288, 316,
318
Sariel 257
Sartaba 44
Satan 256–7
satrap/s 55, 147, 171, 270–2, 274, 279,
286, 298
satrapy/satrapies 171–2, 187, 174,
213, 270, 278–9, 286, 317, 328
scapegoat 241, 256
Scopas 318, 320–2, 324
scribe/s 85, 101–2, 110, 116, 142, 144,
154, 166–9, 189, 193, 195, 203,
209–11, 231, 242, 248, 250, 252, 255,
260, 302, 306, 325–6, 331, 334
scripture/s 75, 83–6, 92, 96, 113, 237,
245–7, 250, 253–4, 263, 293, 303–5,
311, 314, 322
scrolls 65, 67, 95, 98, 100, 133, 234,
245, 248–9, 251, 255, 257, 263, 304
Scythopolis 29–30, 46, 180, 299
secretary 53, 160, 232; *see also*
scribe/s
sect/arian 24, 98, 107–8, 234, 239,
243–4, 249
Seleucea 176
Seleuceia 173–4, 291, 299
Seleucia 137, 290, 298
Seleucid 2–3, 28–9, 32–3, 43–6, 56, 58,
60–2, 75, 77–8, 101–2, 105, 122, 129,
134, 137, 140–3, 150, 156, 159–61,
166, 170–3, 175–7, 185, 187, 190–2,
196, 205, 207–8, 212–14, 219–21,
262–3, 268, 272, 288–91, 294, 297–8,
300–1, 313–14, 316–20, 322, 324–6,
328–9, 331, 335
Seleucids 7, 78, 106, 121, 128–9, 138,
141, 157, 161, 171–2, 176, 186–7, 191,
213–14, 221, 228, 267–8, 274, 289,
298, 300–1, 314, 319–20, 323
Seleucus 57, 78, 171, 176, 229, 268,
272–4, 279–81, 286–91, 298, 316–17,
319, 328–9
Seleucus II 289–91
Seleucus III 291, 317
Seleucus IV 78, 229, 316, 319, 328–9
Semiramis 14, 16, 188
Semitic 24, 58–60, 62, 71–3, 95, 123,
132, 135, 179, 250, 255
senate 86, 189, 230–1, 324–6
senators 231
Sennacherib 8
Septuagint 25, 65, 67–8, 72, 85–6, 88,
91, 110, 117, 248–50, 252–6, 263–4,
305–6, 334
Serapis 137
Sesmaios 178
Sesostris/Sesoosis 116
Shaddai 256
Shechem 32, 47, 61, 94, 177, 277
Shemihazah 81, 256
Shephelah 47
Shiloh 35, 60, 62, 218
shipowner 195
Shiqmona 29, 45
Sibyl/Sibyllina 65, 93, 107–9, 151, 262
Sicily 119, 284
Sidon/ian 28, 46, 48, 58–9, 166, 168,
178–9, 185–6, 280–1, 287, 292, 299,
321
Similitudes (*1 Enoch*) 82
Simon 36, 101, 145, 185, 190–2,
225–9, 231, 234, 323–4, 326, 328
Sinai 89, 93
Sinaiticus 95

- Sir, Wadi as- 296
 Sirach; *see* Ben Sira
 Siwa 270
 slave/slavery 19, 56, 103, 142, 157,
 178–9, 215–17, 269, 277, 291–2, 325
 Sabbathos 58–9
 Sochi 269
 Socrates 92–3
 soldier/s 56–7, 61, 145, 160, 173, 182,
 184, 195–6, 199, 209, 212, 214, 221,
 271, 277, 282, 292, 299, 302, 313, 321,
 324, 327
 Soli 162
 Solomon 20, 87–8, 145
 Solon 92
 Sophocles 91
 Sosibius 300
 Soter 28, 274
 Sparta/n/s 75, 189–90, 226, 269
 Sphragis 292
 Spinoza 265
 Spitamenes 271
 stadia 131
 Stesilaus 277
 Strabo 43, 72, 112, 174, 176, 184, 188
 strategos *see* Greek Words
 Stratocles 18
 Strato/n 217, 292, 303
 Sukkot 100
 Sultan, Tell es- 35
 Sumerian 187, 253
synagoge, *sunedrion*, *sunodos*; *see* Greek
 Words
 Susanna 102–4
 Susiana 61
 synagogue/s 157, 196, 199, 225,
 234–8, 238, 243, 250, 264, 293, 334;
see also proseuche
 Syncellus 122
 Syria 4, 16, 27, 48, 52, 56–8, 60, 76–7,
 97, 121, 129, 132, 138, 141–2, 144,
 146, 148, 162, 172–6, 178, 181, 185,
 187–8, 208, 211, 213, 215–17, 224,
 268, 270, 273–4, 276–80, 282–3,
 286–7, 290–3, 298–301, 313–14,
 317–19, 321–2, 328, 331
 Syriac 113
 Syrian/s 7, 32, 38, 45, 60–1, 138, 146,
 217, 227, 268, 277, 288–91, 294,
 298–9, 314, 317–20, 326, 335
 Tabaqat Fahl 43
 Tacitus 17, 256
taktomisthos 195, 302
 Talmud/ic 113, 135, 234, 275
 Tammuz 59
 tanning 39
 Tarsus 269
 Tartarus 108–9
 Tauromenium 15
 Taurus 176, 280, 318
 tax/ation 40, 54–5, 59, 64, 76–7, 121,
 129, 143, 158, 161, 168–73, 175, 187,
 192, 194–7, 207–16, 218–22, 224,
 230–2, 243, 292, 294, 302, 313–14,
 325–6, 332–3
 Tebtunis 54, 166–7
 temple/s 2, 4–5, 20, 24, 28, 30, 32–4,
 36, 40–3, 49–50, 64, 68, 77, 81, 86–9,
 95–6, 101, 105, 108–10, 113, 115, 118,
 120, 135, 141–2, 148, 166, 169–70,
 172, 177, 185–92, 205, 209, 211, 220,
 222, 225, 227–31, 233–46, 249–51,
 254, 259–60, 264, 270, 276, 281–5,
 293–6, 300–1, 304–6, 311, 313–14,
 318–19, 322–6, 328–9, 332–4
 Tennes 33
 tet 63–4
 tetradrachma/s 30, 32, 60, 212
 tetragrammaton 255
 theatre/s 37, 91, 141
 Thebes/Thebaid 54, 168, 194, 208,
 218, 269
 Themistocles 18
 theocracy 127, 192, 243
 Theocritus 137
 theodicy 96
 Theodotus 84, 90, 93–4, 145, 298–9
 Theophanes 116
 Theophilus 145
 Theophrastus 114
 Thessalian 299
 Thessaly 268
 Thoth 210
 Thrace 269, 271–3, 318
 Thracian 154
 Thrasea 174
 Thraseas 56, 319
 Thucydides 8, 13–15, 18, 119–20
 Tiberias 20, 72–3, 143, 299
 Tiberius 154
 Timaeus 15
 Timnah 47, 218
 tithes/tithing 96, 189, 283
 Titus 70–1
 Tobiad/s 41–2, 44, 46, 48, 75–8, 131,
 160, 186, 191–2, 220–4, 227, 293–8,
 312–14, 333

- Tobias/Toubias/Tobiah 42, 52–3, 75,
 95, 155, 160, 195–6, 257, 291–2,
 294–6, 313
 Tobit 94–6, 100, 103, 236, 251, 257,
 312, 315
 tomb/s 27, 36, 39–40, 44–5, 48, 50, 59,
 179
 toparch/s/toparchy 167–8, 175
 torah 66, 81, 102, 110, 156, 197,
 246–7, 263, 334
 trade/traders 24, 33, 39–40, 45, 51–2,
 61, 64, 129, 141, 143, 148, 161, 180,
 205–7, 211–12, 216–17, 220–221, 224,
 296, 313
 tradents 249
 Trajan 3, 108–9, 121
 Transeuphrates 221
 Transjordan/ian 46, 48, 52, 76, 155,
 176, 180, 223, 292, 295–6, 299, 300,
 320, 333
 translation/s 11, 13, 24–5, 51–2, 55,
 58, 65–71, 84–5, 93, 95, 100–1, 103,
 107, 110–11, 113, 117, 121, 145, 156,
 167, 174, 187, 198, 207, 209–10, 228,
 230, 237, 250, 253–5, 264, 282, 292,
 301, 305–6, 314, 321–4, 327, 334
 treaty 155, 268, 272–3, 290, 300, 317–
 18, 320, 335
 tribe/s 96, 174, 180, 269, 271, 285,
 289, 320–1
 tribute 75, 121, 171–2, 187, 192,
 213–14, 219–21, 224, 294, 297, 314,
 325
 Trikomia 144, 153, 193–4
 Tripolis 288
 Trogus; *see* Pompeius
 Trojans 12
 Tsfania 32, 59, 177
 Tyre 16, 28, 60, 62, 88, 270, 275–6,
 278–9, 281, 286–7, 295–6, 299

 Umm Qeis; *see* Gadara
 urban/ism 47, 49, 179, 181, 197, 205,
 207, 213, 334
 Uriel 257
 Uruk 137–8, 142

 Varro 256
Verschmelzung 126, 159
 Vespasian/s 70–2
 Vesuvius 109
 Via Maris 33
 vinedressers 195, 302
 vines/vineyard/s 195–6, 199, 211,
 215–16, 222, 302
 vision/s/visionary 17, 82–3, 99, 100,
 102, 151, 229, 261, 308, 310
 vulgate Alexandrian tradition
 111–13, 119–20, 122, 321

 wars 44–5, 91, 119, 121, 167, 268, 278,
 288, 314–15
 Watchers 81, 83, 151, 240, 242, 256–9,
 264, 307–8, 310
 watchtowers 42
 wheat 45, 51, 212, 216, 325
 wine 45, 47, 64, 216–17, 223, 325
 winepress/es 33, 36, 50
 wisdom 71, 78, 80, 100–3, 106–7, 110,
 131, 136, 155–6, 190, 238, 242,
 259–60, 264, 284–5, 307, 311, 315,
 335
 woman/women 12, 19, 145, 194, 197,
 200, 202–4, 220, 241, 257, 277–8, 282,
 290, 293, 302–3
 worship/ers 5, 89–90, 96, 104, 119,
 135, 137, 147, 158, 170, 225, 228,
 234–7, 239, 243, 245, 254–5, 264, 276,
 285, 293, 304–5, 334
 writing/s 3–4, 7–11, 14, 17–19, 20–3,
 25, 39, 51, 65, 67–74, 76, 78–80, 83–8,
 90, 92, 95, 103–4, 106, 111, 114, 118,
 120, 122, 129, 135, 139, 142, 144,
 150–1, 160, 166, 174, 190, 205, 227,
 230–1, 233, 238, 240, 242, 245–8,
 250–2, 254–7, 261–4, 268, 277, 283,
 303–5, 308–15, 321, 334–5

 Xandikos 291
 Xenokles 291
 Xenophon 14
 Xerxes 270

 Yahu 25
 Yahweh/Yahwism 25, 127, 165
 Yam 49
 Yarkon 47
 Yarmuk 43
 Yavneh 229, 233
 Yehohanan 230
 Yehud 25, 35–6, 38, 49, 60–3, 218–19
 Yehuda 153
Yēhûdî/ *Yēhûdîm*/ *Yēhûdîn*/ *Yēhûdāyā*;
see Hebrew Words
yēsārîm; *see* Hebrew Words
 Yhwh 25, 63, 146, 228, 237, 255–8,
 262

Yosippon 274

Zadok/ite/s 238–41, 242–3

Zadokite 238–41, 243

Zadokites 238–40

Zaidelos 179

Zalmoxis 284

Zathraustes; *see* Zoroastrian/ism

Zechariah 241, 315

Zenodora 146

Zenon 43, 52, 54, 140, 160, 173,
175–6, 178–80, 194–6, 201, 209, 214–
17, 219, 261, 268, 291–2, 294–5,
297–8, 302–3, 313, 333

Zerubbabel 145, 259, 304

Zeus 28, 30, 93, 145, 147, 187–8, 256

Zeuxis 323, 327, 332

Zion 110, 145

Ziph 49

Zipporah 19, 86

Zoroastrian/ism 149–50, 248, 258,
306, 310

Zugot 233

zuz 59

Greek Words

αἰτίας 15

ἄλλοφυλος 183

archierea 285

archiereus 227, 283

archiphulakites 167

archisynagogoi 234

ἄρχιερέυς 174, 226, 232, 282

archon 182, 184

ἄρχων 141, 182, 232

autarkeia 206

αὐτοψία 16

baris 293, 295

βασιλεία, βασιλεύς 116

basilikos 167, 169

βασιλικός 168

boule 185, 189, 230, 232

βουλῇ 141, 232

dekanikos 195, 302

dioiketes 57, 167–8, 172, 175, 210,
215, 292, 327

γεννηματοφύλακες 168

γερουσία 231

gerousia 189–91, 230–2, 326

grammateus 167, 169

γραμματεὺς 168, 232

ἐκκλησία 141

ekklesia 189

ekpyrosis 108–9

epigone 195–6, 203, 302–3

epistates 144, 167, 170, 203

ἐπιστολογράφος 168

ἐπιστράτηγος 168

epistrategos 167

euergetes 139

εὐσεβεία 154, 229

θεός 154, 256

hikanos 256

Ἰουδαῖος 4, 113, 144, 153–4, 200,
235–6

ἵππαρχίας 195

ἱστορία 16

κάτοικος 196

keletes 217

κλήρος 196

κληρουχία 196

κληρούχος 195

kubaiai 217

kurios 255–6

κύριος 255–6

κωμάρχης 168, 202, 215

κωμογραμματεὺς 168

komogrammateus 193

laokrites 197–8

λαοκρίται 198

nakoros 236

neokoros 236

νόμος 199–201, 225, 253, 255

nomos 156, 185, 201

οἰκονόμος 168

oikonomos 55–7, 166–9, 172, 175,
185–6, 191, 210, 215, 292, 333

Παλαιστίνης 276

παντοκράτωρ 256

pantokrator 256

parépidemos 52

πάτριος 201

patrios politeia 113, 118

patrios nomos 156, 185, 201

pisteuein 68

pistis 68

polis/poleis 46, 138–9, 141, 158, 172–
3, 181–2, 189, 221, 229, 231, 333

politarches 182, 184

polites 183

politeuma/ta 53, 155–6, 167, 177,
181–4, 193, 197, 202

πολιτάρχης 182

πολίτευμα 181–2

πομνηματογράφος 154

presbouteroi 191

προσέγραπται 247
 προσευχή 235
proseuche 235–6, 243
proskunesis 270
 προστασία 190, 220
 Πτολεμαῖος 145
 σιταρχία 61
 στρατηγός 168, 174
strategos 56–7, 167–8, 171–2, 174,
 203, 327
sunagoge 184
sunedrion 189, 230–2
 συνέδριον 230–1
 σύνοδος 182
sunodos 182
taktomisthos 195, 302
 τελῶναι 211
huparcheia 55
huparchos 175
 ὑπομνηματογράφος 168
hupselos 256
hupsistos 256
 ὑψιστος 256
chrematistai 198
phrourarchos 183

Hebrew Words

שׂא 259
 יִשׁ 259
 יִשׁ 259
 שׂא 259
Birāh/Birtā 176, 291, 293, 295
 מוֹבִיָּה 42
 יְהוּדָה 153
 יְהוּדִי 153
 יְהוּדִיָּא 230
 יְהוּדִי/יְהוּדִיָּה 154
Yēhūdī/Yēhūdīm/Yēhūdīn/
Yēhūdāyā 24–5, 153–4
yēsārīm 83
mēdīnôt 174
miqva'ot 39
ml'k 257
 נֶפֶשׁ 258
 נִשְׁמָה 258
nēšāmāh 258
 סִנְהֶדְרִין 230
 עֲלִיָּין 256
 עֲלִין 230
 שְׂדֵי 256

INDEX OF CITATIONS

Hebrew Bible

Genesis

3.16-19 241

5 246

5.24 102

6 246

6.1 257

6.9 102

14 88

15.18 102

34 94

Exodus

32.10-11 249

Leviticus

26 241

27.34 286

Numbers

12.1 19, 90

18.24 285

36.13 286

Deuteronomy

9.20 249

10.9 285

12.12 285

23.20-21 [ET 23.19-20 201

24.1 200

28.1 285

1 Samuel

7.10 102

12.3-4 102

Isaiah

2.2-4 241

11.7 241

24-27 261

26.19 258

45.1 259

45.7 256, 258

51.10-11 110

Jeremiah

18 257

23.5-6 259

24 110

25 262

29 110

30.9 259

31.31 241

40.11 153

44.1 153

Ezekiel

18 257

33 257

Haggai

2.23 102

Zechariah

14 241

Malachi

3.23-24 102

Psalms

132.10-17 259

Job

15.7 259

28.12-28 110

Ruth

4.2-11 202

Qohelet (Ecclesiastes)

1.2 80

1.14 80

2.13-16 307

2.13-14 80, 315,
 2.14-16 80
 2.16 80
 2.17 80
 2.19 80
 2.21 80
 2.23 80
 2.26 80
 3.17-21 258, 307
 3.18-21 80
 4.4 80
 4.8 80
 4.16 80
 6.9 80
 7.13-14 307
 7.23-24 80, 315
 8.5-8 80
 8.16-17 80, 307, 315
 11.8 80
 12.8 80
 12.9-14 80

Esther

2.5 153
 3.6 153

Daniel

1-6 103, 105-6, 262, 312
 1 103-4
 2-6 103, 105
 2 104, 262
 3 104-5
 4 105
 5 104-5
 6 104, 105
 6.11 236
 7-12 103, 105-6, 164
 9.4-19 110
 10.12-13, 20-1 261
 11 105, 121
 11.3-4 273
 11.12 300
 11.15 322
 11.45 105
 12.1-3 106
 12.2 258

Ezra

2.61 86
 8.26-27 326
 9.9 157
 10.14 202

Nehemiah

3.4 86
 3.21 86
 7.63 86
 9.36 157
 13.28 226

1 Chronicles

24.10 86

New Testament

Matthew

4.17 256
 5.3 256
 5.22 232
 26.59 232

Mark

14.55 232
 15.1 232
 15.42-43 232

Luke

2.41-42 235
 22.66 232
 23.50-51 232

Acts

1.13-14 236
 4 232
 5 232
 22-23 232

Jude

14-15 84

Patristic Writers

Clement of Alexandria
Strom. 6.43.1 150, 310

Eusebius

Chronicle

Olympiad CXII (205F) [Helm (ed.)
 1956: 123] 277

Olympiad CXXI (209-10F) [Helm (ed.)
 1956: 127-28] 281, 287

Praep. evang.

13.12.14 92

Jerome (Hieronymus)

Comm. in Dan.

11.10-12 [FGH 260: 44] 299

- Justin Martyr
Apol. 1.44.12 150, 310
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.27.32 89
- Lactantius
Div. Inst.
 7.15.19 150, 310
 7.18.2 150, 310
- Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha**
- Aristeas, Letter of*
 3 67
 4 194
 12–14 194, 282
 95 237
 135 90
 144 67
 308–10 183
 309 67
 310–22 306
 310 183
- Aristobulus
apud Clement, *Strom.* 1.22.148 67
apud Clement, *Strom.* 5.14.99.3 92
apud Clement, *Strom.* 5.14.107.1–4 92
apud Clement, *Strom.* 5.14.108.1 92
apud Clement, *Strom.* 6.16.144.3 92
apud Praep. *Evang.* 13.12.1 67
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 13.12.4 92
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 13.12.13–16 92
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 13.12.13 92
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 13.13.21 92
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 13.13.34–35 92
- Artapanus
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.27.4 89
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.18.1 89
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.23.2 89
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.27.7–12 89
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.27.19 89
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.27.28 20
- 1 Baruch
 1.15–3.8 110
 1.1–14 110
 3.9–4.4 110
 4.1 110
 4.5–5.9 110
- Ben Sira
 Prologue, line 27 101
 7.29–31 101
 15.11–20 307
 16.26–17.19 307
 17.1–2 259
 17.7 257
 17.7 307
 17.32 257, 307
 18.1–14 307
 24 110, 307
 24.2 257, 307
 32.14–17 307
 34.1–7 102
 34.6 102
 34.18–35.16 101
 36.20–21 102, 307
 38.9–11 101
 38.24–39.11 102
 38.34–39.11 307
 39.1–3 102, 307
 42.17 257, 307
 44–50 247
 44–49 304
 45.2 257
 45.25 259
 48.24–25 307
 49.16 259
 50.1–29 101
 50.1–24 101
 50.1–21 192, 324
 50.1–14 228
 50.1–4 228, 323–4
 50.1–3 36
 50.16–21 237
- Demetrius
apud Clement, *Strom.* 1.21.141.1–2 85
apud Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* 9.17.2–9 88
apud Eusebius, *Praep. evang.* 9.18.2 88
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.21.1–13 85

- apud* Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.*
 9.21.16-19 85
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.* 9.29.1-3
 19, 86
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.*
 9.29.16 19, 86
- 1 Enoch*
 1-36 81-3, 256, 258, 307
 1.9 84
 6-11 81
 6 257
 7 257
 8 257
 8.1 307
 9.1 257
 9.7-10 257
 10-11 308
 10 241
 10.1 257
 10.4-6 241
 10.4 257
 10.6 259
 10.9 257
 10.11 257
 10.12-22 259
 11 259
 12-36 131
 14.8-25 83
 15.8-12 257
 17-36 83
 17-19 83
 19.1 257
 20 257
 21 83
 22 83, 258-9, 308
 22.4 259
 22.10-13 259
 23-25 83
 26-27 83
 28-36 83
 37-71 82
 56.5-57.2 82
 56.7-8 82
 57.1-2 82
 62-72 307
 71.1 257
 72-82 81-3, 243, 264
 82.13-20 257
 83-90 82
 83-84 82
 85-90 82
 89-90 259
 90.9-12 82
- 91-105 82
 91.1-10 82
 91.11-17 82
 91.18-19 82
 92.1-93.10 82
- 1 Esdras
 2.13, 19, 22 173
- Jubilees*
 5.1-10 257
- Judith*
 4.6-8 231
 8.36-10.2 236
 11.14 231
 15.8 231
- 1 Maccabees
 1.41-43 126
 2.21 256
 2.42 106
 3.18 256
 8.17 20
 8.17-20 86
 9.52 38
 10.18-45 221
 10.65 172
 11.30-37 221
 12.5-6 231
 13.36-40 221
- 2 Maccabees
 1.10 231
 2.4-5 87
 3.2-3 329
 3.6, 10-11 319
 3.11 222, 294, 297
 4.8 221
 4.11 20, 86
 4.43-50 231
 5.15-16 301
 11.27 231
 11.34-35 210
 3.1-3 229
 4.11 325
- 3 Maccabees
 1.1-5 98
 1.1-7 96
 1.3 154
 1.6-8 231
 1.6-9 98
 1.8-2.24 97

2.25-6.22 97
 3.1 326
 6.23-29 97
 6.30-7.23 97
 7.10 154
 1.6-13 300
 2.1 227

Sibylline Oracles

3.1-96 108-9
 3.46-63 108
 3.63-74 109
 3.75-92 108
 3.97-349 107
 3.185-86 108
 3.193 107
 3.213-64 108
 3.286-94 108
 3.318 107
 3.319-20 108, 110
 3.350-488 107
 3.350-80 108
 3.489-829 107
 3.564-67 108
 3.595-607 108
 3.601-18 107
 3.608 107
 3.624-34 109
 3.652 107
 3.715-19 108
 3.741-95 107
 3.762-66 108
 3.772-73 108
 4 262
 4.4-30 109
 4.40-114 108
 4.102-14 108
 4.115-36 109
 4.159-61 108-9
 4.165 108
 4.171-78 108-9
 4.179-92 108-9
 5.93-110 109
 5.108-9 109
 5.137-154 109
 5.155-61 109
 5.179-99 109
 5.214-27 109
 5.361-80 109
 5.397-413 109
 5.414-28 109
 5.501-3 109-10
 5.527-31 109

Testament of Levi

16-18 99-100
 Tobit
 1.4-6 96
 1.6-8 96
 1.8 96
 1.16-17 96
 1.17-19 96
 2.1-5 96
 2.1-3 236
 2.3-8 96
 2.6 96
 2.14 96
 3.7-9 96, 257
 3.17 96
 4.3-4 96
 4.8-11 96
 4.15 96
 5.4-5 96
 6.13 96
 6.15 96
 7.11-13 96
 8.1-3 96, 257
 8.7 96
 12.6-21 96
 12.8-9 96
 14.3 96
 14.5 95
 14.10-11 96
 14.11-13 96

Qumran and Cairo Genizah

Cairo Genizah

CD 1.4-9 243
T. Levi, Bodleian col. c, 9-21 99
 1Q21 98
 1Q34 237
 1Q34^{bis} 237
 1QH 237
 4Q22 = 4QpaleoExod^{lm} 249
 4QJer^a = 4Q70 249
 4Q119-122 = 4QLXXLev^{a,b} 249
 4QLXXNum 249
 4QLevi^{a-f} ar [4Q213-214b] 98
 4QLevi^a ar (4Q213) 99
 4Q214b, frags 2-6, 1.2-6 99
 4QShirShabb^{a-h} = 4Q400-407 237
 4Q503 237
 4QDibHam^{a-c} = 4Q504-6 237
 4Q507-9 237
 4QDeut 249
 11Q17 237

11Q20 12.15-17

87

11QLev^b 255

11QT 46.1-4 87

Josephus

War of the Jews

1.Pref.1 §3 70

2.14.8 §301 232

2.15.3 §318 232

2.15.6 §331 232

2.16.2 §336 232

2.16.4 §§345-401 70

2.16.4 §385 213

2.17.1 §§405, 407 232

3.5.1-8 §§70-109 70

5.4.2 §144 232

5.13.1 §532 232

6.6.3 §354 232

Antiquities of the Jews

1.8.2 §§166-68 71

4.8.14 §218 231

4.8.17 §224 231

5.1.4 §23 231

11.2.1-2 §§25, 27 173

11.2.1 §§21-22 173

11.7.2 §§302-3 226

11.7.7 §347 226

11.8.1-6 §§304-45 275

11.8.1-6 §§304-45 (Topics) 74

12.1.1 §§3-10 281

12.1.1 §6 75

12.1.1 §§7, 10 194

12.1.1 §8 313

12.2.1-15 §§11-118 75

12.2.5 §43 226

12.2.5 §43 226

12.2.5 §§43-44 226

12.2.5 §44 226-7

12.3.1-4 §§119-53 226

12.3.3 §§132-33 322

12.3.3 §133 323

12.3.3 §§138 323-4

12.3.3. §141 326

12.3.3 §143 326

12.3.3 §143 326

12.3.3-4 §§138-44 325

12.3.3-4 §§138-46 231, 324

12.3.4 §§145-46 325

12.3.4 §§148-53 327

12.3.4 §§148-153 325

12.4.1-11 §§154-236 75, 293

12.4.1-11 §§157-236 75

12.4.1 §57 226

12.4.1 §154 319

12.4.1 §§157-58 226

12.4.1 §§157-59 191-2

12.4.1 §157 227

12.4.1 §§158-59 77, 220

12.4.2-9 §§160-222 76

12.4.9 §§221-22 76

12.4.10 §§223-24 76

12.4.10 §§224-25 229

12.4.10 §225 229

12.4.10 §§225-27 75

12.4.11 §§228-36 76

12.4.11 §§230-33 295

13.15.4 §§395-97 44

14.9.3-5 §§163-84 231

14.9.4 §175 231

15.8.1 §§268-76 91

20.1.2 §§10-14 232

20.5.2 §100 154

20.9.6 §§216-17 232

20.10.5 §250 225

Against Apion (C. Apion.)

1.9 §50 70

1.22 §§183-204 75

1.22 §§187-91 226, 282

1.22 §§187-89 194

1.22 §§189 283

1.22 §§209-12 281

1.22 §§209-11 75

Life (Vita)

65 §§361-63 70

Philo of Alexandria

De Providentia 2.64 235

Ebr. 177 91

Quod omnis probus 141 91

Rabbinic Literature

M. Sanhedrin 11.4

B. Yoma 69a 275

Greek and Latin Authors

Agatharchides of Cnidus

apud C. Apion. 1.22 §§209-11 281

apud C. Apion. 1.22 §209 236

apud C. Apion. 1.22 §§210-11 92

Appian, *Syr.*

1.5 319

- 3.16 318
 8.50 282
 9.52 279, 286
 9.53 279, 286
 9.54 279, 287
 9.55 280
 10.62 171
 11 121
 Aratus
Phaenomena (lines 1–18 93
 Aristotle, *Politics*
 2.7.3–4 (1271b–1272a) 189
 2.6–8 (1269a–1273b) 189
 Arrian, *Anabasis*
 1.Preface 112
 2.13.7 277
 2.20.4–5 276
 2.24.5–6 278
 2.25.4 276
 2.27.7 277
 4.2.24–3.1 276
 Berossus
apud C. Apion 1.20 §142–44 16
 Clearchus of Soli
De somno, apud Josephus, C. Apion.
 1.22 §§179–80 163
 Cicero
De Inventione 1.21.29 17
De Oratore 1.5.17–18 17
De Oratore 1.14.60 17
De Oratore 2.15.62 18
De Oratore 2.82.337 17
De Partitione Oratoria 9.32 17
De Partitione Oratoria 25.90 17
Orator 120 17
Rhetorica ad Herennium 1.16 17
 Cornelius Labeo
apud Macrobius 1.18.18–21 256
 Diodorus
 1.28 115, 120
 1.28.1–4 115, 283
 1.29.5–6 115, 120, 284
 1.31.8 213
 1.55–58 116
 1.55.5 284
 1.94.1–2 284
 1.94.2 120
 1.94.4 116
 2.32.4 14
 1.55–58 116
 2.48.6–9 120
 2.48.6 180
 6.1 90
 13–14 119
 17 120
 17.46.6–47.6 278
 18–21 271
 18–20 120
 18.3.1 278, 286
 18.20–22 279, 286
 18.33–36 279
 18.39.5 279, 286
 18.43.1–2 279, 286
 18.43.1 279, 286
 18.63.6 279, 286
 18.73.2 279, 286
 19.44.4 171
 19.55.1–5 279, 286
 19.57 279, 286
 19.58 279, 286
 19.59.1–3 279, 286
 19.61.5 279, 286
 19.69 279, 286
 19.79 279
 19.80 279, 286
 19.80–86 278–9, 286–7
 19.85.4 280, 287
 19.86.1–2 280, 287
 19.90–93 279, 287
 19.90–92 280
 19.93.1–4 280
 19.93.5–7 280, 287
 19.93.7 177
 19.94–99 140, 180
 19.94.1 280, 287
 19.95.2 171
 19.98–99 120
 19.98.1 171
 19.105.1–4 280
 20.19 280
 20.27 280
 20.37 280
 20.53.1 280
 20.53.2–4 280
 20.73–76 280, 287
 20.106–13 280, 287
 21.4b 280
 21.5 281, 287
 34/35.1.3 120
 40.1–2 116

40.2 116
 40.3 113–16, 120, 190
 40.3.1–7 284
 40.3.5 116, 190, 202
 40.3.6 115, 247

FGH

##117–53 111–12
 #160 298
 #239 B §§1–26 3
 #260 121
 #264 113–5
 #609 122
 #680 122

GLAJJ

1: p. 14 n. 2 176
 1: pp. 545–76 121
 1: ##19–21 123
 2: pp. 444–75 121

Herodotus

1 117
 1.1 16
 2 114
 2.99 16
 3.89–95 214
 3.91 221
 7.96 16

Hesiod

apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.*
 13.12.13 92

Homer

Od. 5.262 93
apud Eusebius, *Praep. Evang.*
 13.12.14 92

Justin

15.1.5–9 279, 287
 15.2.6–7 280
 15.2.10–14 280
 15.4.21–24 280, 287
 15.5.23–24 273
 16.1 273
 16.2.1–3, 6 273
 18.3.18–19 278
 27.1 298
 30.1 299
 30.2.8 320

Manetho

apud C. Apion 1.14 §§73–92 16

Plutarch

Artaxerxes 1.4 14
Crassus 33 143
Demet. 19.1–2 280, 287
Demet. 28–29 280
Demetr. 31–32 273
Demetr. 32.4 281, 287
Demetr. 35.3 273
Demetr. 36–37 273
Demetr. 38.1 273
Demetr. 43–52 273
Ques. conviv. 6.2 256

Polybius

1–5 120
 1.14 14
 2.56 18
 2.56.10 15
 3.7.5 15
 3.20.3–5 18
 3.47.6–48.9 18
 3.57–59 15
 4.28.4 15
 4.37.5 298
 5.1.5 174
 5.29.8 174, 299
 5.30.8–87.8 298
 5.40.1–3 298
 5.40.4–42.9 298
 5.45.5–46.5 298
 5.46.1–4 176
 5.46.6–55.10 298
 5.48.17 174
 5.57 298
 5.58.1–61.2 298
 5.59.2 174
 5.61.3–5 299
 5.61.6–62.6 299
 5.62.7–65.11 299
 5.65.3 174, 323
 5.66 30, 299
 5.67 281, 287
 5.68–69 299
 5.70.3–4 29
 5.70.10–11 299
 5.70–71 299
 5.71.1 300, 321
 5.71.3 43
 5.71.4 43
 5.71.11–12 299
 5.71.11 177
 5.79–87 299
 5.85.4 300, 321
 5.86.8–10 301

5.87.1-2 318
 5.87.3 318
 5.87.5-7 98, 300
 5.87.6 173
 5.107.103 318
 12 15
 12.25b.1 15
 12.25g-25i 15
 12.26d-28a 15
 15.20.1-4 320
 15.25-36 320
 15.25.13 320
 15.25.16-17 320
 16.18.2 321
 16.21-22 320
 16.22a 321
 16.39 = Josephus, *Ant.* 12.3.3 §§135–36 322
 16.39.3 177
 36.1.7 15

Porphry

apud Hieronymus, *Comm. in Dan.* on Dan. 11.13-14 = *FGH* 260 F 45 321
apud Jerome, *Comm. in Dan.* on Dan. 11.14b 323
apud Hieronymus, *Comm. in Dan.* on Dan. 11.15-16 = *FGH* 260 F 46 322

Quintus Curtius

4.8.9-11 276–7

Strabo

11–14 188
 12.2.3 188
 12.3.37 188
 12.8.9 188
 14.5.10 188
 16.2.2 174, 176
 16.2.21 174
 16.2.29, 45 43

apud Josephus, *Ant.* 14.7.2 §117 184

Tacitus

Hist. 5.5 256

Theocritus

Idyll 17 137

Thucydides

1.14 14
 1.20-22 13
 1.22.2-4 13

11.42-43 18

Varro

apud Augustine, *De cons. Evang.* 1.22.30 256
apud Augustine, *De cons. Evang.* 1.23.31 256
apud Augustine, *De cons. Evang.* 1.27.42 256

Papyri, Ostraca, and Inscriptions

AUSTEN

pp. 482–83 301
 #1 3
 #193 56–57, 172, 327
 #267, 296–97, 319 166
 #271 55, 216
 #276 55
 #278 167, 215
 #290 198
 ##296–297 55, 167
 #297 216
 #299 209
 #303 216
 #319 167
 #558 210
 #559 210

BAGNALL-DEROW

#64 55, 172, 292
 #103 166–7
 #104 166
 #114 55, 199
 #164 55
 #196 55

BURSTEIN

#48 147
 #88 139
 #97 211
 #98 298

C. Ord. Ptol. (Lenger 1964)

##17–18 212
 #53 198

CPJ

1 pp. xvii–xix 145
 1: p. 6 182
 1 pp. 12–13 196
 1: p. 28 145
 1: p. 29 146
 1 pp. 32–36 199
 1 pp. 35–36 201

- 1 p. 231 154
 1.1-17 52
 1.1 52, 292
 1.1.3 176
 1.4 52-3, 292
 1.6 52, 181, 215, 292, 303
 1.10 195-6, 302
 1.12 195, 302
 1.13 195, 302
 1.14 195, 302
 1.15 195, 302
 1.18 195, 302
 1.19 196, 199, 203, 302
 1.20 196, 201, 302
 1.21-23 97
 1.21 195-6, 199, 302
 1.22 53, 145, 195, 302
 1.23 195-6, 302
 1.24 195-6, 201, 302
 1.25 195, 302
 1.26 196, 302
 1.27 195, 302
 1.28 53, 302
 1.29 196, 302
 1.30 196, 302
 1.31 196, 302
 1.32 196, 302
 1.36-37 194
 1.36 195, 302
 1.37 195, 302
 1.38 195, 199, 302
 1.41 195, 302
 1.43 195, 302
 1.46 195, 302
 1.47 195, 302
 1.90 195, 302
 1.107 195, 302
 1.127a-e 154
 1.128 200, 203, 303
 1.129 199, 236
 1.133 203
 1.134 236
 1.135 199
 1.137 195, 302
 1.138 236
 2 pp. 188-98 154
 2.144 203
- Hefzibah Inscription
 1.33 173
 2.14 173
 2.19 173
- Horbury/Noy 1992
 ##9, 13, 22, 24, 25, 27, 28, 105, 117,
 125, 126 235
 #117 236
- Marmor Parium (FGH 239)
 B §12 279, 286
 B §23 280
- OGIS*
 9 299
 54 298
 56 55
 56 line 17 216
 90 55
 230 56, 173-4
 262 188
- P. Col. Zen.*
 2.18, 22 = Durand #17 176
P. Gen. III 132 167
P. Gen. inv. 402 A + B, 1-5 167
P. Halle 1 199
P. Lond. 1948 216
- P. Pol. Ind.*
 1.1 182
 1.7-8 183
 1.17 183
 2.1 182
 3 183
 3.1 182
 3.28-29 201
 4 200
 6.1 182
 6.12 202
 9 156, 201
 9.7-8 201
 10.4 183
 11.5 183
 12 156
 12.10 201
 19.1 202
 20.2 202
- P. Tebtunis*
 5.208-20 198
 8 167, 215
 32 183
 703 167, 210
 703.40-60 210
 772 211

PCZ

59003 = *CPJ* 1.1 = DURAND #3 176,
195, 201

59004 = Durand #4 176

59006 = Durand #9 176, 178, 201

59008 = Durand #16 176

59009 43

59012 217

59015 = Durand #42 176, 179

59018 303

59021 = *Sel. Pap.* 2 #409 209, 212

59535 201

59537 = Durand #43 176, 179

59816 216

PSI

406 = Durand #27 176, 180, 217

324 = Durand #33 176

325 = Durand #34 176

Raphia Decree

15-17 301

23-25 300

RC

pp. 64, 297 171

70 187-8

Revenue Laws, cols. 38-56

216

SB

7377 168

8008 55, 215, 292

SEG

29.1613 174

Sel.Pap.

##201, 202, 207 199

#409 209

TAD

A4.7-8 (##30-31) 230

A4.7.18-19 230

C3.28 (*AP* #81) 51

INDEX OF MODERN AUTHORS

- Achtemeier, P. J. 18, 84-5
 Ackroyd, P. R. 248
 Aharoni, Y. 40-1
 Albertz, R. 113, 177
 Albrektson, B. 8
 Albright, W. F. 35
 Allam, S. 197
 Alessandrini, A. C.
 Andreau, J. 205-7
 Andrewes, A. 119
 Aperghis, G. G. 141, 170-2, 185, 187,
 191, 205, 207-9, 212-14, 218, 221,
 322, 328
 Applebaum, S. 46, 177
 Arav, R. 27-35, 37-45
 Archer, G. L. 102, 121, 319, 321-3
 Archibald, Z. H. 205, 213, 218
 Argall, R. A. 81, 100
 Ariel, D. T. 35, 60, 62-4, 218, 223-4
 Ashcroft, B. 5
 Attridge, H. W. 68-9, 84
 Austin, M. M. 3, 54-6, 166-7, 172,
 198, 209-10, 215-16, 301, 327
 Avigad, N. 35, 62, 218
 Avi-Yonah, M. 146-7

 Bagnall, R. S. 5-7, 55, 166-8, 173-5,
 185-6, 208-9, 213, 218, 220, 292
 Balcer, J. M. 8, 12
 Balentine, S. E. 234
 Barag, D. 60, 62, 208, 212, 218
 Barber, G. L. 119
 Barclay, J. M. G. 3-4, 68
 Barfield, T. 152
 Barkay, R. 60
 Bar-Kochva, B. 18, 20, 113-14,
 117-19, 166-7, 298-9, 319, 321
 Barnard, A. 152
 Barr, J. 8, 65, 138-9, 253-4
 Barstad, H. M. 245, 247
 Barth, F. 151-2
 Bartholomew, C. G. 78

 Bartlett, J. R. 155, 176, 180
 Bauckham, R. 144, 153
 Baynham, E. J. 267
 Beaulieu, P.-A. 102, 105
 Beentjes, P. C. 100-1
 Begg, C. T. 68
 Bekkum W. J. van 111, 113, 274-5
 Bengston, H. 171, 173
 Berlin, A. M. 27, 30, 35-6, 44-50, 54,
 176-7, 218-19
 Bernard, P. 159
 Berthelot, K. 113, 115, 118, 283
 Bertrand, J. M. 56, 322, 326
 Betlyon, J. W. 37, 48
 Bevan, E. R. 54-5, 288, 316
 Bickerman, E. J. 78-80, 85, 127-8,
 130, 132, 170-1, 173, 175, 213, 322,
 325-7
 Bienkowski, P. 176, 178, 180
 Bigwood, J. M. 119
 Bilde, P. 68-9, 72-3, 142
 Billows, R. A. 5
 Binder, D. D. 234, 237
 Bingen, J. 197
 Biran, A. 27, 59
 Black, M. 81
 Blasius, A. 149, 306, 309-10
 Blenkinsopp, J. 218
 Boccaccini, G. 81, 238-42
 Bogaert, R. 208-9
 Bohak, G. 153
 Boiy, T. 137
 Boswinkel, E. 54
 Bosworth, A. B. 111-12, 267-8, 271,
 274, 277
 Bouché-Leclercq, A. 267
 Boyce, M. 149-50, 306, 310
 Braulik, G. 95
 Braun, R. 78-9, 132
 Braverman, J. 102, 121
 Bredin, M. 94
 Brenner, A. 102

- Brett, M. G. 151–2
 Briant, P. 134
 Bringmann, K. 218, 221
 Brock, S. P. 65–6, 68, 253–4
 Brooke, G. J. 65, 245
 Broughton, T. R. S. 185, 187–8
 Brown, T. S. 8, 11, 14
 Bruce, I. A. F. 8, 14
 Brunt, P. A. 8, 17, 111–12
 Brutti, M. 225, 227
 Bugh, G. R. 205
 Buitenwerf, R. 107
 Bunge, J. G. 102
 Burkes, S. 78
 Burstein, S. M. 54–5, 113–14, 117, 122, 139, 146–7, 211, 298
 Caldach-Benages, N. 100
 Cambier, G. 197
 Campbell, E. F. 32
 Caquot, A. 259
 Carroll, R. P. 3
 Carter, C. E. 38
 Cartledge, P. 5, 205–6
 Cary, M. 267, 288, 316
 Caspari, M. O. B. 113–14
 Charles, R. H. 81, 98, 102, 107
 Charlesworth, J. H. 149, 234, 306
 Chazon, E. G. 234, 237
 Childs, B. 8
 Clarysse, W. 142, 144–5, 149, 153, 166, 169, 193–4, 208, 213, 307
 Clines, D. J. A. 65, 68
 Coggins, R. J. 100
 Cohen, G. M. 27, 140–2, 170, 173–4, 176, 322, 327
 Cohen, S. J. D. 3–4, 68, 70, 72–3, 274
 Cohen, N. G. 144
 Colledge, M. 147
 Collins, J. J. 3–4, 8, 65–6, 84–6, 89–90, 92–4, 96–8, 102–3, 106–7, 149–50, 260, 306, 310
 Cook, J. 65, 247, 250
 Corley, J. 94, 100
 Cotton, H. M. 57, 322
 Coulson, W. D. E. 62
 Cowey, J. M. 53, 181, 193, 197, 200–2
 Cowley, A. 51
 Cox, C. 255
 Crawford, D. J. 193, 195
 Crenshaw, J. 78–80, 260
 Cross, F. M. 51, 59, 65, 247–8
 Crowfoot, J. W. 31
 Dar, S. 46–7, 176–7, 214–18
 Davies, J. K. 205, 207–8
 Davies, P. R. 102, 135,
 Davis, M. 133
 Davis, N. 60, 267, 288, 316
 Day, P. L. 122, 241, 256–7
 De Groot, A. 35
 Dentzer, J. M. 41, 293
 Derda, T. 144
 Derow, P. 8, 11, 166–7
 Deselaers, P. 94
 De Troyer, K. 65, 68, 248, 252
 Deutsch, R. 60
 Devauchelle, D. 149–50, 306, 309
 Dever, W. G. 34
 Dexinger, F. 81
 Diamond, F. H. 113–14, 118
 DiLella, A. A. 100–1, 103
 Dines, J. M. 65–7
 DiTommaso, L. 85, 102
 Dogniez, C. 65–6
 Doran, R. 84, 89
 Dorothy, C. V. 65, 68
 Dothan, T. 31, 38
 Doty, L. T. 142
 Drews, R. 8, 11, 119
 Dunand, F. 149–50, 306, 309
 Dunayevsky, I. 38
 Dunn, J. D. G. 95
 Durand, X. 52, 176, 178–80, 201, 216
 Duttonhöfer, R. 54
 Eadie, J. W. 5, 119
 Eddy, S. K. 149
 Edelman, D. V. 180
 Edgar, C. C. 54
 Edwards, D. R. 46
 Efron, J. 229, 233
 Ehrenberg, V. 185, 189
 Engberg-Pedersen, T. 142
 Eshel, E. 59, 98, 176–7, 179
 Evans, J. A. S. 166, 248
 Exum, J. C. 238
 Falivene, M. R. 166, 169
 Falk, D. K. 234, 237
 Fantalkin, A. 40
 Farhi, Y. 63
 Feldman, L. H. 68–71, 130–1, 195
 Fernández Marcos, N. 65–7
 Fikhman, I. F. 54
 Fine, S. 28, 234
 Finkelstein, I. 46–7
 Finkielsztajn, G. 63

- Finley, M. I. 131, 205–7
 Finnestad, R. B. 166, 170
 Fischel, H. A. 135–6
 Fischer, A. A. 56, 78, 102, 105, 322, 326
 Fisher, C. S. 31
 Fitzmyer, J. A. 94–5
 Flesher, P. V. M. 234
 Flusser, D. 149–50, 274, 306, 310
 Fornara, C. W. 8, 11, 13, 17
 Fox, M. V. 78, 80
 Fraser, P. M. 197–8
 Frerichs, E. S. 3–4
 Freyne, S. 177
 Frier, B. W. 208, 213
 Fuks, G. 75, 77, 293

 Gabrielsen, V. 205
 Gadot, Y. 63
 Gafni, I. M. 3–4
 Galili, E. 298–9
 Gamberoni, J. 95–6
 Garbini, G. 142
 Garnsey, P. 5, 205
 Gauger, J.-D. 56, 113–14, 322–3, 325–7
 Geertz, C. 151–2
 Geffcken, J. 107
 Gera, D. 75–6, 173–4, 293–4, 319–20
 Geraty, L. T. 58–9
 Gerber, C. 68
 Gerson, S. N. 60
 Geva, H. 35–6, 62–3, 218
 Gibson, S. 63
 Gilbert, M. 100
 Gitin, S. 34
 Gitler, H. 60
 Gmirkin, R. E. 113, 115–17
 Goldberg, A. 248
 Goldingay, J. E. 102
 Goldstein, J. A. 75–6
 Goodblatt, D. 229, 233
 Goodman, M. 75, 142–3, 293
 Grabbe, L. L. 2–3, 8–9, 14, 18–19, 24, 59, 68–9, 75–6, 81–2, 84–8, 92, 95, 102–3, 105, 107, 113, 115, 135, 155, 157–9, 164, 185, 205, 208, 229–30, 234, 238–40, 245–8, 252, 256–7, 260–2, 274, 278, 293–4, 303–4, 306, 322, 325; *JCH* 20, 69, 108, 135, 154, 177, 181, 225, 229, 233; *JRSTP* 4, 110, 200, 233, 235, 250, 256, 259, 308; *HJJSTP* 2–3, 6, 8, 14, 20, 23, 33, 35, 37, 39, 46, 51, 61, 65–7, 74–5, 81, 83, 86, 98, 102, 106, 108, 112, 114, 117, 119, 125, 127, 130, 132, 134, 136, 150, 154–7, 163–4, 169, 174, 178–9, 185, 190, 192–4, 214, 216, 220, 222, 225–6, 229, 235, 239, 242, 244–6, 248, 253–6, 258–62, 264, 277, 282–3, 290, 293, 301, 307–8, 311, 315–16, 328, 334
 Graf, D. F. 140, 180–1
 Grainger, J. d. 173, 176
 Gray, P. 84
 Grayson, A. K. 150, 309
 Greenfield, J. C. 98
 Greenspoon, L. 66
 Grenfell, B. P. 54–5, 166–7
 Griffith, G. T. 126
 Griffiths, J. G. 5, 126, 146, 234–5
 Groot; *see* De Groot
 Grossberg, L. 5
 Gruen, E. S. 5, 107, 135, 319–20
 Gunneweg, J. 62

 Haak, R. D. 68, 205, 260, 306
 Hachlili, R. 234–5
 Hadas, M. 278, 282, 305–6
 Hall, J. M. 151
 Halligan, J. 135
 Halpern, B. 18
 Halpern-Zylberstein, M.-C. 27, 44
 Hamilton, J. R. 111–12, 121
 Hammond, N. G. L. 111–12, 119–20
 Hanhart, R. 66, 95
 Hannestad, L. 142
 Hansack, E. 68
 Hansen, E. V. 139, 185, 189
 Harmatta, J. 51
 Harper, G. M. 52, 208, 211–12
 Harris, E. M. 195
 Harrison, R. 48, 50, 148
 Hata, G. 68, 70
 Hatch, E. 66
 Hauben, H. 166, 168, 185–6, 195
 Hauspie, K. 66
 Hay, D. M. 255
 Heinemann, J. 234, 237
 Hellholm, D. 149, 306
 Helm, R. 274, 277–8, 281, 287
 Heltzer, M. 39
 Hengel, M. 127–33, 135–6, 138–9, 142–4, 163, 173, 175, 195, 323, 325
 Henten, J. W. van 181
 Herbert, S. C. 28
 Herzog, Z. 33
 Hinnells, J. 149–50, 306, 310
 Hoffman, L. A. 234

- Hoffmann, A. 43
 Hölbl, G. 136, 197, 199, 267, 288, 316
 Holladay, C. R. 84–94
 Holleaux, M. 2–3, 319–22
 Holloway, S. W. 102, 155
 Honigman, S. 53, 144–5, 155–6,
 180–4, 193–4, 197, 200–1, 298, 300,
 319, 321
 Hopkins, K. 205–6
 Horbury, W. 193, 234
 Hornblower, J. 119–20
 Hornblower, S. 8, 13, 111–12, 147
 Horowitz, G. 39, 46
 Horsley, G. H. R. 59
 Horst, P. W. van der 181, 234, 237
 Houghton, A. 60, 208, 213
 Howard, G. 255
 Hughes, G. R. 54, 197, 302
 Huizinga, J. 8–10
 Hultgård, A. 149–50, 306, 310
 Humphries, W. L. 103
 Hunt, A. S. 54, 166, 185
 Huß, W. 136–7, 166, 185, 187, 189,
 197, 199, 267, 288, 307, 310, 316,
 319–20
 Hutchinson, J. 151
 Huwiler, E. 78
 Hüttenmeister, F. 234

 Irwin, R. 5

 Jackson, D. R. 238
 Jacob, E. 85, 233, 259
 Jacobson, H. 90
 Jacoby, F. 113–15
 Jähne, A. 173
 Jasnow, R. 54, 197, 274–5, 302
 Jeansonne, S. P. 66, 68, 103
 Jellicoe, S. 66–7, 255
 Jeselsohn, D. 60
 Ji, C.-H. C. 41–2, 44, 46, 48, 293, 296
 Jobes, K. H. 66, 68
 Johnson, A. C. 185
 Johnson, C. G. 136
 Johnson, J. H. 113, 149–50, 307, 309
 Johnson, S. R. 18, 21, 96–8, 298, 301,
 311–12
 Jones, A. H. M. 185
 Jones, S. 151–2
 Jonge, M. de 98

 Kabasele Mukenge, A. 110
 Kaestli, J.-D. 245
 Kamp, K. A. 151–2

 Kaplan, J. 34
 Kasher, A. 75, 180–1, 184, 274, 278
 Kazis, I. J. 111, 113, 274–5
 Kákosy, L. 307
 Keenan, J. G. 54
 Kelso, J. L. 35
 Kenyon, K. 31
 Keyes, C. F. 152
 Kiley, M. 234, 237
 Killebrew, A. E. 152
 Kim, T. H. 274
 Kindler, A. 60
 Kippenberg, H. G. 213
 Kletter, R. 152–3
 Klibansky, R. 8
 Klinkott, H. 170
 Kloner, A. 39, 59, 177–9, 214, 217–18
 Knibb, M. A. 81
 Knoppers, G. N. 177
 Koch, K. 103
 Koenen, L. 149–50, 307, 309
 Koh, Y. V. 78
 König, F. W. 8, 14, 103, 136, 146,
 166, 185, 307
 Kornfeld, W. 95
 Korzakova, H. 59, 177
 Kottek, S. S. 68
 Kottsieper, I. 103, 110
 Kraay, C. M. 60, 267, 288, 316
 Kramer, B. 54, 153
 Kratz, R. G. 103, 110
 Kreissig, H. 213
 Krüger, T. 78
 Kugel, J. 98–9
 Kugler, R. A. 98–9
 Kuhnén, H.-P. 27, 41, 44, 46, 48–9,
 180
 Kuhrt, A. 122, 132, 134, 137–9, 142,
 147, 159, 170, 185, 267, 288, 316
 Kuhs, C. 53, 193–4
 Kvanvig, H. 81

 La Barre, W. 149–50
 Lacocque, A. 66, 68
 Lance, H. D. 34
 Landau, Y. H. 56, 323, 326
 Lanfranchi, P. 90–1
 Lapp, N. L. 41–2, 75, 293
 Lapp, P. W. 42, 63–4, 75
 Laqueur, R. 122
 Larché, F. 41, 293
 Lee, E. P. 78
 Lee, J. A. L. 66–7
 Lee, J. K. 41–2, 44, 46, 48, 293, 296

- LeFebvre, M. 197–8, 200–1
 Lemaire, A. 293
 Lembi, G. 68–9
 Lemche, N. P. 245–7
 Lenger, M.-T. 55, 198, 323
 Lesky, A. 8, 11
 Levine, L. I. 234
 Levison, J. R. 68
 Lewis, N. 193
 Lewy, H. 113–14
 Lieberman, S. 135–6
 Liebesny, H. 55, 323
 Liesen, J. 100
 Lindars, B. 65
 Lindsay, D. R. 68
 Lipiński, E. 166, 185
 Lipschits, O. 27, 32, 35–6, 38, 49, 59,
 63, 148, 177, 218, 220, 246, 274, 322
 Lloyd, A. B. 149
 Loader, J. A. 78, 80
 Lohfink, N. 78
 Lorber, C. C. 60, 208, 213
 Loretz, O. 78–9, 133
 Lozachmeur, H. 293
 Lüddeckens, E. 149, 307
 Lüderitz, G. 181–4
 Lull, D. J. 95
 Lust, J. 5, 66
 Lyon, D. G. 31

 Ma, J. 53, 188
 McClellan, M. C. 208, 213
 McCollough, C. T. 46
 McCown, C. C. 41, 293
 MacDonald, B. 180
 Macfie, A. L. 5
 McKay, H. A. 234, 237
 McLay, T. 66, 68, 103
 McLeod, J. 5
 Mader, G. 68
 Maehler, H. 149, 167
 Maeir, A. 152
 Magen, Y. 32–3, 36, 59, 63, 177
 Magie, D. 185, 188
 Manning, J. G. 167–8, 185–6, 197,
 202, 205, 208–10, 212, 302
 Marcus, R. 69, 218, 220, 225, 227,
 274, 323, 325, 327
 Maresch, K. 53, 181, 193, 197, 200–2
 Marincola, J. 8, 16
 Martin, J. D. 128, 130, 132, 143, 259
 Mason, S. 68–9, 73
 Master, D. M. 31
 Mazar, A. 29–30, 176
 Mazar, B. 38, 41–2, 293–4
 Meadowcroft, T. J. 66, 68, 103
 Mendels, D. 113, 118
 Meshorer, Y. 60
 Meyers, C. L. 58
 Meyers, E. M. 49, 148
 Milik, J. T. 81–3
 Millar, F. 130, 132, 138–9, 142, 144
 Miller, D. B. 78
 Miroschedji, P. de 152
 Misgav, H. 32, 59, 177
 Mittwoch, A. 213
 Modrzejewski, J. Méléze 3–4, 197–8,
 200–1
 Moehring, H. R. 68, 73
 Momigliano, A. 21–2, 75–7, 130–3,
 218, 220, 275, 323, 327
 Montgomery, J. A. 103
 Moore, C. A. 95, 103, 110
 Moore-Gilbert, B. J. 5
 Mor, M. 47, 113
 Mørholm, O. 60
 Morris, I. 205–6
 Muhs, B. P. 54–5, 208, 218, 220
 Mulder, O. 66, 185, 225, 227–8, 234,
 237, 323–4
 Muraoka, T. 66, 100
 Murphy, R. E. 78
 Murray, O. 113–14, 118
 Musti, D. 185, 188, 213

 Nachtergaele, G. 197
 Negbi, O. 33
 Nelson, C. 5
 Neujahr, M. 150, 307, 309
 Neusner, J. 68, 75, 85, 229, 233–4,
 248, 251
 Newman, J. H. 234, 237
 Nickelsburg, G. W. E. 81
 Nikiprowetzky, V. 107
 Nissinen, M. 260
 Nitzan, B. 234, 237

 O'Brien, M. A. 246
 O'Connor, M. 58
 O'Day, G. 84
 Oden, R. A. 146
 Oeming, M. 63, 322
 Oldfather, C. H. 113, 117, 119
 Oliver, G. J. 205
 Oppenheimer, A. 113
 Oren, E. D. 39, 59
 Orlinsky, H. M. 66–7
 Orlov, A. A. 81

- Orrieux, C. 52
 Otto, W. 75–6

 Packman, Z. M. 208
 Parente, F. 69, 96–7
 Parke, H. W. 107
 Parker, S. T. 180
 Pastor, J. 113, 170, 172, 209
 Paton, W. R. 8
 Payne, J. B. 248
 Pearson, L. 111–12
 Perdue, L. 238, 242
 Peremans, W. 149
 Perlman, I. 62
 Pestman, P. W. 2–3, 52, 54
 Petersen, H. 69
 Petzold, K.-E. 8, 17
 Pfister, F. 275, 278
 Pietersma, A. 255
 Pomeroy, S. B. 195
 Porten, B. 51
 Préaux, C. 60–1, 197, 209, 212
 Price, B. B. 208, 213
 Price, J. J. 3–5
 Price, M. 60
 Pucci Ben Zeev, M. 69, 113
 Pugliese Carratelli, G. 142–3

 Qedar, S. 60
 Quaegebeur, J. 166, 170

 Rabenau, M. 95
 Rajak, T. 69, 73, 234
 Rapp, G. 33
 Rappaport, U. 39, 59–60, 75, 177, 234
 Redditt, P. L. 103
 Redford, D. B. 122–3
 Redpath, H. A. 66
 Reed, C. M. 205, 207
 Reeg, G. 234
 Reeves, J. C. 81
 Reich, R. 35–6, 38, 49, 63, 218, 223
 Reif, S. 78–9, 234, 237
 Reisner, G. A. 31
 Rengstorff, K. H. 69
 Rhodes, P. J. 47, 185, 189, 290, 317
 Roberts, J. J. M. 8
 Roche, M.-J. 180
 Rochette, B. 142
 Rogerson, J. W. 95
 Roisman, J. 111
 Roll, I. 33, 46
 Roller, D. W. 46
 Ronen, Y. 60

 Rooke, D. W. 113, 115, 119, 185–6,
 191, 218, 220, 323–4
 Rostovtzeff, M. 52, 55, 126, 142,
 173–4, 185, 188, 195–6, 209, 211
 Rostowzew; *see* Rostovtzeff
 Roueché, C. 159
 Roux, J. 181
 Royse, J. r. 255
 Runia, D. T. 107, 255
 Russell, D. A. 121
 Rutgers, L. V. 3–4

 Sacchi, P. 238
 Sachs, A. J. 2–3
 Sagiv, N. 39
 Said, E. W. 5–6
 Samuel, A. E. 2–3, 142, 147–8, 166,
 168–9
 Samuel, D. H. 149, 166, 307
 Sanders, J. T. 100
 Sanderson, J. 66, 248–9
 Sandmel, S. 260
 Sarkisian, G. K. 137
 Sartre, M. 170, 267, 288, 316
 Sass, B. 62
 Sauneron, S. 166, 170
 Schalit, A. 173, 323, 327
 Schaller, B. 113–14
 Schäfer, P. 248, 250–1
 Scheidel, W. 205
 Schiffman, L. H. 98
 Schipper, B. U. 149, 306, 309–10
 Schmid, S. G. 140
 Schmitt, H. H. 288, 316
 Schnabel, P. 122
 Schoors, A. 78, 149, 307
 Schreckenberger, H. 69–70
 Schröder, B. 69
 Schürer, E. 66, 81–2, 84–6, 89–90,
 92–6, 98, 100, 103, 107, 110, 113
 Schwartz, D. R. 75–7, 113–15, 293
 Schwartz, E. 119
 Schwartz, S. 3–4, 18, 20, 69–70
 Schwarz, H. 5
 Scott, J. M. 3
 Sedman, L. 176
 Seidl, e. 197–8
 Sellers, O. r. 38, 61
 Seow, C.-L. 78–9
 Shafer, B. E. 166
 Shaked, S. 149, 306
 Sharon, I. 46, 62, 148
 Sharpe, E. J. 149, 306
 Shelton, J. C. 54

- Shennan, S. J. 152
 Sherwin-White, S. 122, 132, 134,
 137–9, 142, 147, 159, 170, 185, 267,
 288, 316
 Shoham, Y. 62–4
 Shukron, E. 35–6, 49, 63
 Sievers, J. 68–9
 Skaist, A. 58
 Skehan, P. W. 66, 100
 Skemp, V. 94, 100
 Smend, R. 259
 Smith, A. D. 151–3
 Smith, J. Z. 146–7
 Smith, M. 133–4
 Smith, R. H. 44–5, 49
 Smyly, J. G. 54, 166
 Sokolovskii, S. 152–3
 Soll, W. 95
 Spaer, A. 61
 Sparks, K. L. 152
 Spek, R. J. van der 137–8
 Spencer, R. A. 95, 152
 Spengler, O. 8, 12
 Spilsbury, P. 68–9
 Spivak, G. C. 5–6
 Starcky, J. 180
 Starr, C. G. 5, 119, 147
 Steck, O. H. 103, 110
 Sterling, G. E. 107, 114–15, 234
 Stern, E. 30–2, 38, 40, 63
 Stern, M. 114, 118, 123
 Stone, M. E. 55, 81, 98, 319
 Stoneman, R. 111, 113, 275
 Stuckenbruck, L. T. 81
 Sukenik, E. 31
 Suter, D. W. 81
 Sysling, H. 66

 Taeubler, E. 323
 Tal, O. 27, 33, 35–6, 38, 40, 46, 49,
 148
 Talmon, S. 65, 78, 100, 247–50
 Talshir, Z. 66, 68
 Tarn, W. W. 126
 Tcherikover, V. A. 52, 96–7, 127, 145,
 156, 173–6, 181, 209, 214–18, 229,
 232, 275, 323, 327
 Teixidor, J. 146
 Thackeray, H. St. J. 69, 218, 225, 323
 Thissen, H.-J. 54–5, 149–50, 298–300,
 307, 309
 Thomas, J. D. 95, 167–9
 Thompson, D. J. 142–3, 167, 169–70,
 177, 181–2, 193, 195–6, 208–9, 213

 Tidmarsh, J. 43–4
 Tiffin, H. 5
 Tiller, P. A. 81
 Tishkov, V. 152–3
 Tobin, T. H. 107
 Toloni, G. 95
 Tov, E. 66, 110, 248–9, 252–3, 303
 Trebilco, P. R. 3–4
 Troyer: *see* De Troyer
 Tscherikower; *see* Tcherikover
 Tsfania, L. 32, 59, 177
 Turner, E. G. 54, 136–7, 197, 199,
 209–10

 Ulrich, E. C. 66, 248
 Unnik, W. C. van 3
 Urman, D. 234
 Ussishkin, D. 40

 Van Seters, J. 8–10
 Vanderhooft, D. 63
 VanderKam, J. C. 81, 95, 98, 185,
 190, 225, 227
 Verhoogt, A. M. F. W. 193
 Vermeulen, J. 100
 Veyne, P. 18–19
 Villalba i Varneda, P. 69
 Villeneuve, F. 41, 293
 Vincent, L. H. 52
 Vleeming, S. P. 54

 Wacholder, B. Z. 86–7, 114
 Waddell, W. G. 8, 16, 122
 Walbank, F. W. 120, 126, 298,
 319–20
 Waldmann, H. 146–7
 Wallace, R. W. 195
 Walter, N. 84, 92, 95
 Waltke, B. K. 248–9
 Warner, R. 8, 13
 Weeks, S. 82, 95
 Welles, C. B. 136, 166–7, 185–6, 197
 Wells, J. 114
 Wenning, R. 180
 Werline, R. A. 234, 237
 Wevers, J. W. 66
 Whitlam, K. W. 5–6
 Whitley, C. F. 78–9
 Whittaker, C. R. 205
 Whybray, R. N. 78–80
 Will, E. 5–6, 41–2, 75, 152, 267, 288,
 293, 295, 316, 319–20, 323, 326
 Willems, H. 149, 307
 Williams, M. H. 3–4, 144, 146, 153–4

- Williamson, H. G. M. 238
Wills, L. M. 95
Windschuttle, K. 5
Winnicki, J. K. 54–5, 278
Winston, D. 255
Wiseman, D. J. 2–3
Wolff, H. J. 197–9
Wörrle, M. 57, 322
Worsley, P. 149–50
Wright, B. G. 100–1
Wright, G. E. 32, 34

Wright, G. R. H. 32

Xeravits, G. G. 95

Yadin, Y. 78, 100
Yoffee, N. 151–2
Young, R. 6

Zahle, J. 142
Zauzich, K.-T. 149, 307
Zayadine, F. 75
Ziegler, J. 100–1, 103
Zimmermann, F. 95
Zsengellér, J. 95
Zuckerman, C. 53, 181–4