

26
—
53

A DECADE IN JEWISH HISTORY

[175---165 B. C. E.]

BY

NATHAN KRASNOWETZ.

-A GRADUATION THESIS-

THE HEBREW UNION COLLEGE

1903

T A B L E O F C O N T E N T S .

PREFACE

THE SOURCES -----	page 1
MODERN HISTORIANS OF THIS EPOCH -----	page 16
HELLENISM AND THE JEWS -----	page 29
ANTIOCHUS AND THE ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION -----	page 38
JUDAS MACCABEUS AND THE RECONSECRATION -----	page 59
DANIEL AND CONCLUSION -----	page 79

BIBLIOGRAPHY

TO THE
MEMORY OF MY
BELOVED TEACHER AND FRIEND
DR. MOSES MIELZINER
THIS THESIS
IS RESPECTFULLY DEDICATED.

P R E F A C E -

In the preparation of this essay, I have endeavored to enter the laboratory, as it were, to see how history is made. At the advice of one of my honored teachers I chose a short and exceedingly interesting period of Jewish history as the special topic of research. I have read carefully the sources and the authorities, and have tried to gain an insight into the various methods of the historians who succeeded in fashioning the facts found in the sources into more or less extensive historical accounts. The result of my work in this regard was largely subjective, though I have attempted to indicate the characteristics of the historians of this epoch, both as to conception, interpretation, and manner of treatment. The body of this thesis aims at a presentation of the political and inner history of the Jews from 175 to 165 B.C.E., the period of the Maccabean revolt, beginning with Antiochus Euphron's accession to the Syrian throne, and closing with the reconsecration of the temple at Jerusalem. I realize that owing to natural limitations, and to lack of time, my humble effort will fall

short of its aim.

I wish to take this opportunity in thanking Dr. Bittenwieser for the loan of literature on the subject of this essay. To Professor Gotthard Deutsch, I am under obligations for valuable suggestions on the preparation of this thesis, and for the kindly interest he manifested towards me during my entire course at the college, I wish to express my sincere appreciation. Mere verbal thanks are insufficient to indicate my indebtedness to Professor Ephraim Feldman who was largely responsible for the moulding of my mind, whose intimate friendship I was privileged to enjoy during the eight years of my sojourn in Cincinnati.

N. K.

THE SOURCES-

THE SOURCES.

In the preparation of this thesis, a careful study of the sources and their historical value, was absolutely necessary. The history of the period in consideration could have been obtained at second hand from the various historians who have dealt more or less exhaustively with the events of the Maccabean revolt. But there would not have been that inward satisfaction and familiarity with the history which can come only from a study of the material at first hand. Fortunately the sources for the study of the epoch chosen as the topic of reasearch by the writer were not numerous, and were in most cases accessible. A presentation of the contents and historical value of these is the purpose of this chapter.

The most reliable sources for the study of the Maccabean age are the First and Second books of the Maccabees., and of these, the former is by far of superior merit. The author of,

THE FIRST BOOK OF THE MACCABEES
is unknown. All critics are agreed that he must have been a Palestinian

ch *Johann 40.77*
Jew, for the following reasons: He had an intimate acquaintance with the topography of the country. He also mentions such details as would have little interest for one not living in the very midst of the scenes of the various activities. [Cf. Chaps. 7 & 9, resp. verses 19, and 2,4,33.]. He is less familiar with the geography and history of foreign lands. [Cf. Chaps. 1,8,14, resp. verses 2-6-9, 1-16, 13. also chap.12 verse 6.]. He had an undisguised sympathy with the heroic campaigns conducted by the successive Maccabean leaders. He was and manifests throughout the book an ardent admiration for the entire Asmonean family. He was evidently also in sympathy with the priesthood. The renegade priests Jason and Menelaus, he does not mention at all. From this fact Geiger in his Urschrift concludes that the chronicler must have been a Saducee. [Cf. Shuerer, Vol. 3, 2nd. division, page 3.].

The book contains in detailed form an account of the Maccabean revolt, from the accession of Antiochus in 175 to 135 B.C.E. It prefaces this history by a cursory introduction dealing with the conquests of Alexander and the division of his empire among his generals, erroneously

designated as "the servants who were brought up with him from his youth". The style is that of pure chronicle. The facts are narrated tersely and concisely without flourish and ornament. There is no moralizing such as we find in the less reliable second book of the Maccabees. The religious spirit is not wanting. Frequent allusions are made to the divine power. As in the book of Esther, the word "God" does not occur once in the entire book. The phrase found is "cry unto heaven". [Vide Chaps. 3, 4, 9, 13, resp. verses 50 60, 10 40, 4., 3.]. It has been argued from this striking omission of the word "God", that the genuine religious spirit of the prophets, was no more, and that a cold legalism, "the outward holiness of the scribes" had taken its place. Jahve was no longer the God in immediate contact with his people. He was no longer Israel's leader, the very essence of their existence, "the husband of Israel", but a far-off divine Presence, a Yoshev Bashomayim, a distant dweller in the distant heavens. This religious status of the Jews was a natural consequence of the rigorous legalism instituted by Ezra.

The book must have been written some time between 120 and 63 B.C.E. Various proofs have been adduced for the fixing of this date. There is internal evidence. The writer says that the family monument erected to the Asmoneans by Simon at Modin in 143 B.C.E. was still standing when he wrote. Hence some time must have elapsed between the erection of the monument and the composition of the book. The author's references to the Romans, [Vide Chaps. 8, 12, 14, resp. verses 1 12, 6, 40.], fixes a terminus ad quem, viz., about 63 B.C.E. One theory has it that the author wrote under the inspiration of the glorious reign of Simon, 140-125 B.C.E. Since, however, there is no absolutely definite evidence, an exact date can not satisfactorily be determined upon. Suffice it to say that the dates offered by the termini are not far distant from the time of the recorded events. Hence it is fair to suppose that the author either drew to a large extent from his own personal knowledge and from that of his contemporaries, older than himself, or from popular tradition that was yet untainted by myth, miracle and legend. The statements in Chap.

9, verse 22, "And the rest of the acts of Judah, and his wars, and the valiant deeds which he did, and his greatness, they are not written; for they were exceeding many.", and in Chap. 1., verse 23, "And the rest of the acts of John, and of his wars, and of his valiant deeds, and of the building of the wall which he built, and of his doings, behold they are written in the chronicles of his high priesthood, from the time that he was made high priest after his father"., indicate that there must have been some documents which the author employed in his work, or of the existence of which he was aware. If we assume an earlier date of composition, say, the first terminus, then there need not have been any documents before the writer, for then he could have written from some personal knowledge aided of course by the yet vivid tradition of men who lived in the stirring times. There is no doubt that the original First Maccabees was written in Hebrew. Besides the internal evidence of style, we have the testimony of Jerome [340--420 C.E.] : "The First Book of the Maccabees I found in Hebrew; the second is Greek as can be

proved from its very style". Origen was also acquainted with the Hebrew text of the First Maccabees. [See, Eusebius, Hist. Eccl. 6, 25.].

The historical value of the First Maccabees is now acknowledged by all critics, without exception. Ewald says, "It breathes the freshest inspiration of the peculiar elevation of the time". Grimm calls it "a record of priceless worth". Shuerer says, "It is one of the most valuable sources we possess for the history of the Jewish people". Geiger in his Urschrift, page 206, characterizes the book as a "campaign document". He says: "Die zwei Buecher der Makkabaer sind partei schriften; das erste hat einen der Makkab. Dynastie befreundeten Sadducaer zum Verfasser, das zweite einen die Makkabaer mit Mistrauen beobachtenden Pharisaer zum Verfasser oder vielmehr Epitomator". Yet he does not for a moment question the historicity of the First Book. Its own internal evidence is the best proof of its historical value. First, the most important events are dated according to the Seleucidian era. The accuracy of these dates has been found on comparison with those of Polybius, Livy and other

Greek and latin sources. The minute account of events, the chronological arrangement, the absence of the miraculous element, also of the element of exaggerated martyrology, the lack of white-washing the account so that it should always redound to the glory of Israel, all point in cumulative evidence to the reliability of this book as a source of Jewish history.

THE SECOND BOOK OF THE MACCABEES differs materially from the first in several respects. Geiger has pointed out that the book must have been written by a Pharisee, one ill disposed towards the priests whom he lashes and castigates in his didactic narrative. In Chap. 4, 14 he characterizes Jason, Menelaus and others who are not specifically mentioned, as gross apostates. That the writer was not opposed to the priestly office as such, we infer from his clear epigrammatic remark, "Howbeit, the Lord did not choose the nation for the place's sake, but the place for the nation's sake" [5, -19]. Hence such priests as Jason and Menelaus are an utter abomination to the Lord. Another peculiar feature of the second book is its complete ignoring of

the Asmonean family. J U D A S is the hero of this book. Still another distinct feature is the liberal introduction of the miraculous element and the frequent interspersions of legend. The book purports to be an epitome of a larger work in five volumes composed by Jason of Cyrene. These books are no longer extant and outside of this brief notice we know nothing at all about them. The book is prefaced by a copy of certain letters sent by the Jews of Palestine to those of Egypt, the professed aim being to urge the Egyptian Jews to an observance of the feast of dedication. [Cf. One 9--18, Two 1.]. The body of the book deals with events covering a period of fifteen years, from 176 --161 B.C.E.. [Cf. First Macc. One-7.] It seems that neither the epitomizer nor Jason was acquainted with the first book. There are several notable disagreements patent between the two books in regard to specific chronology, arrangement of events, and statement of facts. The first book, whatever its other motive may have been, was written primarily as a history. The second has as its avowed aim the instruction and edification of the Greek-speaking Jews. [Cf. Two 25--29, and Six12.].

The writer is more of a religious teacher than a chronicler. The date of composition cannot be definitely determined upon. Josephus in all probabilities did not know the book, for he neither used it nor mentions it. In view of this fact it is not going too far to conjecture that the epitomizer flourished somewhere towards the close of the last century before our present era. Jason naturally then, lived and wrote at an earlier period, the approximate date of which is, somewhere in the penultimate century B.C.E. This conjecture is strengthened by the nature of the epitome. The accounts recorded therein are often confused and at times self-contradictory. Jason's sources, if the epitomist as epitomist is reliable, must have been oral and the tradition considerably removed in point of time from the occurrences themselves. Because of its clarity, its consistent account, its accurate chronology, the first book takes precedence over the second as to documentary evidence. That the book was written originally in Greek has been established beyond a doubt. Jerome already says in the Prologus Galeatus, "Machabaeorum liber

secundus Graecus est, quod ex ipsa quoque phrasei probari potest".The critics say that the style is thoroughly Greek, there being not a single Hebraism in the entire book. Though its historical worth, as hinted at before, is inferior to that of the first book, yet in conjunction with it forms a valuable source of information on this period. Of the assertion of the belief in immortality and resurrection in this book, and of the emphatic and apparently purposed omission of these doctrines in the first book, mention shall be made in a subsequent chapter.

J O S E P H U S.

The next source of any importance for the study of this epoch is the Jewish historian Flavius Josephus. Whatever views may be held in regard to his reliability as a historian, his prejudices in favor of the Jews, his distorting of events ad majorem gloriam Judaeorum, must be laid aside in the consideration of his trustworthiness as a chronicler of the decade of the Maccabean age. Josephus evidently had a copy of the first Maccabees before him when he indited his chapters dealing with this era. I have carefully compared his account with that given in the First Macc and have found it to be an accurate epitome of that volume.

The epitome extends as far as 164 B.C.E. No new information is obtained from Josephus on this period. It is to be observed that the confirmatory evidence of Josephus adds to the trustworthiness as an historical document of the First Maccabees.

O T H E R J E W I S H S O U R C E S

contain but slight hints relative to this period, "donnees puisees aux autres sources". The Talmud and Midrashim furnish only indications generally of an obscure nature. In Megilla, 11A, Mattathias and his sons are mentioned. Mattathias is incorrectly designated high priest. The legend about the oil, which is strangely omitted in Second Macc., is told in Sabbath 21B. In the Megillath T'a'anith, of which more will be mentioned shortly, a more plausible account is given for the eight days' celebration of the feast of Dedication. It states that it took the Maccabees eight days to renovate and cleanse the temple. In Pesachim the utter degradation of the priesthood is described. No specific names of priests are mentioned. In Vayikra Rabba the condition of the priesthood at the time of the second temple is described in no flattering

terms. " The grand dignity of the high-priestly office was sold for money, and the high-priests got rid of their competitors by m a g i c, or some other foul manner". The so-called Megillath Ta'anith has an account very ambiguous at times, of the Maccabean period. [See Derenbourg's translation.]. It mentions among other things the command of Antiochus to Lysias to issue orders against circumcision, the observance of the laws, especially that of the sabbath, and the prohibition of the study of the law. Shemoth Rabba, mentions Mattathias and his sons as men who remained faithful to the law and to God, and that they had routed the armies of Antiochus. [See Chap. 15; and in Vayikra, see Chap. 21.]

N O N J E W I S H S O U R C E S .

History must always be read in the light of subsequent events. The most difficult thing is to estimate contemporary history. Events often occur which seem at the time of small moment, but which, viewed from the perspective of several centuries hence, loom large on the historical horizon. The Maccabean revolt in the eyes of the non-Jewish historians

must have appeared as a trivial affair. Little Judea that tiny strip in Coelo-Syria could stir up only a storm in a tea-pot. How insignificant its bickerings and battles are compared with the Roman conquests, the Macedonian victories, the Egyptian and Persian struggles. Such must have been the view-point of the non-Jewish chroniclers of the Maccabean and the immediately subsequent periods. They surely could not have foreseen the tremendously far-reaching consequences of that little Jewish uprising. Hence we find only scant mention in these writers in reference to this period as it concerned the history of the Jews.

POLYBIUS

who flourished about 167 B.C.E. in Book 26, gives a brief description of the character of Antiochus. No mention is made of the Jewish revolt.

DIODORUS SICULUS

who lived during the reign of Caesar and of Augustus, in the 29th book of his annals gives a description of the character of Antiochus that tallies with the one given by Polybius. In the 34th book, he tells briefly of Antiochus's entry into the temple of Jerusalem, of his defilement of the altar, . The account is largely false, because

It differs materially from that of the detailed and reliable Jewish sources. The statement that Antiochus on entering the temple saw the statue of Moses, who gave abominable laws to the Jews, seated on an ass, reading a book, is too ludicrous to deserve further comment. The further assertion that Moses was the founder of Jerusalem, is a specimen of the trustworthiness of the account.

APPIAN

has a short account of Antiochus, but does not tell of his relations to the Jews.

TACITUS

in the fifth book of his History, confusing Antiochus Epiphanes With Antiochus the Third, says, "Demere superstitionem et mores Graecorum dare admixus, quo minus teterrimam gentem in melius mutaret Parthorum bello prohibitus est."

LIVY

in his forty-first book has an account of Antiochus, mostly a delineation of his character.

We are obliged to rely on the Jewish sources, then, for a true history of the Maccabean Age, and of these for the decade that forms

sketch
it
me. list.
the topic of study of this thesis, the Books of the Maccabees are the main authorities.

It may be mentioned in conclusion, that there are three other so-called books of the Maccabees. The third Maccabees tells of a supernatural deliverance of the Egyptian Jews from the persecutions of Ptolmey Philopat IV. in the third century B. C. E. long before the Maccabean revolt. It of no value in the study of our period. The fourth Macc. is "a sort sermon on the supremacy of reason written from a Stoic standpoint addressed to the Alexandrian Jews? It embodies the two martyr stories that are found in the II Macc. and dilates on them at considerable length with a the circumstantiality of an eyewitness endowed with a very vivid imagination. The critics say that it must have been written somewhere near the time of the destruction of the temple in Jerusalem, 70 C.E. The fifth book of the Macc. is merely a Syriac translation of the sixth book of Josephus' [De bello Judaico].

MODERN HISTORIANS OF THIS EPOCH.

MODERN HISTORIANS OF THIS EPOCH.

In this chapter, I have attempted to characterize in as terse and clear a manner as was at my command, the various modern "Ezekiels", who have breathed into the dry bones of history the breath of life, who have endeavored to build the facts they found into attractive structures who have blown away the chaff, sifted carefully the material before them distinguished reality from fabulous episode, essence from accident, and who have tried to infuse a current of charm into the chapters they have written. Some have been brilliant in this latter respect. Some have been faithful followers of the records, and accurate reproducers of the annal with scarce any modification at all, save the addition of a little literary cement to make smooth reading. By one or another the facts were employed as illustrating certain well defined historical theories. Again we see one who has in a cold scientific manner presented us with an orderly arrangement of material which is ready for immediate use to any who care to employ it. Of the many historical writers who have handled

more or less extensively, the epoch in consideration, I read only such as were easily accessible, and that have earned a reputation in the scholarly world.

EMIL SCHUERER,

professor of theology at the University of Giesen, has written "Geschichte des juedischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi", beginning his history with the Maccabean age. The title is not sufficiently indicative of the nature and scope of this masterly work. It is not so much a history, as a rich historical mine whence may be quarried with little difficulty all the necessary material for a history of the Jewish people, using the term history in its larger meaning, that of a scientific presentation of facts and a philosophic interpretation of them. Schuerer has not given us a philosophy of history. He has with the utmost painstaking and diligence gathered together from all available sources historical "material". This has been arranged in a lucid and strictly scientific manner. There is no rhetoric, no brilliantly turned phrases. The author has besides gathered together a large bibliography relative

to his subject. His manner of presentation may well be illustrated by the chapter dealing with the period 175 to 165 B. C. E. which he terms "Religious destitution and revival". He gives first of all the sources whence is drawn all the material used in the chapter; then he appends a list of authorities, that is to say historians , monographers, who have written on this period. He then in a succinct and clear style, without flourish or theorizing, gives the history of the period as he found it in the scattered sources. Schuerer's work has been of great value to me in the planning of my essay and in the suggestions it offered as to the moulding and arranging of my material.

ERNEST RENAN

HAS been characterized as being "too brilliant to be thoroughly reliable"

This characterization is in the nature of a complement with a pointed reservation. The famous French scholar was once a Catholic . When he wrote the history of Israel he was a full-fledged sceptic. He read the story of ancient Israel without prejudice. He wrote it with sympathy. He was an artist. He had a remarkable fund of the most delicate

humor. He used this with all the grace and finesse so characteristic of the French. He had a keen literary appreciation and a luminous philosophic mind. His imagination was poetic and vivid enough to enable him to reconstruct in a style that is fascinating, the background of the times of Jesus. The eighth book of his "Histoire", Chaps. 10 to 16, he devotes to an exposition of that stirring and eventful decade of Jewish history, from Antiochus the Illustrious to the reconsecration of the temple. It is a philosophic interpretation of history blended with a masterly marshalling of data. Renan was temperamentally akin to the old Greeks. He never tired of admiring their colossal intellectual and artistic genius. He has no hesitation in expressing his undisguised contempt for the legalism of the Jews of that epoch. The Torah he terms an intolerable burden drawn up by utopian theorists, one of the worst codes to live by, that were ever seen. The Greek law he considered as purely rationalistic, the only salvation from the impracticability of the Torah. That he was mistaken in a measure in what he said, subsequent events have shown. That there was a germ of truth in his

sweeping declaration, modern times amply illustrate. On the other hand Renan fairly goes into ecstasy about the enthusiasm and martyrdom of the brave Jews of "75". "All honor to enthusiasm. All honor to martyrdom. All honor to the nation that held out longest against luring men to morality by forged tickets of admission to a life which has no reality" Renan is more interested in presenting to the reader a picture of the inner life and history of Israel, of the clashing of Hellenism and Judaism, of the conditions that gave birth to the apocalyptic literature of that time, of the inception of the doctrine of immortality. Of these topics and of Renan's vision of the foreshadowings of Christianity in this turbulent period I shall have a further word to say in a later chapter.

H E R Z F E L D

has put into modern German, with slight variations, a faithful account of the Maccabean uprising, dealing with the events chronologically. He starts his chapter with a portrayal of the character of Antiochus the Illustrious, giving a verbatim account as found in Polybius, Book XXVI 10, and as confirmed by the other extant non-Jewish sources.

Herzfeld ventures the opinion that the cruelty of Antiochus towards the Jews was due not so much to his savage character as to an unlucky chain of circumstances . I am inclined to agree with Herzfeld . My reason I state elsewhere. Herzfeld has followed closely the second book of the Maccabees, though later, he avails himself also of the first book. That the ^{sa} Eliëzar episode and the romantic martyrdom of the mother and her seven sons as a page of history have the value of "a zero from which the formative circle has been eliminated", the author doubts not in the least.

W E L L H A U S E N

in his Israelitische und Juedische Geschichte, devotes but a few pages to the Maccabean epoch. The scope of his work which was mainly the re-writing of the biblical history from a "higher critical" point of view, precludes any other than an abridged account of this period of which we have reliable contemporary documents.

S T A D E

who was a professor at the university at Giesen also wrote a Geschichte des Volkes Israel. He devotes a considerable number of pages to the

Maccabean Age. He writes in an elaborate style expatiating on the event and conditions of the epoch in question. His history of the uprising is interrupted by a rather long digression on the literature of this period. Besides the book of Daniel, Stade thinks that there was a considerable literature at this time. The books of Job, Judith, Tobit, Ruth, according to him were written about the same time as Daniel for which he sets 167 as the date of composition. Stade holds that there were two main reasons for the events that led up to the great revolt. First, the great need of money on the part of the Syrian monarchs. Since the treaty of peace made with the Romans by Antiochus Magnus, in 189, the treasury of the Seleucidian monarchy needed constant influx of money. This the various provinces of the Syrian realm were obliged to furnish. And Judea with its richly reputed temple came in for a large share in the furnishing of funds. The second cause was the Hellenization of the Jews. The great defect of the Syrian kingdom was its heterogeneity. Antiochus Epiphanes sought to remedy this by an attempt at unifying all the peoples in his realm both in their customs as well as in their religion. The Jewish

resistance gradually became a great rebellion. Stade's style is
not full! thoroughly "German".

S T A N L E Y

in volume III of his "History of the Jewish Church", devotes one lecture to Judas Maccabeus, in which he discusses in popular form the Maccabean period. He follows quite faithfully the sources both the books of the Maccabees and the non Jewish sources. He frequently refers to and quotes Ewald. Since his presentation was in lecture form, he takes occasion to draw parallels as far as he can from universal history. He speaks of the book of Daniel as a product of this age, and also of psalms 74 and 79. The psalter of Solomon he also attributes to this age. Though he admits the exaggeration in the account of the martyr-ology in the second book of the Maccabees, he yet asserts that there is some truth in the accounts. The case of Eliezar is a typical one, he thinks. It was pointed out by Dr. Deutsch that Renan in translating the famous dictum of Antigonous of Socho, made a blunder. The word which should be rendered in French "peur", he translates "rosee".

Stanley likewise erred in translating the same word. He translates the Hebrew word "Zora", by "favor" instead of by "fear". Thus great minds err sometimes in little things.

F E R D I N A N D H I T Z I G

professor in Heidelberg, treats at some length of the Maccabean era in his *Geschichte des Volkes Israel*. Here, the account of the Jewish history of this period is prefaced by a chronology of the Egyptian and Syrian dynasties and of the wars of Antiochus with Egypt. There are many references to the Greek and Roman annalists of whose work the writer makes frequent use. His sketch of the Jews and of their revolt is very minute and circumstantial. It lacks literary finish to make it interesting reading. The style is very dry and often quite tedious. Hitzig maintains as do all the other historians of this epoch that the Maccabean revolt was primarily a religious and not a political one. Hitzig parallels the "ass" story as found in Diodorus by one found in Plutarch's *de Isadore* not in reference to the Jews at all. He infers that there must have been some confusion here among the annalists. This need not be the case.

H E I N R I C H E W A L D

professor in Goettingen, has written a very interesting history of the Jewish people. His chapters dealing with the times of the Asmoneans are replete with "Cultur-geschichte", as well as with an account of the external affairs of Israel. His introduction to the study of the Maccabean era is a Rundschau of the condition of the Jews at the time of the accession of Antiochus. He then gives an account of the plundering of the temple and the Maccabean revolt, in concise form. To Ewald the interest lies more in noting the internal development of Israel. The book of Daniel comes in for a brief discussion also some of the psalms. Ewald thinks that Antiochus is mentioned in Gemara Ta'anith p. 66 sq. as Apistomos who burnt the Torah on July 17. "In the little book of the Psalter of Solomon, we possess in all probabilities a genuine and unadorned product of the age, the simplicity of which renders it all the more effective?" Ewald does not speak in very complimentary terms of the hagiocracy and the priesthood. In discussing the psalms that have been considered as products of this age, Ewald concludes that our psalter contains no Maccabean psalms at all.

Ewald mentions some of the unhistorical works that purport to treat of the Maccabean age. One is an extract from the two books of the Maccabees with many additions from various unreliable sources. This work is now known only in an Arabic version and is called Macc. Arab. It also contains the later history of the Jews down to the time of Herod. It is largely dependent on Josephus for this period. Another highly unhistorical work mentioned by Ewald in connection with the literature bearing on the Maccabean age, is the Megillath Antiochus published by Filipowski in Aramaic and Hebrew. It is nothing more than a festival work in the style of Esther, intended to explain the origin of the feast of lights, and was not written till the second century C.E. [I was unable to procure a copy of these books, so I rely wholly on the authority of Ewald.]

G R A E T Z

in the second volume of his *Geschichte der Juden* has quite an extensive and interestingly couched account of the Maccabean period. His detailing of the events is interrupted by a ny number of digressions dealing with the problems of the authorship and composition of the book of Daniel, of the historicity and purpose of the book of Esther, of the Assidean party its origin and position, and kindred questions as suggested by the meagre allusions in the sources. Graetz has a profusion of foot-notes , mostly references to the books of the Maccabees, to Josephus to Daniel and the Greek and Roman authorities. Graetz as all the other historians of this era and as the most reliable critics of the book of Daniel sees in that book unmistakable allusions to the Syrian monarch Antiochus IV. A striking view of Graetz's is that concerning the various parties in Judea. Whereas he notes the clear-cut distinction between the Hellenist and the Assideans, he maintains that the bulk of the people belonged to neither of these sects. The majority were middle-of-the-road men, in the language of modern politics. The bulk of the Jews were neither

staunch adherents of the law as laid down by Ezra, nor altogether enthusiastic admirers and imitators of the Greeks. [Cf. II Macc. IV 19, where mention is made of the messengers that were sent to Tyre to the quinquennial Olympian games in honor of Heracles.]. Graetz has also a novel view as to the duplicity of the character of Antiochus IV. He thinks that all the eccentricities and flagrant frivolities and insanities of this monarch who had received his early training in Rome, were merely bluffs. Antiochus wished to deceive the Romans.

Graetz's strictures against Menelaus are also severe and well merited. From the slight hint in II Macc. IV 50, he infers that all the calumnies heaped against the Jews by Antiochus originated with this abominable priest. Graetz's style is elaborate. He expatiates at great length on matter that other historians like Renan dispose of in a few pregnant sentences. In conclusion, it may be said that in general, the various historians of this epoch agree. If there are differences, they are not those of facts but of interpretation.

HELLENISM AND THE JEWS

H E L L E N I S M A N D T H E J E W S .

When Alexander the Great became master of Asia Minor, Syria, Phoenicia, it was his fond dream to establish an universal empire that should be bound together by the ties of a common language, common customs, and a common civilization. But with the shrewdness of a man who understands human nature thoroughly, Alexander did not impose by force the Greek culture on the nations that fell under his sway. In the footprints of his armies there were seen the steps of Greek colonists who quietly insinuated their customs and language among the peoples in whose midst they settled. We know from non-Jewish sources how Alexander was always accompanied in his marches by some famous Greek poet or philosopher. His love and admiration for the great Greek genius was so pronounced, that he was never content with his victories and conquests unless the introduction of Hellenic culture followed in their wake. Judea which since the return from Babylonian captivity had been a Medo-Persian province, now came under the beneficent sway of the great Macedonian monarch. It was part of the larger province of Coelo-Syria, bounded on the

north by Mount Taurus and Mount Lebanon, and on the south by Egypt. Of the friendly relation that existed between the Jews and Alexander, we have ample evidence in Josephus and in the talmud and midrashim. In the latter two sources, the numerous fanciful tales that have been woven around the character and acts of Alexander, are largely legendary. There is, however, this kernel of truth in all of them, namely, the fact of Alexander's friendly attitude towards Israel. Palestine could not escape contact with the Hellenism that was the aftermath of his conquests. When Alexander died, in 323, his vast empire was divided among the so-called Diadochi. Ptolemy Soter obtained Egypt as his share in the division, but was not content with his lot. He soon conquered Coelo-Syria and thus Palestine became an Egyptian province. After the battle of Ipsus in 301, Judea became an undisputed part of the Ptolemean kingdom. The Jews were not only not molested during the Ptolemean sway, but enjoyed a period of prosperity. They lived in accordance with the laws laid down by Ezra and the hagiocracy, and in general their condition was better than during the time of the Medo-Persian dynasties. The

Jews had charge of their own internal government, which was to a great extent an ecclesiastical government. The theocracy of the second commonwealth flourished in milder form. The priests who were at the head of the worship were also the chief rulers. The high-priest was supreme in all civil authority whenever that authority did not conflict with the superior authority of the Syrian monarch or his representative. The law which was introduced by Ezra was essentially a ceremonial law. It was intended as a "S'yog", a safeguard against assimilation with the heathen nations in whose midst Israel dwelt. To keep up this safeguard, a special order of interpreters of the law was needed. Hence the scribes or hagiocracy, and at the head of these, the High-priest. That extremists soon arose whose zeal for the law in all its minutiae was great enough to cause martyrdom, the history of the Maccabean revolt conclusively proves.

During the reign of Alexander, many Jews had settled in Alexandria where they were admitted to all the rights of Macedonian citizenship. While the Diadochi were fighting for supremacy, and Palestine was in a

precarious condition, many more Jews flocked to Alexandria to join their brethren who enjoyed an epoch of rest and prosperity. Here too the Greek influences left its marks on the Jews. In 218 Antiochus the Great gained possession of Coelo-Syria, Phoenicia, and Palestine. He held these provinces more or less insecurely till 198, when the battle of Panias was fought. Palestine was now undisputedly and for a long period under the rule of the Seleucidae. [See Stark's Gaza page 403 ff.]. The dominion of the Seleucidae was harsher than that of the Ptolmeys, as subsequent events will show. Greek colonies by this time dotted the Mediterranean coast, and that there were Greek settlements in the interior of Palestine we know likewise from II Macc. six, 8. The gradual hellenization which had begun in the time of Alexander the great reached its climax in the reign of one of the sinful offshoots of the Seleucidae, Antiochus the Madman. That the Hellenic influence was bound to spread through all the phoenician and Palestinian towns was inevitable. Antioch was the leading city in Syria and from there as a centre Hellenism radiated

into all the neighboring territory. It went further. The superior civilization of the Greeks, and their superior vices too, spread into Italy, Carthage, Egypt, AssyriaAsia Minor. [See Renan on this point.bk. VIII chap. 10.]. The Jews alone did not succumb to the spirit of the age. Yetthey could not altogether escape from it. The daily contact with the Greeks, their mutual intercourse in business, necessitated the use of the Greek language. That this was not mastered by the majority of the Jews there is no reason to doubt. Even the pretentious work of the more cultured among them as manifest in the Septuagint, shows a lack of mastery of the foreign idiom. How much worse must have been the "Greek" of the great body of Jews.The use of the language was accompanied by the gradual introduction of Greek customs and manners. Hellenism penetrated more deeply the superior strata of the Jews. The great bulk of the Jewish population still spoke among themselves their native idiom, the Jewish worship was still intact, and the law of Ezra and the scribes more or less rigidly observed. The Hellenists or Graeco-maniacs were recruited from the higher ranks. The pietists were the

antipodes of these. The law of opposition was again operative in history. We may safely assert with Graetz that the majority was luke-warm, non-partisan. A similar state of affairs is prevalent in our very midst. On the one hand we have the stanch Zionist party which has as its slogan "Jewish Distinctiveness". This party insists on having everything Jewish from a home in Palestine to language, culture dress art, manners, and fine all that goes to make up the life of a people should in this case be distinctively Jewish. We may liken this party to the Assideans or pietists of the Maccabean age. On the other hand we have the so-called assimilationists. The ethical culture society and the extreme radical wings of Reform are illustrations of this second party and its aims. Between these two extremes are the vast majority of Jews. They have not abandoned their faith. They still take pride in their traditions, they still persist in remaining Jews. Yet they have not scrupled to imbibe the surrounding culture. They speak the language of the people in whose midst they dwell. They have adopted in a large measure the manners and social customs of their non-Jewish neighbors. In spite of all

they maintain their identity and remain to all intents and purposes J E W S. It is fair to conceive a similar state of affairs obtaining in Judea during the Maccabean age. Since Alexander sowed the seeds of Hellenic culture wherever his armies set foot, the Jews held their own in spite of a few renegades now and then and in spite of the adoption of the Greek tongue for commercial purposes. And yet as Ewald has pointed out, when Jew and Greek first met it seemed inevitable that the union and fusion of the two cultures would take place. Israel had saved enough of its culture from ancient days. Activity of mind and a readiness to learn were common to both nations, and there was in addition a number of reasons why the superior morality for which the Jews were distinguished among the Asiatic nations could be nothing but acceptable to the Greeks. But as we have noted often in universal history, as has been pointed out in my history class by our professor of history, the force of opposition made itself very manifest. The growing fusion of the Jew and Greek only brought the deeper seated antagonism between the nationalities and religions on either side into sharper

collision. It is not unlikely that if there had not been any forced im-
position of the foreign cult accompanied by so many distasteful features
if the hellenizing process had been left to take care of itself, a large
contingent of Jews might have been assimilated into the Greeks. Antioch
Epiphanes like Haman, precluded the possibility of such a contingency by
the barbarous attitude he manifested towards the Jews. The "S'eyog" to
the law made by Ezra and the hagiocracy was now made more secure than
ever. When hellenism among the Jews was at its zenith, the great crisis
came. It decided the future of Israel. The extent of the inroads upon
the Jews, on the part of the growing Greek spirit at the time of Anti-
ochus IV, especially among the aristocracy and the priests was had
greater than that apostatising monarch imagined. When we see how
The Greek spirit dominated over and colored the cultures of the differ-
ent nations upon whom it descended, how Syria as well as Egypt lost
their native hue completely, then we can appreciate Renan's enthusiast
applause of that small heroic band of Jews who emerged strong and

unharmd from the severe conflict of these the two foremost civilization
of antiquity.

A N T I O C H U S

AND THE

A B O M I N A T I O N O F D E S O L A T I O N .

ANTIOCHUS AND THE ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION.

In 190, near Magnesia, Antiochus Megalos suffered a crushing defeat at the hands of the Romans under Scipio Africanus. One of the conditions of the humiliating treaty of peace imposed upon him, was the sending of twenty hostages to Rome, including a son of the king. In compliance with this condition, Antiochus Megalos sent his son Antiochus to Rome where he remained for thirteen years. [Cf. I Macc. I, 10]. There he received his education and there he must have imbibed a great deal of that wild hilarity which he so often displayed while he held the sceptre and which gained for him the unenviable soubriquet of "madman". Of the character of this monarch we have several accounts in the annals of the Greek and Roman crronographers. These are supplemented by several scattered allusions in reference to Antiochus, found in the books of the Maccabees. Polybius in the XXVI book of his Res Syriacae, and Livy, who in all likelihood had a copy of the Greek annalist before him when

he wrote his history, in his XLI book give the most detailed delineation Antiochus was a hostage in Rome when his father died in 187. Seleucus Philopater his brother succeeded to the throne. In looking about for means to obtain money with which to fulfill the obligation of the treaty with Rome, he determined upon robbing the temple at Jerusalem. He had learned of the untold wealth and the splendid treasures that were deposited in the sacred treasury of the temple, from Appolonius the governor of Phoenicia and Coelo-Syria, who in turn had received information from a certain Simon the guardian of the temple treasury who owing to a altercation with Onias the honored high-priest, was willing to sell his own honor and his people's. [CF. II Macc. III, 1sq.]. Heliodorus the treasurer of Seleucus and in all probabilities his assassin, was sent to rob the temple. He was frustrated in the attempt. We have no reliable record of this incident. The reason given for the failure of Heliodorus in the II Macc. is, the intervention of supernatural agents. The origin of this legend we may with safety ascribe to the peculiar feeling of the Jews on the subject of such outrageous sacrileges.

The temple and its sacred precincts were regarded as inviolable. He who would dare perform a sacriligious act on that holy territory, would suffer direct punishment from God. Only the high-priest had the prerogative -- and that too only on the most solemn day of the year-- of entering within the holy of holies. No laymen were privileged to have access to the sacred treasury. The divine punishment inflicted on the Medo-Persian monarch was meted out to him on account of his act of egregious impiety committed by robbing the precious vessels from the Jewish temple. Such was the then Jewish interpretation of the cause of the fall of the Medo-Persian empire. That Heliodorus a mere hireling of the king could enter the holy precincts of the temple and rob its treasury with impunity, was unthinkable to the Jewish mind of that epoch. And the writer of the II Macc., in which book the story is related, could not refrain from introducing the supernatural element in his account.

Meanwhile Seleucus died. According to the Greek annalists, he is supposed to have been murdered by that same Heliodorus who immediately usurped the throne. But Antiochus IV, whose liberty had been secured

by Seleucus shortly before his death, by the substitution of his own son Demetrius as Roman hostage, was now on his way to Syria. He "suddenly appeared" in his native home, wrested the sceptre from Heliodorus and with the assistance of the king of Pergamos and the consent of Rome, took possession of the kingdom which rightfully belonged to the hostage Demetrius. [See Appian, de bello Mithridatico XLV]. This sudden and opportune advent of Antiochus gained for him the name "Illustrious". At least such is the view of the non-Jewish chronographers. [Appian, ibid; Livy, XLI, 20 also Jos. Ant. XII 5.]. "And so Antiochus the son of Antiochus the Great took possession of Syria, to whom they gave the cognomen Epiphanes or Illustrious because when strangers seized the kingdom for themselves, he suddenly appeared as the assessor of the ancestral sway". [Livy XLI 20. The latin word for "suddenly appeared" is "illuxerit". The Greek word, Epiphanes, the verb of the same stem as Epiphanes, See Appian XLV.]. According to Livy, the Romans recognized Antiochus as the rightful heir to the Syrian throne. So in 175 B. C. E. Antiochus IV became ruler of the Syrian empire and oppressor of the Jews in whose

history his name is inscribed in letters of blood. His character is a strange composite of frivolity and cruelty. His nature was duplex. He was great in little things, and little in great things, as has been epigrammatically pointed out. A streak of the genius of Alexander the Great was in his make-up. He was intoxicated with power and there was a touch of madness in all his actions. Like Caligula and Nero, he had undoubted fits of insanity. Like Peter the Great, he would mingle among the tradesmen and artisans and discuss their wares and work with them. Like Alexander III of Russia, he would love to disguise himself, and going to some low tavern perform a number of pranks. He would slip away from his palace unknown to his courtiers and with one or two boon companions, would loaf about in the "shady" parts of the city. He scrupled not to enter into intimate conversation with the lowest and hesitated not to drink with them in the vilest shops. He would enter convivial places unexpectedly playing instruments, dancing, and cutting all sorts of capers. Many frightened at his unexpected advent ran away in haste.

Often dressed in a toga minus his royal robes, he would walk about in the market place canvassing votes for himself as tribune or aedile. This custom he had most likely observed in Rome. Frequently also he would act as magistrate, dispensing judgement with all the seriousness of a real judge. For all these acts some called him simple, others crazy. Hewas very lavish in bestowing gifts. He dispensed these in the most indiscriminate and reckless fashion. He frequented the public baths where he caused much merriment by the pranks he played on the bathers.

Such was the character of this deer king as he is depicted by the Greek and Roman writers. That the Jews who looked upon him as the incarnation of brutality were not utterly oblivious of some of his good qualities, we learn from II Macc.IV37, where it is related that when Antiochus heard of the murder of the good high-priest Onias III, he was moved to tears and ordered the summary execution of the cruel assassin. A character like Antiochus is not altogether responsible for all his actions. Graetz is of the opinion that all the eccentricities of this monarch were merely assumed in order to mislead the

This conjecture is hardly correct. If Livy is right in his assertion that the accession of Antiochus met with the approval of the Romans, then wherefore the necessity of throwing sand into their eyes? And since there is no evidence to contradict the statement of Livy, our conclusion is that Antiochus was not feigning or dissembling when he did those things that won for him the sobriquet "madman". The incident with Popilius the Roman legate seems to show that the favor of Rome was not bestowed on Epiphanes. But Rome evidently changed her attitude towards the arrogant Syrian when he presumed to meddle in Egyptian affairs. Furthermore, it is unlikely that any monarch could enact such a role in which Antiochus appears for such a long time. That kings have been dowered with streaks of insanity, history has shown now and then. Renan thinks that "possibly the relations of the conservative Jews with the Romans, already apparent, were the secret cause of the policy of Antiochus towards the Jews". It does not seem plausible that his cruelty can be ascribed to this cause. Herzfeld's theory that the persecutions of the Jews under Antiochus were the result of a con-

catenation of unlucky circumstances seems to me to be nearer the truth. And a strong link in that chain was unquestionably the action of the party of Graeco-maniacs.

Hellenism in all its bad features was at its height at the time of the accession of Antiochus. The priesthood with a single rare exception was thoroughly corrupt. Their coquetting with the degenerate Syrio-Greek their slavish imitation of the heathen customs, were glaringly apparent to all who cared to look. It was not Hellenic culture in its pristine purity and grandeur that was emulated by the corrupt priesthood. Not Plato and Socrates and Aristophanes, but the palaestra and the gymnasium and the Greek games appealed to them as ideals worthy of admiration and imitation. The Greeks believed in the maxim and practised it, that a sound mind should be in a sound body. But the degenerate Jews of this age sought to achieve physical excellence only no matter at what cost and sacrifice. It was not Greek thought tricked out with all the allurements that might appeal to the foreigner, that won the Jews from their faith. It was the vulgar philistine bait

that made "transgressors of the law". To be sure the acceptance of Greek culture even in its vulgar form meant eventually much more. It meant the giving up of Jehovah for Jupiter, monotheism for idolatry, morality and godliness for immorality and a spirit altogether too worldly. It meant the submergence and annihilation of Judaism. The success of Hellenism would have changed completely all subsequent history. Of such vast importance was its timely suppression. No wonder that in view of the prevailing conditions, the Talmud speaks so contemptuously of the priesthood. No wonder that special emphasis is laid on the loyalty of the Asmonean family who served God when others were blinded by the rays of the sun and turned their abominable faces towards the kingdom of Javan. In the opening chapter of the I Macc. we read of the transgressors of the law who were not content with personal defection but persuaded many of their brethren to follow after the manner of the gentiles. They could not bear the brunt of distinctiveness. A phenomenon somewhat similar confronted the Jews of the "Aufklaerungs-Periode" in the

last decade of the eighteenth century and the first decades of the nineteenth. The burden of distinctiveness was too great to bear for a number of Jews, even of the elite. To be like their Christian neighbors was the ambition of many Jews and the conversions to Christianity attest to the intensity of this ambition. Many of course converted for other reasons. And even in contemporary history, we may observe this restiveness under the pin-pricks and petty torments that the Jews are now and then subjected to. And the cry to drop our exclusiveness is paralleled by the more significant trumpet notes sounding the call to apostasy in the days of Antiochus Epiphanes. The rigid legalism of Judaism with all its punctiliousness, its injunction against the partaking of forbidden food, its imperative insistence on the strict observance of the Sabbath and its feasts, and particularly on the rite of circumcision was too onerous a burden for the Graeco-manics to bear. In this move of voluntary hellenization the priests took the initiative and were the leading spirits. Permission was obtained from the king to build near the temple a gym

nasium after the fashion of the Greeks. Here congregated the Jewish youth who were allured by the prospects of participating in the great quinquennial Olympic games. The youth once grecized, it was an easy matter to triumph ultimately. The young Greek athletes exercised in the palaestra nude. So the Jewish imitators were obliged to do likewise. But they were particularly anxious to remove all traces of Jewish distinctiveness. They even went so far as to submit themselves to surgical operations to hide the fact of their circumcision. [See I Macc. I 11-15.] We learn furthermore, in II Macc. that Onias III the good old high-priest was supplanted by his brother Jesus who assumed the Grecian name Jason. This fashion of grecizing the Jewish names prevailed quite extensively and served as another mask behind which the Jewish identity might be concealed. By offering the king an increased tribute, Jason received permission not only to build a gymnasium, but also to enroll all the inhabitants of Jerusalem as citizens of Antioch. Thus, he thought, the Jews would be one step nearer the goal. Greek was now the language these back-sliders constantly spoke. The Greek costumes as well as

customs were now in vogue. II Macc. mentions specifically the Greek cap which was worn by the new converts. That the priests followed in the steps of their renegade leader forsook their priestly functions and instead of offering up sacrifices on the temple altar, wrestled naked in the palaestra is also reported with bitterness and contempt. The defections from Judaism can not be overestimated. And yet we observe here a phenomenon illustrative of the old adage, "What is bred in the bone can not be eradicated". Though many forsook the covenant of their fathers: though they indulged freely in Greek games and customs, when it came to the participation in idolatry the Jewish instinct cried halt! Blasphemous they would not be. They might not live up to the demands of the Law and the S'yog, but they would not wholly give up the God of Israel even though He be but a distant dweller in the distant heavens. He was still supreme. They would not prostrate themselves before the gods and "godlets" of Greece. Nor would they contribute to their worship.

It was otherwise with Jason. He was absolutely without any conscience or scruples on these matters. He threw all overboard that was

Jewish. Imagining that he would ingratiate himself with the powers that be, he sent "sacred envoys as being Antiochians of Jerusalem, bearing three hundred drachmas of silver to the sacrifices of Hercules". But the envoys proved that the epithet "sacred" was not a mere bit of rhetoric. Hellenists as they were, they were not so low and vile as he who sent them. They felt some compunction about contributing to the sacrifices of a heathen divinity. So they offered the money on condition that it be employed for other purposes. The people were not yet wholly gone mad. Hellenism, however, was at its zenith. The people at large were lukewarm. A new party was slowly forming. It was the nucleus of the saving remnant to whom Israel owes its preservation as a race and a religion. How numerous the apostacies were is hard to determine, but that they emanated in no small degree from the upper stratum aggravated matters. The defection on the one hand was counteracted by the growing intensity in zeal for the law and its preservation in totality. The new party came to be known as the Chassidim, in contradistinction to the Resh'im as the transgressors of the law were denominated. It was owing to these

Resha'im that the Maccabean revolt was precipitated. The renegade high-priests sought to gain the favor of Antiochus by buying it. And they paid dearly for it. They gave away their honor and their faith. They treacherously betrayed their brethren. They turned their backs on Jehovah, and bent their knees before Jupiter.

Thus while Jason the supplanter of the faithful Onias III seemed in the full swing of his power, a higher bidder for the degraded office had the incumbent unceremoniously deposed, and donned the pontifical robes. It was Menelaus that vile traitor to his people, whom Graetz holds indirectly responsible for much of the evil that befell Israel. He did not scruple to rob the temple treasury for the purpose of presenting certain golden vessels to Andronicus the deputy of Antioch. This act of unprecedented desecration roused the indignation of the deposed Onias who lived quietly in Daphne near Antioch. Menelaus chafing under his rebuke, had him treacherously murdered. [II Macc. IV 30 sq.]. It was also owing to this same Menelaus that an honorable body of Jews who came to the king to plead against any further violation o

the temple , were brutally slain, -- a despicable act that aroused the pity of the neighboring Tyrians. Antiochus must have learned from this scoundrel all sorts of calumnies against the Jews whose religion he endeavored soon after to exterminate. [Cf. II Macc. IV 50, "But Menelaus through the covetous dealings of them that were in power remained still in office cleaving to wickedness, as a great conspirator against his fellow citizens"]. But the worst was yet to come. The evil was brooding. It was soon ready to descend with a mighty swoop.

Antiochus who was waging war in Egypt, was reported killed. Jason immediately armed himself and some followers and proceeded to attack the city of Jerusalem. He slaughtered his fellows ruthlessly. His assault was unsuccessful. Exiled, held in utter contempt by his own fellow men and most likely by the Greeks also, he died with none to bury him. Antiochus hearing of these intestine dissensions, mistook them for a Judean revolt. He straightway set out for Jerusalem, and made the first attack on the holy city in 170 B. C. E. He "shed torrents of blood and, promoted in his odious deeds by Menelaus, pillaged the temple and

carried off the most precious things to Antioch.[Cf. II Macc.V, 11-23, I Macc. I 20-M; II,9]. After this desecration, Antiochus left Philip as governor in Jerusalem. Things were rapidly drawing to a crisis. The Jews were not only scandalized at the butcheries and sacrilege, but were dumbfounded at the silence of God. No punishment followed the evil doing of the wicked Syrian tyrant. His defeat in Egypt in 168 and his submission to the Romans under Popilius who drew round the haughty king and bidding him make up his mind ere he leaves it as to whether he would submit to the Romans and abandon all claims to Egypt, might have been looked upon as just retribution for his act of impiety in Jerusalem. See, Polybius and Livy for an account of Antiochus' humiliation by Popilius.

Antiochus was now obliged to abandon his eastern wars and he resolved to revenge himself on the Jews. He was fully determined to root out completely the Jewish religion. In 168, he despatched his chief collector Appolonius with a large army to Judea. As soon as he arrived at Jerusalem, he swiftly and deceitfully effected a second massacre of the inhabitants and he set fire to the city.[See I Macc. I 30.]. A

Syrian garrison was placed in Acra, the citadel overlooking the temple.

[There is considerable uncertainty as to the exact location of Acra[].

In their dismay, many inhabitants took to flight, and their places were filled by strangers, "a sinful nation, transgressors of the law".

Antiochus evidently endeavored to extirpate Judaism by exterminating the

Jews. Renan thinks that new colonies of Greeks replaced the slain and

fugitive Jews. It seems, however, from the statement in I Macc. 30, Chap. 2

that hellenists are meant by the transgressors of the law. It is safe,

to assume, at any rate, that a mixed multitude of Greeks and Hellenist

filled the depopulated city. Such substitutions were not uncommon in

those days. Alexander the Great used to transplant Greek colonies in

all the territory that he conquered. The wives and children of the sla

were sold into captivity. Many Jews apostatised. As for Jerusalem, she

was left without Jews: "her sanctuary was laid waste like a wilderness

her feasts were turned to mourning, her sabbaths into reproach, her

honor into contempt". [See I Macc. I 39&II Macc. VI 6, cf. Amos VIII 1

The end of all these misfortunes was not yet. In order to strengthen his commander's hands, Antiochus issued an edict to the effect "that all should be one people and that each should forsake his own laws". The motive was not akin to that of Alexander the Great who dreamed of one universal Greek empire. Furthermore, the general state of Greek culture in the Syrian realm was not of as high a nature as was that in ancient Hellas. It was a deterioration of the civilization of the balmy days of Greece. Antiochus's motive was the suppression of Judaism. With the whimsicality which was so characteristic of this monarch, he persisted in his scheme. To the Jews, consequently, a special edict was dispatched commanding them to forsake their laws, to profane their sabbath, and feast days, and to pollute their sanctuary. They were forced to comply with the most obnoxious heathen customs and rites. In every town they were obliged to sacrifice to idols, animals which they deemed unclean and then eat of the sacrifices. Some acquiesced in these proposals, others resisted them even unto death. Circumcision was prohibited on point of death. The record is found in the two

books of the Maccabees of two women who had the courage to circumcise their children and who were hurled down from the wall of the city with their babes hanging on their breasts. It was the beginning of martyr-ology. A number of pietists whose rigorous and punctillious observance of all the laws of their faith would not suffer them to fight on the sabbath, fled to the caves where they were betrayed and mercilessly butchered.

The last and most grievous stage in the persecution was reached on the 25th of Kislev B.C.E.168. It was the acme of sacrilege. The Jew could not conceive of any crime more outrageous and shocking. Jewish worship utterly ceased. The temple became a heathen shrine. Upon the new altar superimposed on the old one, sacrifices were offered to the Olympian Zeus. Diodorus has an exaggerated account of the desecration. He says that Antiochus sacrificed a huge sow and sprinkled its blood on the scrolls of the law. Josephus has a milder version of this story. He merely alludes to the sacrifice of the sow ignoring the added infamies. Howbeit, the desecration was enormous. It was the

ABOMINATION OF DESOLATION-

It horrified the Jews beyond all measure of description. What the pagans did within the holy of holies is not definitely known. But a drastic and heart-rending picture of the profanities perpetrated within the walls of Israel's sacred fane is graphically described in the II Macc. Regular Bacchanalian orgies took place within the very temple and the vilest vices were practised there. Sacrifices were offered to the statue of the Greek divinity Zeus. Antiochus appointed officers to see that his behests were every where carried out. A monthly inquisition was held to deal with all recusants. These had to suffer the penalty of death for their refusal to participate in the heathen orgies. There were also officers in all the adjacent regions to see that the decrees of the king were enforced. So that everywhere it became impossible for a man to profess himself as a Jew much less to practice his religious rites [See II Macc. V 16]. The scrolls of the law were burned. The time was rife with horrible persecutions and ripe for martyrdom. Several martyr stories are related in II Macc. colored with all the hues of romance. The steadfastness of Eleazar a loyal priest of hoary age^{who} suffers the

most excruciating tortures rather than violate one iota of the law , and the more dramatic episode of the mother and the seven sons, all of whom embrace death in preference to partaking of the abominable heathen sacrifices and worshipping the idols of the wicked Greeks, are depicted with all the extravagance of rhetoric in the fourth book of the Macc. where they are taken as the basis of its "sermon on the supremacy of reason". The II Macc. also graphically tells the tales of these martyrs. The IV Macc. no doubt drew its material from the II Macc.

In this turbulent period of persecution, despair, and anxiety, a new literature sprang up. Of this I shall treat in another chapter

JUDAS MACCABEUS AND THE RECONSECRATION.

JUDAS MACCABEUS AND THE RECONSECRATIO

The Name Maccabee.

It is somewhat surprising that the two apochryphal books containing the history of the Jewish war of independence in 175 B. C. E., should receive their titles not from the family-name of the Modin heroes to whom was due the salvation of Judaism, but from the most prominent member of that family. That the books bore different names in the original Hebrew, we have no occasion to doubt. Eusibius speaks of the Maccabean books under the title *שֵׁרֵי בֵּית שְׁבַנָּה אֵל*, the prince of the house which God has built up. Two other renderings have been made not of the old title mentioned by the church father above referred to, but of a later version adopted by Stephanus and Valisius. [See Fairweather and Black's commentary to the I Macc.], *שֵׁרֵי בְּנֵי אֵל*, history of the princes of the sons of God. Or, *שֵׁרֵיט שֶׁר בְּנֵי אֵל*, the sceptre of the prince of the sons of God. It seems from all the foregoing, that in the original Hebrew of this book, the title was not Maccabees, or any thing

like it. "Maccabaeus" was the distinctive surname of Judas the third son of the Jewish priest Mattathias and later the leader in the Jewish war of Independence. [Cf. I Macc. II 66, III 1, V 24.]. As to the definite meaning of the term "Maccabaeus", various views have been held. It has been claimed that the initial letters of the opening words in Exodus XV 11, מִי כֹכַב בְּאֵלֵם יְהוָה, formed the watchword of the warriors, and that this was later transferred to their chief. There is a difficulty here. We have no authentic records of any such watchword. Josephus does not speak either of it or of the derivation of Judas' surname. Then there is the linguistic difficulty. The Greek transliteration is "Makkabaios". It has a double kappa which is not the equivalent of the Hebrew letter "Kaf". The second view is, that the word Maccabee is derived from the Hebrew כבד [Cf. Is. XLIII 17, כבדוּם "They are quenched"]. Hence the name would signify, the "extinguisher", the "queller" of his enemies. [See the Encyc- Biblica, article "Maccabee", also Curtiss - "The name Machabee," Leipsic 1876.]. This

theory also fails to account for the linguistic difficulty, viz, the double Kappa in the Greek transliteration. The theory accepted by most modern critics, and the most plausible one is this. Maccabee means merely the "Hammerer", the adjectival form of the Hebrew ^סמַכֵּה meaning "hammer". The well known parallel in the case of Charles Martel seems to leave but little doubt as to the soundness of the last view.

The Uprising In Modin.

When the stringent measures instituted by Antiochus for the persecution of the Jews were put into force, when Jerusalem was forsaken by a number of its faithful citizens, the country towns and the caves and fastnesses of the wilderness proved a temporary refuge for the persecuted Jews. [Vide II Macc.VI 11]. The majority of these fugitives were of the new sect that had formed, the C h a s i d i m who were not only remarkably punctilious and scrupulously conscientious in the observance of every jot and tittle of the law, but who grew more fanatical and narrow, and consequently more enthusiastic in their cause, in

proportion as the Hellenists fell away from the faith of their fathers. Not all the fugitives, however, were Chasidim. The Asmonean family are not designated as such, and furthermore we learn that after a high-priest of the seed of Aaron had been appointed at the head of the temple service this party of pietists who had joined the fighting ranks of the Maccabeans withdrew their support. Their aim, religious autonomy had been achieved. Political self-government was not on their program. [Cf. I Macc VII 13]. Among the fugitive families that had now settled in Modin, a town situated midway between Jerusalem and Joppa, was the famous family of the A S M O N E A N S.

This name is not found in the two books of the Maccabees. Josephus mentions it and gives as the origin, the fact that the great grandfather of Mattathias was Asmoneus. "And there was at the time one whose name was Mattathias the son of John the son of Simon the son of Asmoneus a priest of the order of Joarib and a citizen of Jerusalem". [Ant. XII 6]. The talmud and the midrashim also refer to this family as

Hashmonim. It appears from I Macc. chap.II, that Mattathias was only a priest, though the later Jewish sources speak of him as high-priest, the error being due, most likely, to the prestige which the priests of Joarib enjoyed. When the division of the sacred orders into twenty four parts was made by lot, the first place fell to the sons of Joarib. [See I Chron IX 10 and Nem. XI 11].

Thus the initiative taken by the Jews in their war of Independence was in the small town of Modin and not in the sacred city of Jerusalem. When the edict of the king went forth that officers should be appointed in each town to see that the Jews obeyed the command to forsake their religion and do homage to the gods of Syria, it met with strenuous opposition in Modin. Some commissioners of the king came to Modin to force the Jews into apostacy. They approached Mattathias as the leading person of the place and ordered him to set an example to the inhabitants by offering the first pagan sacrifices "Thou art a ruler and an honorable and great man in this city, and strengthened with sons and brethren.

Now therefore come thou first and do the commandments of the king, as all the nations have done and the men of Judah and they that remain in Jerusalem". [2 Macc. II 17]. Bribes of gold and silver were offered him and the promise of high station. But Mattathias answered them in those words that have been the guiding principle in Israel during all the periods of sombre persecution. "If all the nations that are in the house of the king's dominion hearken unto him, to fall away from the worship of their fathers, yet will I and my sons and my brethren walk in the covenant of our fathers". One Jew who was too weak-kneed to refuse obedience to the king's command walked up to the altar to offer sacrifice to the heathen divinity. Mattathias enraged at this flagrant act of impiety, smote the apostate and the king's commissioner, demolished the heathen altar summoned his fellows who wished to adhere to the laws of their fathers to follow him. They all fled to the mountain fastnesses for safety and preparation. The key-note of the war for independence had been sounded. "The Maccabean fight for faith and freedom, the most glorious epoch

in Jewish history had begun". In the mountain fastnesses the patriots were safe at least for a time, from the vile persecutions of the Syrian despot. Here now also congregated bands of Chasidim. They all took their flocks and herds with them, and there in the loneliness of the mountains gained strength to battle at such tremendous odds with the armies of Antiochus. These pietists were rigorous Sabbatarians. It seems that this fact must have been known to the king's officers, because when they discovered the various retreats of these bands of Chasidim, they invaded their hiding places and gave them the alternative of submission or death. They knew that they would not fight on the Sabbath. One large community of a thousand souls was thus mercilessly butchered on a Sabbath because they refused to profane it by fighting on the holy day.[See I Macc.II 33--39]. Also II Macc.VI 11, V 25, VIII 25]. Mattathias in view of the disaster that had befallen his brethren resolved to pursue a more spirited policy. He declared it lawful to fight in times of great peril even on the Sabbath. It was a time when the Law had to be violated in

order to insure its fulfillment. [Cf. Lincoln's memorable words. "It is necessary to violate the constitution in order to preserve it".]. The Chasidim now allied themselves to the Zealots, the regular followers of Mattathias, and scrupled not to fight on the Sabbath if necessary. As the number of followers increased, the spirits of the warriors rose. They no longer were satisfied with being on the defensive, they began now to be on the offensive. Their zeal on behalf of their cause made them fanatical. They were intolerant of all renegades. They turned persecutors. It was the apostates that needed chastisement primarily. The Syrians were of secondary consideration. Mattathias and his band went all thru the country, overthrowing heathen altars, slaughtering apostates, circumcising by force the children whose parents were afraid to perform the rite. This grand coup for a time cowed the Syrian oppressors. The renegade Jews feared the rebuke of these zealous defenders of "the faith". They fled in consequence to the Syrians who were stationed in the garrison at Akra. Thus in the country towns the Law was rescued,

that is to say, the Jews were again able to practise their Judaism without the fear of molestation or summary death. While the Zealots were bravely fighting for their faith, Mattathias felt his end draw near. He summoned his five sons to his bed-side and in a powerful valedictory bade them keep up the noble cause. He pointed to the illustrious examples of Israel's heroes in the past and urged them to emulate these great models. He then appointed Simon as the statesman, the counsellor and Judas as the military chief. The other three brothers played a conspicuous role later on in the rebellion. All were impelled by a sense of duty filial and national and there was not any jealousy among them as appears from their entire course of action. In the 146th year of the Seleucid era or, 167B.C.E. Mattathias died. He was buried in Modin amid the great lamentation of Israel.

JUDAS MACCABEUS.

The leading figure in the Maccabean war was Judas. He is the hero of the second book which virtually glorifies him as the sole author of

the deliverance from Syrian oppression.[Cf. V 27; VIII 1 sq.; XI sq.; XII 26 sq.; XIII 10 sq.; XIV Xv.]. Besides these places, there is specific mention made of the character of Judas in the XV chapter, verse 30. "And he that was in all things was in body and soul the foremost champion of his fellow-citizens, he that kept his youthful good-will towards his countrymen thru life---". He was a giant in stature, a veritable "beau-ideal of a champion of popular liberties".[Vide I Macc. III 3]. He was the pride and glory of his friends and the terror of his enemies.[Ibid.5-6 also II Macc. VIII 1]. He was bold as a lion and his cry was like the lion's whelp roaring for prey.[I Macc. III 4]. As a protector of the helpless and an enthusiast of the religion of his fathers he stood with out equal, and his fame reached far and wide. Renan calls him a saint. He attributes all the qualities of his greatness to his faith. Judas in spite of all--- and Renan is not laudatory over his fanaticism that drove him to murder renegades --- a pillar in the world's history. It was owing to the devotion and wonderful prowess of this hero that the

temple worship was restored. He was a great general, for with no regular force to oppose the well disciplined Syrian army, he yet dared to line up his handful of men against them. [Cf. I Macc. III, IV, VII]. Finally in the face of fearful odds Judas fell at Elasa in 160. [See IX 12-18]. He too was buried in Modin in the sepulchre of his father amid the loud lamentations of his people. Previous to this defeat it seemed as if nothing could thwart Judas in his exploits. Victory after victory was his. After his death the story of his triumphs continued to be handed down to the sons of Israel by whom his memory was lovingly cherished. [III7]. In II Macc. we learn that at the advice of the Syrian general Nicanor, Judas married and settled down quietly and took part in common life until duty once more called him to his nation's service.

THE COMBATS.

With Judas at the head, the Judean struggle assumed the proportions of regular warfare. In 166, Apollonius the lord of pollution as he is called in II Macc. and who a year earlier had entered Jerusalem with a

large army,---I Macc.says it was a large multitude, and II Macc. states specifically that it was a force of 22000 men---- marched out with a large army from Samaria to meet in open battle the new and formidable Jewish commander. The conflict resulted in the defeat of the Syrian hosts and the death of Apollonius whose sword Judas took as trophy wearing it ever after in all the battles he fought. The next encounter was with Seron the governor of Coelo-Syria who came down with a great and strong multitude to reek vengeance on the revolting Jews and to make himself a name and get himself glory in the kingdom. The Jewish forces were very small and ill-armed and they were sore afraid to meet the enemy. But Judas after an inspiring exhortation rallied his men so that they discomfited the army of Seron by suddenly attacking him at the pass of Beth Horon, where 800 were slain and the remainder fled into Philistia. The successes of Judas warmed the hearts of the soldiers and their zeal and courage were more than doubled. Judas was by this time quite famous among the enemy, and even the king, Antiochus learned particulars of this man the ring-

leader of the revolt. Thus gradually the Zealots became trained and hardened soldiers.

When Antiochus learned of the reverses of his armies under Apollonius and Seron, he was full of indignation. To his chagrin at being unable to quell the uprising of this refractory race was added the worry resulting from a depleted exchequer. Ever since the defeat of Antiochus the Great by the Romans at Magnesia in 190, and the consequent necessity of defraying the cost of the campaigns and the furnishing tribute to Rome, the Syrian treasury was well nigh empty. Besides, Antiochus Epiphanes with a whimsicality that dictated a lavishness in expenditure had helped to decrease the contents of the treasury. The impecunious condition of the government on the one hand, and the Jewish rebellion on the other, demanded immediate attention. The treasury must be re-filled, and the revolt suppressed. [Vide Tacitus Historia V 8 and I Macc. III 27]. For this double purpose, his large army had to be divided, half of it was to check Judea and half was to accompany Antiochus to Persia where he went

to enforce payment of the tribute throughout the provinces and to get money and precious things by hook or crook. Such extreme measures as the extortion of the people and the plundering of temples were ordinary matter with this Syrian monarch. When Antiochus set out for the orient in 166, he commissioned Lysias to prosecute the war against Judea. He gave him special charge over all the provinces west of the Euphrates. He also left his son, -- afterwards AntiochusV,-- under his tutelage. The drastic charges in reference to the Jews are unparalleled in all previous Jewish history. [Black and Fairweather give a list of the extreme measures taken by other monarchs with regard to the Jews. Under Shalmanesser and Sargon, the ten tribes were removed to Mesopotamia and Media, II Kings XVII 6, while foreign settlers were brought by Esarhaddon, Ezra IV 2, and the great and noble Osnapper and placed in the cities of Samaria instead of the children of Israel, II Kings XVII 24. Antiochus Epiphanes went much further. Israel was to be exterminated and those that escaped slaughter were to be sold as slaves. Cf. I Macc. III 41& II Macc. VIII 10-11, XIV 14.]. The se instructions havang been left with Lysias,

Antiochus hastened for the East where after a number of reverses he died at Tabis Persia. Polybius in the Greek calls the place of the monarch's demise Tabais. The Latin translator has written it Tabis. Appian says that Antiochus died near Elymasae in persia "e tabe". "Tabe", is the ablative of the Latin word "tabis" meaning a loathsome disease. It is not unlikely that there is more than a coincidence here. Possibly the later annalist confused the name of the town,.Antiochus III had died in that vicinity-- with the nature of the disease. Diodorus also mentions the fact that he died of a loathsome disease , using also the word "tabis". The account of the death of the Syrian oppressor of the Jews as recorded in the two books of the Maccabees smacks largely of the legendary character. The story in the I Macc. is not wholly without foundation, for Polybius also mentions the fact that Antiochus died from insanity produced by dreadful supernatural apparitions during his attempt to plunder the temple in Elymais.

Lysias now endeavored to carry out the commands of the king. He appointed Ptolmey son of Dorymenes governor of Coelo-Syria to direct the campaign. With him were the generals Nicanor and Gorgias. Under this

triple command and with the army of 40000 infantry and 7000 cavalry, Syria felt confident of utterly annihilating the Jews. So confident were they of complete victory that they took slave-merchants along with them on this line of march, ready to sell the captive Jews. [Vide I Macc. III 38-41 & II Macc. VIII 8-11]. The Syrian forces assembled at Emmaus, a town lying at the base of the mountains of Judea, not far from Jerusalem. The Jewish army encamped at Mizpah. Renan says that the military manoeuvres of Judas are admired to this day by military men. [Vide I Macc. IV 1-25 & II Macc. VIII 12 sq. & Josephus Ant. XII A].

After having prayed to God, and organized his troops, Judas delivered an exhortation to his soldiers and was ready for this onslaught. Those who were newly married or betrothed, he sent home. [See I Macc. IV 56; Cf. Deut. XX 7]. It was the intention of Gorgias to attack the Jewish camp by night and smite the Jews suddenly. But Judas who heard of this plan, decamped at night. When Gorgias fell upon the Jewish camp he found it empty. He thought that the Jews had fled in terror and he decided to pursue them. But by dawn Judas appeared in the plain with three thousand men. After another hortatory speech, he suddenly attacked the Syrian troops and utterly discomfited them so that they had to flee in dismay

to the land of the Philistines. [Cf. I Macc. IV 8 & II Macc. Viii 16-23].
An immense booty was left behind. The Jewish soldiers offered thanks and sang songs of praise "unto h e a v e n ". It was a day of great joy for Israel.

When Lysias heard the news of the defeat of Gorgias, he was confounded and dismayed and with a force of 65000 met Judas the following year ,in 165, at Beth Zur where he was routed and forced to retreat to Antioch. The Jewish patriots could now turn their attention to the restoration of the ancestral worship.

THE RECONSECRATION OF THE TEMPLE.

Judah gathered his men together and proceeded to Jerusalem to purify the temple from the defilements of the heathen, to restore the religious usages of Judaism, and to re-dedicate the sanctuary to the service of the God of Israel. The sight that met the Jewish patriots was appalling. "The sanctuary was desolate and the altar profaned and the gates burned and shrubs were growing in the courts as in a forest or on one of the mountains and the priests' chambers were pulled down. And they rent their

clothes and made great lamentation and put ashes on their heads and fell on their faces to the ground and blew with the solemn trumpets and cried toward heaven".[I Macc. IV 38 sq.]. It must have been a touching sight. Three years had now elapsed since the abomination of desolation was brought into the temple. Judas appointed men to guard the sanctuary while it was in the process of purification and dedication. Akra was still in the hands of the enemy, but the temple was situated on another hill. Yet Judas took precautions lest the Syrian garrison and the Hellenists who were stationed at Akra should prevent him from restoring the Jewish worship. The patriots then tore down the altar recently polluted by the heathen and at the advice of a council of worthy Jews decided to lay aside the stones in some convenient place until God should be pleased to intimate his will in the matter of their disposal thru the authoritative medium of a prophetic voice. We see from this that the voice of prophecy was not yet considered as hushed forever. [Cf. Derenbourg's translation of Megillath Ta'anith]. A new altar of stones that were unhewn was built. New holy vessels were made. Burnt offerings, the incense, the table on which the shew-bread

was wont to be laid, and the candlestick were brought into the temple. Everything was arranged according to the Law and on the 25th of Kislev, just three years from the date of the profanation of the altar of burnt-offerings, the temple was r e c o n s e c r a t e d. [Cf. I Macc. IV 52 Derenbourg's Megillath Ta'anith]. II Macc. X 8, which says that only two years had elapsed since the cessation of Jewish worship, is evidently in error. "The temple was dedicated with songs and harps and lutes and with cymbals. And all the people fell upon their faces and worshipped and gave praise to h e a v e n which had given them success". The decorations of the temple were gorgeous. A feast was celebrated in honor of the re-established worship for eight days. This feast Judas ordained to be kept regularly by the Jews. II Macc. X 8, states that the feast was celebrated in nearly the same manner as the feast of tabernacles. "And they kept eight days with gladness in the manner of the feast of tabernacles, remembering how not long afore, during the feast of tabernacles they were wandering in the mountains and in the caves after the manner of wild beasts. Wherefore bearing wands wreathed with leaves and fair boughs and palms also,

they offered up hymns of thanksgiving to him that had prosperously brought to pass the cleansing of his own place".[II Macc. 10]. In the letter addressed by the Jews of Palestine to the Jews of Egypt, the feast of dedication is expressly called "the feast of tabernacles of the month of Kislev". [Cf. II Macc. I 9].

J U D A I S M had gained a decided victory over paganism. Judea spoiled Antiochus's plan of A "Catholic Paganism". The religion that was destined to mould the future of mankind was saved to do its mission. It remained now to preserve what was already gained, to insure domestic tranquillity and to provide for the common defense. Jewish religious autonomy was established. Political independence was now necessary in order that Judea might be safe from further molestation. From Zion again went forth the Law and the word of God from Jerusalem.

DANIEL AND CONCLUSION.

DANIEL AND CONCLUSION-

All critics are agreed that the book of Daniel is a product of the Maccabean age, and was written somewhere near the time of the death of Antiochus Epiphanes. The book contains twelve chapters of which the eleventh treats of Antiochus. Daniel may be divided into two distinct parts, the first division being that which contains a series of narratives, and the second, the one that contains the prophetic visions. In all these stories the didactic purpose is very apparent. The righteous are always rewarded and the wicked always signally punished. Wellhausen describes the book as "a hortatory and consolatory writing for the persecuted, designed to strengthen and cheer them by a knowledge that within a very short time the overbent bow will break". Renan says that the book is a "strange mixture of the sublime and the commonplace, the outcome of intellectual abasement and of the most profound moral movement the world has ever known".

The following reasons which are given for the late origin of the book, I have taken and abridged from Bevan's "Daniel".

The exclusion of Daniel from the prophetic books is hard to reconcile with the supposed antiquity of the book. The passages in Ezekiel XIV 14-20 & XXVIII 3, offer no clue as to the fixing of a date for the authorship of Daniel. Jeremiah similarly speaks of Moses and Samuel, XV 1.

On the supposition that the narrative in Daniel is historical, it is strange to say the least, that it should have been passed over in silence by all ekstant Jewish writers down to the latter half of the second century B. C. E. and that it should have left no trace in any of the prophetical books, in Ezra, in Chronicles, in Ecclesiasticus. This cumulative (argument) evidence derived from such sources can not easily be brushed aside.

The earliest allusion to Daniel is in the I Macc. II 59-60. Hence the book must have been known to the writer of I Macc. The more we realize how vast and profound was the influence of Daniel in post Maccabean times, the more difficult is it to believe that the book existed previously for well nigh four centuries, without exercising any perceptible influence whatsoever. This is the external evidence for a late origin of the book.

Now as to the internal evidence. The author of Baniel is poorly

is informed on events that occurred at the time when Daniel is supposed to have lived. Even those allusions to "contemporary history" can not be reconciled with the known history. The author's accurate knowledge of the history of Antiochus Epiphanes again points to a late origin of the book. The mere mention of the three Gentile Empires and the minuteness of the description of the fourth empire, the crimes of whose wicked king are so vividly set before us go to show that the book is from beginning to end an exhortation addressed to the pious Israelites in the days of the great religious struggle under The Illustrious Syrian monarch.

It is noteworthy that the first definite allusion to immortality is found in the book of Daniel of the entire Old Testament. In spite of the dictum of Antigonus of Socho, men were no longer satisfied with the prevailing solutions to the problem of suffering. The martyrology of the Maccabean age also gave rise to the doctrine of future rewards and punishments. That this new doctrine did not find its way into the minds and hearts of all Jewry at the time, and subsequently, we learn from I Macc. There is no allusion to immortality at all. When Mattathias

died he exhorted his sons to fight for the noble cause and "leave an everlasting name". This is a species of immortality akin to that depicted by George Elliot in her "Choir Invisible". But it is not of such an immortality that the II Macc. speaks when it alludes to "the King who shall raise us up who have died for his laws unto an eternal renewal of life".

But the seeds had been sown for the rapid growth and spread of the doctrine of a future life. And in Daniel we find the precursor of a large apocalyptic literature. Renan may not be altogether wrong in conjecturing that a corner-stone of Christianity was quarried from the Maccabean age. Would it not be more than a figure of speech to venture the view that the Maccabean age like Rebecca carried twins in its womb? That in the birth throes of that great religious struggle, two faiths were born, the one, resuscitated Judaism, the other, Christianity? Of one thing we can be certain. Judaism was in danger of extinction. The heroic Maccabees saved it for the Jews and for the world.

BOOKS USED IN THE PREPARATION OF THIS
T H E S I S.

The two books of the Maccabees in the Revised Version.

Black and Fairweather on I Macc.

Kautzsch's "Die Apokryphen des Alten Testaments.

The book of Daniel .

Josephus Antiquities.

Encyclopaedia Biblica.

The Jewish Encyclopaedia.

Polybius in the Greek and Latin versions.

Appian in the Greek and Latin versions.

Diodorus in the Greek and Latin versions.

Tacitus

Livy.

Derenbourg "Histoire de la Palestine".

The other Jewish sources referred to in Chapter One.

Ewald's Geschichte des volkes Israel

Graetz's Geschichte der Juden.

Herzfeld's Geschichte des Volkes Israel

Hitzig's Geschichte des Volkes Israel.

Renan's Histoire du Peuple d'Israel.

Geiger's Urschrift.

Pauly's Real-Encyclop. der class. Alterthumswissenschaft.

Stade's Geschichte des Volkes Israel.

Wellhausen's Israelitische und Juedische Geschichte.

Schuerer's Geschichte des Juedischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi.

Stanley's Lectures on the history of the Jewish Church.

Jost's Geschichte des Judenthums.

Milman's History of the Jews.

Church's the Hammer.

Mahaffy's Alexander's Empire.

Bevan's Daniel.

26
53