

»If you preserve carefully faith ...« –
Hellenistic Attitudes Towards Religion
in Pre-Maccabean Times

By Stefan Beyerle

(Auf der Wachsbleiche 21, 28359 Bremen, Germany)

For Prof. Werner H. Schmidt on
the occasion of his 70th birthday

As Arthur Darby Nock, the world's leading authority on the religion of later antiquity, put it: Conversion is the »reorientation of the soul of an individual, his deliberate turning from indifference or from an earlier form of piety to another,« including the awareness of a great change from wrong to right.¹ In terms of a certain system of belief, ancient Jewish apocalypticism records the aforementioned move »from an earlier form of piety to another.«² One major point of the apocalyptic »belief system« is the idea of transcendence, i.e., a sharp distinction between the holy heaven on high and the corrupted earthly world of begetting (e.g., in the »Book of the Watchers«: I Hen 1–36).³ Thus apocalyptic groups are characterized by their peculiarity. Their radical rejection of the earthly realm leads to a sharp distancing from other Jews in the Second Temple period, especially from those who were open to Hellenistic influences.⁴ In the recent scholarly debate a distinction between pre-Maccabean and Maccabean apocalypticism is widely

¹ Cf. A.D. Nock, *Conversion: The Old and the New in Religion from Alexander the Great to Augustine of Hippo*, 1933, 7. See also B.R. Gaventa, *Conversion*, *AncBDictionary* 1, 1992, 1131f.

² For discussion of an apocalyptic »belief system« see S. Beyerle, *The Book of Daniel and Its Social Setting*, in: J.J. Collins/P.W. Flint (eds.), *The Book of Daniel: Composition and Reception*, *VT.S* 83,1, 2001, 205–228, and recently *Idem*, *Die Gottesvorstellungen in der antik-jüdischen Apokalypik*, *JSJ.S* 103, 2005.

³ See J.J. Collins, *Ethos and Identity in Jewish Apocalyptic Literature*, in: M. Konradt/U. Steinert (eds.), *Ethos und Identität: Einheit und Vielfalt des Judentums in hellenistisch-römischer Zeit*, 2002, 55–57.

⁴ Here, e.g., political parties like the Hasmoneans and the Pharisees or the Sadducees form characteristic counterparts to apocalyptic groups: cf. A.J. Saldarini, *Pharisees, Scribes and Sadducees in Palestinian Society: A Sociological Approach*, repr. 2001.

accepted. The distinction involves a different estimation of Torah obedience in apocalyptic writings that were written before the Antiochean crisis (167–164 BC), against those that were compiled after it. The older parts of Enochic apocalypses (the »Book of the Watchers« or the »Astronomical Book«) on the one hand and the »Visions of Daniel« (Dan 7–12) on the other provide good examples.⁵ While the »Book of the Watchers« (cf. esp. I Hen 6–36) and the »Astronomical Book« (cf. I Hen 72–82) with a northern Palestinian or a Babylonian setting respectively attest no allusion to a *Mosaic* Torah, the Book of Daniel refers explicitly to »Deuteronomistic« thinking.⁶ Enochic and Danielic writings may share the same »radical« world-view, as both refer to the *Genre* of an »Apocalypse«, but they go back to different socio-historical settings.⁷

The following survey aims at detecting some other differences within apocalyptic traditions. Here the parting line does not run between groups or settings but between the different notions of a political milieu. This milieu finds its starting point with the Seleucid encounter of Palestine at the beginning of the second century BC. Antiochos III gained supremacy over Palestine in the aftermath of the Fifth Syrian War (200–198 BC), where he defeated the troops of Ptolemy V.⁸ Now Judea was under the supremacy of Antiochos the Great and dependent on the religio-political decisions of the Seleucids. The following study tries to analyze those influences on religious attitudes of Palestinian Jews at the dawn of the Antiochean crisis, i.e., at the dawn of an »*inner conversion*« to an apocalyptic thinking.

To start with the Book of Daniel, it is widely accepted that the visions in Dan 7–12 in the Aramaic and Hebrew version attest an apocalyptic reaction against Antiochos' IV desolating abomination.⁹ But the

⁵ Cf. A. Bedenbender, *Der Gott der Welt tritt auf den Sinai: Entstehung, Entwicklung und Funktionsweise der frühjüdischen Apokalyptik*, 2000, 143–207.215–258.

⁶ However, the canonical Book of Daniel refers barely to the Torah of Mose: *pace* G. Boccaccini, *Beyond the Essene Hypothesis: The Parting of the Ways between Qumran and Enochic Judaism*, 1998, 83–86; Idem, *Roots of Rabbinic Judaism: An Intellectual History from Ezekiel to Daniel*, 2002, 181–188.

⁷ See J.J. Collins, *Pseudepigraphy and Group Formation in Second Temple Judaism*, in: E.G. Chazon/M. Stone/A. Pinnick (eds.), *Pseudepigraphic Perspectives: The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, STDJ 31, 1999, 43–58.

⁸ The most detailed historical reconstructions can be found in D. Gera, *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.*, Brill's Series in Jewish Studies 8, 1998, 23–25; W. Huß, *Ägypten in hellenistischer Zeit: 332–30 v. Chr.*, 2001, 489–492.

⁹ Cf. from the historian's point of view E.S. Gruen, *Hellenism and Persecution: Antiochus IV and the Jews*, in: P. Green (ed.), *Hellenistic History and Culture*, *Hellenistic Culture and Society* 9, 1993, 238–274.

ancient Greek version of the Bible text sees things otherwise.¹⁰ First of all, the Old Greek Text (OG) of the Book of Daniel, as preserved on the Papyrus 967 (second or third century CE), placed ch. 7 and 8 between Dan 4 and 5 of the Aramaic version in order to find a better accuracy in the Jewish chronology of things that happened after the Babylonian Exile. And, if this replacement of Dan 7 and 8 should not be interpreted as a witness of thoughtlessness by the Greek transmission of the text, there must be at least some trails of a positive, or to put it more precisely, generous attitude towards the »foreign or Hellenistic element.« And furthermore, the pursuit of empires in the Greek text fits better into the historical outline that we are able to reconstruct. A comparison of both, the Aramaic/Hebrew and the Greek outlines, show:

<i>MT</i>	<i>Pap. 967</i>
Nebuchadnezzar (ch. 4)	Nebuchadnezzar (ch. 4)
Belshazzar (death: ch. 5)	Belshazzar (first year: ch. 7)
Darius (ch. 6)	Belshazzar (third year: ch. 8)
Belshazzar (first year: ch. 7)	Belshazzar (death: ch. 5)
Belshazzar (third year: ch. 8)	Darius (ch. 6)
Darius (ch. 9)	Darius (ch. 9)

Leaving the question of originality aside, the order of the Greek text of Pap. 967 comes obviously closer to history. It is a history that reflects an all in all friendly relationship between the Palestinian Jews and the Seleucids in general. Such an attitude tallies with the general mood of cooperation of Jews and Seleucids in Palestine at the time of the reign of Antiochos the Great.¹¹ As Erich S. Gruen pointed out, referring to the Seleucid decrees that were preserved by Josephus (cf. Ant 12,138–146):

¹⁰ For the text see now A. Geissen (ed.), *Der Septuaginta-Text des Buches Daniel: Kap. 5–12, zusammen mit Susanna, Bel et Draco sowie Esther Kap. 1,1a–2,15 nach dem Kölner Teil des Papyrus 967*, PTA 5, 1968; J. Ziegler/O. Munnich (eds.), *Susanna – Daniel – Bel et Draco, Septuaginta: Vetus Testamentum Graecum XVI,2*, rev. ed. 1999. For a comparison of the Aramaic, Hebrew and Greek texts see K. Koch/M. Rösel (eds.), *Polyglottensynopse zum Buch Daniel*, 2000.

¹¹ *Pace* O. Munnich, *Texte massorétique et Septante dans le livre de Daniel*, in: A. Schenker (ed.), *The Earliest Text of the Hebrew Bible: The Relationship between the Masoretic Text and the Hebrew Base of the Septuagint Reconsidered*, SBL.SCS 52, 2003, 93–120, who suggests in the Greek text an assimilation of the figures of Antiochos Epiphanes and Nebuchadnezzar.

»The king [Antiochos the Great] entrenched his success by showing favor to the Jews for their assistance against his Ptolemaic rivals. He expressed gratitude through a number of measures that bestowed privileges and promised tangible assistance. These included aid in rebuilding the war-battered city of Jerusalem, repair of the damaged temple, the restoration of exiles, subsidies for sacrificial expenses, various exemptions from and reductions of taxes, an endorsement of traditional Jewish religious prescriptions, and an express declaration that the Jews were to govern themselves under their own ancestral laws and institutions. Those benefactions set the tone for three decades of cordial collaboration between the Seleucid regime and the Jewish nation.«¹²

A closer look at the Greek text of Dan 7f. provides further evidence for this privileged relationship.¹³ In Dan 8,9 and 8,11 (OG) we read:

(Dan 8,9: OG) From one of them came forth a strong horn (κέρας ἰσχυρόν) and it became strong, and it rushed off / struck towards (ἐπάταξεν) the south and east and to the north (καὶ ἐπὶ βορρᾶ[v]).

(Dan 8,11: OG) Until the commander-in-chief should rescue the captivity (ἀρχιστράτηγος ῥύσεται τὴν αἰχμαλωσίαν), and from it/him [the foreign king as »horn«] the eternal mountain was dashed down, and their place and the daily offering should be taken away (or: »on high« [ἐξήρθη]). And he [i.e., the foreign king as »horn«] set it [i.e., the »daily offering«] upon the ground (or: »upon the earth«), and it/he prospered and grew, and the sanctuary will be cast down.¹⁴

The Hebrew Masoretic Text reads:¹⁵

(Dan 8,9: MT) From one of them came forth a small horn (קרן אהה מצעירה), and it grew exceedingly great (והגדיל) towards the south and east and to the glorious (land: ואל הצבי).

(Dan 8,11: MT) And he grew great (הגדיל) even up to the prince of the host, from whom the daily offering (התמיד) was taken away and whose sanctuary place (מקדשו) was cast down.

Besides heading »to the north« in the Old Greek version of Dan 8,9 we hear from the battle-like rushing (πατάσσειν) of the »horn« to the south. The notice about the »rescue of the captivity« in Dan 8,11 (Pap. 967) is also remarkable. Taking these blatant deviations of the Greek text together, a historical hint at circumstances seems probable that antedate Seleucid policy in the days of Antiochos IV. While the Hebrew version with elements of a he-goat-vision (Dan 8,5–12) and its interpretation (cf. esp. Dan 8,23b–24) alludes to the Antiochean crisis (e.g., the

¹² Gruen, *Hellenism and Persecution*, 239f.

¹³ Cf. also P.-M. Bogaert, *Relecture et refonte historicisantes du livre de Daniel attestées par la première version grecque (Papyrus 967)*, in: R. Kuntzmann/R. Schlosser (eds.), *Études sur le judaïsme hellénistique*, 1984, 197–224.

¹⁴ For the text see Geissen (ed.), *Septuaginta-Text*, 124.126.

¹⁵ For a comparison of the Hebrew and Old Greek text in Dan 8,9 see Koch/Rösel (eds.), *Polyglottensynopse*, 222–225.

small horn in Dan 8,9, cf. 7,8),¹⁶ the Greek texts call for a different historical setting.

Considering the strike towards the south and north in Dan 8,9, Antiochos III, contrary to Epiphanes, attacked Coele-Syria, Egypt and Asia Minor several times. Already at the beginning of his reign (220 BC) Antiochos the Great fought against Molon in Media. He defeated his cousin Achaios (216–213 BC) in Asia Minor, and between 212 and 205 BC Antiochos III succeeded in Armenia.¹⁷ Antiochos III turned from Asia Minor to Coele-Syria in 202 BC, and in 197 BC he took his third expedition to western Asia Minor.¹⁸

The Seleucid conquest of Coele-Syria after the battle at Panion, as already mentioned, had far-reaching consequences for the Jews at Judea and particularly in Jerusalem. Some of these consequences are attested in the two »Letters of Antiochos III to Zeuxis« and the »Programma«, as preserved in the »Jewish Antiquities« of Josephus.¹⁹ The first »Epistel« (cf. Ant 12,138–144) and the »Programma« (cf. Ant 12,145 f.) are of special interest. In both sections Antiochos III guaranteed the return of the inhabitants of the city of Jerusalem as well as freedom for her citizens. The Seleucid king admitted offerings, ordered the restitution of the Temple and proclaimed a tax relief. Furthermore, Josephus (resp. Antiochos III) refers to Judaism as a *politeia*. Insofar, this is the first official document that declares the ancestral laws to be the constitution or law of the land. And the »Epistel« also uses the term »Jew« in the sense of »citizenship.«²⁰ A striking passage is preserved in Ant 12,145 f. Here, in his »Programma«, Antiochos decrees the ban on foreigners entering the Temple of Jerusalem. Again he refers to the

¹⁶ Cf. also Dan 11,21.36 and the commentary of J.J. Collins, *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*, 1993, 299.331.382 and 386.

¹⁷ Cf. H.H. Schmitt, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte Antiochos' des Großen und seiner Zeit*, *Hist.Einzelschriften* 6, 1964. About Achaios and Antiochos in Asia Minor see J. Ma, *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*, 1999, 54–63; Huß, *Ägypten*, 405 f.

¹⁸ See Ma, *Antiochos III*, 73. The politics of Antiochos III in Caria are discussed below.

¹⁹ For the authenticity cf. E. Bickerman, *La charte séleucide de Jérusalem*, in: *Idem*, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, *AGJU* 9,2, 1980, 44–85; *Idem*, *Une proclamation séleucide relative au temple de Jérusalem*, in: *Idem*, *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*, *AGJU* 9,2, 1980, 86–104. Recently and with regard to the second »Epistel« (Ant 12,147–153), Ma, *Antiochos III*, 267, argued against J.-D. Gauger, *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik: Untersuchungen zur Authentizität von Urkunden bei Flavius Josephus und im I. Makkabäerbuch*, *BBB* 49, 1977, who denied the authenticity of every document preserved by Josephus.

²⁰ See S.J.D. Cohen, *The Beginning of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varieties, Uncertainties*, *Hellenistic Culture and Society* 31, 1999, 125–126.

»ancestral law« (πάτριον νόμον).²¹ Leaving the question of historicity aside, the text uses a widespread literary motif: the desecration of the Temple by non-Jewish people. The motif is also used in the stories of Heliodorus (cf. II Makk 3,9–30) and Apollonius (IV Makk 3,19–4,14). In III Makk 1,6–2,33 it is pointed out that Ptolemy IV Philopater decided to enter the sanctuary of the Temple of Jerusalem (cf. III Makk 1,10). He realized his plan after he had defeated Antiochos III at the battle of Raphia (217 BC).²² The Greek version of the »Decree from Raphia« attests the visit of Ptolemy IV at sanctuaries as a privileged habit (SEG 8, 467,5 f.): εἰσελθῶν τε ὁ βασιλεὺς εἰς τὰ ἱερὰ καὶ θύσας ἀνέθηκεν [...]. And after the Jews had warned Ptolemy IV that only the high-priest is allowed to enter the sanctuary (cf. III Makk 1,11 f.), the king asks (III Makk 1,13) »... why it was that when he entered every (other) shrine nobody present stopped him?«²³ Notwithstanding that the historical value of the events narrated in III Makk 1 f. is a matter of scholarly dispute,²⁴ the notice in III Makk 1,13 reflects on the habit of Ptolemaic kings as attested in the »Synodalic Decrees«.

To sum up, the historical allusions in the Old Greek version of Dan 8,9 match with the events around the conquests of Coele-Syria by Antiochos the Great at the turn of the third to the second century BC. Furthermore, the notice on the deliverance from slavery in Dan 8,11 (OG) reminds the Jewish decree of Antiochos (cf. Ant 12,138–144) after his victory at Panion over Scopas, who was the »officer in chief« of Ptolemy V Epiphanes. Finally, the casting down of the sanctuary (cf. Dan 8,11 [OG]) probably reflects the habit of the Lagides to enter temples and sanctuaries in their domain in the aftermath of a victorious battle. All in all, seen with the eyes of the Palestinian Jews, a negative view to the Ptolemies and a positive attitude towards the uprising Seleucid power under Antiochos III seems reasonable. This general assessment requires some further proof from ancient sources, which provide more information about the Seleucid attitude in pre-Maccabean times.

²¹ Cf. B. Schröder, Die »väterlichen Gesetze«: Flavius Josephus als Vermittler von Halachah an Griechen und Römer, TSAJ 53, 1996.

²² For a detailed reconstruction of the things happened around the Forth Syrian War see now Huß, Ägypten, 386–404.

²³ Transl.: H. Anderson, 3 Maccabees, in: J.H. Charlesworth (ed.), The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha II, 1985, 517f.

²⁴ Already V. Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews: With a Preface by J.J. Collins, repr. 1999, 74, called III Makk »simply fiction« and noticed that there »... is no need to seek a historical nucleus in this tale.« Recently, A. Kasher, The Jews in Hellenistic and Roman Egypt: The Struggle for Equal Rights, TSAJ 7, 1985, 211–232, is more optimistic.

In recent scholarship Antiochos' III policy in foreign affairs is compared with the politics of the Achaimenids.²⁵ As related to that attitude, another notice from the Old Greek version of the Book of Daniel is of special interest. The relevant passage stems from Dan 11,14:

And he shall rebuild the ruins of your people (καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσει τὰ πεπτωκότα τοῦ ἔθνους σου), and he shall stand up in order to realize the prophecy, and they shall stumble.

The question is: who should be identified with the person, who »shall rebuild the ruins?« First of all, an inner-biblical comparison is at hand, because the metaphorical language resembles Am 9,11 (MT):

On that day I will set up David's booth that has fallen, and I will repair their breaches, and I will restore his ruins; I will rebuild it as in the days of old.

With regards to the Septuagint version of Am 9,11 it is obvious that Dan 11,14 uses the same keywords: the future form of ἀνοικοδομέω and forms of the verb πίπτω. Furthermore, a second reference comes into mind. It is a passage from an »Eschatological Midrash« as it is preserved in a non-canonical context. This text was found among the manuscripts from the Dead Sea near Qumran, 4Q174 Frags. 1 col. i, 21, 2, line 11–13:²⁶

»This (refers to the) ›branch of David‹, who will arise with the Interpreter of the law [דורש ההורה] who [will rise up] in Zi[on in] the [l]ast days, as it is written: ›I will raise up the hut of David which has fallen‹, This (refers to) ›the hut of David which has fall[en]‹, who will arise to save Israel.«

Although this »Midrash« without a doubt presents the »hut« or »booth of David« from Am 9,11 in the context of a »messianic« interpretation,²⁷ a reference to the temple cannot be excluded from the beginning. Remarkably, the preceding quotations from the prophecy of Nathan (cf. II Sam 7,10–14) had left out exactly the prophecy about the building of the temple by the Davidic offspring (V. 13). A few lines ear-

²⁵ See S. Sherwin-White/A. Kuhrt, *From Samarkhand to Sardis: A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire, Hellenistic Culture and Society* 13, 1993, esp. 17–18.38–39.52 and 189–190.

²⁶ The Ms. stems from the last third of the first century BC, but the composition is approximately 50 years older. On the text and the translation see F. García Martínez/E.J.C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition I*, 1997, 352f. For a new reconstruction of the text see now A. Steudel (ed.), *Midrasch zur Eschatologie: 4QMidrEschat (4Q174+4Q175)*, in: *Idem, Die Texte aus Qumran II*, 2001, 187–213.

²⁷ Cf. also the »Cairo Damascus Document« that was also found among the manuscripts of the caves at Qumran: CD 7,9–21. Here, a *Pesher*-like messianic interpretation uses Am 9,11 and Am 5,26f. (see 4QD^a [4Q266] Frag. 3 col. III^p) among other biblical references. Cf. J.J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and other Ancient Literature*, 1995, 61.80–82.

lier (4Q174 Frags. 1 col. i, 21, 2, line 3), Ex 15,17b–18 interrupted the same quotation from II Sam, saying (emphases: S.B.):²⁸ »The sanctuary of YHWH your hands will establish. YHWH shall reign forever and ever.«

Furthermore, the concept of this sanctuary is strikingly explained in lines 3–4 of the quoted 4Q174 fragment. And this concept refers exactly to a persecution against the sanctuary that Antiochos III had in mind in his *Programma* (cf. the passage from Ant 12,146):²⁹

»This (refers to) the house [i.e. sanctuary or temple] into which shall not enter [...] ever either an Ammonite, or a Moabite, or a bastard, or a foreigner, or a proselyte, never, because his holy ones are there.«

The suggested combination of quoted passages from Palestine in the Graeco-Roman period leads to the most likely identification of the »re-builder« in Dan 11,14 with God himself (cf. Ex 15,17b–18 in 4Q174 [see above]). Lately, this identification finds corroboration in God's visionary answer of the first night-vision in Proto-Zechariah. In Zach 1,16 God has returned to Jerusalem that his house (בֵּית), the Temple, will be rebuilt (Hebr. *Nif'al* from בָּנָה). Here again the Septuagint translates with ἀνοικοδομέω (cf. Dan 11,14; Am 9,11).

To sum up this comparison of sources: The treatment of Am 9,11 in the »Eschatological Midrash« from Qumran, the subject in Am 9,11 and at least the suggested historical context make it probable that the Jewish God is the subject of the phrase »he shall rebuild the ruins of your people« (καὶ ἀνοικοδομήσει τὰ πεπτωκότα τοῦ ἔθνους σου) in Dan 11,14 (OG): YHWH restitutes the Temple after its desecration. This conclusion in mind, the Old Greek Version in Dan 8 and 11 obviously tried to view Antiochos' III attitude towards the Jews in a markedly positive light. Despite the fact that Dan 11,14 mainly makes a theological point, the God-given restoration is to be seen in a historical context of politically motivated privileges from the beginning of the second century BC.³⁰ The explained innuendoes from the sources men-

²⁸ See also the recent monograph of M. Pietsch, »Dieser ist der Sproß Davids ...«: Studien zur Rezeptionsgeschichte der Nathanverheißung im alttestamentlichen, zwischentestamentlichen und neutestamentlichen Schrifttum, WMANT 100, 2003, 212–219, esp.: 215 with n. 297.

²⁹ The following quotation stems from 4Q174 Frags. 1 col. i, 21, 2, line 3–4. Translation: García Martínez/Tigchelaar (eds.), Study Edition I, 353.

³⁰ The outlined reconstructions only try to evaluate the »mental map« of Jews from Jerusalem in the Hellenistic world from the beginning of the second towards the end of the first century BC. And it should not be dismissed that from a Seleucid point of view the decrees of Antiochos III fit well into his imperialistic policy (cf. for this aspect Ma, Antiochos III, esp. 145f.).

tioned above give an idea of the »tolerance« of Antiochos the Great, or better say: those innuendoes point out how Jewish contemporaries of the earliest Seleucid reign over Coele-Syria could understand Antiochos' decisions as »tolerance« in religio-political affairs. Nevertheless, and with regard to the explained Jewish attitude, later events in the times of Antiochos III and Antiochos IV Epiphanes would lead to an »inner conversion« to apocalypticism.

At least a look at further evidence referring to Seleucid policy will highlight the given conclusions.³¹ An important witness is the inscription found near Hefzibah, northwest of Beth Shean, the ancient Scythopolis.³² This inscription records orders issued for the benefit of Ptolemy, son of Thrasesas (cf. *FGrHist* 260 F 45),³³ military governor and chief priest of Coele-Syria. The orders are by Antiochos III and his eldest son, the junior King Antiochos. The addressees are, amongst others, Kleon and Heliodoros, Seleucid administrators (*dioiketai*):³⁴

I propose, if you approve, King, ————— to/[Kle(?)]on and Heliodo[ro]s [the] *dioiketai* respecting the vi[ll]ages be[lon]ging to me/as [pro]perty and hereditary tenure and respecting those which you ordered to be assigned to me):/ that nobody should be allowed to quarter under no pretence// neither by bringing in others nor by assault also on (or: requisitioning also) the possessions/and not to eject villagers.

The quoted section lays emphasis on a rigid observance of the security of the inhabitants in Palestine. The section is characterized as a *memorandum* written by Ptolemy, who was involved as a Seleucid governor in the Fifth Syrian War. Ptolemy is the owner of various villages in the region, which were partly leased to him as δωρεά by the crown.³⁵ Both, Ptolemy and the Seleucid kings had to guarantee the privileges for the benefit of those villages in Palestine. Furthermore, the Seleucid ad-

³¹ On the royal attitudes towards domestic cults in Asia Minor in general cf. B. Dignas, *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*, 2002, esp. 36–59.

³² The Greek text dates back to the beginning of the second century BC. Cf. Y.H. Landau, *A Greek Inscription Found Near Hefzibah*, *IEJ* 16 (1966), 54–70.

³³ The Greek fragment relates to Porphyry's statement that is quoted by Jerome in his commentary on the Book of Daniel (*In Danielelem*) on Dan 11,14. For the identification of Ptolemy with the son of Thrasesas see D. Gera, *Ptolemy Son of Thrasesas and the Fifth Syrian War*, *AncSoc* 18 (1987), 63–73; Idem, *Judaea*, 28–34; Huß, *Ägypten*, 489.

³⁴ See the commentary by Landau, *Greek Inscription*, 66f., and about the *dioiketai*, financial officials at the »provincial« level, see Ma, *Antiochos III*, 135–137; Dignas, *Economy*, 54f. with n. 85. – The following quotation is from line 21–26 of the inscription (for text and translation cf. Landau, *Greek Inscription*, 59.61).

³⁵ On the δωρεά cf. H. Kreissig, *Wirtschaft und Gesellschaft im Seleukidenreich: Die Eigentums- und Abhängigkeitsverhältnisse*, *SGKA(B)* 16, 1978, 40–46, esp. 45. On the inscription see also Th. Fischer, *Zur Seleukideninschrift von Hefzibah*, *ZPE* 33 (1979), 131–138; J. M. Bertrand, *Sur l'inscription d'Hefzibah*, *ZPE* 46 (1982), 167–174.

ministration had to take care that the villages should remain unmolested by the billeting of troops.

Among the tremendous amount of inscriptions initialized by Antiochos III that is worth observing are two sources from the beginning of the second century BC (197/196 BC): a letter to Zeuxis, the »chief minister« or »viceroy« (ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων) at Asia Minor,³⁶ preserved on an inscription that was found in Kildara (Caria), and a letter probably from Antiochos III to the city of Ilion.³⁷ In both texts the Seleucids granting privileges to the citizens. And especially the inscription from Ilion brings the old established benefits (προϋπηργμένα) to bear on the people. This recalls the reference to the ancestral laws in the *Programma* (see above). It is a small wonder that the Greek historian and chronologist of the time, Polybios, stated in an all-inclusive summary (*Hist.* 28.1.3): »all the above districts [in Coele-Syria and Phoenicia] yielded obedience to the kings of Syria.«

Lately, two inscriptions from Caria are of special interest concerning the Seleucid instructions about local shrines and temples. The first source is an inscription from Labraunda, south of Amyzon and north of Mylasa. Labraunda is of special interest, because »it was not a Greek but an indigenous Carian cult with a distinct history of its own;« but Labraunda is also, nevertheless, »an example of the triangular interaction between city, cult and ruler.«³⁸ The inscription records an instruction of king Antiochos III in a letter, probably from his »chief minister« Zeuxis (in the year 203 BC). The exhortation is addressed to the army, »to take care of the [sanctuaries]« and to »be well disciplined in all other matters.«³⁹ The inscription is in a very fragmentary shape. Therefore a sufficient historical explanation seems to be impossible.

The second inscription is a letter to the Amyzonians from May 203 BC.⁴⁰ Until 203 BC Amyzon was under the Ptolemaic supremacy. Consequently Antiochos III (resp. Zeuxis), in the letter to the Amyzo-

³⁶ This title of Zeuxis is given in the Euromian inscription line 4–5: cf. Ma, Antiochos III, 338. On the position and function of Zeuxis see Idem, 123–130, esp. 126, and the list in E. Olshausen, *Prosopographie der hellenistischen Königsgesandten I: Von Triparadeisos bis Pydna*, StHell 144, 1974, 204f., no. 144.

³⁷ For discussion of the text and translation cf. Ma, Antiochos III, 327–329 and 350–351.

³⁸ So Dignas, *Economy*, 66. For some further examinations of the religio-political situation at Labraunda in Hellenistic times see Idem, 2–6.12.59–69.

³⁹ On the text, translation and interpretation see the recent examination by Ma, Antiochos III, 68 and 304f.

⁴⁰ The text was already provided by C.B. Welles (ed.), *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*, 1934, 166, no. 38; cf. also J. and L. Robert, *Fouilles d'Amyzon en Carie I: Exploration, histoire, monnaies et inscriptions*, 1983, 133–136.

nians, could fall back upon the »covenants of Ptolemy«.⁴¹ Unfortunately, the inscription does not tell us anything about these covenants. We can only guess that they might refer to the reign of Ptolemy II Philadelphos (285/284 and 282–246 BC), when the Lagides probably granted cities in northern Caria.⁴² In an interesting but much disputed and in some ways obscure passage the letter of Zeuxis to the Amyzonians reads as follows (line 7–9):⁴³

For if you preserve [your trust and good faith towards the gods and towards us, it is likely that from them and from us all things pertain[ing to solicitude and] care will be provided to you.

It is obvious from the quoted section of the inscription that Zeuxis or Antiochos III respectively goes beyond a pure reassurance of the war-tantalized inhabitants. If the πίστις has to be preserved in face of the Gods, it connotes more than simply trust. Furthermore, if the text

⁴¹ Pace J.T. Ma/P.S. Derow/A.R. Meadows, *RC 38 (Amyzon) Reconsidered*, ZPE 109 (1995), 76–79, and Ma, *Antiochos III*, 69f., who argue that Olympichos, a local dynast with the seat at Alinda, once controlled Amyzon in pre-Seleucid times (cf. Idem, 70): »It is possible that a Ptolemaic resurgence, in the last years of Ptolemy IV, destroyed Olympichos' dominions ...« Against this Huß, *Ägypten*, 431, and 477 n. 31, doubts that Amyzon was ever under Olympichos' control, because it is not mentioned in his numerous documents. On the Ptolemaic influence at Amyzon see also G.M. Cohen, *The Hellenistic Settlements in Europe, the Islands, and Asia Minor*, *Hellenistic Culture and Society* 17, 1995, 53.246.

⁴² Whether the First Syrian War led to a Ptolemaic supremacy in Carian cities like Labraunda or Chios is a point of scholarly discussion: cf. Huß, *Ägypten*, 270f. with n. 128.

⁴³ The translation follows the reconstructed text of Robert, *Fouilles*, 133.135; F. Piejko, *Review: J. et L. Robert, Fouilles d'Amizon en Carie ...*, *Gn.* 57 (1985), 610.612. Piejko only reconstructs ἐπιμέλεια instead of the reading ἐπιστροφή in the text of J. and L. Roberts:

7 [...] διαφυλάσσουσι γὰρ ὑμῖν τὴν εἰς τοὺς

8 [θεοὺς καὶ εἰς ἡμᾶς πίστιν εἰκὸς π]αρ' ἐκείνων καὶ παρ' ἡμῶν πάντα συγ-
κατασκευ-

9 [ασθήσεσθαι τὰ πρὸς ἐπιστροφήν κ]αὶ πολυωρίαν ἀνήκο(ν)τα·

Against this, Ma/Derow/Meadows, *RC 38 (Amyzon) Reconsidered*, 75f., read in line 8: [βασιλεῖς πίστιν, ... π]αρ' [...]. And Ma, *Antiochos III*, 292f., has: [βασιλεῖς εὐνοίαν?, ... π]αρ' [...], but also suggests τὴν εἰς τοὺς βασιλεῖς καὶ τὰ πράγματα εὐνοίαν. Besides the speculation about filling the lacuna, in the eyes of Ma, *Antiochos III*, 293f., »the inscription is an edict of Antiochos III concerning the centrally organized ruler-cult« (cf. also Idem, 66–68). But especially the analyses of Robert, *Fouilles*, 135 n. 20, and 190, and Piejko, *Review: J. et L. Robert*, 611, could explain the tendency of the letter, as it will be examined above, by providing parallels from inscriptions at Ilion and Teos (Piejko) or by referring to a phrase in the letter to Zeuxis in *Ant 12,148–153* (Robert).

amounts to an oath,⁴⁴ Zeuxis or Antiochos III respectively must have had in mind the »foreign« gods of the inhabitants at Amyzon. All in all, the fragment of the inscription testifies the Seleucid acknowledgement and esteem of native religious practices in the satrapies.

Keeping in mind a Seleucid policy that was far from religious ignorance or, what is more, religious intolerance, a short look at the Ptolemaic attitude in this matter helps to provide more clarifications. Already Ptolemy IV Philopater tried to establish the eponymous or royal cult in the satrapies of Cyprus, Rhodes and Coele-Syria. E.g., there is some evidence of the royal cult from lists of eponymous priests in Egypt in the ages of Philopater and Ptolemy V Epiphanes.⁴⁵ Particularly during the ruling period of Epiphanes the royal cult was attested at Lycia, Cyprus and Coele-Syria (Marisa and Jaffa). At the time after the Fifth Syrian War we hear an emphatic call for military armament with the aim of protecting the Egyptian people and temples.⁴⁶ Furthermore, the Alexandrian Chairemon probably speaks of Egyptian priests who act as a royal legation outside Egypt (cf. *FGrHist* 618 F 6, 8).⁴⁷ At least, findings of coinage, also dating around the Fifth Syrian War, attest the Ptolemaic need for acceptance in the fields of money economy and religion: These coins not only wearing a portrait but also the royal eponymous name on it.⁴⁸

The rough analysis of religio-historical tendencies shed some light especially on the political circumstances among Seleucids and Ptolemies. The religious parties in Palestine at the turn from the second to the third century BC could show a discreet frankness to both, the Seleucid and the Ptolemaic imperialisms. Nevertheless, the concrete decisions and atti-

⁴⁴ The stone with the inscription was found near the sanctuary of Artemis and Apollon. Ma, Antiochos III, 293: »temple or monumental gate.« For the interpretation as an oath see Piejko, Review: J. et L. Robert, 612; *pace* Robert, Fouilles, 135.

⁴⁵ For these lists see P.W. Pestman, Chronologie égyptienne d'après les textes démotiques (332 av. J.-C. – 453 ap. J.-C.), PLB 15, 1967, 135–137; Huß, Ägypten, 452f. 530f.

⁴⁶ Cf. the »Rosetta Stone« (196 BC): See F. Hoffmann, Ägypten, Kultur und Lebenswelt in griechisch-römischer Zeit: Eine Darstellung nach den demotischen Quellen, 2000, 165–169. The religio-political aim of the instructions in this decree was to control inner-Egyptian revolts.

⁴⁷ See W. Huß, Der makedonische König und die ägyptischen Priester: Studien zur Geschichte des ptolemaischen Ägypten, Hist.Einzelschriften 85, 1994, 95f. with n. 96. Cf. also C. Onasch, Zur Königsideologie der Ptolemäer in den Dekreten von Kanopus und Memphis (Rosettana), AfP 24/25 (1976), 148–155.

⁴⁸ Cf. R.S. Bagnall, The Administration of the Ptolemaic Possessions outside Egypt, CSCT 4, 1976, 180–183; see also Huß, Ägypten, 533–535. On the very different and much more restricted use of Antiochos' III title βασιλεὺς μέγας see Ma, Antiochos III, 272–276. Ma concludes that Antiochos became βασιλεὺς μέγας after the victory at Panion.

tudes among the Diadochs around the events of the Fifth Syrian War show more »tolerant« tendencies, in Coele-Syria and in Caria. This does not exclude that Antiochos III himself was inclined to imperialistic ambitions. The Jews in Palestine should get a taste of it lately after the peace of Apameia in 188 BC.⁴⁹ But before the Romans could keep Antiochos III in leading-strings the Seleucid policy is in some ways characterized by an almost Achaemenidic »tolerance« towards the old-established inhabitants' religious life in the empire.⁵⁰

The above survey of different sources going back to the Hellenistic period intends to highlight isolated verses from the Old Greek version of the Book of Daniel, whose intention seems to be an answer to Seleucid policy in the times of the Fifth Syrian War. The protagonists, groups or subjects that were giving these answers are almost unknown. A careful approach could suggest the Tobiads as protagonists. And their turn from a pro-Ptolemaic to a pro-Seleucid policy in those years could help in this regard. But this identification is far from evidence. The multitude of Jewish parties and their different relations to changing constellations of foreign power in Palestine and Coele-Syria at the dawn of apocalypticism lead to a dangerous »medley« of political and religious persuasions. The conflict of Tobiads and Oniads is only one example. Among certain Jewish groups their co-operation with Hellenistic parties collapsed when the Seleucid emperors, in the eyes of these Jews, shifted from »tolerance« to suppression. The Book of Daniel testifies an example of such a collapse if the different textual layers of the Greek and Hebrew text are compared and examined historically. Insofar the Book of Daniel is an example of how certain Jewish segments in the first half of the second century BC could turn into an »inner conversion« to become apocalypticists.

⁴⁹ Cf. M. Rostovtzeff, *Gesellschafts- und Wirtschaftsgeschichte der hellenistischen Welt II*, repr. 1998, 548f.: »Zweifellos schufen die Niederlage Antiochos' III. durch die Römer und die schweren Kontributionen, die ihm und seinen Nachfolgern durch den Vertrag von Apameia auferlegt wurden [...], eine schwierige Lage [...]. [...] Als Stellvertreter Gottes auf Erden zum Beispiel, als die ›Gesalbten des Herrn‹, und also zur Verwendung des Einkommens der Götter, die in verschiedenen Teilen ihres Reiches verehrt wurden, berechtigt, forderten sie von den reichen Tempeln ihres Reiches schwere Kontributionen und griffen ohne Zögern zu Zwangsmaßnahmen, wenn die Priester ihren Forderungen nicht nachkamen.«

⁵⁰ This is true from a Jewish point of view. In the eyes of Antiochos III his »frankness« was certainly another means of his imperialistic ambitions (cf. Ma, *Antiochos III*, esp. 108–121).

The article analyses influences on religious attitudes of Palestinian Jews on the eve of the Antiochean crisis, which resulted in an »inner conversion« to an »apocalyptic« way of thinking. Especially the historical allusions in the Old Greek version of Dan 8,9 match with the events around the conquests of Coele-Syria by Antiochos the Great at the turn of the third to the second century BC. Furthermore, the notice on the emancipation of slaves in Dan 8,11 (OG) recalls a decree of Antiochos III (cf. Ant 12,138–144). The »tolerant« attitude of the Seleucids to religious activity which is evident here finds further confirmation in measures of Antiochos III which are attested in inscriptions from Hefzibah and Caria.

L'analyse traite de la question de l'attitude religieuse des Juifs à la veille de la crise sous Antiochos IV Épiphane. Cette crise peut être interprétée comme la raison d'une »conversion intérieure« de ces milieux qualifiés d'»apocalyptiques«. Le livre de Daniel offre, selon ses témoins grecs, des allusions historiques à l'époque pré-maccabéenne: ainsi Dan 8,9 concerne manifestement des conquêtes en Coelé-Syrie sous Antiochos III. Par ailleurs, la notice sur la libération de l'esclavage en Dan 8,11 renvoie à des mesures comparables de la part d'Antiochos, comme il est établi dans les décrets transmis par Flavius Josèphe (cf. Ant 12,138–144). D'autres témoignages établissent une attitude de coopération et de »tolérance« des Séleucides pour les questions de politique religieuse au début du règne d'Antiochos III; des inscriptions de Hefzibah ou de la Carie confirment cette tendance à la »tolérance« et à la »loyauté« de la part des Diadoques.

Die Analyse stellt sich der Frage nach den Einflüssen auf die religiöse Haltung des palästinischen Judentums am Vorabend der Krise unter Antiochos IV. Epiphanes. Jene Krise kann als Anlass zur »inneren Konversion« jener Kreise verstanden werden, die man als »apokalyptisch« bezeichnet. Historische Anspielungen auf jene vor-makkabäische Epoche liefert das Danielbuch nach seinen griechischen Zeugen: So reflektiert Dan 8,9 offenbar Eroberungen Koile-Syriens unter Antiochos III. Dan 8,11 verweist mit seiner Freilassungsnotiz auf vergleichbare Maßnahmen des Antiochos, wie sie in den durch Josephus überlieferten Dekreten (vgl. Ant 12,138–144) belegt sind. Die hier durchscheinende »tolerante« Haltung der Seleukiden in religionspolitischen Fragen findet schließlich eine Bestätigung in Maßnahmen Antiochos' III., die inschriftlich etwa für Karien oder in einem Dokument aus Hefzibah bezeugt sind.