

# HISTORY OF THE PEOPLE OF ISRAEL.<sup>1</sup>

FROM THE BEGINNING TO THE DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

BY PROF. C. H. CORNILL.

## *VII. The Maccabean Rebellion to the Establishment of the Hereditary High-Priesthood and Principality Under Simon.*

WE HAVE PURSUED historical events as far as the point where Judea became a province of the Syrian empire of the Seleucidæ. We must now take a survey partly reminiscent and partly anticipative of the prevailing and rising spiritual forces of the time, since all the succeeding historical development is quite unintelligible without a clear conception of their nature and significance.

The most important of the spiritual forces in question is Hellenism. It lifted the ancient world out of its ruts, while the Orient in particular was entirely transformed by it. With it an absolutely new factor enters the history of the world. Its victories are not merely of the sword, but of the mind. The Assyrians, indeed, aimed at a systematic destruction of nationalities through their wholesale deportations and the resulting mixture of races; but these measures were taken solely with a political purpose: they wished to make other nations defenceless and harmless in order to maintain themselves in unimpaired possession of the supremacy. The Assyrians had no thought of extending the really important and highly developed Assyro-Babylonian civilisation, or of propagandising for Assyro-Babylonian language or religion; if the subjected races were docile and paid their tribute promptly, the aim

<sup>1</sup> Translated from the manuscript of Prof. C. H. Cornill, by W. H. Carruth of the University of Kansas.

of the Assyrian diplomacy was attained ; they did not ask or desire more.

The conception of the nature of the State as a civilising power appears first in Nebuchadnezzar ; and the Persian kings, continuing and extending his work, gave an admirable organisation to their empire ; yet even this organisation was purely administrative. The Persian Government gave itself absolutely no concern for local and domestic affairs, neither did it ever anywhere attempt a blending of various nationalities : it permitted the Egyptians to be Egyptians undisturbed, the Jews Jews, and the Greeks Greeks, provided only they were and remained loyal Persian subjects.

Into these idyllic conditions came suddenly Hellenism. True, Alexander the Great was most scrupulously considerate of the religious views of conquered races, and it would never have occurred to him to put the Greek Zeus, for instance, in the place of the native gods of the Orient ; and yet Alexander aimed clearly and consciously not only at conquering the Orient, but at Hellenising it. The universal empire which rose before his gifted and ardent spirit was to bring an organic blending of all nationalities into a new unity in which of course the Greek was to be the dominant factor fixing the character of the entire combination, but only in order to transmit to the whole world the treasures of the Greek intellect and the benefits of Greek civilisation.

In Alexander personally these ambitions are indeed reversed : he himself from a Greek became ever more and more an Oriental, so that the old Macedonian veterans who could not reconcile themselves to the altered and un-Greek conditions rebelled against him the year before his death ; but his ambition was magnificent and became of incalculable importance in its results.

The successors of Alexander pursued this ambition deliberately : everywhere Greeks streamed in, everywhere there sprang from the soil new cities which, being settled exclusively by Greeks, spread a distinctly Greek net over the whole Orient, in the meshes of which was entangled even more of the ancient Oriental life. And when we recall what these Hellenes had to offer to the Orient, then only shall we be able to estimate the whole significance of the intellectual process thus initiated and extending its effects ever more swiftly and vigorously. Even to-day our whole culture and civilisation is based upon Hellas and what that divinely-favored race gave to mankind. But at the time of which we are speaking, Greece itself had long passed its Golden Age, its intellectual and political meridian.

It is particularly significant, and not at all a matter of accident, that in order to take the aggressive the Greeks themselves had first to be made again presentable in history, if I may be allowed the expression, by the semi-barbarous people of the Macedonians. Hellenism was enabled to enter upon its victorious career of world-conquest only through the Macedonians and under their dominion.

It is just the case of the Greeks which has shown so very clearly whither a civilisation leads which lacks religious and moral foundations and is solely a product of unrestrained human spirit. With the intellectual perfection went hand in hand a moral decay whose dreadful depths could not be hidden even by the roses that flourished on the edge of the abyss. Aside from the sole shining figure of Epaminondas, who as a Bœotian was a semi-boor in the eyes of every genuine Hellene, Greek history from the end of the Peloponnesian War to the time of Alexander the Great presents a truly depressing picture of abjectness and worthlessness. Very soon the average Greek had of civilisation only the moral decay, of culture only the conceited arrogance. Only recall with what undisguised contempt the Romans looked down upon the Greeks when they first became acquainted with them. The Roman, who still retained the early Roman honesty and thoroughness, regarded every Greek as a mere blackguard, and Græculus became an epithet for the characterisation of a windy, puffed-up, characterless, unreliable fellow.

And this ethical dissolution which may be called absolute decay, made rapid progress: they were soon on the verge of complete moral bankruptcy. And so the Greeks became for the Orient the bearers of civilisation indeed, but also the bearers of moral degeneration. Where they really predominated arose frivolity and scepticism and a moral laxity more repulsive under its varnish of culture than undisguised barbarism and untutored license. The result was what we may observe everywhere when differing nationalities are mixed without the mixture being controlled and protected by a strong hand: the good characteristics are lost, while there is a reciprocal exchange of bad qualities, so that the product finally combines in itself all the bad qualities of its constituent elements while the good are dissipated.

Now what was the relation of the Jewish people to this new factor in the world's history? In the first place, Judea was so fortunate as to become acquainted with Hellenism from its best side. Whatever there was good and great in Hellenism and its product

is inseparably associated with the name of Alexandria, the capital of the empire at this time and for Judea also. The first three Ptolemies, under whose rule Judea stood for eighty years (from 301 to 221) may fairly be designated as the most important historical personages of the entire Hellenistic period; with them and under them Hellenism was solely a civilising power and put itself at the service of Israel also. At the suggestion of the second Ptolemy, who wished to have in legible form in his model library at Alexandria among others also the sacred writings of his Jewish subjects, a beginning was made of translating the Old Testament into the universal language, Greek; and this is since the religious and national consolidation of the Jewish congregation by Ezra and Nehemiah the most important occurrence, perhaps, in the history of the Jewish people.

How well disposed these rulers were towards the Jews and how they favored them in every way, we have already learned. Accordingly the danger of Hellenisation was particularly keen. The Judaism of Ezra and Nehemiah is characterised by an element of gloomy severity and sharp asceticism: that was a soil on which the sunny serenity and merry joyousness of Hellenism was sure to be particularly attractive and to insinuate itself into the heart: it would not have been surprising if the Jews, dazzled by the new light, had deserted in masses. But nothing of the sort took place; religious training prevailed over secular culture, the Jew remained faithful to his God and his law.

The rejection of Hellenism was not at first abrupt and absolute, but there was a sharp and clear perception of the limit where Hellenism must halt. The connexion of the two reached a really touching expression in one of the most remarkable of the books of the Old Testament, the so-called Preacher of Solomon (Ecclesiastes), which was written about the year 200 B. C. by a Jew trained under Hellenistic influence. The author shows himself to be profoundly permeated with Hellenism. He has assimilated it as an element of his culture, he is indubitably influenced by Greek philosophy and Greek science, and expresses views which sound like consummate scepticism; but withal he holds inflexibly true to the faith in a personal God and a moral order of the universe; he gives up the solution of the riddle of existence and falls back resignedly upon the faith of his childhood, although it has shown itself to be inadequate. Truly, Old Testament piety has nowhere had a greater triumph than in this book which at the first glance seems so godless! Yes, Judaism had itself strength and resistance enough to

receive the ennobling and illuminating influence of Hellenism without surrendering to it.

About the same time as Ecclesiastes, was written the book Jesus Sirach. In this book genuine Jewish piety shines with such a mild and pure light, purged of all that is sharp and rude; piety and common sense are here combined into such broadly beautiful charity, morality ennobled by religion and religion manifested in morality, that one can see plainly that Judaism is not inherently hostile to culture, but that here too true religion and true culture join in a beautiful union fruitful for both sides.

For the Jewish people it was a vital question what attitude the dominant circles and especially the family of the high priest would take toward the new intellectual force. The influence of the high priest was tremendous. As a result of the central position which religion held in Judaism, whose one and all it was, the highest functionary in the religious congregation was inevitably the first personage in popular life also; besides, the office of high priest was the only permanent national institution which had its foundation within itself, independent of the heathen secular power. We are nowhere informed that the Persian or Egyptian governments interfered in the least with the appointment to the office of high priest, or even made it dependent upon their confirmation; it was evidently regarded as a Jewish local affair.

Thus the people and the heathen secular power grew accustomed to regarding the high priest as the very head and representative of the nation,—we learn from a casual note in Josephus that the Egyptian Government put also the entire financial management into the hands of the high priest, who had to deliver to the Egyptian Government the sum fixed as annual tribute and was held responsible for it. Accordingly it must be regarded as peculiarly fortunate that the office of high priest in the most critical period was in the hands of two worthy and truly pious men: Simon II., of whom his contemporary, Jesus Sirach, gives such a gratifying characterisation, and above all his son and successor, Onias III., a really luminous figure, who commanded the respect and admiration of even his enemies and the heathen, and who stood a steadfast rock and a fortress of law and faith in the midst of the surging and foaming flood.

This is perhaps the proper place to consider a local Jewish phenomenon which is suddenly present about the end of the second century without our having any positive reports regarding its origin: this is the Pharisees and Sadducees. It is worthy of note

that the first Book of the Maccabees, an historical authority of prime importance for us, nowhere mentions them, although we repeatedly think we have our hands on them. On the other hand they appear in the reign of the third Maccabee as complete and finished phenomena, and from this time on the whole of Jewish history turns about the opposition between these two rival tendencies. It is therefore indispensable for us too for a clear conception of them both.

According to the prevailing view, which has been influenced by the accounts of the Talmud, the Pharisees and the Sadducees are two Jewish sects, and their opposition purely religio-dogmatic; but this view cannot stand in the face of the oldest and most reliable accounts.

It is easiest to form a historically correct conception of the Sadducees. The very name is significant: it marks them as *Zadokidæ* (of the family of *Zadok*). The *Zadokidæ* are the family which furnish the high priest, and therefore the highest nobility of Israel—we have in the Sadducees the party of the aristocracy, the Jewish hereditary nobility. The Sadducees are primarily a purely political party; they are the ruling families whose business is the care for public affairs. They do not concern themselves much about Heaven, but devote themselves to being comfortable on the earth; they are the officials, the diplomats, the councillors of the secular state, the real support and the most faithful adherents of the Maccabean princes. If the demands of the heavenly king are not reconcilable with those of the earthly king, they decide for the latter: they are not so strict about law and religion if only state and people are maintained and prosper. Improbable as it may sound, they are the real patriots and the national party with the motto: Israel above all! Israel's honor, Israel's dignity, Israel's freedom! are their guiding stars.

Their antipodes, the Pharisees have accordingly been represented as simply democrats, the popular party, and it is undeniable that their influence upon the people was tremendous and that the people saw in them their intellectual leaders; but they were anything but democratic. The most hidebound aristocrat, the narrowest country squire did not meet the people with the scornful contempt shown by the Pharisees for the "am haarez," which to them were scarcely more than cattle.

It is the Pharisees who constitute an exclusively religious sect, which knows no political interests; their motto is: The law must be fulfilled even if Israel is ruined by it. Utterly blind to the most

elementary requirements of an actual state and of political life, they judge everything from a purely theoretical theological standpoint; whatever contradicts the letter of the law is evil and must be combated to the death, even though the most vital interests of Israel are at stake. The very name is highly significant. "Peruschim," or in the Aramaic popular idiom, "perischin," means the "set apart," the separatists. Separation from all that was heathen had been since the time of Ezra and Nehemiah the very vital nerve of Jewish piety, and this is the object of the whole ceremonial law. The Pharisees carried out this purpose with unswerving energy and to its utmost consequences; they are the virtuosi of religion and piety, whose calling it is to fulfil vicariously as it were what God demands of every Israelite, but what the common man under the demands of daily life cannot perform, the most complete, the most rigorous, and the most scrupulous observance of the law, and not simply of the written law, but of all the details derived from it partly by the demands of practice and partly by theoretical subtilising. The Pharisees are entirely isolated from the world and live exclusively in their ideas; but the fact that they have an idea behind them, which they bear and by which they are borne is their strength, and in it lies the secret of their power: they are the personified genius of Judaism and one of the strongest evidences of the omnipotence of idealism. As opposed to the practical realism of the Sadducees they represent a transcendental idealism, to which facts are nothing, ideas everything. In Pharisaism and the Talmud we have the outcome of the directions which Judaism took under Ezra and Nehemiah,—this fact was realised, and hence the tremendous moral influence of the Pharisees: they destroyed the newly rising Jewish State, but they saved Judaism.

But it is time to return to our history. Young Ptolemy V., from whom Antiochus took Palestine, was, as will be remembered, under Roman guardianship. After Hannibal had been finally subdued, and Philip of Macedon also defeated in the battle of Cynoscephalæ, 197, Antiochus considered it advisable to make some concessions to the Roman demands; therefore he betrothed his daughter Cleopatra to young Ptolemy, and promised to give her the conquered province as dowry. The marriage was performed in the year 193, but Antiochus had no thought of keeping his word; he did indeed give his daughter the half of the revenues for pin money, but the province remained in Syrian hands. But his hour had come.

In the year 190, in the murderous battle at Magnesia on the

Sipylos, the thoroughly hollow and innerly rotten glory of the Seleucidæ sank in the dust before the Roman swords, and the only care of Antiochus was thenceforth to comply with the immense demands of Rome. While raising forced loans from the temples for this purpose he was slain in Elymais by the enraged populace. His son and successor, Seleucus IV., a quite insignificant and indolent fellow, accepted as an unfortunate inheritance, the obligation to the Romans and fulfilled it in a similar fashion.

And now once more we learn something direct about Judea. Here too Hellenism had made immense progress even among the priests. There were not a few of them who had already adopted Greek names and could scarcely wait for the time when Jerusalem should be a Greek city and they should be free from the troublesome restraint of the law and of Jewish life. Therefore they hated bitterly the pious and loyal high priest Onias and intrigued against him in every possible way. The chief of this Hellenistic party, a priest by the name of Simon, called the attention of the Syrian officials to the treasures of the temple in Jerusalem, and in fact Seleucus sent a certain Heliodorus to Jerusalem to look after things and to materially lighten the temple treasury. The purpose was never accomplished: the second Book of Maccabees tells a marvellous tale of how three angels checked the plundering Heliodorus in his course. Now Simon denounced Onias as a conspirator and traitor, and as the Syrian officials gave him all possible support it came to bloodshed in the streets of Jerusalem. At this Onias himself started upon the way to Antiochia in order to represent his and the people's cause in person. Meantime there had been a change of rulers there. Heliodorus had poisoned Seleucus and raised himself to the throne. The rightful heir, Demetrius, the son of Seleucus, had been sent to Rome as a hostage; then the younger brother of Seleucus, Antiochus, overthrew the regicide, but kept the throne for himself, calling himself Antiochus IV. Epiphanes. This took place in the summer of 175.

Antiochus Epiphanes became a most fateful personage for Jewish history, and there are still disputes as to what his real motives were. Even to his contemporaries this prince was a psychological riddle. The great historian Polybius, who knew him personally, gives a detailed characterisation of him, showing forth the most contradictory traits. Popular wit explained the matter by changing his name Epiphanes to Epimanes, that is, the crazy, the fool, and in fact the whole description of Polybius gives the impression that Antiochus was not really malicious and corrupt, but

rather afflicted with a mental defect, whimsical and irresponsible and not accustomed to submit to any sort of restraint. There even appears in him a leaning to coarse humor which we may almost characterise as waggishness, and which is indeed very unbecoming in a king. They are regular boys' capers which Antiochus cut for his own royal entertainment. We need not expect to find any more serious thought or any more profound purpose in this thoroughly superficial and flippant character.

Before such a ruler Onias was to plead his case. But he was accompanied to Antiochia by his younger brother, Jason. As his Greek name indicates, Jason was a leader of the Hellenistic faction: he promised Antiochus a great sum of money and an energetic Hellenising of the Jews besides, if he would depose his brother and make him high priest. Antiochus could not resist such a temptation: Onias was detained in Antiochia, and Jason returned to Jerusalem as newly appointed high priest.

The work of Hellenisation was now begun under high pressure, theatres and gymnasia were built at Jerusalem, so that not even the priests paid any more attention to the altar and its service, but played ball and other games and pursued various physical exercises in the gymnasium. This Jewish high priest went so far in his catholicity as to send a sacrifice to the Tyrian Melkarth. When Antiochus on a certain occasion came to Jerusalem he was received with great rejoicings and welcomed in a wholly Greek fashion, with games and torch dances.

But the glory of Jason was not to last long. Only three years passed when a certain Menelaus outbid him and offered Antiochus still greater sums; forthwith Jason was deposed and the more generous Menelaus appointed. Menelaus was a brother to Simon, who is already known to us as the chief opponent of Onias; he raged like a wild beast against the faithful, according to the drastic expression of the second Book of the Maccabees. But soon he too was in close straits. When Antiochus tried to collect the larger sum promised he was unable to pay, and Antiochus forthwith took action against him in Antiochia and deposed him. But Menelaus was not at loss what to do. When the king had left his capital he bribed the officials who had the decision in the king's absence, had Onias murdered and was reinstated in his office; a deputation which accused him was simply executed. So Menelaus was again high priest, and pursued his career more shamelessly than before.

But now we must again cast a glance at the political occurrences. Ptolemy V., the husband of the Syrian Cleopatra, sister

of Antiochus Epiphanes, died in 180, and his widow seven years later. Antiochus offered himself to his two Egyptian nephews as guardian, but the Egyptians would have none of this, demanding back instead, Palestine as the inheritance of the deceased queen. So there resulted wars between Antiochus and his nephews for four successive years. This was at a time when the Romans were engaged in the second Macedonian War against King Perseus, and could not therefore pay any attention to Oriental affairs.

The fortunes of these Syro-Egyptian wars do not belong here ; in the second, 170 B. C., Antiochus was reported dead, and the deposed Jason seized the opportunity to recover the high-priesthood by force. He effected a breach in the walls of Jerusalem and inflicted dreadful slaughter, but was unable to capture it ; he was obliged to flee and died in Sparta after a fugitive life full of adventure. Antiochus treated this as a rebellion against his authority : returning from Egypt frustrated, he vented his wrath upon the Jews, entered Jerusalem, plundered the temple and played fearful havoc there ; Menelaus was more firmly established in his favor than ever. But two years later an end was to be put to his ambition. In the battle of Pydna the Romans had destroyed the Macedonian Empire, and now two words from the Roman ambassador Popilius Lænas were sufficient to make Antiochus resign his Egyptian schemes for ever.

Again the Jews had to endure the impotent wrath of the king against fate : a still worse massacre was perpetrated in Jerusalem ; the whole city was plundered, its walls razed, and a Syrian garrison put into the city. And now Antiochus considered the occasion ripe for a master stroke. On the 27th of October, 168, he issued the insane decree which was intended to exterminate Judaism root and branch. All the sacred writings of the Jews were to be delivered up and destroyed, the exercise of the Jewish religion was forbidden on pain of death, all the Jews were to sacrifice to the Greek gods and the temple at Jerusalem was to become a sanctuary of Olympian Zeus. The abomination of desolation was actually established in the sacred place, and on the 25th of December, 168, the first sacrifice was offered to Zeus there—whether by the high priest Menelaus we do not know. The commands of the king were executed with unexampled severity and the subordinate functionaries of authority evidently took fiendish delight in harassing and tormenting in every imaginable way the Jews who were loyal to the law ; one is reminded involuntarily of the dragonades under

Louis XIV. when one reads the accounts in the Books of Maccabees.

Thus the Jews were to be made Greeks by garrisons of occupation and executioners ; but now the measure was full and with elemental power the rebellion burst forth.

The signal for revolt was given by Mattathias, an aged and respected priest in the little city of Modin. He slew the captain who was sent to Hellenise Modin and tore down the altar of Zeus. Then he cried with a loud voice : "Whoever is zealous for the law and will remain faithful to the covenant, let him follow me !" and marched with those who joined him to the mountains. The example had its effect. Everywhere the pious rebelled and withdrew into the mountains and wastes, a veritable "church of the desert."

Such a band was attacked by Syrian troops on the Sabbath ; faithful to the law, they let themselves be slaughtered without raising a hand on the sacred day of rest. Thereupon Mattathias supported by popular decree promulgated the regulation that they were to defend themselves even on the Sabbath, and must do it when attacked. More and more pious enthusiasts gathered about him as a recognised leader. Now Mattathias marched about the country openly destroying the altars and taking the hostile initiative against heathen and Hellenists. But advanced in years as he was, he died in 167, in the very first beginnings of the agitation, leaving the leadership to his son Judas.

Judas Maccabæus is probably the greatest warrior whom the people of Israel ever produced ; in him the primitive heroic spirit of Israel is revived. But he achieved more than ever it did. In the course of four hundred years the people had become entirely unused to war and weapons, yet with his volunteers, supported by nothing but their faith in God and in the final victory of His holy cause, Judas scattered the largest armies and won victory after victory. He was in truth a warrior of God, who regarded war as a sacred matter and drew his sword only for God and the oppressed faith, in this his pure and ideal inspiration combined with such genius in tactics and strategy, he calls to mind spontaneously the great champion of religion, Gustavus Adolphus. His picture is spotless : he did nothing that could throw an unfavorable light upon his character or tarnish his memory. He must be reckoned among the most ideal figures in all history.

Now that a new element had come into the matter with this youthful and fiery soul, the Syrians too gathered their strength to-

gether. The commandant of Jerusalem, Apollonius, collected all the available troops, but was defeated by Judas and himself slain; Judas wore all his life the sword of the defeated opponent. Seron, commandant of Syria, fared no better; despite the superiority of his numbers, his hosts were scattered at Bethhoron, and Judea was freed. This took place in the year 166 B. C.

Now Antiochus realised that earnest measures were necessary against the Jewish rebels; he himself crossed the Euphrates to plunder the rich temples there; Lysias, the imperial vicegerent, was to suppress the rebellion with half of the forces of the empire. At first Lysias sent three experienced generals: Ptolemy, Nicanor, and Gorgias, with nearly fifty thousand men to Judea, to exterminate the Jews, and so impossible did resistance to this mighty force appear that dealers appeared from all quarters to buy up the captive Jews at an extraordinarily low price fixed in advance. But Judas did not lose courage nor his faith in God. He was stationed with his forces at Mizpah, the Syrians at Emmaus. Gorgias planned to surprise the Jewish camp by night with a small force, but Judas anticipated him and undertook the initiative with an attack on the Syrian camp which ended in a total defeat, so that the great army fled in a lamentable condition.

Then the imperial regent Lysias himself undertook the command and invaded Judea from the south with sixty-five thousand men. Judas had only ten thousand with which to oppose him, but again the victory was to the death-defying army; at Bethsura, southward of Jerusalem, Lysias too was defeated and had to seek safety in flight.

After this victory Judas considered the time come to wipe out the insult done the sanctuary: he marched to Jerusalem, and beneath the very eyes of the Syrian garrison, whom Judas held in check, the temple was consecrated anew, all the abominations of idolatry were removed, and on the 25th of December, 165, that is just three years after the first sacrifice had been offered to Olympian Zeus, once more a burnt offering was smoking according to the regulations of the law of Moses, a sweet savor to God, and this day became a fixed festival for Israel.

Judas restored the overthrown walls of Jerusalem and fortified also Bethsura, where he had won that magnificent victory, in order to block the approach to Jerusalem from the south. But this great success had serious results: everywhere in the surrounding districts began persecutions of the Jews, the Syrians attacking and slaying them. Accordingly Judas with his two brothers, Jonathan

and Simon, marched about chastising the heathen and bringing the persecuted Jews to Jerusalem and Judea, where they were received with rejoicings.

But there was still a sharp thorn in their flesh: the citadel of Jerusalem was still in the hands of the Syrians, and the garrison did the Jews much damage. So Judas set about besieging them. At this there came urgent calls for help to Antiochia, especially from the Hellenistic Jews, and Lysias determined to use all his forces to suppress the rebellion. He gathered 100,000 infantry, 20,000 cavalry, and 32 elephants, and took to the war with him the young king, Antiochus V., who had succeeded his father recently deceased. Again the attack was made from the south. The Syrians besieged Bethsura, and Judas was therefore obliged to leave Jerusalem and hasten to the aid of the hard pressed fortress.

The forces met at Bethzachariah. Although the Jews again performed marvels of bravery—Eleazar, a brother of Judas, fought his way through the whole host to a particularly large elephant upon which he supposed the young king to be, he killed the elephant and was himself crushed to death by the animal in its fall—they were utterly defeated and themselves besieged in Jerusalem. Bethsura fell, and Jerusalem also was in great straits, when events in the Syrian Empire brought relief.

Antiochus Epiphanes on his death-bed had formally bequeathed to his general Philip the guardianship of his son together with the regency. Accordingly Lysias made peace with the Jews in the name of the young king. They were granted free exit from the city and perfectly unrestricted exercise of their religion for all time, but the walls of Jerusalem were razed to the ground; the fortresses, of course, remained in the hands of the Syrians. In addition, Lysias executed the high priest Menelaus as the real instigator of the whole troublesome affair, and then marched upon Antiochia where he quickly conquered Philip. This was in the year 163.

With this event we are at a turning-point in affairs. The object for which the sword had been drawn was attained, and religious freedom for all times recognised. In fact, there was one group, the "pious" as they have been especially called, standing for exclusively religious interests, who were satisfied with this and wished nothing further. If the Syrians had proceeded with moderation and good sense, all would probably have remained in *statu quo*, and Judea would not have thought of shaking off the Syrian yoke. But shortsightedness and infatuation threw everything into confusion again.

In the year 162 Demetrius, the son of Seleucus IV., the rightful heir, returned to his country, and soon Lysias and Antiochus V. ended their careers under the axe. Now came the question of appointing a new occupant of the high-priesthood. An Aaronite named Alcimus, accordingly in this respect qualified for the office, applied to Demetrius as sovereign for the tiara; Demetrius conferred it upon him and sent Bacchides with some troops to Judea.

The "pious" were the very ones who met Alcimus with confidence; but Alcimus was a Hellenist through and through and began his official career with an immoderate attack upon the "pious," so that Judas Maccabæus was compelled to resort to the sword again in self-defence. Alcimus did not feel secure and asked Demetrius for reinforcements. Nicanor was sent to Judea with a large army. He tried first to get possession of Judas by cunning, but Judas did not go into the trap, and so they met in the battle at Caphar-salama. Once more victory was favorable to Judas; Nicanor was obliged to retreat, and on his transit through Jerusalem uttered the most terrible threats against city and temple.

Strengthened by new forces, Nicanor took position at Beth-horon. Judas had but three thousand men at his disposal, but full of confidence in God he threw himself upon the superior force of the enemy. On the 13th of March there was a battle at Adasar; at the very beginning of it Nicanor fell, and the whole army poured out of the country in wild flight. So marvellous was this victory, so evidently was the hand of God in it, that the day was celebrated as the day of Nicanor.

By this time Judas was convinced that only separation from the Syrian Empire could give the people peace and permanence to religion, and this, political and national independence, but only as a guaranty and indispensable condition of religious freedom, becomes henceforth the conscious object of his struggle and contention.

Immediately after the battle of Adasar, Judas entered into negotiations with Rome, sending two ambassadors to the senate who were to establish a friendly alliance with Rome; the senate, to which any weakening of the Syrian power was welcome, gladly agreed to this. But when the ambassadors returned from Rome all was lost for the time being.

Scarcely had Demetrius received the news of the defeat at Adasar when in the very next month he sent Bacchides with a new and powerful army after Judas. Now the case seemed so hopeless that Judas's troops dwindled to 800 men. But Judas preferred an

honorable death to a life in disgrace. With his little band of desperate men he undertook the death struggle at Elasa; all day long the heroic band held its own and even won some points of advantage, but toward evening Judas fell, and with that the fate of the day was determined. His supporters were able to carry off in safety the corpse of the fallen hero and to bury him honorably in the tomb of his fathers at Modin; so even this last battle of Judas was not a real defeat, but his followers could not hide from themselves the fact that they were beaten and defenceless.

Now Alcimus continued his reign of terror, and the Syrian troops and commandants gave him hearty assistance in hunting down and murdering those of the national party. The latter chose Jonathan, the younger brother of Judas, as their leader and withdrew into the desert of Judah and to the east side of the Jordan. A third brother, John, was indeed slain by treachery, but Bacchides could win no permanent advantages in this guerilla war; therefore he had a number of cities fortified and occupied by strong Syrian garrisons and the children of the most prominent Jewish families taken as hostages to the citadel of Jerusalem. And when finally Alcimus died suddenly of apoplexy during the execution of some alteration on the temple, Bacchides left the country in May, 160.

Jonathan, who of course continued the struggle against the Hellenists with all the means at his disposal, must have made great progress in the next two years for in 158 the Hellenists again apply to Demetrius, who again sends Bacchides into the country.

Again Jonathan and Simon withdrew to the desert and carried on a guerrilla warfare so successfully and so skilfully that Bacchides caused the leaders of the Hellenistic party who had persuaded him to undertake the hopeless task, to be executed, and concluded with Jonathan a peace which gave the latter quite his own way in local affairs.

The Hellenistic administration in Jerusalem indeed remained under the wing of the Syrian garrison, but six miles from Jerusalem, at Mizpah, Jonathan set up a regular rival government and was soon *de facto* ruler of the country. And his highest hopes were to be surpassed by the favor of circumstances.

Demetrius was an energetic monarch, and a thorn in the flesh of his neighbors. And now an unparalleled comedy was played. In Smyrna lived an obscure young man, named Alexander Balas, who had a striking resemblance to Antiochus Epiphanes, and claimed to be his son. The kings of Egypt, Cappadocia and Pergamon actually backed this young man and set him up as claimant

to the throne, and the whole disreputable crew took the field against Demetrius in the summer of 153.

Now Jonathan was a welcome ally. First Demetrius courted him, appointed him Syrian prefect and returned the hostages. Jonathan immediately appeared before Jerusalem, received the hostages, expelled the Hellenists and began directly to rebuild the walls torn down by Antiochus and Lysias ; only Bethsura remained in the hands of his opponents.

But Balas too made promises : appointed Jonathan high priest and sent him the purple robe and golden crown. Jonathan had no hesitation at receiving the pallium from such besmirched hands ; at the feast of tabernacles, in the year 150, he appeared as high priest for the first time in public, and from this day the office of high priest was reserved to the family of the Maccabees until its extinction.

Thus Jonathan was recognised in fact as ruler of Judea. He remained faithful to Alexander and had no occasion to regret it ; in the year 150 Demetrius fell and Alexander Balas was king in the empire of the Seleucidæ. The lucky swindler had the presumption to sue to Ptolemy for the hand of his daughter Cleopatra, and actually received it. When the marriage was celebrated Jonathan too was invited and was overwhelmed with honors by Alexander.

From this weakling who spent his reign in the most vulgar excesses there was no danger to be expected, but in the year 147 Demetrius II., son of the preceding Demetrius, appeared as claimant to the throne against Alexander. Jonathan remained on the side of Alexander and rendered him important aid : but in the year 145 the adventurer met a disgraceful death and Demetrius II. became king.

Jonathan had meantime ventured to besiege the citadel of Jerusalem, when he was summoned to appear before Demetrius. He actually presented himself, but did not immediately raise the siege ; on the contrary, he managed to frighten Demetrius into fulfilling all previous concessions to him and received considerable extensions of his territory and freedom from taxation. Only the citadel of Jerusalem and a few fortresses remained in Syrian hands.

Soon Jonathan was able to show his gratitude. Demetrius had quickly made himself odious and a general rebellion broke out against him. Trypho, a general of Alexander Balas, set up the latter's little son as anti-king ; even the troops in Antiochia deserted Demetrius, who was in such straits that he appealed to Jonathan for help and promised him in return the evacuation of all the

remaining places held by Syrian garrisons. Jonathan immediately marched to his aid, and his troops succeeded in suppressing the rebellion and in establishing Demetrius upon his throne. But now that the danger was past Demetrius had no intention to keep his word. Thereat Jonathan espoused the cause of Trypho, and waged war upon Demetrius so successfully that Jewish arms carried victory beyond Damascus, while his brother Simon finally captured Bethsura, so that the only Syrian garrison remaining was that in Jerusalem.

Jonathan sent an embassy to Rome to renew his alliance, and also made a treaty with Sparta. Trypho was grateful of course for the help he had received, confirmed the previous concessions and added new ones. But as the advantage turned more and more to his side he became suspicious of the growing power of his Jewish friend and ally. Trypho managed to persuade Jonathan that the maintenance of so large an army was unnecessary in view of their tried friendship. Jonathan actually allowed himself to be deceived, dismissed his troops, and went with only one thousand men to Trypho at Ptolemais. Trypho had the thousand men cut down, took Jonathan prisoner and moved immediately upon Jerusalem. Simon, the sole surviving brother, came out to meet him; Trypho told him that he had a financial claim against Jonathan, and that he would release Jonathan directly if the money were paid and Jonathan's sons given as hostages. The money and the hostages were actually given up to him, but he did not release Jonathan; on the contrary, he attempted to take Jerusalem by surprise, but this could not be carried out because of a sudden great snow-fall. Thereupon he had Jonathan and his sons murdered and returned to Syria. This happened in the winter of 143-142.

In Jonathan we have the real founder of the Maccabean state. He is not to be compared with his brother Judas in moral greatness, but he is a gifted statesman, who understood how to reach his ends by a shrewd use of circumstances, an important character and decidedly a great man.

After the death of himself and sons, Simon was his recognised successor. Simon naturally put himself into touch with Demetrius, and received from him the confirmation of all previous concessions and entire freedom in future from tribute, which was the recognition in fact of the independence of the Jews from the Syrian dominion. Simon captured the important fortress of Gazara, and finally, on the 23rd of May, 142, the citadel of Jerusalem also capitulated, and Simon celebrated his triumphal entry with great pomp.

Thus the last trace of the Syrian overlordship was extinguished, and Simon was the sovereign ecclesiastical and secular prince of the Jews. And this fact did not fail to receive formal and legal sanction. On the 18th of September, 141, took place a great popular assembly in which Simon was solemnly confirmed as permanent prince and high priest, and the office declared hereditary in his family. From that day there is again a national Jewish state, and the Jews now reckon dates from the high-priesthood of Simon. Rome, too, whither Simon immediately turned, formally and solemnly recognised him in his offices.

When Simon's father, Mattathias, took the sword twenty-six years before certainly no one would have foreseen the outcome. Will not the fact that the movement ended otherwise than it began finally bring down a judgment upon it? The spirit is not to be mocked, and nothing can hope for permanence which contains an inner and inherent contradiction. Soon the Maccabees found themselves compelled to combat the very spirit which had carried them and lifted them to the throne; but the idea is superior to violence, and the state of the Maccabees was wrecked upon this inner contradiction.