E03162

THE

HISTORY

OF THE

HEBREW COMMONWEALTH,

FROM THE EARLIEST TIMES TO THE

DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM A.D. 72.

TRANSLATED FROM THE GERMAN OF

JOHN JAHN, D.D.

FORMERLY PROFESSOR OF THE ORIENTAL LANGUAGES, OF BIBLICAL ANTIQUITIES, AND OF THEOLOGY, IN THE UNIVERSITY OF VIENNA:

WITH A

CONTINUATION TO THE TIME OF ADRIAN.

VOL. I.

LONDON

HURST, CHANCE, AND CO.

1829.

ADVERTISEMENT.

IT is the duty of a translator to give a faithful representation of his author's meaning, without violating the purity of his own language. In executing the following work I have uniformly endeavoured to make this principle my guide; but I have found it more difficult to adhere to than I supposed it would be before I commenced the task. There is such a total diversity in the whole mode of constructing sentences in the German and English languages, that it is no easy achievement for a translator to do justice to himself, and at the same time remain faithful to his original. I hope, however, I can venture to say that I have not failed, in any important instance, to give a true expression of my author's meaning; but I must leave the reader to judge how far I have succeeded in preserving the purity of the English language.

In the course of the work a few slight alterations were deemed expedient, which may be seen and appreciated by those who will take the trouble to compare the translation with the original. Most of the references to scripture have been reexamined, and numerous errors in them corrected; and the same has been done in regard to references to the classics, so far as I could have access to the proper editions. In the original these references are all intermingled with the text; but in the translation

they have been removed to the bottom of the page, in order to prevent the interruption occasioned by the former method. To assist the reader in the investigation of the prophecies of the Old Testament, I have taken pains to prepare an index of all those illustrated in this book.

The translation of JAHN was nearly through the press when professor STUART suggested the propriety of continuing the narrative down to the reign of Adrian. This seemed necessary to a complete view of the history of the Hebrews, as that was the time when their national existence actually terminated. It was, therefore, my earnest wish to continue the history; but my health being then so much reduced that I could not undertake the task myself, I requested a friend to furnish me with a translation of that part of Basnage's *Histoire des Juifs*, which relates to this period. The result of his labours will be seen in the Appendix, commencing at page 209 of the second volume.

I cannot conclude without expressing my obligations to professor STUART for the interest which he has taken in this work, and for the encouragement which he has afforded me in the execution of it.

I would also cheerfully acknowledge the assistance which I have received from professor GIBBS of New Haven, whose judicious and well-timed criticisms enabled me to correct many errors and supply several deficiencies in the first sheets of the translation.

CALVIN E. STOWE.

Andover Theological Seminary,
Nov. 7, 1828.

PREFACE.

Of all the nations that have yet existed in our world, the Jewish is the most singular and interesting. History gives no knowledge of any people who have preserved a separate and distinct existence for so long a period, and at the same time maintained, for substance, most of their religious rites and customs. Their present existence, as a separate and distinct nation in many respects, and yet scattered over the whole earth, may justly be considered as a kind of standing miracle, in attestation of the facts concerning them which are recorded in their sacred books. What reason can be given, that all other nations, however peculiar in their religion and laws have been swallowed up in the vortex of time, or have been so commingled with foreigners by conquest or emigration, that no traces of them as a living and distinct people are any more to be found; while the Jews remain what they were three thousand years ago? The history contained in the Old Testament, and this only, gives an adequate and satisfactory answer to this question.

The Christian religion is built upon the Jewish. The Christian scriptures are intimately connected with the Jewish sacred books, and they cannot be understood and explained, except by means of them. The words of the New Testament are Greek; but its idioms, its costume,

its manner of thought and reasoning, its allusions, in short the *tout ensemble* of it, is Jewish; nor can these ever be duly understood by any person who is ignorant of the Jewish nation, its laws, customs, and history.

The design of the principal part of the present volume is to impart a succinct and critically-arranged history of the Hebrews, from their first rise in Abraham down to the destruction of Jerusalem, when their proper national existence may be said to have been suspended. We have no book, in our language, which does this in such a manner as to satisfy the wants of a critical student at the present time. The works of Shuckford and Prideaux, which, in respect to learning, may be mentioned with approbation, particularly the latter, are so copious, and contain so much irrelevant, not to say uninteresting, matter, that the student goes through them with great toil, and with little fruit of his labour. Other books are of a popular form, and ill adapted to the wants of a critical inquirer.

Jahn has bestowed great pains and labour on the following work. None of his numerous publications give higher evidence of critical research than the present. The labour bestowed in harmonizing the various accounts of persons and occurrences contained in the Old Testament, is in itself great and useful; and that bestowed on the prophecies contained in the sacred volume, in order to exhibit the fulfilment of them, the student will find to be valuable.

Besides a regular and continuous history of the Jews, Jahn has also given a succinct account of all the other nations connected with them; so that the student may regard the present book as containing an epitome of the ancient history of Western Asia, and of Eastern Europe. For example: the history of the Assyrians, Egyptians, Canaanites, Babylonians, Medes, Persians, the Greeks in Europe and Asia, and of the Romans, besides many other

short historical sketches, is here briefly presented to the reader with all its substantial features. In addition to this, references are everywhere made to the sources from which the information is drawn; so that the student has before him a kind of general directory for an extensive course of reading, in regard to all these topics.

I know of no book in our language, so well adapted as this volume, to accompany the Archæology of Jahn, which has already found so much approbation with our religious public[1]. It bears manifest impressions of the same diligence, care, sound judgment, and unwearied effort.

If all the conclusions in this work should not hold the test of farther critical investigation, it will not be strange; for what history, so various and important as this, has been composed at any time, except under special divine guidance, of which it could be said, that it contained no mistakes? If the writer has committed mistakes, he has, at least, furnished his readers with references to such sources as may enable them to make the requisite corrections. And this is all that we can reasonably ask of any writer, who has bestowed as much labour and time on a work which he publishes, as he could possibly bestow.

I would urge it upon every theological student, in a particular manner, to make himself familiar with this work throughout. It is impossible that he should not reap the benefit of such an acquisition.

In regard to the Appendix, it may be said, that it fills up a chasm in the history of the Jews, which it is desirable to have supplied. Basnage is a discursive, loose writer, as to style; but on the whole a sober-minded man, and by no means destitute of critical ability. One might well spare the putid fables and stories of rabbins, which he has

[1] This work has also been recommended by Dr. Loyd, the present bishop of Oxford, as regius-professor of divinity.

so copiously inserted; but they could not be separated from his work, without more labour than it would cost to write a new history. The second destruction of the Jews under Adrian, about half a century after the first, was more dreadful than the first; and it makes a crisis in their history, to which a student naturally wishes to come, before he stops in his investigations. On this account the Appendix is desirable. The account also of the subsequent dispersions of the Jews, which is superadded, will be found to be useful.

In regard to the translation, it was undertaken by Mr. STOWE, at my request; and it is performed in a manner which entirely satisfies me, and which, I hope, will satisfy the public[2].

I shall merely add the expression of my earnest hope and wish, that Mr. STOWE may find his labours acceptable to the public; and that this book, on which he has expended so much time and pains, may prove to be as useful and important as those have deemed it, who have been concerned with bringing it before the world, in its present form.

M. STUART.

Andover Theological Seminary,
Nov. 7, 1828.

[2] In this edition the whole has been thoroughly revised, and such alterations made as seemed requisite to render the author's meaning clear and intelligible. The American edition indeed was so totally unfit for English readers as to make this absolutely necessary.

CONTENTS OF VOLUME THE FIRST.

BOOK I.

SURVEY OF BIBLICAL HISTORY TO THE DEPARTURE OF THE HEBREWS FROM EGYPT.

Sect.		Page.
1.	Origin of Civil Society	1
2.	Civil Society before the Flood	4
3.	——— after the Flood	5
4.	——— at the time of Abraham	10
5.	——— at the time of Jacob	14
6.	——— at the time of Moses	16
7.	Departure of the Hebrews from Egypt	21

BOOK II.

CIVIL CONSTITUTION OF THE HEBREWS.

8.	Government of the Hebrews before the Mosaic Law	24
9.	Fundamental Law of the Mosaic Institutions	27
10.	Relation of the Hebrews to other Nations	36
11.	Hebrew Magistrates	45
12.	The Learned Class	49
13.	Relation of the Tribes to each other	56
14.	Legislative Assemblies	58
15.	Form of Government	61
16.	The Chief Magistrate	64
17.	March of the Hebrews from Horeb to Canaan	67
18.	The last Acts of Moses	72

BOOK III.

HISTORICAL SURVEY FROM THE DEATH OF MOSES TO THE INTRODUCTION OF MONARCHY.

19.	Conquest of the Land of Canaan	75
20.	Theocracy from Joshua to Samuel	78

Sect. Page.
21. Predominant States from Joshua to Samuel - - - 80
22. Office of the Judges - - - - - - - 86
23. Condition of the Hebrews in the Time of the Judges - - 88

BOOK IV.

FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF MONARCHY TO THE REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES.

24. The Rulers request a King - - - - - - - 91
25. The Institution of Monarchy - - - - - - - 92
26. Limitations of the Royal Power - - - - - - 94
27. The Reign of Saul - - - - - - - - - 97
28. David anointed King. Saul's Conduct - - - - - 99
29. Saul persecutes David - - - - - - - - 101
30. Death of Saul. David, king over Judæa - - - - - 104
31. The Reign of David - - - - - - - - 106
32. Character of David - - - - - - - - - 109
33. The Reign of Solomon - - - - - - - - 112

BOOK V.

FROM THE REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES TO THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY.

34. Revolt of the Ten Tribes - - - - - - - - 118
35. General View of the two Kingdoms - - - - - - 119
36. Israel from B. C. 975 to 884 - - - - - - - 124
37. Judah from B. C. 975 to 884 - - - - - - - 129
38. Israel from B. C. 884 to 759 - - - - - - - 134
39. Judah from B. C. 884 to 759 - - - - - - - 137
40. Israel from B. C. 759 to 722 - - - - - - - 140
41. Judah from B. C. 759 to 699 - - - - - - - 143
42. ——————— 699 to 611 - - - - - - - 150
43. ——————— 611 to 588 - - - - - - - 153

BOOK VI.

THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY.

44. Theocracy of the Hebrews during the Captivity - - - 158
45. Condition of the Hebrews during the Captivity - - - 161
46. Nabopolassar and Nebuchadnezzar - - - - - 164
47. Evil-Merodach. Nabonned - - - - - - 167
48. Survey of the History of Media - - - - - - 169
49. Fall of the Chaldæo-Babylonian Empire - - - - - 170
50. Conquest of Babylon - - - - - - - - 175

BOOK VII.

FROM THE RETURN OF THE HEBREWS TO THE TIME OF ALEXANDER.

Sect. Page.

51. Release of the Hebrews - - - - - - - - 179
52. First Caravan of the Hebrews to Judæa - - - - 181
53. Return of the Ten Tribes - - - - - - - - 183
54. Building of the Temple - - - - - - - - 184
55. Historical Survey of the Persian Empire - - - - 186
56. Reigns of Cambyses and Smerdis - - - - - 187
57. Reign of Darius Hystaspes - - - - - - - 189
58. Reign of Xerxes the first - - - - - - - - 193
59. Second Caravan of the Hebrews to Judæa - - - - 199
60. Artaxerxes Longimanus - - - - - - - - 201
61. Nehemiah Governor of Judæa - - - - - - - 204
62. Xerxes the second. Sogdianus. Darius Nothus - - 206
63. Second Administration of Nehemiah - - - - - 209
64. Samaritan Temple on Mount Gerizim - - - - 212
65. Artaxerxes Mnemon - - - - - - - - 214
66. The Hebrews under Artaxerxes Mnemon - - - - 218
67. Darius Ochus - - - - - - - - - 220
68. The Hebrews under Ochus - - - - - - - 223
69. Arses. Darius Codomanus - - - - - - - 224

BOOK VIII.

HISTORY OF ALEXANDER AND HIS IMMEDIATE SUCCESSORS.

70. First Victories of Alexander - - - - - - 226
71. Alexander at Jerusalem - - - - - - - - 229
72. Destruction of the Persian Empire - - - - - 233
73. Alexander, B. C. 327—323 - - - - - - - 238
74. Aridæus and Alexander Ægus - - - - - - 240
75. Wars of the Provincial Governors - - - - - 241
76. The Jews under Ptolemey - - - - - - - 243
77. War between Antigonus and Eumenes - - - - 245
78. Wars of Antigonus - - - - - - - - 247
79. Condition of the Jews B. C. 320—311 - - - - 250
80. The Wars renewed B. C. 311—305 - - - - - 254
81. Partition of the Empire B. C. 305—301 - - - - 257

BOOK IX.

FROM THE PARTITION OF THE EMPIRE TO THE TIME OF ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES.

82. History of the four Kingdoms B. C. 301—279 - - - 261
83. The Jews B. C. 311—279 - - - - - - - 266

Sect. Page.

84. Antiochus Soter B. C. 279—260 - - - - - 269
85. Antiochus Theos B. C. 260—245 - - - - - 271
86. Syria and Egypt B. C. 245—221 - - - - - 274
87. The Jews B. C. 279—221 - - - - - - 278
88. Syria and Egypt B. C. 221—204 - - - - - 281
89. Antiochus the Great B. C. 204—187 - - - - 287
90. The Jews B. C. 221—187 - - - - - - 296
91. Seleucus Philopator B. C. 186—175 - - - - 300

BOOK X.

ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES AND THE MACCABEES TO THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE JEWS.

92. Antiochus Epiphanes - - - - - - - 305
93. Antiochus Epiphanes B. C. 175—171 - - - - 307
94. Campaigns of Antiochus Epiphanes in Egypt B. C. 171—167 311
95. Revolt of the Jews B. C. 167—166 - - - - - 317
96. War between the Jews and Syrians B. C. 165—163 - - 323
97. Antiochus Eupator B. C. 164—163 - - - - 330
98. Demetrius Soter B. C. 162—154 - - - - - 334
99. Alexander Balas B. C. 154—146 - - - - - 343
100. Demetrius Nicator B. C. 146—144 - - - - - 349
101. Antiochus Theos the second B. C. 144—143 - - - 353

BOOK XI.

HISTORY OF THE JEWS DURING THEIR INDEPENDENCE, FROM B. C. 143—63.

102. Independence of the Jews B. C. 143 - - - - 358
103. Simon Prince of the Jews B. C. 141—135 - - - 360
104. John Hyrcanus B. C. 135—106 - - - - - 367
105. Aristobulus the first, King of the Jews B. C. 105 - - 378
106. Alexander Janneus B. C. 104—77 - - - - - 380
107. Alexandra Queen of the Jews B. C. 77—68 - - - 395
108. Aristobulus the second, King of the Jews B. C. 67—63 - 400

THE HISTORY

HEBREW COMMONWEALTH.

BOOK I.

SURVEY OF BIBLICAL HISTORY TO THE DEPARTURE OF THE HEBREWS FROM EGYPT.

§. 1. ORIGIN OF CIVIL SOCIETY.

AN observance of the laws of marriage and a regard to the rights of private property, presuppose a mutual understanding among men to abstain from disturbing each other in their possessions, to repel lawless aggressors by force, or to punish them as they deserve, and thus to check all encroachments on the rights of others. For securing these purposes the combined strength of many individuals is often requisite; and consequently, in the early stages of human improvement, a numerous progeny, particularly of sons, is earnestly desired and highly valued as a means of defence. But the members of one family, however numerous, are not always able to maintain their own rights, and often needing the aid of those in their vicinity, they readily grant them assistance in similar circumstances. This need of mutual support against the attacks of wild beasts and of human foes, and a consequent willingness to help one another, induced men to form compacts for their common defence. These compacts were confirmed by

the religious sanction of an oath. Men were therefore soon united respecting the external observances of religion, and the public worship of God was very early introduced. Such is the origin of civil society, as appears both from the natural course of human affairs and from history. The most ancient law, which we call common law, and the earliest statutes of which we have any knowledge, refer only to marriage, private property, the punishment of transgressors, and the duties of religion[1].

As new occasions and new necessities arose, these first principles of society were gradually strengthened, improved, and enlarged by other compacts and laws, either expressly enacted or tacitly admitted. As individuals endeavoured to increase their property, to lighten their labours, to attain more comfort and enjoyment, and in every way to improve their circumstances, society itself acquired firmness and strength; and was aided in its progress by an increasing abundance of food, as well as by inventions and improvements in the arts. Individuals multiplied and became more powerful against their external foes; and as their internal regulations kept pace with their increase and growing strength, the whole community was continually rising to a still higher degree of perfection.

History exhibits a great difference in this respect between the nomadic and the settled nations; a difference which can be easily accounted for by a view of the circumstances of these two states of society. The social bond was very weak among those who lived as herdsmen and hunters, for they were continually roving about with their herds, and attached themselves to no fixed abode; and though they were for the most part related to each other, their residence together was entirely voluntary[2]. As they retained this mode of life from a love of independence, they willingly renounced the pleasures and advantages of a society more closely united, rather than

[1] Goguet l'Origin des Loix, des Arts, etc. t. i. p. 1 and 11.

[2] Gen. xiii. 9—12.

restrict their liberty by civil laws. They did not even wish to reach any higher degree of perfection. If their chiefs or emirs had more enlightened views, and were desirous of improvement, they could not contravene the prejudices of their subjects without subverting their own authority. In such a state of society it was difficult to prevent rapine and its attendant evils, for expert robbers could easily commit depredations upon the wandering herds and escape unpunished.

Men, on the contrary, who have fixed dwellings and employ themselves in tillage, become attached to the soil which affords nourishment to themselves and their families, and are reluctant to tear themselves from their immoveable property. They are desirous to improve their possessions, and to secure them from the attacks of robbers and wild beasts. The bond of social life is more closely drawn; the community is enlivened by a spirit of activity, whence arise inventions and improvements in the arts, a greater abundance and variety of food, and many comforts and pleasures, all which have a tendency to elevate the human character. The necessity of reciprocal aid for the common defence, renders compacts more firm and durable. Thence men derive succour in sudden emergencies. They readily relinquish the privileges of complete independence, when such important advantages can be gained by so small a sacrifice. They experience the happiness resulting from a community closely connected, and will not part with it unless hostile invasions, or other adverse occurrences, compel them to emigrate. A community may be scattered by distant emigrations, or broken up by failures in husbandry; and these circumstances may occasion a return to the savage state. A second elevation to civil society after such a relapse is slow and difficult.

§ 2. CIVIL SOCIETY BEFORE THE FLOOD.

In the fragments of antediluvian history preserved by Moses, there is nothing explicit respecting civil societies. If there was any authentic information on this subject extant in his time, it did not come within the scope of the book of Genesis, which was designed merely as an introduction to the history of the Mosaic legislation. As such, it preserves a knowledge of the Creator, gives a general view of the conduct of men, and a more particular account of the ancestors of the Hebrews, from the creation of man to the origin of the Hebrew commonwealth.

The first man undoubtedly kept his children and other descendants about him as long as possible, and exercised paternal authority over them. Cain was the first who separated from his father's society, and he was impelled to this step through fear of punishment for the murder of his brother. In the course of time, various motives, such as a desire to obtain land for cultivation, or pasturage for cattle, might induce others to follow his example. Thus there arose separate families which were governed by their own patriarchs. This is the state of nature, that golden age which the prophets and poets of later times have painted in the liveliest colours, and exhibited as a picture of perfect happiness[1].

When families had increased to tribes and nations, then without doubt civil societies began. Even at this early period we find that men were engaged in agriculture and in the improvement of the arts; that the laws of marriage, the rights of private property, and the public institutions of religion, were recognised and observed[2]. These societies, however, during the ten generations enumerated in the fifth chapter of Genesis, were very imperfect; for those lawless deeds of violence which arose

[1] Is. ii. 4. xi. 6—9. lxv. 17—25. Joel, iii. 18. Micah, iv. 1—5. Ovid, Metam. i. 89. Virgil, Ecl. iv.

[2] Gen. ii. 15. iv. 2, 3. 17—22. v. 29.

from profligacy and impiety, prove but too clearly, that the power of the strong then generally passed for right[3]. Those famous heroes of great stature, the giants of the old world, who are mentioned as the authors of these crimes, were either powerful chiefs who engaged in open wars, or perhaps merely wandering robbers, who with their lawless bands everywhere plundered and murdered the defenceless. The prevailing form of government during this period was probably the patriarchal; though the patriarchs were either unable to restrain and bring to punishment strong-handed transgressors, or swayed by the ties of relationship, and in some cases perhaps by a participation in the spoil, they were unwilling to exert their authority for this purpose.

§. 3. CIVIL SOCIETY AFTER THE FLOOD.

THE family of Noah retained a knowledge of the first principles of civil society, and of the infant arts which had existed before the deluge; and some of them again applying themselves to husbandry, we find them in Egypt and Southern Asia soon reunited as political communities. At first the new race of men seem to have acknowledged the patriarchal authority of Noah and his lineal descendants. But after the dispersion which followed the unsuccessful attempt to build the tower of Babel, Nimrod, the celebrated hunter and hero, laid the foundation of the Babylonian kingdom. In consequence of the protection which he afforded to the people against wild beasts, he may by their own consent have become their leader and chief, or turning his weapons of hunting against men, he may have compelled them to submit to his dominion. His name seems to favour the latter supposition[1]. His empire extended from Babylon in Meso-

[3] Gen. vi. 4. 11. 13, compare ix. 3—6. Gen. iv. 26, compare vi. 2.

[1] נִמְרוֹד from מָרַד *to rebel*. Gen. x. 8—10. Perizonius, Orig. Babyl. 112. 230—239. 263. 304.

potamia, towards the north over Calneh (Ctesiphon) as far as Accad (Nisibis) and Erech (Edessa), including the whole land of Shinar. But however powerful this empire was for those times, we cannot suppose it to have been either populous or well organised. Even the four cities which are mentioned as the strong holds of this kingdom, were nothing more than small villages slightly fortified. As this was the first attempt to establish an extensive domain, it must have been universally disagreeable to the men of that period. Consequently we shall find that it was of short duration, and Nimrod's Babylon must not be regarded as the germ of that universal monarchy which took its rise, as will be shown hereafter, in a later age, and among a different people.

The kingdom of Assyria was established soon after in the region subsequently denominated Adiabene, situated between the rivers Lycus and Caprus, the greater and smaller Zab. The cities or fortified places of this empire were Nineveh, Rehoboth, Calah, and Resen. The latter being distinguished by Moses as a great city, was probably at that period the metropolis. This monarchy was also of small extent, and its existence is for many ages unnoticed in history, either because it had received no accession during that time, or had been subjected to a foreign yoke. Balaam prophesied respecting its future power and final overthrow[2]; but as late as the reign of David it was an inconsiderable state. The Assyrians seem first to have distinguished themselves about two hundred years after David, and in the time of Isaiah their dominion extended to the Mediterranean sea. What the Greeks have related, therefore, of a great and very ancient Assyrian monarchy, is altogether unfounded[3].

According to the unanimous testimony of the ancients, Menes was the first king of Egypt. His reign com-

[2] Numb. xxiv. 22. 24.

[3] Gen. x. 11, 12. 2 Sam. x. 6. Michaelis, Vorrede zu Jesaias.

menced about the middle of the second century after the flood. Shuckford dates it in the year 116, and Silberschlag 195 after the flood, but Gatterer in 153[4]. The situation of his kingdom was This, afterwards called Ptolemais, between the twenty-sixth and twenty-seventh degrees of N. latitude. About the same time a second kingdom was founded at Thebes, and twenty years later a third at Memphis. As Herodotus was told by the Egyptian priests that Menes reigned over the Thebaic nomos or district, and that the rest of Egypt was then a marsh, it is obvious that by the Thebaic nomos he understands all Upper Egypt and the Heptanomis, as he afterwards observes himself that Thebes was once the name of all Egypt. Perhaps Menes gave up the southern district to one of his sons, and soon after, having confined the overflowings of the Nile by a dike, founded Memphis[5]. It appears that he here placed another of his sons. The declaration of Herodotus, that Egypt was then a marsh, can be understood of the Delta only; and even this district must have been so much raised by deposits from the Nile, as to become dry and habitable at a very early period. Tanis or Zoan, at the Tanitic mouth of the Nile, is mentioned as a well known town only two hundred years later; and Hebron, which was no new city in the time of Abraham, three hundred and sixty-seven years after the deluge, was built but seven years before Zoan[6]. Besides, the road from Canaan to Egypt was easily travelled by Abraham, but if the Delta had then been a marsh, it is hardly possible that he could have entered the country from the great plain east of Egypt, especially as the bay of Heroopolis must at that time have extended much farther north than at present. Homer, indeed, says that Pharos in his time was a day's sail from Egypt, but

[4] Gatt. Weltgesch. s. 219. Silberschlag, Chron. der Welt. s. 141. Shuckford, Connection of Sacred and Profane History, book iv. p. 136, and book ix. p. 174.

[5] Herodotus, ii. 4. 15. 99. [6] Numb. xiii. 22.

by Egypt he means the Nile, from which Pharos is a day's sail distant at the present day[7].

The Cushites, descendants of Ham, established themselves very early in south-western Arabia. They probably emigrated thither, and founded a state immediately after the first dispersion of the tribes; which seems the more likely, as Nimrod, the founder of the kingdom of Shinar, was a Cushite[8]. They therefore had possession of Arabia before the Joktanites. Hence some of the Arabs themselves denominate the Joktanites emigrated Arabians, in distinction from the Cushites, whom alone they acknowledge as the original inhabitants of the country[9]. In the reign of Asa the Cushite monarch, Zerah invaded Judæa with a numerous host, and at another time Sennacherib hastened home to Assyria on account of a false rumour that Tirhaka, king of Cush, was leading an army against him[10]. At an early period they crossed the straits of Babelmandel, and founded the African Cush, anciently called Æthiopia, and now Abyssinia, which was often united with the Arabian Cush, and governed by the same king[11]. Heeren has rendered it probable, that the order of Egyptian priests, which included the royal family, was composed of Cushites who emigrated from Abyssinia, and established governments in Egypt. If this were so, the Abyssinian Cushites must have penetrated to Egypt as early as the middle of the second century after the flood[12].

Thus anciently did the people of southern Asia establish political communities, which they gradually perfected; while the tribes who wandered to more distant regions, sank into a state of barbarism, from which they rose by slow degrees, and in which some remain at the present day.

[7] Odyss. iv. 355, compare xiv. 258. xvii. 427. [8] Gen. x. 8.

[9] Pocock, Specimen Hist. Arab. p. 39. Herbelot, Bibl. Orient. t. I. p. 215.

[10] 2 Chron. xiv. 9. 2 Kings, xix. 9. Is. xxxvii. 8, 9.

[11] Michælis, Spicil. Geogr. Hebr. ext. pt. i. p. 143—157.

[12] Heeren, Ideen uber die Politik, den Verkehr und den Handel der vornehmsten Volker der alten Welt, Th. i. s. 230. 305—317. 344, sqq. compare 419, sqq.

NOTE. In the tables of Suessmilch (Gottl. Ord. in den Verord. des Menschl. Geschl. Th. I. R. viii. s. 92.), in which he computes the increase of population after the creation and deluge, it is supposed that there were upon the earth at the middle of the second century after the deluge only about 131,072 or 262,144 persons; and at the end of this century not more than 1,048,576, or 2,097,152; a number scarcely adequate to the founding of so many and such remote states, allowing them to be of small extent. In the computation of Euler, quoted by Suessmilch (s. 295), the number is still less. This led Michælis to suspect the accuracy of the chronology deduced from Gen. xi. 10—25, and that in this genealogy some families are omitted. But he could adduce no example of such omission in those genealogical tables with which the chronology is interwoven. Eichhorn's Repert. Th. xiii. s. 168—177. But the difficulty vanishes when we observe that the calculations of both Suessmilch and Euler proceed on the supposition, that population then increased in general no faster than it does at the present day. When will men cease to measure the old world by the standard of the new, and to believe that everything in ancient times must have been just as it is now? Let any one examine Suessmilch's periods of duplication, which in the first century are placed at ten, and in the second at fifteen years, and also Euler's mode of computing, and compare them with the condition of the ancient world, when life was long, deaths unfrequent, and nothing to prevent or hinder early marriages, and their incorrectness will be perceived at once. Who will believe that Adam, during the first ten years of his life, had only two, or, according to Euler, during the first eighteen years, only six children; so that at the close of the ten years there were only four, or, of the eighteen years, only eight persons upon the earth? Or that from the marriages of the three sons of Noah there were but six children in ten years? Gatterer instituted a new mode of computation, (Einleit. in die Synchro. Universal. Hist. B. I. Th. ii. s. 118,)

according to which the rate of increase is much greater; but even he seems to make the period of duplication too long, and the number of children by one marriage too small, for such remote antiquity. I might here introduce my own calculations, by which I have shown a much more rapid increase of population after the flood; but I will in this place merely suggest the inquiry, whether in the enumeration of the family of Noah, as well as that of Jacob, (Gen. xlvi. 8—27) the servants are not omitted? If they are, then there will not be the least difficulty remaining in regard to the rapid increase of population during this period.

§. 4. CIVIL SOCIETY AT THE TIME OF ABRAHAM.

In the tenth generation after Noah, while Abraham dwelt in Canaan, (from 367 to 467 after the flood,) there were in that country several small states and kingdoms which had been founded by the descendants of Canaan, the son of Ham. These Canaanites frequently occur in the Arabian poets, historians, and scholiasts, under the name of Amalekites (*Imlikôn* and *Amalikôn*) as a very ancient, numerous, and celebrated people who inhabited Arabia before the Joktanites; and some of whom removed to Canaan, whence they were expelled by the Hebrews. Herodotus also says that the Phœnicians (who are the same as the Canaanites) originally dwelt on the coasts of the Red sea, whence they emigrated to the Mediterranean, and there engaged in navigation to distant countries[1]. We are informed in Genesis, that when Abraham arrived in Canaan the Canaanite was then in the land; a plain intimation that the Canaanites had emigrated thither not long before. The enumeration of the Canaanites among the Amalekites who inhabited Arabia Petræa, but made distant excursions into other countries, is also an

[1] Herodot. i. 1. compare Justin. Trog. xviii. 3. Abulfede, Descrip. Syr. p. 5.

indication that Arabia was their original residence[2]. Of these Canaanites there were three distinct classes.

I. The Canaanites who remained in Arabia and formed a numerous people, of whom in the seventh century there were distinguished families still in existence. In the Bible these are called Amalekites. They could not be descendants of Amalek the grandson of Esau, as they are spoken of long before his time as inhabiting the southern boundaries of Canaan. Balaam calls them one of the most ancient nations, and their king the most powerful monarch that he knew[3]. For the offence of attacking the rear of the Hebrews in their march through Arabia Petræa they received immediate punishment, besides being condemned to future extermination. Those Hebrews who attempted to penetrate into Canaan contrary to the command of God they defeated, and formed an alliance, in later times, with the Moabites and Ammonites, and also with the Midianites, against that people. They were vanquished by Saul, by David, and finally by the Simeonites in the reign of Hezekiah[4]. Being nomads, and subsisting principally by pillage, they led a wandering life, though we find them, for the most part, on the southern borders of Palæstine[5].

II. The Canaanites who emigrated to the northern coasts of Canaan and built Sidon, their most ancient capital[6].

III. The Canaanites who took possession of the interior of Palæstine[7].

[2] Gen. xi. 10—26. Pocock, Specimen Hist. Arab. p. 39. Herbelot. Bibl. Orient. t. i. p. 215. Reland, Palæst. p. 82. Gen. xii. 6. xiii. 7. xxvi. 34. xxviii. 8. Numb. xiii. 29. Ps. lxxxiii. compare Deut. iii. Josh. xii. and xiii. 2—32.

[3] Numb. xxiv. 20.

[4] Ex. xvii. 8—16. Numb. xiv. 40—45. Gen. xxxvi. 12. 1 Chron. i. 36. Gen. xiv. 7. Judg. iii. 12, 13. vi. 3, 4. 1 Sam. xv. xxvii. 8—11. xxx. 1—25. 2 Sam. viii. 12. 1 Chron. iv. 42, 43.

[5] Gen. xiv. 7. Numb. xiii. 29, 30. xiv. 45. 1 Sam. xv. 7. xxvii. 8—10. xxx. 1. 9. 15, 16.

[6] Gen. x. 15.

[7] Gen. xii. 6. compare Michælis, Spicil. Geogr. Hebr. ext. pt. i. p. 165—176.

The states in Palæstine founded by these Canaanitish tribes were small, and generally confined to a single city. The greater part of the land was unoccupied, and Abraham could pasture his herds in the open country without hindrance. It appears that the children of Heth, at Hebron, were not subject to a king. Neither did Mamre, Eshcol, and Aner, three brothers in alliance with Abraham, bear the regal title, though they, as well as he, maintained a body of armed servants. Gerar, afterwards Philistia, and Salem, afterwards Jerusalem, were governed by the kings Abimelech and Melchizedek[8].

The five cities in the vale of Siddim which is now covered by the Dead sea, viz. Sodom, Gomorrah, Admah, Zeboim, and Bela or Zoar, were under monarchical government. Chedorlaomer king of Elam (or Elymais, the ancient name of Persia) had made the kings of these cities tributary. After thirteen years of subjection they threw off the yoke; and in conjunction with their neighbours, the Rephaims of Ashteroth Karnaim, the Zuzims of Ham, the Emims of Shaveh Kiriathaim, the Horites, or dwellers in caves, of mount Seir, the Amalekites of Kadesh, and the Amorites of Hazezon Tamar, they, in the following year, made war upon their oppressor; but they and all their allies were vanquished in one battle. Though this successful expedition of the Elamite king appears so formidable when we view the number of nations concerned in it, the contending armies must have been very small: for Abraham, as soon as he heard that Lot was among the captives, pursued the victorious troops with only his three hundred and eighteen armed servants, and the bands of his confederates, Mamre, Eshcol, and Aner; and, overtaking them at Dan, near the source of the Jordan, he fell upon them by surprise in the night, retook all their booty, and drove them to Hobah, north of Damascus[9].

[8] Gen. xxiii. 4—18 xiv. 13, 14. 24. 18—20. xxi. 22—34. xxvi. 1—16.
[9] Gen. xiv.

It appears that Elam was the most powerful kingdom of that period, and that Shinar, which, with Elassar and Goiim, two nations equally unknown, was in alliance with Elam, had lost the superiority it possessed under Nimrod. Had Djemjid been a Persian instead of a Mede, the tradition respecting him would correspond very well with the scriptural account of Chedorlaomer, for Zoroaster dates the commencement of the empire which he founded a few generations after Noah. This indeed is somewhat too early, but the custom of omitting some families in the genealogical tables will easily account for such an error[10].

About 380 years after the flood, Abraham found in Egypt a well cultivated soil and an abundance of food; he found also a Pharaoh upon the throne, who had his ministers and courtiers, and who did not, like the petty king of Gerar, enter into an alliance with the patriarch as with an equal[11]. The Thinitic dynasty was then extinct, and the reigning monarch was of the dynasty of Memphis, whose dominions included a part of Upper and all Lower Egypt.

That this part of Egypt was then dry, and had been for a long time inhabited, appears from the remark already made respecting the antiquity of the city Tanis or Zoan[12].

NOTE. Greece was peopled principally by colonies from Asia Minor. These colonists were called Pelasgi because they came by sea (πέλαγος). About the time of the death of Abraham, Inachus led the first colony to Argos. About one hundred and thirty years after this, during the latter part of the life of Jacob, the Pelasgi sailed from Arcadia to Italy.

[10] Zend-Avesta, Th. i. s. 92. ii. 132. 197. 265. 304—308. iii. 99. 116. 121.

[11] Gen. xii. 10—20. xxi. 22—32.

[12] Numb. xiii. 22. Gen. xxiii. 2.

§. 5. CIVIL SOCIETY AT THE TIME OF JACOB.

DURING the two hundred and fifteen years which intervened between the arrival of Abraham in Canaan and the journey of Jacob to Egypt, the petty states of Canaan, with the exception of those on the coast who carried on an extensive trade by sea, appear to have made but little progress[1]; while Egypt, on the contrary, had advanced in civilization with a rapid pace. Towards the close of this period the Thebaic or Diospolitic dynasty became extinct, and the whole of Egypt was united under the sceptre of the Memphian Pharaoh, whose power was greatly increased in consequence of this union. To this monarch Jacob was presented by his son Joseph in the 582nd year after the flood. A well-regulated court, dignified courtiers, lifeguards, a strict ceremonial at audience, a powerful prime minister, high officers of state, a state prison under the command of the captain of the lifeguards, a scrupulous distinction of rank, all indicate a rich, flourishing, and well-ordered government[2]. The learned and the labouring class of people composed two separate tribes. The learned caste were not devoted merely to the cultivation of the sciences, but filled all the offices of government, both religious and civil. For their public services they received a stated salary from the king, although they possessed extensive landed property. This caste was divided into three orders. They kept their knowledge secret, and preserved it in hieroglyphics, the care and explanation of which were intrusted to the order of[3] חַרְטֻמִּים who were set apart for that purpose. Priests, and physicians or embalmers, were retained in the service of the great[4].

[1] Gen. xxxiv. xlix. 13.

[2] Gatterer, Weltgeshichte im ganzen Umfang. Th. i. s. 220. Gen. xxxix. 1. xl. 1—3. xli. 40—45. xlvii. 1—10.

[3] In the English translation rendered *magicians*. See Exod. vii. 11, etc.

[4] Gen. xxxvii. 22. 26. xli. 45. compare Herodot. ii. 168. Diod. Sic. i. 63. Gen. xli. 24. l. 2.

The labouring caste comprehended husbandmen, mechanics, artists, and merchants. The works of art with which Egypt abounded were various and costly. The watermen, who were so useful on account of the frequent inundations of the Nile, formed a distinct class. Shepherds, particularly nomads, who neglected agriculture, though numerous, were from motives of policy held in great disrepute[5]. The rise of a military establishment is seen in the royal lifeguards, if indeed this institution does not rather imply that such an order had been previously organized. In later times the soldiery was divided into two classes, (Κάλασιριες τὲ καὶ Ἑρμοτυβίες,) and when in its most flourishing state consisted of 400,000 or 600,000 men. They had lands assigned them in Lower Egypt, where most of them were settled. Each class was obliged to furnish an annual quota of 1,000 men for the royal lifeguards, who received pay during their term of service in natural productions[6].

At this time the king of Egypt, through his minister, provided against an impending famine by purchasing great quantities of corn, in which he afterwards carried on an extensive trade to the advantage of the crown. The Egyptians had hitherto been free from taxation, but during the famine they sold their lands to the king for corn; and when he afterwards made a new and proportional division of landed property among the people, he required a fifth part of the produce as a tax. The priests were maintained during the famine by their salary. Their lands were therefore not sold, and they were exempt from taxation. The same privilege was afterwards extended to the army[7].

Egypt, at this early period, was so celebrated for its affluence, that caravans of Ishmaelites, or Midianite merchants, went thither through Palæstine and Arabia Petræa,

[5] Gen. xli. 42, 43. xliv. 2. 12. xlv. 19—22. 27. xlvi. 5. 34. Herodot. ii. 129. vii. 164.

[6] Herodot. ii. 155. 164. 168.

[7] Gen. xli. 47—57. xlvii. 13—26. Herodot. ii. 168.

with the productions of their country. It appears that they also purchased slaves on the way[8]. The mercantile routes from Egypt, according to Herodotus, were the following: 1. From Thebes to Meroë, (Saba,) thence to Azab, and over the straits of Babelmandel to Arabia. 2. From Thebes, north-westerly through Oasis Magna and the desert of Ammon, to Augela. Here it was met by a road from the northern coast of Africa, and continuing on south-westerly to the country of the Garamantes, it was again intersected by a road from the Carthaginian dominions. Thence it proceeded in a south-western direction to the Atarantes and Atlantes[9]. These routes appear to have been frequented at a very early period, for in Job mention is made of constellations belonging to the southern hemisphere. Moses was well acquainted with the ancient Æthiopia, or Cush, and southern Arabia. He alludes to incense and precious stones from Arabia and Æthiopia, and cinnamon from the East Indies, as well-known commodities. He mentions many distant colonies of Egyptians who are now unknown. He speaks of gold and onyx stones from the interior of Africa[10].

§. 6. CIVIL SOCIETY AT THE TIME OF MOSES.

INTO this flourishing country came Jacob and his family at the invitation of Pharaoh, in the 582nd year after the deluge. During the four hundred and thirty years that his descendants remained there, till they had increased to a great nation, they learned much from the Egyptians, who, for more than a century united under the Pharaohs of Memphis, were constantly improving their political institutions, perfecting the arts, and extending their know-

[8] Gen. xxxvii. 25—28. xxxix. 1.

[9] Herodot. ii. 29. iv. 181—185.

[10] Job, ix. 9. Gen. x. 6—8. Exod. xxx. 23. Gen. x. 13, 14. Exod. xxviii. 20. xxxix. 13. Job, xxii. 24, 25. Heeren, Ideen uber die Politik, den Verkehr und den Handel der vornehmsten Völker der alten Welt, Th. i. s. 151—182. 263—330. 448—455. Gatterer, Weltgeschichte. Th. i. s. 104—106.

ledge of the sciences, which it was impossible for them to keep wholly secret. Here the Hebrews were made acquainted with the advantages of a well-regulated government, the utility of agriculture, and the value of the arts, to the cultivation of which some of their own nation applied themselves[1]. Though most of them continued their nomadic life, yet what they had seen in Egypt could not fail to exert an important influence upon their feelings and habits[2]. They became so much attached to the country of their adoption, that even those who had acquired sovereignty over the Moabites at length returned to Egypt[3]. Their separation and dispersion was prevented by this means, and as the Egyptians despised all nomadic tribes, they could not easily become intermingled with them. The two nations, indeed, could not well mix, as every condition of life among the Egyptians was strictly hereditary. Thus the Hebrews in Egypt became a numerous and distinct nation, insomuch that about the three hundred and fiftieth year of their residence there, they awakened the suspicions of a jealous government. When a king of a new dynasty ascended the throne, ignorant of the public services of Joseph, and fearing that, in the event of war, the Hebrews might join the standard of the enemy or return to Palæstine, he began to oppress them by unreasonable demands of personal service. When he saw that their numbers were not diminished by his severity, he issued the murderous order respecting their infant sons. But in consequence of this very decree, Moses was introduced to court, which afforded him an opportunity of acquiring that knowledge, which, if not indispensably necessary, was very useful to him as the lawgiver of his nation. This oppression was continued for more than eighty years, till at last the Egyptian monarch, terrified by supernatural and public calamities, which Moses always accurately predicted, and readily removed as often as

[1] Exod. i. 14. 1 Chron. iv. 21—23. [2] 1 Chron. vii. 20—22.
[3] 1 Chron. iv. 22.

Pharaoh relented and promised submission, was compelled to release the Hebrews[4].

NOTE. The kings by whom the Hebrews were oppressed, cannot now be identified; nor can we ascertain, with any degree of certainty, even the dynasty to which they belonged. The early history of Egypt, till the reign of Psammetichus, the fifth king of the twenty-sixth dynasty, is involved in obscurity. We have a few notices by Herodotus, who, in his travels through Egypt in the fifth century before the Christian era, diligently explored the ancient history of the country, and acquired much information from the archives under the care of the priests. Syncellus, who wrote in the eighth century, has preserved an old chronicle which contains thirty Egyptian dynasties. In the third century before Christ, Ptolemey Philadelphus employed Manetho, a learned Egyptian priest, to compose a work on the dynasties from the sources then extant. Manetho gives the names of the kings belonging to each dynasty. Eratosthenes, a Cyrenian, who was educated at Athens, and was afterwards royal librarian at Alexandria, apparently dissatisfied with the work of Manetho, (as indeed he must have been if he compared it with Herodotus,) wrote at the request of Ptolemey Euergetes a catalogue of the Thebaic kings for one thousand and seventy-six years, which differs widely from Manetho's. Diodorus Siculus visited Egypt in the time of Julius Cæsar and Augustus, and has recorded in his history what he himself discovered, as well as what he learned from others. But these authors are all inconsistent with each other. Manetho's work would probably deserve more credit than is generally given to it, if we had it genuine and entire. But the original is lost, and we have only a meagre, imperfect, and, to all appearance, very corrupt extract which Syncellus made in the eighth century. Even this extract was not derived directly from the work

[4] Exod. i. 8—22. ii. 1—10.

of Manetho, but was copied from Julius Africanus of the third, and Eusebius of the fourth century. The extracts made by these two writers do not agree with each other' and what Josephus has quoted from Manetho, differs from both. (Against Apion, b. i. sec. 14, 15.) If it were possible to settle these differences, others remain which are wholly irreconcileable. (Shuckford's Connection of Sacred and Profane History, vol. iii. b. xi. p. 141—182. Silberschlag, Chronologie der Welt, s. 127—143.) The extracts from Julius Africanus and Eusebius are inserted in the appendix to this work. Africanus seems for the most part more accurate than Eusebius, yet he undoubtedly is subject to frequent errors, as both these writers sometimes are at the same time. It is evident that these dynasties were not successive, but, with the exception of the last eleven, were mostly contemporary; and that Manetho in his arrangement followed a *geographical* and not a *chronological* order. Thus the first Thinitic, the eleventh Diospolitic, and the third Memphitic dynasties, are undoubtedly all contemporary with the first dawn of civilization and refinement in Egypt. Even the dynasties of the same state seem not always to have followed each other in immediate succession.

The last eleven dynasties, according to Africanus, continued nine hundred and three years, but according to Eusebius, only six hundred and fifty-nine years. The latter asserts, that they extended back only to the year B. C. 1035; but the former to the year B. C. 1227. (Compare Gatterer, Weltgeschichte, s. 216—230.) But of what dynasty was the *king who knew not Joseph?* It is scarcely credible that a grateful remembrance of the services which he had rendered to Egypt, should be entirely obliterated by the transfer of the sceptre from one native family to another. The succession was always in the order of priests, who all had a share in the government, and in whose archives a record of the public acts of Joseph must undoubtedly have been preserved. It is probable then, that the government had passed into the

hands of foreigners. Now, as we find a dynasty of Phœnician shepherd-kings, it is a very natural conclusion that this is the one of which we are in search. Julius Africanus makes the duration of this dynasty two hundred and eighty-four years, Josephus two hundred and sixty, and Eusebius one hundred and six. But the length of time need occasion no difficulty, for it is not necessary to suppose that the oppression of the Hebrews commenced under the first king of the dynasty. As it began when their numbers had so increased as to awaken the suspicions of the government, it might have been during the reign of the last but one of these kings. Some, as Josephus and Perizonius, suppose these shepherd-kings to be the Hebrews themselves. Silberschlag thinks it was one of this race who invited Jacob to Egypt. The Pharaoh who finally dismissed the Hebrews, these writers take to be Chencheres, the eleventh king of the eighteenth Diospolitic dynasty, because Berosus says that he with his army was destroyed in the Red sea. But this opinion is encumbered with many difficulties. It may be sufficient to remark in this place that Berosus, a Babylonian, could scarcely obtain very accurate information on this subject; and that the Hebrews were not oppressed by a Diospolitic king, but by the Pharaohs of Lower Egypt.

Should it be asked who these shepherd-kings were, and how they came to be called by the Egyptian name *Hyksos*, (which, according to Forster, in Epist. ad J. D. Michælis in Spicil. Geogr. Hebr. pt. i. p. 9, signifies in Coptic, at the present day, *pastores cincti*,) the answer is found in the name *Phœnician*, that is, *Canaanite*. But they certainly were not Canaanites from Palæstine, for these were not strong enough to penetrate into Egypt and take possession of the country. We have shown before, that the Canaanites originally dwelt on the Arabian coast of the Red sea, and sent only a few tribes as colonies to Palæstine, while the great body of that ancient and powerful nation remained in Arabia under the name of

Amalekites. The Hyksos then were probably Amalekites from Arabia. This supposition is confirmed by the assertion of the Arabic historians, that the Amalekites once conquered Egypt, and for a long period held possession of the country. Thus we may perceive a reason why the Amalekites attacked the Hebrews in their march through Arabia Petræa, and why the extermination of this people was enjoined by Jehovah. Some light is also thrown upon the causes which influenced Cecrops, the founder of Athens, to emigrate to Attica with some citizens of Sais, about twenty or thirty years before the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt.

It may be observed in this place, that Lelex the first king of Sparta, began to reign about two hundred and sixty-eight years before the departure of the Hebrews from Egypt; and that eighty-five years after this event, Cadmus the Phœnician, who, as Bochart observes, is said to have led several colonies to the northern coasts of Africa, and to have built many cities there, founded Cadmea, or Thebes, in Bœotia. (Comp. Parische Chronik von Wagner herausgegeben, Gottingen, 1790. s. 3. 12. and 26. Epoche 7.) That the Grecian states were then but just beginning to emerge from barbarism, may be concluded from the fact, that Cecrops was the first who introduced into Attica the institution of marriage.

§. 7. DEPARTURE OF THE HEBREWS FROM EGYPT.

Moses requested permission of Pharaoh for the Hebrews to go three days' journey into Arabia Petræa, to celebrate a festival in honour of Jehovah, and the monarch was willing to grant his request rather than endure plagues greater than those which had been already inflicted. But when he required that their wives and children, or at least their cattle, should be retained as a pledge of their return, he perceived, from the reply of Moses, that it was the real purpose of the Israelites to escape beyond the reach of his tyranny. Still perhaps he might hope, that he should

be able by his soldiers to compel them to return if they refused. But when Moses, instead of leaving the western arm of the Red sea on the right and taking the direct road to Arabia, had directed his course southerly, with the sea on his left hand, and was leading the Hebrews towards Suez or Colsum, Pharaoh imagined that he had been deceived, and that those fearful miracles which he had witnessed, were merely natural occurrences, and not interpositions of the Deity; for surely, he thought, a God who had exerted such power for the deliverance of his people, would not afterwards so forsake them as to leave them ignorant of their way to Arabia. He therefore speedily drew together his army from the Delta, and pursued the Hebrews by forced marches, and on the third day came up with their encampment near Suez. Thus they were enclosed by the army between the sea and the mountains which surround this place on the south and west.

As Pharaoh now threatened to treat as enemies his Hebrew guests, whom before, contrary to all right, he had treated as slaves, they were wholly free from obligation on their part, and might justly repel force by force. But a people unaccustomed to arms were not able to contend with a regular military force, provided with a large body of cavalry and six hundred chariots of war. God again interposed, as he had so often done in Egypt, and by night opened a way for his people through the sea. At this place the sea is now one thousand five hundred and fourteen paces broad, and has a sandbank running across to the opposite shore; but at that time it must have been above two thousand paces across, and much deeper than it is in the present day[1].

In the morning Pharaoh perceived that the Hebrews had passed through the sea; "And the Egyptians pursued, and went in after them to the midst of the sea; even all Pharaoh's horses, his chariots, and his horsemen.

[1] Jahn's Biblische Archæologie, band i. s. 83.

And it came to pass, that in the morning watch the Lord looked unto the host of the Egyptians through the pillar of fire and of the cloud, and troubled the host of the Egyptians, and took off their chariot wheels, that they drave them heavily: so that the Egyptians said, Let us flee from the face of Israel; for the Lord fighteth for them against the Egyptians. And the Lord said unto Moses, Stretch out thine hand over the sea, that the waters may come again upon the Egyptians, upon their chariots, and upon their horsemen. And Moses stretched forth his hand over the sea, and the sea returned to his strength when the morning appeared; and the Egyptians fled against it; and the Lord overthrew the Egyptians in the midst of the sea. And the waters returned and covered the chariots, and the horsemen, and all the host of Pharaoh that came into the sea after them: there remained not so much as one of them."

By this fearful overthrow, the fame of which as well as that of the miracles in Egypt, was spread through all the neighbouring countries, the deliverance of the Hebrews was not only perfected, and their independence secured, but a fear of Jehovah, and a dread of his people, was impressed upon all the surrounding nations[2].

NOTE. Respecting the miracles of Moses in Egypt, and the passage of the Hebrews through the bay of Heroopolis, see Michælis, Anmerkungen zur Uebersetzung des zweyten Buches Mosis, k. 3—15, and Zerstreute Kleine Schriften gesammelt, brief i. s. 1—142. Compare Niebuhr, Reise, Th. i. s. 215. 247—251. Beschreibung Arab. s. 358. 403. 408, sqq. Kleuker, Neue Prüfung und Erklärung der vorzüglichsten Beweise für die Wahrheit und den göttlichen Ursprung des Christenthums und der Offenbarung, Th. i. s. 276, sqq. Hess, Geschichte Mosis, band i. erstes Buch k. 3 and 4. and zweytes Buch k. 1—4.

[2] Exod. xiv. and xv. 12—16. Josh. ii. 10.

BOOK II.

CIVIL CONSTITUTION OF THE HEBREWS.

§. 8. GOVERNMENT OF THE HEBREWS BEFORE THE MOSAIC LAW.

IT is now time that we turn our attention to the ancient polity of the Hebrews, as we shall soon have to describe their new constitution, in which many features of the old were retained.

Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, governed their respective families with unlimited paternal authority. The number of servants in these families was so great, that the power of the patriarchs was by no means inconsiderable. Allowing a fourth part of the males to be capable of bearing arms, it appears from the mention of Abraham's three hundred and eighteen homeborn armed servants, that the whole number of males in this class only, exclusive of those who had been purchased, was twelve hundred and seventy-two. His subjects then must have amounted to several thousands, and hence an estimate may be made of the number of his herds, to attend which so many servants were necessary. Bearing this in mind, it will not appear surprising that the land of Canaan was scarcely sufficient for the residence of Abraham and Lot[1].

These patriarchs were powerful princes, as the emirs of the nomads are at the present day. They were completely independent, and owed allegiance to no sovereign; they formed alliances with other princes, and even with kings; they maintained a body of armed servants, and

[1] Gen. xiv. 14. xiii. 6. compare xxxiii. 1—18.

repelled force by force. For their vassals, they were the priests who appointed the festivals and presented offerings; the guardians who protected them from injustice; the chiefs who led them in war; the judges who banished the turbulent, and, when necessary, inflicted even capital punishment upon transgressors[2].

The twelve sons of Jacob, after the death of their father, ruled their own families with the same authority. But when their descendants had increased so as to form tribes, each *tribe*, שֵׁבֶט, מַטֶּה acknowledged a *prince*, נָשִׂיא as its ruler. This office was at first hereditary, and belonged to the eldest son of the founder of the tribe, but probably afterwards became elective. The division of nations into tribes very generally prevailed in ancient times; and the custom is still retained by the Beduin-Arabs, and even by the Persians[3].

As the numbers of each tribe increased, the less powerful families united themselves with their stronger relatives, and acknowledged them as their superiors. Hence there arose a subdivision of the tribes into collections of families. Such a collection was called מִשְׁפָּחָה בֵּית אָבוֹת אֶלֶף *a house of fathers, a clan,* or *a thousand;* not because each of these subdivisions consisted of a thousand persons, for it is evident that the number varied[4]. Before the departure from Egypt, the Hebrews were under the immediate government of the rulers of these clans, who were denominated רָאשֵׁי בֵית אָבוֹת רָאשֵׁי אַלְפֵי יִשְׂרָאֵל אֲלָפִים *heads of houses of fathers, heads of thousands,* etc. and were in rank subordinate to the *princes,* נְשִׂיאִים These two classes of rulers were comprehended under the general names of רָאשֵׁי שִׁבְטִים זְקֵנִים *seniors,* or *heads of tribes*[5]. They were fathers rather than magistrates, governing according

[2] Gen. viii. 20. xiv. 14. 24. xv. 9, 10. xxi. 14. xxii. 13. xxxiv. 14. xxxviii. 24. Job, i. 5.

[3] Shaw's Travels, p. 216. Della Valle, Reise, Th. ii. s. 189.

[4] Judges, vi. 15. 1 Sam. x. 19. xxiii. 23. Numb. xxvi. 5—50.

[5] Numb. i. 16. x. 4.

to the regulations established by custom, according to the principles of sound reason and natural justice. They provided for the general good of the whole community, while the concerns of each individual family still continued under the control of its own father. In general, those cases only which concerned the fathers of families themselves, came under the cognizance of the seniors.

Such is the patriarchal form of government, which the nomads, particularly the Beduin Arabs, have in a great measure preserved to the present day. They call their princes *emirs*, and their heads of clans *sheichs* (elders); under the last of which appellations the Hebrews included both these orders of rulers. The Arabian emirs have their secretaries, who appear to be officers similar to those denominated שׁוֹטְרִים *shoterim* among the Hebrews (in the English version translated *officers*); their peculiar business, as we shall soon see, was to register genealogies; they possessed considerable authority, and sustained an important part in the government[6].

With this government, the Hebrews, in the land of Goshen, continued for the most part the nomadic life of their ancestors, for which the deserts of Egypt and the open plains of Arabia Petræa afforded them ample room. In early times they had driven their herds through Arabia to Canaan, and built cities in that country. Some penetrated into the land of the Moabites and subjected it to their power[7]. They were at length excluded Canaan by its increasing population; though they possessed in that country, (in addition to the right of pasturage they had acquired), certain lands and cities, with many wells and cisterns, which they had inherited from their ancestors. When in Egypt some applied themselves to the arts, and are particularly mentioned as potters, and manufacturers of fine cotton in the service of the crown[8].

[6] Arvieux, Merkw. Nachrichten, Th. ii. s. 138. Th. iii. s. 128, sqq. Exod. iii. 16. v. 10—21.

[7] 1 Chron. vii. 21. 24. iv. 22.

[8] 1 Chron. iv. 21. 23.

In Arabia Petræa several distinguished themselves in the structure of the sacred tabernacle; an evidence that the Hebrews had been much improved by the refinements of Egypt. The Egyptian sovereigns treated them as guests rather than subjects, until the entrance of that foreign dynasty of monarchs, who were ignorant of the services which one of their ancestors had rendered the nation. Even these monarchs, however, did not change the patriarchal form of government. On the contrary, the Hebrew shoterim were employed, under the direction of Egyptian overseers, to apportion and press forward the labours exacted from the people[9]. But as the Hebrews, after their deliverance from Egypt, were to become a settled and agricultural nation, and were besides selected for especial and important purposes; it was necessary that they should be provided with new political institutions, suited to such a condition and destination. For this purpose Moses led them to the foot of mount Horeb, where the people entered into a peculiar compact with God, upon which their whole civil constitution was unalterably settled.

§. 9. FUNDAMENTAL LAW OF THE MOSAIC INSTITUTIONS.

A CORRECT knowledge of the Creator and Governor of heaven and earth, and of the relation of man to his Almighty Judge, is certainly the principal, if not the sole ground of all morality and of all moral happiness among human beings, influenced as they are by the objects of sense. It constitutes, in fact, man's chief good[1]. Now, even though we should allow that a superior mind at the present day—furnished with all the learning of preceding ages, and surrounded by the light of revelation, after so many errors of the ancients have been detected, and so many warnings have been given to guard against false conclusions—can derive this correct knowledge from

[9] Exod. iii. 16. iv. 29. v. 10. 14. 21. [1] John, xvii. 3.

a view of the universe, or from contemplating the situation and wants of man; yet it was certainly unattainable by those men of high antiquity, in the childhood of the world, whose minds were unaccustomed to intellectual effort, who inherited no learned labours from their ancestors, who were destitute of a thorough acquaintance with the works of nature, and were surrounded by error. This conclusion is confirmed by proof far superior to all speculation: by the history of all nations, even of those much more recent in their origin and more highly cultivated. We find, nevertheless, this correct knowledge of God among the pious patriarchs of the highest antiquity; and unless we will absurdly suppose that those simple and unlearned fathers were speculative philosophers and profound thinkers, we must acknowledge the truth of the declarations, that God from time to time revealed himself in a supernatural manner to the men of the old world, and that the knowledge thus communicated was afterwards transmitted from father to son[2].

But it was difficult to preserve the knowledge of God among sensual men, even after it had been revealed. Before the flood, profligacy and practical atheism prevailed[3]; and four centuries after, superstition and idolatry had crept in on every side. Their influence was constantly increasing, and at last became universal; and no people who were left to themselves ever regained a knowledge of the true God.

That a knowledge of himself might not be driven entirely from the earth by the encroachments of idolatry, God revealed himself to an illustrious Chaldean, and appointed him, with his descendants by Isaac and Jacob, to the important trust of preserving this invaluable treasure in the world, and finally of imparting it to other nations[4].

[2] Gen. i. 28—30. ii. 15, sqq. iii. 14, sqq. iv. 9. vi. 3. 12, sqq. ix. 1—18. xii. 1, sqq. xv. 1, sqq. xviii. 17, sqq. and many other places.

[3] Gen. iv. 16. vi. 2, sqq.

[4] Gen. xviii. 16—20. compare Gen. xvii. 9—14. xii. 3. xxii. 18. xxviii. 14.

Idolatry in time became so general through the earth, that it acquired the credit of a settled, undoubted truth, and the authority of a plain principle of common sense. Hence even the descendants of Jacob, though they never entirely forgot the God who created heaven and earth, who caused the deluge, and gave their ancestors such magnificent promises respecting their descendants, became, for the most part, so infected with the idolatry of Egypt during their residence in that country, that all the miracles which they witnessed there, at the Red sea, and mount Horeb, were scarcely sufficient to cure them of their superstition, and bring them back to a constant worship of the true God[5].

That the Hebrews might answer their high destination, and preserve the knowledge of God through succeeding ages, civil institutions were necessary, by which the knowledge and worship of the true God should be so intimately connected with the political structure of this nation, that they must be imperishable, so long as the nation should remain a nation; and could only be annihilated by the annihilation of the political existence of the people. Such institutions were provided by a civil constitution, which was closely interwoven and inseparably connected with the worship of the true God.

Such a constitution could be established without difficulty at that time, as it was exactly suited to the condition of the world, in an age when the civil regulations of every nation were identified with their religion. Though the independent patriarchs, nomadic as well as agricultural, were forced by circumstances to enter into societies, they were never very willing to receive the new constitutions and new laws which were prescribed to them by others. For this reason the ancient legislators, that they might secure the reception and authority of the new order of society introduced by them, always pretended that they had been authorised to impose laws by some divinity.

[5] Exod. xxxii. 1—35. Amos, v. xxvi.

Thus Menes in Egypt gave out that he had received his instructions from Mercury; Cadmus at Thebes, from an oracle; Minos in Crete, from Jupiter; Lycurgus at Sparta, from Apollo; Zothraustes among the Arimaspi, from their national god; Zamolxis, from the tutelar goddess of his nation; and Numa at Rome, from the nymph Egeria[6]. These lawgivers, however, did not invent the religious systems of their people, as some have erroneously supposed, but improved the false religions already in existence, and artfully employed them as the means of establishing and perpetuating their civil institutions. But Moses did not, (as Strabo and Diodorus Siculus assert[7],) proceed in the same manner. He did not deceitfully pretend that he received his laws from the god Jao (יַהְוֹה i. e. יְהוָה); but he proved his mission to be really divine by such supernatural works and wisdom, as no other lawgiver could ever lay claim to. The whole nation heard God himself speak from Sinai. Neither did Moses employ religion to support his political institutions, but he reversed the usual order, and introduced a civil constitution which was designed as a means, and, as the event has proved, was in reality a means, of establishing pure religion permanently upon the earth, and of preserving the knowledge and worship of the true God to the latest generations.

He accordingly made the worship of the one only true God the fundamental law of his institutions, which was to remain for ever unalterable, through all the changes which might occur in the lapse of time. The God who created heaven and earth; who caused the deluge; who revealed himself to the ancestors of the Hebrews as the Most High, and gave them promises respecting their far distant descendants; who was acknowledged by Abraham as the Judge of all the earth; and who now revealed himself as

[6] Diod. Sic. i. 94. Strabo, p. 162. Plutarch, Lycurg. v. xxix. and Numa, iv—xvii.

[7] Diod. Sic. i. 94. Strabo, p. 762.

Jehovah, that is, as the immutably faithful performer of his promises: in short, he who alone is God, whose are the heavens and the earth, and all that they contain; the God over all, who can neither be seen, nor represented by any image; who loves, feeds, and clothes all men;—this only true God was set forth by Moses, the mediator between God and the Hebrews, as their national and tutelar Deity. This was done in accordance with the prevalent notion of those ages, that every nation must have its tutelar divinity. Jehovah had acquired a peculiar right over the Hebrews, by his miraculous deliverance of them from Egyptian bondage; and to him were they all under the most sacred obligations, both on account of that deliverance, and because he is the only true God[8].

The condescending manner in which Jehovah really represented himself to the Hebrews, was yet insufficient to perpetuate the knowledge and worship of the true God among them. He, therefore, through the intervention of Moses, suffered himself to be elected their king by a voluntary choice[9]. The land of Canaan was considered as the royal possession, of which the Hebrews were to be the hereditary occupants, and from which they were to render to Jehovah a double tithe, as the Egyptians did to their king[10].

The invisible king then published from the summit of mount Sinai, with circumstances of awful grandeur, a brief summary of moral and religious duties, among which the worship of the only true God, and a total prohibition of the use of images, held the most conspicuous place. This

[8] Gen. i. 1, sqq. Exod. xx. 8—12. Gen. vi. 7, 8. xiv. 18—20. xvii. 1. xviii. 16—33. Exod. vi. 3. Gen. xii. 1—3. xv. 13—21. xviii. 17, sqq. xxii. 17, sqq. xxvi. 1—4. xxviii. 12—16. xlix. 1—27. Exod. xxiv. 8—12. xxxiii. 18—23. Deut. iv. 12. 15. 32—39. vi. 4—6. x. 12—20. Gen. xviii. 25. Exod. vi. 3. xx. 1—11. Deut. v. 5—15.

[9] Exod. xix. 4—8. comp. Judg. viii. 23. 1 Sam. viii. 7. x. 18. xii. 1. 1 Chron. xxix. 23.

[10] 1 Chron. xxix. 15. Lev. xxvii. 20—38. Numb. xviii. 21, 22. Deut. xii. 17—19. xiv. 22. 29. xxvi. 12—15.

was designed for the unalterable fundamental law of the commonwealth. These first principles were to be farther developed by Moses, and applied to particular cases according to circumstances[11]. God finally promised his subjects such a government, and such a peculiar direction of their affairs and destinies, that blessing and national prosperity should follow the observance of the law as its reward; but cursing and national calamity the transgression of the law as its punishment, till they should again return to their obedience[12].

This fundamental law exhibited the maxims according to which the king was to rule; and these the people accepted, and promised to observe. The Hebrews bound themselves to the observance of this great compact by a solemn oath; and their king Jehovah then delivered to them the summary of his law, written upon two tables of stone, which were to be preserved as a perpetual memorial of their obligations, and as the magna charta of the state[13].

That the Hebrews might have their peculiar relation to God kept constantly before their eyes, there was indeed no image allowed which would have been pregnant with mischief among a people so much inclined to idolatry; but God, as their king, caused a royal tent to be erected in the centre of the encampment, (where the pavilions of all kings and chiefs were usually erected,) and to be fitted up with all the splendour of royalty as a moveable palace. It was divided into three apartments, in the innermost of which was the royal throne, supported by golden cherubs; and the footstool of the throne, a gilded ark containing the tables of the law, the magna charta of church and state. In the antiroom a gilded table was spread with bread and wine, as the royal table, and precious incense was burned. The exterior room, or court, might be con-

[11] Exod. xx. 1—20, 21, etc. [12] Deut. xxvii—xxx.

[13] Exod. xxiv. Deut. xxvii. Hess, Geschichte Mosis, buch iii. kap. 4. and Reich Gottes, abschnitt vi. s. 181- 214.

sidered the royal culinary apartment, and there music was performed, like the music at the festive tables of eastern monarchs[14]. God made choice of the Levites for his courtiers, state officers, and palace guards; and elected Aaron the chief officer of his court and his first minister of state. For the maintenance of these officers, he assigned one of the tithes which the Hebrews were to pay as rent for the use of the land. He finally required all the Hebrew males of a suitable age to repair to his palace every year, on the three great annual festivals, with presents, to render homage to their king; and as these days of renewing their homage were to be celebrated with festivity and joy, the second tithe was expended in providing the entertainments necessary for those occasions. In short, every religious duty was made a matter of political obligation; and all the civil regulations, even the most minute, were so founded upon the relation which God had entered into with his people, and so interwoven with their religious duties, that the Hebrew could not separate his God and his king, and in every law was reminded equally of both. The nation, therefore, so long as it had a national existence, could not entirely lose the knowledge, or discontinue the worship, of the true God.

As God was the king of the Hebrews, a defection from God was a defection from their rightful sovereign. Whoever in the Hebrew nation, over which Jehovah was king, worshipped another God, or practised any superstitions, by this very act renounced his allegiance to his king and deserted to another. He committed high treason, and was properly considered a public criminal. Whoever incited others to idolatry, incited them to rebellion, and was a mover of sedition. Death, therefore, was the just punishment of idolatry and its kindred arts, magic, necromancy, and soothsaying; and also of inciting to idolatry. The punishment of an idolatrous city was the irrevocable

[14] Lev. xxi. 6. 8. 17. Numb. xxviii. 2. Deut. xxiii. 4. Ezek. xliv. 7.

ban, חֵרֶם followed by complete destruction[15]. So strict was the law upon this head, that the inciter to idolatry was never to be pardoned, even though he should claim the character of a prophet, and utter predictions which should be exactly fulfilled[16]. The Hebrews were required to deliver up to just punishment their nearest relatives and dearest friends if they enticed to idolatry; and the accuser, as the first witness, was required to cast the first stone at the convicted traitor. Even a foreigner who dwelt among the Hebrews could not be exempted from capital punishment if he practised idolatry himself, or tempted others to do so; for by so doing he became a mutineer, and excited the people to rebellion by disseminating discontent against the king, and against the whole civil government.

Though coercion for the purpose of preserving the worship of the true God was in this manner sanctioned by the Mosaic law, it was in that age no restraint upon liberty of conscience. According to the universal opinion of the pagans, every people and every country must have its own deities, and pagan religions obligated no man to worship this or that particular deity, much less all deities without exception. Each individual was left at liberty to choose what gods he would worship, and what neglect. Consequently, a superstitious Hebrew, or a foreign idolater, could not complain of violence done to his conscience, if he were required while in Palæstine to discontinue the worship of idols, and when he engaged in the public services of religion, to worship Jehovah only, the divine king of the country.

Moreover, as the pagans did not in their religious worship supplicate the gods to strengthen their virtue and confer upon them true moral happiness, but to grant them blessings merely temporal, such as abundant harvests, rich booty from their enemies, victories, freedom

[15] Lev. xix. 31. xx. 6. Deut. xvii. 2—6.

[16] Deut. xiii. 2—12.

from sickness, and the like; if they, while among the Hebrews, were directed to seek those things from no deity but the God of the nation, it imposed no restraint upon their feelings, but was in perfect accordance with the opinion universally adopted, that in every land the god of that land ought to be worshipped in preference to all others. The law which required capital punishment for idolatry as treason was not applied to the inward faith, which manifested itself by no external acts, and consequently could not be known or proved by a human tribunal, but solely to the public worship of other gods by adoration, prostration, kissing, altars, sacrifices, statues, groves, etc. and to the enticing of others to idolatry. He who believed in the existence of many gods, and secretly put his trust in idols, was indeed guilty of impiety; but as his transgression was unknown, how could it be punished with death? This distinction, which arises from the very nature of the case, is everywhere implied by Moses. When he awards capital punishment to the crime of idolatry, he always speaks of the external worship of false gods, and of enticing others to idolatry[17]. On the contrary, when he speaks in the character of a religious teacher, he requires an internal faith in the one true God, and inculcates, in the most decided manner, supreme love, perfect confidence, and constant obedience to God and his laws[18]. They, therefore, who so boldly assert that Moses taught the Hebrews to believe in the existence of a God merely national and tutelar, and prescribed to them nothing more than an external worship of this God, cannot be supposed to have read his writings with very close attention.

[17] Lev. xix. 31. xx. 6. Deut. xiii. 2—19. xvii. 2—5.
[18] Deut. vi. 4—9. xvi. 9—22, and other places.

§. 10. RELATION OF THE HEBREWS TO OTHER NATIONS.

THE civil polity of the Hebrews was thus altogether peculiar, and its fundamental principles appeared absurd to all other nations of that age. Even Cicero condemns it as a foreign superstition, unsuited to the dignity of the Roman people[1]. The Hebrews were to govern themselves by this constitution in the midst of nations who looked upon idolatry as the only rational religion; who regarded their greatness, power, and prosperity, as the gifts of their gods, the magical effects of their worship. Pagan superstition was made attractive and alluring to the senses, not merely by religious pomp and ceremony, but by indecent imagery and lascivious songs, by indulgence in fornication and unnatural lust, as a part of the worship of their gods. That the Hebrews might live uncontaminated among people so grossly superstitious, and yet highly celebrated for their wisdom, it was necessary that they should avoid all intimate friendships, and, as much as possible, all intercourse with pagans. Formal prohibitions of such intercourse would be scarcely sufficient, and it could be most effectually prevented by the introduction of peculiar customs, which, though in themselves decorous and useful, differed from those of other nations. Such customs, once established, become a second nature; and as they must be relinquished by those who wish to associate with people by whom they are despised, they remained a durable barrier against union with the heathen. The Hebrews had already been accustomed to a similar state of things among the Egyptians; and they had previously adopted several peculiar rites, particularly that of circumcision. These peculiarities formed the ground work upon which the great partition wall between them and other nations was built. Their ancient usages were more accurately defined by the Mosaic law,

[1] Cicero pro Flacco, 28.

and new rites were added. Everything was strongly contrasted with the customs of pagans, or designed to remind the Hebrews of their relation to Jehovah their king. All the details of the law, which, considered without reference to circumstances, may appear arbitrary or trivial, tended to separate the people from the heathen, and to guard them against idolatry; and in this view they were of essential importance to the end for which they were designed, the preservation of the knowledge of the true God.

This separation from paganism was indispensable to the accomplishment of the purpose which the Hebrews were destined to answer. But they were not to be the enemies of all foreigners, and to indulge national animosity and hatred to all nations. Individuals were forbidden to form intimate friendships with the heathen; but whenever they had any necessary transactions with them, they were required to treat them affectionately as neighbours, רֵעַ, and to fulfil in respect to them all the common duties of philanthropy. Precepts to this effect are of frequent occurrence in the Mosaic law[2]. The Hebrew government could also enter into alliances with other states when the public good required it. Moses indeed makes an exception in regard to a few nations; but the very exception is a tacit permission to form connections with others when necessary. The exceptions were:

I. All the Canaanitish nations. These had become very numerous in Palæstine after the time of Jacob, had taken possession of the whole country destined for the Hebrews, and had established at least thirty-one small kingdoms, besides democracies and aristocracies[3]. The Phœnicians on the northern coasts, whose metropolis was Zidon, did not come under this exception; for, although Canaanites, they had settled in that country long before

[2] Exod. xxii. 20. xxiii. 9. Lev. xix. 34. Deut. x. 18, 19. xxiv. 17. xxvii. 19. compare Jer. xxii. 3. Zech. vii. 10.

[3] Josh. ix. 3. 11. xii. 8—24.

Abraham, and they had in their possession none of the pasture grounds of the ancestors of the Hebrew nation. But the Philistines, who came from Caphtor (Cyprus) not long before the arrival of the Hebrews, and had expelled the Avim from the low country in the southern part of Palæstine, and there founded five governments, סְרָנִים were among the excepted nations; for although not Canaanites, but originally Egyptians, from the Pelusian branch of the Nile, they had taken possession of land which belonged to the Hebrews[4].

The Canaanites had appropriated to their own use the pastures occupied by Abraham, Isaac, and Jacob, and expelled from their possessions those Hebrews who had occasionally visited Palæstine during their residence in Egypt[5]. The Hebrews were now about to recover their property sword in hand. These usurpers of the Hebrew lands, wells, and cisterns, were a perfidious race, who paid little regard to treaties. Even in much later times, the *fides Punica* (that is, *Phœnicia, Canaanitica*) of Africa was infamous among the Romans, themselves no very conscientious observers of treaties[6]. The Tyrians delivered up their Hebrew allies to the Edomites, in violation of all the laws of hospitality, and in times of peace sold them as slaves to the Greeks; while the Hebrews religiously observed their treaty with the Gibeonites, though it had been obtained by fraud . The morals of the Canaanites were corrupt in the extreme. Incest was common; they practised fornication, and indulged unnatural lust in honour of their gods; they offered human victims upon their altars. This shocking idolatry, which was high treason in the land of Jehovah the king of the Hebrews, had taken such deep root that it could not be eradicated. Consequently these nations could not be tolerated as allies

[4] Deut. ii. 23. compare Exod. xiii. 17. xv. 14. Jer. xlvii. 4. Amos, ix. 7. Josh. xiii. 1—3. Judg. i. 18. iii. 3.

[5] 1 Chron. vii. 20—29.

[6] Diod. Sic. xxvi. 27.

[7] Amos, i. 9. Joel, iii. 5, 6.

or neighbours, nor even as subjects or slaves, by the Hebrews, who were the sole depositaries of the knowledge of the true God. They might undermine the foundation of the government, frustrate the design, and destroy the prosperity of the Hebrews, if permitted to live among them; or at least might expose them to great injuries, as is abundantly proved by their subsequent history in the Book of Judges. It was therefore made an inviolable law of the Hebrews, that they should enter into no connection with those people; that they should not make them tributary, nor even admit them as subjects or slaves; but should cut off unsparingly all who fell into their hands, and in this manner warn the others to flee from the land where Jehovah was king[8]. The decree of extermination must be understood as implying that the Canaanites might leave the country in peace if they chose. Many betook themselves to flight, and embarking on board Phœnician vessels, sailed to Africa and there planted colonies. This not only appears probable from the well-known fact that the Phœnicians transported many colonies to Africa, but it receives historical confirmation from the pagan Procopius, who relates that the "Phœnicians (Canaanites) who were expelled by Joshua, dispersed themselves over all Africa, and built a castle in a city of Numidia, which is now called Tigisis. There are still standing in that place two pillars of white marble, on which is engraved a Phœnician inscription of the following import: ἡμεῖς ἐσμὲν οἱ φυγόντες ἀπὸ προσώπου Ἰησοῦ τοῦ λῃστοῦ, υἱοῦ Ναυῆ, *we are they who fled from the face of Joshua the robber, the son of Naue*[9]." All, or at least the greater part, might have adopted this course to save their lives and treasures; but they seem to have chosen rather to try the event of a war with the Hebrews. No city except Gideon sought peace, and they were all subdued by

[8] Exod. xxiii. 32, 33. xxxiv. 12—16. Deut. vii. 1—11. xx. 16—18.

[9] Procopius de Vand. lib. ii. compare Bochart, Canaan, lib. i. cap. xxiv. p. 520.

arms[10]. If any of these nations had remained in the country well-disposed towards the Hebrews, and willing to renounce idolatry, they might undoubtedly have been spared, according to a proper construction of the law. David not only permitted the remains of the Canaanites to live, but he promoted them to high stations in his army[11]. Some suppose that the Hebrews were no longer obliged to expel the Canaanites; because, not having at first fulfilled the conditions on their part, but having made some tributary and formed alliances with others, the divine promise respecting their expulsion had been recalled[12].

II. Hereditary enmity, unceasing war, and total extermination, were destined also for the Amalekites, or Canaanites of Arabia. They had too clearly manifested their hostility to the Hebrews, by an unprovoked attack upon the sick and fatigued in the rear of their march through Arabia Petræa[13]. They probably had a secret understanding with the Egyptian tyrants, if the *Hyksos* were Amalekites, as they probably were. They were, besides, a race of plundering nomads, hovering about the southern borders of Palæstine; and the Hebrews could never be secure from their predatory excursions short of extermination[14]. If a regular government were to be established at Algiers, it would probably be found necessary to adopt similar measures in respect to the pillaging hordes who infest that country[15].

III. Against the Moabites and Ammonites, who were descendants of Lot, and consequently relatives of the Hebrews, there was no decree of exterminating war; but all political connection with them was prohibited. The Hebrews were never to promote the interests of these people, nor to admit them to the privileges of citizenship, even in

[10] Josh. xi. 19.

[11] 2 Sam. xxiii. 39.

[12] Judg. ii. 1—3. 20—23.

[13] Exod. xvii. 8—14. Deut. xxv. 17.

[14] Judg. iii. 12, 13. vi. 3—5. 1 Sam. xiv. 28. xv. 1, sqq. xxvii. 8, 9. xxx. 1, sqq. 1 Chron. v. 42, 43. 2 Sam. viii. 12.

[15] Poiret, Travels in Barbary, vol. i. p. 66.

the tenth generation. The reason of this was, that they, notwithstanding the free passage through their territories which they had granted to the Hebrews, had refused to supply them with provisions; in conjunction with the Midianites they had called the prophet Balaam to curse them, which, in consequence of the then prevalent opinion respecting the efficacy of a curse, must have depressed their courage and rendered them an easy prey to their enemies; and finally, when Balaam, instead of a curse, repeatedly pronounced a blessing upon them, they enticed them to idolatry and fornication; that is, to high treason and rebellion against their king[16].

The Hebrews were expressly forbidden to wage war against the Ammonites and Moabites[17]. Not because these nations were too powerful for them; for though the Moabites had formerly expelled the Emims, the Ammonites, and the Zamzummims, the gigantic heroes of the old world, from the region between the rivers Jordan, Arnon, and Jabbok; they were afterwards themselves driven back over the Arnon by the Amorites, and their power was much broken. They therefore entered into an alliance with some Midianitish tribes; but notwithstanding this accession to their strength they still stood in awe of the Hebrews, and dared not venture to attack them[18]. And though the Hebrews, in compliance with the injunction of Moses, never made war upon these hostile nations, they were still unappeased by this clemency. In later times they commenced hostilities themselves against the Hebrews, and sometimes distressed them; but were at length completely subdued by David[19].

The Midianites, allies of the Moabites and Ammonites, were descendants of the fourth son of Abraham and Ke-

[16] Deut. ii. 9—19. 29. xxii. 2. xxiii. 3—8. xxv. 15. compare ii. 9—19. 37.

[17] Deut. ii. 9—19.

[18] Numb. xxi. 26—30. xxii. 4, sqq. Deut. ii. 19—21. compare Judg. xi. 16. xiii. 25.

[19] Judg. iii. 12—30. 1 Sam. xiv. 47. 2 Sam. viii. 2, sqq. x. 1, sqq. xii. 26, sqq.

turah. In scripture they are often confounded with the Ishmaelites[20]. Their residence was the country about the Elanitic gulf, south of the Moabites, and east of the Edomites. They were nomads, manufacturers, and merchants, amassed great wealth, and possessed many cities and fortified places[21]. They did not all make common cause with the Moabites against the Hebrews. Jethro, a prince of the Midianites, and the father-in-law of Moses, always remained, as well as his subjects, friendly to the Hebrews. Only a few tribes connected themselves with the Moabites, and these were exterminated upon the same principle that foreigners, who excite people to rebellion, are, in modern times, condemned to capital punishment by the government against which the offence is committed[22]. With the nation at large there was no hereditary enmity; and those tribes which did not participate in the hostilities against the Hebrews, were included among the nations with whom alliances might be formed. But in later times they acted in so hostile a manner, that no permanent peace could be preserved with them[23].

The Edomites, descendants of Esau, had expelled the Horites (dwellers in caves) from mount Seir, and had there established a powerful empire[24]. At the time of Moses their eighth king was on the throne. Eleven princes were subordinate to him, so that the king was no more than the chief of twelve princes; a relic of the patriarchal form of government, to which the Edomites, in common with all ancient nations, were originally subject[25]. This empire, at the time of Moses, was in a very flourishing state. Mention is incidentally made of eight considerable cities, and also of fields, vineyards, and highways in this country, as well as in the land of the Moabites[26].

[20] Gen. xxv. 2—4. xxxvi. 35. xxxvii. 28. 1 Chron. i. 33. Gen. xxxvii. 25—28. Judg. viii. 24. Is. lx. 6, 7.

[21] Numb. xxxi. 9, 10. 32—36. Is. lx. 6. Hab. iii. 7. Judg. viii. 24—26.

[22] Numb. xxv. 16, 17. xxxi. 1—24. [23] Judg. vi—viii.

[24] Deut. ii. 12. 22. [25] Gen. xvii. 20. xxxvi. 31—43.

[26] Gen. xxxvi. 31—39. Numb. xx. 17. 21, 22.

Though they refused to listen to the repeated request of the Hebrews for a peaceable passage through the heart of their country, that they might enter Palæstine on the south, and even intercepted their way by a numerous army; yet they allowed them to march undisturbed along their frontiers, on the Elanitic gulf, and sold them provisions[27]. War against the Edomites was on this account prohibited, and it was expressly enacted, that in the tenth generation they, as well as the Egyptians, might be admitted to citizenship. These people also, on their part, conducted themselves peaceably towards the Hebrews till the time of David, when their aggressions caused a war, in which they were overcome[28]. From that time they cherished a secret hatred against the Hebrew nation.

No war was enjoined against the Amorites on the east of Jordan, as the ancestors of the Hebrews had possessed no pasture grounds in that quarter. These Amorites had driven back the Moabites and Ammonites over the river Arnon, founded two considerable kingdoms, and built several fortified cities. But when Sihon, king of the peninsula between the Jordan, Arnon, and Jabbok, of which Heshbon was the capital, not only refused the Hebrews a quiet passage through his dominions, which was all they requested, but marched out with his army as far as Jahaz and offered them battle, they attacked and defeated him, and took possession of his territories by right of conquest[29]. Og, the king of Bashan, whose dominions were still farther distant from the direct route of the Hebrews, behaved with a rashness still less excusable. He led his army against them to Edrei, and met with the same fate as Sihon[30]. All the Amorites were cut off or dispersed, and the Hebrews settled in their country[31].

With the Edomites, Egyptians, Phœnicians or Zi-

[27] Numb. xx. 14—21. Deut. ii. 4. 22. 29.
[28] 2 Sam. viii. 13, 14. compare Gen. xxvii. 29. 40.
[29] Numb. xxi. 21—31. Deut. ii. 24—37.
[30] Numb. xxi. 33—35. Deut. i. 4. iii. 1—12.
[31] Numb. xxxii. Deut. iii. 12—18. Judg. xi. 13—23.

donians, and all other people, alliances were permitted, provided they were such as would tend to the public welfare. Thus David was suffered, without reproof, to become the ally of the kings of Geshur, Hamath, and Tyre; Solomon, of the kings of Tyre and Egypt, and of the queen of Sheba. Even the Maccabees, those zealots for the law, did not hesitate to enter into a compact with the Romans. When the prophets speak against confederacies with the Assyrians, Babylonians, and Egyptians, they do not condemn them as direct violations of the law, but as impolitic and ruinous measures, which betrayed a want of confidence in their king Jehovah. The event always showed, in the most striking manner, the propriety of their rebukes.

The league which Ahaz entered into with Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria, contrary to the admonitions of Isaiah, made him the vassal of a haughty monarch, who, without affording him the least assistance, so distressed him, that all the treasures of the temple and palace were scarcely sufficient to deliver him from this troublesome ally. The wounds which this treaty inflicted on the kingdom of Judah were for a long time unhealed. The devastation of the country and the tottering state of the nation in the time of Hezekiah, were consequences of that ill-judged confederacy. The treaties which the kingdom of Israel purchased at an enormous expense of the Egyptians, in order to obtain chariots and cavalry, were never of any real advantage. They only fostered vain hopes, and led the kings to measures which occasioned the destruction of the kingdom. Even the league which Hezekiah made with Egypt proved altogether useless, and but for the interposition of Providence, his power would have been annihilated. The alliance of Josiah with the Babylonians gave occasion to that unfortunate conflict in the plain of Jezreel, the consequences of which brought Judah first under the Egyptian, and afterwards under the Chaldean yoke. Finally, Zedekiah, the last king of Judah, and Hosea, the last king of Israel, relying on the

support of Egypt, rebelled against their conquerors; but Egypt left Hosea to the power of Assyria, and Zedekiah to the power of Chaldea, as Jeremiah had constantly predicted, notwithstanding the threats and bitter persecutions which he suffered from the men in power[32].

§. 11. HEBREW MAGISTRATES.

HAVING thus exhibited the foreign relations of the Hebrews, which were regulated by the fundamental law of the state, we shall now turn our attention to their domestic polity. This remained much as it had been under the patriarchal government, but reorganized in such a manner, that the people in every civil institution might recognise the sovereignty of Jehovah their king. The Hebrews were still divided into twelve tribes, as before. The tribe of Levi was separated from the rest, and devoted to the service of the court and state; but the tribe of Joseph, whose two sons Ephraim and Manasseh were adopted by Jacob[1], was subdivided into two, and received two portions in the allotment of the promised land; so that the number of twelve tribes continued the same. The ancient subdivisions of the several tribes into collections of families, remained unchanged. The princes of tribes and heads of families, as chiefs of these divisions, were the natural representatives of the people, and the magistrates in the realm of Jehovah. At the time of Moses, the larger collections of families were fifty-nine in number[2], the heads of which, together with the twelve princes of the tribes, composed a council of seventy-one members. But it is evident that the subdivisions of the tribes were more numerous than this, and consequently the number of heads of families was much greater also; for there were no less than two hundred and fifty chiefs of this rank who

[32] Is. vii. 2. 2 Chron. xxviii. 20, 21. Is. xxxvi—xxxviii. 2 Kings, xviii—xx. Hos. vii. 11. xii. 1, sqq. Is. xxv. 2—12. xxxi. 1—3. 2 Kings, xvii. 4, sqq. xviii. 20, 21. xxiii. 29, sqq. Jer. xxxvii. 5—10.

[1] Gen. xlviii. 5. [2] Numb. xxvi. 5—50.

attached themselves to Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, in the disturbance which they raised[3]. It is not certain whether the office of these magistrates was hereditary or elective. It is probable that the heads of families were chosen by the fathers of individual families, and the princes of tribes by the heads of families. At least this must have been the case whenever one of these chiefs died without sons, or left only such as were under age.

The *shoterim*, *(genealogists, officers,)* are also mentioned in connection with the elders, זְקֵנִים i. e. the princes of tribes and heads of families[4]. They therefore must have been elevated to the dignity of representatives and magistrates of the people. The peculiar nature of their office may be understood from the employments in which they were engaged. In Egypt, during the oppressions of Pharaoh, it was their business to see that every Hebrew delivered the requisite number of bricks; they afterwards gave their discharge to those soldiers who were legally exempt from military duty. Under Joshua they communicated the orders of the general to the soldiery; and in the time of the kings, the chief shoter, הַשּׁוֹטֵר had a certain superintendence over the whole army, although he was not a military commander[5]. They must therefore have possessed an accurate catalogue of the Hebrews, with an account of the age, ability, and domestic circumstances of each individual; and it has been remarked already, that they kept the genealogical tables. This business at first might have belonged to the princes of tribes, and in time to the heads of families, who afterwards committed it to their private secretaries; and they, having gradually acquired more and more importance by the possession of an office esteemed so honourable among the Hebrews, at last raised themselves to the dignity of magistrates and representatives of the people. They were

[3] Numb. iv. 16.

[4] Numb. xi. 16. Deut. xvi. 18. xx. 5—9. xxix. 10. xxxi. 28. Josh. viii. 33.

[5] Exod. v. 10, sqq. Deut. xx. 5—9. Josh. i. 10. 2 Chron. xxvi. 11.

chosen from the most respectable citizens, who were well acquainted with the art of writing, and who had the reputation of being men of strict integrity. In Palæstine they were distributed into every city, and performed the duties of their office for the city and its surrounding district. They were under the general superintendence of a *chief genealogist*, or הַשֹּׁטֵר *shoter*. This officer must not be confounded with another denominated הַסּוֹפֵר who was the military officer that kept the muster-rolls. But as the etymology of both these names indicates *a writer*, they are sometimes confounded[6].

To these magistrates Moses added a new class for the administration of justice; and that this institution, useful as it was, might be distinguished from those which were given by divine command, he candidly acknowledges that he was indebted for it to the advice of his father-in-law Jethro. When the people brought all their controversies before Moses, a whole day was scarcely sufficient to give them a hearing. Accordingly, Moses, to facilitate the administration of justice, by the advice of Jethro, divided the people into *tens*, *fifties*, *hundreds*, and *thousands*; and over each of these divisions he placed judges who were recommended to him by the choice of the people, as wise, prudent, honest, and pious men. They were selected for the most part from the heads of families, genealogists, or other people of rank[7]. There were about sixty thousand judges of tens, twelve thousand judges of fifties, six thousand judges of hundreds, and six hundred judges of thousands. This institution was willingly received by the Hebrews, as they had witnessed the regular administration of justice in Egypt, and had learned its advantages. There was, undoubtedly, such a subordination among these judges, that the cases which the judges of tens found too difficult to decide, they referred to the judges of fifties;

[6] Deut. xvi. 18. xxxi. 28. 2 Sam. viii. 16. xx. 25. 2 Chron. xxvi. 11. 2 Kings, xxv. 19. Is. xxxiii. 18. Jer. lii. 25. 1 Chron. xxiv. 6.

[7] Exod. xviii. 13—26. Deut. i. 12—15. Compare Exod. xviii. 21. 24.

and in like manner the judges of fifties to the judges of hundreds, and these last to the judges of thousands. Difficult questions, which the judges of thousands did not feel themselves competent to decide, they brought before Moses himself[8]. After his death these were brought before the chief magistrate of the nation; or if there was no such magistrate, the high priest, who was the prime minister of the invisible king, decided causes of this kind, after consultation with the wisest and most learned of the priests[9]. As this institution was designed to be perpetual, when judges died or went out of office, their places were supplied by new elections. After the people were settled in Palæstine, as they could not dwell together in companies of ten, fifty, one hundred, and one thousand, judges as well as genealogists, for each city and its surrounding district, were stationed in the several cities. Both offices were very frequently, if not generally, held by the same person. This is evident from the manner in which they are connected with each other in the Bible; and sometimes indeed the *judges*, שֹׁפְטִים, as chiefs of tens, fifties, hundreds, and thousands, are expressly denominated שֹׁטְרִים, *genealogists*[10]. These judges were included by Moses among the rulers, and summoned by Joshua to the general assemblies: they are mentioned in one instance before the genealogists[11]. Unless, then, all the judges were at the same time heads of families or genealogists, they must, at least those over hundreds and thousands, have been considered as rulers in the state, and as entitled to a seat in the legislative assemblies.

There were therefore in every tribe *judges, genealogists, heads of families*, and *a prince*. Each of these classes of magistrates had its own peculiar duties. The judges administered justice. The genealogists kept the genealogical tables, in which they occasionally noted the

[8] Exod. xviii. 22. Deut. i. 17. [9] Deut. xix. 17. ii. 5.
[10] Deut. xvi. 18. xxxi. 28. 1 Chron. xxiii. 4. xxvi. 29. Deut. i. 15, 16.
[11] Deut. xxxi. 28. Josh. viii. 33 xxiii. 2. xxiv. 1.

most remarkable occurrences of their times. The historical notices contained in the first Book of Chronicles, and which are not found in the Books of Moses, were probably derived from these tables[12]. The heads of families, with the prince of the tribe, had charge of the general concerns of each tribe, and to them the judges and genealogists were in some degree subordinate. In Palæstine, these magistrates were distributed into the several cities, and those who resided in the same city, composed the legislative assembly of that city and the surrounding district. When the magistrates of all the cities belonging to any one tribe were collected, they formed the supreme court, or legislative assembly, of the tribe. In like manner the magistrates of several different tribes might assemble in one body, and legislate conjointly for all those tribes which they represented. When the magistrates of all the tribes met together, they formed the general legislature of the whole nation[13]. Though there was no pecuniary emolument attached to these offices, they conferred great dignity and authority upon those who held them.

§. 12. THE LEARNED CLASS.

THE Hebrews had long acknowledged as magistrates, the *princes of tribes, heads of houses,* and *genealogists;* and they admitted without difficulty the institution of judges, since their office was neither lucrative nor hereditary. When the invisible king afterwards settled for ever on the tribe of Levi the most important offices of the court, state, and church, and, conferring upon the Levites great and peculiar privileges, put them in the place of the first-born, to whom the priestly office had till then belonged, even this regulation was at first submitted to without opposition[1]. It was the less to be expected that

[12] 1 Chron. iv. 21—23. 39—45. v. 10. 19—22. vii. 20—24.

[13] Deut. xxv. 1—8. xix. 12. xxii. 15. xxv. 7. 9. Judg. viii. 14. 1 Sam. xvi. 4. Judg. xx. 1—14. xxi. 1—11.

[1] Exod. xiii. 12, 13, comp. Numb. iii. 6—13. viii. 13—20. Deut. x. 8, 9. xxxiii. 8—11. Exod. xxxii. 29.

discontent should arise on this score, as the Hebrews had seen in Egypt a similar institution productive of great public benefit. The Egyptian priests were a separate caste, divided into three subordinate classes. They performed not only the religious rites, but the duties of all the civil offices for which learning was necessary. They therefore devoted themselves in a peculiar manner to the cultivation of the sciences. This *learned nobility*, so to speak, was strictly hereditary, and no one from another tribe could be received among its members. They studied natural philosophy, natural history, medicine, mathematics, particularly astronomy and geometry, history, civil polity, and jurisprudence. They were practising physicians, inspectors of weights and measures, surveyors of land, astronomical calculators, keepers of the archives, historians, receivers of the customs, judges, and counsellors of the king, who himself belonged to their caste. In short, like Raguel the priest of Midian, and Melchizedek the priest and king of Salem[2], they formed, guided, and ruled the people by establishing civil regulations, performing sacred services, and imparting religious instruction. They were liberally rewarded for the discharge of these important duties; not only by possessing large estates in land, which, if we may credit Diodorus Siculus[3], occupied a third part of all Egypt, but also by receiving from the king a stated salary for their civil employments[4]. However suspicious such an order may appear to many at the present day, it was admirably adapted to those times, and by means of it, Egypt was raised far above all the nations of antiquity, both in regard to her civil institutions and her advancement in the sciences. Hence even the Greeks, in ancient times, were accustomed to borrow their politics and their learning from the Egyptians. If then an institution, in many respects so useful, could be adopted by the Hebrews in such a manner as to retain its advan-

[2] Gen. xiv. 18. Exod. iii. 16.
[3] Diod. Sic. i. 63.
[4] Gen. xlvii. 22. Strabo, p. 787.

tages, and reject, as far as possible, its faults, it was evidently the wisest measure which that people could adopt.

In this manner the tribe of Levi, which had greatly distinguished itself by zeal for Jehovah[5] the invisible king, was actually devoted to the service of the sacred tabernacle and the altar (that is, in a political view, to be the courtiers of king Jehovah), to all those offices of state in which learning was requisite, and thus to the cultivation of learning itself[6]. The *princes of tribes* and *heads of houses*, however, still retained their ancient honours, and the members of other tribes were permitted to hold civil offices and to apply themselves to the sciences. Thus on the one hand the advantages of this institution were secured, and the educated parent was able to instruct his sons in the sciences, and prepare them for public stations; while, on the other hand, its disadvantages were avoided, and learning did not, as in Egypt, become the mystery of the learned order, nor was civil government transformed into a domination of priests. What fruits might not such a plant have borne, if the priests and Levites had faithfully accomplished the purposes of their appointment! Moses can never be accused of introducing regulations which tended to keep the people in ignorance; for every individual of whatever tribe, who had capacity, leisure, and desire to apply to study, was permitted to devote himself to letters: besides, more than a fiftieth part of the whole nation was expressly set apart to promote the progress of literature.

In order to answer the end for which they were destinated, the Levites, more than the other Hebrews, were to study the book of the law; to preserve and disseminate correct copies of it; to perform the duties of judges and genealogists; and consequently to be theologians, jurists, and historians. Accordingly, when David reorganized the Levites, he set apart six thousand for these offices; Jehoshaphat composed the supreme tribunal of his king-

[5] Exod. xxxii. 26—29. [6] Numb. xviii. 2—7.

dom of an equal number of priests, Levites, and heads of houses, and under Josiah the Levites are again mentioned as secretaries and genealogists[7]. As the priests and Levites were to try the accuracy of weights and measures, of which there were several models preserved in the sanctuary, it was necessary that they should understand something of mathematics; and as they were to determine and announce the moveable feasts, new moons, years, and intercalary years, they were obliged to study astronomy[8]. The priests were to instruct the people in religion and the law, and to solve questions which might arise upon these subjects[9]. The spirit of the institution made the Levites also instructors of the people, which office they in reality executed when they publicly sung psalms according to the arrangement of David, to which they were expressly appointed by Jehoshaphat[10]. It was also undoubtedly a part of their duty to read the law to the assembled Hebrews every seventh year; for in such a multitude of people many readers would be required, and the number of priests, at least in early times, was very small[11]. As the priests, by their exhortations, were to inspire the soldiers with courage when about to engage in battle, they probably paid some attention to the cultivation of eloquence; and as they had to perform the duty of police physicians, it was necessary that they should know something of the art of medicine[12]. It was the duty of the high priest, as head of the learned class and minister of state to king Jehovah, to superintend all other persons in office. When there was no chief magistrate of the community, he also, with the advice of the inferior priests, decided the most difficult legal controversies, and managed all the affairs of state, foreign and domestic. In important and doubtful cases, he, at the request of the principal

[7] 1 Chron. xxiii. 4. xxvi. 29. 2 Chron. xix. 8. xxxiv. 13.
[8] Deut. x. 10. xxviii. 11. Lev. xxv. 8—12.
[9] Deut. xvii. 9. Malachi, ii. 4—7.
[10] 1 Chron. xxiii. 5. 2 Chron. xvii. 7—9.
[11] Deut. xxxi. 11, 12. [12] Deut. xx. 2. Lev. xiii. xiv.

rulers, or of the chief magistrate, consulted the invisible king by Urim and Thummim[13]. But in all these employments, the priests and Levites, equally with the other Hebrews, were strictly prohibited the use of magic oracles, necromancy, astrology, omens, soothsaying from the entrails of sacrifices or the movement of clouds, and all those artifices[14] which, among the Egyptians and other ancient nations, were the usual means of managing the populace. Thus the Hebrew priests, who are so little esteemed by many at the present day, were the only priests of antiquity who were not allowed to impose upon the credulity of the multitude.

The Hebrew priests and Levites were therefore even more important and useful in church and state, than the three orders of Egyptian priests. Still they obtained of all the promised land only forty-eight cities, with small suburbs for their cattle; neither had they, like the Egyptian priests, real estate or a definite salary for their services. But it was requisite that they should be liberally provided for in some other way, lest, being compelled to engage in business for their subsistence, they should neglect the cultivation of learning, grow up in ignorance, and fail to discharge the duties of their office; or, by the pressure of want, should be tempted to dishonesty, injustice, and extortion. This was so much the more necessary because it was important that they, as the officers of king Jehovah, should make some show of grandeur to prevent their being despised by the common people, who are mostly moved by external splendour. Accordingly, Jehovah assigned for their maintenance the tithes, which the Hebrews were bound to offer him as rent for the land which he had granted them[15]. Abraham had before given a tithe of all his spoils to Melchizedek, priest of the Most High; many other nations afforded a like tribute to

[13] Deut. xvii. 9. 12. Exod. xxviii. 30. Numb. xxvii. 21. 1 Sam. xxiii. 10—12. xxx. 6—8.

[14] Deut. xviii. 9—14.

[15] Lev. xxvii. 20—23. xxx. 32. Numb. xviii. 21, sqq. Deut. xiv. 23.

their gods, and it was only half what the Egyptians paid to their king[16]. In addition to this, Moses assigned, to the priests alone, the firstlings of animals and the first-fruits of the soil, which amounted to about the sixtieth part of the annual income of a Hebrew; the ransom of the first-born male; the trespass-offerings; most of the sin-offerings; the skins of the burnt-offerings and sin-offerings; that which was devoted; the breast and shoulder of every peace-offering; a shoulder, both cheeks, and the maw of all the animals offered up in sacrifice. This is what is meant by the expression, the portion of the priests and Levites is Jehovah, that is, what is offered to Jehovah[17].

Had Morgan taken into consideration the important services which this learned class rendered to the Hebrew state, and the necessity of a rich provision for such officers, he would have applauded rather than censured Moses for his assignment of the tithes of more than six hundred thousand Hebrews, to about twelve thousand adult Levites. This made the income of a Levite about five times the income of an ordinary Hebrew, but the tithes did not amount to anything near the enormous sums which Morgan has erroneously calculated them at. The priests who, besides the perquisites above mentioned, received from the Levites a tenth of the tithes[18], were indeed liberally endowed; but they bore the expense of the daily sacrifices, and of those which were offered at particular festivals. We must also take into the account, that the whole tribe of Levi received only forty-eight cities of the promised land, and consequently the portions of the other tribes were much greater than they would otherwise have been. Moreover the tithes, especially at certain periods, were not regularly paid; and sometimes they were

[16] Gen. xiv. 20. xlvii. 13—26. Diod. Sic. iv. 21. x. 62. xiv. 93.

[17] Lev. ii. 12. Numb. xv. 18—21. xviii. 8—21. Deut. xviii. 1—8. Exod. xxxiv. 20. Numb. xviii. 15, 16. Lev. vi. 10. xxvi. 29. Numb xviii. 9. Lev. vii. 8. Numb. xviii. 14. Deut. xviii. 3, 4. Numb. xviii. 20, 21.

[18] Numb. xviii. 20, 21.

almost entirely withheld[19]. When the kingdom was divided after the death of Solomon, the priests and Levites, who all attached themselves to the kingdom of Judah, received their revenue from only two tribes. It must not be forgotten that this bountiful provision for the priests and Levites was nothing peculiar;—it was the usual, and not at all oppressive, tax which the Hebrews paid to their king, and which he himself devoted to the support of his officers[20]. An abundant revenue it certainly was, but one that was necessary for the performance of the duties which devolved upon this order; and, after all, it fell far short of that allotted to the priests by the Egyptians. Had Moses designed merely to enrich and exalt his own tribe, he would have had a more particular regard for his own family, and confined the priesthood to that; or at least would have so provided for his descendants, that it would scarcely have been necessary for one of them, soon after, to withdraw from his native city for want of subsistence[21]. Korah of the tribe of Levi, and Dathan and Abiram of the tribe of Reuben (whom Jacob had deprived of the rights of primogeniture and of the priesthood[22]), with two hundred and fifty more of the principal rulers, endeavoured to usurp the priestly office; but their insurrection only gave occasion for an unexpected and lasting memorial of the will of Jehovah their king[23]. If priests so well provided for ever exacted more than their due (of which, however, there is but one example known[24]), no blame on this account can be attached to the institutions of Moses. It should rather be recollected, that there never yet has existed an order of men, of which every individual was perfectly free from crime[25].

[19] Malachi, iii. 10. Nehem. xiii. 10.
[20] Numb. xviii. 8—24. [21] Judg. xvii. 7—13. [22] Gen. xlix. 4.
[23] Numb. xvi. 17. [24] 1 Sam. ii. 13, sqq.
[25] Lowman, Government of the Israelites, p. 195. 205—228.

§. 13. RELATION OF THE TRIBES TO EACH OTHER.

As each tribe had its own magistrates and representatives, and administered its own affairs, each composed an entire political community, in some respects independent of the other tribes. We often find single tribes acting like independent nations, and, as might be expected, sometimes justly and sometimes unjustly. Thus the tribe of Benjamin undertook the protection of the licentious criminals of Gibeah, and sustained a war against all the other tribes. The tribe of Judah alone chose David for its king. It is imputed as a fault to several individual tribes, that they did not, each on their own account, prosecute the war against the weakened Canaanites, but made some of them tributary and formed alliances with others[1]. Hence it is evident that the Hebrew constitution authorized each tribe to provide for its own interests; or, if the strength of any one of them was insufficient for this purpose, to unite with some of the other tribes and make common cause with them. We frequently find several tribes thus acting in concert. Judah and Simeon united in their war against the Canaanites; as did also Ephraim and Manasseh. The tribes of Zebulon and Naphtali united with Barak to oppose the army of Jabin; Manasseh, Asher, Zebulon, and Naphtali, chose Gideon for their leader against the Midianites. The tribes east of Jordan made choice of Jephthah for their general to carry on a war against the Ammonites. In later times, and during the reign of Saul, the same tribes made war upon the Arabs of Hejr (Hagarites), the Ituræans (Jetur), the Nobadites, and Naphishites. Upon the death of Saul eleven tribes remained faithful in their allegiance to his family, and seven years intervened before they submitted to David. After the death of Solomon, ten tribes revolted from the house of David, and elected

[1] Judg. i. 21. 27. 35. xi. xx. 2 Sam. ii. 4.

Jeroboam for their king. In short, any tribe, or any number of tribes united, exercised the power of convening legislative assemblies, passing resolves, waging wars, making treaties, and electing for themselves chiefs, generals, regents, and kings[2].

But though each of the twelve tribes was in some respects an independent state, and as such had its separate interests; still they were all united by certain general interests, and formed but one nation. They were all descended from one ancestor, from whom they had inherited divine promises, which had already in part been fulfilled. This common bond of union, which embraced all the tribes, was strengthened and drawn more closely by the necessity of mutual aid against their common enemies. Jehovah was the God and king of the whole nation; and the sacred tabernacle, which was his temple and palace, was common to all the tribes. They had one common oracle, the Urim and Thummim; one common high priest, the prime minister of the king; a common learned class who possessed cities in all the tribes; a common law of church and state. In short, the constitution was so contrived that, notwithstanding the independence of all the tribes, each had a sort of superintendence over the rest, in regard to their observance of the law. Any of the tribes could be called to an account by the others for a transgression of the law; and if they refused to give satisfaction, they might be attacked and punished by war[3].

It is possible, as Michælis has justly remarked, that a political community thus constituted, may exist without any proper sovereign power, to which the last appeal must be made; but there will probably be a want of promptness and energy in its movements. It may be quiet, prosperous, and happy, or fall into anarchy, con-

[2] Judg. i. 1—3. 22. vii. 23, 24. viii. 1—3. xi. 1—11. 1 Chron. v. 10. 18, 19. 2 Sam. iii. 17. 1 Kings, xii. 1—24.

[3] Josh. xxii. 9—31. Judg. xx.

fusion, and wretchedness, according to the conduct of its members. Many examples of these conditions of the Hebrew state are found in the Book of Judges.

In a community composed of states so nearly independent, jealousies would naturally arise between the more powerful tribes, which might terminate in the dismembering of the commonwealth. Such jealousies and rivalry actually existed between the tribes of Judah and Joseph, the most powerful in the Hebrew nation. The latter inherited a double portion, and was divided into two, Ephraim and Manasseh. They valued themselves upon their descent from such an ancestor as Joseph, who had been so honourably distinguished from his brethren in the blessings pronounced by Jacob and Moses. The tribe of Judah had the right of primogeniture; they had received the most splendid promises, and the expected Messiah was to spring from them. These tribes were perpetually struggling for the preponderance, and at last, after the death of Solomon, the descendants of Joseph having brought over to their party eight of the other tribes, forcibly separated themselves from Judah. These jealousies and dissensions first caused the weakening of all the tribes, and the final destruction of the whole commonwealth [4].

§. 14. LEGISLATIVE ASSEMBLIES.

As the twelve tribes had many interests in common, and in some respects formed but one political body, the magistrates of all the tribes met in general assemblies to consult for the general good of the nation. These general assemblies were convened by the chief magistrate of the commonwealth, by the commander of the army, or by the

[4] Gen. xlix. 8—12. 22—26. Deut. xxxiii. 7. 13—17. Verschuir, Dissert. Philol. Exeg. Leovardiæ et Franequeræ 1773, iv. p. 66—84. de Æmulatione Israelitorum mutua tanquam vera caussa scissæ ac debilitatæ Judæorum Reipublicæ. Michælis, Mos. Recht. Th. i. s. 47. Alt. Or. Bibliothek, Th. vi. s. 50. sqq.

regent; and, when the nation had no such supreme head, by the high priest, in his capacity of prime minister to the invisible king. The great assembly mentioned in the twentieth chapter of Judges, was undoubtedly convoked by the high priest Phinehas, who was so zealous for the honour of Jehovah[1].

The place of assembling was usually before the door of the holy tabernacle, the palace of the invisible king; or on some spot which had acquired a degree of sacredness from its having been the theatre of some great event. While the Hebrews dwelt together in their encampments in Arabia, the assemblies were summoned by the sound of the sacred trumpets; but after they were settled in Palæstine, heralds must have been employed for this purpose[2].

The legislative assemblies were of two kinds. The sound of one trumpet was the signal for the convoking of a select assembly, composed of the princes of the tribes, and the heads of thousands, or associated families. The sound of two trumpets was the signal for collecting the whole congregation, כָּל־הָעֵדָה including the genealogists, judges, and (at least upon very important occasions) as many of the common people as chose to attend. In speaking of these assemblies, the rulers of the congregation are sometimes mentioned first, then the children of Israel; and in some cases the women and children are referred to as being present[3].

The legislative assemblies received different denominations, according to the class of which they were composed. When the whole people כָּל־הַקָּהָל were collected, they formed what was styled, סוֹד or כָּל־הָעֵדָה *the whole assembly, or congregation.* There were also נְשִׂיאֵי הָעֵדָה

[1] Numb. x. 2—4. Josh. xxiii. 2. xxiv. 1. 1 Sam. xi. 14, 15. Judg. xx. 27, 28.

[2] Numb. x. 3. Judg. xx. 1. 27, 28. 1 Sam. x. 17. Josh. xxiv. 1. 1 Sam. xi. 14, 15. 1 Kings, xii. 1. Numb. x. 2—4.

[3] Exod. xxxiv. 31, 32. Deut. xxix. 9—11. Judg. xx.

the princes of the assembly; קְרִיאֵי מוֹעֵד or קְרִיאֵי הָעֵדָה *those called to the assembly;* פְּקוּדֵי הָעֵדָה *those deputed to the assembly;* and זִקְנֵי הָעֵדָה *the elders of the assembly, or senators*[4].

It was to these assemblies that Moses immediately addressed himself, and to them he delivered the precepts which he received from Jehovah. He could not have held direct communication with the whole body of the people, unless his voice had been strong enough to be heard by a multitude of more than six hundred thousand men, besides women, children, and aged persons[5]. The magistrates, particularly the genealogists, then communicated to the people the precepts and orders of Moses, each one to the families under his immediate direction. In like manner the commands of the general and the resolves of the assemblies were made known to the people, who were sometimes assembled ready to receive these communications; or if not, were called together by the proper officers.

The legislative assemblies exercised all the rights of sovereignty. They declared war, made peace, formed alliances, chose generals, chief judges or regents, and kings. They prescribed to the rulers whom they elected the principles by which they were to govern; they tendered to them the oath of office, and rendered them homage[6].

There is no evidence that the magistrates received any instructions from the people, respecting the measures to be adopted in the legislative assemblies. Such a proceeding would have been contrary to the spirit of the patriarchal government, which was, to a considerable extent, preserved in the Mosaic institutions. The as-

[4] Exod. xix. 7. xxiv. 3—8. xxxiv. 31, 32. xxxv. 1—4. Lev. iv. 13. viii. 3—5. ix. 5. Numb. xi. 25. 30. xvi. 2.

[5] Exod. xix. 7. xxiv. 3—8. xxxiv. 31, 32. xxxv. 1. 4. Numb. xi. 25. 30.

[6] Exod. xix. 7. xxiv. 3—8. Josh. ix. 15—21. Judg. xx. 1. 11—14. 18. 28. xxi. 13, sqq. 1 Sam. x. 24. xi. 14. 2 Sam. iii. 17—19. v. 1—3. 1 Kings, xii.

semblies acted independently. On very important occasions, however, of great public interest, they sometimes submitted their resolves to the people for their approbation; as was the case when Saul was raised to the throne. Moses permitted the people to elect their own judges; and it appears that Jehovah was made king of the Hebrews by the voluntary choice of the whole nation. All at least swore fealty to him, not excepting even the women and children[7].

The people were attached to their magistrates, and generally accepted what they proposed, and rejected what they disapproved. Hence the revolt of the two hundred and fifty rulers, who were leagued with Korah, Dathan, and Abiram, and who must have had numerous adherents among the people, was sufficiently dangerous to require a supernatural punishment. There were times, however, when the people raised their voices so loudly against the measures of the magistrates, that they were compelled to abandon them. Even in the times of monarchy, the people refused the honours of a regal burial to those kings who had incurred their displeasure, and elevated to the throne the prince with whom they were most pleased, without regard to the order of succession[8].

§. 15. FORM OF GOVERNMENT.

God condescended to be elected king of the Hebrews; to give them a code of civil laws; to decide their more important litigations; and to solve the inquiries which they proposed. The obstinate and disobedient Hebrews he punished as rebellious subjects of his government[1]. Ac-

[7] 1 Sam. xi. 14, 15, compare Josh. xxiii. 2, sqq. xxiv. 1, sqq. Exod. xix. 7, 8. xxiv. 3—8, compare Deut. xxix. 9—14.

[8] Numb. xvi. Josh. ix. 18, 19. 2 Chron. xxvi. 1, 2. 1 Kings, xxi. 24. xxiii. 30, compare 2 Chron. xxiii. 25. xxxvi. 1.

[1] Numb. xvii. 1—11. xxvii. 1—11. xxxvi. 1—10. xv. 32—41. Josh. vii. 16—22. Judg. i. 1, 2. xx. 18. 27, 28. 1 Sam. xiv. 37. xxiii. 9—12. xxx. 8. 2 Sam. ii. 1. Numb. xi. 33—35. xii. 1—15. xvi. 1—50. Deut. xviii. 18.

cording to his promise, he sent them prophets, by whom he made known the measures which the civil rulers were to adopt; and he led the nation on to the accomplishment of their great design (the preservation of the true religion), by a particular providence, such as no other people had ever been the subjects of; God thus reigning as king of the Hebrews, their form of government was in fact a theocracy. This species of government was altogether suited to the character and necessities of those remote ages, when the political constitutions of all nations were so connected with their tutelar gods, and with their national systems of religion, as to be, at least in appearance, theocratical. But the theocracies of the pagans can bear no comparison with the theocracy of the Hebrews. Those were impostures, this was genuine. In pagan theocracies, religion was employed merely as a means of strengthening and perpetuating the civil constitution; in the Hebrew theocracy, on the contrary, the preservation of religion was the end, the civil constitution the means of attaining it.

But though the constitution of the Hebrews was in reality theocratical, yet it was neither expedient nor proper that their political affairs should all be directed by the immediate interposition of God; and it was necessary that their polity should partake more or less of the usual forms of human governments. In the east, at the present day, all governments are despotic or patriarchal. This is so universally true, that the orientalists, as all travellers testify, can scarcely imagine a different government. The same appears to have been the case in the time of the Maccabees[2]. In the most remote antiquity, however, aristocracies and democracies were well known. The inhabitants of Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjath-jearim, had neither king nor prince. The national council and the people commissioned ambassadors and concluded alliances. The Philistines were governed by five princes.

[2] 1 Macc. viii. 14—16.

The Phœnicians were not at all times under regal government; and when monarchy existed, the power of the king was very much limited. The Carthaginians, who emigrated from Phœnicia, and probably formed their government on the model of that of the mother country, from the first introduced an aristocracy, in many respects similar to the more recent Venetian oligarchy[3]. If the story of Herodotus, iii. 80, 81, be true, the great Persian monarchy, after the death of the impostor Smerdis, was very near being transformed to a democracy.

It is still true, however, that monarchy in ancient times was the most usual form of government among the orientals. There were many subordinate and dependent kings. That the sovereignty of Jehovah over the Hebrews might be the more visible, he employed no viceroy; but he had a minister of state, if we may be allowed the expression, in the person of the high priest. The Hebrew magistrates, who were very jealous of their prerogatives, managed the political concerns of the nation; and their powers were so extensive, that Josephus chooses to denominate the government an aristocracy. Moses laid all the precepts and orders which he received from Jehovah, before the magistrates, acknowledged their authority in the strongest terms, and submitted their demands to the decision of Jehovah[4].

But the magistrates could neither enact laws on their own authority, nor levy taxes. The people possessed so much influence, that it was necessary in all important cases to have their approbation; and when they were not consulted, they often remonstrated so loudly as to force the magistrates to listen to them. They even sometimes proposed laws to be adopted by the legislature; and had power sufficient to rescue Jonathan, when his life was endangered in consequence of the hasty vow of their first monarch. It is evident, therefore, that the aristocracy

[3] Josh. ix. 11. xiii. 3. Judg. iii. 3. 1 Sam. vi. 4. Heeren, Ideen über die Politik, den Verkehr und den Handel, u. s. w. Th. i. s. 194.

[4] Numb. xiv. 5. xvi. xxvii. 5. xxxvi. 5, 6.

was greatly modified and limited by an intermixture of democracy. On this account Lowman and Michælis are inclined to denominate the Mosaic constitution a democracy[5].

§. 16. THE CHIEF MAGISTRATE.

THE invisible king, Jehovah, was in reality the only chief magistrate of the Hebrew state. The sacred tabernacle was his palace, and by it the people were made sensible of his presence. It is true that Moses was magistrate for the whole nation, but he held his office merely as a mediator between God and the Hebrews, for the purpose of delivering them from the power of Egypt; of giving them the law; and of leading them through the wilderness to the land of promise. God gave him a special commission for the transaction of this business, and as soon as the commission was executed, the office expired. Accordingly there was no successor appointed; for Moses had, during his life, accomplished all the purposes for which his office was instituted.

At first Moses ruled the whole state with the assistance of the ordinary magistrates only. But as the people, and even the magistrates themselves, were very jealous and suspicious, unmanageable and stubborn, and constantly inclined to rebellion, it was very difficult, and almost impossible, for this messenger of God to perform all the duties of his office without more efficacious aid. While encamped in the Arabian desert, a general discontent, which threatened a dangerous revolt, broke out among the people on account of the want of flesh. On this occasion, Moses, at the command of God, instituted a council of state, consisting of seventy-two Hebrews, distinguished for wisdom and possessing the confidence of

[5] Exod. xix. 7, 8. xxiv. 3—8, compare Deut. xxix. 9—14. Josh. ix. 18, 19. xxiii. 1, sqq. xxiv. 2, sqq. 1 Sam. x. 24. xi. 14, 15. Numb. xxvii. 1—8. xxxvi. 1—9. 1 Sam. xiv. 24. Lowman, Civil Government of the Israelites, p. 238—273. Michælis, Mos. Recht. Th. i. s. 256.

the people, who were to assist him in bearing the burthens of the government, and in directing the affairs of the nation. They were selected from among the princes, the heads of associated families, and the genealogists. To prevent all jealousy between the tribes, six were chosen from each [1].

This council having been appointed for the express purpose of assisting Moses in the discharge of the arduous duties of his peculiar office, died with him. In the history of the succeeding periods, there is not the slightest mention of such a council; not even in those times when it must have acted a most important part, had it been in existence. When there was no chief magistrate, the whole business of the government would have belonged properly to the council of state. But we find no traces of such a council in the history of those times. When Saul became king; when, after his death, the tribe of Judah withdrew from his house, and placed David on the throne; when the other eleven tribes attached themselves to David; when, after the death of Solomon, ten tribes revolted from the house of David, and elected Jeroboam king; when the usurping queen Athaliah was hurled from the throne, and Joash placed upon it; to say nothing of the numerous revolutions in the kingdom of Israel; there is not the least mention made of a council of state. But in transactions of such deep interest to the Hebrew commonwealth, such a council, if it had existed, must have been actively engaged; and the historians would not have passed over its acts with such profound silence. The rabbins, therefore, are not to be credited, when they assert that the council instituted by Moses continued uninterrupted to the latest times after the captivity, and that the same institution was perpetuated in the sanhedrim which existed after the times of the Maccabees.

But though the Mosaic state was so organized that there could be regularly no chief magistrate except the

[1] Numb. xi.

invisible king, Jehovah, and no minister of state except the high priest; yet it is plain from Deut. xvii. 9, that when the necessities of the nation required it, a supreme ruler of the whole community might be legally chosen. This seems to have been implied in the nature, or inferred from the customs, of constitutions of the same kind. Such a ruler was denominated שׁוֹפֵט *judge*, or rather *governor;* for the root שָׁפַט has a very extensive meaning, and among other things, signifies *to set in order, to govern.* Accordingly Artemidorus remarks, κρίνειν τὸ ἄρχειν ἔλεγον οἱ παλαιοί, *to judge*, signified *to govern*, among the ancients[2].

These magistrates were indeed supreme judges by virtue of their office; but this was not their only, nor even their most important, duty. Such magistrates were known among the Tyrians; for Josephus relates from their own annals, that, after the conquest of Tyre by Nebuchadnezzar, Baal the king reigned nineteen years; after which judges were introduced, whose names, with the time of their administration, he accurately sets down according to the order of succession[3]. The Carthaginian *suffetes* were similar to the שׁוֹפְטִים of the Hebrews and Tyrians, only in name; for the latter were independent rulers, while the former were no more than members of the supreme executive council or senate. This is clearly intimated in several places by Livy. For example: "Suffetes, qui summus Pœnis *magistratus*, cum quæstore elicuit, laceratosque verberibus cruci adfigi jussit.—*Senatum* itaque *suffetes* (quod velut consulare apud eos imperium) vocarunt.—*Judicum ordo* ea tempestate dominabatur. Qui *unum ejus ordinis et omnes* infestos habebat. —Cum *suffetes* ad jus discendum *consedissent*[4]." Bochart has quoted African inscriptions, which contain the names of individual *suffetes* of several cities of the Phœnician colonies in Africa. But these, so far as can be ascer-

[2] Artem. ii. 14. Josh. xvi. 31. 1 Sam. viii. 20. Is. xi. 4. 1 Kings, iii. 9.
[3] Against Apion, i. 21.
[4] Livy, xxviii. 37. xxx. 7. xxxiii. 46. xxxiv. 61.

tained, were always delegated from the council of judges or *suffetes*, for the purpose of transacting some special business[5].

§. 17. MARCH OF THE HEBREWS FROM HOREB TO CANAAN.

THE Hebrews remained at the foot of mount Horeb eleven months and nineteen days. During this time the necessary laws were given; the tabernacle was set up for the palace of their king, Jehovah; the regular service of his court was established; the sanctions of the law were solemnly repeated; the people were numbered and mustered for the approaching war; the order of encamping, breaking up, and marching, was accurately settled; and the whole constitution of the state was completed. On the twentieth day of the second month of the second year after their departure from Egypt, they broke up from Horeb, and proceeded by short marches through the mountains, into the great sandy desert of Zin, as far as Kadesh[1]. Moses says, with the utmost frankness, that he took with him as a guide his brother-in-law Hobab, who was well acquainted with the situation of the fountains, wells, and pastures of that region. The descendants of Hobab from that time always remained among the Hebrews. They sometimes occur under the denomination of Kenites; and a race of them, who were descended from Hemath, were called Rechabites. There was another tribe of Kenites much more ancient than they, from which they are to be distinguished[2]. It is worthy of remark, that the cloud which hung over the sacred tabernacle, and by its rising and setting determined the marches of the Israelites, did not supersede the necessity of another guide, who could conduct them to the secret fountains, the concealed wells, and the distant pastures of the desert.

[5] Bochart, lib. I. cap. xxiv. p. 517.

[1] Lev. xxvi. 3—46. Numb. i. x. 5—30. Deut. i. 1.

[2] Numb. x. 29—32. Judg. i. 16. iv. 11. 1 Chron. ii. 55. 2 Kings, x. 15, 23. Jer. xxv. 2, compare Gen. xv. 19. Numb. xxiv. 21, 22. 1 Sam. xv. 6.

From the wilderness of Zin the Hebrews journeyed to the southern borders of Canaan, with the intention of entering and subduing the country. But it soon appeared that this generation, whose spirit had been broken down by long slavery in Egypt, was entirely unfit for war. Twelve spies, selected from the most noble of the Hebrews in each tribe, were sent to explore the country. After an absence of forty days they returned: and, with the exception of Caleb and Joshua, they gave so fearful an account of the great stature, strength, and courage of the inhabitants, of the lofty position and strong fortifications of their cities, that the whole nation was struck with fear. A most dangerous insurrection broke out, and Moses and Aaron were in imminent danger of being stoned by the populace. Notwithstanding all that Caleb and Joshua could say, the people, in despair, gave up the design of conquering Canaan, and made preparations for returning to Egypt[3].

Then followed the sentence of God, that all the Hebrews who were over twenty years old at the time of the departure from Egypt, should die in Arabia Petræa, and that Canaan should be conquered by the next generation. The people upon this became sensible of their folly, took courage, and made an unsuccessful attempt to penetrate into the country. But this ebullition of courage, even had it been attended with better success, would have been but of short duration, and was productive of no benefit. By their repulse, they were taught that they were not adequate to the conquest of the country; and accordingly they acquiesced in a measure with which they would never have been satisfied, had it not been for this experience of their own weakness. They turned back from the borders of the promised land, to wander thirty-eight years longer in the Arabian deserts, until that whole generation should become extinct[4].

This long period was spent in wandering about mount

[3] Numb. xiii. [4] Numb. xiv. 1—45. Deut. i. 22—46.

Seir. Besides the promulgation of a few additional laws, the most remarkable event that occurred was the rebellion of Korah, Dathan, and Abiram. The history of this period is briefly related, and, at the close of the narration, all the places of encampment are enumerated [5].

In the fortieth year, the new generation returned to Kadesh, in the desert of Zin. Though more courageous, they were scarcely less turbulent and rebellious than their fathers. When water failed them, their recollections of Egypt revived, and they repeated the old reproaches against Moses, because he had not suffered them to remain in that fruitful country. At the command of God, Moses smote a rock with his staff, and water flowed in abundance. But as Moses and Aaron on this occasion manifested some impatience, and a distrust of Jehovah, they were both forbidden to enter the promised land [6].

The Edomites, though frequently requested by Moses, steadily refused to grant the Hebrews a free passage through their country into the southern part of Palæstine. They were therefore compelled to take a more circuitous route. This was a new occasion of dejection and discontent, and the murmurings and complaints of the people rose so high, that an extraordinary chastisement was necessary to reduce them to obedience. They turned back from the desert of Zin to the Elanitic gulf, whence they were permitted to pass along the frontiers of the Edomites. They crossed the river Zared and proceeded northerly, through the territory of the Moabites, to the river Arnon. Then Sihon, king of the Amorites, not only refused to permit them to pass peaceably through his country, as they had requested, but led out his army to attack them; as did also Og the king of Bashan a short time after. These two kings were defeated in quick succession, and their whole country, from the river Arnon to mount Hermon, fell into the power of the Hebrews [7].

[5] Deut. i. 45. ii. 1, 2. Numb. xv. 1—41. xix. 1—22. xvi. 1—32. xv—xix. xxxiii. [6] Numb. xx. 1—14. Deut. i. 29—46.

[7] Numb. xxi—xxvii. xxxii—xxxv.

The Moabites and Ammonites saw with pleasure the defeat of their old enemies, the Amorites; but they regarded with suspicious dread their new and more powerful neighbours, the Hebrews. They, in reality, had nothing to fear, for the Hebrew law prohibited all hostilities against them. They however united with some Midianitish tribes, who were at that time pasturing their herds in the country of the Amorites; but, with this accession to their strength, they ventured on no open acts of hostility. After the failure of repeated attempts to curse the Hebrews by means of Balaam, the allied nations at length succeeded in seducing them to idolatry. As this was in fact instigating the people to rebellion against their rightful sovereign, the Moabites and Amorites might justly have been punished by the war which was prosecuted against Midian. But they were spared, because they were related to the Hebrews, and on condition that they would remain quiet for the future [8].

The Hebrews were now separated from Canaan by nothing but the river Jordan. The conquest of the country was next to be undertaken. For this purpose the new generation of soldiers was mustered and reviewed, and the number of men capable of bearing arms found to be nearly the same as at the former enrolment. The tribes of Reuben and Gad, and half the tribe of Manasseh, received for their possession the conquered country east of Jordan; but they were required to assist the other tribes in the conquest of Canaan, before they settled on their own lands. Finally, the boundaries of the country to be subdued were accurately defined; the order for the expulsion of the inhabitants was repeated and enforced; and the regulations respecting the cities of refuge were established. With this the business was completed with which Moses had been intrusted, as the internuncio between God and the Hebrews [9].

[8] Numb. xxii. 1—25. xvii. xxxi. 1—64.
[9] Numb. xxxiii. 50—56. xxxiv. xxxv.

NOTE. The increase of the Hebrews in four hundred and thirty years, from seventy persons to 603,550 males upwards of twenty years of age, besides 22,000 males of a month old and upwards among the Levites, (Exod. xii. 37. Numb. i. 45, 46. iii. 39.) has appeared to many incredible. The number of 600,000 men capable of bearing arms, necessarily makes the whole number of people amount to 2,400,000, or about two millions and a half. (Compare Sussmilch, Gottl. Ordnung in Verand. des menschlichen Geschlechts, Th. ii. s. 387, sqq.) An anonymous writer in the Literarischen Anzeiger, 1796, Oct. 4. s. 311. has demonstrated, that the Hebrews, in four hundred and thirty years, might have increased from seventy persons to 977,280 males above twenty years old. He supposes that of those seventy persons who went to Egypt, only forty remained alive after a space of twenty years; each one of whom had two sons. In like manner, at the close of every succeeding period of twenty years, he supposes one fourth part of those who were alive at the commencement of the period, to have died. Hence arises the following geometrical progression:

After twenty years, of the seventy there are forty living, each having two sons.

	Consequently	= 80
80	$\frac{3}{4}$	=120
120	$\frac{3}{4}$	=180
180	$\frac{3}{4}$	=270

and so on.

Thus the first term of the progression is 80= =a

The denominator $\frac{3}{2}$= =b

The number of terms $\frac{6}{2}\frac{1}{0}$= =n

Therefore the expression for the whole sum will be

$$\frac{ab^n - a}{b-1} \text{ or } \frac{80 \times \frac{3}{2}^{\frac{6}{2}\frac{1}{0}} - 80}{\frac{3}{2} - 1} = \frac{80 \times 6109 - 80}{\frac{1}{2}} = 977,280.$$

§. 18. THE LAST ACTS OF MOSES.

Moses, having directed the Hebrews thus far during his life, wished to do all in his power towards preserving the knowledge and worship of Jehovah among them after his death. The people, and even the magistrates, during the forty years of his administration, were far from being thoroughly imbued with the spirit of the theocracy which he had established. They had so often rebelled, and offered sacrifice to idols, that it became necessary to have all animals slain at the altar, and under the inspection of the priests. In their journeyings through the wilderness, they carried with them portable tabernacles of Saturn; and it was but a short time since they had been guilty of the grossest idolatry[1]. It was evidently necessary that religion should be made to them, as much as possible, an object of sense; that it should be so closely interwoven with the civil constitution, that it could be neither forgotten nor perverted; and it was particularly desirable that the new generation should be made to perceive the nature of their polity, and the relation in which they stood to the true God.

Moses accordingly wrote for the people an earnest exhortation to obedience, in which he alluded to the instances of the kindness, severity, and providence of God, which the Hebrews had already experienced; he exhibited in a strong light the sanctions of the law; he repeated the most important statutes; and, as circumstances had changed in many respects, he made alterations in some of the laws, and added a few new ones to the code. These exhortations (which compose his Fifth Book, or Deuteronomy), he delivered to the magistrates as his farewell address, at a time when their minds were well prepared to receive wholesome instruction, by the accomplishment of the divine promises which had already

[1] Amos, v. 26. Acts, vii. 43. Numb. xxv. 1—9.

commenced. The genealogists, each in his own circle, communicated all to the common people, including the women and children[2].

That the latest generations might have a visible and permanent memorial of their duty, he directed that, after they had taken possession of Canaan, the law (or at least its fundamental principles, and the first development of its sanctions as exhibited Exod. xx—xxiv.), should be engraved on pillars of stone, plastered with lime, and that these pillars should be erected with appropriate solemnities at Shechem on mount Ebal, or, more probably, mount Gerazim. On this occasion the priests were to utter particular imprecations against all the secret transgressors of the law, to which the people were to assent by responding *Amen*, at the close of each imprecation[3].

Moses then developed, a second time, and still more minutely than before, the conditions according to which Jehovah, their God and king, would govern them. He cast a prophetic glance into the most distant futurity, while he declared the different destinies that awaited them to the latest generations, according to their conduct in regard to the law. In full view of these conditions, and in order to impress them the more deeply on their minds, he caused the whole people, even the women and children, again to take a solemn oath of obedience, and that not only for themselves, but also for their posterity[4].

The official duties of Moses were now closed. He commissioned Joshua, not as his successor, but as a military leader, divinely appointed, to be the conqueror of the land of Canaan, and to portion it out among the victors. He delivered to the priests the whole book of the law, that they might deposit it in the sanctuary with the ark of the covenant. He also left them a song, in which he represented, in a most vivid manner, the perverseness of the nation, their future disobedience and punishment,

[2] Deut. xxix. 10. [3] Deut. xxvii. 2—26.
[4] Deut. xxviii. 1—68. xxix. xxx.

repentance, and pardon. This song the Hebrews were to commit to memory, that they might be aware of the consequences of disobedience; and that, when the threatenings were fulfilled, they might think of the law and return to their duty. Finally, he viewed the land of Canaan from Nebo, the summit of mount Pisgah; and then this great man, and distinguished servant of God, was gathered to his fathers[5]. By the institutions which he introduced for the preservation of the knowledge of God, he conferred an invaluable favour not only on the Hebrews, but on the whole human race; a favour for which no wise and good man can withhold from him his gratitude, whatever objections he may imagine can be brought against some of his laws.

[5] Deut. xxxi—xxxiv.

BOOK III.

HISTORICAL SURVEY FROM THE DEATH OF MOSES TO THE INTRODUCTION OF MONARCHY.

§. 19. CONQUEST OF THE LAND OF CANAAN.

AFTER the death of Moses the Hebrews, under the command of Joshua, prepared themselves for the invasion of Canaan. The inhabitants of this country still retained a fearful remembrance of the miracles in Egypt, and the passage through the Red sea; and the recent victories over the Amorite kings, Sihon and Og, had greatly increased their apprehensions[1]. The Jordan, which was now the only barrier that separated the Hebrews from the Canaanites, was at that season (April) very much swollen, and its deep and broad channel was completely filled. Its breadth was then nearly two hundred fathoms, and its greatest depth about fourteen feet. The Canaanites, therefore, thinking it impossible for so numerous a people to cross the river at that time with their women and children, took no measures to prevent or obstruct the execution of such a design. But to this generation there was granted as miraculous a passage across the Jordan, as had been opened for their fathers through the Red sea; and ere the Canaanites were aware, the Hebrews had encamped on this side of the river, not far from Jericho[2]. By this miracle the idolatrous nations were not only struck with terror, but the greatness and power of Jehovah were shown in the clearest light, both to the chosen people and to their enemies. But however miraculous the passage

[1] Josh. ii. 9—11. ix. 9, 10.

[2] Josh. iii. iv.

over Jordan really was, the history is so far from betraying an undue love for the marvellous, that it relates with great minuteness the relation of the spies respecting Jericho, and all the other human means employed in this expedition.

The Hebrews, however, did not take advantage of the panic of the Canaanites, but gave them time to recover themselves and prepare for war. Instead of laying immediate siege to Jericho, they first circumcised all the males who had remained uncircumcised during the last forty years, on account of the hardships of their journey. Jericho was then taken, and in a manner which tended to depress still more the drooping courage of the Canaanites. After the conquest of Ai, which soon followed, the Hebrews advanced without opposition to Shechem; a city that Jacob gave to his son Joseph, and which, for aught that appears, had always remained in the possession of his descendants. Here were the mountains Gerizim and Ebal, where, in compliance with the iujunction of Moses, the law was engraved on stone, and the covenant with the king, Jehovah, solemnly renewed in the promised land[3].

The victorious arms of the Hebrews, and the confederacy which the inhabitants of Gibeon, Chephirah, Beeroth, and Kirjath-jearim, had so artfully obtained, multiplied the embarrassments of the Canaanites who dwelt in the south of Palæstine. Adonizedek, king of Jerusalem, with four auxiliary or vassal kings, immediately made an attack on Gibeon. The Hebrews hastened to the assistance of their new allies, overthrew their enemies with great slaughter, and by this important victory subjugated almost all the south of Palæstine[4].

By this time the northern kings, whose chief resided at Hazor, had collected at the sea of Merom an army provided with cavalry and chariots. Joshua fell upon them unexpectedly, and gained a victory so decisive, that, in

[3] Josh. v. 1, sqq. vi. viii. 1—29, 30—35. [4] Josh. ix. x.

effect, it brought the northern parts of Palæstine under his dominion[5]. There still remained, however, not only scattered cities, but large tracts of country, in the possession of the Canaanites, with whom a desultory war was continued for some time. But after the land had been divided by lot among the several tribes, it was left to each tribe to expel its own enemies[6]. Of the forty-eight cities which fell to the Levites, six were assigned for cities of refuge, as Moses had prescribed[7]. The forty thousand men of the tribes beyond Jordan then returned to their own country, and on the banks of Jordan erected a monument, as a memorial of their connection with the tribes on this side of the river. From a misunderstanding of their design, this was very near giving occasion to a civil war[8].

While Joshua lived the people were obedient and prosperous. Though idolatry was secretly practised here and there by individuals, it did not break out openly, and the nation remained faithful to Jehovah their king. To prevent future degeneracy, Joshua, in the latter part of his life, convened two general assemblies, and earnestly inculcated on the rulers fidelity to Jehovah, and a conscientious observance of his law. At the last assembly he caused a new election to be made of Jehovah for their king, and to be solemnly acknowledged by all the people. He erected a permanent monument of this renewal of their homage, and recorded the whole transaction in the book of the law. Soon after, seventeen years from the entrance into Canaan, and B. C. 1546, this hero died; a man who devoted his whole life to the settlement of the theocratic policy, and consequently to the preservation of the true religion; services which ought to endear his memory to all succeeding ages[9].

[5] Josh. xi. xii.
[6] Josh. xiii. 13. Judg. i. iii.
[7] Josh. xx. xxi. Numb. xxxv. 9—35.
[8] Josh. xxii.
[9] Josh. xxiv.

§. 20. THEOCRACY FROM JOSHUA TO SAMUEL.

From Joshua to Samuel (a period of about 450 years) the fortunes of the Hebrew nation varied, according as the fundamental law of the state was observed or transgressed; exactly as Moses had predicted, and the sanctions of the law had determined.

The last admonitions of Joshua and the renewal of homage to Jehovah, failed to produce all the effect intended. That generation, indeed, never suffered idolatry to become predominant, but still they were very negligent in regard to the expulsion of the Canaanites. Only a few tribes made war on their hereditary foes, and even they were soon weary of the contest. They spared their dangerous and corrupting neighbours, and, contrary to an express statute, were satisfied with making them tributary. They even became connected with them by unlawful marriages; and then it was no longer easy for them to exterminate or banish the near relatives of their own families. The Hebrews thus rendered the execution of so severe a law in a manner impossible, and wove for themselves the web in which they were afterwards entangled[1]. Their Canaanitish relatives invited them to their festivals, where not only lascivious songs were sung in honour of the gods, but fornication and unnatural lust were indulged in, as part of the divine service. These debaucheries, consecrated by the religious customs of all nations, were gratifying to the sensual appetites; and the subject of Jehovah readily submitted himself to such deities, so highly honoured by his relatives, and worshipped by all the surrounding people. At first, probably, a representation of Jehovah was set up, but this was soon transformed to an idol, or was invoked as an idol by others, of which there is a remarkable example in the time soon after Joshua[2]. Idolatrous images were afterwards set up with the image

[1] Judg. i—vi.

[2] Judg. xvii, xviii.

of Jehovah, and the Hebrews imagined that they should be the more prosperous if they rendered religious homage to the ancient gods of the land. The propensity to idolatry, which was predominant in all the rest of the world, thus spread itself like a plague. From time to time idolatry was publicly professed, and this national treachery to their king, Jehovah, always brought with it national misfortunes.

That madness of debauchery which was exhibited in the city of Gibeah, and the protection which the tribe of Benjamin afforded the criminals, in opposition to all the other tribes[3], displays the true source of so obstinate an attachment to an idolatry that consecrated such vices, and which must have had many adherents among the Benjamites at the time of Phinehas, soon after the death of Joshua. The other tribes, however, were as yet more piously disposed, and idolatry was not openly tolerated till that generation was extinct, which under Joshua had sworn anew to the covenant with Jehovah. After that, the rulers were unable or unwilling any longer to prevent the public worship of pagan deities. But the Hebrews, rendered effeminate by this voluptuous religion, and forsaken by their king, Jehovah, were no longer able to contend with their foes, and were forced to bow their necks under a foreign yoke. In this humiliating and painful subjection to a conquering people, they called to mind their deliverance from Egypt, the ancient kindnesses of Jehovah, the promises and threatenings of the law; they forsook their idols, who could afford them no assistance, returned to the sacred tabernacle, and then found a deliverer, who freed them from the yoke of bondage. The reformation was generally of no longer duration than the life of the deliverer. As soon as that generation was extinct, idolatry again crept in by the same way, and soon became predominant. Then followed subjection and oppression under the yoke of a neighbouring people, till a

[3] Judg. xix—xxiii.

second reformation prepared them for a new deliverance. Between these extremes of prosperity and adversity, as the consequences of their fidelity or treachery to the king, Jehovah, the Hebrew nation was continually fluctuating till the time of Samuel. Such were the arrangements of Providence that, as soon as idolatry gained the ascendancy, some one of the neighbouring people grew powerful, acquired the preponderance, and subjected the Hebrews. Jehovah always permitted their oppressions to become sufficiently severe to arouse them from their slumbers, to remind them of the sanctions of the law, and to turn them again to their God and king. Then a hero arose, who inspired the people with courage, defeated their foes, abolished idolatry, and reestablished in their hearts the authority of Jehovah[4]. As the Hebrews, in the course of time, became continually more obstinate in their idolatry, so each subsequent oppression of the nation was always greater and more severe than the preceding. So difficult was it, as mankind were then situated, to preserve a knowledge of the true God in the world; though so repeatedly and so expressly revealed, and in so high a degree made evident to the senses.

§. 21. PREDOMINANT STATES FROM JOSHUA TO SAMUEL.

THE people who acquired power during this period, and were employed to punish the idolatrous and rebellious Hebrews, were the following:

1. The Mesopotamians under king Chushan-rishathaim. This monarchy must have subdued several of the surrounding nations within thirty or forty years after the death of Joshua; for at this time its conquests extended west as far as Canaan, and here, by victory or by menaces, the Hebrews were made tributary. They were held in severe bondage for eight years. Their deliverer was the hero Othniel or Othoniel, a relative of the celebrated

[4] Judg. ii—vi.

Caleb. He overcame the Mesopotamians, and was their acknowledged regent or judge. During the forty years of his administration the people remained faithful to their God and king, and consequently prospered[1]. This concludes a period of about eighty years, from the death of Joshua to the year B. C. 1446.

2. The Moabites, by a long peace, had recovered from the defeats which they suffered from the Amorites before the time of Moses, and, perceiving that the Hebrews were not invincible, their king Eglon united himself with the Ammonites and Amalekites, and made an attack upon them, probably under the same pretences which are mentioned on another occasion[2]. He defeated the idolatrous Hebrews in battle, subdued the tribes beyond the Jordan, and the southern tribes on this side of the river, and established himself in Jericho. The conquered tribes were obliged to bring him presents, that is, to pay tribute. This subjection to a king who resided among them was still more oppressive than the preceding, and it lasted eighteen years, or to the ninety-eighth year after the death of Joshua. The deliverer was Ehud, of the tribe of Benjamin, who was immediately received as regent. The people remained independent eighty years. The Philistines then made their first attempt to bring the southern tribes under their yoke, but, unable to accomplish their design, they were repulsed, with the loss of six hundred men, by Shamgar and other husbandmen, who fought with ox-goads, being then employed in the cultivation of their fields[3]. This period extended from the year 98 to 178 after Joshua, B. C. 1368.

3. The northern Canaanites, who suffered a total overthrow under Joshua, had gradually regained their power during the interval of one hundred and seventy-eight years. Jabin their king dwelt at Hazor on lake Merom, as in the time of Joshua, and his power was now much

[1] Josh. xv. 17. Judg. iii. 7—11.
[2] Judg. xi. 13—15.
[3] Judg. iii. 12—31.

greater than before. His general, Sisera, was an able warrior, and retained in his service a numerous army, with nine hundred chariots of war, which always shot terror into the hearts of the Hebrews. With such a force he greatly oppressed the northern tribes, and his yoke was undoubtedly more galling than any they had previously borne. From such a multitude of licentious soldiers they were compelled to suffer every species of extortion, in addition to the royal tribute. These oppressions continued for twenty years, or to the 198th year after Joshua. They were shaken off at length by a woman of the tribe of Ephraim, the prophetess Deborah. She aroused the courage of Barak, of the tribe of Naphtali, and in her capacity of regent or judge, appointed him commander of the Israelite forces. With ten thousand men he so completely routed the numerous army of the Canaanites, that they never recovered from the blow[4]. This was followed by a peace of forty years, that is, to the 238th year after Joshua, B. C. 1308.

4. The Midianites, united with the Amalekites and other nomad Arabs, during seven years poured into Palæstine in great numbers, and with their numerous herds trampled down all the fields, gardens, and vineyards without distinction, seized the cattle, plundered men and houses, and rioted in the country as the Beduin Arabs are accustomed to do at the present day, when not restrained by force. This chastisement, the duration of which is not mentioned, was evidently far more distressing than anything which had occurred before. The emigration of Elimelech, the father-in-law of Ruth, probably took place at this time[5]. The hero who delivered them from this oppression was Gideon of the tribe of Manasseh. The stratagem by which he obtained his decisive victory is well known. Two Midianite chiefs, Oreb and Zeeb, were taken prisoners and put to death. Two kings, Zebah and Zalmunna, fled; but they were pursued, over-

[4] Judg. iv. v.

[5] Ruth, i. 1, 2.

taken, and likewise suffered death. Of the numerous army of the Midianites, one hundred and twenty thousand were left dead on the field of battle, and only fifteen thousand saved themselves by flight.

Gideon magnanimously rejected the proffer of hereditary royalty, which the rulers in the warmth of their gratitude made him. '*Not I,*' replied he in the true spirit of theocracy, '*not I, nor my son, but Jehovah, shall reign over you.*' The Shechemites, indeed, after his death, elevated one of his sons to the throne, and he too the most abandoned wretch of the whole family. They also built an idolatrous temple; but they suffered merited punishment from their own king, and their temple was destroyed by fire [6]. The Hebrews now remained unmolested by foreign enemies forty-three years, excluding the period of the Midianitish oppression; to the 281st year after Joshua, B. C. 1268.

5. The foes from whom Tola of the tribe of Isaschar defended the Hebrews are not named; and of Jair the Gileadite it is merely mentioned, that he judged or governed Israel. The administration of Tola continued twenty-three, and that of Jair twenty-two, years [7]. This includes in all forty-five years, and brings the history down to the 326th year after Joshua, B. C. 1223. But it is most probable that these two regents were, part of the time at least, contemporary; and perhaps Tola governed only the northern tribes on this side Jordan, and Jair those beyond that river.

6. The Ammonites laid claim to a part of the land beyond Jordan, which had been wrested from them by the Amorites before the time of Moses. For eighteen years they distressed the two tribes and a half that dwelt there. They also made incursions upon Benjamin, Judah, and Ephraim, who had at the same time to defend themselves against the Philistines, whose power had at this time become formidable. In these severe troubles the

[6] Judg. vi—ix. [7] Judg. x. 1—5.

Hebrews addressed themselves to their God, and the tribes beyond Jordan, choosing Jephthah for their leader, became victorious over their enemies. But the Ephraimites envying the success of their brethren, and the booty they had acquired, stirred up a civil war, which terminated very disastrously to themselves, for they were defeated with the loss of forty-two thousand men. Jephthah died six years after[8]. This period includes twenty-four years, and extends to the 350th year after Joshua, B. C. 1199.

The regents, Ibzan of Bethlehem, who governed seven years; Elon of Zebulon, ten years; and Abdon of Ephraim, eight years; appear to have overawed their enemies by a judicious administration. During their authority no war is mentioned[9]. The whole period of their government comprehends twenty-five years, and brings down the history to the 375th year after Joshua, B. C. 1174. But probably they were a part of this time contemporary, each exercising authority over a few of the tribes.

7. The Philistines held the Hebrews in subjection forty years[10]. Perhaps the first part of this period ought to be included in the above-mentioned twenty-five years; for it is said[11], that in the time of Jephthah God had sold the Israelites into the hand of the Philistines and Ammonites, and it is certain that the Philistines then oppressed them in the most cruel manner. These forty years seem also to comprehend not only the twenty years of Samson, but also part of the twenty years of Eli, who held the united offices of high priest and regent. According to this, the whole time from the death of Jephthah to the death of Eli, includes but little more than forty years. But following our mode of computation, this period terminates in the 415th year after Joshua, B. C. 1134.

Samson was divinely appointed as a deliverer from the Philistines; but the nation had become so degraded and

[8] Judg. x. 6. xi. xii. 7.
[9] Judg. xii. 8—15.
[10] Judg. xiii. 1.
[11] Judg. x. 7, 8.

cowardly, that they were not ashamed to surrender their protector into the hands of their enemies. As the Hebrews refused to second his efforts, he was able only to molest the Philistines by transient and desultory attacks[12].

In the last year of the priesthood and regency of Eli, the Hebrews carried into the field of battle the ark of the covenant; but being defeated, this most precious treasure of the nation became the booty of the Philistines[13]. Twenty years after this battle, a general assembly was held, in which idolatry was renounced and Samuel elected regent. Soon after, the Hebrews defeated the Philistines and handled them so roughly, that they dared not attempt another invasion of their territory[14]. The Philistines, however, not only remained their determined foes, but the Ammonites always continued formidable enemies to the Hebrews, as will be seen hereafter. Samuel governed the nation forty years. Supposing Eli's death to occur in the 425th year after Joshua, and adding to these the sixty years between Eli and the close of Samuel's administration, the sum is four hundred and eighty-five. Allowing thirty-five years for the time during which Tola and Jair, and afterwards Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, were contemporary, we obtain the four hundred and fifty years which Paul assigns[15] to the space between Joshua and Saul. This brings the commencement of Saul's reign to the year B. C. 1096. But an accurate and certain chronology of these times cannot be given[16].

NOTE. According to the Parian marbles, epoch 25, the destruction of Troy took place in the year B. C. 1209; consequently, during the regency of Elon and Abdon, about one hundred and thirteen years before Saul.

[12] Judg. xiii—xvi. [13] 1 Sam. iv. 1—18.

[14] 1 Sam. vii. [15] Acts, xiii. 20.

[16] Compare Michælis, Schreiben an Hrn. Schlötzer u. s. w. im Göttin. Magazin der Wissenschaften und Literatur, Jahrg. 1. Stuck. 5. Die Zerstreut. klein. Schriften, Lief. s. 1, sqq. Jena, 1794. Jahn, Einleitung in die göttlichen Schriften des Alten Bundes, §. 153. s. 275, sqq.

§. 22. OFFICE OF THE JUDGES.

FROM what has already been said respecting the judges and their achievements, we can ascertain, with a tolerable degree of certainty, the nature of their office. Most of them indeed had been at the head of armies, and delivered their country from foreign oppression; Eli and Samuel, however, were not military men; Deborah was judge before she planned the war against Jabin; and of Jair, Ibzan, Elon, and Abdon, it is at least uncertain whether they ever held any military command. Judges are mentioned in the Mosaic law in connection with the high priest, as arbiters of civil controversies without any allusion to war[1]. In like manner the judges who were appointed over Tyre after king Baal, were certainly not military officers, for the city at that time was tributary to Babylon. The command of the army, therefore, can scarcely be considered as the peculiar destination of these magistrates. But as in ancient times the duties of a judge were reckoned among the first and most important duties of a ruler, so the Hebrew judges seem to have been appointed for the general administration of public affairs, and the command of armies fell to them as the supreme executive officers. In many cases, it is true, military achievements were the means by which men elevated themselves to the rank of judges; but our inquiry is, not how the office was obtained, but for what purposes it was instituted. It may, however, be proper to recollect, that Jephthah, Eli, and Samuel, and, for aught that appears, Jair, Elon, Ibzan, and Abdon, were raised to this office by the free unsolicited choice of the people.

The office of these judges or regents was held during life, but it was not hereditary; neither could they appoint their successors. This arrangement was attended with this one disadvantage, that at the death of a judge the

[1] Deut. xvii. 9.

supreme executive authority ceased; perhaps, however, it was more than counterbalanced by its preventing a degenerate heir or successor from giving to idolatry the support of his influence. Their authority was limited by the law alone; and in doubtful cases they were directed to the sacred lot of Urim and Thummim[2]. They were not obliged in common cases to ask advice of the ordinary rulers; it was sufficient if these did not remonstrate against the measures of the judge. In important emergencies, however, they convoked a general assembly of the rulers, over which they presided and exerted a powerful influence. They could issue orders, but not enact laws; they could neither levy taxes, nor appoint officers, except perhaps in the army. Their authority extended only over those tribes by whom they had been elected or acknowledged; for, as we have before remarked, several of the judges presided over separate tribes. There was no salary attached to their office, nor was there any income appropriated to them, unless it might be a larger share in the spoils, and those presents which were made them as testimonials of respect[3]. They bore no external marks of dignity, and maintained no retinue of courtiers, though some of them were very opulent. They were not only simple in their manners, moderate in their desires, and free from avarice and ambition, but noble and magnanimous men, who felt that whatever they did for their country was above all reward, and could not be recompensed; who desired merely to promote the public good, and who chose rather to deserve well of their country, than to be enriched by its wealth. This exalted patriotism, like everything else connected with politics in the theocratical state of the Hebrews, was partly of a religious character; and those regents always conducted themselves as the officers of God; in all their enterprises they relied upon Him, and their only care was, that their countrymen should acknowledge the authority of Jehovah.

[2] Numb. xxvii. 21. [3] Judg. viii. 24.

their invisible king[4]. Still they were not without faults, neither are they so represented by their historians; they relate, on the contrary, with the utmost frankness, the great sins of which some of them were guilty. They were not merely deliverers of the state from a foreign yoke, but destroyers of idolatry, foes of pagan vices, promoters of the knowledge of God, of religion, and of morality; restorers of theocracy in the minds of the Hebrews, and powerful instruments of divine Providence in the promotion of the great design of preserving the Hebrew constitution, and, by that means, of rescuing the true religion from destruction.

§. 23. CONDITION OF THE HEBREWS IN THE TIME OF THE JUDGES.

By comparing the periods during which the Hebrews were oppressed by their enemies, with those in which they were independent and governed by their own constitution, it is apparent that the nation in general experienced much more prosperity than adversity in the time of the judges. Their dominion continued four hundred and fifty years, but the whole time of foreign oppression amounts only to one hundred and eleven years, scarcely a fourth part of that period. Even during these one hundred and eleven years, the whole nation was seldom under the yoke at the same time, but for the most part separate tribes only were held in servitude; nor were their oppressions always very severe; and all the calamities terminated in the advantage and glory of the people, so soon as they abolished idolatry and returned to their king, Jehovah. Neither was the nation in such a state of anarchy at this time, as has been generally supposed. There were regular judicial tribunals at which justice could be obtained; and when there was no supreme regent, the public welfare

[4] Judg. viii. 22, sqq. comp. Heb. xi.

was provided for by the ordinary rulers[1]. These rulers, it is true, were jealous of each other, and their jealousies not unfrequently broke out into civil war; but the union of the state was never entirely destroyed. They were not always provided with arms[2]; but yet, when united under their king, Jehovah, they gained splendid victories. They were not sufficiently careful to suppress idolatry; but they never suffered it to become universally predominant. The sacred tabernacle was never entirely deserted and shut up, nor was it ever polluted by the rites of heathen superstition.

These times would certainly not be considered so turbulent and barbarous, much less would they be taken, contrary to the clearest evidence and to the analogy of all history, for a heroic age, if they were viewed without the prejudices of a preconceived hypothesis. It must never be forgotten that the Book of Judges is by no means a complete history. This no impartial inquirer can ever deny. It is, in a manner, a mere register of diseases, from which, however, we have no right to conclude that there were no healthy men, much less that there were no healthy seasons; when the book itself, for the most part, mentions only a few tribes in which the epidemic prevailed, and notices long periods during which it had universally ceased. Whatever may be the result of more accurate investigation, it remains undeniable that the condition of the Hebrews during this period, perfectly corresponds, throughout, to the sanctions of the law; and they were always prosperous when they complied with the conditions on which prosperity was promised them; it remains undeniable that the government of God was clearly manifested not only to the Hebrews, but to their heathen neighbours; that the fulfilling of the promises and threatenings of the law were so many sensible proofs of the universal dominion

[1] Ruth, iv. 1—11. Judg. viii. 22. x. 17, 18. xi. 1—11. 1 Sam. iv. 1. vii. 1, 2.

[2] Judg. v. 8. 1 Sam. xiii. 19.

of the divine king of the Hebrews; and, consequently, that all the various fortunes of that nation were so many means of preserving the knowledge of God on the earth. The Hebrews had no sufficient reason to desire a change in their constitution, all required was, that they should observe the conditions on which national prosperity was promised them.

The great causes of the frequent interruptions in the welfare of the Hebrew state were: 1. The effeminacy and cowardice of the people; and 2. The disunion and jealousy of the tribes, who never assisted each other with the requisite zeal and alacrity. But as this effeminacy arose from the vices of idolatry, and their cowardice from a want of confidence in Jehovah; so, the disunion and jealousy of the tribes, though selfishness was the immediate cause, resulted from a disposition to neglect their divine king, and not to consider themselves as the united and only people of Jehovah. This disposition, if it did not originate from, was at least very much heightened by the multiplication of deities. Thus both these causes of their misfortunes owed their origin to idolatry, that great source of all their calamities, so often mentioned in the sanctions of the law. Thus the people, by increasing their gods, enervated themselves; and prepared for themselves those sufferings and chastisements, by which they were again to be brought back to their king, Jehovah[3].

[3] Compare Hess, Reich Gottes, Th. i. s. 251, sqq. 269, sqq. and Geschichte Josua und der Heerführer, Th. ii. s. 281, sqq.

BOOK IV.

FROM THE INTRODUCTION OF MONARCHY TO THE REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES.

§. 24. THE RULERS REQUEST A KING.

THE causes of national misfortune just now mentioned, were all in operation at the time of Samuel, and threatened to produce, after his death, still greater calamities. The tribes beyond the Jordan had formidable enemies in the Ammonites, and the southern tribes in the Philistines, while the northern tribes stood aloof from the dangers of their more exposed countrymen. The latter seems to have been the principal reason why the rulers in general assembly requested a king[1]. The tribes in southern Palæstine and beyond the Jordan were most earnest for this change in the government; they feared the death of Samuel would leave them without a supreme magistrate, and, the nation being again disunited, they should be left to their fate. The degeneracy of Samuel's sons, who had been appointed subordinate judges or deputies, increased their apprehensions. They therefore strenuously insisted on their demand: 'Nay, but we will have a king over us, that we also may be like all the nations[2].' They had reason to hope that a king, invested with supreme authority, might be able to unite the power of the whole nation, and protect each tribe with the collected strength of all; that under him the affairs of government would be more promptly administered, and necessary aid more readily afforded; that if he were a man devoted to Jehovah, he

[1] 1 Sam. viii. 4—21. xii. 12. [2] 1 Sam. viii. 19.

could more effectually suppress or prevent idolatry, and thus place the welfare of the state on a more solid foundation. They might imagine themselves justified in this request, as Moses had taken it for granted that the nation would eventually have a king, and the same thing had been promised to their great progenitor Abraham[3]. It conduces not a little to the honour of the Hebrews, that they attempted this change in their constitution not by their own power, but in accordance with the principles of theocracy; they requested it of their king, Jehovah, by the intervention of a prophet, and they effected it without bloodshed; a manifest proof that the time of the judges was neither a barbarous nor a heroic age.

§. 25. THE INSTITUTION OF MONARCHY.

But as the unseen king, Jehovah, would necessarily be obscured by a subordinate, visible monarch, he, by means of Samuel, gave the rulers to understand his disapprobation of their request, and at the same time briefly represented the burthens they would have to bear under a king; especially, how easily he might be induced to imitate the other oriental monarchs, and disregard the law of Jehovah[1]. But as they, notwithstanding, persisted in their demand, it was granted them[2]; probably because the desired change was requested of the invisible king in a lawful manner, through the mediation of his prophet, and because, in the present disposition of the nation, it might be effected without bloodshed. If the remark of Polybius is in all cases true, that 'all aristocracies and democracies terminate at last in monarchy[3],' this change must have taken place at some future time, and perhaps might have been attended with civil war.

[3] Deut. xvii. 14, sqq. xxviii. 36. Gen. xvii. 16.
[1] 1 Sam. viii. 7—19. comp. xii. 15—25. [2] 1 Sam. viii. 20, 21.
[3] Hist. Lib. v. 6, 7.

By this alteration of the constitution, the theocracy was indeed thrown somewhat into the shade, as it was no longer clearly manifest that God was the king of the Hebrews. Still, however, as the principles of theocracy were interwoven with the fundamental and unchangeable law of the state, their influence did not entirely cease, but the elected king was to act as the viceroy and vassal of Jehovah. On this account Moses had already established the following regulations[4].

1. That the Hebrews, whenever they adopted the monarchical form of government, should raise those only to the throne who were chosen by Jehovah himself. As monarchs (called kings of kings) were accustomed to appoint sub-kings, or viceroys, in the several provinces of their dominions, so was the king of the Hebrews to be called to the throne by Jehovah, to receive the kingdom from him, and in all respects to consider himself as his representative, viceroy, and vassal. On this occasion, the will of Jehovah was to be made known by a prophet, or by means of the sacred lot, Urim and Thummim; and the viceroy elect was to prove himself an instrument of God by protecting the commonwealth against its foes. The succession of the royal house was to depend on the will of God, to be made known by his prophets. Saul, David, and Jeroboam, received the promise of the throne from prophets; by them was foretold the succession of the family of David, and of the other families in the kingdom of Israel. These divine interpositions were well calculated to remind the kings of him on whom they were dependant, and to whose choice they were indebted for the throne. Saul was designated by the sacred lot, and David was elected by the magistrates for the express reason that God had promised him the throne. Saul was not established in his kingdom and generally acknowledged, till after he had delivered the inhabitants of Jabesh-gilead from the Ammonites; and the rulers tendered the sceptre

[4] Deut. xvii. 14—20.

to David, because he, in the time of Saul, had defeated the enemies of Israel.

2. Moses had likewise ordained, that the king should be a native Israelite. Thus foreigners were excluded from the throne, even though they should be proposed by false prophets; for being heathens, they might transgress the fundamental law of the state by the introduction of idolatry; or, at least, it might be difficult for them to rule in all respects as the vassals of Jehovah. This regulation had reference merely to free elections, and was by no means to be understood, as it was explained by Judas Galileus[5] and the zealots, during the last war with the Romans, that the Hebrews were not to submit to those foreign powers, under whose dominion they were brought by an all-directing Providence. On the contrary, Moses himself had predicted such events, and Jeremiah and Ezekiel earnestly exhorted their countrymen to surrender themselves quietly to the Chaldeans.

§. 26. LIMITATIONS OF THE ROYAL POWER.

Upon such conditions the choice of a king was permitted according to the law, and in the year B. C. 1096, the first election took place. The prophet Samuel privately announced to Saul his appointment to the throne, and did homage to him as king. Though Saul belonged to a family of the tribe of Benjamin, which was celebrated for its valour, he was at that time very far from aspiring to a crown and sceptre. Samuel afterwards convened a general assembly, at which it was resolved to choose the king by lot (undoubtedly the sacred lot, by which God was accustomed to make known his will), and in this manner to submit the choice to God, as their supreme ruler. As Samuel had predicted, the lot fell to Saul. The laws of the constitution, established by Samuel with the consent

[5] Acts, v. 37.

of the rulers, were sworn to by Saul, and the record was deposited in the sacred tabernacle before the throne of the invisible king[1]. What powers these conferred on the king, and what restraints they imposed on his will, is nowhere mentioned; we only know that his authority was not absolute. The foundation for a limited monarchy had already been laid by Moses: for

1. By the fundamental law of the Hebrew commonwealth, the king was forbidden to introduce any new mode of religious worship; neither could he, like the kings of other nations, perform the functions of a priest, unless he was of the tribe of Aaron, as was the case with the Asmonean princes. On the contrary, he was required to reign as the representative and vassal of Jehovah, to promote the institutions of religion as a matter of obedience to Him, to suppress idolatry as rebellion against Him, to attend to the declarations of the prophets as His ambassadors, and to observe the law of Moses[2]. On this account it was required, that the king should take a transcript of the law from the copy of the priests, and 'read therein all the days of his life, that he might learn to fear Jehovah his God, to keep all the words of the law, that his heart might not be lifted up above his brethren;' that is, he should be no arbitrary despot, whose only law is his own pleasure[3].

2. Moses subjoins to this injunction, 'that the kingdom may remain long to him and to his descendants;' whence it appears that the sceptre was indeed hereditary, but yet might be transferred from one family to another by the will of Jehovah and the wishes of the people. In this manner it afterwards actually passed from the house of Saul to that of David, and in the kingdom of Israel changed very frequently.

3. The king was forbidden to imitate the pernicious luxury of other oriental monarchs; he was not allowed to hoard up large treasures, lest the circulation of money

[1] 1 Sam. ix. x. [2] 1 Sam. xv. 1—20. [3] Deut. xvii. 14—20.

should be obstructed, industry discouraged, or his subjects impoverished; neither was he permitted to keep a numerous harem, lest (not to mention other disadvantages) he should be alienated from God by his women, especially if they were foreigners.

4. As cavalry could be of little use in the mountainous regions of Palæstine, and as the king of the Hebrews was never to become a conqueror of foreign lands, or a universal monarch, he was forbidden to maintain large bodies of cavalry, or to attempt the conquest of Egypt in order to obtain horses.

It was not necessary perhaps to enter these restrictions among the conditions on which the king was to hold the sceptre; but it was necessary that the tribute, and the services to be rendered to the king, should be defined. Of both these, indeed, mention is made[4]. The tribute probably was not levied, since Saul, though king, returned to the plough among his father's family in Gibeah, and received gifts from only a few, as tokens of their homage, while by others he was openly contemned. No innovations meet with general approbation, and it is not strange that this king, although of God's appointment, should meet with some who disliked him, although his house was illustrious, and his person commanding. 'And when he (Saul) stood among the people, he was higher than any of the people from his shoulders and upward.' The orientals are accustomed to regard the stature and exterior of their kings as a matter of great importance[5]. All however obeyed the first and indeed very express command of Saul, to march to the relief of Jabesh-gilead: perhaps because the order was issued with the sanction of Samuel's name. But after Jabesh-gilead was delivered, and the Ammonites, those ancient and powerful foes of the tribes beyond Jordan, who had reduced the city to great extremities, were conquered, and it thus appeared that Saul

[4] 1 Sam. viii. 10—18.

[5] 1 Sam. x. 23. Paulsen, Regierung der Morgenländer, s. 17. Herodot. iii. 20. vii. 187. Aristot. Polit. iv. 4. Curtius, vi. 5.

was indeed favoured by Jehovah as his representative, his authority rapidly increased throughout the nation. At Gilgal he was confirmed on the throne by the whole army, and the transaction sanctioned by sacrifices[6]. At this renewed election of the king, the continuance of the theocracy was earnestly insisted on by Samuel, and he also declared that the Hebrews would be prosperous if they and their king worshipped Jehovah and obeyed his injunctions; but if not, Jehovah would be an adversary to them and to their king[7].

§. 27. THE REIGN OF SAUL.

SAUL affected no great exterior splendour. He was a *hero* in the true sense of the word. He increased his army, by degrees, with able soldiers, provided them with arms, of which the Hebrews had been previously destitute, and carried on successful wars against the Ammonites and Philistines, at that time his nearest and most powerful foes. The latter, indeed, he had to contend with during the whole of his reign. He also fought with success against the Moabites, Amalekites, and the nomadic tribes of the Arabian desert; the Hagarites, Itureans (Jetur), Nephishites, and Nodabeans, whose pasture-grounds he overran as far as the Euphrates; and, finally, with the king of Aramzobah, or Nisibis, who was perhaps a successor of Chushan-rishathaim, the ancient oppressor of the Hebrews[1]. Probably the defeated Arabs applied to this king for aid, which he the more readily granted, as he was not willing that the Hebrews, now grown so powerful, should make conquests in his immediate neighbourhood.

But however distinguished Saul was as a warrior, he never neglected the internal concerns of his kingdom. He tolerated no instance of rebellion against Jehovah,

[6] 1 Sam. xi. [7] 1 Sam. xii.

[1] 2 Sam. i. 17—27. 1 Sam. xiii. 19—21. 1 Chron. v. 18, 19. Judges, iii. 8.

and was very severe in the punishment of idolatrous arts[2]. Consequently the Hebrew arms, according to the divine promise, were everywhere successful. In every respect he seems to have discharged the trust reposed in him for the good of the state; no complaint was uttered against him after his death, and eleven tribes remained faithfully attached to his son.

Saul's great failing, and the source of all his errors, was, that he did not sufficiently give way to the theocratic nature of the Hebrew constitution. He thus rendered himself unfit to be the founder of a royal house, as his conduct could not be regarded as a pattern for the imitation of his successors. He forgot that he was a vassal of Jehovah, and did not always execute his orders, but made exceptions according to his own views[3]. When on one occasion a part of his soldiers deserted him, and the rest were trembling with fear, he ought to have entertained the theocratic sentiments of Gideon, and given to all his successors a signal example of confidence in God. By neglecting to do this, and by conducting himself as a king altogether independent of Jehovah, Samuel announced to him, in the name of God, the transfer of the sceptre to another family. When Saul, after this, neglected the divine command, and held back the predestined punishment of the ancient, marauding, hereditary enemies of the Hebrews, the Amalekites[4]; and, instead of utterly destroying them, retained the best of the cattle as booty, and brought back prisoner, Agag their king, and thus concluded the war without annihilating the nation; the divine decree for the exclusion of his descendants from the throne, was again and irrevocably pronounced by Samuel[5]. This was made known to Saul at a time when he was daily strengthening himself on the throne, and increasing in power and fame, and when Jonathan, his eldest son, was so much beloved by the whole people, that certainly

[2] 1 Sam. xxviii. 9. [3] 1 Sam. xiii. 2—15. xv. 1. xvii—xix.
[4] Exod. xvii. 14. Deut. xxv. 18. [5] 1 Sam. xv.

no man could look on any one else as likely to succeed to the crown.

§. 28. DAVID ANOINTED KING. SAUL'S CONDUCT.

DURING this period, so prosperous for Saul, the invisible king directed the prophet Samuel to assure the throne privately by a prophetic anointing, to David, the youngest son of Jesse a citizen of Bethlehem. He was of a princely family in the tribe of Judah, a tribe which in ancient times had received great promises[1]. David, at that time a youth of eighteen or twenty years of age, and deeply imbued with the spirit of the religion and theocracy of his nation, was shepherd of his father's flocks; a condition which in the east is by no means despised, but yet not so elevated that he who had only governed his flocks, and had carried on no wars but those against the wild beasts which attacked them, could aspire to a throne. The invisible ruler of Israel, however, so directed events, that Saul himself contributed most towards rendering this magnanimous young man an experienced and worthy viceroy of Jehovah. For when he by continually brooding over that determination of God, so unwelcome to his feelings, at last fell into a deep melancholy, in order to divert his thoughts he took David into his court as a private musician; and thus gave him an opportunity of becoming acquainted with the manners of the court, and the business of government. The personal bravery of the young minstrel did not long remain unnoticed by the veteran hero, and he soon elevated him to the honourable station of royal armour-bearer[2].

In an expedition against the Philistines, David, with feelings altogether theocratical, full of confidence in the God of the armies of Israel, engaged in single combat with a champion of huge stature, and heavily armed, whom no one else dared to encounter. The splendid

[1] Gen. xlix. 8—10.

[2] 1 Sam. xvi.

triumph which he obtained, struck the Philistines with panic, and the Hebrews with admiration; acquired for him the friendship of Jonathan, and made him famous throughout the nation.

This act of heroism opened to David a new career, and he soon distinguished himself as an able general; but it also prepared for him a series of persecutions and distresses, which served however to perfect and confirm his loyalty to Jehovah. Saul not only felt indignant that more glory should be ascribed in the triumphal songs to the vanquisher of Goliath than to the king himself, but also began to suspect that David might be the very man to whom the sceptre was to be transferred. He determined, therefore, to put this hated rival out of the way, though he still retained too much feeling of honour to be willingly known as a murderer. In one of his fits of melancholy he hurled twice, as if by accident, a javelin at his minstrel, who both times adroitly avoided the blow.

After this, Saul became more calm, and gave up all thoughts of direct murder. He resolved on another method of destroying David. He gave him the command of a thousand men, and, by repeated promises of marriage with his eldest daughter, induced him to undertake hazardous enterprises, in the hope that he might fall in some of his encounters with the Philistines. But this only afforded David still better opportunities of exercising himself in the art of war, and of making his prudence and good conduct more conspicuous to his countrymen. When Saul perceived that his hopes were frustrated, he gave his daughter to another. He did not, however, entirely relinquish his design. He caused a promise of the younger princess to be made to David, on condition that he would undertake a new enterprise against the Philistines. When he came off victorious in this expedition also, Saul could not, consistently with his dignity, refuse to fulfil his promise, and he accordingly became the father-in-law of David.

An alliance with the royal family made David still more

illustrious in the eyes of the people, and this again increased the jealousy of Saul. He now determined to break through every obstacle, and to destroy his son-in-law, cost what it would. He did not even make a secret of his intentions. He listened, however, to the representations of Jonathan, and desisted a while from his purpose. But after David had gained a fresh victory over the Philistines, Saul resumed his resolution, and, in a fit of melancholy, hurled, with all his strength, a javelin at David, who, though intent on his music, seasonably avoided the stroke. It was now high time for him to leave the court. His house was watched; but, favoured by the artifice of his wife, he made his escape, though with great difficulty. He went to Samuel at Nob, and was pursued thither by messengers, who were sent repeatedly, and at last by Saul himself; he was rescued, however, by the manifest intervention of Providence. But Saul persevered in his intention. Even Jonathan endeavoured in vain to restrain him from deeds of violence against an officer who had rendered such services to his king and country. For the security of his friend, Jonathan gave him secret notice of his father's feelings, and he effected his escape[3].

§. 29. SAUL PERSECUTES DAVID.

THE more Saul endeavoured to secure the crown to his posterity, and to remove David out of the way, the more he, by his persecutions, directed the eyes of all the Israelites to that pious hero; and by these very exertions endangered the succession of his own family. The massacre of eighty-five priests, and of the inhabitants of Nob, who were the Gibeonite servants of the sacred tabernacle, which the calumny of Doeg, the Edomite[1], led him to commit soon after the flight of David, secured to David the sacred lot, with which Abiathar fled to him to save

[3] 1 Sam. xvii—xx. [1] Ps. lii.

his own life, and deprived Saul of the affection of all the well disposed Hebrews. After this, many influential men, even of the tribe of Benjamin, to which Saul himself belonged, joined the party of David[2].

David, who was then in such danger, left untried no allowable means for his own deliverance; but still he kept his mind steadily fixed on the protection of divine Providence. In difficult cases he always consulted the sacred oracle and obeyed its responses. He could scarcely have escaped from the hands of Saul, if Providence had not exerted a special care over him. At Gath, whither he went at first from the high priest, he was probably well received by king Achish; at least Achish was afterwards very favourable to him. But the Philistine princes excited his suspicions, and David, in order to escape their snares, was obliged to feign himself mad. After this, the cave of Adullam, in the tribe of Judah, concealed him for some time. But this must have eventually become a prison in which he might be easily confined, or subdued by famine; for, besides his parents and relatives, who had now likewise become suspected by Saul, four hundred Hebrew malecontents, with their families, had joined themselves to him. He therefore conducted his parents and relatives to Moab, and commended them to the protection of the king; but, by the direction of the prophet Gad, he returned with his party to the tribe of Judah, and concealed himself in the forest of Hareth. His men had now increased to six hundred, and by him they were trained to be heroes. With them he rescued the frontier fortress of Keilah from a siege of the Philistines; but the citizens would have betrayed him for fear of Saul, had he not been warned of their treachery by the sacred lot. In the wilderness of Ziph, to which he then withdrew, he received a very consolatory visit from his magnanimous friend, Jonathan, who encouraged him in the most affectionate manner to place his confidence in God. His

[2] 1 Sam. xxi. 1—9. xxii. 6—23. 1 Chron. xii. 1—22.

residence in this solitary retreat was soon made known to Saul by the inhabitants of the desert, and he would unavoidably have fallen into the power of the king, had not divine Providence so ordered it, that Saul, who was now separated from David by only a single mountain, was called back by the report of an incursion of the Philistines [3].

Neither the lofty, rough, and rocky mountains of Engedi, nor the remote frontier by the great sandy desert of Arabia Petræa, were secure retreats from the snares of Saul. David was betrayed, and Saul scoured the mountains with three thousand men, and afterwards penetrated into the desert with the same number, in order to capture David. But in both enterprises Saul fell into David's power. In the mountains, Saul composed himself to sleep, alone, in the same cave where David and his company were concealed; and in the desert, David stole by night unobserved into the camp, to the very place where Saul lay, while all his men were asleep. His companions interpreted these events, as if God seemed to tell him, by affording such opportunities, what he ought to do in order to secure his own safety at once and for ever. But to the pious David, a divinely-appointed king, though his enemy, was a sacred person. To lay violent hands on him, and to open a way to the throne by regicide, was a crime which he justly abhorred. What God had promised him he was willing to wait for, till he who had promised should deliver it to him in the ordinary course of providence. From such conduct it must be decided whether David was a revengeful man, as some have asserted. The vindictive resolution against Nabal was a precipitate step, as David himself soon saw and candidly acknowledged, and he resolved to be more on his guard in future. Generally, all events, and particularly persecutions, were to David, as we have already seen, lessons by which he was taught to be a good man and a wise ruler, and

[3] 1 Sam. xxi—xxiii.

especially to place confidence in Jehovah, as many of the Psalms demonstrate [4].

This confidence in God, however, did not lessen his care for his own security. As he had been several times betrayed to Saul by the members of his own tribe, he retired with his men to Gath, and received from Achish king of the Philistines, as a present, the small town of Ziklag, which was situated not far from the brook Besor. Here he resided one year and four months, until the death of Saul. He engaged in excursions against the ancient predatory enemies of the Hebrews, the Amalekites, the Geshurites, and the Gezrites, who roved about in Arabia Petræa on the seacoast as far as Pelusium, and on the southern frontier of the tribe of Judah. Here he was secure from the attempts of Saul; but in the last war of the Philistines against Saul, he was driven to the alternative of either taking the field with the Philistines against his brethren, the Hebrews, or of appearing ungrateful to his benefactor Achish. But now the jealousy of the Philistine princes, which had formerly been so dangerous to him, helped him out of this difficulty, and he was dismissed from the expedition. On his return to Ziklag he found the city pillaged and laid in ashes. He immediately commenced a pursuit of the Amalekites, Geshurites and Gezrites, who had thus revenged themselves for his inroads on them, overtook them, recaptured all that they had taken, and gained besides so considerable a booty, that he was able to send presents to all the rulers of Judah who had favoured his cause [5].

§. 30. DEATH OF SAUL. DAVID, KING OVER JUDÆA.

In the war with the Philistines, mentioned above, Saul became so disheartened, that he applied for help even to enchantresses, whom he had formerly, in obedience to the

[4] 1 Sam. xxiv—xxvi. Hess, Geschichte Davids und Salomo's, Band I. B. i. Kap. 2—4. David von Jos. Ludw. Ewald, Band 1. 1795. Abschnitte, 2—5.

[5] 1 Sam. xxvii. xxix. xxx.

law, punished with death as rebels against Jehovah. The battle which was afterwards fought in the plain of Jezreel (Esdrælon) proved very disastrous, and Saul, that he might not fall into the hands of his enemies, slew himself in the year B. C. 1056, after a reign of forty years. His three eldest sons were left dead in the field. Abner, his general, drew off the remains of the army to the other side of Jordan, and caused Ish-bosheth, the youngest son of Saul, to be proclaimed king at Mahanaim. The Philistines, meanwhile, spread themselves over the country, and took possession of many cities[1].

David caused to be executed, as a regicide, the Amalekite who brought to him at Ziklag the royal insignia, and boasted that he had slain Saul with his own hand. He lamented the death of Saul and of his friend Jonathan in a most affecting elegy; and even for Saul he poured forth tears, which they only can impute to hypocrisy, who are themselves incapable of such magnanimity; and are determined to forget that David, during the life of his persecutor, always respected him as a king appointed by God, and spared him when he had him completely in his power. He then, according to the decision of the sacred lot, went from Ziklag to Hebron, where the rulers of the tribe of Judah, with views altogether theocratical, awarded to him the sceptre, as to one whom God had already designated as king. The other eleven tribes did homage to Ish-bosheth the son of Saul. His commander-in-chief, Abner, came with an army to force the tribe of Judah to obedience, but after the first victory of Joab, the general of David, Abner never again took the field, and David was far from wishing to continue a civil war. Thus the war was suffered to die away in silence without an express treaty[2].

When, after two years, Ish-bosheth quarrelled with Abner, who had raised him to the throne, and who was

[1] 1 Sam. xxviii. Acts, xiii. 21. Josephus, Antiq. VI. xiv. 9. 1 Sam. xxxi. 1 Chron. x. 1—15. 2 Sam. ii. 8—11. [2] 2 Sam. ii. iii. 1.

still his sole support, the indignant general made arrangements for bringing the eleven tribes to submit to David. But before the execution of his design, he was treacherously assassinated by Joab, and the union of the tribes was for a while retarded. Soon after, Ish-bosheth, while sleeping at mid-day, was murdered by Rechab and Baanah, two generals of his own tribe. The murderers expected to be rewarded by David, but he condemned them to the death they deserved, and took no advantage of their treachery to hasten the submission of the eleven tribes to his authority. Thus five years passed away, so that David reigned seven years and six months over the tribe of Judah only[3].

§. 31. THE REIGN OF DAVID.

At last, in the eighth year of David's reign, B. C. 1048, the eleven tribes unitedly submitted to him. The rulers sent an embassy to him with the offer, that 'he might become their ruler and general, because under Saul he had been the leader of the Israelites in war, and because Jehovah had said of him, that he should govern the people of Israel.' We see from this, that the Hebrews were always very careful to recognise their theocracy, for they would submit to David only as to a king appointed by Jehovah, and who had proved himself to be such during the reign of Saul. The rulers came with the whole army to Hebron, David obligated himself by an oath to observe the conditions on which he received the sceptre, which are now unknown; homage was rendered to him, and the whole transaction was solemnized by a feast[1].

The first act of David's reign was to undertake the siege of Jebus or Jerusalem, whose citadel Zion had till then remained in the hands of the Jebusites. The castle was taken, and as the city, on the boundaries of Judah

[3] 2 Sam. iii. 6—39. iv.

[1] 2 Sam. v. 1 Chron. xi. xii. 23—40.

and Benjamin, was conveniently situated to be the metropolis of the whole empire, David selected it for his residence, and built a palace on mount Zion, which on this account was called the city of David. It is supposed that David first gave to the city the name of Jerusalem (the possession of peace), but this is not certain. Soon after, he transferred the ark of the covenant, which was the throne of Jehovah, from Kirjath-jearim to Jerusalem. Thus the capital of David became the capital of the invisible king, and was therefore called the city of God, a name which it always retained, because afterwards the temple, the palace of Jehovah, was built on mount Moriah[2]. David, by the declaration of the prophet Nathan, was obliged to leave to his successor the charge of building a temple, as a palace for the throne of God; but he received the promise of a succession in his house, and of an eternal kingdom for his posterity. This promise David valued so highly, that he seems to have had some conception of its extensive import. All the succeeding kings, therefore, of the family of David, were in effect chosen and appointed by Jehovah[3].

David brought the affairs of government into order, improved the army, and gave especial attention to the management of public worship, as the most efficacious means of promoting religion and morality; and, consequently, obedience to the invisible, supreme monarch. The solemn transfer of the ark of the covenant, at which almost all the people were present, had made a deep impression on their minds, and had awakened them to a sincere adoration of Jehovah. These favourable dispositions David wished to uphold and strengthen, by suitable regulations in the service of the priests and Levites; especially by the instructive and animating Psalms, which were composed partly by himself and partly by other

[2] 2 Sam. v. vi. 1 Chron. xi. 4—9. xv. 1—16. 43. 2 Sam. xxiv. 16—25. Ps. xlvi. 5. xlviii. 2. 1 Kings, xi. 36.

[3] 1 Sam. vii. 1 Chron. xvii. 1 Kings, ii. 4. iii. 6. 1 Chron. xxviii. 4, compare Ps. lxxxix. 20—38. cxxxii. 2, sqq.

poets and prophets: they were sung not only by the Levites at all the sacrifices, accompanied with instrumental music, but also by the people while on their way to Jerusalem to attend the feasts. By such instructive means, David, without coercive measures, brought the whole nation to forget their idols, and to worship Jehovah alone; he also made their religion honourable and acceptable even to foreigners[4]. The arms of the Hebrews were consequently victorious in every quarter. The nomadic Arabs, the Amalekites, Edomites, Moabites, and even their more powerful enemies, the Philistines and Ammonites, were obliged to submit to their dominion. The Ammonites, having formed an alliance with the kings of Maachah, Tob, and Nisibis, collected a large body of auxiliary troops, but were defeated. Even Hadarezer, the haughty king of Nisibis, an ally of the Assyrians, who with his other allies brought a formidable army into the field[5], was so much humbled that he was obliged to remain inactive on the eastern side of the Euphrates, and leave to the Hebrews the kingdom of Damascus as far as Berytus. This was undoubtedly a most severe war, and cost much blood, but after many battles it terminated greatly to the advantage and glory of the Hebrews[6]. Thus were fulfilled those ancient prophecies, that the Hebrews should extend their borders to the Euphrates, subject the Edomites, conquer the Moabites and other eastern people, and become formidable to all their neighbours[7]. This success of their arms confirmed the nation still more in their religion, and inspired all the neighbouring people with reverence for the God of Israel.

[4] 2 Sam. xv. 19. 21. [5] Ps. lxxxiii.

[6] 2 Sam. x. 15—19. Ps. vi. viii. xxx. xxxvi. lx. 4—8. lxxxiii. 3—9. lxxxix. 39, sqq. Compare Michælis, Comment. Soc. Reg. Gött. obl. xiii. de Bello Nisibeno. Paulus, Memorabilien, Th. iv. s. 105—120.

[7] Gen. xv. 18. xxvii. 29. 40. Numb. xxiv. 7—9. 17—20. 2 Sam. v. 17—25. viii. 1—14. x. 1—19.

§. 32. DAVID AN EXAMPLE OF A FAITHFUL VASSAL OF JEHOVAH.

DAVID, as a man, was in his sentiments and conduct a true Israelite; as a king, he was a faithful vassal of Jehovah. The Psalms, in which he pours forth his whole heart, exhibit a sincere and zealous worshipper of the true God, who places his religion, not in offerings, prayers, hymns, and other external acts of devotion, but in obedience to the divine precepts, in which he seeks and finds all his happiness. God, and obedience to his will, is with David everywhere the first and predominant idea, which consoles him in his flight from Saul, and attends him to the throne. All deliverances from danger, and all victories, from the first over Goliath to that over the king of Nisibis, he expected from the aid of God, and attributed to the assistance of the Supreme Judge of men and nations[1]. As became a viceroy of Jehovah, he, in all enterprises, viewed himself as dependant on God, and bound to execute the designs of his Lord and Sovereign. He therefore scrupulously followed the directions of the sacred lot and the prophets; he supported the authority of the priests and Levites, though he was so far from being governed by them, that he on the contrary prescribed to them laws and institutions; he dedicated to the sanctuary the spoil, for which he was indebted to the providence of Jehovah, that at some future period a palace might be erected more suitable to the majesty of God; he loved his subjects, caused justice to be done them, called them his brethren, and thought himself not degraded by mingling with them in public worship, like any other subject of Jehovah. The Hebrews therefore, during the reign of David, clearly recognised the theocratical nature of their constitution[2].

[1] Ps. xviii.

[2] 2 Sam. xvi. 18. xix. 20. xx. 19. 1 Chron. xxviii. 2.

The imprecations and curses in the Psalms of David are to be judged of according to the knowledge and situation of the ancient world. They refer either to inimical nations, or to individual oppressors of the people, and so are nothing more than prayers for victory and deliverance; or they refer to the personal enemies of David, and thus are indications of what transgressors are to expect from a just God, and consequently, admonitions to the readers or singers not to suffer themselves to be borne away by a torrent of iniquity and vice. Poets express everything strongly; and under their pen, advice and admonition become a blessing or a curse. Such strong expressions, therefore, are so many proofs of a zealous love of virtue and an irreconcilable hatred of sin. With a view to warn and deter from vice, the Hebrews, according to the law of Moses, were accustomed solemnly to pronounce curses on the secret transgressors of the law[3]; and, considered in this light, who can justly find fault with the practice? Yea, even God himself, in this theocracy, laid curses, that is, threatenings of temporal punishment, on transgressors. After all, these curses in the Psalms of David may be in part ascribed to the translators; and the original text, properly understood, may contain merely threatenings of what would take place as the punishment of crime. If David was in reality so vindictive as his curses seem to intimate, why did he not make Saul, his greatest enemy, feel the weight of his vengeance when he had him in his power? How, in such a situation, could a revengeful man restrain himself?

The adultery with Bathsheba, and the murderous transaction with Uriah, are shocking crimes which David himself is so far from excusing, that he confesses and laments them with the greatest horror. But how earnest was his repentance, and with what submission to the will of God did he bear those calamities which were sent for his punishment, and which, as they were caused by his own

[3] Deut. xxvii.

children, must have been so much the more distressing to his tender paternal feelings[4]! Do we not here again see the soul entirely and steadily devoted to God?

The numbering of the people in order, as it would seem, to push conquests into foreign countries, and the above-mentioned transaction with Bathsheba, are the only two instances in which David seems to have forgotten himself and his God. He was indeed no ideal model of human perfection; he was not without the blemishes incident to human nature. But on the whole, he was an example worthy of the imitation of his successors, and according as they appear on comparison with him, the sacred writers estimate their characters[5].

NOTE. The narrative of the three years' famine, and of the delivering up of seven descendants of Saul to the Gibeonites, is wanting in Chronicles, and occurs only 2 Sam. xxi. 1—14. It is here plainly in a different style from the adjoining text, and seems to be from another hand. It is found, however, in all the manuscripts and in all the ancient translations, and the famine seems to be alluded to, Ps. lxv. 5. 10. 13, and lxxxv. 13. The obscurities of this narrative probably may never be entirely cleared up. One thing however is certain: these seven descendants of Saul, who were partly the children of a concubine, and partly of a daughter of Saul, were not pretenders to the crown; and David cannot be suspected of having embraced such an opportunity to put them out of the way. Neither is it to be supposed that David delivered up the innocent to death, contrary to the law. Deut. xxiv. 16.

They were therefore delivered up to the avengers of blood, and punished with death, not on account of the crimes of Saul, but for the murders which they themselves,

[4] 2 Sam. xi. Ps. li. 2 Sam. xii. 1—23. xiii. 1—20. xv—xviii.

[5] Hess, Geschichte Davids und Salomo's. Niemeyer, Charakteristik der Bibel, Th. iv. s. 128—410. David von Ewald, Band ii. 1796, s. 66, sqq. 308, sqq.

with the connivance of Saul, had committed on the Gibeonites, and for which they had hitherto remained unpunished. They themselves constituted the bloody house, which was generally notorious as such. Saul is mentioned with them, merely because he took under his protection the murderers, who were so nearly related to him, and delivered them from the hands of the avengers of blood. Compare David von Ewald, B. ii. Abschnitt 11. s. 172, sqq.

§. 33. SOLOMON.

In the year B. C. 1015, David, about six months before his death, surrendered the government to his son Solomon, after a reign of forty years and a half. Solomon was at that time about eighteen years old, and consequently he was neither the firstborn, nor the eldest prince; but he succeeded to the throne by the direction of Jehovah[1]. Adonijah, the eldest prince, made an attempt to seize the sceptre; but his design was seasonably frustrated, and Solomon confirmed himself in the government during the life of his father. The last charges which the dying monarch gave to his successor, are mentioned in the scriptures as commendable; and let men judge of them as they please, they are neither revengeful nor unjust, but strictly conformable to the divine precepts. According to the law, criminals were to be punished for the purpose of deterring others from the commission of similar crimes; and it was with this view merely that David gave those directions, the execution of which he left entirely to the discretion of his successor[2].

The kingdom, under David, had been very much extended and brought under good regulations. The arms of the Hebrews were feared by all the neighbouring people, and consequently the reign of Solomon was peaceable. Now the predominant tribe of Judah lay as a lion,

[1] 1 Chron. xxviii. 6. 1 Kings, i. 32—35.
[2] 1 Kings, i. 5—48. ii. 1—9. David von Ewald, ii. s. 227.

and as a lioness, which no nation ventured to rouse up[3]. The Hebrews were the ruling people, and their empire the principal monarchy in Western Asia. From the Mediterranean sea and the Phœnicians to the Euphrates, from the river of Egypt and the Elanitic gulf to Berytus, Hamath, and Thapsacus, and towards the east to the Hagarenes on the Persian gulf; all were subject to the sway of Solomon. The Canaanites indeed had been neither annihilated nor expelled, but they were obedient and peaceable subjects. Their whole number might amount to between 400,000 and 500,000; since 153,000 were able to render soccage to the king. The warlike and civilized Philistines, the Edomites, Moabites, and Ammonites, the nomadic Arabians of the desert, and the Syrians of Damascus, were all tributary to him. Peace gave to all his subjects prosperity; the trade which he introduced brought wealth into the country, and promoted the arts and sciences, which there found an active protector in the king, who was himself distinguished for his learning. The building of the temple, and of several palaces, introduced foreign artists by whom the Hebrews were instructed. Many foreigners, and even sovereign princes, were attracted to Jerusalem in order to see and converse with the prosperous royal sage[4]. The regular progress of all business, the arrangements for security from foreign and domestic enemies, the army, the cavalry, the armories, the chariots, the palaces, the royal household, the good order in the administration of the affairs of the empire, and in the service of the court, excited as much admiration as the wisdom and learning of the viceroy of Jehovah. So much had been effected by the single influence of David, because he scrupulously conformed himself to the theocracy of the Hebrew state.

But in the midst of all this splendour, Solomon fell short of the virtues of his father. At first, indeed, while

[3] Gen. xlix. 9. Numb. xxiii. 24. xxiv. 9.

[4] 1 Kings, v. 9—14. x. 1—13.

the example of David and the instructions of his preceptor Nathan were yet fresh in his mind, he showed himself as faithful to the authority of God as his father, and wished for nothing more than wisdom and understanding, that he might govern his subjects well. The severity with which he treated Joab and Adonijah is not to be blamed; for they were seditious men, who would otherwise have instigated a civil war. Neither was the removal of the high priest Abiathar (by which a prophecy was fulfilled[5]) a violation of the law, as that did not determine by what power the high priest should be appointed. While there was no statute on the subject, it was a matter of policy that the nomination of so important and influential an officer should be retained in the crown. The people willingly offered their services for the building of the temple, and did not esteem it a burthen. The administration of justice was also attended to with impartiality.

Notwithstanding all this, Solomon, after the example of other oriental monarchs, governed in rather an arbitrary manner. His numerous harem, which consisted of one thousand females, was an express violation of the law of Moses[6]. The introduction of a body of cavalry, which amounted to twelve thousand men, might perhaps be excusable in an empire so extensive; and in this view it may be considered as not counteracting the law of Moses, which forbids the multiplication of horses. But the increase of the imposts to defray the expenses of the royal household, which in the east are always great, and in Solomon's court were extravagant, were burthens such as had been predicted[7]; and which the Hebrews, after the death of Solomon, endeavoured to diminish. Even the decision respecting the two prostitutes, which called forth so many eulogies on the king's knowledge of mankind, betrays a leaning towards that arbitrary exercise of the royal power, which is so common among the eastern

[5] 1 Sam. ii. 30, 31. iii. 13. [6] 1 Kings, xi. 3.
[7] 1 Sam. viii. 9—18. 1 Kings, xii. 1—4.

despots. Solomon, as he grew older, receded farther and farther from the law of Moses, which every king of the Hebrews was bound to obey. That he, as well as David, should tolerate idolatry in the foreign countries they had conquered, was not a violation of the law, which was enjoined on the Hebrews only; but that he should allow the idolatry of his wives in his own dominions, and even in his capital; that he should build temples to the gods, if he did not himself offer them sacrifices; this was a breach of the fundamental law of the Hebrew state; it was the seducing of the Hebrews to idolatry; it was encouraging them to rebel against Jehovah, their king[8]. On this account the prosperity of Solomon was interrupted by disquiets in Idumea and Syria, and it was foretold to him that only one tribe (Judah and Benjamin, mentioned as one because the capital, Jerusalem, was situated on the borders of each), should descend to his heirs. The dominion over the other ten tribes was promised to Jeroboam by Ahijah the prophet. Solomon died in the year B. C. 975; and, notwithstanding his glory, was but little lamented[9].

NOTE. 1. The chronology from the departure out of Egypt to the death of Solomon stands thus:

Moses ruled	40 years	Saul ruled	40 years
Joshua	17	David	40½
From Joshua to Saul	450	Solomon	40

Thus the whole period from the departure out of Egypt to the death of Solomon includes 627½ years.

The building of the temple was commenced in the fourth year of Solomon's reign, therefore subtracting 36 years there remain 591½ from the departure out of Egypt to the commencement of the building of the temple. But

[8] 1 Kings, xi. 4—8.

[9] 1 Kings, ix. comp. Hess, Geschichte Davids und Salomo's, Th. ii. s. 231, sqq.

in 1 Kings, vi. 1, this period is mentioned as only 480 years. That some error must in very ancient times have crept into the copy here, appears evident from the following considerations:

(1.) Josephus (Antiq. VIII. iii. 1.) reads in this place 592; and he also (Jewish War, IV. ix. 7.) seems to compute in the same manner. See Michælis, Alt. Or. Bibl. Th. xii. s. 31. 32.

(2.) Paul (Acts, xiii. 20.) reckons the period of the Judges at 450 years, and without doubt his teacher Gamaliel allowed the same space of time. But so many years could not have been allowed, if at that time the Palæstine Manuscripts had read (1 Kings, vi. 1.) 480, and not 592.

(3.) The reading 592 (in 1 Kings, vi. 1.) is farther confirmed by the circumstance, that it is so reckoned by the Jews of China, who wandered thither through Chorasan and Samarcand, A. D. 73.

Consequently, at the time of their emigration the passage must have read 592 and not 480. See Michælis, Alt. Orient. Bibl. Th. v. No. 71. s. 81, sqq. and Schreiben an Hrn. Schlötzer die Zeitrechnung von der Sündfluth bis auf Salomo betreffend in den Zerstreut. klein. Schriften, Lieferung, ii. s. 224—232.

NOTE. 2. We find in these times no mention made of the Elamites and Babylonians. They took no part in the affairs of the western countries. Assyria, together with the king of Nisibis, afforded only twenty thousand auxiliares to the Ammonites, and therefore it could not have been a very great kingdom. The most powerful empire of those times was the Nisibene, and even this could not long withstand the Hebrews. The Greeks, who place the great Assyrian monarchy very high in antiquity, have not accurately distinguished between the different predominant oriental monarchies which succeeded each other. Even Xenophon in his Cyropædia, always calls the Chaldee-Babylonian empire, the Assyrian; and the Chaldæans

and Babylonians he calls Assyrians. Nor is this at all strange, for even in the Bible the two names are frequently confounded.

NOTE 3. Hiram, king of Tyre, who sent timber and artificers to David and Solomon, and also Solomon, are mentioned by Menander. This authentic historian was a native of Ephesus, and he derived his history from the original sources in each of the nations respecting which he wrote. He celebrates Hiram, or, as he calls him, Hiromos, as a lover of architecture and a hero, and Solomon as a sage. His words, as quoted by Josephus against Apion, i. 18, are remarkable. 'Upon the death of Abibalus, his son Hiram took the kingdom; he lived fifty-three years, and reigned thirty-four. He raised a bank on that called the Broad Place, and dedicated that golden pillar which is in Jupiter's (Baal's) temple; he also went and cut down timber from the mountain called Libanus, and got timber of cedar for the roofs of the temples. He also pulled down the old temples and built new ones: besides this, he consecrated the temples of Hercules and Astarte. He first built Hercules' temple in the month Peritus, and that of Astarte when he made his expedition against the Tityans, who refused to pay tribute; and when he had subdued them to himself he returned home. Under this king there was a younger son of Abdemon, who, by his acuteness, mastered the problems which Solomon king of Jerusalem had recommended to be solved.' *Whiston's Translation.*

Although Menander here says nothing of the building of the temple at Jerusalem, it is easy to see how exactly every other circumstance corresponds with the biblical history. It also plainly appears, that it was then customary to erect magnificent temples. We may even conjecture, that Menander confounded the temple of Jehovah at Jerusalem, with the temple of Jupiter at Tyre.

BOOK V.

FROM THE REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES TO THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY. DESTRUCTION OF JERUSALEM.

§. 34. REVOLT OF THE TEN TRIBES.

THE events which took place after the death of Solomon, showed the effect of the arbitrary maxims of government that had prevailed at the court of this king during the last years of his reign. The rulers assembled at Shechem, the capital of the powerful tribe of Joseph, which had always been the jealous rival of Judah. They wished to enter into a new stipulation with Rehoboam, the heir to the throne; a precaution that had been neglected at the accession of Solomon. They would submit to him only on condition, that he would diminish the burthens which his father had laid upon them. Rehoboam required three days to deliberate on their proposal; and when, after that time, instead of granting their request without hesitation, as the elder and more prudent counsellors urged him to do, he threatened them, according to the advice of his younger courtiers, with a still more intolerable yoke, ten tribes renounced their allegiance to him, and elected Jeroboam, the son of Nebat, for their sovereign. He was of the tribe of Ephraim, or Joseph, which had in ancient times received some obscure promises of a crown[1]. During the reign of Solomon, Ahijah the prophet foretold that Jeroboam should reign over ten tribes. Jeroboam was soon after obliged to escape to Egypt on account of his treasonable practices[2].

[1] Gen. xlix. 26. Deut. xxxiii. 16.

[2] 1 Kings, xi. 26—40. xii. 1—20. 2 Chron. x. 1—19.

Thus was the great and powerful empire of David and Solomon torn into two very unequal parts. Jeroboam possessed ten tribes, together with all the tributary nations as far as the Euphrates; and this was now called the kingdom of Israel. Rehoboam retained only the tribes of Judah and Benjamin, which were viewed as one tribe because the capital, Jerusalem, was situated on the frontiers of both. Benjamin is comprehended in the name of Judah[3]. To this division also belonged Philistia and Edom; but the whole of this territory, which was now called the kingdom of Judah, included scarcely a fourth part of the dominions of Solomon. Rehoboam was determined to reduce the ten tribes to obedience, and for this purpose he collected an army; but the prophet Shemaiah announced to him the command of king Jehovah to relinquish the enterprise. Rehoboam was still reasonable enough to see the propriety of this requisition. No definite treaty of peace, however, was concluded, and the frontiers of the two kingdoms always presented a hostile appearance[4].

§. 35. GENERAL VIEW OF THE TWO KINGDOMS.

In the preceding history we have seen that Jehovah, from the time of Moses to the death of Solomon, always governed the Hebrews according to the promises and threatenings which he delivered from mount Horeb. If they deviated from the principle of worshipping Jehovah as the only true God, that is, if they revolted from their lawful king, he brought them, by suitable chastisements, to reflect on their obligations, to return to Jehovah, and again to keep sacred the fundamental law of their church and state. The same course we shall find pursued in the government of the two kingdoms. If the monarchs of both had viewed the late great revolution, the sundering of the empire, as a conse-

[3] 1 Kings, xi. 36. xii. 20.

[4] 1 Kings, xii. 21—24. 2 Chron. xi. 1—4. xii. 15.

quence of the idolatrous and unlawful principles of Solomon's court, as a warning (for such it really was) to them not to break the fundamental law of the state, but to govern their subjects according to the law, and to treat them as the subjects of Jehovah; then both kingdoms might have enjoyed uninterrupted prosperity. Even Jeroboam, though he had received no promise of an eternal kingdom as David had, yet the assurance was given him, that if he obeyed the law as David did, the throne should long continue in his family[1]. But as the kings of both kingdoms often disregarded the fundamental law of the commonwealth—by idolatry rebelled against their divine sovereign, carried their disorders so far, and treated their subjects in such a manner, that they are very aptly described, by Isaiah and Ezekiel[2], under the image of wicked shepherds—there arose a succession of prophets, who, by impressive declarations and symbolic actions, reminded both rulers and subjects of their duties to Jehovah, and threatened them with punishment in case of disobedience; and there followed, as the periods rolled by, calamity after calamity in order to bring the nation to reflection.

In the kingdom of Israel there was from the first the greatest disregard of the divine laws; it was consequently destroyed one hundred and thirty-four years earlier than that of Judah. Jeroboam trusted little to the divine promise made him by the prophet; but fearing that if the people went to Jerusalem to attend the feasts, they would return to their allegiance to the house of David, he set up two golden or gilded calves, as images of Jehovah: an imitation of the Apis and Mnevis of the Egyptians, among whom he had long dwelt in exile. One of these was placed at Bethel, not far from Shechem, for the southern tribes, and the other at Dan, for the tribes of the north. Temples were built, and altars erected, for these images; priests were appointed from all the tribes without distinc-

[1] 1 Kings, xi. 37, 38. xii. 21—24. 2 Chron. xi. 1—4. xiii. 15.
[2] Is. lvi. 9—12. Ezek. xxxiv.

tion, and the priestly functions performed even by the monarch himself. He appointed the festivals a month later than they had hitherto been, and commanded that they should be celebrated before these images of Mnevis and Apis, which the people took for gods, and worshipped as such; although this kind of idolatry had already been very severely punished at mount Horeb[3]. These arbitrary changes became after this so interwoven with the constitution, that even the more pious successors of Jeroboam did not venture to abolish them, and reestablish the authority of the fundamental law.

These rebellious backslidings from God, though so impressively inculcated on the whole people at the first introduction of monarchy, and afterwards on Jeroboam himself[4], did not prevent Jehovah from governing the kingdom of Israel according to his law. We shall see in the sequel how he exterminated, one after another, those royal families, who not only retained the arbitrary institutions of Jeroboam, tolerated and patronised idolatry with its concomitant vices, but even introduced and protected it by their royal authority. The extermination of the reigning family he announced beforehand by a prophet, and appointed his successor. We shall see that the higher their corruptions rose, so much the more decisive and striking were the declarations and signs made to show the Israelites, that the Lord of the universe was their Lord and King, and that all idols were as nothing when opposed to him. Even Naaman the Syrian acknowledged, and the Syrians generally found, to their sorrow, that the God of the Hebrews was not a mere national god, but that His power extended over all nations. History represents a contest (as Hess expresses it) between Jehovah, who ought to be acknowledged as God, and the idolatrous Israelites; and everything is ordered to preserve the authority of Jehovah in their minds. At last, after all milder punishments had proved fruitless, these rebellions

[3] 1 Kings, xii. 25—33. Exod. xxxii.

[4] 1 Sam. xi. 14. xii. 1 Kings, xi. 38.

were followed by the destruction of the kingdom, and the captivity of the people, which had been predicted by Moses, and afterwards by Ahijah, Hosea, Amos, and other prophets[5].

We shall also find that divine Providence was favourable or adverse to the kingdom of Judah, according as the people obeyed or transgressed the law; only here the royal family remained unchanged, in accordance with the promise given to David. We shall here meet indeed with many idolatrous and rebellious kings, but they are always succeeded by those of purer mind, who put a stop to idolatry, reestablished theocracy in the hearts of their subjects, and, by the aid of prophets, priests, and Levites, and the services of the temple, restored the knowledge and worship of God. Judah, therefore, though much smaller than Israel, continued her national existence one hundred and thirty-four years longer; but at last, as no durable reformation was produced, she experienced the same fate as her sister kingdom, in fulfilment of the predictions of Moses, and several other prophets[6].

The following account of the two kingdoms, therefore, should be viewed as that of a real theocracy; and thus, as a continued execution of the determination of God, that the true religion should be preserved on the earth. In this view it certainly deserves our most attentive study. We shall divide it into five periods.

The First Period closes with the year 91 of the revolt, B. C. 884, when both kingdoms lose their king on the same day.

The Second Period extends to the 216th year of the revolt, B. C. 759, when Pekahiah king of Israel is murdered, and soon after Uzziah dies.

The Third Period extends to the destruction of the kingdom of Israel, in the 253rd year of the revolt, B. C. 722, and in the sixth year of Hezekiah's reign. In the kingdom

[5] Deut. xxviii. 36. 1 Kings, xiv. 15. Hosea, ix. Amos, v.
[6] Deut. xxviii. 36.

of Judah this period extends to the death of Hezekiah, 276th of the revolt, B. C. 699.

The Fourth Period extends from the death of Hezekiah to the death of Josiah, 364th of the revolt, B. C. 611.

The Fifth Period extends from the death of Josiah to the destruction of the kingdom of Judah, 387th of the revolt, B. C. 588.

TABLE OF THE KINGS OF ISRAEL AND JUDAH.

FIRST PERIOD.

JUDAH.	*Year of the Revolt.*	*B. C.*	ISRAEL.	*Year of the Revolt.*	*B. C.*
Rehoboam	1	975	Jeroboam	1	975
Abijam	17	958			
Asa	20	955			
			Nadab	22	954
			Baasha	24	952
			Elah	45	930
			Omri	46	929
			Ahab	57	918
Jehoshaphat	61	914			
			Ahaziah	78	897
			Jehoram	79	896
Jehoram	84	891			
Ahaziah	91	884			

SECOND PERIOD.

Athaliah	91	884	Jehu	91	884
Joash	98	877			
			Jehoahaz	119	856
			Joash	135	840
Amaziah	137	838			
			Jeroboam II.	150	825
Uzziah	164	811			
			Interregnum	191	784
			Zachariah	202	773
			Shallum	202	773
			Menahem	202	773
			Pekahiah	214	761

THIRD PERIOD.

JUDAH.	Year of the Revolt.	B. C.	ISRAEL.	Year of the Revolt.	B. C.
Jotham	216	759	Pekah	216	759
Ahaz	232	743			
			Interregnum	235	740
Hezekiah	247	728			
			Hosea	244	731
			End of the kingdom	253	722

FOURTH PERIOD.

Manasseh	276	699
Amon	331	644
Josiah	333	642

FIFTH PERIOD

Jehoahaz	364	611
Jehoiakim	364	611
Jehoiachin	375	600
Zedekiah	375	600
End of the kingdom	387	588

§. 36. ISRAEL, FROM B. C. 975 TO 884.

JEROBOAM reigned twenty-two years, or till B. C. 954. His palace was at Shechem, though he had a summer residence at Tirzah. The changes in the constitution, such as appointing the festivals to be held a month later, the setting up of the golden calves as images of Jehovah, the appointment of priests from all the tribes indiscriminately, which he made in order to secure the throne to himself and to his posterity, brought upon him the judgments of Jehovah; and it was decreed that his family should soon be exterminated, and the sceptre transferred to another.

Many citizens also, who were displeased with these innovations on their fundamental laws, retired to the kingdom of Judah. The priests and Levites especially, all left Israel, and relinquished not only their tithes (which Jeroboam then perhaps gave to his new priests), but also their cities. From this sacrifice (certainly no inconsiderable one), which they made rather than violate the law, it is evident they were not easily seduced from the worship of the true God, and that they always contributed much to its preservation. They, therefore, could not have been so contemptible a class of men, as many at the present day have represented them[1].

Nadab, the son of Jeroboam, succeeded to the throne; but in the second year of his reign he was put to death, with all his father's house, by Baasha, as Ahijah had predicted[2]. Baasha reigned twenty-four years. He fixed his residence at Tirzah. Because he did not reform the abuses of Jeroboam, the prophet Jehu, the son of Hanani, declared to him the determination of God to exterminate his family[3]. Elah his son succeeded him in the 45th year of the revolt, B. C. 930; but in the second year of his reign he was murdered, with all his father's family, by Zimri, according to the prediction of Jehu[4].

When the army, who were besieging Gibbethon on the frontiers of the Philistines, heard of Zimri's treachery, they elected Omri, their general, king, and marched to Tirzah, where Zimri had elevated himself to the throne. Zimri made no resistance, but fled to the harem, which he set on fire and perished in the flames. In the mean time a part of the people had made Tibni king, and though this was the weaker party, it existed for a considerable time; and it was not till after Tibni's death, that Omri's claims were generally acknowledged. Omri reigned twelve years. He built Samaria, about thirty-two miles

[1] 1 Kings, xii. 25. xiv. 7—17. 2 Chron. xi. 13—17.
[2] 1 Kings, xiv. 7—10. xv. 25—32.
[3] 1 Kings, xv. 33, 34. xvi. 1—7.
[4] 1 Kings, xvi. 8—14.

north of Jerusalem, and made it his capital; and there all the succeeding kings of Israel resided[5].

Ahab, his son, the weakest of all the Israelitish monarchs, reigned twenty-one years, from the year 57 to 78 of the revolt, and from B. C. 918 to 897. He was entirely under the influence of his idolatrous wife, Jezebel, a daughter of Ethbaal, or Ithobalus, king of Tyre. Hitherto the golden calves had been the only objects of idolatrous worship; but now Ahab and Jezebel united their authority to introduce the gods of other nations. The king built a temple at Samaria, erected an image and consecrated a grove to Baal, the god of the Zidonians. Jezebel maintained a multitude of priests and prophets of Baal. Idolatry became the predominant religion. Jehovah, and the golden calves as representations of him, were viewed with no more reverence than Baal and his image. It appeared as if the knowledge of God was for ever lost to the Israelites. But Elijah the prophet boldly resisted the regal authority, and retained many of his countrymen in the worship of the true God. The greater the power was which supported idolatry, so much the more striking were the prophecies and miracles which directed the attention of the Israelites to Jehovah, and brought disgrace on the idols and their worshippers. At last the judgment of God on Ahab and his house was pronounced by Elijah, that, during the reign of his son, his whole race should be exterminated. Ahab died of the wounds which he received in a battle with the Syrians, according to the prediction of Micaiah, the son of Imlah[6].

Ahaziah was no better than his father Ahab. In the second year of his reign he fell through the lattice of an upper apartment of his palace, and died soon after, as Elijah had foretold[7]. Jehoram, the second son of Ahab, reigned twelve years, from 79 to 91 of the revolt, and from B. C. 896 to 884. By the prophecies and miracles

[5] 1 Kings, xvi. 15—29.
[6] 1 Kings, xvi. 29 to xxii. 40.
[7] 1 Kings, xxii. 50 to 2 Kings, i.

of Elijah, he had been brought to acknowledge Jehovah as his God and sovereign. He, however, suffered the golden calves to remain, made no attempt to abolish idolatry, and even left undisturbed the temple of Baal at Samaria; probably because he feared the power of his mother Jezebel, who patronised these abominations. He however took away the idolatrous image of Baal which his father Ahab had made. Elisha, who like Elijah was a distinguished instrument of divine Providence for the preservation of the law, and consequently for the protection and prosperity of Israel, or, to use his own language, was 'the chariot of Israel and the horsemen thereof,' always found a ready audience with Jehoram, and gave him many good counsels, in consequence of which the Syrians, with whom Israel had been at war ever since the reign of Omri, suffered several considerable repulses, and were forced to acknowledge the power of Jehovah. Jehoram also gained an important victory over the Moabites, who had revolted under the reign of Ahab, and under Ahaziah had made themselves completely independent. But idolatry and rebellion against Jehovah still continued. Even the seven years' famine, which forced many to emigrate, produced no reformation. At last, the kingdom was promised to Jehu, the commander-in-chief, by a young disciple of Elisha; and he immediately executed the sentence pronounced against Ahab, and extirpated his whole family in obedience to the orders of Jehovah[8].

NOTE. Ethbaal king of Tyre, whose daughter Jezebel was Ahab's queen, is mentioned by Menander under the name Ithobalus. Josephus against Apion, i. 18. This accurate historian, on the authority of the Tyrian annals, thus enumerates the kings of Tyre that succeeded Hiram, the contemporary of Solomon:

'After the death of Hiram, his son Balnazarus succeeded him on the throne, who lived forty-three years, and

[8] 2 Kings, iii—viii.

reigned seven. Next to him his son Abdastartus, who lived twenty-nine years and reigned nine. He was murdered by the four sons of his nurse, the eldest of whom reigned twelve years. Then Astartus, the son of Deleastartus, who lived fifty-four years and reigned twelve. Next, his brother Aserymus, who lived fifty-four years and reigned nine. He was slain by his brother Pheletes, who then ascended the throne. He lived fifty years and reigned eight months. Ithobalus, a priest of Astarte, put him to death and assumed the sceptre. He lived sixty-eight years and reigned thirty-two. His successor was his son Badezorus, who lived forty-five years and reigned six. His son and successor, Margenus, lived thirty-two years and reigned nine. Pygmalion succeeded him, who lived fifty-six years and reigned forty-seven. In the seventh year of his reign, his sister, Dido, fled and built Carthage in Libya.'

According to this, the time from the death of Hiram to the beginning of the reign of Ithobalus, is about fifty years; and from the death of Solomon to the beginning of Ahab's reign, are fifty-seven years. Hiram, who was already king in the time of David, and reigned only thirty-two years, must have died at least ten years before Solomon, and consequently, from the death of Hiram to Ahab, about sixty-seven years elapsed. If all these numbers are correct, Ahab must have married Jezebel after he became king. But allowance must be made for the mistakes which transcribers are apt to make in copying numerals. We here see the reason why Jezebel, the daughter of a priest of Astarte, was so zealous a promoter of idolatry; and as twenty-one years after the death of Ithobalus, his granddaughter Dido built Carthage, and founded that celebrated commonwealth, we may judge what sort of a spirit animated the females of this royal family. Hence we shall feel less surprise that Jezebel should have exerted such an influence over the king and kingdom of Israel, and that her daughter Athaliah afterwards took possession of the throne of Judah. And the fact that a son

of the king's nurse was able to place himself on the throne, confirms the opinion advanced in the Archæologie, Th. I. b. iii s. 285, that in the east, nurses held a very important rank in families.

§. 37. JUDAH FROM B. C. 975 TO 884.

REHOBOAM reigned seventeen years, or to the year B. C. 958. The commencement of his reign was not reprehensible, but when he saw himself firmly seated on the throne, he tolerated idolatry, which had already made great inroads during the last years of his father Solomon, with all its abominations. For his punishment, divine providence suffered Shishak king of Egypt to invade Judæa, with twelve thousand chariots, sixty thousand cavalry, and a great body of infantry. He took all the cities, and even Jerusalem itself was obliged to surrender unconditionally to the conqueror, according to the determination of Jehovah, as made known by the prophet Shemaiah. Shishak, contented with the plunder of the temple and of the royal treasury, returned to Egypt. Jeroboam, while in exile, had enjoyed the protection of this monarch, and it was he, probably, who excited him to attack Judah. This kingdom was receiving constant accessions of strength by emigrations from Israel, and it was the policy of Jeroboam to weaken it, in order to secure himself against the hostilities of Rehoboam[1].

Abijah or Abijam, the son of Rehoboam, reigned only three years, to the 20th year of the revolt, B. C. 955. With courage resulting from the principles of theocracy, he resolved with four hundred thousand men to commence a war with Jeroboam, whose forces amounted to double that number. He gained an important victory, and five hundred thousand of the Israelitish army were left dead on the field. In numbers so large, there may be some error of the transcribers, but it is certain that after this defeat

[1] 1 Kings, xiv. 21—31. 2 Chron. xii.

the kingdom of Israel was considerably weakened, while Judah made constant progress in power and importance. We must here mention once for all, that owing to the mistakes of transcribers in copying numerals, we cannot answer for the correctness of the great numbers of men in the armies which are mentioned here, and in the sequel. When there are no means of rectifying these numbers, we set them down as they occur in the books.

Asa, the son of Abijam, reigned forty-one years, to 61 of the revolt, B. C. 914. He ascended the throne two years before the death of Jeroboam, and as he was then very young, the affairs of the kingdom were administered by his mother, an Israelite of the race of Absalom, but a very superstitious woman, who encouraged idolatry by all the means in her power. But as soon as the young king assumed the government, he rooted out this disorder from the whole country, and walked in the steps of David. He neglected no human means to put his kingdom in the best condition possible, for which purpose the peace he enjoyed during the first ten years of his reign afforded him time and opportunity. His people increased so much, that he was able to bring into the field an army of five hundred and eighty thousand men. In the eleventh year of his reign, relying upon God, he attacked and defeated the numerous host of Zerah king of Cush (undoubtedly both of the Arabian and Æthiopian Cush), who had penetrated through Arabia Petræa into the vale of Zephathah, with a million of men and three hundred chariots. The prophet Azariah declared this splendid victory to be a consequence of the king's confidence in Jehovah, and exhorted him to perseverance; upon which he abolished the remnants of idolatry, and caused the whole people to renew their covenant with Jehovah. Notwithstanding this, when king Baasha had afterwards taken from him the city of Ramah, and was fortifying it for a frontier barrier, he employed the wealth of the temple and of the royal

[2] 1 Kings, xv. 1—8. 2 Chron. xiii.

treasury to purchase the friendship of the king of Damascus, and induced him to attack Israel. By this means he indeed regained Ramah, but his treasures were squandered. The prophet Hanani reproved him for his conduct, as it evinced a distrust of Jehovah; but the king imprisoned him for his fidelity. In the last years of his life, he treated many others with great severity, to which, probably, the ill humour occasioned by the gout in his feet, contributed not a little[3].

In the time of Asa, the poet Hesiod flourished among the Greeks, about the year B. C. 944, according to the Parian marbles.

Jehoshaphat, who ascended the throne in the fourth year of Ahab king of Israel, and reigned twenty-five years, to the 84th of the revolt, B. C. 891, was still more faithful to Jehovah, his sovereign, than his father Asa had been. He not only most diligently suppressed idolatry, but he sent out priests and Levites into every town, to instruct the people. These teachers he raised to the rank of royal counsellors, in order to increase their authority. He travelled himself through the country, to see whether his orders were executed. He improved the administration of justice, by the establishment of a supreme tribunal, and brought his military affairs to a prosperous condition. The effect of his judicious government was visible in the number of his people, who so increased, that he was able to bring into the field a disciplined and well-appointed army of one million one hundred and sixty thousand men. Among these, however, are probably to be included the Edomites, the Philistines, and many Arabians, who acknowledged his authority. But although thus powerful, he was disposed to peace, and ratified the first treaty between Judah and Israel. He visited king Ahab at Samaria, and joined him in an expedition against the Syrians. His conduct in this respect was disapproved of by the prophet Jehu, the

[3] 1 Kings, xv. 9—24. 2 Chron. xiv—xvi.

son of Hanani; and, indeed, as the enterprise proved unfortunate, it tended considerably to lower Jehoshaphat in the estimation of the neighbouring people. Hitherto he had been feared by all the surrounding nations; but now the Ammonites and Moabites pressed into Judæa by the way of Edom. Though they were defeated by Jehoshaphat, in conjunction with Jehoram king of Israel, and the Edomites, yet the victory was altogether the work of divine Providence, and an evident reward of his fidelity to Jehovah. His attempt to revive the navigation of the Red sea was unsuccessful. He seems, however, never to have relinquished the enterprise, though he refused to enter into a commercial alliance with the king of Israel. Had he never formed any connection with the idolatrous house of Ahab, or, at least, if he had not married Jehoram, his son and the heir of his crown, to Athaliah, the daughter of Ahab and Jezebel, much commotion and bloodshed would have been spared to Judæa[4]. During this reign, Homer flourished among the Greeks. The Parian marbles place him in the year B. C. 907.

Jehoram was admitted to a participation in his father's throne in the 84th year of the revolt, B. C. 891, and he reigned eight years. The unhappy consequences of the union with Athaliah, the Israelitish princess, now began to be visible. All the brothers of the king were murdered, undoubtedly through her influence; and idolatry was introduced by royal authority. Upon this the Edomites revolted; and although once defeated by Jehoram, who still had his father's army under his command, they nevertheless made themselves independent, according to the prophecy of Isaac. The Philistines also rebelled, and the Arabians who bordered on the Cushites. They made an incursion into Judæa, plundered the whole country, and even Jerusalem and the royal palace. They led away into slavery all the women of the king's harem, and all the royal princes, with the exception of Jehoahaz,

[4] 1 Kings, xxii. 1—50. 2 Chron. xvii—xx. [5] Gen. xxvii. 40.

or, as he is also called, Ahaziah. Even Libnah, the city of the priests, renounced allegiance to Jehoram, because he had forsaken Jehovah, the God of his fathers. He died miserably, and was denied the honours of a royal burial[6].

His son Ahaziah, or Jehoahaz, succeeded him, and reigned only one year. He was no better than his father, and suffered himself to be governed in everything by the wicked counsels of his idolatrous mother, Athaliah. He joined Jehoram king of Israel in an expedition against Hazael king of Damascus, or Syria, for the conquest of Ramoth-gilead; and he afterwards visited king Jehoram, while he lay wounded in his summer palace at Jezreel. Here Jehu slew both kings on the same day, in the year 91 of the revolt, B. C. 884[7].

During the first eighty-five years of this period, the kingdom of Judah made rapid advances, but afterwards it continually declined, and finally lost all its power.

NOTE. Shishak, who invaded Judæa during the reign of Rehoboam, according to Marsham, Canon. Chron. xiv. p. 376, is the same with Sesostris, the third king of the twelfth Diospolitic dynasty; according to Silberschlag, Chronologie der Welt, s. 143, Sesenchosis, the first of the twenty-second Bubastic dynasty; according to Gatterer, Weltgeschichte im ganzen Umfang, s. 224, Susenes or Phusenes, the second of the twenty-first Tanitic dynasty; according to Syncellus, Semendes, the first of the twenty-first Tanitic dynasty; and, according to others, he is the Asyches of Herodotus (see the table of the Egyptian dynasties at the end of the second volume). Such a controversy cannot easily be decided. See Perizonius, Origg. Ægypt. cap. xiii. p. 222, sqq. From 1 Chron. xii. 3. we know only that Shishak had in his army Troglodytes, Libyans, and Æthiopians; and, consequently, that his authority must have been very widely extended.

[6] 2 Kings, viii. 16—24. 2 Chron. xxi.

[7] 2 Kings, viii. 25—29. ix. 27—30. 2 Chron. xxii. 1—9.

§. 38. ISRAEL FROM B. C. 884 TO 759.

JEHU having extirpated the family of Ahab, ascended the throne of Israel in the 91st year of the revolt, B. C. 884, and reigned twenty-eight years. He entirely abolished idolatry, put to the sword the idolatrous priests and prophets of Baal at a festival, as traitors to king Jehovah, and turned the temple of Baal into a draughthouse. He however suffered the golden calves to remain. For his services he received a divine promise, that his descendants, for four generations, should possess the throne. But the idolatry introduced by Ahab and Jezebel was not annihilated by this coercive reformation. Many still practised it; but it was no longer upheld by regal authority. On account of this idolatry, the whole territory east of the Jordan fell into the hands of the Syrians[1].

Jehu's son, Jehoahaz, reigned seventeen years, to 135 of the revolt, B. C. 840. He suffered so severely from the Syrians, that at last he retained only one thousand infantry, fifty horse, and ten chariots. But as he acknowledged the authority of Jehovah over Israel, he was finally released from these haughty foes, and obtained peace. Joash, his son, reigned seventeen years. As the idolatrous generation had now become extinct, he was able to hold the Syrians in check, and in the end to gain the ascendancy over them. He conquered several cities, and the prophet Elisha, while on his death-bed, predicted that he should gain three victories.

Jeroboam the second, a son of Joash, reigned forty-one years, to 191 of the revolt, B. C. 784. He was as much the enemy of idolatry as his father, and consequently his arms were also victorious. He recovered from the Syrians all which they had conquered during the reigns of Jehu and Jehoahaz, and restored to the empire its ancient

[1] 2 Kings, x. 18 –36.

boundaries; as had been predicted by Jonah, the son of Amittai[2].

No sooner was Israel released from the Syrians, than it was disturbed by domestic broils, and hastened rapidly towards destruction. Upon the death of Jeroboam the second (in the thirty-eighth year of Uzziah, or Azariah, king of Israel), his son Zachariah ascended the throne. For twelve years great internal commotions prevailed. Kings were suddenly raised to the throne, and as suddenly removed; agreeably to the representation which Hosea, who prophesied at this time, gives of the state of the kingdom. This proves a gross degeneracy in respect to religion and morals; a fact which is also proved by the prophecy of Hosea. The people having become dissatisfied with the government of Zechariah, he was murdered by Shallum in the sixth month of his reign, 202 of the revolt, B. C. 773. Thus fulfilling the prediction, that the family of Jehu should retain the throne only to the fourth generation[3].

The regicide Shallum placed himself on the throne; and notwithstanding the civil disturbances of the kingdom, he collected a force sufficient to conquer Thapsacus (Tiphsah), on which occasion he treated the inhabitants with great cruelty[4]. After a reign of only one month, he was slain by his general Menahem.

Menahem retained the sceptre ten years, and died a natural death. His reign was very unfortunate. Pul, king of Assyria (which empire now emerged from its obscurity, and in the course of forty or fifty years acquired universal dominion), made war against him, perhaps on account of the conquest of Thapsacus by Shallum. Menahem could not resist this powerful conqueror. He purchased a peace at the price of one thousand talents, that is, three million shekels of silver, and became tribu-

[2] 2 Kings, xiii. xix. [3] 2 Kings, xv. 8—12.

[4] 2 Kings, xv. 13—16. [The passage referred to attributes the conquest of Tiphsah to Menahem. But he might have taken the city while he commanded the army of Shallum. Tr.]

tary to Assyria. As the king raised this sum by a tax of fifty shekels a head on his military men, it appears that his army amounted to sixty thousand strong, and that the whole system of government, during the preceding disquiets, had become military.

Pekahiah, the son of Menahem, succeeded him; but after a reign of two years he was murdered by Pekah, the commander of his army, in the year of Uzziah's death, 216 of the revolt, B. C. 759[5].

During the first fifty years of this period, the kingdom of Israel sunk deeper and deeper in degeneracy and misery; in the next half century it regained its ancient power and greatness; but during the succeeding twenty-five years it again rapidly degenerated.

NOTE. During the reigns of Ahab, Ahaziah, and Jehoram, the kingdom of Israel was continually harassed by Benhadad king of Syria, who resided at Damascus. Hazael, one of his principal officers, suffocated him as he lay sick, by wetting, and applying to his face, the veil which is used to keep off the gnats during sleep. Hazael succeeded to the throne, and during the reigns of Jehu and Jehoahaz, took possession of all the Israelitish territory east of the Jordan. As late as the time when Jerusalem was destroyed by Titus, these two Syrian kings received divine honours from the inhabitants of Damascus, but were placed by them at a more remote period of antiquity. See Josephus, Antiq. IX. iv. 6. His words are; 'When Hazael was come to Benhadad, he told him good news concerning his distemper, but the next day, he spread a wet cloth, in the nature of a net, over him, and strangled him and took his dominion. He was an active man, and enjoyed the good opinion of the Syrians and the people of Damascus to such a degree, that to this day both Benhadad and his successor Hazael are worshipped as gods, on account of their munificence in erecting temples,

[5] 2 Kings, xv. 17—26.

which contributed greatly to adorn the city of Damascus. They also every day do with great pomp pay their worship to these kings, and value themselves upon their antiquity; nor do they know that those kings are much later than they imagine, and that they are not yet eleven hundred years old.' *Whiston's Translation.*

§. 39. JUDAH FROM B. C. 884 TO 759.

As soon as Athaliah heard at Jerusalem, that king Ahaziah, her son, had been slain by Jehu, she took possession of the vacant throne and murdered all the males of the royal family, with the exception of Joash the youngest son of Ahaziah. He being then an infant, was rescued by Jehosheba, a sister of Ahaziah; and was privately brought up by a nurse in an apartment of the temple. The idolatrous Athaliah reigned more than six years, to the 98th of the revolt, B. C. 877. During this year, by the management of the high priest Jehoiada, the young prince was publicly anointed king in the temple, under the protection of a strong escort of well-armed Levites. Athaliah at the same time suffered the punishment of death, which she merited by her idolatry, treason, and violent usurpation. On this occasion, the covenant with Jehovah was renewed, and the people bound themselves by an oath to observe it; a precaution which the long continuance of an idolatrous government had rendered necessary[1].

. Joash, or Jehoash, reigned forty years, to the 137th of the revolt, B. C. 838. During the life of his guardian, the high priest Jehoiada, his government was entirely consonant to the principles of theocracy. The idolatry introduced by Athaliah was abolished, and about the year 120 of the revolt, the temple was repaired; the people voluntarily contributing to defray the expense. But after the death of Jehoiada, it appeared that idolatry had taken deep root

[1] 2 Kings, xi. 2 Chron. xxii. 9—12. xxiii. 1—21.

during the fourteen years of its predominance under Jehoram, Ahaziah, and Athaliah. The rulers themselves came before the throne and requested toleration for the worship of idols. Joash was weak enough to grant their request; and when the prophet Zechariah predicted national calamities on this account, the king was so ungrateful as to suffer him to be stoned in the court of the temple, though he was the son of his guardian Jehoiada, to whom he was indebted for his life, his education, and his throne, and to whom the nation had awarded a royal burial. But this ingratitude and cruelty did not prevent the fulfilment of the prophecy. The king of Syria, who then possessed all Gilead, came to Jerusalem with a small body of troops, put to death the rulers who had demanded the toleration of idolatry, and returned, laden with spoil, to Damascus. Joash, who had been wounded, was slain soon after by his own servants, and denied the honours of a royal burial[2].

Amaziah his son reigned twenty-nine years, to 164 of the revolt, B. C. 811. Like his father he began well, and then degenerated. In condemning his father's murderers, he observed the law which forbids children to be involved in the punishment due to their parents[3]. At the admonition of a prophet, he disbanded a force of a hundred thousand men, which he had hired from the kingdom of Israel to assist him in carrying on a war against the Edomites. Not, however, without paying them a hundred talents of silver, the sum agreed on for their services; he then gained a decisive victory over his enemies in the valley of Salt, as the prophet had foretold. But when he afterwards worshipped the gods which he had taken from the Edomites, setting them up at Jerusalem and refusing to listen to the warnings of a prophet, the success of his arms ceased. He engaged in a war with Jehoahaz king of Israel, on account of the depredations committed by the mercenary Israelitish troops, who,

[2] 2 Kings, xii. 2 Chron. xxiv. [3] Deut. xxiv. 16.

enraged at their dismission, had on their return murdered three thousand Jews, and plundered every place through which they passed. Amaziah was defeated and taken prisoner at the battle of Beth-shemesh. Jehoahaz restored the captive monarch to his throne; but he plundered Jerusalem and the temple, demolished four hundred cubits of the city wall, and took hostages with him to Samaria. Amaziah was finally assassinated by conspirators at Lachish, whither he had fled for protection[4].

Uzziah, called also Azariah, was raised to the throne by the people, after the death of his father Amaziah. He was then sixteen years old, and he reigned fifty-two years, to the 216th of the revolt, B. C. 759. He had an army of three hundred and seven thousand five hundred men; he built new fortifications, and repaired the old; provided them with suitable arms, and carried on wars successfully. He conquered Elath, Gath, Jabneh, and Ashdod; he defeated the Arabs of Gur-baal, the Mehunims, and the Ammonites. Though so much engaged in military operations, he found time to cultivate the arts of peace. He advanced the interests of agriculture, and made great improvements in the pasturage and breed of cattle. He was for the most part obedient to the law, though he did not demolish the unlawful altars; and on one occasion he attempted to usurp the privileges of the priesthood. For this act of impiety he was punished with leprosy, and for the rest of his life he dwelt in a separate house. Meanwhile, the affairs of government were administered by his son Jotham[5].

The famous era of the Olympiads commenced in the thirty-fifth year of Uzziah, 199 of the revolt, B. C. 776.

[4] 2 Kings, xiv. 1—22. 2 Chron. xxv.
[5] 2 Kings, xv. 1—7. 2 Chron. xxvi.

§. 40. ISRAEL FROM B. C. 759 TO 722.

PEKAH, the murderer of Pekahiah, ascended the throne of Israel in the last year of Uzziah. He formed an alliance with Rezin king of Syria, with the intent of making war upon Judah, expelling the family of David, and placing on the throne a tributary king of another race. They probably engaged in this design in order to strengthen themselves against the Assyrians, who were becoming daily more formidable, and threatened to overpower all their neighbours. But when the allied sovereigns had gained a few advantages over Judah, Tiglath-pileser king of Assyria came and subdued Syria, Galilee, and all the territory east of the Jordan, in the year 235 of the revolt, B. C. 740. He sent the principal inhabitants of Syria to the river Kir (Cyrus), which, at the present day, is called Kur by the Russians, and Kier by the Persians. It unites its waters to the Aras or Araxes, and empties itself into the Caspian sea, under the thirty-ninth degree of north latitude. A people of a foreign aspect, called *Usbecks*, dwell there to this time, who may be the descendants of these captives[1]. The principal inhabitants of Galilee were transferred to Assyria. Pekah was put to death by Hoshea[2].

Though the kingdom of Israel was now enclosed within such narrow boundaries, and surrounded on two sides by the powerful Assyrians, it did not remain quiet, but was continually exhausting its strength by intestine broils and conspiracies. For Pekah was murdered in the third or fourth year of Ahaz; and Hoshea did not ascend the throne till the twelfth year of the same reign. Consequently this state of anarchy continued for nine years; that is, from 235 to 244 of the revolt, and from B. C. 740 to 731[3].

[1] Büchings Magazin, Th. x. s. 402.

[2] 2 Kings, xv. 27—31. xvi. 1—10. Is. vii.

[3] The reading 2 Kings, xv. 30. 'in the twentieth year of Jotham,' is manifestly incorrect; compare xv. 23.

Hosea, or Hoshea, was a better ruler than most of his predecessors; but his kingdom was too much weakened to withstand the Assyrian power. Therefore, when Shalmaneser invaded him, he was obliged to become tributary. This was unavoidable; but Hoshea very imprudently attempted to shake off the yoke. He formed an alliance with So, king of Egypt, and imprisoned the Assyrian officer who was appointed to collect the tribute. Upon this, Shalmaneser laid siege to Samaria, and after three years gained possession of the city and destroyed it. During all this time the king of Egypt made no attempt to come to the assistance of Israel, as Isaiah had declared from the first, and in language of strong reprehension against this alliance[4]. Shalmaneser carried the principal inhabitants, soldiers, and armorers to Halah (Chalachene), to the river Habor (Chaboras, and in Ezekiel, Chebar), to Gozan on the eastern side of the Tigris, and the cities of the Medes. On the other hand, colonists to from Babylon, Cuthah, Ava, Hamath, and Sepharvaim, were seated in Samaria. It appears also, that Esar-haddon afterwards sent other colonists into this country[5]. These people mingled with the Israelites who still dwelt in the land, and were all comprehended under the general name of Samaritans, which was derived from the city Samaria. At first, all of them were worshippers of idols; but as wild beasts increased in their depopulated territory, they began to be disturbed by lions, and this calamity they supposed to be sent on them by the God of the country, as a punishment for their neglect of his worship. Accordingly, an Israelitish priest was recalled from exile, in order to instruct these idolaters in the worship of Jehovah as a national Deity. He settled at Bethel, where one of the golden calves had formerly stood, and afterwards the Samaritans united the worship of Jehovah with the worship of their own gods[6].

[4] Is. xxx. 1—7.
[5] Ezra, iv. 2, compare 9, 10.
[6] 2 Kings, xvii.

NOTE 1. So, the ally of Hoshea, seems to be Sevechus, the second king of the twenty-fifth Æthiopic dynasty; especially as the Hebrew consonants סוא may be pronounced Seve, and thus the name bears a near resemblance to Sevechus. Some suppose So to be Sabacon, the first king of the Æthiopic dynasty; but according to the account of Herodotus, ii. 137—139, he was a hero to whom the description of So in Isaiah, xxx. 3—5, cannot well be applied. Others suppose him to be Anysis the blind, who is said to have hid himself fifty years, during the Æthiopic dynasty, and then to have reascended the throne. Others again suppose him to be Sethos, the successor of Anysis (see the table at the end of the second volume).

NOTE 2. The ancient Assyrian empire should be carefully distinguished from the modern, with which the Hebrew history of these times is so intimately connected. The accounts of the ancient empire are very scanty and uncertain. Though it has been represented by the Greeks as very great and powerful, we have already remarked that this representation is at variance with oriental history. It ended with Sardanapalus, and was destroyed by Arbaces the Mede, about the seventh year of Uzziah's reign, 171 of the revolt, B. C. 804. After the death of Arbaces, there was an interregnum in Media of seventy-nine years, and during this period the Assyrians made themselves independent of the Medes.

This we call the modern Assyrian empire, the sovereigns of which are exhibited in the following table.

NAMES.	*Year of the Revolt.*	*B. C.*	*Years of their Reign.*
Pul	201	774	21
Tiglath-pileser	222	753	19
Shalmaneser	241	734	14
Sennacherib	255	720	7
Esar-haddon	262	713	35
Sardochæus	297	678	20
Chyniladan	317	658	22
Saracus	339	636	13
End	352	623	

The golden age of this empire continued from Pul to Esar-haddon, when its boundaries extended towards the west as far as the Mediterranean sea. Esar-haddon brought the Babylonian empire under his dominion, though he still suffered it to be governed by princes or viceroys; but his successor Sardochæus united it with Assyria. The Sargon, Isaiah, xx. i. who conquered Ashdod by his general Tartan, appears to be Esar-haddon, or rather perhaps Sennacherib, as he, according to Jerome, Comment. in Jes. xx. 1, had several names.

§. 41. JUDAH FROM B. C. 759 TO 699.

On account of the leprosy of king Uzziah, Jotham began to reign during his father's life. After the death of Uzziah, the reign of Jotham continued sixteen years, to 232 of the revolt, B. C. 743. He was obedient to the law, he continued the improvements of the kingdom begun by his father, built several fortresses, and made the Ammonites tributary. The alliance between Pekah and Rezin king of Syria was formed in the last year of his reign, but its effects did not appear till after his death[1]. In the eleventh year of Jotham, 227 of the revolt, B. C. 748, the city of Rome was founded, with the destinies of which the Hebrews were one day to be so intimately connected. Others place the foundation of this city B. C. 750 or 752. In the year following, viz. the twelfth of Jotham, 228 of the revolt, B. C. 747, commences the era of Nabonassar, in the canon of Ptolemey.

Ahaz, the son and successor of Jotham, was the most corrupt monarch that had hitherto appeared in Judah. His reign continued sixteen years, to 247 of the revolt, B. C. 728. He respected neither Jehovah, the law, nor the prophets; he broke through all the restraints which the law imposed on the Hebrew kings, and regarded nothing but his own depraved inclinations. He intro-

[1] 2 Kings, xv. 32—38. 2 Chron. xxvii.

duced the religion of the Syrians into Jerusalem, erected altars to the Syrian gods, altered the temple in many respects according to the Syrian model, and finally shut it up entirely. His cowardice was equal to his superstition. After he had suffered a few repulses from Pekah and Rezin, his allied foes, when the Edomites had revolted from him, and the Philistines were making incursions into his country, notwithstanding a sure promise of divine deliverance, he called Pul, the king of Assyria, to his aid. He became tributary to this monarch, on condition of his obliging Syria and Israel to relinquish their design of destroying Judah; and thus afforded Tiglath-pileser, the successor of Pul, an opportunity of conquering Syria, Galilee, and Gilead. But the Assyrian king afforded Ahaz no real assistance. On the contrary, he drove him to such extremities, that he was scarcely able, with all the riches of the temple, of the nobility of his kingdom, and of the royal treasury, to purchase a release from his troublesome protector[2].

Hezekiah succeeded, and reigned twenty-nine years, to the 276th of the revolt, B. C. 699. He did not follow the bad example of his father, but walked in the steps of his ancestor David. Immediately on his accession to the throne he opened the temple, restored the worship of God, abolished idolatry, destroyed the brazen serpent of Moses, which had become an object of idolatrous worship, overthrew the altars illegally erected to Jehovah, and caused the festivals to be regularly celebrated. To these feasts he invited the Hebrews who still remained in the kingdom of Israel, which had been conquered in the sixth year of his reign. Like David, he provided for the instruction and moral improvement of his people, by the public singing of psalms in the temple, and by a new collection of the moral maxims of Solomon. He extended the fortifications and magazines, and supplied Jerusalem more plentifully with water by a new aqueduct. He

[2] 2 Kings, xvi. 2 Chron. xxviii.

conquered the Philistines, who had penetrated into the southern parts of Judæa, during the reign of his father; and shook off the Assyrian yoke which Ahaz had voluntarily taken on himself. But in the fourteenth year of his reign Sennacherib came with a large army to reduce Judah to obedience, and to conquer Egypt. Hezekiah submitted to this potent conqueror, and paid the three hundred talents of silver and thirty talents of gold which were required. But after Sennacherib had gained possession of Ashdod, the key to Egypt, he thought it would be unsafe, in his invasion of that country, to leave the kingdom of Judah unsubdued in his rear, which had already once thrown off his yoke. He therefore determined to complete the subjugation of Judah in the first place, especially as, from its apparent weakness, he supposed the enterprise would be attended with but little difficulty. He soon reduced all the cities to his power except Libnah and Lachish, to which he laid sie[illegible], and Jerusalem, to which he gave a very haughty summons to surrender by his general Rabshakeh. Though to all human appearance everything was now lost, Hezekiah still relied on the promise of divine deliverance announced to him by Isaiah; and this deliverance was soon accomplished in a manner that admirably corresponded to the implicit confidence of Hezekiah. A report was spread abroad, that Tirhakah (Taracos or Tearcon) king of Cush—one of the greatest heroes of antiquity, who not only ruled over the Arabian, and African or Æthiopian Cush, but also over Egypt, and is said to have pushed his conquests as far as the pillars of Hercules—was on his march through Arabia to attack the Assyrian territories; and soon after, a hundred and eighty-five thousand men of Sennacherib's army were cut off in one night. Sennacherib now fled to Assyria, and was soon after assassinated by his own sons in the temple of Nisroch at Nineveh[3]. By these disasters Assyria seems to have lost

[3] Prov. xxv. 1. 2 Kings, xviii, xix. 2 Chron. xxix—xxxii. Is. xxxvi, xxxvii.

much of her power, or at least to have dreaded hostilities from Tirhakah; for Esar-haddon, the successor of Sennacherib, though he sent colonists to Samaria, made no attempts against Judah.

Soon after, Hezekiah himself was attacked by the plague, which had proved so fatal to Sennacherib's army; and though it made its appearance externally, there was so little hope of his recovery, that Isaiah earnestly requested him to make his will. But he afterwards received from the same prophet a divine promise of recovery, and of an addition of fifteen years to his life. For the confirmation of this promise, the king requested a miracle, and, accordingly, the shadow of the style went back ten degrees on the dial. This prolonging of the king's life was so much the more important, as at that time there was no heir to the crown[4]. This event (which was recorded in the annals of the nation, and celebrated in the thanksgiving ode of Hezekiah), and the miraculous deliverance from Sennacherib, not only cured the Hebrews of the idolatry introduced by Ahaz, and retained them for some time in their fidelity to Jehovah, but it also excited the admiration of all the neighbouring people. Merodach-baladan, the son of Baladan king of Babylon, sent an embassy to Hezekiah to congratulate him on his recovery, and on his deliverance from Sennacherib, to whom Babylon was not at that time tributary, and to make inquiry respecting this miracle[5]. On this occasion Hezekiah received the melancholy prediction of the Babylonian captivity; and that too at a time when Babylon was an inconsiderable kingdom, 262 of the revolt, B. C. 713, which was soon after subjugated by Assyria, 295 of the revolt, and when the people who were to fulfil the prediction were almost unknown[6]. If any one be inclined to interpret this prophecy as alluding to the imprisonment of

[4] Psalms, lxxxviii, lxxxix.

[5] 2 Chron. xxxii. 24—33. 2 Kings, xx. 1—13. Is. xxxviii. 1—22. xxxix. 1, 2.

[6] 2 Kings, xx. 14—21. Is. xxxix. 3—8, compare xxiii. 13.

Manasseh at Babylon, whither he was carried by the Assyrians, he need only read the words of Isaiah to be convinced that the prediction refers to some far more important events, which were first brought about by the Chaldæans[7].

NOTE 1. The overthrow of Sennacherib, whose expedition was designed particularly against Egypt, is described by Herodotus, ii. 141, but evidently corrupted by the Egyptian priests from whom Herodotus received the narration. His words are: "After this, a priest of Vulcan, by name Setho, ascended the throne. He very imprudently treated the soldiers with great severity, as though he should never stand in need of their services. He insulted them in many ways, and took from them the lands which had been granted to them by former kings, at the rate of twelve aruræ (ἀρούρας) to a man. (Compare Is. xix. 1—4.) But afterwards, when Sennacherib king of the Arabs and Assyrians was advancing against Egypt with a great army, the Egyptian soldiers refused to lend their aid against him. The priest was now in great perplexity; and, going into the temple, complained to his idol, with tears, of the peril he was in. In the midst of his complaints he was overtaken by sleep, and there appeared to him in a vision, the god standing by him, and bidding him to be of good courage, for no misfortune should befall him in encountering the Arabian army; for he himself would send him helpers. Confiding in this dream, he took such Egyptians as were willing to follow him, and encamped at Pelusium; for through this place the invaders must necessarily make their attack. None of the soldiers followed him, but only the merchants, artificers, and populace. When they had arrived there, field mice in great numbers spread themselves about among their enemies, and gnawed in pieces the quivers and bows, and thongs of the shields, so that on the following morning

[7] 2 Chron. xxxiii 11. Is. xxxix. 6, 7.

they were obliged to flee, destitute of arms, and many fell. Even to this day there stands in the temple of Vulcan a stone statue of this king, having a mouse in his hand, and speaking by an inscription to the following effect: *Let him who looks on me reverence the gods.* Ἐς ἐμὲ τὶς ὁρέων, εὐσεβὴς ἔστω."

From this narrative, though considerably distorted, it is plain that the Egyptians attributed their deliverance from Sennacherib to a deity, and to that deity whom the Greeks call Ἥφαιστος, Vulcan. Among the Egyptians he is named Phtha or Kneph; and because he is said to have made the world, he is also called Δημιουργὸς, the artificer. Now, as the God of the Hebrews was the creator of the world, the Egyptians might easily confound him with their Phtha, and attribute this deliverance to the latter. The circumstance of Setho's going into the temple and complaining of his danger to Phtha, is manifestly borrowed from what is related of Hezekiah, Is. xxxvii. 14, 15.

Eusebius makes Setho the first king of the nineteenth Diospolitic dynasty, and assigns to his reign fifty-five years. But if Tirhakah, whom Manetho places as the third of the twenty-fifth Æthiopic dynasty, with a reign of twenty years, was master of Egypt, then Setho could be only a tributary king and a vassal of this universal conqueror, or, at most, could only reign over the Delta and Upper Egypt. (See the table of the kings of Egypt at the end of the second volume.)

Note 2. According to the canon of Ptolemey, the kings of Babylon, with whom the Hebrews now began to be connected, and with whom they afterwards had much intercourse, were the following:

NAMES.	*Year of the Revolt.*	*B. C.*	*Their Reign.*
Nabonassar	228	747	14
Nadius	242	733	2
Chinzirus or Porus	244	731	5
Jugæus	249	726	5

NAMES.	Year of the Revolt.	B. C.	Their Reign.
Mardoch-empadus (Merodach-baladan)	254	721	12
Arkianus	266	709	5
Interregnum	271	704	2
Belibus	273	702	3
Apronadius	276	699	6
Rigebelus	282	693	1
Messomordacus	283	692	4
Interregnum	287	688	8
Esar-haddon, king of Assyria	295	680	13
Sardochæus	308	667	20
Chyniladan	328	647	22
Nabopolassar, a Chaldæan	350	625	20
Nabocholassar (Nebuchadnezzar)	370	605	43
Iluarodamus (Evil-merodach)		562	2
Nirichossolassar (Neriglissor)		560	4
Laborasoarchad, reigned nine months		556	
Nabonned		556	17

In the canon of Ptolemey, Laborasoarchad is omitted between Neriglissor and Nabonned, and the nine months of his reign are attributed partly to his predecessor, and party to his successor.

It may be inquired, where, in this catalogue of the Babylonian monarchs, is Merodach-baladan, the son of Baladan, who sent an embassy to Hezekiah? If the time of this embassy be considered, the fifteenth year of Hezekiah's reign, 262 of the revolt, B. C. 713, it will be seen that he is the Mardoch-empadus of Ptolemey. The difference in the name, occasioned by the Greek pronunciation, Mardoch (Merodach), Empadus (Baladan), is trifling, and even if it were greater it would be of no importance.

It may be farther remarked, that Esar-haddon governed the Babylonian empire by tributary princes, and that Sardochæus first united it to the Assyrian crown. Nabopolassar, the first Chaldæan monarch, again made Babylon

independent of Assyria. In the thirteenth year of his reign, 363 of the revolt, B. C. 612, he took Nineveh and utterly destroyed it, for it was never rebuilt, as we are assured by the testimony of Herodotus, i. 106; Strabo, p. 737; Eusebius, Chron. p. 124; and Syncellus, p. 218. The city Mosul was built some time after, near the site of the ancient Nineveh, but on the west bank of the Tigris.

§. 42. JUDAH FROM B. C. 699 TO 611.

MANASSEH, during the fifty-five years of his reign (to 331 of the revolt, B. C. 644), cancelled all the good effects which his father Hezekiah had produced. He upheld idolatry by all the influence of regal power, erected idolatrous altars even in the temple, set up an image which was worshipped with obscene rites, maintained a herd of necromancers, astrologers, and soothsayers of various kinds, and sacrificed his own son to the idol Moloch. No king of Judah had hitherto rebelled against Jehovah in so daring a manner. For this he was defeated in battle by the general of Esar-haddon, or Sardochæus, overtaken in his flight, and led captive to Babylon bound with two chains. Thus began the fulfilment of the prophecy of Isaiah[1], which was completely accomplished by the Chaldæans. Manasseh during his imprisonment reflected on the threatenings of the prophets, repented of his folly and wickedness, and then God permitted him to be restored to his throne. Undoubtedly he remained tributary to the Assyrian monarch, and his territory was probably made to serve as a barrier between Assyria and Egypt. He now earnestly sought to repair the injuries which he had before occasioned. He abolished idolatry, fortified the city of Zion on the west side by a second high wall (or perhaps he only rebuilt and carried to a greater height the wall which the Assyrians had thrown down), and endeavoured as far as possible to restore his weakened kingdom to a better state[2].

[1] Is. xxxix. 3—8. [2] 2 Kings, xxi. 1—18. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 1—20.

Amon appears to have derived little benefit from the instructive example of his father, since he restored idolatry. His courtiers formed a conspiracy and assassinated him in the second year of his reign, 333 of the revolt, B. C. 642. The people put the regicides to death, and raised to the throne Josiah the son of Amon, then but eight years old[3].

Josiah reigned thirty-one years, to 364 of the revolt, B. C. 611. While he continued a minor, and the affairs of government were administered by a guardian or regent, idolatry, if not protected, was tolerated. But in the sixteenth year of his age he assumed the administration himself, and not only destroyed idolatry, but also removed the illegal altars of Jehovah. In the eighteenth year of his reign, while he was engaged in the repairing of the temple, the manuscript of Moses was found, and its curses were read to the king. After this he promoted reformation with still greater zeal, and it may be truly said, that Josiah endeavoured to render idolatry for ever an object of universal disgust and abhorrence. He extended his efforts for the disgracing and the utter annihilating of the worship of idols, not only to the neighbouring tribes of Simeon, Ephraim, and Manasseh, but even to the distant tribe of Naphtali. The remnants of the Hebrews in Israel could offer little resistance to the progress of reformation; for at this time their sovereigns, the kings of Assyria, were involved in perilous wars with the invading Scythians (so Herodotus calls them, though they were probably Chaldæans), and with Nabopolassar, the Chaldæan, who established his throne at Babylon, 350 of the revolt, B. C. 625[4].

In the year B. C. 623, Nabopolassar destroyed the Assyrian and founded the Chaldæ-Babylonian empire, which also is sometimes called the Assyrian in the Bible[5], and frequently by the Greek writers. In the year 364 of

[3] 2 Kings, xxi. 19—26. 2 Chron. xxxiii. 21—25.

[4] 2 Kings, xxii. xxiii. 1—28. 2 Chron. xxxiv. xxxv. 1—19. Herodot. i. 104. Compare sect. 40. note, and sect. 41. note 2, of this volume.

[5] 2 Kings, xxiii. 29.

the revolt, B. C. 611, Nabopolassar had rendered himself so formidable, that the great monarch of Egypt, Neco or Necos (who, according to Herodotus, possessed a large fleet, circumnavigated Africa, and undertook to unite the Red sea with the Nile by a canal), exerted all his power to check the progress of this hero. If the Chaldæan monarch were the leader of those Scythians who invaded Egypt, Necho might be excited by a desire of revenge; or otherwise, he might wish to employ the jealousy which this rising power had excited, as a means of rendering himself master of Asia. He came with a numerous army to Accho (Ptolemais or Acre) by sea, in order to march through Palæstine and Gilead to the dominions of Nabopolassar. He assured Josiah of his friendly intentions in respect to him; but the pious king being at that time, as it appears, in alliance with Nabopolassar, on this account would not allow Necho a passage through his territories. He accordingly drew up his army in the plains of Esdrælon, and a battle was fought at Megiddo, in which Necho was victorious, and Josiah, who went disguised into the field, was mortally wounded[6]. Herodotus mentions this battle in the following words: Καὶ Σύροισι πεζῇ ὁ Νεκὼς συμβαλὼν ἐν Μαγδόλῳ ἐνίκησε· μετὰ δὲ τὴν μάχην, Κάδυτιν πόλιν τῆς Συρίης ἐοῦσαν μεγάλην εἷλε. He calls the Hebrews, Syrians; Megiddo, Magdolon; and Jerusalem, Kadytis, from קְרוֹשָׁה *the holy;* as the Arabs at the present day call Jerusalem, *Alkods* or *Beit'ol mokaddas, the house of holiness,* or *the holy city.*

NOTE. This Pharaoh-necho, whom Herodotus calls the son of Psammeticus, and represents as an enterprising hero, with which representation the Bible perfectly accords, is enumerated by Manetho as the sixth (Nechao the second) of the twenty-sixth Saitic dynasty.

[6] 2 Kings, xxiii. 29, 30. 2 Chron. xxxv. 20—27. Herodot. ii. 158, 159.

§. 43. JUDAH FROM B. C. 611 TO 588.

AFTER the death of Josiah the kingdom of Judah verged rapidly to its fall. The people raised Jehoahaz, the younger son of Josiah, to the throne; probably because he appeared better qualified than the elder. After three months Necho returned to Jerusalem from the conquest of Phœnicia. He deposed Jehoahaz, and placed on the throne the elder son of Josiah, Eliakim, to whom he gave the name Jehoiakim. He also levied a contribution of one hundred talents of silver and one talent of gold, and took the deposed king with him to Egypt. From the smallness of the contribution, it may be seen how low the kingdom of Judah had sunk[1].

Jehoiakim, an unworthy son of Josiah, was in reality, as he is represented by Jeremiah, one of the worst kings that ever ruled over Judah. His reign continued eleven years, to 375 of the revolt, B. C. 600. In the third year after the battle of Megiddo, Pharaoh-necho undertook a second expedition against Nabopolassar, with a numerous army, drawn in part from western Africa, Libya, and Æthiopia. Nabopolassar, who is called Nebuchadnezzar the first, was at this time, as Berosius relates, aged and infirm. He therefore gave up a part of his army to his son Nebuchadnezzar, who defeated the Egyptian host at Carchemish (Circesium) on the Euphrates, and drove Necho out of Asia. The victorious prince marched directly to Jerusalem, which was then under the sovereignty of Egypt. After a short siege, Jehoiakim surrendered, and was again placed on the throne by the Babylonian prince. Nebuchadnezzar took part of the ornaments of the temple as booty, and carried with him to Babylon several young men, the sons of the principal Hebrew nobles, among whom were Daniel and his three friends, to be employed in the service of his court, and at the same time to answer

[1] Diod. Sic. i. 68. 2 Kings, xxiii. 31—35. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 1—4.

the purpose of hostages. Thus the prediction, announced to Hezekiah more than one hundred years before by Isaiah, received a still farther accomplishment[2].

With this year commences the Babylonian sovereignty over Judah, or the Babylonian captivity, which, according to the prophecy of Jeremiah[3], was to endure seventy years. That this was the fourth year of Jehoiakim is evident from Jeremiah, xxv. 1. and xlvi. 2. In Daniel, i. 1. it is said to be the third year, but this arises merely from a different mode of computation. Jehoiakim ascended the throne at the end of the year which Jeremiah reckons as the first (and such a mode of reckoning is not uncommon), but Daniel, neglecting the incomplete year, numbers one less. This is properly the 368th of the revolt, and B. C. 607. But as Usher has made it the 369th of the revolt, and B. C. 606, and as his computation has generally been received, it may be well to retain it, and not take into the account the small difference of a single year[4].

Three years after, Jehoiakim rebelled against Babylon; relying, probably, on assistance which he expected to receive from Egypt. It is said in the Book of Kings, that Jehovah sent the Chaldæans, Syrians, Moabites, and Ammonites, against Judah; that Jehoiakim died, and that Jehoiachin his son ascended the throne. But in Chronicles nothing is said of the rebellion, it being merely said that Nebuchadnezzar came up against Jehoiakim, bound him in chains, and carried him to Babylon. It is plain that some gross error has crept into the Book of Chronicles by means of transcribers. Probably Jehoiakim held out against Nebuchadnezzar till the eleventh year of his reign; that he then died, and while yet unburied, his son Jehoiachin, who had administered the government during his sickness, surrendered; that the Chaldæans

[2] Josephus against Apion, i. 19. 2 Kings, xxiv. 1—7. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 5—8. Dan. i. 3—6. Is. xxxix. 3—8.

[3] Jer. xxv. 1—14. xxix. 10.

[4] Compare Michaelis, Anmerkung. zu 2 Kön. xxiv. 1.

dragged the dead body of the perjured Jehoiakim before the city, and suffered it to lie there unburied, as Jeremiah had predicted[5].

Jehoiachin, or Jeconiah, raised himself to the throne, but retained it only three months. Though he surrendered to the Chaldæans who besieged Jerusalem, he was held a close prisoner. The money of the royal treasury, and the golden utensils of the temple which had been furnished by Solomon, were carried away to Babylon; and the whole court, seven thousand soldiers, one thousand artificers, and two thousand nobles and men of wealth, who with their wives, children, and servants probably amounted to forty thousand souls, were led into captivity to the river Chebar (Chaboras) in Mesopotamia. Thus only the lower class of citizens and the peasantry were left behind. Among the captives was the prophet Ezekiel. Nebuchadnezzar placed on the vacant throne Mattaniah, a brother of Jehoiakim, giving him the name of Zedekiah[6].

The Hebrews who remained in Judah, still cherished the hope of being able soon to shake off the Chaldæan yoke, and the captives were looking for a speedy return to their native land. Jeremiah earnestly reproved the delusions of the former, and Ezekiel those of the latter class; but their prophecies were not believed. Zedekiah, who seems not to have been a very bad king, otherwise than as he was misled by evil counsellors, in the ninth year of his reign was induced to renounce his allegiance to his powerful lord, and to enter into an alliance with the king of Egypt, Pharaoh-hophra (Vaphres or Apries), the eighth of the twenty-sixth Saitic dynasty. The Chaldæan army immediately laid siege to Jerusalem. The Egyptians came up to their relief; but when Nebuchadnezzar marched against them, they retreated to Egypt without

[5] 2 Kings, xxiv. 2—6. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 5—8. Jer. xxii. 19. xxxvi. 30. Compare Michælis, Anmerk. zu 2 Chron. vi.

[6] 2 Kings, xxiv. 8—18. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 9, 10. Jer. lii. 28. compare Is. xxxix. 3—8.

hazarding a battle. The siege was then resumed, and the city taken in the eleventh year of Zedekiah, the eighteenth of the Babylonian captivity, 387 of the revolt, B. C. 588. Zedekiah fled by night, but was overtaken and carried to Nebuchadnezzar, who was encamped at Riblah in the province of Hamath. Here, at the command of Nebuchadnezzar, Zedekiah's sons were put to death in his presence, and then, his own eyes having been put out, he was led in chains to Babylon. Thus was fulfilled the somewhat enigmatical prophecy of Ezekiel, that he should go into that splendid city and not see it[7].

Soon after, Nebuzar-adan, commander of the royal life-guards, came and stripped the temple of everything that was valuable, set fire to that and to the city, and threw down the fortifications. He took away with him the inhabitants, the principal of whom, as the instigators of the revolt, he put to death at Riblah. The rest were forced to go into exile[8].

Nebuchadnezzar appointed the Hebrew, Gedaliah, governor of the peasantry who still remained in Judæa. The nobles and warriors, who had saved themselves by flight, now returned, and received from Gedaliah a solemn assurance that they should have nothing to fear if they would render allegiance to Nebuchadnezzar. Notwithstanding this, Ishmael, a prince of the royal family, with the assistance of his dependants, murdered the governor Gedaliah, with all the Hebrews and Chaldæans who were attached to him. The vengeance of the Chaldæans was now to be dreaded; and accordingly Ishmael, with all his adherents among the Hebrews, escaped to Egypt. They carried with them Jeremiah, who strenuously insisted on their yielding obedience to the divine command, and remaining in their own country. Four years after, the few that remained, seven hundred and forty-five in number, were taken away by Nebuzar-adan, and the land was

[7] Ezek. xvii. 13—15. xii. 13. Jer. xxxvii. 3—10. 2 Kings, xxiv. 18—20. xxv. 1—7. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 11—17.

[8] 2 Kings, xxv. 8—21. 2 Chron. xxxvi. 17—21. Jer. lii. 12, sqq.

entirely bereaved of its inhabitants. Meanwhile new colonists were not introduced, as had been done by the Assyrians in respect to Samaria; and although nomadic tribes wandered through the country, and the Idumæans settled in some of the southern parts of it, yet the land remained for the most part uninhabited, and ready for the Hebrews who were one day to return. Thus Moses had foretold ages before, and succeeding prophets had given more circumstantial predictions of the same events[9].

NOTE 1. According to our computation, the destruction of Jerusalem falls in the 387th or 388th year of the revolt, but according to Ezekiel, iv. 5, in the 390th year of that era. Either an error of two or three years has crept into our computation, or the prophet purposely uses a round number.

The 387th year of the revolt is the 142nd of the era of Nabonassar, the fourth of the 47th Olympiad, the 162nd from the building of Rome, and B. C. 588.

NOTE 2. During the last twenty-three years of the kingdom of Judah, little mention is made of idolatry in the historical books; but from the occasional notices given of it by Jeremiah and Ezekiel, it is evident that it had in reality at that time risen to a higher pitch than ever before. See Jer. ii—ix. Ezekiel, viii—11. xiv. 1—11. xvi. 1—63. xxiii. 1—48. xliv. 9. and other places.

[9] 2 Kings, xxv. 22—26. Jer. xl—xliii. lii. 30. Deut. xxviii. 36. 49, sqq.

BOOK VI.

THE BABYLONIAN CAPTIVITY.

§. 44. THEOCRACY OF THE HEBREWS DURING THE CAPTIVITY.

AT the time when Jerusalem was destroyed, one hundred and fifty-three years had elapsed since the Israelites of Galilee and Gilead had been led captive to Assyria; one hundred and thirty-five years since Shalmaneser had transferred the ten tribes to Halah, Gozan, and the cities of Media; and ten years since Nebuchadnezzar had banished a part of the citizens of Jerusalem to the river Chebar. All these exiles had been flattering themselves with the hope of a speedy return to their native land; but now, in accordance with the frequent predictions of Jeremiah and Ezekiel, they saw their expectations annihilated by the destruction of their capital and the captivity of their remaining countrymen.

Among these Hebrews, who, agreeably to the sanctions of the law, were punished for idolatry by total banishment from their native land, there were certainly many who did not worship idols; and probably not a few, in consequence of this national judgment so often predicted, were brought to reflect on and abhor the superstition which had been the cause of so great a calamity. Others, not wholly relinquishing idolatry, still retained a reverence for Jehovah[1]. They never, like other transplanted nations, intermingled with the people among whom they were settled,

[1] Ezek. xx.

but continued a peculiar race. There were doubtless individual exceptions, but the nation, as such, remained distinct. The intermingling with pagans, and that entire extinction of the Hebrews as a peculiar people, which must have resulted from it, was prevented by the rite of circumcision, by the prohibition of many kinds of food allowed among other nations, by ceremonial impurities, and by various other institutions, designed to segregate, and consequently to preserve the nation. These usages had by time become a second nature, so that any intimate connection with Gentiles was matter of considerable difficulty. The ancient favours of Jehovah, the miraculous deliverances which he had vouchsafed exclusively to them, and the promises he had given them for futurity, could not easily be forgotten. The fulfilment of so many prophecies respecting the fall of the Assyrian empire and of the city of Nineveh, respecting the Babylonian captivity and the destruction of Jerusalem, must have raised Jehovah in their eyes far above all idols; and the very punishment they were then suffering was well calculated to awaken reflection, and thus to become a bitter but powerful antidote to their propensity to idolatry. Many Israelites, therefore, in Assyria, Halah, Gozan, and Media, as the Book of Tobit testifies, persisted in sincere worship of Jehovah; neither could the Jews in Babylon, and those by the river Chebar, fall easily into idolatry, while such men as Ezekiel and Daniel were continually and earnestly reminding them of the God whom they were bound to serve.

The prophecies of Ezekiel, relating for the most part to events near at hand, were accomplished before the eyes of the unbelieving exiles; and every fulfilment was a new proof that Jehovah, the author of these predictions, was the God and ruler of the world. Thus there were repeated opportunities to remind this superstitious people of Jehovah their God. The remarkable prophecy respecting the conquest and destruction of the powerful city Tyre, which was so speedily accomplished, is parti-

cularly worthy of notice[2]. By such striking accomplishments of the prophecies respecting occurrences near at hand, the belief of predictions of more distant events was strengthened, and the eyes of the Hebrews were eagerly directed towards the future.

Daniel, the first minister at the court of Babylon, and his three pious friends, who held important offices, were manifestly sent into exile by divine Providence, to be the protectors of their nation, and, by their own example of piety, to confirm their countrymen in the religion of Jehovah. The jealousy and envy of the courtiers found means to expose the three friends of Daniel, and at last Daniel himself, to inevitable destruction; and the miraculous preservation of these servants of the true God put to shame not their enemies merely but idolatry itself; and exhibited the God of the Hebrews in the most glorious light to the exiles, to the pagans, and even to their idolatrous monarchs. Daniel's interpretations of the prophetic dreams of Nebuchadnezzar, and of the mysterious writing in the banqueting hall of Belshazzar (which were confirmed by events immediately succeeding), were repeated evidences, that none of the gods of other nations could be compared with the God of the Hebrews. This was acknowledged by Nebuchadnezzar and Darius in public edicts, who on these grounds commanded all their subjects to reverence the God of heaven[3]. How consolatory to all the exiled Hebrews must have been such proclamations of pagan monarchs! If the very heathen were made so seriously attentive to the God of Israel, much more would the Hebrews be awakened by the same events to remain true to their own God.

Indeed, during the subjection of the Hebrews to the wholesome chastisement of a foreign yoke, God pursued them (so to speak) with the efficacious dealings of his

[2] Ezek. xxvi. compare xxix. 18. and Berosus in Josephus against Apion, i. 18.

[3] Dan. ii. 47. iii. 21—30. iv. 31—34. vi. 26—29.

providence, with miracles and prophecies, in order to compel them to preserve the true religion, and to place them in a situation in which it would hardly be possible for them to exchange the worship of the Creator and Governor of the world for the worship of idols. By the prophet Ezekiel, Jehovah declares in so many words, that even if the Hebrews desired to become united with the pagans, it should not be done; and that he would himself find means effectually to prevent the execution of such a design[4].

§. 45. CONDITION OF THE HEBREWS DURING THE CAPTIVITY.

THE condition of the Hebrews while in captivity was far from being one of abject wretchedness. This is manifest from the circumstance that a pious Hebrew prophet held the first office at the court of Babylon; that three devout friends of this prophet occupied important political stations; and that Jehoiachin, the former king of Judah, in the forty-fourth year of the captivity, was released from an imprisonment which had continued for thirty-six years, and was preferred in point of rank to all the kings who were then at Babylon, either as hostages or for the purpose of paying homage to the Chaldæan monarch. He was treated as the first of the kings, he ate at the table of his conqueror, and received an annual allowance, corresponding to his royal rank. These circumstances of honour must have reflected a degree of dignity on all the exiles, sufficient to prevent their being ill-treated or despised. They were probably viewed as respectable colonists, enjoying the peculiar protection of the sovereign. In the respect paid to Jehoiachin, his son Shealtiel and his grandson Zerubbabel undoubtedly partook. If that story of the discussion before

[4] Ezek. xx. 32—44. Hess, Regenten von Judah nach dem Exilio, Th. i. s. 1—152.

Darius, in which Zerubbabel is said to have won the prize, be a mere fiction, still it is at least probable that the young prince, though he held no office, had free access to the court; a privilege which must have afforded him many opportunities of alleviating the unhappy circumstances of his countrymen. It is not, therefore, at all surprising, that when Cyrus gave the Hebrews permission to return to their own country, many, and perhaps even a majority of the nation, chose to remain behind, believing that they were more pleasantly situated where they were, than they would be in Judæa. It is not improbable that the exiles (as is implied in the story of Susannah, and as the tradition of the Jews affirms) had magistrates and a prince from their own number. Jehoiachin, and after him Shealtiel and Zerubbabel, might have been regarded as their princes, in the same manner as Jozadak and Jeshua were as their high priests.

At the same time it cannot be denied that their humiliation, as a people punished by their God, was always extremely painful, and frequently drew on them expressions of contempt. The peculiarities of their religion afforded many opportunities for the ridicule and scorn of the Babylonians and Chaldæans, a striking example of which is given in the profanation of the sacred vessels of the temple[2]. By such insults they were made to feel so much the more sensibly the loss of their homes, their gardens, and fruitful fields; the burning of their capital and temple; and the cessation of the public solemnities of their religion. Under such circumstances, it is not strange that an inspired minstrel breaks out into severe imprecations against the scornful foes of his nation[3].

If the Israelites were ill-treated in Assyria after the overthrow of Sennacherib in Judæa, as the Book of Tobit intimates, this calamity was of short duration; for Sennacherib was soon after assassinated. The Israelites of

[2] 1 Esdras, iii. iv. Josephus, Antiq. xi. 3. Daniel, v.

[3] Ps. cxxxvii.

Media appear to have been in a much better condition, since Tobit advised his son to remove thither[4]. This is the more probable, as the religion of the Medes was not grossly idolatrous, and bore considerable resemblance to the Jewish. Even allowing the worship of Ormuzd and of guardian angels, not to be more ancient than Zoroaster, yet the appearance of this celebrated reformer may be fixed between sixty and a hundred years after the arrival of the Israelites in Media. In the Zend-Avesta, it is often mentioned that the reformation of Zoroaster took place under Guspasp, that is, Cyaxares the first, who reigned from B. C. 643 to 603, and the Israelites first went to Media B. C. 722[5]. But the first principles of the religion of Zoroaster are undoubtedly far more ancient, for he himself does not announce his doctrines as new, but as the ancient religion purified from abuses. This seems to be confirmed by the fact, that in the army of Nebuchadnezzar there was found a רַב־מָג (Rabmag), the Desturan Destur of Zoroaster, that is, a chief of the Magi or Mobeds[6]. Consequently, this religion had extended to Babylon as early as B. C. 587. Moreover, at this early period it had penetrated even to Jerusalem, and in the reign of Josiah, who came to the throne B. C. 642, and consequently before Zoroaster began to publish his doctrines in Media, there is mention made of the Persian chariots of the sun, and horses of the sun, at Jerusalem[7].

[4] Tobit, xiv. 4. 12, 13.

[5] Tychsen de Relig. Zoroast. apud Vet. Gent. Vestigiis in comment. Soc. Goett. vol. xi. p. 112, sqq. Compare Kleuker's Anhang zum Zend-Avesta, b. I. Th. ii. s. 65, sqq. and Herbelot, Orient. Bibloth. t. ii. p. 489. sqq.

[6] Jer. xxxix. 3.

[7] Ezek. viii. 16. 2 Kings, xxiii. 11. Compare Herodot. i. 189. vii. 55. Xenophon, Cyrop. viii. 36. Q. Curtius, iii. 3. and Anhang zum Zend-Avesta, b. ii. s. 162—164. Anmerk.

§. 46. NABOPOLASSAR AND NEBUCHADNEZZAR.

BABYLON was subject to the Assyrian kings fifty-five years; from 295 to 350 of the revolt, and from B. C. 680 to 625. Nabopolassar, or, as he is also called, Nebuchadnezzar the first, disunited it from the Assyrian monarchy, and founded the new Babylonian empire in the seventeenth year of Josiah, just a year before the manuscript of Moses was found in the temple. It is said, that before this he was the Assyrian governor of Babylon under Chyniladan and Saracus, and that, uniting with Astyages the son of Cyaxares the first, king of Media, he revolted and overthrew the Assyrian empire. However this may be, it is certain, as his name is sufficient to prove, that he was a Chaldæan. He might have been of that colony of Chaldæans to whom Shalmaneser, or Sennacherib, about a century before, had assigned a residence on the Euphrates south of Babylon[1]; neither is the supposition improbable, that he headed a horde of those Scythians whose incursion is described by Herodotus[2], and that he afterwards settled at Babylon. In the second year of his reign he completely destroyed the famous city of Nineveh, by which the prophecies of Nahum and Zephaniah were fulfilled. He died at a great age, after a reign of twenty years, soon after his son Nebuchadnezzar had defeated king Necho at Carchemish[3].

Nebuchadnezzar the second, or the Great, called, by Ptolemey, Nabocholassar, and, by the Greeks, Nebuchodonosor, ascended the throne in the year 374 of the revolt, B. C. 606, in the fourth year of the reign of Jehoiakim. His treatment of the rebellious Jews has already been related. In the second year after the destruction of Jerusalem, B. C. 586, he laid siege to Tyre.

[1] Is. xxiii. 13. [2] Herodot. i. 103—106.

[3] See sect. 41. note. Herodot. i. 106. Strabo, p. 737. Eusebius, Chron. p. 124. Syncellus, p. 218. Berosus in Josephus, Antiq. X. xi. 1. and against Apion, i. 19.

The siege continued thirteen years, when he gained possession of the city and destroyed it; but not till it had been deserted by its inhabitants, who, with their treasures and most valuable property, made their escape by sea. They afterwards returned, and built a new city on an island about four stadia from the ancient Tyre. To this city they also gave the name of Tyre[4]. During this long siege the neighbouring cities must have suffered severely; and it is at this period that we may fix the accomplishment of the prophecies which Jeremiah and Ezekiel pronounced against the Zidonians, Philistines, Moabites, and Edomites[5].

After this Nebuchadnezzar marched against Egypt, which, on account of the intestine disturbances occasioned by the rival claims of Apries and Amasis, was now still weaker than at the time when she dared not hazard a battle with the Chaldæans for the relief of Jerusalem. The Babylonian monarch made himself master of the whole country without much difficulty, and transferred many Egyptians, as he had before Jews, Phœnicians, and Syrians, to the territory beyond the Euphrates[6]. Megasthenes, as quoted by Josephus, says that he then laid waste a great part of Africa, penetrated to Spain, and in the greatness of his exploits excelled Hercules himself. Τοῦτον τὸν βασιλέα τῇ ἀνδρείᾳ καὶ τῷ μέγεθει τῶν πράξεων ὑπερβεβηκότα τὸν Ἡρακλῆα, καταστρέψαι γὰρ αὐτὸν Λιβύην τὴν πολλὴν καὶ Ἰβηρίαν. Strabo says, p. 687, "that Sesostris king of Egypt and Tearcon (Taracos, Tirhaka) king of the Æthiopians extended their expeditions as far as Europe; but Nebuchadnezzar, who is venerated by the Chaldæans, even

[4] Is. xxiii. 1—13. Ezek. xxvi. 1. 8, sqq. xxvii. 36. xxviii. 1, sqq. xxix. 18. Jer. xxvii. 3. xxix. 22. xlvi. 1—26. xlvii. 1, sqq. Amos, ii. 9. Joel, iii. 4. Comp. Diocles, Megasthenes, Philostratus, Annals of the Tyrians, as quoted by Josephus against Apion, i. 20. and Antiq. X. xi. 1.

[5] Jer. xxv. xlvii—xlix. Ezek. xxv. compare Joseph. Antiq. X. xi. 1.

[6] Herodot. ii. 162, 163. Diod. Sic. i. 68. Megasthenes and Berosus, in Joseph. Antiq. X. xi. 1, and against Apion, i. 20. Compare Jer. xliv. xlvi. 14—19. 25. Ezek. xxix. 12. xxx. 7—14.

more than Hercules is by the Greeks, went not only to the pillars of Hercules (for so far, according to Megasthenes, had Tearcon penetrated), but marched through Spain to Thrace and Pontus." The same events are referred to by Eusebius[7].

Nebuchadnezzar having enriched himself in this expedition with the spoils of his enemies, employed this wealth in ornamenting the temples of Babylon, and in augmenting the splendour of this his seat of empire. He built the splendid temple of Belus, a new royal castle, a city on the other side of the Euphrates, and surrounded the whole with very high and thick walls. He caused the Nahar Malcha to be dug from the Euphrates to the Tigris, the Pallacopas to be turned into a very large lake formed by the labour of men, and various canals to be constructed to draw off the water, so that the city might not be overflowed by the inundations of the Euphrates. The artificial lake into which the Pallacopas flowed, is said to have been twelve hundred and eighty stadia, or about one hundred and twenty-eight English miles, in circumference. These works were afterwards attributed to the fabled Semiramis; and it has also been said that they were completed by Nitocris, the mother of Belshazzar, the last of the Chaldæan monarchs[8].

Berosus, as quoted by Josephus, says that Nebuchadnezzar "was attacked by a disease and died in the forty-third year of his reign." This disease must have been something remarkable, or it would hardly have been particularly noticed in the history. Eusebius relates from Abydenus, a tradition of the Chaldæans, that Nebuchadnezzar, after the enlarging and beautifying of Babylon, pronounced on the roof of his palace a prophecy respecting the conquest of the city by the Medes and Persians, and then disappeared. This tradition is evidently a story made up from his prophetic dreams, his insanity, during

[7] Præp. Evan. ix. 41.

[8] Herodot. i. 184—186. Justin, i. 2. Diod. Sic. ii. 10. Strabo, p. 738. Arrian, de Reb. Alexand. vii. 21.

which he withdrew from human society and resided among wild beasts, and thus disappeared, and from Daniel's explanation of the unknown writing in the banqueting hall of Belshazzar[9].

§. 47. EVIL-MERODACH—NABONNED.

EVIL-MERODACH, the son of Nebuchadnezzar, inherited his father's throne. By Megasthenes he is called Evilmaluruch, by Berosus, Evilmaradach, and by Ptolemey, Iloarudan. Immediately on his accession to the throne, he released Jehoiachin king of Judah from the imprisonment in which he had languished for thirty-seven years, admitted him to his table, assigned him an annual pension, and gave him precedence of all the kings who were at Babylon. Jerome mentions a Jewish tradition, that Evil-merodach, during his father's insanity, had administered the affairs of the empire in so faulty a manner, that on the restoration of Nebuchadnezzar to reason, he was cast into the same prison in which Jehoiachin was confined; and on this occasion a lasting friendship was contracted between them[1]. This is not improbable; but Jewish tradition is very uncertain authority. Insufficient, however, as is the authority of tradition, it is at least as much to be relied on as the conjectures of modern interpreters. According to the testimony of Berosus[2], Evil-merodach, when he assumed the reins of government after his father's death, proved himself an unworthy and tyrannical ruler; on which account he was assassinated in the second year of his reign, B. C. 561, by Neriglissor his brother-in-law. Jehoiachin must have died before this, since it is said that he ate at the table of Evil-merodach as long as he lived.

Neriglissor, called by Megasthenes, Niriglissor, by Ptolemey, Niricassocholassar, and by Josephus, Niglis-

[9] Daniel, ii. iv. v.

[1] 2 Kings, xxv. 27—30. Jerome, Comment. in Jes. xiv. 19.

[2] Eusebius, Præp. Evan. ix. 41.

saros, the son-in-law of Nebuchadnezzar, might have been, perhaps, one of the two officers who are mentioned in Jeremiah, xxxix. 3, under the name of Nergalsharezer. He made great preparations for war against the Medes, and invited the Lydians, Phrygians, Carians, Cappadocians, Paphlagonians, Cilicians, and all the neighbouring people, to an alliance with him against the common enemy. He was however defeated by Cyrus, and left dead on the field of battle in the fourth year of his reign, B. C. 557.

Laborasoarchad his son, called by Megasthenes, Labassoarask, succeeded him. He was young, but unjust and cruel. Probably it is to this prince that Xenophon refers when relating that the king of Babylon, in a hunting party, slew the son of Gobryas, because he twice struck down an animal which the king had missed; and caused Gadatas to be mutilated because he had been praised by one of his concubines. After a reign of nine months he was put to death on account of his tyranny[3].

Nabonned, one of the conspirators against Laborasoarchad, next ascended the throne. He is named by Megasthenes, Nabannidoch, by Ptolemey, Nabonad, by Josephus, Naboandel, and by Herodotus, Labynetus. Berosus says nothing of his family; but Megasthenes, as quoted by Eusebius, has these words: τούτου δὲ ἀποθανόντος βιαίῳ μόρῳ, Ναβαννιδόχον ἀποδείκνυσι βασιλέα, προσήκοντα οἳ οὐδέν: "After he (Labassoarask) had been put to death, they made Nabannidoch king, *who did not approach him.*" This sentence, being taken out of its connection, is somewhat ambiguous. The sense however does not appear to be that he was not *related to,* but that he was *not like,* Labassoarask, whose cruelty had been the subject of discourse. This king is the Belshazzar of scripture, who was certainly of royal blood, and a descendant of Nebuchadnezzar. His mother, in Daniel, appears the same as

[3] Berosus in Joseph. against Apion, i. 21. Megasthenes in Eusebius, *ubi supra.* Joseph. Antiq. X. xi. 2. Xenophon, Cyrop. IV. vi. 2, sqq. V. iii. 13, sqq.

Nitocris, the mother of Labynetus, in Herodotus; a very politic, active, and resolute woman, who completed the works which Nebuchadnezzar had left unfinished, and in effect governed the empire under her dissipated and thoughtless son: such, indeed, is the character given to Belshazzar, both in the Cyropædia and the Bible[4]. After a reign of seventeen years he was slain at the taking of Babylon by the Medes and Persians, B. C. 540. Megasthenes and Berosus, as quoted by Josephus and Eusebius, say, that after being defeated in a battle before the walls of Babylon, he fled to Borsippa, and finally surrendered himself to Cyrus, by whom he was made governor of Caramania. But Xenophon agrees entirely with the Bible, and says that Belshazzar was slain by the Persians in his palace, together with all his attendants[5].

§. 48. SURVEY OF THE HISTORY OF MEDIA.

THE historical narrative of the Bible becomes now more and more connected with those people whose history has come down to us, and tends in turn to throw light on the scriptural accounts. On this account we shall here give a brief view of the history of Media, in order to open the way to a more full history of the Persians and Hebrews. The succession of Median kings was as follows:

Revolt. B. C.		*years.*	*Revolt. B. C.*		*years.*
149	836 Arbaces reigned	29	332	643 Cyaxares I.	40
178	807 *Interregnum*	79	372	603 Astyages	34
257	728 Dejoces	53		569 Cyaxares II.	32
310	665 Phraortes	22		537 Cyaxares II. dies.	

Cyaxares the first, as has already been mentioned, is said to have formed an alliance with Nabopolassar, the founder

[4] Eusebius, *ubi supra*. Dan. v. 2. 11. 15. 22. compare 2 Chron. xxxvi. 20. Jer. xxvii. 7. Herodot. i. 184—186. Prideaux, Connections, vol. i. p. 108—112.

[5] Dan. v. 30. Josephus and Eusebius, *ubi supra*. Xenophon, Cyrop. VIII. v. 9—13. Compare Michælis, Anmerk. zu Daniel, s. 51.

of the Chaldæ-Babylonian empire; and Astyages, his son and general, in conjunction with the Chaldæan monarch, destroyed the city of Nineveh and put an end to the Assyrian empire. This Cyaxares is Guspasp, under whose reign Zoroaster introduced his reformation into Media, between forty and twenty years before the birth of Cyrus[1].

Astyages was the father of Cyaxares the second, and the grandfather of Cyrus. Under Cyaxares the second, hostilities broke out between the Median and Chaldæ-Babylonian empires, and terminated only in the destruction of the latter. When Cyaxares called the Persians to his aid, Cyrus was placed at the head of the Median army, and defeated Neriglissor. This happened twenty-one years before the conquest of Babylon, and from this period Cicero (following Herodotus) dates the commencement of Cyrus's reign. De Divinatione, lib. i. speaking of Cyrus he writes: 'ad septuagesimum annum pervenit, cum XL. annos natus regnare cœpisset.' After this battle Media gained the ascendant; and, after the destruction of the Chaldæ-Babylonian empire by Cyrus, maintained a very extensive dominion. Cyaxares the second, in the Bible called Darius the Mede, reigned thirty years over Media and the conquered countries, and two years over Babylon[2].

§. 49. FALL OF THE CHALDÆ-BAYLONIAN EMPIRE.

Cyrus, the destroyer of the Chaldæ-Babylonian empire, was born B. C. 599, about the seventh year of the reign of Nebuchadnezzar, and one hundred years after the death of Hezekiah king of Judah. According to Plutarch, his name Κῦρος, in Hebrew כּוֹרֶשׁ signifies the

[1] Tychsen de Religion. Zoroast. apud Veter. Gentes Vestig. in Comment. Soc. Goett. vol. ii. p. 112, sqq. Abbé Foucher, Appendix to the Zend-Avesta, vol. i. part ii. p. 65, sqq. and p. 253, sqq.

[2] Dan. vi. 1, 2. Prideaux, Connections, vol. i. p. 109, sqq. Cyrop. i. v. 2. Herodot. i. 95—130. Diod. Sic. ii. 32—34.

sun. In the ancient Pehlvi dialect the name is *korshid*, that is, *splendour of the sun*, from *kor*, *light*, the *sun*, and *shid*, or *shed*, *splendour*[1]. The name first occurs in Isaiah, xliv. 28. xlv. 1, with which compare Jeremiah, l. 44. Herodotus informs us that this was not his original name, but one which was conferred on him at a later period. His father, according to Xenophon, was Cambyses king of the Persians; but Herodotus intimates no more than that he was a nobleman of the Achæmenides, the noblest tribe of the Persians, and the one to which their kings belonged. Both agree that his mother was Mandane, a daughter of Astyages king of Media. Herodotus has admitted into his history some absurd fables respecting the birth and early education of Cyrus, which he had heard while on his travels in Persia. His education, as described in the Cyropædia, agrees entirely with the Persian mode of educating princes and nobles, as it existed in the time of Xenophon; though the severity of the discipline had been then somewhat relaxed by the prevailing luxury. In the twelfth year of his age, he went with his mother to the Median court at Ecbatana, to visit his grandfather Astyages, where he gained the affections of all the Medes by his sprightliness, good humour, and affability. In the sixteenth year of his age he acquired great reputation in an expedition against the Babylonians, undertaken by Astyages to revenge an assault which Evil-merodach, the crown-prince of Babylon, had made on Media while he was engaged in a hunting excursion. The next year, B. C. 582, he returned to Persia. This residence with Astyages perhaps gave rise to the stories related by Herodotus[2].

The tale of Herodotus, that Cyrus rebelled against his grandfather and deprived him of his throne, is founded altogether on the tradition respecting the birth, early exposure, and secret education of this hero. But as this

[1] Plutarch, Artaxerxes. Zend-Avesta, Th. iii. s. 146. 159. 163, and Appendix to Zend-Avesta, p. 85 and 132. Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. ii. 132.

[2] Cyrop. l. ii. 1, sqq. Herodot. i. 107—122.

tradition cannot be reconciled with chronology, and is manifestly fabulous, the account of the rebellion deserves no credit; especially since it is contrary to the whole character of Cyrus, as represented by Xenophon and the writers of the Bible. The manner also in which he is said to have induced the Persians to revolt, has no internal marks of probability. The authority of Herodotus, a traveller who wrote down everything that was told him, and comprehended in his plan so many subjects that it was impossible for him sufficiently to investigate them all, is far inferior to that of the scripture historians, who were contemporary with, and lived near the scene of, the events they record; these clearly assert that Darius the Mede, that is, Cyaxares the second, reigned two years over Babylon after all the victories of Cyrus. Even Xenophon must be preferred to Herodotus; for, as Hutchinson has remarked, in the character of Cyrus and in his whole history, especially where he introduces the Medes as the predominant people against the Babylonians, and even in the very circumstance of the two years' reign of Cyaxares after the conquest of Babylon, he corresponds with the authentic and contemporary testimony of the Bible[3]. Besides, Xenophon was for a long time intimate with Cyrus the younger, from whom he undoubtedly received correct information respecting the elder Cyrus, and writing a particular history, he was able fully to investigate the whole subject. The romantic garb in which the Cyropædia is arrayed, does not affect the great truths it contains; for the romance is not concerned with the principal events, but only with the secondary matters, particularly the conversations which are put into the mouth of Cyrus and others. Xenophon undoubtedly intended, as Plato has remarked[4], to represent in Cyrus a perfect oriental king, like the Djemjid of Zoroaster; but he would not have chosen him for his

[3] Herodot. i. 123—130. Hutchinson's Xenophon, Diss. 1. Comp. Is. xiii. 17. xxi. 2. Jer. l. 3. ix. 41. li. 11. 28—30. Dan. vi. 1.

[4] De Legibus, iii.

hero, unless he had been the best of the eastern monarchs known to the Greeks. Should we deny the historical authority of the principal transactions related in the Cyropædia, on account of the magnificent drapery in which its hero appears, we might, on the same principle, question all the great characters of Grecian history; for they are all ornamented by the pen of the historian with such conversations as the heroes may well be supposed to have held, but which certainly are far enough from being the very words they actually uttered. In the history of Cyrus, then, we can rely with much more confidence on the authority of Xenophon than on that of Herodotus.

Cyrus came, in the fortieth year of his age and the twenty-first before the conquest of Babylon, with thirty thousand well-disciplined Persian troops, to the assistance of his uncle Cyaxares the second against Neriglissor; and the old king appointed him general of the whole Median army. The decisive victory which he gained over Neriglissor (as related in the preceding section) had given a blow to the Chaldæan power, which was the more fatal, as Neriglissor's successors, Laborasoarchad and Nabonned or Belshazzar, were weak and effeminate princes. The tyranny, cruelty, and luxury of the last Chaldæan monarchs formed so striking a contrast with the moderate, mild, and generous conduct of Cyrus, that the Hyrcanians, the Cadusians, and the Sacæ, also the princes Gobryas, Abradatas, and Gadatas, with their principalities, revolted to him. Belshazzar appeared with an army to punish the revolt of Gadatas; but Cyrus put him to flight, pursued him even to the walls of Babylon, and captured some of his fortresses[5].

Perceiving that the Medes under the conduct of Cyrus became every day more formidable, Nitocris, the mother of Belshazzar, made every exertion to put the empire, or at least Babylon, in a state of defence; but all her efforts were fruitless. Belshazzar in the fifth year of his reign

[5] Cyrop. I. v. 4. II. i. 3. III. iii. 12—29. IV. ii. 1. vi. 1—6. V. ii. 1—15. iii. 4—21. iv. 1. 5. 23. VI. i. 23—25.

delivered himself up to the protection of Crœsus king of Lydia; and collecting a large army in Asia Minor from among the Thracians, Greeks, and other people, gave him the command[6]. On this occasion Crœsus consulted the most celebrated oracles respecting the result of the war, and interpreted their ambiguous and enigmatical answers to his own advantage, according to their most obvious meaning. But after the fatal termination of his expedition, he called the oracles to an account for their deception; when a hidden meaning was found for their responses, of a tendency altogether different, with which Crœsus was obliged to rest contented, having then no power to do otherwise[7].

Cyrus, having received accurate intelligence of the movements of his enemies by his spies, marched against Crœsus, who had already passed the river Halys, captured the city Pteria, and made inroads on the adjacent territories. He finally forced Crœsus to action, put his cavalry to flight by the use of camels, and routed his whole army[8]. Crœsus immediately retired with his own soldiers to Sardis, his capital; and his allies returned home, the winter having already set in. But scarcely had he sent messengers to his auxiliaries to warn them to be ready to take the field in the following summer, when Cyrus very unexpectedly approached Sardis with his victorious army. Herodotus relates that Crœsus with his few soldiers, mostly cavalry, gave battle to the mighty host of Cyrus before the walls of the city, and that here Cyrus first made use of camels. How improbable this is, scarcely need be shown, since Xenophon, who resided so long a time at Sardis with Cyrus the younger, makes no mention of it[9].

[6] Herodot. i. 185—188. Cyrop. VI. i. 15. 18—23. ii. 7—10. Herodot. i. 71. 75. 77. compare Jer. li. 8, 9. 46.

[7] Herodot. i. 46—55. 90, 91. Cyrop. VII. ii. 6, 7. compare Is. xli. 21—29.

[8] Cyrop. VII. i. 4—22. compare Is. xxi. 7. Herodot. i. 75—77.

[9] Herodot. i. 79, 80. Cyrop. VI. ii. 1.

The city was captured in fourteen days; and, according to Herodotus, Crœsus, who, not expecting such an end, had formerly pronounced himself the most fortunate of men notwithstanding the decision of Solon, being condemned to the flames by the sentence of Cyrus, was again set free on his invoking in a melancholy tone the name of Solon from the already kindling pile. Xenophon says nothing of this; and besides, it agrees neither with the character of Cyrus nor with the customs of the Persians. This victory was gained in the eighth year of Belshazzar's reign, B. C. 549, and in the fifty-seventh of the captivity.

After this, Cyrus subjected Asia Minor and all the country west of the Euphrates to the dominion of Cyaxares; and in the tenth year of Belshazzar he defeated the Chaldæan army not far from Babylon, and marched immediately and without opposition to the walls of that great metropolis, into which the retreating hosts had thrown themselves [10].

§. 50. CONQUEST OF BABYLON.

BABYLON was considered impregnable. Its high and strong walls, surmounted by lofty towers, its broad and deep ditches, its large magazines, and the numerous squares within the city, which were planted with corn and yielded an annual supply of provisions, seemed sufficient to secure its inhabitants for ever from all the attacks of their enemies. The Chaldæans had reason to hope that the besiegers would finally relinquish their enterprise in despair. They were accordingly in high spirits, and derided the Persians from their walls and towers. Cyrus however continued for some time the siege of the city, and employed each month a twelfth part of his army in the service. But every effort was in vain [1].

[10] Cyrop. VII. ii. 2—4. iv. 1—7. Herodot. i. 81. 84. 86, 87. 153. 168—177. 190. compare Jer. li. 30.

[1] Jer. li. 53—58. Herodot. i. 190. Cyrop. VII. v. 1—7.

A stratagem finally brought the city into the power of Cyrus. Having heard that it was customary at an approaching festival for the Babylonians to spend the whole night in banqueting and revelry, he employed a part of his army at some distance from the city, to turn the course of the Euphrates into a large lake, according to Herodotus, but as Xenophon relates it, into an extensive ditch which he had sunk, as if for the purpose of rendering the blockade more complete; and by this means the water in the natural channel of the river was so diminished, that it could be easily forded. Meanwhile the siege was to all appearance carried on with the greatest vigour, that the Babylonians might not suspect his designs. When the appointed festival arrived, as soon as it was dark, Cyrus placed one half of his army at the entrance of the Euphrates into the city, and the other at its outlet. These two divisions entering the channel at the same time from above and below, pressed into the city through the gates leading down to the river, which, in the negligence and dissipation of the feast, had not been closed[2]; and imitating the shouts of the revellers, they assembled by preconcerted appointment around the royal palace. When the king, imagining that he heard the clamour of a drunken mob before the palace, ordered his guards to open the gates, in order to ascertain the cause of the disturbance, his foes rushed in with resistless force, overthrew everything which opposed them, and penetrated to the royal apartment. Belshazzar indeed drew his sword, but he was immediately overpowered and slain with all his attendants. All who were seen in the streets were put to the sword, and the Persians burnt those houses from the roofs of which they were annoyed, by setting fire to the doors, which were covered with bitumen. The circumstance mentioned by Herodotus, that when that part of the city which borders on the river, was already in the possession of the enemy, those who dwelt

[2] Compare Is. xliv. 1.

nearer the centre knew nothing of it[3], will convey some idea of the extent of this vast capital.

Thus was Babylon subjected to the dominion of Darius the Mede, (Cyaxares the second,) B. C. 539, in the forty-ninth year from the destruction of Jerusalem, and in the sixty-seventh of the captivity. Cyaxares reigned two years after this; to the sixty-ninth year of the captivity. Babylon lost little or nothing of its splendour or strength by this change of masters; but the turning of the Euphrates, which was never brought back to its natural channel, caused many fens in the adjacent country; and thus a part, though not all, of the prophecy respecting this magnificent city was fulfilled[4]. Cyrus reduced the affairs of the empire into order, united the Median and Persian dress, and gave a great feast to his people[5].

On the death of Cyaxares, Cyrus, who had married the only daughter of his uncle, inherited the whole Median empire, which in this manner passed from the Medes to the Persians, and was denominated from both people. If Cyrus, as Herodotus testifies, was obliged to resort to force in order to establish his authority, it was probably in consequence of the refusal of the Median nobles to acknowledge his right to the succession[6]. But such disquiets could be the more easily quelled after the Persians had adopted the Median dress and religion, and thus in fact had become one people with the Medes. It could not have been difficult to introduce the religion of Zoroaster among the Persians, since, in all probability, its fundamental principles were familiar to them long before the age of that philosopher. Cyrus in his youth, during his five years' residence at the court of his grandfather, had become familiar with its doctrines, in conformity with which the ceremonial of that court was regulated. The

[3] Dan. v. Is. xxi. 5. Jer. li. 39. Herodot. i. 191. Cyrop. VII. v. 5—11, compare Dan. v. 29, 30. Jer. l. 38. li. 12. 29. 31, 32. 36. Is. xiii. 15. xxi. 3, 4.

[4] Is. xiv. 23. Jer. li. 25—38. 43—45. 57.

[5] Cyrop. VIII. i. 14. iii. 1. [6] See Anabasis, III. iv. 5, 6.

Persians would readily receive the religious rites introduced by the reformation of Zoroaster, as well as the Median dress, since, according to the testimony of Herodotus, they had always manifested a considerable tendency to adopt foreign manners and usages. For this purpose, therefore, no coercion or strict injunction was necessary[7]. Still it cannot be supposed that the Persians at once entirely dismissed their old religious ideas, for among their more ancient writers we find frequent departures from the Zend-Avesta.

According to Xenophon, Cyrus, after the death of Cyaxares, subdued Egypt. He resided during the seven cool months of the year at Babylon, two months in the spring at Shushan or Susa, and during three months of the hottest weather at Ecbatana in Media; a practice which was kept up by his successors. It is said, in the Cyropædia, that he died in the seventh year of his reign, while on a journey to Persia, and was interred at Pasargada or Parsagada (probably Persepolis), in a small tomb which seems to be the same that was discovered by Niebuhr among the ruins of Persepolis, and is described in his Travels. Herodotus, however, asserts that he was slain in a battle against the Massagetæ. On account of his justice and kindness to his subjects, he was honoured during his life, and for a long time after his death, with the title of FATHER OF HIS PEOPLE[8].

[7] Herodot. I. 123—130. 135. Cyrop. VIII, v. 9, 10. 13.

[8] Cyrop. VIII. vi. 11. vii. 1—3. 10. Niebuhr's Travels, vol. ii. p. 159. Strabo, p. 730. Plutarch, Alexander. Arrian, iii. 18. Herodot. iii. 89. compare Cyrop. VIII. i. 1. ii. 6.

BOOK VII.

FROM THE RETURN OF THE HEBREWS TO THE TIME OF ALEXANDER.

§. 51. RELEASE OF THE HEBREWS.

CYRUS, in the first year of his reign (B. C. 536, seventy of the captivity, fifty-two after the destruction of Jerusalem and the temple), caused his decree to be proclaimed by a herald throughout the empire, that all the people of the God of heaven, without exception, were free to return to Judæa, and rebuild the temple at Jerusalem. This general permission, therefore, extended to the Israelites in Assyria, Halah, Gozan, and Media, as well as to the Jews at Chebar and Babylon. As Cyrus announced in his edict that Jehovah, the God of heaven, had given him all the kingdoms of the earth, and charged him to build a temple at Jerusalem, this proclamation was not merely a permission, but rather an invitation, to all the Hebrews to return and rebuild their temple. He accordingly delivered to the returning exiles five thousand four hundred sacred vessels of gold and silver, which Nebuchadnezzar had carried from Jerusalem to Babylon, prescribed the size of the temple, and directed that the expense of its erection should be defrayed from the royal treasury; all which particulars were verified by a written edict found fifteen years after in the archives at Ecbatana[1].

Thus divine Providence directed, that the temple, which had been destroyed by a foreign king, should also

[1] Ezra, i. 1—11. vi. 2—5.

by a foreign king be rebuilt. But if Cyrus, being a Madejesnan (Magian) or worshipper of Ormuzd, was more favourable to the worshippers of Jehovah than to any other people, on account of the similarity of the religious ideas of the Magians and the Hebrews; the same would undoubtedly have been true of Darius the Mede, for he also was a Magian. But Darius was far enough from granting the Hebrews any such liberty. Supposing Cyrus to have been generally more indulgent than Darius, and perhaps also not so much of a zealot for Ormuzd, still he must have had important reasons for rebuilding the temple of Jehovah, since the Magians did not allow the erection of temples, but only of Pyræa, or small chapels, for the consecrated fire. Daniel, who, on account of his interpretation of the prophetical dreams of Nebuchadnezzar, and of the mysterious writing in the banqueting hall of Belshazzar, was as much esteemed by the Persian monarchs as Jeremiah had been by Nebuchadnezzar, seems indeed to have contributed most to this favourable disposition of Cyrus. But he had probably exerted his influence to the same end with Darius the Mede, by whom he was regarded with such veneration, especially after his preservation in the lion's den, that that monarch, in a public decree, enjoined it on all his subjects to worship the God of Daniel. We cannot doubt that Daniel would have been earnest in his application to Darius, since he looked with such anxious solicitude for the termination of the captivity; and having computed its duration by the prophecy of Jeremiah, in the first year of this Median monarch, earnestly entreated God, with mourning and fasting, to put a period to the exile[2]. From this disposition of Daniel, we may safely conclude that he would neglect neither opportunity to entreat, nor means to persuade, Darius to grant the release of the Hebrews. But still, during the two years' reign of this monarch, he was unable to obtain that which Cyrus, immediately after his

[2] Daniel, vi. 26 - 29. ix. 1, 2.

accession to the throne, granted so freely, that he seems even to have gone beyond the requests of Daniel. It is, therefore, by no means a vain tradition, nor an arbitrary conjecture, on which Josephus relies, when he tells us that Daniel showed to Cyrus the prophecies of Isaiah referring to him, and that it was the manifest supernatural foreknowledge evinced by these predictions, which were pronounced long before his birth, which induced this monarch to concede more than Darius had refused. This will scarcely be questioned by a reflecting mind, after a comparison of these prophecies with the expressions in the edict of Cyrus: 'Jehovah, the God of heaven, hath given to me all the kingdoms of the earth, and hath charged me to build him a house at Jerusalem which is in Judah.' How could Cyrus have said this, if he had never read the prophecy of Isaiah[3]?

§. 52. FIRST CARAVAN OF THE HEBREWS TO JUDÆA.

Thus were the mountains laid low and the valleys filled up for the return of the Hebrews to Palæstine; that is, all obstacles were removed. Zerubbabel, grandson of king Jehoiachin, and Jeshua, a grandson of the high priest Jozadak, and ten of the principal elders, prepared themselves for the journey. To these were joined forty-two thousand three hundred and sixty people, whose servants amounted to seven thousand three hundred and thirty-seven, so that the whole number was nearly fifty thousand[1]. If this number be exclusive of women and children, as in other computations, according to Michælis it would not exceed four times the number of those who were carried into captivity. Eleven thousand six hundred men were taken from Judæa, and they, with their wives, children, and servants, probably amounted to forty or fifty thousand persons. But, as many of the Hebrews remained in the

[3] Josephus, Antiq. XI. i. 2. Is. xliv. 28. xlv. 1. compare Jer. l. 44.
[1] Ezra, ii. 2. 64. compare Neh. vii. 7.

places of their exile, we must allow that they had increased very rapidly during their captivity; though under their last kings in Palæstine their numbers had been continually diminishing. Daniel, at this time nearly ninety years old, remained at the court, where he could be of greater service to his nation than he could in Palæstine.

Those who were to return assembled at an appointed place, according to the usual mode of collecting a caravan, furnished with provisions and other things necessary for their journey. Their camels, horses, and beasts of burthen, amounted to eight thousand one hundred and thirty-six. Zerubbabel, the director of the caravan, received the sacred utensils which had been restored, and the donations towards the building of the temple, made by those who remained behind. He was appointed not only leader of the caravan, but also governor of Judæa, as he is styled by the prophets Haggai and Zechariah, and, fifteen years later, by Darius Hystaspes. The names Sheshbazzar and Tirshatha are, perhaps, Persian denominations of the same office. Several months were consumed in preparations for the journey. Encumbered as they were with baggage and young children, they were obliged to travel slowly, and their journey took up four months[2]. Accordingly, the caravan could not have arrived in Judæa before the close of the first year of Cyrus. Thus the Jews returned precisely at the termination of the seventieth year of the captivity, the fifty-second year after the destruction of the temple. They were now in their own country, governed by their own laws, and formed a distinct commonwealth. The Persian sovereignty afforded protection and security to the weak colony, and this was far more advantageous to the Hebrews than complete independence, which they could not demand.

[2] Ezra, i. 8. 11. ii. 63—67. vi. 7. vii. 9.

§. 53. RETURN OF THE TEN TRIBES.

As the invitation of Cyrus to build the temple at Jerusalem was directed to all the people of Jehovah, and proclaimed throughout the Persian empire, undoubtedly not a few of the ten tribes returned to Palæstine. Those who supposed they could improve their condition by removing, would attach themselves here and there to a caravan of merchants, and proceed to the land of their fathers. But as they arrived one after another, and in small companies, their return is not particularly noticed in a history so concise. There might have been many Israelites in the great caravan of Zerubbabel already described, although it is not necessary to suppose that the ten elders with Zerubbabel and Jeshua, were the twelve princes of the different tribes[1], or that the twelve thousand five hundred and forty-two, the excess of the grand total given by Ezra, ii. 64, above the actual sum of the several numbers mentioned in verses 3—63, were all Israelites. However this may be, it is highly probable that most of the Israelites returned speedily on hearing of the prosperity of their brethren in Palæstine. But whether their return was early or late, it is yet certain that they did actually return, for the history of later periods mentions Israelites as settled in Galilee and Peræa long before the time of Christ[2]. But, connecting themselves with the tribe of Judah, they finally lost the name of Israelites, and all Hebrews were indiscriminately designated as Jews.

But, since many of the tribe of Judah chose to remain in the land of their exile, it is reasonable to suppose that still greater numbers of the Israelites, who had lived in those countries two hundred years longer, would feel little inclination to exchange the happiness they there enjoyed for the prospect of the uncertain advantages of

[1] Ezra, iii. 2. compare Neh. vii. 7. [2] Mac. v. 9—24.

Palæstine. But as the jealousy between Judah and Israel had now ceased, according to the predictions of the prophets, those Israelites also who remained in exile, joined themselves to the tribe of Judah, which was in possession of the temple, and, consequently, they too received the denomination of Jews. All questions, therefore, and investigations, for the purpose of ascertaining what has become of the ten tribes, and whether it is likely they will ever be discovered, are superfluous and idle.

§. 54. BUILDING OF THE TEMPLE.

That the Persian rulers of Palæstine might not hinder the new colony from settling in the country and building the temple, it was necessary that Cyrus should issue a special order to this effect. But as this was sent directly to the Persian magistrates of the province, and was not received by the Jews, it is passed over by Ezra, though mentioned by Josephus[1]. Indeed the succeeding history renders the supposition of such an order necessary; for numerous caravans had taken possession of the country, built towns and villages, and raised a city upon the ruins of their ancient capital. In the next month (Tishri) the whole colony assembled at Jerusalem to the feast of tabernacles, erected an altar among the rubbish of their ancient temple, and resumed their customary sacrifices; and in the second month of the second year after their return, they, by voluntary contributions, laid the foundation of the house of God with great solemnity; and for all this not a Persian officer pretended to call them to account.

Joyful as this occasion was to the younger colonists, and loud as their shouts of exultation were in this tumult of joy, they were counterbalanced by the lamentations of the elder people, who had seen the temple of Solomon in its glory; for they perceived, from the very commence-

[1] Antiq. xi. 1. compare 3 Esd. vi. 29, 30.

ment of the work, that this edifice could be neither so large, so magnificent, nor so highly ornamented as the former. It is true, as appears from a record found in the palace at Ecbatana during the reign of Darius Hystaspes, that Cyrus had directed a sanctuary to be built of twice the dimensions of Solomon's temple, and the expense to be defrayed from the royal treasury: but either the treasurer had neglected to give effect to these orders, or the Jews out of modesty not choosing to avail themselves of the favour of the monarch to its full extent, were satisfied with what was granted without reluctance, lest they should awaken the envy of the worshippers of Ormuzd, and expose themselves to their persecutions. Accordingly, they did not build the temple so large as Cyrus had directed[2].

There was no opposition to this undertaking except from the colonists of the Assyrian kings in Samaria, who, having intermarried with the Israelites, now formed one people with them, under the name of Samaritans. As they placed Jehovah, represented by the golden calves, among their gods, they imagined that they had some right in the temple at Jerusalem, and demanded to be associated with the Jews in the building of it. A request most dangerous to the Jews, who were then scarcely cured of their propensity to idolatry. On the rejection of the proposal of the Samaritans, they made every possible exertion to thwart the enterprise, and though unable to accomplish their object during the life of Cyrus, yet they threw so many obstacles in the way, that the people were wearied out, and the work went on heavily[3]. This very naturally excited the enmity of the Jews; and thus arose that hatred between the two nations, which was continually increased by new provocations, till at last all friendly intercourse entirely ceased.

[2] Ezra, iii. 12, 13. compare Haggai, ii. 1—10. Ezra, vi. 3. compare 1 Kings, vi. 2.

[3] Ezra, iv. 1—5.

THE kings of the universal Persian monarchy, according to Ptolemey, were ten, and the whole time of their reign, two hundred and seven years. But Ptolemey's specific object being chronology, he omitted those who continued not on the throne a full year, and reckoned the months of their reign, partly to the preceding and partly to the succeeding monarch. The whole number of sovereigns was in reality fourteen, as appears from the following table.

B. C.			
538	Cyaxares II.	reigned	2 years.
536	Cyrus		7 years.
529	Cambyses		7 years and 5 months.
522	Smerdis		7 months.
521	Darius Hystaspes		36 years.
485	Xerxes I.		21 years.
464	Artaxerxes Longimanus		40 years and 3 months.
424	Xerxes II.		2 months.
424	Sogdianus		7 months.
423	Darius Nothus		19 years.
404	Artaxerxes Mnemon		46 years.
358	Darius Ochus		21 years.
337	Arses		2 years.
335	Darius Codomanus		4 years.

The monarchy remained powerful from the time of Cyrus till the death of Xerxes the first, and from that period it was gradually weakened by the intrigues of the courtiers, and the insurrections of the provincial governors, till at last it was completely subdued by Alexander the Great, B. C. 331.

After the death of Cyrus, the Samaritans petitioned Cambyses (named, by Ezra, Ahasuerus) against the Jews[1]. We are not informed what effect their representations produced, but we can easily judge from the character of this degenerate son of Cyrus, as it is represented in history, how much of favour or justice, or even of impartial investigation, could be expected from a thoughtless, gluttonous, cruel, furious warrior, who was considered as raving mad even by his own subjects? It is said that he was subject to epilepsy, which is often attended with insanity. In the fifth year of his reign he conquered Egypt, abused gods and men, and would not suffer even the dead to lie quietly in their graves. He was obliged to relinquish his design of subduing the Carthaginians, among whom he would doubtless have exhibited the same conduct, because the Phœnicians refused to employ their shipping against an ancient colony of their own. He then sent out fifty thousand men from Thebes, through the wilderness, to lay waste Oasis Magna, in which the oracle of Jupiter Ammon was situated. But the army was overwhelmed in the desert with a shower of sand, raised by a hurricane, and thus became the victims of the rashness of their sovereign. Meanwhile he himself proceeded with the remainder of his army towards Æthiopia, but was forced to return before he had gone a fifth part of the way, having already suffered so much from the want of provisions, that every tenth man was slain to furnish food for the rest[2]. Under such a monarch it was very easy for the Samaritans to obstruct the building of the temple; not to mention the hindrances occasioned by the march of the Persian army through Judæa.

[1] Ezra, iv. 6.

[2] Herodot. iii. 2—36. Justin, i. 9. Athenæus, xiii. Diod. Sic. i. 46. iii. 3. x. 2, 3. 5.

It is worthy of notice in this place, that the ancients generally supposed Pythagoras to have been taken prisoner by Cambyses in Egypt and carried to Babylon, or Media, where he became a disciple of Zoroaster (more probably of his learned successors), and made himself master of the oriental sciences[3].

As Cambyses was returning from Egypt in the eighth year of his reign, a herald from Shushan met him at Agbatana in Syria, who announced to the army the usurpation of the throne by Smerdis, the brother of Cambyses. This brother Cambyses had some time before privately put to death, by means of his confidant Prexaspes, because he had dreamed that he was aspiring to the sceptre. But the murder had been kept such a profound secret, that the Median Magus, to whom the king had intrusted the administration of affairs during his absence, raised his own brother to the throne, pretending that he was the brother of Cambyses, to whom indeed he bore a strong resemblance. This was done for the double purpose of restoring the empire to the Medes, and of deposing an odious tyrant. Although Cambyses exposed the imposture to his generals, they gave no credit to his story, supposing it to be feigned out of hatred to his brother. Soon after, Cambyses died of a wound he received by the falling of his own sword from its sheath, as he was mounting his horse.

Smerdis retained the throne seven months. He is named by Ctesias, Spendadates, by Justin, Oropastes, and in the Bible, Artahshashta (Artaxerxes[4]). To this monarch the Samaritans again addressed themselves, complaining that the Jews were building (that is, fortifying) the city of Jerusalem, although they had never thought of so doing; nevertheless, in consequence of this false accusation, Smerdis issued a positive prohibition of their work[5].

[3] Apuleius, Orat. de Magia, p. 36. Jamblichus, Vit. Pythag. Porphyrius, Vit. Pythag. p. 185. Clemens, Alex. Strom. i. p. 223.

[4] Ctesias, x. Justin, i. 9. Herodot, iii. 61—67. [5] Ezra, iv. 7—24.

The fraud of the Magus was soon discovered, and the pretended Smerdis was slain by seven of the principal nobles of Persia. These seven princes then deliberated on the reestablishment of the government; when Otanes advised them to introduce democracy, Megabyzus was in favour of aristocracy, but Darius Hystaspes insisted on their retaining monarchy; and he was himself raised to the throne[6]. It was stipulated, however, that these seven princes should always have access to the king without announcing their names, except when he was in the harem; and that a daughter of one of them should be married to the monarch and have the title of queen. That this last condition was not always observed is manifest from the example of Esther[7].

§. 57. REIGN OF DARIUS HYSTASPES.

DARIUS Hystaspes, who reigned from B. C. 521 to 486, was, as Herodotus represents him, a mild and benevolent ruler. He strengthened his alliance with the family of Cyrus by marrying a daughter of the genuine Smerdis, and two daughters of Cyrus, one of whom, Atossa, till that time had remained unmarried. Before his last war with the Greeks he appointed Xerxes, his son by Atossa, successor to the throne, although he had an elder son by another wife. He then divided the empire into twenty satrapies, and made a new assessment of the taxes, which Smerdis the impostor had remitted for three years[1].

As Smerdis was a mere usurper, his prohibition of the building of the temple was of no authority. The Jews then, immediately on the accession of Darius, might have continued their work, especially as this prince was of so mild a disposition, and so highly esteemed every plan which had its origin with Cyrus. When, therefore, the

[6] Herodot. iii. 61—87. compare iii. 80 with iv. 43.

[7] Herodot. iii. 118. compare Ezra, vii. 14. Esther, i. 14.

[1] Herodot. vi. 30. 41. 119. iii. 88—97. vii. 1—4. Justin, i. 10. Cyrop. VIII. vi. 1—9. Plutarch, Apophthegm. viii. p. 84.

Jews pretended that the time for building the temple had not arrived, it must have been on the ground that sixty-seven years only had elapsed since its destruction, and they would reckon the period at seventy years according to the duration of the captivity. But while they were erecting splendid dwellings for themselves, and adorning their apartments with ornamental work, this was manifestly mere pretence, and designed as an excuse for their negligence. Accordingly, in the second year of Darius, there appeared two prophets, Haggai and Zechariah, who appealed to the governor Zerubbabel, the high priest Jeshua, and the whole people, with such powerful representations of the divine commands, that the building of the house of God was once more resumed[2]. This renewed and extraordinary interposition of Jehovah, enlivened them all with new zeal. Upon this, Tatnai, the Persian governor on the west of the Euphrates, came with his officers to call the Jews to an account for their conduct; and when they referred to the permission of Cyrus, he was reasonable enough not to prohibit their undertaking, but wrote to Darius to have the affair investigated. Darius immediately caused search to be made among the royal acts, and in the archives at Ecbatana (Achmetha, now Hamadan), the edict of Cyrus was found, which directed that the temple should be built at the royal expense, and of much larger dimensions. Darius sent a copy of this edict to Tatnai, together with a letter commanding him not to obstruct the building, but zealously to forward it, to defray the expenses from the royal treasury, and also to supply the priests with such animals as were necessary for the sacrifices, with wheat, salt, wine, and oil, from day to day, for the divine service, that they might offer sacrifices to the God of heaven, and pray for the welfare of the king and of his sons. He gave a positive command, that whosoever ob-

[2] Ezra, iv. 28. v. 1, 2. Hagg. i. 2—15. Zech. ii. 5—17. iii. 1—10. iv. 1—14. viii. 1—17.

structed the execution of this decree, should be crucified, and his house demolished; and added an imprecation on all kings and people who should attempt to destroy that house of God. The work was now carried on with renewed vigour, and in the sixth year of Darius, on the third day of the month Adar (March), the edifice was completed. It was then joyfully consecrated, with festive solemnities[3]. It appears that Darius had heard of the obstructions to the building of the temple occasioned by the Samaritans; or at least had suspected something of the kind from the circumstance that an edifice ordered by Cyrus still remained unfinished. This patronage of the Hebrews by a prince of so magnanimous a character as Darius, is well worthy of notice. He undoubtedly knew that Cyrus attributed all his victories to Jehovah the God of heaven, and wished himself to obtain the assistance of the same Deity.

During the disturbances occasioned by Smerdis, the Babylonians were preparing to revolt; and these preparations were privately carried on till the fourth or fifth year of Darius, when they broke out in open rebellion. They had taken every precaution; and, to enable themselves to sustain a siege which, by its long continuance, might exhaust the strength and the patience of their besiegers, they put to death all the females of the city excepting one in each family, whom they retained as a servant[4]. Darius marched against them. After a tedious blockade of nineteen months, Zopyrus, one of the seven princes and a general, cut off his own ears and nose, and went over to the Babylonians, pretending that he had been thus mutilated by Darius. His story being credited, he gradually insinuated himself into their confidence, and finally having become commandant of the city, he opened two gates to the Persians. Darius ordered the immediate crucifixion of three thousand Babylonian nobles, who had been the authors of the revolt; took away the

[3] Ezra, v. 3—17. vi. 1—22.

[4] Compare Is. xlvii. 9. xlviii. 20. Jer. l. 20. li. 6. 47.

hundred brazen gates of the city, and threw down two hundred cubits from the height of the wall. It is owing to this circumstance that more recent writers assert that the walls were only fifty cubits high. Thus the prophecies against Babylon advanced still farther towards their accomplishment[5].

The remainder of the reign of Darius was spent in unceasing wars, which the prophet Zechariah represents by the four winds (spirits) of the heavens riding in chariots of war. The wind was worshipped by the Persians as a superior spirit (Ized) under the name of Behram, and was considered the tutelar genius of war[6]. The expedition of Darius with seven hundred thousand men against the Scythians, was signally unsuccessful; but he reduced Thrace, and, though defeated in Scythia, was victorious in Macedonia. Against the Indies he proceeded with more caution; for he first caused the country to be explored, and then subdued the whole western part of that rich territory. In the twentieth year of his reign the Ionians revolted. They were upheld by the Athenians and Eretrians; but after seven years they were forced to submit to Darius, and at the same time the islands of the Ægean sea fell into the hands of the Persian monarch[7].

The aid which the Athenians and Eretrians had afforded the Ionians, was the cause of the great Persian war with the Greeks, which began in the twenty-eighth year of Darius. After the Persians had lost the battle of Marathon, B. C. 491, thirty-one of Darius, this monarch employed three years in making preparations for a still more energetic campaign against Greece. When everything was ready, Egypt revolted, and the army consequently was divided, one part being destined for Egypt, and the other for Greece. The former division was commanded by a son of the king; but when the time

[5] Zech. vi. 6. Jer. l. 15. li. 44. 53. 58. Herodot. iii. 150—159. Strabo, p. 738. Plutarch, Apophthegm. viii. p. 84.

[6] Zech. vi. 1—8. Zend-Avesta, t. ii. p. 271, sqq.

[7] Herodot. iv. 44. 83. 85—143. v. 17—126.

arrived for the commencement of its march, Darius died in the thirty-sixth year of his reign, B. C. 485[8].

During all these wars the Hebrews enjoyed peace in their own country, a circumstance to which Zechariah alludes in his prophecies[9]. In this last expedition, however, they might have been obliged to participate, as the rendezvous of the army was near their territory. But perhaps they merely supplied the army with provisions, without being forced to engage personally in the service.

§. 58. REIGN OF XERXES THE FIRST.

XERXES, as weak in intellect and as unlike his father as Cambyses had been, exceeded even that mad monarch in gluttony, voluptuousness, and cruelty. In the second year of his reign he reduced the Egyptians again under the Persian yoke, and then his general Mardonius, and the Greek Pisistratus, instigated him to a war against the Greeks, for which at first he felt no inclination. In the second year of his reign (the year in which Herodotus the historian of this war was born) he determined to undertake it. He accordingly called a council of all the noble Persians, to take into consideration the mode of conducting the war[1]. As the sessions of the Persian councils were always attended with feasting, these may have been the feasts of which mention is made in the Book of Esther. All the Persian nobles and officers could not be assembled at a single feast, and as they were arriving one after another, a half year might easily pass away. The author of the Book of Esther has not mentioned the real purpose of this splendid assemblage, either because he knew not what it was, or considered it irrelevant to the design of his book.

Three whole years were spent in the most stupendous preparations, and troops were collected from every part

[8] Herodot. vi. 43—48. 94—119. [9] Zech i. 7—17. vi. 1—8.
[1] Herodot. vii. 5—19. Compare Esther, i. 1—8. Aull. Gellius, xv. 23.

of the Persian empire. That the Greeks might derive no aid from their colonies in Italy and Sicily, an alliance was formed with the Carthaginians, by which they engaged to invade the Italian and Sicilian Greeks. This expedition was undertaken by Hamilcar with three hundred thousand men, but terminated as unsuccessfully as that of Xerxes in Greece. Thus Xerxes, according to the prediction of Daniel, put in motion all the east as far as India, and all the west as far as Spain, where the Carthaginians had hired some of their mercenary troops[2].

In the fifth year of his reign, B. C. 481, Xerxes led his enormous army to Asia Minor, and took up his winter quarters at Sardis. While on this march, he, with all his troops, was magnificently entertained at Celene, by Pytheus, the richest of the Lydians, who made him an offer of all his money, an immense sum, to assist him in carrying on the war. This Xerxes declined: but when Pytheus afterwards requested that of his five sons who were in the army, the eldest might be suffered to remain with him as the support of his declining years, the ungrateful tyrant ordered the youth to be cut in halves, the parts of the body to be laid one on each side of the way, and his army to march between them. After a storm had destroyed the bridge of boats which Xerxes had built across the Hellespont, he ordered the superintendents of the work to be beheaded, the sea itself to be beaten with three hundred stripes, and a pair of chains to be sunk in it. In the spring of the following year, after a passage had been dug through mount Athos, and a new bridge constructed across the Hellespont, Xerxes decamped from Sardis. At Abydos, seated on a throne of white marble, he reviewed his whole army, engaged in warlike exercises by land and sea; an exhibition by which he was at first highly elated, though he soon burst into tears[3].

Seven days were consumed in the passage over the double bridge of boats built across the Hellespont. At

[2] Herodot. vii. 20—25. Diod. Sic. xi. 1, 2. 20—27. compare Dan. xi. 2.
[3] Herodot. vii. 26—44.

Doriscus the army was numbered, and the infantry amounted to one million seven hundred thousand men. It was a mixture of all nations. Herodotus describes the dress and arms of each people; a spectacle certainly such as never had been witnessed before, and probably never will be again. As all the subjects of the Persian empire, from India to Æthiopia and Macedonia, had supplied recruits for this war, there were undoubtedly Jews in the army, even if the opinion of Bochart be correct, that the Solymeans speaking Phœnician, mentioned in Cherilus as quoted by Josephus, were Pisidians and not Hebrews. Besides these, there was a body of ten thousand Persians, named the *immortal band*, and eighty-two thousand cavalry. In the fleet there were one thousand two hundred and seven ships of war, and three thousand galleys of three banks of oars. In these vessels were embarked five hundred and seventeen thousand six hundred and ten men. The army received great accessions during its march through Thrace and Macedonia, so that Herodotus reckons the whole number of fighting men at two millions six hundred and forty-one thousand six hundred and ten, whom, together with the servants, sutlers, and mariners, he computes at five millions. Diodorus Siculus, Pliny, and Ælian, give the number somewhat less, but never under two millions[4].

In the year B. C. 480, this immense army lost twenty thousand men, in a conflict of three days' continuance at the pass of Thermopylæ, which Leonidas king of Sparta had occupied with six thousand Greeks. The pass indeed was gained, and the Spartans, together with their leader, put to the sword; but this desperate resistance brought to view difficulties which Xerxes in his pride had never foreseen. He wreaked his vengeance on the dead bodies of the Greeks, decapitated the corpse of the brave

[4] Herodot. vii. 56—187. Diod. Sic. xi. 3. Josephus against Apion, i. 22. Bochart, Phaleg et Canaan, b. ii. c. 6. p. 378, sqq. Plutarch, Themist. xiv. Isocrates, Panathen. compare Diod. Sic. x. 5. Ælian, Var. Hist. xiii. 3. Pliny, xxxii. 10.

Leonidas, and suspended the headless trunk on a gallows. The Persian fleet, which in the mean time had gone in pursuit of the enemy, soon after lost more than three hundred ships in a storm. They then resolved to blockade the Grecian fleet, which, consisting of two hundred and eighty sail, lay at Artemisium in Eubœa. But, by the advice of Themistocles, the Greeks in good order sailed out to meet them; and although the bloody battle in which they then engaged was not decisive, yet the Greeks had some advantage, and a storm which arose in the following night proved very injurious to the Persians. Equally undecisive was the naval engagement at the straits of Eubœa. The loss on both sides was considerable. As soon as it was known that the Persians had gained the pass of Thermopylæ, and were advancing without resistance, the Athenians all retired to the island of Salamis. Xerxes, meanwhile, with his land forces marched into Attica, devastated the country, burnt the temples, and laid waste the city of Athens, now deserted by its inhabitants. The Persian fleet at the same time sailed from Eubœa to Attica, and laid waste the coast[5].

The skill of Themistocles at length gained for the Greeks the decisive victory at Salamis, where more than two hundred Persian vessels were sunk, many fell into the hands of the Athenians, and the rest fled to Ionia, to take up their winter quarters at Cyme. In these battles the Persians lost in all one million two hundred thousand men. The haughty Xerxes, as Phanodemus and Acestodorus testify, was a spectator of this last naval action, which he viewed from an elevation, seated on a golden throne, and surrounded by historians to witness his own disgrace. Immediately after, on receiving the false intimation which Themistocles had sent him, that the Greeks were on the point of cutting off his retreat by the Hellespont, in an agony of terror he betook himself to flight,

[5] Herodot. vii. 175. viii. 53. Diod. Sic. xi. 4—14. Ctesias, Persic. xxvi. Justin, ii. 11.

recrossed the Hellespont in a fishing boat, and returned to Sardis with all possible expedition. Mardonius remained in Greece with three hundred thousand men to prosecute the war[6].

Mardonius endeavoured to make peace with the Athenians, but his proposals were rejected. Accordingly, in the spring he returned to Attica, laid waste the country, took possession of Athens a second time, and destroyed the empty city, its inhabitants having again deserted it. In the second year of the seventy-fifth Olympiad, B. C. 479, he was defeated by land at Platææ, on the same day in which the Persian fleet was overcome near the promontory of Mycale in Ionia. Mardonius was left dead on the field, and Artabazus led back to Asia forty thousand men, the poor remains of the mighty army of Xerxes! The Ionians now revolted from the Persians, and formed an alliance with the Athenians[7].

Xerxes, ashamed of the result of his enterprise, returned from Sardis to Shushan by the way of Babylon. When he came to Babylon he plundered and destroyed the magnificent temple of Belus, and carried off with him the celebrated golden statues and the golden table which Darius Hystaspes had not ventured to remove. Thus the prophecies against this city were yet farther accomplished. This year, B. C. 478, was the seventh of his reign, so that in the tenth month he could publicly acknowledge Esther as his queen[8].

The war, however, was still far from being over. The Athenians indeed remained at home during the year, in order to rebuild their city, but, B. C. 477, again took the field, and prosecuted the war till B. C. 469. The martial

[6] Herodot. viii. 56—63. 74, 75. 79—91. 100—119. 126. Ctesias, Persic. xxvi. Diod. Sic. xi. 16—20. Justin, ii. 12, 13. Plutarch, Themist. xiii.

[7] Herodot. viii. 136—144. ix. 1—4. 13. 27—104. Diod. Sic. xi. 28. 30—32. 36. Justin, ii. 14.

[8] Herodot. ix. 108. compare i. 183. Diod. Sic. ii. 10. Strabo, p. 738. Arrian, Exped. Alex. vii. 17. Diod. Sic. xi. 36. compare Is. xxi. 9. xlvi. 1, 2. Jer. li. 44. Esther, ii. 16.

zeal of Xerxes was nearly exhausted, for after his first defeats he resigned himself entirely to his pleasures, and finally, B. C. 468, ceased to provide either fleets or armies. During his residence at Sardis, after his disgraceful flight from Greece, he conceived a passion for the wife of his brother and general Masistius; but as she refused to listen to his overtures, he paid his addresses to her daughter. This intrigue led his wife, the queen Amestris, to an act of the most shocking barbarity against the wife of Masistius. This event is the more worthy of notice, as both the name and the character of Amestris favour the supposition that she is the Esther of the Bible. Some suppose that Hegai, the keeper of the harem, is the same person with Hegias, whom Ctesias mentions as an attendant of Xerxes before the battle of Thermopylæ. It is no objection to this opinion that Hegias is called an Ephesian, since this appellation might have been given him, from the circumstance that he was a eunuch purchased at Ephesus[9].

Xerxes at last arrived to such a pitch of voluptuousness, that he published an edict offering a considerable reward to the inventor of a new pleasure. "Si regem spectes," says Justin, "divitias non ducem laudes, quarum tanta copia in regno ejus fuit, ut, cum flumina multitudine consummerentur, opes tamen regiæ superessent. Ipse autem primus in fuga, postremus in prelio semper visus est, in periculis timidus, sicubi metus abesset, inflatus[10]."

By such conduct Xerxes drew upon himself universal contempt; and in the twenty-first year of his reign, B. C. 464, was murdered by Artabanus the commander of his lifeguards. The assassin then persuaded Artaxerxes, the third son of the king, that Darius, the second son, had put to death his father in order to place himself upon

[9] Herodot. ix. 108—112. Plutarch, Cimon, vi—xv. Ctesias, Persic. xxiv. Esther, ii. 8.

[10] Athenæus, Deipnosoph. compare Justi in Eichhorn, Repert. Th. xv. s. 29, sqq. Justin, ii. compare Dan. xi. 2.

the throne. To revenge the supposed parricide, Artaxerxes put his brother to death. But Artabanus, who aspired to the sceptre himself, now attempted the murder of Artaxerxes; and failing in the attempt to inflict upon him a mortal wound, the young prince recovered himself, slew the traitor, and ascended the throne[11].

§. 59. SECOND CARAVAN OF THE HEBREWS TO JUDÆA.

FROM various circumstances, it appears very probable that both the Artaxerxes of Ezra, who is mentioned next after Darius Hystaspes, and the Ahasuerus of Esther, are names of Xerxes the first. It is not improbable that this king, who in the seventh year of his reign had made Mordecai the Jew his prime minister, and Esther the Jewess his queen, should give to Ezra the Jew a commission conferring such full powers as we find vested in Ezra[1]. Xerxes might hope that by thus patronising the Jews, he should obtain some favour after his unsuccessful campaigns from the God of heaven, whom the Jews worshipped, and to whom Cyrus attributed all his victories. Thus much seems to be intimated by the words of the edict, Ezra, vii. 23. The commission of Ezra was given in the seventh year of the king, after the retreat from Greece. It is no objection to our hypothesis, that Ezra began his journey on the first day of the first month, and arrived at Jerusalem on the first of the fifth month, in the seventh year of Artaxerxes, while Esther is said to have been declared queen in the tenth month of this year; for the book of Esther computes the months from harvest, or Tishri, while Ezra reckons from spring, or Nisan. Moreover, the favour of the king towards the Jews did not commence with the elevation of Esther to the throne; for before this time Mordecai had a place among the nobles in the court of the palace, and conse-

[11] Ctesias, Persic. xxix. Diod. Sic. xi. 69. Justin, iii. 1.

[1] Ezra, vi. vii. viii. 31. Esther, ii. Dan. ix. 1.

quently he must have been one of the royal officers. The difference of the names, Artaxerxes, Xerxes, and Ahasuerus, need occasion no difficulty, for these are not so much proper names, as appellatives applied to every king at pleasure. Thus Daniel calls even Astyages, 'Ahasuerus of the Median line.' The seventh year of Xerxes, B. C. 478, is the fifty-eighth after the first return from the captivity [2].

The Hebrew colony in Judæa seems never to have attained to a very flourishing condition. The administration of justice was particularly defective, and neither civil nor religious institutions were firmly established. Accordingly, the king gave permission for all Hebrews to emigrate to Judæa. This was in fact renewing the invitation to the Jews to return to their native land. The priest Ezra, a celebrated scribe, was appointed governor, with a commission to appoint judges superior and inferior, to rectify abuses, to enforce the observance of the law, and to punish the refractory with fines, imprisonment, banishment, or death, according to the degree of their offences. He had permission also to make a collection for restoring the temple among those Hebrews who chose to remain in the land of their exile; and the king and his counsellors not only contributed liberally towards the same object, but the ministers of the royal revenues west of the Euphrates, were ordered to supply Ezra with all he should require, of silver to one hundred talents, wheat to one hundred cors, wine and oil to one hundred baths of each, and salt without limitation, to the end that the sacrifices might be legally and regularly offered, that the wrath of the God of heaven should not be against the realm of the king and of his sons. All those also who were employed in the services of the temple, even the common labourers (nethinims), were exempted from tribute, and thus placed on an equality with the Medes and Persians. This was done to induce the priests and Levites to settle

[2] Ezra, vii. viii. 15—20.

at Jerusalem, for as yet but very few of them had returned[3]. From the whole tenor of the letter it is manifest that the God of the Hebrews was held in high veneration at the Persian court, ever after the time of Cyrus.

Although exemption from tribute was secured to the Levites who would emigrate to Judæa, yet none of this tribe were found in the caravan which assembled in Babylonia on the banks of the unknown river Ahava; and it was with difficulty that Ezra induced two families of priests to accompany him. The caravan consisted of sixteen houses, which, including women and children, probably amounted to six thousand persons. After a journey of three months and a fortnight, the new colony arrived at Jerusalem, deposited in the temple the donations they had received for it, and Ezra delivered his credentials to the royal officers of that district[4]. Of all the improvements and regulations which he introduced into Judæa, the book that bears his name mentions only the removal of the heathen women, a measure which was necessary as a security against a relapse into idolatry. But Nehemiah informs us that Ezra caused the law to be publicly read to the people, and explained by interpreters to those who understood only Aramean. This undoubtedly gave occasion to the multiplying of copies of the law in Judæa[5].

§. 60. ARTAXERXES LONGIMANUS.

AFTER Artaxerxes had inflicted the punishment merited by the faction of the regicide Artabanus, he, in the second year of his reign, defeated his elder brother Hystaspes, who, as lawful heir to the throne, had come against him with a considerable army from Bactria, of which he was governor. Scarcely was this danger removed, when a war with the Egyptians broke out, who, on hearing of

[3] Ezra, vii. viii. 15—20. [4] Ezra, viii.
[5] Ezra, ix. x. Neh. viii. 1—12. compare 1 Mac. i. 57, 58.

the disturbances in the royal family, elected Inarus king, formed an alliance with the Athenians, and collected a large force by sea and land. Artaxerxes sent a still larger force against them, but it was repulsed, and the commander, Achæmenides, a brother of the king, was slain in battle by Inarus, B. C. 459. An attempt was then made to find employment for the Athenian allies at home, by exciting the Lacedæmonians to a war against Athens; but as money could not effect this object, Artaxerxes, B. C. 458, sent, under the command of Megabyzus, a new army of three hundred thousand men, attended by a fleet of three hundred ships, against Egypt, where Memphis had always been held by a Persian garrison. The rendezvous of the army was in Syria and Phœnicia, where the troops were exercised in arms almost a whole year[1].

It was about this time that Themistocles, as a reward for the great services he had rendered his native country against the Persians, was obliged to flee for his life to these very Persians, where he was hospitably received and entertained by the king. He was now sent with a fleet to make a diversion of the Athenian forces; but that he might be neither ungrateful to his magnanimous protector, nor an enemy to his native land, he put an end to his own life, by drinking a quantity of the warm blood of a bull that was offered in sacrifice[2].

The Persian army now marched along the seacoast from Syria to Egypt, the fleet sailing in company near the shore. The Egyptians were defeated, and surrendered on capitulation; but the Athenian auxiliaries, who had burned their fleet and were determined to sell their lives as dearly as possible, were suffered to depart. The new fleet, however, which the Athenians had sent out after the first, fell into the hands of the Persians. Amyrtæus retired with a part of the Egyptian army into the

[1] Diod. Sic. xi. 71. 74. Ctesias, Persic. xxx—xxxii.

[2] Plutarch, Themist. xxxi. Thucyd. i. 137. 138.

morasses, where he maintained himself for some time, as the place was inaccessible to the Persians; but he was unable to carry on any offensive operations. The war still continued with the Athenians, but in the year B. C. 450, the Persians being defeated by land and sea, were forced in the following year to accept a disgraceful peace. They gave up all the Grecian cities in Asia Minor, and engaged to send no armed vessel farther west than Phasaelis in Pamphylia, and no land force within three days' journey of the Ægean sea; while the Athenians, on their part, engaged merely to commit no hostilities upon the Persian dominions[3].

Megabyzus had promised an amnesty to Inarus, with the Egyptians and Greeks of his party, when they gave themselves up to him; which promise was confirmed by Artaxerxes. But this prince, whose character was generally so honourable, at length yielded to the importunity of his mother Amytis, who, enraged at the death of her son Achæmenides, whom Inarus had slain in battle, was continually soliciting the punishment of these people; and Inarus, with fifty Greeks, was crucified. Indignant at this act of perfidy, Megabyzus revolted and raised an army in Syria. He twice defeated the royal forces which were sent against him, and was afterwards received into favour by the king[4].

In the first year of the 87th Olympiad, B. C. 431, the thirty-fourth of Artaxerxes, the Peloponnesian war broke out, which, excited by Pericles from motives of selfish ambition, continued to rage for twenty-seven years. Its horrors were greatly increased by that dreadful and wide-spreading plague, so much spoken of in the history of those times. During this war, the Lacedæmonians often sent ambassadors to Persia to solicit aid. But Artaxerxes, who was not sorry to see the Greeks weakening each other, would not understand their request; nor was it till

[3] Diod. Sic. xi. 74, 75. 77. xii. 3. 4. Plutarch, Cimon, xii. xiii.

[4] Ctesias, Persic. xxxvi—xxxix.

the seventh year of the war, that he sent an ambassador to the Lacedæmonians, and then his only charge was, to ascertain what they wanted. This ambassador fell into the hands of the Athenians; but they, out of respect for the great king (as the Persian monarchs were then called by the Greeks), sent him back to his master with every demonstration of respect. Artaxerxes died soon after, in the forty-first year of his reign, B. C. 424[5].

§. 61. NEHEMIAH GOVERNOR OF JUDÆA.

If we recollect that in the years B. C. 459 and 458, Syria and Phœnicia had been the rendezvous of two armies, and that in B. C. 448 and 447, Megabyzus had waged war in Syria against Artaxerxes, we need inquire no farther for the causes of the decline of the Hebrew colony in Judæa, which had been so well regulated by Ezra. Nehemiah, the cupbearer of Artaxerxes, learned the unhappy state of the Hebrews, B. C. 444, from a certain Jew named Hanani, who had come from Judæa to Shushan with a caravan. Of the regulations introduced by Ezra, B. C. 478, few remained in force, and amid the confusions of war, the condition of the Jews was continually growing worse. This information so affected Nehemiah, a zealous worshipper of Jehovah, that the king observed his melancholy, and inquiring its cause, he appointed him governor of Judæa, with full power to fortify Jerusalem, and thus to secure it from those disasters to which unprotected places are always exposed in time of war. Orders were sent to the royal officers west of the Euphrates, to assist in the fortification of the city, and to furnish the requisite timber from the king's forests; probably from mount Libanus, near the sources of the river Kadisha, as that was the place celebrated for its

[5] Hippocrates de Epid. iii. Thucyd. ii. 47—55. Diod. Sic. xiii. 38. 64. xii. 107. Ctesias, Persic. xliii.

cedars. Thus commissioned, Nehemiah journeyed to Judæa, accompanied by military officers and cavalry[1].

It is manifest from the whole narrative, that Nehemiah, who presented wine to his royal master in the presence of the queen, and consequently in the harem, was a eunuch in high favour with the king; and it is equally evident that he was a person of rank and authority at the court; for he travelled with a great retinue, maintained a large body of servants, and kept open table at Jerusalem, without receiving the usual compensation from the Jews as governor of the province. That a royal cupbearer should be invested with such dignity, will not surprise any one who has read the Cyropædia[2].

As soon as Nehemiah, on his arrival in Palæstine, had been acknowledged governor of Judæa by the royal officers, he made his proposition for the fortifying of Jerusalem to the elders who composed the Jewish council. All the heads of houses, and the high priest Eliashib, engaged zealously in the work. The chiefs of the Samaritans, Sanballat, Tobiah, and Geshem, endeavoured to thwart their undertaking by insults, by malicious insinuations that it was a preparation for revolt, by plots, and by threats of a hostile attack. The Jews, notwithstanding, proceeded earnestly in their business, armed the labourers, protected them still farther by a guard of armed citizens, and at length completed the walls of their city. Nehemiah, during the progress of the work, had improved the condition of the people by the abolition of illegal usury; and he now provided the new fortifications with suitable defenders, by inducing his countrymen to settle at Jerusalem. He reestablished the regular services of the temple, and, after the example of Ezra, expelled the heathen females who were married to Jews[3].

[1] Neh. i. ii. 1—9.

[2] Neh. iv. 10. 17. v. 14—18. Cyrop. I. iii. 7, 8.

[3] Neh. ii. 10—20. iii. 33—37. iv. 1—17. vi. 1—19. xi. 1—36. xii. 27—43.

At the close of the twelfth year of his office, B. C. 432, he returned to the king, and afterwards came a second time to Jerusalem[4]. It has generally been supposed that this second journey to Jerusalem took place in the following year, B. C. 431, the thirty-third of the reign of Artaxerxes; but we shall see in the 63rd section of this work that it must have been several years later.

§. 62. XERXES II. SOGDIANUS. DARIUS NOTHUS.

Xerxes the second, the only son of Artaxerxes by the queen Parysatis, ascended the throne on the decease of his father; but in forty-five days he was assassinated by Sogdianus, the son of Artaxerxes by a concubine.

Sogdianus held the sceptre only six months and fifteen days; for when his brother Ochus, who was governor in Hyrcania, perceived that his own life was in danger from the jealousy of the monarch, he entered Persia with an army under pretence of avenging the death of Xerxes, and was everywhere hailed as king. Sogdianus now became a suppliant, and obtained promise of pardon; but notwithstanding this, he was soon after put to death by suffocation in ashes[1].

Ochus, who was known among the Greeks by the name of Darius Nothus, now commenced his reign, B. C. 423. He was governed almost entirely by his wife Parysatis, and his three principal eunuchs, Artoxares, Artibarxanes, and Athros. His own brother Arsites revolted from him, but was subdued; and after his surrender he was executed in the same manner as Sogdianus had been. Ochus had yet many insurrections to quell, the most dangerous of which was that excited by Pysuthus governor of Lydia, B. C. 414. This insurgent was at last induced by a stratagem to give himself up; and then he also suffered

[4] Neh. xiii. 6.

[1] Ctesias, Persic. xliv—xlviii. Diod. Sic. xii. 71, compare 2 Mac. xiii. 5, 6.

death in the ash-tower. Soon after, the Egyptians shook off the Persian yoke and made Amyrtæus of Sais their king; the same who had defended himself in the morasses during the revolt of Inarus. With the assistance of the Arabians, they drove the Persians from Egypt, B. C. 410, pursued them as far as Phœnicia, and maintained their independence sixty-four years. Ochus sent an army against them, but without success. The Persian forces marched to Egypt, along the coast through Judæa; and this event was undoubtedly productive of great evil to the Jews. Eliashib, the high priest in the time of Nehemiah, was no longer living. He died B. C. 413, and was succeeded by his son Judas[2]. This army, while on its march, might have laid waste Idumea, because the Idumeans had perhaps taken part with those Arabs who, in conjunction with the Egyptians, had pursued the Persians to Phœnicia, while the Hebrews remained faithful to the Persian monarch. To these circumstances Malachi alludes[3].

Ochus was more successful against the Greeks in Asia Minor. His lieutenants, Pharnabazus and Tissaphernes, following the advice of Alcibiades, assisted in the Peloponnesian war the Athenians and the Lacedæmonians alternately, according as the one or the other began to decline; and thus, without any great effort on their part, helped the two parties to weaken each other. In the twentieth year of the war, B. C. 413, Ochus, in return for the money he had lent to the Lacedæmonians, reannexed to his empire those Grecian cities and islands whose independence Artaxerxes had been forced to acknowledge in his disgraceful peace with the Athenians[4].

In the year B. C. 414, the Medes, after the example of the Egyptians, endeavoured to shake off the Persian

[2] Josephus, Antiq. XI. vii. 1. Ctesias, Persic. xlix—lxi.

[3] Mal. i. 2—5.

[4] Ctesias, Persic. lx. Diod. Sic. xiii. 37, 38. 45, 46. 51. Thucyd. viii. compare Nepos, Alcibiades, viii. Plutarch, Alcibiades, xxv. xxxi. Xenophon, Hellen. I. i. 4. 6. 9. 15—18. 23. ii. 3, 4. II. iii. 4. 11. iii. 4. 6—9. iv. 1—3.

yoke; but they were soon vanquished and forced to submit. The Egyptians, however, still maintained their independence, and Pausiris succeeded Amytæus on the throne[5].

In the year B. C. 407, Ochus sent his younger son Cyrus, then scarcely sixteen, to Sardis as governor of Asia Minor, investing him with almost unlimited power. He was led to this imprudent step by his wife Parysatis, with whom Cyrus was a great favourite, and whose object it was by this means to open for him a way to the throne. Cyrus had ambition enough fully to second his mother's views: but he suffered his designs to be discovered so soon as nearly to have brought upon himself irretrievable ruin. He punished with death some children of royal blood, because they did not in his presence cover their hands with the sleeves of their robes; a mark of respect never required but by the king himself. Darius ordered his immediate recall, with a determination to punish him; but yielding to the solicitations of Parysatis, he reinstated him in the government[6].

Cyrus no longer pursued the politic course of affording alternate aid to the Athenians and Lacedæmonians; but in accordance with the injunctions of his father and with his own wishes, he supplied the Lacedæmonians with as much money as they needed. This enabled Lysander, the Spartan admiral, to pay the men of his fleet; and he then drove the Athenians to such extremities, that they were at last forced to desist from this long protracted war in the year B. C. 405. Darius Nothus died the next year, and was succeeded by his son Artaxerxes, who, on account of his retentive memory, was surnamed Mnemon[7].

[5] Xenophon, Hellen. I. ii. 12.

[6] Xenophon, Hellen. I. iv. 1. II. i. 6. 8. 10.

[7] Xenophon, Hellen. I. v. 1—5. vi. 6, 7, 12. II. i. 7—9. ii. 1—14. III. i. 1. Justin, v. 5. C. Nepos, Alcibiades, viii. Diod. Sic. xiii. 70. 104—107. Plutarch, Lysander, iv—xv. Diod. Sic. xiii. 108.

§. 63. SECOND ADMINISTRATION OF NEHEMIAH.

PRIDEAUX dates the second administration of Nehemiah from the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus, B. C. 408. It was then that he undertook the second reformation, in consequence of which Manasseh, the son of the high priest Joiada (not Jaddu as in Josephus), fled to Samaria, because he was unwilling to part with his wife, who was a daughter of Sanballat the Samaritan chief. Though I do not attach equal importance to all the reasons which Prideaux has adduced in support of his opinion, yet some of them are conclusive, and I shall add others which he has not noticed. Still I would not venture to fix definitely on the exact year[1].

The interval from the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes, the date of Nehemiah's return to Persia, to the fifteenth year of Darius Nothus, from B. C. 432 to 408, includes only twenty-four years, and is therefore not too great. When he came to Jerusalem the first time, he was royal cupbearer, an office most usually filled by handsome young men. He was then probably between twenty and thirty years old, and consequently, after a residence of twelve years in Judæa and of twenty-four more in Persia, he would have reached the age of fifty-six or sixty-six; a time of life at which he might easily be supposed to leave the service of the court and become governor of his own people. If, as Josephus says, Nehemiah lived to a very great age, he would now have many years to spend at Jerusalem. Had his life extended to a hundred years, he might himself have written the twenty-second verse of the twelfth chapter of the book which bears his name: "The Levites in the days of Eliashib, Joiada, and Johanan (v. 11. Jonathan), and Jaddua," etc. For though Jaddua, who was an old man in the time of Alexander, B. C. 331, could not have been high priest under Darius

[1] Prideaux, Connexions, vol. I. book vi. p. 383. Neh. xiii. 4—31.

Nothus; yet in the last years of that monarch he might have been fifteen or twenty years old, and so have his name placed in the register, as heir to the priesthood. I would not, however, insist on this; for both this passage and the genealogy of the high priests in the tenth and eleventh verses, appear to have been completed by a later hand.

Should it be objected, that if Joiada, the successor of the high priest Eliashib, entered his office in the eleventh year of Darius Nothus, there would be only three high priests (Jeshua, Jehoiakim, and Eliashib) during the whole period from the first year of Cyrus to the eleventh of Darius Nothus, B. C. 536 to 412, I answer, that for three generations to continue one hundred and twenty-four years, is by no means incredible. Moreover, the register may omit some one or more of the high priests, as being unworthy of notice, or holding the office but a short time. But be that as it may, the difficulty is by no means so great as one we are obliged to encounter on the usual hypothesis: for, according to this, there were four high priests, Eliashib, Joiada, Johanan or Jonathan, and Jaddua, during the thirteen years between the first and second arrival of Nehemiah, B. C. 444 to 431; while, through the whole period of one hundred and twelve years from Cyrus to Nehemiah, B. C. 536 to 444, there were only three, viz. Jeshua, Jehoiakim, and Eliashib. Thus the received opinion gives rise to a second difficulty, without removing the first[2].

But that the second arrival of Nehemiah at Jerusalem and his last reformation, could not have taken place in one year after his return to Artaxerxes, as is generally supposed, is evident from the narrative itself. For in the short space of one year, how could so many great abuses have crept in as Nehemiah found it necessary to correct; the gross profanation of the temple, the open violation of the Sabbath, the unjust withholding of the tithes, in consequence of which the priests were forced to neglect their

[2] Neh. xii. 10, 11.

official duties and to accept defective offerings in order to obtain subsistence? Should the phrase קֵץ הַיָּמִים which Nehemiah employs to express the time of his return, be appealed to; I trust it will be granted, that יָמִים does not always mean exactly one year, but is frequently used for an indefinite period comprehending several years. That the latter is the meaning of the phrase in this place is manifest; for though we may suppose it possible for marriages to be contracted with foreign women, and for them to become mothers within the space of one year, yet their children could hardly learn so soon to speak a jargon made up of the Jewish and heathen tongues, much less have beards for Nehemiah to pull ([3] וָאֲמָרְטֵם). On the contrary, all this is easily explicable, on the supposition that Nehemiah remained in Persia twenty-four years. It is surprising that these circumstances should have escaped the notice of all the commentators.

It is expressly stated, Neh. xiii. 28, that this last reformation took place under Joiada the high priest, for in the words "one of the sons of Joiada, the son of Eliashib, the high priest," the title "high priest" belongs not to the word Eliashib, immediately preceding, but to Joiada. Every tyro in the oriental languages knows, that "—— the son of ——" with the preceding and succeeding names, compose but one proper noun, and that the following name of office belongs to the son and not to the father. But that Eliashib was dead before the second arrival of Nehemiah at Jerusalem, seems evident from the manner in which he is spoken of, Neh. xiii. 4, 5. 7. From the tone of the narrative we should naturally be led to suppose that the subjects of it were no longer living. The Alexandrian Chronicle places the death of Eliashib and the first year of his successor Joiada, in the eleventh year of Darius Nothus, B. C. 412. Consequently, according to this Chronicle, the second return of Nehemiah must have taken place after this year.

[3] Neh. xiii. 23—25.

The book of Malachi has reference to the circumstances of these times. Tradition places this prophet in the last administration of Nehemiah; and the detention of the tithes, defective offerings and heathen marriages, first became general about this period. The severe censures which Malachi passes on the marriage of priests with foreign women, are perhaps aimed directly at Manasseh, the son of Joiada. The deplorable condition of which the Jews complained, as related in the book of Nehemiah, was occasioned principally by the Persian expeditions to Egypt, whose route lay through Judæa, and consequently subjected that country to a share in the evils of war. Amid the confusion of war the institutions of the Hebrews might easily be shaken and corrupted by abuses, and the circumstances of the nation be depressed. It has already been remarked that Edom was laid waste at this period[4].

NOTE. The Alexandrian Chronicle, to which we shall have occasion frequently to refer, was first found in a library in Sicily. It was used at Rome by Sigonius and Onuphrius, and is quoted by them under the title of "Fasti Siculi." Sylburg obtained another manuscript of it, which he gave to Hœschelius, who presented it to the library at Augsburg. Here it was published in 1624, with a Latin translation, by Rhoderus the Jesuit. Because the manuscript contained a preface by an Alexandrian patriarch, the work was entitled "Chronicon Alexandrinum." Prideaux, Connexions, vol. II. book iii. p. 145. note aa.

§. 64. SAMARITAN TEMPLE ON MOUNT GERIZIM.

ON the supposition that Nehemiah returned to Judæa in the latter part of the reign of Darius Nothus, it is easy to see what gave occasion to the mistake of Josephus, who assigns Sanballat, the chief of the Samaritans, contemporary with Nehemiah, to the reign of Darius Codomanus;

[4] Sect. 62. Malachi, i. 2—5.

and makes Manasseh, the son of Joiada and son-in-law of Sanballat, the son of the high priest Jaddua. Misled by the similarity of the names, he confounded Darius Nothus with Darius Codomanus; and this is not at all surprising, for Josephus in his Antiquities treats of this period very negligently, and has fallen into numerous errors. The more modern Jews were very ignorant of the later periods of Persian history. If we correct this oversight of Josephus, it will be no longer necessary to maintain the very improbable assumption, that there were two chiefs of the Samaritans of the name of Sanballat, separated from each other by a century (B. C. 431 and 331), each of whom had a daughter married to a fugitive son of the Jewish high priest. There was but one Sanballat chief of the Samaritans, whose daughter was married to a son of the high priest Joiada, and that about the year B. C. 408[1].

That important historical fact, therefore, which Josephus has placed in the reign of Darius Codomanus, properly belongs to the last years of Darius Nothus. It was from this last-mentioned monarch that Sanballat obtained permission to build a temple for the Samaritans on mount Gerizim. This chief had distinguished himself, perhaps, by his alacrity in furnishing with provisions the army destined for Egypt; and having thus ingratiated himself with the king, his request was the more readily granted. In this temple Manasseh the son of the high priest Joiada, whom Nehemiah had expelled from Judæa on account of his connection with the daughter of Sanballat, was appointed high priest[2]. Afterwards, according to the testimony of Josephus, those Jews who in their own country had been guilty of criminal offences, or who from any cause became dissatisfied, took refuge in Samaria. By means of these emigrants the Samaritans were recalled from idolatry, and brought to worship Jehovah alone. But this circumstance, far from allaying the

[1] Josephus, Antiq. XI. viii. 2. Neh. xiii. 28.

[2] Neh. xiii. 28. Josephus, Antiq. XI. viii. 2. 4.

enmity between the two nations, tended rather to increase it, at least on the part of the Jews, to whom this temple, built after the year B. C. 408, and the reception of fugitive Jews, was a constant source of provocation.

In this manner everything falls naturally and without violence into its proper order of time, and the succession of the high priests, Neh. xii. 10, 11, is completely reconciled with history. For though this table was evidently completed by a later hand, this circumstance alone, without other reasons, cannot prove it incorrect. And no such other proof of its incorrectness now remains; for if Joiada entered on the priesthood B. C. 412, there are for the eighty years which intervene between this period and the time of Alexander, three high priests, viz. Joiada, Jonathan or Johanan (John) and Jaddua; and it is known that Jaddua was very aged when Alexander visited Jerusalem. It is accordingly no longer necessary to assume, without evidence, that there were two high priests of the name of Jaddua, one at the time of Nehemiah, and a second in the days of Alexander.

§. 65. ARTAXERXES MNEMON.

ARTAXERXES the second, surnamed Mnemon, also called Arsaces, ascended the throne on the death of his father, notwithstanding the exertions of his mother Parysatis to secure the succession to her younger son Cyrus. Though at the commencement of his reign he permitted his queen Statira to be guilty of an act of the most horrid cruelty, and generally yielded too far to the wickedness of his mother, he was on the whole a just and magnanimous prince. He pardoned his brother Cyrus, who, on the information of Tissaphernes, was detected in an attempt to assassinate him at his coronation, and even reinstated him in his government of Asia Minor[1]. But Cyrus was

[1] Ctesias, Persic. lvii. Plutarch, Artax. iii. xiv. xxiii. Xenophon, Anab. I. i. 3. Justin, v. 11.

so little affected by his brother's generosity, that he now determined on accomplishing his object by open rebellion. Under pretence of making war upon Thrace, and afterwards upon Tissaphernes, he levied a powerful army, and was powerfully supported by the Lacedæmonians, whom he had assisted with money in he Peloponnesian war. Clearchus, a Lacedæmonian general, joined his forces, already consisting of one hundred thousand men of various nations, with a body of thirteen thousand Greeks. With these forces Cyrus marched to Babylonia, B. C. 401, the same year in which Socrates was put to death. Artaxerxes, who had been seasonably informed of the revolt by Tissaphernes, came against him with an army of nine hundred thousand men. They engaged in a bloody battle at the village of Cunaxa, which was situated about thirty English miles south of Babylon, between the Tigris and Euphrates. The thirteen thousand Greeks had already half gained the victory, when Cyrus, pressing on too zealously against his brother, whom he wounded, was himself slain by the royal guards. This expedition, and particularly the astonishing retreat of the ten thousand surviving Greeks by a route of more than eighteen hundred English miles, have been described by Xenophon, the eyewitness and director of that achievement[2].

Before the ten thousand Greeks had returned in the year B. C. 400, a new war broke out between the Lacedæmonians and Artaxerxes. For when Tissaphernes, who succeeded Cyrus in the government of Asia Minor, demanded the submission of the Ionian states, they sought aid of the Lacedæmonians. These readily acceded to their request, and were at first so successful against the governor Pharnabazus, who was not sufficiently supported by Tissaphernes, that Agesilaus their commander conceived the design of destroying the Persian empire. But

[2] Xenophon, Hellen. III. i. 1, where reference is made to Themistogenes of Syracuse in Κύρου Ἀνάβασις. compare Diod. Sic. xiv. 11. Ctesias, Persic. lvii—lix. Corn. Nepos, Alcibiades, ix. Plutarch, Artaxerxes, iv—xiv. Justin, v. 11. Parian Marbles, Ep. 68.

when the Athenians and other Greeks, excited by Persian gold, B. C. 394, declared war against the Lacedæmonians, their pretensions were somewhat abated. Artaxerxes finally, B. C. 387, made peace on his own terms, and the whole of Asia Minor submitted to the Persian yoke[3].

During this war the Athenians had afforded aid to Evagoras, B. C. 390, who had brought the island of Cyprus under his power, and renounced his allegiance to the Persian king. This must be considered as an act of treachery on the part of the Athenians, for they were at that time in alliance with Artaxerxes. But this difficulty also was settled by the same treaty, and Cyprus was reannexed to the Persian dominion[6].

Artaxerxes now had the guardianship (so to speak) of all Greece. He often sent ambassadors thither, and, under colour of advice or admonition, laid his commands on all the states. The Greeks also in their turn sent frequent embassies to Persia to obtain the assistance, or rather the gracious protection, of the Persian monarch; though their ambassadors were still so proud as to refuse to yield the oriental homage in the royal presence. Even the Theban war, which had continued fifteen years, was concluded in the year B. C. 363 by the intervention of Artaxerxes[5].

Artaxerxes was not equally successful in his other wars. The expedition which he undertook in person, B. C. 384, against the Cadusians between the Black and Caspian seas, cost him many men. His provisions failing him while among the mountains of that region, his whole army would have perished by famine had he not at last obtained peace by stratagem[6].

[3] Xenophon, Hellen. III. i. 2—4. 7, 8. v. 1—18. IV. ii. 1—3. 6—14. iii. 1—8. 39. V. i. 22. 26—33. Plutarch, Agesilaus, vi. ix—xv. xvii—xix. xxiii. and Artaxerxes, xxi. and Lysander, xxiii. Corn. Nepos, Agesilaus ii—vi. and Conon, iii—v. Justin, vi. 1—6. Diod. Sic. xiv. 98, 99. 110. 117.

[4] Xenophon, Hellen. IV. viii. 24. V. i. 10. Diod. Sic. xv. 1—4. 9. 11.

[5] Xenophon, Hellen. VII. v. 27. V. iv. 1. Diod. Sic. xv. 25—89. Plutarch, Pelopidas, xx. xxx. and Artaxerxes, xxii. and Agesilaus, xxvi—xxxv. Corn. Nepos, Pelopidas and Epaminondas.

[6] Plutarch, Artaxerxes, xxiv. Diod. Sic. xv. 8.

Equally unsuccessful was the expedition which he prepared against Egypt, B. C. 377, in order again to subject that country to the Persian power. During the thirty-six years which had passed since Amyrtæus ascended the Egyptian throne, Pausiris, Psammetichus, and Nephereus, had reigned, and the king on whom the present attack was meditated was Achoris. But he died before the attack was made, two entire years having been consumed in preparations. His successor was Psammuthis, who rēigned but one year, and was followed by Nephorites. He continued only four months on the throne, and then Nectanebus assumed the sceptre, which he held twelve years. This king withstood the Persian power by the help of the Greeks, who favoured him with the military services of Chabrias. The Athenians, however, recalled Chabrias at the request of the great king; but Egypt, notwithstanding, still maintained her independence[7]. In the year B. C. 362, Tachus succeeded to the Egyptian throne. He formed magnificent designs, made an alliance with the Lacedæmonians, received from them a large body of auxiliaries under the command of Agesilaus their king, and determined to commence offensive operations against the Persians. He accordingly sent a great army into Phœnicia, with the intention of soon following in person; but before his arrival the soldiers made choice of Nectanebus for their king, and to this election the Lacedæmonians treacherously acceded. Tachus, now deserted by all, was forced to flee for protection to his enemy Artaxerxes, by whom he was hospitably received. An opposing claimant to the throne now appeared with a strong military force against Nectanebus; but the Greek general Agesilaus, ashamed of a second treason, by his management discomfited the rebel[8]. The Idumeans were again

[7] Eusebius, Chron. Syncell. p. 257. Diod. Sic. xv. 29. 41—44. C. Nepos, Iphicrates, ii. and Chabrias, ii. iii.

[8] Diod. Sic. xv. 90—92. Plutarch, Agesilaus, xxxvi—xxxix.

subjected to great sufferings by their participation in these wars [9].

Artaxerxes, the year before his death, named as his successor Darius his eldest son by the queen; but he being soon after detected in a design against his father's life, because he had refused to give him one of his own concubines, was executed. Ariaspes the second son of the queen, driven to despair by the false representations of his younger brother Ochus, the queen's third son, destroyed himself by poison. Ochus also procured the death of Orsanes, a favourite son of Artaxerxes by a concubine. The remaining one hundred and fourteen sons of the royal concubines (among whom were two of the king's own daughters) kept themselves quiet; but the afflicted monarch died of grief. Ochus kept this event secret for ten months, and having during this period made all the necessary arrangements, he promulgated at the same time his father's death and his own accession to the throne, B. C. 358. He assumed the name of Artaxerxes, but he is known in history by his true name Ochus [10].

§. 66. THE HEBREWS UNDER ARTAXERXES MNEMON.

THE Hebrews enjoyed peace during the greater part of the forty-six years' reign of Artaxerxes Mnemon, B. C. 404 to 358. They were exposed to the burthens of a military rendezvous from B. C. 377 to 374, for at that period there were assembled in their vicinity two hundred thousand barbarian soldiers, besides twenty thousand Greeks; and three hundred ships of war, two hundred galleys of thirty rowers, and a great number of store ships were collected at Acco. The invading army of Persia, both in advancing upon Egypt and on their return, took the route along their coasts. The landing of the Egyptian

[9] Mal. i. 4.

[10] Plutarch, Artaxerxes, xxvi—xxx. Diod. Sic. xv. 93.

army of Nectanebus at Acco, B. C. 362, at which time the inhabitants of that region revolted from Artaxerxes, was but a transient storm; for, as soon as the Egyptians had made choice of Tachus for their king, they returned to their own country, and the rebellious Phœnicians again submitted to the Persian monarch[1].

The high priest Joiada died eleven years before these disturbances, in the thirty-second year of Artaxerxes, and was succeeded by his son Jonathan or Johanan (John). About the time of the Egyptian invasion, this priest occasioned great trouble to his nation. His brother Jesus had become such a favourite with Bagoses, the Persian general who commanded the military forces in that quarter, as to have been nominated by him to the priesthood. When he came to Jerusalem in this capacity, Jonathan rashly murdered him in the temple. Bagoses, hearing of this outrage, hastened to Jerusalem; and when an attempt was made to exclude him from the temple as a Gentile, and consequently unclean, he pressed into the sanctuary, indignantly exclaiming, "What! am not I as pure as the dead carcass which lies in your temple? The Jews were very much pained by this profanation of their holy place; but Bagoses, as a punishment for the sacrilegious murder of Jesus, required for every animal offered in sacrifice a tribute of fifty drachms, which was rigorously exacted during the seven years that he remained in that country. Reckoning only the usual daily and festive offerings, the paschal lamb, and the sacrifices connected with it, this tax would amount to a sum of not less than fifty thousand pounds annually. This must have been the more sensibly felt, as the priests had for many years been accustomed to receive large contributions from the Persian monarchs towards defraying the expense of their sacrifices[2].

[1] Diod. Sic. xv. 41—43. 90—94.

[2] Neh. xii. 11. 22. Josephus, Antiq. XI. vii. 1.

§. 67. DARIUS OCHUS.

However careful Ochus had been to secure the crown to himself after his father's death, immediately on his accession to the throne he made shocking havoc among his relatives and all the nobles whom he suspected, filling his palace with blood, "scilicet, (as Justin remarks) ne innocentior fratribus parricidis videretur." In the war which he undertook against the Cadusians, Codomanus, who was of the royal race by a concubine, honourably distinguished himself in a successful single combat with a Cadusian champion. As a reward for his valour, he was proclaimed by an *astanda* (a royal courier, or rather, perhaps, president of the couriers), governor of Armenia. This prepared the way for his future elevation to the throne of Persia[1].

In the third year of Ochus, the first of the one hundred and sixth Olympiad, three hundred and eighty-five after the building of Rome, B. C. 356, Alexander, the future destroyer of the Persian empire, was born at Pella in Macedonia, and on the same day in which Erostratus, in order to acquire an imperishable name, set fire to the celebrated temple of Diana at Ephesus[2].

In the years B. C. 354 and 353, the armies of Ochus were defeated by Artabazus governor of Asia Minor, who had revolted from his royal master. He was at first upheld in his rebellion by the Athenians; and when they were deterred by the threats of Ochus from granting him any farther assistance, he received ai l from the Thebans. Notwithstanding this, however, Artabazus was at last overcome and compelled to flee to Macedonia; but after three years he was again received into favour by the king[3].

[1] Justin, x. 3.

[2] Solinus Polyhist. xl. 4. Plutarch, Alexander, iii. Justin, xii. 16. Arrian, de Reb. Alex. vii. 28. Aul. Gellius, Noct. Att. ii. 6.

[3] Diod. Sic. xvi. 22 34. 92.

The Phœnicians, in consequence of the oppressions of the Persian officers, followed this example of revolt, B. C. 351. They formed an alliance with Nectanebus, who had succeeded Tachus on the throne of Egypt; and this monarch, being then threatened with war by Ochus, gladly embraced an opportunity to employ the Phœnicians as a barrier against him. He accordingly sent four thousand Greeks to their aid. They were then able to defeat the royal army, which was sent against them from Syria and Cilicia. The success of this revolt encouraged the inhabitants of Cyprus to renounce their allegiance to Persia. But when Ochus marched to Phœnicia in person, at the head of three hundred thousand infantry and thirty thousand cavalry, Zidon was betrayed into his hands by Mentor, the commander of the Greek auxiliaries from Egypt, and Tennes the viceroy of the city. The Zidonians, as soon as they discovered the treachery, shut themselves up in their houses, and, setting fire to them, destroyed themselves and all their treasures. The other Phœnicians now surrendered on the best terms they could obtain; and Ochus, being anxious to invade Egypt, was not unreasonable in his demands. The Cypriots followed their example and surrendered by capitulation[4].

After Ochus had drawn into his service ten thousand Greeks, he marched with his army along the coast towards Egypt, while the fleet sailed in company near the shore. It is said that he lost many men in lake Serbonis, which, being then covered with loose sand blown from the deserts, his inexperienced soldiers mistook for solid ground. Notwithstanding this his army was still powerful enough for the conquest of Egypt, which the imprudence of Nectanebus rendered an easy achievement. After the Persian fleet had come to anchor, and the troops, having disembarked, had defeated the Egyptian army which was hastening to oppose them, Nectanebus, who had a force of one hundred thousand men, withdrew all the soldiers from the defiles which he had well garri-

[4] Diod. Sic. xvi. 40—45.

soned, hastened to Memphis, and in this manner laid open the whole country to the invading army. The capitulation of Pelusium was the immediate consequence of these ill-judged measures. The Persians now advanced unobstructed into the interior, and Nectanebus was forced to make his escape into Æthiopia. Thus Egypt again fell under the dominion of Persia, after an independence of sixty-four years. Ochus plundered and destroyed the principal cities and temples, slew the ox Apis, and with his flesh provided a feast for the priests who had worshipped him as their god. He took away all the manuscripts from the archives, and carried them with an immense booty to Babylon[5]. From that period to the present day Egypt has remained subject to the dominion of foreigners, and no individual of the race of the ancient Egyptians has ever attained to the throne. So exactly has the prophecy of Ezekiel been accomplished[6].

After this successful campaign Ochus gave himself up to indolence and luxury, leaving the administration of affairs to his eunuch Bagoas and his general Mentor, from both of whom he had received important services in the Egyptian war. But Bagoas, himself an Egyptian, could never forgive the severities which the king had practised on his native country. Accordingly, B. C. 338, he procured his master's death by poison, and in a horrid manner vented his rage upon his lifeless body. He then collected and sent back, as far as he was able, the manuscripts which Ochus had taken from Egypt. The removal of these documents may, in part at least, account for the fact, that neither Manetho nor Eratosthenes, who had free access to the archives of Egypt, were able to collect from them a complete and accurate history of the country[7].

[5] Diod. Sic. xvi. 46. compare i. 30. xvi. 47—52. Sev. Sulpicius, ii. Ælian, Var. Hist. iv. 8. vi. 8. Suidas in Ὦχος.

[6] Ezek. xxix. 13—16.

[7] Diod. Sic. xvi. 5. Ælian, Var. Hist. vi. 8.

§. 68. THE HEBREWS UNDER OCHUS.

It appears that some of the Jews took part in the Phœnician rebellion, B. C. 351; for Ochus went from Phœnicia to Jericho, subdued the city, took several of the inhabitants with him to Egypt, and sent others into Hyrcania to people that province. Still the nation at large evidently remained faithful to the Persian power, for Jerusalem was not disturbed. Jonathan, the murderer of his brother Jesus, retained the high priesthood. He died in the eighteenth year of Ochus, B. C. 340, and was succeeded by Jaddua[1].

Among the Greeks, Plato flourished during the reigns of Artaxerxes Mnemon and Ochus, and died in the eleventh year of the latter, B. C. 348. Aristotle, his most celebrated disciple, disappointed that Speusippus instead of himself succeeded to the office of his master, withdrew to Mysia, where he married a relative of the king of Atarnea. Clearchus, one of the most distinguished disciples of Aristotle, relates in his book concerning sleep (as quoted by Josephus), that during the three years' residence of his master with this petty monarch, he became acquainted with a learned Jew, who had been conversant with many philosophers, and communicated to them more knowledge than they were able to impart to him[2]. When the king of Atarnea was made prisoner by Mentor the general of Ochus, Aristotle fled to Mytilene. He afterwards went to Macedonia, where for eight years he was the instructor of Alexander, the future conqueror of the world.

[1] Alexand. Chron. Syncell. p. 156. Eusebius, Chron. Josephus, Antiq. XI. vii. 2. and against Apion, ii. Compare Justin. xxxv. 3. 8. Solinus Polyhist. xxxv. 4.

[2] Josephus against Apion, 1. 22.

§. 69. ARSES. DARIUS CODOMANUS.

AFTER Bagoas had removed Ochus out of the way (B. C. 338), that he might retain the direction of affairs in his own hands, he put to death all the elder sons of the king, and placed Arses, the youngest, upon the throne. But as it soon appeared that the young king was determined not to leave unpunished the murderer of his father and brothers, Bagoas anticipated him, and, in the second or third year of his reign, destroyed him and all his family. The old regicide then presented the sceptre to Darius Codomanus, governor of Armenia, who was a descendant of Darius Nothus, and had acquired great reputation in the Cadusian war. But Bagoas soon repented his choice and plotted the death of this king also; but Codomanus having discovered his design, forced the wretch to swallow the poison himself which he had prepared for him[1].

During the exhibition of these murderous scenes at the Persian court, preparations had commenced in Greece for the overthrow of the Persian monarchy. Philip king of Macedonia, after his victory over the Athenians and Thebans at the battle of Cheronæa, under the specious cloak of friendship, made himself master of all Greece. He convened at Corinth a general assembly of all the states. A war against Persia was determined upon, to avenge, as Philip pretended, the sacrilege which the Persians, particularly in the time of Xerxes, had committed against the Grecian temples. To conduct this war, Philip procured for himself the appointment of general of all the Greeks, with unlimited powers. He immediately ordered every city to furnish a certain quota of soldiers. The following year, B. C. 336, he sent his generals, Parmenio, Amyntas, and Attalus, to Asia Minor with a part of the army, to commence hostilities, promising soon to

[1] Diod. Sic. xvii. 5. Justin, x. 3.

follow in person. But, a short time after, he was assassinated at the nuptial feast of his daughter, and the enterprise was for a while suspended[2].

Alexander the son of Philip, and his successor on the Macedonian throne, in a new assembly of all the Grecian states at Corinth, procured for himself the same powers in respect to Greece which his father had enjoyed, and was consequently acknowledged the absolute commander of all the Greeks in the Persian war. While he was engaged in war with the Illyrians and the Triballi, several of the Grecian states refused compliance with the resolution of the general assembly at Corinth; but when he returned with his victorious army, his authority was immediately acknowledged by all the governments except that of Thebes. After a short siege, in which the Thebans defended themselves with great bravery, he took possession of the city and utterly demolished it, as a warning to all the rest[3].

[2] Diod. Sic. xvi. 89. 91. 93. Justin, ix. 3. 5, 6. Plutarch, Demosthenes, xiii—xx. and Phocian xii—xix.

[3] Diod. Sic. xvii. 1—4. 8—16. Justin, i. 1—5. Arrian, de Reb. Alex. i. 1—11. Plutarch, Alexander, xi—xiv.

BOOK VIII.

HISTORY OF ALEXANDER AND HIS IMMEDIATE SUCCESSORS.

§. 70. FIRST VICTORIES OF ALEXANDER.

IN the spring of the year B. C. 334, the second year of the reign of Darius Codomanus, Alexander crossed the Hellespont with only thirty or forty thousand infantry and five thousand cavalry, and provided with but seventy talents of money. On the fifth day after the passage of the Hellespont, he defeated a Persian army of five times his number at the river Granicus, and by this means gained possession of the Persian treasury at Sardis. Several provinces of Asia Minor then voluntarily surrendered to the conqueror, and others were subjected in the course of the summer. In the next campaign, B. C. 333, he subdued Phrygia, Paphlagonia, Pisidia, Cappadocia, and Cilicia[1].

Darius, meanwhile, was not remiss in making preparations for a vigorous resistance. His admiral, whom he had sent with a fleet to make an incursion upon Macedonia, fortunately for Alexander, died in the midst of the enterprise. This design being thus rendered abortive, Darius assembled in Babylonia an army of four hundred thousand or six hundred thousand men, and marched towards Cilicia to meet his enemy. Alexander, as soon as he heard of this movement, hastened forward to seize

[1] Arrian, de Reb. Alex. i. 12—29. ii. 1—5. Plutarch, Alexander, xv—xviii. Curtius, de Exped. Alex. i. 1—9. Diod. Sic. xvii. 17—28.

the passes of Cilicia. In this he succeeded, and stationed himself at Issus, in a situation where not more than thirty thousand men could march up to an attack. By this position, he was able to protect his flanks, and at the same time bring his whole army into action, while scarcely a twentieth part of his enemy's forces could engage in the conflict. The Persians lost the battle; and their numbers were not only useless, but so obstructed the retreat that more were crushed to death in the eagerness of the flight, than had been slain by the weapons of the Greeks. It was with great difficulty that Darius himself escaped. He was obliged to leave his whole camp, and even his own rich baggage, a prey to the victors. Of the Persian army a hundred thousand men lay dead on the field[2].

All Syria now submitted. Even Damascus the capital, where the harem and the treasures of the king and his generals were kept, was surrendered to the conqueror by the Persian commandant. At Zidon, which had voluntarily surrendered, Alexander made Abdolonymus his viceroy, after having in vain solicited others to accept the office[3].

The Tyrians, to manifest their respect for the irresistible conqueror, sent him a golden crown, and thought they managed very adroitly to prevent his entrance into their city, where he wished to offer sacrifice in the temple of Hercules, by replying that the ancient and true temple of Hercules was at old Tyre on the continent. Tyre, which, since the destruction of the ancient city by Nebuchadnezzar, had been rebuilt upon an island about four hundred fathoms from the shore, relied on the aid of Carthage, which was promised by the Carthaginian ambassadors then present in the city, and still more, on its situation in the sea, Alexander being destitute of shipping, and on its strong walls. These were a hundred and fifty feet in

[2] Arrian, ii. 6—14. Curtius, iii. 11. 14—24. Diod. Sic. xvii. 29—31. Justin, xi. 9. Plutarch, Alexander, xix—xxiii.

[3] Curtius, iii. 25. iv. 1, 2. compare Zech. ix 1, 2.

height, and the citizens now constructed an inner wall at about five cubits distance from them, and filled up the intermediate space with rubbish. The city was plentifully supplied with provisions, and fresh supplies could at any time be brought in by sea, without the least difficulty[4].

But Alexander, with the rubbish of the ancient city, constructed a causeway from the shore to new Tyre, and in seven months took the city by storm, although the Tyrians had not only defended themselves with great bravery, but, being warned by a dream, had fastened to the altar of Hercules with golden chains the colossal statue of Apollo, that it might not desert to Alexander. Many of the inhabitants fled to Carthage by sea, but of those who remained, eight thousand were put to the sword, thirteen thousand were sold into slavery, and two thousand were crucified. The city was plundered and laid in ashes, and new colonists were settled among its ruins[5]. Thus the prophecy of Zechariah respecting new Tyre was literally accomplished, as the previous prophecy of Ezekiel against the old city had been fulfilled in the time of Nebuchadnezzar[6].

From Tyre Alexander proceeded along the coast to Gaza. Respecting the fate of the other cities on this route history is silent, but Gaza was captured after a siege of two months. Alexander, who had been wounded during the siege, was greatly irritated by the courageous defence of the city. He put ten thousand of the citizens to death, and sold the rest, with the women and children, for slaves. He bound Betis, the valiant commander of the city, to a chariot, with thongs thrust through the soles of his feet, and in this manner dragged him with horses round the city[7]. By so base an act of cruelty, this Greek, the

[4] Arrian, ii. 16. Diod. Sic. xvii. 40—43. Curtius, iv. v. compare Zech. ix. 3.

[5] Diod. Sic. xvii. 32—47. Arrian. ii. 17—24. Justin, XI. ix. 10. Curtius, iv. 6—15. Plutarch, Alexander, xxiv. xxv. Josephus, Antiq. XI. viii. 3.

[6] Zech. ix. 4—8. Ezek. xxvi—xxviii.

[7] Zech. ix. 5.

disciple of Aristotle, the diligent reader of Homer, boasted that he imitated Achilles, from whom, he would have it, he was himself descended. Yet Achilles, in an age far more barbarous, drew only the dead body of Hector round Troy, while Alexander abused, in this shocking manner, a brave officer, wounded and still living, whose fidelity to his king was his only crime[8].

§. 71. ALEXANDER AT JERUSALEM.

THAT Alexander, when he invaded Syria, summoned all the cities in that region to surrender, to pay to him their usual tribute, and to furnish his army with provisions, is in itself very probable. Josephus testifies that, during the siege of Tyre, a written order of this kind came to Jerusalem, directed by Alexander to the high priest Jaddua, as the chief magistrate of the nation. Jaddua returned answer, that he had sworn fealty to Darius, and could not violate his oath so long as that prince was living. Alexander, naturally of a furious and impetuous temper, was highly irritated by this reply, and threatened that as soon as he had completed the conquest of Tyre, he would, by the punishment of the Jewish high priest, teach all others to whom they must keep their oaths[1].

After the reduction of Gaza, B. C. 332, Alexander proceeded towards Jerusalem. Jaddua and all the citizens were thrown into the greatest consternation; they offered many sacrifices and earnestly entreated God for deliverance. Josephus farther relates, that God then appeared to the high priest in a dream, bade him be of good courage, to adorn the city in the most magnificent manner he was able, and to go out fearlessly and meet the conqueror, arrayed in his official robes, attended by the other priests in their sacerdotal garments, and by the

[8] Curtius, iv. 17—19. Arrian, ii. 27, 28. Plutarch, Alexander, xxv. Diod. Sic. xviii. 49.

[1] Josephus, Antiq. XI. viii. 3.

citizens clothed in white. Everything was done according to these directions. The solemn procession advanced as far as the hill Sapha, which overlooks Jerusalem and commands an extensive prospect of the country. As Alexander approached and saw Jaddua in the robes of his office, he went forward alone towards the high priest, adored the name of God which was engraved on the golden frontal plate of his turban, and then saluted Jaddua. Immediately the priests and citizens surrounded the king and welcomed him with joyful acclamations. All the Greeks were astonished at the conduct of Alexander, and Parmenio asked him how it happened that he, to whom all others did homage, should now himself do homage to the high priest of the Jews. Alexander replied: "I did not adore the man, but that God who hath honoured him with the priesthood: for I saw this very person in a dream, and clothed in this same habit, when I was at Dios in Macedonia. I was considering with myself how I might obtain the dominion of Asia, and this man exhorted me to make no delay, but boldly to pass over the sea thither, for that he would conduct my army, and would give me the dominion over the Persians. Whence it is, that having seen no other in that habit, and now seeing this person in it, and remembering that vision and the exhortation I had in my dream, I believe that I have undertaken this campaign by divine direction, that I shall conquer Darius, annihilate the dominion of the Persians, and successfully accomplish my whole design." Alexander then gave his hand to the high priest, attended him into the city, went to the temple, and there offered sacrifices in the manner which the priests directed. When they afterwards showed him the prophecies of Daniel respecting himself[2], he was highly gratified, and readily granted the request of the high priest, that the Jews might be free from tribute on the sabbatical year, and everywhere have liberty to live according to their own

[2] Dan. vii. 6. viii. 1—7. 21. xi. 3. compare Zech. ix. 1—8.

laws. Of his own accord he promised the same indulgence to those Jews who would join his army, upon which many entered the service. Hecatæus also, as quoted by Josephus, testifies that there were Jews among the soldiers of Alexander[3].

The Samaritans, who had previously submitted to Alexander and sent him auxiliaries to the siege of Tyre, now met him in solemn procession not far from Jerusalem; and as they were graciously received, they also requested exemption from tribute on the sabbatical year, since they, as well as the Jews, then left their lands uncultivated. But as they could not give a direct affirmative to the inquiry whether they were Jews, Alexander replied that he would take farther time to consider their request, and make known his determination when he returned from Egypt. It was the part of prudence for him to keep his liberality within proper limits, for he had reason to fear that many others would come, and, under like pretences, demand a similar privilege. The eight thousand Samaritans who had assisted him in the siege of Tyre, he took with him to Egypt, and assigned them lands in Thebais or Upper Egypt[4].

During Alexander's absence in Egypt, some Samaritans, perhaps enraged that they had not obtained the same privileges as the Jews, set fire to the house of Andromachus, whom Alexander had appointed their governor, and he perished in the flames. The other Samaritans delivered up the offenders to Alexander when he returned from Egypt, but they could hardly dare at that time to repeat their request, as the enraged monarch, not satisfied with the punishment of the guilty, expelled the Samaritans from their city, and transferred thither a Macedonian colony. This event is related by Curtius[5]. The Samaritans, now excluded from Samaria, made She-

[3] Hecatæus in Josephus against Apion, ii. 4.
[4] Josephus, Antiq. XI. viii. 4—6.
[5] Curtius, iv. 21. compare Eusebius, Chron.

chem their metropolis, at the foot of mount Gerizim, on which their temple stood. Josephus says that Shechem was their capital, but inadvertently places this circumstance in the preceding year, while they were still in possession of Samaria. Hecatæus, as quoted by Josephus, adds that Alexander gave the Samaritan territory to the Jews, which may certainly be correct, if we understand by this phrase only the tract of country on the coast as far as mount Carmel. That the more modern Jews did actually reckon this as a part of Judæa, I have shown in another place[6].

This favour of Alexander to the Jews, which is frequently referred to by the Talmudists, particularly in Tractat. Taanith, is mentioned by no author but Josephus. Justin only says in general: 'Tunc Syriam proficiscitur; ibi obvios cum infulis multos orientis reges habet. Ex his pro meritis singulorum alios in societatem recepit, aliis regnum ademit[7].' These 'obvii cum infulis multi orientis reges,' include the high priests of the Jews and Samaritans, who, as the chief magistrates of their people, are called kings, in the same manner as other rulers, by an historian who would not stop to inquire whether they really had the regal title, and mentions nothing respecting them but their splendid turbans (infulas). Though the meeting of Alexander with the Jewish high priest is passed over by historians, as too trifling to be mentioned in comparison with so many other greater events, yet the whole narration of Josephus well corresponds with the impetuosity of temper, and superstitious trust in oracles, for which Alexander was remarkable, as his biographers have shown by many examples, and so far bears every internal mark of probability. It is not necessary to maintain that Alexander and the high priest really had those dreams which are mentioned, though to one who takes into consideration the circumstances of that age, this will not appear at all incredible. But that the Jews, who had such good reasons for wishing to gain the favour of Alex-

[6] Jahn, Biblische Archæologie, Th. i. s. 179. [7] Justin, xi. 10.

ander, should show him their prophecies respecting the Grecian conqueror of the Persian empire, is highly probable; and that he should be gratified with them and lend a favourable ear to the high priest's request, will not appear strange, if we reflect that for the sake of an oracle he marched through the desert to the temple of Jupiter Ammon[8]. But let men think of this as they please, the principal thing mentioned, the royal protection of the Jewish religion and the exemption from tribute on the sabbatical year, certainly rests on good evidence. For stories, however exaggerated, have usually some truth at the bottom, and so great and general a privilege must have been recorded in the archives of the nation and indelibly impressed on the memory of the people. It could not easily be feigned and imposed upon them, if they never had enjoyed such a privilege; and it is certain, from the succeeding history, that their religion was protected. If this was the case (and there appears to be no doubt of it), there must have been some cause for it corresponding to the character of Alexander, and such a cause is alleged by Josephus. There is no proof that his narrative is not true, and some allusion to a like occurrence is made by Curtius, Justin, and Hecatæus[9]. If then we do not receive the narrative of Josephus in all its parts, we certainly cannot reject the principal circumstances contained in it.

§. 72. DESTRUCTION OF THE PERSIAN EMPIRE.

From Judæa Alexander proceeded to Egypt, where he was received with joy as a deliverer from the yoke of the Persians, who had become odious to the Egyptians by their abuses of gods and men. The Egyptian nobles went out to meet him as far as Pelusium to tender him their homage, and the Persian officers were forced to

[8] Compare Hess, Geschichte der Regenten von Juda nach dem Exilio. Th. ii. s. 26—37.

[9] See these authors as quoted above.

surrender without striking a blow[1]. Thus Alexander entered Memphis the capital in triumph. From this place he set out on his mad journey through the wilderness to Ammonium, where he was acknowledged by the oracle of Jupiter Ammon as a true son of this god, who, it was said, had cohabited with his mother in the form of a large serpent. On his return, when he arrived at the seacoast opposite the island of Pharos, where there was a good harbour, he ordered a city to be built on the spot and called Alexandria, after his own name. He afterwards, in the course of his extensive conquests, built several cities to which he gave the same name[2].

In the spring of the following year, B. C. 331, Alexander left Egypt, inflicted on the Samaritans the punishment already related, recruited his army at Tyre, and hastily crossed the Euphrates to seek his enemy. After the defeat at Issus, Darius had retired to Babylon; and having in vain made repeated proposals of peace, he collected a new army of one million one hundred thousand men, with which he was now encamped in Assyria, or, to speak more accurately, in Adiabene. Alexander with fifty thousand men crossed the Tigris, and in the open field defeated an army of more than twenty times his own number[3]. This battle, which decided the fate of Asia, occurred just two years after the battle of Issus, and in the same month, October. The action was fought at Gaugamela, but as this was an inconsiderable place, the battle was named from the celebrated city Arbela, though ten miles distant from the field of battle. Alexander was in effect master of Asia, and this year was the commencement of the great Grecian monarchy. He pursued the Persian king as far as Arbela, and took

[1] Arrian, iii. 3. Curtius, iv. 20. Diod. Sic. xvii. 49. Plutarch, Alexander, xxvi.

[2] Curtius, iv. 21. Arrian, iii. 1—5. Diod. Sic. xvii. 49—52. Justin, xi. 11. Strabo, p. 590. Plutarch, Alexander, xxvi. xxvii.

[3] Compare Dan. vii. 6. viii. 5—7. 20, 21. x. 20. xi. 3.

possession of his rich baggage, but Darius made his escape to Media[4].

After giving his army a few days to rest, Alexander proceeded towards Babylon. Both the military commandant and the governor of the place came out to meet him, and gave up the city into his hands, together with the royal treasures which were kept there. In this place, thirty days were spent in feasting, drunkenness, prostitution, and every species of debauchery; for the manners of the city were then exceedingly corrupt. His next march was to Susa, and thence to Persepolis, whither he arrived by the middle of December. Though almost all places surrendered without resistance, the army everywhere spread desolation and ruin around them. In Persia the passes were garrisoned, and Alexander was obliged to take a more circuitous route, which made the distance nearly thirty stadia greater. Persepolis was plundered, and the inhabitants treated with such cruelty that many of them, in despair, put an end to their own lives. The whole place was given up to pillage, because it was the metropolis of the empire from which the armies had been formerly sent against Greece[5].

While in winter quarters, Alexander celebrated his victories with riotous banquets, and caroused as furiously as he had before fought. During these revels many cruelties were perpetrated. At one of the feasts, when the senses of all the Greeks were drowned in intoxication, the licentious conqueror, heated with wine, set fire, with his own hand, to the palace of Persepolis, at the instigation of Thais, the celebrated Athenian courtesan, in order, as she pretended, to revenge the burning of Athens by Xerxes[6].

[4] Strabo, p. 737. Plutarch, Alexander, xxix—xxxiv. Arrian, iii. 6—16. Curtius, iv. 22—38. v. 1, 2. Diod. Sic. xvii. 39. 53—64. Justin, xi. 12—14.

[5] Arrian, iii. 16—18. Curtius, v. 3—11. 13. Diod. Sic. xvii. 64—71. 73. Justin, xii. 5—7. Plutarch, Alexander, xxxv—xxxvii.

[6] Arrian, iii. 18. Curtius, v. 14. Justin, xii. 6, 7. 11. Diod. Sic. xvii. 72. Plutarch, Alexander, xxxviii.

Meanwhile, Darius was endeavouring to strengthen himself in Media; but before he had collected his forces, in the spring of B. C. 330, he was pursued by Alexander. Hearing of this he decamped from Ecbatana and pressed on towards Bactria, with the intention of increasing his army in that country: but fearing that he should be overtaken and attacked by Alexander, he halted with the thirty-four thousand foot and three thousand three hundred horse which he had with him, and awaited the impending battle. At this time the unhappy monarch, to whom fortune was wanting rather than valour, was seized by surprise, loaded with golden fetters, and conveyed to Bactria in a close chariot, by the treachery of Nabarsanes, a Persian nobleman, and Bessus, governor of Bactria and commander of the cavalry. Alexander, who in the mean time had been rapidly pursuing with his cavalry for eight days without intermission, had come as far as Rages; whence, in despair of overtaking his enemy, he returned to Parthia. But as soon as he heard that Darius was kept prisoner by two traitors, he started in pursuit of them with all possible expedition. He was, however, too late; for Nabarsanes and Bessus, hearing of his approach, mortally wounded their unfortunate king and fled. Darius was dead before Alexander arrived. He was moved to tears at the sight of the pale and lifeless body of the king, and sent the corpse to the queen at Susa, that it might be interred according to the Persian custom[7].

Alexander now soon subjugated the Bactrians, Hyrcanians, Mardi, Arii, Dragogians, Drangæ, Arachotæ, and several other tribes in the northern and north-eastern parts of Asia. Having detected a conspiracy which had been formed against him, he ordered the execution not only of Philotas, the author of the conspiracy, but even of Parmenio the father of the traitor, though one of the oldest, most valiant, and most faithful officers in his army.

[7] Arrian, iii. 19—22. Curtius, v. 15—24. Diod. Sic. xvii. 73. Justin, xi. 15. Plutarch, Alexander, xlii. xliii.

In like manner, before his departure from Macedonia, he had put to death all the most influential men, even his own relatives, though entirely innocent, lest they might excite disturbances during his absence[8]. The campaign continued uninterrupted till late in the winter, and the army proceeded as far as Caucasus, on the northern boundaries of India, where Alexander built another Alexandria. He pursued the regicide Bessus (for Nabarsanes had delivered himself up and received pardon), over the Oxus or Gihon, and, having taken him alive, gave him into the hands of Oxatris, the brother of Codomanus, for punishment. The following year, B. C. 329, he brought under his yoke the warlike Sogdiani, Dahæ, Massagetæ, and many other nations[9].

With such unexampled rapidity did Alexander bring the whole Persian empire under his power! In the year B. C. 334, he crossed the Hellespont, and in 329 he had subdued everything from the Hellespont to Sogdiana, and from Egypt to India. Five years will scarcely suffice for a traveller to pass through these extensive regions, and yet during this period Alexander overrun them with his army and conquered them. But he frequently made forced marches to a great distance, and often hurried on his soldiers for a week without giving them a day for repose. With his cavalry he frequently pursued his enemy night and day; and on one occasion he followed Darius eleven days without intermission, through a distance of three hundred and forty English miles[10]. Very appropriate imagery is employed by Daniel to represent this swift ravager[11].

[8] Justin, xi. 5.

[9] Arrian, iii. 23—30. iv. 1—7. 15—22. Curtius, vi. 3. viii. 10. Diod. Sic. xvii. 74—83. Justin, xii. 5. Plutarch, Alexander, xliv—lvii.

[10] Curtius, v. 11. Justin, xi. 8. Plutarch, Alexander, xlii.

[11] Dan. vii. 6. viii. 5. compare xi. 3.

§. 73. ALEXANDER. B. C. 327—323.

DURING these victorious campaigns Alexander had adopted the oriental costume, and given himself up to the polygamy and sensuality, the despotism and luxury, of the degenerate Persians. He carried his folly so far that he determined, in good earnest, to be viewed as the son of Jupiter Ammon, and desired to be worshipped not as a deity simply, but to be added as the thirteenth god, to the twelve *dii majorum gentium*. At a banquet he murdered Clitus with his own hand, because this philosopher represented to him, in terms somewhat too strong, the truth that he was but a man. Because Callisthenes, his most faithful friend, loudly exclaimed against his folly, he unjustly put him to the torture, and, as is generally supposed, to death. Historians indeed represent this affair of the apotheosis, as if his only aim in it was to hold the subjected nations in awe, without considering that this would be the means of rendering him despicable in the eyes of all the followers of Zoroaster, who were very numerous. But, be his object what it might, he did all in his power to confirm the opinion of his divinity. Because it was said that Bacchus and Hercules, the sons of Jupiter, had made expeditions to India, Alexander also, by a like expedition, would prove himself a genuine son of the same god [1].

In setting out on his Indian campaign, Alexander burnt all the superfluous baggage, that his army might not be encumbered by it; and in the years B. C. 327 and 326, he made himself master of all India as far as the river Hyphasis, when his soldiers positively refused to advance any farther. He then built a great number of ships, which he brought into the Indus by the rivers Acesines and Hydaspes. This fleet was sent into the southern

[1] Curtius, iv. 20. v. 14. vi. 1. 11. viii. 3. 11. 12. 15. x. 4. 6. 9. Arrian, iv. 8—22. vii. 29. Justin, xii. 5—7. Diod. Sic. xvii. 54. Ælian, Var. Hist. ii. 19. v. 12. viii. 7. ix. 3. Plutarch, Alexander, lvii.

ocean under the direction of Nearchus, with orders to sail by the Persian gulf into the mouth of the Euphrates. Alexander, meanwhile, conducted his army back along the coasts, through immense deserts of sand, where three-fourths of his men perished by the violence of the heat and the want of water and provisions. Notwithstanding these sufferings of the soldiers, while in Carmania they marched seven days in Bacchanalian procession, that Alexander might in all respects imitate Bacchus. In the year B. C. 325, he reached Susa with a handful of men, and there celebrated nuptial festivals for himself and all his generals. At the close of the festivals, those officers who had rendered themselves odious during his absence by their cruelty and violence, were executed in great numbers [2].

After recruiting his army, Alexander marched from Susa to Ecbatana, where he favoured his soldiers with a season of repose. He then subdued the Cossæi, and, B. C. 324, led his army to Babylon, still full of projects as to what campaigns he would next undertake, what nations he would subdue, what splendid buildings he would erect in different parts of his dominions. Above all, he wished to restore Babylon, which he destined for his capital, to its ancient beauty and magnificence. Labourers were employed to build dikes about the Euphrates to keep the river in its proper channel, but, meeting with insurmountable obstacles, they were obliged to desist. Several others, together with ten thousand soldiers, were constantly occupied in removing the rubbish of the temple of Belus, which had been destroyed by Xerxes [3]. The Jews who were in Alexander's army were ordered among others to engage in this labour, but they steadfastly refused to assist in the erection of an idolatrous temple, and no punishment could overcome their resolu-

[2] Arrian, iv. 22. vii. 6. Curtius, viii. 17. ix. 18. x. 1. Justin, xii. 7—10. Diod. Sic. xvii. 84—108. Plutarch, Alexander, lvii. lviii. lxx.

[3] Arrian, vii. 13—15. 17. 21. Diod. Sic. xvii. 110. 112. Plutarch, Alexander, lxxi—lxxv.

tion. Alexander was accordingly obliged to dismiss them from that work[4]. Thus would Babylon have regained nearly its ancient splendour, had not Alexander shortened his own life by his debaucheries. He died in the spring of B. C. 323. His body was embalmed; and after two years it was conveyed to Egypt with great pomp, where it was interred, first at Memphis and afterwards at Alexandria[5].

§. 74. ARIDÆUS AND ALEXANDER ÆGUS.

On the death of Alexander violent disputes broke out among his generals and principal officers. After eight days they came to an agreement to exclude from the succession Hercules, the son of Alexander by his wife Barsina, and to place on the throne Aridæus, an illegitimate son of king Philip, and a man of no capacity. To him they gave the name of Philip. It was farther agreed, that if the queen Roxana, who was then in the eighth month of her pregnancy, should bear a son, he should share the throne with Philip. The infant of Roxana proved to be a son, and he was called Alexander Ægus. Perdiccas was now appointed guardian and regent to the two kings, who were both incapable of reigning[1].

After some deliberation, Perdiccas distributed the governments among the generals and ministers. Some who had been appointed by Alexander were confirmed in their provinces; among the remainder the division was as follows:

Porus and Taxiles had India.
Sebyrrius, Arachosia and Gedrosia.
Tleopolemus, Carmania.
Peucestes, Persia.

[4] Hecatæus in Josephus against Apion, i. 23.

[5] Curtius, x. 7. 14. Arrian, vii. 25—28. Justin, xii. 14—16. Diod. Sic. xvii. 117, 118. compare xviii. 26—28. Plutarch, Alexander, lxxv. lxxvi.

[1] Curtius, x. 10—13. Justin, xiii. 2—4. Diod. Sic. xviii. 2. Appian, Syriac. lii. 5—25.

Python, Media.
Phrataphernes, Parthia and Hyrcania.
Stanasor, Aria and Drangiana.
Philip, Bactria and Sogdiana.
Arcesilaus, Mesopotamia.
Archon, Babylonia.
Ptolemey Lagus, Egypt.
Laomedon, Syria and Palæstine.
Philotas, Cilicia.
Eumenes, Paphlagonia and Cappadocia.
Antigonus, Pamphylia, Lycia, and Greater Phrygia.
Cassander, Caria.
Meleager, Lydia.
Leonatus, Lesser Phrygia and the country round the Hellespont.
Lysimachus, Thrace.
Antipater, Macedonia.

The important military office of commander of the cavalry, called ἑταῖροι, was assigned to Seleucus, whom we shall see acting a very conspicuous part in the following history [2].

§. 75. WARS OF THE PROVINCIAL GOVERNORS.

THUS the great horn of the swift and strong he-goat of Daniel was broken; in other words, the mighty empire of Alexander, even while in the plenitude of its power, tottered on the brink of destruction. It was impossible that the authority of two such kings, vested in a regent, should repress the powerful and ambitious governors of the provinces. Aridæus was privately put to death, B. C. 316, by Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great; and in the same year, Alexander Ægus was imprisoned with his mother Roxana in the castle of Amphipolis, by Cassander governor of Caria; and in B. C. 310,

[2] Appian, Syriac. lvii. 45. Justin, xiii. 4. Diod. Sic. xviii. 3.

he also was murdered[1]. But even while these unfortunate princes seemed to hold the helm of state, they were but little regarded by the provincial governors. Immediately after the assignment of the provinces, wars broke out, not only between the governors, but also between them and the regent[2]. We shall describe only that which occurred in the regions nearest Palæstine, and whatever else may be necessary in order to preserve the thread of the narration unbroken to the time of the formal dismemberment of the empire.

It was necessary for Eumenes, before he could take possession of Cappadocia his province, to expel the king who was then reigning there. Antigonus governor of Pamphylia, and Leonatus governor of Lesser Phrygia, received orders from Perdiccas to assist Eumenes in this enterprise. But Antigonus disregarded the commands of Perdiccas, and Leonatus having views on Macedonia, intrusted them to Eumenes, in the hope of inducing him to favour his design. But he laid the whole affair open to the regent Perdiccas, who had himself fixed his eye upon that kingdom. Eumenes was therefore established in his government by Perdiccas himself, and then sent to Cleopatra, the sister of Alexander the Great, to solicit her hand for the regent, that he might by this means lay claim to the Macedonian throne. Antigonus, himself desirous of that crown, saw through the plan of Perdiccas, and fleeing to Antipater, pointed out to him the storm which threatened them. Upon this, Antigonus, Antipater, Leonatus, and Ptolemey, combined against Perdiccas, who kept the young kings with him wherever he went, and was at that time, B. C. *322*, in Cappadocia[3].

The next spring Perdiccas, in company with the kings, led a large army through Syria to Egypt, in order to

[1] Dan. viii. 5—8. xi. 3, 4. Justin, xv. 2.

[2] Diod. Sic. xviii—xx. Justin, xiii. 6—xvii. 2.

[3] Plutarch, Eumenes, iii. iv. Corn. Nepos, Eumenes, ii. iii. Justin, xiii. 6. Diod. Sic. xviii. 16. 22, 23. Arrian, Excerpt. Photii. Appian, de Bell. Mithrid. viii. 50—65.

subdue Ptolemey in the first place, while Eumenes was left in Asia Minor to prosecute the war against Antipater and his allies. Eumenes, a brave and prudent officer, defeated Craterus and the auxiliaries which Neoptolemus had sent to Antipater. Antipater himself had moved on to Cilicia to afford aid to Ptolemey. But he proceeded no farther; for the army mutinied against Perdiccas in Egypt, put him to death, and went over to Ptolemey. The soldiers then proclaimed Eumenes an outlaw, and, at the suggestion of Ptolemey, made Aridæus, who had conveyed the body of Alexander to Egypt, and Pithon a general of Perdiccas, who had deserted to Ptolemey before the mutiny, guardians and regents of the two kings. These new regents, however, were compelled by the domineering spirit of Olympias, the mother of Alexander the Great, to resign their office while on their return through Syria, and Antipater undertook the administration of affairs. He made some changes in the governments: he appointed the general of the cavalry, Seleucus, governor of Babylonia; Antigonus was made general of Asia to prosecute the war against the outlawed Eumenes; and to the command of the cavalry he appointed his own son Cassander, who was then with Antigonus. Antipater now returned to Macedonia, his province, accompanied by the two kings[4].

§. 76. THE JEWS UNDER PTOLEMEY.

A PART of the royal army in its expedition from Cappadocia to Egypt under Perdiccas, B. C. 321, and on its return to Asia Minor, passed through Judæa; and consequently the Hebrews were subjected to a share in the burthens of this war. But when the same army, under the command of Antigonus, was employed against Eumenes, B. C. 320, Ptolemey, who had become very

[4] Diod. Sic. xviii. 29—39. Justin, xiii. 8. Appian, Syriac. liii. 30. lvii. 45. Plutarch, Eumenes, v—viii. Corn. Nepos, Eumenes, iv. v.

powerful, and already subjected Cyrene to his yoke, embraced this opportunity to take possession of Judæa, Samaria, Phœnicia, and Cœle-Syria, and these provinces were subjugated by Nicanor his general. The governor Laomedon, who had endeavoured by bribery to withdraw these provinces from Ptolemey, was made prisoner. But he killed the soldiers appointed to guard him, and escaped to Alcetas in Caria[1].

Judæa for a part of the time was the theatre of this short war. But as Laomedon was not able to make any great resistance, the country sustained but little injury, and the inhabitants were richly rewarded for all their sufferings by coming under the dominion of so just and benevolent a prince as Ptolemey. Josephus relates that Ptolemey himself came to Jerusalem for the purpose of sacrificing in the temple, after the example of Alexander, and that on this occasion he declared himself master of the country. In this statement Agatharchides so far coincides, as to say that Ptolemey took possession of Jerusalem without striking a blow, and for this purpose entered the city on the Sabbath, when the Jews, out of conscientious regard to their law, refused to take arms. This author was certainly deceived if he supposed that the Jews, on any day except the Sabbath, could have resisted a power to which Laomedon himself was forced to submit[2].

As Ptolemey did not feel perfectly secure in the possession of these countries, he took a number of the people with him to Egypt. Among these were several of the Samaritans, and many thousand Jews. They certainly had no reason to regard this emigration as a calamity, for many of their countrymen who were left behind, afterwards followed them of their own accord. When Ptolemey heard of the fidelity of the Jews in observance of

[1] Diod. Sic. xviii. 43. Appian, Syriac. lii. 15—23. Pausanias, Attic. I. vi. 4.

[2] Josephus, Antiq. XI. i. 1. and against Apion, i. 22. and Agatharchides as there quoted.

their allegiance to the Persian kings, and even to Darius Codomanus in the midst of his misfortunes, he employed a part of them, on very advantageous terms, to garrison his fortresses; others he sent to Cyrene that he might have some faithful subjects in that newly acquired territory, and to the remainder he assigned a residence in Alexandria, granting them the same civil privileges as Alexander had conferred on the Macedonian inhabitants of that city. For proof of these facts Josephus refers to the letters of Alexander and Ptolemey, which were extant in his time, and to the testimony of Hecatæus. If, however, we contrast the steady fidelity of the Jews to the kings of Persia, with the continual rebellions of the Egyptians, we shall find nothing incredible in this whole narrative of Josephus[3].

§. 77. WAR BETWEEN ANTIGONUS AND EUMENES.

THE regent Antipater died in the following year, and appointed Polysperchon, the senior surviving general of Alexander, as his successor in the regency. Cassander the son of Antipater, irritated to find that Polysperchon had been preferred to himself, resolved to obtain the first office in the empire by force. In these views he was encouraged by Antigonus and Ptolemey, who wished to involve the regent in difficulties, that they might have opportunity to prosecute their own designs undisturbed. It was the intention of Antigonus, who as commander in chief had all Asia Minor in his power, and held under his command an army of seventy thousand men with thirty elephants, to subject the whole empire to his own dominion. It was therefore his first desire to bring the valiant Eumenes to favour his views. He had already besieged him in Nora for a whole year, and he now offered him an honourable capitulation. Terms were agreed upon; but when Eumenes came to confirm the compact by his oath, he

[3] Josephus, *ubi supra*.

added, with the unanimous consent of the besieging army, an article which completely thwarted the purpose of Antigonus. In this manner he effected his own deliverance, without in the least promoting the designs of his antagonist[1].

The regent Polysperchon soon discovered the real intentions of Antigonus, and appointed Eumenes his general for the purpose of resisting him. By this act Antigonus was in effect declared an outlaw. As Eumenes had but few soldiers, he was obliged to retire before his opponent beyond the Taurus; where, during the next year, B. C. 318, he increased his army to more than ten thousand men. His forces, however, were still far too small to hazard a battle with Antigonus, and accordingly, when the latter took possession of Phœnicia, Eumenes retreated beyond the Euphrates. During his winter quarters at Haran or Carræ, he endeavoured to obtain more men from the adjacent provinces; but all the instructions and commissions with which the regent had furnished him in the name of the kings, were insufficient to induce the jealous governors to comply with his requests. He, therefore, in the spring of B. C. 317, withdrew into Babylonia; but Seleucus the governor of that province hearing of his approach, purposely broke down a dike of the Euphrates, and the whole army of fifteen thousand infantry and three thousand horse were very near being destroyed by the consequent inundation. But Eumenes extricated his little army from this danger, and conducted it in safety to Susiana, where, by virtue of his commissions, he obtained twenty-five thousand men from the neighbouring governors[2].

In the following year Antigonus came against him with a strong force, which was increased by Pithon from Media, and Seleucus from Babylonia; and hostilities were again commenced. Through the whole campaign both

[1] Diod. Sic. xviii. 48—53. Corn. Nepos, Eumenes, v. Plutarch, Eumenes, xii. Justin, xiv. 2.

[2] Justin, *ubi supra*. Diod. Sic. xviii. 57—63. 73. xix. 18—15.

generals exerted all their military talents to the utmost; and Eumenes, though he gained some advantages, was unable to acquire a decided superiority. During the winter Eumenes was surprised by Antigonus; but he delivered himself by a stratagem, and was victorious in the battle which followed. But while engaged in the action, his camp was rifled by a division of the hostile army, in consequence of which Eumenes was seized by his enraged soldiers, put in chains, and delivered up to Antigonus; and by this act of treachery they recovered their plundered property. A short time after Antigonus procured the death of his illustrious prisoner[3].

§. 78. WARS OF ANTIGONUS.

ANTIGONUS having now destroyed the enemy whom he most dreaded, considered himself master of all Asia. He removed the governors whom he suspected, and breaking with Seleucus, intended to put him also out of the way. But that great man, B. C. 315, fled to Ptolemey in Egypt, and disclosed to him the dangerous power and ambitious views of Antigonus. Ptolemey immediately informed Lysimachus governor of Thrace, and Cassander governor of Macedonia, of the danger which was threatening them from that quarter; and in a short time after, the three formed an alliance against Antigonus, and thus new wars were excited[1].

Antigonus now, B. C. 314, wrested from the grasp of Ptolemey, Palæstine, Phœnicia, and Cœle-Syria; and as all the shipping had been prudently sent to Egypt, he built a considerable fleet with all possible despatch, and exerted himself to form alliances against his allied foes. The siege of Tyre (which had been rebuilt since its destruction by Alexander nineteen years before, and was able to make a vigorous defence) he left to the direction

[3] Diod. Sic. xix. 18—44. Justin, xiv. 4. Corn. Nepos, Eumenes, vii—xiii. Plutarch, Eumenes, iv.

[1] Diod. Sic. xix. 55—57. Justin, xv. 4. Appian, Syriac. liii. 35—50.

of his son Demetrius, who afterwards acquired the surname of Πολιορκητὴς, *the vanquisher of cities.* In fifteen months the city surrendered. During this time Antigonus was in Asia Minor, where he pressed so closely on Cassander, as to force him to come to terms. But nó sooner had he recovered himself, than he sent to Ptolemey for aid, in consequence of which Antigonus was still detained, B. C. 313, in Asia Minor. Meanwhile Ptolemey's fleet touched at Cyprus, Cilicia, and Syria, plundered the cities and made many prisoners. Ptolemey himself led an army through Arabia Petræa, defeated Demetrius at Gaza, and drove him back to Syria. After a short siege he regained Tyre[2].

Ptolemey now, B. C. 312, gave to Seleucus, who had been with him in this campaign, a body of two hundred horse and eight hundred foot, that he might regain possession of his government in Babylonia. He sent a strong division of his army into Syria to pursue Demetrius still farther. But it was defeated by Demetrius; and, as Antigonus had then returned with his army from Phrygia to Syria, Ptolemey pillaged Acco, Samaria, Joppa, and Gaza, and hastened back to Egypt, laden with the spoils of those cities. Thus Palæstine was again subject to Antigonus. But many of the inhabitants voluntarily went with Ptolemey to Egypt; for at Alexandria they could enjoy peace and great freedom under a mild government[3].

In the mean time Seleucus, with his handful of soldiers, had crossed the Euphrates and proceeded to Haran, in order to increase his army in Mesopotamia. Thence he marched to Babylonia. As he entered the province the inhabitants flocked to his standard; for they well remembered the justice of his administration, when, four years

[2] Diod. Sic. xix. 58, 59. 62. 69. 72. 75. 80—86. Hecatæus in Josephus against Apion, i. 22. Justin, xv. 1. Appian, Syriac. liii. 50—55. Plutarch, Demetrius, v.

[3] Diod. Sic. xix. 93. Josephus, Antiq. XII. i. 1. and against Apion, i. 22. Appian, Syriac. liv. 65. Plutarch, Demetrius, vi.

before, he was governor subordinate to Antigonus. He found the gates of Babylon open to receive him, and in a short time drove the garrisons of Antigonus from the two castles. Nicanor, whom Antigonus had made governor of Media in the place of Pithon, now appeared in Babylonia with an army; but he was defeated, and after the battle his soldiers went over to Seleucus. With this increase of strength, he took immediate possession of Media, Susiana, and all the adjacent provinces[4].

The taking of Babylon by Seleucus occurred in autumn, B. C. 312. The next year Antigonus sent his son Demetrius to the east to reconquer that city, with orders to return at an appointed time. Demetrius arrived while Seleucus was in Media. The weak garrison of the city retired into the marshes of the Euphrates, the inhabitants fled, and scarcely anything remained but the garrisons of the two castles. Thus Demetrius found an empty city; and when he had subdued one of the castles his appointed time expired, and he was obliged to return to his father. He left five thousand infantry and a thousand cavalry to prosecute the siege of the second castle, but on the return of Seleucus they were put to flight[5].

NOTE. The era of the Seleucidæ commences with the first conquest of Babylon by Seleucus in October, B. C. 312, twelve years after the death of Alexander the Great. It is also called the Greek and the Alexandrian era, and, because employed in all contracts, *æra contractuum*. Among the Jews it was denominated מִנְיַן שְׁטָרוֹת But as Babylon was afterwards retaken by Demetrius, and Seleucus did not get permanent possession of the city till the spring of B. C. 311, the Babylonians fixed the commencement of this era in the latter year. The first Book of Maccabees computes the years from April, B. C. 311, as Michælis has shown in his note on 1 Macc. x. 21;

[4] Diod. Sic. xix. 90—92. Appian, Syriac. liv. 60—65. compare, Dan. xi. 5.

[5] Diod. Sic. xix. 100. Plutarch, Demetrius, vii.

while the second Book dates from October, B. C. 312. Consequently there is often the difference of a year in the chronology of these books. Compare 2 Macc. xi. 21, with 1 Macc. vi. 16; and 2 Macc. xiii. 1, with 1 Macc. vi. 20. This era continued in general use among the orientals, with the exception of the Mohammedans, who employed it together with their own era from the flight of Mohammed, B. C. 622. The Jews had no other epoch until A. D. 1040; when, being expelled from Asia by the caliphs, and scattered about in Spain, England, Germany, Poland, and other western countries, they began to date from the creation, though still without entirely dropping the era of the Seleucidæ. The orientals denominate this epoch *the era of the two-horned;* by which it is generally supposed they mean Alexander the Great. But perhaps the name had primary reference to Seleucus; for on some coins he is represented with two horns. See Frœhlich, Annales Syriæ, Tab. ii. Seleuc. Nicat. 1. et Tab. iii. 29.

§. 79. CONDITION OF THE JEWS. B. C. 320—311.

THE Jews remained undisturbed from B. C. 320, when they became subject to Ptolemey till B. C. 314, when Antigonus possessed himself of Palæstine. For the three following years their country and its vicinity was the theatre of war, and they must have suffered severely, as during that time Judæa frequently changed masters. Consequently many of the Jews emigrated to Egypt. Still the city of Jerusalem received no peculiar injury, and was spared when Ptolemey gave Samaria, Acco, Joppa, and Gaza up to pillage.

The circumstances of this people, and the consideration in which they were held among the neighbouring nations at this period, can be best understood from Hecatæus of Abdera, who, in the reign of Ptolemey Lagus, wrote a book respecting the Jews. Herennius Philo, indeed, as quoted by Origen, expresses a doubt whether this work,

so partial to the Jewish nation, did in fact proceed from that historian; and an anonymous writer in Eichhorn's Bibliothek, has made it appear plausible that the work is the production of some Jew under an assumed character[1]. But as the argument rests entirely on the favourable opinion of the Jews which the author expresses, it cannot be considered decisive. Why should there not be one Greek in so many ages willing to do justice to the Hebrew nation? And would a Jew, who wished to deceive, fall into such gross mistakes as are found in this work? Josephus, in a controversial writing, confidently appeals to it as genuine; and therefore, even if it be not the work of Hecatæus, I should rather consider it the production of some proselyte to the Jewish religion. But if we allow the work to be supposititious, even this will not prove that all it contains is false.

We shall submit to the judgment of the reader the quotations which Josephus, in his controversy with Apion, has made from Hecatæus[2]. "In this (117th) Olympiad, Ptolemey Lagus defeated in battle at Gaza, Demetrius, surnamed Poliorcetes, the son of Antigonus."—"After the battle Ptolemey took possession of the fortified places in Syria; and many of the inhabitants, when they had experience of Ptolemey's moderation and humanity, went with him voluntarily to Egypt, and devoted themselves to his service. Among these was Hezekiah, a chief priest of the Jews, a man about sixty-six years old, and highly respected by his own people. He was a man of learning and eloquence, and as skilful as any man could be in the transaction of business. These Jewish priests, who receive tithes of all the products of the earth, and manage the public affairs, are in number about fifteen hundred." "This venerable man became acquainted with us, and he read to some of his friends a description of

[1] Origen against Celsus, i. Eichhorn's Bibliothek, Th. v. s. 432, sqq.

[2] Josephus against Apion, i. 22.

the peculiarities of his nation, for he had with him a written account of their institutions and civil polity."

Hecatæus then speaks of the firmness with which the Jews adhered to the directions of their law, and proceeds: "though they are despised by the neighbouring nations, and by foreigners, and have often been ill treated by the Persian kings and satraps, yet they can by no means be made to deviate from their principles; and they willingly endure the most cruel tortures and deaths, rather than forsake the law they have inherited from their fathers." —"When Alexander was at Babylon, in order to rebuild the temple of Belus which was fallen down, he commanded all his soldiers to help remove the rubbish; but the Jews alone refused to put their hands to the work, and suffered stripes and severe punishments rather than engage in it, till at last the king gave over and released them from the work." "Certain people once came into their country and built temples and altars; but they destroyed them; and for this many of them were punished by the satraps, but some obtained pardon. In this respect they are indeed worthy of admiration."

Hecatæus writes also of the history of the Jews, of their country, and of Jerusalem their capital. "The Jews were formerly a very numerous nation; for the Persians (Chaldæans) carried many thousands of them out of their country to Babylon; and after the death of Alexander, on account of the disturbances in Syria, many thousands of them went to Egypt and Phœnicia (Arabia)." "Their land contains three millions of aruræ, principally of the best and most fruitful soil; for so great is Judæa."—"They have many fortified places and many villages scattered about in their country; but only one fortified city, which is fifty stadia in circumference, and has about one hundred and twenty thousand inhabitants. They call it Jerusalem. In the midst of this city is a stone enclosure (the temple), about five plethra long and one hundred cubits broad, which has two doors. In this

enclosure is a quadrangular altar, not made of hewn, but of unwrought stone. Its sides are twenty cubits long, and its height is twelve cubits. Near this altar is a great edifice in which there is an altar and a candlestick of gold of two talents weight. The light is not extinguished day or night. There is no image of a divinity there, no consecrated gifts, nothing planted, no grove, nor any thing of that kind. The priests are employed therein night and day; they perform certain purifications, and drink no wine in the temple."

Finally, Hecatæus mentions that the Jews rendered military services not only to Alexander, but to his successors also; and relates from his own knowledge the following remarkable incident. "As I was once travelling by the Red sea, there was one among the horsemen who attended us named Masollam, a brave and strong man, and, according to the testimony of all the Greeks and barbarians, a very skilful archer. Now while the whole multitude was on the way, an augur called out to them to stand still, and this man inquired the reason of their halting. The augur showed him a bird, and told him that if that bird remained where he was, it would be better for them all to remain; if he flew on they might proceed; but if he flew back they must return. The Jew said nothing, but bent his bow, and shot the bird to the ground. This act offended the augur and some others; and they began to utter imprecations against the Jew. But he replied: 'Why are you so foolish as to take care of this unfortunate bird? How could this fowl give us any wise directions respecting our journey, when he could not save his own life? Had he known any thing of futurity he surely would not have come here to be killed by the arrow of Masollam the Jew.'"

NOTE. The expeditions which Antigonus sent out against the Nabathæan Arabs, and their metropolis Hagr or Hejr, the first under the command of his general Athenæus, and the second under his son Demetrius, are

worthy of attention for several reasons: but they do not enter into my plan. Demetrius on his return observed the asphaltos on the Dead sea, and Antigonus wished to render it a source of profit to his treasury. He therefore sent thither Hieronymus, the learned historian, with men to collect the asphaltos for the benefit of the crown. But the Nabathæans annoyed them so much that they were forced to desist. Thus this lake, otherwise useless, became a source of wealth and an object of contention, in consequence of its asphaltos. Diod. Sic. xix. 94—100. Plutarch, Demetrius, vii.

§. 80. THE WARS RENEWED, B. C. 311—305.

In the year B. C. 311, Antigonus, Ptolemey, Cassander, and Lysimachus, the four most powerful governors, made a treaty, by virtue of which Cassander was to remain governor of Macedonia, till Alexander Ægus, who had been imprisoned at Amphipolis with his mother ever since B. C. 315, should come of age; Lysimachus was to have Thrace; Ptolemey, Egypt, Cyrene, and Arabia Petræa; and Antigonus was to retain all that part of Asia which he then possessed, except the Grecian cities, which were to be independent. But none of the contracting parties regarded these stipulations; and, under various plausible pretexts, each endeavoured to make some encroachment to his own advantage. War therefore soon broke out afresh. When Alexander Ægus had entered his fourteenth year, B. C. 310, and there began to be rumours respecting his immediate elevation to the throne, Cassander caused this prince, and his mother Roxana, to be privately murdered in their prison. Lysimachus, Ptolemey, and Antigonus were well pleased at this removal of the heir to the empire; but Polysperchon the governor of Peloponnesus under Antigonus, exclaimed loudly against the deed, took under his protection Hercules the eldest son of Alexander the Great, and his mother Barsina, and pretended that he would place him

on the Macedonian throne. But this was mere pretence; for he soon yielded to the solicitations of Cassander, and put to death the prince and his mother[1].

In the same year, B. C. 310, Leonidas the general of Ptolemey invaded Cilicia, because Antigonus had not given freedom to the Grecian cities according to the treaty. But he was repulsed by Demetrius. As soon as Ptolemey heard of the ill success of his general, he set sail with a considerable armament, B. C. 309, for Phasaelis, took possession of this city, and of several others in Lycia. The next year, B. C. 308, he sailed with a large fleet from Myndus, a port in Caria, to the Grecian islands, and set Andros free by withdrawing its garrison. He next proceeded to the Isthmus, where Sicyon and Corinth came into his power. In order to conciliate the Greeks, he was disposed to give freedom to the remaining cities of Greece; but, as the Peloponnesians did not supply him with money and provisions according to their promise, he came to an agreement with Cassander, that each should retain the cities which he then possessed. At this time he made proposals of marriage to Cleopatra, the sister of Alexander the Great, who was living in widowhood at Sardis. But when she was ready to go to Ptolemey, she was detained by the orders of Antigonus, and shortly after privately murdered[2].

In the year B. C. 306, Demetrius Poliorcetes garrisoned Athens and several other cities of Greece, or, as it was said, restored to them their freedom. On this account he was honoured with the divine title of Σωτὴρ (*Saviour*), and the Athenians erected to him golden statues and altars. In the year B. C. 305, he invaded Cyprus, and had nearly effected the conquest of the island. Ptolemey came with a fleet to the assistance of his allies, but was repulsed, and the whole island came under the dominion of Antigonus. Antigonus was so elated by this

[1] Diod. Sic. xix. 105. xx. 20. 28. Justin. xiv. 6. xv. 2. Plutarch, Demetrius, viii. Pausanias, Bœotic. vii. 2, 3.

[2] Diod. Sic. xx. 19. 27. 37.

conquest, that he and his son Demetrius assumed the diadem, and the regal title in their edicts and upon their coins. Though this was known in the east, in Egypt, Thrace, and Macedonia, yet Seleucus, Ptolemey, Lysimachus, and Cassander, did not imitate the example. Still they did not forbid their subjects to honour them with the title of king, which had then become very common[3].

NOTE. When Demetrius Poliorcetes gave freedom to the Grecian cities, he expelled from Athens the celebrated Demetrius Phalereus, who had governed the city under Cassander for ten years with such wisdom, justice, and humanity, that the Athenians had erected to him as many statues as there are days in the year. These were now all demolished, and, in contempt, their materials were made into vessels for ignoble uses. This great philosopher and statesman fled first to Cassander, and, after *his* death, to Egypt, where Ptolemey, himself an eminent scholar, was a patron of learned men. Here Demetrius Phalereus became the king's librarian, and at his suggestion, according to the testimony of a spurious work ascribed to Aristeas, Ptolemey Philadelphus, the son and successor of Ptolemey Lagus, caused the Books of Moses to be translated into Greek. But we shall see in the sequel, that Phalereus fell under the displeasure of Philadelphus at the very commencement of his reign. Diogenes Laertius, Life of Demet. Phal. V. v. 2. 8. Ælian, Var. Hist. iii. 18. xii. 43. Pliny, Hist. Nat. xxxiv. 12. Strabo, p. 398. Plutarch de Rep. Ger. Præc. Corn. Nepos, Miltiades, vi. 4. and Phocion, iii. 1. Diod. Sic. xviii. 74. xx. 45. Josephus, Antiq. xii. 2.

[3] Diod. Sic. xx. 47—53. Appian, Syriac. liv. 70—80. Plutarch, Demetrius, viii—xix. xxiii. 1 Macc. i. 9. Compare Frœhlich, Annal. Syr. Tab. ii.

§. 81. PARTITION OF THE EMPIRE, B. C. 305—301.

After the conquest of Cyprus, Antigonus fixed his eyes on Egypt. He collected in Syria an army of more than eighty thousand infantry, with eight thousand cavalry, and eighty-three elephants, and proceeded along the coast to Gaza; while his son Demetrius Poliorcetes, went by sea with a hundred and fifty ships of war and a hundred store ships. A council of war was held at Gaza; but, however judiciously the expedition might have been planned, it terminated very unfortunately. The fleet was much retarded in its voyage by unfavourable weather, and when at length it arrived on the coasts of Egypt, they were so well fortified that it was impossible to effect a landing. Accordingly Demetrius was obliged to return without accomplishing anything. The land forces likewise suffered much in their march through Arabia Petræa; and when they came to the borders of Egypt, they could neither enter the kingdom by water for want of shipping, nor by land because all the avenues were strongly garrisoned. Their provisions were now exhausted, and the soldiers deserted in great numbers from the severe Antigonus to the mild Ptolemey, who liberally rewarded all that joined his standard. Antigonus seeing his army in this manner daily melting away, was at last forced to retire in disgrace[1]. Ptolemey was now finally established in the possession of Egypt. For this reason Claudius Ptolemey, who reckons the years before this period from Alexander Ægus, begins with this year, B. C. 305, to compute from Ptolemey Lagus.

The Rhodians, on account of their lucrative trade with Egypt, were attached to the interests of Ptolemey, and had refused to Antigonus the use of their shipping in his Egyptian expedition. To punish this refusal he made war upon them, B. C. 304; but they were so well sup-

[1] Diod. Sic. xx. 73—76. Plutarch, Demetrius, xix.

ported by Ptolemey, that Antigonus was forced to relinquish his demand that they should aid him against the Egpytians as against his other enemies. The Rhodians therefore gave to Ptolemey the title of Σωτὴρ, ordered divine worship to be paid him, and erected the Ptolemæum in honour of their deliverer[2].

During this time, Seleucus had established himself in the possession of Babylonia, Assyria, Media, and the other oriental provinces as far as India; and in B. C. 303, he was making preparations to subdue Sandrocottus, an Indian, who had acquired the sovereignty in that country. But as this new Indian king had a large army in the field, and the presence of Seleucus was necessary in the west, he concluded a treaty with the Indians, by which he obtained five hundred elephants[3].

The same year, Demetrius Poliorcetes conducted another fleet to Greece, and, in prosecution of his plan for restoring freedom to the Greeks, he not only took from Ptolemey, Sicyon, Corinth, and other cities, but pressed so closely upon Cassander in Macedonia, that he was forced to sue for peace with Antigonus. But as Antigonus required him to surrender unconditionally, he and his ally Lysimachus applied to Seleucus and Ptolemey for a renewal of their alliance, and for immediate assistance. Accordingly Seleucus returned from India, as has already been related. The effects of this new alliance were first visible in the countries bordering on the Hellespont, B. C. 302. Cassander diligently prosecuted the war against Demetrius, who, relying too confidently on the great power of his father, was leading a scandalous life in Peloponnesus. Lysimachus in the mean time left Thrace, and, passing the Hellespont, subdued Phrygia, Lydia, Lycaonia, and Propontis, as far as the river Meander. This coming to the knowledge of Antigonus, who was then amusing himself with military

[2] Diod. Sic. xx. 91—100. Plutarch, Demetrius, xxi. xxii. Pausanias, Attic. LI. viii. 6.

[3] Justin, xv. 4. Appian, Syriac. lv. 80—100.

games at Antigonia in Syria, he put his army in motion and recaptured many of the conquered cities. Lysimachus, on account of the inferiority of his forces, was obliged to act on the defensive. Still he continued to dispute every inch of ground with Antigonus, until both armies retired into winter quarters [4].

During these occurrences Seleucus was marching with a numerous army from Babylonia towards Cappadocia. Antigonus received notice of this movement early in the winter, and accordingly recalled his son Demetrius from Greece. Thus Cassander was delivered from his enemy. On his march Demetrius garrisoned some of the revolted cities, and then joined his forces to those of his father. While Seleucus was approaching, Ptolemey also put his army in motion, passed through Arabia Petræa, took possession of Palæstine, and laid siege to Zidon. But a rumour having got abroad that Seleucus had been defeated by Antigonus, Ptolemey, fearing that he should be suddenly attacked by the victorious army, concluded an armistice of four months with the Zidonians, and retired hastily to Egypt. Meanwhile Seleucus entered Cappadocia with twenty thousand infantry, twelve thousand cavalry, four hundred and eighty elephants, and more than one hundred chariots armed with scythes. The hostile armies now approached nearer and nearer, and prepared for a decisive engagement during the ensuing summer [5].

This decisive battle was fought, B. C. 301, at Ipsus in Phrygia. Antigonus brought into the field between seventy and eighty thousand infantry, ten thousand cavalry, and seventy elephants. Seleucus and his allies had sixty-four thousand infantry, ten thousand five hundred cavalry, above one hundred chariots armed with scythes, and more than four hundred elephants. After a bloody battle, Antigonus was defeated and left dead on

[4] Diod. Sic. xx. 106—110. Plutarch, Demetrius, xxiii—xxvii.
[5] Diod. Sic. xx. 111—113. Plutarch, Demetrius, xxviii.

the field, pierced with many wounds. Demetrius escaped with eight or nine thousand men, and fled to Ephesus, where his fleet was stationed. After wandering about for some time, he sailed to Cyprus, which, with some other cities and districts, still remained in his possession. He lived seventeen years after this, and undertook various expeditions, which will be noticed as we proceed; but he could never regain his power[6].

Seleucus, Ptolemey, Cassander, and Lysimachus, now made a permanent treaty. Each was to assume the diadem and the royal title, and to govern his provinces with royal authority. The partition was made in the following manner: to Cassander was allotted Macedonia and Greece; to Lysimachus, Thrace, Bithynia, and some of the adjoining provinces; to Ptolemey, Libya, Egypt, Arabia Petræa, Palæstine, and Cœle-Syria; the remainder, which was assigned to Seleucus, comprehended many provinces in Asia Minor, Syria, Mesopotamia, Babylonia, and the east as far as India; in all, seventy-two satrapies[7].

In the prophecy of Daniel, these princes are the four horns of the he-goat, which sprang up after the great horn was broken: and these are the four heads of the leopard. Seleucus is the prince at the court of the king of Egypt (king of the south), who was to acquire the most extensive power; and of this power he now became possessed[8].

[6] Diod. Sic. xxi. 2. Plutarch, Demetrius, xxviii—xxx. Appian, Syriac. lv. 85. compare Dan. xi. 5.

[7] Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxi. 2. Appian, Syriac. lv. 90—100. lxii. 1. Polybius, v. 67. Plutarch, Demetrius, xxx.

[8] Dan. viii. 8. 21, 22. vii. 6. xi. 5.

BOOK IX.

HISTORY FROM THE PARTITION OF THE EMPIRE TO THE TIME OF ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES.

TABLE OF THE GREEK-SYRIAN AND OF THE GREEK-EGYPTIAN MONARCHS.

GREEK-SYRIAN.	B. C.
Seleucus Nicator	312
Antiochus Soter	280
Antiochus Theos	260
Seleucus Callinicus	245
Seleucus Ceraunus	225
Antiochus the Great	223
Seleucus Philopator	186
Antiochus Epiphanes	175
Antiochus Eupator	164
Demetrius Soter	162
Alexander Balas	150
Demetrius Nicator	145
Antiochus Sidetes	140
Demetrius Nicator II.	130
Zebina	125
Antiochus Grypus	123
Seleucus	96
Philip	92
Tigranes	83
The Romans	66

GREEK-EGYPTIAN.	B. C.
Ptolemey Lagus	323
Ptolemey Philadelphus	284
Ptolemey Euergetes	246
Ptolemey Philopator	221
Ptolemey Epiphanes	204
Ptolemey Philometor	180
Ptolemey Phiscon	145
Ptolemey Lathyrus	116
Ptolemey Alexander	80
Ptolemey Auletes	65
Cleopatra	51
The Romans	31

§. 82. HISTORY OF THE FOUR KINGDOMS, B. C. 301—279.

OF the four sovereigns who shared the empire among them, Cassander died first, B. C. 398, after reigning nineteen years over Macedonia. Philip, his son and

successor, dying soon after, the two younger sons of Cassander contended for the crown. Antipater, the elder of the two, was so eager in the prosecution of his claim, that he murdered his own mother because she favoured the views of his brother Alexander. The latter fled to Demetrius Poliorcetes, who gladly embraced this opportunity of leading an army into Macedonia, under pretence of establishing Alexander on the throne. The intentions of Lysimachus at first were good, and he advised Antipater to an accommodation with his brother. But when Demetrius had put Alexander to death and seized the Macedonian sceptre for himself, Lysimachus murdered Antipater also. Thus Demetrius remained for a few years king of Macedonia[1].

Demetrius, B. C. 295, reconquered the Athenians, who had shaken off his yoke during his absence in Macedonia. He was not so successful in Cyprus, where Ptolemey had made an invasion, for he irrecoverably lost possession of that island, and, as it appears, of Phœnicia also; for we shall find, hereafter, this territory under the dominion of Ptolemey. His power, however, was still considerable; for besides Macedonia, he possessed a considerable part of Peloponnesus and several cities in Asia Minor. He even entertained some hope of recovering his father's kingdom, and for this purpose, B. C. 388, he collected a fleet of five hundred sail, and an army of one hundred thousand men. But as he was preparing to embark, Pyrrhus king of Epirus invaded Macedonia, and almost all the soldiers of Demetrius forsook him and returned home; and he was accordingly forced to flee to Greece in the disguise of a common soldier. He afterwards sailed to Asia with eleven thousand men, and at Miletus, in accordance with an engagement previously made, married a daughter of Ptolemey, and then invaded Caria and Lydia. Here he was repulsed; but he went still farther eastward, and was finally made prisoner by Seleucus his

[1] Justin, xv. 1, 2. Plutarch, Demetrius, xxxvi—xxxix.

son-in-law. He was treated with respect, but could never regain his freedom; and at last died in captivity, B. C. 288[2].

Lysimachus, in the year B. C. 299, took in marriage Arsinoe a daughter of Ptolemey, and his son Agathocles married another daughter of the same king. The next year Seleucus, as has been already intimated, married Stratonice, the daughter of Demetrius Poliorcetes. Megasthenes the celebrated historian of Assyria, Babylonia, and India, died in the same year. He was often consulted on affairs of state by Seleucus, and was employed by him in his negotiations with Sandrocottus king of India. Of his works nothing now remains except some fragments preserved by Eusebius and Josephus[3].

In the dominions of Seleucus many cities had been entirely destroyed, and others greatly injured, by the ravages of war. To repair these losses he built a great number of new cities, among which are reckoned sixteen of the name of Antiochia, nine of Seleucia, five of Laodicea, four of Apamea, and one of Stratonice. Antiochia, or Antioch, on the Orontes in Syria, was the residence of all the succeeding kings, and, in later times, of the Roman governors. About three English miles from the city was the grove of Daphne, which Antiochus made an asylum for criminals, and a place of pleasure. It afterwards became so infamous for its licentiousness, that no man of good character would visit it. One of the five Seleuciæ likewise was situated on the Orontes near the sea, and served as a port for Antioch, which was about twelve English miles farther up the river. The most celebrated city of this name, however, was on the Tigris, between thirty and forty English miles north-east of Babylon, near the site of the modern Bagdad, and opposite to the ancient Ctesiphon. This Seleucia (which was founded in

[2] Justin, *ubi supra*. Plutarch, Demetrius, xliii—liii. Pausanias, Attic. I. x. 1, 2. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxi. 23.

[3] Plutarch, Demetrius, xlvii. Arrian, Indic. v.

B. C. 293) contributed very much to the final ruin and total desolation of the famous capital, Babylon. Great privileges were granted to its citizens, and on this account many of the inhabitants of Babylon removed thither; and after the transfer of the trade to Seleucia these removals became still more frequent. In this manner was Babylon gradually depopulated; especially when, about the year B. C. 130, Himerus, a governor under Phraates the Parthian king, for the most trifling causes, sold many of the Babylonians as slaves in Media, and burned the market, some temples, and the finest part of the city. Soon nothing was left but the empty walls, and this once proud metropolis was used by the Parthian monarchs as a park for wild beasts[4]. The precise period of the entire desertion of Babylon cannot be determined; neither, from the occurrence of this name in more modern writers, can we infer that the ancient city was still in existence. For Seleucia was not only called Seleucia Babylonia, but, sometimes, Babylon simply, as is evident from a passage in Lucan; for the Babylon mentioned by him as a capital of the Parthian empire, where were preserved the trophies of the victory over the Romans at Carræ or Haran, was situated on the Tigris, as Antiochia was on the Orontes. Even Bagdad at the present day is frequently called Babylon or *Erak Babeli*[5].

In the year B. C. 285, Ptolemey abdicated the throne of Egypt in favour of his younger son Philadelphus, and enrolled himself among the royal lifeguards. The elder son Ceraunus, thus excluded from the succession, fled to Thrace, where his two sisters were married, one to Lysimachus and the other to Agathocles. Demetrius Phalereus had dissuaded Ptolemey from this measure. Phila-

[4] Appian, Syriac. lviii. 55—65. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxiv. 23. Justin, xlii. 1. Jahn, Biblische Archæol. b. i. s. 12. 16. Jerome, Comment. in Jes. xiii. xiv. Is. xiii. 19—22. Jer. l. 9—46. li.

[5] Lucan, Pharsal. i. 10, 11. compare vi. 50, sqq. Pliny, vi. 26. Stephan. Byzant. in Βαβυλών. Abulfarag. Chronic. Syriac. p. 527. Herbelot, Biblioth. Orient. tom. i. p. 325.

delphus having learned this, after the death of his father, put this celebrated philosopher in prison, where it is said he destroyed himself by the bite of an asp. Ptolemey Lagus, a valiant general, a just king, a man of learning and an author, a friend of learned men, and the founder of the library and the museum at Alexandria, died in B. C. 284, sincerely and universally lamented[6].

The evil disposition of Ceraunus soon manifested itself, and proved that his exclusion from the throne was not without reason. At the court of Lysimachus he fomented a quarrel between his sisters, to which Agathocles fell a sacrifice, B. C. 283. Flying with his widowed sister to Antiochia, he excited Seleucus to war against Lysimachus. At Corupedion in Phrygia, Seleucus gave battle to Lysimachus in the year B. C. 281, and the latter was slain. Of all the generals of Alexander, Seleucus now alone survived; and he viewed himself with no small complacency as the conqueror of all the conquerors. It was on this account that he acquired the surname of Νικάτωρ, *the Conqueror*. But he did not long enjoy his triumph; for, while on his way to take possession of the conquered kingdom of Lysimachus, he was assassinated by Ceraunus, B. C. 280. This wretch now banished his sister, the wife of Lysimachus, to Samothracia, put her two sons to death because they were the lawful heirs to the crown, and seated himself on the Macedonian throne. His successful career in crime was of short duration; for the next year, B. C. 279, he was taken prisoner and cut to pieces by the Gauls who had invaded Macedonia. His exiled sister Arsinoe then returned to Egypt, and so insinuated herself into the favour of her brother Philadelphus, that he married her[7].

[6] Diogenes Laert. Life of Demet. Phal. V. v. 8. Arrian de Reb. Alex. i. 1. Strabo, p. 793. Pausanias, Attic. 1. v. 1—8. Ammian. Marcellin. xxii. 16. Eusebius, Chron.

[7] Appian. Syriac. lxiii. 5—15. Pausanias, Attic. I. x. 4. xvi. 2, 3. Justin, xvii. 1, 2. xxiv. 2—5. Strabo, p. 623.

It is worthy of notice that the Greek monarchs now not only imitated the incest of the Persian kings by marriages with their own sisters, but carried this vice to still greater excess. About the year B. C. 392, Seleucus gave his own wife Stratonice, the daughter of Demetrius Poliorcetes, to his son Antiochus, and from this incestuous marriage were all the succeeding kings of Syria descended. Plutarch, Demetrius, xxxviii. Appian, Syriac. lix—lxi. 25—95.

§. 83. THE JEWS. B. C. 311—279.

DURING this period of thirty-two years (from B. C. 311 to 279) the Jews everywhere enjoyed tranquillity. By the peace of B. C. 311, Palæstine came under the dominion of Antigonus; in B. C. 302, the country was subdued by Ptolemey Lagus, and the next year the possession of it was secured to him by treaty. The high priest at this time was Onias the first, the son of Jaddua. He died in the year B. C. 300, and was succeeded by his son, Simon the Just[1].

This Simon is said to have been the last of the *great synagogue*, in which are included one hundred and twenty men, and among others, Ezra, Haggai, Zechariah, Nehemiah, and Malachi. Hence it is plain, that this great synagogue, so celebrated among the Jews, is nothing more than that succession of patriots after the captivity, who distinguished themselves by their labours towards the collection and revisal of the sacred books, and the settlement and improvement of the civil and religious constitution of their country. Indeed the Jewish traditions maintain that Simon the Just, as he was the last of the great synagogue, closed the sacred canon. The notices on this subject are so recent that they cannot be relied upon as historical evidence; but as such traditions are generally founded on some truth, it is very probable that

[1] Alexand. Chron. Syncellus. Eusebius, Chron.

Simon did complete the collection and revision of the sacred books, and even add some things respecting events of more recent occurrence. Some of the apparent additions in the Old Testament well correspond to the age of Simon. The genealogical register of David in the first Book of Chronicles, comes down to about the year B. C. 300; and in the catalogue of high priests in the Book of Nehemiah, Jaddua is mentioned in a manner which seems to intimate that he had been dead for some time[2].

Simon the Just, according to Eusebius, died in B. C. 292, in the ninth year of his administration. The Alexandrian Chronicle, which in the chronology of the preceding periods corresponds more nearly than Eusebius with Josephus and the Bible, makes the term of his office fourteen years, which is evidently too great, as has been demonstrated by Prideaux[3].

Simon was succeeded by his brother Eleazar, for his son Onias had not attained the age which the law required for induction to the high priesthood[4]. Eleazar succeeded to the priesthood only, for the presidentship of the sanhedrim was conferred on Antigonus Socho, the most learned Jew of that age. He, it is said, was the first of the *mishnical* teachers who studied the traditions and brought them into repute. This information also is derived from the more modern writings, which cannot be regarded as conclusive authority; though the tradition is, very probably, founded on fact. The collection of those precepts which afterwards acquired such great authority as the oral instructions of Moses, must have been commenced in this age; for we find manifest traces of them in the times immediately succeeding.

During this period many colonies of Jews were established out of Palæstine. On account of their fidelity to their oaths, Seleucus Nicator allured them to the cities

[2] 1 Chron. iii. 17—24. and Michaelis, Anmerk. in locum. Neh. xii. 22.

[3] Eusebius, Chron. Prideaux, Connexions, vol. ii. p. 145, note.

[4] Josephus, Antiq. XII. ii. 5.

which he founded, by raising them to the highest rank of citizens; and in Alexandria the Ptolemeys granted them the same privileges as were enjoyed by the Macedonians. Many of them settled at Antioch on the Orontes, the metropolis of the Syrian empire, where they retained their ancient privileges even after the destruction of Jerusalem[5].

NOTE. The most ancient books which contain an account of these Jewish traditions, originated about the tenth century of the Christian era. At this time the Caraite Jews became numerous, and demanded of the rabbins some proof of the genuineness and authority of their traditions. This proof the rabbins attempted to give, and named the men by whom their traditions were said to have been transmitted. They began with Adam, and where the writings of the Old Testament failed them, they introduced extracts from the Talmud, and the oral testimony of the men who were supposed to have communicated the traditions to their disciples at the high schools in Judæa, Babylonia, and other places. These books are the following:

1. Seder Olam Rabbah, in the early part of the ninth century.
2. Jeshuboth Rabbi Sherira Gaon, in the latter part of the tenth century.
3. Seder Olam Zeurah, in the early part of the twelfth century.
4. Sepher Kabbala Rabbi Abraham Levi Ben Dior, in the latter part of the twelfth century.
5. Sepher Juchasin, in 1580, at Cracow.
6. Shalsheleth Hakkabbala, in 1587, at Venice.
7. Zemach David, in 1592, at Prague, by R. Ganz.

It is plain enough that the authors of these books lived at too late a period to afford satisfactory evidence respecting traditions so ancient; and that their testimony

[5] Josephus, Antiq. XII. iii. 1. against Apion, ii. 4.

is of no value in confirmation of the traditions, as from them all their knowledge of these subjects was derived.

§. 84. ANTIOCHUS SOTER. B. C. 279—260.

After the assassination of Seleucus Nicator, his son Antiochus ascended the throne of Asia, B. C. 279. He immediately sent Patrocles with an army to Asia Minor, to secure those provinces and to make war upon the murderer of his father. But the Bithynians drew Patrocles into an ambush, and destroyed him with all his army. Zipates king of Bithynia was so elated by his victory that his death was attributed to the excess of his exultation. His son and successor Nicomedes was unable to take advantage of this success, because he was involved in a long and dangerous war with his youngest brother. During these difficulties, Antiochus having threatened to revenge the destruction of his army, Nicomedes solicited the aid of the Gauls. At his invitation they entered Asia Minor B. C. 277, and took a very conspicuous part in all the succeeding transactions of that country. The greatness and extent of their influence is thus described by Justin: "Gallorum ea tempestate tantæ fœcunditatis juventus fuit, ut Asiam omnem velut examine aliquo implerent. Denique neque reges Orientis sine mercenario Gallorum exercitu ulla bella gesserunt, neque pulsi regno ad alios quam ad Gallos confugerunt. Tantus terror Gallici nominis et armorum invicta felicitas fuit, ut aliter neque majestatem suam tutam, neque amissam recuperare se posse sine Gallica virtute arbitrarentur." The Galatians, settled on the river Halys, to whom Paul directed one of his Epistles, were the descendants of these Gauls[1].

Antiochus, in consequence of the last victory of his

[1] Livy, xxxviii. 16. Memnon, Excerpt. cap. xvi. 18. 21. Pausanias, Phocic. X. xix. 5—23. 9. Polybius, ii. 13—25. Justin, xxiv. 4—8. xxv. 1, 2. xxvi. 2. Diod. Sic. Fragment. xx. 16.

father over Lysimachus, had claims upon Thrace and Macedonia, but was unable to prosecute them on account of the loss of his army under Patrocles. Accordingly, after Ceraunus had been cut off by the Gauls, Sosthenes succeeded him on the throne. On his death, B. C. 276, Antigonus Gonatas, a son of Demetrius Poliorcetes, who held the government of several Grecian cities, seized the sceptre of Macedonia. Antiochus now advanced with an army to assert his claims; but as Gonatas was in alliance with the Bithynian king Nicomedes, it became necessary for Antiochus to subdue Bithynia before he could proceed to Macedonia. He therefore consented to terms of peace. He gave his daughter Phile in marriage to Gonatas, and relinquished the crown of Macedonia to him and his descendants[2].

Antiochus now (B. C. 275) turned his arms against the Gauls, who, having settled in Asia Minor with the consent of Nicomedes, infested the country with rapine and pillage. He put a stop to their depredations and forced them to remain quiet. The provinces, in the warmth of their gratitude for a deliverance from so severe a pest, conferred on him the divine title of Σωτὴρ, *Saviour*[3].

Against Pergamus he was not equally successful. Philetærus a eunuch, governor and treasurer under Lysimachus, had made himself independent in that city. He died B. C. 263, and was succeeded by Eumenes[4] the son of his brother. Antiochus attacked this prince in the year B. C. 262, but was repulsed by Eumenes. The next year Antiochus nominated his son Antiochus the second for his successor, and died B. C. 260[4].

NOTE. After the Romans had driven from Italy Pyrrhus king of Epirus (B. C. 274), whom the Tarentines

[2] Justin, xxv. 1. Plutarch, Demetrius, liii.

[3] Appian, Syriac. lxv. 70—75.

[4] Pausanias, Attic. I. viii. 12. x. 4. Strabo, p. 623. Appian, Syriac. lxv. 75.

had called in to their aid, they became known in the oriental countries, and Ptolemey Philadelphus entered into an alliance with them. Plutarch, Pyrrhus, xiii—xxv. Livy, Epitome of books xiii. xiv. Eutropius, Brev. Hist. Rom. ii. 15. 18. Eleven years after this, B. C. 263, the first Punic war began, which continued twenty-four years, to B. C. 239.

§. 85. ANTIOCHUS THEOS. B. C. 260—245.

ABOUT this time Timarchus, governor of Caria under Ptolemey Philadelphus, made himself absolute master of Miletus. Antiochus the second delivered the Milesians from his tyranny. They were so overjoyed by the recovery of their freedom that they deemed the divine title of Σωτὴρ, *Saviour*, too mean for so great a benefactor, and conferred on him the idolatrous appellation of Θεὸς, *the God*. This style he ever after bore on his coins[1]. But the deified monarch soon found that he had not risen above the ills of humanity, for he became involved in a disastrous war, which he was compelled to close by a disgraceful peace. We must go back a little in our narrative, in order more fully to develop the origin of this war.

Magas, or Agas, a half-brother of Ptolemey Philadelphus, who was appointed governor of Cyrene in B. C. 307, married Arsinoe, a daughter of Antiochus Soter. In the year B. C. 265, he threw off his allegiance to Ptolemey, and was marching with his army towards Alexandria, when the Marmarides, a nomadic race in Cyrene, excited disturbances which compelled him to return. Ptolemey, who had collected his forces, was prevented from pursuing the rebel by a conspiracy among the four thousand Gauls and the other mercenary troops whom he had taken into his pay. Thus Magas escaped unpunished;

[1] Justin, xxvii. 1. Appian, Syriac. lxv. 75—80. Athenæus, vi. 16. Frœhlich. Annal. Syr. Tab. iii.

and in B. C. 264, he made an agreement with his father-in-law Antiochus Soter, that while he entered Egypt on the west, Antiochus should at the same time invade it from the east. But Philadelphus sent bands of robbers (probably Arabic nomads) and several bodies of light-armed troops into the provinces of Antiochus, which obliged him to keep his army at home to protect his own territories from their depredations[2].

Magas therefore failed to accomplish his purpose; but he maintained his independence nine years longer. In the year B. C. 257 he was pardoned by Philadelpus, on condition that he should give his daughter Berenice in marriage to the crown prince of Egypt, with Cyrene for her dowry. But before the contract was fulfilled Magas died. His widow Arsinoe broke off the negotiation, and gave her hand to Demetrius, half-brother of Antigonus Gonatas king of Macedonia. But in the following year, B. C. 256, Demetrius was put to death by the Cyrenians, the marriage of the princess with the crown prince of Egypt was consummated, and Arsinoe fled to Antioch. There she instigated her brother Antiochus Theos to the unfortunate war above referred to, which commenced in B. C. 255 and continued till 249[3].

Philadelphus, now bending under the weight of years and infirmities, intrusted the conduct of this war to his generals, but Antiochus, in the bloom of youth, led his troops in person. No complete history of the war has been preserved, but neither of the contending parties appear to have gained any very decided advantages. While Antiochus was thus wasting the strength of his empire in hostilities against Egypt to gratify his sister, Parthia, Bactria, and other provinces beyond the Tigris, revolted from his dominion during the year B. C. 250. In consequence of these revolts he was forced, in B. C. 249, to make peace with Philadelphus, on such terms as he could

[2] Pausanias, Attic. I. viii. 1—3.

[3] Justin, xxvi. 3. Strabo, p. 789. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. 5.

obtain. The conditions were, that he should repudiate his beloved queen, who was his half-sister, that he should take in marriage Berenice, a daughter of Philadelphus, and that the first male issue of this marriage should succeed to the throne. The bride was conducted to Seleucia on the Orontes by Philadelphus in person, with a fleet, and the nuptials of which Daniel had prophesied (Dan. xi. 6.) were celebrated with great solemnity[4].

Immediately after the death of Philadelphus, which took place B. C. 247, two years after the peace, Antiochus put away Berenice and restored his beloved queen Laodice. But she soon after murdered her husband. Meanwhile Berenice fled to the sanctuary of Daphne, but found no protection there, for she was slain together with her son[5].

In the mean time Ptolemey Euergetes, the brother of Berenice, who had ascended the throne of Egypt, and the cities in Cilicia, Pamphylia, Lycia, Caria, and Cyprus, which were under the dominion of Egypt[6], despatched troops with all possible expedition to rescue Berenice from the power of her rival. But they arrived too late, her murder having been already accomplished. Euergetes then placed himself at the head of his army to revenge the death of his sister. He entered Syria, slew the queen Laodice, and took possession of the whole country as far as the Tigris on the east and Babylon on the south. He marched from province to province levying heavy contributions, till he was forced to return by a rebellion which broke out in Egypt. He had acquired an immense booty, and among other things, about two thousand five hundred idolatrous images, principally of those which Cambyses had taken away from the Egyptians. When he restored these idols to their temples, the Egyptians, though they

[4] Justin, xli. 4. Strabo, p. 515. Arrian, Parthic. apud Photium, Cod. 58. Syncellus, p. 284. Valerius Maximus, ix. 14. Appian, Syriac. lxv. 75—85.

[5] Valerius Maximus, ix. 14. Justin, xxvii. 1. Appian, Syriac. lxv. 75—85. compare Dan. xi. 6.

[6] Theocritus, Idyll. xvii. 85—90.

did not deify him as the Greek cities did the kings of Asia, testified the warmth of their gratitude by honouring him with the title of Εὐεργέτης, *the Benefactor*[7].

§. 86. SYRIA AND EGYPT. B. C. 245—221.

As soon as Ptolemey Euergetes had returned to Egypt, Seleucus Callinicus, the son and successor of Antiochus, fitted out a fleet on the coasts of Syria, for the purpose of reducing to subjection the cities of Asia Minor which had revolted during the war with Ptolemey. But a storm destroyed the fleet, and Callinicus himself escaped with only a few of his ships. The revolted cities then voluntarily submitted to their king out of compassion for his misfortunes[1].

The next year, B. C. 244, Callinicus fitted out a second fleet against Ptolemey. He was defeated in an engagement with the Egyptians, and fled with the shattered remnants of his armament[2].

Callinicus, now desirous of increasing his strength, promised the independent possession of the cities of Asia Minor to his younger brother Antiochus Hierax (who was governor of Asia Minor, though at that time but fourteen years old), on condition that he would join him with his whole army in the war against Ptolemey Euergetes. But Callinicus, in the year B. C. 243, having obtained from Euergetes a truce for ten years, refused to perform the promise he had made to Antiochus. This occasioned a bloody war between the two brothers, in which Seleucus was so constantly unsuccessful that it appears as if the surname of Callinicus, or *illustrious Conqueror*, had been conferred upon him only by way of ridicule. He was defeated at Ancyra, and with difficulty

[7] Appian, Syriac. lxv. 75—85. Polybius, v. 58. Justin, xxvii. 1. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. compare Dan. xi. 6—8.

[1] Justin, xxvii. 2. Appian, Syriac, lxv. 90—95. Polybius, v. 40. compare Dan. xi. 9.

[2] Justin, xxvii. 2.

saved his life by flight. Antiochus Hierax profited little by this success; for his auxiliaries, the Gauls, to whom he was principally indebted for his victory, became so mutinous that he was obliged to purchase his life of them at the expense of all his treasures. He was at that time threatened by Eumenes prince of Pergamus, and on this account was obliged to treat on equal terms with the Gauls, with whom he had before contracted as with mercenaries. This, however, availed him nothing; for Eumenes fell upon him and overwhelmed all Asia Minor with his power. It is probable that Antiochus fled to the east, as we find him there some time after. Eumenes died B. C. 241, and was succeeded by the sagacious and active Attalus, the youngest son of his brother. Attalus effectually quelled the arrogant spirit of the Gauls, and assumed the regal title[3].

While the Syrian monarchy, in consequence of the discord between the two brothers, was humbled by Eumenes in the west; Theodotus of Bactria, and Arsaces of Parthia, who had revolted in the year B. C. 250, during the imprudent war of Antiochus Theos with Philadelphus, were fortifying and strengthening themselves in the east. Immediately after the battle of Ancyra, Arsaces took possession of Hyrcania and annexed it to Parthia. He then formed an alliance with Theodotus, in order the more easily to withstand the king of Syria. This was the beginning of the Parthian empire, which afterwards became so powerful that it set bounds to the conquests of the Romans, and vanquished the vanquishers of the world[4].

Notwithstanding these losses, the brothers, Seleucus Callinicus and Antiochus Hierax, persisted in their unnatural hostilities. The theatre of the war was now in Mesopotamia, where the battle mentioned in 2 Macc.

[3] Justin, xxvii. 3. Athenæus, x. 16. Strabo, p. 623, sqq. Polybius, v. 78. and Fragments from book xviii.

[4] Justin, xvii. 3. xli. 1. 4.

viii. 20. must have occurred, in which eight thousand Babylonian Jews and four thousand Macedonians defeated the one hundred and twenty thousand Gauls whom Antiochus Hierax had in his army. The remaining history of this war is unknown, excepting that Seleucus Callinicus was at last the conqueror. Antiochus Hierax fled to his father-in-law Ariarathes king of Cappadocia. Not feeling secure at the court of this monarch, he privately withdrew to Egypt, where he was put to death in the year B. C. 240[5].

Seleucus having thus shaken off his brother, and made some progress in bringing the disturbed affairs of his empire into order, in the year B. C. 236, undertook an expedition to the east, for the purpose of subjecting Parthia and Bactria to his yoke. But he accomplished nothing, and was obliged to relinquish the enterprise on account of some disturbances which required his presence in Syria[6].

In the year B. C. 230, Seleucus made a second attempt to subjugate Parthia; but he was himself defeated and taken prisoner. Arsaces treated the captive king with the respect becoming his rank, but never set him at liberty. He continued in captivity till the year B. C. 226, when he died in consequence of a fall from his horse[7].

Seleucus Callinicus left two sons, Seleucus and Antiochus, by his wife Laodice, the daughter of his general Andromachus. Seleucus ascended the throne, a weak man both in body and mind, and therefore very unfitly surnamed Κεραυνὸς, *Thunder*. He was upheld by his father-in-law Achæus, a prudent minister and valiant warrior, who administered the affairs of the empire as well as its weakened state would permit. But when Seleucus Ceraunus made war upon Attalus for the recovery of Asia

[5] Justin, xxvii. 3. Polyænus, iv. 17.
[6] Justin, xli. 4, 5.
[7] Posidonius in Athen. iv. 13. Justin, xxvii. 3.

Minor, he was poisoned by his generals in the year B. C. 223[8].

As Ceraunus left no son, the army offered the sceptre to Achæus, who, besides his affinity with the royal family, was highly celebrated for his own achievements. But he honestly declined the offer, and secured the kingdom to Antiochus the brother of Ceraunus, who was educated at Babylon (Seleucia), or, as Polybius says, he had his residence in northern Asia. Antiochus accordingly came to Antioch; and his reign proved so fruitful in great events that he acquired the surname of Great. He prosecuted the war against Attalus by means of Achæus, who was governor of Asia Minor. He soon forced Attalus to restrain himself within the boundaries of Pergamus[9].

In the year B. C. 222 (the same year in which the Colossus at Rhodes was overthrown by an earthquake), Ptolemey Euergetes, the last good king of Egypt, died after a reign of twenty-five years. He had enjoyed peace during the last twenty-two years of his reign, while the Syrian empire, by the quarrels of the two brothers and the subsequent accession of a weak king to the throne, lost much of its power. Euergetes employed this season of quiet in promoting commerce, and encouraging the progress of the arts and sciences in his dominions. His father Philadelphus, for the furtherance of the East India trade, had built Berenice and laid out a road from Coptus to that city. He had also made great additions to the royal library, and to the collection of paintings and statues. Ptolemey Euergetes followed in his father's steps, and brought commerce and the arts and sciences to a high degree of perfection. After the death of Zenodotus, he appointed to the office of royal librarian Eratosthenes the Cyrenean, who resided at Athens. This is the Eratosthenes who compiled from the Egyptian archives a history

[8] Polybius, ii. 71. iv. 48. v. 40. Appian, Syriac. lxvi. 85—95. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi.

[9] Polybius, iv. 48. v. 40.

of thirty-eight kings of Thebais. Of this work we have only a short extract in Syncellus[10].

§. 87. THE JEWS. B. C. 279—221.

DURING the fifty-eight years from B. C. 279 to 221, the Jews lived in uninterrupted tranquillity. This was the period in which they became acquainted with Greek literature, and began to engage in their peculiar philosophical speculations. The name of Antigonus Socho, or Sochæus, who was president of the sanhedrim, and the most learned Jew of his age, is of Grecian origin. He was the first to introduce those additions to the Mosaic law, which afterwards acquired so much authority under the title of *Traditions*. He died in the year B. C. 260, and was succeeded in the presidentship of the sanhedrim by Joseph the son of Joazar. Joseph, it is said, taught his disciples that they ought to serve God from disinterested motives, and not for the sake of reward. Zadok and Baithos, the most distinguished of his disciples, went still farther, and affirmed that there is no reward to be expected after death; which is supposed to have been the origin of the sect of the Sadducees. This tradition of the Jews is hardly consistent with itself; but from an examination of the history of the following times, in which mention is made of this sect, it appears in a high degree probable that, about the middle of the third century before Christ, the opinions of the traditionists began to find opposers, and thus a party arose out of which the sect of the Sadducees was gradually formed. This seems to be the ground of the tradition to which we have referred.

In the year B. C. 249, the Jews came partly under the dominion of Antiochus Theos; for Ptolemey Philadel-

[10] Justin, xxix. 1. Plutarch, Cleomenes, xxxiii. Polybius, ii. 71. v. 88. Pliny, xxxiv. 18. Strabo, p. 652. 796. Jahn, Biblische Archäologie, Th. I. b. ii. s. 10. Plutarch, Aratus, xii. Suidas in Ζηνοδότος, Ερατόσθενης, Απολλώνιος. Syncellus, p. 91—97. 147.

phus, when he married his daughter Berenice to Antiochus, gave her as a dowry one half of the revenues of Judæa, Samaria, Phœnicia, and Cœle-Syria. But as he retained the other half in his own hands, and as the revenues of Judæa were always farmed to the high priests, this circumstance made no change in their condition; especially as Berenice was murdered two years after, and Ptolemey Euergetes overcame the whole Syrian monarchy. In the year B. C. 245, the Jews had the pleasure of seeing this just and humane king at Jerusalem, while on his return from his victories in the east. He offered many sacrifices and made magnificent presents to the temple. Without doubt the Jews on this occasion showed him the prophecy in Dan. xi. 6—8, which had just been accomplished in his achievements; and this was probably the cause of his making those offerings and presents. The high priest at this time was Onias the second, the son of Simon the Just. Eleazar died B. C. 277, and was succeeded by Manasseh; and by his death, B. C. 250, Onias became high priest[1].

The son, unlike his virtuous father, was avaricious and niggardly to such a degree, that for twenty-four years he withheld the twenty talents of silver, which his predecessors had always paid to the kings of Egypt as an annual tribute for the whole people. In the year B. C. 226 the arrears amounted to 480 talents; and Ptolemey Euergetes sent Athenion to Judæa, to demand what was already due, and to require a more punctual payment of the tribute in future, with the menace, that if these requisitions were not complied with, he would confiscate the whole territory and colonize it with his own soldiers. This fearful threat filled all the people with consternation, but made no impression on the headstrong old man, who would rather hazard everything than refund the money[2].

[1] Josephus, Antiq. XII. iv. 1. against Apion. ii. 5. compare Haggai, ii. 7, 8. Alexand. Chron.

[2] Josephus, Antiq. XII. iv. 1.

His nephew Joseph, a young man of prudence and activity, in vain represented to him the unreasonableness of his conduct. He could not prevail upon him even to go to court and defend himself. With much difficulty he at last obtained permission to go himself to Egypt and attempt to satisfy the king. Joseph then quieted the fears of the people, and endeavoured to gain over to his interests the ambassador Athenion, in which he was completely successful. He obtained money for his journey of the Samaritans, probably because no Jew would comply with the law which required them to lend money without usury[3].

Joseph went to Egypt with a caravan in which several rich Cœle-Syrians and Phœnicians were travelling to Alexandria to obtain the farming of the revenues. From their conversation he learned the amount of these revenues, and, in consequence of this information, he afterwards offered a much larger sum than they for the privilege of farming. On his arrival he was very favourably received by the king, to whom he had been already warmly commended by Athenion. He so insinuated himself into the royal favour, that when he took the revenues to farm he had the boldness to offer the king and queen as his sureties, and he was intrusted with the business without bondsmen. Instead of the eight thousand talents which the Cœle-Syrians and Phœnicians offered for the revenues, he promised double that sum, in addition to all the goods which should be confiscated for neglect of payment. In this manner Joseph became the farmer of the revenues of Judæa, Samaria, Phœnicia, and Cœle-Syria, and he obtained a body of two thousand soldiers to compel the refractory to make payment[4].

After Joseph had paid what was due to the royal treasury from his uncle, with five hundred talents which he borrowed in Egypt, he went to Askelon with his two thousand soldiers to demand the tribute due from that

[3] Josephus, Antiq. XII. iv. 2.

[4] Josephus, Antiq. XII. iv. 3, 4.

city. The inhabitants not only refused payment, but added insult to their refusal. Joseph immediately put to death twenty of their principal men, and sent a thousand talents of their confiscated property to the king. But this example of severity was not sufficient; for the citizens of Scythopolis offered similar resistance and suffered a like punishment. After this he was everywhere acknowledged as royal collector, in which employment he continued for twenty years[5].

This Jew, retaining no scruples as to the lawfulness of eating at the table of the Egyptian king, insinuated himself so much into the royal favour, that he must have possessed great versatility of native talent, and have obtained some acquaintance with Grecian manners, and with the literature and sciences which were in that age so highly esteemed at the court of Egypt; which affords a confirmation of the remark made at the beginning of this section respecting the knowledge of Grecian literature among the Jews.

§. 88. SYRIA AND EGYPT. B. C. 221—204.

PTOLEMEY PHILOPATOR, the son of Ptolemey Euergetes, ascended the throne of Egypt in the second year of Antiochus the Great (B. C. 221). It is said that he poisoned his father, and in the course of his reign he murdered his mother, his brother, and his wife. His whole character was marked with wickedness. Unfortunately for Egypt, all her succeeding monarchs followed his example; so that the Ptolemeys (Lagus, Philadelphus, and Euergetes), the first three Greek kings of that country, were the last of their race who proved themselves worthy of a throne[1].

Antiochus the Great sought to take advantage of the

[5] Josephus, Antiq. XII. iv. 5, 6. 10.

[1] Plutarch, Cleomenes, xxxiii. Justin, xxix. 1. xxx. 1, 2. Polybius, v. 34. Strabo, p. 795, 796.

effeminacy of the Egyptian king, and fixed his ambition on Palæstine, Phœnicia, Cœle-Syria, and all the possessions which the crown of Egypt had held in Syria since the war with Ptolemey Euergetes. But his first campaign was broken off by the revolt of the brothers Molon and Alexander, governors of Media and Persia, who had already twice repulsed the royal army which was sent against them. No sooner had he quelled these revolters, than Achæus, who had formerly declined the sceptre which was offered him in favour of Antiochus, having been calumniated at court as a traitor, was obliged for his own safety to become one in reality. He accordingly declared himself independent. Antiochus contented himself with merely threatening Achæus, and renewed his war with the Egyptians. In the year B. C. 219, he gained possession of Seleucia on the Orontes, which, though but twelve English miles from Antioch, the Syrian metropolis, had remained in the hands of the Egyptians ever since the war with Ptolemey Euergetes[2].

After this, Theodotus, the Egyptian governor of Cœle-Syria, who had offered a bold resistance to Antiochus before the breaking off of his first campaign, betrayed the interests of his sovereign, and voluntarily delivered Cœle-Syria into the hands of Antiochus. He was induced to this step partly by desire of revenge, and partly by his contempt for the character of his master. At the close of the first campaign with Antiochus, he had been recalled to Egypt to answer in person to some accusations which had been made against his conduct in the war. While detained at Alexandria by this disagreeable business, he saw that Philopator was a mean voluptuary, given up to the most shameful vices, and entirely governed by the creatures and instruments of his pleasure, Agathoclea, her brother Agathocles, and their mother Œnanthe; and that the minister Sosibius condescended to

[2] Polybius, iii. 2. iv. 48. v. 41—57. 61. Justin, xxx. 1. comp. Dan. xi. 10.

flatter these infamous wretches, and scrupled at no means, however base, of gratifying the passions of his master. To the injured and irritated Theodotus, the service of such a monarch appeared intolerable, and he accordingly went over to Antiochus[3].

By this means Antiochus gained possession not only of Cœle-Syria and Phœnicia, but also of the Egyptian fleet which lay in the harbours of Phœnicia, and of all the military stores which had been collected in those places. He proceeded to make himself master of the other fortified places in that region, as far as to Sora, or Dora, which had formerly been the frontier city between Manasseh and Dan on the sea, and was less than eight English miles north of Cæsarea. But as this fortress was in good condition, advantageously situated, and plentifully supplied with provisions, he was unable to reduce it; and having received an offer from Philopator of an armistice for four months, he accepted it and went into winter quarters at Seleucia on the Orontes[4].

By the negotiations which followed both kings sought only to gain time; Ptolemey that he might prepare himself for war, and Antiochus that he might subdue Achæus. The negotiations were finally broken off, because both parties laid claim to Palæstine and Cœle-Syria by virtue of the alliance of B. C. 301. The war was accordingly renewed in the year B. C. 218. Nicolaus, the general of Philopator, collected his forces at Gaza, directed his march along the coast to Lebanon, and occupied the defiles near the seashore. Thither the Egyptian fleet attended him. Antiochus came down the coast by land, and was likewise accompanied by his fleet. In the naval engagement which followed, neither side could claim the

[3] Plutarch, Cleomenes, xxxiii. Polybius, v. 40. 61, 62. Justin, xxx. 1, 2. Athenæus, xiii.

[4] Polybius, iv. 37. v. 62—66. Justin, xxx. 1, 2. Athenæus, xiii. Polybius, v. 67—71. comp. Dan. xi. 10.

victory; but by land, Antiochus forced the defiles and drove the Egyptians to Zidon, and their fleet also took refuge in the harbour of that city. As the city was well provided for a siege, Antiochus left it; and, marching into the interior, brought under his power all the cities of Galilee, the city on mount Tabor, and the land of Gilead east of Jordan, together with the metropolis Rabbath-ammon, which Philadelphus had fortified and named Philadelphia. Antiochus at the same time subjugated some of the neighbouring Arabs, and on his return, threw garrisons into Samaria and the adjacent towns, and at the close of the campaign took up his winter quarters in Ptolemais[5].

These repeated losses at length aroused Ptolemey from his lethargy. He forsook the drunken revels in which he had spent most of his time, and placing himself at the head of an army of seventy thousand infantry, five thousand cavalry, and seventy-three elephants, in the year B. C. 217, he marched from Pelusium through Arabia, and encamped at Raphia, between Rhinocolura and Gaza. Antiochus came against him with sixty-two thousand infantry, six thousand cavalry, and one hundred and two elephants; and encamped at first within ten, and afterwards within five, stadia of his foe. After five days they came to battle. Antiochus, when confident of victory, was totally defeated. He lost ten thousand three hundred men slain, four thousand taken prisoners, and fifty elephants; while Ptolemey lost but two thousand two hundred men, and sixteen elephants. It is probable that the soldiers of Antiochus were diminished still more in the flight, by being slain or captured; for he retired to Antioch, relinquished all the conquered cities, and made no attempt to repair his losses. Philopator now restored to his crown all its former possessions without striking another blow; for the cities emulated each other in their

[5] Polybius, v. 70, 71.

zeal to tender him their submission by ambassadors. This battle took place about the same time that Hannibal defeated Flaminius in Hetruria[6].

Antiochus was fearful that discontent and insurrections among his own subjects would be the consequence of his ill success in this campaign; and, as Achæus was still in arms against him, he deemed it necessary to send an ambassador to Ptolemey with proposals of peace. Ptolemey was equally desirous of putting an end to the war, for he longed to return to his pleasures; and though he at first affected to answer the ambassador with severity, he willingly granted a truce for one year, and afterwards sent his own minister to Antioch. A final treaty was concluded in the year B. C. 216, by which Antiochus renounced all claims upon Cœle-Syria, Phœnicia, and Palæstine[7].

Antiochus now, in furtherance of his designs against Achæus, entered into an alliance with Attalus king of Pergamus. Achæus was soon driven within the walls of Sardis, where he defended himself for a whole year; but in B. C. 214 he was delivered into the hands of Antiochus by the Cretan Bolis, and put to death. This Bolis had been sent by Ptolemey Philopator with a large sum of money for the relief of Achæus, but suffered himself to be bribed by Antiochus to betray his trust. He thus gave proof of the shameless avarice and dishonesty of the Cretan character, and verified the old proverb: "*The Cretans are always liars.*" Κρῆτες ἀεὶ ψεῦσται[8].

After Antiochus had adjusted the affairs of Asia Minor, in B. C. 212 he undertook an expedition to the east for the recovery of his revolted provinces. But though he exerted himself to the utmost for seven years, he failed to accomplish his purpose. At the end of the year B. C. 208,

[6] Polybius, v. 79—86. Justin, xxx. 1. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. 11. 3 Maccabees, i. comp Dan. xi. 11.

[7] Polybius, v. 87. Justin, xxx. 1. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. 11.

[8] Polybius, v. 107. vii. 4—7. viii. 12—18. comp. Titus, i. 12.

he was obliged to acknowledge Arsaces the second, whom he had defeated in several battles, as king of Parthia and Hyrcania. He also found it necessary, B. C. 206, to conclude a treaty with Euthydemon, who had expelled the son of the traitor Theodotus from Bactria, and made himself master of the country. By this treaty Antiochus obtained a number of elephants. He then proceeded to the borders of India, and renewed his alliance with the king of that country, from whom he received an additional supply of elephants; so that he now had one hundred and fifty of these animals in his army. He then marched through Arachosia and Drangiana to Carmania, where he passed the winter of B. C. 205, and in B. C. 204 he returned from his eastern expeditions, which had acquired for him the surname of *Great*[9].

Ptolemey Philopator, meanwhile, continued his effeminate and voluptuous course of life. An insurrection broke out in Egypt in B. C. 213, but it must have been soon suppressed; for Philopator not only kept possession of the throne, but pursued his infamous pleasures without interruption. His wife Arsinoe (who was also his sister) upon every opportunity raised her voice so loudly against Agathoclea and her brother Agathocles, who governed the kingdom according to their own pleasure, that finally, at the command of the king, she was put to death by the agency of the old minister Sosibius. This veteran in wickedness was at length compelled to resign his office in favour of Tlepolemus. But Tlepolemus, though a brave general, had not the talents necessary for the management of civil affairs, and consequently this change of ministers produced no change for the better in the measures of the government. In the year B. C. 204, Ptolemey Philopator, exhausted by his continual dissipation, died in the thirty-seventh year of his age, and the seventeenth of his reign. He left an only son, Ptolemey Epiphanes, who was then but five years old. Agathoclea, Agathocles,

[9] Polybius, x. 25—28. xi. 32. Justin, xli. 4—6.

and their mother Œnanthe, with their creatures, designed to retain the young king under their own management during his minority; and kept the death of Philopator secret till they had time to adopt such measures as they supposed necessary to the accomplishment of their purpose. But their efforts were all in vain. The proposals which they made to the Macedonian soldiers were indignantly rejected. The soldiers placed the young prince on the throne in the circus, and gave up Agathoclea, Agathocles, Œnanthe, and their creatures, to the populace, by whom they were torn in pieces. The guardianship of the king was intrusted to Sosibius, son of the old minister of that name[10].

§. 89. ANTIOCHUS THE GREAT. B. C. 204—187.

ANTIOCHUS the Great, and Philip king of Macedonia, determining to take advantage of the minority of the Egyptian monarch, entered into an alliance for the purpose of sharing his dominions between them. In pursuance of this plan, Antiochus, B. C. 202, took possession of Cœle-Syria, Phœnicia, and Palæstine. During the same year the Romans had become famous in the east by the victory of Scipio over Hannibal in Africa, and the consequent successful termination of the second Punic war. To these conquerors, with whom Philadelphus had been in alliance, the Egyptians now applied for aid, offering them the guardianship of the young Ptolemey. The Roman senate accepted the offer with joy, and sent M. Æmilius Lepidus to Alexandria as guardian of the king of Egypt. Lepidus appointed Aristomenes first minister of state. Ambassadors were then sent to Philip and Antiochus, to signify to them that the Romans, having

[10] Justin, xxx. 1, 2. Polybius, v. 107. xv. 24—34. Excerpta Valesii ex Polyb. de Virtut. et Vitiis, xv, xvi.

undertaken the guardianship of Ptolemey Epiphanes, would protect his possessions from all encroachment[1].

Notwithstanding this intimation, Antiochus still retained the territories of which he had possessed himself, until the minister Aristomenes, B. C. 199, sent Scopas with an army to Cœle-Syria. Antiochus was then engaged in a war with Attalus in Asia Minor, and Scopas with little difficulty brought Palæstine, Phœnicia, and Cœle-Syria again under the Egyptian yoke. But when the war with Attalus was closed, Antiochus returned with his army to Syria, B. C. 189, defeated Scopas at Paneas near the source of the Jordan, and then laid siege to Zidon, within whose walls his enemy had taken refuge. The garrison offered a vigorous resistance, but famine at length compelled them to surrender, while the Egyptians were making preparations for their relief. Antiochus then subdued Gaza and the other fortified towns; and at Jerusalem the Jews themselves assisted him in expelling the Egyptian garrison from the castle of Zion. That the Egyptians might seek no farther aid from Rome, Antiochus promised to give his daughter Cleopatra in marriage to Ptolemey Epiphanes, as soon as the youthful pair should arrive at a suitable age, with the dowry of Cœle-Syria and Palæstine. This stipulation was made in B. C. 197, in the seventh year of the reign of Ptolemey Epiphanes[2].

In the same year the Romans, under the command of Titus Quintus Flaminius, and in alliance with the Rhodians, and with Attalus king of Pergamus, commenced a war against Philip king of Macedonia. Antiochus, for the assistance of his ally Philip, sailed with a fleet to Asia Minor, whither his son at the same time led an army by

[1] Polybius, xv. 20. Appian, Syriac. i. 1. Livy, xxxi. 14. xxxiii. 19. Justin, xxx. 2, 3. xxxi. 1. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. compare Dan. xi. 13, 14. Valerius Maximus, vi. 6.

[2] Dan. xi. 15—17. and Jerome, Comment. in loc. Polyb. Legat. §. 72. Excerpta Valesii ex Polyb. de Virtut. et Vitiis, xvi. Justin, xxxi. 1. Livy, xxx. 1. Josephus, Antiq. XII. ii. 3.

land. In this expedition he seized the Asiatic cities belonging to Ptolemey Epiphanes. Attalus died during this campaign, and was succeeded by his son Eumenes, the founder of the library at Pergamus, and the inventor of parchment. The death of Attalus had no influence on the events of the war. In the battle of Cynocephalæ in Thessaly, Philip was defeated with the loss of thirteen thousand men slain and captured, and was compelled to sue for peace. This the Romans granted the more willingly, as they had reason to dread the growing power of Antiochus [3].

Antiochus proceeded steadily in his enterprises, and made rapid advances in power. He had already subjugated several cities in Asia Minor, and taken up his winter quarters at Ephesus. Smyrna, Lampsacus, and the other Grecian cities, who easily saw through the designs of the ambitious monarch, solicited the protection of the Romans. And they, desirous of checking the bold career of Antiochus, lent a willing ear to their supplications. Ambassadors were accordingly sent to the king with the demand, that he should withdraw not only from the cities of Asia Minor which he had wrested from Ptolemey Epiphanes, but also from those belonging to Philip, which he had garrisoned; and that he should set at liberty the Grecian cities which he had subdued; otherwise the Romans would compel obedience by arms. Before the legation arrived at Ephesus, Antiochus had already commenced the siege of Smyrna and Lampsacus, and with the remainder of his army crossed the Hellespont, where he took possession of the Thracian Chersonesus, with the intention of erecting it into a kingdom for his second son. The Roman ambassadors met him at Selymbria, where he resided while employed in the rebuilding of Lysimachia, which he designed to make the metropolis of his new

[3] Dan. xi. 18. Livy, xxxiii. 7—13. 19. 25. 30. 34. Plutarch, Flaminius, iii—ix. Pliny, xiii. 11. Polyb. Legat. §§. 6, 7. 25. Valesii Excerpta ex Polyb. de Virtut. et Vitiis, xxxi.

empire. He replied to them in a manner becoming a great monarch; and when they persisted in their imperious demands, he broke off the conference with the declaration, that he would receive no commands from the Romans[4].

Meanwhile a rumour was spread abroad that Ptolemey Epiphanes was dead; and though this was known both to Antiochus and the ambassadors, each party forbore to mention it to the other. The Roman ambassadors hastened to Egypt, and Antiochus set sail with his fleet for the conquest of that kingdom. But when he arrived at Patara in Lycia, he learned that the report of Ptolemey's death was false. He then determined to turn his arms against Cyprus, which was subject to the Egyptian crown; but his fleet was so shattered by a storm which ensued, that he was obliged to put in for repairs to the harbour of Seleucia on the Orontes. He spent the winter at Antioch[5].

The report of the death of Ptolemey Epiphanes was occasioned by a conspiracy, which had been fomented by Scopas the commander of the Ætolian mercenaries. He was aided in his plans by the notorious Dicæarchus, who, before he left Macedonia, had erected in that country two altars, one to Impiety and the other to Injustice, and had offered sacrifices to these hopeful goddesses. The disturbances in Egypt were soon suppressed; and, as Ptolemey was then fourteen years old, he took the reins of government into his own hands. He retained Aristomenes in his office of prime minister, and the policy of the administration continued unchanged[6].

The next year, B. C. 195, Antiochus, having repaired his fleet, sailed to Ephesus. There he was met by Hannibal, who had come to seek his protection. To a king engaged in a war with the Romans, this hero was

[4] Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. Livy, xxxiii. 38—40. Appian, Syriac. i. 15—ii. 50. iii. 50—70. Polybius, xvii. 31, 32. Legat. §. 10.

[5] Appian, Syriac, v. 70—90. Livy, xxxiii. 41.

[6] Polybius, xvii. 34—36.

most welcome; and the Romans themselves had been principally instrumental in sending him thither. For having learned that he had advised Antiochus, in a written correspondence, to carry the war into Italy, they demanded of the Carthaginians that he should be delivered up to them. But Hannibal, by a timely flight, escaped falling into their hands[7].

Antiochus now made every preparation for the war with the Romans, and took precautions for the security of his own dominions. With this view he gave his daughter Cleopatra in marriage to Ptolemey Epiphanes, B. C. 193, in accordance with a former treaty. He indulged the hope that when his daughter became queen of Egypt, she would bring the kingdom under his influence; but she proved more faithful to her husband than to her father. He married his second daughter to Ariarathes king of Cappadocia, and offered his third to Eumenes king of Pergamus; but he, as a friend to the Romans, refused a connection with their enemy. Antiochus then visited the Thracian Chersonesus, and returned to Ephesus in the winter of B. C. 192. The next spring his expedition against the Pisidians was interrupted by the death of his younger son. In a consultation which he held respecting the prosecution of the Roman war, Hannibal advised him to march immediately to Italy, where the Romans could be most easily conquered. But the Roman ambassadors, by their frequent and crafty visits to Hannibal, had succeeded in exciting the suspicions of the king against him; and his judicious counsel was not valued according to its merits. An embassy arriving soon after from the Ætolians, inviting the king into their country, that they, under his direction, might defend themselves against the Romans, he resolved to carry the war into Greece. He accordingly set sail for Ætolia with ten thousand infantry and five thousand cavalry,

[7] Corn. Nepos, Hannibal, vii. Appian, Syriac. v. 75—90. Livy, xxxiii. 47—49.

leaving orders for more men to be enrolled and sent on after him[8].

In Ætolia he held another consultation respecting his future undertakings, and Hannibal again insisted that the war ought to have been commenced in Italy; but as circumstances then stood, he advised that a fleet should be sent to cruise on the Italian coasts and employ the Romans at home, until the remaining troops of Antiochus should arrive, and that he should then pass over into Italy with all his forces. But Antiochus, out of pride and jealousy lest he should be obliged to share with Hannibal the glory of success, refused to adopt his judicious plan. He however sent orders to hasten the arrival of his remaining forces, but they were detained by contrary winds till it was too late[9].

The rejection of the counsels of Hannibal, who was so well acquainted with the Romans, would of itself have been sufficient to ruin the fortunes of Antiochus. But this monarch was no longer the active and prudent man he had formerly been. He took up his winter quarters at Chalcis, a city in the island of Eubœa, B. C. 191, and there married Eubia, a young lady of great beauty, the daughter of his host Cleoptolemus. He celebrated his nuptials with great festivity, and continued his amusements for a long time after, mindful only of his pleasure, and totally inattentive to business. The example of the king corrupted the officers and the common soldiers. They sunk into voluptuousness, their duties were neglected, and all discipline was destroyed; while the Romans were taking every precaution, and making every preparation for a vigorous prosecution of the war[10].

[8] Dan. xi. 17. and Jerome, Comment. in loc. Livy, xxxv. 13. 19. 23. 43. xxxvii. 53. Appian, Syriac. v. 90—100. vii. 15—xi. 20. xii. 35—xiii. 80. Polybius, iii. 7. 11. Legat. §. 25. Justin, xxx. 4—6. xxxi. 3, 4. xxxii. 1.

[9] Dan. xi. 18. Livy, xxxvi. 7, 8. Appian, Syriac. xiii. 80—xiv. 10.

[10] Diod. Sic. Fragmenta, xxvi. 39. Plutarch, Flaminius, xv. xvi. Philopœmen, xvii. Cato the elder, xii. Livy, xxxvi. 11. Appian, Syriac. xv. 15—xvi. 70. Athenæus, x. 12.

Antiochus had strongly intrenched himself at the pass of Thermopylæ; but was defeated by the Romans with the loss of ten thousand men slain and taken prisoners. He fled with only five hundred horsemen, whom he hastily collected, first to Elateia, and then to Chalcis, whence he set sail for Ephesus [11].

Here he again wasted his time with his youthful bride, till, by the urgent representations of Hannibal, he was made sensible of his danger and aroused from his lethargy. He gave orders for the raising of troops, and sailed in person to the Thracian Chersonesus, where he fortified Sestus, Abydos, and other places; and after having reinforced the garrison of Lysimachia, he returned to Ephesus. His admiral Polyxenidas was soon after defeated in a naval engagement near Corycus in Ionia, with the loss of twenty-three ships [12].

Antiochus, who meanwhile had collected an army at Magnesia, as soon as he heard of this disastrous battle, hastened back to Ephesus, where the remnant of his fleet had taken shelter. During the winter he made every exertion to repair his losses and reinforce his army [13].

The next year, B. C. 190, Polyxenidas by a stratagem surprised the fleet of the Rhodians, which was sailing to aid the Romans, and destroyed or captured all but seven of their vessels. The Rhodians, exasperated by this loss, fitted out a still larger fleet, by which they raised the siege of Pergamus, repulsed Hannibal who was conducting the Phœnician shipping to the assistance of Antiochus, and blockaded him with his fleet in a harbour of Pamphylia [14].

[11] Diod. Sic. xxvi. 41. Appian, Syriac. xvii. 75—xx. 70. Livy, xxxvi. 15, 16. 21.

[12] Dan. xi. 18. Livy, xxxvi. 41—45. Plutarch, Cato the elder, xiii. xiv. Appian, Syriac. xxi. 75—95. xxii. 1—35. Athenæus, x. 12.

[13] Livy, xxxvii. 8. Appian, Syriac. xxii. 5—35.

[14] Livy, xxxvii. 8—12. 18. 23, 24. Appian Syriac. xxiv. 65—95. Corn. Nepos, Hannibal, viii. Polybius Legat. §. 22.

As the naval forces of the Romans were now collected, and in readiness to transport the army from Macedonia to Asia, Antiochus sent an embassy to Æmilius to propose peace. Æmilius replied that no negotiations could be entered into before the arrival of the consul Lucius Scipio. Antiochus then ventured upon another naval battle near Myonesus in Ionia, and was again defeated [15].

Antiochus now lost all presence of mind; and, instead of fortifying the passes which led into his territories, he withdrew his garrisons from all the cities on the Hellespont, and in his precipitant flight left all his military stores behind him. In this manner he not only removed everything which could obstruct the landing of the Romans, but, by leaving his magazines untouched, afforded a most important aid to their enterprise. He renewed his attempts to enter into negotiations for peace, but when he was required to relinquish all his possessions west of the Taurus, and defray the expenses of the war, he resolved to try his fortune once more in a battle by land [16].

Antiochus brought into the field seventy thousand infantry, twelve thousand cavalry, and a great number of camels, elephants, and chariots armed with scythes. To these the Romans could oppose but thirty thousand men, and yet they gained a decisive victory. The chariot horses in the army of Antiochus, being terrified and rushing upon his own men, contributed not a little to his defeat. The Romans lost only three hundred and twenty-five men; while of the forces of Antiochus, fifty thousand infantry, four thousand cavalry, and fifteen elephants, were left dead on the field, fifteen hundred men were made prisoners, and the king himself with great difficulty made his escape to Sardis. Perhaps Antiochus would have succeeded better could he have had the

[15] Livy, xxvii. 19. 29, 30. Appian, Syriac. xxvii. 50—75.

[16] Diod. Sic. Fragmenta, xxvi. 43. Livy, xxxvii. 31. 33—36. Appian, Syriac, xxviii. 80—105. xxix. 10—45. Justin, xxx. 7.

presence of Hannibal in the battle; but that hero was still blockaded by the Rhodians in Pamphylia [17].

Antiochus, by his ambassadors, now humbly sued for peace, and gladly accepted it on the same terms with which he had formerly refused compliance. He relinquished all his possessions west of the Taurus. The Romans gave the Greek cities their freedom, but delivered Caria and Lycia to the Rhodians; and the other provinces to Eumenes, as a reward for the services they had rendered during the war. The expenses of the war, amounting to fifteen thousand talents, Antiochus agreed to pay in Eubœan weight, and in Attic silver; thus uniting the heaviest with the purest standard. Five hundred talents were to be paid as soon as the negotiations were closed, two thousand five hundred more at the ratification of the treaty, and the remaining twelve thousand during the twelve following years, at the rate of one thousand talents a year. He was also to deliver four hundred talents to Eumenes, and to make him compensation for all the corn for which he was indebted to Attalus the father of Eumenes. He farther obligated himself to keep no elephants, and not more than twelve ships. To secure the performance of these conditions, the Romans required him to deliver twelve hostages of their own selection, among whom was his son Antiochus, afterwards surnamed Epiphanes. Antiochus was farther required to deliver into the hands of the Romans his most able generals, Hannibal, Thoas of Ætolia, Mnasimachus of Acarnania, Philo of Chalcis, and Eubulides. But they had prudently made their escape at the commencement of the negotiations [18].

This expensive war, and the large sums he was obliged to pay to the Romans, completely drained the treasury of

[17] Dan. xi. 18, 19. Livy, xxxvii. 39—45. Polybius, Legat. §§. 22, 23. Appian, Syriac. xxx. 50—xxxvii. 65. Justin, xxxi. 8.

[18] Dan. xi. 19, and Jerome, Comment. in loc. Livy, xxxvii. 45. xxxviii. 38. Appian, Syriac. xxxviii. 70—xxxix. 24. Diod. Sic. Fragmenta, xxvii. 46.

Antiochus. He therefore, in the year B. C. 187, went into his eastern provinces for the purpose of replenishing his coffers. But by attempting to plunder the temple of Elymais, he provoked the people to an insurrection, in which he was slain, together with the soldiers who attended him. Thus perished Antiochus the Great. Until the fiftieth year of his age he maintained the character of a just and judicious ruler, but he rapidly degenerated after his marriage with the young Eubia. He was succeeded by his son Seleucus Philopator, to whom he had committed the government on his departure for the eastern provinces[19].

§. 90. THE JEWS. B. C. 221—187.

ACCORDING to the testimony of Josephus, the inhabitants of Judæa and Cœle-Syria suffered severely in the wars of Antiochus the Great with the kings of Egypt; with Ptolemey Philopator between the years B. C. 219 and 216; and with Ptolemey Epiphanes between B. C. 202 and 197. Their country was devastated, and to whichsoever side victory might incline, they were equally exposed to injury. The same historian relates that, at the time when Antiochus gave his daughter Cleopatra in marriage to Ptolemey Epiphanes (B. C. 197), the Samaritans laid waste the lands of the Jews, seized the persons of some of them by fraud, and sold them into slavery. Deducting the seven or eight years of these two wars, it appears that during the remaining twenty-six or twenty-seven years of this period, Judæa was free from commotion[1].

In the year B. C. 217, Simon the second succeeded Onias the second in the high priesthood. After the victory which Ptolemey Philopator gained over Antiochus

[19] Dan. xi. 20. and Jerome, Comment. in loc. Diod. Sic. Fragmenta, xxvi. 30. 49. Justin, xxxii. 2. Strabo, p. 744.

[1] Josephus, Antiq. XII. iii. 2. iv. 1.

the Great in B. C. 211, all the cities of that region sent ambassadors to Raphia to renew their homage to the Egyptian monarch. The Jews were not wanting in zeal on this occasion, and Philopator therefore visited Jerusalem as well as the other cities, offered sacrifices according to the Jewish law, and gave rich gifts to the temple. But when he ventured to violate the sanctuary, and attempted, notwithstanding the earnest expostulations of the high priest, to enter the holy of holies, it is said that he was suddenly seized with a supernatural terror and hastily rushed out of the temple; and when he returned to Egypt he vented his rage on the Jews of Alexandria. This story, however, is of doubtful authority, as it is mentioned by no writer but the author of the third book of Maccabees. The event which Josephus relates (against Apion, ii. 5.) of a somewhat similar character, belongs to the times of Ptolemey Physcon. The story might have originated in the circumstances which are related in the Chronicle of Eusebius, p. 185. It is worthy of remark in this place, that when the Egyptians rebelled against Philopator in the year B. C. 213, forty thousand Jews were massacred, who, in all probability, had taken part in the rebellion[2].

In the last wars of Antiochus the Great with Ptolemey Epiphanes, the inhabitants of these countries, and especially the Jews, appear to have suffered far more from the Egyptian than from the Syrian armies. Probably Scopas the Egyptian commander, who according to the testimony of Polybius was excessively avaricious, had in the former wars been guilty of oppression, and now, to cover his own extortions, permitted his soldiers to plunder the inhabitants without restraint. The Jews also might still remember with indignation, that their sanctuary had been violated by Ptolemey Philopator. Be this as it may, it is certain that in the last war of Ptolemey Epiphanes,

[2] Haggai, ii. 7, 8. Alexand. Chron. Eusebius, Chron. Josephus, Antiq. XII. iv. 10. 3 Macc. i. ii.

the Jews favoured the cause of Antiochus the Great. After his victory over Scopas at Paneas, and after his conquest of Abila, Batanæa, Gadara, and Samaria, they voluntarily tendered him their submission, supplied his army with provisions, and assisted him in expelling the Egyptian garrison from the castle of Zion. This conduct of the Jews towards their old masters, the Egyptian monarchs, under whom they had lived for more than a century, and from whom they had received many favours, is mentioned by Josephus with approbation; but Daniel in his prophecy denounces it as the conduct of robbers and traitors[3].

Antiochus liberally rewarded the Jews for their attachment to his cause. He was under great obligations to them, for in his oriental expeditions, those of that nation who were scattered in the east had proved themselves very faithful and serviceable to him. Josephus introduces the two following edicts of Antiochus in favour of the Jews, the one directed to his governor Ptolemey, the other addressed to his subjects throughout his dominions.

They are thus translated by Whiston:

"King Antiochus to Ptolemey sendeth greeting.

"Since the Jews upon our first entrance on their country demonstrated their friendship towards us, and when we came to their city (Jerusalem) received us in a splendid manner, and came to meet us with their senate, and gave abundance of provisions to our soldiers, and to the elephants, and joined with us in ejecting the garrison of the Egyptians that was in the citadel, we have thought fit to reward them, and to retrieve the condition of their city, which hath been greatly depopulated by such accidents as have befallen its inhabitants, and to bring those that have been scattered abroad back to the city. And, in the first place, we have determined, on account of their piety towards God, to bestow on them, as a pension, for

[3] Polybius, xvii. 36. Josephus, Antiq. XII. i. 3. Dan. xi. 14.

[4] Josephus, Antiq. XII. iii. 3.

their sacrifices of animals that are fit for sacrifice, for wine and oil and frankincense, the value of twenty thousand pieces of silver, and six sacred artabræ of fine flour, and fourteen hundred and sixty medimni of wheat, and three hundred and seventy-five medimni of salt. And these payments I would have fully paid them as I have sent orders to you. I would also have the work about the temple finished, and the cloisters, and if there be any thing that ought to be rebuilt. And for the materials of wood, let it be brought them out of Judæa itself, and out of the other countries, and out of Libanus, tax-free; and the same I would have observed as to those other materials which will be necessary, in order to render the temple more glorious. And let all of that nation live according to the laws of their own country: and let the senate, and the priests, and the scribes of the temple, and the sacred singers, be discharged from the poll-money and the crown-tax and the other taxes also. And that the city may the sooner recover its inhabitants, I grant a discharge from taxes for three years to its present inhabitants and such as shall come to it until the month Hyperbereteus. We also discharge them, for the future, from a third part of their taxes, that the losses they have sustained may be repaired. And all those citizens that have been carried away and are become slaves, we grant them and their children their freedom, and give order that their substance be restored to them."

He also published through all his kingdom, in honour of the temple, a decree containing the following passage:

"It shall be lawful for no foreigner to come within the limits of the temple round about, which thing is forbidden also to the Jews, unless to those who according to their own custom have purified themselves. Nor let any flesh of horses, or of mules, or of asses, be brought into the city, whether they be wild or tame; nor that of leopards, or foxes, or hares; and in general, that of any animal which is forbidden for the Jews to eat. Nor let their skins be brought into it, nor let any such animal be bred up in the

city. Let them only be permitted to use the sacrifices derived from their forefathers, with which they have been obliged to make acceptable atonements to God. And he that transgresseth any of these orders, let him pay to the priests three thousand drachmæ of silver."

Antiochus had such confidence in the Jews, that when he heard of the revolts which had broken out in Lydia and Phrygia, he wrote to his general Zeuxis to transport at the royal expense two thousand Jewish families from Babylonia and Mesopotamia, and place them in the fortified towns, where lands were to be assigned them with freedom from taxation for ten years. This was done that the country might be secured by the fidelity of the new inhabitants [5].

The high priest, Simon the second, held his office from B. C. 217 to 195. At his death he was succeeded by his son Onias the third, a worthy man who lived in times of great commotion [6].

About the year B. C. 187, Joseph, the farmer of the revenues, sent his son Hyrcanus to the court of Ptolemey Epiphanes to congratulate him on the birth of a son. It is not to our purpose to pursue the history of Hyrcanus, but it may be found circumstantially detailed in Josephus. From the fact that Joseph sent Hyrcanus to Egypt on this occasion, it appears that after the marriage of Cleopatra with Ptolemey Epiphanes, or at least after the death of Antiochus, the Jews had again come under the dominion of Egypt, and were well treated [7].

§. 91. SELEUCUS PHILOPATOR. B. C. 186—175.

After the violent death of Antiochus the Great at Elymais in the year B. C. 187, his son Seleucus Philopator ascended the throne of Syria. We know nothing of

[5] Josephus, Antiq. XII. iii. 3.
[6] Josephus, Antiq. XII. iv. 10. Alexand. Chron. Eusebius, Chron.
[7] Josephus, Antiq. XII. iv. 7—10.

his reign excepting what is contained in Appian, for Justin passes him over in silence, and the history of Polybius, relating to this period, is lost[1].

About the time that Seleucus came to the throne, Ptolemey Epiphanes, that his dissipations might no longer be interrupted by the admonitions of Aristomenes, destroyed that faithful and judicious minister by poison. He now became an unrestrained and shameless tyrant. The nobles therefore, in the year B. C. 185, entered into a combination to depose him, but their conspiracy was detected and suppressed. Ptolemey, so far from learning a lesson of moderation from the danger to which he had been exposed, became still more furious, and vented his rage upon those conspirators who had surrendered themselves to him on his promise of pardon. A new insurrection broke out, but was suppressed by the minister Polycrates. He caused four of the principal insurgents, to whom Ptolemey on their surrender had solemnly pledged himself to show favour, to be bound naked to his chariot, and, after having dragged them about in this manner, ordered them to be executed. At length, in the year B. C. 180, his discontented subjects relieved themselves of their hated king by administering to him poison in the twenty-fourth year of his reign, while he was busily engaged in making preparations for a war against his brother-in-law Seleucus. His son and successor, Ptolemey Philometor, was then but six years old; and was placed under the guardianship of his mother Cleopatra, the sister of Seleucus Philopator[2].

From the preparations for a war against Syria, which Ptolemey Epiphanes began to make before his death, it would seem that Seleucus Philopator, taking advantage of the disturbances in Egypt, had reunited to the Syrian crown the provinces of Cœle-Syria and Palæstine, which

[1] Appian, Syriac. xlv. 60—65.

[2] Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxvi. 35. Excerpta Valesii ex Polyb. xx. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi.

Antiochus the Great had given (with the reservation of half the revenues) as a dowry to his daughter Cleopatra. At least, in the history of the succeeding period, we find Palæstine actually under the dominion of the Syrian king, though no mention is made of any other war.

In the year B. C. 176, Simon a Benjamite, who became governor of the temple at Jerusalem after the death of Joseph, the farmer of the revenues under the Egyptian kings, attempted to introduce some innovations, which were steadily resisted by the high priest Onias the third. Simon, enraged that his designs were thwarted, went to Apollonius the governor of Cœle-Syria under Seleucus Philopator, and informed him of the great treasures which were preserved in the temple. Apollonius informed Seleucus of what he had learned from Simon. The king, though a friend to the Jews, and though he had regularly made disbursements according to the directions of his father towards sustaining the expenses of the sacrifices at Jerusalem, determined to apply to his own use the treasures of the temple; for the annual payment of one thousand talents to the Romans had reduced his finances to a very low ebb. With the design, therefore, of replenishing his exhausted treasury, he sent Heliodorus to Jerusalem to plunder the temple. But his sacrilegious attempt is said to have been frustrated by a most striking miracle, to which perhaps Polybius has reference in the following words quoted by Josephus: "concerning which (the temple of Jerusalem), although I have more to say, and particularly concerning *the presence of God about that temple*, yet do I put off that history to another opportunity." If Polybius ever executed the design here intimated, this, as well as many other parts of his accurate and authentic history, has been lost to us. The attempt of Heliodorus seems to be referred to in Daniel, xi. 20[3].

[3] 2 Macc. iii. 4—40. Josephus, Antiq. XII. iii. 3. and concerning the Maccabees, iv.

Seleucus Philopator, in the eleventh year of his reign, sent his only son Demetrius as a hostage to Rome, and released his brother Antiochus who had resided twelve years in that city. As the heir to the crown was now out of the way, Heliodorus sought to raise himself to the regal dignity, and for this purpose destroyed the king by poison. He attached a large party to his interests, and finally gained over those who were in favour of submitting to the king of Egypt, whose mother Cleopatra was the daughter of Antiochus the Great and sister of Seleucus Philopator. Antiochus Epiphanes received notice of these transactions while he was at Athens, on his return from Rome. He applied himself to Eumenes king of Pergamus, whom, with his brother Attalus, he easily induced to espouse his cause; and they, with the help of a part of the Syrians, deprived Heliodorus of his usurped authority. Thus in the year B. C. 175, and 136 of the era of the Seleucidæ, Antiochus Epiphanes quietly ascended the throne, while the lawful heir Demetrius, the son of Seleucus Philopator, was absent at Rome[4].

NOTE. Under the reign of Seleucus Philopator, Josephus (Antiq. XII. iv. 10.) places the letter of Arius, or Darius, or Onairus, king of the Spartans, to Onias the third, high priest of the Jews. This letter, together with a reply to it, is preserved in 1 Macc. xii. 5—23. This unknown king is said to have found it written in a book, that the Spartans were the descendants of Abraham, and consequently the brethren of the Jews. This is altogether in the taste of those times, when all nations were curious to ascertain their origin, and their relationship to other nations; but among the kings of Sparta, history preserves none of the name of Arius, or Darius, or Onairus, and the reply of the Jews is not such as we should expect it would have been, if intended for the Spartans. It is, therefore,

[4] Dan. xi. 21, and Jerome, Comment. in loc. 1 Macc. i. 10. Appian, Syriac. xlv. 60—70.

highly probable that the true name of the people referred to was corrupted by some early transcriber, and is now unknown. Michælis, in Anmerkungen zu dem Ersten Buch der Makk. xii. 5. s. 263, sqq. conjectures that the true reading is Σπαρδιάται, *Spardians*, and that the country סְפָרַד *Sepharad* (Obadiah, 20.) is meant, the situation of which is now unknown. Jerome supposes that סְפָרַד is the Bosporus, or Crimean Tartary, where it is very probable that there might have been in those times a petty king over a colony of Hebrew exiles.

BOOK X.

ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES AND THE MACCABEES TO THE INDEPENDENCE OF THE JEWS.

§. 92. ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES.

BY such means as have already been mentioned, Antiochus gained possession of the crown which of right belonged to his nephew Demetrius. If we may credit the conjecture of Appian he was surnamed Ἐπιφανὴς (*the Illustrious*) because he vindicated the claims of the royal family against the usurpations of the foreigner Heliodorus. He also bore the surname of Θεὸς, which is still seen upon his coins. But as he is represented by historians, he well merited the surname of Ἐπιμανὴς (*the Insane*), which his subjects gave him instead of Ἐπιφανὴς[1].

He often lounged like a mere idler about the streets of Antioch, attended by two or three servants; and, not deigning to look at the nobles, would talk with goldsmiths and other mechanics in their workshops, engage in trifling and idle conversation with the lowest of the people, and mingle in the society of foreigners and men of the vilest character. He was not ashamed to enter the dissipated circles of the young, to drink and carouse with them, and to promote their revelries by singing and playing on his flute. He often appeared among the common people at the public baths, engaging in every kind of

[1] Appian, Syriac. xlv. 70—75. Frœhlich, Annal. Syr. Tab. vi. vii Polybius as quoted by Athenæus, v. p. 193. x. p. 438. Livy, xli. 20. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxvi. 65. xxxi. 7, 8.

foolish jest without the least regard to the dignity of his station and character. Not unfrequently did he appear in the streets in a state of intoxication, when he would scatter his money about and practice various other fooleries equally extravagant.

Sometimes he exhibited still more decisive tokens of madness. He would parade the streets of his capital in a long robe and with a garland of roses upon his head, and if any attempted to pass by or to follow him, he would pelt them with stones which he carried concealed under his garments. When the humour pleased him, he would array himself in a white robe like the candidates at Rome, and in this dress go about Antioch, saluting the citizens whom he met, taking them by the hand, embracing them and supplicating their suffrages for some Roman office, of which they probably had never before heard even the name. When he had thus obtained a number of votes, sufficient to constitute him a tribune or an ædile, he would with great solemnity seat himself in an ivory chair in the market-place, after the manner of the Romans, listen with deep attention to the most trifling disputes, and pronounce judgment upon them with all the gravity of a Roman magistrate. At other times he publicly appeared in familiar intercourse with panders and common prostitutes.

His liberality was profusion without bounds, and often ridiculous. He sometimes presented great sums of money to cities; and often he would give gold to any person whom he chanced to meet, though an entire stranger; and to another he would make a present of a few dates, or some such trifle. He outdid all his predecessors in the splendour of the games which he celebrated at Daphne in honour of Jupiter Olympius; but his conduct was so ridiculous that the foreigners who were present thought him insane. Yet he was so strict as to exclude all females from the exhibition[2]. He paid little regard to the other

[2] Dan. xi. 37.

gods, but for Jupiter Olympus he built a magnificent temple, made offerings to him at an unprecedented expense, and attempted to compel all his subjects, and the Jews among the rest, to worship him. But without referring to this persecution of the Jewish religion, the other parts of his conduct are amply sufficient to justify the appellation נִבְזֶה (*vile, contemptible*), which Daniel gives him[3].

§. 93. ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES. B. C. 175—171.

THE Jews having been so long under the dominion of Grecian monarchs, had now become familiar with the customs, the literature, and the sciences of Greece. They had acquired a taste for them; many preferred the Greek manners to their own, and even the idolatrous Greek religion, to the rational worship of one true God. Of this class was Jesus, a brother of the high priest Onias the third. He assumed the Greek name Jason, and had solicited the high priesthood of Antiochus Epiphanes, at the commencement of his reign. He promised the king three hundred and sixty talents in addition to the tribute paid by his brother (making three thousand six hundred talents in all), eighty talents more from another revenue; and he offered the sum of one hundred and fifty talents for permission to establish a Greek gymnasium at Jerusalem, and for full power of conferring on the Jews the citizenship of Antioch, which was much sought after, on account of the privileges connected with it. Antiochus, without hesitation, granted a request so agreeable to his own feelings. His treasury was exhausted by the tribute which the Romans had exacted of his father, and his own prodigality rendered him necessitous. Thus Jason squandered immense sums for the purpose of depriving his countrymen of the privilege of living according to their own laws; a privilege for which they had made the

[3] Dan. xi. 21. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi.

greatest sacrifices, and which they had but just obtained of Seleucus Philopator by the aid of Eupolemus[1].

Jason soon came to Jerusalem in the capacity of high priest; and his brother, the pious priest Onias, was recalled to Antioch by order of the king, there to remain in exile, that he might offer no resistance to the contemplated innovations. The partiality of many of the nation for Greek customs, and the hope of obtaining the citizenship of Antioch, attracted great numbers to the party of Jason. His gymnasium was so much frequented, that even the priests neglected the services of the temple to engage in athletic exercises; and many Jews, by a painful process, obliterated the mark of circumcision, that when they contended naked in their games, they might appear in all respects like the Greeks. Josephus relates the transactions of these times in an obscure and inaccurate manner; and as he had no other sources of information than we possess in the Books of Maccabees, we shall in the sequel adhere to these authorities, without always referring to the negligences and mistakes of the Jewish historian[2].

The only avowed purpose of these athletic exercises was the strengthening of the body, but the real design went to the gradual changing of Judaism for heathenism, as was clearly indicated by the pains which many took to efface the mark of circumcision. The games, besides, were closely connected with idolatry, for they were generally celebrated in honour of some pagan god. The innovations of Jason were therefore extremely odious to the more pious part of the nation, and even his own adherents did not enter fully into all his views. In the following year, B. C. 174, games were celebrated in the presence of Antiochus Epiphanes at Tyre, in honour of Hercules, and Jason sent thither some Jews of his own

[1] 1 Macc. i. 11—14. 2 Macc. iv. 7—10. Josephus, concerning the Maccabees, iv. compare Zech. x. 2. xi. 3.

[2] 1 Macc. i. 15. 2 Macc. iv. 11—17. Josephus, concerning the Maccabees, iv. and Antiquities, XII. v. 1.

party, on whom he had conferred the citizenship of Antioch, with three hundred talents (or rather, according to the Arundelian Manuscript, three thousand three hundred), as an offering to the god. But the deputies having still too much sense of religion remaining to obey their instructions, devoted the money to the building of ships of war[3].

In the following year (B. C. 173), Cleopatra queen of Egypt died. She was the sister of Antiochus Epiphanes, and guardian of the young king Ptolemey Philometor; and the government of Egypt now devolved on Eulæus the eunuch, and Lennæus the prime minister, the tutors of the prince. They immediately demanded of Antiochus the possession of Cœle-Syria and Palæstine; because these provinces had been secured to Ptolemey Lagus by the treaty of B. C. 301, and they had again been given by Antiochus the Great, in dowry to his daughter Cleopatra, on her becoming queen of Egypt. Antiochus Epiphanes refused to listen to their demands. Both parties then sent ambassadors to Rome, to urge their respective claims to these provinces before the Roman senate[4].

As soon as Ptolemey Philometor had reached his fourteenth year, he was solemnly invested with the government; and ambassadors from all the surrounding nations arrived to congratulate him on his accession to the throne. On this occasion Antiochus sent to Egypt Apollonius the son of Mnestheus, apparently to congratulate the king on his coronation, but with the real purpose of sounding the dispositions of the Egyptian court. When Apollonius, on his return, informed Antiochus that he was viewed as an enemy by the Egyptians, he immediately sailed to Joppa to survey his frontiers on the side of Egypt, and to put them in a state of defence. At this time he visited Jerusalem, when the city was illuminated, and he was received by Jason and the assembled people with every

[3] 2 Macc. iv. 18—20.

[4] Polybius, Legat. §§. 78. 82. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. 21.

possible demonstration of honour. He then returned to Antioch by the way of Phœnicia[5].

Jason had now laboured for three years to destroy the Jewish constitution and religion; and in B. C. 172, he commissioned his younger brother Onias (who had adopted the Greek name Menelaus), to carry the tribute to Antioch and transact other business with the king. But Menelaus, instead of attending to the business of Jason, embraced this opportunity to promote his own interests; and by promising the king three hundred talents more of tribute, he obtained a nomination to the high priesthood. When he came to Jerusalem with this appointment, several joined his party, and, among the rest, the powerful sons of Tobias. But being unable to expel Jason, he was obliged to return to Antioch. Then he and his adherents solemnly abjured the Jewish religion before the king, and bound themselves expressly to bring the whole nation to take the same step, and to introduce the Greek religion. Antiochus then provided him with a competent force, which Jason was unable to resist, and he fled to the Ammonites[6].

Menelaus had promised a larger tribute than his brother, but as yet he had paid nothing. After he had been frequently and in vain reminded of his neglect by Sostratus, the commander of the castle at Jerusalem, who had the charge of collecting the tribute, they were both summoned to appear at Antioch. At their arrival, Antiochus was in Cilicia to quell some disturbances that had arisen there; and Menelaus gained time to order Lysimachus, whom he had left at Jerusalem as his deputy, to take some costly vessels out of the temple and expose them for sale at Tyre. By this means he obtained money enough to discharge his debt and to make large presents to Andronicus, to whom Antiochus had intrusted the adminis-

[5] Polybius, Legat. §. 72. 2 Macc. iv. 21, 22.

[6] 2 Macc. xxiii—xxv. Josephus, Antiquities, XII. v. 1. compare Zech. v. 2. xi. 3.

tration of affairs during his absence. But Lysimachus, Andronicus, and Onias the third, all lost their lives in consequence of this profanation of the temple. For the sacrilege and extortions of Lysimachus excited an insurrection at Jerusalem, and though he had three thousand armed men under his command, he was slain by the people in the treasury of the temple. Onias the third, who dwelt at Antioch as an exile, and was universally beloved on account of his virtues, severely reproved his degenerate brother Menelaus, for the crime of robbing the temple, and then made his escape to the sanctuary at Daphne. At the instigation of Menelaus, Andronicus allured Onias from his place of refuge and treacherously murdered him. Antiochus, on his return, was so enraged at the crime, that he ordered Andronicus to be executed[7].

NOTE. According to the Alexandrian Chronicle, Onias the third was high priest twenty-four years, reckoning to the time of his death. This confirms the statement which we made from Eusebius (sect. 83 of this work) respecting the period of Simon the Just; for the death of Onias the third cannot be placed lower without contradicting the testimony of the books of Maccabees and of Josephus. See Prideaux, Connexions, vol. ii. p. 146.

§. 94. CAMPAIGNS OF ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES IN EGYPT. B. C. 171—167.

MEANWHILE Antiochus Epiphanes made preparations for a war with Egypt. He viewed Ptolemey Philometor and his two ministers with contempt; but to the Romans, the allies or protectors of the young king, he sent an embassy to justify the hostilities he was about to commence. In the year B. C. 170, and 141 or (according to the first Book of Maccabees) 142 of the era of the Seleucidæ, he

[7] 2 Macc. iv. 27—42.

led his army along the coast through Palæstine and Arabia Petræa, and defeated the Egyptians between mount Casius and the city Pelusium. He then left garrisons on the frontiers and retired into winter quarters at Tyre[1].

Here three deputies came to the king from the sanhedrim at Jerusalem, and made complaint against Menelaus on account of the sacrilege and the other crimes he had committed by the agency of Lysimachus. After a full investigation of the cause, no doubt remained of the guilt of Menelaus; yet he was acquitted and the three innocent accusers were put to death. Menelaus effected this turn in his own favour by the aid of Ptolemey Macro, who possessed unbounded influence over Antiochus on account of his having treacherously delivered up to him the island of Cyprus, when he held it as governor under the king of Egypt. But the execution of the innocent deputies was so odious in the eyes of the Tyrians, that they gave their dead bodies an honourable burial at their own expense[2]. During the winter the prodigies are said to have occurred which are related 2 Macc. v. 2, 3.

In the spring of B. C. 169, 142 or 143 of the Greek era, Antiochus undertook a second expedition against the Egyptians, and attacked them by sea and land. He defeated the Egyptian army on the frontiers, and took Pelusium. Diodorus Siculus and Josephus say that Antiochus, on this occasion, availed himself of a mean artifice, without specifying what it was. Possibly they may refer to the pretence that he came as the friend of Ptolemey (Dan. xi. 23.), of which we shall say more hereafter. Antiochus, after this victory, might have cut the Egyptian army in pieces, but he rode round among his soldiers and restrained their fury, and, by this act of humanity, gained great favour with the Egyptians. At length all surrendered to him voluntarily, and with a small

[1] Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxvi. 79. Livy, xlii. 29. Polybius, Legat. §. 71. Justin, xxxiv. 2. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. 22.

[2] 2 Macc. iv. 43—50.

body of troops he made himself master of Memphis and of all Egypt as far as Alexandria, almost without striking a blow[3].

While Antiochus was advancing into the heart of Egypt, king Ptolemey Philometor fell into his hands. He probably surrendered voluntarily, for, at that time at least, he was far from having the character of a hero; and the probability is rendered greater by the fact, that Antiochus admitted him to his table, and in all respects treated him, not as a prisoner, but as a king and a relative. Antiochus pretended that he had come to Egypt solely for the good of king Ptolemey, to settle for him the affairs of his kingdom; nor did his prisoner find it expedient to exhibit any appearance of incredulity. But he must have seen that Antiochus, with all his professions of friendship, was not regardless of plunder, for he ravaged Egypt in every quarter[4].

While these two kings were endeavouring to deceive each other under the mask of friendship, a report was spread abroad in Palæstine, that Antiochus Epiphanes was dead. Upon this Jason, at the head of a thousand men of the Ammonites, took possession of Jerusalem, and massacred great numbers of those who had opposed him; while Menelaus secured himself in the castle of Zion. The first accounts of these disturbances which Antiochus received in Egypt, were very much exaggerated. It was said that all the Jews were in rebellion, and rejoicing at his supposed death. He therefore returned hastily from Egypt and took Jerusalem by storm, according to the united testimony of Diodorus Siculus, the author of the second book of Maccabees, and Josephus. Josephus indeed says (Antiquities, XII. v. 3.), that the city was taken by stratagem, and thus contradicts what he has

[3] Diod. Sic. xxvi. 75. 77. Josephus, Antiq. XII. v. 2. compare Dan. xi. 23. 1 Macc. i. 17, 18. 2 Macc. v. 1. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. 24, 25. compare Dan. xi. 22. 25. 40.

[4] Justin, xxxiv. 2. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxvi. 76. 1 Macc. i. 19. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. 25. compare Dan. xi. 23, 24. 27. 42.

stated in his history of the Jewish War, I. i. 1, 2. and VI. x. 1. But it is most probable that Jerusalem was taken by force; for Antiochus plundered the city, slew eighty thousand persons, men, women, and children, took forty thousand prisoners, and sold as many into slavery. As if this were not enough, under the guidance of the high priest Menelaus, he went into the sanctuary, uttering blasphemous language, took away all the gold and silver that he could find there, the golden table, altar, and candlestick, and all the gold vessels; and that he might leave nothing behind, he searched the subterranean vaults, and in this manner collected eighteen hundred talents of gold, which he carried away. He then sacrificed swine upon the altar, boiled a piece of the flesh, and sprinkled the whole temple with the broth. He appointed Philip, a Phrygian, governor of Judæa, Andronicus and Menelaus, governors of Samaria, and confirmed Menelaus in the high priesthood. Before Antiochus arrived in Judæa, Jason had fled to Ammonitis, to seek the protection of Aretas, a prince or king of the Arabians. But not feeling secure with him, he next escaped to Egypt, and ultimately to the Lacedæmonians[5].

As Ptolemey Philometor king of Egypt was now in the power of Antiochus Epiphanes king of Syria, the Alexandrians raised to the throne his brother Ptolemey Physcon *(the Gross)*, who assumed the name of Euergetes the second. This furnished Antiochus with a pretext for invading Egypt a third time, B. C. 168, 143 or 144 of the Greek era. His pretended object was to support Ptolemey Philometor against the usurpation of his brother, but it was his real purpose to subject the whole country to his own power. He defeated the Alexandrians by sea near Pelusium, and then drew up his land forces before the city of Alexandria. Ptolemey Physcon sent an embassy to Rome to solicit the protec-

[5] Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 1. 1 Macc. i. 18—28. compare Zech. xiii. 7—9. xiv. 1, 2. 2 Macc. v. 5—26.

tion of the senate, and at the same time entered into negotiations for peace with Antiochus, in which he was assisted by the ambassadors from some of the small states of Greece, who were then at the Egyptian court. But Antiochus rejected their proposals; and a second attempt to pacify him, by the aid of the Rhodian ambassadors, was equally unsuccessful. But when Antiochus perceived that the conquest of Alexandria would be no easy achievement, he retired to Memphis, and pretended to deliver up the kingdom to king Philometor; but he retained Pelusium, the key of the country, and leaving there a strong garrison, returned to Antioch[6].

Ptolemey Philometor could not mistake the intentions of Antiochus in holding possession of Pelusium; and he therefore came to an agreement with his brother Physcon, that they should share the government between them, and resist Antiochus with their united power. Accordingly they hired some mercenary troops from Greece. Antiochus now threw off the mask and appeared openly as the enemy of the two brothers, and prepared for a fourth expedition against Egypt. In the year B. C. 167, 144 or 145 of the Greek era, he sent his fleet to Cyprus to secure the possession of that island; and he then led his army towards Egypt, to subdue the two brothers and annex the whole country to his own dominions. At Rhinocolura he was met by an embassy from Ptolemey Philometor; but he quickly dismissed the legates with the positive requisition, that not only Cyprus, but all the region of Pelusium should be delivered into his hands. As no answer was returned to his demand on the day he had appointed, he proceeded along the coast through Arabia Petræa, took possession of all the territory as far as Alexandria, and then directed his march towards that city in order to besiege it[7].

[6] Porphyry as quoted by Scaliger, Græc. Eusebian. p. 60. 68. Polybius, Legat. §§. 81, 82. 64. Livy, xliv. 19. xlv. 11. Justin, xxxiv. 2.

[7] Polybius, Legat. §. 89. Livy, xlv. 11, 12.

When he had arrived at Leusine, about four Roman miles from Alexandria, he met Caius Popilius Lænas, Caius Decimius, and Caius Hostilius, ambassadors whom the Roman senate had sent to him at the earnest request of Ptolemey Physcon. They were instructed to assure Antiochus, that he must leave the kingdom of Egypt and the island of Cyprus in peace, or expect a war with the Romans. Antiochus, during his thirteen years' residence at Rome, had become acquainted with Popilius, and as soon as he saw him, offered him his hand with all the familiarity of intimate friendship. But the ambassador would not recognise the friend of Popilius, and he handed to the king the written demands of the Roman senate. When Antiochus replied that he would lay the affair before his council, Popilius, the head of the legation, with his staff drew a circle about the king in the sand on which they stood, and exclaimed: "Before you leave this circle, you must give me an answer which I can report to the senate." Antiochus was confounded, but on a little reflection said, that he would do whatever the senate required. Popilius then recognised his friend and extended to him his hand. The arrogance of the ambassadors and the submissiveness of Antiochus, were not without cause. The Romans had just made themselves formidable by their victory over Perseus king of Macedonia, in consequence of which that country was reduced to a Roman province; and these ambassadors had waited at the island of Delos, to learn the issue of the Macedonian war before they sailed to Egypt[8].

[8] Polybius, Legat. §§. 90. 92. Livy, xliv. 14. 29. 41—46. xlv. 10. 12. Valerius Maximus, VI. iv. 3. Justin, xxxiii. 1. 2. xxxiv. 3. Velleius Paterculus, i. 10. Plutarch, Apophthegm. xxxii. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxvi. 78—80. 86. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. 27. compare Dan. xi. 29, 30.

§. 95. REVOLT OF THE JEWS. B. C. 167—166.

ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES, thus disappointed in his designs against Egypt, and returning from that country in disgrace, sent Apollonius, his chief collector of tribute, with a division of twenty-two thousand men from his army, to vent his rage on the city of Jerusalem. Apollonius arrived at Jerusalem in June, B. C. 167, just two years after the conquest and cruel treatment of the city by Antiochus himself. On the first Sabbath after his arrival, he sent out his soldiers with orders to massacre all the men they met, and to make slaves of the women and children. Now all the streets of Jerusalem flowed with blood, the houses were plundered and the city walls thrown down. Apollonius demolished the houses that stood near mount Zion, and with the materials thus obtained, strengthened the fortifications of the castle, which he furnished with a garrison and held under his own command. This castle was so situated that it gave Apollonius complete control over the temple, and the Jews could no longer visit their sanctuary to perform the public services of religion. Accordingly, in the month of June, B. C. 167, the daily sacrifice ceased and Jerusalem was deserted, for the inhabitants were obliged to flee to save their lives. Josephus, whose history of this whole period is extremely careless and unsatisfactory, says that Antiochus himself was present at this time; but the Books of Maccabees, which are the only sources of information that he possessed, say nothing of the presence of the king; and their authority is far preferable to his[1].

An edict was now issued at Antioch and proclaimed in all the provinces of Syria, commanding the inhabitants of the whole empire to worship the gods of the king, and to acknowledge no religion but his. The pagans, in accord-

[1] Josephus, Antiq. XII. v. 4. 1 Macc. i. 29—40. 2 Macc. v. 24—26. compare Zech. xiii. 8. xiv. 1—12. and Dan. xi. 30, 31.

ance with their religious opinions, would feel no difficulty in complying with this order; but in the sequel we shall see the effects it produced among the Madejesnans, or disciples of Zoroaster, in Armenia and Persia. The tradition of these worshippers of fire, that their books were destroyed by Alexander the Great, probably owes its origin to this edict of Antiochus Epiphanes, with whom their sacred books would be likely to find no more favour than the sacred books of the Jews; but as his authority did not extend to Media and Bactria, the books might have been preserved in those provinces. The Samaritans, who claimed a Jewish origin in the time of Alexander, now wrote to Antiochus, and informing him that they were Zidonians, offered to dedicate their temple on mount Gerizim, to the Grecian Jupiter. Many Jews submitted to the edict for fear of punishment, and a still greater number, long attached to the Grecian customs, gladly embraced this opportunity to declare themselves fully and pass over to the Syrians. But the better part of the people fled and kept themselves concealed [2].

An old man of the name of Athenæus was sent to Jerusalem to instruct the Jews in the Greek religion, and compel them to an observance of its rites. He dedicated the temple to Jupiter Olympius, and on the altar of Jehovah he placed a smaller altar to be used in sacrificing to the heathen god. This new altar, built by order of the desolator Antiochus, is what Daniel alludes to when he speaks of *the abomination that maketh desolate.* (חַשִּׁקּוּץ מְשֹׁמֵם. Τὸ βδέλυγμα τῆς ἐρημώσεως. *The abomination of desolation*). This interpretation agrees much better with the literal meaning of the words, than that adopted by those who apply this expression to the erecting of an image to Jupiter Olympius; a mode of explanation which is at variance with the authority of Josephus and the first

[2] Josephus, Antiq. XII. v. 4, 5. Jewish War, i. 1, 2. Tacitus, Hist. v. 8. Jerome, Comment. in Dan. viii. ix. 1 Macc. i. 41—53. 2 Macc. v. 27. vi. 2.

Book of Maccabees. (Θυσιάζοντες ἐπὶ τὸν βωμὸν ὃς ἦν ἐπὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου.) Undoubtedly there was an image erected to Jupiter Olympius, for the pagan religion required it; but this is not the circumstance referred to by the prophet in the words we have quoted. This altar was set up on the fifteenth day of the month Kislev, (כִּסְלֵו December) and the heathen sacrifices were commenced on the twenty-fifth of the same month. The Samaritan temple on mount Gerizim was dedicated by Athenæus to Jupiter Xenios, or the protector of strangers: because the Samaritans had pretended in their letter to Antiochus, that they were strangers in that country[3].

Circumcision, the keeping of the Sabbath, and every observance of the law, was now made a capital offence; and all the copies of the sacred books that could be found, were taken away, defaced, torn in pieces, and burnt. Groves were planted and idolatrous altars erected in every city, and the citizens were required to offer sacrifices to the gods, and eat swine's flesh every month on the birthday of the king; and at the feast of Bacchus they were commanded to be crowned with ivy and walk in procession. Those who refused to obey these orders, were put to death without mercy. Among other instances of cruel punishment at Jerusalem, two women with their infant children, whom they had circumcised with their own hands, were thrown from the battlements on the south side of the temple, into the deep vale below the walls of the city. Officers were sent into all the towns, attended by bands of soldiers, to enforce obedience to the royal edict[4].

The Hebrews had never before been subjected to so furious a persecution; but they were so firmly established in their religion that all the threats and tortures which their enemies employed against them, could not force

[3] 1 Macc. i. 44—64. iv. 54. 2 Macc. vi. 1—9. x. 5. Josephus, Antiq. XII. v. 4. Dan. xi. 31. Matt. xxiv. 15.

[4] 1 Macc. i. 47. 60—63. 2 Macc. vi. 7. 10. Josephus, Antiq. XII. v. 4.

them to renounce it. At this time Apelles, a royal officer, was sent to Modin or Modeim, (מוֹדִעִים) a city west of Jerusalem, near the seashore, to execute the orders of the king his master. With fair promises he attempted to persuade Mattathias, one of the principal inhabitants of the place, and a priest of the fourth sacerdotal class of Jehoiarib (Joarib), and the son of Johanan (John), the grandson of Simon (Simeon), and great-grandson of Hasmon (Asamoneus), to comply with the royal edict and offer sacrifice to the idol. But Mattathias indignantly and fearlessly repelled his offers, and with a loud voice, in the hearing of the whole assembly, refused to offer sacrifice; and when a certain Jew approached the altar, with the intention of sacrificing, the zealous priest, in obedience to the law of Moses, struck him down with his own hand as a rebel against Jehovah. He then rushed on the officer and his retinue, and with the aid of his sons and some other Jews who were emboldened by his courage, he slew them and tore down the idolatrous altar. He then encouraged his pious countrymen to follow him, and fled into the wilderness of Judæa, where he was soon joined by many Jews, who were determined to maintain the religion of their fathers [5].

These conscientious Israelites, however, adhered too closely to the letter of the law without fully comprehending its spirit; construing it the more strictly out of hatred to the looseness and impiety of their countrymen who had joined the Greeks. They interpreted the law respecting the rest of the seventh day literally, and considered it criminal to take arms on the Sabbath, even in defence of their own lives. Accordingly about a thousand men, who had concealed themselves in a cave not far from Jerusalem, were massacred on the Sabbath, without offering the least resistance, by Philip the Phrygian governor of Judæa. This event opened the eyes of Mattathias

[5] 1 Chron. xxiv. 7. 1 Macc. ii. 1—30. Josephus, Antiq. XII. vi. 1, 2. compare Dan. xi. 32.

and his adherents to their misunderstanding of the law, and they resolved at once to fight in their own defence, though not to commence an attack on the Sabbath[6].

It seems that Antiochus, when he heard of the resistance of the Jews, came to Judæa himself, B. C. 166, and that at this time he ordered the venerable scribe Eleazar, and the pious mother with her seven sons, to be put to death with the most cruel tortures[7].

Meanwhile the party of Mattathias was continually increasing, for not only great numbers of the Assideans (חֲסִידִים) who in their religious observances even exceeded the demands of the law, resorted to his standard; but he was joined by many of the Zaddukeans (צַדּוּקִים) who regarded only the written law. They were all resolved to hazard everything in defence of their religion, and their number soon became so large as to form a considerable army. With these adherents Mattathias emerged from his concealment, went though the Jewish cities, demolished the idolatrous altars, circumcised the children, slew the apostate Jews and the royal officers, seized the copies of the law which the heathen had taken away, and gained several important advantages over the enemy. While engaged in these expeditions he died, in the year B. C. 166. He appointed Judas, his third and bravest son, military leader, associating with him Simon, his second and most prudent son, as a counsellor[8]. Judas, on account of his heroic exploits, received the surname of Maccabæus (מַקַּבִּי *the Hammerer*), and Simon was surnamed Thassi (תַּדְשִׁי *he increases*).

About this time, Antiochus Epiphanes gave magnificent games at Daphne in honour of Jupiter Olympius, on which he squandered immense sums of money. He invited many strangers to the feasts, but they were con-

[6] 1 Macc. ii. 31—41. 2 Macc. vi. 11. Josephus, Antiq. XII. vi. 2.

[7] 2 Macc. vi. vii. Josephus, concerning the Maccabees, v—xiv.

[8] 1 Macc. ii. 42—49. 70. Josephus, Antiq. XII. vi. 2—4. compare Dan. xi. 34.

ducted in so ridiculous a manner that several of the guests withdrew in disgust. He rode along the solemn procession on a miserable horse, ordered some to go forward and some to remain behind, and gave places to others according to his own caprice; so that those who were unacquainted with him, would never have taken him for the king, seeing him without a diadem, and in a dress no way above that of a common slave. At the feast he went to the door of the banqueting hall, waited on some of those who were entering, ordered others to their couches, and busied himself in arranging the servants who were bringing in the dishes. He went from one guest to another, now seated himself at the table, and then reclined apart from the company. Before they were aware, he would suddenly throw his food and cup out of his hand, spring up, pace about the hall, run round the whole circuit of the tables, receive standing the cups which were drunk to him, and banter the musicians. When the feast had continued till late at night, and most of the guests had retired, he rolled himself up in a cloth, and in this manner he was carried out and laid on the ground by the comedians. As soon as the music began to sound he sprang up naked, played antics with the comedians, and joined them in the most ludicrous and comic dances[9].

While Antiochus was spending his time in these ridiculous frolics at Daphne, Judas, after the example of his father, continued to purify Judæa from idolaters; and he took possession of some cities, and provided them with garrisons. He defeated Apollonius the governor of Samaria, who had drawn out his army against him; and also Seron the lieutenant of Cœle-Syria, under the governor Ptolemey Macro, who had advanced with all his army to the heights near Beth-horon. By these conflicts the Jews were inured to war, their courage was con-

[9] Polybius in Athen. v. 4. x. 12. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxi. 7—9. compare Dan. xi. 21. 38, 39.

firmed, and their fallen enemies supplied them with suitable arms[10].

§. 96. WAR BETWEEN THE JEWS AND SYRIANS. B. C. 165—163.

When Antiochus heard of these successes of the Jews, he determined to exterminate the whole nation, and give their country to others. (Dan. xi. 39.) But he had exhausted his treasures by expensive games and extravagant donations, and found it difficult to raise a large army; and at the same time he received intelligence that the Persians, and Artaxias the tributary king of Armenia, had refused to make him any more remittances. (Dan. xi. 44.) This was the effect of his religious persecutions, which could not but be odious in the eyes of those Madejesnans who abhorred the worship of idols. Accordingly Antiochus was obliged to weaken his forces by dividing them. He sent one division of his army to Judæa, under the command of Lysias, a nobleman of royal blood: and the other he himself led to Armenia in the year B. C. 165, after he had made Lysias regent of the countries west of the Euphrates, and had committed to the care of this officer his son, the heir to his crown, then but seven years old. He soon subdued the Armenians, and then marched against Persia[1].

After Philip governor of Judæa had informed Ptolemey Macro governor of Cœle-Syria of the proceedings of Judas Maccabæus, and he again had sent word to Lysias, these officers collected a force of forty thousand foot and seven thousand horse. One half of this army was brought out under the command of Nicanor, who was accompanied by Gorgias an experienced warrior; and with the other half Ptolemey Macro, the commander-in-

[10] 1 Macc. iii. 1—26. 2 Macc. viii. 1—7. Josephus, Antiq. XII. vii. 1.

[1] 1 Macc. iii. 27—36. compare Dan. xi. 39. 44, 45. Josephus, Antiq. XII. vii. 2. Porphyry in Jerome, Comment. in Dan. xi. 44. Appian, Syriac. xlvi. 80.

chief, formed a junction with Nicanor at Emmaus. Here they were joined by many Syrians and Philistines, and by more than a thousand merchants who came for the purpose of purchasing such Jews as should be taken prisoners; for it was then customary, as Polybius testifies, for slave-dealers to attend the march of armies[2].

To this strong army Judas could oppose but six thousand men, and after they had commended themselves to God at Mizpeh (Μασσηφά), he separated them into three divisions. But the small army of Judas became still less when he gave permission for those to withdraw, who, by the law of Moses, were exempt from military duty; for many, terrified by the number of their enemies, took advantage of this law, and it appears that only three thousand remained with their leader. Notwithstanding this desertion, Judas, confiding in the help of God, was preparing to meet his foes the next day, when he learned that Gorgias, with five thousand foot and one thousand horse, designed to attack him by surprise during the night. Judas seized this opportunity to give the enemy a fatal blow; and leaving his encampment early in the evening, he rushed on the forces of Nicanor in the night, when they, not expecting any attack, fell into confusion, forsook their camp, and endeavoured to save themselves by flight. Three thousand Syrians were put to the sword, and many soldiers and slave-dealers were made prisoners. Early in the morning, as Gorgias was returning from his abortive attempt to surprise the Jews, he saw the Syrian camp in flames; when his soldiers, in a panic, immediately betook themselves to flight, while the Jews pressed so zealously on the fugitives, that they slew on that day nine thousand of their enemies and wounded many more. Nicanor made his escape to Antioch in the habit of a slave, and acknowledged that the Jews were aided by a mighty God. In the camp of the Syrians the

[2] 2 Macc. v. 22. viii. 8. compare Zech. x. 5. 1 Macc. iii. 38—41. 2 Macc. viii. 9—11. Josephus, Antiq. XII. vii. 3. Polybius, iii. 83.

Jews found great quantities of gold and silver, and they celebrated their glorious victory by a thanksgiving festival [3].

On the news of this defeat Lysias himself led an army of sixty thousand foot and five thousand horse into Idumea, and through that country invaded the Jews. But while he was besieging Bethsura (Βαιθσοὺρα), a frontier fortress which lay south-west of Jerusalem, he was attacked by Judas with ten thousand men, and put to flight with the loss of five thousand soldiers who were slain in the engagement. This heroic exploit of Judas so disheartened the soldiers of Lysias, that he was forced to return to Antioch, and issue orders to raise recruits in distant countries for a new expedition [4].

By this victory Judas became master of the whole country, and he determined to return to Jerusalem to repair and purify the temple, which was then dilapidated and deserted. New utensils were provided for the sacred services; the old altar, which had been polluted by heathen sacrifices, was taken away and a new one erected. The sacrifices were recommenced on the twenty-fifth day of the month Kislev (Χασελεῦ, December), the same day on which, three years before, the temple had been dedicated to Jupiter Olympius; and after three years and a half had elapsed since the city was laid waste in June, B. C. 167. The festival of this new dedication was celebrated for eight days, with great joy and heartfelt gratitude; and it was resolved that an annual feast should be observed in commemoration of the event [5].

But the joy of the Jews for the restoration of the public solemnities of their religion, was often interrupted by their enemies in the castle on mount Zion; for the apostate

[3] 1 Macc. iii. 42—60. iv. 1—26. 2 Macc. viii. 12, 13, 16—29. 34—36. Josephus, Antiq. XII. vii. 3, 4. compare Zech. ix. x. xii.

[4] 1 Macc. iv. 26—35. Josephus, Antiq. XII. vii. 5. Jewish War, I. i. 5. compare, Zech. x. 5.

[5] 1 Macc. i. 59. iv. 54. compare Zech. vi. 13—15. viii. 3. 1 Macc. iv. 36—59. 2 Macc. x. 1—7. Josephus, Antiq. XII. vii. 6, 7. Jewish War, I. i. 4. compare John, x. 22.

Jews who had taken refuge there, made frequent sallies, and slew their countrymen who were repairing to the temple. The army of Judas was so small that he could not leave a force sufficient to hold the castle in blockade; but he fortified the temple by surrounding it with a high and strong wall furnished with towers, and stationed there soldiers enough to protect the worshippers from the Syrian garrison of the castle. At the same time he strengthened and secured the fortress of Bethsura on the frontiers[6].

These successes of the Jews awakened the hatred of their neighbours, who viewed them as the enemies of their king and their gods; and they began to commit hostilities against such Jews as fell into their power. The Idumeans especially, who possessed the southern parts of Judæa, and the Baianites (υἱοὶ Βαιάν) who were probably a tribe of Arabians, laid wait for the Jews by the public roads, and slew all who came in their way. Judas marched against these enemies, subdued them, and burned their towers. This is the expedition of which a particular account is given in 2 Macc. x. 15—23. He then proceeded against Timotheus the chief of the hostile Ammonites, defeated him and Bacchides his ally, and subdued the whole country about Jazer. The battle described in 2 Macc. x. 24—38, in which the Jews slew Timotheus and conquered Gazara, is one of the *many battles* mentioned in 1 Macc. v. 7, as having occurred between Judas and Timotheus[7].

As the pagans east of the Jordan had lost many friends and relatives in these defeats of Timotheus, they rose up against the Jews who dwelt in their country, put them to the sword, plundered their property, and made slaves of their wives and children. In the land of Tob (ἐν τοῖς Τωβίου) not one Jew escaped the bloody massacre; but several

[6] 1 Macc. i. 36, 37. iv. 60, 61. compare Zech. vi. 13—15. Josephus, Antiq. XII. vii. 7.

[7] 1 Macc. v. 1—8. 2 Macc. x. 15—23. viii. 30—33. x. 24—38.

from other places had fled to the fortress of Dathema, where they were besieged by another Timotheus, a pagan chief. At the same time the inhabitants of Ptolemais, Tyre, Zidon, and the neighbouring cities, united to destroy the Jews of Galilee. The Syrian governors, if they did not originally instigate, undoubtedly encouraged these attacks; for they all contributed to accomplish the purpose of the king, who had determined on annihilating the Jewish nation and religion[8].

When Judas heard of the sufferings of his countrymen in Gilead and Galilee, he sent three thousand chosen troops to Galilee, under the command of his brother Simon Thassi, who defeated the enemy in several engagements, and then conducted the Jews of this country, with their wives and children, to Judæa, as it was impossible, in any other way, to secure them from the assaults of their foes. Judas himself, attended by his youngest brother Jonathan Apphus, (חפוש) led eight thousand men to Gilead. After a march of three days east of the Jordan, he came into the region of the friendly Nabathæans (Ναβαταίοι), from whom he obtained accurate intelligence of the true state of affairs in that quarter. He heard that in many cities the Jews were kept prisoners, and against these he immediately directed his efforts. He surprised Bosora (Bozrah) and laid it in ashes. He then marched all night, and early in the morning attacked the besiegers of Dathema, who fell into disorder and fled, and the Jews slew seven thousand men in the pursuit. After this he took Maspha (Mizpeh), Casphor, Maked, Bosor, and other cities, put all the males to the sword, gave up the houses to pillage, and laid them in ashes. Among these expeditions was the conquest of the city of Caspis, mentioned in 2 Macc. xii. 13—16; but in all probability this is the city already referred to under the name of Casphor. Timotheus now drew up a numerous army; but the Jews defeated him, took possession of Carnein, or Carnion, and

[8] 1 Macc. v. 9—14.

burnt the city and temple of Atargatis[9]. This is undoubtedly the expedition of which a particular account is given in 2 Macc. xii. 19—31.

Though the Jews had now humbled their enemies, they were in these regions continually exposed to new hostilities. Judas, accordingly, transferred them with their wives and children to Judæa, by which means the strength of the nation was concentrated, and its metropolis supplied with inhabitants. Judas, on his return, conquered the city of Ephron, which had closed its gates against him. He then came to the city of Bethsan (Beth-shan), or Scythopolis, west of the Jordan, expressed his gratitude to its citizens for their kind treatment of the Jews who dwelt among them, and finally arrived in safety at Jerusalem[10].

Judas, during his absence, had left Jerusalem under the command of Joseph and Azarias, with express orders that they should keep within the walls and make no attack on the enemy. They, however, in disobedience to their instructions, assaulted Jamnia, but were repulsed with considerable loss by Gorgias the Syrian governor[11].

It was probably to revenge this repulse that Judas, after he had taken Hebron and the adjacent territory from the Idumeans, invaded the land of the Philistines, and took the city of Azotus, or Ashdod, though in a previous skirmish he had suffered some loss from the enemy. In the second Book of Maccabees, this expedition is mentioned as having been undertaken against Gorgias, who had defeated Joseph and Azarias[12].

Antiochus Epiphanes received intelligence of the success of the Jewish arms and the overthrow of the Syrians, at Elymais in Persia; and as he was then detained there by an insurrection of the people, occasioned by his robbing the celebrated temple in which his father Antiochus

[9] 1 Macc. v. 21—44. compare Zech. x. 6—10. 2 Macc. xii. 10 - 31.
[10] 1 Macc. v. 45—54. compare Zech. x. 6—10. 2 Macc. xii. 29—31.
[11] 1 Macc. v. 55 - 63.
[12] 1 Macc. v. 65—68. 2 Macc. xii. 32 - 45.

the Great lost his life, his vexation was almost beyond endurance. He set out on his return with a determination to make every possible effort to exterminate the Jews; but during his journey he was attacked by a disease in which he suffered excessive pain, and was tormented by the bitterest anguish of conscience on account of his sacrilege and other crimes. He at length died at Tabæ in Paratacene, on the frontiers of Persia and Babylonia, in the year B. C. 163, 147 or 148 of the Greek era, after a reign of eleven years. Coins of his are still extant, bearing the date of 147 of the Greek era [13].

NOTE. The materials for the history of Antiochus Epiphanes are very scanty, for the writings which treat of this period, by Callinicus Sutoricus, Diodorus Siculus, Hieronymus the historian, Polybius, Posidonius, Claudius Theon, and Andronicus Alypius, are all lost except a few fragments preserved by other authors, and we have these only from the second or third hand. Porphyry, in the third century of the Christian era, introduced copious extracts from these works into his fifteen books against the Christians, especially into the twelfth, where he treats of Daniel, and endeavours to prove from the agreement of the Book of Daniel with history, that it must have been written after the occurrence of the events to which it refers. But the work of Porphyry has perished, excepting a few fragments preserved by St. Jerome in his commentary on Daniel. The treatises written against Porphyry by Apollinarius, Eusebius, and Methodius, are also lost, excepting a few sentences quoted by Nicetas and John Damascenus. The loss of Apollinarius is particularly to be regretted, since he, according to the testimony of Philostorgius, viii. 14, was a very accurate writer. Had we all these writings, or at least the fifteen books of the learned Porphyry, they would throw great light on

[13] 1 Macc. vi. 1—16. 2 Macc. ix. Josephus, Antiq. XII. ix. 1. Polybius in Excerpta Valesii de Virtutibus et Vitiis, xxxi. Appian, Syriac. xlvi. 80.

the obscurities of the Book of Daniel; for Jerome says of this opposer of the prophet: "cujus impugnatio testimonium veritatis est, tanta enim dictorum fides fuit, ut propheta incredulis hominibus non videretur futura dixisse, sed narrasse præterita." Præfat. Comment. in Dan.

§. 97. ANTIOCHUS EUPATOR. B. C. 164—163.

ANTIOCHUS EPIPHANES before his death delivered the regal insignia to his parasite Philip, appointing him regent of the empire and guardian to his son Antiochus, who was then but nine years old. But Lysias, who had the young king in his power and gave him the surname of Eupator, was determined not to relinquish so important a charge. Philip accordingly fled to Egypt to solicit the support of the Ptolemeys; but when he saw that the two contending brothers and rival kings themselves needed an umpire to settle their own difficulties, he withdrew to Persia, whence he afterwards returned with an army to assert his claims to the regency [1].

Demetrius, the son of Seleucus Philopator, who was sent to Rome as a hostage in the place of Antiochus Epiphanes, had now reached his twenty-third year; and when he heard of the death of Antiochus, made an effort to get himself established in his father's kingdom. But the wisdom of the senate having decided that it would be more advantageous for the Romans that the throne of Syria should be occupied by a minor than by the able Demetrius, they rejected his suit. Cneius Octavius, Spurius Lucretius, and Lucius Aurelius were then sent from Rome to Syria as ambassadors, to confirm Antiochus Eupator on the throne, and to arrange all the affairs of his empire according to the treaty which had been concluded with Antiochus the Great [2].

[1] 1 Macc. vi. 17. 2 Macc. ix. 26. 29. x. 10, 11. Josephus, Antiq. XII. ix. 1. Appian, Syriac. xlvi. 80—85. Eusebius, Chron.

[2] Polybius, Legat. §. 107. Justin, xxxiv. 3. Appian, Syriac. xlvi. 85—95.

After the death of Antiochus Epiphanes, the Jews were kindly treated by Ptolemey Macro, the governor of Cœle-Syria; but this season of tranquillity was of short continuance and productive of but little benefit; for when Ptolemey saw that he was universally despised as a traitor for having betrayed into the hands of Antiochus Epiphanes the island of Cyprus, when he held it as Egyptian governor, he destroyed his own life by poison. Soon after, in the year B. C. 163, Lysias invaded Judæa with an army of eighty thousand foot, eighty elephants, and a large body of cavalry. He laid siege to Bethsura, but was repulsed by Judas with the loss of eleven thousand foot and one thousand six hundred horse, and his whole army was broken up. Lysias was now convinced that all efforts against the heroic Jews were unavailing, and he gave them peace on reasonable terms. The Roman ambassadors, Quintus Memmius and Titus Manlius, afforded efficient aid in the obtaining of this treaty[3].

But the Jews were exposed to continual injury from the Syrian garrison, which still held possession of the castle of Acra on mount Zion. Judas therefore laid siege to this fortress, in order, if possible, to subdue it and secure his countrymen from future depredations. But some apostate Jews, who had taken refuge with the Syrian garrison, and knew that if the castle should fall into the power of Judas they could have no hope of pardon, stole out of the fort and made their way to Antioch, where they excited Lysias and the king to undertake a new war against Judæa. The Syrian army which was raised for this purpose in the year B. C. 163, consisted of one hundred thousand foot, twenty thousand horse, thirty-two elephants, and three hundred chariots armed with scythes; a very great force for those times, when, on account of the extravagant wages which soldiers received, it was difficult to keep more than eighty thousand men in the field. The Jews could make no open resistance to so numerous a

[3] 2 Macc. x. 12, 13. xi.

host; but while the Syrians were besieging Bethsura, Judas fell upon them in the night, and, before they were aware who had entered their camp, he slew four thousand men, and drew off in safety by break of day. On the following morning they came to battle, and Judas, that he might not be surrounded by the numbers of his enemy, was forced to retire to Jerusalem, the fortifications of which he now strengthened and put in a state of defence. In this battle he lost his younger brother, the brave Eleazar Savaran, or Auran (ὁ Σαναράν, or חוֹרָן), who fell in achieving a deed of desperate valour[4].

The Jews were now reduced to great distress. Bethsura was forced to surrender, Jerusalem was closely besieged, and could not have held out long against the attacks of the enemy. All the advantages which had been obtained at the expense of so much blood, seemed now about to be lost for ever; when, fortunately for the besieged, Lysias received intelligence that Philip, whom Antiochus Epiphanes had appointed regent, had entered Syria with an army levied in Media and Persia, and taken possession of Antioch the metropolis of the empire. Lysias accordingly found it necessary to make peace with the Jews. He acceded to all their demands, and was admitted into Jerusalem; when, in violation of the treaty which he had sworn to observe, he threw down the walls of the city; and then returned to Syria, where his victorious army forced Philip to retreat[5].

Menelaus, the apostate high priest, who had attended the king in this expedition against the Jews, was now viewed by his royal master as the author of all these unhappy wars; and by the orders of Antiochus he was suffocated in the ash-tower of Berea. The king then nominated to the priesthood Alcimus or Jacimus, whom we shall find by the subsequent history to have been an

[4] 1 Macc. vi. 19—51. 2 Macc. xiii. 15—22.

[5] 1 Macc. vi. 48—65. 2 Macc. xiii. 3—23. Josephus, Antiq. XII. ix. 6, 7.

unprincipled and impious man. As Alcimus was not of the lineage of the high priest Onias, the son of Onias the third, the high priest who had been murdered at Daphne near Antioch, having no hope of attaining his father's dignity, fled to Egypt, where he established a new priesthood and filled the office himself, as we shall see in the sequel[6].

In the following year, B. C. 162, Octavius, Aurelius, and Lucretius, the Roman ambassadors already mentioned, arrived at Antioch, in order that while the sceptre was held by a child of eleven years of age, and the kingdom was in a very weakened state, they might enforce the observance of the treaty concluded after the battle of Sipylus. Accordingly they burnt all the shipping except twelve vessels, and slew all the elephants; but these measures were so odious to the Syrians, that Octavius, the head of the embassy, and an ancestor of Octavius Cæsar Augustus, was assassinated by Leptines, while anointing himself in the gymnasium at Laodicea. Lysias being suspected as an accessary to this murder, immediately despatched an embassy to Rome to clear himself and the king from this imputation; but the senate dismissed his ambassadors without giving them any answer[7].

In Egypt the contest between the two brothers, Philometor and Physcon, was every day growing more violent. The Roman senate wrote to their ambassadors Octavius, Lucretius, and Aurelius, to settle the difficulties; but before the letter arrived, Philometor had been expelled by his younger brother Physcon. Philometor immediately sailed to Italy and went to Rome on foot, and in a miserable habit, in order to move the senate to compassion; and for the same reason he refused the royal robes and diadem which were offered him by Deme-

[6] 2 Macc. xiii. 3—8. xiv. 3. Josephus, Antiq. XII. ix. 7.

[7] Polybius, Legat. §§. 114. 122. Appian, Syriac. xlvi. 90—100. Cicero, Philippica, IX. ii. 4, 5.

trius the son of Seleucus Philopator, who was then detained at Rome as a hostage. The senate received Philometor very favourably, and sent Quintus and Canuleius as ambassadors to Alexandria, to reestablish him in his kingdom. As the result of their negotiation, it was agreed that Physcon should reign over Libya and Cyrene, and Philometor retain Egypt and Cyprus. But a new quarrel soon broke out between the brothers respecting the island of Cyprus. Physcon now in his turn repaired to Rome, and the senate despatched a second embassy to Egypt; but nothing was accomplished, for Philometor insisted on the terms of the original agreement. Polybius remarks, in his account of these embassies, that it was by taking advantage of such imprudent contentions that the Romans extended their dominion[8].

§. 98. DEMETRIUS SOTER, B. C. 162—154.

While the Roman senate were disaffected towards Antiochus Eupator, on account of the murder of the ambassador Octavius, Demetrius again attempted to obtain from them an appointment to his father's throne; but his efforts were unavailing. He therefore, by the advice of his friends, particularly of Polybius the historian, privately embarked on board a Carthaginian ship; and his designs were not known at Rome till the fifth day after his departure. The senate made no attempt to recall him, but immediately despatched an ambassador to observe his movements. As soon as Demetrius landed at Tyre, he industriously spread a report that the Romans had given him the crown of his father. This intimation had the desired effect; for soldiers flocked to him from every quarter, and even Lysias and Antiochus Eupator delivered themselves into his hands. He put them

[8] Diod. Sic. xxxi. 10. Porphyry in Græc. Eusebian. Scaligeri, p. 60. 68. Livy, Epitome of book lxvi. Polybius, Legat. §§. 113. 116, 117.

both to death, and took possession of the throne of Syria[1].

Demetrius then expelled Timarchus and Heraclides from Babylonia, where they were endeavouring to make themselves independent; and for this service the Babylonians gave him the surname of Soter, which he ever after retained. Timarchus was slain; but Heraclides saved himself by flight, and was soon engaged in other projects for his own aggrandisement. Demetrius now desired to have his claims to the throne acknowledged by the Romans; for which purpose he sent an embassy with a golden crown as a gift to the Roman senate, and at the same time delivered up to them Leptines, the murderer of the ambassador Octavius. The senate accepted the present, but dismissed the murderer; for they intended to take some opportunity of avenging the death of Octavius on the whole Syrian empire[2].

In the mean time Alcimus, the high priest appointed by Antiochus Eupator, was preparing new distresses for the Jews, who refused to acknowledge him in his official capacity. He repaired with his adherents to the king, and made complaint against Judas and the Assideans, that they continued in disobedience to the orders of their sovereign. Accordingly Demetrius, in the year B. C. 161, 151 of the Greek era, sent an army to Judæa under the command of Bacchides, to establish Alcimus in his office by force. Bacchides entered the country under pretence of friendship; and many Jews, who relying on his professions intrusted themselves to his power, were treacherously put to death. Bacchides, after having confirmed the authority of Alcimus, withdrew his troops, leaving with the high priest a force which seemed sufficient for his security. But now Judas, who had retired before Bacchides, again made his appearance, marched through the land with his people, and punished the apostate

[1] Polybius, Legat. §. 114. Appian, Syriac. xlvii. 1—10. Justin, xxxiv. 3. Josephus, Antiq. XII. x. 1. 1 Macc. vii. 1—4. 2 Macc. xiv. 1, 2.

[2] Polybius, Legat. §. 122. Appian, Syriac. xlvii. 5—10.

Jews. Alcimus, unable to offer any effectual resistance, went again to Antioch, and renewed his complaints against Judas. Demetrius then sent another army to Judæa under the command of Nicanor, with orders to kill Judas or take him prisoner, and secure Alcimus in the quiet possession of his office. Nicanor at first disguised his real intentions, and appeared as a friend, though he soon threw off the mask and made every exertion to get Judas into his power; but this hero baffled all the efforts of his enemy and escaped. Hostilities were now renewed, for Nicanor ravaged the country with his troops, and massacred the people[3].

During this year, B. C. 161, a battle was fought at Capharsalama, in which Nicanor lost five hundred men, and was forced to seek refuge in the castle of Zion. Thence he sent out a party of soldiers to sieze Razis, a Jew of great influence, and celebrated for his justice and piety; but he laid violent hands on himself, rather than fall into the power of his enemies. Nicanor, enraged at his disappointment, then demanded of the Jews, with blasphemies and threats of vengeance in case of refusal, that Judas and his army should be delivered up to him; but in a battle which took place soon after, he was himself slain, and his whole army, consisting of two thousand five hundred men, was routed and entirely dispersed. Judas cut off the head and the right hand of Nicanor, and brought them to Jerusalem as trophies of his victory. This battle was fought on the thirteenth day of the month Adar (March), and was deemed of so much importance by the Jews, that they kept that day as an annual festival in commemoration of the event[4].

After this victory the Jews enjoyed a season of tranquillity. At this time Judas sent an embassy to Rome to solicit the friendship of that powerful nation. The am-

[3] 1 Macc. vii. 5—7. 25, 26. 2 Macc. xiv. 3—25. Josephus, Antiq. XII. x. 1—4.

[4] 1 Macc. vii. 25—50. 2 Macc. xiv. 37—46. xv. 1—36. Josephus, Antiq. XII. x. 4, 5.

bassadors employed in this negotiation, were Jason the son of Eleazar, and Eupolemus, who had formerly obtained permission of Seleucus Eupator for the Jews to live according to their own laws. The Romans, who knew how to render alliances with other nations the means of their future subjugation, readily concluded a treaty on such terms as could do no injury to themselves, and might yet be of some advantage to the Jews. At the same time they sent orders to Demetrius to make no encroachments on Judæa. Justin writes respecting this transaction: "a Demetrio, cum defecissent Judæi amicitia Romanorum petita, primi omnium ex orientalibus libertatem receperunt, facile tunc Romanis de alieno largientibus[5]."

But before he received the letter of the Romans, Demetrius had sent a large army to Judæa under the command of Bacchides, which on its march subdued the famous cave of Mesaloth in Arbela of Galilee. He then, in the month Nisan (April) of the year B. C. 160, encamped near Jerusalem, whence he marched to Berea with twenty thousand foot and two thousand horse. Judas was stationed at Eleasa with three thousand men; and venturing on an attack when this small number, by continual desertion, had dwindled down to eight hundred, he lost his life[6].

The apostate Jews, under the protection of the Syrians, now regained the ascendancy; and, as Bacchides gave them all the offices of trust in the country, their insolence was without restraint. A severe famine occurring at the same time, they monopolised the provisions, and in this manner reduced their countrymen to great distress. Bacchides, meanwhile, ravaged the country with his soldiers, and massacred all the adherents of Judas who fell in his way[7].

[5] 2 Macc. iv. 11. 1 Macc. viii. 1—30. Josephus, Antiq. XII. x. 6. Justin, xxxvi. 3.

[6] 1 Macc. ix. 1—22. Josephus, Antiq. XII. xi. 1.

[7] 1 Macc. ix. 23—27. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. i. 1.

In this extremity of suffering, the pious Jews repaired to Jonathan Apphus, the youngest brother of Judas, and choosing him for their leader, they withdrew to the wilderness of Thecoe (Θεκωέ) and encamped at the cistern of Aspher (ἐπὶ τὸ ὕδωρ λάκκου Ἀσφάρ). After a few skirmishes with the Arab tribes in that neighbourhood, Jonathan sent the wives and children and the most valuable property of his soldiers to the Nabathæans, under a convoy commanded by his eldest brother Johanan, or John, Caddis (Καδδὶς, גַּדִּי). But while on their way they were attacked and plundered, and John himself was slain by the Arabic tribe of Jambri from Medaba (υἱοὶ Ἰαμβρὶ ἐκ Μηδαβά). Jonathan, soon after, revenged this unprovoked assault by falling upon these Arabs, while they were walking in the marriage procession of one of their princesses[8].

Jonathan the more effectually to secure himself against the forces of the enemy, now withdrew into the marshes which were formed by the overflowings of the Jordan, where access to him was very difficult. But Bacchides, on the Sabbath, made an attack on the pass which led to his camp, and carried it by storm. The Jews defended themselves with great bravery; but being overpowered by numbers, they leaped into the Jordan and swam to the other side, whither their enemies did not venture to follow them. Bacchides then returned and repaired the fortifications of the castle on mount Zion, in which he placed the sons of the principal Jewish families, to be kept as hostages. He also fortified several other cities, and provided them with garrisons to hold the country in subjection[9].

Alcimus was now established in the priesthood; but in the year B. C. 159, when he directed that the חֵיל or the lower wall, which separated the court of the Gentiles from the court of the Israelites, should be thrown down, that

[8] 1 Macc. ix. 35—42. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. i. 2. 4.
[9] 1 Macc. ix. 43—53. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. i. 3.

the heathen might have free access to the temple, he was seized with the cramp and died in great agony. Bacchides, having nothing to detain him in Judæa after the death of the man on whose account his expedition was undertaken, now left the country, and the Jews had two years of tranquillity [10].

It was probably about this time that Demetrius received the letter from the Roman senate, commanding him to regard the Jews as the allies of the Romans; and this will explain the reason why he undertook nothing farther against Judæa; for he was then making every effort to gain the favour of the Romans, that he might be confirmed by them in the possession of his throne. For this purpose he sent Menochares as his ambassador to the court of Ariarathes king of Cappadocia, to solicit the mediation of the three Roman ambassadors who were there at that time; but as they refused to listen to his representations, he followed them by a second embassy to Pamphylia, and again by a third to Rhodes; promising everything they could demand, and persevering in the most humiliating and earnest entreaties, till at last he induced them to espouse his cause, and, through their intervention, the Romans acknowledged him as king of Syria. In testimony of his gratitude he sent to Rome, in the year B. C. 159, another crown, valued at ten thousand pieces of gold, and again delivered up to them Leptines, the murderer of Octavius, and also Isocrates, who had defended the cause of the assassin; but they were again set free by the senate, for the same reasons as before [11].

During the same year Demetrius very unnecessarily involved himself in another affair, which occasioned him incredible trouble, and became in the end a principal cause of his own ruin. He deposed Ariarathes the

[10] 1 Macc. ix. 54—57. Compare Jahn's Biblical Archæology translated by Prof. Upham, §. 199. v.

[11] Polybius, Legat. §. 122. Appian, Syriac, xlvii. 10—15. Diod. Sic. xxxi. 29.

lawful king of Cappadocia, and placed on the throne Holophernes or Orophernes, a pretended elder brother of Ariarathes. In the year B. C. 157, the dethroned monarch laid his complaints before the Roman senate, and though the ambassadors of Demetrius and Holophernes exerted themselves to the utmost to defend a bad cause, these kings were compelled to admit Ariarathes to a participation in the throne of Cappadocia. Holophernes, by his voluptuousness and gluttony, soon exposed himself to the contempt of his subjects, and was expelled from his kingdom by Ariarathes, with the assistance of Attalus the successor of Eumenes on the throne of Pergamus. He fled to Demetrius and maintained himself at the Syrian court by the immense sums of money which he had deposited at Priene in Ionia. He afterwards attached himself to the party opposed to Demetrius, and became a dangerous enemy to his greatest benefactor [12].

Meanwhile the apostate Jews grew uneasy at the peace which their nation enjoyed, and, in B. C. 158, invited Bacchides to aid them in their malicious projects, by attacking Jonathan and his party. Bacchides, accordingly, advanced to Judæa with his army; but Jonathan, having discovered the design of the malecontents to seize his person, put to death fifty of the principal conspirators, and thus deterred the rest from the execution of their purpose. But as his forces were not sufficient to oppose the invading army of Bacchides, he retired into the wilderness to Bethbasi, which was conveniently situated for a place of defence, though its fortifications had fallen into decay. He repaired the dilapidated fortress so thoroughly, that Bacchides, whose army had been increased by levies in Judæa, was unable to subdue it; especially as Simon, the commander of the garrison, made frequent and successful sallies on the besiegers, and Jona-

[12] Polybius, Legat. §. 126. Appian, Syriac. xlvii. 15—20. Livy, Epitome of book xlvii. Polybius, iii. 5. and in Excerpt. Valesii de Virtutibus et Vitiis, xxxi. p. 171.

than, in his excursions, gave constant annoyance to their foraging parties. Bacchides broke up the siege, and, in his rage, put to death the apostate Jews who had induced him to undertake this ruinous campaign. Jonathan despatched after him a deputation with proposals of peace, and Bacchides acceded to the terms which were offered. The treaty was concluded and sworn to by both parties, and all who had been taken prisoners in the war were released[13].

In the year B. C. 156, the quarrel between the kings of Egypt broke out anew. The gluttonous and cruel Ptolemey Physcon was attacked by a party of conspirators in Cyrene, severely wounded, and left for dead. But he recovered; and as soon as his wounds were healed, hastened to Rome and complained before the senate of his brother Philometor, as having been at the bottom of the conspiracy. The senate gave credit to his accusations, and, without regarding the defence made by Philometor, sent five ambassadors to establish Physcon in the island of Cyprus, with the help of the neighbouring allies. In the year B. C. 155, Ptolemey Physcon landed on the island with the army he had collected, but was defeated and taken prisoner. Ptolemey Philometor, so far from revenging himself on his brother, treated him with great respect, and sent him back to Cyrene, which he enlarged by adding to it some of his own territory; and, by this generous act, put the Roman senate to shame. But Philometor, soon after, was near losing Cyprus; for Archias, the governor of the island, had agreed to deliver it up to Demetrius king of Syria, for five hundred talents of silver. The plot, however, was seasonably discovered, and the detected traitor hanged himself[14].

[13] 1 Macc. ix. 58—73. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. i. 5, 6.

[14] Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxi. 27. Polybius, Legat. §. 132. Polybius in Excerpt. Valesii de Virtutibus et Vitiis, xxxi. p. 170.

§. 99. ALEXANDER BALAS. B. C. 154—146.

About the year B. C. 154, Demetrius Soter retired to the new palace which he had built near Antioch, and there gave himself up entirely to luxury and pleasure. As those who had business to transact could seldom get access to the indolent king, discontents were excited that finally gave rise to a conspiracy, in which his guest Holophernes joined. Holophernes was detected and imprisoned; but Demetrius spared his life, intending, when an opportunity should occur, to employ him against Ariarathes[1].

Notwithstanding this check, the conspiracy gained strength and was fostered by Ariarathes king of Cappadocia, Attalus king of Pergamus, and especially by Ptolemey Philometor king of Egypt, from whom Demetrius had taken the island of Cyprus. They availed themselves of the services of Heraclides, whom Demetrius expelled from Babylonia with Timarchus. Since that time he had lived at Rhodes; and now, at the instigation of the three kings, the abettors of the plot against Demetrius, he persuaded a young man of low birth, named Balas, to announce himself as a son of Antiochus Epiphanes, and lay claim to the Syrian throne. As soon as Balas had been sufficiently instructed in the part he was to act, in the year B. C. 153, Ptolemey, Ariarathes, and Attalus, publicly acknowledged him as the son of Antiochus Epiphanes. Heraclides then conducted him to Rome, together with Laodice, a genuine daughter of Antiochus, and presented them to the senate. The senators soon discovered the imposture; but out of hatred to Demetrius, they promised Balas the kingdom of Syria. He then, under the title of Alexander king of Syria, proceeded to levy troops, and sailed to Ptolemais, where

[1] Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxii. 6. Athenæus, x. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. ii. 1. Justin, xxxv. 1.

his party was strengthened by the accession of great numbers of the malecontents[2].

Demetrius, at length aroused from his lethargy, left his palace and collected a numerous army; but Balas was ready to meet him with nearly an equal force. In these circumstances both kings were anxious to secure the friendship of Jonathan, who was able to render essential service to the cause he espoused. Demetrius, in order to gain him over to his party, offered to make him commander-in-chief over Judæa, with full power to levy soldiers, and promised to release the Jewish hostages who were detained in the citadel of Jerusalem. Jonathan read the letter of Demetrius to the garrison of the citadel, and they immediately delivered up the hostages. The Syrian garrisons which Bacchides had left in the fortified towns of Judæa, then withdrew from the country, with the exception of the garrisons of Bethsura and of the castle of Jerusalem, which, consisting principally of apostate Jews, were afraid to leave their places of refuge. By these revolutions, the power of Jonathan was greatly increased; he levied soldiers and provided them with arms; he repaired the dwellings of Jerusalem and rebuilt its walls. The city was once more strongly fortified, and Jonathan built there a house for his own residence[3].

Alexander Balas now attempted to excel Demetrius in the liberality of his offers; in the very commencement of the letter which he wrote to Jonathan, he called him his brother, gave him the title and rank of a friend of the king, appointed him to the high priesthood, and sent him a golden crown and purple robe. Jonathan accepted all that was offered him, without openly joining the party of either king, and became the high priest of the Jews. Thus this office was transferred from the first class of priests and from the family of Jozadak, in which it had

[2] Justin, xxxv. 1. Athenæus, v. Livy, Epitome of book lii. Polybius Legat. §. 140. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. ii. 1. 1 Macc. x. 1.

[3] 1 Macc. x. 2—14. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. ii. 1

remained ever since the time of Cyrus, to the family of the Hasmoneans or Asmoneans, of the twenty-fourth class, denominated from Jehoiarib, in which it continued till the days of Herod[4].

When Demetrius heard of the offers of Balas, he wrote again to Jonathan and endeavoured, if possible, to outdo Balas in the generosity of his promises. The letter of Demetrius is preserved in 1 Macc. x. 21—47. and in Josephus, Antiquities, XIII. ii. 3. The following is a translation of it by Whiston:

"King Demetrius to Jonathan, and to the nation of the Jews, sendeth greeting: Since you have preserved your friendship for us, and when you have been tempted by our enemies, you have not joined yourselves to them, I both commend you for this your fidelity, and exhort you to continue in the same disposition, for which you shall be repaid and receive rewards from us; for I will free you from the greatest part of the tributes and taxes which you formerly paid to the kings my predecessors, and to myself; and I do now set you free from those tributes which you have ever paid; and, besides, I forgive you the tax upon salt, and the value of the crowns which you used to offer me; and instead of the third part of the fruits of the field, and the half of the fruits of the trees, I relinquish my part of them from this day: and as to the poll-money which ought to be given me for every head of the inhabitants of Judæa, and of the three toparchies that adjoin to Judæa (Samaria, and Galilee, and Perea), that I relinquish to you for this time, and for all time to come. I will also, that the city of Jerusalem be holy and inviolable, and free from the tithe, and from the taxes, to its utmost bounds. And I so far recede from my title to the citadel as to permit Jonathan, your high priest, to possess it, that he may place such a garrison in it as he approves of for fidelity and good will to himself, that they may keep it for us. I also make free all those Jews who

[4] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. ii. 2. 1 Macc. x. 15—21. 1 Chron. ix. 10.

have been made captives and slaves in my kingdom. I also give order that the beasts of the Jews be not pressed for our service: and let their Sabbaths and all their festivals, and three days before each of them, be free from any imposition. In the same manner, I set free the Jews that are inhabitants in my kingdom, and order that no injury be done them. I also give leave to such of them as are willing to enlist themselves in my army, that they may do it, and those as far as thirty thousand; which Jewish soldiers, wheresoever they go, shall have the same pay as my own army hath; and some of them I will place in my garrisons, and some as guards about mine own body, and as rulers over those that are in my court. I give them leave also to use the laws of their forefathers, and to observe them; and I will that they have power over the three toparchies that are added to Judæa; and it shall be in the power of the high priest to take care that no one Jew shall have any other temple for worship, but only that at Jerusalem. I bequeath also, out of my own revenues, yearly, for the expenses about the sacrifices, one hundred and fifty thousand drachmæ; and what money is to spare, I will that it shall be your own. I also release to you those ten thousand drachmæ which the kings received from the temple, because they appertain to the priests that minister in that temple. And whosoever shall fly to the temple at Jerusalem, and to the places thereto belonging, or who owe the king money, or are there on any other account, let them be set free, and let their goods be in safety. I also give you leave to repair and rebuild your temple, and that all be done at my expenses. I also allow you to build the walls of your city, and to erect high towers, and that they be erected at my charge. And if there be any fortified town that would be convenient for the Jewish country to have very strong, let it be so built at my expenses."

These promises of Demetrius were so extravagant as to defeat their own object. The Jews gave them no credit, especially when they recollected the sufferings

which Demetrius had formerly occasioned them; and, accordingly, Jonathan and the whole nation espoused the cause of Alexander Balas[5].

In the year B. C. 152, Alexander Balas lost his first battle with Demetrius; but he was immediately reinforced by Ptolemey Philometor, Ariarathes, Attalus, Jonathan, and even by the discontented Syrians themselves; for many soldiers from the army of Demetrius deserted to him. Demetrius was so dispirited by this unexpected termination of his victory, that he sent his two sons, Demetrius and Antiochus, with the most valuable of his treasures, to Cnidus, that, in case of the worst, they might be spared to avenge his ruin[6].

Demetrius had, at this time, an opportunity of retaliating on the Romans the part they had acted in the imposture of Balas; for Andriscus, who pretended to be a son of Perseus king of Macedonia, and was endeavouring to establish his claims to that kingdom, had taken refuge at his court. But Demetrius, either fearing the power of the Romans or designing to put them to shame for their dishonesty to him, delivered up the pretender to the Roman senate. The senate, despising this dangerous man, dismissed him; and by this imprudent measure brought upon themselves a very expensive and bloody war[7].

In the year B. C. 150, a decisive battle was fought between Demetrius and Alexander Balas. At the beginning of the engagement Demetrius had the advantage, but at last his army was entirely routed, and he himself, becoming entangled in a morass with his horse, was slain by the darts of his enemies[8].

Alexander Balas now ascended the throne of Syria and married Cleopatra a daughter of Ptolemey Philometor, who was conducted by her father to Ptolemais, where the

[5] 1 Macc. x. 21—47. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. ii. 3, 4.

[6] Justin, xxxv. 1, 2. Livy, Epitome of book lii.

[7] Livy, Epitome of books xlviii. xlix. l. Eutropius, iv. 15. Florus, Epit. Rer. Rom. ii. 14.

[8] Justin, xxxv. 1. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. ii. 4. 1 Macc. x. 43—50.

nuptials were celebrated with great magnificence. At Ptolemais Jonathan paid his respects to both kings, and was received by them with such marked distinction, that all the complaints which his discontented countrymen sought to lay against him, were rejected without a hearing. Alexander honoured him with a purple robe, placed him among his principal friends, made him military commandant of Judæa, and raised him to the rank of a meridarch (μεριδάρκης), or ruler of a part of the empire[9].

As soon as Balas saw that his throne was secure, he resigned himself entirely to voluptuousness and debauchery, and left the administration of affairs to his favourite Ammonius. This minister made himself odious by his cruelties. To ensure the safety of his royal master, he murdered a son and a sister of Demetrius Soter, and all the other members of that family whom he could get into his power. Demetrius, the eldest son of Demetrius Soter, was then at Cnidus; and hearing that the Syrians were disaffected towards their new sovereign, in the year B. C. 148, he collected a small body of Cretans by the aid of Lasthenes his host, and landed with them in Cilicia, according to the testimony of Josephus, where he received considerable accessions to his numbers, and made himself master of that whole district[10].

Alexander Balas now intrusted the concerns of his government at Antioch to Hierax and Diodotus, or Trypho, and took the field with an army against Demetrius. Meanwhile Apollonius the governor of Cœle-Syria joined the party of the pretender, and collecting his forces at Jamnia, challenged Jonathan, who remained faithful to Alexander Balas, to meet him in arms. Jonathan advanced with ten thousand men, took possession of Joppa before the eyes of Apollonius, overcame this governor in a pitched battle, subdued Ashdod (Ἄζωτος), to which the

[9] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. iv. 1, 2. 1 Macc. x. 51—66.

[10] Livy, Epitome of book l. Justin, xxxv. 2. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. iv. 3. 1 Macc. x. 67—69.

enemy had retired after his defeat, and laid the city in ashes. Askelon (Ἀσκάλων) opened her gates to the conqueror and gave him a magnificent reception; and he then returned to Jerusalem, enriched by the spoils of his enemies. When Alexander Balas heard of these victories of Jonathan, he presented this faithful vassal with a golden chain, such as was worn by none but princes, and gave him possession of Ekron (Ἀκκαρών). This city was peopled by Jews, or the original inhabitants had submitted to circumcision and adopted the Jewish religion, and had thus become one people with the Hebrews; as the Jebusites of Jerusalem had done in ancient times. There is an allusion to this occurrence in Zech. ix. 7 [11].

During this period, Onias the son of the high priest Onias the third, who escaped to Egypt in the year B. C. 153, had acquired great favour with king Ptolemey Philometor and the queen Cleopatra, by his skill in political and military affairs; and in the year B. C. 149 he was raised to the office of commander-in-chief of the Egyptian army. The next to him in command was Dositheus, who was also a Jew. During the reign of Ptolemey Philometor these two Hebrews had the government of all Egypt in their own hands. Onias represented to the king and queen, that it would be productive of great advantage to their kingdom, if the numerous Jewish inhabitants of Egypt and Cyrene could have a temple of their own, which would supersede the necessity of their repairing to Jerusalem, in the dominions of a foreign monarch, to perform their religious services; and that, if such a temple were built, many more Jews would be induced to settle in the country, as Judæa was continually exposed to the evils of war. By such representations he at last obtained permission to erect a temple for the Jews on the site of an ancient temple of Bubastis, or Isis, at the city of Leontopolis in the Heliopolitan nomos, over which

[11] Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxii. 16. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. iv. 4. 1 Macc. x. 69—89. Zech. ix. 6, 7.

he was governor. To the Jews he justified his undertaking by the passage in Is. xix, 18, 19; and the temple was soon completed on the model of that at Jerusalem. Onias himself was invested with the high priesthood, the subordinate priests were furnished from the descendants of Aaron, Levites were employed in the sacred services, and the whole routine of religious worship was performed in the same manner as at Jerusalem. This continued for two hundred and twenty years, when, on account of the rebellions of the Jews, the temple was shut up and finally demolished by the emperor Vespasian [12].

Josephus tells us that, at this time, there was a famous controversy in Egypt between the Jews and Samaritans; the former contending that mount Moriah in Jerusalem, and the latter that mount Gerizim, was the proper place for the worship of God. The Samaritans lost their cause, which was argued before the king, and the advocates they employed were punished with death, in accordance with an agreement previously made, that such should be the fate of the losing party [13].

§. 100. DEMETRIUS NICATOR. B. C. 146—144.

In the year B. C. 146, Ptolemey Philometor, who had been invited the year before by Alexander Balas to assist him against Demetrius, proceeded along the coasts of Palæstine to Syria, attended by a fleet and a numerous army. In compliance with the orders of Alexander, all the cities opened their gates to Ptolemey, who reduced them entirely under his own power, by placing a body of soldiers in each as a garrison. At Joppa he was met by Jonathan, whom he received in the most friendly manner and paid no regard to the accusations that were made against him, for he then needed the alliance of that potent

[12] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. iii. 1—3. XX. x. 1. and against Apion, ii. 5.
[13] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. iii. 4.

warrior. They marched together in great harmony as far as the river Eleutherus, when Jonathan returned to Jerusalem. Ptolemey, having now secured to his own interests all the cities as far as Seleucia on the Orontes, by means of the garrisons he had left in them, appeared openly as the enemy of the Syrian king. He sent an embassy to Demetrius the pretender to the crown, promising to give him in marriage his daughter, the wife of Alexander Balas, and to place him on the throne of Syria. He alleged as a reason for his treachery to Alexander, that he had detected that monarch in a design against his life; an accusation which Josephus supposes to be well grounded, but which the author of the first Book of Maccabees represents as a mere pretence[1].

As Ptolemey Philometor drew near to Antioch, the discontented citizens of that metropolis excited an insurrection, murdered the hated minister Ammonius while he was attempting to make his escape in a female dress, opened their gates to Ptolemey, and made him an offer of the crown. This Ptolemey declined, and recommended to them Demetrius as the lawful heir to the kingdom. Alexander Balas was at that time in Cilicia, where he had taken the field against Demetrius; but on hearing of the proceedings of Ptolemey, he returned to Syria with his whole army. In the battle which ensued he was defeated, and fled with five hundred cavalry to Abæ in Arabia, where he took refuge with the emir Zabdiel, or, according to Diodorus Siculus, Diocles, under whose protection he had placed his children at the commencement of the war. There Zabdiel murdered him, in the fifth year of his reign over Syria, and sent his head to Ptolemey. But Ptolemey did not long enjoy his triumph; for, having been wounded on the head by a fall from his horse during the battle, he soon after died in the hands of his surgeons, in the thirty-

[1] 1 Macc. xi. 1—12. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. iv. 5—7. comp. Livy Epitome of book lii.

fifth year of his reign over Egypt. Demetrius then ascended the throne of Syria, and assumed the surname of Nicator (Νικάτωρ, *the Conqueror*[2]).

Ptolemey Philometor and Alexander Balas died in the same year (B. C. 145.) in which Lucius Mummius took and destroyed Corinth, and Scipio Africanus the younger conquered Carthage, at the termination of the third Punic war, which had continued three years. In the burning of Corinth the numerous statues in the city were melted and run together, and this mixture of different sorts of metal produced the celebrated *æs Corinthiacum*, or Corinthian brass. In this year also Polybius of Magalopolis in Arcadia completed the fortieth and last book of his history. He was then at Rome, whither the Romans had removed him, with many other Grecian noblemen, for the purpose of breaking up the Achæan league[3].

Cleopatra queen of Egypt, the wife and sister of Ptolemey Philometor, endeavoured to secure the crown to her son; but as he was then very young there was a strong party in favour of the recall of Ptolemey Physcon, the turbulent and quarrelsome brother of Philometor, from Cyrene. Onias and Dositheus, the two Jews at the head of the Egyptian army, espoused the cause of the queen and the young king, but Thermus the Roman ambassador, who was then at Alexandria, reconciled the two factions by proposing that Physcon should marry his sister Cleopatra and take the guardianship of her son. But on the very day of the nuptials, the unfeeling guardian murdered the young king in the arms of his mother. He then ascended the throne, and assumed the surname of Euergetes (*the Benefactor*), though he was called by all his subjects Cakergetes (*the Evildoer*), a name which he well deserved by his odious character; for, as Justin fully tes-

[2] 1 Macc. xi. 13—18. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. iv. 7. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxii. 17. Polybius in Excerpta Valesii de Virtutibus et Vitiis, xxxi.

[3] Livy, Epitome of book lii. Justin, xxxiv. 2. Pausanias, Achaic. vii. 16. Pliny, xxxiv. 3. Florus, ii. 16. Appian, Punic. cxxvii—cxxxv. Velleius Paterculus, i.

tifies, he was the basest and most tyrannical of all the Ptolemeys[4].

In Syria the change of rulers was productive of little benefit to the country; for Demetrius Nicator, a young and inexperienced prince, committed the government entirely to the hands of Lasthenes, whose efforts had essentially contributed to his advancement to the throne. But this minister, a man of furious temper, massacred the garrisons which Ptolemey Philometor had left in the cities of Syria, and put to death all those who had taken part in the wars against Demetrius, or against his father. As if these odious measures had made the king no enemies, from whose vengeance there was anything to be dreaded, Lasthenes then dismissed all his soldiers, and even the auxiliaries he had brought from the Grecian islands, who were hated equally by the Syrians and by the ancient Greek inhabitants of the country[5].

During these transactions in the kingdom of Syria, Jonathan had laid siege to the Syrian garrison of the castle on mount Zion. Notice of the siege was sent to Demetrius Nicator, and he accordingly summoned Jonathan to appear before him at Ptolemais. The Jewish leader, on his arrival at that city, so represented the affair to the king, that he not only dismissed him without rebuke, but confirmed him in the high priesthood, and added to his government the principalities of Apherima, Lydda, and Ramatha, which had before appertained to Samaria, and, for the sum of three hundred talents, remitted to him all the tribute of the whole country. Jonathan then returned to Jerusalem with his wealth and power greatly increased. The siege of the castle, which had not been interrupted by his absence, was now urged forward with new energy; but the place was so strongly fortified, and the garrison made so obstinate a resistance, that nothing could be

[4] Justin, xxxviii. 8. comp. Josephus against Apion, ii. 5. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxii. 24. 36, 37. Athenæus, iv. 25. x. Valerius Maximus, IX. i. 5. ii. 5.

[5] Diod. Sic. xxxii. 22. 26. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. iv. 9. 1 Macc. xi. 38.

effected towards its reduction. Jonathan then sent ambassadors to the king, with a petition that the garrison might be withdrawn. Demetrius was then in great distress, for the citizens of Antioch, weary of his tyranny, had rebelled against him; and the humbled monarch promised the Jewish ambassadors that he would comply with all their demands, on condition that Jonathan would immediately afford him some assistance. Jonathan, accordingly, despatched to Antioch three thousand well armed Jews, who summoned the rebellious citizens to lay down their arms; and on their refusal they fell upon them, put about a hundred thousand to the sword, and set fire to the city. After Demetrius Nicator had, in this manner, been rescued from the dangers which threatened him, he not only refused to withdraw the garrison from the castle at Jerusalem, but made a demand on all the Jews to the full amount of the tribute, which he had remitted to Jonathan for three hundred talents. By such perfidy he alienated the affections of all his Jewish subjects [6].

§. 101. ANTIOCHUS THEOS THE SECOND. B. C. 144—143.

DEMETRIUS had scarcely escaped from these perils, before another and still more dreadful storm was ready to burst on his head. Diodotus, or Trypho, who in conjunction with Hierax had formerly administered the affairs of government at Antioch under Alexander Balas, repaired to Zabdiel, the emir of the Arabs to whom Alexander Balas had intrusted the care of his son Antiochus. By earnest entreaties, and false representations, he at length induced the Arab chief to resign the young prince to his custody. Trypho then, in the year B. C. 144, conducted Antiochus to Syria, with the intention of placing him on his father's throne. This was no sooner

[6] Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxii. 22. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. iv. 9. v. 2, 3. 1 Macc. xi. 20—53.

known, than all the soldiers dismissed by Lasthenes, who were out of pay, extremely necessitous, and enraged against Demetrius, eagerly pressed into the service of the pretender. Demetrius was defeated and driven into Seleucia. All the elephants, many of the most important cities, and the metropolis itself, fell into the power of Antiochus, who now ascended the throne and assumed the surname of Θεὸς (*the God*[1]).

Antiochus Theos then applied to Jonathan, and on condition that he would join his party, the young king confirmed him in his rank of the first of the king's friends, established him in the office of high priest of the Jews, conferred on him the dominion of the four toparchies, or principalities, gave him the right of wearing a purple robe and chain of gold, and made his brother Simon commander of all the royal forces from the mountains near Tyre, called the Ladder of Tyre, to the boundaries of Egypt. Jonathan had sufficient cause to be dissatisfied with Demetrius, and readily accepted the proposals of Antiochus; and as soon as he began to levy troops under his standard, he was joined by great multitudes of the discontented Syrians, by whose aid he in a short time subdued the whole country as far as Damascus, to the power of his new sovereign. The troops of Demetrius offered no resistance to his progress, but invaded Galilee. Shortly after, Jonathan fell into an ambush of his enemies, and narrowly escaped a total defeat; but the bravest of his soldiers making a stand, gave the others opportunity to rally, when they happily succeeded in beating off their foes. During these enterprises of Jonathan, his brother Simon took the fortress of Bethsura and garrisoned it with Jews[2].

When Jonathan returned to Jerusalem, and found every thing tranquil, in order to provide against future vicis-

[1] Diod. Sic. xxxii. 16. 1 Macc. xi. 39. 54—56. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. v. 3. Livy, Epitome of book lii. Strabo, p. 752.

[2] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. v. 4—7. 1 Macc. xi. 57—74.

situdes, he sent ambassadors to Rome, where they were received with honour by the senate, and dismissed with assurances of friendship. The ambassadors, on their return, visited the Spartans, or Spardians (see Sect. 91, note), as the ambassadors of Judas had formerly done. At this period Josephus first mentions the three sects of the Jews, the Pharisees, the Sadducees, and the Essenes, whose origin we have already had occasion to notice[3]. (Sect. 87.)

As soon as Demetrius had recruited his army, after the defeat in Galilee, he ventured on another campaign against the Jews. Jonathan marched out to meet his enemies as far as Amathis (Hamath), on the extreme frontiers of Canaan; and having ascertained from his spies that the Syrians intended to attack him on the following night, he made such preparations for their reception, as not only to deter them from their purpose, but to induce them to retreat so hastily, that the next day Jonathan was unable to overtake them, though he pursued them to the river Eleutherus. On his return he subdued the Arabians, who were attached to Demetrius, and took Damascus. Meanwhile Simon had conquered Joppa, and garrisoned the city with his own soldiers[4].

When the two brothers returned to Jerusalem, the council of the elders determined to prepare themselves in the best manner possible to meet future exigencies. Accordingly, the fortifications of Jerusalem were repaired under the inspection of Jonathan, the castle with the Syrian garrison was separated from the city by a high wall; and Simon was sent to several towns in the country, to fortify and put them in a state of defence; and thus the Jews were gradually prepared to maintain their future complete independence[5].

The scene now began to change, and it soon appeared

[3] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. v. 8, 9. 1 Macc. xii. 1—23.
[4] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. v. 10. 1 Macc. xii. 24—34.
[5] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. v. 11. 1 Macc. xii. 35—38.

that the precautions which had been taken for the security of Judæa were not unnecessary. Trypho, who had elevated Antiochus to the throne for the sole purpose of murdering him and usurping the regal authority himself, was now ready for the execution of his design; but he dreaded the power of Jonathan. Determining if possible to secure the Jewish hero, for this purpose he entered Palæstine with an army, and advanced as far as Bethshan. But when Jonathan came against him with forty thousand men, he pretended that his intentions were friendly, and that he had entered Palæstine in order to put Jonathan in possession of Ptolemais. He acted his part so dexterously, that Jonathan was deceived, and dismissing his whole army excepting three thousand men, he left two thousand of these in Galilee, and advanced with one thousand to take possession of Ptolemais. But he had no sooner entered the city, than the gates were shut, his men cut to pieces, and he himself put in chains. Trypho then sent a division of his army to destroy the two thousand men whom Jonathan had left in Galilee; but the Syrians, seeing that the Jews were determined to sell their lives as dearly as possible, dared not attack them[6].

When the Jews heard these gloomy tidings, their consternation was universal; but Simon called them together in the temple, encouraged them to make a vigorous defence; and offering himself to become their leader in the place of Jonathan, his proposal was joyfully accepted. When the Syrian army was again put in motion, Simon advanced with so strong a force, that Trypho dared not hazard a battle; but he pretended that Jonathan was detained on account of one hundred talents of tribute which remained unpaid, and that if this money should be sent him, and two sons of Jonathan delivered to him as hostages, their leader should be set at liberty. Simon saw clearly that this was a new artifice of the crafty enemy; but that it might not be said that he had left any

[6] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. vi. 1, 2. 1 Macc. xii. 39—52.

means untried for the release of his brother, he sent to Trypho the sons of Jonathan and the money he had demanded. But Trypho received the money, and retained both Jonathan and his sons. He then proceeded to ravage and lay waste the country, but Simon pressed closely on his steps, and as far as possible thwarted his purposes[7].

The garrison at the castle of Jerusalem now made known to Trypho the sufferings they endured, in consequence of their long-continued blockade; and he ordered his cavalry to hasten to their relief. But during the night there was such a fall of snow, as not only to prevent the relief of the garrison, but to force Trypho himself to retire to winter quarters in Gilead, where he put Jonathan to death, near the city of Bascama, in the year B. C. 143. Soon after, he privately murdered king Antiochus, and gave out that he had died under the hands of a surgeon; but as he immediately proclaimed himself king of Syria, his story gained no credit. Simon took the corpse of his brother from Bascama, and interred it in his father's sepulchre at Modin, where he erected a magnificent mausoleum, which was standing in the time of Eusebius[8].

As soon as Simon had assumed the high priesthood and the command of the army, he sent ambassadors to Rome, to inform the senate of the fate of Jonathan, and of his own accession to the offices of his brother, and to renew his alliance with the Romans. The ambassadors were received at Rome with every demonstration of honour, and returned with the terms of the treaty engraved on tables of copper. The same ambassadors were intrusted with mandates to the Spartans, or Spardians, and the other allies of the Jews[9].

[7] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. vi. 3—5. 1 Macc. xii. 53. xiii. 1—24.

[8] 1 Macc. xiii. 25—32. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. vi. 6. Justin, xxxvi. 1. Livy, Epitome of book lv. Eusebius *περὶ τῶν τοπίκων ὀνομάτων*. comp. Jahn, Biblische Archæologie, Th. I. Band II. §. 245. s. 548. and Kupfertafel x. No. 8.

[9] 1 Macc. xiv. 16—23. 40.

BOOK XI.

HISTORY OF THE JEWS DURING THEIR INDEPENDENCE FROM B. C. 143—63.

§. 102. INDEPENDENCE OF THE JEWS. B. C. 143.

MEANWHILE the hostilities between Demetrius and Trypho were not interrupted, though the former paid little regard to the progress of his rival, and continued his voluptuous life at Seleucia. His general Sarpedon lost a battle near Ptolemais, in the year B. C. 143, but it was far from being decisive[1].

The Jews, however, who had been grossly injured by Trypho, found that the dominion of Demetrius was more tolerable than the yoke of that deceitful tyrant; and they sent an embassy to Seleucia, with the present of a golden crown, to make peace with the king. Demetrius, who needed the aid of the nation against Trypho, readily acceded to all the demands of the ambassadors: he acknowledged Simon as the high priest and prince of the Jews, relinquished all his claims on them for tribute, customs, and taxes, and consented to bury in oblivion all their former offences against him. These concessions he committed to writing in the form of a royal edict, which he gave to the ambassadors to be conveyed to Jerusalem. In this manner the Jews once more became a free and independent people; and accordingly with this year (B.C. 143) they commenced a new epoch, and dated from the year of the freedom of Jerusalem; an era which is used

[1] Athenæus, viii. Diod. Sic. xxxii. 26. Strabo, p. 758.

on the coins of Simon, as well as by Josephus and the author of the first Book of Maccabees[2].

Simon the prince of the Jews now exerted himself to improve the condition of his country; he repaired the military works, and formed a harbour for shipping at Joppa. He conquered Gaza (Gazara?) and in the year B. C. 142, forced the garrison in the castle on mount Zion to surrender. Josephus relates that he then not only demolished the castle, to prevent its falling again into the hands of the enemy, but that he levelled mount Zion itself, on which the castle stood, because it commanded the temple; a labour which it took three years to accomplish. But the author of the first Book of Maccabees makes no mention of the levelling of the mountain; and the expressions in 1 Macc. xiv. 37, are entirely at variance with the story of Josephus, so that it probably originated in mistake. Simon then strengthened the fortifications of the mountain on which the temple stood, and built there a residence for himself[3]. This was called *Baris*, (בִּירָא, Βαρὶς or Βαρεῖς,) originally the Persian name of a royal palace, but which, according to the testimony of Jerome, was afterwards adopted in Palæstine, and applied to all the large quadrangular dwellings built with turrets and walls[4]. Simon appointed his son John Hyrcanus the general of his army, and assigned him his quarters in the fortress of Gazara.

The Jews now enjoyed a season of quiet. They took this opportunity for renewing their alliance with the Ro-

[2] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. vi. 7. 1 Macc. xiii. 34—42. Jahn, Biblische Archæologie, Th. II. Band I. Kupfert. vi. und Beschreibung der Kupfer im Band i. s. 56—61.

[3] 1 Macc. xiii. 43—52. comp. xiv. 7. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. vi. 7. Michælis, Anmerkungen zur Uebersetzung des Ersten Buches der Makkabäer, bey 1 Macc. xiii. 52. und xiv. 37.

[4] Jerome, Epist. ad Princip. tom. ii. p. 689. Jahn, Biblische Archæologie, Th. I. Band II. §§. 43—47. s. 199—219. Upham's Translation, §. 34. p. 37. comp. 1 Chron. xxix. 1. 19. 2 Chron. xvii. 12. xxvii. 4. Neh. i. 1. ii. 8. vii. 2. Esth. i. 2. 5. ii. 3. 5. 8. iii. 15. viii. 14. ix. 6. 11. 15. Dan. viii. 2.

mans, and with the Spartans, or Spardians; and Simon deputed a special ambassador to Rome, with the present of a golden shield weighing a thousand minæ, that he might be acknowledged by the senate as an independent prince[5].

In the year B. C. 141 a general assembly was held at Jerusalem, in which the people, out of gratitude to the house of Mattathias, made both the high priesthood and the office of regent, or prince of the Jews, hereditary in the family of Simon. This decree of the assembly was engraved on plates of copper, and fixed to a monument which was erected in the temple[6].

If we may credit the traditions of the Jews and their modern books, such as Sepher Juchasin, Shalsheleth Hakkabbala, and Zemach David, these times were distinguished by the celebrated teachers, Simon Ben Shetah and Judah Ben Tabbai, who are said to have established schools at Jerusalem at this period.

§. 103. SIMON PRINCE OF THE JEWS. B. C. 141—135.

THE throne of Parthia was occupied at this time by Arsaces the fifth, or sixth, who was called Mithridates. During the disturbances in the kingdom of Syria, which have already been mentioned, he had taken possession of all the country of the Euphrates, and extended his dominions to India, and was now improving the internal regulations of his enlarged empire, by digesting into a code the best laws of all the conquered nations[1].

The Macedonians who had settled in those countries were not satisfied with this change of masters; and by messengers repeatedly sent, they invited Demetrius to lead an army to the east, where they promised to join his standard. Demetrius accordingly left Trypho in posses-

[5] 1 Macc. xiv. 16—24.

[6] 1 Macc. xiv. 25—49.

[1] Justin, xli. 5, 6. Diod. Sic. xxxii. 34. Oiosius, v. 4.

sion of the greater part of Syria, and marched over the Euphrates and Tigris, when the Elymæans, the Persians, and the Bactrians, welcomed him as their sovereign. Strengthened by these people, he defeated the Parthians in several engagements; but afterwards, deluded by a pretended negotiation, he was made prisoner, and his army cut to pieces[2].

Mithridates exhibited the captive king in every part of his empire, to show his discontented subjects that they could expect no aid from Demetrius. He then sent him into Hyrcania, where he treated him with the respect due to his rank, and even gave him his own daughter Rhodoguna in marriage. In this condition Demetrius remained under Phraates, the successor of Mithridates, though he twice attempted to make his escape from captivity[3].

In the year B. C. 140, Cleopatra, the wife of the captive Demetrius, shut herself up with her children in Seleucia on the Orontes. Her force soon became formidable; for many, disgusted at the severity and tyranny of Trypho, went over to the party of the queen. Still she did not venture on any offensive operations; but when she learned that her husband had married Rhodoguna, she sent to Antiochus the brother of Demetrius, who was then at Rhodes, and made him an offer of her hand and kingdom. Upon this, Antiochus, surnamed Eusebes and Sidetes, or Zidetes, assumed the title of king of Syria, levied soldiers, and wrote to Simon, the prince of the Jews, promising him his friendship[4].

In the following year, B. C. 139, he sailed to Syria with a large army, married Cleopatra, joined her forces to his own, and took the field against Trypho. The soldiers of this tyrant deserted in great numbers to Antiochus, in consequence of which, his army was soon in-

[2] 1 Macc. xiv. 3. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. vii. 1. Justin, xxxvi. 1. xxxviii. 9. Orosius, v. 4.

[3] Justin, xxxvi. 1. xxxviii. 9. xlii. 1—3.

[4] Justin, xxxvi. 1. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. vii. 1. 1 Macc. xv. 1—9.

creased to one hundred and twenty thousand infantry, and eight thousand cavalry. Trypho was defeated and forced to seek refuge in Dora, where he was immediately besieged by land and sea, by the numerous forces of Antiochus, and reduced to the last extremity. He, however, escaped on shipboard, and sailed to Orthosia, whence he fled to Apamea his native city; but there he was made prisoner and put to death, after he had reigned three years over a part of Syria. Thus Antiochus Sidetes became master of the whole Syrian empire, of which he held possession for nine years[b].

When Antiochus, on his arrival in Syria, saw the strength of his party, he paid no regard to the promises he had made to Simon in his friendly letter to that prince; he rejected the two thousand auxiliaries, the gold and silver, the arms and military machines, which the Jewish ruler had sent to his aid in the siege of Dora; and despatched Athenobius to Jerusalem to demand possession of Gazara, Joppa, the castle on mount Zion, and other fortified places, or, in lieu of them, the payment of five hundred talents; and five hundred talents more as a compensation for the damage which the Jews had done to the Syrian empire. Simon offered to pay one hundred talents for the possession of Gazara and Joppa; but the other places he claimed as the hereditary inheritance of his fathers, which had been wrongfully seized and retained, but were now restored to their lawful owners. This answer only served to irritate Antiochus. Even the friendship of the Romans afforded, at this time, no protection to the Jews; for though the senate, immediately after the embassy of Simon, had directed the consul Lucius Cornelius Piso to send letters to all the allied kings and nations, signifying the alliance of the Romans with the Jews, and commanding them to abstain from all encroachments on that people, and to give them no cause of dissatisfaction; the letter to the king of Syria was addressed to Demetrius,

[b] Justin, xxxvi. 1, Josephus, Antiq. XIII. vii. 2. 1 Macc. xv. 10—14. 38.

who was then a captive in Parthia, and therefore Antiochus chose not to consider himself bound by its requisitions. Accordingly he sent an army into the neighbourhood of Joppa and Jamnia under the command of his general Cendebeus, who fortified Cedron, provided it with a garrison, and made hostile incursions on the Jewish territories. Simon, who was now too old to endure the fatigues of a campaign in person, sent out a detachment of twenty thousand infantry and some cavalry, under the command of his sons John Hyrcanus and Judas. They soon repulsed Cendebeus, and forced him to shut himself up in the fortress of Cedron. Judas was wounded in the battle, but John Hyrcanus pursued the fugitives and burnt the tower of Azotus or Ashdod, into which they had thrown themselves. By such energetic measures, the Syrians in a short time were expelled from Judæa[6].

The next year, B. C. 137, Antiochus Sidetes was constantly occupied in suppressing the adherents of Trypho, so that the Jews enjoyed a season of tranquillity. Simon took this opportunity to make a tour through Judæa, for the purpose of examining and improving the condition of the country; and in the beginning of the year B. C. 135, he came to Jericho, where his son-in-law Ptolemey was governor. Ptolemey invited him into his castle, and, at a feast, treacherously murdered him, with his two sons Mattathias and Judas, after he had governed Judæa for eight years. Ptolemey, intending to usurp the principality of Judæa, immediately sent intelligence of the death of Simon to Antiochus Sidetes, with whom he probably had a secret understanding in respect to this perfidious murder. For the farther promotion of his design, he despatched messengers to all the principal military officers of the country, in order to gain them over to his cause by promises. He also sent a party of assassins to Gazara, to murder John Hyrcanus the son of Simon; but Hyrcanus, having received notice of his danger, put the

[6] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. vii. 3. 1 Macc. xv. 15—41. xvi. 1—10.

assassins to death and hastened to Jerusalem, where he was universally acknowledged as the successor of his father in the high priesthood and principality of Judæa. Ptolemey then fled to Zeno Cotylais, the tyrant of Philadelphia, and his name occurs no more in history[7].

Though the treachery of Ptolemey had proved so fatal to himself, Antiochus Sidetes entered Judæa with an army, laid waste the country, and besieged Jerusalem. The siege was vigorously prosecuted, and the citizens defended themselves with great bravery: but famine would soon have compelled them to surrender unconditionally, had not an opportunity offered of making peace with the king. John Hyrcanus requested an armistice during the feast of tabernacles that was approaching, which Antiochus not only granted, but even sent into the city sacrificial animals, to be used in the solemnities of the festival. Won by such a proof of humanity and piety, Hyrcanus sent an embassy to the king with proposals of permanent peace. Though the Syrian generals attempted to instigate their sovereign at this time to root out the Jews, who were so much hated by all other nations, he rejected their bloody counsels, and listened to the overtures of Hyrcanus. He was probably influenced in some degree by a dread of the Romans, as he soon after sent a magnificent present to Scipio Africanus the younger. The distresses of the Jews were so great, that, in order to obtain relief, they consented to pay tribute for Joppa and several other cities, to demolish the fortifications of Jerusalem, and to rebuild the castle of mount Zion; and in their harassed state even these conditions did not seem severe, especially after Antiochus, for the sum of five hundred talents, relinquished his demand to have the castle rebuilt. Thus in the ninth month after the death of Simon the Jews again obtained peace. But three hundred talents of the money promised to Antiochus were to be paid immediately; and, in order to obtain the

[7] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. vii. 3, 4. viii. 1. 1 Macc. xvi. 14—22.

money, John Hyrcanus is said to have opened the sepulchre of David, and to have taken from it three thousand talents. I have elsewhere expressed my opinion respecting this tradition. Allusion is made to the depressed circumstances of the Jews at this time in the following words of Justin, in his account of Antiochus: "Judæosque, qui in Macedonico imperio sub Demetrio patre armis se in libertatem vindicaverant, subigit[8]."

Egypt, during this period, was groaning under the tyranny of Ptolemey Physcon Euergetes, who, by his repeated cruelties, had well deserved the surname of Cakergetes. Hierax who, in conjunction with Trypho, once governed Syria under Alexander Balas, had fled to Egypt, and was now the prime minister of Ptolemey. He exerted all his power to prevent insurrections; but after the year B. C. 136, the whole kingdom fell into confusion; either because Hierax had been put to death by Ptolemey, as Athenæus asserts, or because the minister was no longer able to repair the mischiefs of the sovereign. Ptolemey Physcon permitted his mercenary soldiers to murder his subjects at pleasure, and his empire was daily deluged with blood. He ravished his daughter-in-law and then married her, after having repudiated her mother, who was his own sister. His cruelties compelled his subjects to emigrate in great numbers, and many houses in Alexandria were abandoned by their inhabitants. The artists and learned men settled in Greece, Asia Minor, and the Grecian islands, and by their means the arts and sciences were revived in those places, while they ceased to flourish in Egypt. Ptolemey attempted to allure foreigners to the forsaken dwellings of Alexandria, but they soon became disgusted at his voluptuousness and cruelty. About this time Publius Scipio Africanus, Spurius Mummius, and Lucius Metellus, were sent from Rome by the

[8] Livy, Epitome of book lvii. Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 1. Justin, xxxvi. 1. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. viii. 2—4. compare Jahn, Biblische Archæologie, Th. I. Band, II. §. 244. s. 541.

senate as ambassadors to inquire into the condition of their allies, and they came to Egypt in the year B. C. 136. By their temperate mode of living, and by their whole conduct, they formed the most striking contrast with the luxurious and inhuman king; and they could not, without pain, observe the miserable condition of Egypt, which, under a suitable government, might have been a prosperous and happy kingdom; and where there had been, according to the testimony of Theocritus, thirty-three thousand three hundred and thirty-nine cities in the reign of Ptolemey Philadelphus. This number may perhaps exceed the truth; but the flourishing cities were undoubtedly very numerous in the time of the first two Ptolemeys. What idea must the temperate and sagacious Roman ambassadors have formed of Physcon, who, in his gluttony and cruelty, and even in his person, resembled a wild beast rather than a man, and who heightened his natural deformities by wearing a garment so thin, that every part of his hideous form could be distinctly seen through it! He was surely a strange figure for a king; short of stature, and withal so thick that no man could clasp him; and, to finish the picture, arrayed in a transparent robe. "Erat enim," says Justin, "et vultu deformis, et statura brevis, et sagina ventris non homini, sed belluæ similis. Quam fœditatem nimia subtilitas perlucidæ vestis augebat, prorsus quasi astu inspicienda præberentur, quæ omni studio occultanda pudibundo viro erant[9]."

Attalus Philometor, the son of Eumenes, as unnatural a tyrant as Ptolemey Physcon, had occupied the throne of Pergamus ever since the year B. C. 138. He had been well educated by his uncle Attalus, his predecessor on the throne; but when he assumed the government, on the decease of his uncle, he murdered all his near relatives

[9] Justin, xxxviii. 8. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxx. 24. 28, 29. 36, 37. Athenæus, iv. 25. vi. vii. xii. Theocritus, Idyll. xvii. Valerius Maximus, IX. i. §. ii. 5. Cicero, Somnium Scip. ii.

and friends, with their wives and children, under pretence that they had been instrumental in the death of his mother. He then arrayed himself in a sordid garment, suffered his hair and beard to grow neglected, refused to appear in public, and cultivated the soil in his garden, as if he would now do penance for his crimes; but he sowed poisonous plants with the good, and sent them, mingled together, as presents to his friends. At last he undertook with his own hands to cast a statue for his mother; when, in consequence of the heat, he was thrown into a fever, of which he died in the year B. C. 133. The most remarkable thing respecting him is, that in his will he made the Romans the heirs of his kingdom. Aristonius, a natural son of Eumenes, and half-brother of Attalus, asserted his claims to the crown, and made himself master of several cities; but after a four years' war, in which the Romans at last poisoned the waters of the country, he was overpowered and taken prisoner. The Romans then took possession of Pergamus, made it a Roman province, and dignified it with the name of Asia[10].

§. 104. JOHN HYRCANUS. B. C. 135—106.

JOHN HYRCANUS now enjoyed the government of his principality undisturbed; and in the year B. C. 131, he attended Antiochus in a campaign against Phraates king of Parthia. Antiochus pretended that he undertook the war with Parthia for the purpose of delivering his brother Demetrius from captivity; but the real cause of his enterprise was a rumour which had reached him, that the Parthians treated Demetrius with so much attention, in order at some future time to employ him against Syria, and perhaps reestablish him on the throne. The Syrian army consisted but of eighty thousand soldiers, the ser-

[10] Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxiv. 14. Justin, xxxvi. 4. Strabo, p. 624. Florus, ii. 20. Livy, Epitome of books lviii. lix. Eutropius, iv. 20. Orosius, v. 10.

vants, however, sutlers, comedians, and other attendants, amounted to three hundred thousand, and the most extravagant luxury prevailed during the whole expedition. Notwithstanding this Antiochus Sidetes was at first successful; for he defeated the Parthians in three battles, and confined them within the boundaries of their own country. At the approach of winter, John Hyrcanus led back his forces to Judæa, with increased reputation for his conduct in the campaign. It was well for him that he returned so soon; for when the army of Antiochus, which consisted in all of four hundred thousand men, went into winter quarters, and, in order to maintain their luxury, oppressed the inhabitants, they fell upon their uninvited guests when separated from each other, and overwhelmed them with a promiscuous massacre. Antiochus, with the soldiers under his immediate command, hastened to join the divisions of his army which were stationed nearest to his quarters; but he was met by Phraates, defeated, and left dead on the field [1].

While Phraates, during this campaign, was exposed to danger from the inroads of the Syrians, he had called the Scythians to his aid, and dismissed the captive Demetrius to Syria, to regain possession of that kingdom, that Antiochus might, in this manner, be compelled to return. But when Antiochus and his whole army were so unexpectedly destroyed, Phraates sent to recall Demetrius, who had safely arrived in Syria after a rapid journey, having been everywhere received with joy by the inhabitants, who were fearful of new troubles. Phraates was also involved in a war with his Scythian auxiliaries, because, having no farther occasion for their services, he refused to pay them their stipulated wages. In this war he was so imprudent as to enrol among his own soldiers the Greeks whom he had taken from the army of Antiochus Sidetes; but they went over to the Scythians in the

[1] Nicolaus Damascenus in Josephus, Antiq. XIII. viii. 4. ix. 1. Justin, xxxviii. 10. Orosius, v. 10. Valerius Maximus, IX. i. 4. Athenæus, v. 13. x. xii.

first battle, and turned their arms against the Parthians. The army of Phraates was totally routed, himself slain, and his whole kingdom given up to pillage. His uncle Artabanus then ascended the throne, but he also was killed in his first encounter with the Thogarian Scythians. The crown then descended to Mithridates the Great, afterwards so celebrated for his wars and conquests[2].

Syria had now a king, but the strength of the empire had been exhausted by the defeats in Parthia. John Hyrcanus well knew how to avail himself of these circumstances. As soon as he received intelligence of the death of Antiochus Sidetes, he took the field, conquered Medaba, Samega, and several other cities of the Syrian empire, and made himself completely independent. From this time the Jews disowned all the authority of the Syrians over their country, and their princes no longer acknowledged themselves the vassals of the Syrian monarchs. In allusion to these transactions, Justin observes, "quorum (Judæorum) vires tantæ fuerunt, ut post hunc (Antiochum Sidetem) nullum Macedonum regem tulerint, domesticis imperiis usi, Syriam magnis bellis infestaverint." About the year B. C. 159, Hyrcanus subdued the city of Shechem and destroyed the temple of the Samaritans, which was situated on the south side of mount Gerizim, at a little distance from Shechem. The Samaritans, however, continued to perform the public services of their religion on the same mountain. John Hyrcanus then conquered the Idumeans and gave them their choice, either to be circumcised and obey the law of Moses, or to leave the country. They chose the former, and became one people with the Jews[3].

Meanwhile Ptolemey Physcon continued his disorderly reign in Egypt; and when he saw that his tyranny was hateful to the inhabitants whom he had invited to Alex-

[2] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. viii. 4. Justin, xxxiii. 10. xxxix. 1. xlii. 1, 2.

[3] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. ix. 1. x. 1. Justin, xxxvi. 1. Compare Zech. i. 14—17. viii. 20—23.

andria, in order to prevent an insurrection, he directed his mercenary soldiers to massacre all the youth of the city in the gymnasium. But this only hastened the insurrection which he dreaded. The enraged citizens set fire to the royal palace, hoping that the odious tyrant would perish in the flames. But he effected his escape, and fled to Cyprus with his young queen Cleopatra. The Egyptians then surrendered the government to Cleopatra, the sister and repudiated wife of Physcon; but he levied troops in Cyprus to make war on the queen. He had left his son as governor of Cyrene, but fearing that the Egyptians might raise him to the throne, he recalled him to Cyprus and put him to death. The Alexandrians were so exasperated by this unnatural murder, that they overthrew all the statues of Physcon. He, supposing that this was done at the instigation of the queen, his former wife, took his son Memphitis, whom he had by her, caused him to be beheaded before his eyes, and the body to be cut to pieces. The mangled remains he ordered to be deposited in a box and sent to Egypt, to be presented to Cleopatra, at the festival on her birthday. By this the Egyptians were still more enraged, and resolved to make every effort to prevent the return of so inhuman a monster to their country. For this purpose they raised a large army, which protected Egypt under the command of Marsyas. But in the year B. C. 128, Hegelochus led the forces of Physcon to Egypt, defeated Marsyas, and took him prisoner. Contrary to the expectations of all, Physcon set Marsyas at liberty; for the tyrant hoped by this means to regain the affections of his subjects. Cleopatra, in the danger which now threatened her, sent an embassy to Demetrius king of Syria, who, after his return from Parthia, had married her eldest daughter by Philometor. She offered him the crown of Egypt on condition that he would lead an army to her assistance.

Demetrius listened with pleasure to so attractive an offer, and immediately conducted an army through Palæstine to Egypt. But while he was engaged in the siege

of Pelusium, the citizens of Antioch revolted from him, and induced several others to join their party, and, among the rest, the powerful city of Apamea. Demetrius, therefore, was compelled to leave Egypt, and returned along the coasts of Palæstine to Antioch. Cleopatra thus forsaken, collected her most valuable treasures, and fled by sea to seek protection with her daughter by Philometor, Cleopatra queen of Syria, who was then residing at Ptolemais. This princess had been first married to Alexander Balas, then to Demetrius, afterwards to his brother Antiochus Sidetes, and was now again the wife of Demetrius. Ptolemey Physcon then entered Egypt and took possession of the kingdom without opposition[4].

As Demetrius in his expedition to Egypt had led his army through the land of the Hebrews by the seacoast, and returned by the same route, John Hyrcanus sent an embassy to Rome, not so much to get himself acknowledged by the senate as the successor of Simon in the principality of Judæa, as to complain of the aggressions of Antiochus Sidetes and Demetrius; the former of whom had made war on the Jews, the allies of the Romans, and taken from them Gazara, Joppa, and several other cities, while the latter was at that very time leading an army through their country. The Roman senate renewed their alliance with the Jewish ambassadors, promising to take into consideration the aggressions complained of, when they had opportunity. Soon after, Hyrcanus sent a second embassy to Rome, consisting of Alexander the son of Jason, Numenius the son of Antiochus, and Alexander the son of Dositheus, on the same business, and with them a present of a golden shield valued at fifty thousand pieces of gold. But they accomplished nothing more than had already been effected by the former ambassadors. Josephus places this embassy in the high priesthood of

[4] Justin, xxxviii. 8, 9. xxxix. 1. Livy, Epitome of book lix. Oiosius, v. 10. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxiii. 28, 29. Græca Euseb. Scaligeri, p. 61. Valerius Maximus, ix 2. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. ix. 3.

Hyrcanus the second, and says that the design of it was to obtain permission to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem, which had been thrown down by Pompey. But this is evidently a mistake; for in the decree of the senate there is not a word respecting the rebuilding of the walls: besides, the permission to rebuild the walls of Jerusalem was granted as a reward for the services which Hyrcanus the second had rendered to Cæsar in the Egyptian war, and consequently it must have been given after the twenty-third year of Hyrcanus the second, when that war was closed; whereas this decree was issued in the ninth year of Hyrcanus: again, the permission to rebuild the walls was given in the ides of December, that is, on the thirteenth of October; but this decree is dated in the month of Panemus, or July: and, finally, the decree itself mentions Numenius the son of Antiochus as one of the ambassadors; but he had been sent as one of the ambassadors to Rome in the time of Jonathan, and consequently could not have been living under Hyrcanus the second, a hundred years after[5].

When Ptolemey Physcon found himself again secure on the throne of Egypt, he resolved to be revenged on Demetrius for his attempt to take possession of the kingdom by the aid of Cleopatra. For this purpose he brought forward Zebina the son of Protarchus, a merchant, as an adopted son of Antiochus Sidetes, or Alexander Balas, and a claimant to the crown of Syria, and sent him with an army against Demetrius. However contemptible such a pretender might appear, he easily succeeded in depriving Demetrius of his kingdom and his life; for this monarch had made himself universally hated by his severity. In the year B. C. 126, a battle was fought near Damascus between Zebina and Demetrius, in which the latter was defeated. He withdrew to Ptolemais, where his wife Cleopatra then resided; but she ordered the gates of the city to be closed against her husband, and in this manner

[5] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. ix. 2. XIV. viii. 5. 1 Macc. xii. 16.

compelled him to flee to Tyre, where he was slain. The Syrian empire was now divided; Cleopatra retaining part, and the remainder coming under the dominion of Zebina, who was also called Alexander, an equitable and popular ruler. To secure himself more firmly on the throne, he entered into an alliance with John Hyrcanus[6].

Seleucus, the only son of Demetrius Nicator, assumed the title of king of Syria; but the government was entirely vested in the hands of his mother Cleopatra. In the twentieth year of his age, B. C. 124, he manifested a determination to exercise the authority of a king; when his mother, with her own hands, murdered him with a javelin. Zebina did not enjoy his throne undisturbed; for Clonius, Æropus, and Antipater, three of his ablest generals, revolted from him. They were however defeated at Laodicea on the Orontes, and pardoned by their sovereign[7].

The next year, B. C. 123, Cleopatra queen of Syria recalled Antiochus Grypus, her second son by Demetrius, from Athens, whither she had sent him to be educated, and proclaimed him king; though she still retained all the authority herself. In the following year, the imperious queen had the satisfaction of seeing Ptolemey Physcon break off his connection with Alexander Zebina, because the latter refused to do him homage for the sovereignty of Syria. Physcon then came to terms with Cleopatra, gave his daughter Tryphæna in marriage to her son Antiochus Grypus, and provided her with a large army. Alexander Zebina was then defeated; and when he attempted to obtain money for his flight to Greece from the temple of Jupiter at Antioch, the citizens rose against him, drove him out of the temple, and then slew him. Thus Cleopatra became mistress of all Syria. She, however, enjoyed her good fortune but a short time; for, in

[6] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. ix. 3. Justin, xxxix. 1. Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 24. Livy, Epitome of book lx.

[7] Justin, xxxix. 1. Diod. Sic. xxxiv. 24. Livy, Epitome of book lx.

the year B. C. 120, his mother finding that Antiochus Grypus was determined to take the government into his own hands, to preserve her own authority, prepared poison for her son. But she was detected, and Antiochus compelled his murderous mother to drink the poison herself[8].

Three years after this, B. C. 117, Ptolemey Physcon died, after he had reigned twenty-nine years from the death of his more amiable brother Philometor. He made over Cyrene to Apion, his son by a concubine, and left the government of Egypt in the hands of Cleopatra, his wife and daughter-in-law, with directions for her to bestow the sceptre on either of her two sons, Lathyrus or Alexander, according to her own choice. Though preferring her younger son Alexander, yet the voice of the people compelled her to raise to the throne Lathyrus, the first-born, who was surnamed Philometor and Soter. She required him, however, to repudiate his beloved wife and sister Cleopatra, and to marry his younger sister Selene[9].

Antiochus Grypus had a half-brother whom his mother Cleopatra had borne to Antiochus Sidetes who perished in Parthia. This son, after the return of her former husband Demetrius from Parthia, Cleopatra had sent to be educated at Cyzicus on the Propontis. Antiochus Grypus now attempted by poison to procure the death of this prince, who was called Antiochus Cyzicenus; but having discovered his murderous intentions, Cyzicenus collected an army, with which he marched to Syria, to make war on his brother Grypus. The next year, B. C. 113, Cyzicenus married Cleopatra, the repudiated wife of Ptolemey Lathyrus, who brought him, as her marriage gift, an army she had levied in Cyprus. Notwithstanding this reinforcement he was defeated in a battle with Grypus, and forced to flee to Antioch. Having left his wife Cleopatra,

[8] Josephus, Antiq. XII. ix. 3. Justin, xxxix. 1, 2. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxiv. 26.

[9] Justin, xxxix. 3. Pausanias, Attic. I. ix. 1, 2. Eusebius, Chron. Ptolemey, Canon.

he departed to levy more troops in the adjoining provinces; but Grypus meanwhile took possession of the city, and Cleopatra sought refuge in the temple. The conqueror was disposed to clemency towards her, but her sister Tryphæna, the wife of Grypus, contrary to the wishes of her husband, seized Cleopatra, cut off her hands by which she had clasped the altar, and put her to death because she had married the enemy of the king. But in the following year, B. C. 112, Antiochus Cyzicenus returned to Syria with a new army, overcame his brother Grypus in battle, took Tryphæna prisoner, and sacrificed her to the manes of his murdered wife. Antiochus Grypus made his escape to Aspendus in Pamphylia. But in the year B. C. 111, Grypus was again successful in Syria, and the rival brothers then agreed to share the empire between them. Antiochus Cyzicenus obtained Cœle-Syria and Phœnicia, and fixed his residence at Damascus; while Antiochus Grypus held the remainder of the kingdom, and dwelt at Antioch, the ancient metropolis. Unfortunately, both kings were voluptuous libertines; and their endless contentions, which could never be entirely appeased, at last produced the expulsion of both from their dominions[10].

Cleopatra queen of Egypt was not disturbed by the unhappy fate of her two daughters in Syria; for she was entirely occupied in exertions for the security of her own power. In furtherance of her designs, she had appointed Alexander, her youngest and favourite son, governor of Cyprus, that, in case of necessity, she might receive aid from him[11].

John Hyrcanus took advantage of the disturbances and divisions in Syria, to increase his own power and extend his territories. In the twenty-sixth year of his administration, B. C. 110, his two sons, Aristobulus and Antigonus, laid siege to Samaria, to retaliate on the

[10] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. x. 1. Justin, xxxix. 3. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxiv. 30. Porphyry in Græca Euseb. Scaligeri, p. 62.

[11] Pausanias, Attic. I. ix. 1, 2.

Macedonians, who had possessed that city ever since the time of Alexander the Great, the hostilities which they, at the instigation of the Syrian kings, had committed against the Jewish colony at Merissa. Antiochus Cyzicenus marched with an army to the relief of Samaria; but he was repulsed, and the siege continued to be vigorously prosecuted in the year B. C. 109. The citizens again applied to Cyzicenus for aid; and though he had received of Ptolemey Lathyrus six thousand auxiliary troops from Egypt, he was unable to render any effectual aid to the distressed city. The cooperation of Egypt was of no real advantage to Cyzicenus, and had nearly deprived Lathyrus of his throne; for his mother Cleopatra, influenced by Chelcias and Ananias, two Jews, the sons of Onias who had built the temple at Leontopolis, was strenuously opposed to the design of sending troops against the Jews. Cyzicenus, with his Egyptian reinforcement, could do nothing but ravage the country of the Jews, intending by this means to withdraw the besieging army from Samaria; but in these predatory excursions, his army was continually weakened by skirmishes with the Jews and by the desertion of his soldiers. At length he retired to Tripolis, leaving his generals Callimander and Epicrates, with the army, to prosecute the mode of petty warfare which he had commenced. But Callimander was soon cut off with his whole army by the Jews, and Epicrates betrayed into their hands Scythopolis, and the adjoining places which belonged to Cyzicenus. At last Hyrcanus, in the year B. C. 109, conquered Samaria, demolished its fortifications, and made it entirely desolate by laying it under water[12].

John Hyrcanus, who, according to Josephus, had been favoured with divine revelations, was a zealous Pharisee, and universally beloved for his justice and virtues. Towards the close of his administration, about the year B. C. 108, he requested the Pharisees who were present with

[12] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. x. 2—4.

him at a feast, to inform him of any failure in his towards God or man, which might have come to their knowledge. From all the guests he received testimony of his blameless conduct, and the highest praises for his virtues. But a certain Eleazar, a turbulent and peevish man, told him that he ought to resign the high priesthood and content himself with the civil government of the nation; because, his mother having been once a captive, it was uncertain whether he was a descendant of Aaron or of a pagan. Hyrcanus was the more offended at this, because, as Josephus assures us, the allegation was false. The Sadducees took this opportunity to excite the disgust of Hyrcanus against the Pharisees. Jonathan, his intimate friend and a Sadducee, persuaded him that all the Pharisees agreed with Eleazar, as might be made evident by demanding of them what punishment the detractor merited, for they would certainly be very lenient towards him. This Jonathan could say with the more safety, as the Pharisees generally were milder in their punishments than the Sadducees. But Hyrcanus, in his displeasure, overlooked this principle of the sect; and when they answered his question respecting the punishment of Eleazar, by recommending imprisonment and scourging according to the law of Moses, he renounced all connection with them and attached himself to the Sadducees. On this account, the Pharisees, who had unbounded influence over the common people, afterwards manifested great hostility and caused many embarrassments to the family of Hyrcanus. After Hyrcanus had governed Judæa thirty or thirty-one years, he died in B. C. 106, the same year in which Pompey the Great and Marcus Tullius Cicero were born. He is said to have made a regular castle of the house which Simon built north of the temple, and it was ever after the residence of the Asmonean rulers [13].

[13] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. x. 3. 5—7. xi. 2. xiii. 1. Compare Velleius Paterculus, ii. 9. Aulus Gellius, xv. 28. Pliny, xxxvii. 2. 1 Mac. xiii. 53.

§. 105. ARISTOBULUS I. KING OF THE JEWS. B. C. 105.

JOHN HYRCANUS left the principality to his wife; but Aristobulus, his eldest son, soon usurped the government, and as his mother refused to relinquish her authority, he committed her to prison, where she perished by hunger. He also imprisoned the three youngest of his four brothers; but towards Antigonus, who was next to him in age, he entertained better feelings, and intrusted him with the transaction of public business. No sooner had he, by these violent measures, secured to himself the high priesthood and principality, than he assumed the diadem and the regal title. Thus the Hebrews again had a king, and he at the same time held the office of high priest, as Zechariah had prophesied (vi. 9—15.) more than four hundred years before. The fourth Book of Maccabees contains a decree of the Roman senate, in which John Hyrcanus is styled king; Strabo, on the other hand, asserts that Alexander, the brother and successor of Aristobulus, first assumed the regal title; but in this case, the testimony of Josephus is undoubtedly of greater weight than that of Strabo, or the fourth Book of Maccabees[1].

At this time Syria was kept in constant commotion by the dissensions of the two dissolute brothers Grypus and Cyzicenus; and Aristobulus, taking advantage of these disturbances to extend his own dominions, subdued Iturea. He left it at the option of the Itureans, either to leave their country or become Jews; and they accordingly submitted to circumcision, and were incorporated with the Jewish nation[2]. Aristobulus fell sick during this campaign, and, before its close, returned to Jerusalem, leaving his brother Antigonus to complete the subjugation of the country and the settlement of its affairs. After Antigonus

[1] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xi. 1. Jewish War, I. iii. 1. Zech. vi. 9—15. 4 Macc. ii. Strabo, p. 762.

[2] Compare Zech. viii. 20—23. xiv. 14—17.

had accomplished the business with which he had been intrusted, at the close of the feast of tabernacles he returned to Jerusalem; and having entered the temple in complete armour with his body-guards, it was whispered to Aristobulus, that his brother had designs to take his life and usurp his power. Aristobulus could scarcely credit such a calumny, but sent a summons to his brother in the temple to appear unarmed before the king, at the same time stationing a party of well-armed soldiers in the dark passage which led from the temple to the Baris, or royal tower, through which his brother must necessarily pass, with orders to kill Antigonus if he came in his armour. But the enemies of Antigonus seduced the messenger appointed to bear the summons to violate his instructions, and direct Antigonus to go to the royal castle in his armour, as the king desired to see it; and he was accordingly slain in the subterranean passage[3].

Aristobulus was much disturbed by this event, and suffered severely from the reproaches of conscience, which were aggravated by the recollection of the cruel murder of his mother; and the disease of his body was increased by these distresses of his mind. A hemorrhage soon put an end to his life, after he had reigned one year. He was an admirer of the Greeks, and highly esteemed by them. According to Josephus, Strabo quotes from Timagenes the following words respecting this king: "He was a reasonable man, and very serviceable to the Jews; he extended their territory, and united a part of the Itureans with the Jews by circumcision[4]."

Salome or Alexandra, the wife of Aristobulus, immediately on the death of her husband released his three younger brothers from prison; the eldest of whom, Alexander Janneus, ascended the throne in the year B. C. 104. He had been educated in Galilee; for, from his earliest infancy, his father John Hyrcanus would never suffer him

[3] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xi. 1—3. Jewish war, I. iii. 2.
[4] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xi. 3. Jewish War, I. iii. 6.

to appear in his presence. The next eldest brother attempted to depose Alexander, and was executed: but Absalom, the youngest, lived contentedly in a private station, and was esteemed by the king[5].

Meanwhile Cleopatra in Egypt had severely punished her son Lathyrus for his disregard to her wishes in furnishing Cyzicenus with auxiliary troops against the Jews. She took from him her daughter Selene, whom she had before compelled him to marry; and having wounded her daughter's most faithful eunuchs, she pretended, in an assembly of the principal citizens of Alexandria, that they had received these wounds in defending the queen against Lathyrus, who had attempted to murder her. Lathyrus then found it necessary to make his escape from Egypt, and went to Cyprus; when Cleopatra recalled her youngest and favourite son Alexander, and placed him on the throne[6].

§. 106. ALEXANDER JANNEUS. B. C. 104—77.

While Antiochus Grypus and Antiochus Cyzicenus, notwithstanding their dissensions, were continuing their idle and voluptuous course of life, Tyre, Ptolemais, Gaza, and other cities, also Theodorus of Gadara and Amathus, and Zoilus of Dora and Strato's Tower, and other provincial governors, were attempting to establish their own independence. In these circumstances, Alexander Janneus was not idle, and formed the design of subduing Ptolemais, Gaza, and Dora to his own power. In the year B. C. 104, he took the field against the citizens of Ptolemais, defeated them, and laid siege to the city; when he sent a part of his army against Gaza and Dora, to lay waste the country, that Ptolemais might derive no aid from that quarter. The citizens of Ptolemais then applied for help to Ptolemey Lathyrus, who reigned in

[5] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xii. 1. Jewish War, I. iv. 1.
[6] Justin, xxxix. 4. Pausanias, Attic. I. ix. 2.

Cyprus; but being soon after convinced of the danger of employing such an ally, they declined his assistance. But as Ptolemey had already collected an army of thirty thousand men, and prepared a fleet to transport them, he was determined on prosecuting his expedition. When he arrived at Ptolemais, the citizens closed their gates against him, and he was in great perplexity, till ambassadors came to him from Gaza and Dora, entreating him to march to their assistance. He accordingly directed his course towards those places, and consequently Alexander Janneus found it necessary to raise the siege of Ptolemais, in order to watch the motions of Lathyrus. As Alexander could gain no advantage over his enemy, he secretly sent to Cleopatra queen of Egypt to solicit her aid, and at the same time concluded with Lathyrus a treaty which he had no intention of observing. In this he bound himself to pay four hundred talents to Ptolemey, on condition that he would deliver Zoilus and the principality of Dora into his power. Lathyrus then turned his arms against his allies, made himself master of Gaza, and easily expelled Zoilus from his principality; but he detected the negotiation of Janneus with Cleopatra in time to prevent his surrendering these places to him.

In the year B. C. 103, Lathyrus with one division of his army laid siege to Ptolemais, and with the other dispossessed Alexander Janneus of Asochis in Galilee, where he took ten thousand prisoners, and enriched himself with the spoils of his enemies. He then made an attempt against Sepphoris, which was not far from Asochis; but there he was repulsed with the loss of many men. In his retreat from this place he met Alexander Janneus, who had come against him with fifty thousand, or, according to Timagenes, with eighty thousand men. The hostile armies were separated by the river Jordan, which Lathyrus forded with his troops, and routed Janneus, who in this battle lost thirty thousand, or, as Timagenes says, fifty thousand men. Lathyrus then ravaged the country in every direction; and, to increase the terror of his name,

massacred the women and children of several villages, cut their bodies in pieces and boiled the flesh, to impress the inhabitants of Palæstine with the belief that his soldiers were cannibals. At the same time Ptolemais was subdued by the other division of his army [1].

Alexander Janneus fled with the remnant of his forces, and would probably have been entirely ruined, had not Cleopatra, in the following year, B. C. 102, sent an army to his aid, under the command of her two Jewish generals, Chelcias and Ananias; while her son Alexander went to Phœnicia with a fleet and took possession of that country. She first laid siege to Ptolemais, and Chelcias pursued Lathyrus to Syria, and there died. Lathyrus then set sail for Egypt, expecting to find the land defenceless, and to regain the throne without difficulty. But the Egyptian garrisons held out so long, that Cleopatra had time to send reinforcements to them from Palæstine, which drove Lathyrus out of the country. In the mean time Ptolemais had surrendered to Cleopatra. Afterwards, Alexander Janneus visited her, and had nearly fallen a sacrifice to her ambition; for the Egyptian counsellors urged her to put him to death, and unite Judæa to Egypt. But Ananias, the Jewish commander of her army, advised the queen to more equitable measures, and she concluded an alliance with Janneus at Scythopolis [2].

When Lathyrus now, in the year B. C. 100, perceived that he could effect nothing more in Palæstine, he sailed to Cyprus, having first made a treaty at Damascus with Antiochus Cyzicenus, by which this king agreed to aid him in his next expedition to Egypt. Cleopatra, having heard of this alliance on her return from Phœnicia, gave her daughter Selene, whom she had taken from Lathyrus, in marriage to Antiochus Grypus, and sent him auxiliaries to enable him to prosecute the war against Cyzicenus. Thus Lathyrus was deprived of the aid of Cyzicenus, and

[1] Josephus, Antiq. XII. xii. 2—6. Jewish War, I. iv. 2.
[2] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xiii. 1, 2.

his contemplated expedition to Egypt was prevented. Ptolemey Alexander, the youngest son of Cleopatra, took offence at the marriage of Selene with Grypus, and perceiving that his life was not safe with his mother, he fled. But when the Alexandrians were afterwards dissatisfied with the queen, and demanded a king, he was with difficulty persuaded to return[3].

On the departure of Cleopatra, Alexander Janneus, after a siege of ten months, gained possession of Gadara. He then took the strong fortress of Amathus, near the banks of the Jordan, and all the treasures which Theodorus, the son of Zeno, had deposited there; but on his return he was attacked by Theodorus, and lost ten thousand men, together with the captured treasures, and all his own baggage. Alexander was not discouraged by this repulse, but crossing the Jordan, he entered Judæa, and directed his march towards the southern coasts, which had been left defenceless by the departure of Lathyrus. There he took possession of Raphia and Anthedon. The conquest of Gaza was a more difficult achievement, but at length, in the year B. C. 96, he took that place by treachery; for he entered the city under pretence of friendship, and massacred the inhabitants without distinction, because they had joined with Lathyrus. But the citizens made a determined resistance, and slew many of the soldiers of Janneus; some even put their wives and children to death with their own hands, and set fire to their dwellings, that there might be no booty left for the enemy. Thus Alexander Janneus, after he had demolished the city, returned to Jerusalem without being in the least enriched by his conquest[4].

While Janneus was revenging himself on the citizens of Gaza, and thus giving an example of the extreme severity of the Sadducees, Antiochus Grypus was slain by his vassal Heracleon, in the twenty-ninth year of his reign,

[3] Justin, xxxix. 4. Livy, Epitome of book lxviii.

[4] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xiii. 3. Jewish War, I. iv. 2.

B. C. 96. Antiochus Cyzicenus now attempted to make himself master of the whole kingdom, and took possession of Antioch. But Seleucus, the eldest of the five sons of Grypus, attached a large party to his interests, and became so powerful, that in the year B. C. 93 he made war on Cyzicenus, took him prisoner, and put him to death. While Seleucus was engaged in the design of bringing the whole empire under his power, Antiochus Eusebes, a son of Cyzicenus, came to Aradus and drove Seleucus out of Syria, who then retired to Mopsuestia in Cilicia, and attempting to extort money from the citizens, was burnt by them in his house. Antiochus, the second son of Grypus and the brother of Seleucus, then made an attack on Eusebes; but he was slain, and his whole army cut to pieces. In the mean time Philip, the third son of Grypus, had gained possession of part of Syria. Eusebes had strengthened his party very considerably by a marriage with Selene, the widow of Grypus, who had a large part of the empire in her possession; but yet he was not able to subdue Philip; and in the year B. C. 91 a new enemy appeared againt him. For Lathyrus, who had formerly been the husband of Selene, irritated by her marriage with Eusebes, called Demetrius Eucerus, the brother of Philip and the fourth son of Grypus, from Cnidus, where he had been educated, and sent him to Damascus as king of Syria. Eusebes and Philip, who had then taken the field against each other, could offer no effectual resistance to the designs of Demetrius; and in the same year Eusebes was defeated, and compelled to retire to Parthia. Josephus relates that he was finally slain in a battle against the Parthians, while acting as an ally to Laodice, the queen of the Gileadites; but this must have taken place several years later, and after he had again returned to Syria. Philip and his brother Demetrius Eucerus now shared the empire between them[5].

[5] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xiii. 4. Porphyry in Græca Eusebian. Scaligeri, p. 67. Eusebius, Chron.

In Judæa, during the year B. C. 94, the hatred of the Pharisees began to break out in open violence against Alexander Janneus, whose father Hyrcanus had withdrawn from their sect. For at the feast of tabernacles, while Janneus the high priest and king stood at the altar, performing the functions of his office, the populace, instigated by the Pharisees, assailed him with the citrons which it was customary for them to carry in their hands at that festival, and saluted him with the cry, that he was a slave, the son of a captive, and unworthy of the priesthood. Janneus, for his own security, had before taken into his pay six thousand Pisidians and Cilicians, and they were now almost his only supporters. By means of them, in accordance with the severe principles of the Sadducees, he cut off six thousand of the insurgents, and thus the disturbances were for the present allayed; but three years after they broke out again with much greater violence, as we shall see in the sequel[6].

After quiet had been in this manner restored at Jerusalem, in the year B. C. 93, Alexander Janneus undertook a campaign to Arabia, made the Arabs of Gilead and the Moabites tributary, and the next year demolished Amathus, from which Theodorus the son of Zeno had withdrawn with his treasures. But during the year B. C. 91, in his campaign against the king or emir of the Arabs in Gaulanitis, he fell into an ambush in the mountainous regions near the village of Gadara, where his army was driven over the precipices and entirely destroyed, and it was with great difficulty that he effected his escape[7].

This defeat so imbittered the feelings of the already discontented Pharisees, that they had recourse to arms, and for six years maintained a bloody war against their king. They refused to listen to any proposals of peace, even though upon their own terms, and nothing would satisfy them but the death of Janneus. After several de-

[6] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xiii. 5. Jewish War, I. iv. 3.
[7] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xiii. 5. Jewish War, I. iv. 4.

feats, the insurgents called the Moabites and the Arabs of Gilead to their aid; and Janneus, to prevent hostilities with these tribes, whom he had made tributary, was compelled to remit their tribute and resign his sovereignty over them. But Demetrius Eucerus accepted the invitation of the rebels, and in the year B. C. 88 came with an army of forty thousand infantry and three thousand cavalry, composed of Jews and Syrians, and at Shechem overthrew Alexander Janneus with great slaughter. Of the six or eight thousand Pisidians and Cilicians, which Janneus had in his service, not a man was left alive; and of the ten or twenty thousand Jews of his party, the greater part perished. This bloody battle was decisive; and Alexander, no longer able to maintain his ground, fled to the mountains with the remnant of his discomfited army[8].

Six thousand of the rebels, pitying the misfortunes of their king, now relented, and went over to his party; and Demetrius, fearing a still greater defection, returned to Damascus. Janneus was then again successful in all his battles, but could not bring his revolted subjects to terms. At length, in the year B. C. 86, a second decisive battle was fought, in which the greater part of the rebels were slain; and the remainder, including some of the principal men, took refuge in the fortress of Bethone, or Bemeselis, which was immediately besieged, and during the next year reduced. Janneus led the prisoners to Jerusalem, and in one day fastened eight hundred of the leaders to crosses, and massacred their wives and children before their eyes. During this barbarous execution, the Sadducean king, who had the reputation of a prudent and valiant general, was triumphing at a feast which he gave to his wives in sight of the crucified victims. This inhuman conduct, however, which acquired for Janneus the surname of *Thracian*, produced the designed effect; for the remaining rebels, consisting of about eight thousand, betook

[8] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xiii. 5. xiv. 1, 2. Jewish War, I. iv. 4, 5.

themselves to flight, and the quiet, which had been so dearly purchased, was never again disturbed during the reign of Janneus[9].

Demetrius Eucerus, after his return from Judæa, in the year B. C. 86, took the field against his brother Philip, expelled him from Antioch, and then laid siege to Berea (חֵלֶב or חֲלִבוֹן, Aleppo). Strato, the prince of Berea and an ally of Philip, called to his aid Zizon, an emir of the Arabs, and Mithridates Sinax, a general of the Parthians; and they, with their united forces, fell upon the camp of Eucerus, took him prisoner, and sent him to Mithridates king of Parthia, who succeeded his father Artabanus on the throne B. C. 128, and, as we have before remarked, acquired the surname of Great. Philip now, for a short time, was sole master of the Syrian empire, which, however, had been reduced to narrow limits. Demetrius Eucerus was treated with great respect in Parthia, but died after a short captivity; and then the Parthians released Antiochus Eusebes who had fled to them, and must have restored to him a part of his kingdom, as we find him in possession of it soon after. During these transactions Syria enjoyed no repose; for Antiochus Dionysius, the youngest brother of Philip, had taken possession of Damascus, and ruled over Cœle-Syria six years[10].

This new ruler of Damascus, in the year B. C. 84, undertook a campaign against the Arabs; when his brother Philip came and took possession of the city without striking a blow, through the treachery of the commandant Milesius. But Milesius, finding himself unrewarded and neglected, expelled Philip, and preserved the city for Dionysius; who, on hearing what had occurred, immediately returned; but his hostile brother, by a seasonable flight, escaped from his hands. Dionysius then prepared for a second expedition against the Arabs, and led his

[9] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xiv. 2. Jewish War, I. iv. 6.

[10] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xiv. 3. xv. 1, 2. Jewish War, I. iv. 7. compare Justin, xlii. 2.

army along the coasts of Palæstine, to penetrate into Arabia Petræa. Alexander Janneus attempted to intercept his march, and for this purpose dug an intrenchment near Joppa, from Chabarzaba, or Antipatris, to the sea, a distance of about sixteen English miles, provided it with a wall and wooden towers, and garrisoned it with soldiers. But Antiochus Dionysius burnt the towers, forced his way through the garrison, and marched to Arabia. The Arabians at first retired before him, but soon reappeared with a force of ten thousand cavalry. Antiochus vanquished them, but lost his life in the battle; and his army then fled to Cana, where most of them perished by famine. The Damascenes then called to the throne of Damascus the Arabian chief whom Dionysius had attacked. This chief, who is called Aretas by Josephus, assumed the government of the city, expelled Ptolemey Menneus, who was aspiring to the throne, and undertook an expedition against Alexander Janneus, whom he defeated at Adida. He then concluded a treaty with Alexander, and retired from Judæa[11].

In the year B. C. 83, the Syrians, weary of the perpetual dissensions of the Seleucidæ, and determining to free themselves from those quarrelsome princes, they offered the crown of Syria to Tigranes king of Armenia, who, having been a hostage among the Parthians, was by them placed on the throne of Armenia in the year B. C. 94. When Tigranes took possession of Syria, Philip fled; and Eusebes withdrew to Cilicia, where he remained concealed until his death. But Selene, the wife of Eusebes, retained Ptolemais and a part of Cœle-Syria and Phœnicia, and there educated her two sons, Antiochus Asiaticus and Seleucus Cybiosactes[12].

Meanwhile, in the year B. C. 83, Alexander Janneus had conquered Dios and Pella. As the citizens of Pella

[11] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xv. 1, 2. Jewish War, I. iv. 1.

[12] Jewish War, I. iv. 8. Justin, xxxviii. 3. xl. 1, 2. Appian, Syriac. xl. 25—35. Plutarch, Pompey, xxviii. Strabo, p. 532.

refused to adopt the Jewish religion, they were expelled, and their city destroyed. The next year Janneus besieged Essa, or Gerasa, where Theodorus the son of Zeno had deposited his treasures after his expulsion from Amathus. Both the city and treasures soon fell into the hands of Janneus. In the year B. C. 81 he extended his conquests beyond the Jordan, took Gaulana, or Golan, Seleucia, the vale of Antiochus, and the strong fortress of Gamala, of which Demetrius was governor. After this three years' campaign he returned to Jerusalem, and received from the citizens a joyful welcome on account of his victories. Alexander Janneus, having now subdued his enemies, was attacked by a quartan fever occasioned by excessive drinking, and of this disease he died three years after, while engaged in the siege of Ragaba in Gerasena [13].

The reign of Alexander Janneus continued twenty-seven years, from B. C. 104—77. During his reign he made large additions to the Jewish territory by his conquests; for at the time of his death the kingdom of Judæa included mount Carmel, all Idumea, and all the coast as far as Rhinocolura; towards the north it extended to mount Tabor and Scythopolis; beyond the Jordan it comprehended Gaulanitis and all the territory of Gadara, including the land of the Moabites towards the south, and extending as far as Pella towards the east [14].

In the year B. C. 96, the king of Cyrene, Ptolemey Apion, a natural son of Ptolemey Physcon, died; and, having no heir, bequeathed his kingdom to the Romans. To promote their own interests, they gave the Cyrenean cities their freedom; and consequently many petty princes rose to power, who disturbed the country by their perpetual contentions, in which the African Jews are said to have taken a very active part; till at length, in the year B. C. 76, Cyrene was made a Roman province, and the

[13] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xv. 3—5. Jewish War, I. iv. 8.
[14] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xv. 4.

numerous Jews of that region became subjects of the Roman empire[15].

In the year B. C. 87, Cleopatra queen of Egypt made an attempt on the life of her son Alexander, that she might reign alone; but he discovered her design and put her to death. Upon this the Alexandrians revolted, expelled Alexander, recalled Lathyrus from Cyprus, and replaced him on the throne of Egypt. The next year Alexander, with a small fleet, made an effort to regain his kingdom, but was defeated by the admiral of Lathyrus, and compelled to retire to Mira in Lycia. The attempt which he afterwards made against Cyprus was still more unfortunate, for he lost his own life in a battle[16].

Lathyrus then marched against Thebes, which had revolted from him, and after a siege of three years, from B. C. 84—81, he conquered the city, and demolished it so entirely that it never afterwards regained its importance. In the same year Lathyrus died; and as he left no sons, his daughter Cleopatra Berenice succeeded him on the throne, in the year B. C. 80. But Alexander, the son of that Ptolemey Alexander whom we have just mentioned as the murderer of his mother, was now sent to Egypt by Sylla the Roman dictator, to take possession of the kingdom. To avoid giving offence to the *dictator perpetuus*, the Alexandrians agreed that Alexander should marry the princess Cleopatra, and share the throne with her; but in nineteen days after the nuptials he murdered his wife and reigned alone. This Ptolemey Alexander was educated at Cos, whither he had been sent, with a large sum of money, by his grandmother; and afterwards Mithridates king of Pontus robbed him of his money, though he still treated him with the respect due to a king. Alexander then fled to Sylla, who took him to Rome, and

[15] Livy, Epitome of book lxx. Plutarch, Lucullus, ii. Appian, Bell. Civ. i. 111.

[16] Justin, xxxix. 4. Eusebius, Chron. Pausanias, Attic. I. ix. 1—3. Athenæus, xii. Porphyry in Græca Eusebian. Scaligeri.

afterwards, as has just been related, sent him to Egypt. Appian says that he was put to death by the Alexandrians on account of the murder of his wife; but this cannot be true, for he reigned fifteen years[17].

At this time the Mithridatic war gave the Romans another opportunity for displaying their power and extending their conquests in the east. They were indeed very much weakened by civil dissensions, but were still powerful enough to maintain a war with the orientals; especially after Marius, in the year B. C. 101, had defeated the Cimbri, who invaded Italy from the Cimbrian peninsula (Jutland, Sleswick, and Holstein), and was on this account acknowledged as the third founder of Rome after Romulus and Camillus. Mithridates, surnamed Eupator, was descended from a long line of kings and governors, and the founder of his family was one of those seven princes of Persia who slew Smerdis the Magian. This prince was governor of Pontus, and having secured the province to his descendants, they at length made themselves independent, and assumed the title of kings of Pontus. Mithridates Eupator was the sixth, or more probably, according to others, the sixteenth, descendant of this prince. He ascended the throne in the twelfth year of his age, B. C. 123, the twelfth year of the reign of John Hyrcanus[18].

In the year B. C. 90, Mithridates, after the death of Ariarathes king of Cappadocia, who had married his sister, destroyed all the sons of that monarch, and placed on the throne of Cappadocia his own son Ariarathes, who was then a minor. Nicomedes king of Bithynia, jealous of the growing power of his neighbour, then brought forward a young man of Laodicea, named Ariarathes, acknowledged him as the third son of king Ariarathes, and sent him to Rome to solicit the aid of the senate in

[17] Pausanias, Attic. I. ix. 3. Appian, Bell. Civ. ii. 102.

[18] Plutarch, Marius, xi—xxvii. Florus, III. iii. 5. Justin, xxxvii. 1. Strabo, p. 477. Memnon, xxxii. Eutropius, vi. 6. Polybius, v. 43. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. ix. 65—80.

obtaining the crown of Cappadocia. The senate rejected his suit, but at the same time deposed the son of Mithridates, and decreed that the Cappadocians should govern themselves as an independent people. The Cappadocians however declined this offer and requested a king; upon which the senate resolved that they should elect a king for themselves. They accordingly made choice of Ariobarzanes, and he was established in the kingdom by Sylla[19].

This was the first cause of the Mithridatic war. Mithridates, thus offended, made no open resistance to the Romans, but secretly prepared himself for hostilities. In the year B. C. 89, he married his daughter Cleopatra to Tigranes king of Armenia; and an alliance was concluded between the two monarchs, according to which Tigranes was to have all the prisoners and the booty that should be taken in the Roman war, and Mithridates all the conquered territory. The first step was for Tigranes to expel Ariobarzanes, whom the Romans had established in the kingdom of Cappadocia, and restore the crown to the son of Mithridates. At this time Nicomedes king of Bithynia died; and, though he left a son, Mithridates took possession of his kingdom. The son of Nicomedes, thus deprived of his crown, and Ariobarzanes, the dethroned king of Cappadocia, both repaired to Rome; and the senate resolved to reestablish them in their kingdoms. At the instigation of the Roman ambassadors, they then invaded the dominions of Mithridates, and, after some ineffectual negotiations, hostilities were commenced. Lucius Cassius, the Roman prefect of Pergamus, Quintus Oppius, proconsul of Pamphylia, and Mannius Aquilio, in the year B. C. 88, collected three armies, each amounting to about forty thousand men, and began the war without waiting for orders from Rome. Mithridates had a force of fifty thousand infantry, four thousand cavalry, a

[19] Justin, xxxviii. 1, 2. Strabo, p. 460. Plutarch, Sylla, v. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. x.

hundred and thirty chariots, and three hundred ships; with which he defeated the three Roman generals, and made prisoners of Aquilio and Oppius. Upon this, all the provinces and cities of Asia Minor, all the islands of the Ægean sea as far as Rhodes, and several cities of Greece, forsook the party of the Romans and joined Mithridates[20].

In the following year, B. C. 87, Mithridates sent secret orders to his lieutenants in Asia Minor, to massacre all the Romans and Italians to be found in their respective governments, on a certain day which he appointed; and accordingly, on the day fixed, eighty thousand, or, according to some authors, one hundred and sixty thousand Italians were destroyed[21].

Mithridates, being in want of money to prosecute the war, then stripped Ptolemey Alexander, who had been sent by his grandmother from Egypt to Cos, of all his treasures, which were very large; yet he gave the prince an education befitting his rank, as has already been remarked. At the same time, he seized eight hundred talents which the Jews of Asia Minor had collected for the purpose of sending them to Jerusalem, to be kept in safety during the disturbances of the war[22].

Mithridates now levied a large army in Asia Minor, and had money enough to support it. At first he made an ineffectual attempt to subdue the Rhodians, with whom some of the Italians had taken refuge. He then sent Archelaus with one hundred and twenty thousand men to Greece, who, among other cities, took possession of Athens, and made it his head quarters. Mithridates

[20] Justin, xxxviii. 3. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. x—xxi. Memnon in Excerpta Photii, xxxii. Livy, Epitome of books lxxvii. lxxviii. Strabo, p. 562. Florus, iii. 5. Diod. Sic. Fragm. xxxvii. 8—10. Velleius Paterculus, ii. 18. Plutarch, Sylla, xi.

[21] Livy, Epitome of book lxxviii. Florus, iii. 5. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. xxii. xxiii. Cicero pro Flacco, xxv. xxvi. pro Lege Manilia, ii. Orosius, vi. 2. Valerius Maximus, ix. 3. Velleius Paterculus, ii. 18.

[22] Appian, Bell. Mithrid. xxiii. Bell. Civ. i. Strabo in Josephus, Antiq. XIV. vii. 2.

had, besides, one hundred and ten thousand men under the command of Taxiles, and eighty thousand more under the command of Doryalus, or Dorilæus. But notwithstanding the great number of his troops, he soon lost all that he had acquired; and at length, in the year B. C. 85, he was defeated, first at Chæronea, and then again at Orchomenus, and compelled to retire to Asia with the loss of one hundred and sixty thousand men, by Sulla, or Sylla, whose army consisted of only fifteen thousand infantry and fifteen hundred cavalry[23].

The next year the army of Mithridates, under the command of Archelaus, was defeated in Asia Minor by the Roman general Fimbria (who, however, did not belong to the faction of Sylla), and pursued to Pergamus. Mithridates then went to Pitana in Ætolia, where he was besieged; but he effected his escape by sea to Mitylene[24].

Mithridates then made peace with Sylla; and he was obliged to give up Bithynia to Nicomedes, and Cappadocia to Ariobarzanes; to surrender to the Romans all they had possessed before the commencement of hostilities; and to pay the expenses of the war with two or three thousand talents and seventy ships. He would scarcely have been permitted to retain his hereditary dominions, had not Sylla been anxious to return to Rome on account of the disturbances in that city, of which he had been informed by some of his adherents who fled to his camp. Sylla, therefore, after having punished the Asiatic cities for their revolt by a fine of twenty thousand talents, which was to be paid in five years, hastened back to Italy[25].

[23] Livy, Epitome of books lxxviii. lxxxii. Orosius, vi. 2. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. xxiv—l. Florus, iii. 5. Eutropius, v. 6. 8. Plutarch, Sylla, xi. xvi—xxi. Memnon, xxxiv.

[24] Livy, Epitome of book lxxxiii. Orosius, vi. 2. Memnon, xxxvi. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. l—lni. Plutarch, Lucullus, iii. Sylla, xxiii.

[25] Livy, Epitome of book lxxxiii. Velleius Paterculus, ii. 23. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. liv—lviii. lxi—lxiii. Bell. Civ. i. 55. Plutarch, Sylla, xxii—xxiv. Lucullus, iv. Florus, iii. 5.

§. 107. ALEXANDRA QUEEN OF THE JEWS. B. C. 77—68.

ALEXANDER JANNEUS, who died at the siege of Ragaba in the year B. C. 77, as has been related, foresaw the troubles which awaited his family at the hands of the exasperated Pharisees; and therefore, during his last illness, he advised his wife Alexandra, to whom he left the government, to keep his death secret till Ragaba had been subdued, then to lead the army to Jerusalem, to deliver his corpse to the principal Pharisees that they might dispose of it as they pleased, and to promise them that she would conduct the affairs of government by their advice, and would do nothing without their approbation. Alexandra followed the counsels of her husband, and by this means the hatred of the Pharisees was at once appeased. They spoke with the greatest reverence of the deceased king, whose death they had often desired while he was living; they eulogized his heroic achievements, and gave his body a magnificent burial[1].

Under these favourable circumstances Alexandra commenced her administration; and, having no power to act otherwise, faithfully observed her promise to the Pharisees. She appointed her eldest son Hyrcanus to the high priesthood, who was then probably about thirty years of age, but an inactive and indolent man; she reestablished the authority of the traditions and the sentiments of the Pharisees, which had been rejected by John Hyrcanus; and invested this sect with a predominant influence in all the concerns of the nation. The Pharisees now opened the prisons and released all the rebels and traitors, recalling from banishment all those who had fled during the reign of Alexander Janneus. In this manner the Pharisees governed according to their own principles: but Alexandra was not inactive; for she took so many mercenary troops into her pay, as to become an object of

[1] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xv. 5. xvi. 1. Jewish War, I. v. 1.

fear to all the neighbouring petty princes, and receive hostages from them for security against their depredations. Consequently her reign, which continued nine years, was peaceful; though many were dissatisfied because she gave up to the power of the Pharisees those who had advised Alexander Janneus to crucify the eight hundred rebels, whose cruel execution we have already mentioned. The Pharisees called some of the counsellors to trial and put them to death; but the principal men among them, together with the young and enterprising prince Aristobulus, came before the throne and requested permission, either to leave the country or to retire to the frontier cities, where they might be secure from the enmity of the Pharisees. Alexandra, not daring to do anything that would offend the Pharisees, could only permit Aristobulus and his adherents to go to the frontier cities, with the exception of Hyrcania, Alexandrium, and Macherus, where her principal treasures were deposited. Soon after, in the fifth or sixth year of her reign, she sent to Damascus the young prince Aristobulus with an army to protect that city from Ptolemey Menneus, the priest of Chalcis, or Antilibanus, who had begun to be troublesome to the Damascenes. But Aristobulus had different views, and sought only to gain the affections of his soldiers; and he returned to Judæa without having accomplished any important object of the expedition[2].

In the mean time the Egyptians became very much dissatisfied with their king Alexander, and the country was disturbed by frequent insurrections; when Selene, the sister of Lathyrus, who still resided at Ptolemais and had a small territory under her power, sent her two sons, Antiochus Asiaticus and Seleucus, whom she had borne to Antiochus Eusebes, to Rome, to obtain from the senate an appointment to the throne of Egypt. The Romans at first gave them some encouragement, but it was only for the purpose of extorting larger presents from Alexander

[2] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xvi. 1—3. Jewish War, I. v. 2, 3.

king of Egypt; and he was not confirmed on the throne till he had completely exhausted his finances by extravagant gifts, and the two pretenders returned to Ptolemais without having effected their purpose, in the year B. C. 69, the eighth of the reign of Alexandra. While Antiochus was in Sicily, on his way home, he was plundered by Verres. After this Selene imprudently attempted to extend her dominions in Cœle-Syria; for Tigranes had now become very powerful, both by the surrender of the kingdom of Syria, and by the expeditions which, at the instigation of Mithridates, he had undertaken in Cappadocia, whence he led away three hundred thousand of the inhabitants, to people Tigranocerta (קַרְתָּא), his new metropolis. He came against Selene with five hundred thousand men, subdued Ptolemais, took Selene prisoner, and, on his return, ordered her to be executed at Seleucia in Mesopotamia[3].

While Tigranes, in this campaign, B. C. 69, was besieging Ptolemais, Alexandra sent him an embassy with valuable presents to obtain his friendship; and, as the Romans were then making rapid advances in Asia Minor, the Armenian king returned a favourable answer to the Jews and hastened back to his own country[4].

In the year B. C. 75 both Cyrene and Bithynia became provinces of the Roman empire; for Nicomedes, the last king of Bithynia, who died during this year, made the Romans the heirs of his kingdom. By the successful termination of the piratical war, Crete and Cilicia were also reduced to the form of a Roman province. "Creta Ciliciaque," says Justin, "piratico bello perdomitæ, in formam provinciæ rediguntur[5]."

Mithridates could not view these accessions to the power of the Romans without anxiety; for his last treaty

[3] Cicero in Verr. iv. 27—32. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. lxvii. Strabo, p. 532. 539. 749. Plutarch, Lucullus, xiv. xx. Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xvi. 4.

[4] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xvi. 4. Jewish War, I. v. 3.

[5] Justin, xxxix. 5. Eutropius, vi. 6. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. lxxi. Bell. Civ. i. Livy, Epitome of book xciii. Velleius Paterculus, ii. 4. 39.

with them had never been ratified, and his kingdom had continued to suffer from their hostile incursions. Accordingly, he made an alliance with Sertorius, who had revolted from the Romans in Iberia; and in the year B. C. 75, while the Romans were detained in Italy by their civil dissensions, he made great preparations for war. During the next year he took possession of Bithynia and Paphlagonia; but the province of Asia, which had suffered severely from the extortions of the Romans, submitted to him voluntarily. The Mithridatic war was thus commenced anew in the year B. C. 74[6].

In the year B. C. 73 the Romans sent two armies against Mithridates, under the command of Lucius Lucullus and Marcus Cotta. Cotta was soon defeated with great loss at the battle of Chalcedon; but in the year B. C. 72, while Mithridates was engaged with three hundred thousand men and four hundred ships of war, in besieging the maritime city of Cyzicus on the Propontis, Lucullus, by cutting off his supplies, compelled him to retreat[7].

Mithridates, who had lost a great part of his army by this repulse, fled to Nicomedia, and brought back to the Hellespont only ten thousand men and a few of his ships. In the two battles which were fought at Tenedos and Lemnos he was entirely routed by Lucullus. Mithridates continued his retreat towards Pontus, and lost the greater part of his fleet on the stormy Black sea. He then went to Sinope, and at last to Amisus, where he endeavoured to recruit his army. Lucullus meanwhile pressed into Pontus and laid siege to Amisus, Eupatoria, and Themiscyra[8].

[6] Appian, Bell. Mithrid. lxiv—lxvi. lxviii—lxxxii. Livy, Epitome of book xcix. Plutarch, Lucullus, vii.

[7] Cicero pro Lege Manilia, ii. Memnon, xxxix. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. lxxii—lxxvi. Plutarch, Lucullus, v—xi. Sallust, Fragm. iv. Livy, Epitome of book xcv. Eutropius, vi. 8. Orosius, vi. 2. Florus, iii. 5. Strabo, p. 575.

[8] Orosius, vi. 2. Florus, iii. 5. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. lxxi. lxxviii. Plutarch, Lucullus, xiii. xiv. Cicero pro Lege Manilia, iii—viii.

In the year B. C. 70 Mithridates gained some advantages; but afterwards his army was put to flight and entirely routed, and he escaped to the dominions of Tigranes his son-in-law with only two thousand cavalry. Here he was obliged to wait a year and eight months on the frontiers before he could obtain an audience. Meanwhile all Pontus fell into the hands of the conqueror[9].

Lucullus sent Appius Clodius to Tigranes, to demand of him the surrender of king Mithridates, or to declare war against Armenia in case of refusal. Tigranes, on his return from Ptolemais, met Clodius at Antioch on the Orontes, in the year B. C. 69; but when he heard the haughty language of the Roman ambassador, he indignantly broke off the negotiation and received the declaration of war[10].

Soon after the departure of Tigranes from Ptolemais, Alexandra queen of the Jews was taken sick, and died in the year B. C. 69. During her sickness the young prince Aristobulus prepared for the execution of a plan which he had long before matured, of ascending the throne after the death of his mother. He secretly left Jerusalem during the night, and went to those cities where, in consequence of his own intercession, the friends of his father had been permitted to reside; and by their aid he gained possession of twenty-two fortified towns in fifteen days. Every facility was afforded to his enterprise by the soldiers and the common people, who expected from him a limitation of the odious power of the Pharisees, for which they could not hope from the inactive Hyrcanus, who was entirely devoted to that sect. The Pharisees had endeavoured to persuade the queen, during her sickness, to nominate a successor; but she replied that she had nothing more to do with the concerns of the govern-

[9] Livy, Epitome of book xcvii. Eutropius, vi. 8. Memnon, xlv—xlvii. Phlegon and Trallianus in Photius, Cod. 97. p. 268. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. lxxix—lxxxiii. Plutarch, Lucullus, xv—xix. xxii. Cicero pro Lege Manilia, iii—xi.

[10] Plutarch, Lucullus, xix. xxi.

ment, and left them all in their hands. After her death they placed Hyrcanus on the throne, and retained the wives and children of Aristobulus in the castle of Baris as hostages. Three months after a battle was fought between the two brothers near Jericho, in which Hyrcanus was overcome. He fled to Jerusalem and shut himself up in the castle of Baris, while his party, which was every day diminishing, took possession of the temple. Soon after, the few soldiers who still adhered to Hyrcanus, went over to Aristobulus, and the two brothers then came to terms. Hyrcanus engaged to retire from public life, and Aristobulus ascended the throne of Judæa[11].

§. 108. ARISTOBULUS II. KING OF THE JEWS, B. C. 69—63.

JOSEPHUS says nothing respecting the reign of Aristobulus till the year B. C. 64, when the dissensions between the king and his brother Hyrcanus broke out afresh. We shall, therefore, here resume our account of the Mithridatic war.

After the declaration of the Roman ambassador, Tigranes prepared for war. He admitted Mithridates to his presence, and sent him to Pontus with ten thousand cavalry, to levy troops and act in concert with him. He himself remained at Tigranocerta, and gave orders for the raising of soldiers throughout his dominions. But Lucullus anticipated him; for immediately on hearing the result of his embassy, he despatched Sornatius with six thousand men to Pontus, and in the year B. C. 67, marched himself with twelve thousand infantry and three thousand cavalry through Cappadocia, crossed the Euphrates in the midst of winter, and appeared before Tigranocerta, ere Tigranes had completed his preparations. This monarch could not believe that the Romans had advanced so rapidly, and he put to death the mes-

[11] Josephus, Antiq. XIII. xvi. 5, 6. XIV. i. 2. XX. x. 1. Jewish War, I. v. 4.

senger who first informed him of their approach; so that afterwards, no one dared give him any intelligence respecting the advances of his enemies. He, however, sent Mithrobarzanes against them, with orders to take Lucullus, dead or alive; but this was not so easily done. Mithrobarzanes was defeated and left dead on the field; and then Tigranes fled to mount Taurus. The Romans immediately besieged Tigranocerta, and by their incursions into the adjacent country, destroyed great numbers of the new recruits of Tigranes. Meanwhile Tigranes had brought together about two hundred thousand men. Lucullus left a body of six thousand soldiers to prosecute the siege of the metropolis, and with the remainder of his forces, about nine thousand men, defeated the numerous army of the enemy, and Tigranes himself effected his escape with great difficulty. Mithridates, who had returned from Pontus and received intelligence of this defeat, endeavoured to encourage the disheartened Tigranes. They collected a new army, and Tigranes wrote to Arsaces Sinatrux king of Parthia, to obtain his assistance. Meanwhile Tigranocerta was treacherously surrendered into the hands of the Romans, and the citizens of this new city, who had been collected from various quarters, returned to their respective countries; in consequence of which, the metropolis was reduced to an inconsiderable village. But Lucullus did not follow up his advantages against Tigranes, so as to put an immediate end to the war; and by this neglect incurred the displeasure of the army and of the Roman senate[1].

The delay of Lucullus afforded Tigranes opportunity to assemble another army, to which he added the forces of Megadates, whom he at this time recalled from Syria. By the departure of Megadates, Syria was left defenceless, and Antiochus Asiaticus, the son of Selene and

[1] Eutropius, vi. 6. Orosius, vi. 3. Memnon in Photius, cod. 55—59. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. lxxxiv—xc. Plutarch, Lucullus, xx—xxxi. Livy, Epitome of book xcviii. Strabo, p. 532. 539. Dion Cassius, xxxv.

Antiochus Eusebes, seized the government, formed an alliance with Lucullus, and retained possession of a part of the empire till the arrival of Pompey in the east. The new army of Tigranes consisted of seventy thousand men, and during the campaign of B. C. 66, he endeavoured to cut off the supplies of the Romans, and to avoid the danger of another battle. Meanwhile Lucullus conquered Nisibis, and then marched without opposition to Artaxata, the ancient capital of Armenia, where Tigranes had deposited his treasures. Tigranes thought it necessary to hazard an engagement in defence of his capital, and the Romans were again victorious. The soldiers of Lucullus now resisted his intention of terminating the war by the conquest of Artaxata; and he was compelled to cross mount Taurus and march southward into Mesopotamia to winter quarters. Here the spirit of revolt among his troops was encouraged by Publius Clodius, the brother of his wife[2].

In the year B. C. 65, Mithridates marched to Pontus with eight thousand men, defeated Fabius, and pressed on vigorously against Triarius and Sornatius, the two remaining Roman generals. The mutinous soldiers of Lucullus for a long time refused to afford their distressed comrades any assistance; and when at length they were persuaded to march to Pontus, Triarius had already been defeated, with the loss of seven thousand men. Lucullus on his arrival found the field of battle covered with the dead bodies of the Romans, and as he neglected to bury them, his army positively refused to obey his orders any longer. The mutinous disposition of the soldiers became the more obstinate, when they heard that Lucullus was out of favour at Rome, and that Pompey, who had just concluded the war with the pirates employed by Mithridates, had been appointed his successor in Asia. They, however, remained with the general whom they so much

[2] Appian, Syriac. lxx. Bell. Mithrid. xci. Justin, xl. 2. Dion Cassius, xxxv. Lutropius, vi. 9. Orosius, vi. 3. Plutarch, Lucullus, xxxi—xxxiv.

hated till the next year, when Pompey arrived to take the command [3].

As soon as Pompey had assumed the direction of the war, he concluded an alliance with Phraates, who had ascended the throne of Parthia the preceding year. He then made proposals of peace to Mithridates; but as he was expecting to enter into an alliance with king Phraates, he would open no negotiations with the Romans. But when he heard that Phraates had made a treaty with Pompey, he proposed peace himself. Pompey required, as the first condition, that all the deserters should be surrendered; and when this was known, Mithridates was compelled by his soldiers, among whom were many deserters from the Roman army, to bind himself by an oath to continue the war. The circumstances of Mithridates at this crisis were encouraging; for while the soldiers of Lucullus refused to fight under their general, he had reconquered the greater part of his kingdom [4].

All his efforts were now directed to avoid a battle with the Romans, and to cut off their supplies. This he was able to do for some time; but at last was compelled to retreat by little and little, and when he arrived in Lesser Armenia, he was attacked by night on the banks of the Euphrates and entirely routed. He fled beyond the sources of the Euphrates into the northern regions, and took refuge in Colchis [5].

Pompey was now on the frontiers of the dominions of Tigranes, who was then engaged in a war with his son. Tigranes had put his two eldest sons to death, and the third then made his escape to Phraates king of

[3] Appian, Bell. Mithrid. xci—xcvii. Plutarch, Lucullus, xxxv. and Pompey, xxv—xxix. Compare Eutropius, vi. 12. Dion Cassius, xxxv. xxxvi. Cicero pro Lege Manilia, xi—xxii.

[4] Dion Cassius, xxxv. xxxvi. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. xcii. xcviii. Livy, Epitome of book c. Plutarch, Lucullus, xxxv; Pompey, xxxii.

[5] Dion Cassius, xxxvi. Florus, iii. 5. Livy, Epitome of book c. Eutropius, vi. 12. Orosius, vi. 4. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. xcix—cii. cxv. Plutarch, Pompey, xxxii. Strabo, p. 555.

Parthia, whose daughter he had married. In Parthia he raised an army, with which he returned to Armenia and commenced an attack upon the metropolis of his father's kingdom; but being repulsed, he sought refuge with Pompey. The Roman general, who needed a skilful guide in Armenia, received the young prince very favourably, and marched with him directly to Artaxata. Then Tigranes, who had before felt the irresistible power of the Romans, went himself to Pompey and surrendered both his person and kingdom entirely to his disposal. Pompey becoming now umpire between Tigranes and his son, decided that Tigranes should retain the throne of Armenia, pay six thousand talents to the Romans for the expenses of war, and relinquish all the conquests he had made west of the Euphrates; that the son should have Gordiena and Sophena, be appointed successor to the throne, and surrender to Tigranes the treasures which he had in Sophena, that the six thousand talents might be paid to the Romans without delay. Tigranes was well pleased with the decision; but his son was so dissatisfied, that he attempted to make his escape privately, and Pompey ordered him to be carefully guarded. But as the prince persisted in his refusal to give up his treasures in Sophena, and even attempted to excite the Armenian and Parthian noblemen to a war, Pompey took him in custody to be reserved for his triumph. Tigranes, in the warmth of his gratitude, not only paid the money demanded of him, but made valuable presents to the Roman soldiers, and was acknowledged as a friend to the Romans[6].

Pompey then marched in pursuit of Mithridates, into the northern regions between the Black and Caspian seas. Having crossed the river Cyrus, he subdued the Albanians and Iberians, who had always maintained their independence against the Medes and Persians, and against

[6] Appian, Bell. Mithrid. civ. cv. Dion Cassius, xxxvi. Eutropius, vi. 13. Velleius Paterculus, ii. 37. Florus, iii. 5. Plutarch, Pompey, xxxiii. Orosius, vi. 4.

the Macedonians. He then subdued the Colchians, and reconquered the Albanians, who had shaken off his yoke during his campaigns with the Iberians and Colchians. Mithridates, meanwhile, after having passed the winter at Dioscurias on the Black sea, marched through the Scythian provinces to the Cimmerian Bosporus; whence he expelled his son, who had concluded a treaty of peace with the Romans [7].

Pompey did not venture to pursue the retreating king to those dangerous places, and directed his march towards the south. In this campaign he compelled Antiochus king of Comagene to solicit the friendship of the Romans, and put to flight Darius the Mede. These were petty princes, who had made themselves independent during the disturbances in the Syrian empire. He then, by his generals, took possession of Syria, which Tigranes had relinquished to the Romans, after having held it eighteen years. Pompey also subjected to the Roman yoke all the other countries west of the Euphrates as far as Arabia, and, in violation of his treaty with Phraates, a part of the territory between the Euphrates and Tigris. Thus all the dominions of the Syrian empire came under the Roman power. Antiochus Asiaticus humbly preferred his claim to the throne of his ancestors, but his representations were disregarded; and in the year B. C. 64, the empire of the Seleucidæ ceased, after it had continued two hundred and fifty-eight years [8].

About this time, B. C. 64, Pompey went to Damascus, where he was met by many ambassadors, and more than twelve kings. Among these was Ptolemey Alexander king of Egypt, who had been deposed by his subjects. He requested that he might be reestablished on his throne; but as this request was not granted, he went to

[7] Livy, Epitome of books xcviii. ci. Dion Cassius, xxxvi. xxxvii. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. cii. ciii. Florus, iii. 5. Eutropius, vi. 14. Orosius, vi. 5. Plutarch, Pompey, xxxiv. xxxv. Strabo, p. 496. 498.

[8] Appian, Bell. Mithrid. cvi. Dion Cassius, xxxvii. Justin, xc. 2. Plutarch, Pompey, xxxvi.

Tyre, where he soon after died, having bequeathed his kingdom to the Romans. The Egyptians then raised to the throne Ptolemey Auletes, also called Dionysius Neos, a very effeminate man, the son of Ptolemey Lathyrus by a concubine. He sent ambassadors to Pompey at Damascus, with the present of a golden crown valued at four thousand pieces of gold. Claudius Ptolemey, in his Canon, places this king immediately after Lathyrus, though Alexander reigned fifteen years between Lathyrus and Auletes[9].

Aristobulus king of the Jews also sent an embassy to Pompey at Damascus, with the present of a golden vine valued at five hundred talents, to obtain from the Roman general a recognition of his authority as king. But since the name of Alexander Janneus was inscribed on the vine, which was deposited in the capitol at Rome, it appears that Aristobulus was unsuccessful in his application, though a recognition of his regal title was then an object of great importance to him, on account of the dissensions which at that time prevailed in Judæa. It is necessary that we should now trace the origin of these dissensions[10].

They were excited by Antipas, or Antipater, the father of Herod the Great. According to the testimony of Nicolaus Damascenus, a friend of Herod, Antipater was descended from a distinguished Jewish family; but Josephus says that he was of a noble family of Idumeans who had adopted the Jewish religion. His father, who was also called Antipas, had been governor of Idumea during the reigns of Alexander Janneus and of the queen Alexandra. Antipater the father of Herod was a man of great influence at the Jewish court, and, after the death of queen Alexandra, joined the party of Hyrcanus against Aristobulus. Accordingly, he lost his influence when

[9] Cicero contra Rullum, xvi. Strabo, p. 796. Josephus, Antiq. XIV. iii. 1. Lucian de Calumniis. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. cvi. cxiv. Plutarch, Pompey, xxxviii.

[10] Strabo in Josephus, Antiq. xiv. 3. 1.

Aristobulus ascended the throne; and on this account he persuaded Hyrcanus, under the idea that his life was in danger from his brother, to enter into a secret alliance with Aretas, a king of the neighbouring Arabs. After Antipater had made all the necessary preparations and brought over many Jews to his party, he and Hyrcanus fled to Aretas, who conducted them back to Judæa, with an army of fifty thousand men, defeated Aristobulus, and took possession of Jerusalem without resistance. Aristobulus, being deserted by most of his soldiers, took refuge in the temple, where he was besieged by Aretas. The hatred of the besiegers against Aristobulus was so great, that at the feast of the Passover they would allow no animals for the sacrifices to be carried into the temple, though Aristobulus had given to them from the walls the full sum which they had demanded for such a permission. They even stoned the pious Jew Onias, because he refused to utter imprecations against Aristobulus. In these distressed circumstances, Aristobulus applied to Scaurus, the Roman general, who had then taken possession of Damascus, and promised him four hundred talents if he would come to his aid. Though Hyrcanus, immediately after, offered him an equal sum, the Roman general accepted the offer of Aristobulus and received the money; and, at the same time, a sum of three hundred talents was given to Gabinius. Scaurus now marched to Judæa and commanded king Aretas to return to his own dominions, or expect that the power of the Roman arms would be directed against him. Awed by this threat, Aretas proceeded towards Arabia; but was overtaken on his march by Aristobulus and defeated with great slaughter. In this battle many Jews of the party of Hyrcanus were slain, and, among others, Phalion, or Cæphalion, the brother of Antipater. Aristobulus was now master of Judæa; and he attempted to obtain an acknowledgment of his authority from the Romans, by the embassy to Pompey which has already been mentioned[11].

[11] Josephus, Antiq. XIV. i. 3—ii. 3. compare iii. 2. Jewish War, I. vi. 2.

Pompey, in the mean time, had returned to Pontus, where many cities still remained unsubdued. He passed the winter at Aspis in Pontus, and conquered the city of Caine or Cæne, where he found the treasures and medical writings of Mithridates; for this great king was distinguished for his learning, particularly in medical science, and is said to have been the inventor of the celebrated medicine called *Mithridate*, after his own name[12].

After Pompey had stationed the Roman fleet in the Black sea, to intercept the supplies of Mithridates in the Bosporus, he returned to Damascus, with the determination to push his conquests, which already extended to the Caspian sea on the north, towards the south as far as the Red sea, and thence through Africa and Spain towards the west, as far as the Atlantic ocean. On his march he everywhere took measures to repress the robberies and extortions of the petty princes, who had established their independence during the disorders of the Syrian empire; but Ptolemey Menneus prince of Chalcis, the most tyrannical of them all, escaped unpunished by presenting Pompey with one thousand talents[13].

At this period Hyrcanus applied to Pompey through Antipater, and Aristobulus through Nicodemus. Both parties were heard and dismissed in a friendly manner, with orders that the two brothers should appear in person. But as Nicodemus had made complaint against Scaurus and Gabinius for receiving the bribes already mentioned, Aristobulus could entertain little hope of a decision favourable to himself. At the same time, Mithridates sent ambassadors from the Bosporus with proposals of peace. He offered to accept the same terms which had been granted to Tigranes, namely, to retain his hereditary dominions, to surrender all the rest to the Romans, and to give up his sons as hostages. But when

[12] Plutarch, Pompey, xxxvii. Strabo, p. 556. Pliny, xxv. 2. Valerius Maximus, xiii. 7.

[13] Josephus, Antiq. XIV. iii. 2. Plutarch, Pompey, xxxviii. xxxix. Eutropius, vi. 14. Dion Cassius, xxxvii. Strabo, p. 551. 556.

Pompey required him to make his proposals in person, as Tigranes had done, he refused, and made the best possible preparations for a renewal of the war. Pompey, therefore, marched again towards Pontus. It was the intention of Mithridates to cross the Ister or Danube, march through Pannonia, and penetrate into Italy over the Alps; but his soldiers refused to follow him in so hazardous a campaign, and his son Pharnaces placed himself at the head of the revolters. Mithridates now administered poison to his wives and daughters, and drank of it himself, but without effect. He then fell upon his own sword, but the wounds which he gave himself were not mortal. At length this highly gifted, but ambitious, cruel, and voluptuous monarch was slain by his seditious soldiers; or, according to some, by a Gaul, at his own request. His body was embalmed, and sent to Pompey by Pharnaces. Pompey gave the body of Mithridates a royal burial, and established his son on the throne of Pontus[14].

[14] Josephus, Antiq. XIV. iii. 2. Appian, Bell. Mithrid. cvii—cxii. Strabo, p. 541. 547. 558. 567. 796. Dion Cassius, xxxvii. Livy, Epitome of book cii. Florus, iii. 5. Plutarch, Pompey, xli. xlii. Pliny, vii. 24. xxv. 2. Orosius, vi. 5.

END OF VOL. I.

PRINTED BY D. A. TALBOYS, OXFORD.