

## JEWISH URBAN COMMUNITIES AND GREEK INFLUENCES

The influence of Greek culture on Jewish life in this country in the Second Temple period and subsequently is today an accepted fact among most historians, and in 1956 the American scholar Morton Smith wrote a brief survey of this influence,<sup>1</sup> which may be defined as expressing a maximalist view on the subject. In this connexion it would be superfluous to mention the crisis in relations engendered by Greek influence in the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes. It is nevertheless desirable to examine in greater detail the social and economic processes which led to that crisis, and to their continuation in different circumstances after the victory of the Hasmoneans and after Rome had conquered Judaea. This theme certainly would have attracted the sympathy of Alex Fuks, whose chief and abiding interest lay in the study of social factors in Greek society and of the conflicts resulting from them.

My intention here is to evoke several ideas regarding the influence and results of urbanization in this country during the hellenistic period.

In an earlier study<sup>2</sup> I endeavoured to suggest a new evaluation of the attitude of the Jews, and more particularly of the Hasmonean rulers, to the phenomenon known as "the city", and pointed to some expressions in Jewish literature of the 3rd century BCE and later which may be understood to show certain reservations in respect of city-life. Naturally the picture is far from simple; the reservations arose to some extent from Jerusalem's unique position as the centre and focus of Jewish loyalty and from the fact that for over two centuries Jewish life had

<sup>1</sup> In the collection *Israel, its Role in Civilization*, ed. M. Davis, New York, 1956, pp. 67-81.

<sup>2</sup> *The Ancient Historian and his Materials: Essays in honour of C.E. Stevens*, ed. B. Levick, Farnborough 1975, pp. 59-73: *Hellenistic Cities of Judaea and its Vicinity — some New Aspects*.

centred preponderantly upon it. But this attitude interfered neither with Jewish settlement in the hellenized cities of the country, more especially in those of the coast — nor with the partial hellenization of the outer life of Jerusalem itself. It did not prevent the external hellenization of the Samaritans who inhabited Tell Balata, where excavation has revealed a completely Greek style of dwelling,<sup>3</sup> despite the rising of the Samaritans against Alexander the Great and their punitive expulsion from the city of Samaria.<sup>4</sup> This way of life, moreover, had already crystallized in the 3rd century BCE. A simple example of this development was the presence in Jerusalem before the Maccabean rising of an *agoranomos*.<sup>5</sup> The Greek title, of course, may have applied to a function that had long existed in Jerusalem, but the importance of the post and the demand to fill it on the part of a member of the hellenizing party undoubtedly indicate the influence of Greek civilization. The incident, nevertheless, was part of a broader and deeper development.

Ever since the Macedonian conquest of Judaea, and probably previously, Jerusalem had entered a stage of rapid growth, and all the contemporary sources emphasize that the town had become a city of some proportions.<sup>6</sup> The *Book of Ecclesiastes*, indeed, furnishes valuable information on one of the economic and social processes which accompanied this growth during the 3rd century BCE, i.e. under Ptolemaic rule. "I made great works, I built houses, and planted vineyards for myself; I made gardens and orchards for myself and planted trees in them of every fruit. I made for myself water-cisterns from which to irrigate a wood of growing trees. I bought slaves and slavewomen, and had housebred slaves; I also possessed herds of cattle and many sheep, more than any before me in Jerusalem. I collected silver and gold and rare things from kings and provinces (*or* the cities of the coast?) and male and female singers, and the delights of men, male and female paramours. I became greater than any man before me in Jerusalem, and my cunning stood me in good stead."<sup>7</sup>

<sup>3</sup> BASOR 148, 1957, pp. 24 sqq.

<sup>4</sup> Curtius IV, 8, 9; Euseb. *Chron.*, tr. Hieron., 123. Cf. Syncellus, I, p. 496.

<sup>5</sup> II *Macc.*, 3, 4.

<sup>6</sup> Diod. XL, 38; Agatharchides ap. Jos., *Ant.* XIII, 6.

<sup>7</sup> *Eccles.*, 2:4-9.

The above passage paints an entire picture — the accumulation of resources and their application to the energetic and successful development of agricultural estates based on several branches and on the exploitation of slaves. It is not stated whether the capital accumulation or the agricultural development came first, and what was the source from which the initiator drew his capital for investment. According to the strict text the money was accumulated as a result of his estates' development, but the writer's connexions with the "provinces" (מדינות) or — more probably — the coastal cities (מדינות הים) — are mentioned, probably implying contacts with foreign countries. Moreover, the owner of these projects is only one member of a complete group among the Jerusalem population — "I became greater than any man before me in Jerusalem." The picture means the growth of a new class of landlords who derive their wealth from agricultural production combined with commerce, but who reside principally in Jerusalem. Is it therefore a coincidence that the two well-known administrative documents relating to Judaea in the mid-3rd century BCE are royal orders relating to the illicit possession of slaves and the taxation of cattle?<sup>8</sup>

To affirm that the men who controlled the Greek cities were generally the more comfortable landowners would be no innovation: this was also to a large extent true for Jerusalem in the period of the Return from Babylon.<sup>9</sup> In the case of Jerusalem in the 3rd and 2nd centuries before the common era, the innovation appears to have lain in the combination of agricultural production and commerce, in the exploitation of slaves and in the use of technology.<sup>10</sup> The whole phenomenon is in a pronouncedly hellenistic spirit, which has much in common with the outlook of the Tobiad family. The account, moreover, has one allusion that leaves no doubt of hellenistic influence: this is the reference to

<sup>8</sup> Pap. Rainer — *Aegyptus*, XVI, 1936, pp. 257 sqq.

<sup>9</sup> The vital evidence is to be found in *Neh.* chaps. 4 and 5.

<sup>10</sup> For technological progress in the earlier hellenistic period also affecting Judaea, see M. Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, 2 I, London 1974, (Eng. trans.), pp. 46 sqq.; cf. Rostovtzeff, *Soc. Ec. Hist. Hell. World*, II, Oxford, 1947, pp. 1186–1197. Improvements included the screw oil press, the treadmill, irrigation machinery, the introduction of the papyrus, new fodder plants, various gourds and legumes, also the expansion of summer wheats. An agricultural terrace in Samaria was recently found to have been constructed in the hellenistic period.

homosexuality.<sup>11</sup> The difference between *Ecclesiastes* and the Tobiads (at least as the latter are portrayed in the biographical accounts utilized by Josephus) is that the former is a resident of Jerusalem, faithful to Judaism as the faith of his fathers (for all his backslidings, his doubts and his soul searchings) who writes a rich Hebrew. Moreover he is, on his own confession, one of a group or class that is occupied in the same activity as himself. All the same, it were well to recall that Joseph son of Tobiah had married into the High Priestly family,<sup>12</sup> and that his ancestor had possessed a chamber in the Temple.<sup>13</sup> Even Mattatياهو the priest and rebel, whose ancestral estate lay at Modi'in, is called "a man of Jerusalem."<sup>14</sup>

Examination of the above passage of *Ecclesiastes*, which does not seem to have commanded the attention of scholars to the extent of inducing them to extract from it the full legitimate implications, leads us to reconsider the significance and reality of the urbanization process in Judaea in the period under review, in so far as it affected the majority of the people, namely, the cultivators of the soil.

The inauguration of a city on the Greek model meant the appropriation of an entire rural area for the new urban unit, in order to ensure its food and natural resources. The foundation of a new *polis* outside Greece can generally be interpreted to mean that the settlers themselves worked the land around it, but in most cases we find also an additional stratum of the indigenous population which furnished at least part of the labour and was of inferior status;<sup>15</sup> the same is found in Asia Minor.<sup>16</sup> When the Greeks established settlements in the territories conquered by Alexander in the east, on the other hand, they were not settling in backward or sparsely inhabited countries but in areas possessing

<sup>11</sup> The meaning of the words *שדה ושרות* is much disputed. I have translated them as "male and female paramours". The Septuagint has *οἰνοχόου καὶ οἰνοχόας*, which indicates what Greek speakers understood from the Hebrew. Ganymede was first and foremost Zeus' boyfriend.

<sup>12</sup> *Ant.* XII, 160.

<sup>13</sup> *Neh.* 13:4-8.

<sup>14</sup> *I Macc.* 2.1.

<sup>15</sup> See eg. A. Andrews, *The Greek Tyrants*, 1956, pp. 54 sqq.

<sup>16</sup> D. Magie, *Roman Rule in Asia Minor*, Princeton, 1950, II, n. 69; Rostovtzeff, *Gesch. des römischen Kolonates*, Leipzig, 1910, pp. 259, 265; A.H.M. Jones, *The Greek City from Alexander to Justinian*, Oxford 1940, pp. 160 sq.

numerous cities and dense populations, hence most of their new cities were of necessity founded near, or were imposed on, existing urban communities. Their contacts with the indigenous population were therefore close, and the Greeks in various cases had to take land, near existing villages, already under cultivation. Given estates and regions became royal property; other tracts were granted to aristocratic beneficiaries or to military settlers and to Greek inhabitants of the new *poleis*.<sup>17</sup> A number of Greek cities subsequently founded, it is true, (and this applied to Syria) were inhabited primarily by natives who had reached a fairly advanced stage of hellenization;<sup>18</sup> they were not Greek colonies as such, and extensive readjustments of land tenure would not have applied to them, but to the genuine Greek foundations. Most of these latter probably arrived at some form of compromise and cooperation between the Greek settlers and the property owners who had previously controlled these communities, but all the inhabitants of cities with Greek constitutions now found themselves within a framework requiring from them submission to the *polis* régime and payment of taxes to the kings. The effective controllers of the internal administration were, by and large, the owners of land. The taxes were paid according to various arrangements determined by the ruler and influenced by the status of the city, and the nature of such arrangements can be illustrated from various inscriptions.

Alexander the Great, for instance, states in an official document directed to the city of Priene,<sup>19</sup> that "I affirm that all the countryside around (the city) is mine, and that those resident in the villages will pay taxes (φόρους), but I remit the war contribution (τῆς συντάξεως)<sup>20</sup> where the city of Priene is concerned." The significance of this

<sup>17</sup> For the allocation of land to troops near Pergamum — C.B. Welles, *Royal Correspondence of the Hellenistic Kings*, New Haven 1934, no. 51, lines 9 sq. (2nd century BCE); confiscation of temple land at Aezani for cleruchs — *OGIS* 502; furnishing of grain to a city of Asia from nearby royal estates — *SEG* II, 663. (2nd century BCE). Herod assigns land to veterans at Sebaste (*BJ* I, 403), implying a redistribution of cultivated land between them and the citizens already resident.

<sup>18</sup> Jones, *The Greek City*, pp. 15–16.

<sup>19</sup> *OGIS* I, 1, line 10.

<sup>20</sup> For the meaning of syntaxis, (σύνταξις), A. Heuss, *Stadt und Herrscher des Hellenismus*, 2 Aalen, 1963, pp. 105 sq. (*Klio*, Beitr. zur alten Geschichte, 39).

statement seems to be that as most of the citizens of Priene itself would have owned land, their estates were free of the σύνταξις; in other words the same tax, in addition to the φόροι, fell upon those peasants (presumably the descendants of the indigenous non-Greek population) who lived in the villages on their own holdings. The above inscription, therefore, lends added significance to another recording a grant by Antiochus II to Smyrna, remitting taxes payable both by the city *and* its χώρα (rural territory).<sup>21</sup> Should there be doubt as to who bore the basic burden of these payments, it will be removed by the record concerning Sardis,<sup>22</sup> which paid imposts on wine jars, a tax in hard cash, another in commutation for labour service (φόρος λειτουργικός) and on a third of all village products (τὰ ἄλλα γενόμενα ἐὼν κώμων) — i.e. agricultural produce. But what such royal taxation could amount to, and who paid it, may be learnt from the list of taxes remitted to Teos at the end of the 4th century BCE.<sup>23</sup> This includes no less than eleven taxes listed specifically, apart from those mentioned as ἄλλοι φόροι. All those specified are paid on flocks and herds and on activities connected with agriculture.

Most of the examples we have cited come from Asia Minor, because that region has yielded the richest harvest of documents, but the reality cannot have differed basically in Syria and Judaea. In addition, of course, the rural communities paid taxes to the cities in whose territories they lay. Thus Pedasa pays Miletus;<sup>24</sup> Laodicea, having purchased a village and an estate of 15,000 hectares near Cyzicus from her husband King Antiochus II (262–246), is instructed to attach the estate to a city-territory, the inference being that she must pay taxes on it to the city concerned, meaning that the peasants must cover both her own revenue and the payments made to the city. In a later period, Hadrian grants the city of Stratoniceia the customs (τέλη) from her rural areas.<sup>25</sup>

If however land-confiscations on city-territories were restricted on the whole to those towns in which organized Greek settlement took place,<sup>26</sup>

<sup>21</sup> OGIS I, 238, line 7.

<sup>22</sup> AJA XVI, 1912, Inscriptions of Sardes, I, 1, lines 12–13. (Buckler, Robinson).

<sup>23</sup> SEG II, 579 (=Welles, *Royal Correspondence*, no. 3/4).

<sup>24</sup> SEG II, 633 (176/5 BCE).

<sup>25</sup> BCH XI, 1887, pp. 109, 121.

<sup>26</sup> As definite Macedonian colonies we may identify Samaria, Gadara, Abila, Pella, Philoteria, Gerasa, Hippos and Dium. (Syncellus, Dindorf, pp. 558–9); there were some

this did not exempt the other *poleis* from the burden of taxation. It is here relevant to observe, that Judaea proper in the hellenistic period possessed few urban communities worthy of the name besides Jerusalem; this would have meant that Jerusalem had to levy for the entire Jewish area of Judaea, presumably through the governors of the merides or hyparchies transmitting from the High Priests. From the mid-3rd century a centralization of tax-farming took place under the Tobiads, who took over the fiscal duties of the High Priest. This would have emphasized Jerusalem's rôle as an exorter of fiscal pressure both in the Jewish areas and in relation to the Greek cities, and may have led to a considerable exacerbation of relationships. But no doubt Judaea also contained tracts of royal domain directly administered by the king's officers or the tax-farmers, and worked by tied λαοί. The existence of such estates is demonstrated by the Hēphtziba inscription<sup>27</sup> and by the Zenon archives,<sup>28</sup> but the domains there referred to lay outside Judaea *sensu stricto*; for Judaea itself we have the evidence of the stamped jar-handles which, beginning in the Persian period, continue after Alexander's conquest and are interpreted to represent transmission of revenue from royal domains.<sup>29</sup> If Lapp was right in interpreting the stamps that part went to the king, part to the Temple of Jerusalem, then we have here a precise parallel to the arrangement at Aezani in Phrygia, where the revenue of the lands of the temple of Zeus, seized by a hellenistic king for cleruchic settlement, were divided between him and the temple.<sup>30</sup> It would follow by analogy that the Jerusalem temple estates were also seized by the Persian rulers and inherited by the first hellenistic kings ruling Judaea. That these estates existed under Persian rule we need not doubt, and there is a strong suspicion that some of the taxes recorded as paid by Jewish cultivators in the time of Nehemiah<sup>31</sup>

Greeks in Gaza, and Anthedon may have been settled by men of Boeotia. Doar and Jaffa probably had permanent garrisons. Marissa held both Phoenicians and literate hellenized inhabitants.

<sup>27</sup> Y. Landau, *IEJ*, XVI, 1966, pp. 66 sqq.

<sup>28</sup> Beth 'Anat — PSI 594; 544; A. Tcherikover, *Jews in the Graeco-Roman World*, Jerusalem 1961, pp. 44-45. (Heb.).

<sup>29</sup> *BASOR* 172, 1963, pp. 22 sqq.

<sup>30</sup> *CIL* III, 355.

<sup>31</sup> *Ezra* 7:24: the reference is to הלך and מנדה (*Neh.* 5:4=מדת המלך or Bab. *madattu*), both paid on royal land.

were those imposed on the lessees of royal domain. In view of the very limited area covered by the Persian province of Yahud at that time, the said estates must have been in the immediate vicinity of Jerusalem itself. A.H.M. Jones indeed thought that the aristocratic estates located in the city-territories were regarded as crown-land at the disposal of the government to grant to individuals or to sell to the cities.<sup>32</sup> The evidence for this is drawn chiefly from Asia. What is evident is 1) that the royal land in Judaea was of considerable extent; 2) that Herod and his sons, at least, treated most of the country, including the city-territories, as their own to do as they liked with, if necessity arose. As regards the Seleucid period, there are some grounds for seeing Alexander Balas' gift of the 'Eqron region to Jonathan as the direct grant of a royal appanage,<sup>33</sup> and for thinking that the toparchies of Lydda, Aphairema and Ramatayyim<sup>34</sup> ceded by Demetrius II to him were likewise crown domains. (See below).

The exclusion of hellenized cities from Judaea proper in the hellenistic period could to some extent have protected the Jewish cultivator from direct confiscation of his land in the interest of the citizens of new city-foundations, but, as stated, Jerusalem paid taxes, most of which must have come from the countryside of Judaea. Those levied on Judaea itself are given by *Ant.* XII, 142 — the polltax, by *Ant.* XIII, 51 and by *I Macc.* xi, 35 — the tithe,<sup>35</sup> which is evidently distinct from the tithe paid to the Temple. Those paid by the three toparchies of Aphairema, Lydda and Ramatayyim are given by *I Macc.* x, 29–30 and xi, 34 as a third of sown crops and half the produce of the plantations; the crown tax and the salt-gabelle; *Ant.* XIII, 52 adds the *angareiai* of oxen. It seems improbable that the last three were not paid also by Judaea as a whole, but the two taxes on produce paid by the three toparchies so much resemble the rates imposed on the λαοί of the βασιλική γῆ in

<sup>32</sup> *The Greek City*, p. 44.

<sup>33</sup> *I Macc.* 10.89 — εἰς κληροδοσίαν; *Ant.* IV, 102 — εἰς κληρουχίαν.

<sup>34</sup> *I Macc.* 11. 34.

<sup>35</sup> B. Bar Kochba, *CNRS*, no 936, *Armées et fiscalité dans le monde antique*, Paris 1966, pp. 171, 172, points out that this is not the Temple tithe, but a Seleucid tax (see the references there given, p. 171, n. 3); it appears to have been paid mainly by cleruchs (katoikoi) or by temple lands (Cf. Welles, *Royal Corresp.*, p. 174, and his references, *ibid.* n. 3).



Egypt,<sup>36</sup> that Rostovtzeff was certainly right in seeing their origin in such.<sup>37</sup> This means that they came from royal land in Judaea, and had originated under Ptolemaic rule. The theory that these lands had been taken over by Antiochus IV as a punitive measure during the Maccabean rising<sup>38</sup> would therefore seem untenable. But there were also the big estates of the type described by *Ecclesiastes*, and their existence is indirectly attested by the complaint of the Jewish hellenizing party to Antiochus V that the rebels had seized their estates,<sup>39</sup> the verb used (διαρπάζω) could mean that they also divided the estates concerned amongst themselves.

Generally speaking it is evident that as a result of Nehemiah's agrarian reforms, the majority of the Jewish smallholding peasantry had succeeded in securing their farms in permanent hereditary proprietorship,<sup>40</sup> and it was they who comprised the bulk of the Jewish cultivators on the eve of Alexander's conquest. The question is — what occurred to them between that time and the Maccabean revolt? Just before the rising broke out we can distinguish three groups: a) The peasants subject to tenancy on the royal lands; b) independent smallholders; c) the big estate-owners. Clearly, while the first group had been converted to hereditary lessees, the second group would have suffered most from the added impositions which preceded the rising, but the tenants of the big landlords would also have felt the burden. As we have seen, the large estates had developed by the exploitation of slave labour, and we have no information to what extent slave labour or alternatively tenancy, was applied; but it seems reasonable to suppose that the resentment which caused the seizure and possibly the breakup of the large estates by Judah the Maccabee's followers was activated by something more than simple anti-Hellenism. It is at least arguable that the same estates had grown at the expense of the small peasant, by seizure of his land for debt or by leaving no tracts upon which an

<sup>36</sup> U. Wilcken, *Griechische Ostraka aus Aegypten*, I, 1899, pp. 199 sqq.

<sup>37</sup> Rostovtzeff, *Soc. Econ. Hist. Hell. World*, I, pp. 349, 468.

<sup>38</sup> E. Bickerman, *Les institutions des Séleucides*, Paris, 1938, p. 179.

<sup>39</sup> I *Macc.* 6.24: καὶ αἱ κληρονομίαι ἡμῶν διηρπάζοντο (seize or tear to pieces).

<sup>40</sup> Nehemiah enforced the seventh-year remission of debts. (*Neh.* 10:32). Cf. *Diod.* XL, 3,5-7, on the Jewish prohibition to alienate smallholdings. The mortgaging of smallholdings prevalent when Nehemiah took office (*Neh.* 5:1-5) implies proprietorship.

expanding population could find a living. There may have been a further potent factor. The rearing of sheep and cattle by the estate owners is mentioned specifically. The expansion of this branch may have been accompanied by extensive seasonal transhumance, which is invariably damaging and even destructive both to the smallholder and to the state of the soil and its vegetational cover, especially if it is not controlled as an integral part of the agricultural pattern.<sup>41</sup>

That confiscation of holdings and seizure of vacant lands for military settlers or hellenizing beneficiaries had taken place under the Ptolemies and Seleucids is highly probable, although military confiscation would have been most frequent east of Jordan. The threat to turn Judaeian soil into holdings for military settlers, once uttered and possibly carried out subsequently,<sup>42</sup> nevertheless suggests that a shortage of areas for such schemes existed. The large estate-owners, moreover, were identified with the hellenistic tax-collecting bureaucracy and aspired to hellenization. One of the practical advantages of the conversion of Jerusalem to a city organized on the hellenistic model would have been to strengthen the fiscal hold of the new *polis* upon its χώρα — which would have been among the largest of the Greek cities of the country.<sup>43</sup> Where the tenants of the royal lands were concerned, the leases were rigorous, the cropping plan (at least under the Ptolemies) dictated, the percentages of

<sup>41</sup> For the effects of transhumance in ancient times, see C. Yeo, *TAPA* 79, 1948, pp. 275, 899.

<sup>42</sup> *Ant.* XII, 159; *Daniel* 11:39; *I Macc.* 1:32 — Antiochus' commanders τὰ κτήνη ἐκληρονόμησαν. B. Bar Kochba (*Zion*, XXXVIII, 1973, pp. 39) has rejected the generally accepted view that Antiochus IV's forcible occupation of Jerusalem was accompanied by the city's conversion to a military colony enjoying confiscated city land. (*I Macc.* 1:38: ἐγένετο κατοικία ἀλλοτρίων). Yet it is hardly likely that the holdings of the expelled Jewish population would have been left vacant. On the other hand Bar Kochba's interpretation of *Daniel* 11:39 as the sale of confiscated lands to Jewish hellenizers (*loc. cit.*, p. 42) would fit in very well as a subsequent development of the picture painted by *Eccles.* 2:4-9.

<sup>43</sup> Precisely for this reason I do not believe that Antiochus IV granted Jerusalem the constitution of a *polis*. He went halfway: the decisive evidence is the absence of any known city coinage. The full grant would have been opposed by the Seleucid bureaucracy; the Greek cities would have feared the recrudescence of ambitions of the sort displayed by the Tobiads. Compare the extreme violence with which Jerusalem was handled by Apollonius and other Greek officers.

produce paid to the government oppressive — and all administered by hellenized officials.

The followers of the Maccabees presumably broke up the large estates of the hellenizers. Not all the landowners, of course, took the Seleucid side; Mattatياهو himself possessed enough land to be a man of weight in Modi'in; some of the men of the type described in *Ecclesiastes* (or their sons) may have stood in with the Hasmoneans (compare the priestly family of Hakkotz, subsequently distinguished in Hasmonean diplomacy).<sup>44</sup>

Despite the social revolutionary aspects of the movement led by Mattatياهو and Judah the Maccabee, the changes engendered by it or initiated by the Hasmonean brothers and their successors included both a more positive attitude to cities and the renewed expansion of royal land and large estates. The first trend was encouraged by objective logistic, strategical and demographic requirements; the second by the crystallization of a new dynasty of rulers. Naturally the Hasmonean régime tended to adopt the hellenistic models of administration it was used to, and it would be good psychology, though requiring confirmation, to suppose that they preferred the Ptolemaic to the Seleucid example; but they may have recoiled before the elaborate and remorseless character of the Egyptian bureaucracy. Further, there is an old principle, which I have nowhere found stated in print, that generation-long hostilities tend to create similarities between the opposed sides.<sup>45</sup>

In a previous study<sup>46</sup> I endeavoured to show that the widespread tendency of historians hitherto to see the Hasmoneans as simple destroyers of urban life cannot stand up to archaeological evidence. Destruction there certainly was, but it can be shown that occupation continued or was renewed in a number of cities and in some townlets; this has been proved by the sources or by archaeological excavation at Samaria, Gerasa, Ashdod, Scythopolis (Beth Shean), Jaffa, Gezer and

<sup>44</sup> See M. Stern in *The Jewish People in the First Century*, I, ii, Assen-Amsterdam, 1976, pp. 566–568.

<sup>45</sup> But it is remarked on, I find, by that wise mariner Herman Wouk in *War and Remembrance*.

<sup>46</sup> *The Ancient Historian and his Materials* (n. 2), pp. 62–64.

Gamala. The archaeological evidence at Doar and Strato's Tower is not decisive or clear, but concerning the latter we have the numismatic record; some eighteen coins of Yannai are known from Caesarea and its vicinity.<sup>47</sup> To the above list should also be added Iamnia, which in Judah the Maccabee's time had a Greek *strategos*<sup>48</sup> (probably in this case the royal sheriff), but under Augustus was Jewish<sup>49</sup> and in Gaius' reign was inhabited by a mixed Greek and Jewish population.<sup>50</sup> While Josephus<sup>51</sup> says Gabinius rebuilt Iamnia, thus a city in Pompey's view,<sup>52</sup> Strabo calls it a village (κώμη). The contradiction may be resolved by assuming that Strabo was thinking of Yavneh, while the statements of Philo and Josephus refer to Iamnia by the sea — but both, be it noted, possessed mixed populations.

A reexamination of Josephus' texts also shows that the situation was not one of wholesale destruction or wholesale deurbanization. In the *War* (I, 156) Josephus writes that Pompey liberated the inland cities which had not been previously destroyed (ἄστας μὴ φθάσαντες κατέσκαψαν); they are listed as Hippos, Scythopolis, Pella, Samaria, Iamnia, Marissa, Ashdod and Arethusa. On the coast Josephus adds Gaza, Joppa, Dora and Strato's Tower. Not all his facts, it is true, are accurate, since Pella and Gaza were certainly destroyed;<sup>53</sup> Ashdod, though demolished, was reoccupied a few years later. If Strato's Tower was razed (which is not proven) it was soon reoccupied. In the *Antiquities* (XIV, 75) Josephus adds Dium to the list of cities restored intact to their original inhabitants. In *War* I, 166 we find it stated that Gabinius reestablished the cities which had *not* been damaged

<sup>47</sup> H. Hamburger, *Yedi'ot (BIES)*, XV, 1950, p. 80.

<sup>48</sup> *Ant.* XII, 350.

<sup>49</sup> Strabo, XVI, 759C.

<sup>50</sup> Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium*, 37-41.

<sup>51</sup> *BJ* I, 166.

<sup>52</sup> *BJ* I, 156.

<sup>53</sup> Pella and Philoteria (the latter not mentioned by Josephus) may have been destroyed because as Macedonian settlements their establishment had involved the appropriation of coveted agricultural land in a densely populated area. The recurrence of the name Pella south of Jerusalem (*BJ* III, 55) suggests a further Macedonian colony in that region, but not of city status. It has been identified (apparently) with Hīrbet Bad-Faluḥ, a hellenistic site near Bethlehem, (*Surv. Ind. Sam. Colan*, 1967-8, Jerusalem, 1972, pp. 28, 44 Site 49).

(ἀπορθήτους), and rebuilt those which had been destroyed (καταστραμμένους); he repopulated (συνεπολίσθησαν) Scythopolis, Samaria, Anthedon, Apollonia, Iamnia, Raphia, Marissa, Adora, Gama-la (here Gadara should be read) and Ashdod. Of these cities, therefore, only Ashdod had suffered vitally. We know from elsewhere (*Ant.* XIII, 356, 396) that Gadara was captured by Yannai. Thus, despite some inaccuracies which can be emended by reference to the results of excavation, generally Josephus' list appears to be correct, and in any case clearly indicates that if some destruction took place, it was far from the general rule.

Whether the picture was the same with regard to the villages it is hard to say, but a number of townlets or villages seem to have been evacuated round about 150–140 BCE — obviously as a result of offensives by Jonathan and Simon.<sup>54</sup>

On the whole, it becomes evident that the Hasmonean high priests were not unaware of the value of cities, whether as strategic points securing lines of communication, as commissariat depôts or as centres of administration. As such, they had to be retained, and an empty city was a military risk. Furthermore access to the sea was desirable (hence the retention of Jaffa, Ashdod, Iamnia etc.). The importance of towns in the period, indeed, can be demonstrated by a peculiar discovery; in central Samaria, where urbanization was thin and long remained so, there has been found north of Qarwat beni Ḥassan, an extensive acropolis occupying a long boat-shaped hill, walled, and containing at its east end a series of long storehouses resembling those at Pergamum and Masada. There is also a funerary columbarium within the west end of the fortified area. The surface pottery is both pre-hellenistic and hellenistic;<sup>55</sup> but there can be little doubt that the fortress belongs to the latter period. It could have originated in the early phase of Greek conquest (eg. after the Samaritan rising), or alternatively during the

<sup>54</sup> P. Lapp, *Palestine Ceramic Chronology 200 BC–AD 70*, New Haven 1961, p. 109. Some end later, apparently under John Hyrcanus; as examples may be cited Dothan, where occupation ceased about 100 BCE (*Bib. Arch.*, 19, 1956, pp. 47–48; *BASOR* 138, 1954, p. 15; 139, 1955, p. 5) and Shechem (Tel Balata; *BA* 26, 1963, p. 25).

<sup>55</sup> The site was found by Shim'on Dar in the course of archaeological survey work in western Samaria.

offensives against the Hasmoneans (Bacchides<sup>56</sup>). In the ancient village to the south, the Hasmoneans or Herod built a strong fortress which evidently replaced the fortified *dépôt*. Speculations apart, this remarkable site demonstrates the necessity of creating fortified supply-centres in operational areas where urbanization was lacking.<sup>56</sup> The problem of supplies was of course vital, and it is significant that I *Maccabees* found it worthwhile to report that Simon supplied 'the cities' with food at his own expense,<sup>57</sup> doubtless after the ravaging of their territories, and in all probability from the crown domains whose management he had retained. This is a characteristically hellenistic operation.<sup>58</sup> At this date the Hasmoneans held only Jaffa, possibly Iamnia, but no other known city with a Greek constitution; the passage shows that these were Jewish open townlets which he re fortified, and the possibility exists that Jonathan and Simon had begun a programme of developing larger village-centres into towns. In the meantime we may summarize that the Greek cities as population-centres were at least in part perpetuated.

On the urban question, two further points may be made. The first is, that not all the hellenistic cities exhibited an uncompromising hostility towards the Jews. Ascalon came to terms with the Hasmoneans, although this did not prevent active manifestations of hatred towards the Jews<sup>59</sup> after the coastal cities had been liberated by Pompey. More complex was the situation in Ptolemais-'Akko, where the popular element, when threatened by Lathyrus and his mother Cleopatra III, actually decided to seek Jewish support, a move in which they were thwarted by the latter. The sequel in the internal life of the city, unfortunately, is unknown, but excavations have proved the considerable destruction wrought by Cleopatra.<sup>60</sup> When Scythopolis was threatened by Judah the Maccabee in 162 BCE, her Jewish inhabitants appealed to

<sup>56</sup> The site is nearly equidistant from Qalqilya and Shechem (Nablus).

<sup>57</sup> I *Macc.* 14.10.

<sup>58</sup> Cf. C.B. Welles, *Royal Corresp.*, nos. 3/4, pp. 15 sqq., para. 10 (Antigonus' offer of corn from royal lands to Teos).

<sup>59</sup> *BJ* III, 10; Philo, *Leg. ad Gaium*, 205.

<sup>60</sup> Excavations carried out by the writer in 1958. Evidence was found of thorough destruction at this time, and similar evidence was disclosed in the subsequent excavations of Professor M. Dothan elsewhere in the hellenistic city. Cf. *The Ancient Historian and his Materials*, (n. 2), p. 65.

him to hold his hand, pleading excellent relations with the gentile population, and Judah left the city to its own devices.<sup>61</sup> This peculiar internal situation no doubt affected the calculations of the Seleucid commander Epicrates when he surrendered to John Hyrcanus on terms,<sup>62</sup> and much the same situation is found in 66 CE, when the Jews and Greeks of the city combined to resist the Jewish activist offensive. The tragic dénouement<sup>63</sup> merely shows that the forces within were more delicately balanced during the great revolt, and that the balance was easily upset by the general position throughout the country. Of equal interest was the course of events at Gamala. Yannai, having occupied the townlet, subsequently removed the local *archon* (presumably the local governor who had his headquarters in the townlet),<sup>64</sup> suggesting that the latter had been left at his post, had therefore surrendered without resistance, and had reached an understanding with the Jewish king.

Gamala represents a class of townlet not nominally of city-status, which nevertheless had in given cases adopted certain features of city-organization. The factor contributing to this situation was in this case its administrative function, and Gamala's status is succinctly stated by Jerus. *Makkot* II, 6, which says: They set apart Qaddesh in Galilee ... but set apart Gamala in its stead until Qaddesh should be captured ... these towns are not built either as cities (כרכים) or as small townlets (עיירות) but as intermediate between one and the other (בינונית).<sup>65</sup> Klein<sup>66</sup> believed that this statement was to be attributed to the Hasmonean period and referred to the establishment of cities of refuge. Another example of a townlet with some features of city-organization was Gezer, known to have possessed an *agoranomos* before its capture by Simon.<sup>67</sup> Gezer disposed of its own well-marked territory, whose

<sup>61</sup> II *Macc.* 12.30–31.

<sup>62</sup> *Ant.* XIII, 280. Cf. *BJ* I, 66, which merely states that the territory of Scythopolis was overrun.

<sup>63</sup> *BJ* II, 466–481.

<sup>64</sup> *Ant.* XIV, 394. The *archon* is called ἐπὶ τοῖς τόποις, i.e. Gamala was the centre of an administrative subdistrict. Cf. *BJ* III, 56, which refers to the Γαμαλιτικὴ. See below for complementary talmudic evidence.

<sup>65</sup> I owe the above useful reference, with parallel passages, to my pupil Wilk Roman.

<sup>66</sup> *Be-eretz ha-Galil*,<sup>2</sup> Jerusalem 1967, pp. 25–27.

<sup>67</sup> R.A.S. Macalister, *The Excavation of Gezer*, London, 1912, pp. 37–40.

boundary-stones, inscribed in Hebrew and Greek, are now dated to the years before the great revolt of 66–74;<sup>68</sup> exactly when the bounds were fixed or redefined, we do not know, but one may suspect a Hasmonean date, the more so since Rabban Gamliel is found removing an undesirable “head” of this town<sup>69</sup> from his post. The form of the local governing body which this man headed remains a matter for speculation; it is likely to have resembled the institutions described in the *Book of Judith* with reference to the town of Bethulia,<sup>70</sup> which is specifically termed a πόλις in the Greek text (VI, 12) and is administered by three archons, a committee of elders (πρεσβύτεροι), and a general meeting (ἐκκλησία). The *Book of Judith* is regarded, though not *consensu omnium*, as a hellenistic product. It would be unwise to state categorically that Bethulia’s institutions were the product of Greek influence, but their representative basis as suggested by the distinction between the archons and the elders, and by the summoning of the town-assembly, may reflect a general trend in Judaea in the hellenistic age.

In this respect something is to be learnt from Gamala. The place, at least partly Greek in Yannai’s time, was completely Jewish in 66–74, and, despite the presence of Philip the Zamarid, commander of Herod’s Zamarid force, overwhelmingly activist and revolutionary. Its synagogue, as excavated, is distinguished by its plan — a series of graded masonry benches or steps surrounding a hall whose roof was supported by internal columns.<sup>71</sup> In form it thus resembled the synagogues at Masada<sup>72</sup> and Herodeium<sup>73</sup> in their second phase, which belonged to the time when these fortresses were held by the Jewish activists. The provision of the surrounding seating I believe to reflect democratic procedures,<sup>74</sup> and

<sup>68</sup> F. Cross, *JBL* 74, 1955, p. 163, n. 34.

<sup>69</sup> B. *Rosh ha-Shanah*, 57b, reads ‘Gader’; the Leiden ms. ‘Gezer’.

<sup>70</sup> VI, 12–16.

<sup>71</sup> The building was uncovered during the second season of excavation at the site now identified as Gamala (e-Salem south-east of Bir Qaruah) by Shemaryah Guttman. See *id.*, *Gamala, the Historical Background; the First Season of Excavation*, Dept. of Antiquities and Local Knowledge of the Qibbutz Movement, Tel Aviv, 1979, pp. 20–24.

<sup>72</sup> Y. Yadin, *Masada*, New York, 1966, pp. 180 sqq.

<sup>73</sup> *Encyclopedea of Archaeological Excavations*, II, Jerusalem, 1976, p. 509, sv. Herodeum (Eng. edn.); *Qadmoniot*, I, 1968, p. 136.

<sup>74</sup> Cf. Applebaum, *Fourth World Congress of Jewish Studies, Papers I*, 1967, pp. 107–108.



the same popular spirit which found expression after the initial fighting in Jerusalem, in the appointment of a new high priest chosen by lot,<sup>75</sup> a method regarded by the Greeks as the extremest expression of democracy. But most revealing are the prototypes of this synagogue plan, which comprise the bouleuteria and ekklesteria of a number of hellenic cities of Greece and Asia, and take the form of hypostyle halls with tiers of seats set round the interior. The most recent known buildings of this type appear to be those at Delos (3rd century BCE)<sup>76</sup> and at Notion (Asia)<sup>77</sup> (2nd century BCE) — but the plan is found in the third telesterion at Eleusis as early as the 6th century BCE,<sup>78</sup> likewise at Athens.<sup>79</sup> It is therefore an interesting phenomenon that one of the most tangible manifestations of hellenic influence on Jewish practice is linked, so far as present evidence goes, precisely with the most revolutionary and patriotic currents of the Jewish community in the 1st centuries before and of the present era. This, however, should not be interpreted necessarily to apply also to Jewish municipal organization as such. While it is true that Jerusalem was virtually recognized as a *polis* by the Roman authorities before 70,<sup>80</sup> and that the Herods founded Tiberias and reestablished Sepphoris as Jewish cities with Greek constitutions, there is plenty of evidence in talmudic literature that in the Jewish townlets which Rome refused to recognize as municipalities, there persisted and flourished the type of internal authority described much earlier in relation to Bethulia.

Such townlets must have been part and parcel, in their growth and development, of what we may call Hasmonean “internal colonization”. As another instance Yavneh may be cited. Its area was densely populated by Jews in the early Roman period according to Strabo,<sup>81</sup> and

<sup>75</sup> *BJ* IV, 153–155.

<sup>76</sup> *Exploration archéologique de Délos*, II, Paris, 1914; D.S. Robertson, *Handbook of Greek and Roman Architecture*, Cambridge 1943, fig. 81.

<sup>77</sup> *Athenische Mitteilungen*, XI, 1887, p. 422.

<sup>78</sup> C. Anti, *Teatri greci arcaici*, Padua 1947, pp. 153 sqq.

<sup>79</sup> *Hesperia* VI, 1937, p. 212.

<sup>80</sup> Cf. *Ant.* XX, 11; *BJ* II, 405–7; H. Zucker, *Stud. zur jüdischen Selbstverwaltung*, Berlin, 1936, pp. 61 etc.; A. Schalit, *The Roman Régime in Eretz Yisrael*, Jerusalem 1937, p. 38; M. Stern, *The Jewish People in the First Century*, I, i, pp. 344–5.

<sup>81</sup> Strabo, XVI, 759C.

Vespasian evacuated troublesome elements from here during the great rebellion.<sup>82</sup> From Simon's time it was, I believe, as part of the district of 'Eqron, Hasmonean state land settled by Jewish military settlers.<sup>83</sup> Where Samaria is concerned, we have Merrous (evidently near Dothan), the attack upon whose Jewish inhabitants, ἀποικοῦντας καὶ συμμάχους ὄντας τῶν Ἰουδαίων,<sup>84</sup> led to the siege of Samaria. Grintz<sup>85</sup> thought they were a longstanding Jewish enclave, but in this district it seems more likely that they had been recently planted by John Hyrcanus as part of his pincer-movement against the Samaritan region. The same policy may be less directly traced in Galilee. Suggestive is our information concerning Simonias, identified with Hirbet Semuniyeh west of Nazareth. The biblical Shimron,<sup>86</sup> frequently mentioned in Egyptian documents of the Late Bronze Age,<sup>87</sup> it was apparently deserted during the Israelite conquest and only reappears in the Second Temple period. The site has yielded some hellenistic and more Roman and Byzantine pottery.<sup>88</sup> The Septuagint gives Συμῶν, a Greek form perhaps influenced by the Egyptian pronunciation,<sup>89</sup> suggesting that the site was first reoccupied in the 3rd or 2nd century B.C.E., and this form (שמעונייה סימוניא) is found in all the talmudic sources.<sup>90</sup> As Simonias occupies a strategical crossroad and possesses a wide tactical command, it may well have been resettled by John Hyrcanus or Judah Aristobulus when Galilee was overrun. Would it be too wild to suggest that the adoption of the form 'Simonias' was influenced by the name of the last of the Maccabean brothers?

<sup>82</sup> BJ IV, 444.

<sup>83</sup> I Macc. 10.89; cf. Ant. XIII, 102 and Applebaum, *The Jewish People* etc. I, ii, Aasen, 1976, p. 642.

<sup>84</sup> Ant. XIII, 275; cf. Applebaum, Dar, Z. Safrai, *PEQ* 110, 1978, p. 99.

<sup>85</sup> *The Book of Judith*, Jerusalem, 1957, p. 32. (Heb.).

<sup>86</sup> Josh. 11:1; Jer. Meg., I, 70a.

<sup>87</sup> B. Mazar, *BPJES*, I, 1934, p. 2; J. Garstang, *Joshua Judges*, London, 1931, pp. 399 sq.

<sup>88</sup> Mazar, *loc. cit.*

<sup>89</sup> Klein, *BPJES* II, 1934, p. 43.

<sup>90</sup> *Sepher ha-Yishuv*, I, Jerusalem 1939, p. 111; *Tos. Shev.*, VII, 3; *Jer. Yeb.*, XII, 170a etc. *Mid. Tannaim*, p. 176, ki tavo, p. 176, refers to a communication of Rabban Simon ben Gamliel, mentioning Simonia(s), then evidently a centre of local importance. Cf. Alon, *Hist. of the Jews of Eretz Yisrael*, I, Tel Aviv 1954, pp. 56, 143 n. 77.

We have other indications of Hasmonean military settlement in Lower Galilee. When Herod in his campaign against Antigonus fought a Galilean Jewish force near Arbel, he was nearly defeated by well-trained and ably handled troops operating in formation.<sup>91</sup> It is difficult to explain this phenomenon other than by the assumption that these men derived their fighting tradition from two or three generations of Hasmonean military settlement.<sup>92</sup> There are other instances from which a policy of such colonization in or round Greek cities, or on the countryside, can be deduced. The first relates to Hippos (Susita); seven Jewish villages in its territory are listed in *Tos. Shevi'it* (IV, 10), and as this was a Greek city taken over by the Hasmoneans and restored to the Greeks by Pompey, the villages concerned are likely to derive from the period before that. As the official Seleucid name of Hippos was οἱ Ἀντιοχέεις πρὸς Ἰππου,<sup>93</sup> it is more than possible that a Jewish Hasmonean settlement not yet located lay near or under the present Susita. The second instance is that of Antipatris. During the rebellion of 66–74 CE, both Cestius Gallus<sup>94</sup> and later Vespasian<sup>95</sup> ravaged the villages surrounding the city, showing plainly that they were Jewish. As John Hyrcanus is known to have held Pegae (probably Antipatris) till the reign of Antiochus VII,<sup>96</sup> it is probable that the said Jewish population preceded the foundation of the city by Herod.

Archaeological investigation in western Samaria in recent years has further revealed very considerable evidence of organized settlement attributable to the Persian and hellenistic periods. This takes the form of agricultural intensification associated with concentrations of field-towers. Although the origin of these towers was apparently in the Persian period, and some belong, on pottery evidence, to the earlier hellenistic age, considerable expansion appears to have taken place in the second half of the 2nd century BCE.<sup>97</sup> Part of it coincides geographically with a

<sup>91</sup> *BJ* I, 403–7.

<sup>92</sup> Cf. Applebaum, *JRS* LXI, 1971, p. 159.

<sup>93</sup> B.V. Head, *Historia Nummorum*,<sup>2</sup> Oxford, 1911, p. 786.

<sup>94</sup> *BJ* II, 514.

<sup>95</sup> *BJ* IV, 443.

<sup>96</sup> *Ant.* XIII, 261.

<sup>97</sup> See Applebaum, *ANRW*, II, 8, Berlin 1977, pp. 361–7: Judaea as a Roman Province: the Countryside as a Political and Economic Factor; Applebaum, Dar, Z. Safrai, *PEQ* 110, 1978, pp. 91–100: The Towers of Samaria.

considerable area which placenames and some sources show was crown domain in the Roman period and probably earlier. But the questions evoked by these discoveries concern the development both of Hasmonean royal property and of large private estates in the period under review, and their discussion must be reserved for a separate paper.

We may conclude by summarizing our provisional conclusions. City development in Judaea in the hellenistic period meant the imposition of a considerably increased burden of taxation on the rural areas of the city lands, and also the confiscation of tracts round the cities actually settled by the Greeks — although this phenomenon applied initially chiefly to Samaria and to the cities east of Jordan. The fiscal burden, however, also fell on the large city territory of Jerusalem, while the rapid development in that area of large estates with slave labour and Greek techniques (livestock and plantations) by a new Jerusalem aristocracy, was part of the process leading to the hellenizing movement and to its explosive consequences. The conditions of tenure on the royal domains, part located in Judaea proper, may have contributed to the existing tension. For entirely practical reasons a change in the Jewish attitude to city-life is traceable with the beginning of the Hasmonean expansion, and examination of texts and of the archaeological evidence shows that the amount of urban destruction wrought by the Hasmoneans has been much overestimated. There are also signs that Greek opposition to the Hasmoneans was not utterly monolithic and there are indications of a Hasmonean promotion of smaller urban centres and of military colonization in various areas. Archaeology also furnishes some evidence of the influence of Greek democratic ideas on the Jewish activist movement which developed in the later Hasmonean period and under Roman rule, and perhaps owed something to the Hasmonean military tradition in Galilee. The problems arising from the new crown lands and the reappearance or perpetuation of large estates, however, require further discussion.