

Coele-Syria after the battle. Especially interesting are lines 23ff. of the Demotic text, which relate the resistance encountered by the king in one place in Syria, the waging of the war with these enemies, and the signing of a peace-treaty with them; these lines are not as clear as they might be and have been the source of various translations and interpretations (cf. below, n. 97).

96 See my article "The Third Book of the Maccabees as a Historical Source of the Augustan Period," *Zion*, X, 2ff.

97 In line 23 of the above-mentioned (n. 95) Demotic inscription, Sottas read: "Eléazar et ses partisans," thus providing the grounds for the supposition that those rebelling against the king were Jews. Cf. Abel, *Histoire de la Palestine*, 83. Spiegelberg, however, translates the text differently, and no trace of Eleazar appears in his rendering. Momigliano also concurs with his translation and remarks that Sottas took the name Eleazar from *III Macc.* (6.1). Nevertheless, Momigliano believes that the revolt mentioned in the inscription was a Jewish one, but that these were "minor disorders" (*piccoli disordini*) rather than a real rebellion. However, with the erasure of the name Eleazar, the only link associating the revolt with the Jews is lost, and *III Macc.* is not a reputable historical source which can serve as an authority. To our regret, no single sentence on the rising has survived in the Greek version of the inscription (SB. 7172) and the doubtful Demotic text is the only source at our disposal.

98 See above, ch. 4, on Heliodorus' visit to the Temple. The possibility that the story about Ptolemy in *III Macc.* influenced the author of *II Macc.* to describe Heliodorus' visit in the same language, cannot be considered, as the comparison between the two stories evidences the originality of *II Macc.*; cf. my above-mentioned article, p. 4, n. 16.

99 Cf. Part II.

100 See Bickermann, "L'avènement de Ptolemy V Epiphane," *Chron. d'Egypte*, 15, 1940, 124ff., on the chronological question in connection with the succession of Ptolemy V Epiphanes.

101 In settling the chronological order of events, I have followed E. Täubler, "Jerusalem 201 to 199 B.C.E. On the history of the Messianic Movement," *JQR* 37, 1946, 47, p. 1ff. On the difficult question of the date of the battle of Panion, Täubler decides in favor of the year 200 as against 198; he was anticipated in this dating by Eduard Meyer, *Urspr. d. Christ.*, II, 123, n. 2; cf. B. Niese, *GGMS*, II, 578, n. 6. The most important proof in favor of this date is the fact that Polybius described the battle of Panion in the sixteenth book of his history, and this book ended with an account of the events of the year 200.

102 Josephus (*Ant.* XII, 131) writes: "After Antiochus had defeated Ptolemy, he brought Judaea over to his side"; then he describes the