

Introduction

Sylvie Honigman

The present volume contains the proceedings of an international conference titled “Judea in the Long 3rd Century BCE: The Transition between the Persian and Hellenistic Periods,” which was held at Tel Aviv University from May 31 to June 3, 2014. The conference was part of a series of events, each dedicated to Judea in a specific time framework, and five volumes of proceedings have already been published from the series (Lipschits and Blenkinsopp 2003; Lipschits and Oeming 2006; Lipschits, Knoppers and Albertz 2007; Lipschits, Knoppers and Oeming 2011; Grabbe and Lipschits 2011). The term “long 3rd century” in the title of the conference was used to encompass the period ranging from Alexander’s conquest of the region in 332 BCE, through the time of the Diadochi (324–301 BCE) and the Ptolemaic domination (301–198 BCE), to the early years of the Seleucid domination that followed Antiochus III’s conquest in 198 BCE.¹ The nomenclature was based on the concept of a “long 19th century” ranging from the French Revolution in 1789 to the outbreak of World War I in 1914—a time-frame familiar to experts of modern European history—and this “long 3rd century” was preferred to “early Hellenistic times,” which we felt was

less informative, and to “pre-Maccabean,” which implicitly invites scholars to engage with the 3rd century in the light of what followed. For the published volume, however, we opted for the phrase “early Hellenistic times” for the sake of clarity.

It is not surprising that a conference on this period came late in the aforementioned series of events—it was preceded by a conference on the Maccabean period (Grabbe and Lipschits 2011). Until quite recently, the early Hellenistic period was reputed to be poorly documented in the material evidence and even poorer in textual production. This picture has been gradually revised, as a number of archaeological and literary studies independently began to reveal the late 4th and the 3rd centuries BCE as a period in which decisive processes took place. At the same time, historians of the Hellenistic East have refreshed our understanding of this period in recent years, and in particular have shed new light on the nature of the Hellenistic empires and the relationship between the central power and local entities in ancient imperial settings. The bearings of these works on the specific history of Judea in the early Hellenistic period required renewed investigation.

When we considered in conjunction the respective changes that have affected these three fields of research individually, it became clear that as a time of transition and change this period needed to be appraised afresh and that a conference on the history and culture of Judea in the “long 3rd century” was now overdue.

The Tel Aviv conference aimed to contribute to this reappraisal by bringing together scholars from various disciplines—Hellenistic history, the archaeology of Judea and biblical studies—to confront their views on this period. A central concern was to situate Judea in its broader regional and trans-regional imperial contexts as a means of providing an interpretative framework of its political, social and economic history in the period in question. With this approach in mind, the present volume includes historical studies pertaining to Egypt and neighboring provinces of the Seleucid empire.

The present introduction is divided into three sections. First, it offers an overview of the changes in the various fields of research that have helped cast new light on the history and the material and literary culture of Judea in the period in question and that are tackled in this volume. This overview is followed by a summary of the essays included in the volume. Finally, it outlines some of the conclusions that may be drawn from the contributions to the volume, making suggestions on how the data presented in these studies may be brought to bear upon the political, social and cultural history of Judea and indicating various channels for further investigation.

The State of the Research

Following the publication of Amélie Kuhrt and Susan Sherwin-White’s *From Samarkhand to Sardis* in 1993, the historical study of the early Hellenistic era pivoted on the premise that the stately structures in the Hellenistic East were basically a legacy from the Achaemenid empire (Kuhrt and Sherwin-White 1993). While no one nowadays would deny that the Greco-Macedonian kings were indebted to their predecessors, numerous studies published since the early 2000s focusing on both Ptolemaic Egypt and the Seleucid empire have sought to point out both changes and continuities. All in all, the Hellenistic period has come to be treated as a distinct

phase in the longer history of the ancient Near East (see, in particular, Kosmin 2014). In particular, it has been emphasized that the conception of a universal empire that applied under the Achaemenids and then under Alexander gave way to a fragmented system of peer-kingdoms vying with each other for territory, power and prestige.² One consequence of this new system was ever-present warfare—notably, the five Syrian wars that had the southern Levant as their main theater.³ Also noteworthy is the intense recent research into other differences between the Persian and Hellenistic eras, starting with royal ideology. While earlier studies emphasized the Greco-Macedonian dynasties’ adoption of the local idioms of kingship to buttress their legitimacy, recent studies have brought to light that they also asserted their Greekness (Ma 2003). The scale of population mobility in the eastern Mediterranean in the last third of the 4th century and in the 3rd century was incommensurably greater than in Achaemenid times.⁴ In accordance with the various social and occupational roles that these immigrants acquired in their new locations, the new settlements that accommodated these migrants addressed several functions, from modest military colonies to full-fledged cities of the polis type (Cohen 2006; Mueller 2006).

The new picture of the Hellenistic world emerging in recent years, however, owes some of its most important insights to the new empire studies that have been flourishing since the early 2000s and that seek to advance our understanding of how empires work by comparing historical case-studies either in the narrow timeframe of antiquity or in more global perspectives.⁵ This approach has produced sophisticated models of the structures of empire, imperial ideology and the relations between imperial power and the local power-holders. The new models theorizing this latter topic complexify the dialectical relation between cooperation and resistance, as well as the cultural impact of empire. Particular useful cross-fertilization has come from studies that address how spatial aspects are brought to bear upon local identities, contributing to the rephrasing of old topics such as “Hellenization” and “Romanization.” Further contributions to the question of identity have emerged from linguistic models, which have been used to map situations of bilingualism, multilingualism and code-switching among the population. These new angles of

inquiry into Hellenistic times will certainly be pursued further in the near future, but some of the finds are already reflected in recent volumes of collected essays dealing with the dynamics of elites (Lavan, Payne and Weisweiler 2016; Chrubasik and King 2017; Chrubasik, this volume).

Alongside this new input, various noteworthy revisions have also emerged from the more conventional channels. Among key topics currently being extensively explored is the extent to which members of the native elites were incorporated into the court elites, along with the relations between Greco-Macedonian rulers and temples, on the one hand, and cities, on the other.⁶ Thanks to the wealth of extant documentation, Ptolemaic Egypt remains a privileged area for investigating old questions afresh. For example, recent studies have revealed how the Greco-Macedonian rulers actively sought to rely on both Greek and Hellenized administrators by encouraging the learning of the Greek language and literacy and were responsible for the far-ranging renewal of the Egyptian elite families, including those linked to the Egyptian temples.⁷

Strikingly, a key element in the current revision of the archaeological history of Judea and the southern Levant has highlighted that in Hellenistic times the pattern of rural settlements in Judea and neighboring regions was markedly different from that of Persian times, and that the early Hellenistic period—rather than the Maccabean and Hasmonean period—was when significant changes occurred. In archaeological terms, the sites that may be dated to the period ranging from the early 6th century to the establishment of the Hasmonean state in the mid-2nd century BCE have revealed no layers of destruction. Given that the local material culture in the region evolved very gradually, the absence of destruction layers largely prevents archaeologists from moving from a relative to absolute dating of the native material culture, and hence from dating numerous archaeological layers with any accuracy. Dating therefore relies primarily on imported goods.

In particular, this dearth of secure chronological markers has seriously hampered our understanding of the transition from Persian to early Hellenistic times, because the objective difficulty in dating occupation layers with precision has resulted in numerous publications dating occupation layers somewhat broadly to “Hellenistic times,” and archaeologists largely tend

to assume that no genuine change occurred between late Persian times and the mid-2nd century. This conviction was moreover bolstered by the fact that sites from early Hellenistic times are underrepresented in archaeological surveys.

In recent years, however, this notion of apparently seamless continuity from late Persian to early Hellenistic times up to the Hasmonean period has been dramatically overturned, as the data from archaeological surveys was being supplemented by actual excavations in a significant number of sites that were active during this period—in particular, Ramat Raḥel, Jerusalem, Tel Azekah, Khirbet Qeiyafa and Ramat Beth Shemesh. Likewise, reliable chronological markers have been supplemented by the recent publication of several ceramic assemblages from the sites of Lachish and Khirbet er-Rasm that could be securely dated to precise periods between the 5th and 2nd centuries BCE. Thanks to this growing wave of new finds, it now appears that the change in the pattern of rural settlement previously linked to the formation of the Hasmonean state in fact occurred much earlier, in the Hellenistic period. That said, any precise redating remains elusive.

Notably, the two sites of Khirbet Qeiyafa and Tel Azekah have shed much light on the history of the rural settlement of the region in late Persian and early Hellenistic times, respectively, and have been instrumental in the current reappraisal of the upheavals that occurred in early Hellenistic times. At Khirbet Qeiyafa excavations were conducted between 2007–2013, and at Tel Azekah they are still underway. The two sites are related to one another and appear to have been of strategic importance, thanks to their domination of the fertile Elah Valley and control of a major crossroads at the border between Judea, Philistia and Idumea. The layers of occupation uncovered range from late Persian times to ca. 260 BCE, when the two sites were abandoned, and this particular timespan offers the possibility, for the first time in the archaeological history of Judea, to examine the transition from late Persian, through Macedonian, to Ptolemaic domination. Furthermore, for the first time it was possible to date the seam of transition between two layers and their associated material finds, and the date that emerged roughly coincides with the time of Alexander the Great. This discovery provided the means to distinguish between the

ceramic assemblages of the late Persian and the Macedonian periods, respectively, thus providing archaeologists with a long-awaited chronological marker for dating contemporary layers in other sites as well.

In biblical studies, the significance of the 3rd century has long been downplayed, largely—albeit not exclusively—as a result of the emphasis placed on the Maccabean and Hasmonean periods. The prevailing supposition was that the Maccabean and Hasmonean periods had witnessed a resurgence of literary activity spurred either by resistance to the Seleucid dynasty—in particular to Antiochus IV—and subsequently to the Hasmonean dynasty, or conversely, by royal patronage under the Hasmoneans. More recently, the paradigm has begun to shift, and several studies have argued independently that the early Hellenistic period may have been more important for the formation and transmission of scriptural collections than previously assumed.

This reappraisal hinges on the history of the editions of texts, in particular those of the prophetic books of Jeremiah and Ezekiel. It is now well accepted that the structural differences between LXX Jeremiah and LXX Ezekiel and their MT counterparts cannot simply have resulted from the process of translation, but attest to the Greek translators having used different Hebrew prototypes than the proto-Masoretic texts. A logical inference is that the Greek translators in the 2nd century did not consider the proto-Masoretic recension to be the most authoritative text at their time, and this is corroborated by textual studies that have established that the *Vorlagen* to the LXX texts were earlier than the proto-Masoretic editions. Altogether, a variety of clues suggests that by the 2nd century BCE the proto-Masoretic editions of both Jeremiah and Ezekiel were recent texts dating from early Hellenistic times (for detailed discussion, see Gonzalez, this volume). Moreover, these two examples are far from isolated: in recent years the once-prevailing view that the prophetic books were completed in Persian times has been questioned, and some scholars have come to consider a significant part of the prophetic traditions to have been composed in early Hellenistic times. The same applies to sapiential traditions. In particular, a majority of scholars nowadays are inclined to date the Book of Qoheleth to the 3rd century. Other studies have reaffirmed a 3rd-century dating for the translation of the

Pentateuch (and presumably other books as well) into Greek. Finally, some scholars date Chronicles to the late 4th, early or mid-3rd century BCE, and others situate the final composition of MT Ezra-Nehemiah and 1 Esdras in pre-Maccabean Hellenistic times—but the dates of these texts remain the subject of debate.

Conversely, several parabiblical traditions that were held to originate in Maccabean times, in particular the Enoch and Levi traditions, have been redated to the 3rd or—for some texts—the late 4th century BCE. Until the mid-1970s the MT Book of Daniel was held to be the earliest Judean apocalypse. Given that this work refers to Antiochus IV's so-called religious persecution, which occurred in the 160s BCE, and that its composition is held to be contemporary with these events, scholars inferred that there was a causal link between the two, that is, that the apocalyptic genre was primarily resistance literature, which emerged in the context of the Maccabean revolt. The publication by J.T. Milik of Aramaic fragments of the Book of Watchers and the Book of Luminaries that were found among the Dead Sea Scrolls (the Qumran library) and were paleographically dateable to the early 2nd century (that is, prior to the revolt) disproved this causal link (Milik 1976). Based on the Qumran evidence, it appears that the Book of Watchers (1 Enoch 1–36) should be dated to the 3rd century at the latest and that Section 6–16 may even hark back to the time of the Diadochi in the late 4th century BCE. It has been further established that the longer section in the Book of Luminaries (1 Enoch 72–79), purporting to be a heavenly vision revealed to Enoch and explaining the courses of the stars and their meaning, originates in the 5th century BCE, whereas the series of predictions on the end of time and the fates of the righteous and the wicked is deemed to be a 3rd-century addition (80–81). The Apocalypse of Weeks (1 Enoch 93:1–10 and 91:11–17), an historical apocalypse, is usually dated to the early 2nd century, that is, before the Maccabean revolt.

These developments suggest that a reassessment of the evidence may provide substantial clues regarding basic issues such as the emergence of new cultural trends in that period, the perception by the local population of continuities and discontinuities between Achaemenid and Hellenistic rulers, and the relation

between homeland(s) and diaspora (center and periphery) and its impact on local communities.

Summary of Essays

The Chronological Frame, Politics and Identity

Four essays clarify the time-frame covered by the present volume and discuss the documentary evidence. Lester L. Grabbe's survey of the extant sources for the history of Judea from Alexander the Great to ca. 200 BCE resolutely strikes an optimistic note, while recognizing the critical gaps in our current knowledge. For early Hellenistic times, he argues, research into Judea is still lacking, as both the well-known and the potential sources are as yet under-exploited. The settlement and demographic patterns in Syro-Palestine and Transjordan detailed by the archaeological evidence suggest remarkable continuity between late Persian and early Hellenistic times, and this is true also of their defensive function, of certain economic aspects—as shown by coinage and by stamp impressions on vessel handles—and of cultural features, such as Hellenization, which remained minimal until the 2nd century BCE. For now, a proper overview of the archaeological evidence of this period remains a desideratum. Moreover, our understanding of the period has long been hampered not only by objective difficulties in distinguishing between late Persian and early Hellenistic pottery, but also because in the heyday of “biblical archaeology,” the sites and layers dating from the pre-Maccabean Hellenistic period were largely neglected. Likewise, although literary sources only became abundant in the last two decades of Ptolemaic rule, in connection with the Fourth and Fifth Syrian Wars of 217 and 201–198 BCE respectively, earlier textual sources—both literary and documentary—provide precious data about the imperial administration and social organization of the region.

Catharine C. Lorber revises the chronology of the Fifth Syrian War (201–198 BCE), which ended with Antiochus III eventually conquering the province of Syria and Phoenicia from Ptolemy V. The currently accepted chronology, established by Maurice Holleaux in 1908, was largely based on literary sources, which, however,

do not provide a continuous narrative of the war; consequently, both the relative dating and the absolute chronology of the war's main stages remain disputed. In order to compensate for the lacunae in literary evidence, Lorber draws upon coinage and upon epigraphic and papyrological documents to cast light on a variety of events that occurred in the Seleucid and Ptolemaic realms during these years. Notably, she has adduced evidence from these data relating to military operations that were led elsewhere in this period by either Ptolemaic or Seleucid actors, the timing of which necessarily interfered with the various phases of the Fifth Syrian War, as did the diplomatic activity of the Roman Senate. On the basis of these data, Lorber offers a revised chronology of Antiochus III's successive two invasions (and of Scopas' successful repulsion of the first) and identifies the routes taken by Antiochus III in these invasions. Moreover, she establishes that the decisive battle of Panium took place in 198 BCE and was followed by the rapid conquest of the entire province of Syria and Phoenicia in the summer of that year.

Stefan Pfeiffer examines afresh the Greek dedication of a statue of Ptolemy IV inscribed on a small plate (*CIIP* 3.2172) and discusses its broader political and ideological contexts. The inscription was discovered in Joppe, one of the central naval bases of Ptolemaic dominion over their province *Syria kai Phoinicia*. The importance of the city is evident in the fact that it had its own mint and seems to have achieved the status of a Greek polis. The inscription is of great importance not only because it was the first to have been discovered in the Land of Israel in the 19th century, but also, as shown by Pfeiffer, because of its ideological content. Several problems arise from this text, such as the unusual mention of Ptolemy Philadelphus, Ptolemy IV's grandfather. More importantly, several aspects shed light on the core of royal representation and the perception of the king's victories in the Ptolemaic empire. The inscription generates various questions, such as why a priest of the royal cult in Joppe bears the typical Greek name Anaxikles, what information we may gather on royal (re)presentation after the king's victory at the battle of Raphia, and why Ptolemy is called “Great King,” a title not very common in Hellenistic royal ideology.

David S. Vanderhooft investigates how monumental and cursive scripts in use across Judea and neighboring regions evolved during the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods and in what sense their evolution was related to the politics of identity. This question first arose in the 1960s, when F.M. Cross identified three distinct script groups, which he dubbed paleo-Hebrew, Aramaic cursive and “Jewish,” respectively. Cross further delineated three chronological phases in the evolution of what he called the “Jewish book hand.” As new evidence appeared, paleographers largely retained Cross’ chronological and notional framework. Jan Dušek, in his revised study of the Semitic inscriptions from Mount Gerizim, was the first to question this system. Following a historiographical discussion of the discipline of paleography since Cross’ attempt to clarify the issues under discussion, Vanderhooft proposes a revised framework of interpretation on the basis of an extensive corpus of epigraphical data. According to Vanderhooft, the introduction and subsequent uses of the monumental Aramaic script in Judah had no ethnic connotation. This is in contrast to the paleo-Hebrew script, the ethnic undertones of which are strongly suggested by its extensive textual use in Torah manuscripts among the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Gerizim stone inscriptions, and, not least, in the Samaritan Pentateuch.

The History of Rural Settlement in Judea

Four essays deal with the archaeological history of Judea and neighboring regions. In a joint essay, Nitsan Shalom, Oded Lipschits, Noa Shatil and Yuval Gadot offer a comprehensive survey of the archaeological history of Judea and neighboring regions (including Idumea) from the late 6th to the mid-2nd century BCE. They trace processes of continuity and change in the pattern of rural settlement in these regions in relation to two transitional phases: from the Iron Age to the Persian period and from Persian to Hellenistic times. To study the latter transition, they exploit new finds from recent excavations, and the presentation of the evidence provides an opportunity to discuss methodological issues in the reconstruction of settlement patterns. Based on their detailed surveys of the two transitional phases, the authors emphasize the contrast between the overall continuity in the pattern of

rural settlement in Judea evident in the transition from the late Iron Age to the Persian period, on the one hand, and the drastic changes in the size and pattern of rural settlement following the transition from Persian to Hellenistic times, on the other. Some of the changes previously believed to have occurred only in the Hasmonean period must be redated to the early Hellenistic era, and major changes affected Idumea as well. The authors underscore two pivotal details: the importance of the administrative complex in Ramat Rahel declined in the 3rd century, whereas Jerusalem started to grow significantly only under Hasmonean rule.

Three essays present the finds from Khirbet Qeiyafa and Tel Azekah and explore their broader bearings upon the history of rural settlement in the region. Yosef Garfinkel presents the data for the late Persian/early Hellenistic stratum uncovered at Khirbet Qeiyafa in 2007–2013. Material remains from these periods were found in each of the excavation areas, directly above the Iron Age stratum. The later constructions extensively reused the Iron Age building material, especially for the massive casemate city wall and the gates. The site yielded a rich assemblage of coins, and their distribution throughout the various excavation areas has made it possible to differentiate between pottery of the late Persian period (4th century BCE) and that of the early Hellenistic period (3rd century BCE).

Yoav Farhi’s detailed analysis of the numismatic finds from the two sites shows that these finds are unique in quantity and variety, in comparison to coins from other sites in Judea and the region as a whole. It is still uncertain, however, whether this unique profile is indicative of the intrinsic nature of the sites or whether it should be attributed to the introduction of metal detectors on the excavation site. The coins, in conjunction with other small finds, suggest that the two sites were abandoned ca. 260 BCE, and the numismatic evidence sheds further light on the various types of coins circulating in the region of Judea during the Persian–Hellenistic transitional period. Further studies will help us reconstruct the local and regional circulation patterns of this coinage. Based on an array of data—the strategic location of the sites, their abandonment in the 260s BCE, and possibly the unique quantity and variety of the coins—Farhi’s analysis raises the possibility that the sites in question

formed a Ptolemaic cleruchy—an agricultural site occupied by Ptolemaic reservists.

Igor Kreimerman and Débora Sandhaus explain how the new ceramic finds from Khirbet Qeiyafa open up new avenues to rewrite the history of the transition between the late Persian and early Hellenistic periods in the region. The material retrieved from Stratum III at Khirbet Qeiyafa has made it possible for the first time to distinguish between two phases of occupation and their respective associated pottery, as the chronological seam between the two roughly corresponds to the days of Alexander the Great. Thanks to this new chronological marker, Kreimerman and Sandhaus offer revisions in the dating of several sites in the hill country of Judah and Samaria, as well as in the Shephelah. As shown by the authors, this micro-data analysis is crucial to substantiate the currently accepted views on the history of the transition, which are based upon surveys and preliminary excavation reports only. Thanks to their redating of the findings, Kreimerman and Sandhaus refute the current picture of a smooth transition, in which there was a surge in the number of settlements in the Hellenistic period, compared to the Persian period. They show that on the contrary, the various sites throughout the hill country and the Shephelah followed separate trajectories during the transition. In particular, the evidence shows that several sites with an administrative function suffered violent destruction.

The Workings of Empires in Local and Comparative Perspectives

Six essays engage with the working of empires through various thematic emphases, placing Ptolemaic Judea into a comparative perspective, both chronological and spatial.⁸ Gil Gambash examines afresh the history of Akko's artificial harbor. According to the accepted view, the harbor's construction is closely connected to the military operations led by the Persians in Egypt. Through a review of the material and literary sources relating both to the history of Phoenicia in Persian times and to the technical aspects of maritime activity in the Mediterranean in ancient times, Gambash dismisses the possibility that the artificial harbor was built in Persian times and that its primary function was military. Akko was destroyed

in 312 and refounded as Ptolemaïs by Ptolemy II Philadelphus, and Gambash proposes that the city's harbor was built after this time and that the primary motivation for its construction was commercial, not military. To support this theory, Gambash broadens the debate to address in a critical way the prevalent notion that ancient Mediterranean empires acted according to a grand strategy scheme—that is, they were able to devise and implement constant and intelligent reassessment of the polity's ends and means.

Andrea M. Berlin and Sharon C. Herbert reconstruct the history of a complex of interrelated sites in Upper Galilee and the Hula Valley and through it, trace the sweeping changes in the imperial way of government brought by the transition from Achaemenid to Ptolemaic dominion. Around 500 BCE a large building compound was erected at Tel Kedesh, at a time when the region formed the edge of the Tyrian agricultural hinterland. The compound was built under the auspices of the Tyrian royal house and was used to collect agricultural goods from the inland valleys until Alexander's conquest. At no point is there any material evidence that Persian imperial officials were present either at Tyre or in the compound. Following Ptolemy I's conquest of the region in 301 BCE, the Hula Valley was transformed into royal land. The palatial compound of Kedesh was thoroughly remodeled into an administrative center for the direct collection of agricultural commodities and was peopled with Ptolemaic officials. Several small agricultural settlements were established in the Hula Valley, a Greek sanctuary replaced the Tyrian one, and a new species of bread wheat was introduced. Through their study of the material evidence, Berlin and Herbert trace the impact of empire on the daily life of inhabitants in a certain territory. Their study also makes the distinctions between the imperial cultures of the Achaemenids and the Ptolemaic dynasty very palpable.

Boris Chrubasik proposes an innovative model for understanding the workings of the Seleucid empire, in which the central power and local elites were interdependent. He compares the relations between the Seleucid kings and two local dynasts—the Teucid priestly dynasty from Olba, Asia Minor, and Jonathan Maccabee. Both case studies illustrate that this privileged relationship between local dynasts and Seleucid kings

was underscored—not concealed—in inscriptions and writings at the time. This explicitness, Chrubasik argues, resulted from the necessity of this relationship to both parties. On the one hand, the king needed independent dynasts who were strong enough to administer their region, sparing him the need to deploy officials of his own. Dynasts were free to mint coinage in their own names and to found cities and, on occasion, could forget their allegiance to the king, while at the same time, they fulfilled local functions on behalf of the king and were an integral part of the Seleucid empire. On the other hand, the king ensured that royal support was indispensable to the dynasts by exploiting local tensions between competing power-holders—sanctuaries vs. cities in Asia Minor, Simon and John Hyrcanus vs. Ptolemy son of Abubus, and Zenon Cotylas in Judea and Transjordan. Chrubasik’s model allows him to refute the once-popular view that the multiplication of local dynasts and local coinages in the second half of the 2nd century BCE was evidence of the weakening of the Seleucid empire.

Damien Agut-Labordère and Gilles Gorre offer two correlated diachronic surveys of the relations between royal power and Egyptian temples in Egypt, from the last (Thirtieth) native dynasty to Ptolemy II Philadelphus. Agut-Labordère sets out to refute the two-fold claim promoted by the ancient historians of Alexander, according to which the second Persian domination (342–336 BCE) was a time of oppression for the Egyptian temples, whereas Alexander displayed piety towards the Egyptian gods. Taking as his cue two prominent markers of the royal policy toward the Egyptian temples—the royal subsidizing of building works in the temples and the burials of the sacred bulls in Memphis and Armant—he shows that different Persian kings conducted very different policies and that Alexander the Great’s generosity was a short-lived episode. Whereas Alexander’s early successors subsidized the cult of the sacred animals to secure the support of the Egyptian population at large, they neglected the temples out of financial and political calculation. At the same time, the dramatic cuts in the royal subsidies to the temples, which aimed to fill the royal coffers at the expense of the temples, was a long-term tendency. It was initiated shortly after Cambyses’ conquest in 526 BCE and was steadily continued by the pharaohs of the period of

independence in the 4th century BCE and by the Macedonians up to Ptolemy II Philadelphus.

Gilles Gorre traces the sweeping changes that affected the Egyptian temples in Ptolemaic times, starting in the reign of Ptolemy II (284–246 BCE), and that resulted in the temples being dispossessed of their key function of administering the country to the benefit of the royal administration. The royal administration installed itself within the temple precincts (*temenē*), and was to a large extent manned with former temple scribes who had restyled themselves as royal scribes. Three correlated kinds of changes occurred in this process. First, the administrative offices within the temple *temenē* that had traditionally managed the temples’ internal administration and their land estates were now converted into offices of the royal administration. Second, new buildings were constructed in the *temenē* in order to meet the needs of the royal administration. Third, new royal officials were installed in the *temenē* alongside the former temple scribes and came to form new local elites, either along with or instead of the local priests. In several documented cases, as shown by the archaeological evidence, these changes entailed major adjustments in the spatial organization of the *temenē* and hence, in all likelihood, modifications to the daily religious workings of the temple. As evidence of these evolutions, Gorre offers a detailed analysis of the changes that transformed the spatial organization of the *temenos* of the god Thot in Hermopolis, Middle Egypt, in the second half of the 3rd century BCE.

Sylvie Honigman offers a diachronic survey of the history of the temple and the powers of the high priests from Persian times through the early Seleucid era. Throughout, she underscores the relationship between the temple and royal administrations, with a view to contributing to the debate on the social location of literary genres in Hellenistic times. Her point of departure is the supposition that some works or literary genres were produced by scribes linked to the temple, whereas others were composed by scribes employed in the royal bureaus. While it is plausible that certain works were produced for specific social uses—and hence potentially for specific institutional sites—it does not automatically follow that the literate circles linked to the different institutions—in particular, the temple and the royal

administration—were not only separate, but had distinct cultural trainings—for instance, that one circle was Hellenized, whereas another was not. For Honigman, the premises of the debate require reformulation. On the one hand, all scribes followed the same educational curriculum, facilitating the circulation of personnel between the temple and the royal bureaus. On the other hand, their effective circulation depended upon the relationship between the imperial authorities and the high priest, a relationship that fluctuated considerably over time, and changes from Persian rule through the Ptolemaic to the Seleucid dominations were anything but linear.

The Pentateuch: Early Greek Translations and Receptions

Four essays deal with the early receptions and translations of the Pentateuch in Greek. Timothy H. Lim questions two particular statements made in the Letter of Aristeas, namely, that Ptolemy II Philadelphus commissioned the translation and that he bore its costs. To this end Lim surveys what we know of the royal library and the Museum associated with it, as well as the debated issue of whether the cases of extant translations from native languages to Aramaic and Greek may serve as parallels to the translating of the Pentateuch. Finally, he points to key divergences between the accounts about the origins of the Septuagint displayed in the Letter of Aristeas and in Philo's biography of Moses (2.25–44), respectively. Crucially, Philo's account mentions neither the library nor Demetrius the librarian, and he implicitly points to the Jews as the initiators of the translation. Lim concludes that the motive for the translation being made at the request of the library that is given in the Letter of Aristeas was not integral to the tradition, but was an addition by the author, aiming to lend greater prestige to the Greek Pentateuch.

Benjamin G. Wright examines afresh the historical conditions in which the Greek translations of the Pentateuch books were produced. He proposes to define the Septuagint (i.e., the Pentateuch) as a Greek text. As a consequence, the vertical dimension of the text—that is, the relationship of the (Hebrew) source text to the target (Greek) text—must be taken into consideration

when we assess its horizontal dimension—or in other words, we need to cross-reference the quality of its linguistic features against texts originally composed in Greek. Wright follows in the footsteps of past scholars who have sought to retrieve details regarding the conditions of the production of the translations by closely examining this horizontal dimension. While he endorses their conclusion that the Septuagint vocabulary mixes administrative nomenclature with stylistic and rhetorical flourishes, he questions his predecessors' inference that the translators were scribes within the Ptolemaic administration. Because of the constraints placed on the translators by the vertical dimension of the translation, the relationship between the Greek of the LXX and the educational levels and social backgrounds of the translators is by no means straightforward, not least because the translators may have had far greater literary skills than their translations reveal. Likewise, the exact *Sitz im Leben* of the Septuagint at its point of production remains uncertain, because a specifically “functional” translation could meet a variety of purposes, including liturgical and educational uses.

Martin Rösel examines how the various translators of the Pentateuch books into Greek took advantage of their translations to adapt the Torah to the cultural needs of the Jewish communities of Alexandria and Egypt in the 3rd century BCE. To this end, he focuses on the numerous passages for which it can be ascertained that the translators knowingly departed from the Hebrew *Vorlage* they used. These passages show how the translators acclimated terms and concepts borrowed from Platonic philosophy, modernized the Torah's understanding of man in line with the Greek notion of a mind-body dichotomy, updated geographical knowledge, and synchronized biblical genealogies and chronologies using data from the Greek historiographic and mythographic traditions. Various adaptations to their cultural, Greek and pagan environment can also be discerned, and meanwhile they introduced various religious innovations. That said, the translators aimed to preserve the Torah, not to rewrite it or comment on it, in contrast to the Hellenistic-Jewish literature, the Dead Sea Scrolls and the *targumim*. Lastly, the strong presumption that the five books were translated in the canonical order—starting with the Book of Genesis—calls into question the view that the translation of the

Torah was primarily motivated by the need to have a Greek version of the Jewish law and suggests instead that the Jews in Egypt needed a narrative that would explain their presence there.

Reinhard G. Kratz investigates the various ethnographic accounts on Jews and Jewish customs that appear in the works of pagan historians writing in Greek. He dwells in depth on passages found in Berossus, Manetho and Hecataeus of Abdera, with a view to assessing their authenticity. Because of their early date—the late 4th and the early 3rd centuries BCE—these references are potentially of crucial importance for the history of the Pentateuch. If genuine, they would provide a *terminus ad quem* for the date of completion of the Pentateuch. Moreover, they would offer evidence for its early reception among Jews, as well as the existence and circulation among pagan circles of a Greek translation that antedated the Septuagint. However, these quotations only crop up in excerpts preserved in the later authors—from Diodorus Siculus in the 1st century BCE, through Josephus and Julius Africanus, to Eusebius, Photius and Syncellus in the 9th century CE. Kratz applies methods of source criticism borrowed from Pentateuch and biblical criticism to examine the complex process of their textual transmission. Although no definite conclusion can be drawn, he argues that in every passage alluding to biblical history, it is either certain—or, at the very least, possible—that such references were added during the process of transmission. Consequently, Kratz argues, these pagan authors do not offer any reliable external evidence about the history of the Pentateuch.

Biblical Texts in the 3rd Century BCE

In the final section, four essays deal with the composition of biblical texts in the 3rd century BCE. As phrased by Konrad Schmid, identifying a text from the Ptolemaic period in the Hebrew Bible is not particularly difficult for those who answer in the affirmative to Niels Peter Lemche's question: "The Old Testament—A Hellenistic Book?" Whereas Lemche's stance is perhaps less radical than generally perceived, we may in turn admit that the Hebrew Bible is, in some sense, a Hellenistic book, given that its formation continued into the 3rd and even 2nd centuries BCE. Schmid distinguishes three categories of

texts in the Hebrew Bible that tentatively date from the Ptolemaic period, providing examples for each category. The first category is Hebrew texts that are missing from the earliest Greek translations (especially in Jeremiah—e.g., Jer 33:14–26). The second is of texts alluding to Alexander the Great or transferring tales about Alexander to biblical heroes. Examples for this approach include Zechariah 9:9–10 and 2 Samuel 23:13–17. The third category consists of texts that presuppose the fall of the Persian empire and interpret it as a cosmic judgment (e.g., Isa 34:2–4 and Jer 45:4–5). A final section of the paper briefly discusses other texts from the Hebrew Bible the dates of which are disputed, but which—at least in part—probably originated in the 3rd century: Qoheleth, as well as parts of Daniel, Chronicles and Proverbs.

Hervé Gonzalez contends that certain textual units in the corpus of late prophets date from the Hellenistic period. By his reasoning, the general view that the prophetic corpus had been completed in Persian times assumes a clear-cut distinction of time-frame between the composition of the books and their subsequent transmission, and Gonzalez propounds various methodological, philological and historical arguments to challenge this assumption. In particular, the ancient manuscript witnesses (i.e., the Dead Sea Scrolls and the Old Greek and Old Latin translations) show that the textual traditions associated with the prophetic figures remained fluid until late into the Hellenistic era, if not up to the very end of the Second Temple period. Gonzalez therefore claims that we cannot rule out the possibility that certain textual units were in fact composed in the late 4th or the 3rd centuries BCE. Admittedly, the prophetic books contain few, if any, explicit allusions to the Hellenistic period, but this may result from the compositional technique whereby prophetic books were revised and expanded in early Hellenistic times.

As changes were introduced in a certain prophetic text, the new sections were composed using terms and motifs borrowed from other sections in the same text, from other prophetic texts, or from other corpora, primarily the Pentateuch and Psalms. This system of composition points to the desire of the late scribes to assert continuity between the new sections and their textual context, thus maintaining the apparent antiquity of the prophetic traditions. Claims that prophets ceased to exist after Persian times, such as

in Zechariah 13:2–6 and Malachi 3:22–24, arguably fulfilled a similar function.

This conservative attitude of the late scribes hampers attempts to apply linguistic criteria as a means of dating the prophetic texts. That is to say, the linguistic differences between the Hebrew of the late prophetic texts—which is generally close to Classical Biblical Hebrew—and the Late Biblical Hebrew attested in the books from Esther to Chronicles should primarily be viewed as indicating distinct literary genres and not as a diachronic evolution. Thus, whereas the books from Esther to Chronicles explicitly refer to Persian times, prophetic traditions insist upon their pre-exilic origin. Post-exilic prophets do refer to Persian times, but they also present themselves—sometimes explicitly—as continuing the prophecy of monarchic times. The low number of features of Late Biblical Hebrew in prophetic books arguably serves this claim. As Gonzalez further argues, conservative writing is in fact a salient aspect of literary activity in Hellenistic times, not only in Judea but across the ancient Near East, and was part of a broader trend of preserving, emphasizing and reinterpreting ancient traditions that was spurred by the heightened cultural confrontation entailed by the Hellenistic domination.

Whereas the conservative attitude of the scribes who revised the prophetic books in early Hellenistic times explains why the texts do not openly allude to events or characters of their times, the question remains whether subtler allusions to the Hellenistic era can be pinpointed in passages revised or composed in this period. As Gonzalez shows through his discussion of selected examples, the identification of such allusions raises methodological issues. Notably, although it is stimulating as an approach, the suggestion that certain theological ideas can be more particularly associated with Hellenistic times cannot provide us with a definite criterion. Given the methodological complexity involved, the safest way to identify prophetic passages most likely dating from the Hellenistic period remains the meticulous analysis of the texts in question, especially where various kinds of evidence can reasonably be combined into a cumulative argument.

This proposed approach is illustrated through the example of Zechariah 9–14. His detailed reading highlights how the text avails itself of previous traditions,

adjusting them accordingly, and by combining this with various historical observations Gonzalez not only shows that the early Hellenistic period is the most likely context of this section, but also that it is best understood as alluding to the troubled times associated with the end of the Persian domination and the military conflict against the Greeks, which is presented as threatening Jerusalem itself (Zech 9). Indeed, the identification of an allusion to Alexander’s conquest at the very beginning of the section (Zech 9:1–8)—as several scholars have suggested—not only explains several details of the text, but also supports its central thesis, namely, that the era of Persian domination would be followed by a more troubled period dominated by another great power, the Greeks, until YHWH drastically intervenes to restore Jerusalem. By this token, Zechariah 9–14 is a good example of how prophetic literature was adapted and expanded in early Hellenistic times in order to uphold its function as a divine revelation about Israel’s future. This conclusion suggests that other prophetic texts announcing critical times before the restoration of Israel could also date from early Hellenistic times, and it calls for further investigations into the way Judean elites adapted their traditions at a time of socio-political and cultural changes.

Sylvie Honigman discusses the social setting and nature of early Judean apocalyptic literature. The assumption that apocalypticism is a form of “resistance” literature generated in response to foreign oppression first emerged at a time when the Book of Daniel was believed to be the earliest case of this Judean apocalyptic genre. When later it emerged that certain apocalypses included in 1 Enoch were composed in the 3rd century, decades prior to Antiochus IV’s alleged religious persecution, various commentators upheld this definition. Elsewhere, however, there were others who redefined the apocalyptic genre as an innovative hermeneutic aimed at interpreting the Pentateuch and the prophetic corpora compiled in Persian times. Inevitably, this ongoing debate impinges on our understanding of the political, social and religious history of Judea in early Hellenistic times. In particular, the proponents of the “resistance” paradigm assume that these apocalyptic texts were composed by priests critical of the temple’s Hellenized priestly establishment and of the oppressive foreign rule, to the

extent that they rejected the temple institution and cult. Conversely, the view that revelatory literature was a matter of hermeneutics makes these speculations redundant. Honigman surveys the premises of these two diverging schools of interpretation and, in particular, questions the “resistance” paradigm. She also examines how different methodological premises can lead to widely divergent understandings of individual apocalyptic texts through the case study of 1 Enoch 6–16.

Manfred Oeming surveys the corpus of literary texts dated to pre-Maccabean times, which tell of covert plots to annihilate the Jews. These include the slaughter of the newborns, as recounted in various texts, such as Exodus 1, Manetho’s excerpts in Josephus’ *Contra Apionem*, the Book of Tobit, the Book of Psalms, the Books of Judith, Daniel and Esther, 3 Maccabees, and 1, 2 and 4 Maccabees. Oeming draws from a mixture of archaeological, numismatic and epigraphical material to refute the claim that the accounts of the mass massacres of Jews had any historical basis. He concludes that the only episodes in which anti-Judaism was tenably manifest were the destruction of YHWH temples in Jerusalem and elsewhere. If this is the case, the historical reasons underlying the frequent assertion among ancient Jewish sources of the mass slaughter of Jews remain to be ascertained. After surveying the main modern theories on this issue, Oeming addresses the question afresh, concluding that this literary motif is largely a reflection of the sense of insecurity experienced by Jews in early Hellenistic times, an anxiety that resulted from complex factors. For Oeming the key to this vision of annihilation is the sense of impending doom and the fear that the self-divinization of the Hellenistic kings under whose rule they lived would lead to calamity for the Jews because of the central commandment for them to venerate YHWH alone.

Insights and Proposals for Further Investigation

As demonstrated by the above summaries, the strength of the present volume lies in its multidisciplinary dialogue. This approach allows new interpretive paradigms to emerge and helps advance answers to basic

questions such as why these cultural changes occurred in this period, what social conditions (such as the possible emergence of new elites) allowed such changes at the local level, and what structural conditions (such as the culture of empire, warfare and economic trends) may have played as background factors on the regional and interregional levels. At the same time, the choice of a multidisciplinary approach also poses certain constraints on the endeavor, meaning that the answers provided in the present volume can only be preliminary and partial and much research remains to be done. In an effort to suggest paths for further inquiry, the rest of this introduction offers various insights emerging from the scrutiny of the new data presented in this volume.

Several essays in the volume tackle the related issues of continuity and change and of periodization. Interestingly, the various essays that engage with the transition between the Persian and Hellenistic eras advance contrasting views, and hence invite us to apprehend this issue in a nuanced way. Agut-Labordère argues that different kings within a single dynasty—whether Persians or Macedonians in Egypt—could implement very different policies toward the Egyptian temples, while at the same time the transition from one dynasty to the next in Egypt was relatively smooth. Berlin and Herbert show that the transition from Achaemenid to Ptolemaic domination in the Hula Valley brought dramatic changes both in the administrative practices and the daily lives of the local inhabitants. Kreimerman and Sandhaus argue that different settlements in the hill country of Judea and Samaria and in the Shephelah suffered contrasting fates. As archaeology provides new chronological markers to distinguish between layers of occupation dating from late Persian and early Hellenistic times, respectively, we may expect that further studies will contribute to write afresh the history of the transition between the Persian and Hellenistic eras in Judea.

At the same time, the present volume is not concerned only with this transition. As noted above, biblical scholars and archaeologists of Judea tend to divide the Hellenistic period between the so-called “early Hellenistic” or “pre-Maccabean” period and “Maccabean times.” As we essay to rehabilitate and reassess the period from Alexander’s conquest to the Maccabean revolt, we should also aim to achieve a higher resolution. Historians of

Egypt are able to distinguish between the time of the Diadochi (or, to use their nomenclature, the Greco-Macedonian period) and that of the Ptolemaic dynasty, starting from Ptolemy II. The history of the administrative complex in Tel Kedesh studied by Berlin and Herbert might point to a similar distinction in the Galilee, as might Honigman's survey of the history of the Jerusalem high priest's powers. Similarly, our apprehension of the similarities and differences between the Ptolemaic and Seleucid ways of ruling is in need of further refinement. On the one hand, the material evidence from Tel Kedesh and Ramat Rahel—to name two prominent administrative sites—is compelling, and the evidence of the Zenon papyri mentioned by Grabbe and the history of the high priest traced by Honigman seem to give further ballast to the notion that the two periods were markedly different. On the other hand, the relevance of Chrubasik's model to an understanding of internecine tensions between elite families in Ptolemaic Judea that is discussed below may suggest otherwise.

At the same time, the redating of several biblical texts to the 3rd century BCE—one of the major threads explored in the present volume—challenges the traditional periodization of Judean history in a bidirectional way. If only because of the sheer amount of evidence he gathers, Gonzalez makes a compelling case that prophecy did not end in Persian times, but that the prophetic corpus continued to expand well into Hellenistic times. Conversely, it is currently well established that some of the most conspicuous cultural trends shaping Judea in Maccabean and Hasmonean times in fact crystallized in the “long 3rd century.”

The present volume casts considerable new light on the historical setting in which the literary production of the late 4th and the 3rd centuries BCE took place. Much, however, still remains to be done, and, as shown by the contradictions between the various essays included in this volume, the answers are by no means simple. As a point of departure, we may phrase a few questions that should perhaps be borne in mind in investigations to come. For example, to what extent were the new trends a response to the so-called “Hellenization” at large or prompted—either in an antagonistic mood or, conversely, as a way of emulation—by the ruling culture of the imperial power controlling the region at the time? For

instance, as Gorre, Honigman and Gonzalez argue in separate contributions in this volume, the Ptolemies as a rule aimed to reduce the social and economic power of native temples, and we can easily imagine that such a policy elicited hostile feelings within the circles of the temple personnel and learned scribes. It remains to be seen whether (and if so, how) these tense relations reverberated in the textual production.

Alternatively, it may be time to consider the period under discussion here in light of what preceded it, and not only what followed it: less as “pre-Maccabean” and more as “post-Persian.” In this regard, it is noteworthy that some scholars in recent years have suggested that the fall of the Persian empire was a major trigger for intellectual questioning in learned scribal circles across the ancient Near East (Silverman 2012: 26; Waerzeggers 2015).

Agut-Labordère's and Gorre's surveys of the relations between kings and temples in Egypt from the last native dynasties to the Ptolemies offer comparative material for a consideration of the relations between kings and temples in Judea (and Samaria). Even though there were differences of substance between the temples' structures in each region, on the one hand, and the status of the king in the respective religious systems of Egypt, Judea and Samaria, on the other, the imperial power that dominated the two regions was the same, and consequently, a common ruling culture underpinned the decisions taken in both. In the perspective of a comparison with Judea, the complex chronology of the changes traced both by Agut-Labordère and by Gorre is certainly of interest. Moreover, Agut-Labordère's discussion of the (all but linear) economic policy of kings—especially from the Persian dynasty—toward the Egyptian temples will be of interest to scholars studying the Persian decrees inserted in MT Ezra and LXX 1 Esdras. Relevant to the history of Judea in Hellenistic times is Gorre's description of how Ptolemy II's establishment of a dense network of royal offices throughout Egypt impinged upon the relationship between the royal administration and those of the temples. First, the offices of the royal administration were located within the temple precincts, a move made possible by the status of pharaohs in Egypt as heads of the Egyptian religious system (and the Ptolemies were pharaohs). Second, while the development of the royal administration required the hiring of new personnel, it

did not result either in Greeks systematically replacing Egyptians or in Egyptian lay families replacing temple families. New elites indeed emerged—but to a large extent they were composed of Egyptian temple families of lower rank, who replaced the formerly powerful temple families. In this matter, Gorre’s comparison between Petosiris’ and Padykam’s social and career profiles in Hermopolis is particularly inspiring. While it would be bad historical method to simply transpose to Judea the evidence we have for Egypt, Gorre’s discussion may open up new avenues for interpreting the sketchy evidence pertaining to Judea.

In his model capturing the workings of the Seleucid empire, Chrubasik not only defines the imperial power and local power-holders as being interdependent, but also outlines the tensions between local power-brokers as an inherent part of the system. Chrubasik’s model also has potential significant impact on our understanding of social tensions in Judea in the 3rd century BCE. First, it may cast light on the tensions between elite families attested in Judea under Ptolemaic domination, primarily those between the Oniads and the Tobiads narrated in Josephus’ *Romance of Joseph the Tobiad* and the local strongmen disclosed by the *Zenon papyri*. This suggests a case in which the imperial setting *per se*—not the identity of the dynasties in power—becomes a decisive factor, indicating that we cannot posit that the Ptolemies and the Seleucids were systematically different.

Chrubasik’s model has yet another potential bearing on our study of social tensions in Judea in the 3rd century BCE. Drawing from post-colonial studies, several scholars have revived the paradigm of “resistance to empire” to explain the emergence of apocalyptic literature in this period, and they largely suggest an equation in this literature between attacks against the

priests dominating the temple and attacks against empire. Chrubasik’s model invites us to reconsider this correlation. For instance, attacks against priests emanating from other priestly circles may be read as symbolic weapons in a competition for power, but according to Chrubasik’s model, local power would imply making an alliance with empire.

Alternatively, a far more radical shift of paradigm may come from combining both the social and the literary considerations. The historiography of the encounter between the Greco-Macedonian conquerors and the learned scribes of Judea often portrays it in terms of either Hellenization or resistance to it. We need to allow for a wider gamut of responses. In particular, we need to acknowledge that whereas the scribal cultures undoubtedly related to Greek culture in their writings, they may have been primarily concerned with addressing a new aspect of their reality, which was all the more relevant since this was the culture of the new rulers. But thematization does not necessarily equate with resistance.

Finally, it is to be hoped that the multidisciplinary and trans-regional approach adopted in the present volume will be deemed worthy of emulation for the same and other periods of time. The present volume has broadened the scope of its inquiry to Ptolemaic Egypt and to the north—namely, Galilee and Asia Minor. It may be worth casting the net even wider. For instance, scholars engaging with the Enochic literature, on the one hand, and with Judean sapiential literature, on the other, have long since engaged in comparative studies including Demotic wisdom literature, and Qumran scholars have been debating various kinds of Hellenistic influences on the organization of the sectarian community. These studies, which are mainly literary, would certainly benefit from more social contextualization.⁹

NOTES

1. For this date, see Lorber, this volume.
2. This issue is cogently explored by Kosmin 2014. Also useful is Chrubasik 2016.
3. On warfare in the Hellenistic world, see Chaniotis 2005: 57–77.
4. See, for instance, Capdetrey and Zurbach 2012; for Egypt, see Mueller 2006: 165–179. Migrants originated from all over the eastern basin of the Mediterranean, and not only from the Greek world, as shown by papyrological and epigraphical evidence.
5. For volumes covering antiquity, see, for instance, Alcock *et al.* 2001; Lavan, Payne and Weisweiler 2016; Ando and Richardson 2017.
6. On local elites, see Dreyer and Mittag 2011; Feyel *et al.* 2012. On the Hellenistic courts, see Strootman 2014; Erskine, Llewellyn-Jones and Wallace 2017. On kings, temples and cities, see, for instance, Clancier and Monerie 2014.
7. On the Ptolemies encouraging the learning of Greek, see Clarysse and Thompson 2006: 2.125–133; on the renewal of the Egyptian temple elites, see Gorre 2009.

8. In some essays, the spelling of ancient Greek names follows the increasingly accepted convention in the field of Hellenistic history, based on transliteration from the Greek, rather than from the Latin: thus, Seleukos/Seleukid, rather than Seleucus/Seleucid, and Antiochos, rather than Antiochus.
9. Newsom 2004 is a pioneering attempt to explore this avenue.

REFERENCES

- Alcock, S.E., d'Altroy, T.N., Morrison, K.D. and Sinopoli, C.M., eds. 2001. *Empires: Perspectives from Archaeology and History*. Cambridge, U.K.
- Ando, C. and Richardson, S., eds. 2017. *Ancient States and Infrastructural Power: Europe, Asia, and America (Empire and After)*. Philadelphia.
- Capdetrey, L. and Zurbach, J., eds. 2012. *Mobilités grecques: Mouvements, réseaux, contacts en Méditerranée, de l'époque archaïque à l'époque hellénistique (actes du colloque de Nanterre, juin 2012)* (Scripta Antiqua 46). Bordeaux and Paris.
- Chanotis, A. 2005. *War in the Hellenistic World. A Social and Cultural History*. Malden, MA and Oxford.
- Chrubasik, B. 2016. *Kings and Usurpers in the Seleucid Empire. The Men Who Would Be King* (Oxford Classical Monographs). Oxford.
- Chrubasik, B. and King, D., eds. 2017. *Hellenism and the Local Communities of the Eastern Mediterranean, 400 BCE–250 CE*. Oxford.
- Clancier, P. and Monerie, J., eds. 2014. Les sanctuaires autochtones et le roi dans l'Orient hellénistique. *Topoi. Orient et Occident* 19: 11–277.
- Clarysse, W. and Thompson, D.J., eds. 2006. *Counting the People in Hellenistic Egypt* (2 vols.). Cambridge, U.K.
- Cohen, G.M. 2006. *The Hellenistic Settlements in Syria, The Red Sea Basin and North Africa*. Berkeley.
- Dreyer, B. and Mittag, P.F., eds. 2011. *Lokale Eliten und hellenistische Könige: zwischen Konfrontation und Kooperation*. Berlin.
- Erskine, A., Llewellyn-Jones, L. and Wallace, S., eds. 2017. *The Hellenistic Court: Monarchic Power and Elite Society from Alexander to Cleopatra*. Swansea, Wales.
- Feyel, C., Fournier, J., Graslín-Thomé, L. and Kirbihler, F., eds. 2012. *Communautés locales et pouvoir central dans l'Orient hellénistique et romain* (Études Anciennes 47). Nancy.
- Gorre, G. 2009. *Les Relations du clergé égyptien et des Lagides d'après les sources privées* (Studia Hellenistica 45). Leuven.
- Grabbe, L.L. and Lipschits, O., eds. 2011. *Judah between East and West: The Transition from Persian to Greek Rule (ca. 400–200 BCE)* (The Library of Second Temple Studies). London.
- Kosmin, P.J. 2014. *The Land of the Elephant Kings: Space, Territory, and Ideology in the Seleucid Empire*. Cambridge, MA and London.
- Kuhrt, A. and Sherwin-White, S. 1993. *From Samarkhand to Sardis. A New Approach to the Seleucid Empire*. London.
- Lavan, M., Payne, R.E. and Weisweiler, J., eds. 2016. *Cosmopolitanism and Empire: Universal Rulers, Local Elites, and Cultural Integration in the Ancient Near East and Mediterranean*. Oxford.
- Lipschits, O. and Blenkinsopp, J., eds. 2003. *Judah and the Judeans in the Neo-Babylonian Period*. Winona Lake.
- Lipschits, O., Knoppers, G.N. and Albertz, R., eds. 2007. *Judah and the Judeans in the Fourth Century BCE*. Winona Lake.
- Lipschits, O., Knoppers, G.N. and Oeming, M., eds. 2011. *The Judeans in the Achaemenid Age: Negotiating Identity in an International Context*. Winona Lake.
- Lipschits, O. and Oeming, M., eds. 2006. *Judah and the Judeans in the Persian Period*. Winona Lake.
- Ma, J. 2003. Kings. In: Erskine, A., ed. *A Companion to the Hellenistic World*. Oxford: 177–195.
- Milik, J.T., ed. 1976. *The Books of Enoch: Aramaic Fragments of Qumran Cave 4*. Oxford.
- Mueller, K. 2006. *Settlements of the Ptolemies: City Foundations and New Settlement in the Hellenistic World* (Studia Hellenistica 43). Leuven.
- Newsom, C.A. 2004. *The Self as Symbolic Space: Constructing Identity and Community at Qumran* (Studies on the Texts of the Desert of Judah 52). Leiden and Boston.
- Silverman, J.M. 2012. *Persepolis and Jerusalem: Iranian Influence on the Apocalyptic Hermeneutic*. New York and London.
- Strootman, R. 2014. *Courts and Elites in the Hellenistic Empires: The Near East after the Achaemenids, c. 330 to 30 BCE*. Edinburgh.
- Waezegggers, C. 2015. Facts, Propaganda or History? Shaping Political Memory in the Nabonidus Chronicle. In: Silverman, J.M. and Waezegggers, C., eds. *Political Memory in and after the Persian Empire* (Ancient Near East Monographs 13). Atlanta, GA: 95–124.