Daniel Lecture # 11 11/20/78 page 5

he shall be destroyed neither in anger nor in battle." It will be hard to tell what it's going to be, but when it happened, you saw that Antiochus III had to pay such aarge tremendous reparations to Rome that it was necessary that his a son devote himself to trying to reestablish fiscal stability in the kingdom and spent most of his time raising taxes and making up for the great expenses. Mr. Montague?

Yes, Seleucus IV, either he raised the taxes or he sent somebody toraise the taxes. It could be taken either of the two ways, but his principal activity was in reestablishing fiscal stability.

Then vv. 21ff. we noticed the account of Antiochus Epiphanes. At the end of the last hour we discussed his career. We won't go into much detail about it again. I looked a couple of days ago at the latest widixwmxxxx edition of Encyclopedia Britannica(which you may know was completely re-written a couple of years ago, with an entirely different play plan.) I looked up the article In most of the previous issues they continue articles on and on and on. If you get an Encyclopedia 10 years away you don't know whether an article in it was written that year or 15 years before because there were just little changes all the time. But this was a complete change.

So I was interested in seeing what they would say about Antiochus IV. They said he was a very able king, a very effective king and an able fighter and quite inadvertently he gave the occasion for the establishing of an independent Jewish state. Whic is a modernistic way of saying he tried to destroy the Jewish religion, that he took over the temple inJeruslaem and established the worship of the Greek Gods there, killed Jews who would not sacrifice to idols and made things so terrible that the Maccabean uprising developed. And an independent Jewish state lasted for the next century.

It's easy to see what was the bias of the man who wrote that particular article on Antiochus. But the interesting thing is that in the beginning of the Article he says that Antiochus IV Epiphanes, also called Zpimam Epimines. That's really the only detrimental thing he said about him in the article, and unless you know Greek it will not convey any meaning to you.

He called himself Antiochus Epiphanes, which means Antiochus the outshining god. Now all the Seleucid kings before this and the Ptolemies also called themselves gods. But he was the first one to put it on his coins. The word Epiphanes. He was the outshinning god. The Epiphanes. But his people seeing his crazy antiques — which we noticed, he would steal from the temples and go as around just throwing money around. He would kill somebody at a crazy impulse and then he would take some poor person and lift him up and give him lots of honors. He was very eratic. So the people instead of calling him (when he wasn't around) Epiphanes, the outshinning god, called him Epimines, the Mad One.

This article is funny -- it says, he was also called Epimines. And everything else they say about him is very favorable. But the