

An Elymaean Temple Plundered by the Seleucid Kings Antiochus III Megas and Antiochus IV Epiphanes

Raúl Navas-Moreno

Universitat Autònoma de Barcelona

raul.navas@uab.cat

 0009-0001-5125-8314



© the author

Received: 13/04/2025

Accepted: 11/07/2025

Published: 22/12/2025

Recommended citation: NAVAS-MORENO, R. (2025). “An Elymaean Temple Plundered by the Seleucid Kings Antiochus III Megas and Antiochus IV Epiphanes”. *Faventia*, 47, 49-64. <<https://doi.org/10.5565/rev/faventia.227>>

Abstract

This article investigates the sacking of an Elymaean temple by the Seleucid kings Antiochus III Megas and Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The study pursues two main objectives: first, to evaluate the possibility that accounts in classical sources present a single event attributed to both monarchs; and second, to highlight the importance of incorporating cuneiform documentation into the research on the Hellenistic East. Discrepancies within the Graeco-Roman sources are analysed to support the argument for two distinct occurrences. Additionally, the article seeks to demonstrate how this hypothesis is further supported by evidence from a Mesopotamian chronicle and a Babylonian astronomical diary, underscoring the necessity of integrating cuneiform sources into Hellenistic studies.

Keywords: Seleucid Elymais; Antiochus III; Antiochus IV; temples; plundering; sacking

Resum. *Un temple elimeu saquejat pels reis selèucides Antíoc III Megas i Antíoc IV Epífanes*

Aquest article investiga el saqueig d'un temple elimeu per part dels reis selèucides Antíoc III el Gran i Antíoc IV Epífanes. L'estudi persegueix dos objectius principals: primer, avaluar la possibilitat que els relats dels autors clàssics presentin un únic esdeveniment atribuït a ambdós monarques; i segon, destacar la importància d'incorporar la documentació cuneïforme en la recerca sobre l'Orient hel·lenístic. Hom examinarà les discrepàncies dins de les fonts greco-llatines per donar suport a l'argument de dos esdeveniments diferents. A més, l'article intenta demostrar com aquesta hipòtesi es fonamenta també en els testimonis d'una crònica mesopotàmica i d'un diari astronòmic babilònic, que subratllen la necessitat d'integrar les fonts cuneïformes als estudis hel·lenístics.

Paraules clau: Elimaida selèucida; Antíoc III; Antíoc IV; temples; pillatges; saqueigs

Summary

- | | |
|--------------------------------|----------------------------|
| 1. Introduction | 4. Conclusions |
| 2. Accounts in Ancient Sources | Bibliographical references |
| 3. Historical Reconstruction | |

1. Introduction

Several Graeco-Roman authors document an attempted sacking of a sanctuary in Elymais by the Seleucid king Antiochus III in 187 BCE. According to some sources, this endeavour was ultimately futile, resulting in the monarch's death at the hands of the local populace. Other authors, however, describe a similar incident in 164 BCE involving Antiochus IV, whose death, in contrast, is attributed to illness following the event. Despite significant differences between the two accounts, their striking resemblance has sparked scholarly debate regarding the possibility of duplication by classical authors. The evidence provided by Graeco-Roman literature seems sufficient to develop a coherent theory addressing the historical accuracy of one or both events. However, investigating the process by which these historical narratives were constructed may also help determine whether one event, or perhaps both, holds historical validity. This approach may shed light on the reasons behind the similarities between the two episodes. Moreover, the incorporation of cuneiform documentation provides a fresh perspective. While it cannot definitively determine the veracity of either event, it enriches the debate and allows for the development of arguments that diverge from those previously posited by the academic community.

Indeed, scholars of the Seleucid world have generally accepted the premise that the two events are independent occurrences as documented in ancient sources, often without examining the reasons behind their striking similarity. However, there are exceptions to this consensus. A. Gutschmid was among the first to suggest that the account attributed to Antiochus IV may be a duplicate of the one ascribed to his father¹. Similarly, A. Bouché-Leclercq proposed that the event associated with Antiochus IV was derived from that of Antiochus III². E. Herzfeld went further,

1. GUTSCHMID (1888: 41): "was uns über die letzten Schicksale des Antiochus Epiphanes berichtet wird, gleicht so sehr bis ins Kleinste den Ausgängen seines gleichnamigen Vaters, dass man ohne die vortreffliche Bezeugung versucht wäre, an eine blosse Doublette zu denken".
2. BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ (1913: 223-24, 297-98, 300-306). According to BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ (1913, 223): "On nous dit que Antiochos, besogneux ou cupide, sacrilège en tout cas, ayant voulu piller le temple de Bel en Elymaïde et l'ayant assailli de nuit avec ses troupes, fut tué, lui et les siens, par les habitants accourus à la défense du sanctuaire. Il n'y aurait pas lieu de suspecter ces témoignages, si l'on ne se trouvait en présence d'un parallélisme de traditions dont on citerait difficilement un autre exemple. [...] Lui aussi [Antiochos VI Epiphane] vient en Elymaïde pour spolier un opulent sanctuaire, le même évidemment qui avait excité les convoitises de son père, et, comme son père, il meurt après avoir été repoussé par les habitants".

suggesting that Antiochus IV never set foot in Elymais³, while W.W. Tarn outright rejected the possibility of the temple's sacking by him⁴.

In contrast, M. Holleaux presents a different perspective, arguing for the plausibility of both events based on the differences between the accounts, which he believes prevent duplication⁵. Furthermore, he suggests that the similarities between the two events can be explained by the analogous circumstances – specifically, the economic pressures stemming from the war indemnities they were required to pay to Rome⁶ – that both monarchs faced. Several other scholars hold the same view, or else treat it as an established fact⁷.

2. Accounts in Ancient Sources

As many as thirteen distinct accounts exist regarding the attempted sacking of an Elymaean temple by a Seleucid king (see below, from [a] to [m]). The event is attributed to Antiochus IV Epiphanes in the writings of Polybius [a], *1 Maccabees* [b], *2 Maccabees* [c], Diodorus Siculus [d], Porphyrius [e], Flavius Josephus [g], Appian [h] and Sulpicius Severus [l]. Similarly, the plundering is linked to Antiochus III Megas in the works by Diodorus [d], Strabo [f], Justin [i], Porphyrius [e] and Eusebius of Caesarea [k]. Notably, the only authors who connect the event to both monarchs are Diodorus [d] and Porphyrius [e]⁸.

3. HERZFELD (1932: 39): “die griechischen Überlieferungen über das Ende Antiochos III. und IV. lauten ganz gleich: beide kommen elend bei einem Tempelraub in Susiana um, aber nie kommen beide Nachrichten in derselben Überlieferung vor. Bouché-Leclercq in seiner Abhandlung darüber hätte noch entschiedener aussprechen können, daß die Erzählung nur auf Antiochos III. zu beziehen und irrig auf den IV. übertragen ist, wenn er gewußt hätte, daß Γαβαί Gai-Isfahān ist: dahin war Antiochos IV. von Armenien aus sicher nicht über Elymais und das für Heere ungangbare Bakhtiaren-Land gezogen, sondern über Agbatana”.
4. TARN (1938: 465); cf. TARN (1938: 463-66) explicitly states that “the story then that Antiochus IV sacked or tried to sack the temple of Nanaya is very late and demonstrably untrue”. He suggests that the sources describing the event involving Antiochus IV do not indicate the looting of any temple; instead, they refer to an attack on a city. This interpretation is highly improbable, especially considering the inaccuracies of classical authors who mistakenly identify Elymais – or worse, Elymus – as a city. Furthermore, this argument requires an excessively speculative reading of classical texts, such as Tarn’s claim that Polybius only mentions the king’s intention to assault a temple without indicating if this plan was ultimately executed. Similarly, Tarn notes that Strabo describes the looting carried out by Antiochus III and Mithridates I of Parthia, but omits any reference to a sack by Antiochus IV. While this omission by Strabo is indeed intriguing, Tarn’s argument relies on an *argumentum ex silentio*, which is ultimately inconclusive.
5. HOLLEAUX (1916).
6. Above all, see Polyb. XXI, 17, 5-6; Diod. Sic. XXIX, 10; Liv. XXXVII, 45, 4-21; Plut. *Aem.* VII, 2; App. *Syr.* 38-39; Eutrop. IV, 4, 3. Other minor sources about the peace agreement are Cic. *Sest.* 58; *Deiot.* 36; Liv. XXXVIII, 55, 5-7, 59.1-7; Val. Max. IV, 1e, 9, VII, 3, 4; Memn. *FGrHist* 434 F1 18.9; Gell. IV, 18, 3; Just. XXXI, 8, 8; Hieron. *Chron.* 1825; Sulpic. *Chron.* II, 19; Zonar. IX, 20.
7. MÖRKHOLM (1966: 32, 170); TAYLOR (2014: 222-41); KRIKONA (2017: 19-28).
8. HOLLEAUX (1916: 80) asserts that for the period between 200 and 146 BCE, Diodorus merely transmits the tradition of Polybius. However, no reference to the event attributed to Antiochus III is preserved in the surviving works of Polybius.

Polybius' account [a] describes how Antiochus IV attempted to sack the sanctuary of Artemis at Elymais but he was unsuccessful and subsequently retreated to Tabae in Persis, where he died⁹:

In Syria, king Antiochus, wishing to provide himself with money, decided to undertake an expedition against the temple of Artemis at Elymais. When he reached the place, he was disappointed in his hope, for the barbarians living there did not permit the transgression, and so he withdrew to Tabae in Persis and lost his life, maddened, as some say, by some manifestations of divine power due to this transgression towards the temple¹⁰.

In *I Maccabees* [b], Antiochus IV is said to have attempted to plunder a temple in Elymais – the divinity to which it was dedicated is not specified. The local population rose against him, forcing him to retreat to Babylon. The author of the text mistakenly refers to Elymais as a city located in Persis:

King Antiochus was marching to the upper satrapies when he heard that there was a city in Persis called Elymais, which was renowned for its riches, silver and gold. The temple there was very wealthy, as it contained coverings of gold, armours and weapons left there by Alexander, the son of Philip, king of Macedon, who was the first to rule over the Greeks. And he came and tried to take the city and plunder it, but failed, because the plan became known by the citizens and they resisted by force of arms. He had to flee, departed from there and, with great sorrow, came back to Babylon¹¹.

9. BOUCHÉ-LECLERQ (1913: 300) considers that this passage refers to Antiochus III, arguing as follows: “On ne trouve, en effet, dans ce texte de Polybe d’autre désignation que «le roi Antiochos», et il est à remarquer que ce texte terminerait au moins aussi bien la biographie d’Antiochos le Grand, dont la fin manque dans l’ordonnance actuelle de l’historien. Si Antiochos Epiphane est parti pour combattre l’Arménien Artaxias et les Parthes, il est singulier que Polybe le représente uniquement préoccupé d’amasser de l’argent et se dirigeant tout droit sur l’Elymaïde, absolument comme Antiochos le Grand endetté et pressé par ses créanciers”. However, this interpretation seems unlikely when we consider the correspondence between Polybius’ account and other texts describing the death of Antiochus IV, particularly concerning the divinity of the sacked temple and the manner in which the monarch died.
10. Polyb. XXXI, 9 [Const. Exc. 2 (2) p. 186]: ὅτι κατὰ τὴν Συρίαν Ἀντίοχος ὁ βασιλεὺς βουλόμενος εὐπορήσει χρημάτων προέθετο στρατεύειν ἐπὶ τὸ τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν εἰς τὴν Ἐλυμαΐδα. [2] παραγενόμενος δ’ ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους καὶ διαψευσθεὶς τῆς ἐλπίδος διὰ τὸ μὴ συγχωρεῖν τῇ παρανομίᾳ τοὺς βαρβάρους τοὺς οἰκοῦντας περὶ τὸν τόπον, [3] ἀναχωρῶν ἐν Τάβαις τῆς Περσίδος ἐξέλιπε τὸν βίον, [4] δαμονήσας, ὡς ἐνιοὶ φασί, διὰ τὸ γενέσθαι τινὰς ἐπισημασίας τοῦ δαμονίου κατὰ τὴν περὶ τὸ προειρημένον ἱερὸν παρανομίαν.
11. *I Macc.* 6, 1-4: καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος διεπορεύετο τὰς ἐπάνω χώρας καὶ ἤκουσεν ὅτι ἐστὶν Ἐλυμαῖς ἐν τῇ Περσίδι πόλις ἐνδοξος πλούτω, ἀργυρίῳ καὶ χρυσίῳ· [2] καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ ἐν αὐτῇ πλούσιον σφόδρα, καὶ ἐκεῖ καλύμματα χρυσᾶ καὶ θώρακες καὶ ὄπλα, ἃ κατέλιπεν ἐκεῖ Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ τοῦ Φιλίππου ὁ βασιλεὺς ὁ Μακεδόν, ὃς ἐβασίλευσεν πρῶτος ἐν τοῖς Ἑλλησι. [3] καὶ ἦλθεν καὶ ἐζήτηι καταλαβέσθαι τὴν πόλιν καὶ προνομεῦσαι αὐτήν, καὶ οὐκ ἠδυνάσθη, ὅτι ἐγνώσθη ὁ λόγος τοῖς ἐκ τῆς πόλεως, [4] καὶ ἀντέστησαν αὐτῷ εἰς πόλεμον, καὶ ἔφυγεν καὶ ἀπῆρεν ἐκεῖθεν μετὰ λύπης μεγάλης ἀποστρέψαι εἰς Βαβυλῶνα.

Moreover, *2 Maccabees* [c] recounts the defeat and probable demise of Antiochus IV in his attempt to plunder a temple of Nanaya in Persis:

For the leader having reached Persis and his army being apparently irresistible, he was cut to pieces in the temple of Nanaya as a result of a trick carried out by the priests devoted to the goddess. Since Antiochus had come to the place with his friends to marry her, he decided to take the numerous treasures as a wedding gift¹²; the priests had presented them to him and he had entered the sacred enclosure with a small retinue. Once he was inside, they closed the temple, and after opening a privy door of the roof, they threw stones like thunderbolts to the general, smashed them to pieces, beheaded them and threw their heads to those outside. Blessed in all things be our God, who gave us the sacrilegious¹³.

The same work also describes Antiochus IV's attempt to plunder several temples in Persepolis, where he was ultimately repelled by the local population and forced to retreat:

At that time, Antiochus happened to be disorderly retiring from the regions around Persis. He had entered the city called Persepolis and attempted to plunder a temple and to seize the city. Therefore, the population at once took up arms to defend itself, so that Antiochus was defeated by the inhabitants and forced to make a shaming retreat. When he was at Ecbatana, he heard about what happened to Nicanor and to Timotheus' forces. Inflamed with anger, he thought of making the Jews pay for the wickedness committed by those who had made him flee. He ordered his charioteer to drive without pause, hastening his journey as if heavenly judgment were accompanying him. He had arrogantly boasted to Polyander, "I will make Jerusalem a city of Jews when I arrive there"¹⁴.

12. The attempted union between the monarch and a deity evokes the concept of hierogamy, which plays a significant role in the religion of ancient Mesopotamia. In this case, however, it likely does not serve a substantial purpose but rather acts as a contextualization that indirectly conveys a specific cultural substrate. A similar phenomenon is described by Granius Licinianus concerning an unnamed monarch, whom TAYLOR (2014: 234) believes to be Antiochus IV (XXVIII, 6, 1): *asturcone pompam agebat et se simulabat Hierapoli Dianam ducere uxorem, et ceteris epulas instruentibus uasa e sacro protulit atque cenatus de mensis ea abstulit in dotem extra anulum, quem unum omnium e deae donis reliquit* ("he organised a parade upon an Asturian horse, pretending to marry Diana of Hierapolis, and while others were preparing a banquet, he took vessels from the sanctuary and, having eaten, stole them from the tables as a dowry, except for a ring, the only one of all the goddess's gifts that he left behind").
13. *2 Macc.* 1, 13-17: εἰς τὴν Περσίδα γενόμενος γὰρ ὁ ἡγεμὼν καὶ ἡ περὶ αὐτὸν ἀνυπόστατος δοκοῦσα εἶναι δὴναμις κατεκόπησαν ἐν τῷ τῆς Ναναίας ἱερῷ, παραλογοισμῷ χρησαμένων τῶν περὶ τὴν Ναναίαν ἱερῶν. [14] ὡς γὰρ συνοικήσων αὐτῇ παρεγένετο εἰς τὸν τόπον ὃ τε Ἀντίοχος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ φίλοι χάριν τοῦ λαβεῖν τὰ χρήματα πλείονα εἰς φερνῆς λόγον [15] καὶ προθέντων αὐτὰ τῶν ἱερῶν τοῦ Ναναίου κάκεινου προσελθόντος μετ' ὀλίγων εἰς τὸν περίβολον τοῦ τεμένου, συγκλείσαντες τὸ ἱερόν, ὡς εἰσηλθεν Ἀντίοχος, [16] ἀνοίξαντες τὴν τοῦ φατνώματος κρυπτὴν θύραν βάλλοντες πέτρους συνεκεράνωσαν τὸν ἡγεμόνα καὶ μέλη ποιήσαντες καὶ τὰς κεφαλὰς ἀφελόντες τοῖς ἔξω παρέρριψαν. [17] κατὰ πάντα εὐλογητὸς ἡμῶν ὁ θεός, ὃς παρέδωκεν τοὺς ἀσεβήσαντας.
14. *2 Macc.* 9, 1-4: περὶ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκείνον ἐτύγγαθεν Ἀντίοχος ἀναλελυκῶς ἀκόσμως ἐκ τῶν περὶ τὴν Περσίδα τόπων. [2] εἰσεληλύθει γὰρ εἰς τὴν λεγομένην Περσέπολιν καὶ ἐπεχειρήσεν ἱεροσυλεῖν

This event may correspond to the sacking of the Elymaean temple described earlier, particularly when considering the lack of historical reliability that characterises the books of Maccabees¹⁵. Similarly, the passage above situates the sanctuary of Nanaya in Persis, rather than in Elymais.

Diodorus [d] reports that Antiochus III Megas was killed by the local population after the unsuccessful sacking of a temple of Zeus in Elymais:

As for Antiochus, having set out to plunder the sanctuary of Zeus at Elymais, he met with what seemed to be the disaster of his life, and perished with his entire army¹⁶.

In another passage, Diodorus makes a further reference to the plunder of a temple of Belus in Elymais by Antiochus III. The author explicitly attributes his disastrous end to divine punishment:

Antiochus, lacking money and hearing that the temple of Belus at Elymais had a large quantity of silver and gold offerings, decided to plunder it. He arrived at Elymais and having accused the locals of starting the conflict, he plundered the sanctuary; but although he took a large amount of money, he quickly received punishment he deserved from the gods¹⁷.

According to Jerome, Porphyrius [e] states that Antiochus III perished in combat against the Elymaeans:

When Antiochus was defeated, he was ordered to reign beyond the Taurus, and from there he fled to Apamea and Susa, and in the last moments of his reign he penetrated into the cities; and when he fought against the Elymaeans, he was destroyed along with all his army¹⁸.

καὶ τὴν πόλιν συνέχειν· διὸ δὴ τῶν πληθῶν ὀρμησάντων ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ὄπλων βοήθειαν ἐπράπησαν, καὶ συνέβη προποθέντα τὸν Ἀντίοχον ὑπὸ τῶν ἐγχωρίων ἀσχήμονα τὴν ἀναζυγὴν ποιήσασθαι. [3] ὄντι δὲ αὐτῷ κατ' Ἐκβάτανα προσέπεσεν τὰ κατὰ Νικάνορα καὶ τοὺς περὶ Τιμόθεον γεγονότα. [4] ἐπαρθεὶς δὲ τῷ θυμῷ ὤρετο καὶ τὴν τῶν πεφυγαδευκότων αὐτὸν κακίαν εἰς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐναπερεῖσασθαι, διὸ συνέταξεν τὸν ἀρματηλάτην ἀδιαλείπτως ἐλαύνοντα κατανοεῖν τὴν πορείαν τῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δὴ κρίσεως συνουσίας αὐτῷ· οὕτως γὰρ ὑπερηφάνως εἶπεν Πολυάνδριον Ἰουδαίων Ἱεροσόλυμα ποιήσω παραγενόμενος ἐκεῖ.

15. This is a matter of broad scholarly consensus. See ECKHARDT (2016: 55).

16. Diod. Sic. XXVIII, 3 [Const. Exc. 2 (1) p. 270]: Ἀντίοχος δὲ τὸ κατὰ τὴν Ἐλυμαΐδα τέμενος τοῦ Διὸς συλᾶν ἐπιβαλόμενος πρόπευσαν τὴν καταστροφὴν εὐρε τοῦ βίου, μετὰ πάσης τῆς δυνάμεως ἀπολόμενος.

17. Diod. Sic. XXIX, 15 [Const. Exc. 2 (1) p. 273]: ὅτι Ἀντίοχος ἀπορῶν χρημάτων, ἀκούων δὲ κατὰ τὴν Ἐλυμαΐδα τὸ ἱερὸν τὸ τοῦ Βήλου πολὺν ἐκ τῶν ἀναθημάτων ἔχειν ἄργυρον τε καὶ χρυσόν, ἔγνω τοῦτο συλῆσαι. καὶ ἦκεν εἰς τὴν Ἐλυμαΐδα, καὶ καταιτιασάμενος τοὺς ἐγχωρίους πολέμου κατάρχεσθαι τὸ μὲν ἱερὸν ἐσύλησε, χρημάτων δὲ πλήθος ἀθροίσας ταχὺ τῆς προσηκούσης ἐκ θεῶν ἔτυχε κολάσεως.

18. Porph. *FGrHist* 260 F 47 [Hier. *In Dan.* XI vers. 18-19 (ed. MIGNE, 1884: 564)]: *uictus ergo Antiochus, intra Taurum regnare iussus est et inde fugit ad Apamiam ac Susam et ad ultimas regni sui penetrauit urbes; cumque aduersum Elymaeos pugnaret, cum omni est deletus exercitu.*

Additionally, he provides a detailed account of the sacking of the temple of Diana in Elymais by Antiochus IV. He concurs with Polybius in noting that the Seleucid monarch ultimately perished in Tabae, a settlement located in Persis. However, Polybius attributed the sanctuary to Artemis:

And he will come, he says, to the summit of this mountain located in the province of Elymais, which is the easternmost region of the Persians; and there he, wishing to despoil the temple of Diana, which treasured infinite offerings, was put to flight by the barbarians who guarded that sanctuary with admirable veneration, and died in Tabes, a citadel in Persis, consumed with grief¹⁹.

Similarly, Porphyrius recalled a piece of news going back to Polybius (*cf.* XXXI, 9 above) and Diodorus (*cf.* XXVIII, 3 and XXIX, 15 above) referring to Antiochus IV's plunder of a temple dedicated to Diana in Elymais:

For Polybius and Diodorus, who write libraries of history, relate that he not only acted against the God of Judea, but, kindled by the flame of avarice, he also attempted to plunder the temple of Diana at Elymais, which was very rich. But he was crushed by the defenders of the temple and the people of the surrounding area, and because of some apparitions and terrors, he went mad and finally died of disease. It is remembered that this happened because he tried to violate the temple of Diana²⁰.

Conversely, Strabo [f] provides a brief account of the sacking of the Elymaean temple of Belus by Antiochus III:

When Antiochus Megas tried to plunder the sanctuary of Belus, the barbarians living nearby attacked and killed them²¹.

On the other side, Flavius Josephus [g] refers to the sacking of a temple in Elymais by Antiochus IV. As in *1 Maccabees*, the author erroneously assumes that Elymais is a city in Persis. Additionally, he criticises the testimony provided by Polybius, particularly regarding the attribution of Antiochus' death to the plundering of this temple rather than to that of the temple in Jerusalem:

19. Porph. *FGrHist* 260 F 56 [Hier. *In Dan.* XI vers. 44-45 (ed. MIGNE, 1884: 573)]: *et ueniet, inquit, usque ad summitatem ipsius montis in Elymaide prouincia, quae est ultima Persarum ad orientem regio; ibique uolens templum Dianae spoliare, quod habebat infinita donaria, fugatus a barbaris est, qui mira ueneratione fanum illud suspiciebant, et mortuus est maerore consumptus in Tabes oppido Persidis.*
20. Diod. Sic. XXXI, 18a [Hier. *In Dan.* XI vers. 36 (ed. MIGNE, 1884: 570) = Porph. *FGrHist* 260 F 53]: *siquidem Polybius et Diodorus, qui Bibliothecarum scribunt historias, narrant eum non solum contra Deum fecisse Iudaeae, sed auaritia facibus accensum, etiam templum Dianae in Elymaide, quod erat ditissimum, spoliare conatum oppressumque a custodibus templi et uicinis circum gentibus et, quibusdam phantasiis atque terroribus uersum in amentiam, ad postremum morbo interisse; et hoc ei accidisse commemorant, quia templum Dianae uiolare conatus sit.*
21. Strab. XVI, 1, 18: Ἀντίοχον μὲν οὖν τὸν μέγαν τὸ τοῦ Βήλου σὺλᾶν ἱερὸν ἐπιχειρήσαντα ἀνεῖλον ἐπιθέμενοι καθ' αὐτοὺς οἱ πλεῖστον βάρβαροι.

At the same time, king Antiochus, advancing into the upper regions, heard of a city in Persia called Elymais, renowned for its wealth, with a magnificent temple of Artemis, full of varied offerings, and even weapons and breastplates that were said to have been left there by Alexander, the son of Philip, king of the Macedonians. Moved by these reports, he set out against Elymais, attacked the city and laid siege to it. However, the inhabitants were neither intimidated by his advance nor by the siege, but they resisted vigorously and he saw his hopes frustrated. They drove him away from the city and pursued him in flight, forcing him to retreat to Babylon, losing many of his soldiers. Stricken by grief over this failure, he received news of the defeat of the commanders he had left to wage war against the Jews, and of the growing strength of the Jewish forces. Troubled by these concerns and overwhelmed by despair, he fell ill. As his illness worsened and his sufferings increased, he realized that his death was near. He summoned his friends, informed them of the severity of his condition, and confessed that his afflictions were the result of the wrongs he had done to the Jewish people, when he plundered their temple and showed contempt for their God. After saying these things, he expired. It is therefore surprising that Polybius the Megalopolitan, despite being a virtuous man, claims that Antiochus died due to his intention of plundering the temple of Artemis in Persia. However, desiring to do something, without actually carrying it out, is not worthy of punishment. If, for this reason, Polybius believed that Antiochus ended his life in this manner, it is far more plausible to attribute the king's death to his sacrilege against the temple in Jerusalem. Nevertheless, regarding this matter, I do not dispute the cause assigned by the Megalopolitan, as it is closer to the truth than that suggested by us²².

Appian [h] provides a detailed account of the sacking of a temple by Antiochus IV. He does not specify the location of the temple in question, and the deity to whom the temple was dedicated, Aphrodite Elymais, does not align with the testimony of the other authors:

22. Joseph. *AJ* XII, 354-59: ὑπὸ δὲ τὸν αὐτὸν καιρὸν καὶ ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἀντίοχος τὴν ἄνω χώραν ἐπερχόμενος ἀκούει πόλιν ἐν τῇ Περσίδι πλούτῳ διαφέρουσαν Ἐλυμαῖδα τοῦνομα καὶ πολυτελεῖς ἱερὸν Ἀρτέμιδος ἐν αὐτῇ καὶ παντοδαπῶν ἀναθημάτων πλήρες εἶναι ἐτι γε μὴν ὄπλα καὶ θώρακας, ἃ καταλιπεῖν ἐπυνθάνετο τὸν υἱὸν τὸν Φιλίππου βασιλέα δὲ Μακεδόνων Ἀλέξανδρον. [355] κινήθεις οὖν ὑπὸ τούτων ὤρμησεν ἐπὶ τὴν Ἐλυμαῖδα καὶ προσβαλὼν αὐτὴν ἐπολιόρκει. τῶν δ' ἐν αὐτῇ μὴ καταπλαγέντων τὴν ἔφοδον αὐτοῦ μηδὲ τὴν πολιορκίαν, ἀλλὰ καρτερῶς ἀντισχόντων ἀποκρούεται τῆς ἐλπίδος· ἀποσάμενοι γὰρ ἀπὸ τῆς πόλεως καὶ ἐπεξελθόντες ἐδίωξαν, ὥστ' αὐτὸν εἰσθῆναι εἰς Βαβυλῶνα φεύγοντα καὶ πολλοὺς ἀποβαλόντα τῆς στρατιάς. [356] λυπομένῳ δ' ἐπὶ τῇ διαμαρτίᾳ ταύτῃ προσαγγέλλουσιν τινες καὶ τὴν τῶν στρατηγῶν ἦτταν, οὓς πολεμήσοντας τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις καταλελοίπει, καὶ τὴν ἰσχὺν ἤδη τὴν τῶν Ἰουδαίων. [357] προσγενομένης οὖν καὶ τῆς περὶ τούτων φροντίδος τῇ προτέρᾳ συγχυθεὶς ὑπὸ ἀθυμίας εἰς νόσον κατέπεσεν, ἧς μηκνυμένης καὶ ἀξάνοντων τῶν παθῶν συνείς, ὅτι μέλλοι τελευτᾶν, συγκαλεῖ τοὺς φίλους καὶ τὴν τε νόσον αὐτοῖς χαλεπὴν οὖσαν ἐμήνυε καὶ ὅτι ταῦτα πάσχει κακῶσας τὸ τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἔθνος παρεδῆλου συλήσας τὸν ναὸν καὶ τοῦ θεοῦ καταφρονήσας, καὶ ταῦτα λέγων ἐξέπνευσεν. [358] ὥστε θαυμάζειν Πολύβιον τὸν Μεγαλοπολίτην, ὃς ἀγαθὸς ὢν ἀνὴρ ἀποθανεῖν λέγει τὸν Ἀντίοχον βουλευθέντα τὸ τῆς ἐν Πέρσας Ἀρτέμιδος ἱερὸν συλῆσαι· τὸ γὰρ μηκέτι ποιῆσαι τὸ ἔργον βουλευσάμενον οὐκ ἔστιν τιμωρίας ἄξιον. [359] εἰ δὲ διὰ τοῦτο Πολύβιῳ δοκεῖ καταστρέφειν τὸν βίον Ἀντίοχον οὕτως, πολὺ πιθανώτερον διὰ τὴν ἱεροσυλίαν τοῦ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις ναοῦ τελευτήσαντος τὸν βασιλέα. ἀλλὰ περὶ μὲν τούτου οὐ διαφέρομαι τὴν ὑπὸ τοῦ Μεγαλοπολίτου λεγομένην αἰτίαν ταύτην ὑφ' ἡμῶν ἀληθῆ νομιζόντων.

Frightened, he retired from the country and plundered the temple of Aphrodite Elymais. Then, he died of illness, leaving a son of nine years of age, the already mentioned Antiochus Eupator²³.

In his account, Justin [i] describes the sacking of a temple of Jupiter in Elymais by Antiochus III, who, having been defeated in a war against the Romans and burdened with substantial war indemnities under the terms of the Peace of Apamea, sought to replenish his coffers²⁴. This endeavour ultimately led to his demise at the hands of the local population:

Meanwhile, in Syria king Antiochus, burdened with a large peace tribute after being defeated by the Romans, was either pressed by the scarcity of money or incited by his greed. The latter, since he hoped that his sacrileges were excused by the apparent necessity of the tribute, set out on the campaign, assembled his army and attacked the temple of Jupiter at Elymais by night. [2] But when this affair became known, he was slain along with his whole army by the villagers who had gathered there²⁵.

Moreover, Hieronymus [j] describes the same event in comparable terms:

When this was heard by Antiochus, who had revolted against the prince of princes, that is, against the lord of lords and the king of kings in Elymais, a Persian region, desiring to spoliage the temple of Diana, which had precious offerings, after he lost

23. App. Syr. 66: ὁ μὲν δὴ καταπλαγεῖς ἀνέζηυξε καὶ τὸ τῆς Ἑλυμαίας Ἀφροδίτης ἱερὸν ἐσὺλησε καὶ φθίνων ἐτελεύτησε, παιδίον ἔνναετὲς ἀπολιπὼν, Ἀντίοχον τὸν Εὐπάτορα, ὡς μοι καὶ περὶ τοῦδε εἴρηται.
24. In this context we should also understand the king's visit to Babylon, during which he received various gifts that were, in fact, disguised and embellished tributes. A clear example of this is provided by the astronomical diary *AD 187A* [BM 34711] 8^o-12^o: (8^o) (...) LU²ŠA₃TAM E₂SAG.GIL₂ u E₂KI.MEŠ LU²U²KKIN ša₂ E₂SAG.GIL₂ [...] (9^o) [...] šu²-pal-šu₂ ki-li-[/i] šá 1 lim GIN GUŠKIN ana^MAn LUGAL il-tak-nu-u' U₄ BI LU²pa-h[at] E^{KI} [u LU²pu-li-še-e] (10^o) [ša₂ ina E.KI ... KU]. GI ana^MAn LUGAL GAR^{MEŠ} U₄ [BI] ana E₂SAG.GIL₂ E₁₁ uš-kin-nu U₄ BI ana E₂ U₄ 1.KAM₂ KU₄-ub GU₄MEŠ UDU. †SISKUR^{MEŠ} [ana^{DEN} DGASAN-ia₂] (11^o) [u DINGIR^{MEŠ} GAL^{MEŠ} ina IGI^{DINNIN}] †TIN[†].TIR^{KI} AGA KU₃.GI †GADA[†] pi-ša₂-an-nu KU₃.GI ša₂ DGASAN-ia₂ u TUG₂.SIG₂.SAG ša₂ M^{DPA}.NIG₂.DU.ŠEŠ LUGAL ša₂ ina E₂ bu-[še-e GAR^{MEŠ} DU₃] (12^o) [...] †X[†] MU-a-ti₃ ina E₂ †bu[†] še-e [GAR^{MEŠ} E₃ GIŠKIRI₆ LUGAL ša₂ ina BAL.RI <D>UTU.ŠU₂ A i-te-bir U₄ BI ana E₂.GAL-šu KU₄-ub (...), "The šatammu of the Esagil and the Babylonians, the assembly of the Esagil [...] under it, a crown of 1000 shekels of gold to king Antiochus they presented. On that day, the pāhātu of Babylon [and the Graeco-Macedonian citizens of Babylon] [...] of gold to king Antiochus presented. [On that] day, he went up to the Esagil and prostrated himself; on that day he entered the Temple of the First Day and [performed] sacrifices of oxen and sheep [in honour of Bēl, Bēlfiya and the great gods, before the Ištar] of Babylon; [did they offer him] a golden crown, a golden chest of Bēlfiya and a robe of king Nebuchadnezzar from the treasure-house [...]. He left the treasure house. He went to the king's garden on the west bank. That day, he entered his palace".
25. Just. XXXII, 2, 1-2: *interea in Syria rex Antiochus, cum graui tributo pacis a Romanis uictus oneratus esset, seu inopia pecuniae compulsus seu auaritia sollicitatus, qui sperabat se sub specie tributariae necessitatis excusatus sacrilegia commissurum, adhibito exercitu nocte templum Elymaei louis adgreditur. [2] qua re prodita concursu incolarum cum omni milite interficitur.*

his army, he was also destroyed without hands, that is, he died of the disease of sorrow²⁶.

The Armenian translation of Eusebius of Caesarea's chronicle [k] recounts Antiochus III's death in Susa during an expedition to the eastern provinces, while fighting against some Elymaeans (347-48):

[Antiochus] was called the Great and reigned for 36 years, from the second year of the 139th Olympiad [223 B.C.] until the second year of the 148th Olympiad [187 B.C.]. In the latter year, he made an expedition to Susa and the eastern provinces, but was killed with all [his men] in battle with the Elymaeans; he left behind two sons, Seleucus and Antiochus²⁷.

In contrast, Sulpicius Severus [l] reports that Antiochus IV attempted to plunder a sanctuary in Persis but was ultimately compelled to retreat due to the local population's resistance. However, the author situates this event in the city of Elymus, a toponym that is likely erroneous and derived from the name Elymais:

Meanwhile, Antiochus, who we remember had marched to Persis, arrived to the very wealthy city of Elymum situated in that region, and tried to plunder the temple full of gold located there, but fled because of the multitude of people who had converged from everywhere to defend the place²⁸.

Finally, Zonaras [m] recounts that Antiochus IV attempted to pillage a temple of Artemis in Persis and was ultimately forced to seek refuge in Babylon. Once again, the author situates the events in the non-existent city of Elymais:

When Antiochus knew that there was a city in Persis known for its wealth in the region called Elymais, and that there was a shrine of Artemis full of many luxurious offerings inside, set out and besieged it. However, repulsed by those who came out of the city, he fled and reached Babylon losing the majority of his army along the way²⁹.

26. Hier. *In Dan.* VIII vers. 14 (ed. MIGNE, 1884: 537): *quod audiens Antiochus qui contra principem principum surrexerat, id est, Dominum dominantium, et regem regum in Elimaide, quae regio Persarum est, templum Dianae spoliare cupiens, quod habebat pretiosa donaria, et ibi quoque amisso exercitu, sine manibus contritus est, id est, tristitiae morbo periiit.*
27. Euseb. *Chron.* 347-48: *ew anowanec'aw mec: tireal ams 36. 'i 100-ordē eresnerordē innerordē olompiadin yerkrord amin, minē'ew 'c' 100-ord 40-erord 8-erord olompiadh erkrordi amin. ekeal haseal 'i Šawšay, ew 'i verin naxararac'n kalowacs, amenayn hamajenj satakēr yelimac'woc' čakatown. ew mnayin erkow ordik' Selewkos ew Antiok'os. Cf. Latin translation by SCHOENE (1875: 253).*
28. Sulpic. Sev. *Chron.* II, 22, 2: *interea Antiochus, quem in Persidem profectum supra memorauimus, oppidum Elymum regionis illius opulentissimum, fanumque ibi situm multo auro refertum diripere conatus, confluyente undique ad defensionem loci multitudine fugatus.*
29. Zonar. I, 320: *ὁ δ' Ἀντίοχος μαθὼν πόλιν εἶναι ἐν τῇ Περσίδι πλούτῳ κομῶσαν Ἐλυμαῖδα ὠνομασμένην, καὶ ἱερὸν Ἀρτέμιδος ἐν αὐτῇ πλήρες ἀναθημάτων πολυτελῶν, ὄρμησεν ἐπ' αὐτὴν καὶ ἐπολιόρκει. ἀποκρουσθεὶς δὲ παρὰ τῶν ἐν τῇ πόλει ἐπεξεληθόντων φεύγων ἤκεν εἰς Βαβυλῶνα καὶ τῆς στρατιᾶς πλείστους ἀπέβαλεν.*

3. Historical Reconstruction

A review of the accounts in the classical sources reveals two clearly distinct events. Firstly, the temple attributed to the sacking by Antiochus III is consistently referred to in the sources as being dedicated to Zeus, Jupiter or Belus. However, the sanctuary sacked by Antiochus IV is said to have been dedicated to Artemis³⁰, Diana or Nanaya, with the notable exception Appian's attribution to Aphrodite Elymais. Similarly, the sequence of events reaches distinct conclusions depending on the monarch in question. On the one hand, Antiochus III is reported to have been killed by the locals defending the sanctuary. On the other, Antiochus IV is said to have been confronted by the local population, but ultimately fled to Babylon or, according to other sources, to the town of Tabae³¹, where he died of disease. The authors who attribute the death of Antiochus IV to divine punishment also appear to indicate that he met his end without violence, in contrast to Antiochus III (MENDELS, 1981: 53-54; WEITZMANN, 2004: 229-30, note 45).

It is also essential to consider another factor. Strabo, who had previously described the sacking of Belus's temple by Antiochus III, mentions that at a later point, a Parthian king – whose name remains unspecified³² – proceeded to sack the temples of Athena and Artemis in Elymais:

Some time later, the Parthian king, knowing the things that had happened to Antiochus, hearing that the temples there were very rich and seeing that they were disobedient, went on the attack with his great army and took the temple of Athena

30. TARN (1938: 463-66) suggests that the temple of Artemis described by Polybius, Josephus, and Zonaras corresponds to the sanctuary of Nanaya in Susa. This identification, however, is highly speculative.
31. Polybius mentions that Antiochus died ἐν Τάβαις τῆς Περσίδος, while Porphyrius makes reference to the death of the king in *Tabes oppido Persidis*, although the precise location of this settlement remains uncertain. Moreover, Curtius Rufus refers to a city of the same name which Alexander reached while pursuing Darius (V, 13, 2): *Tabas (oppidum est in Paraetacene ultima) pervenit* ("he arrived in Tabae, a city located in the farthest part of Paraitacene"). HOLLEAUX (1916: 94) posits that Tabae should be identified with Gabae, the modern city of Isfahan, on the basis of a reference by Strabo (XV, 3, 3): ἦν δὲ καὶ ἄλλα βασιλῆα τὰ ἐν Γάβαις ἐν τοῖς ἀνωτέρω που μέρεσι τῆς Περσίδος καὶ τὰ ἐν τῇ παραλίᾳ τὰ κατὰ τὴν Ταόκην λεγομένην ("there was another palace at Gabae, in the upper parts of Persis, and another in the coast, near a place called Taoce"). Other scholars are of a similar opinion, see NIESE (1903: 218; see. Curt. Ruf. VI, 13, 2); TARN (1938: 214-15). However, LOREIN (2001: 169) posits that, although there may have been some confusion between the two cities, Tabae and Gabae were, in fact, two distinct settlements. Similarly, GERA and HOROWITZ (1997: 250) concur with this assessment.
32. Some scholars suggest that this monarch was Mithridates I, linking the narrated events to a military campaign that likely took place in 139/8 BCE. Regarding this campaign, Justin states (XLI, 6, 8): *unde reuersus bellum cum Elymaeorum rege gessit, quo uicto hanc quoque gentem regno adiecit imperiumque Parthorum a monte Caucasus multis populis in dicionem redactis usque flumen Euphraten protulit* "Returning from there, he waged war against the king of the Elymaeans, and after defeating him, he also annexed this people also to his dominions, and extended the Parthian empire, by reducing many peoples under his dominion, from Mount Caucasus to the river Euphrates". Cf. NODELMAN (1960: 87); GUÉPIN (1965-66: 19); HANSMAN (1978: 154); HARMATTA (1981: 207).

and the temple of Artemis, also called Azara, and carried off treasures of ten thousand talents³³.

This suggests the existence of additional temples in the region, particularly one dedicated to Artemis, which could correspond to the sanctuary plundered by Antiochus IV. Furthermore, Strabo notes that this Artemis was also known as Azara, potentially an alternative form of the divinity Zaratis, another name for the Persian goddess Anahita³⁴. Notably, this deity was known among the Greeks as Artemis Persica, and in Zoroastrian doctrine, she is associated with the planet Venus. This confusion may clarify Appian's reference to a temple dedicated to Aphrodite Elymais. Additionally, Aelian refers to a temple of Anaitis – the Greek name for Anahita – located in the region³⁵.

Nevertheless, this discussion could be further enriched by incorporating cuneiform documentation. The Mesopotamian chronicle known as the *Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period* (CM 4; BM 35603) provides a concise account of the reigns of Babylonian monarchs from Alexander the Great to Demetrius II Nicator. Upon the death of Antiochus III, the text states the following (rev. 7): “Year 125, in the month of Siwan, it was rumoured in Babylon that the 25th day An(tiochus III), the king, was killed in Elam”³⁶. Similarly, upon the death of Antiochus IV, the text provides the following account (rev. 14): “[Year 148, in the month of] Kislimu, it was heard that An(tiochus IV), the k[ing, died]”³⁷. It is worthy noting that two distinct verbs are employed to describe the monarchs' deaths. The logogram GAZ is equivalent to the Akkadian verb *dāku* “töten, schlagen”³⁸, while NAM.MEŠ corresponds to *šimātu* “er starb”³⁹ or *šimtu* “eines natürlichen Todes sterben”⁴⁰. The death of Antiochus III in Elam is fully consistent with the historical accounts found in classical sources. Moreover, the violent nature of his death, as opposed to the natural death of Antiochus IV, aligns with the narratives provided by Graeco-Roman authors.

Another relevant cuneiform text, the astronomical diary *AD 163* (BM 41628), provides additional details. Concerning Antiochus IV, it states the following (obv.

33. Strab. XVI, 1, 18: ἐκ δὲ τῶν ἐκείνων συμβάντων παιδευθεὶς ὁ Παρθαῖος χρόνοις ὕστερον ἀκούων τὰ ἱερὰ πλούσια παρ' αὐτοῖς, ὄρων δ' ἀπειθοῦντας, ἐμβάλλει μετὰ δυνάμεως μεγάλης, καὶ τό τε τῆς Ἀθηνᾶς ἱερὸν εἶλε καὶ τό τῆς Ἀρτέμιδος, τὰ Ἄζαρα, καὶ ἦρε ταλάντων μυρίων γάζαν.
34. THIRLWALL (1833: 192). The connection is established based on the similarity between the expressions τὰ Ἄζαρα [Azara] and τὰ Ζάρα [Zaratis]. Nonetheless, it is highly speculative; see THIRLWALL (1833) and GUÉPIN (1965-66).
35. Ael. *NA* XII, 23: ἐν τῇ Ἐλυμαίᾳ χώρα νεῶς ἐστὶν Ἀναΐτιδος, καὶ εἰσὶν ἐνταυθοῖ τιθασοὶ λέοντες, καὶ τοὺς ἐς τὸν νεὼν παριόντας ἀσπάζονται τε καὶ σαίνουσι, “In the land of Elymais there is a temple of Anaitis, and tamed lions are there to welcome and greet with their tails those who come to the sanctuary”.
36. *CM 4* (BM 35603) rev. 7: MU.1.ME 25.KAM₂ SIG *ina* E^{K1} *it-te-eš-me um-ma* U₄ 25.KAM₂ ^MAn LUGAL *ina* KURE-lam^{K1} GAZ.
37. *Ibid.* rev. 14: [MU.148.KAM₂] GAN-*it-te-eš-me ša*₂ ^MAn L[UGAL NAM.MEŠ].
38. VON SODEN (1965: 152); BORGER (1981: 107).
39. BORGER (1981: 79).
40. VON SODEN (1974: 1239).

C₂17'-18'): "[... the men who] came [wi]th the king's corpse, with [...] [18'] [...] of Antiochus, son of Antiochus"⁴¹. Thus, the king's body was likely transported to Babylon several months after his death (BEAULIEU, 2022: 262). Concurrently, Granus Licinianus provides the following account (XXVIII 6): *Corpus eius cum Antiochia*<*m*> *portaretur, exterritis subito iu*<*m*>*entis in fluvium abreptum non com*<*pa*>*ruit* "while his body was being taken to Antioch, the animals suddenly became frightened, and his body was thrown into the river and disappeared". The idea that Antiochus IV's body was taken to Antioch via the Orontes and then passed through Babylon suggests that he likely died in the eastern part of the empire. This fits with the accounts of Polybius and Porphyrius, who state that he died in Tabae, i.e. in Persis, after his failed attempt to plunder the Elymaean temple.

4. Conclusions

As has been demonstrated, an analysis of the Graeco-Roman literature reveals two distinct narratives. The first concerns Antiochus III's attempt to plunder a temple dedicated to Zeus/Jupiter/Belus at Elymais, which led to his demise. Several years later, Antiochus IV endeavoured to sack a temple of Artemis/Diana/Nanaya but also failed, retreating to Tabae in Persis, where he subsequently died. While both accounts are plausible, the striking similarities between them suggest that the transmission of these events may have been distorted in the textual tradition, leading to the conflation of certain aspects of the two kings' stories.

Cuneiform documentation provides valuable insight into these events. The *Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period* (CM 4; BM 35603) offers compelling evidence that Antiochus III was killed in Elymais. The strong alignment between this account and the Graeco-Roman literature suggests that the account of Antiochus III's death is likely accurate⁴². Similarly, the astronomical diary AD 163 (obv. C₂17'-18') (BM 41628) indicates that Antiochus IV died in the eastern regions of the empire, aligning with classical sources, although the plundering of the temple is not mentioned. It is therefore reasonable to conclude that both accounts are historically plausible, especially given the relatively frequent occurrence of temple looting during this period⁴³. Moreover, it is conceivable that, in

41. AD 163 [BM 41628] obv. C217'-18': [... it]-[ti] LU₂UŠ₂ ša₂ LUGAL GIN^{MES}-ni it-ti [...] [18'] [...] ša₂ ^MAn A ša₂ ^MAn.

42. The following reference by Valerius Maximus to the death of Antiochus III should be interpreted as an invented anecdote or one largely distorted by literary embellishments (*Vir. Ill.* 54.4): *uictus et ultra Taurum montem relegatus a sodalibus, quos temulentus in conuiuio pulsarat, occisus est* "defeated and exiled beyond the Taurus Mountains, he was killed by his own companions, whom he had struck while drunk at a feast".

43. For instance, Antiochus III plundered a temple in Ecbatana (Polyb. X, 27, 12-13); Antiochus IV plundered some temples in Egypt during his invasion (Polyb. XXX, 26, 9); also, Antiochus IV engaged in a sacred marriage with the Artemis of the temple of Bambyke in Hierapolis and obtained the goods of the temple (Gran. Lic. XXVIII, 6, 1). In addition, GELLER (1991: 1-4) and TAYLOR (2014: 232) propose that Antiochus IV also sacked the Esagil at Babylon (AD 168 C1 rev. 10'-11'). About other Seleucid kings, Seleucus I plundered a temple in Ecbatana (Polyb. X, 27, 11); Heliodorus, a Seleucid official under Seleucus IV's command, tried to sack

the event that elements of one story were attributed to the other, the more accurate account would be that of Antiochus III.

Source	King	Temple's Divinity	End of the story
[a] Polybius XXXI 9	Antiochus IV	Artemis	Death by disease
[b] 1 <i>Maccabees</i> 6.1-4	Antiochus IV	–	Flight
[c] 2 <i>Maccabees</i> 1.13-17, 9.1-4	Antiochus IV	–	Flight
[d] Diodorus XXVIII 3, XXIX 15, XXXI 18a ⁴⁴	Antiochus III Antiochus IV	Zeus Diana	Killed by local people Divine punishment
[e] Porphyrius <i>FGrHist</i> 260 F 47, 53, 56	Antiochus III Antiochus IV	– Diana	Killed by the Elymaeans Non-violent (?) death
[f] Strabo XVI 1.18	Antiochus III	Belus	–
[g] Flavius Josephus <i>AJ</i> XII 354-359	Antiochus IV	Artemis	Death (?)
[h] Appian <i>Syr.</i> 66	Antiochus IV	Aphrodite Elymais	Death by disease
[i] Justin XXXII 2.1-2	Antiochus III	Jupiter	Killed by local people
[j] Hieronymus VIII 19 675-676	Antiochus IV	Diana	Death by disease
[k] Eusebius <i>Chron.</i> 347-348	Antiochus III	–	Killed by the Elymaeans
[l] Sulpicius Severus <i>Chron.</i> II 22.2	Antiochus IV	–	Fight with local people (?)
[m] Zonaras I 320	Antiochus IV	Artemis	Flight

Yahweh's temple in Jerusalem (2 *Macc.* 3-4); Alexander II sacked a temple of Zeus in Antioch (Diod. Sic. XXXIV, 28; Just. XXXIX, 2); Seleucus I sacked the royal palace of Ecbatana; also, TAYLOR (2014: 225-27) suggests that Seleucus I plundered the temple of Nabû in Borsippa (AD 302/301).

44. Diod. Sic. XXXI, 18a = Porph. *FGrHist* 260 F 53.

Bibliographical references

- BEAULIEU, P.-A. (2022). “The Death of Antiochus IV in the Context of Babylonian Hellenistic Historiography”. In ANAGNOSTOU, E.; PFEIFFER, S. (eds.). *Culture and Ideology under the Seleucids. Unframing a Dynasty*. Berlin-Boston: De Gruyter, p. 251-66.
<<https://doi.org/10.1515/9783110755626-016>>
- BORGER, R. (1981). *Assyrisch-babylonische Zeichenliste*. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Verlag Butzon & Bercker Kevelaer.
- BOUCHÉ-LECLERCQ, A. (1913). *Histoire des Séleucides*, 2 vols. Paris: E. Leroux.
- ECKHARDT, B. (2016). “The Hasmoneans and their Rivals in Seleucid and Post-Seleucid Judea”. *JSJ* 47(1), p. 55-70.
<<https://doi.org/10.1163/15700631-12340449>>
- GELLER, M. J. (1991). “New Information on Antiochus IV from Babylonian Astronomical Diaries”. *BSOAS* 54(1), p. 1-4.
<<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0041977X00009575>>
- GERA, D.; HOROWITZ, W. (1997). “Antiochus IV in Life and Death: Evidence from the Babylonian Astronomical Diaries”. *JAOS* 117(2), p. 240-52.
<<https://doi.org/10.2307/605488>>
- GUÉPIN, J. P. (1965-66). “A Contribution to the Location of Ta Azara, the Chief Sanctuary of Elymais”. *Persica* 2, p. 18-26.
- GUTSCHMID, A. (1888). *Geschichte Irans und seiner Nachbarländer von Alexander dem Großen bis zum Untergang der Arsaciden*. Tübingen: H. Laupp.
- HANSMAN, J. F. (1978). “Seleucia and the Three Douraks”. *Iran* 16, p. 154-60.
<<https://doi.org/10.2307/4299655>>
- HARMATTA, J. (1981). “Parthia and Elymais in the Second Century BC”. *AAnthHung* 29, p. 189-217.
- HERZFIELD, E. (1932). *Sakastan, Geschichtliche Untersuchungen zu den Ausgrabungen am Kuhh I Khwadja*. Berlin: Archäologische Mitteilungen aus Iran.
- HOLLEAUX, M. (1916). “La mort d’Antiochos IV Epiphane: Études d’histoire hellénistique III”. *REA* 18(2), p. 77-102.
- KRIKONA, E. (2017). “Plunder of Temples by Seleukid Kings – The Cases Under the Reign of Antiochos III, Seleukos IV, and Antiochos IV”. *Journal of Ancient History and Archaeology* 4(1), p. 19-28.
<<https://doi.org/10.14795/j.v4i1.222>>
- LOREIN, G. W. (2001). “Some Aspects of the Life and Death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes: A New Presentation of Old Viewpoints”. *AncSoc* 31, p. 157-71.
<<https://doi.org/10.2143/AS.31.0.48>>
- MENDELS, D. (1981). “A Note on the Tradition of Antiochus IV’s Death”. *IEJ* 31(1/2), p. 53-56.
- MIGNE, J.-P. (1884). *Sancti Eusebii Hieronymi Stridonensis Presbyteri Opera Omnia*. Paris: Garnier fratres.
- MØRKHOLM, O. (1966). *Antiochus IV of Syria*. Aarhus: Gyldendal.
- NIESE, B. (1903). *Geschichte der Griechischen und Makedonischen Staaten: seit der Schlacht bei Chaeronea*. Gotha: F.A. Perthes.
- NODELMAN, S. A. (1960). “A Preliminary History of Characene”. *Berytus* 13, p. 83-121.
- SCHOENE, A. (1875). *Eusebi Chronicorum Libri Duo*. Berlin: Weidmanns.
- TARN, W. W. (1938). *The Greeks in Bactria and India*. Cambridge: CUP.
- TAYLOR, M. J. (2014). “Sacred Plunder and the Seleucid Near East”. *G&R* 61(2), p. 222-41.
<<https://doi.org/10.1017/S0017383514000175>>

- THIRLWALL, C. N. (1833). “On the Position of Susa”. *The Philological Museum* 2, p. 185-92.
<<https://doi.org/10.1017/CBO9781139410717.009>>
- VON SODEN, W. (1965). *Akkadischen Handwörterbuch*, Bände I. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
— (1974). *Akkadischen Handwörterbuch*, Bände III. Wiesbaden: Harrassowitz.
- WEITZMAN, S. (2004). “Plotting Antiochus’s persecution”. *JBL* 123(2), p. 219-34.
<<https://doi.org/10.2307/3267943>>