

The Torah in 1Maccabees
A Literary Critical Approach to the Text

Francis Borchardt

Academic Dissertation to be publicly discussed by due permission of the
Faculty of Theology, at the University of Helsinki in Auditorium XII on the
4th of May, 2012, at noon.

F. Borchardt, *The Torah in 1Maccabees*

ISBN 978-952-10-7907 (paperback)

Printed in Finland by Unigrafia 2012

This dissertation is published electronically by E-thesis,

University of Helsinki

ISBN 978-952-10-7908-5 (PDF)

Acknowledgements

Throughout the process of preparing this dissertation I have received invaluable guidance from various professors in the department of Biblical Studies at the University of Helsinki. Professor Raija Sollamo has overseen the work from the beginning, and shepherded me through the entire doctoral process. I owe her many thanks. Professor Anneli Aejmelaesus has, especially in the context of meetings and colloquia, offered great support and insightful comments on various issues within the text. Her input was always highly valued as I worked through the details of my argument. Professor Martti Nissinen has been extraordinarily supportive in a variety of ways, even preceding the commencement of my doctoral studies. I am happy to have him as a professor and friend. Special thanks must be extended to Professor Christoph Levin of Ludwig Maximilian University in München, who willingly and skillfully took up the task of forming my kernel of an idea into a workable and pertinent thesis. Without his aid, the literary critical sections of this study would have been far more daunting.

Dr. Juha Pakkala has been helpful and supportive in countless ways throughout this process. From helping me to wind my way through the foreign university bureaucracy to providing me with funding through the European Young Investigator (EURYI) award he received for the Birth and Transmission of Holy Tradition project. This allowed me opportunities to travel, research, and participate in conferences that would have been otherwise impossible. More important than the funding, however, was the opportunity Dr. Pakkala offered to participate in the dynamic research group he formed. The members of the Birth and Transmission of Holy Tradition project helped me to entirely change my perspective on some of the most fundamental questions in biblical studies, and I always treasure their input.

I received further financial support from the University of Helsinki in the form of research and travel grants that helped to bring this study to completion.

My family, however, has been my greatest strength and most valuable asset throughout my period of study. The support offered first by my mother, father and brother, and later by my wife and children has never waned. I especially must thank my wife Nele, and my daughters Alexandra and Sophia, for being so eager to lead a life of continent hopping and library visiting. It's not always easy, but they constantly greet this life with a smile. It is to them that this book is dedicated.

On To Fung Shan (the Christian mountain), Hong Kong, March 2012

Francis Borchardt

Table of Contents

Part I

I. Introduction.....	6
I.1 Aim.....	6
I.2 Previous Studies.....	8
I.2.i The Law in Scholarship of 1Maccabees.....	9
I.2.ii The (dis)Unity of 1Maccabees in Scholarship.....	38
I.3 Restatement of Aims.....	50
I.4 Methods and Premises.....	50
I.5 Partitio.....	54
II. Literary Criticism of 1Maccabees.....	56
II.1 1Macc 1.....	56
II.2 1Macc 2.....	66
II.3 1Macc 3.....	73
II.4 1Macc 5.....	79
II.5 1Macc 6.....	88
II.6 1Macc 7.....	98
II.7 1Macc 8.....	113
II.8 1Macc 9.....	124
II.9 1Macc 10.....	138
II.10 1Macc 11.....	154
II.11 1Macc 12.....	156
II.12 1Macc 13.....	165

II.13 1Macc 14.....178

II.14 Organizing the Additions.....188

Part II

Excursus: The Law in Tradition.....221

III. The Law and Its Place in 1Maccabees.....241

 III.1 Meaningful Vocabulary.....242

 III.2 Religious Value and Significance of the Concept of the Law.....244

 III.3 Summary: The Law and Laws in 1Maccabees.....282

IV. Concluding Remarks.....294

Bibliography.....299

Abstract.....308

Part I

I. Introduction: The Torah in 1Maccabees

The first book of Maccabees is perhaps best known as one of the few ancient sources left to modern scholars concerned with the Judean rebellion from the Seleucid empire beginning shortly after 170 BCE. The book uses the rise of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and his subsequent persecutions of the Judeans as its starting point, and closes with Judean autonomy secured under the third-generation scion of the Hasmoneans, John Hyrcanus I, in c.140 BCE. In between these two events the plot tells the story of the Judean rebellion through a focus on its Hasmonean leaders and their role in the events. Battles, schemes, and diplomacy dominate the account and provide a vivid picture for any reader. For its historical value alone, the first book of Maccabees has become a necessity, and for this same reason, has been well researched.

I.1 Aim

This study begins with a specific, though complicated goal: to outline the extent, function, and scope of the law¹ in the first book of Maccabees.² In embarking on this

¹ Henceforth, the terms *nomos*/*νόμος*, *torah*/תּוֹרָה, and *law* will be used interchangeably throughout the study. Though each of these terms has several possible meanings, we use this terminology to refer to the prospective ancestral (or perceived as such) commands, stories and instructions passed down (or perceived to be passed down) through the generations in oral or written form, which may or may not carry some degree of authority among a self-defined group of adherents either confined to, or tracing their origins from, the area of the southern Levant. It is our hope that this choice avoids begging the question by approaching the goal with too narrow a definition of the term. The decision to proceed with this definition seems to keep open a wide range of functions and identities for the law while taking account of the literary and cultural context, which give us a relatively narrow understanding of the term.

² We will refer to this book also as 1Macc and 1Maccabees throughout the study.

study, we are seeking to show what teachings, instructions, and acts 1Maccabees specifically includes under the heading νόμος, which aspects of those teachings are particularly stressed by the author(s), and how those specific examples might instruct us concerning the way in which the law was used for 1Maccabees. By studying this aspect of the text we seek to shed light upon a long-neglected feature of 1Maccabees that has implications both for the understanding of 1Macc itself, and for historical and religious reconstructions of the Hasmonean period.

The two-fold benefits of such a study are easily discernible. Intrinsicly for 1Maccabees, the nomos and terms related to it are mentioned at several points throughout the book.³ Because of the frequency of legal language, it is important for any interpreter of 1Maccabees to understand what is being referenced when the text refers to the law. More importantly, the law is specifically referred to as one of the main reasons for the rebellion on various occasions in 1Macc.⁴ Since this is the very reason for the Hasmonean revolt as stated by both characters in the story and the narrator of 1Maccabees, it follows that one should understand precisely what it is that is being defended. Of further importance to comprehending the law in 1Maccabees is the fact that at four points the characters are said to act “according to the law” (κατὰ τὸ κρίμα/ κατὰ τὸν νόμον).⁵ It is only once we understand the full impact and place of the law in 1Maccabees that each episode can be properly interpreted for its own sake.

Extrinsicly, there are also numerous reasons why such an undertaking might be helpful. Firstly, any opportunity to sketch the influence of the torah on the Judeans of the 2nd/1st centuries BCE should be pursued because there is not an overwhelming amount of reliable evidence in existence. Aside from 1Maccabees, there are only explicitly 2Maccabees, parts of what we now know as the apocrypha and pseudepigrapha, likely some psalms, the (Hebrew) book of Ben Sira, the book of Daniel, some texts found in the caves in the Judean desert, and the secondary layers and additions to the texts that would

³ Νόμος is referenced 26 times in 1Maccabees; δικαίωμα is mentioned 3 times; πρόσταγμα appears 6 times; νόμιμος is referred to 7 times; ἐντολή occurs 4 times; κρίμα appears 2 times; συγκρίμα is referred to 1 time.

⁴ 1Macc 2:27, 42, 50; 3:21, 29; 13:3; 14:29

⁵ 2:24; 3:56; 4:47, 53

later become canonized into scripture. Not all of these texts testify to the influence of the law, and certainly few of them treat it explicitly. Thus the historical depiction of the *nomos* at this time is spotty at best. The one place where we have the best and most data concerning the function and influence of the torah during this time is from the “library” of Qumran, but even there one could not suggest that the entirety of legal understandings of the 2nd and 1st centuries BCE are represented. These embody only a small part of the wide variety of opinions concerning the law during this formative period. Likewise, the input of 1Maccabees is able to fill in another segment of the full depiction of how the law performed and was received in this era. This is of special significance to 1Maccabees because of the setting of the text. Since parts or all of 1Maccabees likely stem from the Hasmonean court or its supporters, one might reasonably expect that the opinions put forth in the text resemble those propagated as official teachings during the Hasmonean era. Though it is obvious from some of the other evidence available that these were not the only interpretations popular at the time, they were likely the ones connected with the temple and palace. Thus, knowledge of the way 1Maccabees views the law is invaluable for the reconstruction of the religious, political, and national circumstances of the Hasmonean dynasty.

1.2 Previous Studies

Though there have been a wealth of studies in the modern era of biblical and historical scholarship treating 1Maccabees, only a handful of projects have attempted descriptions of the legal situation in the first book of Maccabees. The most important commentaries of Grimm,⁶ Keil,⁷ Kautzsch,⁸ Oesterley,⁹ Abel,¹⁰ Zeitlin,¹¹ Dancy,¹²

⁶ C. Grimm, *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1853).

⁷ C. Keil, *Commentar über die Bücher der Makkabäer* (Leipzig: Dörffling und Francke, 1875).

⁸ E. Kautzsch, “Das erste Buch der Makkabäer” *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tübingen: Mohr, 1900).

⁹ W. Oesterley, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Schocken Books, 1948).

¹⁰ F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949).

¹¹ S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950).

¹² J. Dancy, *Commentary on 1 Maccabees* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954).

Bartlett,¹³ Goldstein¹⁴ and Doran¹⁵ are surprisingly unconcerned with questions about the law, opting for a more general historical and literary approach to their comments. In the historical reconstructions of the Hasmonean revolt and the ensuing dynasty, such as those of Bickerman,¹⁶ Schürer,¹⁷ Fischer,¹⁸ Derfler,¹⁹ Efron,²⁰ Sievers,²¹ Bar Kochva,²² and Harrington,²³ as well as in the partial treatments of Wellhausen²⁴ and Grabbe²⁵ there is equally little interest in legal matters. The same of course goes for the sociological and political discussions of the broader period, which are too numerous to mention, but include the impressive studies of Collins,²⁶ Gruen,²⁷ and Mendels.²⁸ Where these topics are treated, the relationship to the law is only tangential.

1.2.i The Law in Scholarship of 1Maccabees

There are only three studies in existence, to my knowledge, that attempt to look seriously at the content or quality of the *nomos* in 1Maccabees in any way. All three of

¹³ J. Bartlett, *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1973).

¹⁴ J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976)

¹⁵ R. Doran, *The First Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections* (New Interpreter's Bible 4; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996).

¹⁶ E. Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (SJLA 32; Leiden: Brill, 1979).

¹⁷ E. Schürer, et al. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1973).

¹⁸ T. Fischer, *Seleukiden und Makkabäer* (Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1980).

¹⁹ S. Derfler, *Hasmonean Revolt: Rebellion or Revolution* (ANETS 5; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1989).

²⁰ J. Efron, *Studies on the Hasmonean Period* (New York: Brill, 1987).

²¹ J. Sievers, *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters. From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 6; Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1990)

²² B. Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989).

²³ Harrington, D. *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution* (Wilmington: Glazer, 1988).

²⁴ J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1921).

²⁵ L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992).

²⁶ J. Collins, *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora* (New York: Crossroad, 1986).

²⁷ E. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998).

²⁸ D. Mendels, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism* (New York: Doubleday, 1992).

these investigations stem from a period of just over a decade in the middle of the twentieth century. They all approach the outline of the law in different ways, and with different aims, which shall be outlined below.

William R. Farmer, in his (significantly redacted) dissertation *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*²⁹ is the first of these three scholars to attempt any sort of description of the Maccabean attitude toward the torah. His goal, it should be made clear, is not to endeavor an illustration of the Maccabean concept of the law on its own, nor is it to specifically focus on 1Maccabees. Rather, as his title suggests, Farmer tries to draw positive comparisons between the Jewish nationalism of the Maccabean period³⁰ and that of the Roman period.³¹ Particularly, Farmer concerns himself with showing the hypocrisy of Josephus' bias against the zealots during the period of rebellion against Rome (66-70 CE) by providing numerous examples of their connections to the Maccabees, whom Josephus celebrates.³² In this effort, we should recognize that Farmer is actually very successful. His many examples of the resemblance between actions taken at the time of the Maccabean rebellion and those acts performed during the Roman rebellion show a close relationship between the two movements.

Part of the way Farmer facilitates his comparison is by showing that the basis of the two manifestations of Judean nationalism is zeal for the torah.³³ Specifically, he brands this sort of nationalism *Torahcentric*.³⁴ It is in presenting the evidence for this claim that Farmer delves into specific aspects of the law in both the Seleucid and Roman periods. As one might guess, Farmer's sources for the Seleucid period are 1Macc, 2Macc, and Josephus. By these means, Farmer's study becomes of special interest to our

²⁹ W. Farmer, *Maccabees, Zealots, and Josephus: An Inquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956).

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 47. Farmer defines the Maccabean or Seleucid period as the 2nd century BCE, though elsewhere he narrows this to the time between the rise of Mattathias to the death of his son Simon [168-134 BCE], 49.

³¹ *Ibid.*, 49, the Roman period is defined as the era from the capture of Judea by Pompey to the destruction of the temple by Titus [62 BCE-70 CE].

³² *Ibid.*, 12.

³³ *Ibid.*, 48-49.

³⁴ *Ibid.*, 48.

own. We should also recognize that the study does not describe the whole of Maccabean law, but only those aspects that deal with Judean nationalism. Our review of Farmer's work shall only touch upon his treatment of the law as it relates to 1Maccabees; we shall not comment on the rest of his argument other than to note that he lacks any sort of acceptable definition or model of nationalism and is largely uncritical of his primary sources.

Farmer begins with the premise that in the post-exilic period the torah is the unchallenged ruling factor in Israel.³⁵ While there is an argument to be made concerning this claim, it is not at all self-evident. Yet, Farmer provides no proof, either from ancient or modern sources. A second issue with this statement is the problem of determining what is included in the term torah. Though he is never explicit, it appears that Farmer restricts the definition to the canonical Pentateuch.³⁶ This comes with its own problems due to the fact that there was certainly by this time some form of oral-torah,³⁷ as well as laws arising out of other situations,³⁸ which might have been equally as authoritative as those contained in the Pentateuch. Because of both of these unsubstantiated premises, it is obvious that Farmer's study can only be of limited use when investigating the place of the law for the author(s) of 1Maccabees. If we already assume a primary spot in the society and culture, and have already identified the body of laws that are most important, then it is difficult to foster any sort of discussion. Still, the individual facets of laws Farmer highlights and describes are of some interest.

³⁵ Ibid., 50.

³⁶ Ibid., 49, 51-52. There is already a significant problem here regarding the transmission of texts. Even if one were to accept that the Pentateuch was at the center of Jewish consciousness, there is no guarantee that the contents of that Pentateuch were identical, and evidence (LXX, Samaritan, proto MT, e.g.) suggests that they were in fact not. On another problematic aspect of this claim see F. Borchardt "Concepts of Scripture in 1Maccabees" in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality, Vol. 1: Thematic Studies* (eds. C. Evans; D. Zacharias; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 32-33.

³⁷ The evidence of the various sects with their own laws and unique interpretations of "generally accepted" laws, as well as the development of halakah around this time show clearly that one cannot only speak of the Pentateuch when discussing the torah.

³⁸ An example of this might be the decision at 1Macc 2.40-41 to fight against attackers on the Sabbath, which by the time of Josephus (*Ant.* 14.63) is referred to as law. Interestingly, Farmer notes this, but does not account for it as part of the torah which lies at the center of post-exilic Israel, W. Farmer, *Maccabees*, 75-76.

Among the many features of the torah Farmer compares are: the desire on the part of the Judeans to protect the scrolls of the torah/covenant from destruction,³⁹ the abstention from unclean food,⁴⁰ the abhorrence of cultural (i.e. non-religious) Hellenization,⁴¹ the willingness to fight-and-kill/suffer-and-die for the torah,⁴² the centrality of circumcision (especially forced),⁴³ and the fluidness of Sabbath observance in war-time compared to its rigidity in peace-time.⁴⁴ Some of these subjects are in evidence in 1Maccabees more than others, but all are found somewhere in the narrative. Because of this, Farmer's ideas are valuable in that they can point to specific ways the torah is treated in 1Maccabees that might separate it or form a continuation with teachings in other books or from those of other periods. For instance, though Farmer does not pursue the idea to its end,⁴⁵ the fact that the scrolls of the law are sought out for destruction by the gentiles on the one hand, and protected by the Judeans on the other, is a fascinating clue to the way 1Maccabees, and the world it depicts, regard the law. Most of Farmer's insights are helpful to our investigation in this same way. That is, they highlight specific qualities and categories of the law that shed light upon the place of the law in 1Maccabees. Beyond this though, the scope of Farmer's research is too far removed from either 1Maccabees or the law itself to be of true value for us.

The second of three works that treats the law of 1Maccabees in any detail is that of Bernard Renaud. In an article published in *Revue Biblique* 68 (1961)⁴⁶ entitled "La Loi et les Lois dans les Livres des Maccabées", Renaud attempts to accomplish our goal almost exactly, the only difference being that he tries to discuss the law in both the first and second books of the Maccabees. Though his treatment of the material is relatively brief, it is full of information, and he acknowledges himself that "Il y a place dès lors

³⁹ Ibid., 52-54.

⁴⁰ Ibid., 54-56.

⁴¹ Ibid., 56-60.

⁴² Ibid., 60-68.

⁴³ Ibid., 70-72.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 72-81.

⁴⁵ Ibid., 53. Farmer's analysis is limited to the observation that both in the Seleucid and Roman periods the sources tell us about the destruction of sacred writings, which is out of character for both the Seleucid and Roman policies.

⁴⁶ B. Renaud, "La Loi et les Lois dans les Livres des Maccabées" *RB* 68 (1961) 39-52.

pour une petite monographie, qui à notre connaissance, n'a jamais été tentée.⁴⁷ It is unclear whether he ever attempted such a monograph, but no other scholar has yet taken up the challenge of describing the law in either or both first and second Maccabees in a lengthened monograph form. Whether this can be credited to the quality of Renaud's study (and that of Arenhoevel,⁴⁸ who follows him), or to the insistence of critics of 1Maccabees to focus on the historical questions,⁴⁹ cannot be guessed. What is certain is that Renaud makes an incredibly important contribution to the research of 1Maccabees on the one hand and the growth and acceptance of the torah on the other, despite the fact that his work may not be widely read.

Renaud's work is organized in such way to pull out from 1Maccabees those aspects of the law, which he finds most useful in sketching a full depiction of the torah's influence. He begins with an analysis of the most central terms to the question at hand,⁵⁰ then moves to discuss the value and significance of the concept of the law.⁵¹ The latter section is broken down into subsections that highlight particular features of the torah's value, such as the law's supremacy in the hierarchy of religious values,⁵² the law's role as the principle discrimination between good people and miscreants,⁵³ and the attempt to subordinate all the other traditional religious categories under the general heading of the torah.⁵⁴ As each of these contributions is quite different from the others we will treat each separately in our review.

Renaud cites five different terms that are of primary importance for the study of the law in 1Maccabees: νόμος, δικαίωμα, πρόσταγμα, νόμιμα, ἐντολή. About νόμος Renaud states that the term is the most frequently used word concerning the law.⁵⁵

⁴⁷ Ibid., 39.

⁴⁸ Cf. the review of Arenhoevel's work below.

⁴⁹ D. Williams, *The Structure of 1Maccabees* (CBQMS 31; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999), 2.

⁵⁰ B. Renaud, "La Loi", 39-42.

⁵¹ Ibid., 42-52.

⁵² Ibid., 43-45.

⁵³ Ibid., 45-49.

⁵⁴ Ibid., 49-52.

⁵⁵ Ibid., 39. He counts that it is employed 27 times by our author. He does not cite the places he finds the word in use, so it is not clear where the discrepancy between his count

Additionally he remarks that it seems to be used almost systematically to refer only to the Judean law, whether designating the scroll of the torah, a particular piece of legislation, or even a more vaguely defined large facet of the Judean religion.⁵⁶ He notes further that it is at times difficult to choose between the possible definitions of νόμος, and that the absence or presence of an article and whether the word is singular or plural does not seem to make a significant difference.⁵⁷ Renaud closes his discussion of νόμος with perhaps the most interesting fact: it has a total absence of determinatives such as θεοῦ (of God), κυρίου (of the Lord), or Μωϋσέως (of Moses).

The terms δικαίωμα, πρόσταγμα, and νόμιμα are all treated together by Renaud because he sees them as all referring back to the same Hebrew terms רַב־כֹּהֵן and חֻקִּים (statute, ordinance, decree) in the rest of the LXX. The main differentiation between these words and νόμος is that these terms can refer equally to the Judean statutes as they can to the Gentile decrees. In 1Maccabees, Renaud finds that δικαίωμα and πρόσταγμα are far less common than νόμος, occurring only four and six times respectively. Additionally, he sees these terms as practically synonymous, as proven by their similar uses in parallel phrases. Renaud believes that νόμιμα has an almost identical meaning to the previous two terms as well. Like the previous terms, and as it is used in the LXX, νόμιμα indicates both the customs and laws of the Judeans and the pagans. Through a similar method of comparing terms in parallel phrases, Renaud shows that νόμιμα is synonymous with δικαίωμα. He does allow for the possibility that the term takes on its traditional meaning of “custom”,⁵⁸ though he stipulates that it is only in cases where the custom is so old that it has the value of a proscription. Renaud concludes that all three of these terms are basically synonymous and refer to particular statutes and customs, which are in the orbit of the torah if not specifically prescribed there.⁵⁹

and ours (26) is to be found. However, he is likely citing the evidence of Alexandrinus at 2:22, which is against the reading of the majority of other witnesses.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 39.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 40.

⁵⁸ Ibid., 40.

⁵⁹ Ibid., 40.

ἐντολή is the final expression described by Renaud. He claims that it is used as a technical expression for a royal ordinance based both on its usage in 1Maccabees (2:19, 31; 11:2) and on examples attested in the papyri of the Hellenistic period. Only in one case is ἐντολή found to refer to the torah (2:53), but Renaud suspects that it is because the text is inspired heavily by the praise of the ancestors in Ben Sira 45:5, 17. He also allows for the possibility that ἐντολή is used for the laws of the ante-torah patriarchs, while νόμος is reserved for the law promulgated by Moses.⁶⁰

By way of summarization, Renaud claims that the usage of the legal vocabulary by-and-large reflects that of the rest of the LXX. Especially notable for Renaud is the way 1Maccabees preserves all the senses of the torah: teaching, instruction, and revelation. He further cites that the lack of determinatives used for the term νόμος as a sign of the invasion of the law into the religion because the law has absolute value, and no longer needs to claim lofty origins. Renaud also believes that there is more attention paid to particular laws and customs, especially those dealing with worship, than previous to 1Maccabees, because these laws maintain Judean individuality amid the Hellenistic melting pot.⁶¹ Finally, Renaud remarks that the legal vocabulary is found far more frequently in the first four chapters than the last twelve; he attributes this to the course of the revolution, which had attained all its religious goals with the cleansing of the temple, but still had political aspirations.⁶²

Much of this work done by Renaud is important and groundbreaking for our purposes. The way in which he traces the meaning of the terms, and particularly the way he relates their usage in the rest of the LXX is very helpful. Moreover, he makes some fine observations regarding the exclusive use of terms for certain technical purposes, while showing how other words are used far more freely. There are only a few points where one may criticize his work. First, Renaud should probably have included σύγγραμμα (decree) and κρίμα (judgement, decree) in his collection of legal terms. This

⁶⁰ Ibid., 41.

⁶¹ Ibid., 41.

⁶² Ibid., 42.

is a minor point as each word is only used once,⁶³ but they are explicitly legal, and do influence the overall information. A similar, though less minor criticism has to do with Renaud's omission of λόγος (command) when used in an explicitly legal sense. The word is used seven times in this manner,⁶⁴ making it the second most frequently employed legal term. This sort of oversight is inexcusable, especially when the term can be used for both torah and gentile laws.

Renaud's arguments for considering δικαίωμα and πρόσταγμα nearly synonymous are also not entirely convincing. While he is correct that in one instance of each word there appears to be synonymous usage (1:49; 10:14), the terms are employed rather differently outside of this setting. πρόσταγμα is used almost exclusively of the king's commands, with only one other exception (2:68) outside of 10:14, while δικαίωμα refers only to the Judean ordinances except for one instance where it obviously references general gentile customs, but never the king's commands. For this reason it appears that πρόσταγμα is used in the sense of more official decrees, while δικαίωμα is employed more generally for particular customs.

Also dubious are Renaud's arguments for the Judean meaning of ἐντολή. Though he is certainly correct that in all its uses in a gentile setting, 1Maccabees strictly employs ἐντολή for royal ordinances, the explanations he provides for its use at 2:53 do not hold water. If the author of 1Maccabees were so wedded to his apparent source in Sirach 45:5, 17 using ἐντολή in the sense of torah, then one would expect that other traces of this source would come out in the immediate context. However, Joseph, who is referred to in 1Macc 2:53 is not praised in the context in Sirach, nor is he recalled anywhere in the whole praise of the ancestors. Further, aside from some similarities with the praise of Abraham (Sirach 44:20; 1Macc 2:52), the praise of Phinehas (Sirach 45:23-24; 1Macc 2:54), and the praise of Caleb (Sirach 46:9; 1Macc 2:56), there is little to tie the two passages together. 1Maccabees passes over many of the important heroes and focuses on different aspects of the ones the two songs of praise do share. It is thus unlikely that 1Maccabees is preserving the sense of ἐντολή recalled from the poem (if the author even

⁶³ Σύγχριμα: 1:57; κρίμα: 2:24

⁶⁴ λόγος: 1:50; 2:33, 34, 55; 3:14, 39, 42.

knew of it). The second explanation Renaud provides is equally unlikely. If the author used ἐντολή only for the ante-Sinaitic laws, and reserved only the term νόμος for the laws of Moses then we would expect that Joshua would obey the νόμος; he instead follows the λόγος. Further, Renaud has already correctly stated that the law does not receive any determinatives like “of Moses” nor is Moses praised here; this should signal that it would not matter to our author whether the law being followed was transmitted by Moses. It is more probable that ἐντολή is simply used just as ambiguously as πρόσταγμα.

Finally the conclusions Renaud draws from some of his observations should be questioned. It seems rather rash based on such a scant amount of evidence as is provided by Renaud to conclude that the law has taken a more dominant place in religion. The lack of determinatives for the law (such as “of Moses”, “of the Lord”, “of God”) hardly has anything to do with providing justification for it to be followed. Perhaps at its inception attributing the law to YHWH through Moses gave it a certain amount of weight among the community of Israel, but in most literature where the law is attributed to a specific author it is more a familiar expression than proof of its validity. Further, if the law were so common and so engrained in Judean culture and mindset for the author or audience of 1Maccabees there would not be such a difficult task to get all the Judeans to perform the precepts of the law. Also, if the law were essential for the Judean culture and national identity, they would not be so willing to bend or break it for the sake of their lives (1Macc 2.39-41; 9.43-49).

The second conclusion that Renaud puts forth concerning the frequency of the legal terminology is also challenging. By showing that the legal terminology is fairly concentrated on the first four chapters, Renaud believes he is lending credence to the argument of Dancy, who claims that there is a movement from the religious to the political in the course of the revolution and its account in 1Maccabees.⁶⁵ The problem with this is that Renaud is not looking at the broader religious picture, and negating the argument he put forth immediately before this, that the cultic laws are stressed as a matter of sharpening the Judean identity in the broader Hellenistic picture. If we look at the

⁶⁵ J. Dancy, *Commentary*, 1-3.

terms for temple and sanctuary, which have obvious religious connotations—at least as strong as the terms for the law—we find an entirely different set of circumstances. The terms ἁγίασμα (9x/4x),⁶⁶ ἅγιος (9x/17x), ναός (5x/1x), ἱερόν (0x/7x) and οἶκος (2x/1x) appear less frequently in the first four chapters (25x total) than they do in the last twelve chapters (30x total). This might seem to be quite advantageous for the first four chapters until one recalls that the cleansing of the temple is reported in chapter four, which has a large amount of temple vocabulary on its own (10x). This evidence shows it is not so obvious that there is a movement toward the political after chapter four, and that Renaud in some places is trying to use very little data to say quite a bit. This puts to the side the question of whether “religious” and “political” are spheres that can rightly be separated when discussing the ancient Judean context.

Renaud’s second section, concerning the value and religious significance of the concept of the law is where he gets into the real meat of his argument. He outlines his methodology at the start of this section:

L’étude du vocabulaire nous a montré l’importance capitale de la Loi dans la perspective religieuse de 1M. Il reste à préciser et à approfondir ces conclusions par une analyse détaillée du concept lui-même en examinant pas à pas les différentes expressions où le terme νόμος est employé. A partir de là, nous pourrions dégager les traits caractéristiques de cette catégorie religieuse.⁶⁷

The approach Renaud takes is perhaps different from what one might expect. By examining the expressions where νόμος is found and then comparing them to other expressions found in cognate literature Renaud hopes to find a meaningful enough connection to be able to unlock the religious value of the law. He is surprisingly innovative in doing so, and at times finds very convincing examples for his conclusions, which he intersperses throughout his argument.

Renaud begins this section by showing the supremacy of the law in the hierarchy of religious values. Renaud first tries to show the consecration of the law by studying one phrase concerning the Hasideans in 1Macc 2:42: ὁ ἔκουσιαζόμενος τῷ νόμῳ (who

⁶⁶ The first of these two numbers is the amount of times the term is used in the first four chapters, the second is the amount it is used in the last twelve.

⁶⁷ B. Renaud, “La Loi”, 42.

volunteered for the law). Renaud shows how the verb is normally used to translate the hithpael of כָּתַב in the LXX, which always implies free engagement. Renaud also highlights the fact that the Hebrew term always has a sacerdotal or cultic meaning throughout the written tradition, being used for contribution to the tent of meeting, the sanctuary, or for the construction of the temple. He underscores further one instance in 1Chronicles 29:9 where the people volunteer for YHWH. It is because of this last instance that Renaud concludes “Dans le premier livre des Maccabées le Loi se substitue à Dieu et annexe à son profit un élan religieux primitivement cultuel. On se consacre à la Loi comme dans le culte on se consacre à Dieu.” In short, God is replaced by the torah as the primary object of devotion. Renaud provides a second proof of this consecration using the same method only changing the phrase: ζηλωσαι τῷ νόμῳ (zeal for the law). This occurs three times in 1Maccabees (2:26, 27, 50) but not at all anywhere else. Renaud concludes, with a few examples, that one is zealous for YHWH in literature outside of 1Maccabees⁶⁸. This all leads Renaud to conclude that “the law is no longer the lamp which lights the way to God, it has become the end and the object of religious veneration.⁶⁹”

There are some obvious problems with both the methods employed and, consequently, the results reached by Renaud in this analysis. First, the example chosen from 1Maccabees, which describes the Hasideans’ enthusiasm for the law is not a representative phrase for 1Maccabees. Only on this one occasion is any person or group described as volunteering for anything. In the face of numerous other uses of the term νόμος (26 by Renaud’s count) it is puzzling that this expression, which does not even describe major characters in the plot,⁷⁰ would significantly represent the overall viewpoint of 1Maccabees. To be sure, the evidence cannot be discounted, but it should not be taken as representative. Along these same lines, when searching for this phrase, and particularly for the term ἔκουσιν αἰζόμενος or its Hebrew equivalent, the hitpael of כָּתַב, Renaud chooses one particular use in the biblical corpus out of nearly twenty possible examples and presents it as the comparative term. While it is true that on one

⁶⁸ Ibid., 43.

⁶⁹ Ibid., 44. Translation mine.

⁷⁰ The ἄσιδαῖοι appear only twice in 1Macc 2:42; 7:13.

occasion in 1Chronicles 29:9 the people are said to have “given freely to the LORD” on numerous other occasions the term is used in a more general temple context of volunteering for service. It is irresponsible of Renaud to imply that because the term was once used with YHWH as the indirect object, and is in 1Maccabees once used with the torah as the indirect object, that the νόμος has somehow replaced the deity in the first book of Maccabees.

In a similar vein, Renaud’s analysis of ζηλωσαι τῷ νόμῳ is equally problematic. The phrase is more common in 1Maccabees than the previous one, being employed three times, so it can be seen as more representative, however, the use of the term in biblical literature is equally cherry-picked by Renaud. Out of thirty-four occurrences of the word זָהָב and an additional fifteen of the verb ζηλωσαι, he finds four places in the scriptural corpus where characters “zeal for the Lord/God”. Needless to say, there are many other uses of the term that have nothing to do with the deity, but Renaud simply passes over them, preferring the evidence that supports his claims.

A final criticism of this section of Renaud’s treatment of the law in 1Maccabees has to do with his overall choice of texts from the source material. Every one of his phrases comes from 1Macc 2. Though there is some truth to Renaud’s claim that this chapter is special and is perhaps central to exposing the real motives of the revolt,⁷¹ it is also the case that it is just one chapter in a book of sixteen. If we are really attempting to get a true sense of how the law is presented and functions in the world of 1Maccabees, it is necessary to look beyond the scope of one chapter that, by Renaud’s own admission, puts forth certain idealistic claims as motivation for the revolt.

As a second approach to showing the religious value of the law, Renaud endeavors to prove that the law is the principle of discrimination between the good and the miscreants. He states, “Le monde est divisé en deux camps, suivant l’option que l’on prend à son propos: d’un côté les observateurs de la Loi, de l’autre les « sans-Loi » (ἄνομοι) ou les « anti-Loi » (παράνομοι).” Renaud also points out that the pious and faithful Judeans are described with reference to the law; he concludes from this that the

⁷¹ B. Renaud, “La Loi”, 44.

“good” Judeans are essentially observers of the torah.⁷² Among the expressions he draws attention to are those mentioned in the previous section, as well as some new ones: θελητὰς νόμου (devoted to the law), ποιητὰς τοῦ νόμου (those who do the law), οἵτινες τὸν νόμον ποιούσιν (those who do the law).⁷³ In each of these cases pious and good members of the community of Israel are described. Renaud also underscores the different points at which living according to the law is communicated to characters within the book.⁷⁴ All of this is meant to show that good people and proper action are often described with legal terminology.

On the flip side, Renaud then goes into detailed descriptions of each of the terms for evil used in the book, and describes the groups to which they refer. He claims there are two groups whose qualifiers never overlap.⁷⁵ Renaud sees the terms as being applied systematically to either foreign persecutors on the one hand, or Judean apostates on the other. The terms used for the pagans are: ἁμαρτωλός (sinner), πονηρός (evil), διάβολος (adversary), οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας (the sons of arrogance), and οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀδικίαν (the workers of injustice). Renaud comes to this decision basically by relying on his opinion that parallelism with respect to these terms in 1Maccabees is never synonymous, but always an effort to juxtapose terms. This is how he proves ἁμαρτωλός (1:34; 2:44), πονηρός (14:14), and οἱ ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀδικίαν (9:23) all must refer to gentiles, as they are apposed to his terms for the apostate Judeans. With regard to διάβολος, Renaud relies both on context and its utilization in Esther to decide that it refers to the pagans. Most skillfully, Renaud shows that οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας refers to the gentile royal officers because the only other uses of ὑπερηφανία in 1Macc both refer to the gentile king (1:21, 24).⁷⁶

Renaud finds that the words for the apostate Judeans can be boiled down to three terms which are used quite frequently: ἄσεβής (impious), ἄνομος (lawless), and

⁷² Ibid., 45.

⁷³ Ibid., 45. These are found at 1Macc 4:42; 2:67; and 13:48 respectively.

⁷⁴ Ibid., 45.

⁷⁵ Ibid., 46.

⁷⁶ Ibid., 46.

παράνομος (outlaw).⁷⁷ Renaud proves that these words refer to apostates mostly by context clues, which show in certain instances that the members of these groups live in Judea or are related to Judean personages. Through this analysis Renaud concludes that the gentiles are never defined with regard to law, while members of the community of Israel are always judged based on their allegiance (or lack thereof) to the torah. Renaud notes that the usage in 1Maccabees is far more specific than in the LXX; he sees this as a significant development toward the nomistic traits of rabbinism. This is because in the rabbinical mind, according to Renaud, one must belong to the holy people in order to perform the law properly. He sees this reflected in the two-fold division between the Judean apostates and foreign sinners, who in previous literature would be treated all the same as sinners.⁷⁸ In Renaud's perspective this rabbinic mindset conceives of the foreigner as a sinner by his very nature, while the Judean, who belongs to the holy people, has a special responsibility to fulfill the law.⁷⁹

Much of what Renaud does in this section is excellent work. Particularly his efforts to point out the special terms used to designate the good and evil parties in the book is of great value to this type of study. One problem Renaud seems to skirt in this section, though, is circular argumentation. Because he looks at the terms to describe pious Judeans, it is somewhat likely that he will find them described with expressions testifying to their faithfulness to the law. If he were to look at all instances where characters are praised in the book, and sections where more general judgment is passed on people's character, he might find a greater variety in both the expressions, and the subjects who are considered good. A second area where this circular reasoning comes into play is the unilateral decision he makes that juxtaposition and parallelism are not synonymous in the book. Renaud gives no good reason for this, and in certain places very good arguments can be made for the parallelism to be synonymous.⁸⁰ This weakens his overall conclusion that the terms used for different groups of sinners are totally exclusive. Once the strict division of the terminology used for the opponents of the law

⁷⁷ Ibid., 47.

⁷⁸ Ibid., 48.

⁷⁹ Ibid., 48-49.

⁸⁰ For example at 1Macc 1:34; 2:44.

is in doubt, then also follows the close ties Renaud draws to rabbinical Judaism. A further problem with his nomistic thesis has to do with sourcing his argument. Though it may well be that rabbinical Judaism excludes foreigners from the law and considers them sinners *de natura*, Renaud provides no examples of this in his text, and more importantly, no proof of similar terminology being used in the Mishnah. In the same way, though it can probably be generally accepted that rabbinical Judaism had some concentration on the law, without examples from sources it seems a stretch to say that this focus on the torah was at the expense of the deity itself.

In Renaud's final section, treating the law's subordination of the other traditional religious categories, he has three subsections depicting the relationship between the law and cult, covenant, and prophecy. At first, Renaud admits that it seems that the temple and law are the two pillars of Judaism, and are fully equal.⁸¹ He shows how on a number of occasions the law and the cult are placed on equal footing as the bases of the revolution, in the mouths of the Hasmoneans (13:3; 14:29).⁸² Moreover, Renaud shows that the laws focused upon have particularly to do with the cult, both on the part of Antiochus and on the part of Mattathias.⁸³ Renaud then reverses his case and avers that, in fact, the defense of the temple and cult are less for their own sake and more because they are institutions commanded by the torah. He proves his case by citing the reaction to Antiochus' cultic reforms, which state that he reversed all the laws and commandments (1:43-49). He further states that the cultic reforms of Mattathias in chapter two are portrayed as the reestablishment of the law.⁸⁴ Most convincing are the points at which he shows that the central event of the reestablishment of the cult in the temple is couched in references back to the law (4:42, 47, 53).⁸⁵ Because of this proposed relationship

⁸¹ B. Renaud, "La Loi", 49.

⁸² *Ibid.*, 49.

⁸³ *Ibid.*, 49. He particularly cites Antiochus' installation of the pagan cult, profanation of the temple and Sabbath, and prohibition of sacrifices, feasts, and circumcision. As for Mattathias, he destroys the pagan altars, reestablishes circumcision, and returns the customs essential to the cult.

⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 49.

⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 50. It is particularly the blameless priests devoted to the law who are chosen to cleanse the temple, the consultation of the law in establishing a new altar of burnt

between law and cult Renaud sees more similarities with rabbinic Judaism, where the law, particularly the ceremonial law becomes central at the expense of the cult.

The law appears to supplant or annex the covenant for Renaud in the second subsection of his analysis. He reaches this conclusion because, in contrast to the primitive understanding of the covenant, where the emphasis is on the actual formation of the pact, 1Maccabees appears to stress the way the ancestors lived out the precepts of the covenant.⁸⁶ This analysis is based primarily on the way in which the praise of the ancestors in 1Macc 2:51-61 presents Judean heroes from all eras, rather than only concentrating on Moses or other patriarchs who actually concluded some sort of contract with the deity.⁸⁷ A further support for Renaud's conclusion lies in the constant parallels between *διαθήκη* and *νόμος* (1:15, 56-57, 63; 2:20, 27, 50). In this Renaud concludes there has been an inversion from a people founded upon a covenant that follow its laws, to a community focused on the torah which then reminds itself of the covenant.⁸⁸

It should come at no surprise by this point that Renaud also finds that the role of prophecy is entirely replaced by the law. According to Renaud, except for one occasion where the solution to a problem is not found in the law, and is reserved for a future prophet (4:46), all other functions formerly filled by prophets are taken over by the torah.⁸⁹ He shows, in one comparison, how prophets were used before battle to divine its outcome (Dt 1:34-36), but that in 1Macc 3:48, the scroll of the law is unrolled in order to perform the same function. In this new role Renaud finds strong connections between 1Maccabees and the rabbis who found the solution to everything in the law.⁹⁰

The section treating the law's subordination of the primitive religious categories is perhaps Renaud's strongest. His awareness and full presentation of the counter arguments to his own show a strong consideration of the material and the consequences.

offering, and finally the reference to the law when offering the first sacrifice of the day on the new altar, which stand out in his analysis.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 50.

⁸⁷ Ibid., 50.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 51.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 51. Renaud particularly cites the roles of intermediary between people and their god, seer before battle, and general oracle.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 51.

This can be particularly said of his presentation of the relationship between the law and cult. The only problems with the argument for the cult being subsidiary to the torah come in his decisions to lump almost all the laws stressed under the general heading of cult. For instance, though the Sabbath and circumcision statutes are important, there is nothing either in 1Maccabees, or in the scriptural source to indicate that these have especially to do with the temple cult. Further, classifying Mattathias' acts in chapter two as a cultic reform is a bit of a stretch. The one act he does with relation to the cult is to tear down illicit altars (2:23-26; 2:44), all other acts have legal implications, but do not necessarily impact worship.⁹¹ When all these acts are removed from specifically cultic contexts there are far less connections between law and cult, and fewer reasons to place the cult as only an extension of the law.

With regard to Renaud's argument about the covenant, one might question his selective use of synonymous parallelism on these occasions to show the law's annexation of the covenant, while eschewing it when examining his terms for the opponents of the law. Another fault is his concentration on only the praise of the fathers when considering the presentation of the covenant, as opposed to other occasions where the covenant is depicted. It is necessary in this sort of study to present all the evidence available when showing one's conclusions. As for the relationship between the torah and prophecy, Renaud outright neglects the evidence he first presents showing a continued reliance on prophets, instead emphasizing his other example of the torah being used as prophecy. To make matters worse, the interpretation Renaud presents of this passage is highly suspect, as the Greek is difficult and even when an acceptable reading is reached, there are a number of possible interpretations.⁹² Yet Renaud makes no mention of any of this.

In sum, Renaud makes some strong points in his study of the role of the law in the religious field of 1Maccabees. Though some of his methods and sourcing might at times be problematic, his conclusions are promising and challenging. It is an interesting project

⁹¹ We should point out however that 1Macc 2:19 has Mattathias announce he will not abandon the religion of the ancestors by obeying the king's commands. The context seems to suggest the referenced command is that of sacrificing on the illicit altar in Modein, given at 2:18.

⁹² To be fair Renaud relies on the theory of F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 70, so the argument is not his to criticize. It would be helpful, however, to present other viable interpretations.

to try to find connections between rabbinical Judaism and that of 1Maccabees, as opposed to connections with previous or alternative Judaisms of the literature that would later become scripture. However, he seems to come to this study with the conclusion foreordained. He never outlines where the text bears relation to the wisdom tradition or to the Deuteronomistic⁹³ or priestly “schools”. Renaud does not seem to even acknowledge this variety. He also is not always forthcoming with the multiplicity of interpretations that can be found in 1Maccabees with regard to all his questions. Rather, he tries to fit all different sorts of data under one label without good reason. Finally, even in his conclusion he never comes to a good definition of rabbinical Judaism or the law’s role in it:

En somme 1M présente comme une lointaine esquisse du judaïsme rabbinique : prédominance et valeur absolue de la Loi, accent mis sur la religion des œuvres, division du monde en deux camps pour ou contre la Loi, une première indication du dogme du salut par l’unique Israël.⁹⁴

In describing the “rough draft of rabbinical Judaism” Renaud presents these qualities without any sources that show any of these points, neither here nor anywhere else in the article. It is hard to believe that all of rabbinical Judaism can be reduced to these traits, and even harder to believe that any number of these qualities can be found in non-rabbinical writings just as easily. It is in these ways that Renaud’s otherwise strong study falls short of definitively solving the description of the law in 1Maccabees.

A third study, treating the place of the law in 1Maccabees, at least in part, is that of Diego Arenhoevel, entitled *Die Theokratie nach dem 1. und 2. Makkabäerbuch*.⁹⁵ As the title indicates, the aim of the book is to illustrate the political situation described in the two extant accounts of the early Hasmonean dynasty that stem from the Hasmonean era. However, the book is wide-ranging, describing many aspects of the society illustrated by each of these books, including brief commentaries. Part of these

⁹³ This is not to say that this term or an argument drawing a relationship to it would be unproblematic.

⁹⁴ B. Renaud, “La Loi”, 51-52.

⁹⁵ D. Arenhoevel, *Die Theokratie nach dem 1. und 2. Makkabäerbuch* (Mainz: Matthias-Grünewald-Verlag, 1967).

descriptions involves Israel's relationship with the law in 1Maccabees.⁹⁶ This depiction of the law is in many ways an improvement on the previous two studies and helps us come closer to our aim of describing the law and its place in 1Maccabees.

Arenhoevel begins with the premise that understanding the meaning of the law in 1Maccabees is of central importance, as otherwise there would be little talk of religion at all.⁹⁷ He further states that the author of the book wishes to portray the salvation of religion, or more accurately, the salvation of the law. Even at the outset it is clear that Arenhoevel recognizes the importance of the question to studying the book. It is necessary not only to gauge the religion of the Judeans in 1Maccabees, but also to understand the plot, which is based on the protection of the torah. The author makes some further arguments for the importance of the law based on the arguments of Renaud, such as its function as the judge of character, and the willingness of some to die for the law.⁹⁸

This is not to say, however, that Arenhoevel blindly follows Renaud in his descriptions of the law. Rather, he offers a number of corrections to Renaud's investigations and has his own point-of-reference on the question of the law. In response to Renaud's conclusion that the law subordinates all the other mechanisms of religion, and is the apex of the theology of 1Maccabees, Arenhoevel remarks that this could hardly have been the author's intention.⁹⁹ He further questions whether the torah is truly the pinnacle of the author's theology. From this point on in his examination of the law Arenhoevel makes his own way, and comes up with some fascinating conclusions.

Arenhoevel first examines Renaud's conclusion that the people are subordinate to the law and only exist for the law's sake. He does so by bringing up the particularly illustrative passage at 1Macc 2:29-38, wherein one group of Judeans try to escape apostasy by refusing to fight their persecutors on the Sabbath. The martyrs are mourned by Mattathias and his allies, but then the decision is made that Mattathias and his friends

⁹⁶ *Ibid.*, 3-20, 28-31.

⁹⁷ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 3.

⁹⁹ *Ibid.*, 4.

should fight on the Sabbath for the express purpose of saving their own lives and the lives of the people. Arenhoevel correctly assesses this act as placing the people above the law, thus putting Renaud's statement in doubt. He further shows that in contemporary literature the Sabbath observance was no minor matter, as Jubilees counts it among the highest of the laws.¹⁰⁰ Thus, the changing of the Sabbath law is just as important as the adaptation of any other part of the torah, which is also strictly forbidden in the contemporary literature.¹⁰¹ Arenhoevel successfully shows that 1Maccabees, far from being a mere product of its environment, takes an innovative view on at least this issue.

Another notable contribution by Arenhoevel is his recognition of a dual definition of Israel in the text. He sees that there is an ethno-geographically defined entity in the Judeans, who constitute one Israel, and there is another Israel that is comprised of all those who observe the law. Even more important is the deduction Arenhoevel makes from this claim: "Ist Israel im ersten Sinne dem Gesetz vorgegeben, so erscheint es im anderen Sinne erst von der Thora erstellt."¹⁰² By this statement Arenhoevel points out the central place that the definition of Israel has in the description of the law. If we look at passages only in the first definition, then the law appears to be a privilege belonging to Israel, but in the second meaning it appears to be the reason for Israel's existence. This has obvious consequences for how the overall evaluation of the law is made.

From this basis Arenhoevel goes on to narrow down the area in which the law operates in 1Maccabees by both negative and positive comparisons to other theological schools of thought that are contemporary or nearly contemporary. He starts with the recognition that two schools are totally absent from the way 1Maccabees conceives of the law:

Um so mehr muß auffallen, daß *1 Makk* auf zwei Theologumena ganz oder fast ganz verzichtet, die den Zeitgenossen teuer waren und dem Gesetz erst seinen Glanz gaben: auf die Gleichsetzung von Gesetz und Weisheit und auf die Lehre von der Heilsbedeutung des Gesetzes.¹⁰³

¹⁰⁰ Ibid., 5-6.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 6.

¹⁰² Ibid., 7.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 7.

Arenhoevel proves his point that both the wisdom tradition and the teaching of the sanctifying effect of the law are absent by breaking each of these down into their constituent parts. He then shows how 1Maccabees displays none of these traits when speaking about the law. Arenhoevel first discusses the correlation between torah and wisdom.

The wisdom tradition is described by our author as making law and wisdom basically equals, which he argues contributed to the glorification of the law.¹⁰⁴ This is the case because the whole of divine wisdom is embodied in the torah, so that there can be nothing wiser or more splendid than the Jewish law. Arenhoevel shows this to be the case through evidence from Ben Sira as well as the letter of Aristeas, which has the sages seeking the law because it is full of wisdom and without fault.¹⁰⁵ However, in 1Maccabees, he points out that none of this sort of praise for the law is visible. There are never any hymns to the law, nor is the law better than the customs of the other peoples. It is simply in existence, and applies to Israel. Arenhoevel points out that, at times, the author even seems to recognize the great wisdom in the practices of others (1Macc 8:14-16).¹⁰⁶

A second characteristic of the wisdom tradition pointed out by Arenhoevel is that of its universal applicability. He states that because the torah is the highest available wisdom, indeed stemming from the one heavenly God, it is open and applies to everyone.¹⁰⁷ Arenhoevel compares this to 1Maccabees where he claims the torah only applies to Israel, and each people has its own law, which they should follow.¹⁰⁸ As a consequence, a conversion to Judaism is impossible. Heathens must evacuate the realm of Israel. The law is so exclusive according to Arenhoevel, that one might think the reign of Josiah continued uninterrupted right into the time of the Maccabees.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 7. This trend can be seen more clearly in Sirach than in, for example, Proverbs.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 7.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 8.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 8. This, however, is a feature that is up for debate depending on the different worldview displayed in separate writings of the wisdom tradition.

¹⁰⁸ Ibid., 8.

¹⁰⁹ Ibid., 9.

Though Arenhoevel's descriptions are largely correct, this last statement of his introduces one element of his work where he is perhaps at greatest fault. Whereas Renaud might be criticized for trying to connect 1Maccabees too much to a somewhat nebulous rabbinic nomism, Arenhoevel tries to connect the book's theology to an only slightly better defined pre-exilic¹¹⁰ deuteronomism. Throughout his description of the law he comes back to this point, that the law is largely based on the older traditions of Deuteronomy without sufficiently explaining what those traditions are, and without being critical of his deuteronomic source material. This is not to say that Arenhoevel's observations are entirely wrong concerning this, but they are also not wholly right. His bias toward this view of deuteronomic renaissance closes out possibilities that would otherwise be viable options. These include alternative dates for deuteronomic authorship and editing, a continuation of the deuteronomic school¹¹¹ through the Maccabean times, and a more nuanced approach to the text wherein certain aspects represent deuteronomic thought, but others have entirely separate bases. All of these should be considered in a balanced study of the material, but appear to be passed over with the end-point in sight.

The second aspect of the law that Arenhoevel claims is (almost) completely passed over is the sanctifying nature of the law. He describes this as basically a retribution theology wherein those who obey the law stand to gain something, while those who forsake the law will be punished.¹¹² Though Arenhoevel does acknowledge that Mattathias' testament (2:51-61) contains some elements of the sanctifying effect of the law, he claims that it is merely carried over with its genre, which is itself borrowed from his source material, noted as the "Mattathiaslegende".¹¹³ Arenhoevel believes that, outside of this small section of text, fame and honor are the only rewards for the law, and these are reached only after death.¹¹⁴ Otherwise, all the Maccabean heroes die early violent deaths, which are no different from the way the renegades are repaid for their

¹¹⁰ We remain sceptical as to whether deuteronomism can be spoken of as a pre-exilic movement. This is Arenhoevel's premise.

¹¹¹ If a "school" in any sense of the word can even be spoken of.

¹¹² *Ibid.*, 9-10.

¹¹³ *Ibid.*, 10. The Mattathiaslegende comes from the study of K.-D. Schunck, *Die Quellen des I. und II. Makkabäerbuches* (Halle: Max Niemeyer Verlag, 1954) and will be discussed below.

¹¹⁴ D. Arehoevel, *Die Theokratie*, 10.

transgressions.¹¹⁵ Through the lens Arenhoevel uses, the idea of reward/retribution does seem to be absent from 1Maccabees' understanding of the law.

There are, however, several problems with Arenhoevel's conclusions. Because of his focus on the individual lives of the Hasmoneans in his assessment, he fails to see that the family as a whole is in fact rewarded handsomely for their efforts on behalf of the law (14:25-49 *inter alia*). In the same way, he misses the fact that utter destruction does indeed come to those who do not follow the law as a whole (6:21-27; 9:58-61; 10:64 *inter alia*). This group, in fact, simply disappears from the text two thirds of the way through 1Maccabees. Further, considering that the history recorded in 1Maccabees is a martial history, it is amazing that he misses the several points at which the Maccabean party enjoys reversals and victories explicitly because of their allegiance to the law (3:21 ff.; 3:54-4:25 *inter alia*). A fourth problem with Arenhoevel's analysis on this matter comes with his reliance on Schunck's "Mattathiaslegende"¹¹⁶ as one of the sources of 1Maccabees. G.O. Neuhaus showed (admittedly a decade after the publication of Arenhoevel's work) that the source is unlikely because there is no way these stories would stand on their own or could be bound together in a stand-alone legend; they make much more sense in their current position.¹¹⁷ Finally, to reduce the question of whether the law has some sort of sanctifying property to matters of death, ignores significant portions of the lives of each of the heroes wherein they are richly rewarded with power, fame, and wealth (3:25-26; 4:23; 10:18-20; 11:27-28 *inter alia*). These are most important because they can be seen as specifically fulfilling the promises of Mattathias' testament that Arenhoevel wants to so easily discount.

After attempting to show the ways the torah is *not* communicated in 1Maccabees Arenhoevel begins to depict the ways it is depicted. First among his descriptions are the functions of the torah in Israel. The primary use of the torah Arenhoevel treats is the

¹¹⁵ *Ibid.*, 10-11.

¹¹⁶ Schunck believes the Mattathias quelle is comprised of 2:1-7a, 14-28, (49-70).

¹¹⁷ G.O. Neuhaus "Quellen im 1.Makkabäerbuch?: Eine Entgegnung auf die Analyse von K.D. Schunck" JSJ 5, 2 (1975) 162-175, esp. 169. Some very similar questions are raised concerning the Mattathias source by F.V. Filson JBL 75, (1956), 86-87 in his review of Schunck's work.

torah as way of life.¹¹⁸ He argues that because the king's decree changes individual customs *in order to make all into one people*, and because Mattathias vows to keep the customs and the covenant *even if all the other nations do not*, then the customs must be a defining characteristic of Israel. Arenhoevel includes religion under the broad title of customs, which is supported by the text itself (1:45-50). He goes on to suggest that these customs make Israel, and that without them the people does not exist.¹¹⁹ His theory can be summarized with just one of his sentences: "*Die Thora ist der Nationalcharakter Israels.*"¹²⁰ Arenhoevel means to say that it is the torah that separates Israel from the Hellenistic melting pot in which they would otherwise be drowned. They do not keep the torah for its own sake but for the continuity of the culture and for their ancestors. For Arenhoevel, the devotion to the law has very little to do with religion.¹²¹ The law does not exist so that people must adhere to it, rather, without the law the people would not be a people. For Arenhoevel this all comes about because of the "apolitical existence" that Israel had after the exile.¹²² He believes that because the people were defined by their ruler and their land in the monarchic period, they did not have the opportunity to define themselves by the law, but once they were reliant only on worship and observance in the Babylonian, Persian, and Hellenistic periods, the torah took on the character of being the identifying symbol of Israel.

It is very difficult to argue with Arenhoevel's results here. Much of what he points out rings true. However, there is perhaps greater nuance needed. Despite the fact that the torah might be nationally characteristic, it is not immutable (2:39-41). Further, it is very significant that of the laws mentioned in the text, there are a number that have a cultic focus (1:45-47; 4:47, 53 *inter alia*). If it is not important that these laws have to do with the cult, then what significance does the cult have outside of being a national symbol? If the cult is a national symbol, does Arenhoevel then see those who cannot

¹¹⁸ D. Arenhoevel *Die Theokratie*, 11.

¹¹⁹ *Ibid.*, 11.

¹²⁰ *Ibid.*, 13. (Emphasis in the original)

¹²¹ *Ibid.*, 13.

¹²² *Ibid.*, 14. This, of course, is highly dubious. Though relatively little is known for certain about the Persian period, few would describe it as apolitical.

regularly participate in it as outsiders from Israel according to 1Maccabees? These sorts of questions must be raised if Arenhoevel's definitions are taken.

The second function the torah has for Arenhoevel is that of a fence. This means that the torah functions as a way to isolate the community of Israel from outsiders. The outsiders are not only the gentiles, according to Arenhoevel, but also some of those from Israel itself.¹²³ This function is not true of every national custom, but only of the torah.¹²⁴ The breaking of the law and the mixing with the gentiles almost always go together because whoever wants to ally with the gentiles must also break the law.¹²⁵ In the same way the keeping of the law properly causes the isolation of the people of Israel, because Israel is not supposed to make a covenant with the peoples around them. Arenhoevel goes so far as to state:

Siehe, ein Volk das für sich allein wohnt, das nicht unter die Völker gerechnet wird! (Nm 23,9). Diese Sätze könnten als Motto über 1Makk stehen.¹²⁶

This theme of isolation is understood by Arenhoevel as the central aspect of the law in 1Maccabees. It is the basis of the law's function as a fence.

This again would seem to be a masterful interpretation of the way the law works in 1Maccabees, but new questions continually arise. If the torah prevents treaties and intermingling with the gentiles, why are the Hasmoneans clearly made to be allies of the Romans (8:17-29), Spartans (14:20-23), Seleucids (10:18-20), and Ptolemies (11:4-7)? What of the fact that the Spartans are specifically labeled as relatives, and that the two peoples mutually share their livestock and property (12:11, 23)?¹²⁷ None of these relationships are reported with regret, or in connection with any breaking of the law. Further, if the law were to function as a fence in 1Maccabees would we not expect the

¹²³ Ibid., 14.

¹²⁴ Ibid., 14. It should be noted that in the study of nationalism, the methods and models of which Arenhoevel appears to be totally unfamiliar, this function of customs and symbols is not at all uncommon, but central to every aspect of nationalism. See e.g. A. Smith, "Ethnicity and Nationalism" in *The SAGE Handbook of Nationalism* (eds. Gerard Delanty and Krishan Kumar; London: Sage, 2006), 175.

¹²⁵ D. Arenhoevel, *Die Theokratie*, 14.

¹²⁶ Ibid., 15.

¹²⁷ This question is valid even if it is part of diplomatic convention.

laws featured to be ones that primarily differentiate the Judeans from the people living around them? Most of these claims have only little basis in Arenhoevel's work, though they may be true, at least in part.

Arenhoevel asserts that, because of the special link between the torah and the national identity of Israel, the torah develops into and functions as the state law of Israel. He is quick to point out that he does not see the torah as a true constitution or an entity that depends on the state form.¹²⁸ Rather, Arenhoevel means that the torah is a state law because of its penetration from political leaders by means of the power one attains from the state, and because it can first exercise its function when Israel becomes an independent state.¹²⁹ This means that the torah in 1Maccabees is a top-down politically motivated and propagated tool of those in power. The suggestion is perhaps shocking, but rings true in many ways. Arenhoevel presents his case for the torah as state law by further breaking it down into distinct categories.

The first of these examples is in the struggle for the torah. Arenhoevel sees this as an innovation in 1Maccabees when compared to other post-exilic literature.¹³⁰ While other post-exilic works allow for the defense of the law by dying on its behalf, or dying in innocence, 1Maccabees leaves this practice behind. Instead, Arenhoevel argues that 1Maccabees prefers the pious to actively fight on behalf of the law.¹³¹ This is because he sees politics and religion as inexorably tied in 1Maccabees. He even goes so far as to claim that almost all the history of religion in the book is a war-history.¹³² Because of this emphasis on the need to actively fight for the torah, Arenhoevel draws connections between 1Maccabees and the Deuteronomic traditions, jumping over the whole unremarkable post-exilic period.¹³³

¹²⁸ Ibid., 15.

¹²⁹ Ibid., 15-16.

¹³⁰ Ibid., 16.

¹³¹ Ibid., 16. He particularly cites the fact that though the martyrs are recalled in 1Maccabees, the heroes of the book are those who fight Israel's battle with great joy (1Macc 3:2.).

¹³² Ibid., 16.

¹³³ Ibid., 17. It is interesting to note, however, that Arenhoevel sees this war-like trend continuing after 1Maccabees into other late post-exilic literature such as Jubilees and the

We have already remarked on the problems with Arenhoevel's attachment to the Deuteronomic/Deuteronomistic corpus in various respects above. This is just another example where he displays a non-nuanced understanding of the development and authorship of that literature or the "school" out of which it may have arisen. On the more important point of the active fighting for the law giving the law a political sense, we cannot disagree. The Hasmoneans increasingly gain political power throughout the course of the narrative, and it was certainly written while they maintained centralized power in Jerusalem. Their group is the one responsible for stewardship of the law, and the law is only fully followed under their guidance. As 1Maccabees portrays it, the martial element of the defense of the law emanates from and through the Hasmonean seat of power. Arenhoevel does gloss over the fact that there are other causes fought for, however, which cannot be explicitly defined as political, even by his own definition. For example, the people and sanctuary play a big role in the motivation for war (3:43, 51-53, 58-59; 5:1-3; 6:44; *inter alia*), and their definition is more often in an existential and cultic sense than a governmental one. In short, though the Hasmoneans, who enjoy some degree of political power, fight on behalf of the law, they more frequently fight on behalf of other causes that one might be less inclined to understand in a purely state-power-centered sense. This calls into question the absolute centrality of the torah as state-law of Israel.

A second proof of the torah's function as the state law of Israel comes from the display of the torah's validity in the life of the community. Arenhoevel avers that inside the community of Israel, there is no place the law does not apply.¹³⁴ For 1Maccabees, no member of Israel has the right to abandon the law of his own choosing, according to this thesis. A second part of this same argument is that it is not possible for the faithful members of Israel to live according to the precepts of the torah in the presence of sinners and renegades because it undermines the basis of the state.¹³⁵ Arenhoevel further points out that this philosophy is in no way new, referring back to Deuteronomy's reminders to

Testament of the Twelve. The question of dating of 1Maccabees and these other works is key here for his thesis to hold true.

¹³⁴ *Ibid.*, 17.

¹³⁵ *Ibid.*, 17-18.

Israel to remove the enemy from their midst (Dt 13:6; 17:7; 19:9). He adds, however, that 1Macc adapts the old teachings slightly by making them nationally motivated instead of cultic; they cannot have heathens living in their land because the torah applies to the land.¹³⁶

Arenhoevel's suggestion that the law applies to all Israel, and even more so, to their whole territory appears to be supported at least in parts of the text. It is true that the thought of willful conversion from the torah is impossible. However, it is not as clear that all non-believers must be removed from the land. Though on numerous occasions the Hasmoneans are celebrated for removing the godless from Israel (ἀσεβεῖς ἐξ Ἰσραὴλ) and the gentiles from their midst (3:8; 7:6; 9:73; 14:14), there are other events which suggest there was much more tolerance. For instance, at 13:47 and 13:50, where foreigners are expelled from the strongholds at Gazara and Jerusalem, it is only from the strongholds, not from the land entirely. The fact that these are settled with people who observe the law may be more an example of smart military strategy on the part of the Hasmoneans than a national concern for purity of the people and land. This is even testified to in the text at similar points (6:8-19; 11:41). Further, it is evident that even once the Hasmoneans have control of the country they seem to allow renegades to remain unhindered (10:61, 64; 11:21, 25). Lastly, Hasmoneans welcome foreigners into the land on several occasions in the text: Nicanor is welcomed by Judas (7:29), Ptolemy is welcomed by Jonathan (11:6-7), and Jonathan fights in allegiance with the Syrian army from Gaza to Damascus (11:60-62). All of this suggests that the law was not always applicable to the whole territory under Hasmonean control. While it may have applied for all Israel, there were constantly others in the territory that did not obey the law, and were welcomed. This all is not to argue, however, with the larger point that the torah does act as a state-law occasionally in 1Maccabees. As usual, Arenhoevel's assertions concerning the Deuteronomic instructions to remove the enemies from their midst are somewhat too simple. One cannot say the commands of Deuteronomy were solely cultic and not nationalistic, just as it is difficult to argue that 1Maccabees commands in this regard are solely nationalistic and not cultic.

¹³⁶ Ibid., 18.

The last proof Arenhoevel provides for the torah being a state law is its strong connection to the land of Judea. He argues that the author of 1Maccabees mostly thinks of members of Israel residing in Palestine when discussing the torah. Arenhoevel believes that this positional aspect is so prevalent that the author limits the law's true efficacy to those who live within a day's travel to Jerusalem, finding it unnatural that members of Israel would live outside the borders of Judea.¹³⁷ Because of this connection to a particular territory, and because those outside are not required to live by the law, Arenhoevel concludes that the torah must be the state law of Judea.¹³⁸

There are very strong arguments in this proof, which are unfortunately accompanied by some that are more dubious. While it is certainly true that 1Maccabees presents an in-gathering to the homeland as a viable, and perhaps even preferable option for the community of Israel to take (5:23, 45, 52), it may be a little bit strong to suggest that the author frowns upon those living in the Diaspora. That the author does not comment on the communities in Alexandria and Babylon and other centers in the near east and Mediterranean is true, but this does not mean that the law does not apply to them. At every turn where the community of Israel outside of Judean political boundaries is presented, the law appears to hold sway (e.g. 10:36-37). The recognition that those outside the community and outside the borders of Judea do not have to live by the law is correct in as far as those people are not identified as Israel. The problem is that this would be true even with an ethno-religious understanding of the law that limits the cult of Yahweh to ethnic Israelites, wherever they might live. This is especially the case given the lack of evidence for the communities outside of Palestine in 1Maccabees. As we have stated above, the law in 1Maccabees does at times act as a state law for Judea, but it also often takes on many other functions, which are stressed far less by Arenhoevel. His overall presentation is thorough and worthwhile, but is lacking support in some important areas.

The most important contributions of Renaud and Arenhoevel cannot be discounted, but as we have shown, they still have their faults. Whether it is the desire to

¹³⁷ *Ibid.*, 19.

¹³⁸ *Ibid.*, 20.

connect the understanding of the law to the later Rabbinical Judaism or the earlier Deuteronomic temple community, each has its biases. Further, the lack of total agreement their conclusions have with the texts raises some doubts as to their applicability. However, by far the most glaring problem both of these scholars face is their text. Renaud and Arenhoevel treat the entirety of 1Maccabees as a unity, which in turn assumes that the depiction of the law in 1Maccabees will be unified. This is problematic because there is a history of scholarship that suggests the text might not be a unity at all.

I.2.ii The (dis)Unity of 1Maccabees in Scholarship

The early years of academic research into 1Maccabees treated the text as a unity, as one might expect. Nineteenth century scholars such as Grimm¹³⁹ and Keil¹⁴⁰ saw no need to question the harmony of the different parts of the text. It was not until Justus Destinon's *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Arch. Buch XII-XVII=Jüd. Krieg Buch I*,¹⁴¹ that the "addendum theory"¹⁴² was fully formulated. The hypothesis essentially rests upon Josephus' utilization and subsequent cessation of that use of 1Maccabees as his source for the period of Judean history covered by the first book of Maccabees.¹⁴³ Destinon's thesis states that, because 1Maccabees is followed so closely through chapter 13 by Antiquitates 12.246-13.212, but is not discernable as a source for the material following it, Josephus must have had a shorter version of 1Maccabees before him. This version would have ended at 1Macc 14:15 with the poem in praise of Simon.¹⁴⁴ The argument was taken up by a number of researchers following Destinon,

¹³⁹ C. Grimm, *Das erste*.

¹⁴⁰ C. Keil, *Commentar*.

¹⁴¹ J. Destinon, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Arch. Buch XII-XVII=Jüd. Krieg Buch* (Kiel: Lipsius und Tischer, 1882).

¹⁴² The term was not applied to this theory until nearly a half century later, when H. Ettelson, "The Integrity of I Maccabees" in *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 27 (1925) 249-384, gave Destinon's thesis and its offspring the title.

¹⁴³ J. Destinon, *Die Quellen des Flavius*, 85 ff.

¹⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 90.

including Kautzsch¹⁴⁵ and Wellhausen.¹⁴⁶ Indeed, the hypothesis came to be accepted as fact until the mid 1920s.¹⁴⁷

It was at this point that H.W. Ettelson showed the faults in that argument, on his way to proving a unified composition of 1Maccabees.¹⁴⁸ Because the line of reasoning that Destinon put forth is entirely non-integral to 1Maccabees, Ettelson was largely successful in discounting its claims. He showed that there is nothing within the plot's theme or arrangement to imply that chapters 14-16 are additional.¹⁴⁹ Ettelson further made clear that the overall style, theological outlook, and idiosyncratic use of vocabulary are continued from chapters 1-13 unbroken into chapters 14-16.¹⁵⁰ Finally, Ettelson makes a long and thorough investigation showing that the Greek translation of 1Maccabees is made by one hand, and was used by Josephus in his composition of *Antiquitates*.¹⁵¹ After Ettelson's work it basically became accepted as fact that 1Maccabees is a unity with a few relatively recent exceptions.¹⁵² Only Dancy,¹⁵³ Zeitlin,¹⁵⁴ and Gauger,¹⁵⁵ since the publication of Ettelson's thesis raised any doubts concerning the integrity of 1Maccabees, until recently.

¹⁴⁵ E. Kautzsch, *Das erste*, 29 ff. In a somewhat different tack on the argument, W. Oesterley, "The First Book of Maccabees" in *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English* R.H. Charles, ed. (Oxford: Clarendon Press, 1913), 62-65, suggests that certain documents might be interpolations by a later editor into the original text of the author. He otherwise maintains unitary authorship.

¹⁴⁶ J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische*, 257.

¹⁴⁷ D. Williams, *Structure*, 113.

¹⁴⁸ H. Ettelson, "Integrity", 249-384.

¹⁴⁹ *Ibid.*, 292.

¹⁵⁰ *Ibid.*, 297-306.

¹⁵¹ *Ibid.*, 307-341.

¹⁵² N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 14; D. Williams, *Structure*, 114.

¹⁵³ J. Dancy, *Commentary*, 7, holds that the author died before the work was finished and an editor completed the work with already written and available materials, particularly regarding the Spartan and Roman documents, and the last three chapters.

¹⁵⁴ S. Zeitlin, *First Book*, 32, basically holds on to the addendum theory, but supports it with some truly outlandish claims. Cf. N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 14-15, and his review of Zeitlin's views.

¹⁵⁵ J.-D. Gauger, *Beiträge zur Jüdischen Apologetik: Untersuchungen zur Authentizität von Urkunden bei Flavius Josephus und im I. Makkabäerbuch* (Köln-Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1977), 311-317, shows that there were at least two occasions upon

This all ended with the breakthrough work of Nils Martola. In his *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees*, Martola reexamines the presumed integrity of 1Maccabees. Though he agrees with Ettelson that the old addendum theory, as put forth by Destinon, Kautzsch, and later Zeitlin,¹⁵⁶ is utter nonsense, he does not discount the possibility that there are other ways in which the text of 1Maccabees might not be wholly original. Cast aside are the old arguments relating to Josephus' use, or lack thereof of 1Maccabees, and an essentially form-critical argument is put in its place.¹⁵⁷ Both Martola's investigation and the results he reaches through it are incredibly detailed and enlightening as to the text's composition. He basically ends up reorganizing and reevaluating the whole text of the book passage-by-passage in order to decide what the basic story is, and whether there are outlying sections that may be secondary to the original composition.¹⁵⁸

Martola first proceeds by describing and pointing out all the poetic and possibly-poetic passages in 1Maccabees, thus drawing them out of the narrative and giving them definite outlines.¹⁵⁹ In this endeavor he largely defines the differences between poetry and prose through parallelism, meter, inverted word order (SVO instead of VSO)¹⁶⁰, and overly descriptive passages. Martola comes up with a more well-defined and shorter list of poetic passages than those who have gone before him, while providing solid reasoning for his classifications. After this, Martola moves onto other formally differing passages, which he calls the "diplomatic and political passages".¹⁶¹ These are broken down into passages that give the impression of being based on written originals,¹⁶² and those that do not go back to originals.¹⁶³ Most of this, Martola bases on context, and what the

which the correspondence with the Romans and Spartans were introduced into the text. Both of these came long after the time of the author.

¹⁵⁶ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 11, 15.

¹⁵⁷ D. Williams, *Structure*, 3 n.8, points out that the study is form-critical; Martola is never very clear about labeling his method, but he may have considered it more literary critical. In any case, Williams' assessment seems applicable.

¹⁵⁸ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 33-34.

¹⁵⁹ *Ibid.*, 36-56.

¹⁶⁰ *Ibid.*, 39-41.

¹⁶¹ *Ibid.*, 56.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 59.

¹⁶³ *Ibid.*, 65.

surrounding narrative states concerning the passages. He also separates all those passages in direct speech from the narrative prose, dividing them into smaller categories: self exhortation, dialogue, speech of encouragement, prayer, command, oath, and the amorphous “statement”.¹⁶⁴ In his final group of formally differing elements from the narrative base, Martola names indirect speech, list, indirect presentation of contents, and narrative passages with groups of clauses in inverted word order, as defining characteristics.¹⁶⁵ All of the above groupings are separated out of the first level of analysis by Martola, only to be addressed later as to how they can be fit into their contexts on individual bases.

It is following this incredibly thorough and helpful formal analysis that Martola gets started on his real goal: “to isolate elements along the length of the basic narrative, i.e. to find basic episodes or shorter sequences of clauses which seem to belong more to each other than to others.”¹⁶⁶ Martola sets up the basic criteria for delimiting the different narrative episodes, and defines them as change of subject, change of place, and change of time, all of which are, of course not original to him.¹⁶⁷ After doing a dry run of these criteria on chapter 5 of 1Maccabees, Martola finds that these criteria are in no way suitable on their own, but must be amended.¹⁶⁸ He adds to these several supporting criteria, and breaks them up into those that help identify the beginning of a passage and those that aid in demarcating an episode’s conclusion.¹⁶⁹ The first group consists of eight criteria: change of subject, change of place, change of time, new course of events or another type of action, verb which denotes the beginning of a set of events, a description of a situation, the introduction of a new person, and final clauses. The second group is far shorter: change of place, verb that marks the end of a course of events, evaluation, and

¹⁶⁴ Ibid., 68-80. Each of these is self-explanatory except perhaps for the statement. This is defined as any utterance, which does not fit into the above categories.

¹⁶⁵ Ibid., 81-84. These too are all self-evident except for the “indirect presentation of contents”, in which the contents of a letter are communicated without the actual letter being reproduced.

¹⁶⁶ Ibid., 84-85.

¹⁶⁷ Ibid., 85-86. This by Martola’s own admission.

¹⁶⁸ Ibid., 96. “In other words, it is not a feasible way of finding borders between passages to mechanically note the occurrence of SC, PC, or TC.”

¹⁶⁹ Ibid., 99.

formally differing passage. Once Martola has outlined these criteria he proceeds to go through every passage of the book and mark off where each of the criteria are met.¹⁷⁰ As a result of this examination of the material Martola then outlines several passages that he considers interesting or problematic because of how they indicate endings or beginnings of a section.¹⁷¹ It is these passages that later become of interest in his study. Martola ends the section with a list of every segment he has demarcated through his criteria in 1Maccabees.

After the whole of 1Maccabees is broken down into its most atomic parts, Martola proceeds to link the story back together again by showing connections between different passages and segments.¹⁷² Many times, one passage will have connections to several others both in a forward and backward direction. By using this method Martola is able to almost fully reconstruct the whole of 1Maccabees, including the formally differing passages he previously removed. This results in a main story that narrates the capture of Jerusalem, the cult, and the law by the Seleucids, and its subsequent liberation by the Hasmoneans, starting with Mattathias and ending with Simon.¹⁷³ He is, however left with certain sections he calls “islands” which appear to have no connection to their surrounding narrative, and upon final analysis, a poor connection to the rest of the basic narrative as a whole.¹⁷⁴ The islands he is left with are chapter 8; 12:1-23; 14:16-16:24.¹⁷⁵ Martola finds that all of these passages for separate reasons are additional to the story, but likely added at the same point in the editing process. This is because there is a clear link in subject matter (diplomatic treaties; the Romans) between each of these sections.¹⁷⁶

Though the additional nature of chapter 8 and 12:1-23, as argued by Martola, will be treated below in our own analysis, it is essential here to outline why Martola finds 14:16-16:24 as additional. It is especially interesting that these are the same exact

¹⁷⁰ Ibid., 100-107.

¹⁷¹ Ibid., 108-111, 116-126. The reason for the break is a brief excursus on the nature of the battle accounts in 1Maccabees.

¹⁷² Ibid., 143 ff.

¹⁷³ Ibid., 201.

¹⁷⁴ Ibid., 130-131. Martola’s definition is actually quite long and involves a number of intricacies, but this summary reduces it to its most important points.

¹⁷⁵ Ibid., 226-227, 236.

¹⁷⁶ Ibid., 236.

chapters seen as additional by Destinon a century earlier. Martola treats this section in two parts. First, he shows how 15:1-14, 25-16:24 are additional,¹⁷⁷ then he shows how 14:16-49; 15:15-24 are secondary,¹⁷⁸ but added at the same time as 15:1-14, 25-16:24. In the first part of the argument Martola states that there are basically three events narrated in 15:1-14, 25-16:24: Antiochus VII's pursuit of Trypho, the erosion of the relationship between Antiochus VII and Simon, which leads to the campaign of Cendebeus against Simon, and the unsuccessful coup d'état of Ptolemy against Simon.¹⁷⁹ He further notes that the first two events, dealing with Antiochus VII are so related that it is impossible to separate them from one another, even if one can recognize two threads. In every case Martola notices that the narration of events ends unsatisfactorily from a literary standpoint.¹⁸⁰ There is no final conflict in which Trypho is killed, instead he simply flees. Antiochus' attempt on Simon is foiled by the work of Simon's son John Hyrcanus, but Simon is then actually killed by Ptolemy. However, Simon is never buried nor mourned, as the other brothers were, and John, who has been built up as the new leader only avenges his father's death just before the book abruptly ends. No threads are really closed in this section. Martola goes on to explain that this abrupt ending is explained by the work being historical and not fictitious; though the main story ended with Simon seemingly secure, events continued as reported culminating with Ptolemy's coup being thwarted by John Hyrcanus. According to Martola, this did not justify starting a new book, so some passages treating these events, as well as some documents were added to the text at this time.¹⁸¹ These additional documents stressed the relationship with Rome, which was only becoming stronger in the time of John Hyrcanus, and also stressed the contributions of Simon himself, which lead to a series of pronouncements and privileges extended to him and his descendants.¹⁸²

Martola's book is in many ways a masterpiece. He does such in-depth work, and moves so fluidly through every section of the narrative that it is hard to question his

¹⁷⁷ Ibid., 186, 225-226.

¹⁷⁸ Ibid., 227-232.

¹⁷⁹ Ibid., 225.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid., 225-226.

¹⁸¹ Ibid., 226.

¹⁸² Ibid., 232, 236.

results. Without making any reference at all to the fact that Josephus does not use the last three chapters in his account of the Hasmonean rebellion, he makes a very strong argument for those same chapters being additional to the main story of 1Maccabees. In addition, his new contribution of seeing chapter 8 and 12:1-23 as secondary also rings true. With *Capture and Liberation* he convincingly shifts the burden of proof back to those who would argue for the unity of the first book of Maccabees.

The criticisms of his work are few. One could ask whether, in balance, the formal section of Martola's argument, wherein he separates certain specific passages by their literary form and then later by their boundary markers, is more helpful than hurtful to seeing all the possible additions to the text. That is, Martola efficiently singles out passages and episodes as whole entities, deeming them integral or islands, but misses possible smaller additions such as sentences, clauses, or words. Further, his lack of concentration on characterization and style as a clue to authorship might also prohibit him from noticing material that strays from the norm of 1Maccabees. Another area where he might be criticized is the way he includes certain passages over which he initially has serious doubts. When he can imagine some function for an episode, despite a wealth of clues that suggest it might be additional, he always chooses to retain the section as part of the main story. These critiques of Martola are, however, minor as compared to the great contribution his work has made toward reaching the original form of 1Maccabees, and reading it as literature and not history alone.

After Martola's contribution, and perhaps because of it, another literary study of 1Maccabees has added to the idea that 1Maccabees as we currently read it, is not a unitary work. David Williams, in *The Structure of 1 Maccabees*, performs a rhetorical critical study on the first book of Maccabees in order to isolate the overall structure of the narrative, and draw out any sections of the text that might not belong to that structure.¹⁸³ As he is using rhetorical criticism, the main feature Williams investigates in the text is the

¹⁸³ D. Williams, *Structure*, 3.

use of repetition.¹⁸⁴ He argues that repetition is a major structural clue to any book, especially in 1Maccabees.¹⁸⁵

In order to curtail the normal criticisms of structural analyses focusing on repetition and chiasmus particularly, Williams uses a fairly novel method developed by Butterworth.¹⁸⁶ He first sets out to establish the divisions of the text independently of structural considerations. Then he looks for all repetitions, discarding those that are insignificant. Thirdly, he estimates the likely importance of what remains, emphasizing the repetition of phrases and rare words. Finally, he explains the purpose of the perceived structure as best he can with the available evidence. Williams adds to this description of his methodology by clarifying that he is concerned with the structure of 1Maccabees and not its texture.¹⁸⁷ What he means by this is that he is interested in how larger segments of the book are connected to each other, rather than how individual words or phrases relate.

Once he has outlined his method, Williams sets off on his investigation, which can be broken down into: 1) a list of the fundamental units of 1Maccabees, 2) an examination of the repetitions in each unit, 3) a map of the tripartite chiastic structure of 1Maccabees based upon the findings of the previous two steps, 4) a comparison of formal symmetries between paired components of his perceived chiastic structures, 5) a discussion of the major themes in the chiastic structures, 6) a wide-ranging discussion on the third section of the book, falling outside the chiasmus, 7) a comparison of his findings with previous analyses of the structure of 1Maccabees.¹⁸⁸ We will merely give the highlights of each part of this argument so as to show Williams' major contributions to the discussion. Certain areas of his argument will be passed over entirely as they are only tangentially relevant to the question of 1Maccabees' unity.

¹⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 6-7.

¹⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 8.

¹⁸⁶ *Ibid.*, 9, 13. The study in which Butterworth develops the methods Williams implements is *Structure and the Book of Zechariah* (JSOTSup 130; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1992).

¹⁸⁷ D. Williams, *Structure*, 14.

¹⁸⁸ *Ibid.*, 15.

Williams differs with Martola on his choice of selecting the criteria, which mark the boundaries of units. He selects the more conventional temporal shift, spatial shift, and change in cast of characters or dramatic situation.¹⁸⁹ As a result the units he comes up with are rather in line with those featured in Martola's table of divisions from the major commentaries.¹⁹⁰ The only differences come in Williams' addition of four boundaries. In regard to his findings on the borders between sections, Williams notes that up until 1Macc 6:17 the boundaries are all well marked, while after this point they seem to be less clear.¹⁹¹ Because of this he believes the boundaries will have to be shifted.

The real meat of Williams' argument follows with his look at the repetitions of rare words and phrases in 1Maccabees. Importantly, Williams defines rare words as those that appear in 1Maccabees between two and five times, while appearing in the whole LXX less than seventy-five times.¹⁹² Williams also particularly looks for the use of these rare words in repeated phrases, which he defines as the combination of two or more separate words (including at least one rare word) used in the same sequence in two or more literary units.¹⁹³ Despite the strict methodology, Williams comes up with twenty-five different rare words which he groups into eight promising indicators of structure, due to the nature of the repetitions, and their similarity, and sixteen possible indicators of structure, because of the lack of other supporting evidence.¹⁹⁴

After he has done the necessary groundwork, Williams lays out a blueprint for the overall structure of 1Maccabees. Focusing on the repeated phrases, and applying them to his previously noticed structure, Williams comes up with two broad and far-reaching chiasmic patterns that make up the bulk of 1Maccabees.¹⁹⁵ These structures are based on smaller skeletons where Williams finds both verbal and thematic repetitions. In the first section it is the death of Alexander the Great at the beginning and the death of Antiochus at the end with the desecration of the altar toward the beginning and the dedication of the

¹⁸⁹ *Ibid.*, 16.

¹⁹⁰ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 25-27.

¹⁹¹ D. Williams, *Structure*, 36.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 37.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 38.

¹⁹⁴ *Ibid.*, 53-54.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 58.

new alter toward the end that lead Williams to his proposed structure.¹⁹⁶ For the second section the notable events that also share rare phrases are the Jewish missions to Rome, and the visits of the High Priest Jonathan to Ptolemais. Because he does not have strong parallels in other areas of his structure he refrains from naming them and fully fleshing them out at this point in his study. The result in section one is a five-element chiasm with the first part matched and the third part matched, but the second and fourth left blank, as well as the central element.¹⁹⁷ In section two Williams has a three-element chiasm with the central points matched under the title “Jonathan rises in power”/ “Jonathan maintains his powerful status”, and the Roman missions matched around this, but he leaves both the first and last sections of the chiasm unnamed.¹⁹⁸

To strengthen his argument for the basic structure put forth in the previous chapter, Williams notes formal similarities between the matching elements of his chiasmus.¹⁹⁹ These amount to thematic resonance, repetition of words that are not considered rare, and reintroduction of characters.²⁰⁰ In the relationships between his chiastic pairs Williams sees that some are parallel, others intensificatory-parallel, and still others contrastive²⁰¹. His collection of evidence is enough to convince Williams that there are two chiastic structures in 1Maccabees, one starting with 1:1 and extending to 6:17, and a second beginning with 6:18 and closing with 14:15.²⁰²

Once the structure is decided upon, Williams seeks to show which themes are of central importance to sections one and two of his work. That is, he tries to find the meaning of the chiastic structures he has proposed.²⁰³ He begins with his, as yet untitled, central point of the first section (3:1-26/ I. E). Williams finds that there are two important themes in this central passage of his “section one” (1:1-6:17): pro-Hasmonean

¹⁹⁶ Ibid., 56.

¹⁹⁷ Ibid., 58.

¹⁹⁸ Ibid., 69.

¹⁹⁹ Ibid., 72.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 83-84, 93-94.

²⁰¹ Ibid., 94.

²⁰² Ibid., 94.

²⁰³ Ibid., 96.

advocacy, and double-causality.²⁰⁴ Williams is then able to find these themes in numerous other parts of the book, up to the end of section two. In addition to the themes above, Williams finds one further theme stressed by the structure of the book, namely the liberation of the temple and citadel.²⁰⁵ These themes, he claims, confirm both theories for the central premise of 1Maccabees: the traditional one of Hasmonean advocacy, and Martola's capture and liberation.²⁰⁶

Having explained the structure and themes central to sections one and two, Williams goes on to discuss section three (14:16-16:24). He sets out on his discussion by positing that his study has provided more evidence for the hypothesis that 1Maccabees actually did originally end at 14:15.²⁰⁷ This is not only because it falls outside his chiasmic structure, but also because of the agreement with the results of Martola and the evidence from Josephus, which he seems to give some credence. Williams adds to the evidence by differentiating the anti-gentile rhetoric found in the first two sections of 1Maccabees with the rather pro-Gentile stance taken in section three.²⁰⁸ Williams further sees a concentration on the office of the high priesthood in connection with the temple in section three that is not in evidence in the other areas of 1Maccabees.²⁰⁹ This all leads Williams to posit that section three was written for the needs of John Hyrcanus or his son, both of whom faced revolt.²¹⁰ The section could have legitimized the office of high priest as hereditary in the Hasmonean family, as well as shown John Hyrcanus as a worthy

²⁰⁴ Ibid., 98, 99. By double-causality Williams means that events occur as a result of both human and divine causes. For example, armies are often "crushed" (συντρίβω) before the Judeans. Williams sees this not as miraculous intervention, but the result of the Judean efforts in combination with divine assistance.

²⁰⁵ Ibid., 103-104. It is important to note that he finds the liberation of the temple to be stressed in section one and the liberation of the citadel to be the central focus of section two.

²⁰⁶ Ibid., 107.

²⁰⁷ Ibid., 108.

²⁰⁸ Ibid., 117-119. He builds this argument on the observations of S. Schwartz, "Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion" JJS 42, (1991) 16-38, who argued for a time of authorship early in the reign of John Hyrcanus before Judea expanded to include gentiles into even the upper echelons of Judean society, due to the anti gentile rhetoric in 1Maccabees.

²⁰⁹ D. Williams, *Structure*, 123.

²¹⁰ Ibid., 126.

successor to Judas and his brothers. Further, Williams claims that section three helps to clarify other matters of concern to the ruling dynasty not answered by sections one and two alone.²¹¹

Williams' study is a great contribution to the discussion of the structure, central themes, and most important for our own purposes, diachronic development of 1Maccabees. Though he has approached the question from a different angle than Martola, his results largely confirm those of his predecessor. Many of the themes he notices are important to keep in mind, and his work with repetition of certain terms is at times illuminating. One must agree that with regard to at least 14:16-16:24, the evidence suggests Williams is correct, even if not all of his arguments are totally convincing.

Though the themes of double-causality, pro-Hasmonean advocacy, and liberation of temple and citadel are plainly visible, it is not entirely clear how the structures Williams develops really highlight this. Neither the center point of his section one (3.1-26), nor the two innermost elements of his section two have much to do with any of these themes. Further, some of the titles Williams gives to important pairs of his structures might be questioned. For example, 2B (8:1-32) is fittingly called "The Jews make a treaty with Rome", while the other half of its pair (12:1-23) is called "The Jews renew their treaty with Rome" despite the fact that only four verses in this section have anything to do with Rome at all. The use of these titles suggests a symmetry that is simply not present. Another problem, which Williams himself acknowledges,²¹² is the concentration only on larger units of text when finding his structure. This lack of feel for smaller sections of the text makes his exclusion of the last few chapters seem rather arbitrary because it tacitly accepts everything in the first two sections as long as it can fit under one of his broad titles. To be fair to Williams, this is not in his project's purview. On the whole, Williams has made an important work that cannot be passed over, and which adds objective evidence to the addendum hypothesis that was already strengthened by Martola.

²¹¹ *Ibid.*, 127.

²¹² *Ibid.*, 15.

I.3 A Restatement of Aims

What Martola and Williams have shown then, is that it is not possible to consider 1Maccabees a unity, at least not without proper investigation. This knowledge is exactly what Arenhoevel and Renaud lack in their studies of the law in 1Maccabees. Even if the possible additions to 1Maccabees are limited to those Martola finds, this would still affect the way the torah functions and is presented in the book. Arenhoevel and Renaud cannot be blamed for their lack of concern because Ettelson's integrity hypothesis ruled the day, and the only theory that argued for additions was hardly well supported. This does not discount the fact that a more thorough and beneficial result can be reached by taking the development of the text into account.

Though Martola and Williams have done a good job of restarting the argument for a diachronic development of 1Maccabees, they have not gone far enough. This is partially because their aims and approaches do not look for possible additions, and also because their connection of units ignores the pieces that make up those units. For this reason the first part of our study must be devoted to a literary-critical reading of 1Maccabees, particularly centered on the history of the composition of the book. Though this may only reveal the same results as previous scholars, it is necessary to consider the possibility now that the question of secondary compositions in 1Maccabees has been reopened. It is only after this research that we will apply the study of the torah to our results. It is hoped that taking account of the layers of the first book of Maccabees will enhance the depiction of the law already sketched out by Renaud and Arenhoevel.

I.4 Methods and Premises

We will start this investigation with the hypothesis that, where they agree, Martola and Williams are correct. That is, 14:16-16:24 is a secondary addition to the original composition, and has been added as a unit.²¹³ We also must take their claims for the basic themes of 1Maccabees very seriously. The pro-Hasmonean stance, anti-gentile rhetoric, double-causality, and most importantly, the focus on capture and liberation of the temple and Judea seem to be the central messages that the base story, whatever that

²¹³ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 236; D. Williams, *Structure*, 126-127.

may be defined as, is trying to communicate. Though the evidence for these claims is not irrefutable, the burden of proof falls on those who wish to argue against them, rather than on those who accept them. Beyond these propositions, however, it would not be wise to make any assumptions. We start from this point despite the fact that even after Martola's claims, commentators have been slow to pick up on his hypothesis. The evidence from the combination of the two studies speaks for itself. Further, they are the only two literary studies treating the whole of 1Maccabees, and they are among the most recent works. This does not mean we will not add to their findings at the appropriate place, only that proving the secondary nature of the final three chapters will not be a central concern of this work. Instead, we will focus our criticism on the great variety in the first thirteen chapters.

In the first part of our study we will be employing literary criticism. We understand this to mean the process of "separating out of historically different layers in composite works",²¹⁴ describing their content and characteristics, and relating them to one another.²¹⁵ This methodology seems most appropriate for a number of reasons. First, Martola and Williams have already shown that there were at least two stages of development in the production of 1Maccabees. Second, there are a number of sentences and passages in the body of the "main story" of Martola, and sections one and two of Williams, which are inexplicable without recourse to the explanation of multiple authors or multiple traditions.²¹⁶ We should add that this does not come from a presupposition that there must be several layers to the text, but from a continued attempt to read 1Maccabees as a unity, only to fail at some very crucial points. Like all literary criticism, this study is attempted in order to judge the unity, or lack thereof of our text.²¹⁷ A third reason for the literary critical approach is that outside the few texts where there is clear evidence of unity of authorship, the first step to any study should be to perform a literary-

²¹⁴ J. Barr, "Reading the Bible as Literature" in *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 56 (1973) 10-33, 20-21.

²¹⁵ J. Hayes,; C. Holladay, *Biblical Exegesis: A Beginner's Handbook* (Louisville: John Knox, 1987), 73.

²¹⁶ These of course will be discussed below in the first part of the body of this work.

²¹⁷ J. Floss, "Form, Source, and Redaction Criticism" in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*, Rogerson, J.; Lieu, J., eds. (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 604.

critical analysis, which either proves the unity of the text, or underscores those areas where the text has been influenced by later insertions.²¹⁸ Since IMaccabees has not had a thorough literary-critical investigation, it would be folly to investigate the theme of the law in the text. If the text is, in fact, a composite, then the way the law was presented would belong to no historical situation or historical author, but simply be an amalgam of multiple separate, and perhaps competing interpretations.

The criteria we will use to determine the unity of the text will be those traditionally associated with literary-critical studies. Doublets, parallels, differences in rhetoric and style, abrupt changes in form, content, competing traditions, and irregularities in vocabulary will all be used as major clues to a given phrase or passages composite nature.²¹⁹ Though, to be sure no single one of these clues can dictate a passage's lack of coherence with the larger context, a combination of a number of the criteria can strongly suggest that a given portion of text is written by a different hand than those around it. In every case priority will be given to logical and sound arguments for unity, where they exist. Though there is danger in imposing western and modern rationalistic norms upon a text that only tangentially is affected by Greek rational thought, and is obviously not Cartesian, we will do our best to consider non-western and pre-modern thought processes in our assessment. It is only in those instances where the text cannot be otherwise understood that we will conclude that a given passage is secondary.²²⁰

Because of the strength of Martola's work in showing the unity and connections between the different passages in the first book of Maccabees,²²¹ we will not present our literary critical results for all parts of the book. Instead, we will present only the passages in which we notice a number of criteria that mark off a text as problematic. Though this presentation may seem to proceed with the intent of finding inconsistencies in the text, it

²¹⁸ Ibid., 605.

²¹⁹ R. Knierim, "Criticism of Literary Features, Form, Tradition, and Redaction" in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*, Knight, D.; Tucker, G., eds. (Chico, California: Scholars Press, 1985), 133.

²²⁰ J. Barton, *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study* (Louisville, Kentucky: Westminster John Knox Press, 1996), 23.

²²¹ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 99-127.

is rather an acknowledgement that so much of 1Maccabees appears to be unified, which forces this type of presentation. Otherwise the first part of this study would be even more heavy-handed stylistically, and quite similar in results to Martola. The current presentation will allow for ease of use and readability.

A second consideration to be made has to do with the feasibility of performing literary criticism on a text that exists only in translation. Indeed, since it is widely assumed that 1Maccabees was written in Hebrew, and all the oldest manuscripts exist only in Greek, an approach that often deals with the usage of characteristics of vocabulary and style can be applied only with care. In 1Maccabees, there is thankfully evidence that the translation has stuck very close to its Hebrew original. Both in the Hebrew syntax used in the Greek (κἀὶ+verb+subject+object to imitate the vav-conversive) and the frequency of incomprehensible Greek phrases suggest a conscious attempt to maintain both Hebrew grammar and meaning in the translation.²²² Despite this fact the literary critic should still proceed with caution. There is always the chance that the translator has corrected some inconsistencies in the text, and even made some of his own mistakes in the reproduction. Because of this, in this study, matters of style and vocabulary will be placed only as secondary proof of the additional nature of passages. First disagreements in content, context, characters, and internal chronology will be presented. Then, only after those arguments are made for any given passage, the stylistic and vocabulary evidence will be employed. This should ensure that we do not falsely mark a passage as additional due to a translator's mistake, or miss an additional portion of text due to the corrections of the translator. It should be clear by the above discussion that we see all additions having been made before the translation into Greek. The Greek edition used for this study will be that of Kappler.²²³ We should further note that given the text-centered nature of this study, and the rather sparse attention previously paid to 1Maccabees as a work of literature, the first part of the investigation will rely for the

²²² F.-M. Abel *Les Livres*, XXIII-XXIV.

²²³ *Maccabeorum Liber I* (ed. W. Kappler; *Vetus Testamentum Graecum* 9/1; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1936)

most part on original work and have rather few references outside of those to the text itself.

In the second part of the study, where we outline the role and function of the torah in 1Maccabees, we will be using the same questions and categories employed by Renaud and Arenhoevel. The benefit of posing the same questions to the text is that this procedure can best determine whether either of their studies is affected by the breakup of the text into its constituent parts. This method also makes use of the great insights each scholar has come to concerning the text's connections with either Deuteronomic or Rabbinic laws, and tests those findings. The reliance on the categories Renaud and Arenhoevel propose does not necessarily mean that we will be following their methodology entirely. As we have shown above, there is some serious methodological concern over the procedure of Renaud in particular. Instead, we will approach the question of whether and how the torah operates in specific roles or categories by the method most appropriate to each question. Of course we will look very seriously at the way the legal vocabulary is used in phrases, but we will also look at the broader picture of how the law operates at the level of the plot, and in the narrators own presentation. This should provide the necessary connections to allow the findings of Arenhoevel and Renaud to really be highlighted and useful to future scholars.

Partitio

The study shall proceed with the literary-critical investigation that forms the first half of our presentation. The literary critical arguments for each passage will be presented divided by chapter and in canonical order. This is not to suggest that each chapter is considered a textual unit unto itself, unconnected to its surroundings; it simply makes the presentation more readable. Connections between each passage and the broader context outside the chapter will always be presented. Because of the diversity of problematic passages (regarding their unity with what appears to be the main story) in both length and type, the amount of material devoted to each chapter will vary greatly. In this chapter-by-chapter presentation we will only discuss the question of unity of the text. That is, the conversation will deal with the evidence for being secondary, and how it changes the text, and propose reasons why it might have been added, all on the level of

the text. We will not group texts together to form hypothetical sources or editorial layers until later, according to the proper use of literary criticism.²²⁴

At the close of the first part of the discussion we will put forth arguments for the relationship between the various additions and the main story. We will accomplish this task by discerning what, if anything, ties the additions together, and re-examining what the central themes and plot of the main story are. Once this is determined, we will attempt to place these in relative chronological order through examples from the text that show which passages assume the existence of others. Finally, we will turn to the historical record of scholars, both modern and ancient to suggest the occasions during which the text may have grown, discussing the probability and strengths and weaknesses of each.

Following this summarization of the material in part one of the project we will turn to the second part, which is really the main question: How is the law presented in 1Maccabees? We will approach this by looking at the categories and roles of the law in each of our suggested textual layers and noticing the differences and similarities between those layers. We will also discuss the way the overall presentation of the law changes with the addition of each layer to the basic story. Finally, we shall present our conclusions by summarizing the work and suggesting how the findings could be used to further enlighten studies on 1Maccabees, the Hasmonean period, and the torah in late second temple Judea.²²⁵

²²⁴ J. Floss, "Form, Source, and Redaction Criticism", 606. "The aim of literary criticism comes from the definition of this term within its methodology. It lies in answering the question of whether the text that is being analysed is a literary unity or whether there are indications that it is composite. If the latter is the case, the aim of literary-critical investigation is expanded to embrace the relative diachrony of the various elements of the text. At this stage of the analysis the decision is confined to determining the original unit"

²²⁵ We will constantly use Judea and Judeans in place of Judaism or Jews, as the terms are not only foreign to 1Maccabees, but may also be foreign to all Jews until much later. Cf. S. Mason, "Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History" JSJ 38 (2007) 457-512.

II Literary Criticism of 1Maccabees

II.1 1Macc 1

Nils Martola, who has made a comprehensive study of the composition of 1Maccabees,¹ maintains that the first chapter of the book is a literary unity.² He claims this chapter forms the introduction to 1Maccabees, describing the background and origin of the attack on Jerusalem. While Martola initially raises some doubts concerning certain passages in the chapter relating to the whole work,³ he decides they can all fit in under the broad function of the "introduction to the troubles". While it is true that this chapter fits together underneath this umbrella in the final form of the text, it does not rule out that this relative harmony is the result of editorial work.

It is clear when reading the first chapter that there are two sources for the troubles visited upon Israel. One source of Israel's tribulations is the activity of the gentiles, chiefly under the guidance of Antiochus Epiphanes.⁴ The other cause of nuisance to Israel comes from opponents within the Judean nation. Apostate Judeans, who act alongside the gentiles, bring trouble for the people and the land.⁵ The connection between these two groups is established only loosely, and only within the passages concerning the apostates.⁶ This fact and other matters of literary integrity open the

¹ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984).

² N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 156, 199-201, 203-207. Admittedly Martola's purpose is to determine how the different parts of the final form of 1Maccabees fit into a literary whole, not to determine different literary levels, though he does some of this.

³ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 156, 199-201.

⁴ 1Macc 1:1-10, 16-24, 29-35, [41-43a, 44-51, 53-61]. With the exception of the excised verses these divisions reflect those of Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 155.

⁵ 1Macc 1:11-15, 43b, 52. Cf. E. Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), 18. We use the negative terms for the "apostates" throughout this discussion, not out of approval for the judgments of the pro-Hasmonean author, but because our task is to investigate and discuss the narrative world presented in the text. This world uses definitive terms and makes clear judgments.

⁶ This assertion admittedly seems tautological. Of course connection can only be made between two groups when both groups are mentioned. However, we assert that these sections treating apostates are self-contained units that refer primarily to the apostates,

possibility that the verses referring to the lawless Israelites are a secondary composition in 1Macc 1, and, if related to one another, may represent a separate literary layer.

1:11-15

The first passage to be examined is 1:11-15. The context of this pericope is only narrowly connected to the passage itself. Verses 1-10 report, rather negatively,⁷ on the work of the Hellenistic kings stemming from Alexander to Antiochus Epiphanes. The last verse of this prologue is itself an introduction to Antiochus and already calls attention to his sinful nature. Just as Antiochus reaches his throne the narrative concerning Antiochus breaks off until verse 16, where the story picks up again as if it had not ended.⁸ The story then reports on some of the deeds of Antiochus. In the midst of this otherwise continuous narrative rests the pericope concerning the lawless Judeans. The presence disturbs the flow of the story in recounting the wrongs of the gentiles and especially Antiochus.

Of further note concerning the secondary nature of the passage is that neither in the verses before, or those following are the events of 1:11-15 alluded to. The υἱοὶ παράνομοι (outlaws/renegades) are not mentioned again at all in the first chapter. Even in Antiochus' entrance into Jerusalem on the way back from Egypt (1:20-24) there is no mention of the Judeans who have already made a covenant with him and follow his laws. Nor is there any recognition of a gymnasium or the treaty made with the Judeans anywhere else in 1Maccabees. Beyond this, there is little reverse connection with the

and tangentially to the gentiles. The sections treating the gentiles make no mention at all of the apostates.

⁷ The narrator's remark that ὑψώθη καὶ ἐπήρθη ἡ καρδία ([Alexander's] heart was lifted up and he was exalted) may remind the reader of the pride denounced for rulers in Isaiah 2:5-22, if the text was accessible for the audience. The remark in v.9 that the Kings caused many evils upon the earth can be seen as negative. Also, on different grounds: J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees* (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 197.

⁸ 10 καὶ ἐβασίλευσεν ... βασιλείας Ἑλλήνων, Καὶ ἠτοιμάσθη ἡ βασιλεία ἐνώπιον Ἀντιόχου. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 190 notes that 1-10 belong to the genre of scene-setting sentences. He also notes that inherent in this genre is a repetition of the important element of the sentence in the following verse. For Goldstein "in those days" is the repeated line from v.11, but if this is secondary, it is the taking of the kingdom by Antiochus [vv.10, 16] that becomes the important and repeated point of the introduction.

passages surrounding 11-15. Though a king is mentioned in verse 12, he goes unnamed. Antiochus' newness to the throne and perhaps unstable existence as king is not acknowledged. This is odd considering the two immediately proximate verses to the pericope.⁹ The only similarity between the passage and those in its vicinity is the way the lawless sons are described as ἐξῆλθον ἐξ (coming out from) Israel. This recalls how in the previous verse Antiochus is said to have ἐξῆλθεν ἐξ αὐτῶν (come out from [the Hellenistic kings]). This connection does not seem strong enough to establish this passage as original, specifically because it could simply be an imitation of the language, rather than evidence of a consistency of style. The redactor could have picked up this turn of phrase in 1:10 and used it in 1:11 to form a bridge between the original material and his own addition. More significantly, the closeness in formulation could be the result of the translator's efforts to form a coherent work.

Nils Martola has also remarked astutely, that while each visitation of evil comes with a poem of lament in the first chapter, this incident lacks one.¹⁰ The robbery of vessels from the temple, the erection of the citadel by the gentiles, and the imposition of foreign laws upon the people all have their own laments which are directly related to the accomplishment of the deeds.¹¹ However, this incident, which involves making a covenant with a foreign nation and taking on their laws and customs and abandoning the covenant, forsaking the laws of the torah, is not followed by one word of lament regarding the state of affairs. Even if it is argued that the actions of these few only related to them, the erection of the gymnasium, like the erection of the citadel is a source of strength for the gentiles, which would also call for a similar lament. The fact that the activity of these apostates is mentioned nowhere in any of the laments is also of note. Structurally the passage does not fit the established pattern.

⁹ In verse 10 Antiochus comes to take the throne after being a hostage in Rome, while verse 16 notes that Antiochus recognized his Kingdom was firmly established. Both of these remarks indicate there was perhaps at least a brief period wherein Antiochus' place was in question. This is no surprise if one sees the later Kings mentioned in 1Macc. On insecurity of Antiochus' early reign: J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 202 and W. Dommershausen, *1 Makkabäer 2 Makkabäer* (Würzburg: Echter, 1985), 16.

¹⁰ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 156.

¹¹ Temple robbery 1:20-24, lament: 24-28; Citadel 1:29-35, lament: 36-40; Introduction of foreign laws 1:41-61, lament: 2:7b-13.

1:43

The next verse that does not quite fit its context is v.43. It also describes the activity of those within Israel violating the law. Unlike the previous passage it is not its own self-contained pericope. Instead, it is one line in an account of the implementation of Antiochus' decree. Though there are less clear seams in this passage, the verse does appear to be out-of-place when read attentively. In Martola's analysis, he also notes that there appears to be a lack of relation between 1:43 and the verses that follow.¹² However, he justifies that 1:43 fits into the composition in its ties to 1:52 and 1:62-3, which recall similar elements of the internal reaction to Antiochus' decrees.¹³ In the text as it stands now, Martola's argument is somewhat valid. These verses seem to tie together either in vocabulary or content. However, Martola fails to see that some or all of these latter verses may also be additional.¹⁴

The section of the work containing this verse begins by reporting that the king writes to his whole people that they should give up their individual customs and become one (1:41). Following this, in v.42 the narrator reports that all the gentiles accepted the command of the king. At v.43 the narrator turns from the general view of the whole kingdom and promptly reports that many from Israel thought well of his religion and sacrificed to idols and profaned the Sabbath. As might already be clear, the progression of the report is abrupt. Without further information the narrator jumps to a point at which he is ahead of the audience. The reader is not aware that the customs of which Antiochus wrote are religious in nature, nor has the narrator informed what the specific statutes contained. However, when turning to the "many in Israel" the narrator already reports that they gladly adopted Antiochus' new religion and sacrificed to idols and profaned the

¹² N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 109,153-4.

¹³ *Ibid.*, 154.

¹⁴ To be fair, it must be stated that the scope of Martola's argument is not to determine literary levels but to describe how the final text operates as a whole. He does venture into literary analysis however, and never offers this possibility. The argument will turn to the related passages below.

Sabbath. This jump in time and place from the general view of the kingdom to the specific one of Israel, and from knowing only of a decree to reacting to those who have accepted the specific statutes of the law is too large to be ignored.

This leap taken from v.42 to v.43 is even more odd when considering v.44 and those following it. The report in v.44 is that the king sent messages to Jerusalem and Judah to instruct them to follow customs strange to the land. From vv.45-50 the actual statutes (as they apply to Israel) are listed. Among those specific laws of the King's decree are the profanation of the Sabbath (1:46) and the need to sacrifice to idols (1:47). If the reader follows the narrative as it now stands then one must conclude that those from Israel who accepted the decree did so before the King sent his decree to Judah. This is not only strange in the context of the narrative, but also odd considering the style of the author. In every other instance wherein the king or some other gentile official sends a decree, the author first describes the sending of the diktat and the actual content of the pronouncement before he has the Judeans act on its contents (6:60, 9:70, *inter alia*).

The statement stands out of place, though not entirely. Verse 42b does allow for the mirror image of acceptance of the decrees in Israel which, 43a reports. However, this would be acceptable only if the text is read without vv.44 ff. The similarities between the gentiles and those from Israel would fit properly following the listing of the statutes, or at least following the arrival of the king's commands in Judah. In addition, 43b (and perhaps even 43a) requires one to know the nature of the statutes already; the contents of these lines call at least the placement of the verse into question. This can also be seen in the change of scope between v.42 and v.43 from the whole kingdom to just Israel. This change of view happens one verse too early because it is only after this that the king's actions turn to Judah.

Further, if v.42 is read expecting the illustration of differences between the gentiles and Israel,¹⁵ then v.43 is entirely out of place. If the verse is removed then little harm is done to the passage itself, and the theme of contrast between Judeans and gentiles

¹⁵ E. Bickerman, *God of the Maccabees*, 19. Bickerman proposes that the contrast between the gentiles and Israel is the governing force behind the work, but sadly goes into no further detail on the subject.

is made all the more clear. The nations accept the king's decree unanimously. The Judeans only receive threats and punishment and death as a result of the decree and refuse to accept it, as is evidenced by vv.53-61. In this way the acceptance of the law by those from Israel in v.43 interrupts the surrounding structure. It singles out an element of Israel who did accept the laws, and thus makes Israel like the nations. This view does not agree with much of the broader context.

In view of the above argument it is likely that 1:43 is an addition to the passage detailing the implementation of the king's decree in Judah. However, it cannot be denied that this argument rests on the secondary nature of v.52 as well. As mentioned above, Martola correctly links these two passages together by similarity in vocabulary. David Williams also links these passages together with 1:11-15 through a rhetorical encircling pattern.¹⁶ The relatedness of these lines cannot be denied. The ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ πολλοὶ... πᾶς ὁ ἐγκαταλείπων τὸν νόμον (many from Israel...all who accepted the law) of v. 52 must refer back to πολλοὶ ἀπὸ Ἰσραηλ (many from Israel) of v.43.

1:52

Verse 52 has similar problems to v.43. The verse interrupts a context that otherwise refers to gentiles acting upon Israel. Verse 51 narrates that the king appointed overseers (presumably gentiles) to command the towns of Judah to offer sacrifice, city by city. Verse 53 adds that they drove Israel into every refuge they had. The acts related in 54-61 continue without ever naming the subject and only using third person plural verb forms. The whole of the passage relates the way in which the king's decree, previously mentioned, was enforced in Israel. For this reason, v.52 is a vague statement in the context. That the many joined the overseers makes little individual statement about them other than their ties to the gentiles. The further statement that ἐποίησαν κακὰ ἐν τῇ γῆ (they did evil in the land) is unspecific, in contrast to the rest of the passage. The presence of this group has no additional function in the story. They do nothing more than the gentiles themselves.

¹⁶ D. Williams, "A Literary Encircling Pattern in 1Maccabees 1" *JBL* 120, 140-142.

There is another problem with v.52 relating to the broader context of the book. While there are two episodes in chapter 2 wherein the decree is enforced upon Israel (2:15-22, 29-38), there are no reappearances of this group from Israel helping to enforce the statutes of the king. Also of note: in the lament poem related to this occurrence of tragedy for Israel (2:7-13), no group of defectors is recalled at all. It is significant that in two contexts where the mention of this group would fit quite well, they are not regarded as any sort of entity. Since their presence is nowhere else acknowledged and their action in v.52 is vague and insignificant to the context, it is likely that the verse itself is secondary to the original narrative.

1:62-63

The case of vv.1:62-63 is more complicated than the other possible "renegade"¹⁷ additions. The difficulty starts already with the premise. These verses do not describe the activity of the apostates. Instead, they report on the fate of the faithful remnant within Israel as a result of the immediately preceding enforcements. The verses also seem to continue the story about the effect of the king's decree upon Israel. However, there are several pieces of evidence that argue against the originality of these verses.

Martola's observation of these verses primarily acting as contrast to 1:43 has been noted above.¹⁸ He states the "πολλοὶ ἀπὸ Ἰσραηλ / πολλοὶ ἐν Ἰσραηλ" (many from Israel/many in Israel) in each verse recall each other and assume an opposition party from among the people. Martola observes that vv.62-63 otherwise have rather little in common with those verses preceding them. They are almost solely opinion and do not deal directly with the measures taken by the enforcers upon Israel. His observation is astute. While 1:41-61 (minus additions) details first, the decree of Antiochus, and then its implementation in Israel, vv.62-63 report on the *reaction* of many in Israel to the persecution.

Secondly, the transition from v.61 to v.62 makes little sense in the scope of the story. The death sentence described in vv.60-61 is for the crime of circumcising children.

¹⁷ The term is used here to describe all those possible additions that describe the presence or activity of lawless within Israel.

¹⁸ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 153-4.

Verse 62 states that many in Israel stood firm and were resolved in themselves not to eat unclean food. Their reaction should be defiance to the decree mentioned immediately preceding in the narrative. In fact, their stance to not eat common food is not against any of the statutes in the decree, nor is it a crime for which the enforcers passed sentence. The verse is a *non sequitur* of the highest order. It is possible that this use of a single ordinance of the torah is an instance of metonymy or synecdoche, however it would fit better if the verse recalled some part of the king's decree, which it does not. Verse 63 reiterates the choice to not be defiled by food, and adds to this a refusal to profane the covenant. The punishment for holding fast to these beliefs according to v.63 is death. None of these statements by this group recall the king's decree particularly well.

In the context of the narrative this passage also stands as a problem, if it is original. These verses anticipate the pious reaction of those in Israel, which is otherwise only made clear in chapter 2. The pious resistance is also otherwise seen as the result of the activity of Mattathias and his sons, after the test at Modein. The rest of the first chapter has only the activity against the people as its subject. The passage can also not be connected smoothly to be included as part of the resistance in chapter 2 because 1:64 stands as a clear ending to the activity of chapter 1, and 2:1 is a firm marker of a new beginning to chapter 2. Thus vv.62-63 are an island with no real place in the structure. Given its general nature, 1:64 is as appropriate after 1:61 as in its current place. It is a comment about all the preceding events of chapter 1, and does not have any direct ties to vv.62-63.

Of further note is that each of the additions relate somewhat closely to each other. 1:11-15 and 1:52 each directly note the introduction of evil into the land by the apostates. 1:62-63 and 11-15 both remark on the transgression of the holy covenant by those who adopt the gentile customs. 1:11-15, 1:43, and 1:52 each note that these rebel groups are ἀπὸ Ἰσραὴλ (from Israel) while there is contrast in verse 62 that the faithful are ἐν Ἰσραὴλ (in Israel). Indeed there seems to be systematic agreement between all these passages without much reference to the text surrounding them.

Implications

A reading of the first chapter without the additions creates a clear picture of gentile enmity against Israel. The story then concentrates on the series of brutal acts committed by gentiles (especially Antiochus IV) against the Judeans. The narrative builds the foundation for the evil of Antiochus' actions by presenting him as one in a series of evil rulers to follow Alexander. There is no reason for his violence upon Israel other than a general quality of greed and lust for power, just as those who came before him.¹⁹ The effect of Antiochus' actions on Israel is crushing. The sanctuary is robbed and defiled (1:20-24, 54, 59), their laws are changed (1:44-50), and their religion is all but removed (1:54-61). They also have a strong foreign presence in the country,²⁰ and are being murdered for trying to preserve certain marks of their religious and cultural identity (1:57-8, 60-61). The situation is hopeless for Israel;²¹ there is nothing for them to do.

There is thus a contrast between the nations and Israel. While the gentiles accept the decree of the king, Judeans die protecting their laws and nation.²² Also, while the kings are exalted, the house of Jacob is clothed in shame.²³ When the gentiles move into Jerusalem, the Israelites move out.²⁴ The laws also are presented in direct contrast to those of the Judeans (1:48-9). The impression the reader receives is one of direct competition between righteous Israel and evil Gentiles. The device of binary opposition sets up the battle of identity that is presented throughout the chapter. This situation

¹⁹ Alexander plundered and was exalted over many nations: 1:3-4; His officers and their descendants put on crowns, doing evil: 1:8-9; Antiochus in attempting to take Egypt plunders: 1:19; He then plunders Jerusalem: 1:21-24a; He sends his officers to plunder: 1:31, 35 and strengthen themselves: 1:32-4; Even his decree was written "for his whole kingdom to be one people"- a consolidation of power.

²⁰ 1:33-35. This is against the judgments of S. Zeitlin, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), 74; and Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 124, who, on the basis of comparative translations in the LXX see both Judeans and gentiles as being referenced here.

²¹ The two laments in chapter 1:24b-28 and 1:36-40 present a situation of utter despair, without any sign of light. Even the third lament at 2:7b-13, tied to the decrees of Antiochus recalls the utter hopelessness ending with the phrase ἴνα τί ἡμῶν ἐτι ζώῃ.

²² Gentiles: 1:42, Judeans: 1:57-8, 60-61.

²³ Kings: 1:16-20, Jacob: 1:24b-28.

²⁴ Gentiles in: 1:33-35, Jews out: 1:38-39.

allows for the Hasmoneans to arise in the second chapter as leaders in the effort to remove the foreign menace from Israel.

The presence of the additions changes the picture somewhat. There is no longer a monolithic Israel and unified gentile horde, which can be clearly contrasted. Israel also no longer plays the blameless victim to the power and monetary whims of the evil gentile invaders. In fact, the gentiles themselves are not alone in acting against Israel after these additions are made.

The actions of the first apostates already bring evil into the land (1:15).²⁵ The further actions of Antiochus then become manifestations of God's wrath for transgression of the covenant. At every point in which the Gentiles are shown to be disloyal to their own ancestral laws and religion, a group of Judeans is shown to be just as bad (1:43, 52), even aiding in the destruction brought on by Antiochus' decree (1:52). The additions then leave those who obey the laws in the face of Antiochus' persecutions as an elect, singled out by their faithfulness to the law and the covenant (1:62-63). Whoever added the four passages to 1Macc 1 may have intended for the true blame for the Judean suffering under the Seleucids to be placed on Judeans they viewed as disloyal. They also seem to have had in mind a situation in which those who remained loyal were victims of the irresponsible acts of the Judean opponents. The gentiles in all this move to the background.

The motive for such inclusions could be as simple as recognition of an alternate understanding of the way the trouble started, perhaps even influenced by other sources (e.g. Jason of Cyrene's work, or its epitome II Maccabees). In this case the editor might have thought an important aspect of the story was being left out.²⁶ It is also possible that the additions are made as an allegory for a later situation in which one Jewish group held itself as pious and considered another impious group to be the source of some troubles. One might even detect a hint of the Deuteronomistic understanding of history in the final form of the chapter, positioning Israel as the author of its own destruction. All of these

²⁵ The introduction of evil continues with the group mentioned in 1:52.

²⁶ This seems exceedingly possible, as it is clear that there were Judeans who had different ideas about interacting with gentiles.

suggestions, however, require more evidence and deeper investigations in order to be proven. If other additional material in 1Maccabees matches the motives for the additions in 1Macc 1, then we may be able to come to a decision concerning the setting of the additions. For now it suffices to say that all the inclusions investigated in 1Macc 1 seem to be related to one another and point to a Judean participation in the persecutions, and a divided Israel.

II.2 1Macc 2

Though scholars differ on the exact function of 1Macc 2 in the overall composition,²⁷ it is difficult to not view the chapter as a self-contained section.²⁸ 1Macc 2 begins with the introduction of Mattathias, and ends with his death. Every passage, except one (2:29-38) deals directly with the person of Mattathias, either by quoting his words or by reporting his actions. The central role of Mattathias and the underlying structure (discussed below) of the chapter show that it is proper to investigate the unity of 1Macc 2 separately from chapter 1.

As the second chapter is currently constructed there are ten sections of varying length and importance: introduction of Mattathias (1-5), lament of Mattathias (6-14), visitation of the officers to Mattathias (15-18), Mattathias' reaction (19-22), Mattathias as Phinehas (23-26), retreat of Mattathias (27-28), retreat of other pious Jews (29-38), Mattathias' decision (39-41), Mattathias' deeds (42-48), and Mattathias' testament (49-70). Though there are links between each of these sections, reading the whole chapter as

²⁷ Some scholars place this chapter as part of a diptych introduction of chapter 1 and chapter 2, such as F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949), XXX; J. Bartlett, *1 Maccabees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 24; and B. Renaud, "La Loi et les Lois dans les Livres des Maccabées" *RB* 63 (1961), 44 who base their work upon C. Grimm, *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer* (Leipzig: S.Hirzel, 1853), XII. Others such as N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 271; E. Kautzsch, "Das erste Buch der Makkabäer" in *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1900), 24; E. Bickerman, divide the introduction of chapter 1 from what they see as the beginning of the main story in chapter 2.

²⁸ Though the section is self-contained, this does not mean it cannot be or is not connected to other sections of the text; only that it can be viewed as a subsection.

a unity is problematic. This has much more to do with the content of these sections than the sections themselves.

There are two passages that challenge the unity of 1Macc 2, each with its own issues. The passage that describes Mattathias as the new Phinehas (2:23-26) displays continuity problems in that it interrupts an otherwise uniform speech regarding his reaction to the request of the King's officers, and disrupts the consistent actions of Mattathias and other Judeans from 2:1-2:38. The other passage incongruous with its surrounding is vv.42-44. These verses clearly interrupt a continuous account of Ματταθίας καὶ οἱ φίλοι αὐτοῦ (Mattathias and his friends)(2:39, 45) and their change of course against gentiles. They treat a different group (or groups) with a different end.

2:23-26

Mattathias' zeal for the law demonstrated by his murder of a Judean man and the king's officer is perhaps one of the most famous episodes in all of 1Macc. However, the passage does not fit its context well for several different reasons. The most notable discontinuity this episode creates is that it interrupts a surrounding speech, which seems to be otherwise continuous and of a unified subject matter.

From v.19-22 Mattathias speaks with a loud voice (φωνῆ μεγάλῃ) about his refusal to live under the rule of the king as long as it forces him to abandon the covenant and the law. In v.27-28 Mattathias continues yelling in the town with a loud voice (φωνῆ μεγάλῃ) asking all who have zeal for the law and support the covenant to come out and follow him. The twin uses of the dative of means in Mattathias' speeches draw attention to the fact that his subject matter and manner of speaking are identical in the two instances. It is very likely that these could simply be one speech, which is divided in two by the insertion of vv.23-26.

Several pieces of evidence support this. The second part of the speech does not make any mention of Mattathias' most recent act. It simply continues his original train of

thought. Since this is the central event of the chapter according to scholars,²⁹ it is strange that no mention is made of it by Mattathias in exhorting his followers. Further, this act is mentioned nowhere else in the rest of the chapter or even anywhere else in the whole of 1Maccabees, which lends some doubt to its central role.

Thirdly, vv.15, 17 speak of οἱ παρὰ τοῦ βασιλέως (the ones [sent] from the king) as the ones who came to Modein to enforce the sacrifice. This speaks of a plural number of people, not simply an individual. However, v.25 reports that Mattathias killed τὸν ἄνδρα τοῦ βασιλέως (the man of the king) on the altar. Mattathias has killed only one man where more than one was present. There is nothing indicating that the others fled or went after him or were also murdered. This would be a glaring gap in the story's internal logic, considering the actions of the enforcers both in chapter 1 (54-61) and later in chapter 2 (29-38).³⁰

Another indication that this passage might be secondary is its heavy reliance on Numbers 25:6-8. Verse 23 recounts a Judean coming forward to break the law, just as Numbers 25:6. The reaction of Phinehas in Nm 25:7-8 is also nearly identical to Mattathias vv.24-25 in that he murders not only the Judean, but also the gentile aiding the sin of the apostate. Finally, at v.26 Mattathias is explicitly compared to Phinehas. This story could have simply been given to Mattathias because of his later mention of Phinehas as an ancestor in v.54. It would create a binding reminder to the audience of how this family was tied to the priesthood and also foreshadow the later action of the Hasmoneans and their allies against apostates.

One final hint toward the fact that vv.23-26 might be additional is the location of these verses within the story. At 1Macc 2:1, 28, 29-30 Mattathias and other like-minded

²⁹ J. Bartlett, *1Maccabees*, 23, 25, 66, et alii. Bartlett also notes that this passage has all the marks of the storyteller and is hardly from a historical chronicle. The legendary character of it contributes to the fact that it could have been added in at a later date.

³⁰ Josephus attempts to correct this error in *Antiquitates* 12.270 by having Mattathias assisted by his sons. These seem to be inventions of Josephus as he has an alternate account in *War*. 1.36 with the incident occurring in Jerusalem, and against Bacchides, as noted by J. Sievers, *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters. From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (South Florida Studies in Judaism 6; Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1990), 30-31.

Judeans flee from the troubles brought on by the gentiles. It is only after the massacre of innocent members of Israel at 2:38 that Mattathias and his friends reach the decision at 2:40 that they must fight for their lives and for their ordinances. Before this, there is no indication of them doing so. Immediately after this decision, however, they take to a proactive fight (2:42-48). This puts Mattathias' action in 23-26 firmly out of place. He has fled before this, and flees after this, and then is among those who voice concern over continually fleeing. This suggests Mattathias has done nothing else, and thus likely did not murder the Judean and the gentile officer in an earlier version of the story. The combined weight of the evidence points to the secondary nature of 23-26.

2:42-44

The other passage that disturbs the unity of 1Macc 2 is vv.42-44. As mentioned above, it is difficult to read a clear transition from v.41 to v.42 and also from v.44 to v.45. The plot of each of these adjoining passages, though similar, is not exactly the same. The subjects of vv.39-41 are clearly *Ματταθίας καὶ οἱ φίλοι αὐτοῦ* (Mattathias and his friends). This group is the only proper-noun subject in the section and all those who speak are clearly part of this group. Similarly, *Ματταθίας καὶ οἱ φίλοι αὐτοῦ* are the subjects of vv.45-48, for the same reason that all the third person plural verbs refer back to this antecedent in v.45. The situation is different in vv.42-44. In v.42 it is the Hasideans (*Ἀσιδαίων*) who are the subjects, while in v.43 the fugitives (*οἱ φυγαδεύοντες*) are the subjects. This change in subject creates confusion in how to read the pronouns and third person plural verb forms in vv.42-44.

Martola sees *αὐτοῦς* in 42a as referring to Mattathias and his friends,³¹ which is undoubtedly right, as there is little other possibility. But where Martola raises questions is in relation to *αὐτοῖς* in 43a and the subjects of 44a-b.³² Martola concludes that the antecedent of *αὐτοῖς* at 43a must be the Hasideans, because they are the closest proper nouns. Likewise, the subjects of the verbs in 44a-b must be the Hasideans and fugitives together, due to the fact that if it were the friends of Mattathias who were the subjects,

³¹ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 157.

³² *Ibid.*, 157.

there would be no need to name them again in v.45. Finally, Martola concludes that because of this situation the narrator is purposefully mentioning an independent group of Judeans in the Hasideans and fugitives who are striving for the same goal as the Hasmoneans, but are not united with them.³³

For the most part, Martola's arguments are convincing. This means that in the midst of two accounts dealing with Mattathias and his friends, a passage detailing a second group and their efforts is present. The fact that this passage abruptly changes subjects and then reverts back to the original subject should already cast doubts about its originality.

A second inconsistency with the passage is in a place where I believe Martola to be wrong. He claims that although the groups are separate "They do not differ in the sense that they strive after different aims", providing as support that "the Asideans joined Mattathias and his supporters".³⁴ However, the report of the deeds of the two groups seems to prove otherwise. In vv. 42-44 the Hasideans and the fugitives are said to have "formed an army and struck down sinners in their anger and lawless men in their wrath" (συνεστήσαντο δύναμιν καὶ ἐπάταξαν ἀμαρτωλοὺς ἐν ὀργῇ αὐτῶν καὶ ἄνδρας ἀνόμους ἐν θυμῷ αὐτῶν). This report tells of three acts of the Hasideans and fugitives: they established a fighting force, they struck down sinners in their anger, and struck down lawless men in their wrath. These events are all linked in reality and can be all united under one act of organizing an army to kill people. The identity of their victims is clearly apostate Judeans as it is reported that "the remnant fled to the gentiles for safety (οἱ λοιποὶ ἔφυγον εἰς τὰ ἔθνη σωθῆναι).³⁵

The identity of the victims is important because when we turn to the deeds of Mattathias and his friends there is a remarkable difference in the aim of their work. Mattathias' group tore down the altars (καθεῖλον τοὺς βωμοὺς; 2:45) circumcised the

³³ Ibid., 157.

³⁴ Ibid., 157.

³⁵ J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 237. However B. Renaud, "La Loi", 46 sees that two separate groups, one of apostates and one of gentile opponents is named here. But, he does not account for either the fact that the survivors fled to the gentiles or that this could easily be a case of synonymous parallelism, where he sees antonymous parallelism.

uncircumcised children (περιέτεμον τὰ παιδάρια τὰ ἀπερίτμητα; 2:46), hunted down the sons of arrogance (ἐδίωξαν τοὺς υἱοὺς τῆς ὑπερηφανίας; 2:47), rescued the law out of the hand of the gentiles and kings (ἀντελάβοντο τοῦ νόμου ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν ἔθνῶν καὶ τῶν βασιλέων; 2:48), and never gave the sinner the upper hand (καὶ οὐκ ἔδωκαν κέρως τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ; 2:48). The five acts are diverse. However separate the acts of Mattathias are, they all have a unified aim- to protect the (mostly) cultic customs. This is unlike the acts of the Hasideans, who seem to seek vengeance only on apostate Judeans. The acts of Mattathias, however, are universally against gentiles and gentile institutions. They tear down altars, an act that, in effect, removes the gentile cult. They circumcise the uncircumcised children of Israel, which overturns the king's decree (1:48, 60-61). In chasing down the sons of arrogance, Mattathias and company remove the gentiles from the land.³⁶ The statement in v.48 is obviously also explicitly against the gentiles and may be a summary of all Mattathias' previous work.³⁷

Because the identity of the group as well as the mission are so thoroughly different between vv.42-44 and vv.39-41, 45-48 it seems very likely that the Hasidean and fugitive passage could be additional. The change clears up the reading of v.45ff, and allows for 39-41,45-48 to be read as one continuous passage describing the changes implemented by Mattathias and his friends and culminating in proclamation of victory over the sinners.

Implications

Unlike 1Macc 1, the secondary passages in 1Macc 2 do not appear to be related to one another. Each additional passage has its own independent vocabulary, focus, and function in the final form of 1Maccabees. 2:23-26 takes a speech of Mattathias, wherein he pledges his loyalty to the law and covenant (2:19-22, 27), and inserts an episode that illustrates Mattathias' zeal for the law through action. It diminishes the importance of Mattathias' speech, and subsequent flight to the hills, and places all the focus on his

³⁶ F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 44-45 among others sees the sons of arrogance as a title designated to the emissaries of the King. This is due to the king being the only character described as arrogant anywhere else in the book.

³⁷ B. Renaud, "La Loi", 46, points out that v.48 should be read with the final clause being a consequence of the previous clauses i.e. "therefore he never let the sinners have the upper hand"

assassination of the Seleucid official and Judean man, and his destruction of the illicit altar. This becomes the central act in the career of Mattathias. The passage also elevates Mattathias to the level of Phinehas through his similar zeal for the law. Further, the addition of this passage makes Mattathias a paradigm for proper response to the persecutions, which is only later carried out by others (2:45-48).

The sum of these changes brought on by the addition of the passage point to a desire to elevate Mattathias to a full-fledged father of the rebellion. The editor who included this story may have wanted to make Mattathias like one of the ancestors he commands his sons to emulate. The editor may also have wanted a concrete action by which the audience could remember Mattathias, instead of a lament (2:7-13) and three speeches (2:29-22,27; 39-41; 51-70) with only vague reference to actions (2:45-48). The setting in which such an addition would take place is difficult to hypothesize with this one isolated passage. One can only imagine that the heroicizing and mythologizing trend displayed by the passage is something that takes longer to develop than a simple narrative. It is also likely this passage is not added in isolation, but as part of a wider set of additions. Once we have more of an idea of this layer, then it will be easier to determine the setting for which this passage was included.

2:42-44 appears to be of a different sort altogether. It concerns itself with various groups of Judeans, which it claims were major players on the stage of the Hasmonean rebellion. The Hasideans and a group of fugitives who join them are introduced on the side of the faithful, while a third group, labeled ἄνομος and ἄμαρτωλός,³⁸ are revealed to be loyalists to the Seleucids. The effect of this introduction is that an otherwise united Israel appears to be somewhat more fractured than previously presented. Far from being an ethno-religious community united in its efforts, Israel is presented as a compilation of sub-sets, some of whom are Hasideans who offer themselves for the law, others of whom are fugitives, just trying to escape troubles, and still others of whom do not seem to regard the law at all (if the name ἄνομος is an indication). Secondly, the addition

³⁸ It seems fairly clear that ἄμαρτωλός appears relatively frequently in 1Maccabees, including in the immediate vicinity (2:48, 62) referring to gentiles. Here we interpret the word to be used in synonymous parallelism with ἄνομος due to the synonymous parallelism of ὀργή and θυμός in the same clauses.

shows the increased prestige Mattathias and his friends were gaining among Israel by attracting groups outside their own core. Though, as we pointed out above, these new groups, who attacked apostate Judeans, had different aims than Mattathias and his friends, who focused their attacks outwards.

The similarities to the additions in 1Macc 1 cannot be missed. The apostate Judeans are again presented as allies of the gentiles. Israel once more is divided between those faithful to the law and troubled by the persecutions on the one side, and those who have found solace in the arms of the persecutors on the other. It is a possibility that 2:42-44 was added as part of the same layer of additions as those in 1Macc 1 because of this. We will only test this theory once we have realized the full extent of the additions in 1Maccabees, but it now looks more likely.

II.3 1Macc 3

Only one passage in 1Macc 3 stands out as a possible addition. Otherwise, a relatively unified report of Judas Maccabeus' early military career is the subject of the narration. Three battle scenes dominate the account. The first (3:10-12) introduces Judas as a warrior in the mold of David through his use of his opponent's sword throughout his life (1Sm 17). The second battle (3:13-26) builds on the first, pitting Judas against a more powerful general and a larger army. There is considerably more detail in the second account, as well as a lengthy pre-battle introduction. The result is that Judas' fame reaches the king. This sets up the third battle account wherein the king appoints Lysias, his surrogate in the western empire, and orders him to destroy Israel (3:27-36). Lysias in turn appoints two members of the royal court as commanders of an army and sends them into Judea (3:38-41). Judas then reacts by convening his body of followers and asking aid from heaven before finally marching out to battle and encouraging his troops (3:42-60).

The three accounts logically build upon one another and make many internal references to each other. Seron, in the second battle account, reacts to Judas' victory in

the first battle. King Antiochus in the third, hears reports of the previous two battles, and reacts to them. Even the third battle account, which contains numerous parts, is internally tied together by the logical delegation of duties from the higher to lower rulers and internal links.

The two poetic passages (3:45, 50-53), though abruptly changing form, continue and confirm themes from the rest of the chapter. The statements of the first poem are basically a repetition of Antiochus' orders to Lysias concerning Israel. The second poem ties both to its immediate context (3:48-49), and to the broader context of the chapter. Verse 51 recalls v.45 and anticipates v.59. The gentile army, encamped in the land at vv.40-41, is recalled by v.52, which is further duplicated in v.58. Further, the theme of double-causality displayed by the poem echoes the speech of Judas in the second battle account (3:17-22) and also foreshadows his speech at the close of the chapter (3:58-60). Though the change of form is a clue that might have suggested a secondary insertion, it appears the links are too strong for this to be the case.

Even the narrative introduction to Judas' career (3:1-2) fits the content of the rest of chapter 3 well. Judas is highlighted as the commander of the forces in the first verse, thus focusing the reader on the central figure of the chapter. The second verse stresses not only the participation of his brothers and the other followers of his father, which are later recalled (3:13, 14, 25, 42), but also the military nature of Judas' campaign. Further, the implication that Judas is fighting for Israel is repeated numerous times (3:21, 43, 59). The introduction provided by 3:1-2 is entirely appropriate.

3:3-9

The problematic passage remains. 3:3-9 strikes this reader as problematic on a number of levels. The first clue is the formal difference; 3:3-9 is a poetic passage, technically a *preisgedicht*,³⁹ which is surrounded by narrative prose. There is no narrative introduction to the poem that gives it a clear context, and similarly the succeeding narrative makes no reference to it. Though poetry makes two other

³⁹ G. Neuhaus, *Studien zu den poetischen Stücken im 1. Makkabäerbuch* (FzB 12; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1974), 95.

appearances in the chapter, one poem (3:50-53) has a clear narrative introduction that suggests the content of the verses are utterances of the characters mentioned throughout its context. The other poem (3:45), like 3:3-9 does not have a narrative introduction, but does have numerous links to the surrounding text. There is one further *preisgedicht* in the text (14:4-15), but this seems to have a similarly dubious relationship with its context.⁴⁰

This leads to the second problem with 3:3-9: there are very few connections that can be made between its contents and the immediate context. Certainly none of the verses are precise enough to tie to any event in chapter 3 specifically, but even if one employs a generalizing principle of analogy, one finds very few and very weak ties to the context. The proclamation of v.3, that the subject of the poem extended the glory of his people could be interpreted as relating to the spread of fear achieved by Judas among the gentiles, referenced in v.27, or Seron's knowledge of Judas and his companions (3:13-14), but the connection might be a stretch. Also in verse 3, the claim that the subject of the poem waged battles can certainly be seen throughout Judas' reign, including in the rest of the chapter. However, this too is quite general given the circumstances of rebellion. Verses 5 and 6, which speak of Judas' efforts against the apostate Judeans, can be tied only to 7:21-25, the sole instance in which Judas attacks his Judean opponents. The kings Judas is reported to have embittered in v.7 must be seen as Antiochus IV, Antiochus V and Demetrius I, though it must be said that Judas hardly achieved outstanding results against the second two. The two comments in v.9 have different references; the first part of the verse, about Judas' renown, can be tied to 3:25; 5:1, 63; 8:1-32. The second comment about gathering in the perishing can be seen as relating to chapter 5. However, nothing is specific in the verses. Every phrase is exceedingly general, and skirts the truth.

The generalities even extend to the subject of the poem. On the first reading it seems as though the text has connections to vv.1-2, by sharing the same subject. However, if one reads these verses closely there is a clear disconnection: While verse 1 has Judas as its subject, verse 2 has a third person plural subject (ἐβροθήθουν, ἐπολέμουν)

⁴⁰ See the discussion ad loc.

in both of its clauses. In 2a the subject is explicitly Judas' relatives and allies; these are very likely the subjects of 2b as well. However, v.3, the first verse of the poem then has a third person singular subject. One expects that a change in subject requires a noun to be restated once it is brought up again, but here it is not. Judas' name is not mentioned in v.3 or at any other point in the poem. The combination of the lack of a clear poetic subject and the dearth of references to specific acts raise the possibility that the poem does not belong to this context.

Further evidence for the hypothesis of the secondary nature of 3:3-9 comes from the discrepancies between the poem and the narratives. This can particularly be seen in v.8 where it is reported that "he went through the cities of Judah and destroyed the ungodly out of it" (καὶ διῆλθεν ἐν πόλεσιν Ιουδα καὶ ἔχωλέθρευσεν ἀσεβεῖς ἐξ αὐτῆς). The report is entirely wrong. Judas never removes his opponents entirely from the land. From beginning (3:10) until end (9:23) there is a strong presence of Judas' opponents in Judah. They continually cause problems for him, and, in fact, kill him in battle. Another disagreement between the poem and the surrounding text is that the *preisgedicht* is written from the future perspective wherein the subject is already long deceased (3:7, 9) while the narrative account of Judas' reign is just beginning. These discrepancies, coupled with the general nature of the poem, and its disconnection from the surroundings, all show that the poem rests uneasily in its current setting.

The point is carried home by the close relationship that appears to exist between 3:1-2 and 3:10-11. In v.2 it is reported that all of Judas' followers gathered to fight Israel's fight (καὶ ἐπολέμουν τὸν πόλεμον Ισραηλ). This is echoed in the attack of Apollonius when he gathers troops to fight against Israel (τοῦ πολεμῆσαι πρὸς τὸν Ισραηλ). Once Judas' troops are introduced as eager to fight for Israel, they are immediately confronted by foreign soldiers attacking Israel. Judas' military command is then the subject of the rest of the passage (3:11-12). The two pairs of verses follow on each other very well, both in content and in verbal similarities. There is little question they can be read together.

Implications

Due to the isolated nature of 3:3-9, scholars have, since very early on tried to explain its function and presence in the text. C.F.W. Grimm wrote that the poem was an apologia for Judas' reign that preceded it and summarized it.⁴¹ He however found no problems with its place in the text or lack of connections. A number of scholars have followed his initial report more or less.⁴² They all see the function as a sort of summary-before-the-fact for Judas' reign, and tie it to the whole of 1Macc in that way. Nils Martola adds to this that it is not only a framing summary for the account of Judas, but also for the entire story of the work of liberation.⁴³ Martola makes this statement despite recognizing that the poem has little to do with the immediate context.⁴⁴

The problem with the above arguments is that while they hypothesize a specific function for the poem that might work, they fail to explain the problematic way in which the poem is associated to the text of 1Macc. While the poem can be seen as a summary of Judas' reign, it could also summarize the reigns of Jonathan or Simon or indeed many other heroes, given the lack of any stated subject. Also, as a summary the poem would seem to be awfully unbalanced as compared to the narrative account. While only five verses of the narrative are devoted to Judas' attacks on apostate Jews (7:21-25), two out of the seven verses of the poem treat this aspect of his exploits (3:5-6). Further, the majority of his time, spent defending Israel from the gentiles is reduced to a small aspect of his work in the poem (3:7a, 8a). With this in mind the poem seems less like a summary-before-the-fact than a summary-unaware-of-the facts of Judas' campaigns, as reported in the narrative. Though the poem is seen by Martola as a framing poem for the work of liberation, it is clear that the process of liberation has been started before the poem (2:45-48; 3:1-2). Combining this with Martola's notice that the poem has no bonds with its context, it is impossible to firmly state that the poem is original to chapter 3. Moreover, the fact that the poem's only hypothesized function is as a summary also allows for the fact that it is additional to the main story.

⁴¹ C. Grimm, *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer* (Leipzig: S.Hirzel, 1853).

⁴² F.-M. Abel *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949); J. Dancy, *A Commentary on 1Maccabees* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954); N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study of the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984).

⁴³ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 37, 237, 263.

⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 263.

A second proposal is made by J.R. Bartlett⁴⁵ and J.A. Goldstein:⁴⁶ the poem is a contemporary poem added to the text. This would seem likely based on the information at hand. It would explain the discrepancies between the poem and the story itself. However, the fact that there is no stated subject in the poem would require that the narrative already existed and that the poem is either only fragmentary, or was about someone else and edited to fit the existing context. This is certainly possible, but may suggest that the poem is an entirely new composition added to 1Macc at a later time by an editor. However, when a reason for the poem's addition is hypothesized, an already existing source again seems more likely. If a copyist or editor knew this poem about Judas (or perhaps another hero) and thought it fit the literary situation, he may well have been eager to insert it into the account in any way he could, trying to find an appropriate place for it. However, it is difficult to see why the poem would be composed by a later editor of the book and placed so poorly in the text.

Based on the evidence from the poem itself, it appears that whoever inserted the poem into its current context, either by composition or redaction, might have wished to put a specific stamp on Judas' life. The tradent picked up the martial depictions of Judas already present in the text (2:66; 3:1-2, 25), and recast Judas as a larger-than-life heroic warrior (3:3-4, 8-9) who aptly defended Israel against the two-fold attack of the apostate Judeans and the gentile kings (3:5-7). The reality, as we have pointed out, is that Judas attacks apostates infrequently, and after initial success, fares poorly against the Seleucid kings and their forces. This reimagining of Judas, which is placed in front of the account of Judas' career, influences the reader to view Judas in the new image of the giant, the lion, and the hero.

The mythologizing tendency this poem has is similar to that of the account of Mattathias' act in the addition at 1Macc 2:23-26. It focuses on one character, recasts him as a paradigm, and makes him an opponent of gentile and apostate Judean alike. Though each of these passages does include apostates, they do not share the tendency of elevating the apostates to the status of prime enemy with the additions of 1Macc 1 and 1Macc 2.42-

⁴⁵ J. Bartlett, *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 45.

⁴⁶ J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976), 100.

44. In the case of 3:3-9, the lawbreakers are merely among the enemies, and do not appear to be the purpose of the text's inclusion. For this reason it seems unlikely that it would be linked with the latter group of additions, though it would certainly be irresponsible to connect 3:3-9 to 2:23-26 on the evidence at hand. At this point it merely seems the two passages have been included with the same overall result: the mythologizing of a member of the Hasmonean family.

It is difficult to place an addition of this sort into a historical setting. This is complicated by the lack of any clear historical references, or even a named subject of the poem, as well as by the fact that it is unclear whether the poem is an original composition or an established work at the time of its inclusion. One might doubt however that the poem's inclusion into 1Maccabees stems from a time later than the narrative portion. Because the poem appears to appeal to popular interests and the emotions of the people instead of basing itself on historical events, it is also likely from a different stratum of society than the narrative groundwork. If it can be linked more closely to other additions in the book, then perhaps the greater amount of evidence can be applied for a more firm setting.

II.4 1Macc 5

Chapter 5 is a relatively tight unit within the whole of 1Maccabees. It begins with the desire of the "gentiles all around" (read local gentiles) to destroy the members of the community of Israel who lived among them, and ends with Judas destroying their altars and graven images, and plundering their towns before finally returning to the land of Judah. In D.S. Williams's structural analysis of 1Maccabees, he sees chapter 5 as a unit because of the subject change, spatial shift and new course of events from chapter 4, repetition of style, and the "framing" of the events with attacks on the descendants of Esau.⁴⁷ Further, he sees a spatial shift, subject change and new course of events at 6:1,⁴⁸ which closes off 1Maccabees 5 into a nice unit.

⁴⁷ D. Williams, *The Structure of 1Maccabees* (CBQMS 31; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999), 23-25.

Despite this overall unity of the chapter, when reading through there are some difficult passages toward the close of chapter 5. The most glaring problems in reading an unadulterated text come in relation to 5:55-62 and 5:67. The first group of verses discusses Joseph and Azariah, commanders of the forces of Judea, and their desire to be like the Hasmoneans. This desire leads them to attack the gentiles on their borders, resulting in a crushing defeat for the Judeans, due to their disobedience of the commands of Judas and his brothers. Verse 67 tells of a group of priests who go out to battle unwisely and thus are crushed in an attack in the area of Marisa. The thematic similarities can already be seen in this summary, but may not create a problem. However, the motivation for Joseph and Azariah (οἰόμενοι ἀνδραγαθῆσαι)—*proposing to do a brave deed*, is repeated almost verbatim in the description of the priests' motivations (βουλόμενοι ἀνδραγαθῆσαι)—*desiring to do a brave deed*. The tie between the theme and verbal similarity is too close to go unnoticed. The fact that the match occurs only six verses apart, but is apparently about a different subject, arouses suspicion.

If we look to Josephus' *Antiquities* to see how he has treated the event, we find he glosses over the second occurrence.⁴⁹ This may be due to simply not finding it noteworthy, or perhaps it is because he too thought it strange that there were two instances where Judean leaders went out to war foolishly because they wanted to accomplish brave deeds. S. Zeitlin, in his commentary, also notices that there is something wrong here and says of v.67, "this verse is out of place and interrupts the continuity of the story".⁵⁰ Though we do not really see how the verse is out of place, when associated with the battle of Marisa, we must note the problems created by these passages.

⁴⁸ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁴⁹ *Antiquities* XII 353.

⁵⁰ S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950), 121.

Because of the omissions of Josephus, and the problems caused by the passage, we may be tempted to agree in part with Zeitlin, and propose that v.67 is additional. However, if we do this, we must ask first why it would be added. According to F.-M. Abel, the verse reiterates and emphasizes the point made in vv.55-62, that is, the Judeans should not go out and make war without the Hasmonean help.⁵¹ This suggestion might make sense, but let us test it in view of the verse being additional. First, the verse actually says nothing about going out to battle without Hasmonean help. In context it could speak of going to battle outside of the command of Judas, or within the rubric of his march through Marisa. What it does say, is that the priests went out to battle “without counsel” (ἀβουλεύτως). This certainly could imply “without the advice of Judas or his brothers”, but it does not necessarily carry this meaning. Second, the verse says nothing about the election of the Hasmonean family as saviors of Israel, which is the main point and climax of v.62.⁵² Further, it would be strange to add this verse to expand on the point made in vv.55-62, when it contains so much less detail. The names of the priests are not given, the name of the enemy is not provided, it is not clear who the enemy is, and the circumstances of the army are nowhere even hinted at. After examination, there is little reason to imagine what this verse adds to the point made by vv.55-62, other than depicting a very vague instance where something similar occurred.

However, if we turn this argument on its head, and test what 5:55-62 would add to the point made by v.67, we come up with an array of fascinating results. It is immediately obvious that the kernel of v.67 is fleshed out in all directions by the Joseph and Azariah passage. In this version of the story, leaders among the Hasmonean faction go into battle against Gorgias at Jamnia. They do this against the advice of Judas and his brothers, but out of admiration for their brave deeds (ἀνδραγαθιῶν). Because of their foolishness, two thousand of the people of Israel fall on that day (ἔπεσον ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ), because they did not listen to Judas and his brothers and did not belong to the family through whom salvation was given to Israel. The passage adds: names of the

⁵¹ F.-M. Abel *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949), 107. It must be pointed out that Abel does not hold v.67 to be an addition, or out of place.

⁵² S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin, *First Book*, 121 sees v.62 as an interpolation made in the post-70 CE era, because Josephus does not repeat it, making v.61 the main point of 55-62. The opinion is not reflected by other scholars.

antiheroes, the name of the enemy general, a definite location for the battle, a double emphasis on the motivation, the number of people who fell, and two clear reasons for their failure.

If we follow this hypothesis further, the expansion would add all of these while picking up the key phrases “fell on that day” (v.60, 67⁵³) and the previously mentioned “proposing to do brave deeds” (v.56⁵⁴, 61, 67). This makes a strong case for the secondary nature of vv.55-62. I propose this is where we look for the addition in this chapter.

There are a few external arguments, which support our hypothesis. The first of these is that, according to 2Macc 12:38-45,⁵⁵ where there is a parallel account, the episode with Gorgias is related to the attack on Marisa. Since Gorgias is associated with Marisa, it is more than suspicious that 1Macc 5.55-62 associates him with Jamnia, but has a strikingly similar turn of events occur at Marisa. Though there is no way to prove which account is in fact correct, or whether either author intended their account to be factually correct, we must mark that 2Macc supports the claims that there was a massacre of some of the Jewish party associated with Gorgias, and places this at Marisa. Though the reasoning for their demise is different,⁵⁶ the overall context supports the privilege we have given v.67 in this context. The link of defeat at Marisa against Gorgias in both

⁵³ At v.67 the verb is placed at the end of the phrase “on that day” as opposed to the beginning, but the verb form and meaning are the same.

⁵⁴ As noted above the first instance merely shows the brave deeds done by the Hasmoneans, which they intend to mimic according to the following verse.

⁵⁵ This was first pointed out by C. Keil, *Commentar über die Bücher der Makkabäer* (Leipzig: Dörffling und Francke, 1875), 110, but has since been endorsed by S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin, *First Book*, 123; J. Dancy, *A Commentary on 1Maccabees* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), 109; J. Bartlett, *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1973), 78.

⁵⁶ 2Macc 12:38-45 alleges these men were idolators, who fittingly wore graven images of idols taken from Jamnia. It is also interesting to note that both this account and the account in 1Macc 5:67 attempt in their own way to clear Judas of any fault, though perhaps the author of 5:55-62 thought it was not enough in 1Macc.

passages for a select number of the Judeans constitutes too close a connection to dismiss.⁵⁷

A second clue, which comes from 2Macc, is that Joseph son of Zechariah and Azariah are unknown in this context.⁵⁸ If they really were the commanders of the army in this battle, one might reasonably expect 2Macc to make mention of their presence at least someplace among the soldiers, but it does not. Further, if they were in fact commanders of the forces in Judea, one would suppose that they would make some other notable appearance in 1Macc or 2Macc, but this also is not the case.⁵⁹ Moreover, the theological reasoning and the profane explanation for the downfall of these two, or any of the Judeans, supplied by 1Macc 5:55-62, are nowhere reflected in the account of the battle with Gorgias in 2Macc.

The third clue to the secondary nature of this passage from extrinsic sources comes in the parallel nature of the account from 1Macc 5 surrounding the incident of Joseph and Azariah, with that reported in 2Macc. At 1Macc 5:52-54 the people setting out after their destruction of Ephron, following Judas, cross the Jordan in the plain before Beth She'an and pass by it on their way to Jerusalem, where they offer burnt offerings on Mt. Zion. At 2Macc 12:29-31, the Jews come before Scythopolis (Beth She'an), pass it by because of their friendship, and go up to Jerusalem because the festival of weeks was close at hand. The symmetry here is unmistakable. The small differences come only in elaboration. 2Macc clarifies that it was the feast of weeks, and that they passed by Scythopolis because of their kind treatment, while 1Macc emphasizes that they offered burnt offerings. The more interesting part of the parallel follows: 2Macc 12:32 states that the people hurried against Gorgias at Idumea. The attack on Idumea is related in 1Macc 5:65, after the story of Joseph and Azariah and a small note of praise for Judas and his brothers. The otherwise close agreement between events in 1 and 2Maccabees at this

⁵⁷ However see the remarks of J. Goldstein, *1Maccabees* (AB; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976), 304, who claims Jason of Cyrene (the author of the history of which 2Macc is an epitome) does not cover the episode in vv.55-62 because of its pro-Hasmonean bias.

⁵⁸ Though J. Bartlett, *First and Second*, 71; and J. Goldstein, *1Maccabees*, 304-5, argue that these may be the same characters as at 2Macc 10:19.

⁵⁹ However see the above comment and 5:18-19, which we will discuss below.

point is disrupted by this one passage, which according to a number of other intrinsic and extrinsic clues, appears to be secondary. It is becoming clear that vv.55-62 may well be a later insertion into the story, which elaborates on v.67. But let us find what other hints there are toward this end in 1Macc 5.

If we look at the context clues of 1Macc 5:54 and 5:63, which stand on either side of our proposed addition, the text seems to support the idea that it is an insertion. Verse 63 says that Judas and his brothers were greatly honored in all Israel and among the gentiles, and that people gathered to them and praised them. The verse would fit very well after verse 54 where the text reports that the members of Israel, led by Judas, went up to Mt. Zion with joy and gladness, because they had returned in safety and not one of them had fallen. Not only are the scenes both ones of exultation and joy, but one can imagine that those Judeans who had just been saved by Judas and his brothers from the gentiles roundabout would gather to the Hasmoneans and praise them. The temple setting is also an appropriate place for the celebrations to be going on. On the other hand, v.63 is a bit laughable following vv.55-62, where lieutenants of Judas and his brothers have just suffered a crushing loss of 2,000 Israelites⁶⁰ to a powerful gentile governor. Not only would it be strange that the nations would all praise Judas, as they would have him in a vulnerable position, but the Judeans who lost their relatives may not see things the same way as the narrator of vv.61-62. Their loss of family members and countrymen without any good reason would have at least been cause to question why Joseph and Azariah were chosen at all. It does not matter so much that the narrator attempts to remove blame from Judas and his brothers. In the end, there is still a defeat under their watch.

Further, there are hints from the vocabulary of vv.55-62 that it is a self-contained unit, separated from its surrounding text.⁶¹ The first and the last lines of 55-62 concern

⁶⁰ The number is significant in that Simon went and accomplished his work in the Galilee with only 3,000 men and Judas only 8,000 in the Gilead. Thus 2,000 is more than 15% of the whole force the brothers used, and perhaps more than 15% of the entire Hasmonean army in total. Cf. 1Macc 5:20.

⁶¹ This is briefly remarked upon by N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 139, where he

the Hasmonean family in particular. Verse 56 and verse 61 both use terminology concerning brave deeds (ἀνδραγαθῶν/ἀνδραγαθῆσαι) and both contrast the Maccabees, who do brave deeds, with non-Hasmoneans, who do not. Verse 57 reports the exhortation of Joseph and Azariah to “go to make war against the gentiles around us” (πορευθῶμεν πολεμῆσαι πρὸς τὰ ἔθνη τὰ κύκλω ἡμῶν) and verse 60 contrasts this with the report of the Joseph and Azariah being “turned and pursued until the borders of Judea” (καὶ ἐτροπώθη Ἰωσηπος καὶ Ἀζαριᾶς καὶ ἐδιώχθησαν ἕως τῶν ὁρίων τῆς Ἰουδαίας). The reversal is clear, in v.57 they “go”, “make war against” the gentiles “around (i.e. outside) us”. All these are outward-looking words. In v.60 those same speakers are “turned” and “pursued” until the “borders”, which are all inward-looking terms. The intricate structure in the first three and last three verses, shows that this passage is a self-contained unit. The unit then, can be seen as an insertion into its current context, when combined with the other clues.

One problem that arises from viewing the Joseph and Azariah passage as an insertion, is the question of what we are to do with 5:18-19. These are the only other verses in the book that refer to Joseph and Azariah. Is there a connection between these verses and the passage at v.55-62, and if so, are these also additional? We shall treat each question in turn. The evidence suggests that the verses are related.⁶² Outside of the clear vocabulary connections (Ἰωσηπον τὸν τοῦ Ζαχαρίου: v.18, 56; Ἀζαριᾶς: v.18, 56, 60; πόλεμον πρὸς τὰ ἔθνη: v.19, 57) there is also the direct command of Judas in v.19, which clearly sets up the breaking of the command, which is referred to in v.61. The links are too close to be mere coincidence.

5:18-19

As to the second question of whether the verses are also additional, the evidence points to that possibility. If we accept that vv.55-62 are additional then vv.18-19 would be superfluous and irrational, but this is circular reasoning, and should be avoided.

sees it having a special position, evident from the way it is constructed, but then goes no further.

⁶² N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 140; J. Bartlett, *First and Second*, 78; J. Dancy, *Commentary*, 108.

Second, v.17 is clearly closely tied to verse 20.⁶³ This can be seen in the vocabulary, which mentions Judas (v.17, 20), Simon (v.17, 20), Galilee (v.17, 20) and Gilead (v.17, 20). Meanwhile, vv.18-19 contain none of the verbal parallels between 17 and 20, and have no further verbal connections to those verses or any other verses in the chapter outside of vv.55-62.

One further hint at the possible additional nature comes again in a link between vv.17-20. In terms of subject matter the two are very similar. In v.17 Judas tells his brother Simon to choose men and go to Galilee to rescue his kin, and states further that he and Jonathan will go to the Gilead. In v.20 the logical answer to Judas' command comes: Simon is assigned his three thousand men, and Judas his eight thousand. One would expect these men to be assigned immediately after the command is given, however vv.18-19 intrude. The way in which they intrude is most interesting: Judas leaves Joseph and Azariah in charge of the rest of the forces in Judea to guard it, and then gives them the command that is destined to be broken. The problem is that in terms of the chronology of the story, there is no "rest of the forces" yet; no troops have been divided. Further, in the division of forces at v.20 Simon gets 3000, Judas gets 8000 and Joseph and Azariah get no troops! The only indication we have of the number of their forces comes in 55-62 where 2000 of their people die. We cannot know if these were all their troops, a significant portion, or only a drop in the bucket, because of the ill-fitting way vv.18-19 are incorporated. The combination of these facts puts the originality of vv.18-19 in doubt.

Implications

It appears then that the problematic readings in chapter 5 are solved by looking critically at the narrative and finding that vv.55-62 are a significant expansion on the original kernel of v.67. These verses seem to cobble together parts of the story also found in other sources. They then transfer the elements of the story to a different place, time, and assign the responsibility to different leaders in order to instruct the reader more

⁶³ In N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 138, Martola notices this association in a number of different connections, but proceeds to link these verses to 18 and 19 through other means.

concisely in the superiority and election of the Hasmonean family. The story has the fingerprints of legend on it because of the unique construction and the motives attributed to the antiheroes. Further, it appears that when this expansion was inserted into 1Macc vv.18-19 were also included in order to prove the conclusion of v.61 true. Once these verses are removed a clearer reading of chapter 5 emerges.

The inclusions here have some resemblance to those at 2:23-26 and 3:3-9 where Mattathias and Judas are respectively memorialized and celebrated as heroes. Though here it is the whole Hasmonean family that is celebrated, the outcome is the same. As at 2:23-26 and 3:3-9 the subject of the praise emerges larger than life. Here it is because the Hasmonean family are the ones through whom deliverance is given to Israel; at 2:23-26 it is because Mattathias is on par with Phinehas; at 3:3-9 it is because Judas is quite literally compared to a giant, a lion, and a protector of the people. There is a slightly greater connection with 2:23-26 because both passages point to a specific event, which proves the superiority of the subject, in this case, the ill-advised attack on Jamnia by non-Hasmoneans.

There is a clear pattern emerging, which points to a group of mythologizing legends being added to the text that have the effect of elevating Hasmonean claims, or recalling the greatness of the family. This result hardly points to a clear historical situation in which these additions might have been made. If there really is a link between the addition of these passages it is possible that it could be at a time in which the Hasmoneans were waning in power, or perhaps were even a part of history being fondly remembered. However, there are clearly other explanations that would make nearly as much sense. It is enough to recognize the possible connection between these additional texts at this point.

II.5 1Macc 6

Chapter six of 1Macc treats the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the rise of Antiochus V Eupator along with his regent Lysias. It focuses on the effect on Israel of

each of these events. Antiochus IV states on his deathbed that it is because of the wrongs he has committed in Jerusalem and Judah that he is dying, disappointed and in a foreign land (6:11-14). Nearly the entire account of Antiochus V's and Lysias' reign deals with their wars against Israel (6:28-41,47-63). In the midst of this account is a brief episode, which adds another set of characters and a separate motive to the young king's hostilities against the people (6:21-27). The episode seems to disrupt an otherwise unified picture of the Seleucid rulers in 1Maccabees, and makes them less active and more reactive in their wars, thus alleviating some of their guilt. For this reason, among others, it is possible that this episode is secondary to the base story and added to place more of the blame for the wars on internal opponents of the Hasmoneans than on the gentiles. A second passage, treating the martyrdom of Eleazar (6:42-46), also departs from the overall scope of chapter six, and has questionable connections to its context. It too may be secondary.

6:21-27

The evidence for 6:21-27 being an addition is manifold. It falls however in two categories: lack of unity and change of focus. These two areas of divergence from the rest of chapter six show that a reading excluding 6:21-27 as original is highly probable. The categories also help to illustrate the exact ways in which the additional material affects the final story.

The passage in question follows directly after vv.18-20, which describe the damage the citadel was doing to Israel and Judas Maccabeus' subsequent response to it.⁶⁴ 6:21-27 narrates the story of a small body of people from the garrison, comprised of both gentiles and apostate Judeans, which goes to the king and invokes his support against the Hasmoneans, who have caused them a great deal of suffering. They warn that this danger that they face does not end with the citadel but also affects those all around the territory (6:25) and even the king himself (6:27). Their plea is one-way; there is no verbal

⁶⁴ Though some consider 18-27 to be a literary unit, cf. F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949), 113; J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees* (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 319. N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 126, sees more basic literary units in 18-20 and 20-27, which are only later connected by similarity of subject matter.

response from the king. Rather, the plot continues with the next section narrating the king's anger and his reaction at finding out this deed (28-31). Within this immediate context 6:21-27 fits fairly well in general terms. However, when one examines the specific components of the text, the unity is seen to be unsound.

The first problem one encounters is that the king's reaction to the attack on the citadel by Judas is not dependent upon the report of the group of apostates and gentiles. Presumably, when the king's property was attacked he would act promptly and decisively without entreaty from his subjects.⁶⁵ This sort of activity can be seen in Apollonius' reaction to Judas' rebellion (3:10-12), in Seron's response to the defeat of Apollonius (3:13-15), and in Antiochus IV's retort to Judas' victory over Seron (3:27). It is this occasion, which first introduced Lysias into the land of Judah. It is not out of the scope of 1Maccabees for the Seleucid rulers to react swiftly and boldly against Israel without receiving complaints from their subjects, when their troops are besieged.

As a possible counter-argument to this, v.28 begins Καὶ ὠργίσθη ὁ βασιλεὺς ὅτε ἤκουσεν (and the king was enraged when he heard [this]). This can suggest some sort of report coming to the king, thus showing vv.21-27 to be original. However, it is not necessary that ἀκούω always carries the literal sense "hear" nor does this "hearing" always require a preceding report in 1Maccabees. Another primary meaning of ἀκούω is "understand, come to know".⁶⁶ In 1Macc there are numerous occasions wherein ἀκούω is used and there is no report at all to precede it in the text (8:1; 9:43; 10:15, 22; *inter alia*). When this knowledge is imputed back into v.28 then it is not entirely apparent that a report has preceded it. Instead v.28 might follow directly after

⁶⁵ E. Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (Leiden: E.J. Brill, 1979), 18. "Again and again their [apostate Jews] complaints cause the Syrians to march against Israel. These complaints are listed even in cases where the government would not have remained inactive anyway, such as during the siege of the citadel by the Maccabees." The quote illustrates that even Bickerman, a strong proponent for the unified composition of 1Maccabees, sees the episode as superfluous to the order of events, if not the actual plot.

⁶⁶ *Shorter Lexicon of the Greek New Testament*, 2nd ed.; Gingrich, F. and Danker, F. eds. (Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983), 7.

v.20. The reaction of Antiochus V and Lysias fits as well in this reading as with vv.21-27.

The reading without this passage is also likely because throughout the whole subsequent account of the battles at Beth-Zur, Beth-Zechariah, Beth-Zur (again), and the sanctuary, neither the report nor the group of gentiles and Judeans who delivered it to the king are mentioned. One might also notice that in all the battles waged by the king in reaction to the report concerning the citadel, not one of these takes place at the citadel. While it is true that both Beth-Zur and the sanctuary are listed as Hasmonean fortifications by the mission to the king (6:26), these were already known by those in the royal circles to be strongholds of Israel. Lysias himself was defeated at Beth-Zur the last time he was in Judea (4:29-35), immediately after which the sanctuary was rededicated and fortified (4:36-61). Additionally, an anonymous informant already told Antiochus IV, the king's father, of these strongholds in Judea (6:5-7). Considering the circumstances of his deathbed speech to all his friends⁶⁷ (πάντας τοὺς φίλους αὐτοῦ) concerning the Judeans, it is rather likely that Lysias and Antiochus V were also informed of these seats of Hasmonean power.

Beth-Zechariah, the only other place of battle, is made known to the King and Lysias only after the complaints of the apostates and gentiles. After Judas marches away from the citadel and encamps at Beth-Zechariah, this becomes a place of battle. None of these strongholds and battlefronts requires the complaints of the apostate-gentile mission at all. They are all known to the Seleucids from places immediately outside the speech. For all the reasons listed above it is clear that there is no necessity of the speech to be in the text in terms of plot continuity. The reports are either unacknowledged or old. The ones reporting are otherwise unknown to the narrator, and the king's reaction would be the same whether there was ever any mission made.

Essentially, the whole of chapter six has two central concerns: the fall and rise of gentile power under Antiochus IV and Antiochus V, and the transfer of power from one to the other. In the first part of chapter 6, vv.1-16 detail the fall of the gentiles and

⁶⁷ This term is used to identify the courtiers and peers in the Hellenistic kingdoms.

simultaneous rise of the Judeans. Antiochus IV is unable to achieve his goal in Elymais (6:1-4), he hears of his losses to the Judeans (6:5-7), and he falls sick and dies in a foreign land due to his evil works against the Judeans (6:8-13, 16). The gentiles are at their lowest point in the narrative up to this point. They are impotent and in disarray. The Judeans are described in lofty words. They have turned away the king's armies (6:5), and have numerous supplies, arms, and spoils won from their enemies (6:6). The Judeans have also removed the desecration from the temple, and have established fortifications even in a royal exclave (6:7). The power of the Judeans is never before greater than at the end of verse 7.

This situation begins its change, however, when Lysias establishes Antiochus V Eupator as king (6:17). Though the succession is shown to be somewhat controversial in that Lysias is not the rightful regent, nothing comes of this until later in the chapter. After the coronation of the new king, the gentiles begin their rise and the Judeans begin to fall. Those in the citadel encircle and attack the Judeans continuously, "endeavoring [for] evils through everything and (endeavoring) support for the gentiles" (6:18). The gentiles here at least start to gain strength enough to act decisively against the Judeans again. In vv.19-20, Judas and all the people besiege the citadel in response, but here they are not victorious. The Judeans reach no outcome. There is no longer the definitive victory for Judeans and loss for the gentiles. The battle is open ended.

The trend continues in verse 28. Antiochus V, in response to the work of Judas assembles a large army from his commanders and courtiers and a mercenary force from the independent kingdoms of the Mediterranean. They attack Beth-Zur, a Judean stronghold in the south. Though here again the battle is open-ended, the irresolution of the battle is a loss for the Judeans, who had become mighty, and a gain for the gentiles, who had fallen so far at the death of Antiochus IV. Verses 32-41, 47-54 then detail the impressiveness of the king's army in defeating the Judeans at Beth-zechariah, Beth-zur, and the sanctuary. By the end of this passage the gentiles are again in control and the Judeans are "scattered, each into his own place" (ἐσκορπίσθησαν ἕκαστος εἰς τὸν τόπον αὐτοῦ).

After this the text turns to the concern for the transfer of power. The controversy in the regency comes back to Lysias. His rival Philip has taken control in the capital (6:55-56). This dictates the course of the army, which then chooses to make peace with the Judeans in order to go back and defend the office of Lysias (6:57-59). The indecision in the gentile ranks seems at this point to be moving the Judeans back into prominence, with the restoration of their laws and the cessation of hostilities with the gentiles (6:60-61). However, the gentile power is only further ensured through the subsequent turn of events. The oath of peace is broken no sooner than it is made. The Judean fortifications are destroyed and Antiochus V turns back to Antioch and defeats Philip (6:62-63).

The picture of this chapter is a fairly unified one. The Judeans enjoy a period of dominance at the same time as the gentiles have a series of failures, which culminate in the death of the greatest gentile antagonist, Antiochus IV. The situation presented by the narrator provides a false sense of hope for the readers. However, this changes with the rise of Antiochus V and his regent Lysias. Their coronation is the turning point where the relations between the Judeans and gentiles return to their pre-Hasmonean status.⁶⁸ The gentiles begin to attack and harass the Judeans again. The king brings a great force against the Judeans and reestablishes strongholds, and for the first time since Antiochus IV, returns to Mt. Zion. Though the position of Lysias and Antiochus V is challenged, that confrontation only serves to further reduce the power of the Judeans and to strengthen the gentiles. Thus, the account ends with Lysias and Antiochus V firmly established on the throne in Antioch, and the Judeans left without fortifications or peace, and with the foreign presence heavy in the land.

The picture detailed above has been reconstructed of course without verses 6.21-27. These verses are different in scope from the outline above. Though they do deal with the same themes of change of kings (6:23-24) and the rise of the Judeans and fall of the gentiles (6:24-27), the verses disturb the turning point. Instead of the accession of the new king becoming the impetus behind the rise of the gentiles and fall of the Judeans, it is the impious Judeans who spur on the king. Their allegiance to the gentiles changes the

⁶⁸ Judas is in fact only mentioned three times: 19: besieging the citadel, 32: leaving the citadel, and 42: leading an army and killing six hundred.

sentiments of the king and the war turns in his favor. The testimony these apostates make is vital to the efforts of the king and Lysias with this addition. At the same time, the accession of the king loses importance. No longer do his policies represent a rejuvenation of the gentile practices, but only the wishes of the apostates. The fact that there is a new king makes no difference to the speech of the impious Judeans. Ignoring this central theme suggests the speech could be additional.

6:42-46

The way 6:42-46 connects with its context is a complicated matter. Though at first blush it has a number of links to the broader context of chapter 6 and the rest of 1Maccabees, the way it contributes to the plot is problematic. First, v.42 has a clear relationship with vv.32-33 through their report on Judas' battle preparations. Then, v.43 brings up the character of Eleazar, who was mentioned at 2:5, and refers to animals, which must be the elephants mentioned at v.34. At v.45 Eleazar's attack on the phalanx is brought up, which recalls vv.35, 38. Finally, Eleazar's death through being crushed under the weight of the elephant again recalls their description in vv.34-37. The combination of these connections might cause few to question the primary nature of the passage.

There are however immediate concerns with the passage. One is the sudden reintroduction of Eleazar at 6:43. Aside from his introduction in 2:5 he plays no role in the rest of the book, except perhaps as part of the collective brothers of Judas (3:2, 25; 4:36, 59; 5:63, *inter alia*) or sons of Mattathias (2:14, 20, 49, *inter alia*). Despite this fact, at v.43 he takes charge and attacks what he assumes to be the king's elephant in order to win fame for himself. It seems odd that Eleazar would be unremarkable throughout the entire account until his death, where he becomes a true martyr for the cause. Especially strange is that the author does not anticipate this passage describing Eleazar's death by putting him at the scene earlier in the account. There is not even a reference to Judas' brothers being present at Beth-Zechariah. Prior to this passage, only Judas explicitly, presumably aided by some army, is involved in any of the fighting throughout the chapter (6:19, 32). One expects that the author would place Eleazar at the scene before he appears to send himself to certain death. Or, if not this, then one

expects that there would be some reaction to Eleazar's death by the Judeans or his own brothers. None of this occurs. This alone does not mean 6:42-46 is additional, but it does cast doubt on its relationship to the context.

A second problem comes in the rather improbable progression from v.46 to v.47. After Eleazar's great rampage through the phalanx and slaying of the royal elephant is described, one expects that the Judean forces would be inspired and energized to continue the battle. The logic here would be that the heroism and skill of one man among them was so effective that if they all fought with the same spirit they might gain a victory. The exact opposite comes in v.47. The Judeans instead turn in flight upon seeing the strength of the approach of the royal forces. This reaction by the Judeans in v.47 not only somewhat laughable after the events in v.46, but also seems to allege that the Seleucid troops are only beginning their attack at this point. The text specifically states that they turned away (ἐκκλίνω) because they "saw the royal might and the swift approach of the forces" (καὶ εἶδον τὴν ἰσχὺν τῆς βασιλείας καὶ τὸ ὄρμημα τῶν δυνάμεων). Even if one does not think it odd that the Judeans would retreat after Eleazar's heroism, it is indubitable that this passage contradicts the whole episode beginning with v.42. There could have been no fight for Eleazar or Judas if the troops only begin their attack at v.47.

In support of this, v.41 is continued very logically by v.47. The former verse narrates that "all who heard the noise of their multitude, of the march of their multitude, and the clashing of their weapons, shivered, for the army was exceedingly large and mighty" (καὶ ἐσαλεύοντο πάντες οἱ ἀκούοντες φωνῆς πλήθους αὐτῶν καὶ ὁδοιπορίας τοῦ πλήθους καὶ συγκρουσμοῦ τῶν ὄπλων ἦν γὰρ ἡ παρεμβολὴ μεγάλη σφόδρα καὶ ἰσχυρά). The connection between the two verses is easy to see. They both focus on the perceptions of the royal force's approach. They both treat the battle as not having commenced. Both passages also have third person plural subjects, which must refer to the Judeans who were watching the enemy forces approaching. There can be little doubt that these verses fit together.

Of course, problems have been noticed in this passage before, most notably by Martola.⁶⁹ He remarks that the passage concerning Eleazar is clearly delimited and ends with v.46. Because of this, he considers the Eleazar passage an “embedded” episode. This is a passage, which interrupts another passage by existing in the midst of that passage, but is still tied to the context enough for it to be considered integrated.⁷⁰ Martola never gives a tangible reason for the assumption that the Eleazar story is integral, but one assumes that it is because of the verbal and thematic connections it shares with its surroundings. An interesting feature of Martola’s analysis is that he considers the limits of his embedded passage to be 6:43-46,⁷¹ instead of 6:42-46. He bases this upon the fact that those verses deal with Eleazar and are internally consistent.⁷²

Though we would have to agree that 6:43-46 forms its own unit, his decision to include 6:42 as part of the original narrative is simply untenable. The fact that the verse speaks of Judas and his army’s advance into battle, and reports the number of enemy troops killed cannot be reconciled with v.47, as Martola suggests.⁷³ Though he is correct that v.47 ends the account of the battle at Beth-Zechariah, v.42 also appears to end that account with the familiar ending formula of the enemy body count: καὶ ἔπεσον ...ἄνδρες (3:24; 5:22, 34; 7:32; 9:49; 10:85; 11:74). In almost every use of the formula, the phrase ends the battle account. Where it does not end the battle account it is never followed by an antithetical statement, as would be the case in Martola’s assessment. If Judas’ men managed to achieve some degree of success against the Seleucid forces, and nothing is said about the number of fallen Judeans, then there is no reason for the Judeans to retreat at the mere sight of the Seleucid army. Yet, Martola believes v.47 is a natural continuation of v.42. A more plausible explanation is that 6:42 is also additional, though its relationship with 6:43-46 is not entirely clear.

Implications

⁶⁹ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 119.

⁷⁰ *Ibid*, 130-131.

⁷¹ *Ibid*, 119.

⁷² *Ibid*, 118.

⁷³ *Ibid*, 118-119.

As we touched on above, 6:21-27 has a very specific effect on the text; the passage places the blame for the ensuing attacks of Lysias and Antiochus V at the feet of the apostate Judeans. The verses are essentially a report to the king in direct speech concerning the state of his loyal subjects and strongholds in Judea. Their placement between the accession of the new king and his attack on the Judeans makes it seem as though the king attacks the Judeans because of the report the apostates give to him. Without the inclusion of 6:21-27 the king, and especially his regent Lysias, would simply be following protocol by putting down the rebellion. Not only is it obvious that Lysias and Antiochus V were aware of the troubles in Judea before the apostate's report, but they explicitly had plans to invade Judea again after their last invasion failed (4:35).

The tendency to point the finger at the apostates for all the worst episodes in the time of the rebellion is, of course, nothing new. We have seen it already as part of the trend in the additions of 1Macc 1 and one of the additions in 1Macc 2. It increasingly looks likely that these additions are related to each other, and may be meant to place the harshest criticism on those labeled apostates. The reason and setting for this cannot be discerned until all the evidence is collected, but the pattern is unmistakable.

6:42-46 is a different case entirely. First, it is not clear whether v.42 is in fact related to vv.43-46. It is apparent only that it is additional. Second, vv.43-46 mention nothing of apostasy, or of any divisions within the Judean ranks, which makes it thoroughly unlike the group noted above. 6:43-46 has entirely to do with Eleazar's great act of heroism in crushing a phalanx and then sacrificing himself by toppling what he believed to be the royal battle elephant. The addition specifically states that he did so to win fame for himself and in order to save his people (6:44). These verses serve the function of elevating Eleazar's role in the Hasmonean rebellion from a mere footnote to a full-fledged savior. The placement of the passage at the battle of Beth-Zechariah may have to do with the descriptions of the elephants in the vicinity, or may have a kernel of truth to it. Whatever the case, the specific placement at the end of the account likely has to do with the fact that no battle is described anywhere before, and the succeeding verse already speaks of the Judean retreat.

The mythologization and depiction of a Hasmonean as a hero and savior is part of the other trend we have noticed in some additions. At 2:23-26; 3:3-9; 5:18-19, 55-62, we saw the Hasmonean family described as saviors, put on par with biblical heroes, and shown to be set apart from the rest of Israel. Several of those passages tied this status to specific acts, just as Eleazar's willing martyrdom. These all seem to have a similar effect on the narrative, and may well have been added together.

As for v.42, it seems most likely that it is a separate addition from vv.43-46, but it must be added in reaction to the addition of those verses. This is because there would be no reason for v.42 to be added between v.41 and v.47 without the account of Eleazar's martyrdom. It would simply state that Judas and his army killed six hundred men between two descriptions of the great fear the Judeans had of the Seleucid force. It would also create the confusion of two closing sentences for the battle. If, however, v.42 was included after 6:43-46, then a more clear reason for the addition can be proposed. In that form of the text, it looks like Judas and his army did nothing, and had to be saved by the efforts of Eleazar. They are merely witnesses of the giant army and one man's deed against it. A tradent may have noticed this and might have decided that it could not be that Judas the mighty warrior did nothing. He then might have added Judas' contribution to the battle and transformed him from a retreating coward at vv.41, 47, to a leader who gave his best effort in a losing fight. The addition of v.42 would then also create an artificial ending for the battle account before vv.43-46, which then takes v.47 as its own ending, though admittedly rather strangely.

It is not evident how long after the first addition 6:42 would have been added, nor if it was added after 6:43-46 at all. It may just be that vv.43-46 existed as a unit already and v.42 is just not part of that unit. Though, this is less likely than a later editor adding the single verse to elevate Judas. In the end, the provenance of v.42 will have to remain in doubt.

II.6 1Macc 7

As has been noted elsewhere, a large literary unit exists in the final form of 1Macc, which begins with the rise of Demetrius in chapter 7:1 and ends with the departure of Bacchides from Judah at the close of chapter 9,⁷⁴ but excludes chapter 8. However, despite the thematic ties between the many passages of these works, clear seams can be isolated, separating one section from another. One of the best examples of this is between 7:25 and 7:26. The story dealing with the rise of Demetrius and his sponsorship of the high priest Alcimus, and commission of Bacchides is entirely the subject of 7:1-25. Beginning in 7:26 the account is only regarding Nicanor and his efforts against Judas and the Judeans, along with the Judean resistance to him. Not once from 7:26 to the end of the chapter are Bacchides or Alcimus mentioned, nor are any other characters or events seen in the first part of the chapter. For these reasons we shall begin isolating 7:26ff. from the first part of chapter 7 in our literary criticism.

7:26-50 has a relatively clear structure⁷⁵ and arc of narrative:

A) Demetrius sends Nicanor (26-28)

B) Nicanor tries to trick Judas, fails, they do battle (29-32)

C) Priests and elders greet Nicanor peacefully (33)

D) Nicanor threatens priests and temple, makes oath (34-35)

⁷⁴ See literary criticism in chapter 9 in this work as well as the work of N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 166-7. Here he notes that the continued focus on invasions by Bacchides and Alcimus and the references to the invasion of Nicanor tie the many subsections of these chapters together. This excludes chapter 8 as an 'island' however, due to its focus entirely on Rome and its clear interruption of the progression seen from the end of chapter 7 and the beginning of chapter 9. Note that D. Williams, *The Structure of 1Maccabees* (CBQMS 31; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999), 64 ff. objects to Martola's thesis and ties chapter 6 to chapter 7 on the basis of the description of the characters in each invasion. He also seems to want to include chapter 8 as integral.

⁷⁵ I am often skeptical of structures found in texts because the elements that compose them are so general, and the perception of the structure so subjective. This structure may too appear that way to the reader, but for me, it is self-evident.

C') Priests bemoan Nicanor and army (36-38)

B') Nicanor and Judas encamp at Beth-horon and do battle (39-43)

A') Judeans chase army of Nicanor to their deaths (44-46)

Ep.1) Judeans take spoils, including head and hand of Nicanor (47)

Ep.2) Judeans rejoice and celebrate achieving temporary peace (48-50)

The main section of the Nicanor passage is unmistakably chiasmic. The beginning and end have the gentile army entering (ἔρχομαι: 7:26) and leaving (φεύγω:7:44) the land respectively. The two battles between Judas and Nicanor mirror each other (7:31: συνάντησιν...ἐν πολέμῳ; 7:43: συνῆψαν...εἰς πόλεμον), and surround the event at the temple. The focus of the temple event at first is on the peaceful approach of the priests and elders when they see Nicanor. Then, Nicanor's response to the temple priests, mocking them and defiling them, and threatening the temple's existence with an oath, shows his prime sin and his real character as a gentile who hates and detests Israel. The lament of the priests represents the voice of the faithful Israel asking for help from their god for protection of the temple and of their religion. This reaction is the reflection of the priest's approach in v.33 (7:33: ἐξῆλθον ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερέων; 7:36: εἰσῆλθον οἱ ἱερεῖς). Before Nicanor showed his true evil nature the Judeans were willing to try peace with him. But, when he showed his arrogance and hatred for the temple and the priests, they then appeal to their god for justice. The dichotomy seen in this section is a micro-example of the one displayed throughout the main story of the book. Judeans are faithful to their god, temple, and covenant, while gentiles, in being faithful to their king and his commands, are utterly opposed to Israel. The two are not able to coexist.

It is clear the structure here leaves the dishonoring of Nicanor and the brief *pax Judaeana* as an epilogue to the battle between the Judeans and the gentiles. This is somewhat problematic in that these events are the prime reasons for creating a holiday from the defeat of Nicanor. Also, there is enough detail in these verses that they should be treated more prominently in any analysis of the structure of the narrative. This will be returned to after the analysis of vv.1-25.

The structure and unity of 7:26-50 is not matched in the first half of chapter 7. The events of 7:1-25 can be described as a series of separate events with a loose narrative arc. 7:1-4 is clearly one unit unto itself. The scene-setting passage describes the accession of Demetrius to the throne of the Seleucid Empire, and provides the background for all following acts in chapters 7 and 9,⁷⁶ but especially for the section immediately following his accession. After this brief description, two other characters, Alcimus and Bacchides, take a central role in vv.5-25.

Once the king is established on his throne, just as in 1:11-15 and 6:21-27, a band of apostate Judeans makes overtures to the new king seeking to tie themselves to him. This particular group is led by Alcimus, of whom it is reported that he wanted to be high priest (βουλόμενος ἱερατεύειν). The appeals of the group all center upon requesting aid from the king against Judas as punishment for the work he has done against the apostates and against the gentiles (7:5-7). The next section describes the people whom the king sent to fulfill this request and what they did in order to accomplish their task of punishing Judas (8-17). This section is followed by the reaction of the people to the king's forces and the retreat, first of Bacchides (7:20) and then of Alcimus (7:21-25) back to the king. There is a clear beginning and end, but many of the intermediate events do not make sense within these contexts.

In vv.5-7 Alcimus asks the king to punish Judas, his brothers, and all who help them (7:7). Though Bacchides and Alcimus briefly make an effort to gain the Maccabees' trust (7:10), none of their efforts focus on the Hasmoneans. Instead, they work against the other people of the land (7:9, 12-13, 19, 21-23). In fact, according to these passages, the vengeance was meted out more to those Judeans who were not inimical to their cause than it was to those who were tied to the Hasmoneans (7:12-14, 19). The effect of their visit does more damage to the apostate and gentile parties than Judas could have done.

Though the commissioning of Alcimus as high priest, and Bacchides as leader of the expedition do fit nicely in their context, it is unclear as to what role each plays in the passages as they are currently formed. According to Alcimus' request, Bacchides (ἄνδρα

⁷⁶ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 164.

ὁ πιστεύεις) should be the main agent of the vengeance after witnessing Judas' destruction of the king's land (7:7). However, Bacchides notably does nothing until throwing some renegades into a pit and then leaving Alcimus in charge of the country with an army (7:19-20).⁷⁷ According to these verses it is Alcimus who finally gains control of Judah and is even noted to have done more wrongs against Israel than the gentiles. This emphasizes the severity Alcimus' efforts in comparison to the deeds of Antiochus IV and V and Lysias. This order of events does not follow from his request for the king to send one of his trusted men, since that man does little, and Alcimus does very much on his own. Further, that his efforts are against Israel (according to the king's command) and not against Judas and those who help him, makes the originality of vv.5-7 dubious.

Many commentators have noted other large differences marking off the Alcimus section of chapter 7 from its surroundings and other similar sections of 1Macc. Benjamin Scolnic notes that the passage dealing with Alcimus' massacre of the Hasideans, central in these verses, is likely made up, or at least falsely attributed to Alcimus.⁷⁸ Goldstein also has problems understanding how the Hasideans could be tricked here when other Judean groups have been tricked before in the plot of 1Macc.⁷⁹ Bartlett notes that the whole of Bacchides and Alcimus' first visit is skipped by 2Maccabees, which leads some to believe that this whole passage could be a doublet for Bacchides and Alcimus' second

⁷⁷ It is debatable who the subject of the action in 9c-18 is. The frequent use of the singular pronoun and singular verb forms complicates the understanding of the passage as currently constructed. J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees* (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 326 among others, suggests that it is Bacchides, but Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 160ff. notes that through the continuation of references it is more likely Alcimus who is the antecedent to all these pronouns. F. -M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949), 131 has a similar opinion.

⁷⁸ B. Scolnic, *Alcimus, Enemy of the Maccabees* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2005), 164 bases his conclusions on previous work done by L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992) and J. Kampen, *Hasideans and the Origins of Pharisaism: A Study in 1 and 2 Maccabees* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1988) which together point to the fact that the passage seems to be an artificial production because of continuity problems in the behavior of the Hasideans and also due to great similarity between this passage and 1:29-30.

⁷⁹ J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 332.

visit.⁸⁰ Bartlett also notes this passage is unique in that it is the only mention of a non-Hasmonean high priest in all of 1Macc, and that he is only presented in a negative light.⁸¹ Martola also suggests that the nature of this passage is strange in that "the evil intentions by and large emanated from the king in Antioch, this time they emanate only from the lawless ones in Israel."⁸²

Given the many notably unique qualities of this passage in 1Macc, it is possible that the episode in its current form is not part of the original composition. The proposed adaptations to this passage mostly treat Alcimus and are: the secondary composition of vv.5-7, a minor addition of Alcimus' name in v.9, the inclusion of Alcimus as subject in addition to Bacchides in v.12, the addition of vv.13-14, the insertion of vv.16d-17 the addition of 20ab, and the supplementation of vv.21-25. Though we believe these to be connected, we will consider each possible adaptation on its own merits.

7:5-7

Some of the problems with 5-7 have already been pointed out above, nevertheless they shall be recounted. The action of Alcimus and the other godless from Israel is distinctly similar to other passages, which also bear the marks of being secondary additions.⁸³ Secondly, very few of the requests of Alcimus and the men are fulfilled in the following sequence, making his complaint to the king seem as though it went unheeded.⁸⁴ Even if all the information communicated in the possible additions is included, Alcimus himself makes no direct action against Judas during his whole stay in Judah. The king's order in v.9 is to take vengeance on the sons of Israel. This of course includes Judas and his allies, but is not limited to them. It does not conform with Alcimus' request. Most of Alcimus' purposes are ignored.

⁸⁰ J. Bartlett, *1 Maccabees* (Sheffield: Sheffield University Press, 1998), 81 mentions this in regard to the relatively short amount of time between Demetrius' accession and Bacchides' encampment against Jerusalem in chapter 9.

⁸¹ Ibid., 81 also N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 167.

⁸² N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 160, 167.

⁸³ See above in the discussions on 1Macc 1, 6 for the other instances.

⁸⁴ Only the installment of Alcimus as high priest and the commission of a trusted officer of the king fulfill Alcimus' request.

Though there are ties between vv.5-7 and its context, these do not necessarily prove originality of the passage. In Alcimus' request he tells Demetrius to send “a man whom you trust” (ἄνδρα ᾧ πιστεύεις) to punish the Maccabees. In verse 8 Bacchides is introduced as “one of the Friends of the King, governing in the province beyond the river and powerful in the kingdom and loyal to the King” (τῶν φίλων τοῦ βασιλέως κυριεύοντα ἐν τῷ πέραν τοῦ ποταμοῦ καὶ μέγαν ἐν τῇ βασιλείᾳ καὶ **ΠΙΣΤὸν τῷ Βασιλεῖ**). The last words are important because they would seem to match the description of the type of man whom Alcimus requested. However, on several other occasions in 1Macc, it can be seen that most officers sent from the royal parties also are described with various titles and qualities.⁸⁵ The qualities with which Bacchides is described fit well as one of these introductory descriptions of royal officers, without needing to have been requested as such. It is possible then that the language in v.7 is meant to imitate that of the description in v.8, rather than evincing a unity of style.

Likewise, Alcimus' complaint to the king about “Judas and his brothers” (λουδας καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί) cannot prove originality of vv.5-7 because of its ties to v.10 where Bacchides [and Alcimus] send messages “to Judas and his brothers” (πρὸς Ιουδαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς). This is because, in an almost identical situation at v.27, Nicanor also sends messages “to Judas and his brothers” (πρὸς Ιουδαν καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφούς). The similarity between the situation and the wording points to the originality of vv.10 and 27. While it is certainly not necessary that the phrasing of v.6 is borrowed from either v.10 or v.27, the word choice of v.10 cannot be traced back to Alcimus' request in v.6.

7:9*

The brief addition in v.9, to which I referred above, is the phrase, “along with Alcimus the impious one, and he established him in the high priesthood” (καὶ Ἄλκιμον

⁸⁵ 3:13 (ἀρχῶν τῆς δυναμεως), 3:32 (ἀνθρώπων ἐνδοχῶν καὶ ἀπο γένους τῆς βασιλείας), 3:38 (ἀνδρας δυνατοῦ τῶν φίλων τοῦ βασιλέως), 6:14 (ἐνα τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ) 7:26 (ἐνα τῶν ἀρχόντων αὐτοῦ τῶν ἐνδοχῶν καὶ μισοῦντα καὶ ἐξθραίνοντα τῷ Ἰσραηλ), 15:28 (ἐνα τῶν φίλων αὐτοῦ)

τὸν ἀσεβῆ καὶ ἔστησεν αὐτῷ τὴν ἱερωσύνην). Though the addition is small, much of the passage changes through it. According to Martola's argument, mentioned above, the presence of Alcimus in this sentence makes him the subject of all singular verbs and antecedent to all pronouns that follow in verses 9 and 10.⁸⁶ Removing Alcimus from here would alleviate the confusion caused by the king sending two officials in v.9 but only commanding one of them to take vengeance on the Israelites. The removal would also allow for a clear subject in v.10 as to who sent the messengers to Judas and his brothers. Bacchides would be the answer to all these questions. This would also make logical sense since Bacchides is the friend of the king, the regional governor, the great man of the kingdom, and faithful to the king. There seems to be little reason for the king to waste such a high-ranking official on an expedition where he was commanded to do nothing.

Verse 10 does have some plural verbs, but these could be later adaptations, meant to cause less confusion, as there is manuscript evidence for singular verbs in verse 10.⁸⁷ The plurals could also be the work of a translator alleviating the confusion caused by two actors being described with singular terms. Thus, a very clear reading could be made without Alcimus in vv.8-11 at all. Bacchides would be chosen by the king and commanded to take vengeance on the Israelites. He would then march to Judah with a large force and send messengers to Judas and his brothers, who would turn away the messengers, being aware of the army.

7:12*

Of course, if this reading is taken, then vv.12-17 must be significantly adapted. But this is neither out of the question, nor very difficult to explain. Verse 12 requires the removal of only “Alcimus and” (Ἄλκιμον καί). This leaves Bacchides as the only agent, since he is the only person to come to the land. This change in turn clears up another set of confusing singular verbs and pronouns in vv.15-16. In the present text they can be taken most easily as referring to Alcimus, but then what of Bacchides? He is mentioned as present, but then seemingly does nothing. If Alcimus is removed, Bacchides is still

⁸⁶ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 160. Verse 9: αὐτῷ Verse 10: ἀπέστειλεν

⁸⁷ The evidence is however found solely in the Codex Alexandrinus.

present, then he is approached by the scribes. Bacchides speaks peaceable words to them, as he sent in messages to Judas and his brothers and he swears an oath to the scribes. They believe him, and he seizes sixty of them and kills them in one day. This would agree with Josephus' account of the events, which also omits Alcimus' role in the killing of the sixty.⁸⁸

7:13-14

Along with the adaptation of verse 12 in the addition of Alcimus' name, both verses 13 and 14 should be seen as secondary. These verses mention the Hasideans and their explicit trust of the army due to the presence of Alcimus who is “a priest from the line of Aaron” (ἄνθρωπος ἱερεὺς ἐκ σπέρματος Ααρων). Besides the fact that the mention of the Hasideans is somewhat unnatural in this context, it is important to note that Josephus never tells of any massacre of Hasideans in his account of the murder of the sixty. The group that approaches Bacchides in verse 12 is a group of scribes (γραμματέων). The Hasideans in their other appearance in 1Macc are not noted as scribes but as mighty warriors of Israel who offer themselves willingly for the law (2:42). While they could also be scribes, it is never mentioned explicitly. The way it is reported in vv.12-13, there seem to be two separate groups who approach, in verse 12 one of scribes, and in 13, one of Hasideans. But, if this were the case, then the presence of the scribes would contradict the report that the Hasideans were the first to seek peace. Without the Hasideans and their speech, then Bacchides is simply approached by a group of scribes who seek justice. He then tricks them by swearing an oath of peace with them, and then kills them. It is a clear reading and has none of the inconsistencies, which appear in the final form.

7:16d-17

16d-17 also ought to be removed from the passage to reach the original rendering. The final clause of 16 refers to Alcimus' composition of the line quoted in v.17, which is

⁸⁸ *Antiquities* 12.396. This is especially remarkable in light of Josephus' heavy reliance on 1Macc and in light of his less than favorable view of Alcimus Cf. *Antiquities* 12.400. It may be that he was aware of a different version of the story, which could be represented by the original account.

a paraphrase (or alternative version) of psalm 79:2-3. It is possible that whoever added the Alcimus accounts to this section either recalled his authorship of the psalm, or wished to trace the psalm's provenance to Alcimus. The editor then may have seen the account of Bacchides' massacre of the sixty as a relevant event, to which the verses refer, particularly because of the Hasideans (חֲסִידֵי־בָּחֳבַיִם) who are massacred in the psalm (79:2). He then could have simply placed Alcimus as the leader of the massacre to go along with the overall negative image that was being created for Alcimus. It is also possible that this reference could be on a tertiary level and could have happened after Alcimus had already been inserted into these events. This is especially likely given that authorship of a psalm was probably considered a positive trait, while everything else reported about Alcimus is totally negative. The only other strong possibility is that the editor was tracing the authorship of the psalm to this event, making even the authorship of the psalm something not entirely positive. The problem of the psalm's authorship is not helped much by modern scholarship, which is rather in disagreement as to whether the psalm refers to the sixth century destruction of Jerusalem,⁸⁹ a fictional apocalyptic event,⁹⁰ the persecutions under Antiochus IV,⁹¹ or is itself a composition of a number of additions.⁹² The true authorship of the psalm remains a mystery.

7:19

In verse 19 the phrase “many of the men deserting with him” (πολλοὺς ἀπὸ τῶν μετ’ αὐτοῦ αὐτομολησάντων ἀνδρῶν) also could potentially be secondary, but actually appears to be one of the few authentic verses in 1Macc that speaks of any internal dissent. In the context of the suggested original story the phrase fits well. We have seen in Bacchides' prior action in Jerusalem that there were a group of scribes who

⁸⁹ H. Kraus, *Psalms 60-150: A Commentary* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1989), 134; M. Tate, *Psalms 51-100* (WBC 20; Dallas, TX: Word Books, 1990)

⁹⁰ F. Hossfeld,; E. Zenger, *Psalmen 51-100* (HthKAT; Freiburg: Herder, 2000), 447.

⁹¹ J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees* (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 333; B. Scolnic, *Alcimus, Enemy of the Maccabees* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2005), 123.

⁹² C. Briggs, *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Book of Psalms, Vol. III* (ICC; Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1907), 198.

approached Bacchides acting counter to the intelligence of the Hasmoneans (vv.11-12). After they seek justice from the gentile commander, he tricks them and kills them (vv.15-17). Bacchides then in v.19, after moving to a different part of the country does the same thing, not only to those who went to him seeking peace, but also to innocent bystander Israelites. This is not out of line with Bacchides' overall character, and in fact enhances his ruthlessness as a gentile.

Further, though the action of the scribes is certainly not endorsed by the narrator or by the Maccabean characters, they are by no means negatively portrayed. The reaction in v.18 proves this by mentioning only the terrible deed of the gentiles and not the desertion of the Judeans. A third point, which bears mentioning is that the specific phrase used to describe the deserters –*ἀυτομολησάντων ἀνδρῶν*- is used only one other time in 1Macc, and it comes at 7:24. This participial phrase is not inherently negative, nor does it imply anything more than the action of those to whom it refers. This can be seen in contrast to the many other titles given to the apostate Judeans throughout the book: ἄνομοι, παράνομοι, ἀσεβεῖς, ἄμαρτωλός, etc. All the other titles have a very negative sense behind them, and certainly do not always refer to the particular deed of the actors being described at the point of their use. Even though in 7:24 the narrator reuses the participle of *ἀυτομολέω* and puts it in a negative context, the title for those Judeans is even there not negative in itself. The negative context of vv.21-25 will be discussed further below.

Verse 19 seems very much in the same vein as the original story. It continues Bacchides pattern of traitorous violence, it does not place the pious, if disloyal, Judeans in an unfavorable light, and it continues the gentiles' cycle of attacks on Judeans who are presented as anything but rebellious.⁹³

7:20a-b

⁹³ The cycle begins with the scribes (vv.12-16), continues here in v.19 with the deserters, is seen again in vv.27-28 with Nicanor's first approach to Judas, and finally ends with the account of vv.33-35 where Nicanor threatens the priests and the Temple after he is shown the sacrifice for the King.

Most of verse 20, however, must be considered secondary through its use of Alcimus as the antagonist again. Like vv.5-7, 9, 12 and vv.13-14, 16d-17, this verse figuratively and literally places the blame on Alcimus and removes Bacchides from most of his guilt. This can be most clearly seen in the way v.20a-b sets up vv.21-25. These verses together establish that Alcimus takes control of the country and does more damage than the gentiles. Alcimus and his army become the main perpetrators because of this verse, and the gentiles pale in comparison. This is wholly out of synch with the rest of the chapter, which focuses on the brutality and treacherous ways of the gentiles. 20a-b not only requires that 21-25 appear after it but that at least 5-7 and 9b come before it. All of these seem to be additional for their own merits as well.

7:21-25

As mentioned above, vv.21-25 have some marks of being additional. The main reason for this is their strong focus on the person and character of Alcimus, and emphasis on his opposition to Israel. He is joined by those who trouble the people (v.22). And, he gains control of Judah, doing great damage in Israel (v.22). Alcimus is also described as doing worse than the Gentiles had done (v.23), and bringing malicious charges against Judas (v.25). In all of Alcimus' accounts he is totally negatively portrayed, but there is scarcely any detail in these descriptions. In 21-25 not one specific event is shown to point to the damage he did. No place or group of people are mentioned by the narrator. This is in stark contrast to both Bacchides (vv.10, 12, 15-16, 19) and Nicanor (vv.29, 31, 33-43) who have specific episodes that relate their animosity toward Israel. Alcimus is also the only "secondary character" to carry the bulk of an episode,⁹⁴ the only non-Hasmonean high priest, and indeed the only named apostate in all of 1Macc, as mentioned above.

Implications

If one combines all these odd traits concerning Alcimus' account with its possible interruption of an underlying structure in the original layer of the stories, it is perhaps clear that the Alcimus passages are later introductions into the material in 1Macc 7. The familiar structure and plot arc of vv.8-20 is:

⁹⁴ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 161.

A) Demetrius sends Bacchides (8-9)

B) Bacchides tries to trick Judas and fails (10-11)

C) Scribes approach Bacchides seeking peace and justice (12)

D) Bacchides swears oath to scribes, then murders them (15-16)

C') All the people call out against them because of the violence (18)

B') Bacchides kills others at Beth-zaith (19)

A') Bacchides returns to the king (20)

The story arc is clear in the structure, and evident to any reader of the material. It is the violence done against the scribes that is the centerpiece of Bacchides' first entrance into Judah. The actions of Bacchides in tricking Judas, while *entering* the land and the seizing of the deserters and people while *withdrawing* draw further attention to the central episode, which is made up of three parts. The approach for justice (δίκαια) by the innocent and faithful Judeans leads to Bacchides opportunity to betray and kill them, which results in the reaction of the Jews in denouncing any justice (κρίσις) in the gentiles. The synonyms for justice on either side of the murder again call attention to its prominence and to the change in attitude from one of hope for justice, to a total lack of faith in gentile justice. The entrance and exit of Bacchides clearly indicate the beginning and end of his account.

The arc of this narrative is of note in its similarity to that of 7:26-46. Both begin with the commission from the king to a gentile commander to punish Israel.⁹⁵ Bacchides and Nicanor both begin their efforts by sending a peaceful message to Judas and his brothers (vv.10; 27).⁹⁶ Bacchides fails in carrying out his treachery because the

⁹⁵ ποιῆσαι τὴν ἐκδίκησιν / ἐξᾶραι

⁹⁶ λόγοις εἰρηνικοῖς μετὰ δόλου / μετὰ δόλου λόγοις εἰρηνικοῖς

Maccabees realize it is a trick (v.11). Nicanor likewise is foiled in his plot by Judas learning of his intent, which leads to a skirmish between the two (vv.29-32). A group of implicitly faithful Judeans approaches each after their failed attempts with Judas and attempts to seek peace (vv.12; 33).⁹⁷ Nicanor answers the priests and elders with violence and derision, accompanied by an oath that he will tear the temple down if Judas is not turned over to him (v.35). Bacchides answers the group of scribes who approach him with an oath of peace, but then instantly breaks the oath and brings violence on the scribes by killing sixty of them (v.15-16).

In response to the violent action of each gentile commander there is a direct speech response from a body of Judeans. All the people respond to Bacchides with the exclamation that "there is no truth or justice in them, because they have violated the agreement and the oath that they swore" (v.18). The priests who were defiled by Nicanor exclaim to heaven, "You chose this house to be called by your name, and to be a house of prayer and supplication. Take vengeance on this man and on his army, and let them fall by the sword, remember their blasphemies and let them live no longer" (vv.37-38). While the priest's lament also contains supplication, thus differentiating it from that in reaction to Bacchides, it fills the same purpose within the structure. Both of these prayers recall the principle deed of the antagonist, and both signal their opponents' immanent departure.

Bacchides departs from Jerusalem immediately after the speech of the people and encamps at Beth-zaith where he seizes a number of people and deserters and kills them, throwing them into a cistern (v.19). Nicanor also departs from Jerusalem after the speech of the priests, and encamps at Beth-horon, where he goes into battle with Judas and is defeated and killed (vv.39-43). This leads to the Judeans chasing his army to the ends of Judea until every one of them was killed, which marks the exit of Nicanor (vv.44-46). Bacchides simply departs back to the king after his killing of the Judeans and is not seen again in the chapter (v.20). The end result of each is the lack of foreign presence in the

⁹⁷ For Bacchides the group is one of scribes, while Nicanor is approached by a group of priests and elders from the temple. Both groups would be well respected and certainly thought of as "orthodox" within 1Maccabees' constructed reality, especially considering there is no comment to the contrary within the text.

land. In the case of Bacchides it is not necessarily a happy end, while in the case of Nicanor it is a joyous event.

The great similarities in each arc and structure call for the reader to compare the stories, and draw out where they are dissimilar. The main point of disagreement in the accounts of Bacchides and Nicanor comes at the diverse reactions to the crime of each. For Bacchides the people were afraid and lamented, but then did nothing, only to be further victimized before he returned to the king. In the case of Nicanor, the people lamented, but also appealed for help from heaven. They then fought against Nicanor when he withdrew from Jerusalem and utterly defeated him and his whole army. The message is clear: the proper course of action with gentiles is to fight against them to protect one's people and one's temple as Judas did, because when peace is sought from gentiles it only leads to treachery and violence.

This structure has thus far ignored vv.1-4, which treat the rise of Demetrius and and death of Antiochus V and Lysias, and vv.47-50 detailing the despoiling of Nicanor and the gentiles and the rise of Judean peace. These too can be part of the inherent structure in the chapter. The rise of Demetrius to prominence is mirrored on the other end of the chapter by the rise of peace in Judah. Each of these events brings its subject to a new plateau. Further, the killing of Antiochus and Lysias and taking of their throne can be seen as the equivalent to the decapitation of Nicanor and despoiling of the gentiles by Judas' army. It is the symbolic act that brings about the change in order. Nicanor's head and hand displayed at Jerusalem's gates marks the Judean victory, peace, and lack of foreign presence in Judea, just as the murder of the former king and his regent by Demetrius ensures his place in the empire. This leads to an overall reversal of fortunes for the gentiles and Judeans. While Demetrius was victorious at first, the Judeans in the end achieve a goal of victory over gentiles, and establish peace. Below is the overall structure of the chapter.

1) Demetrius comes from Rome and begins to rule the Seleucid empire (1)

2) Demetrius has Antiochus and Lysias killed, takes his seat on the throne (2-4)

F. Borchardt, *The Torah in 1Maccabees*

- A) Demetrius sends Bacchides (8-9)
 - B) Bacchides tries to trick Judas and fails (10-11)
 - C) Scribes approach Bacchides seeking peace and justice (12)
 - D) Bacchides swears oath to scribes, murders them (15-16)
 - C') All the people call out against them because of the violence (18)
 - B') Bacchides kills others at Beth Zaith (19)
 - A') Bacchides returns to the king (20)
- A) Demetrius sends Nicanor (26-28)
 - B) Nicanor tries to trick Judas, fails, they do battle (29-32)
 - C) Priests and elders greet Nicanor peacefully (33)
 - D) Nicanor threatens priests and temple, makes oath (34-35)
 - C') Priests bemoan Nicanor and army (36-38)
 - B') Nicanor and Judas encamp at Beth-horon and do battle (39-43)
 - A') Judeans chase army of Nicanor to their deaths (44-46)
- 2') Judeans take spoils, including head and hand of Nicanor (47)
- 1') Judeans rejoice and celebrate achieving temporary peace (48-50)

This structure obviously neglects the Alcimus accounts. Which would be rather difficult to fit into the arc. While Alcimus could, in theory be included with Bacchides in vv.9-17 with fairly little intrusion, the large sections of vv.5-7 and vv.21-25 would disrupt the whole structure and in fact make it impossible to glean a consistent message from 1Macc chapter 7. While each half of the chapter currently shows different aspects of the ruthlessness of the gentiles, and the incorrect and correct methods of response by the Judeans, the Alcimus passages would remove guilt from the gentiles in the first half by placing the blame and the majority of the damage on Alcimus. Secondly, even if

Alcimus was truly worse and the cause of the gentile problem, where is his character in the second half of the chapter, or where is he even mentioned? Since such a consistent message is communicated by only the removal of those passages and verses mentioning Alcimus, combined with the various other stylistic differences, it is very likely that those passages are secondary insertions.

The insertions could have been made with the intention of drawing the apostate Judeans and especially Alcimus into the center of the problems the Judeans had with the gentiles. This would point out that it was a priest from a legitimate line who brought suffering on Israel, and who united with the gentiles in murdering his own people. These additions also point out that the Hasmoneans were opposed to Alcimus and opposed to his party, and that since the Hasmoneans achieved victory and were protected by heaven, Alcimus and his people must have been wrong. Judas and the faithful Israel are quite different from the lawless and impious apostates in that they protect the people and the temple, whereas the apostates only kill, damage, and harm Israel. It goes without saying that these verses have a great similarity to many of the other additions we have seen in previous chapters, which contain all the same qualities.

II.7 IMacc 8

When reading through the whole of IMaccabees, chapter 8 comes as a surprise. Instead of reporting on the scenes of battle and intrigue in Judea and the Near East, the narrative moves away to distant lands and nations and obscure events on the far west and east of the Hellenistic world.⁹⁸ Rome and its power and deeds rise to prominence, while Judas, the Hasmoneans, and the Seleucids against whom they are fighting recede into mere supporting roles. Prior to this chapter Rome is only known as the seemingly fertile ground from which the antagonistic Seleucid kings spring,⁹⁹ but this characteristic of Rome is nowhere mentioned in chapter 8. Because of the sudden praise and

⁹⁸ Ρωμαίοι (8:1, 17, 19, 23, 24, 26-29); Γαλάταις (8:2); Σπανίας (8:3-4); Κιτιέων (8:5); Ἰνδικήν (8:8); Ἑλλάς (8:9)

⁹⁹ Antiochus IV Epiphanes (1:10); Demetrius I (7:1).

concentration on the Romans in this chapter one might imagine that a new and important character is being introduced into the story, but just as quickly as the Romans rise, they fall out of the narrator's conscious thoughts once chapter 8 reaches its close. Only periodically are they mentioned again as diplomatic partners (12:1-23; 14:16-19, 40; 15:15-24).¹⁰⁰ In addition to the rather striking appearance and then disappearance of the Romans in this chapter, the content does not seem to add anything to the outcome of the book.¹⁰¹ This all suggests the possible secondary nature of chapter 8 in 1Maccabees.

Despite these difficulties that arise in trying to read 1Macc 8 as an integral part of the primary composition of 1Maccabees, scholars have, for the most part, been remiss in following the clues to their most likely conclusion.¹⁰² For the most part, scholarship of 1Macc 8 has either been concerned with the nature of the diplomatic treaty in the second half of the chapter (8:17-32)¹⁰³ or with the historical reliability, or lack thereof, with regard to the praise of the Romans in the first half of the chapter (8:1-16).¹⁰⁴ These questions are perhaps interesting, but in the end they pass over the bigger concern of how the chapter fits into the narrative of 1Maccabees as a whole.

Though they have only touched on the subject, J.R. Bartlett¹⁰⁵ and D. Arenhoevel¹⁰⁶ both at least make attempts to connect the chapter to its context. Bartlett, for his part notes that the warning to Demetrius at the close of the diplomatic correspondence (8:31-32) connects the contents of the chapter to the material in chapter

¹⁰⁰ As to the nature of 12:1-23, see the argument below *ad loc.*, and notice that the other passages all fall in the addendum proposed by Destinon and successfully argued by D.S. Williams and Nils Martola.

¹⁰¹ J. Goldstein, *1Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 346, mentions humorously "If ch.8 had been omitted, no modern reader would have missed it."

¹⁰² The most striking example of this is evidenced by J. Goldstein, *1Maccabees*, 346, who continues the statement in the above note with "Nevertheless it is an essential part of our author's narrative." Goldstein gives little evidence to support the latter sentence.

¹⁰³ S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), 39; J. Dancy *A Commentary on 1Maccabees* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), 128, *inter alia*.

¹⁰⁴ S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin, *First Book*, 32, 39, 153; J. Goldstein, *1Maccabees*, 346-50; *inter alia*.

¹⁰⁵ J. Bartlett, *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1973), 111.

¹⁰⁶ D. Arenhoevel, *Die Theokratie nach dem I. und II. Makkabäer* (Mainz: Matthias Grünewald, 1967), 87-88.

9.¹⁰⁷ Arenhoevel first argues that the strange placement of the chapter has to do with Judas' impending death in the early part of chapter 9 (9:18), and the need of the narrator to have the victory over Nicanor to have occurred, so that Judas would have the opportunity to send the embassy to the Romans.¹⁰⁸ He then adds that the placing of chapter 8 also has the effect of lengthening and amplifying the victory over Nicanor,¹⁰⁹ which is clearly an important event considering the feast that it spawned. Finally, however, Arenhoevel acknowledges the struggle to find connections between this chapter and the rest of 1Maccabees by admitting:

Das einzige Erfolg, den die Bündnisse mit ausländischen Mächten einbringen, ist Ehre und Ruhm für Israel, das dadurch auch äusserlich einen Ehrenplatz unter den Völkern einnimmt¹¹⁰

This statement combined with Arenhoevel's and Bartlett's previous ones sharply points out the general problem of connecting this passage to its literary context by showing that only the most vague associations can be drawn between the passage and those preceding and following.

The problem with the link between the warning to Demetrius (8:31-32) and the context was already pointed out by Bartlett: "Demetrius does not seem to have taken this threat very seriously."¹¹¹ To this statement might be added an additional one: nor did the Romans or the Judeans. Though the Romans not following through on their threat to Demetrius may be seen as normal Roman diplomacy by modern historians,¹¹² there is no doubt that the threat and failure to fulfil it would elicit some response from Demetrius and the Judeans. This should especially be the case in the narrative, because, without any reaction on the part of Demetrius or the Judeans, there is absolutely no reason to believe that chapter 8 is an essential part of 1Macc. However, Demetrius simply continues his attack without any care for the threat (9:1), even going so far as to kill Judas (9:18). The

¹⁰⁷ J. Bartlett, *First and Second*, 111.

¹⁰⁸ D. Arenhoevel, *Die Theokratie*, 87.

¹⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 88.

¹¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 88.

¹¹¹ J. Bartlett, *First and Second*, 113.

¹¹² S. Tedesche ;S. Zeitlin, *First Book*, 39ff. Zeitlin mentions that the Romans were using this same strategy against Demetrius in Babylonia by promising aid to the rival Timarchus, which never arrived, allowing Demetrius to succeed.

Judeans attempt to defend themselves, and elect a new ruler (9:28-31), and drive out Bacchides from the land (9:62-73), all without any help from, or appeal to, Rome.

While Arenhoevel's arguments differ, they are equally problematic. The relationship between Judas' impending death and the placement of the passage is clear enough. Judas is alive at the time of the embassy (8:1, 17, 20), so it must take place in his lifetime. The tie between the chapter on the Romans and events of chapter 7 though is not so clear. There is nothing in chapter 7, aside from the rise of Demetrius that would imply any linkage at all between the embassy and chapter 7. The embassy to Rome could be placed after 7:4 just as well as it is after 7:50 according to this argument. In fact, that hypothetical position would probably even work better, as Judas would be in an actual situation where he required aid.

Arenhoevel's second point, that chapter 8's position lengthens and brings significance to the death of Nicanor can be seen easily enough in general terms. However, when one looks at the specifics, this argument breaks down. 7:50 expressly mentions that "the land of Judah had rest *a few days*" (καὶ ἡσυχασεν ἡ γῆ Ιουδα ἡμέρας ὀλίγας). If it were the intention of the author to lengthen the time of victory enjoyed by the Judeans after the defeat of Nicanor, it would be very strange for him to emphasize that the peace was an especially temporary one. Further, there is no hint at all in 8:1-32 of any time period whatsoever, let alone one of peace or one following the defeat of Nicanor. Finally, the same argument could be used of an editor, placing chapter 8 into the context; so Arenhoevel does little to show how chapter 8 is integral to its framework.

Nils Martola is one scholar who both recognizes the problems with chapter 8 and draws the inevitable conclusion that the chapter is secondary.¹¹³ Martola points to a number of criteria in his form-critical discussion of the book's composition which show chapter 8 to be secondary. He notes that the chapter represents "a totally new field of interest".¹¹⁴ This "new field of interest" for Martola is the relationship with Rome. There are no connections between this diplomatic relationship and the rest of the story,

¹¹³ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 276.

¹¹⁴ *Ibid.*, 278.

outside of his other additional passages.¹¹⁵ Further, the whole of these additional passages contain no bridge to the rest of 1Macc.

The second point that Martola makes is that 8:1-32 does not fit the inner logic of the main story.¹¹⁶ What Martola sees as the central point of the “main story” is the capture and liberation of the temple cult and land of Judea.¹¹⁷ He further sees the main struggle as one between Judah and the Seleucid Empire.¹¹⁸ Neither of these elements is really present in 8:1-32. The temple cult is non-existent in the chapter, and though the liberation from the Seleucids is briefly mentioned (8:18, 31) it is hardly emphasized in the passage. Further, the episode plays no role in either the oppression of the Seleucids or the eventual liberation from the oppression by the Judeans. The Judeans obtain independence of their own accord and the Seleucids oppress alongside gentile allies, but these do not include the Romans.

Martola’s third, and most important argument for the additional nature of 8:1-32 is its disruption of the events of chapters 7 and 9, which are relatively in agreement.¹¹⁹ Martola specifically connects 9:1 to 7:5-25 and 7:26-50 through the characters of Nicanor and Bacchides and Alcimus. Indeed, though each of these characters is absent in all of chapter 8, they reappear at 9:1. This causes Martola to remark that 9:1 is a direct continuation of 7:50.¹²⁰ Also, according to Martola, if we ignore chapter 8, then 7:5-25, 26-50; 9:1-57, 58-72 report four contiguous invasions into Judea.¹²¹ The fact that chapter 8 has absolutely no effect on, and is not affected by, any of these attacks provides another strong piece of evidence that the inclusion of chapter 8 is the work of an editor.¹²² It

¹¹⁵ Ibid., 229, 238. The additional passages for Martola which contain information on the Romans are: 8.1-32; 12.1-23; 14.16-24; 15.15-24.

¹¹⁶ Ibid., 276.

¹¹⁷ Ibid., 279.

¹¹⁸ Ibid., 234.

¹¹⁹ Ibid., 161. This conclusion was reached previously by others such as J.-D. Gauger, *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik: Untersuchungen zur Authentizität von Urkunden bei Flavius Josephus und im I. Makkabäerbuch* (Köln-Bonn: Peter Hanstein Verlag, 1977), 188.

¹²⁰ Ibid., 161.

¹²¹ Ibid., 166.

¹²² It must be noted that N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 232 believes the editor to be either the same person as the author, only at a later date, or someone who has

should be clear that we believe the connection between the chapters to be strong even without the character of Alcimus, who, as we have pointed out in the previous chapter, appears to be a secondary addition.

D.S. Williams differs with Martola by regarding chapter 8 as integral to the overall story of 1Maccabees.¹²³ Though he never directly addresses Martola's arguments concerning the chapter, he offers his own reasons for the necessity of 8:1-32 in 1Macc. Chief among these is the role of repetition in the composition of the book.¹²⁴ Williams sees a two-fold chiastic structure in 1Maccabees 1:1-14:15 (which he considers to be the original composition¹²⁵), each of which highlights the major themes of liberation of the temple cult and liberation of Jerusalem from gentile influence.¹²⁶ In his second chiastic structure, which consists of 6:18-14:15, Williams highlights the important role played by 8:1-32.¹²⁷ He sees these verses as a balance in the chiasm to the mission to Rome and Sparta in 12:1-23.¹²⁸ Thus his structure for section two looks like this:

- A 6:18-7:50 The Jews obtain freedom of religion
- B 8:1-32 The Jews make a treaty with Rome
- C 9:1-10:66 Jonathan rises in power
- C' 10:67-11:74 Jonathan maintains his powerful status
- B' 12:1-23 The Jews renew their treaty with Rome
- A' 12:24-14:15 Simon liberates the citadel and obtains independence¹²⁹

intentionally adapted the "phraseology of the main story". The latter seems to us more likely.

¹²³ D. Williams, *The Structure of 1Maccabees* (CBQMS 31; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999), 132.

¹²⁴ *Ibid.*, 130-131. Williams uses rhetorical criticism to mark the repetition of rare words and key themes and phrases to come up with his unbiased structure.

¹²⁵ *Ibid.*, 132. See also the much more in-depth discussion of this aspect of Williams' argument in the introduction of this work.

¹²⁶ *Ibid.*, 131.

¹²⁷ *Ibid.*, 131.

¹²⁸ *Ibid.*, 131-132.

¹²⁹ *Ibid.*, 131.

The structure is indeed impressive, and Williams succeeds in showing how this highlights the theme of liberation and the pro-Hasmonean stress in the book.¹³⁰

There is, however, a clear problem. Williams never demonstrates how 8:1-32 (or 12:1-23 for that matter) press the point of the book. None of the key words or themes pointed out by Williams (double-causality, liberation of the temple, liberation of the citadel, ἄγιον/ἁγίασμα, ἄκρα, pro-Hasmonean stance¹³¹) appears in chapter 8. Nowhere among his argument for pointing to these themes, does Williams refer to 8:1-32 as a positive example.¹³² In fact, the only reference to chapter 8 in these pages is in a note in which Williams¹³³ refers to R. Doran's statement that a comparison between the praise of the Romans in chapter 8 and the Hasmoneans throughout 1Macc casts the Hasmoneans in an unfavorable light,¹³⁴ as a counter argument to his own proposal of a pro-Hasmonean theme. However, Williams never addresses this criticism with regard to chapter 8 or the whole book.

Williams thus presents no reasons for the integral nature of chapter 8, and in fact notes an interesting point as to how the chapter may not fit the overall theme of the book. This is not a solitary occurrence. At another point Williams states:

In 8:1-32 we encounter a shift of focus to Rome: in 8:1-16 a history of the Romans is presented, and in 8:17-32 Judas sends ambassadors to Rome to effect a treaty between the Jews and Romans. There is, then, a clear change in the cast of characters. In addition, the unit interrupts the flow from 7:1-50 into 9:1-22. In 9:1 we read: "When Demetrius heard that Nicanor and his army had fallen in battle, he sent Bacchides and Alcimus into the land of Judea a second time." This statement, referring to Nicanor's death, hearkens back to 7:43-47, wherein Nicanor is killed by Jews and his body is dismembered.¹³⁵

¹³⁰ Ibid., 132-136. Williams discusses here the improvements his structure make on Martola's by highlighting the main themes through repetition and reversals of fortune.

¹³¹ Ibid., 107.

¹³² Ibid., 96-107. This is chapter 6 in Williams' work, which for the most part is a very adept and sound analysis of the themes presented by 1Maccabees, and their constancy throughout 1:1-14:15.

¹³³ Ibid., 98.

¹³⁴ R. Doran, *The First Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections* (New Interpreters' Bible 4; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 22.

¹³⁵ D. Williams, *Structure*, 29.

I include this whole paragraph because it is evident Williams notes many of the problems with 8:1-32: the change of characters, the interruption of chapters 7-9, and the close connection particularly between 7:43-47 and 9:1. Though Williams is aware of all of these problems, he only addresses the connection between chapters 7 and 9 at one point in his study.¹³⁶ Williams agrees that the two chapters have some superficial relationship as four consecutive attacks on Israel based mostly on complaints of internal opponents,¹³⁷ however looking at the terminology used to identify the internal opponents he concludes that there is actually no strong relationship between them.¹³⁸ He follows this logic to the point of placing the two chapters in separate sections of his chiasmic structure, which we saw above.

Williams' argument seems to be slightly flawed here. The king is featured as a major player in 7:8, 7:26 and 9:1. He is not merely an innocent bystander in the affairs of chapter 9. Further, Williams does not address how to account for recollection of Nicanor at the start of chapter 9, or the continued appearance of Bacchides throughout the chapter. It would seem that his constant presence might be a greater unifying feature than the precise terminology used for the internal opponents; a terminology that, in the end, might not reflect separate Hebrew words. Also, Williams himself again recognizes the connection between the two chapters and acknowledges that chapter 8 interrupts them, later in his argument.¹³⁹ He states:

In 2.B (8:1-32) a history of Rome is presented, which is followed by an account of a Jewish mission to Rome that leads to a treaty between the Jews and the Romans. In 2.B' (12:1-23) a second Jewish mission is sent to Rome to confirm and renew the treaty made in 1 Maccabees 8, and also Jewish relations with Sparta are related.

The reader will recall from my discussion in chapter two above that each of these subsections interrupts a sequence of military campaigns. This situation is important, given scholarly attitudes toward such interruptions elsewhere in studies of structure.¹⁴⁰

¹³⁶ Ibid., 64-66, 87.

¹³⁷ Ibid., 64.

¹³⁸ Ibid., 65. Specifically Williams notes that the opponents in chapter 7 are the "godless" and those in chapter 9 are "all the lawless". Thus he sees that the invasions in chapters 6 and 7 are related as originating with godless people, while in chapter 9 it is the king himself and the lawless who originate the invasions.

¹³⁹ Ibid., 87.

¹⁴⁰ Ibid., 86-87.

It is not only puzzling that Williams appears to renege on his assertion that 7:1-50 and 9:1-73 are unrelated, but also that he sees the same to be the case in the relating passage, 12:1-23. Despite this, he is adamant that the passages represent strong structural markers in 1Macc and are part of the original. The fact is not helped by his implication in the final sentence of the paragraph quoted above. In the note he alleges that “features such as unexpected, problematic repetitions, or material which seems chronologically or thematically misplaced... suggest that an author/editor was structuring the material with a particular purpose in mind.”¹⁴¹ While Williams surely is implying that the author of 1Macc placed these passages in order to structure the material, one could also successfully argue that a later editor placed the passages in the already existing material, creating a new structure. This is especially the case given that Williams never connects the themes or vocabulary, let alone the actual content of 1Macc 8 (and 12:1-23) to any other passages in sections one (1:1-6.17) or two (6:18-14.15).

Finally, though Williams does not touch on this at all, it is rather amusing to see the amount of connections 1Macc 8 does have with 14:16-16:24, which he sees as additional. The Roman treaties mentioned at 14:16-19, 24, 40; 15:15-24 are just the beginning of this rather strong relationship.¹⁴² We will however address this more specifically at the close of this section.

Given the rather scanty evidence Williams provides as to the structural necessity of 8:1-32, we are inclined to agree with Martola. Not only does he support all the problems with the passage that any reader encountering it might notice (i.e. the change in characters, the interruption of chapters 7 and 9, the lack of continuation or recognition of the events, etc.) but he also provides strong formal evidence as to its relationship to other passages he sees as secondary. Given all the evidence and problems reading chapter 8, the burden of proof falls on those who wish to read it as original.

¹⁴¹ The citation comes from M. Brettler, “The Structure of 1 Kings 1-11” *JSOT* 49 (1991) 88-89.

¹⁴² This is in agreement with, though arrived at independently from N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 236.

Implications

It is obvious that the insertion of an entire chapter in between two other chapters has a clear impact on the text as a whole. What is less clear, given the fact that the chapter does not play a large role in the story, is what the intention might have been. The key to the addition is more than likely the diplomatic relationship focused on in the second half of the chapter. This is focused on through the inclusion of two separate diplomatic documents (8:20, 23-32), and the reference to a third (8:30-32). The context and content of the letters underline a relationship of friendship and alliance with Rome (8:17, 20, 25, 27, 31). It seems to be very important to the editor that the Judeans have this relationship. However, since we have already observed that the alliance plays no major role in the succeeding narrative, we must search deeper to establish what the relationship with the Romans truly means.

There are several clues that reveal the true meaning of the alliance with the Romans. These come from the first half of chapter 8. In the first verse and at several other points (8:12,13) the narrative introduction to the documents highlights what an alliance from the Romans means in the world that is being described. The Romans approve (εὐδοκέω) of all those who make alliances with them and approach them (8:1). They are also loyal and protect friendship (συνετήρησαν φιλίαν) with their friends, and those who rely upon them (ἐπαναπαύομαι) (8:12). These are rather self-evident statements concerning the way the Romans treat their friends and allies. They merely show that the Romans keep their word. The last such verse says quite a bit more however: “Those who they wish to help to rule, they rule, but they depose those whom they wish” (οἷς δ’ ἄν βούλωνται βοηθεῖν καὶ βασιλεύειν βασιλεύουσιν οὓς δ’ ἄν βούλωνται μεθιστῶσιν).¹⁴³ Basically 8:13 states that the Romans are the official decision makers on recognition in the ancient world. If Rome recognizes a ruler or

¹⁴³ Though the Greek here is slightly ambiguous in the first clause, the second clause seems to clear up any confusion. One could render the translation of the first clause “whoever they wish to help and to rule, they [the Romans] rule... “ though this would cause its own problems with the case of the pronoun. The second clause’s clarity elucidates the meaning of the first clause by contrasting the scenario of deposition with that of causing to rule. The NRSV translation supports this reading, though it opts for the more specific “be king” definition of βασιλεύω, which limits the meaning.

people as sovereign, then they effectually are independent. Yet, if they wish to depose a ruler or empire from control over an area, then they bring about their desired result with an equivalent amount of conviction.¹⁴⁴ The Romans have gained this status in the world through their military might recounted in 8:2-11.

It thus seems possible that our author/editor intends his addition of chapter 8 to be the first step toward recognition of Judean and especially Hasmonean autonomy and authority over their own land. This understanding is backed up by the stated intention of Judas' embassy to the Romans in 8:18: "to remove the yoke from them, because they saw that the kingdom of the Greeks was utterly enslaving Israel" (καὶ τοῦ ἄραι τὸν ζυγὸν ἀπ' αὐτῶν ὅτι εἶδον τὴν βασιλείαν τῶν Ἑλλήνων καταδουλουμένους τὸν Ἰσραὴλ δουλείᾳ). The whole importance of the alliance and the documents and the narrative construction of Roman history and polity in chapter 8 can be reduced to the fact that it communicates that the Romans have recognized the Judeans, and especially Judas Maccabeus at their head, as rightful rulers.

It is difficult to ascertain a specific historical instance where this sort of addition might be important for the Hasmonean rulers of the country. One clue that the addition is likely at earliest written late in the reign of John Hyrcanus (c.120-104) is the lack of anti-gentile rhetoric in the chapter. The Romans are celebrated, as are their allies. There appears to be no problem with Judean alliance with the gentiles. Late in the reign of John Hyrcanus, gentiles were accepted into the Judean kingdom, and hired into the army,¹⁴⁵ which reversed the position of the early Hasmonean rulers, who were establishing a strictly ethnically Judean nation. It is likewise probable that the addition stems from a time before the invasion of Pompey in 62/61 BCE both because of its pro-Roman stance and because of the large number of factual errors concerning the Romans in the narrative

¹⁴⁴ One only needs to think of the famous episode of the "Day of Eleusis" wherein a single Roman diplomat, C. Popilius Laenas, was able to force Antiochus IV to retreat from Egypt, which he had recently conquered (Polybius XXIX 27 *inter alia*).

¹⁴⁵ L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (Minneapolis: Augsburg, 1992), 300. He bases his reconstruction on Josephus' account in *Antiquities* XIII 258.

introduction to the treaty.¹⁴⁶ Beyond this it would be imprudent to discern a situation where the text was included without seeing if there are similar additions elsewhere in 1Maccabees, which might shed more light on the subject. It seems clear though that this addition is remarkably different from the two other groups of additions we have recognized as possibly being related.

II.8 1Macc 9

Like many sections of 1Maccabees, chapter 9 contains an amalgam of events in the life of the Hasmonean rebellion in Judea. The overall arc of this chapter is fairly self-contained; it deals with the second visit of Bacchides to the land, and the effect it had on the Hasmonean revolution. This section forms the second half of a larger episode, which begins in chapter 7 and is interrupted by chapter 8.¹⁴⁷ As is normal throughout 1Macc, it is the gentiles *acting* and Israel *reacting*, which drives the story.¹⁴⁸ Though the chapter can be read coherently, it is not free from certain problems and inconsistencies in a number of its verses.¹⁴⁹

The main problem in most of these verses is a divergence of presentation concerning the enemy and the central themes of the chapter. While the section begins and ends with the respective entrance and exit of Bacchides to/from Judah, Alcimus and the lawless Judeans play a role in many of the events. These problematic verses have a number of references to the surrounding text, yet, the rest of the chapter makes no allusions to the events presented in the problematic verses. There are clear seams

¹⁴⁶ Just as an example, 8:16 states that the Romans trust one man each year to rule over them; in actuality there were two consuls elected annually. Other mistakes come in 8:15, 8:14, *inter alia*.

¹⁴⁷ Chapter 8 deals with the Romans and the Jewish mission sent to them. It has little to do with any of the events or characters portrayed in the two surrounding chapters. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 159-168, shows the relation of these chapters rather well in establishing the composition of 1Macc.

¹⁴⁸ E. Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 18.

¹⁴⁹ 9:1, 23-24, 35-42, 54-61, 69, 73d

between the majority of the sections that deal with Bacchides and those that treat Alcimus and the renegades. For this reason it is possible that Alcimus and the renegades are part of the larger body of possible additions to the text of 1Macc, which emphasize the role of the lawless Judeans in the evils visited upon Israel. There is also another passage (9:35-42) that appears to be additional, but is of an entirely different type and scope than the Alcimus passages and the surrounding context. All of these passages will be examined as to their possible secondary nature.

9:1

The first problematic verse begins the chapter. This is the only verse in what would otherwise be wholly in the same context and worldview of the main story that deals with Alcimus. The reference to the high priest is not extensive, only mentioning his name following that of Bacchides as re-entering the land after Nicanor's defeat by Judas.¹⁵⁰ This is done on royal orders, and a royal company of troops joins them. The group is reported to have encamped against the roads of Arbela and killed many people (9:2), followed by encamping against Jerusalem (9:3) and finally marching to Berea (9:4). After this the story turns to Judas and his troops.

Alcimus' presence in this story has a particular problem in that he is otherwise completely absent from the chapter until his death at vv. 54-57, in which he is named three times. In contrast, Bacchides is mentioned elsewhere nine times,¹⁵¹ and is the subject or object of the vast majority of the action in the chapter. There can be no confusion that Alcimus is not referenced in any of the sections, in which he is not named.¹⁵² A notable instance of Alcimus being passed over unnamed comes at 9:29-30 wherein the friends of Judas ask Jonathan to take his place as leader of the rebellion. Here they name their enemies, but Alcimus is nowhere to be found. If Alcimus did come with Bacchides and the army at the beginning of the chapter and did participate in the

¹⁵⁰ The reference recalls their first entrance together in chapter 7.

¹⁵¹ Outside of the passages I consider additional, in which Bacchides is named an extra three times.

¹⁵² N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 162, notes this fact but brushes it aside in claiming that because Alcimus is present at the beginning he shares all of Bacchides guilt in his activities.

military raids it seems likely that he would be among the enemies of the rebellion, though he is not.

For the first verse of this episode to name Alcimus and subsequently neglect to include him in the plot for fifty verses is alarming. However, it is not without support. In verses 2-4, though no proper name is mentioned all the verbs appear in third person plural. This fact is not decisive, however, in claiming originality for Alcimus' existence in the verse. There are numerous examples in 1Macc where an individual commander and his troops are spoken of in the third person plural, as one might expect.¹⁵³ However, there are as many examples where only the commanders are referenced when expeditions are made with an army, and the verbs are singular. This would lend some weight to the possibility that the plurals in vv.2-4¹⁵⁴ referring to both commanders and not Bacchides and his army. Since there are examples of both usages it is difficult to argue from either side that this proves or disproves the possibility of Alcimus being additional. Aside from this, there is also the strong possibility that if there were additions to the text they would have been made to the Hebrew version prior to any Greek translation, thus the Greek text would reflect the later version. Though the presence of Alcimus' name in 9:1 creates a slightly awkward reading, leaving the reader to wonder where Alcimus has gone, it must remain a possibility that it is original, based upon the evidence. However, if we tie in the evidence from the additions to chapter 7, wherein we observed that Alcimus seemed to be additional, it would follow that 9:1, building upon chapter 7, would also originally not include Alcimus. It would be difficult to imagine how the text could mention a second entry for Alcimus, when he has not even been introduced yet. The logic used here is admittedly circular, but the evidence in chapter 7 strongly suggested Alcimus was secondarily inserted.

9:23-24

¹⁵³ The best examples come at 1:19, 32-35; 6:31, 34-35 because of the gentile attacks and because of specific mentions of the army included before the verbs.

¹⁵⁴ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 162 most notably sees these as referring to Alcimus and Bacchides, not Bacchides and the army.

The second problematic passage does not mention Alcimus, rather it has the apostate Judeans as its subject. Verses 23-24 form a self-contained unit describing the situation of Israel in the time after Judas died in battle against Bacchides. Renegade Judeans (ἄνομοι), and practitioners of injustice (ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀδικίαν) are the center of the activity. These two verses first introduce these two groups into the action, then describe their ubiquity in the region of Israel. They also depict the specific circumstance under which the groups gained great influence, namely a famine.

The problem with these verses is not their lack of connections with their context. Rather it is the lack of continuity these verses share with the material surrounding them despite those links, which arouses suspicion. The text clearly speaks of the death of Judas, which has just been reported and commented upon (9:18-22), and which is spoken of again during the commissioning of Jonathan as leader of the rebellion (9:29). There is no doubt that in the chronology of the narrative the verses fit perfectly. However, the characters of the “lawless” and the “practitioners of injustice” are nowhere else present in the immediate context. The lawless are mentioned twice more in the chapter (9:58, 69), but, as we shall see, each of these instances is also problematic. The practitioners of injustice are mentioned nowhere else in the entire book, despite the fact that all of them are said to have sprung up (ἀνατέλλω). Most importantly, these two groups play no role in the rest of the passage, which describes the situation after Judas’ death. Instead it is the familiar enemy, Bacchides who is featured along with the godless (ἄσεβεις ἄνδρας). Together they are said to take control of the country, search for the friends of Judas, take vengeance upon them, and make sport of them.

While it is possible that the godless (ἄσεβεις ἄνδρας) are synonymous with the lawless and the practitioners of injustice, thus bringing them into the fold, the evidence of 1Maccabees does not seem to support this. The only other place where 1Maccabees uses ἄσεβεις without the modifier ἐξ Ἰσραηλ comes at 3:15. There the context makes it clear that the group described is composed of gentiles, not apostate Judeans. There are a number of occasions wherein ἄσεβεις is used to describe apostates,¹⁵⁵ but every time it is with the additional terms ἐξ Ἰσραηλ. Since 9:25 lacks that modifier, it is doubtful that the

¹⁵⁵ The other instances are: 6:21-27; 7:9b; 9:73d.

group described could be the same ἄνομοι who clearly are apostate Judeans.¹⁵⁶ Further, ἐργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀδικίαν must be considered synonymously parallel to ἄνομοι considering the synonymous meanings of their parallel verbs (ἐκκύπτω/ἀνατέλλω).

The second continuity-related problem that arises with these two verses is that there is an intense famine (λιμὸς μέγας σφόδρα) mentioned that gets no other recognition or explanation. The other two instances in 1Maccabees where famine is mentioned provide full explanations for the famine and the results of it. At 6:48-54 it is explained that because of the sabbatical year and the influx of refugees, the Judeans had no food, and could not withstand a siege. It goes on to report that many fled to their homes to escape the famine. Likewise, 13:49 reports that the population in the citadel were experiencing a famine because they were not permitted to go out into the country to buy or sell goods during a siege, and that many died of famine as a result. However, at 9:24 the famine is only briefly mentioned as quite intense, and then spoken of as a reason that the country went over to the side of the lawless. The succeeding verses mention nothing about such a famine, and there is no evidence of it in the actions of any of the characters. One would imagine that if such a famine were so great, there would be at least some additional comment outside the verse. The fact that the content of these two verses plays no part in the rest of the chapter makes it somewhat likely that they are secondary.

9:34-42

The first verse of this passage has a relatively colorful history in scholarship on 1Maccabees. A fair number of scholars have remarked that v.34 is out of place. Grimm,¹⁵⁷ Bruppacher,¹⁵⁸ Abel,¹⁵⁹ and Goldstein,¹⁶⁰ among others, have come to the decision that the verse is either a gloss or doublet for v.43. This conclusion is based not only upon the close relationship between v.34 and v.43, but also on a number of points that show v.34 to be problematic in its position. For one, Jonathan is the subject of 9:33

¹⁵⁶ This is based upon the context of each passage: 2:42-44; 7:5-7; 9:58-61, 69; 11:25.

¹⁵⁷ C. Grimm, *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer*, (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1853), 138.

¹⁵⁸ H. Bruppacher, "Textkritisches zu I. Macc." (ZAW 49, 1931), 149-150.

¹⁵⁹ F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949), 167.

¹⁶⁰ J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees* (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 380-382.

and 9:35, but 9:34 has Bacchides as the subject. However, 9:35 does not name its subject explicitly. One would expect that after a subject change the new subject would be named. Another argument brought forth, particularly by Bruppacher is that the content of v.34 is far less significant than v.43, which repeats much of the information but importantly states that Bacchides came with a large force on the Sabbath day, as opposed to v.34 which only states that Bacchides found this out on the Sabbath day. Bruppacher avers that nobody cares when Bacchides found out, they care when he moved his force. No matter the argument the opinion of scholarship has been that v.34 is likely non-essential.

Though Martola ultimately agrees with the previous scholars in seeing v.34 as non-essential, largely based on Bruppacher's criteria,¹⁶¹ he mentions an intriguing possibility in a note, but does not ever explore it. Martola states: "There exists a possibility that 9,35-42 has been added later with 9,34 serving as a redactional link."¹⁶² This hypothesis is profound and ought to be investigated. When looking at 9:35-42 it is quite clear that it interrupts the account of Jonathan's flight to the desert and Jordan marshes, which leads to the battle between him and Bacchides at the same location. This account is begun at 9:32 and continues to 9:33, and then is picked up again at 9:43. This last verse continues as if nothing had happened in the interim. Bacchides hears of Jonathan's flight to the pool of Asphar and comes with all his army to the Jordan marshes. The passage is further entirely non-essential for the plot of the chapter or the broader narrative.

In addition to this, 9:35-42 does not have any strong connections with its context. The baggage, which plays a central role in the episode, is nowhere referred to either before or after the episode. John, the brother of Jonathan and Simon who is killed by the Nabateans, is also entirely absent from the context; he only appears at 2:2 elsewhere. Similarly, the family of Jambri, the term Canaan, and all of the locations mentioned in 9:35-42 are only found in this passage. From the point of view of the context, there are also no solid connections. Bacchides, who is the main character of most of the chapter, is

¹⁶¹ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 120.

¹⁶² *Ibid.*, 120, n.36.

entirely absent from the passage. Also missing is any mention of Bacchides' plot to kill Jonathan, which is integral to the context. One link that exists is seen in the characters "Jonathan and his brother Simon" (Ἰωνᾶθαν καὶ Σιμωνι τῶ ἀδελφῶ αὐτοῦ), who appear at v.33 and v.37 with the same phrase, only the case changing. A second connection is that the Jordan is mentioned at v.42 and vv.43, 45, 48 (2x). The bond however is weak considering all the clues that point to the passage being additional.

Further, if the passage is not a secondary addition, then one must explain the very reason for the doublet of v.34 and v.43 in the first place. There would be absolutely no incentive to put Bacchides at the scene beforehand unless the verses marked the insertion of secondary material. This all suggests that the passage including v.34 is an addition.

9:54-61

There are really two subsections that can be divided in these lines, but because the two passages tie together in some subject matter and are entirely insular from their surroundings, we treat them together. Verses 54-57 treat Alcimus' activity in attempting to tear down a wall of the inner court of the sanctuary,¹⁶³ and his sudden paralysis and death following this attempt. This results in Bacchides retreat to the king, and Judea's peace for two years. The second part of this section deals with the action of the lawless in bringing Bacchides back to the land in order to capture Jonathan and his followers. The section reports their plot and its ultimate failure, ending in the death of the leaders of the treachery. Verses 58-61 depend upon Bacchides' departure in verse 57 and allude to the peace, which resulted from Alcimus' death, so there are ties between these sections. The other tie between these two passages is their treatment of apostate Judeans as the source of impious acts, and their reception of punishment for those acts. Both sections also end with the death of the leaders in treachery.

¹⁶³ There are a number of opinions on which wall the author intends Alcimus to destruct here. S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), 163, suggest that it is the wall separating the inner court, where Judeans are permitted, from the outer court, where the gentiles were allowed. This would eliminate distinction between Judeans and gentiles. J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 392 thinks this is not some major dividing wall but some outer part of the temple of little significance. He sees this as the remnant of some conflict between Judean parties at the time over the legality of adapting the temple structure.

There is however, little connection between the unit formed by these two sections and the verses surrounding them. Verses 50-53 report on Bacchides' building activity throughout the cities of Judea and his kidnapping of the children of the leading men of the country. Verses 62-68 tell of Jonathan and Simon's withdrawal to Bethbasi and their rebuilding of it. These verses then report on Jonathan's works against scattered gentiles and Simon's efforts against Bacchides. The subject matter of the surrounding lines is universally about gentile efforts against Judeans and Judean reaction against the gentiles, specifically Bacchides. These verses also form a logically continuous story. Once Bacchides has taken control over the cities of Judea and taken many leading Judeans as hostages, Jonathan and his men remove themselves to a small settlement¹⁶⁴ close to their former settlement of Tekoa (9:33). They then build up Bethbasi in order to establish a stronghold for themselves in lieu of Jerusalem or the other cities, which Bacchides has just taken back through his building efforts (9:50-53). Bacchides, hearing this, comes to destroy this stronghold but is subsequently turned away by Jonathan and Simon. For all the enmity reported in the surrounding verses, none of them refer to any internal foes or to Alcimus. It is only gentiles and Bacchides who are mentioned as the opponents of Israel.

Verses 54-61 however treat entirely different subject matter. The role of the gentiles is only ancillary to that of the apostates in Alcimus and the lawless. From these passages the reader receives the impression that Bacchides relies on Alcimus' presence to maintain any control, and that the only reason Bacchides returns is because of the leaders of the apostates. These characters are not mentioned anywhere else in the surrounding passages except for v.69, which also is questionable in its originality.

In addition to the subject change and place change introduced by these verses, there are some obvious continuity problems. After vv.58-61, where Jonathan defeats those plotting against him, there is little need for Jonathan and Simon to withdraw to Bethbasi. According to v.57 they have enjoyed two years of peace, and according to vv.60-61 the leaders in the treachery were captured and killed. For Jonathan to retreat to

¹⁶⁴ Bethbasi is thought by F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 214; J. Goldstein, *IMaccabees*, 392; S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin, *First Book*, 165, to be Khirbet Beit-Bassa in the wilderness of Judea, three miles east of Tekoa.

a small town in the desert after such a stirring victory over his opponents would be odd. It makes much more sense that Jonathan would have withdrawn to Bethbasi once all the other strongholds and cities were taken and built up by Bacchides, which is the situation in vv.50-53.

The fact that Bacchides performs the same actions twice in close succession is also rather suspicious. Within the passage, at v.60 Bacchides sends orders to all his allies in Judea and departs for Judea (because according to v.57 Bacchides must be in Antioch). Then at vv.63-64, Bacchides once again comes to Bethbasi (because according to v.53 he never left Judea) and sends orders to those of Judea. It should be clear that the group referenced in v.63 is that of the troops stationed all around Judea in vv.51-53. The duplication of events make it seem that one of the events is copied from the other. Since vv.63-64 are consistent in all other ways with the general arc of the chapter, and because they contribute a full story, they should be preferred over the account in v.60. All the evidence suggests that 9:54-61 is a secondary edition.

9:69

This single-verse report of Bacchides' acts against the lawless Judeans who counseled him to return to the land seems entirely out-of-place in its context. It interrupts the narrative of Bacchides' defeat and surrender with a tangential story concerning the treatment of his allies. Verse 68 reports the defeat of Bacchides by Simon and the men in Bethbasi, which leaves Bacchides with nowhere to turn. Jonathan then recognizes this, and seeing his advantage calls for a peace in order to obtain the release of the hostages Bacchides took from Judea (9:53) in v.70. The progression between these lines makes good sense. First Jonathan and Simon have Bacchides trapped between their armies, which come from the town on the one side, and the plain on the other. Then Jonathan recognizes they have Bacchides trapped, and uses the chance to gain concessions. Finally, Bacchides would concede in this case, having no strength, from which to negotiate.

Verse 69, in discussing Bacchides' punishment of the renegade Jewish allies changes the focus from the battle to a setting somehow separated from the war.

Bacchides also shows a certain amount of power in his resources in that he kills the apostates to repay them for their faulty advice. The verse only reminds the reader that it was the lawless Judeans who were at the base of Israel's problems, and has little to do with Bacchides' imminent loss and surrender. Secondly, v.69 has Bacchides deciding to return to his own land. Though the sentence does not necessitate immediate action on Bacchides' part, it does seem to imply that he was already on his way. But, Bacchides does not actually return to his land until v.72 after he makes the truce, undoing all the wrongs he has done.

Thirdly, it is difficult to see how Jonathan recognizing that Bacchides has killed apostates and is on his way home allows him to obtain such promises from Bacchides as a release of captives, and a sworn oath not to harm Jonathan. If Bacchides were on his way home already he would not need to conclude a peace treaty; he would already have an exit strategy implemented. Further, v.69 absolutely relies upon vv.57-61 to be original, as it assumes that Bacchides had not been in the country and had been counseled by apostates to come. As we have seen, these verses seem to be additional. Moreover, v.63 specifically states that Bacchides came to Bethbasi on his own volition because Jonathan and his men had set up a fortification there. This added inconsistency casts a very dubious light on the originality v.69.

9:73d

The whole of this final verse of the chapter arouses some suspicion as to its originality. The first problem is that it seems to provide three endings for the chapter among four verbal clauses. The first clause, “The sword ceased from Israel” (καὶ κατέπαυσεν ῥομφαία ἐξ Ἰσραηλ), could easily serve as a summarizing sentence for the whole chapter. The second and third clauses combine to make another fine conclusion in their statement that “Jonathan settled in Michmash and began to judge the people” (καὶ ὤκησεν Ἰωνάθαν ἐν Μαχμασ καὶ ἤρξατο Ἰωνάθαν κρίνειν τὸν λαόν). A similar statement is used to end a passage at 1Sam 7:6. The fourth and final clause adds the current concluding sentence, “He banished the impious of Israel” (καὶ ἠφάνισεν τοὺς

ἀσεβεις ἐξ Ἰσραηλ). The fact that all these clauses are used together as a concluding unit seems strange.

Though any one or two of these clauses could easily be regarded as superfluous, 9:73d seems to be the best candidate. First, 9:73a is a direct reaction to the previous verses. Jonathan negotiated a peace treaty with Bacchides, then he left never to return again, giving Israel peace. Second, 9:73b-c is supported not only by the fact that Jonathan is in fact the ruler of Israel, but also because of 10:10.¹⁶⁵ It is clear by the language at 10:10 that Jonathan has been settled someplace else, and only later comes to Jerusalem. Though the verse does not mention Michmash as his previous residence, there is no rival candidate. Third, 9:73d is patently exposed as a lie both by the content of previous verses and by succeeding verses. Even if we were to accept that Jonathan has killed some of the lawless at 9:61, there are still large numbers of them left for Bacchides to kill at 9:69. Further along, at 10:14 the impious are still present in the country, and they reappear again at 10:61, 64; 11:21, 25. If Jonathan did banish the group, he did not do a very good job of it. Without the addition of this clause, the conclusion may still be crowded, but acceptably so.

Implications

From 9:1, 23-27, 54-61, 69, 73d one can see a fairly consistent pattern of narrative. The apostate Judeans, and especially Alcimus, are continually tied in tightly with the gentiles¹⁶⁶ and shown to be enemies of Israel. When Bacchides is sent from King Demetrius, Alcimus is also sent (9:1). They proceed to act against a number of Judeans, killing them, and even encamp against Jerusalem. Alcimus thus acts on behalf

¹⁶⁵ It has been pointed out to me in private conversation with Dr. Raija Sollamo that 73c's repetition of the subject "Jonathan" seems odd. It is possible that this clause is also additional and that the chapter originally ended with 73b. I am open to both possibilities here.

¹⁶⁶ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 467 sees most of the Alcimus passages with Bacchides as having the intention of implicating Alcimus and the apostates in Israel's problems.

of gentiles [Demetrius] and against Judeans.¹⁶⁷ Further, when Judas dies, the renegades reappear, aid Bacchides, and cause distress in Israel (9:23-27). Then, when Alcimus again appears he acts against the temple, and the work of the prophets (9:54). Bacchides also leaves Judea upon his death, showing a close relationship between Alcimus and the gentile captain once more (9:56-57). Finally, through vv.58-61, 69 there is a clear picture drawn of apostates seeking out gentiles in opposition to Judeans, and even being the sole cause of the gentiles' presence in the land. This impression is consistent in all the different sections of chapter 9 and shows a strict dichotomy between those who are Israel on the one hand, and the apostate Judeans and gentiles on the other. The final piece to this is the banishment at 9:73d, which is intended to drive a tangible wedge between the internal opponents and Israel by unilaterally excommunicating them from the population.

This overall impression given by the additional passages is also seen in other possible additions in 1Maccabees. These sections all present the renegades to be at the base of the trouble and gentiles to be only their cohorts. The emphasis is on the difference between this compound body of renegades and gentiles on the one side and the loyal Judeans faithful to the covenant, their people, and the Hasmoneans on the other. This is however different from the presentation of the rest of the book, and specifically from the rest of chapter 9 (outside of 9:34-42).

In the other additional passage in 1Maccabees 9 the intention is difficult to pinpoint. Because 9:34-42 does not add anything to the overall arc, we must look at the internal clues to see the intention of the author/editor who included it. There is a possibility that the passage is meant to depict John's death, thus mythologizing another of the Hasmonean brothers. However, as John's death is never actually depicted, and he seems to die because he was duped, this cannot be the true reason for the addition. It does not seem likely either that the intent of the passage is to present the Nabateans in general, or the family of Jambri specifically as enemies of Israel. They are too easily defeated for this to be the case. Rather, it appears that the passage is meant to celebrate the honor or heroism of Simon and Jonathan in avenging their brother's blood. This is explicitly

¹⁶⁷ J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 372 notes that the "land of Judah" reference in 9:1 and the mention of the encounter in Arbela are intended to show that the action of Bacchides and Alcimus is against all Judeans and not simply the Hasmonean rebels.

stated as their goal in the final sentence of the addition (9:42), and is also previously brought up as a reason to go after the family of Jambri (9:38). Thus, the addition seems to be another example of a passage that spreads the mythology of the Hasmoneans by depicting the great loyalty they have to their own family. It bears some resemblance to the other passages that we have seen in this theme. One can only guess at why it would be placed in this spot in chapter 9, because it is not immediately clear.

It is obvious that there are two worlds presented in this chapter as in most sections of 1Maccabees. There is the Judean world and the gentile world. This worldview is depicted most often by interweaving the intrusions of the gentile world into the Judean sphere and showing how it affects the Judeans. In this way the reader does not see the whole of gentile life and culture and politics, but only the non-Judean world in so far as it touches upon the life of Israel.

On the gentile side of the narrative, the arc is clear: chapter 9 reports on the second entry of Bacchides into the land of Judah from his victorious and cruel entrance to his defeated and peaceful exit. During his stay in Judah, Bacchides has a number of major effects on the plot; his attack results in: the death of Judas (vv.18-22), the rise of Jonathan (vv.28-31), the reestablishment of gentile dominance throughout the cities (vv.50-53), and finally the removal of the foreign presence in Judea (vv.72-73). It also establishes the theme of Jonathan as skilful diplomat and negotiator.

With respect to the Judeans, the narrative arc of chapter 9 is also fairly easy to define. The Judeans are only acting in response to Bacchides. They flee from Bacchides when he arrives at the battlefield (vv.5-10). Judas and Israel fight against Bacchides until Judas' death (vv.11-18). The Judeans elect Jonathan as leader in Judas' place to "go against our enemies, Bacchides, and the adversaries of our nation" (vv.28-31). Jonathan and Simon flee from Bacchides, who is trying to kill them (vv.32-33). Jonathan implores his followers to defend themselves against Bacchides when he attacks on the Sabbath, and they are able to escape (vv.43-49). Jonathan and Simon and all their men retreat to Bethbasi after Bacchides takes hostages and control of all the cities and strongholds (vv.50-53, 62-63). Jonathan and Simon defend Bethbasi and are victorious against Bacchides and his allies when they attack (vv.64-68). Finally, Jonathan makes peace

with Bacchides arranging for return of the captives and the exit of Bacchides from the land. (70-73c).

The acts of the Judeans are the opposite of those of Bacchides. As he enters the land with a large force, the already small force of the Judeans flees. When Bacchides kills Judas, The Judeans bring in a new leader, Jonathan. When Bacchides tries to kill him, Jonathan escapes. When Bacchides builds up the strongholds and takes captives, Jonathan removes himself to another settlement and builds it up himself, which results in return of the captives, removal of Bacchides and the gentiles, and cessation of all violence which Bacchides brought with him. The contrast between the efforts of the Judeans and the gentiles under Bacchides is stark. The Judeans fight on behalf of their people and for preservation, while Bacchides fights on behalf of the king and seeks only to destroy all Judean power.

Nowhere in this plot is there any place for the apostates. Neither the acts of Bacchides nor those of the Judeans are dependent on or even reactions to the work of the apostates. Nowhere in these events do the Judeans try to take vengeance on the renegades for their cooperation. And most notably, nowhere in these reports are the deeds of the gentiles presented as anything other than their nature as being inimical to the Judeans.

The additions change that perception. In the new context, they bring the work of Alcimus and the apostate Judeans to a prominent status in Bacchides' second entry. They worsen Bacchides' acts against Israel. They appear as the power and authority behind Bacchides' presence in the land. With the additions Bacchides seems to be an almost neutral character, only acting on the behalf of the renegades. This is totally out of synch with the events of the chapter and the presentation of the gentiles and Bacchides in the rest of the book.

II.9 *1Macc 10*

The tenth chapter of 1Maccabees is not easily separated from the surrounding material. It comprises part of a larger section concerning the exploits of Jonathan, the first Hasmonean high priest. The section begins at 9:28 and closes at 12:52 or 54.¹⁶⁸ However, there is a strong case to be made for studying chapter 10 in its own right, largely separate from its context within the broader narrative.¹⁶⁹ The combination of the strong ending formula,¹⁷⁰ which closes chapter 9, and the new start, which begins chapter 10,¹⁷¹ makes at least one natural border for chapter 10.

On the other hand, an end point for the section is less clear. The end of the tenth chapter closes with the third wave of benedictions given by Alexander to Jonathan, however, a number of the characters, and a notable amount of the storyline from chapter 10 continue through the first half of chapter 11. Also, one might see a natural end for a section at 10.66, midway through the chapter.¹⁷² Though it is unclear, I believe that chapter 10 can be studied as its own sub-section with a unified theme: the rise in prominence of Jonathan under the sovereign Alexander Balas.¹⁷³ The chapter is the only section wherein Alexander is an active character and the story cycles three times, in the beginning (vv.15-20), middle (vv.59-66), and end (vv.87-89), to the honors paid by the king to Jonathan.

¹⁶⁸ This depends on whether one sees Jonathan's death or Simon's rise to leadership as the beginning of a new section.

¹⁶⁹ As J. Bartlett, *1Maccabees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 27 among others does.

¹⁷⁰ Καὶ ὤκησεν Ἰωναθαν ἐν Μιχμασ καὶ ἤρξατο Ἰωναθαν κρίνειν τὸν λαόν.
“Jonathan settled in Michmash and began to judge the people” or simply “Jonathan settled in Michmash.” See note 390 above.

¹⁷¹ The exact-dating reference, the introduction of a new character and a new plane on which events take place combine to make it clear that a new section is begun -- as N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 95.

¹⁷² N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 168-9 sees this is the case again because of the dating formula in v.67 and the introduction of a new foe in Demetrius II. D. Williams, *The Structure of 1Maccabees* (CBQMS 31; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999), 131, argues the same on rhetorical grounds.

¹⁷³ J. Bartlett, *1Maccabees*, 27.

The difficulties in studying chapter 10 do not end with its limits and its place in the context of the larger narrative. The ability of the chapter to be read as a unity must be seriously called into question on a number of occasions. Though there are some minor verses or passages that are only partially problematic, some of the issues in reading chapter 10 present broader problems with continuity. Both shall be covered to show the overall effect the possible redactions have on the text of IMacc.

Most of the difficulties in reading chapter 10 as an unredacted whole come in those passages related to the diplomacy between Jonathan on one side and Alexander and Demetrius on the other. The problematic passages in this vein all occur between 10:1 and 10:45. When reading this section one gets an unclear picture of who has sent diplomatic offers, what their contents were, and when they were sent.¹⁷⁴ The main question emerging out of reading this subsection is whether Demetrius I has in fact acted first in conducting diplomacy with Jonathan. There are strong points to be made for each argument.

10:3-9, 15, 25b-45*

The passages that can shed the most light in particular are vv.3-9, 15-25, and 46-47. In addition, possibly independently problematic within this section are vv.12-14. These will be treated separately once the main material has been analyzed.

After the scene-setting notes in vv.1-2 in which the imminent battle between Alexander Balas and Demetrius is foreshadowed, v.3 starts on a new course, which is continued in one line of thought through v.9. These verses describe Demetrius sending Jonathan a letter of peace wherein he allows Jonathan three permissions in exchange for his allegiance: the recruiting of troops, the arming of troops, and the release of the hostages in the citadel (vv.3-6). The passage then continues to describe Jonathan's actions upon receiving the letter. He reads it in earshot of the people and those in the citadel. They are then alarmed at his new ability to recruit troops, and release the hostages from the citadel as a result (vv.7-9). The passage is clear and has good

¹⁷⁴ As noted by F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949), 192 and J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees* (AB; Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 414.

connections with its context: Demetrius is the subject of both v.2 and the first part of this passage, and Jonathan is the subject of the second part of this passage and v.10. Also, the hostages in the citadel are mentioned before in 9:53, and their fates are unknown up to this point. There is no reason to doubt the report of vv.3-9.

At v.15, after two further reports of Jonathan's actions following his newfound powers, it is Alexander who decides to write a diplomatic letter to Jonathan. Most notable in this first verse is that he does this because he "heard of all the promises that Demetrius had sent to Jonathan". This also corroborates with the story given in vv.3-9. Further reasons for allying with Jonathan are given in v.16 before the report of the actual writing in v.17. From vv.18-20 a diplomatic letter from Alexander is quoted which promises the high priesthood and the title φίλον βασιλέως (friend of king) and asks for allegiance in return. In addition, the narrator reports that he sent along a gold crown and a purple robe. This is fine and can be easily understood within the context. Demetrius has sent one letter, and Alexander, hearing about it, has decided to send another to outbid him for the allegiance of Jonathan. There are no inconsistencies yet.

Following the report of Alexander's diplomacy to Jonathan there is a one-verse narration of Jonathan's actions in response to the diplomacy, to which we will later return. Verses 22-24 then tell of Demetrius' next move. It is here that the first sign of trouble arises. Demetrius is first said to be troubled by the news at v.22, and beginning with verse 23 says, "What is this we have done? Alexander has preceded us in making a firm friendship with the Judeans (Τί τοῦτο ἐποιήσαμεν, ὅτι προέφθακεν ἡμᾶς Ἀλέξανδρος τοῦ φίλιαν καταλαβέσθαι τοῖς Ιουδαίοις εἰς στήριγμα). The critical remark here is that Demetrius himself says Alexander has *gone before* (προφθάνω) him in forming a friendship with the Judeans. This implies that Alexander sent his offer before Demetrius has sent any diplomatic letter or promises to Jonathan. This same idea is confirmed in v.23 when Demetrius expresses his intent with the statement, "I will also write words of encouragement to them" (γράψω αὐτοῖς κἀγὼ λόγους παρακλήσεως). Demetrius confirms his previous inaction by stating that he *will also* write words of encouragement to the Judeans, as if he has not done so already.

The new information disagrees with vv.3-9 and 15, which all refer to the earlier communication of Demetrius with Jonathan. This might be easily dismissed as an addition or an error if they were the only such reports in chapter 10, but they are not. Following Demetrius' statement of intent to engage in diplomacy with Jonathan, a rather long and heavily detailed letter appears from vv.25b-45. The letter outlines the numerous promises and guarantees the king is offering for continuing the friendship with him (v.27). Following this letter, vv.46-47 report on the rejoinder of Jonathan and the people to Demetrius' offer. In v.46 Jonathan and the people "did not believe or accept them because they remembered the great evils which he made against Israel, and he oppressed them greatly. (οὐκ ἐπίστευσαν αὐτοῖς οὐδὲ ἐπεδέξαντο ὅτι ἐπεμνήσθησαν τῆς κακίας τῆς μεγάλης ἧς ἐποίησεν ἐν Ἰσραηλ καὶ ἔθλιψεν αὐτοὺς σφόδρα). In combination with the news at v.24 that this is Demetrius' first letter, v.46 raises more questions because Jonathan and the Judeans did not believe or accept the letter, not based on anything intrinsic to the letter but based upon Demetrius' cruelty and oppression. If one were to accept that vv.3-9, 15 are original to the chapter, then one would have to answer why Jonathan is easily able to accept an initial offer of diplomacy from Demetrius, but then is completely unwilling to accept a later one with far more at stake both for Jonathan himself and the country as a whole.

In combination with the previous statement, v.47 offers more confirmation of the idea that Demetrius sent his letter after Alexander made the initial effort at diplomacy. The verse reports that they favored Alexander because "he was the originator of peaceful words" αὐτὸς ἐγένετο ἀρχηγὸς λόγων εἰρηνικῶν.¹⁷⁵ According to the narrator Alexander was clearly the first to make the offer of peace with Jonathan and the Judeans, and for this reason, combined with the distrust of Demetrius they sided with Alexander. Thus we are presented with a problem.

¹⁷⁵ F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 192 and J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 414 each note the problem here, but each "solve" it with creative translations. Goldstein states that instead of being originator Alexander should be understood as the "original cause" of the peace. A claim that has little merit and does nothing to answer the questions raised by vv.22-24. Abel claims that the Greek represents a mistranslation of the Hebrew where $\square\aleph\psi$ was intended but $\square\aleph\psi$ was understood. This is equally unlikely and fails to address the point that Abel himself makes in regard to Demetrius' statement at vv.22-24.

On the one hand, vv.3-9, 15, which all seem to fit their context reasonably well, report that Demetrius has acted first in offering peace to the Judeans, and that Jonathan accepted that peace. On the other hand, vv.22-24, 46-47 present a rather straightforward scene surrounding a quoted letter of Demetrius, wherein it is clear that he is attempting for the first time to contact the Judeans. There must be a way to read this as a whole, which possibly involves recognizing a redactional layer in the text. To further determine which report is original we must return to the contextual verses we passed over in our original assessment of the first half of 1Macc 10.

Following the literary unit vv.3-9 a continuation of Jonathan's actions (begun in verse 7) is presented. In vv.10-11 the narrator tells of Jonathan's move to Jerusalem and his start of restoration and fortification of the city and especially Mount Zion. What is especially notable in these lines is that aside from maintaining the subject (Jonathan) and the location (Jerusalem) from vv.7-9 there is little strong connection between the two subsections. Further, there is even less connection with vv.3-6, wherein the allowances of Demetrius' letter are reported. Nowhere in these verses does the king state that Jonathan may move his center of power to Jerusalem or fortify the city and the temple. And, Jonathan nowhere in vv.10-11 gives any indication of allying with Demetrius, recruiting troops, or even gathering arms. These verses could be read entirely independently of the unit preceding them and would make good (or better) literary sense. Additionally, if these verses were read as coming directly after v.2, then Jonathan's resettlement of Jerusalem would still be a significant and opportunistic step toward further independence, wholly in line with his character.¹⁷⁶ This casts a doubt on the originality of vv.3-9.

How the secondary nature of vv.3-9 would relate to v.15 is a much more difficult matter to investigate. Because the narrator tells of Alexander's cognizance of Demetrius' promises to Jonathan, the originality of vv.3-9 must be considered a real possibility. However it is important to recognize that only a small part of v.15 actually has any bearing on the promises of Demetrius. Most of the verse, and indeed those verses

¹⁷⁶ At 11:13-22 Jonathan takes advantage of the turmoil in Antioch to launch an attack on the citadel. The act also has a precedent in Judas' attack on the citadel during the war between Philip and Lysias for the regency over Antiochus V, described in 6:14-21.

following it, do not rely on the events of vv.3-9. It is only the phrase “Alexander, the king heard of the promises which Demetrius sent to Jonathan” (ἤκουσεν Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ βασιλεὺς τὰς ἐπαγγελίας ὅσας ἀπέστειλεν Δημήτριος τῷ Ἰωνᾶθαν), that mentions anything of Demetrius or his diplomacy. It is clear from the context that the ἐπαγγελίας can only be those promises mentioned in v.6. The phrase also connects to the rest of v.15 in that it contains Jonathan's name, which is the antecedent of all the following pronouns. The phrase also notably mentions Alexander as the subject the only time in vv.15-17, which is important because he is the subject and speaker in these verses. When considering these factors it becomes difficult to surmise that the phrase is secondary.

This set of facts, must be balanced against the one overarching problem with the phrase: it has very little connection in terms of content to the following verses, most importantly to the speech (vv.18-20). Nowhere in vv.15b-20 does the fact of Demetrius' promises become an issue. At 15b the narrator tells only of Alexander's knowledge of Jonathan's bravery, battles and troubles. In vv.16-17 Alexander decides to make him an ally and writes a letter to Jonathan to form an allegiance with him. Remarkable is his comment in v.16, “We will not find another such man” (Μὴ εὐρήσομεν ἄνδρα τοιοῦτον ἕνα). This statement on the quality of Jonathan is likely a reaction to his bravery and his wars more than to his knowledge of Demetrius' diplomacy. Further, in v.19, part of Alexander's offer to Jonathan, he explicitly states that "we have heard about you that you are a powerful and strong man" as the reason for his worthiness to be an ally. In the offer he mentions nothing of Demetrius' promises either negatively or positively. Striking also is that Alexander's counteroffer has no similar offer to Demetrius' three promises, but instead holds out titles for Jonathan.

It is thus possible that v.15a is inserted into the text to tie it in with the insertion of vv.3-9 and to portray Alexander's offer as secondary to Demetrius'. In this case the mention of the ἐπαγγελίας of Demetrius would be easily explicable. The lack of the name of Alexander in 15b-17 would be answered by simply shifting the current name from 15a to 15b: καὶ διηγῆσαντο Ἀλέξανδρος ὁ βασιλεὺς. Jonathan's name would continue to be absent but the context would be clear both because of the inclusion of the diplomatic treaty following in v.18 and because of those verses preceding v.15b, to which

we will return later. In this reading the inconsistency between 3-9, 15 and 22-24, 46-47 begins to be clarified, and at the same time a more consistent reading of Alexander's offer is achieved.

There are however further obstacles to reading vv.3-9, 15 as secondary. In v.21, which reports on Jonathan's actions after receiving Alexander's diplomatic offer, there is again a degree of inconsistency. Jonathan's first action is clear and understandable, "Jonathan put on the sacred vestments" (καὶ ἐνδύσατο Ἰωναθαν τὴν ἁγίαν στολὴν). Jonathan appears to accept Alexander's offer of the high priesthood by donning the high priestly robes. This action is even further marked by an exact dating of Sukkoth in the seventh month of the one hundred sixtieth year of the Seleucid reign. However, Jonathan's further actions seem to follow the provisions of Demetrius. The narrator says that Jonathan gathered an army and equipped them with many arms (συνήγαγεν δυνάμεις καὶ κατεσκεύασεν ὄπλα πολλά). These are finite forms of the exact same verbs Demetrius uses in his letter to Jonathan in v.6. Despite this close similarity in vocabulary, Jonathan's deeds likely stem from his newly accepted offices of high priest and friend of the king. Since he is the officially recognized ruler of Judea, he receives these privileges.¹⁷⁷ Indeed this may be confirmed by Demetrius' reaction in v.22,¹⁷⁸ discussed above.

The letter of Demetrius itself also could stand as evidence for the originality of vv.3-9, 15. In the opening line of the letter Demetrius states that he is delighted with the Judeans because, "you have kept the agreement with us and remembered our friendship and not sided with our enemies" (συνετηρήσατε τὰς πρὸς ἡμᾶς συνθήκας καὶ ἐνεμείνατε τῇ φιλίᾳ ἡμῶν καὶ οὐ προσεχωρήσατε τοῖς ἐχθροῖς ἡμῶν). It is clear that Demetrius is here referring to an earlier agreement he has made with the Judeans that somehow allied them to him. The rest of the letter with its sweeping concessions is the reward for continuing the current state of (perceived) fidelity. Within the context the

¹⁷⁷ J. Sievers, *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters, From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1993), 93-96.

¹⁷⁸ Contra F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 184 who sees surprise in the tone of Demetrius' reaction, suggesting he has sent a letter beforehand, though he notes that the verse is significant because it does not mention this explicitly.

only agreement to which Demetrius could refer is that mentioned in vv.3-6. No previous friendship or alliance was reached with the Judeans by Demetrius. At 9:70 it is an agreement only with Bacchides, a local leader, and Jonathan that takes place. The initial encounter between Demetrius and Judeans, reported at 7:5-7 cannot really be considered any agreement of friendship, nor is any allegiance required of the Judeans. So, it is clear that the treaty mentioned in vv.3-6 is the one intended in the context.

However, it is evident that the support offered by the opening line of this letter is not a solid foundation upon which to build the case for the originality of vv.3-9, 15. The reason can be easily seen even in the verse transcribed above. Demetrius lauds the Judeans for their continued loyalty and friendship, which is manifestly opposed to the previous report wherein Jonathan has accepted the treaty of Alexander and raised an army for him. This opens up the question of the letter's authenticity. Sievers hypothesizes this was mere diplomacy or hyperbole on the part of Demetrius to try to win over supporters to himself,¹⁷⁹ however he also admits the possibility, with others, that the letter is a forgery.¹⁸⁰ A third possibility noted by Martola et al.,¹⁸¹ is that the letter is authentic, but misplaced in the text because it belongs to a later time. Though scholarship is divided on the issue of its originality/forgery/insertion, the letter clearly has marked problems dealing with its context even beyond the first lines. In verses 32 and 38 a high priest is mentioned by Demetrius, though he has neither named a new high priest since the death of Alcimus (9:56) nor accepted Jonathan as high priest within the text¹⁸². The letter also offers Ptolemais, which according to v.1 he does not hold. With all these questionable elements it is unlikely the letter is original to the context.

¹⁷⁹ J. Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 94.

¹⁸⁰ Ibid, 94; similarly F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 184.

¹⁸¹ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 254. He specifically notes that its connection to the surrounding context is weak.

¹⁸² W. Dommershausen, *1 Makkabäer 2 Makkabäer* (Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1985), 72 notes the problem with the high priesthood, and mentions that Demetrius is passing over Jonathan in his letter, but fails to comment on this inconsistency. F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 187 and S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), 171-173, similarly make no further comment after this recognition. J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 405 makes note of the same bypassing of Jonathan's authority, and in keeping with his belief in the authenticity of the letter sees no reason to view Jonathan as the holder of that office, though the text clearly has no other high priest.

It is highly unlikely, too, that the letter is a forgery, because one would expect a forgery to better fit its context and be more internally consistent. More likely is that the letter is authentic but imported and perhaps embellished from a different context at a later stage in the composition of 1Maccabees, perhaps in place of a shorter letter or a summary in the same location.

We have seen that there are some specific contextual pieces of evidence to suggest that 10:3-9, 15 are secondary compositions inserted into our present text. The connections these verses have to their context are fairly weak, only agreeing in subjects. Their content is in disagreement with content outside their bounds, and the only two verses which lend some support to their authenticity (vv.21, 26) can be shown to be on the one hand following from a different strand of the text, and on the other to be also of a secondary nature.

A plausible reason for the insertion of vv.3-9, 15 can be found in the identity of the Seleucid rulers involved. Demetrius I is the father of the victorious line of pretenders to the Seleucid throne (15:1). It is his descendents who take over the Seleucid empire after Alexander and his son are defeated. To have the blessing of only a disputed and defeated ruler (11:9-11,17) without any recognition from the father of the victorious line may have been an embarrassment to the Hasmoneans, and even could have caused a problem among their people with regard to the office of High Priest. The addition of these lines provides recognition by Demetrius I as well as connecting them to another insertion in the letter of Demetrius (10:25b-45). Combined, these can build an illusion of support for Jonathan as high priest. Further, with the insertion placed between v.2 and v.10 of the final text, Demetrius' backing of Jonathan has more far reaching effects than simply freeing hostages. It also becomes the reason for his move to Jerusalem, for the restoration of the city and for the fortification of the temple.

It is in this same vein that vv.12-14 fall. They portray further effects of Demetrius' backing of Jonathan, namely the withdrawal of the foreigners from the strongholds and the flight to their own lands. I believe these lines too are inserted from a separate position. The most central reason for this is that they basically form an island in their context. Though vv.12-14 loosely connect to vv.10 and 11 and perhaps a bit more strongly to vv.3-9, there are no vocabulary or subject clues that would link them to this spot. These lines however have connections with the end of chapter 9. In particular, vv.72-73 provide a very strong context to which 10:12-14 might be tied. The mention of Bacchides (10:12) and the flight from the land (10:12-13) fit perfectly into the context of Bacchides' departure (9:72) and the statement that "the sword ceased from Israel" in 9:73. It is far more likely that the fortifications he built and the troops that he installed would be mentioned in connection with his own departure than they would in connection with Jonathan's rebuilding of Jerusalem. The fact that the troops fled from these strongholds does not logically follow from Jonathan's actions, but is perfectly natural as a result of Bacchides' pact with Jonathan. If it is the case that the original context of these lines comes from between 9:72 and 9:73 then the reason they would have been moved would be to show the deeper and extensive effects of Demetrius' recognition of Jonathan as leader of the Judeans.

The way we examined the secondary material in the first part of this chapter has been unconventional when compared to the previous chapters. This is largely because the material was so interrelated in these passages, and the arguments so linked that it only made proper sense to cover each of these additions together. There is, however a second group of possible additions which we will investigate in a more conventional way. This set is comprised of three verses: 10:14, 61, 64.

10:14

As we have observed above, 10:14 may originally come from the context of 9:72-73 and might have been moved along with vv.12-13 to its current location in order to strengthen the claims of 10:3-9. It is also possible that 10:14 was added after the move, as there is nothing tying it specifically to either context. This move alone cannot explain the differences between v.14 and its context. The initial two verses of the unit 12-14 deal

very clearly with foreigners (οἱ ἀλλογενεῖς, v.12/ καὶ ἀπῆλθεν εἰς τὴν γῆν αὐτοῦ, v.13). The text is unequivocal about this.¹⁸³ The group described as being at Beth-zur in v.14 is not made up of foreigners, but is clearly meant to be those to whom the law and commandments previously applied: Judeans. There is little logical connection here between the two except that at different times both groups are portrayed as enemies of Israel. Like other places where there is an addition of this sort, the tie between gentiles and Judeans is attempted, but the seams are visible because the change is abrupt and given without logic.

This passage also adds nothing to the surrounding story of diplomacy and the successes of Jonathan in its present context, nor does it advance the narrative in chapter 9 well. The verse stands alone in reducing the remaining enemies of Jonathan to those in Beth-zur. It is especially noteworthy that Beth-zur is never attacked in chapter 10, and when it is finally attacked (11:65-66), it is not a priority. Jonathan delegates the work to his brother Simon, while he goes to meet troops outside of Judea. Also remarkable is the fact that Beth-zur does not appear to be inhabited by apostate Judeans, as 10:14 suggests. It appears that these pieces of evidence put together a case that supports the secondary status of 10:14.

10:61, 64

Along with v.14, two connected verses toward the end of the chapter also show marks of addition. In the midst of an account of the honoring of Jonathan by Alexander, Ptolemy VI and their peers (vv.59-66),¹⁸⁴ vv.61 and 64 stand out as being of a different subject than the rest of the passage. In vv.59-60 Alexander invites Jonathan to Ptolemais, receives him, and favors him due to Jonathan's offering of gifts to Alexander and his friends. Immediately following v.61 the actual honors are described: Jonathan is stripped

¹⁸³ This is against the protestations of J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 400, which argue based on usage in Daniel and in older Israelite literature that apostate Judeans are most often called foreigners. This may or may not be so, but it has little to do with 1Macc and of course does not address the immediate contextual clues of the flight of the foreigners into their own land.

¹⁸⁴ This occasion is that of the marriage of Ptolemy's daughter and Alexander, the Hellenistic context of which is discussed in G. Hölbl, *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire* (tr. Tiina Saavedra; New York: Routledge, 2001), 192 ff.

and clothed in purple. However, v.61, instead of reporting on the honors paid by Jonathan to the Seleucid/Ptolemaic party or the honors they pay back to him, shows a group of lawless men (ἄνδρες παράνομοι) gathering together to accuse (ἐντυγχάνω) Jonathan. There is no reason provided for their accusations, nor are any specific charges provided. The group simply accuses Jonathan, and then is ignored by the king (οὐ προσέσχεν αὐτοῖς ὁ βασιλεύς). The lawless here appear from nowhere, and are dismissed just as quickly without any real contribution to the surrounding story.

One could argue that at v.63 wherein the king has his princes (τοῖς ἄρχουσιν αὐτοῦ) go out in the middle of the city and publicly order (κηρύσσω) that nobody can accuse (ἐντυγχάνω) Jonathan, might stem from v.61. Particularly evident are the ties in usage of ἐντυγχάνω in both verses (as well as v.64) and the charge to make this proclamation in the midst of more mundane honors (vv.62, 65). However, Abel has stated that this proclamation is a necessary part of the ceremony of investing Jonathan with royal offices and titles, and that the presence of the king's officers and princes with Jonathan throughout the city announces and ratifies his status.¹⁸⁵ In light of this insight, it is possible to imagine that v.63 might be the core from which these additions were created and then inserted. This would explain the similar vocabulary and the similar subject matter in vv.61,64.

This theory gathers more fuel when one sees that v.64 merely summarizes the contents of vv.61-63, before adding that all of the accusers fled (ἔφυγον). The verse brings up the accusations of the lawless men (ἄνδρες παράνομοι) in v.61, ties it to the honors paid in v.62 and to the proclamation in v.63, and then makes its only new contribution by having the subjects exit from the scene. The verse does nothing more than create a connection between v.61 and vv.62-63, that would not otherwise exist.

It is easy to see where the motivation to build a small narrative concerning the accusations of the lawless ones might have come out of the original account, particularly v.63. The proclamation lends itself to inserting a group that was in fact speaking out

¹⁸⁵ F.-M. Abel *Les Livres*, 196. He especially draws attention to the similarity to the biblical instances where heralds are used to confirm proclamations: Gen. 41:44; Ex. 36:6; Dan. 3:4; 5:29.

against Jonathan, and provides a chance to showcase the most common quality attributed to the apostates-- their role as accusers. Thus, a passage about the first official meeting of Jonathan and a gentile king, wherein he is officially installed, is enhanced into a defeat over the accusatory apostates, who no longer hold sway with the gentile kings.

Implications

The complicated composition history of this chapter has been demonstrated above. Let us examine the chart below to see how the whole chapter fits together:

1-2: Alexander Epiphanes arrives in Ptolemais and begins to reign, Demetrius hears of it and assembles an army to battle.

3-9: *Demetrius sends his first offer of peace to Jonathan, Jonathan accepts, and gets the hostages freed.*

10-11: Jonathan takes up residence in Jerusalem, restores the city and fortifies Mt. Zion

12-13 (from 9:72-73): *Foreigners leave the strongholds and go to their own lands*

14: Those who forsake the Law remain in Beth-zur

15a: *Alexander hears of Demetrius' letter*

15b-24: Alexander sends a diplomatic letter to Jonathan granting him the high priesthood, and political office. Demetrius is shocked and decides to send a similar message.

25-45 (perhaps replacing a shorter paraphrase): *Demetrius' embellished letter offers a variety of concessions to Jonathan and the Jews*

46-60: Demetrius' offer is rejected in favor of Alexander's. Alexander defeats and kills Demetrius. Alexander sets up an alliance between himself and Ptolemy VI

through a wedding between he and Cleopatra. Jonathan is invited to come to meet the kings and wins their honor.

61: The apostates come to complain to the king about Jonathan

62-3: Alexander honors Jonathan in return for his gifts, clothing him in purple, seating him among his princes, and ratifying his position of authority through a ceremony.

64: The apostates see how he is honored and flee

65-66: Alexander further honors Jonathan by promoting him to a rank higher in the peerage and makes him general and local leader.

67-89: Demetrius II comes to take his father's place, sends a general against Jonathan and his brother Simon. Simon and Jonathan outwit Demetrius' general along the coastal plains. Jonathan is honored again with a gold buckle, another promotion in the peerage, and a personal fiefdom in the city of Ekron.

Essentially there are three levels of composition in the chapter. The original layer of the work is represented by the text on the far left. The additions made in connection with Demetrius' first correspondence, and essentially with issues of Hasmonean legitimization among the victorious Seleucid line are represented by the italicized text. The third layer, which represents the three other additions, all having to do with the apostates, are represented by the underlined text.

It is probably by now apparent how the original text is affected by the additions. The plot of 1Macc 10 is originally one where Jonathan receives honors from Alexander three times. Each of these instances is preceded by the circumstances surrounding the honors. In the first cycle, Jonathan takes advantage of Demetrius' vulnerability on the throne and seizes power, moving back to Jerusalem (v.1-2, 10-11). Alexander, seeing a reliable and brave ally, gives him the honor of the high priesthood, the rank of friend of the king, and sends him a purple robe and a gold crown (vv.15b-21). In the second cycle,

Demetrius disingenuously offers promises in return for Jonathan's obedience (vv.22-24), but Jonathan rejects him because of his evil ways and stays loyal to Alexander (vv.46-47). Because of this, Alexander is able to gain the throne, and forge an alliance with Ptolemy (vv.48-59). Jonathan is thus honored again with even more titles, being clothed in purple again, and further powers (vv.59-60, 62-63, 65-66). The third cycle finally shows how Jonathan and his brother earn their honor in war, and not only in diplomacy and loyalty. They defeat Demetrius II's troops in battle and take back cities for Alexander (vv.67-86). As a result Jonathan receives his final honors from Alexander of the highest title in the peerage, a golden buckle, and land.

The original level demonstrates how Jonathan raises his honors with greater and more important deeds under Alexander. It also details the fruitful relationship between the two rulers, with each acting as a strong tool of power for each other. The secondary editions change the situation slightly by raising Demetrius' role in the start of the events, and ensuring that the reader knows that he too was a strong supporter of Jonathan, and granted him many favors. Alexander in turn is reduced to a role where he reacts to Demetrius instead of acting first. Additionally the second level increases the effect Demetrius' "original" diplomacy would have had on Jonathan's rule by making it the reason for his move back to Jerusalem and the reason for the foreigners departing from the land.

In the third level, the renegade additions, there is only a slight change in the overall plot of the chapter. At the particular instances where the additions occur, the most despicable (according to the narrator) qualities of the apostate groups are highlighted. The reader is reminded too, of their presence in the land as the major enemies of Israel. In v.14 it is their attachment to the gentiles and their abandonment of the law that is stressed, while in vv.61 and 64 it is their accusatory nature that is presented. In each case they remain as the only enemies in the land, considering the context of vv.12-13 on the one hand, and 59-66 on the other. In the end, this is the most important information to be gleaned from these additions. The apostate Judeans are the worst enemies and the hardest to remove, even when all the gentiles are supporting the Hasmoneans, they constantly reappear, and constantly cause more hassle.

Though it is difficult to find a concrete setting for the additions concerning Demetrius' letter, one should note that the theme of recognition (both for Jonathan as high priest, and for the Judeans as an internationally recognized ethnos) is central. The fact that this is accompanied by a clear lack of anti-gentile bias creates two solid links with the addition of chapter 8 that must be investigated. If the two are related, one can imagine the additions were made to strengthen Hasmonean claims to power, and Judean claims to autonomy.

It is clear that the other three additions in 1Macc 10 share a lot of the same characteristics as the additions we have seen all over the book since chapter 1. The evidence these provide will at the end be tested to see if these connections can be more concretely proven. If the connections between all these additions can be made, then there will be a wealth of evidence available to determine a setting from which these additions might stem.

II.10 1Maccabees 11

On a grand scale it is not difficult to read chapter 11 as a unity. There is a clear border at its close in the cessation of Jonathan's wars and return to Jerusalem (11:74). The start is also discernable when read from the point of view of the international setting, because the coverage focuses almost solely on Ptolemy at the beginning of chapter 11 (1-18) as opposed to Alexander throughout chapter 10. Though the overall flow of this section may be difficult to unite, there is a common thread throughout: Jonathan's use of the Seleucid situation to consolidate power in Israel.¹⁸⁶ The result of these efforts has Jonathan and Simon both in positions of power and favor in the empire.

Though it is easy to read the text consistently in most areas, there are two verses, which seem to be secondary. These occur within the section treating Jonathan's relations

¹⁸⁶ This is clear in Jonathan's lack of rebellion with Ptolemy (5-7), his gifts (23-24) and dispatch of troops (41-44) to Demetrius, and his assistance of Trypho and Antiochus in ridding Palestine of Demetrius' allies (54-74). Each time he gains promised favor for himself and a chance at independence for Judea.

with Demetrius II (19-53).¹⁸⁷ While the vast majority of the narrative treats events in the wider Seleucid Empire and details how Jonathan makes allegiances with the pretenders to the throne, vv.21, 25 are unique in their concern with the Judean apostates. Nowhere else are these mentioned within the chapter, and their familiar role as accusers is puzzling within the context. As we have previously seen,¹⁸⁸ the apostates are often part of verses that are easily separated from their context. This passage is hardly different.

The pericope of which these verses are a part stretches from v.19¹⁸⁹ to v.37. The passage treats the rise of Demetrius and Jonathan's response to it. After Demetrius' reign is announced by the narrator (v.19), Jonathan is reported to have attacked the citadel in Jerusalem (v.20). As is their character in the narrative, the apostates then are said to "report to him that Jonathan was besieging the akra (ἀπήγγειλαν αὐτῷ ὅτι Ἰωναθαν περικάθηται τὴν ἄκραν). Verse 22 then continues with a description of Demetrius' anger, his move toward Ptolemais, and his summons of Jonathan. Once he receives Demetrius' message Jonathan orders his troops to continue besieging the akra, then goes to Ptolemais with some elders and priests (v.23). Verse 24 tells that he won the king's favor there by taking silver and gold and numerous articles of clothing. This is followed by v.25, which seemingly out of nowhere reports that the apostates made complaints against Jonathan, and subsequently in v.26 the description reverts back to the king's willing acceptance of Jonathan.

11:21, 25

Verses 21 and 25 stand out among these, however perhaps more clearly v.25 than v.21. There is very little argument to be made for the originality of v.25 from the

¹⁸⁷ This division goes against most commentators, most notably N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 123 who sees 11:19 as the close of the section dealing with Seleucid problems. However, he neglects to explain how the announcement of a new reign, in all other places marking a new section, does not signify a beginning in v.19. My division puts the announcement and dating formula as the beginning of Demetrius' section and closes Ptolemy's section with the fallout from his death.

¹⁸⁸ See the research on 1Macc chapters 1, 2, 3, 6, 7, 9, and 10 above.

¹⁸⁹ See note 412.

standpoint of the narrative or the text. The existence of the renegades and their role as complainers contribute nothing to the context, and the thread is not continued anywhere else. When this is coupled with the concentration of the surrounding verses on the person of the king, it is even harder to understand how this verse fits into the text. The answer might lie in the similarity of this scene with 10:61.¹⁹⁰ In both of the scenes Jonathan visits a foreign ruler at Ptolemais bringing gifts. Accusers from the lawless people of Israel rise up and attempt to get the king to turn on Jonathan; they are promptly ignored. Jonathan is then given more favors from the king. This relationship suggests that the trend in the previous chapter toward inserting uprising whenever Jonathan gains favor might be continued in this chapter, but to a lesser extent.

There is a more valid argument for the originality of v.21. The report made by the apostates is the only one in the text. The king would otherwise not have been told of Jonathan's attack on the citadel anywhere in the narrative. This is problematic reasoning however, because on several occasions within 1Macc the king and other gentiles become aware of news in Judea without any report provided (3:27; 5:1; 9:1, 32, 43; 10:88). The evidence suggests it is not necessary for the king to be informed of the activity within Judea for him to have a reaction to it. By attacking the akra, Jonathan could incur the wrath of Demetrius. Verse 20 could run directly into v.22 and make good sense in this context.

However, a second argument, which suggests the originality of v.21 is that it is the only mention of the king's identity within the context. Verse 22 contains only third person singular forms for all finite verbs, and has one pronoun, but no announced antecedent to which all of these refer. The provision of the king in v.21 makes a perfect antecedent. Without this verse the last named individual is Jonathan in v.20, though the king is clearly the subject. However, this might be solved by expanding the context slightly. If one reads v.19 along with vv.20 and 21, there is no real problem. Then the story would be reported as: Demetrius became king in the one hundred sixty-seventh

¹⁹⁰ As noted by N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 198 in agreement with F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 207 who sees this close similarity as a reason for including these verses in the compositional unity of 1Maccabees. This however ignores the possibility that something else might have occurred here at an earlier stage of composition.

year. In those days Jonathan assembled the Judeans to attack the citadel in Jerusalem, and he made many engines of war against it. Hearing this he (Demetrius-- referring back to vs.19) became angry. Though this reading is not entirely ideal, it is certainly plausible.

Thus, when one takes all the evidence into account, the scarcity, and lack of connectedness to the context of the apostates casts a doubt on the originality of these verses. When examined further, their interruption of the stream of the passages also call them into question. Any evidence that points to a primary nature within the story can easily be dismissed from evidence within 1Macc as well.

What these passages add is not at all significant to the chapter and only slightly significant to 1Macc as a whole. They bring the apostates into a position where they rise in prominence as enemies of Israel. They also reinforce the primary characteristic of this group as being accusatory. This goes along with the similar descriptions found elsewhere in 1Macc, which place the lawless as the greatest enemies and inhibitors of Judean independence.

II.11 1Macc 12

The difficulties in reading chapter 12 as a single unified composition do not arise immediately from reading the chapter from its start. Rather, it is only upon reading the whole of the chapter and looking at its continuity with both chapter 11 and chapter 13, that the reader encounters problems. The last part of chapter 11 (vv.63-74) treats the attack of Demetrius' troops on Jonathan because of his alliance with Trypho and Antiochus VI, as well as Jonathan's defense and ultimate victory. The setting for these events is the far northern reaches of Galilee, but it finishes with Jonathan's return to Jerusalem. At 12:1-23 the scene changes to the international arena, specifically the Roman senate and other locales, most notably, Sparta. The passage consists of a narrative frame (12:1-4) and then two successive diplomatic statements of alliance between the Judeans and Spartans (12:3-18, 19-23).

At 12:24-34, after the passage describing the alliance, the scene again returns to Jerusalem, and the subject matter again to Jonathan's troubles with Demetrius' troops, whom he goes off to fight in the far north. Jonathan then returns to Jerusalem and

strengthens the city (12:35-38) before the conflict with Trypho that ultimately leads to Jonathan's demise is narrated (12:39-53). The beginning of chapter 13 continues along this same course, reporting Simon's rise and efforts to save his brother from Trypho (13:1-19).

12:1-23

In this summary of the events in and around chapter 12, it is obvious that 12:1-23 seems to be out of place. Not only is it the only passage that does not treat the defense of the land and Hasmonean power against the Seleucids, but it also begins a thread that is totally unrelated to any other passage in the surrounding context. Further, the content of the letter does not fit the situation in which Jonathan finds himself. 12:13-15 seems to imply that the trouble is all behind Jonathan, and that there is no king or war left to disturb him. However, Demetrius II, who has just sent some commanders to attack Jonathan, is still around, and the Seleucids still have a presence in the citadel in Jerusalem. The small victory over the Seleucid troops at Hazor can hardly be the humbling defeat of the gentiles Jonathan refers to in his letter.

Of course we are not the first to find problems with this passage. From the beginning of modern biblical scholarship's treatment of 1Maccabees, questions have arisen concerning 12:1-23. Though not all scholars have raised questions as to the originality of the passage in the text, it is clear that all have issues with the way in which it functions and fits in its current context. Grimm, in his commentary, laid out three main issues/questions concerning the passage:¹⁹¹ the perceived kinship between the Judeans and Spartans, the truth behind each of the alliances between the Judeans and Spartans in these verses, and the authenticity of the diplomatic letters. The two former questions Grimm answers in the positive,¹⁹² but the latter, Grimm answers in the negative.¹⁹³

¹⁹¹ C. Grimm, *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1853), 187.

¹⁹² *Ibid.*, 188-189. Grimm states that there appears to be sufficient evidence that could have led to the two nations finding historical basis for their kinship. He follows this up with a decent amount of support for the truthfulness of the alliance between Sparta and the Judeans at this time.

¹⁹³ *Ibid.*, 190. He points to certain marks, particularly in history that indicate the letter is a fabrication of the author.

Though he does not see the letter as genuine, Grimm views it as a composition of the author, and not a later insertion.

Grimm's points are important because the issues he raises with 12:1-23 are followed to a greater or lesser extent by a number of scholars after him. Keil too, takes up the question of authenticity without taking the further step of directly questioning the passage's originality in its context.¹⁹⁴ However, Keil does comment that the alliance communicated in 12:1-23 like that in chapter 8 of 1Macc is merely an assurance of friendship into the future, and not a treaty meant to be followed.¹⁹⁵ The mere fact that Keil raises this issue gives rise to a new strain in questioning the originality of the passage. It is clear that in this instance Keil recognizes that the alliance has no bearing on its context or on the war waged between the Judeans and Seleucids after the alliance is made. This leads him to come up with the explanation that it is merely a statement of friendship and not a treaty.

By the time Abel, Tedesche & Zeitlin, and Dancy make their commentaries on 1Maccabees, the originality of the passage has become a major question. For instance, Abel notes that 12:1-23 has no effect on its context,¹⁹⁶ but proceeds no further along these lines. Tedesche and Zeitlin see the passage as original,¹⁹⁷ though they elsewhere argue for additions to the text. However, they do note that 12:1-23 interrupts the surrounding story.¹⁹⁸

Dancy remarks upon the strange character of the treaty and the fact that it does no positive good.¹⁹⁹ Moreover, Dancy suggests that this passage (along with chapter 8) could be removed from the text, not only with no negative effect, but actually with a

¹⁹⁴ C. Keil, *Commentar über die Bücher der Makkabäer* (Leipzig: Dörffling und Francke, 1875), 204.

¹⁹⁵ *Ibid.*, 204.

¹⁹⁶ F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949), 220.

¹⁹⁷ S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper and Brothers, 1950), 45-46.

¹⁹⁸ *Ibid.*, 204. Specifically they state that 12:24 picks up the thread that was left off at 11:74, which is interrupted by the embassy to Sparta and Rome.

¹⁹⁹ J. Dancy, *A Commentary on 1 Maccabees* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), 163.

beneficial result.²⁰⁰ However, Dancy goes on to attribute the position of this passage to the work of an editor who placed this section in the unfinished work of 1Maccabees after the death of its author.²⁰¹ The logic Dancy is using here does not seem to connect. The first two comments suggest that it is more than simply placement, but the inclusion of the passage at all that causes a problem in 1Macc, but Dancy's solution that the passages are written by the original author and misplaced by a later editor does nothing to address this problem. The passage would still have no connection to its context no matter where it was placed, even according to Dancy himself.²⁰² The reluctance of Dancy to move in the direction of the logical conclusion of his findings seems to be seen in his statement concerning previous scholarship on 1Maccabees in general:

From these various sources, oral and written, Jewish and Gentile, the author took his material and made it into his own. Stylistically and dramatically the book is a unity, and on those grounds alone it is no longer credible that the work as we have it contains considerable later interpolations, neither documents, as Oesterley thought, nor the whole of the last three and a half chapters, as Destinon sought to prove by Josephus' neglect of them.²⁰³

It is clear Dancy wishes to maintain the conclusions of Ettleson,²⁰⁴ to whose work he is referring when mentioning the unity of style and drama in 1Maccabees. The problem is that Ettleson's findings are highly flawed.²⁰⁵ Dancy's insistence on not transgressing them is the only reason one could see for him not hypothesizing a later addition apart from the author, given all his other statements related to 12:1-23. Dancy is only guilty of maintaining the majority opinion of his time, but makes important strides toward realizing the secondary nature of 12:1-23.

²⁰⁰ Ibid., 6.

²⁰¹ Ibid., 164.

²⁰² Ibid., 6. Dancy states: "Chapter 8; 12.1-23; 14.16-24 and 15.15-24 can all be removed from their context not only with no harm but with positive advantage; the only reference in the rest of 1M to all that they contain is the verse 14.40, and that is quite intelligible without them".

²⁰³ Ibid., 6.

²⁰⁴ H. Ettleson, "The Integrity of 1Maccabees" *Transaction of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 27 (1925) 249-384.

²⁰⁵ For a full critique of Ettleson see D. Williams, *The Structure of 1Maccabees* (CBQMS 31; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999) 114-117.

Goldstein follows Dancy in noticing that “Like the story of the embassy to Rome, no one would have missed vs. 1-23 had they been omitted.”²⁰⁶ However, he too does not proceed to the logical conclusion of their secondary nature, rather postulating that they are placed due to the author’s strict adherence to the order of historical events.²⁰⁷ Again, the problem of 12:1-23 being totally non-essential to the story is not explained by Goldstein’s theory, it is only heightened. Why would the historian include an episode in his history that has no bearing on the events within it, if it is the same historian?

Though Dancy and Goldstein raise the issues with 12:1-23 that lead toward a hypothesis of addition, it is not until Martola that the theory gains its greatest support since the counter-argument of Ettelson, mentioned above. Martola, in his study on the composition of 1Maccabees, finds that 12:24-28, 29-30, 31-32, 33-34, 35-38 are a continuation of 11:60 [63]-74.²⁰⁸ Thus, he, like Abel, Tedesche and Zeitlin and Dancy, notices that 12:1-23 interrupts an otherwise continuous account. Where Martola differs is that he is uninhibited by the conventional wisdom about the unity of 1Maccabees, which has Ettelson as its source. Martola continues to pursue the questions that arise from the revelation that 11:74 is continued by 12:24. He states:

Between the two accounts of Jonathan’s campaigns [...] there is a segment (12, 1-23) which has no points of contact with the surrounding basic narrative. It concerns the account of Jonathan’s mission to Rome and the documents presented 12, 5-23. Here again it is a question of an ‘island’.^{209, 210}

Martola takes the first clue toward the secondary nature of 12:1-23 and joins it with this second piece of evidence and concludes already that 12:1-23 is a questionable passage. Once he has made this decision based on the solid ground of the intrusive nature of 12:1-

²⁰⁶ J. Goldstein, *1Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976), 445.

²⁰⁷ *Ibid.*, 445.

²⁰⁸ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 172.

²⁰⁹ *Ibid.*, 231, states “The passages which are called ‘islands’ are so called because they occupy an isolated position since they exhibit no, or very few, literary relations with their contexts”.

²¹⁰ *Ibid.*, 172-173.

23 and its lack of connection to its context, Martola adds that the content of the passage is marginal to the course of events.²¹¹ He stresses this point even further when he shows that the passage exerts no influence whatsoever on the main story of conflict between Judah and the Seleucid empire.²¹² This all leads in the end to Martola's decision that the passage is part of a series of later additions,²¹³ and an expansion which does not fit the inner logic of the main story.²¹⁴ Martola's conclusion is profound in that it is based firmly in form criticism, and is part of a full investigation into the composition of 1Maccabees. What he questions in the passage is supported by many before him, but only Martola's responses provide a reasonable solution.

Martola has not had the last word on the nature of 12:1-23. D.S. Williams, in his work on the structure of 1Maccabees, makes his own observations. Though Williams uses rhetorical criticism to outline the book, he is in many ways a throwback to those who wrote concerning the passage before Martola. Williams notes that 12:1-23 is a distinct unit in its context, marked off by a subject change at its start and a further change after its final verse.²¹⁵ He further marks that the passage is enclosed by two invasions by officers of Demetrius II; he states also that the accounts of these invasions share similar vocabulary.²¹⁶ These two remarks suggest that Williams sees the connection between 11:60-74 and 12:24 ff. as pointed out by Martola, and the fact that 12:1-23 is an interruption of that continuity. However, Williams continues from these notices in an unexpected direction: He sees the mission to Rome and Sparta (12:1-23) as an integral part of the structure of his "section two" (6:18-14:15).²¹⁷ Williams uses the embassy as an important part of the chiasm he suggests governs the section. 12:1-23 is specifically the counter-point to chapter 8 and the mission to Rome there, which he identifies as 2B' and 2B respectively.

²¹¹ Ibid., 200.

²¹² Ibid., 234.

²¹³ Ibid., 268.

²¹⁴ Ibid., 276.

²¹⁵ D. Williams, *Structure*, 32.

²¹⁶ Ibid., 33.

²¹⁷ Ibid., 56, 59, 66, 69.

Given Williams' previous observations on the passage, it is surprising that he would conclude the passage is integral. The reason behind this lies in his further statements. Williams indeed discerns that 12:1-23 interrupts a sequence of military campaigns, but sees this as *support* for his perceived structure, arguing that when passages seem out of place there is generally intentional structuring behind it.²¹⁸ While the statement has a degree of truth to it, the interruption hardly argues for the originality of the passage; secondary passages can be used to create structure as well. In order to further support his structure, Williams is successful in drawing connections between the vocabulary of chapter 8 and that of 12:1-23.²¹⁹ This again shows good support for the placement of these passages as counterpoints in the chiasmic structure, but is useless as an argument for the originality of the passage if one also considers chapter 8 to be additional, as Martola²²⁰ and I²²¹ hold. Moreover, as Williams makes many of the same observations concerning chapter 8,²²² he is responsible for more clearly showing why both these passages could not be additional, and inserted together into a structure that already exists. Especially noteworthy in this is Williams' final argument where he contrasts his findings with those of Martola and simply restates that chapter 8 and 12:1-23 have an important structural role for him, though Martola finds them to be additional.²²³

Williams never actually shows how these passages play an important structural role because he simply shows their role in the chiasmic structure without dealing with their content or any connections to passages outside of 8:1-32 and 12:1-23. Using his arguments we could simply pull out these two passages, still have a chiasmic structure in section two, and then have two separate passages dealing with embassies to Romans and Spartans that are related to each other, and only later successfully inserted into the structure. This point is furthered by Williams' own argument that his sections one (1:1-6:17) and two (6:18-14:15) emphasize the work of liberation of the temple and citadel

²¹⁸ Ibid., 87 and 87 n. 23.

²¹⁹ Ibid., 88-89.

²²⁰ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 228-229.

²²¹ See argument and further citations ad loc.

²²² E.g., D. Williams, *Structure*, 32.

²²³ Ibid., 132.

respectively.²²⁴ However, neither chapter 8 nor 12:1-23 mention anything about either of these liberations, and Williams nowhere uses them as support for this being the primary material of the story. Likewise, the other primary themes of sections one and two according to Williams: pro-Hasmonean advocacy, and double causality (victories as the result of the efforts of God and Man together), are also absent from chapter 8 and 12:1-23. In fact, the content of the two chapters seems to be very ambiguous as to the role of double causality because the Judeans seek alliances with powerful nations against their enemies, instead of relying totally on their god. 12:9 and 12:15 make some attempt at explaining the role of double causality, but it hardly erases the acts of the rest of these passages.

Though Williams attempts to again read 12:1-23 as integral to 1Maccabees, in spite of all the clues that would suggest it is a secondary insertion, he, like many before him, fails to answer the important questions about how it fits into the story and what function it serves. Williams, unlike Abel and Goldstein, is not inhibited by the findings of Ettelson, but his own imagination of the structure gets in the way of seeing the evidence before his eyes. It is imperative to follow the argument of Martola here, which matches the initial instincts of most scholars on the passage. 12:1-23 has numerous problems: lack of connections with its context, no effect on the outcome of the history, and interruption of the narrative running through the immediate context. There have also been no alternative solutions to Martola's, which answer those problems. Until such explanations arise, one must see 12:1-23 as secondary.

Implications

It is very difficult to discern the effect such an addition has on a book when one realizes that the plot is not advanced in any way by its inclusion. Because the passage makes no mention of Demetrius or Antiochus and Trypho, the most prominent enemies in the context, the passage's insertion cannot be meant to state anything about them. This is underlined by the fact that enemies are only brought up once in the letters, and are neither explicitly named, nor are they any longer a problem. It is also notable that the character

²²⁴ *Ibid.*, 131.

of Jonathan does not seem to be a major concern in this passage either. In both of these letters, including their narrative introduction, Jonathan is mentioned only four times.

What does appear to be important in the letters is the theme of allegiance and recognition. The Judeans seek to renew their alliance with the Romans (12:1). The speech of the Judean ambassadors, in which they specifically declare their intentions to confirm their friendship and alliance to the Roman senate, is then reproduced (12:4). The Romans then grant them letters to “the those in every place” (καὶ ἔδωκαν ἐπιστολὰς αὐτοῖς πρὸς αὐτοὺς κατὰ τόπον), an act that *de facto* establishes international recognition for the Judeans (cf. 1Macc 8:1-17). The theme is later picked up within the letter through the typical greeting in v.5, through the repeated reference to their brotherhood in v.7, in the recollection of former allegiance and friendship in v.8, and in the request for renewed alliance in v.10. The same relationship with the Spartans is mentioned again in v.11, v.14, and v.17, while the relationship with Rome is again brought up in v.16. The constant concern for familial bonds and ties of friendship with the Spartans and Romans ensures that this is the main reason for the inclusion of the passage.

It is less clear why this bond was important, considering the lack of support the Romans and Spartans continue to give to the Judeans in the narrative. If this passage can be related to chapter 8, then it is perhaps for the same reason of recognition of the Judeans and the Hasmoneans in positions of power. At least superficially, a number of links appear in theme, form, characters, and content of the material. As we stated in chapter 8 these connections shall be investigated more deeply at a later point to come to a conclusion on whether these passages are related and were added together.

II.12 *IMacc 13*

Chapter 13 of *IMaccabees*, which according to some scholars,²²⁵ is the last full chapter of the original work, appears to be relatively unified. It describes the rise of the last brother, Simon, to take command of the Judeans against their current Seleucid opponent, Trypho (13:1-11). The narrative follows the thread of maneuvering between Trypho and Simon up through 13:24. First Trypho holds Jonathan hostage, so Simon must pay him ransom (13:12-19). Then Trypho attempts to invade the country as Simon makes things difficult for him (13:20-22). This standoff ends with Trypho's execution and burial of Jonathan, before his return to Syria (13:23-24). The same thread is picked up with Trypho's murder of Antiochus VI and seizure of the Seleucid crown, which causes more problems for Israel (13:31-32). In the face of this Simon takes a number of measures to ensure the safety of his people, including building fortresses, storing food for sieges and concluding a peace with Trypho's rival, Demetrius II (13:33-40). Following from this last action, Simon takes the two remaining gentile citadels in his country and expels their inhabitants, replacing them with Judeans (13:43-51). The result is the accomplishment of all Hasmonean goals and the settlement of Simon in one former citadel, and of his son John in the other (13:52-53); this last pair of acts ends the chapter.

In the summary above I have left out two passages that fall outside of the narrative thread described above: 13:25-30 and 13:41-42. Though the fact that the verses do not continue the same narrative thread is not reason enough to count them as secondary, it does raise questions as to how they do fit into the material both in their immediate context and in the scope of the broader story. The subject matter of 13:25-30 is the erection of a tomb by Simon for his immediate family. 13:41-42 presents what

²²⁵ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984) and most recently D. Williams, *The Structure of IMaccabees* (CBQMS 31; Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999) see the original story ending at 14:15. J. Destinon, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der Jüid. Arch. Buch XII-XVII= Jüid. Krieg Buch I* (Keil : Lipsius and Tischer, 1882) agrees. However S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950) differs in ending the book at chapter 13. Of course there are many other scholars who see the work as a unity.

amounts to the Judean declaration of independence from the Seleucids. The specifics of each of these passages will be discussed separately below.

13:25-30

This section of chapter 13 describes how Simon first attained the bones of his brother Jonathan, and then organized official mourning among the people of Israel after he buried them in the Hasmonean ancestral home, Modein (13:25-26). The passage then goes on to report that Simon built a splendid funerary monument over the family graves of all his brothers and his parents (13:27-29). Included in this narrative is a thorough depiction of the overall monument: seven pyramids (one for each of his four brothers and his father and mother and the last for Simon presumably) with polished stone surrounded by great victory columns, which were mounted with suits of armor and either carvings of ships or prows of ships, symbolizing military might on land and sea. The passage ends with a remark that this monument exists “to this day” (οὗτος ὁ τάφος ὃν ἐποίησεν ἐν Μωδεῖν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης) -an observation by the author breaking frame from the narrative (13:30).

There are several notable elements to this section. First, when read in the context of chapter 13, Jonathan is buried twice. Originally he is buried by Trypho, after he is killed (13:23), then he is buried by Simon at Modein (13:25). Though v.25 avoids contradiction by stating that Simon took the bones of his brother and buried them, thus implying that some time passed, the dual burial is at least suspicious, and raises the point that 13:23 would be intelligible without 13:25 ff. A second prominent aspect of 13:25-30 is that 13:26 marks the second time Jonathan is mourned; the first mourning comes at 12:52. This too does not have to be a contradiction, but could be. Jonathan was presumed dead in the earlier instance, and so mourned, but in the second instance he was long dead, and mourned again. If there were to be a public mourning of the type described after Jonathan’s actual death one would imagine that it would happen before Simon’s reburial, but that occasion might also have called for a public mourning. Despite the explanation that the text may provide, it is somewhat odd that the passage, which does not fit the narrative thread, also contains a second burial and a second mourning for Jonathan.

A third interesting facet relating to the passage is that v.24 appears to be the immediate precursor to v.31. The content of each passage makes this clear. Verses 20-24 deal directly with Trypho and his deceit in trying to attack Judea and then killing the innocent Jonathan. Trypho again deceives in verse 31 ff. by killing the young king Antiochus VI, taking the throne of Asia, and bringing great ruin upon the land. The similarities are intensified when one realizes that in both the passages Simon takes extraordinary measures to counter Trypho's efforts. So, not only are the same set of characters mentioned, but their acts are the same, and they logically follow sequentially from each other. However, when one looks at vv.25-30 only Simon and Jonathan are mentioned, and the time period is implicitly much later, as Simon buries his brother's bones. Further, the only connection between the surrounding passages, specifically v.23, and vv.25-30 is the death and burial of Jonathan, which is only ancillary to 13:25-30, and which does not make chapter 13 any more intelligible. In addition, the tomb Simon erects is never again mentioned in the text, and no part of the thread 13:25-30 begins is picked up later in the story.

Despite the several discrepancies found in 13:25-30, scholars have been slow to even consider it noteworthy, let alone secondary. C.F.W. Grimm is not concerned at all with the literary merits of the passage, but more on aspects of construction and historical accuracy of the account.²²⁶ Keil²²⁷ and Abel,²²⁸ likewise spend most of their time on historical matters, but both note, following the lead of Grimm, that Israel's mourning for Jonathan is quite like their mourning for Mattathias (2:70) and Judas (9:19-20). Though surely this is not meant as an argument of originality, it could stand as an impediment for viewing this passage as secondary. However, we must first realize that if 13:25-30 is secondary, it is added to 1Maccabees with full knowledge of the book and its style. It is unlikely that the report would be wildly different coming from diverse authors, especially relating to the report of a death. Secondly, there are differences between each of these accounts. Though they all contain burials in Modein and mourning for the fallen Hasmonean, only Jonathan is specified as being buried in the *city* (πόλει) of his

²²⁶ C. Grimm, *Das erste Buch des Maccabäer* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1853), 197-200.

²²⁷ C. Keil, *Commentar über die Bücher der Makkabäer* (Leipzig : Dörffling, 1875), 215.

²²⁸ F.-M. Abel *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949), 239-241.

ancestors; Judas and Mattathias are buried in the tomb (τάφω) of their ancestors. Further, though all Israel mourns each with great lamentation (καὶ ἐκόψαντο αὐτὸν πᾶς Ἰσραηλ κοπετὸν μέγαν) only Judas and Jonathan are mourned for many days (καὶ ἐπένθουν [πένθησαν αὐτὸν] ἡμέρας πολλάς), and this mourning is communicated differently. Therefore, the reports of burial and mourning hardly reveal a universal stylistic trend of the author.

J.C. Dancy is the first scholar to argue for anything meaningful in the composition of these lines. He suggests that v.30 is the work of a later hand, such as a transcriber or translator.²²⁹ His reasoning for this is never fully spelled out, but it appears to be based upon the suggestion of a much later date the verse carries. Dancy otherwise sees 1Macc as having been finished in the lifetime of John Hyrcanus (d.104 BCE),²³⁰ so he has to move this verse back. Though his logic for the additional nature of the verse is flawed, it does point out a rather interesting fact: v.30 does suggest a very late date. However, it is not at all unlike the rest of vv.25-29 (especially vv.27-29), which have the tone of a travelogue, where a visitor is remarking on a great monument and its origins. Therefore, Dancy's observation may add another reason to consider 13:25-30 as additional.

Though Dancy was the first to take notice of the oddness of 13:30, we have seen that he really does not say much about the previous lines in the questionable passage. Nils Martola, in his study of 1Maccabees, is a trailblazer in this regard. He asks really meaningful questions of 13:25-30 and its relationship to its context.²³¹ Martola notices that in terms of context, v.24 and v.31 ff. are much closer together than either is to vv.25-30.²³² He also notes that the internal chronology of the story suggests that 13:25-30 is later than v.31.²³³ Martola provides no solutions for these issues, however. Instead he

²²⁹ J. Dancy, *A Commentary on 1 Maccabees* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), 8, 174.

²³⁰ *Ibid.*, 8. It should be pointed out that Dancy sees the last three chapters as unfinished and the placement of the Roman and Spartan treaties (discussed above) as the work of a later compiler as well.

²³¹ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 177.

²³² *Ibid.*, 177.

²³³ *Ibid.*, 177. Martola sees, as I pointed out in my own observations above, that for Simon to take the bones of Jonathan, a significant amount of time would have passed between his death and reburial.

says that he finds it difficult to read v.31 as a continuation of v.24 literarily because of the reintroduction of the subject (Trypho), and the use of the adversative particle $\delta\epsilon$.²³⁴

Though the reintroduction of the subject is odd in 1Macc,²³⁵ the fact that at 13:33 and 13:34 a subject is reintroduced in sequence, makes the possibility of Trypho's reintroduction much more acceptable. The close proximity could be coincidence or could reflect the author's or translator's choice in this section of 1Macc. With regard to the $\delta\epsilon$ in v.31, I must confess I fail to see the reasoning behind Martola's insistence that this would be evidence against the verse following on v.24. No matter what the particular use of the particle here, it would clearly not be an impediment to reading the two passages together. If $\delta\epsilon$ is indeed being used adversatively, it would state that "Trypho turned and departed to his own land (v.24), but he brought treachery on Antiochus, the young king, and killed him (13.31)." This sense would show that Trypho's departure was not the end of his evils, and would agree with the assessment of Trypho in 13:34 where he is accused of only plundering. Martola's literary arguments for not reading the verses as a continuation of one another do not hold true.

It seems that even Martola recognizes the problems with his own objections, when concluding his analysis of this passage. He states:

But, in relation to the main course of events the account of 13, 25-30 undoubtedly stands out as a sort of parenthesis, whose function is partly to point to the piety of Simon, partly to explain the existence of the memorial, known to the intended contemporaneous reader.²³⁶

The statement shows that Martola does not abandon the elements in the passage that he first notices: its lack of connections to its context, the continuation of v.24 and v.31 in terms of content, and the chronological difficulties posed by the passage in its current place. Although it is clear he does want to tie it to the main story, based upon his misgivings with reading 13:31 as a literary continuation of 13:24, the comment above comes very close to admitting that the passage plays no role in the course of events. It is

²³⁴ Ibid., 177.

²³⁵ It is only seen in two consecutive sentences at 10:2 and 10:3 and 13:33 and 13:34. 10:3 I consider to be the first line of an addition.

²³⁶ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 179.

only the literary reasoning, which we have seen as problematic, that prevents him from reaching the same conclusion as we have: 13:25-30 appears to be a secondary insertion.

13:41-42

This brief passage contains only two statements, which seem to be related to each other. 13:41 states that in the one hundred seventieth year (142 or 141 BCE), the gentiles ceased to hold power over Israel. Verse 42 continues to report that the people began dating their documents by the reign of Simon's high priesthood. The first verse seems to note Judean independence from the Seleucids, while the second depicts the practical acceptance and acknowledgement of that independence by the Judean people. No explanation is provided for either of these statements.

What is remarkable about these verses is, most of all, their disagreement with Demetrius' letter. The passage comes after a long quoted document sent by Demetrius II (13:36-40), which grants a number of releases from taxes and confirms previous grants he made (11:30-37).²³⁷ The letter also gives the Judeans full pardon and a general peace (εἰρήνην μεγάλην). Moreover, Demetrius allows the strongholds which the Judeans have built (τὰ ὀχυρώματα ἃ ὠκοδομήσατε ὑπαρχέτω ὑμῖν) remain in their jurisdiction. The allowances granted by Demetrius are vast and generous, however, they fall short of independence. The content of vv.41-42 unmistakably disagrees with the letter at several places. Whereas Demetrius addresses Simon as the high priest and friend of kings (ἀρχιερεῖ καὶ φίλῳ Βασιλέων), the people sign their contracts in the name of the great high priest, general and prince of the Judeans (ἀρχιερέως μεγάλου καὶ στρατηγοῦ καὶ ἡγουμένου Ιουδαίων). The difference is notable because both appear in official documents, and the context seemingly suggests that the latter titles given to Simon are based upon the former grants by Demetrius.

Secondly, the statement in v.41, that the yoke of the gentiles (ὁ ζυγὸς τῶν ἔθνῶν) was lifted from Israel certainly implies Judean liberation. However, Demetrius does not grant independence. He makes peace (v.37), he rescinds taxes (v.39), and gives

²³⁷ These grants are largely financial--release from taxes, plus the addition of two territories to Judea.

a general pardon (v.39), but specifically gives control of only the strongholds, which the Judeans have built, to Israel (v.38). This notably leaves the citadel in Jerusalem among others, which remain in the possession of the Seleucids, and stand as obstacles to true independence. What is more, the line at the close of Demetrius' letter that anyone who is qualified should be enrolled in the king's court (13:40) makes it clear that this is not a grant of independence, but that the vassal-king relationship still exists.

Partially in connection to Demetrius' letter and partially in association with the stories that follow 13:41-42, the lines also appear to be premature. We have seen already that Demetrius does not grant freedom, despite what 13:41-42 communicate, but this does not rule out that the author or his narrator viewed it as such. However, if this were the case, 13:43-51 would not be written. Or, their contents would at least be depicted quite differently. In these verses it is clear that Simon is still at war with the inhabitants of Gazara (13:43-48) and blockading the citadel in Jerusalem (13:49-51). If Simon or the narrator believed that Judea had achieved independence already, then there would be no need to continue to make war on Seleucid strongholds. Nevertheless, Simon does pursue battles against strongholds the gentiles had built (1:33; 4:9) in agreement with the content of Demetrius' letter. In addition, 13:51 stands as a very odd statement if one believes 13:41-42 have already occurred. The verse takes time to note the specific date and describes the specific celebration of the capture of the citadel "because a great enemy has been crushed from Israel" (ὅτι συνετρίβη ἐχθρὸς μέγας ἐξ Ἰσραηλ). The verse makes clear that the defeat of the citadel is the true point of independence, which leaves 13:41-42 as anomalous.

A further question that arises in trying to read 13:41-42 as original to the text again has to do with 13:51. As stated above, the verse specifically dates the day of the fall of the citadel. However, it does not use the new dating system instituted in relation to Simon in v.42, but uses the normal Seleucid dating found elsewhere. One would imagine that especially in commemoration of such a national victory as the defeat of the citadel, the author would use the nationalistic dating he has just introduced to his audience 10 verses earlier. However, the author does not use the dating, not even in combination with

the more familiar Seleucid dating. This fact, combined with the other disagreements introduced by 13:41-42 call the originality of these lines into serious doubt.

Despite the highly questionable nature of the verses, scholarship has either not focused on the problems surrounding them, or defended their originality. In relation to these lines Grimm argues:

Die Meinung ist nicht, dass sie unbedingt selbständig wurden, denn sie syrischen Könige behielten die Oberhoheit, wie nicht nur die ganze Ton des vorstehenden Schreibens, sondern auch der bekannte Lauf der folgenden Geschichte.²³⁸

Grimm takes an interesting tack here. Though he recognizes that the preceding and succeeding lines clearly argue against actual granting of independence, he puts forth that 13:41-42 itself does not actually hold this to be true either. The argument is difficult to make, however, in light of the statement that the yoke of the gentiles was lifted in v.41, and the institution of the new dating scheme and new titles for Simon in v.42. In Grimm's defense, he was likely not thinking at all in a model that considered the possibility of multiple editions of 1Macc.²³⁹ He thus used the information available to come to the most suitable conclusion. Nevertheless, it is clear that his reading of the text makes 13:41-42 no less problematic. Despite the problems with Grimm's analysis of the verses, Keil, wholeheartedly endorses it.²⁴⁰ He too sees the primary explanation required of these verses as a statement that the Judeans in fact were not independent, but also offers no reason for the phrasing of vv.41-42.

F.-M. Abel takes a slightly different approach. He argues that the events and titles in vv.41-42 do not suggest independence, but merely a step toward independence.²⁴¹ He tries to tie the title of ἡγούμενος to a theorized Seleucid title, however provides no strong basis for this. Further, he tries to link v.41 together stylistically with 1Macc 8:18 through the use of the term ζυγός in relation to the gentiles.²⁴² The problem with his

²³⁸ C. Grimm, *Das erste*, 202.

²³⁹ Grimm precedes J. Destinon and W.O.E. Oesterley by 30 years and 50 years respectively.

²⁴⁰ C. Keil, *Commentar*, 219.

²⁴¹ F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 244.

²⁴² It should be made clear that F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 244, is not attempting to form a counter argument against the secondary nature of the verses with this stylistic similarity.

theory concerning Simon's title in 13:42 is that it is not granted in the previous decree of Demetrius, nor is he referred to by this title. If it were a title given by Antioch then one would expect it to be mentioned. As for the similarity between the use of ζυγός at 13:41 and 8:18 (and 8:31 for that matter), the agreements are certainly there. However, as we have argued in a previous chapter, chapter 8 has a number of marks of addition as well. So, this link only provides us with evidence of a possible connection between two verses, each of which seem to be additional.

Another viewpoint on these verses is provided by J.C. Dancy. He avers that the dating of documents in Simon's name is simply following the Judean tradition of dating by the reigns of high priests, and not the Hellenistic tradition, which changed dating systems by dynasties or new ages.²⁴³ He further states that it is only coincidental that independence occurred in the same year as Simon's first as high priest.²⁴⁴ He adds nuance to this hypothesis with the statement that independence could not have been realized at the time because of Demetrius' prior deceit (11:52).²⁴⁵ The problem with this reading is that he is agreeing with the account of 13:41 that independence occurred in 170 Seleucid era, but stating that the dating system introduced in 13:42 has nothing to do with it. We have already seen the pitfalls of agreeing with 13:41 on the issue of independence, but disassociating the occurrence in 13:42 seems to be counter to the text. Dancy recognizes this and is forced to admit that even the author ties the two events together.²⁴⁶ Nevertheless, Dancy's reading remains flawed because he accepts the author's account in 13:41-42 as original in the face of all the evidence, which stands counter to it.

Despite the flaws with Dancy's argument, J.R. Bartlett basically agrees with all Dancy's conclusions:²⁴⁷ the declaration of independence expressed in 13:41-42 is not actual, the realization of any step toward independence would not be true until years later in history, but, the author clearly does not present it as such. While we have no dispute

²⁴³ J. Dancy, *First Book*, 177.

²⁴⁴ *Ibid.*, 177.

²⁴⁵ *Ibid.*, 177.

²⁴⁶ *Ibid.*, 177.

²⁴⁷ J. Bartlett, *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1973), 185.

with the first two points of Dancy and Bartlett, the third point is disputable precisely because of all the clues around 13:41-42, which suggest the author does not believe independence occurs at this time. The problem with the theory espoused by both scholars is that while they do recognize 13:41-42 argues for independence, they do not seem to realize that Demetrius' letter and Simon's successive actions argue against it, and thus they fail to see the contradictions to the report of independence that exist within the text. It goes without saying that since they do not recognize the discrepancies, they do not engage them and explain their presence alongside each other.

J.A. Goldstein approaches the text entirely differently from previous scholars. He suggests that 13:41-42 recognize a new era of independence and freedom for the Judeans, and that the dating formula signals the new era of freedom under Simon's rulership.²⁴⁸ The new approach Goldstein takes is daring, but ultimately flawed because it takes no account of the actual wording of Demetrius' letter, or the attacks on Gazara and the citadel. These would both have to be explained if 13:41-42 were to be accepted as truth *and* as original. Goldstein explains none of it, and takes it all as true, which gets the reader no closer to being able to understand the text than when they started.

Nils Martola, as is his norm, provides us with some excellent observations concerning 13:41-42, and their connections to the surrounding text. First, Martola observes:

Even though there is no subject matter in common between 13,41-42 and 13,34-40, there should hardly be any doubt of the fact that the author is of the opinion that Demetrius' letter is the signal that 'the yoke of the gentiles was lifted from Israel [...].' This can be concluded from the position of the segment. It was so important that the people began a new era as a result of this.²⁴⁹

Martola makes it clear that he sees no connection between 13:41-42 and its context, specifically Demetrius' letter. He also suggests that the placement of the lines is meant to give Demetrius' letter great importance as a grant of independence. On the first point, it should be obvious that we agree that 13:41-42 do not tie together well with the letter preceding them, and in fact, diverge from it on several points. The second point is an entirely new suggestion, which deserves consideration. It should be observed that 13:41-

²⁴⁸ J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976), 477-480.

²⁴⁹ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 180.

42: a) give the letter greater importance in the text, and b) change the letter's content from a declaration of ceasefire and a treaty into a grant of independence. Martola seems to be correct on both points here, however it is difficult to see how he could make both these observations, yet still see the lines as original. He does so by averring that 13:41-42 are an exaggeration in their current location, which more properly belongs after 13:51-52, where true independence is achieved.²⁵⁰ Martola builds from this point in stating that the original ending of 1Maccabees was 14:4-15, a poem of praise, which emphasized Simon's ability, but there was not much for the author to praise. So, he placed vv.41-42 in their position in order to make the letter of Demetrius an achievement as a monumental accomplishment equal to the defeat of the citadel.²⁵¹

Martola thus alleges that 13:41-42 are taken out of *historical* context and written in their current location because they emphasize Simon's approach to Demetrius as a major step toward independence on par with his military might. This allows 14:4-15 to justly praise Simon for his deeds. There are several problems with this hypothesis. First, if one accepts that 14:4-15 constituted the original end of 1Maccabees,²⁵² and accepts that it praises Simon's deeds, then one would expect that 14:4-15 would mention the letter of Demetrius, or Simon's diplomacy as one of his great accomplishments or qualities. Neither of these things is true. Though 14:4-15 does mention the recapture of Gazara and the citadel, which occur immediately after 13:41-42, Demetrius' letter and its implications are nowhere to be found in 14:4-15. Martola thus expects us to believe that the original author of 1Maccabees placed 13:41-42 in their position because it gave Simon more deeds to praise in the final poem, but then that same author did not use this newly created event in his poem of praise. From this angle Martola's argument seems illogical.

Second, Martola's original point about vv.41-42 being taken out of context, having no links to the preceding passages and occupying their position after the letter of Demetrius, rely only upon the author of 13:41-42. The letter of Demetrius is not harmed if the verses are removed, nor is the succeeding account of Simon's military victories. If

²⁵⁰ Ibid., 182.

²⁵¹ Ibid., 182.

²⁵² An assertion I do not accept. See the next chapter.

13:41-42 is the work of an editor, then the editor emphasizes Simon's diplomacy, and the editor looks back on the occasion as one which really started the independence of Judea. That editor would then also be responsible for the other disagreements and disconnections between 13:41-42 and its context. However, Martola seems to only want these lines to be the work of the original author, and not of an editor. This is especially surprising as Martola is perfectly willing to see passages which do not connect to their contexts as additions.²⁵³ Though Martola's scrutiny of the passage is otherwise quite solid, the reasons he gives for it being the work of the original author are unsound.

D.S. Williams also recognizes that, historically, the verses are out of place; he suggests that though the text shows independence to come during the reign of Simon, it actually only occurred while John Hyrcanus was the ruler of Judea.²⁵⁴ Williams however does not go beyond this observation to argue for any additional nature of the passage. He simply states the fact and moves on. This is significant for Williams in particular because 13:41-42 share so much in common with his perceived additions to 1Maccabees (section III).²⁵⁵ Williams notices that section III has a heavy concentration on the office of high priesthood,²⁵⁶ which is also made clear through the new dating formula reported in v.42. Further, the titles of leader (ἡγούμενος) and high priest (ἀρχιερώς) appear together outside of 13:41-42 only at 14:35, 14:41, and 14:47, all of which are part of Williams' section III.²⁵⁷ The latter two passages (14:41;14:47) also connect the title of commander (στρατηγός) with Simon's other titles, a link which is otherwise only made at 13:41-42. Beyond this, Demetrius' letter, which is given greater importance by 13:41-42 is mentioned at 14:38-40 as the source of Simon's high honors. Moreover, both the dating system (14:27) introduced by 13:41-42 and the order to sign contracts in Simon's name (14:43) only reappear in Williams' section III. Despite these connections, Williams makes no mention of the possible additional nature of the passage, which he admits is historically out of place.

²⁵³ Ibid., 228-229 in relation to 1Macc chapter 8 and 1Macc 12:1-23.

²⁵⁴ D. Williams, *Structure*, 84-85.

²⁵⁵ Ibid., 123.

²⁵⁶ Ibid., 123.

²⁵⁷ Ibid., 108.

It is clear that though many scholars have recognized problems with 13:41-42 and its connection to history and to its context, no scholar has taken the obvious step of testing whether it may be an addition. We have made observations, which point out the discrepancies between these verses and their contexts, some of which have been shared by previous scholars, and tried to show how they go unsolved by any scholar who has dealt seriously with the passage. It seems obvious that in light of all the problems the passage raises and the easy removal of it without harm to the text, 13:41-42 is supplementary. In addition, there may be connections between the inclusion of these verses and Williams' addendum in section III.

Therefore, we have observed that chapter 13 likely contains two editorial insertions, which appear unrelated. We have seen 13:25-30 has few connections to its context, disputes and repeats certain material found outside its bounds, disrupts an otherwise unified text and contains internal marks of insertion. It has also been noticed that 13:41-42 contains no connection to its context, and diverges with the material found in the reports surrounding it. The remainder of chapter 13 appears as a unified whole, which details the rise of Simon from the final remaining Hasmonean of the first generation to the liberator of Judea through his attacks on the citadel and Gazara.

Implications

The significance of each of these passages on their context, and the information we garner from their internal evidence has already been hinted at throughout this argument, so we will only briefly recount the main points here. The inclusion of 13:25-30 into chapter 13 does little to disturb its surroundings other than creating a double-mourning and double-burial for Jonathan. The passage does not impact the way Trypho or the surrounding events are presented. These verses add the founding and continued existence of the Hasmonean funerary monument, and attribute it to Simon. In so doing, the passage elevates Simon and the other Hasmoneans as heroes. The combination of the mourning of all Israel in the early verses of the passage, and the detailed description of the elements of the monument, highlight its importance as a symbol of Hasmonean power in Israel. In addition, the continued emphasis on the monument's permanence underlines

the staying power of the Hasmonean family, as well as the mausoleum. The passage appears to be added in order to help build the myth of the Hasmonean family.

This theme has been observed in other additional passages, and may bind them together. If it does belong with those other mythologizing passages we have seen, an important piece of information concerning their inclusion can be gleaned from the last verse of this passage. The recognition that the monument still exists can only be taken to be meaningful long after the structure was built. This means that the passage and perhaps those like it were added also a long time after the initial construction of the tomb. This might also be long after the earliest part of 1Maccabees was written.

As for 13:41-42, we have observed that it changes the understanding of the surrounding text fundamentally, though not entirely convincingly. The verses attempt to alter the meaning of Demetrius II's reply to Simon, transforming it from a peace treaty to a grant of independence. This elevates both Demetrius' letter and Simon's diplomacy. It also seems to diminish the significance of Simon's efforts against the citadel at the close of chapter 13, since this event no longer symbolizes Judean independence. We have also already seen that the text has numerous connections with other additional material, which might point to its inclusion at the same time as those verses. There is little evidence from 13:41-42 itself as to when and under what circumstances it might have been added, but through the connections a much more rounded answer might be reached.

II.13 1Macc 14

We pointed out in the introductory material above that D.S. Williams, based on his rhetorical study of the structure of 1Maccabees, suggests that there are two editions of 1Maccabees. One earlier, which ends in chapter 14, and a later edition which includes an addendum containing all the material from the original ending to the current ending of the

book.²⁵⁸ We have already noticed in certain parts of 1Maccabees, Williams does not go far enough with his proposed additions; chapter 14 is no different. While Williams sees the original ending of the book as coming at 14:15, we aver that 1Maccabees originally ended at 13:53.²⁵⁹ We would hold that all of chapter 14 is additional.

The remainder of the chapter, after Williams' addendum is removed, consists of two sections, made up of fifteen verses in total (14:1-3; 4-15). 14:1-3 tell the brief story of Demetrius II's expedition to Media to obtain help against Trypho, and his ultimate defeat and capture by one of King Arsaces VI's generals. 14:4-15 form a hymn of praise for Simon that sings about his great deeds and the peace the land had under his reign. The two sections appear to be distinct from one another based on content, form, and characters, thus they should be evaluated separately.

14:1-3

Verses 14:1-3 are perched in a somewhat precarious place in the text; they have little connection to the verses preceding them in that they bring about a temporal (14:1: 172 S.E.; 13:51: 171 S.E.) and spatial shift (14:1-2: Media; 13:43-53: Jerusalem and Gazara).²⁶⁰ Further, it is clear the text has no connection to its immediate context in terms of characters (14:1-3: Demetrius and Arsaces; 13:43-53: Simon, the inhabitants of the strongholds, and John Hyrcanus) or content (14:1-3: Demetrius' foreign preparations against Trypho; 13:43-53: Simon's defeat and cleansing of the gentile strongholds in Judea). There are no links between these verses and the poem of praise in 14:4-15.²⁶¹

The relationship between 14:1-3 and its broader context is more promising, though also questionable. On the one hand, 14:1-3 closes the conflict between Trypho

²⁵⁸ D. Williams, *The Structure of 1Maccabees* (CBQMS 31; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999), 122. See also my evaluation of Williams' study in the introduction to this work.

²⁵⁹ S. Zeitlin; S. Tedesche, *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950), 29-30, also argue that the original ending of 1Maccabees was at the end of chapter 13, though they do so on different grounds.

²⁶⁰ D. Williams, *Structure*, 34.

²⁶¹ Given this evidence it is no wonder that C. Grimm, *Das erste Buch des Maccabäer* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1853), 206, states: "Ausdruck und Darstellung in diesen drei Versen ist mindestens unbeholfen und unklar".

and Demetrius reported at 11:39-40, 54-56; 13:34. On the other hand, while the conflict between the two Seleucid pretenders is closed, new problems arise that go unanswered. Demetrius, reintroduced at 13:34-40, is an ally of the Judeans against Trypho, and has made a general peace with them. Trypho, since his kidnapping (12:48), extortion (13:17-19), and murder (13:23) of Jonathan is an enemy of the Judeans; this point is made explicit (13:32, 34). Although the events of 14:1-3 seem to remove the greatest ally the Judeans have, and also to remove any obstacles to Trypho's defeat of the Judeans, neither these verses, nor any other in 14:1-15 report on the outcome of this alarming turn of events for the newly independent Judean nation (13:51). The omission seems odd considering the circumstances. This would especially be the case if Williams were correct in placing the original ending of 1Maccabees at 14:15. In this case, the book would end with the fledgling Judean independence hanging in the balance.

The explanation for the placement of the verses might come by rejecting Williams' proposed ending. If one views 14:1-3 not as the last narrative verses of the main story, but as the first part of the addendum, then their presence makes some degree of sense. The episode in 14:1-3 can be read as the necessary prerequisite to the arrival of Antiochus VII, and his subsequent attacks on Trypho, which are reported starting at 15:1.²⁶² Nils Martola, initially makes this point in his study of the composition of 1Maccabees when he states:

The segment 14,1-3 reports that Demetrius departs for Media in order to prepare a confrontation with Tryphon. That is the last we learn about Demetrius in 1M. But the course of events on the plane of the Seleucid Empire continues in 15,1-14 as the son of Demetrius –Antiochus VII– enters the stage and goes on where his father stopped, with the pursuit of Tryphon. Thereby 14,1-3 is linked to be above unit 15, 1-14. 25-16,10, which also deals with the worsening relations between Antiochus and Simon.²⁶³

²⁶² Ibid., 206 and C. Keil, *Commentar über die Bücher Makkabäer* (Leipzig: Dorffling und Francke, 1875), 223, notice the connection between 14:1-3 and 15:1. F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949), 248, agrees with Grimm and Keil and goes so far as to suggest that the proper place for 14:1-3 would be immediately preceding 15:1. The opinion of Abel, with all its nuances is shared by J. Dancy, *A Commentary on 1Maccabees* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954), 179.

²⁶³ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 186.

Martola supports our supposition by displaying that if any connection is to be made at all, 14:1-3 must be linked with the rise of Antiochus VII and his attacks against Trypho. This would explain why Demetrius' capture is mentioned and also why the character of Trypho is reintroduced. The relationship between 14:1-3 and 15:1 ff. also alleviates the awkward tension between the last narrative passage of the book, according to Williams, and the closing poem celebrating Simon's reign.

Inconceivably, however, Martola retracts this suggestion when he comes to his final analysis. He finds 14:1-3 as an appropriate setup for the end of the book because it has Simon's strongest adversary disappearing from the scene and ceasing to be a threat.²⁶⁴ Martola adopts this position because he, like Williams, finds 14:4-15 to be the original ending of the book.²⁶⁵ To support this, he not only drops his adept analysis relating 14:1-3 and 15:1 ff., but also develops the argument for its appropriateness as the final narrative in 1Macc. The argument is problematic. First, Demetrius is at no point an opponent of Simon. Demetrius II first ascends to the Seleucid throne during the reign of Jonathan (11:19). Immediately, Jonathan wins his favor (11:24), and Demetrius grants Jonathan and the Judeans numerous benefactions (11:30-37). The king then proceeds to enlist the help of the Judeans led by Jonathan against his own revolting troops. There the troops gain wealth and glory (11:41-51). After this, a brief negative comment is made that Demetrius broke his word to Jonathan and treated him harshly (11:52-54). Following this remark, the relationship between Demetrius and Jonathan turns sour. Demetrius sends officers to remove Jonathan from office, but they are defeated (11:63-74). Then, Demetrius again sends an army, this time even larger, which is again summarily driven to flight by Jonathan and his forces (12:24-33). This is the last time Demetrius II is mentioned until 13:34-40, where he is clearly a strong ally of Simon. Therefore, Martola's argument that Simon's greatest rival is removed, does not ring true. The two hardly interact, and when they finally do interact, it is in the form of a peace treaty, which confirms Simon in his office as high priest. It is Jonathan who has a complicated relationship with Demetrius, but even this can be at best be interpreted as

²⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 201.

²⁶⁵ *Ibid.*, 201, 207.

ambiguous, because they are quite friendly at first, and when the relationship does turn, it is Jonathan who always has the upper hand.

The second point: even if it were true that Demetrius constituted Simon's greatest rival at some point in the text, then one would have to ignore the content of the diplomatic letter and its narrative surroundings at 13:34-40 to come to the conclusion that Demetrius was still Simon's enemy. The letter clearly calls for peace (13:37, 40), grants a general pardon (13:39) and frees the Judeans from all taxes (13:39). Demetrius also asks for any qualified Judean to be inducted into his court (13:40). There is no way that one could read this letter and interpret that the two parties involved are enemies. Thus, Martola's assertion that 14:1-3 makes a good ending and a proper setup for the closing frame of 14:4-15 is doubly false. Both his insistence on any negative relationship between Simon and Demetrius, and his ideas on the overall nature of the relationship between Demetrius and the Judean people are unfounded. When this is combined with his own analysis that the text ties in closely with 15:1 ff., then it is puzzling to see how he could miss that 14:1-3 is an addition made in connection with 15.1 in order to set the political scene.

This seems like a reasonable conclusion in light of the evidence: Williams' overall thesis that there is an addendum in the last three chapters seems correct; there are ties between 14:1-3 and 15:1 ff. seen by a number of scholars, including Martola. The scene adds nothing to the story told in the first 13 chapters, and because of this and its relationship particularly to 13:34-40, it would make an extremely awkward ending of the original story. However, as the first part of an addition, which stretches until 16:24, the passage makes much more sense. It takes the story that concludes with chapter 13 and turns it on its head. The Seleucid monarch, who is in allegiance with Simon and the Judeans, is in exile. Trypho now stands unopposed, and Simon along with his newly appointed son John must once more fight for the freedom of their nation. The addition then treats this material with particular emphasis, as Williams points out, on the leadership of the Judeans and the position of high priest in connection to the descendants of Simon.²⁶⁶ Though the emphasis is not made in 14:1-3, the verses open up the thread

²⁶⁶ D. Williams, *Structure*, 126.

that leads to Antiochus VII, which brings about the defeat of Trypho, which results in the king's attack on the Judeans, which allows John Hyrcanus' rise to the high priestly office.

14:4-15

While we view 14:4-15 as additional, as should be clear from the arguments above, it is important to realize that it is secondary not only to the main story, but also to the addition that begins with 14:1-3. As has been argued above, 14:1-3 has no bearing on 14:4-15, and in fact seems awkward in relation to it. After three verses, which talk about the fall of Demetrius, one would not imagine that a song in praise of Simon would be fitting. Some commentators acknowledge this fact and make the argument that the praise of Simon belongs immediately after 13:53 and the defeat of the citadel.²⁶⁷ This would appear to make sense. Simon might deserve praise immediately following the act that brings independence to Judea, and at least the character of Simon would remain central throughout.

However, the details of the poem do not necessarily agree with chapter 13, an agreement that would be necessary for its connection to the chapter. The statement in v.4 that the land had peace all the days of Simon can only be understood in the most strict and technical sense of the land of Judah.²⁶⁸ It is reported that after Simon took power (13:1-9), Trypho went out from Ptolemais and tried to invade the land of Judah (13:12-16, 20-22). Moreover, in v.33 the narrator clearly states that Trypho "brought great calamity on the land" (καὶ ἐποίησεν πληγὴν μεγάλην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). Furthermore, 14:5 seems to attribute the taking of Joppa to Simon, while 13:11 makes it clear that it was Jonathan son of Absalom who took Joppa and remained in it. Granted, he was sent by Simon, but the proud place the victory holds in the poem suggests that it was Simon himself who took the harbor, according to the poet. Verse 13 is also suspicious in its claim that "the kings were crushed" (οἱ βασιλεῖς συνετρίβησαν). Not only is Demetrius II, one of the two kings around, Simon's ally at this point, but Trypho, far

²⁶⁷ F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 248 and J. Dancy, *Commentary*, 179.

²⁶⁸ J. Dancy, *Commentary*, 181. It should be pointed out that some manuscripts (S, V, La) include the reading "of Judah" though most support a broader "land".

from being crushed, is still in power. These disagreements with chapter 13 raise serious doubts as to whether one can view this as a direct continuation of 13:52.

There are no fewer problems connecting the poem to the other additional material in chapter 14 and beyond. While some links may be seen in Simon's worldwide fame (14:10, 16-24), and his general praise (14:4-15, 25-49), there are enough discrepancies between the poem and the following material to also make this doubtful. Many of the same passages that caused problems relating to chapter 13 and the beginning of Simon's reign, also cause trouble with linking the poem to the end of Simon's reign. The peaceful land for Simon's whole reign, mentioned at verse 4, is proved false by 15:39-41; 16:1-17, which ends with Simon's murder by treachery.²⁶⁹ 14:7, which states that there was none to oppose Simon is also disproven by the reports regarding Antiochus VII (15:28), Cendebeus (15:38-41; 16:4-10), and Ptolemy son of Abubus, son-in-law of Simon (16:11-22).²⁷⁰ Further, v.13, which proclaims that all the kings were crushed is starkly contrasted with chapter 15, which reports on Antiochus VII and his rise against Simon after the former's victory over Trypho (15:37-41).²⁷¹

In addition to the lack of continuity displayed in the verses above, there is also the glaring fact that the change of form from a narrative report to a poem of praise is abrupt. In the face of this evidence, scholars have tried to explain its link to either the rest of the additional material,²⁷² the remainder of the original level,²⁷³ or to the whole of

²⁶⁹ J. Bartlett, *The First and Second Books of Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 191.

²⁷⁰ C. Grimm, *Das erste Buch*, 208; F.-M. Abel, *Les Livres*, 248; however see the counter argument of Keil, *Commentar*, 224 which states that the verse means "Kein Gegner ihm erfolg reichen Widerstand konnte". Verses 12b, 13, 14c seem to support the arguments of Grimm and Abel.

²⁷¹ J. Bartlett, *First and Second*, 191.

²⁷² J. Dancy, *Commentary*, 6-8, 179; S. Tedesche; S. Zeitlin, *First Book*, 221.

²⁷³ J. Destinon, *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Arch. Buch XII-XVII = Jüd. Krieg Buch I* (Keil: Lipsius and Tischer, 1882), 11; E. Kautzsch, "Das erste Buch der Makkabäer", 29; and J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1921), 257.

1Maccabees in a variety of ways.²⁷⁴ The two most recent and most pertinent cases to this study, those of Martola and Williams deserve a closer look.

Nils Martola, as was the case with 14:1-3, first comes to one conclusion about the poem in 14:4-15, and then changes course to another opinion. Initially, Martola states: “I cannot but classify this unit [14, 16-24; 15, 15-24; 14, 25-49] including the poetic passage 14, 4-15 as an ‘island’.”²⁷⁵ He marks off these texts as being secondary to the main story, and related to each other because they mark a break in the story and go on reporting different circumstances.²⁷⁶ Though, as we have seen, it is troublesome to find links between 14:4-15 and the rest of the material surrounding chapter 14, the basic point that Martola notices is correct. Despite this original deduction, Martola changes course and sees the poem as an integral part of the original 1Macc, acting as the closing half of a poetic frame, which in 3:3-9 introduces and in 14:4-15 closes the work of liberation.²⁷⁷ Though Martola tries this new hypothesis, he fails to show how the poem, once considered an island, can all of the sudden be tied to the main story. The doubts he had about continuity of content and form persist, and this new connection with 3:3-9 as a poetic frame is weak.

First, 3:3-9 does not precede the work of liberation; chapter 2 consists of a whole series of attempts by Mattathias and others to liberate the Judeans from the oppressive Seleucid cult (2:19-22, 29-38, 39-41, 45-48). Even if some of these attempts are unsuccessful, the last two passages deal with successful attempts at liberation, so much so that 3:1 claims Judas took command of the work of Mattathias “in his place” (καὶ ἀνέστη Ιουδας ὁ καλούμενος Μακκαβαῖος υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀντ’ αὐτοῦ). 3:2 also states that “all who had joined his father” (πάντες ὅσοι ἐκολλήθησαν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ) helped him. Thus, the claim that the work of liberation begins with Judas after the “framing poem” is not supported by the text.

²⁷⁴ F.-M. Abel *Les Livres*, 248; C. Grimm, *Das erste Buch*, 208; J. Goldstein, *I Maccabees* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 488; C. Keil, *Commentar*, 223.

²⁷⁵ N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation*, 186.

²⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 187.

²⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 201.

Second, the work of liberation does not end with the poem at 14:4-15, or even immediately before it. Rather, as Martola himself points out, the work of liberation ends at 13:53:

Seen from the horizon of the first chapter, 1M is thus, above all, the story of the liberation of Jerusalem, in the first hand the liberation of the temple temporarily occupied by foreign powers, secondly the liberation and sanctification of the Acra, built and inhabited by foreign heathens. Seen from this point of view 1M ends with the thirteenth chapter.²⁷⁸

14:1-3 clearly has nothing to do with liberation, and as discussed above, may even hinder the work of liberation. The poem in 14:4-15, for all its praise, only discusses works related to liberation in two verses, v.7 and v.13. Otherwise the poem is more of a general praise of Simon's reign. Despite this recognition of the work of liberation ending in the thirteenth chapter Martola insists still that 14:4-15 is part of a poetic frame.

Some of the same criticisms lobbed at Martola can be applied to David Williams' analysis as well. Williams shares Martola's view of the book as a story of liberation, first of the temple and cult and second of the citadel;²⁷⁹ hence, one might also question why the poem he has ending the main story does not comment on this work more than twice. But, Williams' argument is different from Martola's, and in some ways more sophisticated. Williams argues that the poem forms connections through statements and motifs with various previous parts of 1Macc, as if summarizing what has come before.²⁸⁰ Though Williams proceeds with the argument basically making connections in vocabulary between the poem and other points in the book, instead of showing any sort of summary, he does succeed in raising the possibility that the poem is related to the main story. The problem with Williams' analysis however, is that most of it is superficial, accomplished with somewhat common terms (πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, καὶ ἠσύχασεν ἡ γῆ, πρεσβύτεροι... νεανίσκοι),²⁸¹ and takes little account of the possibility that the poem might imitate vocabulary in the rest of the book or of the more important fact that the whole composition is a translation into Greek, which could easily have been harmonized

²⁷⁸ Ibid., 201.

²⁷⁹ D. Williams, *Structure*, 107.

²⁸⁰ Ibid., 66.

²⁸¹ Ibid., 67-68.

by the translator. Williams further makes no mention of the discrepancies between the poem and the material that comes before it. This especially weakens his argument.

Williams continues his justification for 14:15 being the end of the original story with a number of side notes: He points out that 14:15 is a chiasm, which he deems appropriate for an ending to the book,²⁸² and sees 14:13 as signaling double causality through the use of the term *συνετριβησαν* (crush).²⁸³ Williams also relates the poem to that of Judas, though differently from Martola, perhaps seeing the flaw in Martola's structure with regard to the work of liberation. He sees the poems as given to their particular heroes because each played a major role in the work of liberation.²⁸⁴ While this could be an explanation for why Jonathan does not receive a poem of praise, it is hardly convincing, especially since Mattathias and his friends are also praised (2:47-48) but do not have a major feat in the struggle for liberation. Finally, Williams too uses the poem as part of a frame, though not with 3:3-9 but a frame with 1:2-4.²⁸⁵ He relates the two passages through vocabulary and content. Williams sees the crushing of kings in 1:2 as echoed by the defeat of the kings in 14:13, and the quieting of the earth before Alexander (1:3) as echoed by the peace of the land (14:4) under Simon. Third, Williams sees that Alexander's domination of *countries* and *nations* (1:4) is echoed by Simon's extension of the borders of his *nation* and his gaining full control of the *country* (14:6). The problem of course is that this takes no account of the difference in form between the two passages, nor the fact that no structure is displayed by his recognition of like terms. These are haphazard similarities in what amount to terms commonly used of political leaders.

Though Williams and Martola both make interesting observations, and are both correct that the thirteenth chapter ends the work the main story discusses, it seems they have missed the points of inconsistency between 14:4-15 and its surrounding. It looks as though the answer for the time and place and occasion for the composition of 14:4-15 is

²⁸² *Ibid.*, 68.

²⁸³ *Ibid.*, 101.

²⁸⁴ *Ibid.*, 107. The major roles being the liberation of the temple for Judas and the liberation of the citadel for Simon.

²⁸⁵ *Ibid.*, 68, n. 18.

betrayed by the poem itself. The poem is meant to treat the whole of Simon's reign.²⁸⁶ This is clear from the statement in v.4 that the land had rest "all the days of Simon". It is also the case that much of the vocabulary in the poem is idealized and presents Simon's time as a golden age along the lines of that promised in various points in the Hebrew Scriptures.²⁸⁷ In view of this idealization it may be that the poem was composed well after the time of Simon, and entirely separately from 1Macc as an idealized praise of the reign of Simon. It could then have been inserted into the text by an editor who was making other alterations or by a copyist who knew the poem, and thought it appropriate before the praises of Simon coming from the Spartans, Romans and Judeans. This would explain not only the poem's idealization of Simon in an otherwise sterile and factual account of his reign in both the original story (e.g. 13:17-19, 46) and the addendum (e.g. 16:16), but also the contradictions between the poem and both the main story and addition.

II.14 Organizing the Additions: The Literary Layers of 1Maccabees

Now that we have demonstrated the possibility of various secondary passages in 1Maccabees, it is necessary to organize and describe the information these sections communicate. The most central questions to the summary of the secondary material will be: Is there an overall unity to the secondary material? If there is a unity, what characters are featured, how do those characters behave and how are they described? What specific events do these secondary passages report, and what sort of features might tie these passages together?

Let us first remind ourselves of the secondary passages we have observed:

²⁸⁶ J. Dancy, *Commentary*, 181.

²⁸⁷ *Ibid.*, 181; J. Bartlett, *First and Second*, 191; J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 488. These scholars draw particular attention to vv. 8: Lev 26:3-4; Zech 8:12; 9: Zech 8:4; 12: Micah 4:4, Zech 3:10.

Chapter	Verse
1	11-15, 43, 52, 62-63
2	23-26, 42-44
3	3-9
5	18-29, 55-62
6	18b, 21-27, 43-46
7	5-7, 9b, 12*, 13-14, 16d-17, 20ab, 21-25
8	1-32
9	1*, 23-24, 35-42, 54-61, 69, 73d
10	3-9, 14, 15*, 25-46, 61, 64
11	21, 25
12	1-23
13	41-42
14	1-3, 4-15, 16-49
15	1-41
16	1-24

We will note that there appears to be additions in every chapter but chapter 4 and that there is no consistent pattern in the additions. Some chapters are wholly secondary, while others have only a few additional verses. We may also observe that, as stated in the introduction, we have subscribed to the addendum theory as argued by D.S. Williams and Nils Martola with a few significant adaptations.

Classification of the Secondary Material

There are several thematic ties between a number of the passages we have proposed as secondary. We observed that many of the passages dealt with matters pertaining to the internal opposition to the Maccabees by other Judeans. Let us call this collection “group 1” for the moment. A second, rather large portion of the secondary material is heavily based on political alliances and proclamations and focuses on the rise in power of the Hasmoneans. This includes the so-called addendum of Williams and

Martola.²⁸⁸ This will be “group 2”. The rest of the additional material, also a considerable amount, can be united by its subject matter dealing with praise of the Hasmonean cause. This will be “group 3”. We shall use these descriptions as skeletons onto which we may add further details for our passages and flesh out further characteristics of our redaction.

Group 1

In this group we can tentatively include the following passages: **1:11-15**, 43, 52, 62-63; **2:42-44**; **6:18b**, 21-27; **7:5-7**, 9b, 12*, 13-14, 16d-17, 20a-b, 21-25; **9:1***, 23-24, 54-61, 69, 73; **10:14**, 61, 64; **11:21**, 25. It was clear in our investigations in each chapter that every one of these passages dealt with some aspect of internal opposition to the Maccabees. Let us first identify whether there is continuity between the groups causing the disruption in each of these passages.

In 1:11-15, it is the υἱοὶ παράνομοι who are the cause of the disturbance. This group does not appear again under that specific name, though ἄνδρες παράνομοι make an appearance at 10:61 and 11:21.²⁸⁹ The term seems to be roughly synonymous in each of these cases, though one should note the slight difference in vocabulary.²⁹⁰ In addition to these instances, it appears that οἱ ἐντυγχάνοντες at 10:64 are synonymous with the group at 10:61 and τινες ἄνομοι at 11:25, due to context. 11:25 is particularly interesting in that it provides two clues that link these groups. First, the statement that the group is ἐκ τοῦ ἔθνους connects it to the community in 11:21, who are described as hating their own nation (μισοῦντες τὸ ἔθνος αὐτῶν). Secondly, their act of accusation

²⁸⁸ D. Williams, *Structure*, 122-126; N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 227-232. The Addendum theory was first put forth by Destinon and carried great weight for others until the 1920s, but Martola is the first to argue convincingly on literary grounds, and not on the basis of Josephus' text of Antiquities breaking off from 1Macc at this point.

²⁸⁹ Though the term appears at 1:34, we did not find this passage problematic, nor do we see this group as connected to any of the above groups, as it refers to a clearly foreign population -- in opposition to all of the above.

²⁹⁰ Part of the reason for our feeling that this change is only minor stems from one fact we must never forget: The text we have now is a translation, and the Hebrew behind these terms may be more similar than the Greek terms let on.

(ἐντυγχάνω) bonds them to the group at 10:64. There is thus a web of connections uniting the groups at 1:11-15; 10:61, 64; 11:21, 25.

11:25 provides us with further links to the source of the internal opposition in some of the other passages in group 1. The term ἄνομοι, which is used at 11:25 is also used of the opponents to the Hasmoneans at 2:42-44; 7:5-7; 9:23, 58-61, 69. The links between all these opponents combined with 11:25 and the connections it provides to the former passages, means that there is a significant amount of material linking our hypothesized group 1. This material is connected by some of the main actors. The associations do not cease here. In 7:5-7 the group, which is first called ἄνδρες ἄνομοι, is also called ἄσεβεις immediately afterward. This term is used to describe internal opponents²⁹¹ of the Hasmoneans at 6:21-27; 7:9b; 9:73d. Through the connection of these terms there appears to be a strong relationship between almost all the internal opponents of the Hasmoneans.

Alcimus, who is described as ἄσεβεις at 7.9b and as a member of the group at 7:5-7 accounts for a number of the other verses not already covered by the terms above: 7:12, 13-14, 16d-17, 20a-b, 21-25; 9:54-57. He also happens to be the only internal opponent explicitly named. 7:21-25 also mentions another group called οἱ ταρασσόντες τὸν λαὸν αὐτῶν, which could be an entirely different group of internal opponents. However, given the connection Alcimus has with the group already mentioned above, it is likely the same people.

The sole opponents left unaccounted for in the assemblage above are those at 1:43, 52, and 10:14. Both the opponents at 1:52 and 10:14 are called the same name, the ones who abandoned (καταλείπω) the law. This group must be the same as that at 1:43, who carry no name, but fit the description by accepting the king's law and breaking their own law because they blaspheme the Sabbath and sacrifice to idols. There are however, no links from this group of three out to the other much larger group of internal opponents, based on the characters' names alone.

²⁹¹ The term also appears several other times in the text where context makes it fairly clear that it is not Judeans but gentiles who are intended by the term. E.g. 3:15, 9:25. The difference appears to be the absence of ἐξ Ἰσραηλ in connection with the term.

The result of the investigation into the leading characters of group 1 has yielded promising results: all the verses except three seem to refer to the same group of internal opponents, and share in the general loosely applied theme of “internal opposition” to the Maccabees. It is remarkable that a group of passages that cause various literary problems for diverse reasons in their own chapters should be linked by their characters so closely. We admit that at times, these characters themselves have been the cause of the literary problems in our analysis of the text, but this is hardly always the case. This association warrants further investigation into the actions and themes associated with these characters. If these can be linked then we have a very solid foundation on which to build our theoretical redaction.

At 1:11-15 the “renegades” are described accomplishing a number of acts: they come out from Israel; they make a covenant with the nations; they get permission from the king to observe the ordinances of the gentiles; they build a gymnasium; they reverse their circumcisions; they abandon the holy covenant; and they join with the gentiles selling themselves to do evil. This collection of deeds provides a rather large palette from which to create our picture of the group of opponents in question. Particularly interesting is the act of going to the king (ἐπορεύθησαν πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα). The act is repeated with exact phrasing in 6:22 and 11:21. It is repeated with different terminology also in 7:5 and 7:25. Another connection from these first acts is the abandonment of the covenant/laws, not only at 9:59 but also at 1:43, 1:52 and 10:14.²⁹² This similarity draws the small group of unaccounted-for opponents into the larger whole, uniting the opponents under one set of characters. This latter act can probably also be joined to the act of observing the laws of the gentiles, which takes place in 1:43 and 6:23 as well. Finally, the act of joining with the gentiles is continued at 6:21.

6:21-27 also contain a rich collection of deeds, as can be seen from the list above, where the characters act three times in accordance with 1:11-15. In addition to these exploits, the verses bring up a new one of report/accusation to the gentiles. After these verses, where the opponents report to the king about the work the Hasmoneans have

²⁹² The reverse of this is testified to in 1:62-63, which contrasts a faithful remnant with the group of opponents mentioned at 1:11-15, 1:43 and 1:52.

done, similar reports are mentioned at 7:5, 25; 10:61, 64; 11:21, 25. This collection of acts leaves us with the impression that the opponents in group 1, in decreasing amounts: go to the king, accuse or report against the Hasmoneans, and observe the laws of the gentiles/abandon the ancestral laws. They do perform other deeds, but these latter only occur in one instance. The links between the characters and their exploits now force us to take seriously the possibility of a redactional layer surrounding the Judean opponents of the Hasmoneans.

Let us finally look at the ways in which these passages are written. If we can detect a significant trend, this would set up a good paradigm for recognition of this redactional layer. By far, most of the material here is reported in a straightforward narrative fashion, similar to a chronicle. The majority of the following material is recorded in this manner: (1:12-15, 43, 52; 2:42-44; 6:18; 7:20a-b, 21-25; 9:23-24; 9:54-57, 69, 73b; 10:14, 61, 64; 11:25). The narrative character is perhaps not surprising for material included in a historical chronicle. There are a few significant sections with direct speech. These have a bent toward supplication (6:21-27; 7:5-7) or alternatively exhortation (1:11; 7:13-14; 9:58). Every one of these passages is, of course, surrounded by at least a few phrases of exposition to provide the setting for the direct speech. There is also a minority of passages where indirect speech is employed: (9:60; 11:21).

There is some apparent specialized function applied to these modes of narration in group 1. The narrative chronicles, of course, communicate most of the acts of the internal opponents, but also tell of the two occasions where Hasmoneans or their allies fight back (2:42-44; 7:23-24). The direct and indirect speech passages communicate the allegiance to the gentiles. The opponents deliver the exhortations among their own group in order to gain support to go to the gentiles. The supplications give actual evidence of the Judean opponents going to the king, proclaiming their support, and asking for aid against the Hasmoneans.

Now that we have filled-out the initial sketch of group 1 we can say something more about this redaction. It covers the majority of the material dealing with internal opposition to the Hasmoneans and their allies. The main actors in this redaction seem to be identified as a single group, which can be proven by the use of similar and sometimes

identical terminology to name them. This group performs a number of acts, but is most notable for going to the king, accusing or reporting against the Hasmoneans, attempting to seize power, and abandoning the ancestral Judean covenant and ordinances. Their observation of the king's decrees and their joining with the gentiles seems to be only incidental in the reports. Accordingly the most important theme of this redaction seems to be the willing relationship this group has with the gentiles, and their opposition to the Hasmoneans, which portrays the group as traitors. This is stressed not only by the frequency of these acts, but also by the direct and indirect speeches in these passages, which exclusively treat this material. For this reason, it might be suitable to call this redaction 1Macc Opposition (1MaccO).

It is interesting to point out that throughout 1MaccO, few of the main themes pointed out by Williams make any appearance at all.²⁹³ The liberation of the temple is of no concern at all to the redactor of 1MaccO, and the liberation of the citadel and strongholds only has some limited support in 6:26. There is of course some pro-Hasmonean stress in this redaction, but that seems to cover all parts of the book.²⁹⁴ There is clearly very little anti-gentile bias in these sections, as most of the blame is thrust upon the internal opponents. Also, the theme of double-causality is totally absent. If indeed Williams is correct that these are the main themes of 1Macc, then it is provocative that 1MaccO carries none of those themes.

Group 2

To this group we have assigned the following problematic passages: **8:1-32; 10:3-9, 25-46; 12:1-23; 13:41-42; 14:1-3, 16-49; 15:1-41; 16:1-24**. There are several notable elements here. No part of this group appears before the midpoint of the book. There are

²⁹³ D. Williams, *Structure*, 107. Williams states the main themes of the work are liberation of the temple, liberation of the citadel, double-causality (God helps those who help themselves), pro-Hasmonean slant and an anti-gentile bias.

²⁹⁴ R. Doran, *The First Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections* (New Interpreters' Bible, v.4; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996), 22, is the only author I have encountered who challenges the notion that the book is basically Hasmonean propaganda, and thus heavily pro-Hasmonean.

essentially four whole chapters belonging to this group.²⁹⁵ Finally, the group contains the entire proposed addendum of Williams and Martola, and then adds to it. Since Williams, building on the work of Martola, already provided some of the guidelines to recognize the addendum, both as a unit and as an addition, we will apply these when pertinent to the discussion.²⁹⁶ It is worthwhile, because of this, to start with the addendum when proving the connections in this group.

In the addendum (14:16-16:24) there are a number of characters. Some of the most prominent are the Romans (16 v.), the Spartans (5 v.), Simon (33 v.), Antiochus VII (20 v.), and John Hyrcanus (12 v.).²⁹⁷ Let us now look to determine whether these characters that are prominent in the addendum, are also important in the other passages of group 2.

The Romans appear prominently in chapter 8 of 1Macc. The whole chapter deals with the Romans. The first sixteen verses of the chapter provide a brief (and flawed) history of the Romans, while the final sixteen treat Judas' dispatch to the Romans and their reply. A treaty with Rome is also described at 12:1, 3, 4, 16. Thus, in terms of character there appears to be a strong connection between these verses and the addendum.

The Spartans, who are not prominent in the addendum, but make appearances at 14:16, 20-23; 15:23, are also represented at 12:1-23. Here, they are first the addressees in a contemporary letter from Jonathan (12:5-18) and are then the correspondents in a historical letter to the high priest Onias (12:19-23).²⁹⁸ Also interesting is that they are

²⁹⁵ Chapter 14, in my estimation contains one section added later (14:4-15), but the rest is all part of the theorized group 2.

²⁹⁶ See the full summary of Williams' argument in the introduction for a complete review.

²⁹⁷ Williams' Section 3 contains 99 verses. I have divided the verses according at times to the speaker of the material or to the subject of the material, depending on content, and which seems more prominent. Though Ptolemy makes an appearance here, his deeds have heavily to do with Simon, and thus he is left out.

²⁹⁸ Note that our interest in any of these documents is not in authenticity. We wish neither to prove it nor to challenge it. Monographs and articles have already been devoted to the subject. Our only concerns are a) whether the material supports and agrees with the addendum, and b) if the material is secondary due to associations with the addendum and troubles fitting into the main story.

associated with the Romans at 12:1-3 as well as within Jonathan's letter at 12:16-17. The same association is made at 14:16-19 where letters come from Sparta and Rome on the occasion of hearing of Jonathan's death. Through the Spartans the ties between the addendum and 12:1-23 become even stronger.

As is evident, Simon and his son John Hyrcanus are both major characters in the addendum. However, they do not appear anywhere else in group 2 except at 13:41-42, where Simon is extremely important as the leader and liberator of the Jews. He is specifically characterized in these verses as ἀρχιερεύς μέγας and στρατηγός and ἡγουμένος. The same characterization of Simon is used at 14:41-42; 46-47. Further, at 14:43 the declaration of the Judean leadership states that all documents should be written in the name of Simon, just as the people do at 13:41-42. Thus, the character of Simon provides a clear connection between the addendum and these verses.

Unfortunately, Antiochus VII does not have any links outside of the addendum because his character only arises in chapter 15. Therefore there are no other major characters in the addendum, which can provide links to the rest of group 2. However, we already have observed the strong links between the addendum and 8:1-32, through the Romans, as well as the connections to 12:1-23 through the Romans and Spartans. We have also seen a strong relationship between 13:41-42 and the addendum through the character of Simon, who is very important in the addendum. These associations are positive signs of a bond between the addendum and the rest of group 2. Nonetheless, it must be noted that left out of these character connections are the problematic verses at 10:3-9, 25-46; 14:1-3. No major characters in any of these sections are brought up again in the addendum. This puts the inclusion of these verses into group 2 in doubt.

Let us now look at the themes highlighted in the addendum and see if they can be found in the other parts of the proposed group 2.²⁹⁹ As noted by Williams, looking at the

²⁹⁹ Themes are used here instead of acts because there is simply not a wealth of action in the addendum. All of chapter 14 is filled with documents. Chapter 15:1-9, 15-24 is also comprised by two documents, while 15:28-31, 33-35 though not documents, are diplomatic messages delivered by messenger. This leaves only one military episode and the betrayal of Ptolemy in terms of action.

vocabulary, one of the major themes in the addendum is the high priesthood,³⁰⁰ particularly in relation to the family of Simon. We would argue that along with the high priesthood, international esteem is another theme of the addendum. 14:16-19 mention the recognition the Romans and Spartans extended to Simon on hearing of his rise to power. The Spartan letter itself (14:20-23) also supports the international fame of the Judeans. The embassy sent to Rome is concerned with furthering their honor for the Judeans. At 14:38-40 the document praising Simon specifically mentions the rewards he received from Demetrius were due the honor the Judean leaders were paid by the Romans. Antiochus VII's letter also raises the esteem for the Judean nation, and ends on the promise to extend it even further (15:1-9). The Roman letter at 15:15-24 is specifically concerned with making it known that the Judeans are allies with them through the whole world; this can be seen by the address to Ptolemy (v.16) but also to the list of kings and nations listed as addressees at the end of the letter (v.22-24).

With these two themes as a starting point we can search through the material outside of the addendum to see if the themes it contains correspond to those in the other passages of group 2. Chapter 8 includes the theme of international recognition in two directions. The first half of the chapter shows the high regard the Judeans have for the Romans, while the second half acknowledges Rome's alliance with the Judeans. This raises the Judean profile, especially given the warning to Demetrius, which is appended to the letter. The other proposed passages of group 2 also contain this theme of international esteem. At 10:3-6 Demetrius writes to Jonathan specifically to honor him. The honors include the allowance to recruit troops and become his ally. These specific honors are used by Jonathan, in turn, to great effect in 10:7-9 against the gentiles in the citadel. Additionally, 10:26-45 contain a document from Demetrius that is simply full of honors and allowances for the Judeans based on their rising prestige. The embassies to Sparta and Rome at 12:1-23 have the same aim of raising Judean renown throughout the world. The passage not only mentions the former fame achieved (12:7-8), but then quotes the exact letter wherein the Spartans recognized their allegiance to the Judeans (12:19-23). It might also be noted that here and at 10:26-45, the office of high priest, the

³⁰⁰ D. Williams, *Structure*, 123-125.

other theme of the addendum, is mentioned no less than six times (10:32, 38; 12:3, 6, 7, 20). The same theme of high priesthood is continued at 13:41-42, where it is especially linked to Simon.

The thematic ties thus seem to be strong between all the proposed passages of group 2 and the addendum. Though not all the passages contain the high priesthood theme recognized by Williams, many do. Secondly, all seem to contain the secondary theme of the addendum we proposed, which is that of international recognition for the Judeans. When this is combined with the similarities observed in the central characters of these sections, it becomes quite plausible that these separate problematic passages are all related to the addendum and added at the same time. It only remains for us to look at the ways in which the additional passages communicate the material to see if further support might be garnered there.

In the addendum there are basically two prominent types of communication: official documents (diplomatic letters, indirect diplomatic letters, constitution) and narrative chronicle. The narrative report is restricted almost entirely to the last chapter of the addendum. Specifically this covers 15:37-41; 16:4-22. It is only interrupted with a short testament from Simon to his sons (16:1-3). The official documents are much more prevalent throughout the rest of the addendum.

14:16-19 comprises what amounts to an indirect diplomatic letter. In this sort of communication the contents of the document, but not the document itself, are delivered, following the model of indirect speech. This type of communication notably also appears at 10:3-9. First, in 10:3-6, the contents of Demetrius' message to Jonathan are communicated through this indirect diplomatic letter, then Jonathan again repeats them in the same way to the inhabitants of the citadel at 10:7-9.

14:20-23 is a more traditional diplomatic correspondence. It is quoted in full and properly addressed. The same form is used elsewhere in group 2 at 8:23-32; 10:26-45; 12:3-4, 6-18, 20-23; 15:1-9. The diplomatic letters are thus highly prevalent throughout group 2, both within and outside the addendum. This further strengthens the link we have noticed between all these passages.

We can now give a concise description of this redactional layer. Group 2's passages are heavily focused on the specific characters of the Roman people and the Spartan nation, particularly in their relationship to the Judeans. There is also a focus on the characters of Simon, Antiochus VII, and John Hyrcanus, which only comes through on rare occasions outside of the addendum. This redaction is concerned with the office of high priesthood, which is evident in many passages both in the addendum and in the passages outside the addendum. In addition, another strong theme, that of international recognition is displayed throughout. Both of these themes are communicated primarily through political documents, which call attention to the office of high priesthood and bestow international recognition. The reliance on documents suggests that we should rename group 2 1Macc Documentarian or 1MaccD.

Group 3

The third group of problematic passages consists of the following verses: **2:23-26; 3:3-9; 5:18-19, 55-62; 6:42-46; 9:34-42; 13:25-30; 14:4-15**. These were loosely grouped together by a somewhat general trend to be concerned with honoring the members of the Hasmonean family to the exclusion of other Judeans and allies. There is nothing of special note on the general content of these verses, we shall therefore proceed with an analysis of the characters, themes, and forms found in these passages in order to determine if they might be linked.

As we noted above, there seems to be a privileging of Hasmoneans in most of these passages. This characteristic is not especially notable in the scope of the basic story of 1Maccabees, but when we examine the sections that have appeared troublesome in the reading of the book, this quality is quite rare. As we saw in 1MaccO and 1MaccD, though the Hasmoneans do appear, they are not stressed. Instead it is the actions of others in response to the Hasmoneans that plays the central role. Because of this situation, characters outside the family of Mattathias are the central figures. These passages in group 3, however, are different.

2:23-26 provide a good starting point for the study of characters. The most prominent character in this passage is Mattathias. He is characterized within the passage

as a hero and righteous warrior, through his murder of a Judean sacrificing on an illicit altar and the murder of the king's officer who was enforcing that sacrifice. This point is furthered by the comparison to Phinehas son of Salu because he “was zealous for the law” (καὶ ἐζήλωσεν τῷ νόμῳ).

The same characterization is given to Judas Maccabeus in 3:3-9, where he is specifically described in 3:5-6 as a warrior against those who break the law. In many ways Judas is an imitation of Mattathias in these verses because of his disposition as a warrior against both gentiles and apostate Judeans for the sake of the law. At 6:43-46, Eleazar Avaran, brother of Judas, is also glorified as a righteous warrior. In this scene, where his death is described, he fights against the gentiles, and tries to kill the king. He does this all to save his people (τοῦ σωσαι τὸν λαὸν αὐτοῦ). The role of the Hasmonean princes as righteous warriors is further stressed by 14:4-15. Simon is the subject of this song, and at verses 5-7, 13-14 his military victories are stressed. This culminates in 14:13 and 14:14, which report that “the kings were crushed in those days... [and] he sought out the law and did away with all the renegades and outlaws”. This mirrors exactly the way Mattathias is pictured in 2:23-26, the way Judas is portrayed in the song praising him at 3:3-9, and the way Eleazar is described at 6:43-44.

There are two further passages which tend toward the description of the Hasmoneans as righteous warriors within group 3. These two are more general in nature. In the description of the tomb that Simon built (13:25-30), there is a definite motif of presentation for the family as warriors. Their tombs are decorated with suits of armor and with ships (or rostra) as a warning to those who sail the seas. Though the tombs say nothing of their cause, the martial tone is not lost.

The second of these passages comes at 5:55-62. Here, the episode features Joseph and Azariah--two generals under the command of the family of the Hasmoneans--but the passage is indisputably about the family of Mattathias. At 5:55-56 and then at 5:62 the Hasmonean family's character as warriors and saviors is established. This is shown at 5:55-56 by the desire of Joseph and Azariah to make war because “[they] heard of the brave deeds and war [the Hasmoneans] had made” (ἤκουσεν Ἰωσηφ τοῦ Ζαχαρίου καὶ Ἀζαρίας ἄρχοντες τῆς δυνάμεως τῶν ἀνδραγαθίων καὶ τοῦ πολέμου οἷα

ἐποίησαν). After the pair unsuccessfully make war and are routed, the text comments at 5:62 that their failure came because they were not of the family through whose hands salvation was given to Israel (αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων οἷς ἔδόθη σωτηρία Ἰσραὴλ διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν).

As this brief look at the characterization of the passages shows, the characters in group 3 are closely linked, not only by virtue of their being family members, but also by virtue of their being warriors. Further, there are some even closer ties between some of the characters in group 3, through their description as fighting particularly on behalf of the law. There is one passage that was left out of the grouping above because it does not present the Hasmonean family particularly as warriors. 9:35-42 first presents the death of the last brother, John, at the hands of the Nabateans by means of trickery. It then presents the vengeance of Simon and Jonathan who take on the Nabateans by ambush. Though the retribution is accomplished through paramilitary action, it is not strictly war-like, and certainly does not appear to be honorable. This passage as of yet does not have links to the rest of group 3, but these may arrive in the following sections.

In each passage one can notice several possible themes. Many of these compliment each other within the passage, while others stand on their own. At 2:23-26 one theme appears to be righteous anger. This can be deduced from the statement in the passage that describes Mattathias' reaction to the apostasy he witnesses, which is expressed as "anger according to the judgment" (θυμὸν κατὰ τὸ κρίμα). The statement ties together the crime in the first half of the passage with the punishment meted out by Mattathias in the second part of the section. The statement ties into the final declaration by the narrator, that he was zealous for the law. Zeal for the law also appears to be a theme, as legal terminology is used in the two verses mentioned here. Another related theme appears to be obedience; the Judean man is obedient to the king's command, while Mattathias is obedient to the ancestral law. Further, the final theme one can glean from the passage is that of appropriate action taken against enemies. The notable element of the passage is that Mattathias takes action by attacking the lawbreaker and the king's man and the illicit altar, which all stood in opposition to him.

As we have seen in the above section concerning characterization in group 3, appropriately battling against enemies is a popular theme among these passages. At 5:18-19; 55-62 Joseph and Azariah battle against the gentiles who had not been harassing Israel, against the orders of Judas. It is this act that ultimately defines them in contrast to the Hasmoneans. At 3:3-9 Judas battles enemies both in the form of opposing kings and lawbreakers, and this is shown to be the reason for his greatness and fame. Eleazar's great deed at 6:42-46, which brings about his downfall, is a battle against the royal phalanxes and elephants, which is made in an effort to save his people. Finally, at 14:4-15, Simon is praised for his victories over the kings, lawbreakers and enemies of the people. This theme is ubiquitous, but it is not the only theme shared by many of these passages.

Fame, glory and renown dominate as a general theme in many of these passages too. The song of praise for Judas claims in the first verse that "he extended the glory for his people" (καὶ ἐπλάτυνεν δόξαν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ), and in the final verse mentions that Judas was "renowned to the ends of the earth" (καὶ ὠνομάσθη ἕως ἐσχάτου γῆς). Joseph and Azariah, after hearing of the wars and brave deeds of the Hasmoneans, say "Let us too make a name for ourselves" (ποιήσωμεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἑαυτοῖς ὄνομα). This statement at 5:57 works in two ways: first it shows the desire that the two generals had for becoming famous, and second, the fact that the Hasmoneans already made a name for themselves. Eleazar too, at 6:44 goes out after what he believes to be the king's elephant in order to "win eternal fame" (περιποιῆσαι ἑαυτῷ ὄνομα αἰώνιον). In the song of praise for Simon at 14:4, the singer reminds the listener that his reign was pleasing to the people "as was his glory all his days" (καὶ ἡ δόξα αὐτοῦ πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας). The song continues, at 14:10, to comment on his deeds in the towns of Judah "until the renown of his glorious name spread until the ends of the earth" (ἕως ὅτου ὠνομάσθη τὸ ὄνομα τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἕως ἄκρου γῆς). Then in the last verse, the song tells how "he glorified the temple" (τὰ ἅγια ἔδόξασεν).

Besides these examples where the theme is explicitly mentioned, 13:29-30 stress Simon's intentions for making the elaborate tombs for his family along the same lines. These verses report that he erected columns "as a permanent memorial" (εἰς ὄνομα

αἰώνιον) for his family “which still exists today” (ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης). The theme of glory and fame here and in the passages listed above is unquestionable, and unites all but two passages (2:23-26; 9:35-42). These two however share other themes with many of the other fragments in group 3. We have already seen how 2:23-26 shares the theme of taking appropriate action against enemies, but we have not seen yet how 9:35-42 connects to any of these segments of group 3.

The connection for 9:35-42 comes with the third major theme of these passages: death of the Hasmonean family. In this story, the narrative of John’s death is recounted. Though it is a death without honor and does not speak terribly much about him, the mention of his capture (9:36), his death (9:38), and the vengeance of which his killers were victim (9:42) ensure that it plays a central role in the story. Similarly, 6:42-46 narrates the death of the other “minor³⁰¹” brother in the family. That his death plays a major role in this scene can be observed in the mention of his death at 6:44 and again at 6:46. The third passage that deals with the mortality of the Hasmoneans is the account of the construction of the tomb at Modein by Simon (13:25-30). Though this passage does not narrate the death of one of the brothers, it does narrate Jonathan’s burial in a particularly morbid phrasing (13:25) “Simon sent and took the bones of his brother Jonathan” (καὶ ἀπέστειλεν Σιμων καὶ ἔλαβεν τὰ ὀστά Ἰωναθου τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ). The passage not only refers to the deaths of Simon’s father and all his brothers (13:27), but also foreshadows his own death, because he builds a tomb for himself as well (13:28). Thus, death of the Hasmoneans is a strong motif.

We have seen then that thematically, there is no universal trend for the passages in group 3. Some of the passages underline the glory and fame of the brothers and their deeds, while others emphasize their victories against the enemies of Israel. Still a third group stresses the deaths of the family. However, the themes shown here are not necessarily mutually exclusive. Some passages contain traces of all three themes, others, a combination of two. Therefore, we can say that the themes in group 3 provide further evidence of a connection between these passages.

³⁰¹ I call Eleazar and John minor brothers because, aside from their introduction in 2:1, neither appears again in the story until his death.

The forms of communication of the material used in these passages are not especially remarkable. Some are reported only with the narration of a chronicler: 2:23-26, 6:43-46, 13:25-30. Others are mostly narrative reports, but also contain some direct speech in the form of exhortations, commands or reports: 5:18-19, 55-62; 9:35-42, the last of which also contains a portion in indirect speech. Finally, there are the two songs of praise for Judas and Simon: 3:3-9; 14:4-15. The forms used definitely do not provide another means to connect these passages, but this does not seem to speak against the connections either.

The overall impression one gets is that there is some link between all these passages. We have seen that they all deal very closely with matters pertaining to the Hasmonean family in general, or individuals within the Hasmonean family. Further, we have seen that those characters featured in these passages are shown in particularly martial terms. One can also notice a trend in group 3 toward glory and fame, which is not totally unrelated to the martial characterization or the secondary theme of death of the heroes. Beyond these themes one notices another connection between many of these stories is the highly particular and legendary nature in which they are told, which is different from the broad narrative scope featured in most of the book. Particularly this applies to the story of Mattathias, the deaths of Eleazar and John, the episode of Joseph and Azariah and the erection of the family tomb by Simon. But this also applies in some ways to the songs of Simon and Judas, which lionize (literally in the case of Judas) the men, and make their characters larger-than-life.

Another feature, which arouses the interest is that group 3 appears to incorporate some of the main themes from the other two redactional layers. The focus on the defeat of lawbreakers by Mattathias, Simon and Judas reminds one of 1MaccO. The motif of fame throughout the passages is akin to the international recognition focused upon in 1MaccD. The final verse of the passages concerning Joseph and Azariah (5:62) reminds one of the double-causality theme of the main story. The heavy focus on the Hasmonean family is also reminiscent of the basic layer of the book. These facts are all what separate group three from the other redactional layers and the basic layer of the book.

Because of the focus on the Hasmoneans, and the legendary character we will name group 3 the 1Macc Hasmonean legend redaction or 1MacCH.

Historical Arguments

We accept the basic dating of the composition of 1Macc to 132-128 BCE, as proposed by many scholars.³⁰² We apply this dating only to the foundational layer of 1Maccabees, which we shall call 1MaccGrundschrift.³⁰³ We have arrived at this dating based upon a variety of criteria. First, the text of 1MaccG covers the time period from 175-141 BCE.³⁰⁴ A text of this magnitude would have taken some time to commission and then compose, this especially applies to the sources used, which may have included some Seleucid annals, and would have taken more time to obtain and then translate.³⁰⁵ Further, though 1MaccG contains no explicit information on the succession, it might hint

³⁰² This has been proposed most recently by D. Williams, *Structure*, 122, who marks ca.130 as the date for his sections 1 & 2 (1:1-14:15), based on the criticisms by S. Schwartz, "Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1Maccabees and Hasmonean Expansion" (*JJS* 42, 16-38, 1991) of a later date, due to anti-gentile rhetoric. However, many scholars hold firm to dates much later on, e.g. R. Doran, *The First Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections* (New Interpreters Bible, v.4; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996) and J. Dancy, *A Commentary on 1Maccabees* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1954). It must be stated that these latter hypothesizes dates based on two sections I deem to be secondary (13:30; 16:23).

³⁰³ Hereafter 1MaccG, which is all parts of 1Maccabees outside the problematic passages listed above. Namely: 1:1-10, 16-42, 44-51, 53-61, 64; 2:1-22, 27-43, 45-70; 3:1-2, 10-60; 4:1-61; 5:1-17, 20-54, 63-68; 6:1-18a, 19-20, 28-41, 47-63; 7:1-4, 9c-11, 15-16a, 18-19, 20c, 26-50; 9:1*-22, 25-33, 43-53, 62-68, 70-72; 10:1-2, 10-13, 14-24, 47-60, 62-63, 65-89; 11:1-20, 22-24, 26-74; 12:24-53; 13:1-24, 31-40, 43-53.

³⁰⁴ For discussions on the calendrical concerns in 1Maccabees see J. Goldstein, *1Maccabees*, 540-543, where he tries to solve the disparities of dating used by 1Maccabees. The upshot of this is a half-year difference at most, and does not affect our argument here.

³⁰⁵ K. -D. Schunck, *Die Quellen des I. und II. Makkabäerbuches* (Halle: Niemeyer, 1954), 36-51, makes the argument for a Seleucid chronicle based on the dating system, and information directly pertaining the broader Hellenistic world, however, G. Neuhaus, "Quellen im I. Makkabäerbuch?: Eine Engegung auf Die Analyse von K.-D. Schunck" (*JSJ* vol. V, no. 2, 1974, 162-175), 168, sees that the evidence is against there being a Seleucid source. The question remains open.

at the passage of power to John Hyrcanus in the final verse (13:53). This would mean that a date of 134 BCE would be a starting point for the process of composition, however it could be as early as 140, under the reign of Simon. The date of 1MaccG likely has a lower limit in the expansionist policies of John Hyrcanus, both in his hiring of foreign mercenaries and his introduction of non-Jews into the nation.³⁰⁶ This policy started once Hyrcanus was freed from the gentile chains that bound him, in around 130 BCE.³⁰⁷

The conclusion one must draw then, is that 1MaccG, which has a focused aim of describing the liberation of the Jerusalem temple cult and the Judean state from the gentiles,³⁰⁸ would be written shortly after the time this task was completed. This leaves open the question of the various additions to 1MaccG, and their possible date of inclusion and historical setting. We will now try to hypothesize the occasions for which each of these redactions were made, basing our information on what the text stresses and on the outside historical situation as far as we know it. These ideas about dating should not be taken as fact, rather they should be appreciated as recommendations of occasions wherein composition of each of these layers might make sense. It is of course highly possible that the composition and inclusion of any of these layers was not particularly occasional, but the result of far more complex processes of textual transmission. We will proceed with this investigation in the order in which the additional layers were covered above.³⁰⁹ These have no bearing on the supposed chronology, but simply will make for a clearer presentation.

1MaccO- The Internal Opposition Redaction

For this addition we must find a situation that fits the description of characters, themes, and events as presented in 1MaccO. As a reminder: the redaction describes a group most notable for going to those in power (usually kings, though not always), complaining against, or accusing the Hasmoneans, trying to seize power from the

³⁰⁶ This is the aforementioned argument of S. Schwartz, "Nations Roundabout", 17, and Williams *Structure*, 126

³⁰⁷ S. Schwartz, "Nations Roundabout", 18.

³⁰⁸ See D. Williams, *Structure*, 107 and N. Martola *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition in the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984), 279.

³⁰⁹ 1MaccOpponents, 1MaccDocumentarian, then 1MaccHasmonean Legends.

Hasmoneans, and abandoning ancestral laws. This group also incidentally has an association with the gentiles and their laws, though the relationship to the Seleucid laws particularly is not stressed. I propose that the situation in which this redaction was written may have something to do with the rise of Judean sects during and after the reign of John Hyrcanus³¹⁰ and his sons. It is clear that the precariously positioned government under the Hasmoneans would want unity more than anything else.³¹¹ The last thing a new ruler wants is dissension among his subjects. For this reason, 1MaccG had every reason to cover up, or minimize the efforts of the “hellenizers” against the Hasmoneans in the rebellion.³¹² However, when the sects arose and became a threat, perhaps a number of efforts could have been undertaken by the Hasmoneans to convince the populace of the problems inherent in sectarianism. Part of these efforts could have included propaganda against the institutions of sectarianism, through comparison to the previously glossed-over Hellenistic factions during the war for independence. By this proposal it should be clear that we are not attempting to challenge the famous proposition of Bickermann regarding the religious persecutions under Antiochus IV and subsequent rebellion being largely internal matters for Judea. We merely propose that it was in the interest of the Hasmoneans and those who supported an independent Judea to minimize those facts in order to more sharply define the conflict and hence Judean identity as opposed to gentile influence.

A.I. Baumgarten’s work on the rise of Judean sects will be of help here in making our case. In this book, Baumgarten argues that the time at which Judean sects really came into their own, and began to exercise their full power, was the period after the

³¹⁰ As might already be apparent, I am basing much of the following section on the conclusions of A. Baumgarten, *The Flourishing of the Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (Leiden: Brill, 1997). Though it must be clearly stated that he does not draw analogies between the Hellenizers and the sects. I am simply using his description of sects as a backdrop against which I place the description of the opponents in 1MaccO.

³¹¹ *Ibid.*, 89. Baumgarten argues that at first when the sects arose there was hope for healing in the land under the new Judean rulership.

³¹² The role of the “hellenizers” is particularly stressed in 2Maccabees, written around the end of the second century BCE (and perhaps also the work of Jason of Cyrene, which may significantly predate it), and may reflect similar biases and/or a more honest account of the internal situation during the rebellion.

Hasmonean dynasty achieved independence from the Seleucids.³¹³ Baumgarten also describes the sects that arose, using the information available, particularly in relation to the Pharisees, Essenes, Sadducees, and the Qumran sectarians.

He describes the groups as large, but not more than 10% of the population at most.³¹⁴ This can be compared to the descriptions of the opponents where they are described as πολλοὶ ἀπὸ Ἰσραηλ \ ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ πολλοὶ (many from Israel \ many of the people; 1:43, 52). These suggest that the group in question was sizable. However, further along in the narrative, it seems that they were still a minority. 10:14 specifically speaks to this where it says “only in Beth-zur did some remain who had abandoned the law and the commandments”. This similarity is, of course, not conclusive. Many groups can be described in such terms, and this particularly could reflect the Hasmonean victories in the scope of 1MaccG, rather than making statements concerning the general size of the opposition parties. However, Baumgarten lists more qualities of the sects during the Maccabean period.

The sects were mostly an urban phenomenon, and many had close ties to Jerusalem, according to Baumgarten.³¹⁵ This is reflected in a number of the passages relating to the opponents of the Maccabees. 1:14 relates the erection of the gymnasium in Jerusalem by the internal opposition. 7:21-25 speaks of Judas preventing those in the city (the followers of Alcimus) from going out to the country, where Judas’ strength lay. 10:14 again supports this claim by stating that only in Beth-zur did the opponents remain. The urban concentration of the opponents is very clear, and marks another similarity to Baumgarten’s description of Judean sects of the Hasmonean period.

Baumgarten claims the sectarians were also largely from the elite classes, though not necessarily aristocracy. This is due to their leisure to pursue sectarian activities and the requirements of some sects to contribute considerable property.³¹⁶ Further, these groups were favorable to many because of the positions of power they offered one in

³¹³ Ibid, 86.

³¹⁴ Ibid., 42-43.

³¹⁵ Ibid., 45-46.

³¹⁶ Ibid., 47. Baumgarten mentions for example that members of the Qumran sect were supposed to contribute property.

society.³¹⁷ The description of the group at 6:24 matches that of a propertied class. They claim the Hasmoneans have, among other things, plundered their property (οἱ κληρονομίαί ἡμῶν διηρπάζοντο). This sentiment is backed up by the opponents led by Alcimus at 7:7. The fact of their status as those who held great influence is shown by their many approaches to the Seleucid overlords (1:13; 2:44; 6:21; 7:5, 20ab, 25; 9:58-61; 10:61,64; 11:21, 25) and by their influence over the people of Israel (1:11-12; 7:13-14, 22-24; 9:23-24, 54-57). In each of these latter instances the opponents mislead the populace or gain their support. The similarities here too may be mere coincidence, but the three similarities together between sectarians and the opponents in 1MaccO are striking.

The correspondences do not end there though. Related to their elite status, Baumgarten argues that the sects had a higher quality diet than the general population, consisting of meat and wine in some cases.³¹⁸ This may have attracted opportunistic people to their ranks during lean times and famine.³¹⁹ After Judas' death, the narrator of 1MaccO reports on all the opponents coming out in all parts of Israel, and that "in those days a very great famine occurred, and the country went over to them [the opponents]." The description is undoubtedly of the same phenomenon. There is a clear cause and effect relationship between the rise of the famine and the popularity of the opponents' ranks. While it is possible the opponents had the same profile as the sects, it becomes more likely now that the similarities are due to the opponents being modeled on the sects.

Another of many striking analogies between the sects and the opponents is described by Baumgarten:

³¹⁷ Ibid., 63. He especially notes that being a Pharisee at the time of Salome Alexandra and a Sadducee at the time of Alexander Jannaeus must have been profitable. This is also backed up by 4QpNah ii 9, which describes Ephraim (Pharisees) as the group that held kings, priests, laymen, and converts under their sway, according to Baumgarten.

³¹⁸ Ibid., 64. Baumgarten states further that the sects probably had better agricultural know-how and better means than the average subsistence farmers of the time.

³¹⁹ Ibid., 65. He states that this may have especially been the case with Essenes and Qumranites of whom it is attested that they did well in famine times.

They were thus well positioned to become sectarians of the reformist or introversionist kind, either working to change the culture from a position of advantage, and sometimes even succeeding in achieving dominance, or being the most obstinate opponents of the establishment.³²⁰

Though the description here is of the sectarians, could it not easily be also said of the opponents to the Hasmoneans? The group works to change the culture at the outset of the book (1:11-15) while in a position of advantage. This same trend continues while they have the ear of the king and his minions (6:18, 21-27; 7:5-7; 9:58-61; 11:21). They also periodically achieve the dominant position (1:52), most notably under Alcimus (7:13-14, 23-24, 16d-17, 20ab, 21-25) by taking control of the country and the temple. At other times, when the Hasmoneans have clearly taken control, the opponents are surely depicted as “the most obstinate opponents of the establishment” (10:61, 64; 11:25). The groups have up to this point, very comparable characteristics.

The comparison can be carried even a bit further: according to Baumgarten, sects need something central, in which they all share, that they must contend over. For the Judean sects at this time, it was the temple.³²¹ In 1MaccO this struggle for the temple by the opponents is shown most succinctly in the Alcimus passages (7:5-7, 13-14, 16d-17, 20ab, 21-25; 9:54-57) where he successfully wrests control of the temple away from the Hasmoneans, and even succeeds in turning much of the country (including the scribes and Hasideans) toward him as a result. The association between the opponents and the sects is outstanding.

One might wonder about one of the characteristics of the opponents, i.e. their relation to the law. They are described as lawbreakers, those who abandoned the law, and those accepting the king’s laws. Though this is not the major attribute of the opponents, it is still present. Certainly the major Judean sects of the Maccabean age were not Hellenizers or lawbreakers. Baumgarten provides a useful analogy for the Judean mainstream’s view of the sectarians at the time: they would have thought the sectarian laws and ideas to be pure invention, and they would have wondered why the ancestral

³²⁰ *Ibid.*, 48.

³²¹ *Ibid.*, 69. In the following pages Baumgarten dismisses the claims that it is the law or any other matter about which the sects contended, arguing that much of their observance in the law and halakah was quite similar. However, even if it is the law, there is some support for this in the description of the opponents.

laws and customs served the people so well for so many years if they were in fact wrong.³²² If we view the sects in this light we see that it is possible that the Hasmoneans might successfully try to paint the sectarians as lawbreakers and inventors, who were trying to change the law. This criticism could apply to any number of the sectarian customs, from the Pharisaic “ancestral tradition”³²³ to the various rules of community for the sectarians at Qumran.³²⁴ The specifically Hellenizing aspect of the opponents, we must recall, is nowhere stressed in 1MaccO, and only even mentioned twice. These instances can be attributed to the allegory being employed by the author of 1MaccO. That is, to make the connection deeper and firmer between the actual Hellenizers of the rebellion (and later?), and the opponents of the Hasmoneans, the latter could have been imbued with characteristics of the former.

Though we have suitable evidence for a set of groups to which 1MaccO might refer, an addition to the dynastic history may also have a specific occasion behind it. The situation would have to be one in which the sects gained such strength in the country, and caused such opposition to the Hasmoneans, that they truly merited comparison to the roughly drawn sketch in people’s minds of the hellenizers of old.³²⁵ Even with these precepts, there are several examples of this from historians of the period. When writing about the period, S.J.D. Cohen states:

Their fall from power was caused by both internal and external enemies. During the reigns of John Hyrcanus (135-104 BCE) and Alexander Jannaeus (103-76 BCE), many Jews opposed Maccabean rule. These opponents were not “Hellenizers” and “lawless” Jews who supported

³²² Ibid., 62. Baumgarten comes to this conclusion by comparing the group dynamics of the Anglican church during the Puritan reformations of the 1600’s. He does so cautiously, and brings it up as a significant possibility.

³²³ S. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah* (2nd ed.; Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 140-141 describes this as supplemental laws to the written torah.

³²⁴ For example: 1QS/4QSa-j, CD, etc.

³²⁵ This is not to say that Hellenizers ceased to exist after the Maccabean rebellion, S. Cohen, *Maccabees to Mishnah*, 34, notes that there is plenty of evidence for “hellenizers” existing straight through the period and extending even into rabbinic times. However, as noted above, the picture of the group in 1Maccabees is not overly concerned with the “hellenizing” nature of the Judean opponents.

Antiochus's attempt to destroy Judaism, but loyal Jews who had had enough of Maccabean autocratic ways.³²⁶

Through this statement one might envision situations like the one 1MaccO might have been written in, to be commonplace. Indeed, L.L. Grabbe, shares the same view as Cohen on the period. Citing the evidence from Josephus, he mentions one particular instance in which Hyrcanus had to put down a rebellion during his priesthood.³²⁷ Grabbe similarly cites Josephus concerning the rule of Alexander Jannaeus, stating that the two biggest themes concerning Jannaeus are: 1) the expansion of his power and 2) the internal opposition he faced.³²⁸ Likely, both Cohen and Grabbe are relying on the same source, as Josephus is the only extant historian who covers the period of Judean history in any significant and nominally reliable way. He is, after all, our oldest extant secondary source for the period. It is noteworthy that, for Josephus in the *Antiquities*,³²⁹ the source of the troubles under both these later Hasmonean leaders stems at least in part from sectarians.³³⁰

This period of history, wherein there was common opposition to the Maccabees is possibly the situation in which 1MaccO was weaved into the existing version of 1Macc. We propose to place the insertion during or following one of the periods of open rebellion reported by Josephus. We would also suggest that specific details make it more likely that it is the civil war under Alexander Jannaeus that provided the occasion to make the addition. Not only does this occasion provide a true crisis for a young and independent nation, but it reflects some of the same themes as the rebellions under Judas Maccabeus and his brothers.

According to Josephus, Alexander Jannaeus faced a six-year civil war, which resulted in his Judean opponents seeking aid from a Seleucid pretender to the throne.

³²⁶ S. Cohen, *Maccabees to Mishnah*, 3.

³²⁷ L. Grabbe, *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian, Volume 1: The Persian and Greek Periods* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992), 301. Grabbe specifically cites the *Jewish War* 1.2.3-8 sections 54-69 and *Antiquities* XII 228-300. We shall return to these directly below.

³²⁸ *Ibid.*, 302.

³²⁹ Note that in *Jewish War* the sectarian nature is fully absent in both of these accounts.

³³⁰ *Antiquities* XIII 288-300 concerning Hyrcanus, and *Antiquities* XIII 377-383. See also the interpretations of these verses by Grabbe, *Cyrus to Hadrian*, 301-303.

Demetrius III eventually had Alexander on the run, only to be chased out by Alexander when some of Demetrius III's supporters switched sides and went over to Alexander. After this, Alexander punished many of the opponents with crucifixion, which led many of the survivors to abandon the Hasmonean state for the gentiles for the rest of Alexander's reign.³³¹ It is implied by a scene at Alexander's deathbed that among the opponents was the sect of the Pharisees, concerning which he instructs his wife to pardon and befriend once he dies so as to gain control of the country.³³²

The particular similarities to 1MaccO should be clear: the rebels in both cases are notable for seeking Seleucid aid and fighting against their own countrymen (1:52; 2:42-44; 6:18, 21-27; 7:5-7, 13-14, 21-23; 9:58-61; 10:61; 11:21). Also remarkable is that each set of opponents apparently flees the country once they have lost control (2:44; 6:21; 7:25; 9:23; 10:64; 11:25). Further, each of these groups claims a massacre at the hands of Hasmonean leadership (2:42-44; 6:24; 7:24; 9:61, 73). It is especially interesting that in specific cases the opponents in 1MaccO report on the expansionist policies of the Hasmoneans (6:25-27; 7:6-7), which we remarked were a major feature of Alexander Jannaeus' reign.

When these similarities are tied particularly to the sectarian nature of the revolt under Alexander Jannaeus, the connection becomes all the more firm. We have already extensively noted the associations between the "apostate" identity in 1MaccO and the identity of sectarians in the study of Maccabean sects by Baumgarten. We only add the further point that the identity of historical Hellenists is rather unclear. Grabbe notes that a problem when discussing Hellenists is that parties implied as Hellenists often had nothing to do with Greek practices or religion. The term simply meant non-Judean for many. This allowed for many innovations to be categorized under the title.³³³ S.J.D. Cohen similarly remarks on the complicated relationship between "Hellenism" and

³³¹ *Antiquities* XIII 377-383. All the information above in this paragraph is a summary of Josephus' material.

³³² *Antiquities* XIII 401. See the interpretation of Grabbe, *Cyrus to Hadrian*, 303, where he claims it is unlikely the Pharisees were the only group who rebelled, merely a major force.

³³³ L. Grabbe, *Cyrus to Hadrian*, 257-258. The two sentences are a paraphrase of Grabbe's words on the subject.

“Judaism” at this time. He notes that all forms of Judaism were in some ways Hellenic, and all were alloys of some sort; this state led to the fact that, at least for a modern reader it is sometimes difficult to determine why those called apostates or Hellenizers merited the claim.³³⁴ This situation of innovations receiving the brand of “apostasy” or “lawlessness” could explain how the sectarian opponents of Alexander might be depicted as Hellenizers of his grandfather’s day without too much trouble.³³⁵

The situation proposed for the inclusion of 1MaccO into the overall framework is just that, a proposal. As we noted before, the period saw a number of minor rebellions against the Hasmonean leadership by sectarians. Any number of these situations could have been apt places for an addition of this nature to be made to 1Macc. More importantly, these additions do not have to be occasional at all; they may simply reflect an editor’s desire to include the actual and historical “apostates” in the story of the Hasmoneans. However, if we take the great degree of similarities into account it seems that the period from 88-86 BCE +/- four years is a good place for 1MaccO to have been written into the framework of 1Macc. It may have been written as an argument against the sects and their role in fomenting rebellion. 1MaccO would not only satirize the inventions of the sects, but would also show how following such inventions toward rebellion leads to the utter destruction of sects at the hands of “mainstream” Judaism under the guidance of the Maccabean family.³³⁶ The addition would also draw Alexander in the mold of his forebears by acknowledging his destruction of “Hellenist” inventors and the Seleucid authorities to which they appealed. In short, the addition is an argument

³³⁴ S. Cohen, *Maccabees to Mishnah*, 29-33. Much of the section surrounding these pages deals with the difficulty of discussing Judaism against Hellenism, but the discussion in these pages comes most to the point.

³³⁵ We should also recall here that although the opponents are introduced as “hellenizers” i.e. practitioners of Greek laws, 1:11-15, 43, 52; 2:44 there is a turn at 6:21-27 where they mention their obedience to the king’s laws, but only incidentally and continue most to be identified as accusers and traitors for the rest of the book 7:5-7, 13-14, 16-17, 20ab, 21-25; 9:54-57, 58-61, 69; 10:14, 61, 64; 11:21, 25.

³³⁶ It should be noted that we do not envision a single mainstream Judean identity, nor a fixed sectarian identity to be in place, or even possible. By mainstream we mean only the Judeans who were not excluded, either by choice or by force, from the religious and communal life of their Judean neighbors. We also recognize that the identity of those who were excluded was quite fluid.

for the unity behind the Hasmonean leadership, in order to build a stronger and “more traditional” Judean state.

1MaccD – The Documentarian Redaction

In the (very brief) diachronic section of D.S. Williams’ work, he suggests that the addendum to 1Maccabees (14:16-16:24) was tacked on in a second edition of the work, which appeared ca. 100 BCE.³³⁷ He says further:

[W]e may infer that section three was probably added because of the political exigencies of John Hyrcanus and/or his son Alexander Jannaeus, each of whom faced internal revolt. Indeed, according to Josephus and rabbinic literature, John was asked by a Pharisee to give up the office of high priest, and open rebellion against Alexander came when he was exercising his priestly office. Possibly in the face of such troubles, section three establishes that the leadership of the Jews—and the position of high priest—was handed down from the generation of Judas, Jonathan, and Simon to another generation. Particularly interesting in this regard is the connection that section three makes between John and Judas. The implication would seem to be that John was a worthy successor to the generation of his father.³³⁸

There are several suggestions that Williams makes here, but let us zero in on the one that seems to have the most evidence behind it. While it is true that John Hyrcanus and his son Alexander Jannaeus both faced challenges to their high priesthoods, according to Josephus,³³⁹ there appears to be more linking the addendum to John Hyrcanus, as the last sentence of the quotation implies.

Given that there is a strong thematic (and literal) connection between Williams’ section three and our 1MaccD, we might look for the same historical situation where the emphasis of 1MaccD would fit. Let us recall that an emphasis on the office of the high priesthood, and international recognition of the Hasmonean’s power were the main themes we saw in 1MaccD. In addition, the major characters were the Romans, Simon, and John Hyrcanus. Since these themes would also fit nicely in the time of John Hyrcanus, let us look there.

The strong link between Hyrcanus and the Romans is supported by Josephus in a passage where he first succeeds in finally removing the Seleucids from the land

³³⁷ D. Williams, *Structure*, 122.

³³⁸ D. Williams, *Structure*, 126. Note that section three for Williams, is one and the same as the addendum (14:16-16:24).

³³⁹ *Antiquities* XIII 288 ff. and XIII 299

permanently, and then renews his friendship with the Romans.³⁴⁰ So, not only would the presence of the Roman and Spartan letters in 1MaccD acknowledge Hasmonean leadership, but Hyrcanus would also have special reason to remind the populace of the family's recently renewed Roman support.

Josephus also reports an episode that would fit John Hyrcanus' need to ensure his position as high priest and ruler of the people. In *Antiquities* 288 ff. Josephus tells of the opposition to Hyrcanus' rule by one of the Pharisees, Eleazar. While banqueting with the group, Hyrcanus mentions that he will do anything the Pharisees ask of him to become a more proper leader, and this Eleazar asks Hyrcanus to step down from the High Priesthood because he is unfit for the office. Jonathan the Sadducee then convinces Hyrcanus that Eleazar was simply a mouthpiece for all the Pharisees and asks the high priest to test their allegiance to him by asking what punishment Eleazar should be given. Once they fail the test, Hyrcanus lashes out against them, and there is a short period of rebellion, where the Pharisees and others who do not think Hyrcanus should be high priest are finally defeated by Hyrcanus. The story is also told in *Jewish Wars*, though without reference to the sect of the people involved.³⁴¹

Whether the people questioning Hyrcanus' rule as high priest are Pharisees is not at issue, 1MaccD nowhere mentions any sectarians or any group that could be an allegory for them. What this story from Josephus does relate, however, is the fact that his role as leader and high priest was questioned by people who had some degree of influence. The influence they wielded was great enough that there was a small rebellion under Hyrcanus, particularly concerning his qualifications for his cultic role. The situation presented by Josephus is just the type that may have encouraged John Hyrcanus to commission a secondary edition of 1Macc.

The initial version told the story of independence under his uncles and father. This newer version added emphasis on the high priesthood and the early recognition received by the family in this office. Hyrcanus could prove through these additions he was not some usurper, but was already the fourth leader who was endorsed by the great

³⁴⁰ *Antiquities* XIII 256-264.

³⁴¹ *War* I 54-69

and powerful Romans and their allies (8:1-32; 12:1-23; 14:16-20; 15:15-24), the third recognized as leader and high priest internationally (by the leading wing of the Seleucid house:³⁴² 10:3-9, 25-45; 14:38-40; 15:1-9), the second leader of the independent Judea (13:41-42; 16:24) and a rightful heir to his father's position and title, as stated by the Judean leadership and his own father (14:25-26, 49; 16:1-3). Thus, John Hyrcanus ensured his place as high priest by as many means possible.

The problems which arise from placing the authorship and subsequent insertion of 1MaccD during this episode are multiple: 1) There is no date provided by Josephus for the event he reports.³⁴³ 2) The epilogue (16:23-24) may suggest John Hyrcanus' death.³⁴⁴ To the first point, we do not need a specific date, only the situation, which is aided by the fact that 1MaccD contains little anti-gentile rhetoric, which would place it into the time of Hasmonean expansion—sometime during the 120s or after. As for the epilogue, I must agree with C.F. Keil, who states that the presence of the annals does not have to necessarily mean that the book was completed after Hyrcanus' death, but merely after the annals were begun.³⁴⁵

I would suggest that 1MaccD was added sometime between 120 and 104 BCE, which covers the period from the expansionist policies of the Hasmoneans until the death of Hyrcanus. Further, it was written in order to strengthen his claims as high priest by every means available in the face of opposition from some people among the nation.

³⁴² J. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 405. Goldstein sees a fundamental reason for the presence of 10:25-45 in the text is that the author is trying to seed the family tree of Hasmonean high priesthood in the reign of Demetrius I, father of the surviving Seleucid line. Why would this motive not be extended to 10:3-9, broadening from only the high priesthood, to Hasmonean power in general? It is important to note that Goldstein does *not* see the letter as a secondary insertion. He merely speaks of the author's use of the source material. The suggestion however carries much weight in relation to 1MaccD, which emphasizes the backing of the house at every turn.

³⁴³ L. Grabbe, *Cyrus to Hadrian*, 301, states "Exactly what form this rebellion took or when it occurred is unclear".

³⁴⁴ C. Grimm, *Kurzgefasstes Exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments, Dritte Lieferung: Das erste Buch der Maccabäer* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1853) is the first to mention this, but it has been repeated up to the time of R. Doran, *First Book of Maccabees*, 22.

³⁴⁵ C. Keil, *Commentar Über Die Bücher der Makkabäer: Supplement Zu Dem Biblischen Commentar Über Das Alter Testament* (Leipzig: Dörfling und Franke, 1875).

This means that 1MaccO was added at a time when 1MaccD already existed. This fact matters little, as the two redactions never interact and have entirely different purposes and scopes. A slight support of 1MaccD's addition prior to 1MaccO might be the fact that 14:29-37, which form a *res gestae* of the activity of the Hasmoneans and especially Simon, make no mention of any internal opposition at all, and tell of no attacks or accusations by those of the Judean nation. Though, this could also be explained by the propagandistic nature of 1MaccD.

1MaccH – The Hasmonean Legend Redaction

The nature of this redaction is rather difficult to put into an occasional context. The fact that the stories are highly legendary in character give them a timeless feel. The focus on the martial characteristics and glory and fame of the Hasmoneans also could apply to any occasion. One aspect of 1MaccH might suggest an approximate time of composition: the presence of elements or themes of each of the different redactional layers. We will recall that 1MaccH contains some mention of the victories of Mattathias, Judas and Simon over the lawless, which recalls 1MaccO. We may also remind ourselves that the motif of glory and fame is quite closely related to the international renown stressed by 1MaccD. These motifs, which are present in 1MaccH, may suggest that the redaction was written as the last part of the current form of 1Maccabees before its eventual translation and widespread distribution.

We may take this hypothesis even further by noticing the themes of glorification of the Maccabean heroes, emphasis on their chosen character, idealization of their rule, and particularly the recollection of their deaths and burial place may be appropriate after the death of one of the monarchs, or following the close of the Maccabean era altogether. Josephus may provide a clue toward this. In *Antiquities* XIII 405-406 he recalls that after Alexander's death the Pharisees recounted the deeds of Alexander, claimed he was a just king, caused the people to mourn him in their eulogies, and gave him a fantastic burial, greater than all the kings before him.

If this is reliable information, then this might be just the setting that provided for circulation of all these legendary stories of the Maccabees. Surely, after the civil wars there would have been harsh feelings toward Alexander Jannaeus still. But the eulogies may have recalled first the deeds and deaths of the first generation of the family (2:23-26; 5:55-62; 6:43-46; 9:35-42), and then slowly moved into comparisons of the work of that generation with Alexander Jannaeus. The mourners may also have recalled songs praising Simon and Judas (3:3-9; 14:4-15), such as those found in 1MaccH, and expanded on them from their knowledge of 1Maccabees (3:5-6; 14:14). The burial is not given a setting by Josephus, but it is possible that it too happened in Modein, the ancestral home, causing the editor to remark that indeed the tombs built by Simon were still standing, 70 years later (13:25-30). This general spirit of sorrow instigated by the Pharisees could then have inspired one of the scribes of the Hasmonean house to add to 1Maccabees some of the legends, which were fresh in his mind. This process reflected not only the grieving for the old king, but the admiration and longing for that first generation who had liberated the temple and country from the hands of the gentiles. This is all speculation of course, but the funeral proceedings were remarkable for Josephus, as opposed to any of those for the rest of the family, and the combination of themes does suggest a late date of insertion. If this is the case the addition would have been made in 76-74 BCE, within a few years of Alexander's death, during the reign of his wife Salome Alexandra. Conversely, it could have been made even later into the Roman period, though before the translation of the text into Greek.

Conclusions

We have seen that the original collection of problematic verses from 1Maccabees were able to be collected into three groups based on themes and characters contained in them. We found that each of these groups represented a different focus. 1MaccO was centered on the internal opponents to the Hasmoneans, 1MaccD was focused on documents that proved the family's validity as high priests, and 1MaccH was characterized by its concentration on Hasmonean legends. We also proposed situations wherein these could have been added to 1MaccG, the base story. We hypothesized that

the base story was composed sometime early in the reign of John Hyrcanus and that 1MaccD was the first redaction made, sometime between 120 and 104 BCE, in a response to questions about John Hyrcanus' position. We suggested that 1MaccO was written sometime between 88 and 86 BCE or possibly a bit later due to its concern with internal opponents and the analogies between these opponents and the Judean sects at the time. Finally we put forth that 1Macch could have been written following the funeral proceedings of Alexander Jannaeus, due to their notability in Josephus' account and the particular characteristics of 1Macch. We must stress that the timeline is more important in a relative sense than it is in an absolute sense. As we remarked above, these additions do not necessarily require any occasion for their composition or addition to the text. We merely mention these time periods and situations as possibilities in order to offer historical grounding for some of the sentiments reflected in each of the additional layers. If these hypotheses are correct, they provide a very good timeline for us to now trace the developments in understanding of the law in 1Maccabees.

One challenge that immediately presents itself is: if Josephus in fact had a copy of 1Maccabees without 1MaccD, or all the elements that compose it, how is it that his version still contained parts of 1MaccO and 1Macch? The best answer that presents itself might be that there was a far greater variety of versions in the early transmission of the text than this model allows. Some parts of what we consider to be 1MaccD may have been universally adopted, others only partially. Likewise, portions of 1MaccO and 1Macch might have had greater currency and utility for certain scribes and audiences than others. This would manifest itself in different versions of the text even after such additions had been made.

Part II

Excursus: The Law in Tradition

Though the primary aim of the second part of this thesis is to outline the character and function of the law in the separate layers of 1Maccabees, it is necessary to understand how the law functions in the broader tradition of Israel. This necessity arises not only out of the conversation with Renaud and Arenhoevel, who tie the place of the torah in 1Maccabees to the rabbinical tradition and the Deuteronomic school respectively, but also from the basic scholarly need for definitions. While our investigation into the law's place in the society presented by 1Maccabees will largely focus on the text itself, this does not mean connections cannot be drawn between the results of the description in 1Maccabees and those of other scholars of diverse parts of the Judean/Jewish tradition. As opposed to Arenhoevel and Renaud, we will not make these comparisons until we have reached results in each field, nor will we propose any generative or directional arguments for influence between the different conceptions of the law. It is enough to trace the similarities, and to recognize the variety of ideas about the law in Israel at any one time or in any one body of literature, let alone across broad swaths of time. Though the question at hand is essentially an Old Testament theological question one need not fall into the traditional practices of this field that tend to ignore individual context, disagreements within traditions, and the uneven course of the history of ideas.

This excursus also allows for the study to proceed with an easy and sure idea of what is meant when we compare the understanding of the law at some point in 1Maccabees, and the understanding of the law in e.g. the wisdom tradition, or the Mishnah. This leads to our next point: this outline of the laws in Israel's tradition is to be done on the basis of texts and not history. There are multiple reasons for this procedure. First, it is difficult to find total agreement anywhere as to the dating of individual works in the secondary literature. The differences might be a matter of decades, or in extreme cases a matter of centuries. Beyond this, even if there were agreement to be found among

F. Borchardt, *The Torah in 1Maccabees*

scholars as to when these texts reached their final form, most books reflect numerous traditions from various different periods in the history of the people sometimes identified as Israel. Moreover, the texts themselves have grown either by editing, interpolation, or any number of other processes, and thus have an untraceable conception of the law in any historical sense. Furthermore, even if these problems did not exist, what is represented in the texts may well be an ideal depiction of the law's place in Israel or the world as a whole. Very few people among the general population during the kingdoms of Israel and Judah or the exilic families in Babylon, or the small temple community during the Persian period, or the far-flung settlements of the Hellenistic era might have practiced or even known the torah in the same way as any part of the literature that has been investigated. More problematic is the very likely possibility that even the learned and informed few who did know the ideal presentations of the law in these bodies of literature were divided themselves, adhering to one school of thought simultaneously with another.

This overview is in no way meant to be in-depth or exhaustive. It is not in the purview of this project to name and describe the way the torah is used in every case in every book in every genre of literature available. Such a study would not only take a lifetime, but the result would be so muddled and boring, it would not be worthwhile. Rather, we will simply discuss the overall impression among scholars as to the different views of the torah in each of the major groups of literature in the available library of the community of ancient Israel. We will proceed with the study in roughly canonical order (for books that were later included into a canon) building up to, and then surpassing 1Maccabees into the rabbinical literature. We will not look at the place of the law among the Christian writings, however, as the legal interpretation there is so vast that the length of this excursus would exceed reasonable limits.

The Torah in the Pentateuch

The first words of any study on the place, function and meaning of torah invariably remind the audience of the breadth of possible definitions of the Hebrew term,

and underscore that it should not be understood simply as law.¹ This is perhaps nowhere more applicable than in the Pentateuch.² In this, arguably the most central corpus of later Judaism, there are several understandings of “torah”, none of them meaning or relevant to full judicial statutes applying to a court of law. Though these are all based upon specific codes. It is best to treat each of these with a separate brief summary.

Covenant Code

The covenant code, also called the book of the covenant (Exod 20:22-23:33), is hardly a complete law code, in and of itself.³ It is rather narrowly focused, and contains a limited amount of actual rules. These rules are delivered in both casuistic and apodictic form, and treat the concerns of a rural agricultural community, as well as some cultic concerns.⁴ In the context of Exodus and the broader Sinai narrative, into which the code was interpolated, the covenant code appears as the precepts for the contract between God, the suzerain, and Israel, the people.⁵ Israel is meant to fulfill the precepts to keep the covenant with the god who took them out of Egypt, and who will keep them safe and install them in their own land.⁶ Both because of its limited scope, and because of its application specifically to the covenant, it cannot be said that this code is presented as the overarching religious or theological aspect of Exodus. The book of the covenant seems to have been inserted and thus used in its setting as a fence for the Israelite community from surrounding cultures, particularly from alien cultic influence.⁷ It also seems to have been an attempt to combine all of Israel’s early, foreign-influenced laws, and bring

¹ B. Jackson; P. Achtemeier, “Law” in *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary* (ed. P. Achtemeier; San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1996), 592-593, and A. Fitzpatrick-McKinley, *The Transformation of the Torah from Scribal Advice to Law* (JSOTS 287; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 21.

² J. Unterman, “Torah” in *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*, Achtemeier, P., ed. (San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1996), 1162-1163.

³ W. Doorly, *The Laws of Yahweh: A Handbook of Biblical Law* (New York: Paulist Press, 2002), 7.

⁴ *Ibid.*, 14, 18, 19.

⁵ J. Unterman, “Covenant” in *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*, (ed. P. Achtemeier; San Francisco: Harper San Francisco, 1996), 208-209.

⁶ *Ibid.*, 209.

⁷ B. Childs, *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1974, 2004), 459.

them into agreement with the history of the people as told in the Sinai narrative.⁸ In its literary context the book of the covenant appears as a set of laws, some civil and casuistic, some cultic and apodictic, attributed to Moses and Yahweh at Sinai, which must be followed in order to maintain the covenant between Yahweh and Israel. This covenant ensures divine aid in wars, against pestilence and plague, and in settling the land. The laws are simply what must be kept in order for that covenant to be maintained (Exod 24:3, 7). They are neither the entirety of civil law, nor are they solely cultic. The laws of the book of the covenant exist and apply specifically within the realm of the mosaic covenant.

Priestly Code

Elsewhere in the Pentateuch there are different laws that play a separate role in the Israel these laws help to shape than those in the covenant code. The priestly code, which unlike the covenant code is not a set collection, but merely groups of laws found at various points throughout the books of Exodus, Numbers, and Leviticus, appears to have its own distinct place in Israelite society. It presents its rules as divine in origin, stemming from Sinai.⁹ This body of laws is primarily concerned with ritual and religious instruction.¹⁰ These ceremonial laws in the priestly code are analogous to church ordinances, liturgical prescriptions, and ecclesiastical laws in modern communities of worship. They serve to outline one's identity, separating the members of the group from those outside of it.¹¹ That is, applied to all of Israel, the rules of cultic practice in the priestly code are created in order to mark off that community from others who live around and among them. The priestly code reconstructs Israel as a religious community ruled by a religious hierarchy and concentrated around the temple, apart from a monarchy.¹²

⁸ Ibid., 459.

⁹ D. Patrick, *Old Testament Law* (London: SCM Press, 1985), 146.

¹⁰ B. Jackson,; P. Achtemeier, "Law", 594.

¹¹ E. Gerstenberger, *Leviticus: A Commentary* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox, 1996), 16.

¹² D. Partick, *Old Testament Law*, 146.

Notably the legal system set forth by the priestly code also organized the internal structure of Israel according to ritual purity. The most holy were the priests, then the rest of the tribe of Levi, then the rest of the community.¹³ The goal of keeping these laws, aside from structuring a community along religious lines, was to ensure Yahweh's presence within the community. The laws also derive from belief in this presence as the sanctity was most stringent in the holy of holies, where Yahweh lived, and grew less and less so as one moved away from the dwelling.¹⁴ These ritual laws and the priesthood at their core were what held the community together, and held the divine at the center of the community.

Holiness Code

A third body of laws, which has some (debatable) connection to the priestly code, is the holiness code (Lev 17-26). It is embedded in an entirely priestly context, and stresses that the whole people, not just the priesthood, must be holy.¹⁵ As opposed to the priestly code, which surrounds it, the Holiness code has a great deal of concern with ethical and secular laws, as well as the cultic.¹⁶ It also includes assurance of blessings if the code is obeyed and curses if the laws are not followed.¹⁷ The main idea of the code is based on the command found within it: "You shall be holy; for I, Yahweh your God, am holy" (Lev 19:2).¹⁸ The members of the community are called to follow the laws because of their connection with the divine. Though the formulation is not explicitly covenantal, it has some affinities through the blessings and curses. One notable feature that stands out in the holiness code, but bears some similarity to the priestly code's organization, is the application of specific laws to particular addressees. Some laws apply only to the priesthood, others only to the general populace, while still other laws apply to the whole

¹³ Ibid., 150.

¹⁴ Ibid., 150-151.

¹⁵ W. Doorly, *The Laws of Yahweh*, 49.

¹⁶ Ibid., 53.

¹⁷ D. Partick, *Old Testament Law*, 151.

¹⁸ B. Jackson,; P. Achtemeier, "Law", 594.

community including the priests and people.¹⁹ The code is delivered, at least in part, as a direct address from Yahweh to his people, with the speaker often employing the first person singular.²⁰ Finally, the code bears some hints that it must be followed in order for Israel as a community to keep the land, otherwise it will be expelled just as the Canaanites.²¹ In sum, the holiness code is presented in context as a law applicable to the community because of its relationship with Yahweh, and which bears rewards for being followed, and punishment for being ignored. This punishment has particular consequence for Israel's residence in the holy land.

Deuteronomic Code

It is arguably only with the Deuteronomic legal corpus (Deut 12-26) that we can speak of true function and interpretation of the torah in the Pentateuch. While the covenant code, priestly code, and holiness code are presented as legal systems or divine instructions in one way or another, they hardly show how "torah" should be implemented and function in society. The Deuteronomic code is different in that it not only treats a broader swath of situations than the other codes,²² but also is unequivocal about its status and application as "torah".²³ The code is presented as Moses' interpretation and delivery of the laws originally given at Horeb anew at the borders to the promised land.²⁴ The Deuteronomic law shares some similarities with the other law codes. First, like the covenant code, adherence to the law is closely tied in with the Mosaic covenant.²⁵ The Deuteronomic legal corpus may also be partially based upon the formulae of the book of the covenant, using many of its laws as the basis for the Deuteronomic retelling.²⁶ Like the priestly code, there is some concentration on purity, especially for the reason of creating a separate identity for the people.²⁷ And, like the Holiness code, the

¹⁹ D. Partick, *Old Testament Law*, 153.

²⁰ *Ibid.*, 154.

²¹ *Ibid.*, 154.

²² B. Jackson,; P. Achtemeier, "Law", 594.

²³ J. Unterman, "Torah", 1162-1163.

²⁴ D. Patrick, *Old Testament Law*, 97.

²⁵ B. Jackson,; P. Achtemeier, "Law", 594.

²⁶ D. Patrick, *Old Testament Law*, 97. It is however also possible that a different relationship exists between the Deuteronomic code and the Covenant code.

²⁷ J. Unterman, "Torah", 1163.

Deuteronomic corpus comes with a series of blessings for following its precepts, and curses for forsaking them.²⁸

Certain subjects are especially of interest to the Deuteronomic code. First, and most importantly, is the requirement to worship Yahweh in only one location.²⁹ This manifests itself in the orders to eliminate all other cults and shrines, and in instructions for how the central shrine shall be built. Of further interest, and equally idiosyncratic, is the lack of interest in such subjects as priestly activity, Yom Kippur, a weekly Sabbath, or bodily circumcision.³⁰ There is also a lack of evidence for Zion theology in these laws; Deuteronomy distinguishes itself in claiming the Yahweh's name dwells at the temple, instead of Yahweh himself, as claimed in the priestly and holiness codes.³¹ Instead of stressing the importance of these various subjects, Deuteronomy focuses on the presentation of Yahweh as a god preoccupied with observance of his law.³² It shows interest in subjects ranging from conduct of wars, rights of kings, and the place of prophets, to annual festivals, pillars, farming, slaves, resident aliens, and the responsibilities of Levites.³³ All of this creates a national identity for Israel based on the laws that are necessary to fulfill the covenant.

The focus is on the community to the extent that any of the laws broken by individuals within Israel bring sentence upon the whole community if they are not expiated.³⁴ This not only makes the people of Israel their own watchdog, but also responsible for dealing out the punishment for not observing the law; this is something the other law codes do not stress. Because of this it should be clear that parts of the law are far too brutal and impractical to have ever been implemented in Israel.³⁵ The Deuteronomic code is thus a nationalistic code in every sense; it centralizes worship on one location, forms laws for the entirety of the people, puts the responsibility for

²⁸ W. Doorly, *The Laws of Yahweh*, 48.

²⁹ *Ibid.*, 35.

³⁰ *Ibid.*, 38.

³¹ D. Patrick, *Old Testament Law*, 100.

³² W. Doorly, *The Laws of Yahweh*, 32.

³³ *Ibid.*, 28, 38.

³⁴ D. Patrick, *Old Testament Law*, 103.

³⁵ W. Doorly, *The Laws of Yahweh*, 28.

following the law and for sentencing when it is not followed on the ethnic community, and has the most far-reaching system.

Summary of Pentateuchal Law

It should be clear from the brief reports above that within the Pentateuch there are a variety of laws and legal systems. These likely stem from different time periods and different groups, and none of them could have comprised the entirety of judicial law for their authors. The presentation of each body of laws instead suggests that they applied to specific institutions (covenant/cult) or represented idealized visions of Israel (a holy people/an unadulterated and united people). Further, it is not clear from their place in the Pentateuch whether each code was conceived of as the entirety of “torah” or only a part of it. All of this only displays the already well-known fact that one cannot speak of a unified Pentateuchal definition or function of the torah, only a variety of such understandings. Added to this, it is important to realize that for many communities of reception and even perhaps for some of the authors and editors of the Pentateuch, the torah of the Pentateuch is more than simply the legal codes; it is also the narrative stories. The variety of ways these narratives function in various contexts as law is too diverse and abstract to trace accurately, but this does not deny their importance. Despite these limitations, knowledge of the basic facets of the legal codes of the Pentateuch is extremely important for placing the other concepts of the law found in the literature that would become scripture.

The Torah in the “Deuteronomistic Histories”

The significance and definition of the torah in the “Deuteronomistic histories” (Joshua-2Kings) is largely dependent on that of Deuteronomy.³⁶ That is, because of the Deuteronomic influence, whether through editorial work or composition, these books basically define the “torah” as the contents and teachings of the book of Deuteronomy.³⁷ The same nationalistic, collectivized, largely democratizing laws are stressed as in Deuteronomy, while not much else is admitted as torah or law. At the same time, it is not

³⁶ J. Unterman, “Torah”, 1163.

³⁷ This is true to different degrees in the different parts of the various books of this corpus. The Deuteronomistic influence, to the extent that it can be traced, also varies.

a nationalized judicial law, but still a holy law existing and applying to Israel outside of time. The torah, that is Deuteronomy, does not apply in Judean courts or in cases in the Deuteronomistic histories.³⁸ Judicial laws in the Deuteronomistic histories passed from the king to the judges, and were largely temporary.³⁹ It is only the theorized institution of the laws of Deuteronomy by Josiah that bring these two into some sort of agreement,⁴⁰ but even then the laws were not fully followed.

The Torah in the Prophets

As one might expect there is some variety in the understanding of the torah among the prophets, owing both to the different time periods from which the prophets stem, and the amount of literary expansion that has been put into the texts. For Hosea, the torah appears as cultic rules, as a parallel to the covenant, and as a set of divine instructions published for the northern kingdom of Israel.⁴¹ This makes Hosea's conception of the torah somewhat like that of the priestly code, or the second part of the covenant code, with its frame. But there is simply not enough definition of the terms to justify any more comparison. One thing is certain: it is not a central aspect of Hosea's theology, even if it were acknowledged as the word of god.⁴² Amos includes the moral and ethical commands by the divine as torah, however there is no indication whether these are precepts known elsewhere.⁴³ The language Amos uses does seem similar to that in the Deuteronomistic histories however.

Isaiah also has a moral understanding of the torah, and even goes so far as to suggest that the torah will be taught to all nations in the eschaton.⁴⁴ This last element, shared also by Micah, is a marked contrast from the Deuteronomic, covenant, priestly,

³⁸ B. Jackson,; P. Achtemeier, "Law", 593.

³⁹ Ibid., 593.

⁴⁰ However, see the convincing arguments of J. Pakkala "The Date of the Oldest Edition of Deuteronomy" *ZAW* 121.3 (9/2009), 388-401, which suggest that Deuteronomy originated after Josiah, and thus was never even dreamt of as civil law during the monarchy.

⁴¹ J. Unterman, "Torah", 1163.

⁴² F. Crüsemann, *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1989), 20.

⁴³ J. Unterman, "Torah", 1163.

⁴⁴ Ibid., 1163.

and holiness codes, which are squarely centered on the community of Israel. Isaiah further distinguishes his understanding of torah by proclaiming the words he preaches as the torah of god.⁴⁵ However, Isaiah also decries the written statutes being applied in the Israel of his day.⁴⁶ This all gives Isaiah a unique perspective on the torah and laws of Israel and their place in society. They are both universally applicable and belong to Israel. The torah is further both written and spoken. Most perplexingly, the laws and decrees are both of human and divine origin. The variety of views in Isaiah no doubt has to do with editing, but it serves to show that, regarding the torah, diversity is the norm rather than the exception in the books that would become the Hebrew bible.

Habakkuk has an ethical understanding of the torah, equating it with righteousness, and marking the wicked as the enemies of the law.⁴⁷ In his complaint, Habakkuk grumbles about the lack of observance of the law (1:4). Conversely, Micah, Zephaniah, Ezekiel, Malachi, and Jeremiah all criticize the teaching of the torah by priests, suggesting theirs is the wrong teaching.⁴⁸ One should not construe that for the prophets the torah is not important. In every case the torah is at least revered, and in some it is sanctified. Further, each one of these prophets seems to have a particular understanding of what the torah is in his criticisms. Micah likens the teaching of the priests to prophecy and the judgments of rulers (3:11). This betrays the fact that, for him, the torah is not the judicial law, and also not the only way to learn the will of the divine. Zephaniah too puts the prophets and the priests of the torah in the same boat, railing against them both (3:4). Looking at his teaching (1:4-6, 8-9; 3:12), it becomes clear that Zephaniah's torah looks remarkably similar to Deuteronomy. Jeremiah too has affinities with Deuteronomic teachings, in his understanding of the torah.⁴⁹ Ezekiel, and to a lesser extent Malachi (2:6-9), on the other hand show a sensitivity to the teachings of the priestly code when discussing their torah. Does this mean that for each of these prophets, or even their later compilers, the torah was composed of only the priestly code on the one hand, or the Deuteronomic code on the other? It is difficult to argue, as it is an argument

⁴⁵ Ibid., 1163.

⁴⁶ F. Crüsemann, *The Torah*, 23.

⁴⁷ J. Unterman, "Torah", 1163.

⁴⁸ Ibid., 1163.

⁴⁹ Ibid., 1163.

from silence. What can be gleaned from the prophets is that in all cases the torah exists alongside the oracles of prophets and the justice of rulers and judges in the hierarchy of values. Each of these elements must be done correctly in order for Israel to be in good standing with the divine.

The Torah in Chronicles and Ezra-Nehemiah

For the Chronicler the torah appears to have a largely didactic function and to stem from the king.⁵⁰ Though the king is also under the sway of the torah, as in the Deuteronomic code and the subsequent “Deuteronomistic histories”.⁵¹ The judicial function does not appear to be in evidence. However, one can point out that in Chronicles more than simply one code is seen as torah. There are specific references to commands from both the priestly code and Deuteronomy in Chronicles (2Chronicles 23:18; 25:4 *inter alia*). This shows that for the Chronicler the law began to be seen as one whole combining the different codes, or perhaps the whole torah. However, it would still not be correct to say that the torah becomes the central aspect of the religion. Hezekiah specifically says in 2Chronicles 18-19, “The good Yahweh pardon all who set their hearts to seek god, Yahweh god of their ancestors, even though not in accordance with the sanctuary’s rules of cleanliness.” This prayer is answered by Yahweh healing the people in the context. The episode shows that though the law is an important aspect of the religious life of the community in Chronicles, it is trumped by seeking Yahweh and being of good intention. For Chronicles the torah can be defined as a definite and written divine instruction, which is the responsibility of the kings to publish and bring about. However, that instruction does not cover judicial matters, nor is it concrete and inflexible.

It is often repeated that not until the stories of Ezra-Nehemiah does the torah take on both the definition of divine teaching and the function of practical implementation.⁵² The law becomes an institution of this sort for Israel when Ezra studies the law to teach it

⁵⁰ B. Jackson,; P. Achtemeier, “Law”, 593.

⁵¹ J. Unterman, “Torah” 1163.

⁵² B. Jackson,; P. Achtemeier, “Law”, 594.

and to do it.⁵³ The torah, for Ezra appears to be a definite written document, which helps to give some of this force to it.⁵⁴ The body of written laws mentioned as part of Ezra's law appears to be from all different parts of the Pentateuch, suggesting that, for the first time, the whole Pentateuch took on the title of "torah".⁵⁵ However, there are also laws referred to that are clearly not part of the Pentateuch.⁵⁶ Some of these references are found nowhere in the corpus of what would become scripture, others are found in other texts, such as Joshua.⁵⁷ Nonetheless, it is without doubt that most of the legal references in Ezra refer to statutes coming from the Deuteronomic code.⁵⁸ Other legal (and non-legal) material supplements this from elsewhere in the Pentateuch to reveal the broad understanding of the torah.⁵⁹ This broader understanding rises out of the torah taking a written form, which allowed it not only to become an institution, but also to be interpreted.⁶⁰ It is more than likely that this conception of the torah in Ezra-Nehemiah is the result of development over a series of editions. It has been pointed out that in the original layers only Deuteronomic laws are intended to be understood as torah, with broader and broader understandings being seen in the later additions, until in the final form it is the whole Pentateuch that is referenced.⁶¹ So with this stage of development the law is both written and authoritative, both divine and practical, and encompasses the whole Pentateuch, but also includes some additional teachings.

The Torah in the Wisdom Tradition

⁵³ Ibid., 594.

⁵⁴ J. Unterman, "Law", 1163.

⁵⁵ L. Grabbe, *A History of the Jews and Judaism of the Second Temple Period, Volume 1. Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah* (London: T&T Clark, 2004), 334, 336.

⁵⁶ Ibid., 335.

⁵⁷ Ibid., 336.

⁵⁸ J. Blenkinsopp, "Was the Pentateuch the Constitution of the Jewish Ethnos?" in *Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch* (ed. J. Watt; Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 2001), 57.

⁵⁹ L. Grabbe, *Jews and Judaism*, 337.

⁶⁰ A. Fitzpatrick-McKinley, *The Transformation of Torah from Scribal Advice to Law* (JSOTS 287; Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1999), 155.

⁶¹ L. Grabbe, *Jews and Judaism*, 342.

The book of Proverbs departs somewhat from all the previous understandings of torah, defining it as advice given from a parent to a child, or a sage to his student, or even a good lesson.⁶² The torah is mostly used in a general sense throughout Proverbs, though at times it can be understood as specifically religious.⁶³ Regardless of the way this breaks down, torah is not written and it is not the institution revealed in the understanding of Ezra-Nehemiah. It is also not necessarily a legal code, as in the different parts of the Pentateuch, though it does contain precepts and statutes (e.g. 3:1). Beyond this, there is not much that can be said about the law in Proverbs without getting quite deep.

Though the psalms are not specifically wisdom literature, the psalms that have their focus on the torah generally are understood to be under the influence of the wisdom tradition.⁶⁴ Two illustrative psalms for the understanding of the torah are psalms 19 and 119. These attach a spiritual significance to the law, and describe the law as perfect, sure, right, clean, and righteous.⁶⁵ They also claim that the torah revives the soul, brightens the mind, and enlightens the eyes.⁶⁶ Finally, and most specifically, psalm 119 promises that those who keep the law and walk in the way of the law will be blessed.⁶⁷ The understanding of the torah in the psalms is not entirely separate from that of Deuteronomy. It borrows many of the ideas, but expands them to apply the law to a general way of life.

From the evidence of the praise of the ancestors, it appears that Ben Sira knows the contents of the torah, and if it can be trusted, the prologue suggests that he knows of the law as a set collection, separate from the prophets and other semi-authoritative writings.⁶⁸ This places Ben Sira in a degree of agreement with the final form of Ezra. However, Ben Sira is important because it is likely the first example of wisdom being

⁶² J. Unterman, "Torah", 1163.

⁶³ *Ibid.*, 1163.

⁶⁴ *Ibid.*, 1163.

⁶⁵ C. Lehman, *Biblical Theology. Volume I: The Old Testament* (Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press, 1971), 424-425.

⁶⁶ *Ibid.*, 424-425.

⁶⁷ *Ibid.*, 424-425.

⁶⁸ L. Grabbe, *Jews and Judaism*, 341.

equated with the law.⁶⁹ The book sets up the knowledge and observance of the torah as a precondition for wisdom. However, most interestingly, the observance of the law is not reserved only for Israel, but appears to be open to all.⁷⁰ This marks the last step in the torah tradition before the first layers of 1Maccabees, and the step is a major one. For Ben Sira, the torah is no longer tied to the holy people (priestly code/holiness code), nor to the covenant (covenant code/Deuteronomic code), nor to the land (Deuteronomic code). It is wisdom, and thus should be sought by all.

Summary of the Torah in the “Bible”

It is evident from the above synopsis that one cannot really speak of any one particular biblical understanding of the law. There are multiple law codes that go on to influence multiple prophets and scribes in their own understandings and interpretations of the law and how it should be followed. However, it is important to underline that for the vast majority of the “scriptural” material, the torah is equated with Yahweh’s instruction to Moses on Sinai.⁷¹ Only in a few cases does the definition move beyond this, especially once the torah applies, at least in part, to a written form. The major differences come when each proponent of the torah discusses how the law relates to Sinai, and why it must be followed, and by whom. This continues largely into the Rabbinic period, with some adaptations.

The Torah in Rabbinic Literature

Just as when one discusses the place of the law in the literature that would eventually become scripture, one cannot simply speak of a single rabbinic definition and

⁶⁹ K. Dell, “Wisdom” in *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*, (eds. J. Rogerson; J. Lieu; Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2006), 415-416.

⁷⁰ *Ibid.*, 416.

⁷¹ J. Unterman, “Law”, 1163.

function of the torah.⁷² Instead, if one traces the use of the word throughout the foundational texts of rabbinic Judaism, one finds a series of different meanings and functions for the torah.⁷³ Because of this we should be aware of the different views of the law present in the documents of formative Judaism.

The Torah in the Mishnah

In the Mishnah material the torah most often denotes a concrete object, that is a scroll, which can be held, used, read from, studied, and even bought and sold.⁷⁴ The Mishnah, however, does not simply reduce the torah to a tradable good; it refers to the contents of the scrolls as torah at the same time as the scroll itself.⁷⁵ The contents are considered holy because they are also considered to be revelation, directly from the divine. Thus “torah” can take on an active meaning in the Mishnah (doing the torah), which can mean the process of learning the revelation, or in some cases generic learning.⁷⁶ The torah also denotes a special status for the authors of the Mishnah; if a rule has its roots in the torah it is considered better than and trumps a rule not found in the torah.⁷⁷ Related to this, the Mishnah has no concept of two equal torahs, one oral, another written. The scroll is manifestly better than any law deriving from sages, scribes, or anywhere else because the laws of the torah come from the deity revealed to Moses on Sinai, while the other rules of the Mishnah do not.⁷⁸

It is important to note, however, that the torah is not a magical source of salvation for the Mishnah. That is, following it does not offer eternal life, or the opportunity to escape the crises of this world.⁷⁹ Finally, and perhaps most importantly, the references to torah in the Mishnah appear to be to all of the pentateuchal writings (legal or not) as well

⁷² J. Neusner, *Torah: From Scroll to Symbolism in Formative Judaism* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1985), 4-5.

⁷³ *Ibid.*, 12.

⁷⁴ *Ibid.*, 19.

⁷⁵ *Ibid.*, 20.

⁷⁶ *Ibid.*, 22.

⁷⁷ *Ibid.*, 23.

⁷⁸ *Ibid.*, 26.

⁷⁹ *Ibid.*, 26.

as the prophets and other writings, without much distinction.⁸⁰ In terms of the place of the law in the religion put forth by the Mishnah, the torah served as the manifest proof of the recognition of the sovereignty of God.⁸¹ Further, the strict legalism and the responsibility to the torah were not central aspects of Judaism. There were certainly always Jews who were not able to follow all the laws of Judaism to their fullest extent, just as there were always apostates, and likely always groups that adhered to the torah strictly, but none of these could have been said to be normative for the Mishnah or its authors.⁸² So, in the beginnings of rabbinic Judaism the torah is a physical scroll and its contents, which appear to encompass the entirety of revered books, whatever they were. This torah and its laws were important because they were revelation, and testified to Israel's relationship to God, but were only secondary in the scope of the whole religion. The concept is not far off from some biblical conceptions of the torah, but certainly has a broader definition and function than many of those concepts discussed above.

The Torah in Tractate Abot

For this tractate, the torah has a markedly different definition and function than the Mishnah proper. Firstly, torah never refers to a particular object or scroll, but instead to an undefined corpus of authoritative writing.⁸³ Though torah is used in the sense of revelation on a number of occasions, it does not only appear in writing.⁸⁴ It is everything a sage does, and all that a sage says that comprise the torah.⁸⁵ Related to this, the torah does confer status on people, e.g. 'man of the torah' is a particularly highly respected sage.⁸⁶ Another difference comes in the fact that, in Abot, the torah offers definite

⁸⁰ Ibid., 27. However, see S. Schechter, *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology* (New York: Schocken, 1961), 118, who states that the torah is equivalent to Pentateuch, and is put on a higher plane than the prophets in rabbinic literature.

⁸¹ S. Cohen, *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah. Second Edition.* (Louisville: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006), 68.

⁸² Ibid., 69-70.

⁸³ J. Neusner, *Torah*, 50-51.

⁸⁴ Ibid., 51.

⁸⁵ Ibid., 55.

⁸⁶ Ibid., 53.

rewards for following it and studying it. At the very least, the study of the torah frees one from the yoke of the state, and it may hint at the possibility of salvation and eternal life.⁸⁷ The differences between torah in the Mishnah and in tractate Abot are as great as those between any two concepts of the law in all the literature of ancient Israel we have surveyed. Yet, these texts come from roughly the same time period and circles.⁸⁸

This perhaps best illustrates the futility of formulating studies tracing legal traditions diachronically. Though there is no doubt variety in legal interpretation in all these texts, this diversity may stem from competing synchronic groups as much as it could from the “normative” Judaism of any particular era. Nevertheless, a definition of the torah in these different texts is necessary for specific comparisons, which can be enlightening. The torah in Abot is the revelation stemming from sages, which has no visible relation to Sinai, but which offers rewards and redemption for its accomplishment. It can be written or spoken and this has no effect on its status.

The Torah in the Tosefta

The Tosefta again returns to defining the torah as an object, which can be sold, used as the base for an oath, and cannot be burned.⁸⁹ Torah also refers to revelation, but never at the same time as it refers to a physical object. The revelation is in the contents of the object and is not the torah scroll itself.⁹⁰ In the Tosefta the torah can also stand for the whole body of divine law.⁹¹ The term “torah” can further be used for any generic rule that is followed, with no relation to divine law.⁹² Like in the Mishnah, the torah gives status to certain teachings; the rules attributed to scribes are of a lower value than those attributed to the written torah delivered on Sinai.⁹³ As one might expect from this

⁸⁷ Ibid., 54.

⁸⁸ Ibid., 31-32.

⁸⁹ Ibid., 58.

⁹⁰ Ibid., 59.

⁹¹ Ibid., 59.

⁹² Ibid., 60.

⁹³ Ibid., 61.

distinction, the Tosefta knows nothing of two torahs, or of the Mishnah or any other writings or oral tradition as torah.⁹⁴

A rather new feature of the torah introduced by the Tosefta, is the concept of torah as a way of life.⁹⁵ Torah becomes synonymous with the whole system of practice and belief that the writers of the Tosefta would consider Judaism. People can become apostates from the torah and make vows against the torah, all of which could not happen if the torah did not stand in the place of the religion.⁹⁶ Despite this fact, the torah offers no salvation for the authors of the Tosefta. No other rewards are spoken of either.⁹⁷ The concept of the torah in the Tosefta can perhaps best be seen as the penultimate step in the development of the torah for formative Judaism. The major step introduced, which many associate with Rabbinic Judaism is the equation of the torah with the Jewish religion.⁹⁸ However, the fact that the torah offers no rewards or salvation keeps it a step behind the final rabbinical dogma.⁹⁹ For the Tosefta the torah is both a physical object and all revelation, both the religion, and a specific secular rule. It is holy and its study offers atonement, but it has no salvific reward. The Tosefta allows the torah to span a breadth of meanings, and to be a contradiction.

The Torah in the Talmuds

Once we reach the Talmud Yerushalmi and the Talmud Bavli, the sages no longer differentiate between the laws of the Mishnah and those of the written torah.¹⁰⁰ Both are subjected to the same kind of exegesis, and are cited with the same sort of reverence and consistency. The torah is often a physical object in the talmuds, but can either mean a scroll, or an actual sage, with the sage becoming a personified torah.¹⁰¹ The torah, as before, is revelation. However, it does not matter whether the torah spoken of is from the Pentateuch, from the entirety of scriptures, or from the Mishnah or Tosefta; all of it can

⁹⁴ Ibid., 61.

⁹⁵ Ibid., 62.

⁹⁶ Ibid., 62.

⁹⁷ Ibid., 63.

⁹⁸ S. Schechter, *Rabbinic Theology*, 127.

⁹⁹ S. Cohen, *Maccabees to the Mishnah*, 212.

¹⁰⁰ J. Neusner, *Torah*, 67.

¹⁰¹ Ibid., 68.

be used as a proof text for any statement or rule.¹⁰² Despite this seemingly more encompassing concept of torah, the teachings of the scribes do appear to have a lower status than the written torah.¹⁰³ However, given their devotion to torah, sages and scribes become equivalent to prophets because their pronouncements essentially become torah, and they are seen as speaking for the divine.¹⁰⁴

It is finally in the Talmuds, especially the Bavli that the concept of two separate but equal torahs exists,¹⁰⁵ with one written down in scripture and the other passed down by word of mouth from Sinai. Torah here also becomes a way of life in a fuller sense than in the Tosefta, due to the fact that the Talmuds exclude any other philosophy or way of life; only the torah is acceptable, and it is sufficient in and of itself.¹⁰⁶ Because of this transformation into the exclusive way of life in the Talmuds, the torah becomes the source of salvation and of reward for those who follow its statutes.¹⁰⁷ Stemming from this, one who is devoted to the law is not only wise but also holy. The torah in this case stands for the whole religion, and more than that, the whole way of life.

Summary of the Torah in Rabbinical Literature

Even in its final stages of its development, rabbinical Judaism was not a religion totally dependent and devoted to laws. This can be seen in the broad definition that “torah” has in the latest literature, the talmuds. Though it became the way of life, the torah was not done for its own sake.¹⁰⁸ It was instead, intended to be done for the sake of the lawgiver, i.e. God. Further, the high value placed on prayer in rabbinical Judaism, and the way it replaced the cult, betray that people had and desired personal devotion beyond what is mandated by torah, even in its broadest sense.¹⁰⁹ The obedience to the law is based on the need to strengthen the relationship between God and his people, for

¹⁰² Ibid., 69.

¹⁰³ Ibid., 72.

¹⁰⁴ Ibid., 72.

¹⁰⁵ Ibid., 76-77.

¹⁰⁶ Ibid., 79.

¹⁰⁷ Ibid., 81.

¹⁰⁸ Schechter, *S. Rabbinic Theology*, 161.

¹⁰⁹ S. Cohen, *Maccabees to Mishnah*, 211; and Schechter, *S. Rabbinic Theology*, 157.

the sages.¹¹⁰ This is not to say, however, that the torah was only open to ethnic Judeans or their descendants. According to Philo and Josephus, living at the same time as the sages whose sayings make up parts of the Mishnah, conversion was possible for all, as long as they followed the customs and declared the existence of only one God.¹¹¹ Even in the rabbinic literature itself, the torah is offered to all nations at Sinai, and should be offered by Israel to all nations.¹¹² This picture of rabbinic conception of the law is likely different from the caricatures drawn by some scholars, but it is sensitive to the texts themselves, and shows the true diversity in the concepts of torah.

¹¹⁰ Schechter, *S. Rabbinic Theology*, 167.

¹¹¹ S. Cohen, *Maccabees to Mishnah*, 52.

¹¹² Schechter, *S. Rabbinic Theology*, 131-133.

III The Nomos and its Place in 1Maccabees

As we indicated in the introduction to this work, our aim is to show how the first book of Maccabees depicts the nomos and places it in the broader scope of the Judean religion and society. We also noted that this precise question had been dealt with previously by Bernard Renaud in his work “La Loi et les Lois dans les Livres des Maccabées”. Since we already reviewed his work in the introduction, let us merely highlight his most significant findings: 1) The law sits atop the hierarchy of religious values, surpassing or even replacing the deity, the sanctuary, the people, etc. 2) The law is the main quality by which characters are judged to be good or evil; if they follow and defend the law, they are good, if not, they are evil. 3) The law subordinates the other traditional religious categories such as the place of the cult, the reverence for the covenant, and the role of the prophets. 4) Because of this role played by the law, the religion of 1Maccabees is a highly legalistic proto-rabbinic Judaism.

We noted that Diego Arenhoevel also attempted to outline how the law is described in 1Maccabees and came to his own conclusions: 1) the torah in 1Maccabees either completely rejects or is ignorant of the teachings of the wisdom tradition and of retribution theology. 2) The law seems instead to be tied largely to the concept of the torah in Deuteronomy. 3) This affinity to Deuteronomy can be seen in the concept of the torah as way of life. 4) It can also be seen in the torah’s function as a fence, keeping Israel protected from outsiders and foreign influence. 5) Finally, the connection to Deuteronomy is in evidence through the torah’s function as the state law of Judea. As we pointed out in our review of Renaud and Arenhoevel, their works, while important for the questions they ask and the challenging solutions they reach, have a methodological problem in that they do not take into account the possibility of separate literary layers in 1Maccabees which could each hold different representations of the law, and in turn influence the way the law appears in the final form of 1Maccabees.

Now that we have introduced the literary layers we have observed in 1Maccabees, we can return to our original goal of describing the nomos. We will follow the same organization used by Renaud and to a lesser extent, address the claims of Arenhoevel. These categories address most of the key features of the law, and suitably explain where these qualities fall in the religion and/or broader culture described by 1Maccabees. We may add or subtract some piece of evidence, which seems to us superfluous, but the overall strategy will be the same. The major difference of course is that we will look at these conclusions in the scope of only each compositional thread of the book. 1MaccG, 1MaccD, 1MaccO, and 1MaccH will each be brought into the discussion on every question and finally outlined to show how each depicts the law. Once this is done, taking note that the various layers do not exist in a vacuum, we will compare the results and show how each builds upon the next to form the composite picture of the law. Finally, we will compare our results with those of Renaud and Arenhoevel.

III.1 Meaningful Vocabulary:

As outlined by Renaud,¹ the vocabulary in 1Maccabees pertinent to the general discussion of the law consists of: νόμος, δικαίωμα, πρόσταγμα, νόμιμα, ἐντολή, λατρεία. In addition to these words we may add a few more, since they are used in 1Maccabees: σύγγραμμα, κρίμα, λόγος. In the case of the last of these words especially, we limit the study to only the instances where there is a legal connotation.²

Already in a preliminary exercise we can see a remarkable trend. The bulk of the legal vocabulary falls in 1MaccG: 1:42, 44, 49 (2x), 50, 56, 57 (2x), 60; 2:18, 19 (2x), 21 (2x), 27, 31, 33, 40, 48, 50, 54, 55, 58, 64, 67, 68 (2x); 3:5-6, 14, 21, 29, 39, 42, 48; 4:42, 47, 53; 6:59; 13:3, 48. About forty instances of legal vocabulary show that the legal focus of 1Maccabees is present already in the basic layer of the text. It is also notable that the majority of these uses come in the first four chapters of the book, where the Judean nomos is particularly threatened. By far the most prominent legal term in 1MaccG is νόμος (18x), which is specifically used to describe the Judean law as a whole (Torah). The only other word used so precisely is δικαίωμα (3x), which also refers to

¹ B. Renaud, "La Loi", 39-42.

² See our discussion on pp.10-11 on these words and their legal context in 1Maccabees.

the Judean ordinances, but on a more particular scale. Other words, such as πρόσταγμα (3x), νόμιμα (5x), ἐντολή (3x), λόγος (7x), σύγχριμα, and λατρεία may alternately refer to the statutes, decrees, and customs of the Judeans or the gentiles in 1MaccG.

In comparison to 1MaccG the later additions are not nearly as concerned with the law, based on their usage of legal vocabulary, even when one takes into account the differences in length of the additions. 1MaccD contains only four instances of legal vocabulary, three of them referring to the νόμος and one to λόγος. The words are used with the same precision as in 1MaccG, with νόμος referring to the torah, and λόγος to Judean rules not found in the torah. In the case of 1MaccO there is slightly more of a legal concern with eight uses of legal vocabulary (outside the various titles for the renegades, which will be discussed below). Once again νόμος (3x) refers only to the Judean law as a whole and πρόσταγμα (2x) is used interchangeably. In the case of δικαίωμα, the word refers to gentile ordinance and religion, as opposed to its uses in 1MaccG, which exclusively define Judean ordinance and worship. λατρεία is also used only once in 1MaccO and refers to the gentile religion. Finally, in 1MaccH νόμος is used twice, again exclusively for the Judean law, while πρόσταγμα and a new word, κρίμα, appear once each for the king's decree and Judean law respectively.

What we may learn from this preliminary study of the legal vocabulary is: 1) the legal material appears in all four layers of the text; 2) the material appears most often in 1MaccG (particularly at the start), hardly at all in 1MaccD, and a significant amount considering their lengths, in 1MaccO and 1MaccH; 3) it appears that the word νόμος is used most often, and exclusively for the Judean law in all four layers. Beyond this we must be cautious as the final form of 1Maccabees is a Greek translation of a Hebrew original, which may or may not have contained the same distinctions in vocabulary as the current Greek. Even the exclusive use of νόμος could be the work of a translator as opposed to evidence of like-minded authors and editors employing the same Hebrew word (תּוֹרָה) for the Judean law. All this evidence suggests that 1MaccG will be the place where the most information will be found regarding the place of the law in 1Maccabees, with the several additions only adding their own spin to the already-present material. It is acknowledged however, that discussion or presumption of the law need not

be explicit. Especially given the late date of composition of the various layers of our text, certain aspects and statutes of the law may be assumed and lie behind the text at several points, without ever using legal terminology. We will acknowledge these issues too on a case-specific basis.

III.2 Religious Value and Significance of the Concept of the Law

Is the Nomos supreme in the hierarchy of religious values?

1MaccG

Leaving aside the evidence Renaud provides, which is certainly instructive, let us approach the argument from a slightly different direction. Instead of looking at stock phrases referring to religious institutions in biblical and cognate literature, let us look at 1MaccG to determine how the law and the other aspects of the Judean religion and nation are valued in the scheme of the whole book. Though 1Maccabees as a whole never refers to the deity by the familiar terms “god/θέος” or “lord/κύριος” it can hardly be said that the Judean god is absent from the story and subsumed under the law.

Instead, in 1MaccG, the deity is called “heaven/οὐρανὸς” (10x), “savior/σωτήρ (and derivatives, 2x)”, or simply referred to by pronouns. Though the number of instances does not match up with the number of times the nomos is mentioned, context is important. 1MaccG particularly brings up the deity as encouragement, and in prayers before battle as a way of heartening the troops. Heaven is the strength behind the Judean army and the source of salvation (2:61; 3:18, 19, 50-53, 60; 4:10, 11, 24, 30-33; 5:31; 7:41-42; 9:46). In those situations where Heaven is not invoked before, during or after a battle, the deity is a figure to whom the Judeans direct laments (4:40, 7:37-38) and give thanks (4:55). It is significant that the law is only mentioned in two of the contexts where Heaven is addressed (2:61; 3:18). In both of those contexts, following the law is the path by which one gains favor before the divine. It is not an end in itself. For 1MaccG, as much as the law is fought for and respected, it is only because it (and not the law alone, cf. 4:30-33, 7:42 *inter alia*) is a way to gain Heaven’s favor that it achieves this status.

Where the law itself is mentioned in 1MaccG, one gets the impression of an entirely different respect than that which is paid to the deity. One example of the way the

law is revered in 1MaccG comes from Mattathias' final testament to his sons (2:49-70). In these verses the law is mentioned numerous times. Mattathias implores his sons to show zeal for the law (2:50), to grow brave and strong in the law in order to gain honor (2:64), to rally together all those who observe the law (2:67), and to obey the commands of the law (2:68). He further gives them examples of Israelite heroes and ancestors who have done the same. Mattathias particularly notes that Joseph obeyed the commandment and was rewarded by becoming lord of Egypt (2:53), and that Joshua became a judge in Israel because he fulfilled the command (2:55). There are two main points that one can pull from these verses: 1) while the law is an important part of the lives of the Hasmoneans and their followers, it is not an object of worship, and does not constitute their whole religious responsibility; 2) obedience to the law is not its own end, but a means to show one's allegiance to God, and also to reap rewards, both earthly (lord of Egypt, judge) and ethereal (honor).

Both of these points hold true in the other instances where legal vocabulary is used in 1MaccG. Nowhere in the text is the law worshipped, and only rarely is it an object of special veneration (2:21-22;³ 3:48;⁴ 4:42⁵). As to the second point, the fact that the law is not the highest of religious values can nowhere be more clearly observed than at 2:39-41 where the Sabbath law is transgressed in order that the people will live. If the law were the highest value, the heroes would not be celebrated for this transgression. Though the law is often mentioned in 1MaccG, the evidence we have seen suggests that it is not the highest religious value, and does not replace the deity. Instead, because it is the law that is attacked by Antiochus' persecution, it becomes the rally point for the Hasmoneans and their supporters who are resisting that persecution. Heaven still reigns supreme, while the law simply leads to it.

1MaccD

³ Here the law, along with the covenant is basically equivalent to the religion as a whole.

⁴ The scroll of the law is unrolled in this context along with a number of other objects that belong to the temple, e.g. first fruits, tithes, priestly vestments, and the Nazirites who recently completed their service time.

⁵ Judas selects priests to cleanse the temple who are especially *devoted to the law*.

The evaluation of the religious outlook of 1MaccD is perhaps more complicated than with 1MaccG due to the rather limited amount of material dealing with the Judean religion and culture. As we noticed above, the law (νόμος) is mentioned only three times in 1MaccD (10:37; 14:29; 15:21). Only in 14:29 is there a faintly religious coloring to the law. In the two other instances, decrees announce the validity of the law as part of the national entity of the Judeans. These give the law a nationalistic sense. Even at 14:29, though the sanctuary and law are recalled as the reasons for which Simon and his brothers fought, they are raised more as national institutions than as meaningful elements of their religion. The immediate context betrays this understanding as ἔθνος (nation) is mentioned frequently in the vicinity of the proclamation (14:29 [2x], 14:30, 14:32 [2x]). The one instance where λόγος is mentioned (14:46), it is clear that there is no impact on the religion, as these rules are related only to temporal power. It is clear however, that the peoples of the ancient Mediterranean in general, and ancient Judeans in particular, did not conceive of religion as an entity separated from their identity, whether nationalistic, ethnic, or otherwise. So, we must be aware that as we make these observations, they come from a thoroughly modern perspective, not necessarily present among the early audiences and compilers of the text.

The fact that the law is so thoroughly detached from the cult in 1MaccD might seem to be damning, but we must also consider that 1MaccD has little to report on what moderns would recognize as religious values at all. Only two verses mention οὐρανός (12:15; 16:3), and few others have any concern for cult or cultic subjects (12:9, 11). Despite the dearth of material dealing with the relationship between the people and their god(s), these values are not entirely absent. Simon's instruction to his son John Hyrcanus at 16:3 is quite pious, and recalls the role of οὐρανός in 1MaccG. Simon asks his son to take his place in the wars of Israel and to fight for the nation, but before Hyrcanus is sent off, Simon says: "and may the help that comes from Heaven be with you" (ἡ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ βοήθεια ἔστω μεθ' ὑμῶν). Here, Heaven's help is once more invoked before a battle and shown to be of great importance in this context. The same role is confirmed by the only other occurrence of οὐρανός in 1MaccD, 12:15. In the midst of the diplomatic letter to the Spartans, Jonathan states that he was unwilling to ask his allies for aid while the Judeans were being attacked because "we have the help that comes from Heaven for

our aid” (ἔχομεν γὰρ τὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ βοήθειαν βοηθοῦσαν ἡμῖν). The repetition of the phrase again in a martial context confirms that in the direst circumstances the deity was called upon.

This shared concept of Heaven between 1MaccG and 1MaccD is of course not surprising, but in comparison to the near total lack of religious sentiment for the law in 1MaccD, it raises questions: Is the law solely tied to nationality and not to cult for 1MaccD? Given the lack of ties between the law and Heaven, does the *nomos* retain the function of being a path through which one can earn Heaven’s favor? Does the largely diplomacy-based nature of 1MaccD lend itself to a more nationalistic interpretation of the law, which then excludes any cultic meaning it might carry?

All of these questions are difficult to answer, but perhaps some light can be shed on them from the two additional verses treating piety in 1MaccD. Both of these verses come in the same Spartan treaty in which the help of Heaven is recalled. The first of these verses is 12:9 in which the message of 12:15 is essentially communicated in a different way. While the Judeans in both verses have no need of allies, in 12:9 it is the holy books that are in their possession and not the help of Heaven that fills this need. We might surmise, considering the close context and content of the two verses, that the holy books (12:9) are likely testify to the help that comes from Heaven (12:15), but it is worth noting that the direct connection is never made in the text. The big question behind 12:9 is the identity or contents of these holy books. There is no hint within 1MaccD. Even if we extend the search to 1MaccG, which the author of 1MaccD was editing and supplementing, only the book of the law and the book of the covenant are mentioned, without any other reference to holy books. If the holy books are the scrolls of the law and covenant,⁶ then there might be an indirect connection between the law and Heaven, which is otherwise absent in 1MaccD. This interpretation, of course, is supported by texts emanating from nearly contemporary Judean communities in the Levant and Egypt. Sirach, its translation, the Letter of Aristeas, and other texts all testify

⁶ For more on this discussion see F. Borchardt “Concepts of Scripture in 1 Maccabees” in *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality. Volume I: Thematic Studies* (eds. Craig A. Evans; H. Daniel Zacharias; London: T&T Clark, 2009), 26-30.

to an idea that the holy/revered books have some connection to the law. If 1MaccD shares this view, its logic would be that the law is an example of, or guarantees the help that comes from Heaven. In this particular case the function of the law would be the same as in 1MaccG: a guarantee of the help and reward of the deity. However, we must recall that this conclusion operates on two assumptions, even if they are reasonable.

The second verse with cultic significance in 1MaccD is 12:11. Following the statement that the Judeans do not need alliances, and after a subsequent request for renewal of their ostensible ancient alliance with the Spartans, the author remarks on the way the Judeans commemorate the Spartans in their cultic practice. He reports that the Judeans recall them constantly, in festivals, on other appropriate days, at the sacrifices they offer, and in prayers. Though little interesting information can be drawn from this, it is important that 1MaccD testifies to the existence of the cult and mentions sacrifices, festivals and prayers. Moreover, the proximity of this verse to the mention of the holy books may indicate that the cultic practice is observed according to the dictates of the holy scriptures, as one might expect.

As a result of looking at these two additional passages in 1MaccD we can perhaps come closer to answering some of the questions about the function of the law and its place in the religious hierarchy of 1MaccD. First, it appears that the law though largely tied to nationality, also has a pious aspect. The books that contain the law seem to be considered holy, and obedience to the law, by extension, may ensure the divine help the Judeans receive against enemies in battle. The law may also govern or dictate the way the cult is performed. As such, the law in 1MaccD, though not as clearly or as strongly as in 1MaccG, remains a path through which one can gain divine favor. Though the law has a clearly more nationalistic character than in 1MaccG, this does not seem to be the result of the diplomatic and documentarian forms of 1MaccD. Rather, because Heaven and other truly religious aspects of the Judean cult appear in 1MaccD, even in the diplomatic passages, the nationalistic character of the law seems to be a genuine feature of 1MaccD's understanding. Finally, one can clearly see that the law is not the supreme religious value in 1MaccD. Where religion is mentioned it appears Heaven holds prime

place again, as in 1MaccG. The *nomos* is only loosely associated with cultic practice or pious belief at all, being more of an ethnic symbol.

1MaccO

At first glance, the fact that only eight instances of legal vocabulary occur in 1MaccO might give us the impression that, like 1MaccD the law does not play a large role in the religious values of 1MaccO. In some ways this first impression is valid, in other ways it must be scrutinized further. Only four of the eight words included in legal vocabulary refer to the Judean law, the other four instances make reference to gentile laws. Among the four points where Judean law is referenced (1:52, 2:42, 10:14 [2x]) not once is it given any overtly religious significance. In each of the instances the law is the object of choice. In 1:52; 10:14 (2x), a group of people willingly forsake the Judean law. At 2:42 another group, the Hasideans, volunteer themselves for the law. This does not give the Judean law in 1MaccO a special place however, as the same can be said of the gentile laws. At 1:13, 14, 43; 6:23 a group of “hellenizing” Judeans willingly adopts the gentile religion and laws in a similar way. Thus, one could argue that the law has no special religious significance other than being the object of choice that somehow identifies the chooser.

On the other hand, there is some association between the law and religion. Those who choose the king’s religion in 1:43 are referred to in 1:52 as “those who forsook the law (*νόμος*)”. Further, the willingness of the Hasideans to offer themselves for the law seems to lend some special place to the law. Finally, it must not be forgotten that the entire conflict in 1MaccO is framed around the law. The internal opponents are called *ἄνομοι*, *παράνομοι* and *ἄσεβεις ἐξ Ἰσραηλ*, which makes their opponents in the conflict, the Hasmoneans, the pious ones who, like their allies, offer themselves willingly for the law. The tie between piety and observance of the law makes the *nomos* of supreme religious importance.

Another important factor in this evaluation is that little else in 1MaccO competes for the top spot in the religious hierarchy. Heaven is never mentioned, there are no holy books, and the cult is entirely absent. The law alone has religious significance for

1MaccO. Though there is little in terms of religion at all, the dominance of the law in the religious psyche is a development of 1MaccO.

1MaccH

The religious value of the law in 1MaccH is clear. Though there are few instances where explicitly legal vocabulary is used, almost every one of them gives a cultic understanding to the law. The bulk of these instances come in one scene: Mattathias' judgment on the Judean man sacrificing on the illicit altar in Modein (2:23-26). At 2:23 King Antiochus' law is referenced in connection with offering sacrifice on the altar. This sets up a strong link between religious practice and law. 2:24 then describes how Mattathias was moved to action by his countryman's decision to obey the king's law. The specific wording is that he gave vent to anger according to the law (or judgment) (κατὰ τὸ κρίμα) and proceeded to kill the man on the altar. In the context it is clear that Mattathias' act is contrasted with the Judean man's. Each acts according to a law and each law governs cultic acts. This point is carried home by the summarizing verse (2:26), which compares Mattathias' zeal for the law to Phinehas'. This context undoubtedly casts the law in a religious mould.

This religious sense of the law is not maintained in the two *preisgedichte* (3:3-9; 14:4-15) for Judas and Simon, the only other places the law is described in 1MaccH. In each of these poems the Hasmonean heroes appear to be protectors and defenders of the law, and opponents of those who oppose the law. There is no religious significance tied to this depiction though. The defense of the law is merely one in a number of deeds for which Judas and Simon are praised. The law is not tied to any special place of honor, and if anything, is more a nationalistic than a religious value, in that protection of the law (3:5; 14:14) is tied to protection of the people (3:5; 14:14).

There is not much religious sentiment in 1MaccH in general, so the few places the law is tied to religion make it stand out. The deity makes a brief and indirect appearance in 1MaccH through a reference to the uniqueness of the Hasmoneans. At 5:62, following on the account of the fateful mission of Joseph and Azariah, the narrator states that they failed because "they did not belong to the family of those men through whom deliverance

was given to Israel” (αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων οἷς ἐδόθη σωτηρία Ἰσραηλ διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν). The provenance of the deliverance is where the deity is implied. For 1MacH, God has given Israel salvation through this particular family. This is the deity’s only act though. Aside from this, only the law is given religious value. Thus the law has the supreme place in the religious hierarchy of 1MacH *de facto*, as there is little else with which to compete. With that said however, we must recall that 1MacH is neither particularly interested in the law or in Judean religion, but with the personalities of the Hasmonean dynasty.

Does the nomos decide whether characters are good or evil?

1MaccG

This question can be answered in the negative in 1MaccG, though there is some room for debate. There are good characters and there are evil characters in 1MaccG. Some of the good ones are particularly upright defenders of the law, some of the bad attack the law, but the overall judgment on character is not that simple. A straightforward proof of this comes from examining the characters or actions called bad (κακὸς), evil (πονηρὸς), sinful (ἁμαρτωλός) and their respective derivatives, as well as a few more synonyms.

In 1MaccG there are twelve occasions where characters or acts are described by one of the negative adjectives. In several of these occasions there is indeed some tie between lawlessness and evil. Antiochus IV is called a sinful shoot (ρίζα ἁμαρτωλός) at 1:10, and though he has not yet done anything wrong in the narrative, it might well be foreshadowing his later offense against the law. At 1:34 the group of gentiles stationed at the garrison in the city of David are called “a sinful nation” (ἔθνος ἁμαρτωλόν) and are further described immediately after as “outlaw men” (ἄνδρας παρανόμους). Though the acts of which the group is accused are not particularly targeted against the nomos, it is clear by this context that the sinful nation is so-called at least partially because of their antipathy to the law. In the brief poem praising Mattathias and his friends at 2:48 the link between law and character is again doubtless. Mattathias and his friends are praised for never letting the sinner (τῷ ἁμαρτωλῷ) gain the advantage. Immediately before this,

and perhaps parallel to it, it is reported that they rescued the law out of the hands of the gentiles and kings. It seems clear that the kings and gentiles are called sinners here because of their assault on the law. Similarly, at 2:62 Mattathias instructs his sons not to fear the words of sinful man (ἀνδρὸς ἀμαρτωλοῦ). This character seems to be contrasted with the famous ancestors who observe the law, who are positive examples for the sons throughout the rest of the speech. This contrast may indicate that the sinful man exists outside of the scope of the law, or is in fact in opposition to it.⁷ The sentiment is never explicit.

The final case in which an act is called wicked with some regard to the law is not as clear as the first two. At 13:46 the people of Gazara, while under siege by Simon and his soldiers plead “Do not treat us according to our wicked acts, but according to your mercy” (Μὴ ἡμῖν χρῆσι κατὰ τὰς πονηρίας ἡμῶν ἀλλὰ κατὰ τὸ ἔλεός σου). Though prior to this there are no acts that can be attributed to the population as evil, or against the law, the description of what follows once Simon makes peace with them may suggest a legal connection. First, Simon expels the population from the city, and then cleanses the houses that contained idols. Finally, he settles in the city all those who observe the law. Because of the lack of any other clues, the primary sin of the gentile⁸ inhabitants of Gazara seems to be their lack of observance of the Judean law. Though it is not necessarily the case, it seems most likely because this is the only blame placed on them in this context. It is however possible that the two events are unrelated and that the wicked acts are not otherwise named in 1MaccG.

Even though these several instances seem to support Renaud’s claim that the law is the main judge of character for 1Maccabees, a much greater amount of evidence suggests otherwise, especially in 1MaccG. In the introductory verses to the book, the heirs to the diadochi before the arrival of Antiochus IV, are said to have “caused many evils on the earth” (καὶ ἐπλήθυναν κακὰ ἐν τῇ γῆ). The group has no connection to any hindrance of the law either in this context or any context within the book. They are not

⁷ I must thank Lester Grabbe for pointing this out in his remarks on an earlier draft of this work.

⁸ See 14:34, 15:33-35, though of course these belong to 1MaccD, and may reflect a different tradition.

mentioned again, and the decision of Antiochus IV to attack the law (1:41) is presented as an innovation. This clears the Hellenistic successor kings of any injury against the law,⁹ but does not prevent them from having their acts called evil. Though it is unclear what they did that was evil, it certainly did not have anything to do with the law.

At 6:12 Antiochus IV recalls “the evils I have done in Jerusalem” (τῶν κακῶν ὧν ἐποίησα ἐν Ἱερουσαλημ) on his deathbed. These are enumerated as seizing the silver and gold vessels from the temple (1:21-23) and destroying the inhabitants of Judah without good reason (1:24-28, 30, 37). Though he is certainly guilty in the worst way of assaulting the Judean law, there is no mention of his attack in this context. Thus, the characterization of his deeds as “evils” has nothing to do with the law in this instance. We see here most strikingly the subtle understanding of character. Antiochus IV is at one point denoted as a sinner, likely with some connection to his violation of the law. However, at another point his acts are called evil, though they have little to do with the Judean law and customs at all. Were the law the supreme judge of character, we would likely not witness such variety in the text.

Again at 1:36, the new citadel erected in the city of David is called an “evil adversary” (διάβολον πονηρὸν) of Israel. This status is directly linked to its being an ambush (ἐνεδρον) to the temple in the previous verse, and to the shedding of innocent blood in the verse following. Even when we consider that in 1:37 a further accusation of defilement of the sanctuary is lobbed at the citadel and its inhabitants, we still must admit that the reason for the citadel being called evil is its attack on the temple, not on the law. The temple remains the focus of all the acts of those in the citadel, and appears to be the target for its assaults. An affront to the temple is also the reason for which Nicanor and his speech, which are both also called “wicked” (κακῶς ἐλάλησεν; τὴν κακίαν αὐτοῦ) in 7:42 receive this description.

⁹ It is interesting to note that historically too, these kings did nothing to attack the Judean law or the laws of any peoples they ruled over. Cf. E. Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 33-34.

Aside from these cases discussed above, the wickedness (κακίας) of 5:4 and 10:46, and the evil designs (λογισμοὺς πονηρούς) of 11:8 all have nothing to do with attacks against the law. 5:4 precisely accuses the sons of Baean of ambushing the Judeans on the highways; 10:46 is in reference to Demetrius I, who at no point in the narrative has any negative effect on the Judean law, and 11:8 is in reference to one gentile's plans against another. For these references to be tied to a violation of, or apathy toward the law, a great deal of rhetorical gymnastics would have to be performed.

These examples should remove all doubt that Renaud's claim does not hold up to scrutiny in 1MaccG. While the law appears to be *an* indicator of whether a person or act is good or evil, it is certainly not the *only* or even primary judge. This is only further emphasized if we examine the use of other negative adjectives like arrogant (ὑπερήφανος) which is used entirely exclusive of the law (1:21; 2:47; 7:34, 37). Also revealing is the very positive appraisal of Alexander Balas (10:47) and the Nabateans (5:25) who are neutral to the law, neither attacking it, not defending it. The argument that the law plays an extraordinarily significant role in the decision of character is simply untenable.

1MaccD

There is likewise little relationship between the law and judgment of character in 1MaccD. This is perhaps expected as 1MaccD lays part of its focus on foreigners to whom the law appears to be unavailable or inapplicable (10:37; 12:9; 15:21). However, the evidence against positing the law as the decision-maker between good and evil is so strong that it is shocking.

There are three instances in 1MaccD wherein vocabulary used for evil or sinful is employed: 8:31; 10:5; 16:17. In two of these examples the evil is certainly not tied to opposing the law. In 8:31 the Romans accuse Demetrius of doing “wrongs” (κακῶν) based on the Judean testimony to them, and at 10:5 Demetrius himself recalls the “wrongs” (κακῶν) he has done to the Judeans before deciding to allow them a certain degree of autonomy. Nowhere in 1MaccD or 1Maccabees as a whole does Demetrius attack the Judean law. Rather, he sends officers to attack the people or the rebels.

Observance of the ancestral laws has already been granted to the Judeans by Demetrius' predecessor (6:60), therefore it is no longer an area of conflict. The law is unrelated to Demetrius' wrongs.

At 16:17, a summarizing sentence concludes the account of the murder of Simon and his sons by his son-in-law Ptolemy. The narrator writes "he committed an act of great treachery and returned evil for good" (καὶ ἐποίησεν ἀθεσίαν μεγάλην καὶ ἀπέδωκεν κακὰ ἀντὶ ἀγαθῶν). It is obvious here by the general context and by the statement itself that Ptolemy's act of treachery, murdering the High Priest and his sons, is the act condemned as evil. Ptolemy is never explicitly portrayed as being a law-breaker or outlaw, rather he is a greedy usurper attempting to put the country in his own hands. It is very likely however, that whatever understanding the author of 1MaccD had of the law, it included a prohibition against murder. Therefore, though the transgression of the law is not cited as the reason for which the act of killing is considered evil, we cannot discount the connection between the act and the legislation. This forms a sort of middle ground between explicitly noting contravention of the law, and judging a character or act evil without regard for its relationship to the law.

In the face of the above evidence, there is one occasion in 1MaccD where a negative depiction of characters is certainly based upon the law. At 14:29, in the midst of the proclamation for Simon and his sons, comes a brief *res gestae*. One part of this account is that the family of Simon "resisted the enemies of their nation, in order that their sanctuary and the law might be preserved" (καὶ ἀντέστησαν τοῖς ὑπεναντίοις τοῦ ἔθνους αὐτῶν ὅπως σταθῆ τὰ ἅγια αὐτῶν καὶ ὁ νόμος). The depiction here of the early enemies is primarily based upon their opposition to the temple and the law. Thus, the law does play some part in characterization of these characters as "enemies" and thus to some extent as evil. The unambiguous usage however seems to be limited to this instance.

Though the evidence so far suggests that in 1MaccD the law is for the most part separate from the depiction of characters as good or evil, the two above examples put the suggestion in doubt. One further piece of evidence removes some of that uncertainty: usage of the terms "friendship" (φιλίαν) and "allegiance" (συμμαχίαν) and their

derivatives. In 1MaccD these terms are used ten times to describe the relationships between the Judeans and gentile non-law-abiding nations or groups. If the law were the ultimate indicator for character, as Renaud suggests, there is no way the Judeans could befriend the Romans, Antiochus VII, or the Spartans. These parties were not under the sway of the law and did nothing for the law or against it, but are repeatedly joined in allegiance and friendship with the Judeans. Because of this phenomenon, combined with the fact that all but one or two of the usages of “evil” or its synonyms is divorced from any legal consideration, it is clear that 1MaccD places little importance on the law with respect to judgments of character.

1MaccO

The situation is totally reversed when we look at 1MaccO. The law undoubtedly takes a primary place in the text’s judgment of characters. Aside from the fact that the internal opponents are repeatedly given the names ἄνομος (8x) and παρανόμος (4x), a negative judgment is passed on characters and acts an additional five times (1:15, 52; 2:44; 7:23; 9:23), every time in relation to the law.

At 1:15 the internal opponents are reported to have “sold themselves to do evil” (ἐπράθησαν τοῦ ποιῆσαι τὸ πονηρόν). This statement summarizes a series of events all stemming from the group’s wish to make a covenant with the gentiles, which results in the observance of gentile laws and customs, removal of circumcision, departure from the covenant and unity with the gentiles. Though the antipathy to the Judean law is not explicit, it is clear that adoption of the gentile laws means the Judean laws are forsaken.

Again at 1:52 a group of Judeans that abandons the Judean law is reported to do “evil in the land” (κακὰ ἐν τῇ γῆ). Here the evil is doubly connected to the law, as the opponents not only abandon the law willingly, but also attempt to force other Judeans to forsake the laws and commandments. It is in fact this latter act, a thorough attack on the Judean law, which is called evil.

At 2:44 and 9:23, the ἄνομοι are compared to sinners (ἁμαρτωλοῖ) and wrongdoers (οἱ εργαζόμενοι τὴν ἀδικίαν). This relationship again reinforces the ties between disobeying the law and being evil in 1MaccO. This viewpoint is also supported

by the indication at 7:23 that Alcimus and his followers did worse than the gentiles. Though there is no explicit effort against the law in this context, Alcimus and his supporters are called lawless (ἄνομοι) at 7:5, thus the tie to the law can also be seen. It is obvious then that, reversing the pattern of the previous editions, 1MaccO shows a strong link between the law and the judgment upon people or acts as good or evil.

1MaccH

There is not enough evidence in 1MaccH to decide whether there is a connection between the evaluation of characters and the law. Only the Hasmoneans appear to be truly good (3:7; 5:55, 61-62; 14:4), but this positive judgment is never applied to the law. At the same time there are ambiguous presentations of several characters, both law-abiding (Joseph and Azariah 5:56-61) and those outside the law (Nabateans 9:35-36). It would appear that 1MaccH does not attach the same importance to the law as 1MaccO in this respect, but the evidence is not convincing either way.

Does the law assume the other traditional religious categories?

Though this question seems similar to the first, it differs slightly in the way Renaud formulates it, and the way we shall follow it. What is specifically being sought here is whether the cult, the covenant, and the prophets are subordinated under the general heading of law in 1Maccabees. Renaud suggests that all of these separate entities are annexed by (and become categories of) the law. While there is merit to some of Renaud's claims, he paints too broad a picture of the religious scene. The three religious categories should be read and described according to the literary layers of 1Maccabees.

1MaccG

The cult is somewhat difficult to place in 1MaccG. On the one hand, as Renaud suggests,¹⁰ there are a number of scenes in which the performance of religion is fully tied to the law (1:44-47, 51, 54-55; 2:19-22, 45-48; 3:46-53; 4:42, 47, 52-55; 13:3, 47-48). In these instances it appears that the cult really is just the highest and most distinct part of the law, and not a separate entity from the law. The point is made in a variety of settings. At 1:44-47, 51, 54-55 the king introduces strange customs (νόμιμα) that change the law (νόμος) and the ordinances (δικαιώματα). The customs listed are almost exclusively cultic: he forbids burnt offerings and drink offerings, defiles the sanctuary and the priests, builds sacred precincts and shrines for idols, and mandates the sacrifice of swine and other unclean animals. The law in this case is virtually a synonym for the cult. Mattathias' speech at 2:19-22 holds basically the same to be true when it compares obedience to the king's ordinance not only to abandoning the religion of the ancestors, but also to deserting the law (νόμος) and the ordinances (δικαιώματα). The scene at Mizpah (3:46-53) shows a possible connection between the law and cult as well, as the book of the law (τὸ βιβλίον τοῦ νόμου) is consulted in order to find the proper procedure for dealing with a variety of items, which would normally be used in the performance of the cult. The link is less direct than the first two, but still present. A similar connection is shown also in all the other verses in this group. The cult or cultic objects are mentioned in the same breath as the law. This most notably occurs at the cleansing and rededication of the temple (4:42, 47, 52-55), where a number of the acts are accomplished specifically and meticulously according to the law. The group as a whole would seem to suggest that Renaud's hypothesis carries weight in 1MaccG.

There is another group of passages in 1MaccG that refers to the cult and sanctuary outside the context of the law (1:59; 2:12, 15; 4:36, 48-51, 56; 5:54; 7:33; 10:20-21, 84). Many of these passages, however, are inconclusive for different reasons. 1:59 reports on the main event that profaned the altar of burnt offering –the offering of illicit sacrifice by the gentiles, but it does so without any comment or judgment whatsoever. In Mattathias' lament at 2:12, 15, the desecration of the sanctuary is mentioned twice without any reference to the law, but this may be only because the desecration is outside a Judean

¹⁰ B. Renaud, "La Loi", 49.

legal context anyway. In the context of the rededication of the temple (4:36, 48-51, 56) despite legal connection to some of the acts described above, there are also several important events that seem to be done outside the confines of a strict relationship between the cult and the law. The actual rebuilding, the consecration of the temple, the fabrication of new holy vessels and the replacement of the altar of incense, the lampstand, the table, and the curtains are all done without regard for any explicit legal procedure. Further, the lighting of the lamps, the offering of incense and the placing of bread on the table are also reported independently of any overt legal directive. The connection between these acts and the law, may be understood by the audience, however. Finally, the celebration of the dedication made for eight days and the burnt offerings of thanksgiving and well being have no legal context for 1MaccG. This could be by mere accident, or it could be that the cult is in fact a separate entity from the law when the cult is not in crisis. The other examples do nothing to alleviate the confusion. Based upon the evidence at hand one has to agree with Renaud, at least in 1MaccG, that the law assumes the cult in aggregate.

The situation seems similar when we look at the covenant. In most cases in 1MaccG it appears to be annexed by and in parallel relationship to the law (1:57, 63; 2:20, 27, 50). At 1:57 the book of the covenant (βιβλίον διαθήκης) is mentioned as a parallel to the book of the law just one verse earlier. Though it is unclear if the two titles represent the same tome, there is a clear relationship between them. The scene at 2:20, which is continued in 2:27 also makes direct connections between the law and covenant that can be said to be nothing less than an annexation of the covenant by the law. Mattathias in the first instance states that he will continue to live by the ancestral covenant, and follows this with the explanation that he will not desert the law and the ordinances. In the second instance Mattathias calls to those in Modein that all who zeal for the law and support the covenant should follow him. In both situations it seems that the covenant is nothing more than the body of Judean law. The same sentiment is made at 2:50 where Mattathias instructs his sons to show zeal for the law and give their lives for the ancestral covenant. Here as in all the other examples it is not possible to see where the law ends and the covenant begins.

This evidence may suggest that Renaud is correct that the law annexes the covenant, however there are several verses that advise the hypothesis must be modified slightly (2:54; 4:8-10). At 2:54, during the praise of the ancestors, Mattathias mentions that Phinehas received the covenant of everlasting priesthood because he was deeply zealous. The use of covenant here clearly has nothing to do with the law itself, but refers to the actual making of a covenant. The difference, of course, is that the covenant referenced is not the Mosaic covenant. The stipulations for this covenant, however, have to do with zeal for the law. Also, at 4:8-10 Judas encourages his troops before battle and closes with the statement that they should cry to Heaven to see whether he will remember his covenant with the ancestors and crush the army before them. The key difference between this instance and those previous is that the covenant clearly refers to the actual pact itself. The obligation to obey the laws, which are part of the covenant, is not referenced, because Heaven's obligation to protect and save Israel is instead. The fact that the covenant is recalled alongside God's responsibility to it provides a new lens through which the previous passages should be viewed. It appears that in 1MaccG the covenant is always mentioned alongside parts of it that must be kept by one of the parties.

Seen from the perspective of this passage the hypothesis of Renaud begins to break down. The law does not annex the covenant in 1MaccG, nor does the law confer respect on the covenant. The opposite seems to be true; the law is merely the obligation on the Judean side of the covenant-relationship. Mattathias' statement that he will keep the covenant of the ancestors means that he will not break the laws, not because the two are the same, but because breaking the laws and ordinances would break the covenant by not living up to its commands. Especially important in this instance is that the law Mattathias and his sons are asked to transgress is that of illicit sacrifice or the prohibition against idolatry, each of which are central aspects of torah. Thus, in the final judgment, the covenant appears to remain an independent entity, which though closely related to the law is not annexed. But, it is fulfilled by the observance of law for the author of 1MaccG.

Finally, Renaud argues that prophecy and prophets are replaced by the law in 1Maccabees as the primary mediator between God and man.¹¹ More precisely, Renaud

¹¹ B. Renaud, "La Loi", 50.

finds the law to be the primary way in which divine will and judgment are communicated to Israel. The point is well taken when we apply it to 1MaccG. At 3:48 the people search the book of the law to divine what they might do with the cultic objects they have brought to Mizpah in the face of a desecrated temple. Further, the absence of any prophet from the book, and indeed the statement that prophets are not present at the time (4:46; 9:27) may support Renaud's claim. However, if we look at these verses more closely and see the logic behind them, the argument loses strength.

At the rededication of the temple (4:44-46) the priests devoted to the law, led by Judas are unsure of what to do about the profaned altar of burnt offering. They decide to tear it down so as not to have a constant reminder of the gentile defilement of the temple. They then remove the stones of the altar to a place on the temple mount and store them *until a prophet should come and tell them what to do about them* (μέχρι τοῦ παραγεννηθῆναι προφήτην τοῦ ἀποκριθῆναι περὶ αὐτῶν). A wealth of information is communicated in this brief series of verses. First, the law does not hold all the answers to divine will. Even though these priests are devoted to the law, and indeed consult it when applicable (4:47), in this case the law provides no answer. Second, though it is true that prophets are not present in the setting of the book, there is hope for their appearance in the future. If they did not think prophets would return they would not store the defiled stones of the previous altar on the temple mount. Third, prophecy was still the preferred method for finding divine will because it could clearly instruct them on subjects about which the law is unclear or silent. The scene nicely contrasts the lack of decision reached by the discussion of the legal scholars with the clear instruction that might be given by the future prophet. This shows the hierarchy that exists in the minds of the characters.

If we then turn to the scene at Mizpah again (3:48) we might notice that even though the law is consulted on matters of divine will, the Hasmoneans and their followers get no answer. They are forced to turn toward Heaven to ask for the answer as well as aid (3:50-53). The scene closes without them receiving any response. The limits of using the law as a mediator are in agreement with those at the rededication of the temple; there are times when it provides no answer. Here again, though the lack of prophets is apparent, the preferred method of communication with the divine seems to be direct

address. It is acknowledged, however, that this need not be an endorsement of prophecy over the law; it is only one possible interpretation.

Lastly, when the days between Judas' death and Jonathan's vocation are described (9:23-27) one particular verse stands out. At 9:27 the narrator states: "So there was great distress in Israel such as had not been since the time that prophets ceased to appear among them." Two clear points are made. First, prophets have stopped appearing at some point in the past, according to 1MaccG. Second, this situation was accompanied by, and perhaps caused, great distress for Israel. The combination of these statements shows that, far from being annexed or replaced by the law, prophecy is longed-for in 1MaccG. When we combine all the evidence we see a situation noticeably different from the one Renaud describes. Though the premise is perhaps correct that prophecy has at least temporarily departed from Israel, the law has not stepped in as a suitable replacement. In the places where the law is used to seek the proper course of action, it fails. The methods of the prophets are favored instead. Thus, though the law may have been used for the purpose of divining, prophecy was still the preferred method when it was available according to 1MaccG.

1MaccD

Discussion of the law annexing the cult in 1MaccD is infinitely harder than in the above section, mostly because of the dearth of evidence. As discussed above, there are only three occasions in 1MaccD (10:37; 14:29; 15:21) wherein legal vocabulary is used. Even fewer places discuss the cult (12:11; 14:36). Neither law nor cult is very important for 1MaccD, and it can certainly not be said that religion on its own is key. Though the temple and the office of high priest are of great concern for 1MaccD, it is primarily in political respects that these play a role. No major character ever performs a cultic function in this addition, and the sanctuary is hardly more than the stronghold of Hasmonean power. However, since there is some discussion of cultic and legal subjects in 1MaccD it is still possible to test Renaud's theory in these instances.

A cultic rite is mentioned only once, in the context of the first letter to the Spartans (12:11). In this diplomatic treaty Jonathan tells the Spartans that since the Judeans and

Spartans are related they “remember [them] constantly on every occasion, both at our festivals and on other appropriate days, at the sacrifices that we offer and in our prayers, as it is right and proper to remember brothers.” Here we have some specifics of the cult, but certainly no annexation by the law. There is a connection to the law in this context, because 12:9 mentions the holy books (τὰ βιβλία τὰ ἅγια), which likely contain some laws pertaining to the cult. However, it must be reiterated that the cult seems to be important in its own right instead of its being the highest obligation of the law. There is no unequivocal connection made between these books or the law and the cult in this context. There may be some relationship there, but it is open to interpretation.

At 14:36 the text recounts the acts of Simon. The proclamation from the Judean elders, priests, and the whole nation tells of Simon’s defeat of the gentiles from the citadel, who had previously defiled the environs of the sanctuary and damaged its purity. Unlike other instances where the temple is mentioned, this verse has a concern for the temple’s function as the place for the cult. The repeated mention of purity/defilement ensures that. Once again though, the content and context suggest only a tangential link with the law. The desire for purity of the temple is very likely associated with the law, but the temple itself, and the cult performed there do not exist because of the law. The cult is important in the Judean religion because it is the cult, not because it is the most important and unique part of the law to the Judean people.

As covenant language is entirely foreign to 1MaccD there is no way of deciding the extent to which the law has annexed the covenant under its umbrella. The community presented in 1MaccD neither seems to be based around the law nor the covenant, so that Renaud’s suggestion does not apply to this addition. Because of this, we are faced with a question that must remain open. However, it is worth noting that 14:41-49, without making it explicit, seem to establish a Judean community under the control and guidance of Simon using the covenant form. If this really is a new covenant with its own new stipulations (14:43-45), then there is some minor evidence for the observance of law being tied to keeping a covenant in the worldview of 1Maccabees. Even in this case though, the covenant does not exist for the sake of the law. The various provisions exist for the sake of the covenant.

In terms of prophecy's role in carrying communications from God to humanity, though the evidence is sparse (14:41), it seems to agree with the situation in 1MaccG. The testament to prophecy's existence comes in the midst of the document (covenant?) granting Simon and his descendants a series of privileges in thanks for the Hasmonean role in the war against the Greeks. The applicable passage comes in the awarding of the eternal leadership of the Judeans to the Hasmoneans: "The Judeans and their priests have resolved that Simon should be their leader and high priest forever, until a trustworthy prophet should arise" (καὶ ὅτι οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ οἱ ἱερεῖς εὐδόκησαν τοῦ εἶναι αὐτῶν σιμωνᾶ ἡγούμενον καὶ ἀρχιερέα εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα ἕως τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφήτην πιστόν). It is clear that in this central piece of decision-making there is no law involved. The priests and the Judeans decide themselves, not because they know the will of God, but because there are no trustworthy prophets to communicate that will to them.

One distinction between the understanding of prophecy in 1MaccG and this document is that while 1MaccG understands its time is one without any prophets, 1MaccD does not discount their existence, merely their authenticity. It is not evident that the compiler of 1MaccD, or perhaps the author of the document he quotes would agree with the assertion of 1MaccG (9:27) that there was a time when prophets ceased to appear. The author is familiar with prophets, only not credible ones. Despite the difference, the overall judgment on prophecy is the same; it is the preferred method for divining God's will, and its return is anticipated. One could, of course take a more cynical view of this Hasmonean document and suggest that there was no anticipation of a return of authentic prophets by the author or his sponsors, and the line was included for precisely this reason. However, even in this case, one would have to admit a second group (members of the populace?) that was being duped because they did believe in the promise of future prophets.

1MaccO

The relationship between cult and law in 1MaccO is similar to that in 1MaccG. The cult, in its single brief appearance (1:43) is only of any concern because it is an example

of the impiety of those in Israel who accept the king's commands. The mention of the cult comes in a single verse insertion of 1MaccO into the context of a passage otherwise entirely from 1MaccG. After Antiochus IV's reform is introduced and we learn that all the gentiles accepted it, 1:43 tells us that "many even from Israel gladly adopted his religion; they sacrificed to idols and profaned the Sabbath." The inclusion of the cultic transgressions alongside the Sabbath offense is telling. 1MaccO simply sees the cult as one of the distinct laws of the Judeans. It is listed alongside the Sabbath law, which some rebellious Judeans chose to forsake. The cult is no more important in the religious understanding of the author than Sabbath observation.¹² This demotes the place of the cult from the unifying element of the Judean religion to being merely one of the laws. 1MaccO has great concern for the keeping of the cult properly, but only because it is part of the distinct laws.

Covenant language appears only three times in 1MaccO; two instances are in the same very early passage (1:11, 15). Each of these occurrences directly contradicts one of Renaud's premises¹³ for viewing the covenant as being taken up by the law in 1Maccabees; they focus on the actual making of pacts instead of on the covenant as a set of laws under which the Judeans must live. At 1:11 a group of "outlaws" from Israel chooses to go out and "make a covenant" (διαθώμεθα διαθήκην) with the gentiles in order to make a better life for themselves by putting an end to their separation. Though the covenant is not the Mosaic pact that is comprised of legal obligations on the part of the Judeans, the verse is concerned with the actual making of the covenant and its results. This not only recalls for the reader the making of the Mosaic covenant, but also distinguishes between covenant and law. It is the pact itself that becomes important.

This understanding is solidified by the final verse in the passage (1:15), which emphasizes how these same Judeans broke the "holy covenant" (διαθήκης ἁγίας). The verse states that they "removed the marks of their circumcision, and abandoned the holy

¹² This is not to demote the Sabbath observance, which is after all included in the Decalogue and enshrined in several culturally relevant stories. We only point out that Sabbath observance is a part (if an important part) of torah, and the cult is treated in the same way.

¹³ B. Renaud, "La Loi", 50.

covenant.” The implication here is that the removal of circumcision is the act that, at least symbolically, broke the covenant. It is interesting that here too it is not the Mosaic covenant that is recalled but the Abrahamic covenant. The requirement for Judeans to be circumcised comes from Gen 17:10-13 and is only explicitly mentioned once more in Lev 12:3. The promise broken by these Israelites is the one that promises kings and nations to come from the Judeans, not the covenant on Sinai. This is ensured by Gen 17:14 which states that any male who is not circumcised shall be cut off from his people because he has broken the covenant. The sentence is mirrored by 1MaccO. Abraham’s sealing of the covenant and God’s conditions for the covenant are thus at the forefront of this passage. Finally at 1:63, 1MaccO suggests that those who chose death rather than being defiled by unclean food, did so in order that they would not profane the holy covenant. Though this may seem to equate the law with the covenant, it is more plausible that the covenant requires the separation from unclean food among its many stipulations. The protection of the covenant is the reason for the personal sacrifice, not the law treating unclean food. The covenant is thus recalled by 1MaccO as important for its own sake. It does not have dependence on the laws, and certainly is not respected only because of its connection to the law.

The prophets are mentioned once in 1MaccO, but it hardly reflects upon prophecy itself. At 9:54 Alcimus, the high priest at the time, tears down one of the walls of the temple, at which point the narrator of 1MaccO breaks frame and exclaims “he tore down the work of the prophets” (καὶ καθείλεν τὰ ἔργα τῶν προφητῶν). Nothing more is said about the prophets or their work.¹⁴ The passage certainly reflects knowledge of, and respect for prophets, but does not comment at all on their use as a means to divine God’s will. The law likewise is never used for such purposes. 1MaccO simply does not reflect the place Renaud claims for the law regarding prophecy in all of 1Maccabees.

1MaccH

There is precious little to say about the correlation between cult and law in 1MaccH. Only one passage has any concern with cultic material (2:23-26); the same

¹⁴ One imagines it is related to the stories of the construction of the second temple under the guidance of Haggai and Zechariah (Ezra 5:1, 6:14; 1Esd 7:3).

passage is full of legal references as well. The scene in question is Mattathias' vengeance against the sacrificing Judean at Modein. In this scene a Judean comes forward to sacrifice on the illicit altar in accordance with the command of King Antiochus. In response to this apostasy Mattathias is enraged in accordance with the law and kills the man on the altar. He then proceeds to also assassinate the king's officer who was sent to enforce the sacrifice. Mattathias' last act is to tear down the altar. The cultic concern is obvious; a sacrifice is being offered by a Judean outside of Jerusalem, possibly to a foreign god, and likely with an unclean animal.¹⁵ Mattathias' actions are in defense of the cult. However 1Macch couches the whole scene in legal language. The Judean offers sacrifice *according to the king's command* (κατὰ τὸ πρόσταγμα τοῦ βασιλέως). Mattathias' anger is said to be *in accord with the law* (κατὰ τὸ κρίμα). Further, the whole scene is summarized by the narrator with the statement that Mattathias *burned with zeal for the law* (καὶ ἐζήλωσεν τῷ νομῷ). The connection between the law and cult is unmistakable. The cult is of importance to 1Macch because of its status in the law. Renaud's hypothesis thus holds true in this final level.

Neither the covenant nor the prophets make any appearance in 1Macch. It is impossible to decide whether the compiler of this section envisions the Jewish community as one based around the law instead of the covenant or whether divine will is sought through the law instead of through prophets. These subjects are not related to the contents of 1Macch. They are reserved for the earlier sections.

Is the Torah Israel's Way of Life?

One of Arenhoevel's major revelations concerning the nomos in 1Maccabees is that it becomes the way of life for Israel. By this he means that the collection of customs

¹⁵ If we can assume that the editor who included this story knew of, and tied it to 1Macc 1:47.

and rules are what define Israel's existence.¹⁶ That is, the torah gives Israel its national character, and forms a continuity with Israel's ancestors. The law does not exist so that it should be followed, nor does it persist as a religion. For Arenhoevel, it defines Israel. As we noted in our review of his work, many of Arenhoevel's theories make a great deal of sense, but let us test them in each of the layers of 1Maccabees.

1MaccG

Essentially this proposal by Arenhoevel suggests that in 1Maccabees the torah is divorced from religion, and becomes an ethno-cultural phenomenon instead of a religious one. There is great evidence for this in 1MaccG. The introduction of the king's decree at 1:41 particularly underlines the identity aspect of laws and customs, in general. The narrator reports: "Then the king wrote to his whole kingdom, so that they would be one people, and that each people should forsake its own customs" (Καὶ ἔγραψεν ὁ βασιλεὺς πάσῃ τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ εἶναι πάντας εἰς λαὸν ἓνα καὶ ἐγκαταλείπειν ἕκαστον τὰ νόμιμα αὐτοῦ). The customs outlined in relation to the Judeans in the following verses, are all ordinances of the torah. Among these newly banned customs is the practice of circumcision (1:48), which is probably one of the more identity-related ordinances in the whole torah. When it comes to reversing the decrees of Antiochus IV, one of Mattathias' first missions is to circumcise all those who were previously prevented, so that they may be part of Israel (2:48). From these verses one gets the impression that 1MaccG sees the torah, in its existence as law, as defining Israel's identity.

This identifying aspect of the torah is only strengthened by Mattathias' own words at 2:20-21 where he states, "I and my sons and my brothers will live according to the covenant of our ancestors. Far be it from us to abandon the law and ordinances" (κἀγω καὶ οἱ υἱοὶ μου καὶ οἱ ἀδελφοί μου πορευσόμεθα ἐν διαθήκῃ πατέρων ἡμῶν. ἴλεως ἡμῖν καταλιπεῖν νόμον καὶ δικαιώματα). The tie to the ancestors makes the law and covenant something that belongs to the Judean nation and identity. The point seems to be that if they were to abandon the law and covenant, they would not so much be turning their back on Yahweh, with whom the covenant was struck, but betraying their ancestors,

¹⁶ D. Arenhoevel, *Die Theokratie*, 11.

whose identity they are maintaining. The same sort of connection between the law and identity can be seen at 2:67, 3:21, and 3:29. In each of these cases, observance of and fighting for the law is tied to the basic identity of the Judean ethnos.

This is, however, not the last word on the question of the *nomos* as the Judean identity and way of life. Several passages particularly underline the religious aspect of the law, which, though certainly not divorced from Judean identity, goes beyond simple identity. At 1:44-49, the new laws enforced in Antiochus' decree are overwhelmingly cultic. Burnt offerings, sacrifices, drink offerings, and festivals are all banned. Shrines, altars, and sacred precincts are built for idols, and the sacrifice of pigs and other unclean animals is sanctioned. If the understanding of the law were, for the most part, unreligious, then why would so many of the new proclamations particularly affect cultic practice? There are certainly other ordinances, more tied to identity, that could have been chosen were this the case. These laws affect, particularly the way in which the cult is practiced by the Judeans, and are shown to be central aspects of the torah.

The religious qualities of the torah are also stressed at 2:19 and 2:22. In each of these cases the collection of laws the Judeans are asked to break are said to be "religion" (λατρεία). If indeed the torah has a broader application than religion, that is, as the basic identity of the Judeans, these verses do not understand it as such. They may tie the religion to particular nations (2:19), but the law is a part of religion, more than it is the foundation of identity. The important role the law plays in religion is further stressed by 2:45, where Mattathias' first act is to tear down the illicit altars built by Antiochus IV, and 4:42-53, which highlight the centrality of the law in the reconstruction of the temple. Especially this latter passage describes a situation in which the law is particularly important in dictating the proper function of the cult, and has nothing to do with the identity of Israel.

The answer to the question of the torah as a way of life in 1MaccG is somewhat mixed. Though the law plays some part in forming the basic identity of Israel, creating Israel as it were, it cannot be explained as only this. The law has a number of religious uses and understandings contained within it, all of which maintain the idea of the law as religion. It might be fair to say that this religious aspect of the law is important as an

identifying marker for 1MaccG, but even there, it is not only Israel's identity. It seems here, that Arenhoevel's thesis does not hold up to scrutiny.

1MaccD

It should come as no surprise, given what has been observed already concerning 1MaccD, that the very nationalistic redaction clearly presents the torah as a way of life. At every turn, it seems, where the torah is mentioned, it is tied to some idea of the Judean nation, and thus, Judean identity. It is also, importantly, largely divorced from religious practice. At 10:37, where the Judeans to be enlisted in Demetrius' army are allowed to live by their own laws, the sense is clearly tied to their ethnicity. These soldiers would be in their own battalions, under their own officers, and thus live by their own laws. The fact that this is communicated in a diplomatic letter among a number of other provisions ensures that the torah is understood in the most civil sense, apart from religion. At 14:29, as discussed above, Simon and his brothers are celebrated for their defense of the sanctuary and the law in a particularly nationalistic context. The "enemies of their nation" sought the destruction of the law. Further, the defeat of those enemies, and protection of the law, "brought great glory to the nation". It could not be more clear that the torah is understood here as an aspect of the Judean identity, as is the sanctuary. Though the mention of the law at 15:21 only brings up the law in a civil context, the fact that it is kept separate from religion likely confirms the two earlier instances where the law is discussed in 1MaccD. The Judean nation is thus symbolized, in part, by its law. This is a clear development from the viewpoint of 1MaccG, where the religious and identifying aspects of the law are dually stressed.

1MaccO

Perhaps surprisingly, 1MaccO appears to reverse the trend toward seeing the law as a mark of identity rather than a separate aspect of devotion, religious or otherwise. If only the first instance of apostasy in 1MaccO were available, one might be led to believe

that the law is the decision-maker on identity. At 1:11-15, the way in which the Judeans depart from Israel, and join with the gentiles by observing their laws and customs, betrays an understanding of the law wherein it is central to Judean identity. This can be especially seen in the emphasis on the reversal of circumcision,¹⁷ which physically makes these apostates into gentiles. This is, however, the last instance of such an understanding of the law in 1MaccO.

At 1:43, those who adopt the king's new decrees are tellingly called "many from Israel" (πολλοὶ ἀπὸ Ἰσραηλ). They are still included among Israel, even though they are explicitly not observing the laws any longer, instead preferring those of the king. Also telling in this verse is that this group is said to observe the king's religion, not his laws. Among the signs of this in 1:43 are their sacrifice to idols, and their profanation of the Sabbath. This verse enforces the idea that the torah's ordinances are not the source of Israel's identification, but the rules of its religion, which ought to be followed. This same idea is communicated at 1:52, where "many of the people" (ἀπὸ τοῦ λαοῦ πολλοὶ) join the king's officers in enforcing the king's law on the land. Even though this group is joining in the apostasy, they are still members of the people.

Further evidence comes from the mention of the Hasideans at 2:42. This party is introduced with the special qualification that they "volunteered for the law" (ἐκουσιαζόμενος τῷ νόμῳ). If the law were the foundation for the identification as a member of Israel, offering oneself for the torah would not be noteworthy. Here, the Hasideans are especially praised for it. This suggests again that the law was an object of special devotion, and not the basis of whether one was considered Judean. The final clue suggesting that 1MaccO holds the law to a more confined role than that of "way of life" comes from 6:23-24. After the apostates confess to following Antiochus IV's laws, they tell Antiochus V and Lysias that "the sons of our people" (οἱ υἱοὶ τοῦ λαοῦ ἡμῶν) besieged the citadel in Jerusalem. This shows that even the Judean opponents of the Maccabees themselves do not consider their abandonment of the torah to be an abandonment of their people. The laws are not the identifying character of Israel, or its

¹⁷ This was done through the process of epispasm, described by Celsus. *De Medicina* 7.25.1

way of life, but one aspect of its religion. 1MaccO has nearly no concept of the torah as Israel's unique mark.¹⁸

1MaccH

As is sometimes the case with 1MaccH, there is not really enough information to decide whether the torah is presented as the way of life for Judeans, or a set of religious rules, or anything else. There is one instance, at 3:5-6 where Judas' people are clearly set against those who break the law. Later in the poem, at 3:7, it is clear that Judas' people are Jacob. This may mean that for 1MaccH the law is the basis of identification more than anything else. However, 2:23 may counter this statement by calling the man from Modein who went to sacrifice on the altar a Judean, despite his sin. Part of the problem comes from the likely use of various different sources to cobble together 1MaccH, resulting in perhaps a muddled view of the law.

Is the Torah a Fence?

Arenhoevel's second major conclusion is that the torah is a clearly marked border designed to protect Israel.¹⁹ The torah not only keeps Israel from outsiders, and vice-versa, but also keeps the good law-abiding Israelites from the apostates. This is not something that other national and ethnic customs do, only the torah. This results in an isolation of Israel from the gentiles, due to the fact that allegiance with the gentiles automatically means breaking the law. Thus, because of the torah, Israel must survive on its own. This must be tested in each of the layers.

1MaccG

¹⁸ On the subject of the names of the opponents, which sometimes refer to their status with respect to the law, no firm conclusions can be reached. On the one hand, the group is especially highlighted for its lack of observance of the law, indicating normity. On the other, the group is considered to be Israel, and is also called impious, which indicates the law is a religious category instead of a social one.

¹⁹ D. Arenhoevel, *Die Theokratie*, 14.

Due to the similarity in definitions between the law as a fence and that of way of life identifying Israel, it should be no wonder that many of the same passages will come up in the discussion. We shall try to focus only on the aspect of separation from gentiles (and apostates, for 1MaccO), which is where the torah's function as fence differs most from its definition as a way of life. 1MaccG is typically full of conflicting interpretations on this matter. The change of laws called for by Antiochus IV at 1:44-49 suggests that the torah was a fence. The king's demand for removal of these laws supposedly will make all his kingdom into one people (1:41). The laws highlighted in these verses are all particularly aimed at the abolition of the torah. Therefore, at least these ordinances must separate Judeans from the rest of the kingdom. However, one aspect of Arenhoevel's argument does not ring true here. It is clear in the first verse of this section (1:41), that the king asks all to give up their particular customs to be one people. It seems that, counter to Arenhoevel's assertion,²⁰ the customs of other nations act as a fence as well, not only those of the Judeans. Perhaps the other nations are more willing to give up their customs (1:42), but that does not change the fact that their laws do create some sort of isolation. This same idea of the torah as fence, while maintaining other legal systems as fences also appears at 2:19. Mattathias' announcement that he will keep the covenant of his ancestors in the face of all the other nations abandoning theirs implies that the other nations also have laws that prevent them from fulfilling the king's command.

A more clear distinction between the gentiles and the law can perhaps be seen at 2:48 and 2:68. In each of these verses the gentiles are explicitly inimical to the law. 2:48 announces that Mattathias and his friends "rescued the law out of the hands of the gentiles and kings" (καὶ ἀντελάβοντο τοῦ νόμου ἐκ χειρὸς τῶν ἔθνῶν καὶ τῶν βασιλέων). There is only one interpretation: the law is to be kept away from the gentiles and their leaders. They reside outside the fence created by the law. Likewise at 2:68, obeying the commands of the law is linked with avenging the wrong done to the Judean people by the gentiles. The gentiles are the enemy, and the law keeps them that way.

²⁰ Ibid., 14. As pointed out in our evaluation of Arenhoevel, this will come as no surprise to social scientists who study nationality and ethnicity.

There are a series of other passages though, that speak directly against this conception of isolation. The Hasmoneans are continuously in allegiance with different peoples and nations. They are also clearly held up as law-abiders, and the primary defenders of the torah (3:21;13:3). How can the torah be a fence when Judas is on peaceful terms with the Nabateans (5:24) and the Seleucid governor Nicanor (7:28-29)? Would it not prevent Jonathan from making allegiances with the Seleucid governor Bacchides (9:70-73c), the Seleucid pretender Alexander Balas (10:15-21, 47, 65-66), the Egyptian king Ptolemy VI (11:6-7), and Demetrius II (11:30-37)? Jonathan even goes so far in his allegiance to Demetrius II that he sends Judeans as mercenaries to quell a rebellion in Antioch (11:44-51), yet this does not appear to be problematic for the narrator. There is no ensuing mention of the law. Jonathan also makes an alliance with Trypho (11:54-59), while his brother Simon achieves his final goals by cutting a deal with Demetrius II (13:34-40). In none of these cases are the Judeans isolated from the gentiles. Many of these introduce the Judeans to active participation in gentile armies, yet no judgment is passed. If the law really were a fence that isolated the Judeans, this could not be so. In the end Arenhoevel's idea of the torah as fence does not appear valid as a sweeping judgment in 1MaccG.

1MaccD

Based on what we have already noted concerning 1MaccD and its attitude toward gentiles, it should be obvious that there is little evidence for the torah acting as a barrier for Israel in this layer. Simon and his brothers are both praised for defending the law (14:29), and the many treaties they make with foreign nations are celebrated (8:1-32; 12:1-23; 14:16-24, 40; 15:1-9, 16-24). There is no questioning their faithfulness, and the Hasmoneans are obviously not isolationists. The treaties with Rome, in particular, are cited as a major reason for recognition of Judea and of Simon's high priesthood (14:40). There is no case to be made that the law prevents the Judeans from making alliances with gentiles, or that such alliances necessarily entail breaking the law. In fact, 1MaccD even goes so far as to admire the customs and laws of the Romans (8:1-16), and to share all its property (symbolically) with the Spartans (12:1-23). If anything, one might imagine that the law encourages connections with the nations, based on the evidence of 1MaccD.

1MaccO

It is only with 1MaccO that Arenhoevel's model of torah as fence is fully realized. 1:11-15 introduce the Judean opponents first going to the gentiles to make a covenant with them, which also involves following their laws. This leads to the reversal of their circumcisions, and finally to their breaking of the covenant. Here one notices exactly the pattern concerning which Arenhoevel has created his model. Allegiance with gentiles leads to obeying their laws, which in turn leads to transgression of Judean customs. Finally this results in breaking their previous pact with the divine. The same philosophy can also be seen at 1:43 and 1:52. In both of these cases a group of Judeans take an assimilationist approach to gentiles and their laws, and end up transgressing the torah in the worst possible ways. At 1:43 this is manifested in idolatry and a disregard for Sabbath observance, two of the commands of the Decalogue. At 1:52, the allegiance with the gentiles leads them to not only break the torah, but force others to break it too. 2:44 has evidence of this fence between torah-observant Judeans and others from Israel in that the latter become victims of the wrath of the former. Similar isolation of the lawless from the law-abiding Judeans can be seen at 7:5-7; 9:58-61, 73d; and 10:14.

6:23-24 makes the explicit link between following gentile laws and excommunication. The impious Judeans specifically cite their connection with the gentiles as the reason for which their own people become hostile to them. This connection is manifested in service to the Seleucid monarch, and also in obedience to his commands. In all these examples from 1MaccO, the torah acts as a clear fence to protect the members of the torah-community, led by the Hasmoneans, from the outsiders who do not observe the torah. As we noticed above, this does not mean that Judeans who do not observe the torah are no longer Judean, or no longer "Israel", only that they are isolated from the community that 1MaccO envisions the Hasmoneans to be forming. It is likely these passages in 1MaccO that influence Arenhoevel into believing this model of the torah is prevalent throughout 1Maccabees.

1MacH

Once again, in 1MacH there is such little material treating the law that it is difficult to grasp whether this model fits. Though there is evidence for isolationism, particularly in the *preisgedichte* of Judas (3:3-9) and Simon (14:4-15), it is never explicitly said to be based upon the torah. Surely the lawbreakers are removed by both brothers (3:5-6; 14:14) and also by Mattathias (2:23-26), but there is also evidence that the Hasmoneans had an allegiance with the Nabateans in 1MacH (9:35). This allegiance is not judged harshly, though it does end up harming the Hasmoneans in the end. Perhaps it is best to conclude that there is a hint of the model of the torah as fence in 1MacH, but one must be sure to recall that it is not a central feature of this layer.

Is the Torah the State Law of Judea?

Arenhoevel uses this point as his final conclusion. Based on the other models of the torah he finds in 1Maccabees, he sees the torah transformed into a law which emanates from those in power, and fully becomes an instrument of the ruling class to maintain order among the people.²¹ Arenhoevel gives three proofs of the metamorphosis into state law: 1) the torah begins to be fought for, instead of being merely died for; 2) the torah applies throughout the community in all parts of life and to all members; 3) the torah is strongly tied to the geographical entity of Judea. These each function as part of the outgrowth of the torah becoming state law. We will test each aspect of the model in each of the layers.

1MaccG

It is overwhelmingly evident that the law is actively fought for in 1MaccG, instead of only being worthy of a passive martyrdom. Though there are three occasions in which characters die on behalf of the law, it can hardly be argued that this is the ideal. At 1:60, mothers who have their children circumcised, despite the king's decree lose their lives. Those who follow the law, or possess scrolls containing the torah, also face death (1:57). Though 1MaccG undoubtedly sees these people as heroes and martyrs, the

²¹ D. Arenhoevel, *Die Theokratie*, 15.

episode at 2:37-38, and the reaction to it at 2:39-41 prescribe the proper course of action. After a group of law-abiding Judeans remove themselves to the desert, only to be tracked down by the royal officers, they make the explicit decision to die in their innocence rather than follow the king's command, or profane the Sabbath by fighting back (2:37-38). When Mattathias hears of it, though he mourns for them, he decides that it is necessary to fight the gentiles on behalf of the law (2:39-40). Mattathias and his friends then make a pact to fight against anyone who comes against them even on the Sabbath day. This set of events sets into motion the martial philosophy displayed in 1MaccG concerning the law. After this episode, the Hasmoneans and their allies can be seen or described as fighting on behalf of the law at 2:45; 3:21, 29; 6:59; 13:3. There is never another instance where a character dies passively for the law.

Whether the law truly applies as broadly as Arenhoevel suggests is difficult to argue, considering the limited examples of legal material in 1MaccG. For instance, it is not clear whether purification rituals were strictly followed, or laws regulating marriage or divorce were applicable in the community described. However, what is evident, is that in so far as the torah is mentioned in 1MaccG, it is applied very broadly, and applied to the entire community. The laws mentioned at 1:44-49 are overwhelmingly cultic, but also include Sabbath observance and circumcision among their ranks. Additionally, a summary remarks that the order to drop the Judean ordinances was intended “to make themselves detestable, in all things unclean and profane” (βδελύξαι τὰς ψυχὰς αὐτῶν ἐν παντὶ ἀκαθάρτῳ καὶ βεβηλώσει). This phrase suggests the laws were far-reaching and touched all parts of their lives. More evidence for the broad applicability of the law comes at 3:56 where the rules for preparation for war are followed by sending home those with pressing engagements (newly married, planting a vineyard, bulding a house, etc.).²² There is certainly nothing limiting the applicability to the entire community anywhere in the text, but no text specifically supports it either. The only possible example of limits put on the law in any respect comes in the overt transgression of the Sabbath by Mattathias and his followers, by deciding to fight (2:39-41; 9.43 ff.). This

²² Cf. Deut 20:5-9

occasion looms large, but it is one particular case regarding a single law, so we cannot draw too much information from it.

There is a definite association between the land of Judea and the law in 1MaccG. At 1:44 the innovations imposed by Antiochus IV's decrees are said to be "customs foreign to the land" (νομίμων ἀλλοτριῶν τῆς γῆς). This phrase implies that there is a bond between the land and its native laws, separate from the connection between the laws and people. At 2:46 this same link between the land and the law is reinforced by the forced circumcision of all the uncircumcised young boys "in the region/borders of Israel" (ἐν ὁρίοις Ἰσραηλ). This passage underlines the necessity for the characters of 1MaccG for the law to apply throughout the land. 3:29 makes a similar association between the customs and the land, stating that the removal of the customs caused disaster for the land.

Despite all these factors being strongly in evidence in 1MaccG, it is perhaps a stretch to argue that the torah functions as a state law. There are, for example, new rules instituted, which must be followed, and are not necessarily considered torah. Aside from the reinterpretation of Sabbath observation (2:39-41), there are also three new feasts created by Judas: Channukah (4:59) and the Day of Nicanor (7:49) and the day of cleansing the citadel (13:52). This all may seem benign, but it suggests that to a certain degree state laws still emanated from the Judean leadership regardless of whether it was considered torah. There is no doubt that at least part of the torah seems to have been part of the state law, but it is unlikely that it constituted the law of Judea in its entirety for 1MaccG.

1MaccD

There is only one verse that speaks of fighting in the same phrase with the law in 1MaccD, and there is a positive connection. At 14:29 the Hasmoneans are celebrated for their defense of the law, and at no other point in 1MaccD is fighting or dying for the law raised as a possibility. This suggests that for 1MaccD the only acceptable possibility when the law was threatened was to fight.

Since there are very few laws mentioned in 1MaccD, and even the torah as a whole is mentioned infrequently, it is impossible to decide just how much the law applies

to the community, and if every aspect of the law is valid to the whole people. There is one hint that the torah may apply as an overarching law for the community at 15:21, where the Romans write concerning the Judeans: “If there are any detestable men from their country who have fled to you, send them to Simon the high priest, so that he may punish them according to their law” (εἴ τινες οὖν λοιμοὶ διαπεφεύγασιν ἐκ τῆς χώρας αὐτῶν πρὸς ὑμᾶς παράδοτε αὐτοὺς Σιμωνι τῷ ἀρχιερεῖ ὅπως ἐκδικήσῃ αὐτοὺς κατὰ τὸν νόμον αὐτῶν). Since we know already that in all the layers νόμος refers to the torah, and it is evident that the torah is being used in a normal judicial sense here, it follows that the torah applies in truly all aspects of the community, and to all its members.

This same passage clearly also ties the torah to the land of Judea. The law is applicable to the fleeing criminal, but in order for it to be exercised the criminal must be sent to Simon, who is in Judea. It is only in that country where the criminal can be punished according to the torah. This connection between land and law is also spoken of in 10:37, which has Demetrius granting the Judeans he wishes to enlist in his army the right to follow their laws, “just as the king has commanded in the land of Judah” (καθὰ καὶ προσέτακεν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἐν γῆ Ἰουδα). Though Demetrius is here in fact disconnecting the law from the land for his soldiers, the proclamation recognizes the already existing relationship between torah and Judah.

With 1MaccD it is perhaps easier to see the torah as functioning like a state and national law. This is largely because it is made plain in 15:21 that this is one of the torah’s functions. However, one must be cautious. Even in 1MaccD there are regulations that fall outside the traditional body of instruction one might consider torah. Nevertheless these are central parts of the state law. In the miniature covenant made between the Judeans, priests, and Simon, which appoints Simon as high priest, leader, and general, there are a number of rules that go along with this covenant (14:41-46). Among them are instructions relating to Simon’s responsibility, and other rules relating to what the people must do, and even what clothing they are allowed to wear. It is specified that, “whoever does not act according to these, or rejects one of them will be liable” (ὅς δ’ ἂν παρὰ τὰυτα ποιήσῃ ἢ ἀθετήσῃ τι τούτων ἔνοχος ἔσται). This last

statement makes it clear that rules outside the traditional torah may be enacted at any point, and still apply in certain matters. Judicial and state law includes both the torah and extra rules for 1MaccD, even if the torah seems more official than in 1MaccG. It may well be the case that these other rules were also considered “torah”, but these are never given the official title.

1MaccO

As in the previous two layers, 1MaccO presents a world in which it is preferable to fight for the law. Only in the first instance where a choice must be made (1:62-63), are Judeans praised for their decision to die rather than defile themselves and break the covenant. After this, the Hasideans and their allies take action against the Judean apostates (2:42-44), the apostates testify to the king that Judas and his brothers have attacked them and disenfranchised them because of their adherence to the king’s law (6:24), and Alcimus and the rest of the lawless Judeans report to the king that they have been driven out of their land (7:6). In all these instances it is clear that the Hasmoneans are attacking their victims on behalf of the torah. No sympathy is offered for the opponents.

Though obedience to the law is clearly preferable to disobedience in 1MaccO, the extent of the law’s applicability in the community is indistinct. On the one hand, all the passages mentioned in relation to fighting for the law suggest that the Hasmonean point of view was that all members of their community should follow the law. On the other hand, there are few passages in 1MaccO that detail what exactly was the law’s rightful application. At 1:62-63, the law is represented by the regulation against unclean food, and seems to be important as part of the covenant. This is a somewhat limited field in which the law would apply. Further, those who follow the law are depicted as making a choice (1:63; 2:42), as are those who choose not to follow the torah (1:43, 52; 6:23). The fact that one can choose for or against the law, and that it applies in a seemingly limited field, suggests that the torah is not applicable to the whole community, either in all parts of life, or to all its members.

1MaccO appears to recognize no connection between the law and the land whatsoever. The lawless are constantly shown to be in the land (1:11-15, 52; 7:5-7, 12-14, 21-25; 9:23-24, 54-60). Though at times they appear to be hindered by the work of the Hasmoneans and their allies (6:24; 7:5), there are too many examples of the lawless residing in the land even when the Hasmoneans are at the height of their power for there to be any real connection (9:58; 10:14, 61, 64; 11:21, 25).

Based on all the evidence, 1MaccO decidedly does not display the model of torah as state law of Israel. Though the torah is fought for, it never seems to apply to the whole community, nor does it dictate action in all aspects of life. There is also no reasonable way to argue that the torah has a connection to the land for 1MaccO. There are no other clues that argue for or against the torah as state law in 1MaccO, so we have only this evidence to decide.

1MaccH

The constant refrain with 1MaccH as it regards the law must continue in this section. There is really not much information to decide how the law functions. One thing is certain: 1MaccH believes in fighting on behalf of the torah. Not only does 1MaccH include the famous scene where Mattathias recalls his ostensible progenitor, Phinehas (2:23-26), but Judas (3:5-6) and Simon (14:14) are both praised for their attacks on the lawless and outlaws. There are no instances where a character dies for the law, and there is no reason to believe that this would be a favored course of action.

It is entirely unclear to what extent and to whom the law applies for 1MaccH. The law seems to govern the cult, at least as far as one can tell from the Mattathias episode (2:23-26). This passage may also imply that the torah can be used as justification for inflicting punishment, with Mattathias' action validated by the expression κατὰ τὸ κρίμα (according to the law/judgment). Other passages give no indication what is included in the law. This one passage is too little evidence to come to any conclusions.

As with 1MaccO, there is no indication that the land has anything to do with the law in 1MaccH. Though the land is mentioned on occasion in this layer, it is never of

significance to where the law applies. The law may apply to all Judeans in Judea, or Judeans all over, or only to some Judeans; the evidence would allow for all possibilities.

In 1MaccH it is obvious that the torah is not a state law, or at least does not appear to be. Though there is no other additional law that competes with it, the torah does not seem to have broad applicability, being used in only the cultic setting. The torah, in whatever model, just is not that important to this layer.

III.3 Summary: The Law and Laws in 1Maccabees

1MaccG

As we have seen, 1Maccabees is already concerned with the law in the primary compositional layer, 1MaccG. A significant amount of the legal vocabulary in the whole of 1Maccabees is found here, and much of the material in the first few chapters of 1MaccG is the chief legal section.

1MaccG clearly places a high value on the law, but it does not sit atop the religious hierarchy. The deity still reigns supreme in the religious world of 1MaccG. The law seems to enjoy a special place, particularly in the first four chapters, because it is the law specifically that is under attack. When the law is not threatened, as is the case later in 1MaccG, it appears far less frequently and occupies a less honored place. The law, for 1MaccG is merely one of several stepping-stones to reach divine favor.

The law is also not the arbiter of good and evil for 1MaccG. While some characters, who are called “good” are defenders of the law, this is not always the case. Those labeled as “evil” likewise most often have no malice for the law. The law may play some role in determining a character’s worth, but the evidence could also be interpreted to suggest that even in these cases it is only coincidental. Far more important for 1MaccG in judging whether a character is good or evil is whether they attack Judeans, are trustworthy, or are cooperative with Judean interests at the time.

Further, 1MaccG seems to have a partially expanded role for the law in that it seems to consume the cult and cultic ritual under its umbrella. The cult is of import to 1MaccG because it is mandated by the law. Religious performance is not as important on

its own as it is as the centerpiece of the law. This is not to say however that the law overtakes all the traditional elements of religion. It is still subservient to the covenant. The reason the laws must be practiced is because they keep the Judeans in their special relationship with the divine, who offers them protection in return. Individual laws may be obeyed or dropped for situational purposes as long as the covenant relationship remains intact. The covenant is still the primary space within which the Judeans and their god coexist. Prophecy remains the preferred way to gauge divine will and determine the proper course of action, even if its absence is acknowledged. The law is used for the same purpose in 1MaccG where it can be, but often the most pressing and dire circumstances are reserved for future prophets.

On the secular side of the torah, 1MaccG does not appear to view the torah as the identifying and community-defining characteristic of Israel. Though obedience to the laws does seem to play a role in identifying one as a member of the community, the torah's function cannot be reduced to this. There are too many situations in 1MaccG where the laws either play no part in identification, or are used in a strictly religious context.

Related to this, the torah also does not appear to function as a fence between Israel and the nations for 1MaccG. Far from isolating its followers, the torah seems to allow its adherents to make various pacts and alliances with gentiles of all types. Though it cannot be argued that the torah calls for such alliances in 1MaccG, it can equally be seen that there is no obvious problem either. The Hasmonean heroes, celebrated both for their adherence to the law, and their alliances are evidence of this.

In 1MaccG, there is some evidence suggesting the beginnings of understanding the torah as state law. The torah is actively fought for, and its precepts are actively defended, as opposed to merely being the reason for martyrdom. Further, the torah seems to apply to the whole community in a variety of situations and occasions. There is also a definite attachment between the law and the land. This creates a strong identification between the torah and the Judean government. However, the torah does not seem to fully apply as the national law of Israel. There are interpretations made, feasts created, and rules applied, that all fall outside the body of texts and customs identified as torah, but are

enforced nonetheless. For 1MaccG the torah can best be argued to be a major part of the state law, though one which is not immutable.

Now the question may arise, what sort of legal understanding does this represent? Does the law function here in the same way as in Deuteronomy, Rabbinic literature, or something else? The answer is yes, to all of these. The torah in certain respects in 1MaccG resembles many different interpretations and functions of the law in the tradition of Israel. The way that the torah functions as a major part of state law is similar to the common understanding of the law in the final form of Ezra-Nehemiah, which contains laws from the entire Pentateuch, but also ordinances which fall outside of this corpus. Some of the rewards for following the torah recall the setting of the views of the covenant code, in that keeping of the laws and the covenant ensures aid in battle and presence in the land (3:18-22; 4:8-11). Like the priestly code, there is an emphasis on cultic and ritual laws (1:44-49), instead of the ethical and secular. 1MaccG also shares an interest in the holiness of the Sabbath (2:34) and the need for bodily circumcision (2:46) with the priestly code. With Deuteronomy, 1MaccG bears a distinct lack of concern for Zion theology (7:37), a concept of law applying to wars (3:56), and a strong idea of proper worship of Yahweh only taking place in Jerusalem (1:47; 2:45).²³

The way that torah is represented by the prophets, that is, as a revered institution alongside and equal in authority to prophetic instruction (4:46) and as the individual judgments of rulers (5:59; 7:49; 13:52), can also be seen in 1MaccG. Like the Mishnah, the torah in 1MaccG refers to both the scroll itself (1:56; 3:48) and its contents (1:57). Moreover, the Mishnah carries a similar respect for the torah as being a direct revelation from the divine (3:48-53). In Tractate Abot, the law confers status on those who are devoted to it and learn it, as it does in 1MaccG (2:64; 4:42). Another similarity is that in both Tractate Abot and 1MaccG, obedience to the law can free one from the yoke of the

²³ For more on the subject of Deuteronomistic influence in 1Maccabees, see F. Borchardt, "Deuteronomistic Legacy in 1Maccabees" *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*, (ed. Marko Marttila, Juha Pakkala, and Hanne von Weissenberg; BZAW 419; Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2011)

state (3:29; 6:59). Many of these qualities can also be found in the Tosefta and the Talmuds.

The list of similarities with many diverse understandings of the torah in the tradition underlines how 1MaccG cannot simply be tied to one theological tradition or another. It also cannot be placed on an imagined timeline of linear legal development, however constructed. Though its legal teachings do bear some resemblance to Deuteronomy, they also share a number of characteristics with rabbinic texts, and even more qualities held by other traditions. 1MaccG, like any other work is complex, and its understanding of the law is no different.

1MaccD

The second edition of 1Maccabees, which adds several documents as well as a brief addendum, is largely devoid of any legal concerns. There are only three occasions in which legal vocabulary is used, and each of these attributes a heavily nationalized sense to the law. In a study such as this one, which studies the law in its religious and secular senses, the contribution is almost solely from the secular side of the torah in 1MaccD.

The limited value the law has for the religious outlook of 1MaccD makes it certain that the law is not the most important sacred element for the edition. Rather, it appears that in the few religious passages 1MaccD contains, it is in agreement with 1MaccG that Heaven is of primary importance. The law and the cult both seem to testify to the relationship with the deity, but are not of great concern to the compiler.

There is little relationship between judgments of a character's disposition and their position with regard to the law. In many instances in which 1MaccD names a character as evil, that person has caused no injury to the law whatsoever. Further, the characters that are called friends and allies by 1MaccD are ones who are foreigners and thus not law-abiders. In agreement with 1MaccG, it is rather a character's treachery and opposition to the Hasmoneans that makes them evil. The highly subjective judgments made on characters by 1MaccD have everything to do with the Hasmonean mission, and rather little to do with the law, especially if we think of explicit references. Here, as in

the previous areas, 1MaccD adds nothing to the understanding of the law displayed in 1MaccG, either out of agreement or apathy.

One place where 1MaccD does differ from 1MaccG is in its separation of law and cult. Whereas 1MaccG draws the cult under the law, in the few places 1MaccD discusses either the cult or the law, each subject is for the most part divorced from the other. The evidence is not necessarily suggestive of a shift in perspective on the cult's relationship to the law, however. There is so little substantiation and 1MaccD does not appear to try to correct the connection between cult and law made in 1MaccG. It simply lacks the close relationship. It is likely more accurate to say that 1MaccD represents one of the variety of views on the cult and law at the time of its compilation.

Regarding the covenant, 1MaccD is entirely silent. One might surmise that either it is in total agreement with 1MaccG on the relationship between law and covenant, or more likely, is not concerned with the subject at all. In respect to prophecy, the law remains an imperfect and secondary option for 1MaccD. It idealizes and hopes for the time when trustworthy prophets return, but agrees that they are not present at the time of writing. The most dire situations are still left for the prophets to decide, while those in power do the best they can to perform God's will.

Overall we can recognize that 1MaccD is basically in agreement with 1MaccG on the place of the law in the religious world of the early Hasmonians. The law is still not the dominant force in the worldview of 1MaccD, and may even be demoted in its authority due to the concentration on friendly relations with foreigners. The torah is, however, important to 1MaccD as the identifying factor for the Judean way of life. At every instance in which the law is mentioned, it is tied to the people's identity as Judeans. This connection is made in both Judean and gentile documents, and also by enemy kings and allied republics. This changes the view of 1MaccG, which had some hints toward the torah as an identifying factor of Israel, but also saw the law as much more, particularly in the religious sense. The secular use of 1MaccD ensures that this understanding of the torah as way of life is pushed forth.

The torah's secular function does not, however, extend to being a fence for Israel. Instead of isolating the Judeans, the torah seems to build their identity and esteem before the nations. For 1MaccD, the most important relationships are those made with foreigners, who are not open to the torah. These relationships are neither discouraged nor detrimental to the characters in 1MaccD, but lead to Judean and Hasmonean success. The torah no more acts as a fence here than it does in 1MaccG.

It seems to be the case that 1MaccD disagrees with 1MaccG on the matter of the torah as state law. Though 1MaccG, like 1MaccD gave evidence of all the elements that go into being the state law of Judea, for 1MaccG this did not add up to a truly national law. With the additions of 1MaccD, the unequivocal reinforcement of the law's being fought for, of its application to the whole community in all matters, and of its strong attachment to the land of Judea, go a long way to changing the perception of the torah as national law. Since this is specifically said to be the case in 1MaccD (15:21), the fact that there are laws additional to what some might consider torah, which are also part of the national law, matters less than it does in 1MaccG.

The place of the law in 1MaccD can be compared only cautiously to the torah in the rest of the tradition of Israel. There is so little said about the law, and so much room for interpretation without basis that any wide-ranging comparison would be laughable. There is some similarity to the way the torah is used in Ezra-Nehemiah in that the torah is meant to be practically implemented (10:37; 15:21), instead of presenting an ideal situation. However, like the Tractate Abot, the torah never appears to refer to a physical object or even a collection of writings, such as a scroll. As in the Tosefta, general rules (14:45-46) are included under the law, but there is little contact with any religious understanding. The understanding of the law in 1MaccD seems to be wholly different from that of 1MaccG, and also fairly unique among the other examples from the Judean tradition.

1MaccO

The case can be made that 1MaccO entirely changes the landscape of 1Maccabees regarding the law and its role in the Judean religion. Though the law itself is a subject of

discussion relatively few times, it provides much of the undercurrent that moves the characters in 1MaccO. It is also the chief source of identity for all of the actors in this addition. In 1MaccO, as opposed to both prior editions, the law overtakes all other subjects as the central religious value. Any mention of the divine is absent, the sanctuary is nearly insignificant, and other religious subjects play no part at all. The law is everything for 1MaccO's religious worldview.

Because of the great sway the law holds for 1MaccO, it is no surprise that it is the primary means by which characters are judged. One's position on the law means everything for the author of 1MaccO. Anyone who is outside the law or against the law is evil, while all those who support the law are implicitly good. Even those characters that do not explicitly act out against the law are still tagged with names like "outlaw" and "renegade" because of the fact that those terms are synonyms for bad or evil. This is of course a major development in comparison to 1MaccD and 1MaccG, which do not base their judgments on the law. The worldview is far more legalistic when everyone is judged on one group's rules.

This newfound power the law has in 1MaccO continues to be evident when we look at the way the cult is overtaken by the law. Though there is only one occasion in which the cult is mentioned, it is referred to as only one part of a set of laws. The cult appears to have no importance for its own sake in 1MaccO. It merely is performed as one of the precepts of the law as a whole. This intensifies the same relationship seen in 1MaccG, but disagrees with 1MaccD. With regard to the covenant, there is still clear separation between the law and the pact. This is primarily seen in the concentration of the act of covenant making and breaking in 1MaccO. If the covenant were merely a synonym for the law or religion, the pact itself and the mechanics of it would hold no importance. This is perhaps surprising considering the great power the law has for 1MaccO. However, the importance of the law seems to come from the continued belief that the community is founded upon the covenant, and the covenant requires the community to uphold the law. This is in stunning agreement with the previous editions of 1Maccabees, but belies Renaud's thesis that the law becomes the central element of the community in 1Maccabees. Both prophecy and use of the law to discern the will of

God are foreign concepts to 1MaccO, so it is impossible to know whether it agrees with the previous two editions or is unconcerned.

As for the torah being the identifying characteristic of Judeans, 1MaccO surprisingly disagrees with 1MaccG and 1MaccD. The apostates, no matter how much they fight against the law, and disobey it, are constantly labeled as Israel, or identify themselves as kin to the Hasmoneans. Further, the fact that there are parties who are especially notable for their devotion to the law suggests that torah-adherence was not the basic definition of what made someone part of Israel. Though we noted that the law identifies these characters and marks them off, it is not their status as Judeans or Israel that is criticized, only their identity as law-abiders.

Related to this last point, the torah clearly acts as a fence for 1MaccO. It separates the law-abiding Hasmoneans and their followers from the lawless and outlaw Judeans. It further keeps those faithful to the law from making any allegiance with the gentiles. Only the apostates make any sort of allegiance with the nations and kings in 1MaccO. This apostasy seems to go hand-in-hand with the gentile alliance. This also turns the philosophy of 1MaccG and 1MaccD on its head. The text to which this was added knows very little of the isolating tendency of the torah. 1MaccG and 1MaccD welcome alliances with gentiles, and are unaware of (or unconcerned with) any *active* Judean resistance to the torah. Thus, the torah has no chance to become a fence. 1MaccO erects the missing fence, and builds it firmly.

1MaccO clearly does not have the torah functioning as the state law of Judea. Though, like 1MaccG and 1MaccD, the law is actively fought for, the torah neither applies to the whole community, nor does it seem to apply to the way of life. There is also no connection between the law and the land for 1MaccO. Even at the height of Hasmonean power, Judeans who do not follow the law live in the land with impunity. Given this presentation it would be foolish to posit that the torah is the national law of Judea in 1MaccO. The presentation here disagrees with both 1MaccG and 1MaccD. Though 1MaccG also does not see the torah as the national law, it is not for its lack of ties to the land or application in all parts of life, but rather for its highly religious nature. 1MaccO has little of this aspect. 1MaccD contrasts the view of 1MaccO entirely seeing

the torah as specifically the national law of the Judean state. The addition thus has the effect of reversing the overall view of the torah.

In its connection to the covenant (1:15, 63), its function as a fence (1:11-14), and its somewhat limited application in real-world events, the presentation of the torah in 1MaccO is very close to that of Deuteronomy. Of further similarity to Deuteronomy are the concern for the proper function and performance of the centralized cult (1:43) and the construction of the sanctuary (9:54-55). However, 1MaccO is not entirely Deuteronomic. It resembles the priestly code in its concern for Sabbath observance (1:43), and circumcision (1:15). As with Tractate Abot, the torah gives status to people, both positively (2:42-44), and negatively (1:11, 43; 6:21; 7:5-7; 9:58, *inter alia*). Like the Talmuds, the worldview appears to be highly legalistic, but still based upon the relationship to god through the covenant. Even 1MaccO, it seems cannot be tied to any single understanding of the law.

1MacCH

Since the material relating to law or religion in 1MacCH is so limited, the overall effect any of it has on the final form of 1Maccabees is rather small. That being said, 1MacCH in some ways moves the text further into the direction 1MaccO takes the text, but in others reins it in. The law is of primary religious significance to 1MacCH, but really, this is because of one passage, and the lack of any real reference to the divine, and only passing references to the sanctuary or other religious values in any other sections. Outside of the few examples in the one passage the law too would have little religious value. This may confirm 1MaccO, but it is more likely that 1MacCH is unconcerned with what religious point of view it puts forth.

The role played by the law in 1MacCH is ambiguous. In one passage it is certainly the arbiter of good and evil. The character that defends the law is good, the ones who oppose the law are evil and punished. In other sections, characters who defend the law, but not according to the Hasmonean way are given negative evaluations, as are other characters who make no attacks on the law whatsoever.

This of course agrees more with 1MaccG and 1MaccD than it does with 1MaccO, but the overall effect is subtle.

1MaccH only makes comments about the cult in one of its passages, and here the cult is certainly part of the law, and not important on its own. This one passage agrees with 1MaccO, while all other passages are silent on the cult altogether. The covenant and prophets are never mentioned or compared with the law in 1MaccH largely because they are outside of its area of concern. The material is far more interested in glorifying Maccabean heroes than it is in the Judean religion.

The torah in 1MaccH is so infrequently spoken of, and is acted upon even less that it is impossible to judge whether it is an identifying characteristic of Israel. Though it is fairly clear that Mattathias, Judas, and Simon are devoted to the law, and attack lawbreakers, there is no indication that all Israel has the same philosophy toward the law. There are some characters still included in the community even though they disobey the torah. At best, there is an ambiguous message as to the torah's function as identifying "way of life" of Israel. This means that the ambiguous picture one receives from the combination of 1MaccG, 1MaccD, and 1MaccO is maintained in the presentation of 1MaccH.

Equally ambiguous is the decision of whether the torah acts as a fence for Israel. Though those against the law are clearly removed from the land and from the presence of the people, the Hasmoneans have some gentile allies. The law-abiding people are thus not entirely isolated. There may be a slight hint toward the preferred isolation, but the evidence is really too sparse to come to a conclusive decision. The function of the law as a fence, however slight in 1MaccH, moves the overall function of torah in 1Maccabees slightly toward that of 1MaccO. However upon a review of the whole text, the answer to the question is still very unclear.

The one secular function of the law that is clearly not part of the presentation of 1MaccH is that of state law. Nothing in the presentation implies that the law is anything more than an ideal aspired to by certain characters. Though, as in all the other layers, the torah is obviously fought for, there is limited application of the law in the community,

and no suggestion of a connection to the land. This idea of the law disagrees with 1MaccD, and to a lesser extent 1MaccG, but is in agreement with 1MaccO. The final form is a mixture, as one might expect from such diverse presentations of the law.

For 1MaccH, the presentation of the law makes it difficult to build any connections with the way the torah is presented elsewhere in the tradition. The one place where the law is applied, it is in a cultic context (2:23-26), based particularly on a passage from Numbers (Num 25:6-15). The passage is not explicitly legal. This may suggest a concept of torah similar to that of Ezra-Nehemiah, or the Mishnah, which extends the title over the whole of the Pentateuch (and even more), whether the material is, in fact, legal. However, because the law is never a physical written object, the understanding is similar to Tractate Abot. The fact that the adherence to the law clearly pays rewards (3:3-9; 14:4-15) makes it similar to the understandings of the priestly, holiness, and Deuteronomic codes, in addition to Tractate Abot.

The law in the final form of 1Maccabees is thus one that displays characteristics of the older religion, wherein the divine and the sanctuary are primary with the law playing an important supporting role, while also showing signs of rabbinism wherein the religion becomes much more focused on laws, rules, and their interpretations. People in 1Maccabees are judged based upon their relationship with Judeans and the Hasmoneans in particular, but also on their position with regard to the law. In some ways the law consumes the cult, becoming the reason for its existence, while in some others religious practice is individually valued. The covenant and prophecy are the two areas that are unambiguously still independent of the law throughout 1Maccabees. The covenant remains the reason for the laws and the uniting principle of the community and the prophets are still hoped-for and still a possibility to set the community on the right path. The torah is generally an identifying characteristic for the community, though there are many examples that would argue directly against this notion. The torah, at times, acts as a fence isolating Judeans from the outside world, but in the majority of cases, the Judeans gladly make treaties and partnerships with the nations. By and large, the torah does not function as the state law of Judea, though in the nationalistic passages of 1MaccD this is changed. In the final form connections to the ideals of torah in various parts of the

tradition of Israel can be pointed out. None of these fully explain the whole text, and none have a dominant influence over the text. Though certain aspects of the theories of Renaud and Arenhoevel hold true, their overall arguments have been proven false.

IV Concluding Remarks

Our study began with one major question: what is the place and function of the torah/nomos/law in 1Maccabees. We asked this question because the law is so prominent in many sections of the text, and because the period of the Hasmonean rebellion and subsequent rule are increasingly viewed as a period when the torah gained binding authority. As one of the most important sources for the period, and one that has long been thought to stem from a group associated with the temple and palace, it is self-evident why the ideas of 1Maccabees on torah would be of interest. Even though ideas concerning “the torah”, if it is even appropriate to use the definite article here, were likely as broad and varied as any other ideas current in society, appreciating the type and level of honor or even authority given to the torah by the ruling party is clearly illuminating.

As we began to investigate this question, we were influenced enormously by the work of Bernard Renaud and Diego Arenhoevel, who had previously tried to place the law in the world of 1Maccabees. However, it was soon evident that their studies were flawed for several major reasons. The first problem was that for both of these scholars, the thought world of ancient Israel moves in a linear and progressive direction, marching forth from stipulations in a pre-exilic covenant until it reaches its destination in late rabbinic Judaism wherein the law becomes religion itself. Leaving aside the possibly offensive caricature of rabbinic Judaism provided by these scholars, there is simply little support for a direct progression of ideas in the history of Israel’s literature, or much more so, its history. While certain views may have dominated at any given time among all the different Judeans, even examining only the literature that has survived the centuries indicates a great amount of both synchronic and diachronic disagreement concerning many ideas, including the place and definition of the law. Because scholarship has become more aware of this fact over the nearly five decades since Renaud and Arenhoevel wrote, we found it necessary to approach the question with more nuance (though some may have desired even more). As a result we divorced discussion of the law in 1Maccabees from a chronological timeline, and when we did make comparisons to the dominant views in other bodies of literature, did so only to illuminate 1Maccabees. We have not posited direct influence from or to any of these bodies of literature, but have

recognized situations wherein there is agreement between 1Maccabees and the dominant position in these texts. It is hoped that our study has successfully avoided the pitfalls of chronological comparison, while maintaining a valuable assessment of the law in 1Macc.

The second major fault in both the arguments of Arenhoevel and Renaud, is a lack of acknowledgment for the complexity and growth of the literary work they were studying. Both scholars set out with a premise that 1Macc is a unity, and thus has a unified vision and appreciation for the law, though they disagree about what that appreciation is. Given the relatively recent research that has underlined the complex and composite nature of 1Macc by scholars such as Nils Martola and David Williams, it is necessary to at least address these literary questions when examining any issue in 1Maccabees. It is obvious that, without recognizing layers in the development of the first book of Maccabees, one would reach rather different conclusions about the law's place in the text. Once we examined the text, we found that not only should some of the observations of Williams and Martola be accepted, but even more of the text should be called into question as to its originality. This necessitated a new literary-critical reading of the text, looking for seams even on the micro level, which Williams wholly, and Martola partially avoid.

In our analysis of the text, we found four separate levels of composition emerged, each with its own themes, biases, and forms. The primary level we observed was a vast majority of the present text. It covered the Hasmonean-led struggle for freedom from the Seleucids starting with the entrance of Antiochus IV Epiphanes into Jerusalem, and ended with the expulsion of foreign troops from the Akra in Jerusalem, securing the rule of Simon as high priest. The text had major themes of capture and liberation of Jerusalem and the temple, heavy anti-gentile rhetoric and a strong Hasmonean bias. This text appears to have stemmed from supporters of the Hasmoneans and may have been composed during the reign of Simon, or shortly thereafter. We termed this layer 1MaccGrundschrift.

The second layer we observed consisted primarily of documents, though it also included narrative sections. It included a large number of verses: 8:1-32; 10:3-9, 25-46; 12:1-23; 13:41-42; 14:1-3, 16-49; 15:1-41; 16:1-24. There was a concern for the prestige

and independence of the Judean state and the Hasmoneans as its rulers in this section. The additions seem to ground Judean independence and autonomy in documents which range from Seleucid royal decrees, Roman statements of friendship, and Spartan recognitions of brotherhood to internal decrees of the Judeans. The primacy of the Hasmoneans in this new nation is ensured in these documents as well as in a covenant purportedly ratified between Simon and the priests, elders, and people of Judea. It should be evident from the context that there is little anti-gentile rhetoric in this layer. Because of the concentration on independence, primacy of the Hasmoneans, and the lack of anti-gentile rhetoric, we hypothesized that this text might have emerged late in the reign of John Hyrcanus, when the country was newly independent, and Hyrcanus was under criticism from Pharisees (if Josephus can be trusted). This likely would have been composed by someone with access to the temple archives who also supported the Hasmoneans. Because of the domination of documents within this layer we termed it 1MaccDocumentarian.

The third layer we encountered introduced an aspect of 1Maccabees that many who are familiar with the classic hypothesis of Bickerman will recognize. This set of clauses and passages, which appear throughout the work, but are concentrated in its first half, deal primarily with the internal opponents of the Hasmoneans. The passages are: 1:11-15, 43, 52, 62-63; 2:42-44; 6:18b, 21-27; 7:5-7, 9b, 12*, 13-14, 16d-17, 20a-b, 21-25; 9:1*, 23-24, 54-61, 69, 73*; 10:14, 61, 64; 11:21, 25. This layer seems to have been primarily concerned with removing the blame for Judean suffering from the gentiles, and placing it squarely on the shoulders of the internal opponents, which the layer terms lawless, outlaw, and impious. There is little concern for the work of the gentiles themselves, and relatively little identifying any features or beliefs of the opponents. They are rather nebulous except in their opposition to the Hasmoneans, their reliance on foreign support, and their attempts to seize power. This layer has few actors and only one named character, Alcimus the high priest. Most of the passages are given in direct or indirect speech, as they often involve reports to the Seleucid monarch or one of his courtiers. The fact that these opponents are not necessarily imitating Hellenistic practices, and are primarily defined by opposition to the Hasmonean leadership, led us to hypothesize that the layer may have arisen during the rebellion against Alexander Jannaeus by part of the Judean population in the 80s BCE. It may have come from

loyalists to the Hasmoneans, or from the court itself. Because of its concentration on one set of characters set in opposition to the Hasmoneans, we have named it 1MaccOpposition.

The final layer we observed in the text of 1Maccabees can only be termed a layer in the loosest possible definition. It consists of eight separate passages that all have to do with individual or corporate praise of the Hasmoneans: 2:23-26; 3:3-9; 5:18-19, 55-62; 6:42-46; 9:34-42; 13:25-30; 14:4-15. Each communicates material that paints the Hasmoneans as idealistic characters in the distant past. Mattathias, Judas, Eleazar, John, and Simon are all given individual praise. The family as a whole is also praised at two separate points. In each of these cases the style and substance of the passage is largely different from the others in this group, with the exception of praise of the Hasmoneans. It is very likely that parts or all of the passages in this group were taken from existing disparate sources and added to the text. This could have happened at any point, but due to context, seems to be the latest group. We termed this last layer 1MacCH.

Though the discussion and analysis of the composition of 1Macc was initiated in service to the goal of describing the law accurately, we believe our findings to be important in their own right. The recognition of four separate layers, and the indication that the picture of the internal opposition provided by 1Maccabees may be heavily influenced by later groups have real consequences for the historical reconstruction of the period. Also important for historical purposes are the suggestions that the various documents and passages dealing with John Hyrcanus may have been added with the particular intention of supporting an unsure Hasmonean claim to the temple and state, and an unsure Judean claim to independence. The literary consequences for studying 1Maccabees are obvious and numerous, and so will not be rehearsed here.

After encountering the text with a fresh perspective, we endeavored to examine in what ways the law did and did not have influence in the various layers of 1Maccabees. We did so by first searching for the important legal (and by this as always, we meant torah-related, not specifically *legal*) terminology. This revealed a heavy concentration in 1MaccG, though it appeared in all four layers, and barely appeared at all in 1MaccD. This also revealed that there were specific terms used for the Judean law in all four

layers. We then asked a series of questions about the law, which were intended to show all the areas in which it might have significance. These questions included: Is the *nomos* supreme in the hierarchy of religious values? Does the *nomos* decide whether characters are good or evil? Does the law assume the other traditional religious categories? Is the *torah* Israel's way of life? Is the *torah* a fence? Is the *torah* the state law of Judea? The six questions were asked of the four different layers of the text. The answers were, of course, complex. No two layers agreed on all categories, though some categories were more similar than others across all the layers. What this reveals about the law is only what the author of any given layer either assumed, or wished to propagate about the law. It is not necessarily the actual situation in Judea at the time of writing. That being said, the variety of answers to these questions within one book, written over the course of less than a century, is an illuminating reminder that the *torah* was not universally recognized and universally applicable to all even in the Judean heyday of the Hasmonean period. It is hoped that the findings in this work serve as an informative caution to those wishing to create a normative Judaism out of a situation in which there appears to have been no such concept, even among the ruling class.

This study has been limited by my own biases, which influence not only our impressions of the composition, but our definitions concerning *nomos* and *torah*. I do not pretend that this is the final word on the subject of the composition of 1Maccabees nor on the idea of the law in 1Maccabees or the first and second centuries BCE more broadly. I welcome any debate or development that comes out of or in reaction to this work. I hope only to have reignited the discussions on these topics, and to have provided an important tool for students of 1Maccabees, theologians, scholars of canon, and historians of the Hasmonean period.

Bibliography

Accordance 9 Bible Software. Copyright 2010. Oak Tree Software, Inc.

Attridge, H.

1976 *The Interpretation of Biblical History in the Antiquitates Judaicae of Flavius Josephus*. Missoula, Montana : Scholar's Press.

Abel, F.-M.

1967 *Géographie de la Palestine*. Paris: Gabalda.

1949 *Les Livres des Maccabées*. Paris: Gabalda.

Aptowitz, V.

1927 *Parteipolitik der Hasmonäerzeit im rabbinischen und pseudepigraphischen Schriftum* New York: Kohut Foundation.

Arenhoevel, D.

1967 *Die Theokratie nach dem 1. und 2. Makkabäer*. Mainz: Matthias Grünewald.

Bar-Kochva, B.

1988 *Judas Maccabeus: The Jewish Struggle against the Seleucids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Barr, J.

1973 Reading the Bible as Literature. *Bulletin of the John Rylands University Library* 56.

Bartlett, J.R.

1998 *1 Maccabees: An Introduction*. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

2002 *Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities*. London: Routledge.

1973 *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees*. Cambridge: Cambridge University.

Barton, J.

1996 *Reading the Old Testament: Method in Biblical Study*. Louisville: WJK.

Baumgarten, A.

1997 *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation*. SJSJ 55; Leiden: Brill.

Bévenot, H.

1931 *Die Beiden Makkabäerbücher*. Bonn: Peter Hanstein.

F. Borchardt, *The Torah in 1 Maccabees*

Bickerman, E.J.

1979 *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*. SJLA 32. Leiden: Brill.

Blenkinsopp, J.

2001 Was the Pentateuch the Constitution of the Jewish Ethnos?
Persia and Torah: The Theory of Imperial Authorization of the Pentateuch.
Ed. J. Watt. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Borchardt, F.

2009 Concepts of Scripture in 1 Maccabees. *Early Christian Literature and Intertextuality, Volume 1: Thematic Studies* eds. Craig A. Evans and H. Daniel Zacharias; London: T&T Clark. 24-41.

2011 Deuteronomic Legacy in 1 Maccabees. *Changes in Scripture: Rewriting and Interpreting Authoritative Traditions in the Second Temple Period*. Eds. Marko Marttila, Juha Pakkala, and Hanne von Weissenberg. BZAW 419. Berlin: Walter de Gruyter.

Brettler, M.

1991 "The Structure of 1 Kings 1-11." *JSOT* 49. 88-89.

Briggs, C.

1907 *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary of the Book of Psalms, Vol. III*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Bringman, K.

1983 *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa: Eine Untersuchung zur jüdisch-hellenistische Geschichte (175-163 v. Chr.)*. Göttingen: Vandenhock & Ruprecht.

Bruppacher, H.

1931 Textkritisches zu I. Macc. *ZAW* 49, 149-150.

Butterworth, M.

1983 *Structure of the Book of Zechariah*. JSOTSup 130. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Childs, B.

2004 *The Book of Exodus: A Critical, Theological Commentary*. Second edition. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Cohen, S.J.D.

2006 *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*. Second edition. Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox Press.

Collins, J. J.

1981 *Daniel, First Maccabees, Second Maccabees*. Wilmington: Michael Glazier.

1986 *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. New York: Crossroad.

F. Borchardt, *The Torah in 1Maccabees*

Cornfeld, Gaalyahu (ed.)

1962 *Daniel to Paul: Jews in Conflict with graeco-Roman Civilization: Historical & Religious Background to the Hasmoneans, Dead Sea Scrolls, The New Testament World, Early Christianity, and the Bar Kochba-War*. London: Macmillan.

Crüsemann, F.

1989 *The Torah: Theology and Social History of Old Testament Law*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

2003 *Concept of Covenant in the Second Temple Period*. Eds. Stanley E. Porter and Jacqueline C. R. de Roo. SJSJ 71. Leiden: Brill.

Dancy, J.C.

1954 *A Commentary on 1 Maccabees*. Oxford: Basil Blackwell.

Dell, K.

2006 *Wisdom. The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*, eds. J. Rogerson; J. Lieu. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Derfler, S.L.

1989 *Hasmonean Revolt: Rebellion or Revolution*. ANETS 5. Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press.

Destinon, J.

1882 *Die Quellendes Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Arch. Buch XII-XVII = Jüd. Krieg Buch I*. Keil: Lipsius and Tischer.

Dommershausen, W.

1985 *1 Makkabäer 2Makkabäer*. Würzburg: Echter.

Doorly, W.

2002 *The Laws of Yahweh: A Handbook of Biblical Law*. New York: Paulist Press.

Doran, R.

1996 *The First Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections*. New Interpreter's Bible 4. Nashville: Abingdon.

1981 *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2Maccabees*. CBQMS 12. Washington: Catholic Biblical Association.

Efron, J.

1987 *Studies on the Hasmonean Period*. New York: Brill.

Ettelson, H.W.

1925 *The Integrity of 1Maccabees*. *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences* 27. 249-384.

Falk, Z.

1972 *Introduction to Jewish Law of the Second Commonwealth*. Leiden: Brill.

F. Borchardt, *The Torah in IMaccabees*

Farmer, W.

1956 *Maccabees Zealots and Josephus: An Enquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period*. New York: Columbia University Press.

Feldman, L.H.

1994 Josephus' Portrayal of the Hasmoneans Compared with I Maccabees. *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period* ed. F Parente and J. Sievers; Leiden: Brill. 41-68.

Fischer, T.

1980 *Seleukiden und Makkabäer*. Bochum: Brockmeyer.

Fitzpatrick-McKinley, A.

1999 *The Transformation of Torah from Scribal Advice to Law*. JSOTSup 287. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press.

Floss, J.

2006 Form, Source, and Redaction Criticism. *The Oxford Handbook of Biblical Studies*. Eds. J. Rogerson, and J. Lieu; Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Gauger, J.-D.

1977 *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik*. Cologne; Bonn: Hanstein.

Gerstenberger, E.

1996 *Leviticus: A Commentary*. Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Goldstein, J.A.

1976 *IMaccabees*. AB 41; Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

1982 *2 Maccabees*. AB 41A; Garden City, NY: Doubleday,

2002 *Peoples of an Almighty God: Competing Religions in the Ancient World*. New York: Doubleday.

Grabbe, L.L.

2006 *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period, Volume 1: Yehud: A History of the Persian Province of Judah*. London: T&T Clark.

2008 *A History of the Jews and Judaism in the Second Temple Period, Volume 2: The Coming of the Greeks: The Early Hellenistic Period (335-175 BCE)*. London: T&T Clark.

1992 *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Grimm, C.F.W.

1853 *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer*. Leipzig: S.Hirzel.

F. Borchardt, *The Torah in 1 Maccabees*

Gruen, E.

1998 *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Harrington, D.

1988 *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution*. Wilmington: Glazier.

Hayes, J.; Holladay C.

1987 *Biblical Exegesis: A Beginner's Handbook. Revised Edition*. Louisville: WJK.

Hengel, M.

1973 *Judentum und Hellenismus: Studien zur ihrer Begegnung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung Palästinas bis zur mitte des 2. Jahrhunderts v. Christus*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Hieke, T.

2007 The Role of 'Scripture' in the Last Words of Mattathias (1Macc 2:49-70). *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology. Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Papa, Hungary, 9-11 June 2005*. Eds. Geza Xeravits; József Zsengellér. Boston: Brill.

Hölbl, G.

2001 *A History of the Ptolemaic Empire*. Tr. Tina Saavedra. London: Routledge.

Hölscher, G.

1904 *Die Quellen des Josephus für die Zeit vom Exil bis zum jüdischen Kriege*. Leipzig: Teubner, Horsley, R.

2007 *Scribes, Visionaries, and the Politics of Second Temple Judea*. Louisville: WJK.

Hossfeld, F.; Zenger, E.

2000 *Psalmen 51-100*. HthKAT. Freiburg: Herder.

Jackson, B.; Achtemeier, P.

1996 Law. *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*. Ed. P. Achtemeier; San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.

Johnson, N. B.

1948 *Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Study of the Jewish Concept of God*. SBLMS. Vol. II. Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis.

Kampen, J.

1988 *The Hasideans and the Origin of Pharisaism: A Study in 1 and 2 Maccabees*. Atlanta: Scholars Press.

W.Kappler, (ed.)

1936 *Maccabeorum Liber I; Vetus Testamentum Graecum 9/1*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

F. Borchardt, *The Torah in IMaccabees*

Kautzsch, E.

1900 Das erste Buch der Makkabäer. *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Keil, C.

1875 *Commentar über die Bücher der Makkabäer*. Leipzig: Dörffling und Francke.

Knierim, R.

1985 Criticism of Literary Features, Form, Tradition, and Redaction. *The Hebrew Bible and Its Modern Interpreters*. eds. D. Knight and G. Tucker; Chico, California: Scholars Press.

Kraus, H.

1989 *Psalms 60-150: A Commentary*. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Lehman, C.

1971 *Biblical Theology. Volume I: The Old Testament*. Scottsdale, PA: Herald Press.

Mandell, S.

1991 "Did the Maccabees Believe That They Had a Valid Treaty with Rome?" *CBQ* 53. 202-220.

Martola, N.

1984 *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi.

Mason, S.

2007 Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History. *JSJ* 38. 457-512.

McConville, J.

1984 *Law and Theology in Deuteronomy*. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Mendels, D.

1992 *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism*. New York: Doubleday.

1987 *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History of Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land*. Tübingen: Mohr.

Moyise, S.; Menken M. (eds.)

2007 *Deuteronomy in the New Testament: The New Testament and the Scriptures of Israel*. London: T&T Clark.

Nelis, J.T.

1972 *I Makkabeën*. Roermond: Romen & Zonen.

F. Borchardt, *The Torah in IMaccabees*

Neuhaus, G.O.

1975 "Quellen im 1. Makkabäerbuch?: Eine Entgegnung auf die Analyse von K.-D. Schunck." *JSJ*, vol. V, no. 2; Leiden: Brill. 162-175.

1974 *Studien zu den Poetischen Stücken im 1. Makkabäerbuch*. Würzburg: Echter.

Neusner, J.

2005 *Contours of Coherence in Rabbinic Judaism*. Leiden: Brill.

1999 *Four Stages of Rabbinic Judaism*. London: Routledge.

1985 *Torah: From Scroll to Symbol in Formative Judaism*. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Nongbri, B.

2005 "The Motivations of the Maccabees and the Judean rhetoric of Aestral Tradition." *Ancient Judaism in Its Hellenistic Context*. Ed. Carol Bakhos. *SJSJ* 95. Leiden: Brill. 85-111.

Oesterley, W.O.E.

1913 "The First Book of Maccabees." *APOT*. New York.

Patrick, D.

1986 *Old Testament Law*. London : SCM.

Rajak, T.

"Hasmonean Dynasty." *ABD* 3.67-76.

Renaud, B.

1961 "La Loi et Les Lois dans Les Livres des Maccabées." *RB* 68. 39-52.

Schechter, S.

1961 *Aspects of Rabbinic Theology: Major Concepts of the Talmud*. New York: Schocken Books.

Schunck, K.-D.

1980 *1. Makkabäerbuch*. *JSHRZ* 1 /4. Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn.

1954 *Die Quellen des I. und II. Makkabäerbuches*. Halle: Niemeyer.

Schürer, E., et al.

1987 *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*. Second edition. Edinburgh: Clark.

Schwartz, D.

2008 *2Maccabees*. Berlin: Walter De Gruyter.

Schwartz, S.

1991 Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion. *JJS* 42. 16-38.

F. Borchardt, *The Torah in IMaccabees*

- 1990 *Josephus and Judean Politics*. Leiden: Brill.
- 1993 A Note on the Social Type and Political Ideology of the Hasmonean Family. *JBL* 112/2. 305-317.
- Scolnic, B.E.
- 2005 *Alcimus, Enemy of the Maccabees*. Lanham: University Press of America.
- Shorter Lexicon of the Greek New Testament, 2nd ed.* Eds. F. Gingrich and F. Danker. Chicago: University of Chicago Press, 1983
- Sievers, J.
- 1990 *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters. From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I*. South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 6. Atlanta: Scholar's Press.
- 2001 *Synopsis of the Greek Sources of the Hasmonean Period: 1-2 Maccabees and Josephus War 1 and Antiquities 12-14*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.
- Smith, A.
- 2006 Ethnicity and Nationalism. *The SAGE Handbook of Nationalism*. Eds. Gerard Delanty and Krishan Kumar. London: Sage.
- Smith, M.
- 1978 Rome and the Maccabean Conversions—Notes on I Macc. 8. *Donum Gentilicum: New Testament Studies in honor of David Daube*. Eds. C.K. Barrett, E. Bammel, and W.D. Davies; Oxford: Oxford University Press.
- Tate, M.
- 1990 *Psalms 51-100*. WBC 20. Dallas, TX: Word Books.
- Tcherikover, V.
- 1961 *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Philadelphia: JPS.
- Tedesche, S. and Zeitlin, S.
- 1950 *The First Book of Maccabees*. New York: Harper & Brothers.
- Unterman, J.
- 1996 Torah in *The Harper Collins Bible Dictionary*. Ed. P. Achtemeier. San Francisco: Harper San Francisco.
- Vogt, P.
- 2006 *Deuteronomic Theology and the Significance of Torah: A Reappraisal*. Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns.
- Von Dobbeler, S.
- 1997 *Die Bücher 1 / 2 Makkabäer*. Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk.

F. Borchardt, *The Torah in 1Maccabees*

Weingreen, J.

1976 *From Bible to Mishna: The Continuity of Tradition*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Wellhausen, J.

1921 *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Will, E.; Orrieux, C.

1986 *Ioudaïsmos – Hellenismos: essai sur le judaïsme judéen à l'époque hellénistique..* Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy

Williams, D.S.

2001 A Literary Encircling Pattern in 1Maccabees 1. JBL 120. 140-142

1999 Narrative Art in I Maccabees VI 1-17. VT 49. 109-118

2001 Recent Research in 1Maccabees. CR:BS 9. 169-184

1999 *The Structure of I Maccabees*. CBQMS 31. Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America.

Xeravits, G.; Zsengellér, J., (eds.)

2007 *Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology. Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Papa, Hungary, 9-11 June 2005*. Boston: Brill.

Abstract

The Torah in 1Maccabees: A Literary Critical Approach to the Text

By Francis Borchardt

This study investigates a text that has only periodically aroused interest in the scholarly community. Though there have been a number of commentaries in recent decades dealing with the various issues related to the book, few monographs have been devoted to specific problems presented by 1Maccabees. Because of this, there are several areas wherein the understanding of the text and the history about which it reports might be furthered by an in depth study. This dissertation sets out to resolve one such subject.

Though it has long been recognized by commentators that the law takes a primary place in the narrative and thought-world of 1Maccabees, the extent and role of the law have rarely been traced by scholars. There have been only two treatments of the subject: one (by Bernard Renaud) is a brief article, and another (by Diego Arehoevel) is a chapter within a much broader monograph, and both are now nearly fifty years old. Added to this, both studies disagree as to the role of the law within the narrative and the community that it portrays. Both also present their findings in a (perhaps) outdated linear Old Testament theological milieu, tying the understanding of the law to texts and communities that existed either long before or long after, depending on the scholar. They also do not take account of the literary critical findings that have since called into question the unity of 1Maccabees. On account of these methodological and chronological concerns, it seems a fresh approach is warranted.

This dissertation makes two innovations in method to solve the problems with the earlier studies. First, it investigates the unity (or lack thereof) of the text. Because the two most recent studies by Martola and Williams both agree that the text has been redacted, but disagree as to the extent and location of redactions, it is necessary to approach the problem from a fresh perspective. Second, once the character of the text has been resolved, this thesis investigates how the law functions in each of the literary layers of the text and gives voice to the various perspectives on the law present in the text. This approach underlines and solves the main problems associated with the previous studies,

while it must be conceded it also reveals a less satisfying answer for adherents to a linear Old Testament theology.

The results of the study reveal that there are certain sections of the book wherein the law plays no role at all or is only incidentally mentioned. However, they underline that in two layers especially there is a concerted effort to place the law in the center of the community constructed by each author. Nevertheless the outlines of what can be included under the concept “law” differ from layer to layer. Because of the increased study of the Hasmonean and post-Hasmonean periods in biblical studies, the contributions of this study can be important for a wide range of scholars looking for comparisons to text and evidence coming from different contexts.