

NATIONALISTS, THEOCRATS AND APOCALYPTISTS:

A Study illustrating the inter-relationship of politics and theodicy in Daniel and the texts of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, which stem from the Maccabean Crisis.

By

Anne E. Gardner



I should like to thank my family
and friends for their encouragement
throughout the writing of this thesis
and in particular my Supervisor, Dr.
A.P. Hayman for his help and valuable
criticism.

To go after Thana.

ABSTRACT OF THESIS

This thesis looks at the political, economic, cultural, social and religious aspects of life in Judaea in the century prior to the Maccabean Crisis to see how far they may have contributed to the Crisis. The events leading to the Crisis are then delineated and an attempt is made to clarify the reasons for the Prohibition of Religion.

Daniel and the texts of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha which stem from the Maccabean Crisis (including some texts which are not commonly held to date from that time or to refer to it) are studied and linked together according to the stance they take on politics and theodicy. That the question of God's justice was a problem at this time can be seen from the number of works which consider it. The answers given are related to the political stance of the author/authors.

I Maccabees and Judith are Nationalistic in outlook, wanting no foreign overlord and they both assert that in a time of trouble God will eventually help his people and act through a chosen human being. Daniel 1-6, I Esdras and II Maccabees, which I have designated as Theocratic in outlook, are not concerned with who rules the country as long as there is freedom of worship. They are all interested in divine justice for the individual and the assertion of life after death for those martyred for their faith appears in II Maccabees. The Apocalyptists - Daniel 7-12 and Enoch 85-90 - see the present historical era as coming to an end and a new one being inaugurated by God. Then those who have been faithful and obedient will be resurrected but those who have not will be punished eternally.

III and IV Maccabees have been included in this thesis because they adopt elements of the Maccabean Crisis to direct their readers to a better understanding of the secular government and of their own religion.

1
TABLE OF CONTENTS

INTRODUCTION	1
CHAPTER ONE : THE SITUATION IN JUDAEA PRIOR TO THE MACCABEAN CRISIS AND THE CAUSES OF THE CRISIS ITSELF.	2
Political Situation	2
Economy	2
The Influence of Hellenistic Culture	6
Social Divisions	8
Religious Groups in Judaea before the Maccabean Crisis	11
Events leading to the Prohibition of the practice of the Jewish religion :	
The Jewish Sources	15
The High Priestly Quarrels	15
The Second Attack on Jerusalem by Antiochus	19
The Edict of the Prohibition of the Jewish Religion	21
Conclusion	25
CHAPTER TWO: LITERATURE WHICH IS NATIONALISTIC IN ATTITUDE	27
I Maccabees: Date	27
Comparison of I Maccabees with II Maccabees	27
Events which are included in I Maccabees, but not in II Maccabees	42
Laments which appear in I Maccabees but not in II Maccabees	45
Exhortations which occur in I Maccabees, but not in II Maccabees	46
Editorial Comment which is not included in II Maccabees	48
Extra Detail to events which are also included in II Maccabees	49
Prayers which are in I Maccabees but not in II Maccabees	50

Songs of Praise which are in I Maccabees but not in II Maccabees	50
Summary of the differences between I and II Maccabees	50
Vocabulary used in I Maccabees which is not used in II Maccabees, or is used in a different context	55
A Comparison of I Maccabees with Josephus's <u>Antiquities</u>	57
A Comparison of I Maccabees with Josephus's <u>The Jewish War</u>	57
I Maccabees Advocates Political Independence	57
Theodicy in I Maccabees	61
The Inter-relationship of Politics and Theodicy in I Maccabees	66
The Book of Judith: Was it written as a result of the Maccabean Crisis?	66
The Book of Judith advocates active resistance and political independence	67
Theodicy in the Book of Judith	70
Conclusion to I Maccabees and to the Book of Judith	75
CHAPTER THREE: LITERATURE WHICH ILLUSTRATES THE DESIRE FOR A THEOCRATIC COMMUNITY IN THIS ERA	
Daniel 1-6 : Is Daniel 1-6 relevant to the Maccabean Crisis?	76
The Political Outlook of Chapters 1-6 of the Book of Daniel	76
Theodicy in Daniel 1-6	78
Conclusion to Daniel 1-6: The Inter-relationship of Politics and theodicy	82
I Esdras: Was I Esdras written as a result of the Maccabean Crisis?	83
Textual relationship to the Canonical Books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah	83

The relationship of the contents of I Esdras to the events and people of the Maccabean Crisis.	88
The possible dating and purpose of I Esdras, given its similarity to the people and events of the Maccabean Crisis	90
The Political Outlook of I Esdras	90
Theodicy in I Esdras	92
Conclusion to I Esdras	96
II Maccabees: Was II Maccabees written as a result of the Maccabean Crisis	97
A Comparison of II Maccabees with I Maccabees	98
Events which are included in II Maccabees but not in I Maccabees	125
Extra detail given to events which are included in I Maccabees	130
Details of events which are opposed to those given in I Maccabees	132
Letters which appear in II Maccabees but not in I Maccabees	134
Prayers which are in II Maccabees but not in I Maccabees	137
Encouragement given before battle	138
Editorial Comment	140
Vocabulary which is used repeatedly in II Maccabees or which is used in a different context from I Maccabees	144
The Political Outlook of II Maccabees	145
Theodicy in II Maccabees	148
The Inter-relationship of Politics and theodicy in II Maccabees	151
General Conclusion to Daniel 1-6, I Esdras, II Maccabees.	152
CHAPTER FOUR: APOCALYPTIC LITERATURE : Daniel	
7-12, Enoch 85-90	154
Daniel 7-12:Date	154
The Political Outlook of Daniel 7-12	154
Theodicy in Daniel 7-12	156

The Inter-relationship of Politics and Theodicy in Daniel 7-12	159
Enoch 85-90:Date	159
The Political Outlook of Enoch 85-90	160
Theodicy in Enoch 85-90	162
The Inter-relationship of Politics and theodicy in Enoch 85-90	166
A Comparison of the Politics and Theodicy of Daniel 7-12 and Enoch 85-90	166
NOTE ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ATTITUDE OF EACH GROUP OF TEXTS TO THAT OF A PARTICULAR SOCIAL GROUP WHICH EXISTED BEFORE THE CRISIS	168
CHAPTER FIVE: III AND IV MACCABEES.	171
The Dating of III Maccabees	171
The Similarity between II and III Maccabees	172
The Political Outlook of III Maccabees	174
The Theological Outlook of III Maccabees	174
Conclusion to III Maccabees	176
The Date of IV Maccabees	177
Author and Provenance	178
The Connection of IV Maccabees with the Maccab- ean Crisis.	179
The Conjunction of Jewish Faith with Greek Philos- ophy	179
Political Implications of the Treatise on the Supremacy of Inspired Reason	181
Implications for theodicy in the Treatise on the Supremacy of Inspired Reason	181
Conclusion to IV Maccabees	182
CONCLUSION	184
APPENDIX:THE ADDITIONS TO THE BOOK OF ESTHER	187
Footnotes	195
Bibliography	227

INTRODUCTION

The Maccabean Crisis precipitates the Independence of Israel for the first time for over four hundred years, the emergence of Apocalyptic literature and the concept of life after death. Obviously it was one of the great watersheds in the life of the people of Israel.

This thesis outlines the situation in Israel prior to the Crisis, then takes a look at the causes of the Crisis and the theological dilemma of the people when they were forbidden to practice their religion on pain of death. Why had God allowed such suffering to befall his people? Indeed had he allowed it or was he powerless? These questions and many others concerning the Justice, the Power and the Mercy of God provoked the writing of the Book of Daniel and many of the books of the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: perhaps many more than are usually thought to refer to the Crisis.

An investigation of the above mentioned books discloses that the lines of theodicy are interwoven with a particular political standpoint and their arguments based on different strands of the Torah. It also appears that there is a link between political outlook and social standing and a tentative identification is made as to which social group is responsible for the various books studied.

In times of stress in the Diaspora too, Jews appear to have looked back to the Maccabean Crisis and to the answers given to the question of why God had allowed such suffering.

CHAPTER 1THE SITUATION IN JUDAEA PRIOR TO THE MACCABEAN CRISIS AND THE CAUSES OF THE CRISIS ITSELF.Political Situation

'...After 586 the history of the Jews is primarily a process of trial and error aimed at national survival.'¹ Prior to the conquest by Alexander the Great, Judaea belonged to the Persian Empire, during which time it enjoyed cultural autonomy although power was in the hands of the Persian Governor.² His second-in-Command was the High Priest, and as Finklestein says, 'here as elsewhere the Persian government favoured the priesthood among its subjects as against the military aristocracy.'³

In 333B.C. the whole of Palestine, including Judaea, fell to Alexander the Great as a result of the Battle of Issus. Alexander appears to have ratified the Persian grant of cultural autonomy⁴ as was his usual practice, but as Tcherikover points out the Persian governor was removed but no Greek one was put in his place so the 'High Priest at the head of the people assumed the aspect of a petty monarch.'⁵ After the death of Alexander the Great in 323B.C. there was a period of confusion during which the Empire was divided among his generals.

Palestine, as an important strategic and economic area, was a bone of contention between the Ptolemaic power based in Egypt and the Seleucid power in Syria but by 305 was held by the former, a state of affairs which continued until the Battle of Paneion in 198B.C.⁶ Judaea had the same status under the Ptolemies as under Alexander but there were some unpleasant aspects to this regime which will be discussed below.⁷ After the Battle of Paneion Judaea was part of the Seleucid Empire and remained so until it became independent in 142 B.C.

Economya) Judaea as part of Coele-Syria under Ptolemaic Rule

It must be borne in mind that Judaea was part of the province of Coele-Syria during the Hellenistic period and so in some

instances cannot be considered apart from the whole. During the Ptolemaic period (c.300-200B.C.) Palestine flourished economically due to technical developments which aided agricultural production, and because new industries were founded.⁸ But, as Hengel points out,⁹ such prosperity had its obverse side; the population increased and when there were bad harvests in the poor Judaeen hillside some people were forced to emigrate. Another unfortunate aspect of life in Palestine during the Ptolemaic Rule was that the administration was harsh. The Ptolemies in Egypt had joined the Egyptian system of 'Royal Land' (whereby everything theoretically belonged to the king), to the Greek system of Poleis or independent cities.¹⁰ In Palestine there were a number of independent cities, many on the coast, but some inland. The rest of the Province was divided into 'Hyparchies' which were in turn divided into villages.¹¹ The economy was based upon agriculture and royal monopolies, and Rostovtzeff¹² thinks that the early Ptolemies probably organised Judaea and other parts of Palestine more strictly than before, for the purpose of taxation. Evidence of taxation is given by a document of the Rainer collection¹³ which contains fragments of the two orders of Philadelphus about the tax return to be given by the inhabitants of Syria and Phoenicia about their moveable property, including cattle. Apart from this kind of taxation, Rostovtzeff thinks that land tax, and royal taxes, such as poll tax, the crown tax, and the salt tax were demanded from the inhabitants of Palestine. The evidence which he adduces for this comes from a later period and all refers to Seleucid taxes but Rostovtzeff thinks it likely that these taxes were originally Ptolemaic and then taken over by the Seleucids.¹⁴

The slave trade was always an important part of the Hellenistic economy and the Delphinian manumissions of 250-201B.C. show that many slaves came from Syria and Palestine.¹⁵ However a prostagma of Philadelphus forbade any further purchase of free σώματα δικά and Rostovtzeff says that this order was given to counteract the enslavement of peasants during the war or may have been to differentiate Hellenistic regular servitude from oriental, contractual servitude.¹⁶ Whichever way the order was intended it must have been necessary to change the existing status quo, possibly for

economic reasons as deprivation of one working member of a family through enslavement would have caused hardship. Indeed there must have been great hardship after Ptolemy Soter's invasion of Judaea when a lot of slaves were taken.¹⁷

b) Collection of Taxes

The village was the economic unit, says Rostovtzeff,¹⁸ and each village as a whole was probably leased to a tax farmer. This situation was modified with the appointment of Joseph, son of Tobiad,¹⁹ to the position of tax farmer for the whole of Palestine between 230-220B.C.²⁰ According to Tcherikover, Josephus gives an idyllic account of Joseph's acquisition of this position but the basis of the story is correct: 'There now arose alongside the traditional theocratic authority, a new power based on the personal financial skill and experience of a private individual who was closely bound up with the broad international field.'²² This post then brought wealth and political power to the Tobiad family and also to Jerusalem, but in its wake accentuated the great divide between rich and poor. Ecclesiastes gives an interesting picture of life during the Ptolemaic period.²³ He talks of the 'tears of the oppressed' with no one to comfort them (4:1) and of the great divide between ruler and subjects because of the autocratic nature of kingship (8:3-5), in short he points out the general hopelessness of the situation.²⁴

It appears then that during the hundred years or so of Ptolemaic rule, Palestine, including Judaea, had a relatively peaceful period when there was economic prosperity, although harsh administration and oppression of the poor by the rich caused considerable hardship.

As stated earlier, with reference to events about 305B.C., Palestine was a bone of contention between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids. This was again true a century later and Josephus gives some details of battles fought over the province noting that: 'When Antiochus the Great reigned over Asia it was the lot of the Jews to undergo great hardships due to the devastation of their land.'²⁵ The already existing difficulties of the poor must have been further aggravated by this. Jerusalem also appears to have been damaged during this period, possibly severely by Scopas,²⁶ a regent of the Ptolemaic Empire, and seems to have needed some rebuilding,

according to the decree of Antiochus given in Josephus (Antiq.XII, 138). After the defeat of the Seleucids by the Romans and the harsh conditions of peace given in the Treaty of Apamea (198B.C.) with high war reparations, it seems to have been of paramount importance for the Seleucids to retain Palestine in order to meet their debts. Apart from taxes which could be collected from the people, possession of Palestine ensured control of the lucrative caravan trade from Arabia and India and China.²⁷ That indeed money was desperately needed by the Seleucids is shown by the attempt of Heliodorus to take money from the Jerusalem Temple (II Macc.3:1). As Hengel²⁸ says, large war reparations to Rome and the consequent high taxation helped to bring about the economic recession in Palestine in the Second Century B.C. When Antiochus III first gained Palestine from the Ptolemies he promised help with the rebuilding of Jerusalem,²⁹ freed the Temple personnel and ιερουσια from three royal taxes:- salt, garland and poll tax, and gave general exemption from taxes for three years to everyone in order to enable the quick rehabilitation of the city. He also granted relief of a third of the tribute which had been paid to the Ptolemies.³⁰ The burden of taxation then must have seemed immeasurably greater when Seleucus IV revoked these concessions and demanded 300 talents, which was increased to 400 on the accession of Antiochus IV. Later when Menelaus bought the position of High Priest he had to ensure that 600 talents were paid.³¹ Antiochus III made another proclamation concerning Jerusalem and its Temple which must have led to the decline of the city as a mercantile centre. This proclamation was apparently supportive to the Jewish Law in that it forbade entry to the Temple to those who were not pure.³² However it also forbade the bringing of unlawful animals into the city, and it is this latter rule which was economically harmful. There is no rationale for it in terms of the Jewish purity laws³³ and Hengel thinks it may have been directed against the economic strength of the Tobiads.³⁴ This may well have been so as the Tobiads had achieved a position of power and wealth based on the favour of the Ptolemies and this gave Antiochus concern about their allegiance to the Seleucid Empire.

It appears then that immediately prior to the Maccabean Crisis

the rich as well as the poor were suffering economically which may be one reason why a group of renegade Jews wished to enter into covenant with their Gentile neighbours saying that disaster upon disaster had come upon them since their segregation from the latter (I Macc.1:11)³⁵

The Influence of Hellenistic Culture.

The Hellenistic Empires of the Ptolemies and the Seleucids inevitably affected the way of life of the people who were subjected to them. It has been seen above how great this was in the economic and administrative sphere but it must also be considered on the cultural level. Hellenistic strength was first displayed to Oriental peoples in war³⁶ and its impact must have been great on the Jewish people for Alexander the Great³⁷ and Hellenistic war techniques³⁸ figure strongly in Apocalyptic, Jewish Alexandrian and even Rabbinic writings. Jewish mercenaries were important in disseminating Hellenistic culture in their homeland, for these mercenaries during their working years had learnt Greek ways as a defence against being regarded by their masters as part of the downtrodden native barbarians.³⁹

One of the primary aspects of Hellenistic culture was the use of the Greek language which became the lingua franca of all the peoples of the Hellenistic Empires. Although undoubtedly many poor people did not know Greek, their native tongue was eventually affected by this language. It is known, for instance, that Hebrew incorporated some Greek words into its vocabulary as is shown by books such as Ecclesiastes. Words however are not an objective grouping of letters, but can retain nuances and meaning from their original application and this is especially true if they are associated with religious or philosophical ideas. In this way it was possible for there to be a gradual and barely perceptible growth of Hellenistic culture and ideas within another culture.⁴⁰ This, however, took time to evolve, and during the period under discussion i.e. the time of the Ptolemaic and Seleucid domination of Palestine, the Greek language was perhaps no more than a bridge between cultures.

Education was an important part of Greek culture and it laid

great emphasis on the fitness and beauty of the human body. To this end gymnasia were built and one such was instituted in Jerusalem.⁴¹ It is likely that there was a long tradition of Greek education among the Jewish aristocracy of the city for there to be support for the institution of the gymnasium in the city.⁴² It must have caused great consternation to the more conservative members of the nation though, for those who partook in the games did so naked which was against the Torah⁴³ and they even went as far as to have the marks of the covenant removed (I Macc.1:15) as this was considered by the Greeks to be a disfigurement of the beauty of the human body.

Despite the disapproval of their compatriots it was undoubtedly tempting and indeed positively necessary for those Jews involved in the political and economic aspects of the Hellenistic culture to partake of its cultural aspects also. Judaea was a small country surrounded by independent Hellenistic cities⁴⁴ and officials of the Empire apparently regarded those who did not participate in Greek ways as Barbarians.⁴⁵ To partake in international Hellenistic games was a way of furthering one's social and economic position for it brought one into contact with like-minded people from other countries.⁴⁶ However in order to go to these games one had to be a citizen of a Polis (a semi-independent Greek town) and it is highly probable that Jason, who secured the High Priesthood from Antiochus IV, at the expense of Onias, encouraged the foundation of a Polis in Jerusalem for this very reason.⁴⁷

Further to the development of the body it appears that Greek education included 'intellectual and literary elements'⁴⁸: Life in the Ancient World was intimately bound up with religion and by analogy with the word Ἑλληνισμός 'Hellenism must be treated as a complex phenomena which cannot be linked to purely political, socio-economic, cultural or religious aspects but embraces them all'.⁴⁹ If this is so then the adoption of its cultural aspects by those Jews who were concerned with the political and economic government of their country⁵⁰ must have had serious consequences for their religious beliefs.

Social Divisions

The previous two sections have already disclosed a certain number of social divisions among the Judaeans. Ecclus.13:15-20 shows social division between rich and poor on the eve of the Maccabean Crisis. Many of these divisions were long-standing although worsened by the current political, economic and cultural conditions.

It is evident that during the period of Persian domination there was considerable social strife. Nehemiah 5:1-5 tells of the complaints of the people who were forced to mortgage their land or sell their property in order to stay alive or pay their taxes. Nehemiah strove to alleviate this situation by instituting a general remission of debts. But this solution did not have a lasting effect as passages in some of the late prophets show.⁵¹ The institution of the Ptolemaic 'economic and social policy' made the social conflict which Nehemiah had tried to eradicate more acute.⁵² The Ptolemies needed the upper class in order to maintain their rule and Joseph the Tobiad obtained the rights of Tax Farmer. He guaranteed to pay a fixed sum to the Ptolemies but the residue of what he collected was his own. Such a situation allowed him to become rich at the expense of the poor. The social ramifications of this were in accordance with the general Ptolemaic view of the native populace i.e. an object of exploitation.

The gulf between the poor and the upper classes was widened by the participation of the latter in Greek education and culture. From the foregoing it is obvious that the poor were exploited financially and Ecclesiastes witnesses to the misery caused when he tells of the 'tears of the oppressed'.⁵³ Indeed economic hardship must have been greatly aggravated by the period of wars between the Ptolemies and the Seleucids.⁵⁴

It would, however, be a gross over-simplification to suggest that the rich and the poor themselves were homogenous groups. As far as the rich are concerned there is evidence found in Josephus (B.J. 1:31) that there was a split between the Oniad and Tobiad families. The Oniad family held the High Priesthood whereas the Tobiad family was a strong economic force during the Ptolemaic period. As has been seen above the Tobiads had firm

contacts with Hellenistic culture and certainly some of the episodes reputed to have taken place in the life of Joseph, the tax collector, suggest that he was lax in his attitude to the Jewish Law.⁵⁵ Joseph had several sons, the youngest of whom, Hyrcanus, succeeded in gaining the favour of the Ptolemaic King in a way which was displeasing to his father and brothers.⁵⁶ The situation was such that the brothers of Hyrcanus were now unable to gain much power for themselves and they appear to have become friendly with Simon II, the High Priest, who had probably succeeded in gaining power with the help of active religious groups which included people like Ben Sira.⁵⁷ In order to achieve his position Simon had probably suppressed his family's Hellenistic tendencies because he needed the help of the more conservative religious circles.⁵⁸ Again for political reasons, Simon and the Tobiad brothers undoubtedly favoured the Seleucid Empire over against the Ptolemies, and when Antiochus III was victorious over the Ptolemies at Paneion they were rewarded by a decree allowing them to live according to their ancestral law.⁵⁹ As we have seen there were elements in this decree which went beyond what was laid down in the Torah, and it has been suggested that it was directed against the economic strength of the Tobiads or more particularly Hyrcanus, who was in great favour with the Ptolemaic King.⁶⁰ The successor of Simon II to the High Priesthood was Onias and he appears to have been pro-Ptolemaic as he kept the money of the pro-Ptolemaic Hyrcanus in the Temple (II Macc.3:11). This is no doubt why Jason was allowed to buy the High Priesthood from the Seleucids and so usurp the authority of his brother Onias. It would appear from II Macc.4:10f. that Jason was more inclined towards Hellenism than Onias, and the institution of the Polis is probably an indication that the economic restrictions which ensued from the decree of Antiochus III were now irksome and would be overcome only by a greater participation in the Hellenistic way of life. All this suggests that there was an authority/economic power struggle amongst the aristocracy and this corresponds to a large extent to Buehler's thesis,⁶¹ although the distinctions between the two aristocratic

groups are not quite as clear cut in the pre-Maccabean era as they are before the Herodian civil war; the period upon which Buehler concentrates. In the former time the High Priest is sometimes more inclined towards power through authority and sometimes towards power through commerce and wealth.

The poor people cannot be classed together as a homogenous group. Indeed three rough divisions can be made: the artisan, the farmer, the dweller on the Judaeen tableland. As commerce developed so did the artisan class.⁶² These artisans organised themselves into socio-religious groups called haberim in order to try to overcome the sense of isolation given to the individual by city life.⁶³ Farmers undoubtedly suffered under the Ptolemies for taxes were numerous and high.⁶⁴ They were probably short of labour⁶⁵ because many slaves had been taken in war and Josephus talks of the devastation of the land during the reign of Antiochus the Great.⁶⁶ Despite the similarity of the farmers to the urban artisans in terms of economic hardship there appears to have been social tension between the two groups with the farmers as ardent nationalists, aligning themselves with the Αυγατόλ, the aristocracy whose power was based on wealth and commerce⁶⁷. On the other hand the urban lower classes tended to side with οἱ Ἰπώτοι probably because they little to gain from war.⁶⁸ The people on the Judaeen tableland were even poorer than the farmers and the enmity between the two groups was traditional going back to the time of the settlement in Canaan. The urban artisans had little time for the people of the Tableland for they considered them to be impure.⁶⁹

The picture of Judaea then on the Eve of the Maccabean Crisis is one of great social division. Ecclus.7:15 'Do not resent manual labour or farmwork, for it was ordained by the Most High', most probably indicates that many people were in fact dissatisfied with their lot in life and envious of the rich and yet neither the aristocracy nor the lower classes were homogenous groups but each contained its own social divisions and tensions. This social antagonism was apparently widespread throughout the Seleucid Empire⁷⁰ with divisions between the aristocracy and the bourgeoisie, between town and country, city and village, between Hellenised and non-Hellenised. Such divisions were compounded

by religious differences and this was no less true in Judaea than elsewhere. The religious situation and outlook of these must therefore now be considered.

Religious Groups in Judaea before the Maccabean Crisis.

The decision of the Exiles in Babylon who had never known another country to hazard everything and to make the difficult journey back to Judaea (Ezra 1f.) had its rationale deep in the Old Testament. The land was a gift from God; Abraham was called out of Haran by God to go to a promised land. In Exod. 3:8 Moses was told by God that he was to lead the people to a land flowing with milk and honey. The books of Joshua and Judges tell of the struggles for possession of the land and Deuteronomy gives the conditions for its continued existence in the land. The land then for the Exiles was inextricably bound up with their relationship with God.

After the Return, the people of Judaea lived in a hierocratic community, based on Ezekiel's vision of the Restoration, and strengthened by the reforms of Ezra and Nehemiah. The High Priest was the official religious leader of the Jewish community and had high political standing in the eyes of each of the successive Empires which governed Judaea.⁷¹ Following the pattern of the Book of Chronicles, the Temple and ritual were at the centre of religious life and the theocratic community was the accomplished ideal. Jerusalem was the legitimate place for sacrifice as had officially been the case since the Deuteronomic Reform during Josiah's reign. Josephus⁷² attests that there were various classes of Temple personnel: priests, scribes and Temple singers. Ezra and Nehemiah tried to make this religious community more tightly knit by reinforcing social duties to one's fellow worshippers (Neh. 5:1-3) and by forbidding foreign marriage and even encouraging those who had foreign wives to put them away. (Ezra 10:1-3).

Such was the status quo but beneath the apparently unified exterior, the members of this community were not all of one accord. The separatist ideals of Ezra and Nehemiah were certainly not held by some Hellenists prior to the Maccabean Crisis as a group

of them are reported as saying, 'Let us enter into a covenant with Gentiles round about because disaster upon disaster has overtaken us since we segregated ourselves from them.' (I Macc. 1:11) The way this phrase is couched suggests that the group were not motivated simply by economic considerations. They may have had the feeling that God had allowed disasters to come upon Israel because he did not approve of their separation from other peoples. Certainly there is evidence that some of those who subscribed to this view did so while holding fast to their ancestral religion. II Macc. 4:18-20 shows that envoys sent by the High Priest Jason to Tyre to contribute 300 drachmas to the sacrifice in honour of Hercules, had scruples about its intended use and instead devoted the money to the fitting out of triremes. However Jason and Menelaus appear to have wanted a closer liaison with other peoples for reasons of personal gain and were quite prepared to go against the tenets of their ancestral faith to further this end. (II Macc. 4:7-5:26). Unfortunately for the rest of Judaea, these individuals were the ones in a position of power, which they were able to employ for their personal gain, without regard to the sufferings of their fellow brethren of the theocratic community.

Zechariah 9-14 gives evidence of a group opposed to the narrow exclusive hierocratic one, basing itself upon Deutero-Isaiah. However when Deutero-Isaiah's promises failed the group held fast to his universalistic visions but increasingly detached them from the realm of history and put them on the level of cosmic myth.⁷³ They believed that the present historical era was working towards its close and that God himself would inaugurate an era in which the nations of the earth would be overcome and the survivors do homage to the God of Israel (Zech. 9:1-8, 14:16-19).⁷⁴

A third group appears to have been descended from the urban plebeian returnees from the Exile. II Kings 24:14, 18 says that the first deportation included 1,000 smiths and carpenters and it has been suggested that these had been the supporters of Jeremiah and were the people whom Jeremiah exhorts 'to build houses and dwell in them.' (29:5).⁷⁵ The Temple, which had been denounced by Jeremiah, became a sacred memory and was greatly revered by the Exiles.⁷⁶ However in its absence new emphasis was placed upon various aspects of the ancestral faith. Particular attention was

paid to the Sabbath (Lev.19:3,23:3; Num. 28:9), to the law of circumcision (Gen.17:10), to abstinence from forbidden foods (Lev. 11:1f.) and to rules of purity (Lev.12-15). These trends were even further developed after the Return.

The farmers in Israel appear to have had yet another attitude. Because of the very nature of their work, they were intimately linked to the land and thus nationalistic in outlook. Temple ritual had great meaning for them as much of it was connected to the seasons of the year. Evidence of this attitude can be adduced from Joel and Obadiah where imagery of the countryside (Joel 1:3f.), reference to Temple ritual (Joel 1:9,11) and frequent mentions of 'Israel', 'Judah', 'Jacob', and 'Zion' (Joel 2:23,3:1,3:6, Obad.1:17,21) are found.

TABLE OF SOCIAL POSITION, ECONOMIC STATUS, RELIGIOUS ATTITUDE

<u>Social Position</u>	<u>Economic Status</u>	<u>Religious Attitude</u>
Commercial Aristocracy	Very rich	Commerce before religion
Traditional Priestly Aristocracy	Rich, had much land.	Fairly conservative, but wanted personal power through the High Priesthood.
Levites and other excluded Temple personnel - probably urban groups.	Poor	Based on D-Is.'s vision:- Era working towards its end and Divine intervention.
Urban artisans	Poor	Emphasis on various aspects of Temple and Law - land not so important (Basis in Exile)

Farmers	Poor	Nationalistic, Ritualistic
---------	------	-------------------------------

People of Judaeen Tableland	Very poor	Lex
--------------------------------	-----------	-----

THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ABOVE GROUPS TO EACH OTHER

<u>Social Position</u>	<u>Relationship of one group to another</u>	
Commercial Aristocracy	See Farmers	Disagreement between two
Priestly aristocracy	See urban artisans	aristocratic groups.
Inferior and excluded Temple personnel		
Urban Artisans	Disagreed with the farmers and the people of the Tableland in religious matters. Supported <u>οἱ Ἱερῶν</u> probably because they had little to gain from war. Also probably because of reverence for the Temple.	
Farmers	Disagree with urban artisans in religious matters. Traditional enmity with people of the Judaeen Tableland. Aligned themselves with <u>Δουλοί</u> ⁷⁷	
People of the Judaeen Tableland.	A class apart. Not mixed with by any group.	

THE EVENTS LEADING TO THE PROHIBITION OF THE PRACTICE OF THE
JEWISH RELIGION

The Jewish Sources.

The Jewish sources are I and II Maccabees, the Book of Daniel and two of the works of Josephus:- Jewish Antiquities and The Jewish War.

The High Priestly Quarrels

Josephus and II Maccabees are the main sources for the quarrels of the High Priests, prior to the Maccabean Crisis. I Maccabees does not mention them at all, though Daniel 11:22-23 may be an oblique reference to the changes of High Priest. From II Maccabees it is known that Onias III was ousted from the High Priesthood by his brother Jason who succeeded in buying the office from Antiochus (4:7-10). According to II Maccabees 3:1 Onias was a popular High Priest, who kept the peace and observed the laws.⁷⁸ There are indications that he was pro-Ptolemaic for he kept in the Temple the money of Hyrcanus, the Tobiad, who was closely associated with the Ptolemies (II Macc.3:11). Simon, the Temple administrator, quarrelled with Onias over the regulation of the city market (II Macc. 3:4) and when he was unable to get his own way in this matter he suggested to the Seleucid authorities that Onias was hoarding money (II Macc.3:6),⁷⁹ probably in the hope that Onias would be removed from office leaving the way to trade open for those who were opposed to Hyrcanus. As a result Heliodorus, Antiochus's chief minister, was sent to Jerusalem to remove the Temple treasure (II Macc.3:7). Then follows the miraculous tale of how Heliodorus was overcome and subsequently was unable to take the money due to his having witnessed the power of God. The factual basis behind this story may be that Heliodorus was bought off by Hyrcanus.

Onias was then accused by Simon of conspiring against the government (II Macc.4:2) i.e. the Seleucid government. Onias went to Antiochus IV to appeal against this but meanwhile Onias's brother, Jesus (Greek name Jason) bought the High Priesthood from Antiochus for 360 talents down payment and 80 talents to be paid later (II Macc.4:8). Antiochus was no doubt favourably inclined to Jason; firstly he probably considered that Onias had less sympathy with the Seleucid government than Jason; secondly, Jason

was prepared to pay for the office, which was useful in a time of economic hardship;⁸⁰ and thirdly, he was sympathetic to Hellenistic culture as is indicated by his change of name and his institution of a sports stadium in the Greek style in Jerusalem (II Macc. 4:9f.).⁸¹ Three years later, Menelaus, the brother of Simon the Temple administrator and a Benjaminite⁸² was sent by Jason to take money to Antiochus. Menelaus was able to buy the High Priesthood from Antiochus by promising a larger sum of money than Jason had done (II Macc.4:23) although it appears that he never actually paid the money (II Macc.4:27). In 170-168 Onias was killed by Andronicus who was in charge of the Seleucid government during Antiochus's absence in Cilicia where there was trouble. According to II Maccabees once again, Antiochus put Andronicus to death, so great was his sorrow over Onias's murder. However Diodorus XXX:7,2 gives another reason for this: Andronicus had killed the son of Seleucus IV, the rightful heir to the throne and in order to clear himself in the eyes of the public of complicity in this crime, Antiochus had to execute Andronicus. It is unknown whether Antiochus was actually innocent of the death of the son of Seleucus IV, but if he was, Andronicus must have thought it would please Antiochus.⁸³

It appears, then, that a High Priestly struggle took place in Jerusalem. Onias III, supported by Hyrcanus, was pro-Ptolemaic, while Jason and Menelaus, supported in turn by the rest of the Tobiad family, were pro-Seleucid. The reason for this power struggle was economic. The High Priest had control of the city market and Onias's policy on this was likely to have been conservative as by all evidence he was pious and kept the laws of his religion. The Letter of Freedom of Antiochus III (Josephus, Antiquities.145-6) was a restrictive factor and one of the easiest ways of repealing this was by transforming Jerusalem into a Polis.⁸⁴ This could only be carried out by someone who was inclined to Hellenistic culture. Jason instituted the changes but Menelaus was undoubtedly more extreme and gained the support of the Tobiads. Menelaus, however, was not a legitimate High Priest as he was a Benjaminite and he gained and maintained his position through bribery, apparently without the support of the general populace.

After the accession of Menelaus to the High Priesthood there is evidence of trouble in Jerusalem between the people and the government. II Maccabees tells of an incident which happened when Menelaus left Lysimachus in charge of the city during his absence. Lysimachus apparently 'committed many acts of sacrilegious plunder in Jerusalem (4:39) in order to pay Antiochus, and as a result the people rebelled against him. Lysimachus sent 3,000 armed men against the people as a result of which some died including Lysimachus himself. The people held Menelaus responsible and sent envoys to Antiochus to complain. Menelaus was acquitted through bribery and the envoys were put to death (II Macc.4:43-50).

The second incident between the people and the government in Jerusalem involved Antiochus personally. Antiochus was returning home after a victorious campaign in Egypt in the summer of 169B.C.⁸⁵ and he visited Jerusalem on the way. Here it should be borne in mind that Palestine, including Judaea, was an important strategic and economic area in the power struggle between the Seleucid and Ptolemaic Empires. It is likely that Antiochus had heard rumours of anti-Seleucid and pro-Ptolemaic feeling in the city and therefore made a detour in order to verify the situation for himself. According to Daniel he went 'against the Holy Covenant' (11:28); I Maccabees says that he 'marched against Israel and Jerusalem' (1:20). Josephus, on the other hand, says that Antiochus 'took the city without a battle for the gates were opened to him by those who were of his party' (Antiq.XII 246). Josephus continues that Antiochus 'killed many of those who were in opposition' and in The Jewish War 1:32 he makes this more explicit when he says that Antiochus 'slew a large number of Ptolemy's followers'. Antiochus also appears to have carried off a large amount of money as spoils, indeed I Maccabees 1:20f. says that he took the Temple vessels, although Josephus says that this happened during Antiochus's second visit to Jerusalem. Some sense may be made of this attack if one concludes that the account in II Maccabees of the attempt of Jason the High Priest to gain control of the city refers to the same incident. Many scholars appear to think that it does, although II Macc. 5:1

states that it was connected to Antiochus's second campaign in Egypt, whereas Josephus relates it to his first (Antiq.XII 246-7). According to II Maccabees 5 Jason attacked Jerusalem because he had heard a rumour of Antiochus's death in Egypt. Menelaus, the current High Priest, had to take refuge in the citadel, but it would appear that Jason fled from Jerusalem before Antiochus appeared on his way back from Egypt. If Josephus and II Maccabees are talking about the same incident then the fact that Jason fled before the arrival of Antiochus would link up with the statement in Josephus that the gates were opened to Antiochus by those of his own party i.e. those who followed Menelaus. In this case Jason must have been defeated prior to the arrival of Antiochus. It is a vexed question who defeated him. Tcherikover⁸⁶ thinks that the Hasidim defeated him but Hengel points out that their policy tended to be pacifist.⁸⁷ Evidence in Josephus⁸⁸ would tend to support Hengel here for Josephus says that when there was strife between Jason and Menelaus, the general population supported Jason, and the Tobiads supported Menelaus. This statement appears to be a logical one for it is much more likely that the general populace would support Jason, a High Priest of a legitimate line, than Menelaus, a Benjaminite. There is then only one group of people who could have dealt with Jason - Menelaus and his followers along with the troops from the citadel. The taking of the Temple vessels is connected with the first attack of Antiochus on Jerusalem in both I and II Maccabees and it could well be that Menelaus gave these to Antiochus as payment for the High Priestly office, which was long overdue and which Antiochus was anxious to collect as is shown by II Maccabees 4:28.

There remains the question of whether Josephus's statement in The Jewish War (1:32) that Antiochus killed a lot of Ptolemy's followers should be taken seriously. No doubt Antiochus eliminated a lot of Jason's followers and it may well be that after his deposition from the High Priesthood Jason changed his political allegiance and became pro-Ptolemaic and so his followers would also be considered as such. It is also possible though, that in view of Jason's apparent popularity among the people,

Menelaus attempted to gain Antiochus's firm support by suggesting that Jason and his followers were pro-Ptolemaic.

The Second Attack on Jerusalem by Antiochus.

Josephus and Daniel say that after Antiochus's second campaign in Egypt (168B.C.) when he was defeated by the Romans, he again went to Jerusalem and attacked it. They each give reasons for this attack. Daniel says that he vented his fury at defeat by the Romans on the Holy Covenant (11:30). Josephus says that it was because of greed for money to pay war reparations. Unfortunately, I Maccabees says that Antiochus took the sacred vessels during the previous attack on the city and II Maccabees, if the Jason story is connected with Antiochus's earlier campaign, would agree with I Maccabees. It is unlikely, in any case, that the motivating factor of Antiochus's attack on Jerusalem would have been merely to steal the sacred vessels because he needed money; it would have been much more in his interests to keep a vital part of his Empire happy. Josephus, too, is well known to have been biased in his history writing and this comes out clearly in The Jewish War where he is concerned with whitewashing any rebellions by the Jews. It is much more likely that the reason for Antiochus's intervention in Jerusalem was renewed rebellion in the city.

In connection with this attack on Jerusalem, Josephus says that Antiochus pretended to offer peace but overcame the city by treachery.⁸⁹ This time he did not even spare those who admitted him.⁹⁰ This is doubtless the same incident which is mentioned in I and II Maccabees although there the king did not personally lead the attack. (I Maccabees says that a high revenue official led the attack - 1:29-32; II Maccabees says that Apollonius did so - 5:25). Daniel concurs with I and II Maccabees here for he says that Antiochus sent armed forces to the city. However I and II Maccabees do agree with Josephus that the attack was a treacherous one. II Maccabees 5:25 says that it was carried out on the Sabbath. Immediately one wonders why the attack was treacherous. The only possible explanation, although the sources do not confirm it, must surely be that the city was not under the control of Menelaus

and his followers, who were strongly pro-Seleucid, but in other hands. Who these people were is not possible to say but a likely conjecture is that they were the ordinary populace who, as we know from Josephus and later indications in II Maccabees,⁹¹ were opposed to Menelaus. The people were possibly not strongly anti-Seleucid at this stage and probably welcomed the intervention of Antiochus's troops who, they no doubt thought, had come to support them in their cause against Menelaus. The statement in Josephus that on this occasion Antiochus (or his representative) did not spare even those who admitted him, now makes sense:⁹² He did not spare them because those who admitted him were not Menelaus and his party but the common people or their representatives. It may even be possible to go as far as to say that the people were not pro-Ptolemaic at all, but that Menelaus, knowing that the people were opposed to him because he was not a legitimate High Priest according to the Jewish Law and because he was an extreme Helleniser for reasons of personal gain, deliberately gave Antiochus the idea that the people were pro-Ptolemaic to further his own ends.

It appears that, after Antiochus or his troops subdued Jerusalem and killed many people, the Akra was fortified with foreign troops (Antiq. XII 252) and the renegades or impious people of the Jewish nation also took refuge there. Josephus says that the city was destroyed at this time and apparently the citizens fled (II Macc.5:27, I Macc.1:38). I and II Maccabees concur that the fortification of the Akra, the destruction of the city and the flight of the citizens took place before Antiochus announced his Edict of the Prohibition of the Jewish Religion, although Josephus places these events concurrent with the Edict. It is difficult to judge who is correct here, and Daniel gives no decisive indication of whether there was a time lag between the troops attacking the city and the publication of the Edict. In that two sources concur here over against one it is probably better to place reliance upon them, and it is probable, in any case, that the Edict took time to be formulated.

With regard to the three disturbances in Jerusalem prior to the Edict, it is possible to say that any attack on the people was

a response to their rebellion. It is noteworthy that all three rebellions took place after Menelaus was High Priest. This was probably because Menelaus was not a legitimate High Priest, because he was an extreme Helleniser and because he was guilty of sacrilegious plunder. The motivation then for the rebellions was religious and if the conjecture concerning the final attack on Jerusalem by Antiochus or his representative is correct i.e. that the ordinary people admitted him then they cannot have been either anti-Seleucid or pro-Ptolemaic at this stage.

The Edict of the Prohibition of the Jewish Religion

II Maccabees 6:1 says that Antiochus sent an elderly Athenian to Jerusalem to implement the Edict although it is not mentioned in other sources. The accounts of the Edict are in almost complete agreement as to the factors involved although some give greater detail than others. All say that the Temple was desecrated,⁹³ but only II Maccabees names the cult which replaced that of the Jewish God - that of Olympian Zeus (6:2). The sources say that swine were sacrificed and it was forbidden to keep any part of the Jewish Law, including the circumcision of baby boys. Shrines and altars to the new god were set up throughout Judaea and the people were compelled to worship pagan gods. It has long puzzled scholars why the Edict was enacted, and near contemporary documents give various reasons for it, although none of them are totally satisfactory. It has been pointed out that the image of Zeus on Antiochus's coins resembles Antiochus himself and it has been thought that perhaps Antiochus set himself up as a god to be worshipped. Support for this view has been claimed in Daniel 11:37 where it is said, 'to no god will he pay heed but will exalt himself above them all.' However this theory is upheld only by modern scholars and Jewish sources which think in terms of religious monotheism. For Antiochus to have thought in such terms would have been out of character with his time and culture.⁹⁴

I Maccabees says that the Edict was universal and applied to all peoples in Antiochus's Empire, but this is patently untrue according to other evidence for the period. The Samaritans were not prevented from practising their religion and yet the

Torah was no less holy to them than it was to the Jews,⁹⁵ therefore Antiochus did not prohibit the practice of the Jewish religion through hatred of it. Indeed the Edict applied only to the Jews of Jerusalem and Judaea i.e. the Jews who were under the rule of the High Priest.⁹⁶

II Maccabees gives no human reason for the prohibition of the Jewish religion. It simply states that it was according to divine will (6:12-17).

Josephus gives no separate reason for the Edict but connects it to Antiochus's previous attack on Jerusalem, the motive for which he said was greed.⁹⁷ That he intended this motive to apply to the Edict also is confirmed by The Jewish War where he says that Antiochus 'being unable to control his passions and remembering what the siege had cost him, tried to force the Jews to break their ancient law...' The attribution of the motive of greed to the prohibition of the Jewish religion and the attempts to suppress those who had refused to abandon it, is not really very logical, for it must have cost a great deal to provide troops to enforce obedience to the Edict. In the above quotation from The Jewish War there is also the suggestion that Antiochus was mad or at least unbalanced and this is something which Polybius would support.⁹⁸ But again, if this was the overriding factor one would expect to find that Antiochus had forced other people to abandon their religion, which was not so.

It is now necessary to look at Greek documents connected with the Edict to see if they shed any light on the motivation for it. Soon after the death of Antiochus it was suggested that he was a conscious promoter of Greek culture i.e. a Helleniser⁹⁹ but there is no reference to this in contemporary Greek documents¹⁰⁰ or in the Samaritan petition to Antiochus.¹⁰¹ The Samaritan petition suggests that the Jews had been rebellious and the letter of Lysias confirms this,¹⁰² as does the above analysis of the troubles in Jerusalem prior to the Edict. There is a snag in ascribing the motive for the Edict to a response to rebellion in Jerusalem or Judaea: If the fortification of the Akra, the destruction of the city and the flight of the citizens actually took place before the promulgation of the Edict, indicating that the Seleucids had

the situation under control, then an Edict which went against the general cultural and religious policy of Antiochus, would surely have been superfluous.

An impasse has then been reached regarding the reasons given by the ancient sources for the Edict. Two views of modern scholars must now be considered. Bickermann's thesis is that the extreme Hellenistic party in Jerusalem was the driving force behind the Edict.¹⁰³ This is most probably true as none of the evidence or any conjecture regarding Antiochus's motivation for the Edict is totally convincing. The events prior to the promulgation of the Edict show that Menelaus and his party clashed with the general populace of Jerusalem on religious issues and it is therefore likely that they clashed on another religious issue. However Bickermann goes further than attributing responsibility for the Edict to Menelaus, in that he attempts to explain why Menelaus felt it necessary to take such a dramatic step. He conjectures that Menelaus and his followers were greatly influenced by Greek philosophy which regarded developed religions as a distortion of the original truth. This thesis has been questioned though, on the grounds that it is unlikely that Menelaus and his followers had such a deep knowledge of Greek philosophy as Bickermann's thesis would indicate.¹⁰⁴ Indeed that any kind of instruction in Greek thought took place in Jerusalem parallel to Greek physical education, is in itself conjecture.¹⁰⁵ Individual aspects of Bickermann's thesis also seem rather dubious. He says that the Books of the Maccabees highlight the fact that the persecutors wished to force their food (pork) upon the Jews.¹⁰⁶ He goes on to say that this was peculiar in that the Greeks only used swine in sacrifices that were not fit to eat - for Demeter or in the Dionysian cult. But the new god of Jerusalem was Zeus Olympius (II Macc.6:42) to whom a bull was a fitting sacrifice. This contradiction is soon cleared up though, he says, if one assumes that the extreme Hellenists wanted to do away with abstention from pork as it was for them one of the characteristics of the distorted and exclusive Jewish religion. This surely is not correct and reflects the view of a twentieth century enlightened Jew living in a world

which regards abstention from certain foodstuffs for religious reasons as a peculiar and primitive superstition. If the surrounding peoples and dominant Hellenistic culture of the second century B.C. concurred with the Jews over abstention from pork, surely Menelaus and his party would not consider it a peculiarity of the Jewish people. Another factor which Bickermann does not satisfactorily resolve is that, side by side with Olympian Zeus, the cult of Dionysius is mentioned in II Maccabees 6:2,7. This anomaly will be discussed later after outlining the view of the second modern scholar, Tcherikover.

Tcherikover says that 'the key to an understanding of the events of the entire period has to be sought...in the conflict of interests between the aristocracy and the people.'¹⁰⁷ Despite differences between these groups which were evident in the pre-Maccabean era and which have been outlined above, they erupted into open rebellion only when traditional religious values were thrust aside by the Hellenists. According to Tcherikover, Antiochus prohibited the Mosaic Law because the rebels had this as their catchword. He also says that by this time Antiochus had come to regard Judaism as a Barbara superstitio because of such customs as the exclusion of any Gentiles from meals. He continues that it is not unknown in Ancient History for a cult to be suppressed if it ran contrary to the political aims of the state. Events and sources would tend to agree with Tcherikover here, but perhaps he does not carry his thesis quite far enough. The upholding of authority as a motive for the Edict was probably quite strong but it should be borne in mind that apart from upholding the authority of Antiochus it also upheld the authority of Menelaus. The conflicts between Menelaus and the people were caused by breaches of the Torah and what would be more natural than that the ultimate sanction against the people should be the enforced abolition of what was the motivating factor in the revolt. This may well be upheld by II Maccabees 13:4 where Lysias tells Antiochus that Menelaus is responsible for all the troubles with the result that Menelaus is executed.

The revolts prior to the Edict took place in Jerusalem and the killing of some of those involved, the destruction of the city and

the installation of many troops in the Akra should have been sufficient to prevent any further rebellion in the city. It has been shown, however, that many citizens fled from Jerusalem after the last rebellion. These people went into the Judaeen countryside and desert and it is notable that the Edict applied to Judaea as well as to Jerusalem. By persuading Antiochus to promulgate the Edict in order to prevent further rebellion from the people, which he must have emphasised was fundamentally religious, Menelaus was protecting his own position.

The mention in II Maccabees 6:2,7 of Olympian Zeus and Dionysus begs the question whether on uniform cult replaced the worship of the Jewish God. The troops stationed in the Akra were Macedonians¹⁰⁸ and as such were probably mercenaries with various religious backgrounds¹⁰⁹ who would naturally expect to be allowed to continue their own worship while on active service. In view of this then it is possible that the worship of any god other than their own was permitted to the inhabitants of Jerusalem and Judaea. The worship of Dionysus included the sacrifice of swine, and although the sacrifice was not normally eaten, the enforcement of this for the Jews should probably be interpreted as part of their further religious humiliation and not as Bickermann¹¹⁰ suggests as evidence of the abhorrence of peculiar Jewish customs and beliefs on the part of the extreme Hellenist party.

Conclusion

The political, economic, social and religious situation prior to the Maccabean Crisis was very unsatisfactory but there are no indications of widespread revolt. However when the High Priest Menelaus took office and carried to extremes the policy of Hellenisation which his predecessor Jason had instituted, with a view to economic gain, and actually committed sacrilege, then there was an uprising against him and indirectly against the Seleucid power which had appointed him. The rebellions of the people persuaded Menelaus and Antiochus that some action must be taken against them. Troops were stationed permanently in

the Akra and an Edict prohibiting the practise of the Jewish religion was promulgated. As suggested above, it is likely that there was a double motive behind the Edict:- it was directed towards the elimination of that element which caused the people to revolt and a means of showing the authority of Menelaus and Antiochus. This authority was further demonstrated by the way in which people were humiliated in the carrying out of the Edict.

After the promulgation of the Edict, those who disobeyed were punished by death.¹¹¹ Yet if one was to be faithful to the ancestral law, the law of the Jewish God, then one had to disobey the Edict, and if caught, pay the penalty of death. This created an acute crisis of faith. Why had God allowed the Edict to be promulgated? Why were those who were faithful to Him killed? This state of affairs seemed to contradict the Torah's main explanation for suffering, which was that it was retribution for wrongdoing.¹¹² Most of the Jewish literature produced in the century after the Edict is concerned with the problem of God's justice which shows how acute the crisis of faith was. The answers given seem to correspond to a particular political point of view: 1) Nationalistic 2) Theocentric:- political subjugation does not matter as long as there is freedom to practice the law and the Temple is ritually pure. 3) One which considers its own time as the end of the era of rule by the Gentile nations and the prelude to a new era when God and his people Israel will rule supreme. Some consideration will then be given to the question of whether there is any evidence that the people who formulated each answer link up with a known socio-economic religious group prior to the Crisis. Lastly literature from the Diaspora which refers to the Maccabean Crisis will be considered.

CHAPTER TWO

LITERATURE WHICH IS NATIONALISTIC IN ATTITUDE

This chapter deals with books which have a politically nationalistic outlook and two texts fall into this category - I Maccabees and The Book of Judith. For the sake of clarity each of these books will be considered separately. In the case of I Maccabees there is a complicating factor - its first seven chapters are paralleled by II Maccabees. It is therefore valid to contrast I Maccabees with II Maccabees to show what is unique in the former as this will highlight the stance from which it is written. For similar reasons I Maccabees must also be compared with the parallel account in Josephus's Antiquities and The Jewish War.

I MACCABEES1) The Date of I Maccabees

There are two statements in I Maccabees which suggest that it was written after the death of John Hyrcanus (134-103): The first - I Macc.16:23-24 - says that 'The rest of the story of John, his wars and the deeds of valour he performed, the walls he built and his exploits, are written in the annals of his high-priesthood from the time when he succeeded his father'; The second - I Macc.13:30 - refers to the monument which Simon, John's successor, built over the tombs of his father and brothers. These statements then, place the terminus a quo at 103 B.C.¹ The terminus ad quem may be fixed prior to 63 B.C.,² the date of Pompey's invasion of Palestine for if the book had been written after this date one would not expect to find a favourable attitude to the Romans such as is displayed in 8:17f. Such an attitude is in marked contrast to the hostility shown to the Greek Empire which was 'reducing Israel to slavery' (I Macc.8:18).

2) Comparison of I Maccabees with II Maccabees

The table below lists the contents of I Maccabees 1-7 and shows where it differs from II Maccabees. There are differences in events and in pericopae such as lamentations, exhortations, editorial narrative, prayers and songs of praise and these will be

analysed at the end of the table. Words and themes which constantly recur in I Maccabees, but not in II Maccabees, are underlined.

I Maccabees

II Maccabees

1:1-10 Alexander ('his pride knew no limits'), his generals, Antiochus Epiphanes - all wicked.

-

1:11-15 There appeared in Israel a group of renegade Jews who made a covenant with Gentiles:- built a sports stadium, removed marks of circumcision, repudiated holy covenant. Intermarried with Gentiles.

 No mention of intermarriage with Gentiles.

1:16-19 Antiochus made up his mind to be king of Egypt - victorious. N.B. Arrogance.

 If this corresponds to 4:21-22 then Antiochus went to Egypt because Philometor was hostile.

1:20-24 On his return from Egypt - 169B.C. Antiochus marched against Israel and Jerusalem. He plundered the Temple and gloated over what he had done.

 Possibly links with 5:5-16 after Jason incident³ - Antiochus desecrated the Temple. No mention of Antiochus gloating.

1:25-28 Poem about lamentation of Israel.

-

1:29-32 High Revenue official came to Israel. Was full of guile, attacked the people. He killed many Israelites. He plundered the city, pulled down houses etc.

 cf. 5:21-26, Appolonius attacked on the Sabbath.

I MaccabeesII Maccabees

1:33-36 City of David turned in-
to a citadel - garrisoned by for-
eigners and renegades:- 'a perpet-
ual menace to Israel.'

Cf. 5:21-26

1:37-40 Poem about the state of
Jerusalem.

1:41-50 Edict of prohibition of
ancestral religion - Edict univ-
ersal.

Edict not universal, only
against the Jews cf. 6:1-9.
Long description of the things
which the Jews were forced
to do.

1:51-53 Antiochus appointed super-
intendants over the people and
ordered pagan sacrifice to be made
in every town in Judaea. People
thronged to do his bidding and
'their wicked conduct through-
out the land drove Israel into
hiding in every possible place
of refuge.'

Judas and his friends fled
to the desert even before the
Edict. 5:27

1:54-58 Abomination of desolation
167B.C. People punished if found
keeping the Law. (Very general,
no great emphasis on it.)

Martyrdoms more personal in
II Maccabees cf. 6:10-11,6:
18-7:42.

2:1-28 Mattathias of Modin and the
incident there.

2:7-11 Mattathias's lamentation
over the crushing of his people.
Officers of the King attempt to
enforce apostasy. Mattathias said
'Though all the nations for-
sake their ancestral worship....

I Maccabees

yet I and my sons and brothers will follow the covenant of our fathers.' Mattathias then killed an apostate Jew who offered to make the pagan sacrifice and thus 'showed his fervent zeal for the law, just as Phinehas had done by killing Zimri, son of Salu.'

2:29-38 People flee to the wilds. Word reached the King's officers in Jerusalem, the City of David. Attacked on the Sabbath. The Israelites did nothing in reply, so were massacred.

Cf.6:11

2:39-41 Mattathias said, 'If we all do as our brothers have done, if we refuse to fight the Gentiles for our lives as well as for our laws and customs, then they will soon wipe us off the face of the earth.'

2:42-44 Mattathias and his friends joined by a group of Hasidaeans.

2:45-48 Mattathias and his friends swept through the country -pulled down pagan altars, forcibly circumcised baby boys. 'They hunted down their arrogant enemies and the cause prospered in their hands.'

 Cf. 8:5 but there Judas, rather than Mattathias is active. Emphasis there that it was God's doing - 'Maccabeus proved invincible to the Gentiles, for the Lord's anger had changed to mercy'

2:49-64 Mattathias is about to die and encourages his sons. Tells

I Maccabees

them how famous people in the past remained steadfast despite terrible trials and assures them that anyone who holds fast to Heaven shall never lack strength. All figures who are mentioned had an earthly reward apart from Elijah. Great glory is the reward for drawing one's strength from the law.

2:69-70 Mattathias dies and is buried in the family tomb.

3:1-9 Judas Maccabeus 'carried on the fight for Israel with zest.'

Judas was able to do this because 'the Lord's anger had changed to mercy.' cf. 8:5

3:3-7 Description of Judas in terms of a great warrior:-

'The cause of freedom prospered in his hands.' ... 'He turned wrath away from Israel.'

3:10-12 Apollonius brought a force 'to fight against Israel.'
 Apollonius was defeated.

3:13-24 Seron and his troops were reinforced by renegade Jews who 'marched up to help him take vengeance on Israel!' The forces of Judas were few and had little to eat. Judas encourages them by saying 'Victory does not depend on numbers; strength comes from Heaven alone.' Highlights the motive for

II Maccabees

I MaccabeesII Maccabees

fighting on the part of both sides. Insolence and lawlessness cause the enemy to plunder and to kill; The Israelites are fighting for their lives and for their religion. Judas victorious.

3:25-26 Judas and his brothers are feared - 'alarm spread to the Gentiles all around.'

 God's role is emphasised cf. 8:5

3:27-37 Antiochus prepared a powerful army but was short of money therefore he went to Persia on a plundering expedition. He left Lysias as viceroy and guardian of his son. Lysias had to 'break and destroy the strength of Israel.'

 The expedition of Antiochus to Persia is mentioned in 9:1-2 but Lysias did not become viceregent until after the death of Antiochus cf. 10:11

3:38-41 Lysias sent three of the King's friends with a large army to Israel. Merchants from the region of Emmaus were so confident that the army would be successful that they went to the camp prepared to buy Israelites for slaves.

 This seems to apply to Nicanor cf. 8:9f.

3:42-44 Judas and his brothers said to one another 'Let us restore the shattered fortunes of our nation and for the holy place.'

N.B. 'NATION' before 'HOLY PLACE'

3:45 Lamentation Jerusalem deserted...aliens and heathens lodged in her citadel.

I Maccabees

3:46-54 Judas and his compatriots assembled at Mizpah, put on sack-cloth and ashes and fasted. Sought the guidance from the scroll of the law which the Gentiles sought from the images of their gods. They brought priestly vestments, first fruits, tithes and Nazarites who had completed their vows. Plea to God to help them against the Gentiles who had gathered to destroy them. Sounded trumpets and a great shout went up.

3:55-3:60 Judas appointed leaders of the people: officers over thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens. He also ordered back to their homes those who were building houses, those who were newly-wed, those who were planting vineyards or those who were faint hearted. Judas encouraged his troops by saying 'Be ready...to fight these Gentiles who are massed against us to destroy us and our holy place. Better die fighting than look on while calamity overwhelms our people and the holy place. But it will be as heaven wills.'

N.B. 'PEOPLE' before 'HOLY PLACE'

II Maccabees

 Cf. 8:21 Judas divided his army into four and gave each of his brothers a division of 1,500 men. There is no mention of anyone being sent back home.

Cf. 8:16-21 The content of Judas' words of encouragement is quite different. His troops should fight, having before their eyes the crimes of the Gentiles against their Temple etc. The enemy rely upon their weapons and their own audacity whereas the Jews rely upon their God who is able to overthrow the whole world if necessary. Two examples are given of how God had overthrown the enemies of his people in the past. 'His words put them in good heart to die for their

I MaccabeesII Maccabees

laws and for their country.'
(8:21) N.B. LAWS first.

4:1-5 Georgias and his detachment came to attack Judas.

4:6-11 Judas encourages his men before the battle with Georgias. He reminds them how God had saved the people at the Red Sea. He tells them to cry to Heaven to favour their cause and to remember the Covenant made with their fathers.

8:15 Mentions covenants made with their ancestors.

4:12-22 Judas victorious.

4:23-25 Judas and his followers plundered the enemy camp and then sang songs of thanksgiving; 'for it is right, because his mercy endures forever.'

8:27 Praises to the Lord who had kept the first drops of his mercy to shed upon them that day.'

4:26-27 Report of escapees to Lysias. He was disappointed 'because Israel had not suffered the disaster he had hoped for.'

4:28-33 Attack of Lysias who was encamped with his forces at Bethsura. Prayer to God by Judas - 'Saviour of Israel, who didst break the attack of the giant by thy servant David..... humble their pride..'

4:34-35 Judas victorious again. Lysias departed to get mercenary forces.

I MaccabeesII Maccabees

4:36-40 Judas and his army went to Mount Zion. The Temple had been laid waste. They tore their garments and put ashes on their heads etc.

-

4:41-51 Cleansing of the Temple.
 'They took unhewn stones 'as the law commands...'

Cf. 10:1-8 No mention of
 'as the law commands.'

4:52-55 Sacrifice on the new altar
 'On the anniversary when the Gentiles had profaned it, on that very day, it was rededicated...' The people praised 'Heaven that their cause had prospered'

-

4:56-58 Celebration for eight days
 '.... and the disgrace brought on them by the Gentiles was removed.'

Cf. 10:1-8 Celebration.
 'The One who had so triumphantly achieved the purification of his own Temple.'

4:59 Celebration to be annual.

Cf. 10:8

4:60-61 Fortification of Mount Zion -
 'to prevent the Gentiles from coming and trampling it down as they had done before.'

-

5:1-2 The Gentiles were furious about the altar and the Temple and were 'determined to wipe out all those of the race of Jacob who lived among them.'

-

I Maccabees

5:3-8 Judas takes revenge on the descendants of Esau 'because they had hemmed Israel in', and on the Beanites who 'were continually ambushing the Israelites.' Crushed the force led by Timotheus.

5:9-13 Gentiles in Gilead gathered against the Israelites who sent a letter to Judas. 'The Gentiles round us have gathered to wipe us out.'

Jews in Tubias had been massacred.

5:14-15 Galilee was also hostile to the Jews living in the region. 'All heathen Galilee have mustered their forces to make an end of us.'

5:16-20 Simon appointed to go and rescue Jews in Galilee. Judas and Jonathan go to Gilead. Josephus and Azarias were left in Jerusalem and were told not to battle with the Gentiles.

5:21-23 Simon was successful in Galilee. He 'broke the resistance of the Gentiles.'

5:24-27 Judas and Jonathan went to Gilead. Nabateans told them, 'Your enemies are marshalling their forces to storm your fortresses tomorrow so as to capture them and destroy all the Jews in them in a single day.'

II Maccabees

Cf. 10:15-16 Idumeans received fugitives from Jerusalem.

Simon left in Jerusalem 10:19
N.B. Simon does not have such a heroic part. Josephus and Zaccheus left in Jerusalem.

Cf. 10:24-38, 12:10-31

5:28-34 Capture of Bozrah. Fort-
ress of Dathema. Battle - '...and
the army of Timotheus recognised that
it was Maccabeus and took to flight
before him.'

5:35-36 Judas took the other towns of
Gilead.

5:37-44 Gentiles rally to Timoth-
eus - Judas attacked and the
Gentiles fled and took refuge in
Carnaim. Carnaim was subdued.

Cf. II Macc. 10:24-38 Maccabeus
prayed while wearing sackcloth
and ashes. Emphasis on God's
role in the battle. Timotheus
took refuge in the fortress at
Gazara.

5:45-48 Judas escorts all Israel-
ites in Gilead to Judaea. The towns-
people of Ephron refused them right
of way.

N.B. Again Gentile Hostility.

5:49-53 Judas took the town then
went to Mount Zion and offered
burnt offerings, because they had
returned in safety without the loss
of a single man.

5:55-62 Josephus and Azarias batt-
led against the Gentiles and failed
because 'they were not...of that
family to whom it was granted to
bring deliverance to Israel'

Cf. 10:18-23 Simon's men were
bribed and let some of those in
towers escape.

5:63-64 The above is reinforced
by 'Judas and his brothers won a
great reputation in all Israel and
among the Gentiles, wherever their
name was heard, and crowds flocked

to acclaim them.'

5:65-68 Judas made war on the descendants of Esau, attacked Hebron and Philistine territory.

'On that day several priests, who had ill-advisedly gone into action wishing to distinguish themselves fell in battle.'

Judas destroyed the altars, burnt the images of the gods in Azotus.

6:1-4 Antiochus covets the wealth of Elymais in Persia. The citizens defeat him.

Cf. 9:1-2 The city is called Persepolis.

6:5-7 Antiochus hears of the defeat of Lysias in Judaea.

Cf. 9:3f. Antiochus heard what had happened to the forces of Nicanor and Timotheus.

6:8-13 Antiochus falls ill with grief because of the miscarriage of his plans. He knows that the reason for his death is his plunder of the Jerusalem Temple and his attempted annihilation of the inhabitants of Jerusalem.

Cf. 9:4-29 The role of God in the illness of Antiochus is greatly emphasised.

N.B. FALLEN PRIDE.

6:14-16 Philip is appointed as regent in 163B.C.

9:29 Philip was afraid of Antiochus's son so he went over to Ptolemy Philometor in Egypt. 10:11 Lysias is appointed as regent.

6:17 Lysias usurps Philip's position.

6:18-20 The garrison of the citadel harrassed the Israelites and gave support to the Gentiles.

6:21-27 Renegade Israelites complain to the King that they have been robbed and some of their number killed by their fellow countrymen.

6:28-31 The King assembled a large force plus elephants and laid siege to Bethsura.

Cf. 11:1f. Lysias undertakes the siege. Miraculous portents appear in the sky.

6:32-41 Battle scene prepared.

6:42-46 Judas and his followers killed 600 of the king's men. Eleazer died when the elephant he killed fell on top of him. 'So he gave his life to save his people and win everlasting renown for himself.'

6:47-50 Judas was forced to fall back as the 'King put Judas and Mount Zion into a state of siege.' King occupied Bethsura.

6:51-54 The King gained victory at the Temple. This happened because the defenders had no food in store because it was a sabbatical year.

6:55-59 Lysias, threatened by

the return of Philip from Persia, decided that he could no longer afford to continue the siege in Judaea so intended to guarantee the Jews the right to follow their laws and customs 'for it is our abolition of these very customs and laws that roused their resentment, and produced all these consequences.'

Cf. 11:13f. 'Lysias was no fool and as he took stock of the defeat he had suffered he realised that the Hebrews were invincible, because the mighty God fought on their side.

 6:60-63 But the King, who had approved of Lysias's intention went back on his sworn oath when he saw how strongly Mount Zion was fortified.

He ordered the surrounding wall to be demolished.

 7:1-4 161B.C. Demetrius, son of Seleucus, arrived on the coast. His army seized Antiochus V and Lysias and put them to death.

Cf. 14:1-2

 7:5-9 Godless renegades from Israel, led by Alcimus (who wanted to be High Priest) asked for help from Demetrius against Judas and his brothers. Demetrius sent Bacchides.

14:3f Alcimus had formerly been High Priest.

14:6 Judas is identified with the Hasidaeans.

Nicanor is sent to Israel.

 7:10-11 Bacchides sent envoys to Judas to offer friendship. Judas refused this because he suspected treachery in view of the large force which Bacchides had brought with him.

7:12-17 The Hasidaeans made friendly overtures to Bacchides because Alcimus was of the family of Aaron and so they thought he would deal with them justly. Alcimus appeared friendly at first but then he had sixty Hasidaeans arrested and put to death.

7:18-20 Bacchides put others to death, then departed leaving Alcimus in charge.

7:21-25 All trouble makers rallied to Alcimus. They gained control over Judaea 'and did terrible damage in Israel!' 'When Judas saw all the mischief which Alcimus and his followers had brought upon the Israelites, far worse than anything the Gentiles had done...' Judas punished the deserters,

7:26-32 The King sent Nicanor with a false offer of friendship to Judas. Judas realised that the offer was false and refused to meet Nicanor again. There was a battle between the two forces and about 500 of Nicanor's men were killed. The rest escaped to the City of David.

7:33-38 Nicanor went to Mount Zion. He threatened to burn down the Temple if Judas and his army did not surrender to him.

14:14 The Gentile population of Judaea supported Nicanor.

14:8f. Nicanor realised how brave Judas and his followers were so he made an offer of genuine friendship. Alcimus interfered by telling the King that Nicanor's policy was detrimental to the interests of the Empire.
No battle yet.

14:31f. Elaborates what Nicanor will do to the Jerusalem Temple. Prayer to God to keep the Temple free from defilement.

Priests prayed to God to take vengeance upon Nicanor's blasphemy.

Martyrdom of Razis.

 7:39-42 Judas also prayed for god to take vengeance upon Nicanor. He talks of a King whose followers blasphemed and 185,000 were struck down. Plea for God to do the same thing now so that everyone would know that Nicanor had reviled the Holy Place.

 15:6-16 Judas is confident that he would get help from God because of help in the past. Onias and Jeremiah appeared in a dream. Also talks of 185,000 of Sennacherib's men who were struck down.

 7:43-50 Nicanor fell in battle. Annual celebration.

 Cf. 15:28-37

EVENTS WHICH ARE INCLUDED IN I MACCABEES BUT NOT IN II MACCABEES

Events which are included in I Maccabees but not in II Maccabees fall into several categories. There are those which highlight the hostility of the Gentiles (and often the word 'Gentiles' or the name of a Gentile nation is put in direct opposition to the word 'Israel' or 'Israelites'); those which show the treachery of the renegade Jews; those which glorify the Maccabees or show the special nature of their election; and those which describe or advocate active resistance to the enemy.

Events which highlight the hostility of the Gentiles.

At the very beginning of I Maccabees it is stressed that Alexander and his successors were arrogant and brought misery to the peoples who were subject to them. Alexander's 'pride knew no bounds'(1:4), his generals and their descendants 'brought untold miseries upon the world'(1:9). Antiochus Epiphanes a 'scion of this stock' is called a 'wicked man' (1:10). The officials sent by the King are also opposed to 'Israel': Apollonius was sent 'to fight against Israel' (3:10), Seron came 'reinforced by a strong contingent of renegade Jews who marched up to help him take vengeance on Israel'. (3:15), the garrison of the Akra 'were confining the Israelites to

the neighbourhood of the Temple, and giving continual support to the Gentiles by their harrassing tactics.' (6:18)

The surrounding nations were also opposed to Israel. The Beanites 'were continually ambushing the Israelites'(5:4). 'The Gentiles in Gilead gathered against the Israelites' (5:9). The Jews in Galilee wrote to Judas and his brothers saying 'all heathen Galilee have mustered their forces to make an end of us.' (5:15) The townspeople of Ephron refused to allow the Israelites to pass through their town on their way to Judaea (5:48). The Nabataeans tell Judas and Jonathan 'Your enemies are marshalling their forces to storm your fortresses tomorrow so as to capture them and destroy all the Jews in them in a single day' (5:27).

Thus, as with the representatives of Antiochus, the individual nations in almost every case are opposed to 'Israel' rather than to the 'Jews'. The exceptions occur in the actual reported speech of the Nabataeans (5:27) and in the letter from the Jews in Gilead who talk about their 'fellow Jews in the region of Tubias' (5:13). The narrative of the author of I Maccabees usually talks of 'Israel' or 'Israelites', not 'Jews'.

Events which highlight the role of the Renegade Jews.

'Seron was reinforced by a strong contingent of renegade Jews who marched up to help him take vengeance on Israel'. In 6:21-27 renegade Israelites complain to the King about the measures which Judas had taken and incited the King to send an army to Judaea. 7:21-25 is a grave indictment of renegade Jews. All the trouble makers rallied to Alcimus and gained control over Judaea. They 'did terrible damage in Israel' (7:22), 'far worse than anything the Gentiles had done'(7:23)

Events which glorify the Maccabees.

Mattathias of Modin is credited with striking the first blow against apostasy and rallying others who felt the same way (2:15-28).⁴ Simon 'broke the resistance of the Gentiles in Galilee' (5:21) whereas in II Maccabees he is assigned a less noble role at that time. He remained in Jerusalem and some of his men took bribes from those in the towers to allow them to

slip through their lines (II Macc.10:19-20). Judas was also extremely successful in combatting the Gentiles and in I Maccabees 5:54 it is said of him that he and his men went up to Mount Zion to offer burnt offerings 'because they had returned in safety without the loss of a single man'. In contrast to this it is said in the following paragraph that 'the Israelites suffered a heavy defeat, because their commanders, thinking to play the hero themselves, had not obeyed Judas and his brothers. They were not, however of that family to whom it was granted to bring deliverance to Israel' (5:61-62). Similarly in 5:67 'several priests, who had ill-advisedly gone into action wishing to distinguish themselves, fell in battle.'

Events concerning Mount Zion

There are three events concerning Mount Zion, one of which has already been mentioned.⁵ This is where Judas offered burnt offerings on Mount Zion because they had returned without the loss of a single man (I Macc.5:54). Another example is given in 4:60-61 where Zion is fortified to prevent the Gentiles from trampling it down again. In 4:36-40 Judas and his army went to Mount Zion and when they found that the Temple had been laid waste they tore their garments and heaped ashes upon themselves.

Events which encourage active resistance.

The action of Mattathias in killing the apostate Jew who was willing to sacrifice on a pagan altar (2:24) belongs to this category. This was the first blow which was struck against the tyranny of those who were forcing the Jews to go against the tenets of their religion. The determination to continue this struggle was encouraged by what happened to those Jews who refused to fight for their lives because it was the Sabbath day and as a consequence were massacred (2:29-38). Not only did the Maccabees and their friends fight their Syrian overlords, they also persuaded their fellow countrymen to be faithful to their ancestral religion, forcibly if necessary. In 2:45-48 it is stated that Mattathias and his friends went through the country pulling down pagan altars and forcibly circumcising those who weren't circumcised and it is said that 'the cause prospered in their hands: they thus saved

the law from the Gentiles and their kings and broke the power of the tyrant'. An event such as the death of the sixty hasidim who had made friendly overtures to Alcimus, the High Priest of the line of Aaron, encouraged Judas to go through Judaea and punish deserters (7:24). Active measures were also taken to prevent the Gentiles from being destructive in Israel as is shown by the statement that Judas and his brothers 'encircled Mount Zion with high walls and strong towers to prevent the Gentiles from coming and trampling it down as they had done before.' (4:60)

It appears then that events which are recorded in I Maccabees but not in II Maccabees show a preoccupation with the hostility of the Gentiles towards Israel; with the even more infamous role of the Renegade Jews; with the special election of Mattathias and his sons; with Mount Zion and with the need for active resistance to the enemy.

LAMENTS WHICH APPEAR IN I MACCABEES BUT NOT IN II MACCABEES

1:25-28	Lamentation over Israel
1:37-40	Lamentation over Jerusalem
2:7-11	Lamentation over the nation
3:45	Lamentation over Jerusalem and Jacob

All these lamentations refer to the present state of Jerusalem and Judaea and all make allusion, or at least show a great similarity, to laments in the Old Testament. 1:27 is reminiscent of Jeremiah 7:34 and 16:9 where God silences all joy including that of bride and groom. The shedding of innocent blood (1:37) is an Old Testament phrase (cf. Ps.106:38), and this particular verse, taken as a whole, is very similar to Ps.79:1-3 where the heathen have defiled the Temple, laid Jerusalem in ruins and spilt blood around the Holy City like wine. The complaint in 1:38 that Jerusalem had become the abode of aliens is reminiscent of Lamentations 5:2. Verse 39 'her feasts were turned to mourning' brings to mind Amos 8:10 'I will turn your pilgrim feasts into mourning and all your songs into lamentations.'

Mattathias's lament over Judaea and Jerusalem begins with the

bitter question, 'Oh! why was I born to see this? (2:7). Job cursed the day of his birth in 3:3 and in 3:11 asked the question 'Why was I not still-born, why did I not die when I came out of the womb?' Jeremiah also had cause to regret the day of his birth saying 'Alas, alas, my mother, that you ever gave me birth!' (15:10). Mattathias also recalls Israel's past history when he asks 'Is there a nation that has not usurped her sovereignty...?' In verse 11 Jerusalem is pictured as a woman who 'has been stripped of all her adornment' in a similar way to the picture painted of her in Lamentations.

* In I Macc. 3:45 Jerusalem lies deserted, and 'flute and harp were dumb'. It is known from Isaiah 24:8 that these instruments were not used during times of mourning.

There is no doubt then that these laments see the present situation in a direct line with Israel's past history and literature. Another feature which occurs in all these laments is the non-resistance of the people of Israel. In the first lament (1:25-28) everyone is languishing and lamenting their fate; in the second one (1:37-40) 'The citizens of Jerusalem fled', Jerusalem's 'children deserted her' (1:38); in the third Mattathias complains bitterly that the people 'sat idly by when it (the holy city) was surrendered' (2:7); In the fourth 'Jerusalem lay deserted like a wilderness' (3:45).

EXHORTATIONS WHICH OCCUR IN I MACCABEES BUT NOT IN II MACCABEES

- 2:39-41 Mattathias and his friends encourage one another to active resistance.
- 2:49-64 Mattathias encourages his sons to hold fast to the law. He cites past figures in Israel's history who have done this.
- 2:65-68 Mattathias encourages his sons to active resistance.
- 3:18-22 Judas encourages his forces before battle.
- 3:58-60 Judas and his brothers exhort each other to active resistance.

Exhortations to active resistance

After a group of Jews had been massacred on the Sabbath day, preferring to die rather than to profane the sanctity of the

day (2:29-38), Mattathias decided that if it was necessary they would fight on the Sabbath. In support of that decision they said, 'If we all do as our brothers have done, if we refuse to fight the Gentiles for our lives as well as for our laws and customs, then they will soon wipe us off the face of the earth' (2:41). On his death bed Mattathias counselled his sons saying, 'avenge your peoples' wrongs. Repay the Gentiles in their own coin' (2:67-68). Judas had to encourage his forces in the face of Seon's army which was immeasurably larger. He says that heaven will help them because they are fighting for 'their lives and their religion', whereas 'their enemies come filled with insolence and lawlessness to plunder and to kill...' (3:18-22). Judas also encouraged his men before they engaged in battle with Georgias. His words to them were 'Prepare for action and show yourselves men. Be ready at dawn to fight those Gentiles who are massed against us to destroy us and our holy place. But it will be as heaven wills' (3:58-60). In three of these examples the reasons given for the need for active resistance are so that they might save their lives as well as their laws and customs (cf. 2:40. 3:21 has 'religion' instead of 'laws and customs'; 3:58 expresses a need to save 'the holy place' in place of 'laws and customs'). The other exhortation to active resistance, that of Mattathias to his sons in 2:65-68 is closely allied to a need to preserve the law. The whole preceding paragraph deals with the importance of holding fast to the law.

Exhortation to hold fast to the law.

Mattathias encourages his sons to hold fast to the law despite the fact that 'arrogance now stands secure' (2:49). He gives several examples of famous figures in the past who have maintained their loyalty to God in the face of all adversity. The trust of these people was vindicated by God-e.g. 'Joseph kept the commandments, hard pressed though he was, and became lord of Egypt' (2:53); 'Joshua kept the law, and became a judge in Israel' (2:55). Conversely those that are wicked will find that, although they might be 'high in honour' at the present time, their 'schemes will come to nothing' (2:63).

All exhortations then encourage active resistance to the Gentiles because of the need to preserve one's life and the law.

EDITORIAL COMMENT WHICH IS NOT INCLUDED IN II MACCABEES.

In some instances editorial comments contain extra details about incidents which are also reported in II Maccabees, although the majority relate to incidents which do not occur in that book.

The Arrogance of the Gentiles

The author of I Maccabees attributes the cause of the war with Egypt to the fact that 'Antiochus made up his mind to become King of Egypt and so to rule over both kingdoms' (1:16). This sortie to Egypt may correspond to II Maccabees 4:21-22⁶ but II Maccabees gives the hostility of King Philometor as the reason for the war. It is impossible to say which version is correct, but all that need be noticed here is that in I Maccabees the arrogance of Antiochus is the motivating factor in hostilities. His arrogance is underlined again in the next paragraph where Antiochus marches against Israel and Jerusalem - 'In his arrogance he entered the Temple' (2:21).

Both I and II Maccabees⁷ relate the details of Nicanor's death in that his head and his right hand were cut off. However only the author of I Maccabees adds a further description of this right hand saying 'that right hand which he had stretched forth so arrogantly' (I Macc.7:47).

The hostility of the Gentiles

The hostility of the Gentiles is expressed very strongly after the rededication of the Temple. 'They were furious, and determined to wipe out all of those of the race of Jacob who lived among them' (5:2).

The glorification of the Maccabees.

The author of I Maccabees points out that 'Judas and his brothers won a great reputation in all Israel and among the Gentiles, wherever their fame was heard, and crowds flocked to acclaim them' (5:63-64).

EXTRA DETAILS TO EVENTS WHICH ARE ALSO INCLUDED IN II MACCABEESRelating to the Law

1:11-15 says that renegade Jews made a covenant with the Gentiles and although this is described in much greater detail in II Maccabees⁸, one detail which is included in I Maccabees is omitted there, namely that the renegades 'intermarried with Gentiles'. This was something which had been strictly forbidden by Ezra.⁹

The narrative of the cleansing of the Temple in 4:41-51 emphasises that what was done was in accordance with the law. Judas selected 'priests without blemish, devoted to the law.' (4:42). These priests 'took unhewn stones as the law commands' (4:47). There is no mention of the law in the corresponding passage in II Maccabees.¹⁰ 'Sacrifice was offered as the law commands' (I Macc.4:53) on the twenty fifth day of Kislev. Once again II Maccabees says nothing about this being in accordance with the law.¹¹

The accounts of the decision of the Seleucid Empire to allow the Jews to live in accordance with their own law are different in I and II Maccabees.¹² I Maccabees says that this decision was taken by the Seleucids because 'it was our abolition of these very customs and laws that roused their resentment, and produced all these consequences' (6:59).

The glorification of Judas Maccabeus.

Both I and II Maccabees say that Judas defeated Timotheus in battle¹³ but whereas II Maccabees 10:29-30 emphasises the divine rule in this defeat I Maccabees says that when 'the army of Timotheus recognised that it was Maccabeus...(they) took to flight before him' (I Macc.5:34).

Active Resistance.

The incident of Eleazer Avaran killing the elephant which wore royal armour because he thought that it carried the king is recorded in II Maccabees 13:15 as well as in I Maccabees 6:43-46. His death beneath the elephant is not commented upon in II Maccabees but in I Maccabees it is said 'so he gave his life to save his people and win everlasting renown for himself.' (6:44).

PRAYERS WHICH ARE IN I MACCABEES BUT NOT IN II MACCABEES

Both I and II Maccabees record the battle between Lysias and Judas and his followers but only I Maccabees records the prayer of Judas before the battle (4:28-35). II Maccabees contents itself with saying that Judas and all his men 'prayed the Lord to send a good angel to deliver Israel' (11:6). Judas's prayer in I Maccabees praises God for his action on behalf of Israel in the past and asked him to do the same at this particular time. The event in Israel's past which he recalls is that of the defeat of the Philistines by Jonathan and David.

SONGS OF PRAISE WHICH ARE IN I MACCABEES BUT NOT IN II MACCABEES

The only one which occurs is that of Judas and his deeds in I Maccabees 3:3f. This song represents Judas as extremely active in fighting for his people and their freedom; 'the lawless cowered in fear of him; all evil doers were confounded. The cause of freedom prospered in his hands;' (3:6). This song then glorifies one of the Maccabees and emphasises his active resistance to the enemy.

Summary of the differences between I and II Maccabees.

It can be seen that the various categories above of the differences between I and II Maccabees contain material directed towards similar ends. The hostility of the Gentiles is emphasised both in the category of events and that of editorial comment, and this is reinforced in the latter by reference to their arrogance. The word 'Gentiles' is frequently in direct opposition to 'Israel' or the 'Israelites' and on occasion this opposition is expressed in the wish of the former group to totally destroy the latter. The treachery of the Renegade Jews is linked to the hostility of the Gentiles.

One of the most persistent themes is the need for active resistance which appears in five of the above categories and which is linked once with active compulsion to keeping the law (2:46). A theme which is closely coupled to that of active resistance is the glorification of the Maccabees.

Concern is shown for 'Mount Zion' (Events), with the 'Law', and with linking present events to past ones.

It should be borne in mind that the detailed list given above of the differences between I and II Maccabees extends in I Maccabees only as far as the end of chapter 7, i.e. only as far as it is paralleled by II Maccabees. Thus chapters 8-16 of I Maccabees have not so far been considered. It is appropriate at this juncture to look at these chapters in order to see whether they continue the same themes as chapters 1-7.

The hostility of the Gentiles.

There are many passages in chapters 8-16 which deal with the hostility of the Gentiles towards Israel.¹⁴ The hostility has the same character as that which appears in chapters 1-7. The Gentiles are in direct opposition to 'Israel',¹⁵ and on one occasion it is stated that the surrounding Gentiles were bent on destroying Israel 'root and branch' (12:43). Even the Romans are represented as questioning the oppression of the Jews by the Seleucids (8:31).

The Hostility of the Renegade Jews.

Renegade Jews who do not like Maccabean leadership appear to lie low unless the Maccabees are weak in which case they try to wrest power away from them (9:23) or unless the Maccabees are being so successful that they fear their complete control over the country. There are several examples of the latter type:- When Judaea had been at peace for two years the renegades are represented as putting their heads together and saying 'Jonathan and his people are living in peace and security. Let us bring Bacchides here; he will capture them all in a single night' (9:58). Again when Jonathan had won the favour of the Seleucid and Ptolemaic kings, the renegades did their best to reverse this situation (10:61, 11:25).

The need for active resistance to the Gentiles

Once again it was necessary to fight on the Sabbath (9:43-50). Bacchides had Jonathan and his men hemmed in and then there was no possibility of escape until battle had been enjoined. Jonathan told his men 'Now is the time to fight for our lives.' (9:44). In 9:38-42 vengeance was wrought upon the Jambrites who



had kidnapped John and this really amounts to active aggression in response to a past wrong rather than active resistance.

Glorification of the Maccabees

The unique character of the Maccabees is further emphasised in Chapters 8-16. It appears that no one but a Maccabee could successfully lead Israel against her enemies and for this reason the people begged Jonathan to take over the position which Judas, described as the 'Saviour of Israel' (8:21), had held before his death (9:29). Similarly the people of Israel were willing to follow Simon after Jonathan's demise (13:9). The enemy also seemed to recognise the invincibility of the Maccabees, they certainly were alarmed when they heard that Jonathan and his men were ready for battle (12:28). At times they also came to the realisation that it was preferable to have a Maccabee on their side than fighting against them, as during the dispute between King Alexander and King Demetrius when both were anxious to enrol Jonathan as a friend and ally (10:15-45).

The Maccabees were not only successful in fighting Israel's enemies, but were apparently also able to give the country peace and prosperity.¹⁶ Simon was particularly outstanding in this respect for 'as long as Simon lived, Judaea was at peace. He promoted his people's welfare, and they lived happily all through the glorious days of his reign' (14:4). The picture given of life in Judaea in Simon's reign is almost that of a golden age, the enemy had vanished, food was plentiful, people were able to lead a leisurely life.¹⁷ Simon looked after the poor and 'paid close attention to the law.' (14:14). The passage under discussion here contains many allusions to past history. The Book of Judges is brought to mind by verse 4 'As long as Simon lived Judaea was at peace'. It is stated in Judges 2:18 'Whenever the Lord set up a Judge over them, he was with the Judge, and kept them safe from their enemies as long as he lived.' Thus the introductory phrase to the passage infers that Simon was like a Judge. Verse 6 is reminiscent of Exodus 34:24 where God extended Israel's territory after he had driven out her enemies. The fruitfulness of the land described in verse 8 is a constant

Old Testament theme¹⁸, and one of the passages which deals with this, Zechariah 8:12, mentions that the old men were able to sit peacefully in the streets, as does verse 9 of the present passage. Verse 12 shows great similarity to I Kings 4:25 where throughout the reign of Solomon, 'Judah and Israel continued at peace, everyman under his vine and fig tree from Dan to Beersheba.' This allusion to Solomon is particularly interesting in view of I Macc. 14:15 where it is said of Simon that 'He gave new splendour to the Temple and furnished it with a wealth of sacred vessels.' Solomon of course built the first temple and this was during a period of peace (I Kings 5:4-5). Verse 14 shows that Simon 'gave his protection to the poor' and this was in accordance with the law of Deuteronomy.¹⁹

The people of Israel showed their approval of Simon and his brothers and father by erecting a monument to them on Mount Zion (I Macc 14:25f.). The Romans and Spartans too, showed their pleasure and approval of Simon as successor to his brother by renewing their treaties of alliance with Israel (I Macc.14:16-23).

When Simon asks his two sons to take his place as he himself is unable to go into battle due to old age, he reminds them of what he and his brothers had done. 'My brothers and I and my father's family have fought Israel's battles from our youth until this day, and many a time we have been successful in rescuing Israel' (16:2).

There are many times throughout chapters 8-16 it is emphasised that the Maccabees, often described in terms of great figures in Israel's past, have been successful in battle and peace, that they have the confidence of the people, the respect of foreign powers and inspire their enemies with fear. Fittingly the book ends by mentioning Simon's son, John, and his exploits.

Mount Zion

Mount Zion is mentioned in 10:11 in connection with fortification as it was in 4:60-61. This specific mention of Mount Zion shows its importance to the Maccabees as does its continued fortification. The latter is another facet of active resistance to the enemy. Mount Zion is mentioned again in 14:27 where it is stated that

the people erected a monument on Mount Zion to show their gratitude to Simon and his sons (14:25f.) This again shows a connection between the Maccabees and Mount Zion.

Law

The law is mentioned several times in chapters 8-16. As in chapters 1-7 two of these references show that active resistance arose from the need to preserve the law (13:3) and that the law or the holy books were a much needed support to those who were engaged in this struggle (12:9). A third time that the law is mentioned is in 13:48 where Simon had cleansed the town of Gazara and settled men there who would keep the law. This active promotion of the law by Simon concurs with what is said of him in 14:14 'He paid close attention to the law and rid the country of lawless and wicked men.' Jonathan, too, took pains to root 'the godless out of Israel' (9:73). It was found in Chapters 1-7 that Mattathias and Judas portrayed similar characteristics in that they removed practices against the law²⁰ and Mattathias, at least was concerned with promoting adherence to the law even if this had to be done by force.²¹

The present linked to the past.

Both Jonathan and Simon appear to be cast into the role of Judges. It is said that after the death of Judas, 'It was a time of great affliction for Israel' (9:27). This often happened after the death of a Judge until a new one was established.²² The people begged Jonathan to take over from Judas (9:30). When Jonathan had successfully concluded the war against Bacchides he 'took up residence in Michmash and began to govern the people, rooting the godless out of Israel! (9:73). The picture of Jonathan is that of a Judge who has successfully completed his campaigns against the enemy and has the respect of his people.²³ The greek word κρίνειν here translated 'to govern' literally means 'to judge'. Michmash was also a famous place in Israel's history. Another Jonathan, son of Saul, Israel's first king, drove back the Philistines from there and this episode may well have been in the mind of the author of I Maccabees. Simon, Jonathan's brother

is also characterised in terms of a judge, as has been shown above.²⁴

The themes then which are exclusive to I Maccabees as against II Maccabees are continued in the second section for which no parallel is available in II Maccabees.

VOCABULARY USED IN I MACCABEES WHICH IS NOT USED IN II MACCABEES, OR WHICH IS USED IN A DIFFERENT CONTEXT IN II MACCABEES.

When 'nation' or 'people' are mentioned in juxtaposition with 'law' or 'temple' in I Maccabees it is quite noticeable that the former precedes the latter. This begins with the appearance of the Maccabees. Mattathias laments the state of things in Israel and asks bitterly, 'Why was I born to see this, the crushing of my people, the ruin of the holy city?' (2:7). Only after he has asked this does he lament the state of the Temple. When Judas and his brothers were encouraging each other to fight against the enemy they said to one another 'Let us restore the shattered fortunes of our nation; let us fight for our nation and for the holy place.' (3:43) Once again the holy place is mentioned after the 'nation'. In the face of Trypho's invasion force Simon rallied the people and proposed himself as their leader in the hour of their need saying, 'I will take up the cause of my nation and the holy place'. So once again 'nation' takes precedence over 'temple'.

There is one word which constantly recurs throughout I Maccabees and it is particularly noticeable because of its rare use in II Maccabees. The word is 'Israel' or the derivative adjective 'Israelites'.²⁵ The adjective 'Jewish' to describe the people on whose behalf the Maccabees were fighting, is used only in commerce with foreign powers.²⁶ When the author of I Maccabees is narrating his tale and commenting upon events which concern the people fighting for their lives and their temple he usually describes them as 'Israelites'.²⁷ On occasion, however, he describes the people of Israel by the collective term 'Israel'. In these cases it is obvious that the people are meant and not the country; e.g. 1:53 states, 'Their wicked conduct throughout the land drove Israel into hiding in every possible place of

refuge'. 2:70 says that when Mattathias died, 'All Israel raised a loud lament for him'. Again it must have been the people of Israel who did this. It must be questioned whether there is any meaning in this use of the word 'Israel' in place of the adjective 'Israelites' or whether it is simply bad grammatical usage. 4:8-11 may give an answer to this and in order to elucidate this fully it is necessary to reproduce the whole text of this paragraph.

Judas said to his men: 'Do not be afraid of their great numbers or panic when they charge. Remember how our fathers were saved at the Red Sea, when Pharaoh and his army were pursuing them. Let us cry to heaven to favour our cause, to remember the covenant made with our fathers and to crush this army before us today. Then all the Gentiles will know that there is one who saves and liberates Israel.'

'Israel' here is more than the country it is the body of people who are not Gentiles. They are the descendants of those with whom God made a covenant, of those people whom God saved at the Red Sea. This accords with what was discovered above²⁸, namely that when the hostility of the Gentiles was mentioned, 'Israel' was found in direct opposition to the 'Gentiles', i.e. to a group of people. There are other times when the author of I Maccabees uses the word 'Israel' to indicate the country but again it is sometimes questionable whether this is the true meaning of the word. 1:11 may be taken as an example of this: 'At that time there appeared in Israel a group of renegade Jews who incited the people'. Now the word 'Jews' is the adjective used to describe the people of Judaea not the people of Israel, so 'Israel' could again be being used to indicate a community of people. This may well be supported by another example. 'Against these Lysias was to send a force, and break and destroy the strength of Israel and those who were left in Jerusalem, to blot out all memory of them from the place.' (3:35). Here 'Israel' is placed next to the phrase 'those who were left in Jerusalem' and so it is natural to assume that what is intended by 'Israel' is 'the people' or 'the community' of Israel.²⁹

The above analysis of vocabulary which appears repeatedly in I Maccabees but not in II Maccabees ends the comparison of the

former book with the latter. Before turning to a consideration of how far the distinctive features of I Maccabees contribute to any particular political or religious stance or to theodicy, the differences between I Maccabees and the account of the same period in Josephus's Antiquities and The Jewish War must be considered.³⁰

A COMPARISON OF I MACCABEES WITH JOSEPHUS'S ANTIQUITIES.

A comparison of I Maccabees with Josephus's Antiquities shows that there is very little difference between the two accounts. It is generally agreed amongst scholars that Josephus used I Maccabees in his account of the Maccabean Crisis and the struggle for independence, although he does at times supplement I Maccabees with a small amount of material from Greek sources.³¹

An analysis of the variations between I Maccabees and Josephus's Antiquities reveals the intentions and biases of Josephus³² but adds nothing to a consideration of the motives behind the writing of I Maccabees as Antiquities was written at a later date.³³

A COMPARISON OF I MACCABEES WITH JOSEPHUS'S 'THE JEWISH WAR'.

A comparison of these two works shows that certain statements in The Jewish War cannot be reconciled with those in I Maccabees.³⁴ However Josephus wrote this work before Antiquities in which he corrected errors made in The Jewish War. As stated above Antiquities follows I Maccabees closely, thus deviations in The Jewish War were made in error or were deliberate and directed towards any ends which Josephus might have had in writing the work.³⁵ Thus although differences between I Maccabees and The Jewish War may be considerable, they reflect upon Josephus's purpose in writing the latter work, not upon the author's intention in writing I Maccabees.

I MACCABEES ADVOCATES POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE.

All the material which points to an advocacy of political independence has emerged from the comparison of I Maccabees to II Maccabees. Time and time again the material appeared in the various types of literary units which were analysed and so its importance must

not be underestimated. It is the intention of this section to show the various ways in which independence is advocated and indeed is shown to be the only possible way of preserving the nation and its religion.

Advocacy of Active Resistance.

The need for active resistance was impressed upon Mattathias and his followers early on in the struggle against Antiochus and his forces. A group of Israelites refused to defend themselves because it was the Sabbath day and were consequently killed in cold blood by the Syrians, because they had continued to follow their ancestral law (2:29-38). Mattathias and his followers realised the necessity of fighting for their lives as well as for their 'laws and customs' (2:40), the implication being that their lives were primary for if they were dead the law also would perish. Similarly it was seen above that 'nation' frequently took precedence over 'temple'.³⁶

Another example of the need to fight on the Sabbath day is given in the second half of the book after the Temple had been rededicated and freedom of religion re-established. Jonathan and his men were completely hemmed in by the army of Bacchides and so Jonathan said, 'Now is the time to fight for our lives' (9:44).

The Folly of Trusting Gentiles or Apostate Jews is Emphasised

Many instances are given of where Gentiles proved that they were not to be trusted. There are four examples of Gentiles going back on their word³⁷ and three offers of friendship which proved to be false.³⁸ Fortunately in some of these cases the Maccabee who was involved recognised the promises or offers of friendship for what they were and ignored them.³⁹ The worst example of treachery given is that of the High Priest Alcimus who betrayed the sixty Hasidaeans who had made friendly overtures to him. These Hasidaeans had been prepared to make peace despite the fact that Alcimus was backed by Syrian troops because Alcimus was of the line of Aaron (7:14). Alcimus had these men put to death (7:16) after he had promised that they would come to no harm (7:15). All these instances of treachery showed that the Syrians were not to be trusted and therefore active resistance

to them was the only sensible course of action.

The Gentiles were intent on completely destroying the Jewish People.

Several times it is stated that the Gentiles were intent on wiping out the Jews. Mattathias and his friends realised that the Gentiles would soon wipe them off the face of the earth if they did not fight for their lives (2:40). Antiochus sent Lysias to Judaea 'to break and destroy the strength of Israel and those who were left in Jerusalem, to blot out all memory of them from the place' (3:35). Chapter 5 which deals with attacks of surrounding Gentile nations on their Jewish population, is prefaced by an introduction which says that these Gentiles were furious about the rededication of the Temple 'and determined to wipe out all those of the race of Jacob who lived among them. Thus began the work of massacre and extermination among the people.' (5:2). This preface is strengthened by individual statements throughout chapter 5 of the aim of these Gentiles.⁴⁰

This theme is taken up again in Chapter 12 after the death of Jonathan when Israel was without a strong leader. 'The surrounding Gentiles were now bent on destroying them root and branch, saying to themselves, 'The Jews have no leader or champion, so now is the time to attack, and we shall blot out all memory of them among men.'" (12:53). This inspired Simon to take up the leadership of his people for as he said to them. 'all the Gentiles in their hatred have gathered to destroy us.' (13:6).

The attitude of the Gentiles towards the Jews was more than that of hostility, it was a ruthless determination to exterminate them.

People to place their trust in the Maccabees.

In the comparison of I and II Maccabees it was seen that the Maccabees were glorified,⁴¹ they were the leaders of their people; they were 'of that family to whom it was granted to bring deliverance to Israel'. (5:62). They were the ones who rescued their people from the Gentiles even at the cost of their own lives. Judas in the face of impossible odds is recorded as

repudiating a suggestion to withdraw saying, 'If our time has come let us die bravely for our fellow countrymen, and leave no stain on our honour.' (9:10). The way for the people of Israel to achieve freedom was through following the Maccabees for the Gentiles and some of the Jews were untrustworthy, as has been demonstrated above.⁴² The very untrustworthiness and wickedness of these people is often placed side by side with a passage showing the integrity of one of the Maccabees on behalf of his people.⁴³ Even after the people of Israel were allowed to follow their own law, they were not free from the hostility of the Gentiles and the Maccabees were the ones who fought their battles for them.⁴⁴ The beginning and end of I Maccabees show a great contrast. It is unlikely to be coincidence that the first ten verses of the book dwell on the wickedness of all the rulers of the Greek Empire, and that the end of the book talks of the deeds of valour of John, one of the Maccabees, and the one destined to become the first king of Israel since the Exile.⁴⁵

Religion and Politics

'It is no more possible to make a sharp distinction between religion and politics in I Maccabees than in any other Jewish writing', said a commentator on the book.⁴⁶ Indeed it is difficult to make a sharp distinction between past and present Israel in its relationship with politics and religion. As was seen in the comparison of I Maccabees with II Maccabees particular reference was made to Mount Zion and the law, and allusions were made to figures in the past. These all involve religious and political aspects and view Israel past and present as continuous.

Mount Zion was at the very heart of Jerusalem and was first captured for Israel by King David.⁴⁷ It was also the dwelling place of God, the place where Solomon built his Temple, and as such is featured frequently in the Psalms.⁴⁸ Mount Zion then was a very important place to the people of Israel for it was the seat of their greatest king and of their God and had to be safeguarded at all costs.

Only when 'every enemy vanished from the land and every hostile king was crushed' and the country rid of 'lawless and wicked men' were the people of Israel able to live in peace (14:13-14).

It seems that for everyone to be able to live according to the law and live in peace, Israel had to be free of foreign domination. The Law was the distinctive feature of Israel, it was the covenant of the fathers⁴⁹ which bound Israel past and present. Events such as the execution of the sixty Hasidaeans (7:12-17) had proved that life according to the Law was impossible if one was living under foreign domination. Therefore independence was the only answer.

It has been suggested above that the Maccabees are described in terms reminiscent of the Judges and this shall be further elaborated upon in the next section. However at this stage it should be pointed out that the Judges were the forerunners of the establishment of the monarchy⁵⁰ as the Maccabees were to the Hasmonean dynasty.

The actions of the Renegade Jews and of hostile Gentiles led the Maccabees, who pursued an active policy against these people, to believe that the only sure way of protecting the nation and its law was to achieve political independence. In this capacity the author of I Maccabees likens them to ancient Judges.

THEODICY IN I MACCABEES

Lines of theodicy in I Maccabees account for many of the differences which were discovered in a comparison of that book with II Maccabees.

Communal Retribution

One of the major lines of theodicy in I Maccabees is remarkably similar to that of the Book of Judges and this helps to explain three major emphases, that of the persistence of the Renegade Jews, the hostility of the Gentiles and the glorification of the Maccabees. In the Book of Judges 'Israel did what was wrong in the eyes of the Lord'. The Lord then gave them into the hands of the enemy.⁵¹ In I Maccabees a group of renegade Jews 'repudiated the holy covenant. They intermarried with Gentiles and abandoned themselves to evil ways.' (I Macc.1:15). Following this the Seleucid King, Antiochus IV, plundered the Jerusalem Temple and two years later Jerusalem itself was sacked and a citadel was established on Mount Zion. After this a decree was issued for-

bidding the practice of ancestral religion and many in Israel died because of adherence to their beliefs (I Macc.1:16-64). These actions of Antiochus came about because the 'Divine wrath raged against Israel' (I Macc.1:64). Thus the pattern of the Book of Judges can already be seen. Some people in Israel transgressed the divine commands therefore the people were given by God into the hands of hostile Gentiles. The Mattathias of Modin refused to abandon the law and acted in accordance with it when he killed the apostate Jew who dared to present himself to offer pagan sacrifice (I Macc.2:23) When he, Mattathias, died, his son Judas 'carried on the fight for Israel with zest' (I Macc.3:2). It is said of him that 'He passed through the towns of Judaea, he destroyed the godless there. He turned the wrath away from Israel' (I Macc.3:8). Judas then through his actions in eliminating the godless appeased the anger of God. There may be a suggestion that Mattathias also helped to atone for the sins of the renegade Jews, for his action in killing the apostate Jew is likened to that of Phineas, son of Salu. Phineas killed a man who had endangered the exclusiveness of Israelite worship (Numbers 25), and Ecclesiasticus says that 'by doing so he made atonement for Israel' (Ecclus. 45:23).⁵² There is no doubt that Judas's actions were considered to be an atonement by the author of I Maccabees and it is likely that Mattathias's actions were similarly viewed, and as such there is a deviation here from the normal pattern of theodicy in the Book of Judges. In Judges the people cried out to the Lord in their affliction⁵³ and the Lord raised up a Judge for them. In I Maccabees there are two laments over the state of Jerusalem and Judaea which precede the action of Mattathias in killing the apostate Jew⁵⁴ although it is not specifically stated that either Mattathias or Judas were raised up by God as Judges. However it has been demonstrated above that their successors, Jonathan and Simon, are modelled on the pattern of Judges.⁵⁵ Thus it is likely that the author of I Maccabees thought of Judas and Mattathias in similar terms. Another factor in the general pattern of I Maccabees upholds this. The Judges fought the enemies of their people⁵⁶ and the people of Israel then appeared to live according to the law during the lifetime of the Judge who had saved them but after his death they again

'did what was wrong in the eyes of the Lord'⁵⁷ and were attacked by surrounding nations. A similar pattern occurs in I Maccabees - 'After the death of Judas the renegades raised their heads in every part of Israel and all the evil doers reappeared' (I Macc. 9:23). After the death of Jonathan 'the surrounding Gentiles were now bent on destroying them (the Israelites) root and branch...' (I Macc.12:53).

Thus whether or not the Maccabees were called by God to act as Judges they certainly fulfilled that function. Events and the author of I Maccabees suggest that they were chosen to deliver Israel. The failure of Josephus and Azarias (5:55-62) and of certain priests (5:65-68) against the Gentiles shows this. It is specifically stated in 5:62 that Josephus and Azarias 'were not however of that family to whom it was granted to bring deliverance to Israel', the implication being that that honour went to Mattathias of Modin and to his sons.

Supplications to God before Battle.

Supplications to God before battle take two major forms - physical and verbal - and these taken together with the outcome of the battle add up to theodicy.

The physical form of supplication to God before battle appears to fit into the framework of the rites for the Holy War. 3:46 states, 'They assembled at Mizpah, opposite Jerusalem, for in former times Israel had a place of worship at Mizpah.' Mizpah is specifically mentioned in I Samuel 7:5f. and Judges 20, where all Israel is assembled together and the similarity of I Maccabees 3:46 to these Old Testament passages has been taken as evidence of a revival of Holy War rites in the Maccabean era.⁵⁸ Mizpah was apparently the place of God where the oracle was consulted before battle in the time of the Judges and I Maccabees 3:48 appears to do the equivalent of seeking an oracle when it says, 'They unrolled the scroll of the law, seeking the guidance which Gentiles seek from the images of their gods.' In I Sam. 7:6 it is said 'When they assembled there (Mizpah), they drew water and poured it out before the Lord and fasted all day.' In I Macc. 3:47 Judas and his men also fasted and in 3:49-50 they offered to God priestly vestments, first fruits, tithes and Nazarites.

At Mizpah it is also said that Judas and his men wore sackcloth, put ashes on their heads and tore their garments (3:47) and immediately before battle, trumpets were sounded (3:58). This procedure was repeated before subsequent battles although sometimes only one or two of these actions are specifically mentioned.⁵⁹

In I Maccabees 3:55-56 it is said 'Judas then appointed leaders of the people, officers over thousands, hundreds, fifties and tens. As the law commands, he ordered back to their homes those who were building their houses or were newly wed or who were planting vineyards, or who were faint hearted.' These actions of Judas also represent ancient practice. God had allowed Moses to appoint leaders in order to ease the burden on his servant⁶⁰ and the men who were exempted from battle are those whom God had allowed to stay at home.⁶¹

Verbal supplication to God before battle takes various forms. On occasions all that is reported is that the forces of the Maccabees cried to heaven to save them from the enemy.⁶² On other occasions God is reminded of what he has done for his people in the past. In I Macc. 4:8-9 he is reminded of how he saved Israel at the Red Sea when Pharaoh and his army were pursuing them. In 4:30 David's victory over Goliath and Jonathan's success against the Philistines are recalled. These examples serve to underline that Israel is viewed as one community past and present in her relationship with her God.

It is often stated that the outcome of a battle was that a large number of the enemy had perished. This showed that God had heeded the supplications of his people and indeed Judas once assured his men that this would be the case for the enemy came filled with insolence and lawlessness to plunder and to kill them and their wives and children whereas they themselves were fighting for their lives and for their religion (3:18-21).

These successes in battle must still be viewed within the context of the framework of theodicy which is seen in the Book of Judges for they are dependent upon Judas having been successful in averting the wrath of God and upon his family being the ones chosen to deliver Israel.

It is noticeable that in the beginning the actions of a few

Jews who are called 'renegades' brought disaster upon the whole of Israel, so the actions of two men, Mattathias and Judas, averted the wrath of God on the whole community. Thus the actions of a few have consequences for the whole.

Individual Retribution

There is some reference in I Maccabees to individual retribution. It is emphasised that if one lives one's life according to the law, despite all trials, then God will be with one. Nowhere is this more strongly asserted than in Mattathias's speech to his sons before his death (2:49-64). He cites famous figures in Israel's past who had struggled in their attempts to keep God's commandments in the face of terrible adversity and they were all rewarded for this. All the rewards were earthly, apart from that of Elijah who was taken up to heaven. It was not expected, however, that this reward of Elijah's would apply to anyone else. The only thing which could be expected and indeed was assured, was that by observance of the law, one would win 'great glory and eternal fame' (2:51).⁶³ This is reinforced by what is said concerning the death of Eleazar of Avaran who was crushed while attempting to kill an elephant whom he believed was carrying the enemy king. It is said of him that 'he gave his life to save his people and win everlasting renown for himself.' (6:44). On the other hand Mattathias says of a wicked man that 'tomorrow there will be no trace of him, because he will have returned to the dust and all his schemes come to nothing.' (2:63). The death of Antiochus Epiphanes gives an example of the punishment of the individual wrongdoer. He realised that he was dying - in his own words - because 'I remember the wrong I did in Jerusalem, when I took all her vessels of silver and gold, and when I made an unjustified attempt to wipe out the inhabitants of Judaea' (6:12). Thus Antiochus who had been God's instrument in the punishment of his errant people was punished in his turn.

Summary of Theodicy in I Maccabees.

The author of I Maccabees is concerned to point out that events are not meaningless but are the result of previous actions whether these be communal or individual. All rewards or punishments,

however take place on this earth, although in the case of individual reward this may take place after his lifetime in the form of 'eternal fame.'⁶⁴

God does not intervene in the course of events directly, but uses 'instruments' such as Antiochus and Judas to achieve his purpose.⁶⁵

THE INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF POLITICS AND THEODICY IN I MACCABEES.

When I Maccabees is compared with II Maccabees, the particular emphases which emerge as characteristic of the book centre around the advocacy of national independence and the divine role of the Maccabees as both the agents of God's justice and the averters of his wrath. 'Israel' past and present is a nation distinguishable by its religion, but its religion cannot be defined without reference to the nation, so the survival of the nation is vital to the survival of the law. With this in mind the Maccabees advocate active resistance to, and independence from, the Gentiles, the instruments of God's punishment, who wish to exceed their writ and annihilate Israel, frequently with the help of renegade Jews. The primary act of resistance by Mattathias of Modin helped to atone for Israel's past actions and Judas succeeded in totally averting God's wrath. That the Maccabees are God's chosen instruments in his punishment of the Gentiles is illustrated by their success in battle and by the failure of other well-intentioned Israelites.

THE BOOK OF JUDITH

WAS THE BOOK OF JUDITH WRITTEN AS A RESULT OF THE MACCABEAN CRISIS?

Many scholars⁶⁶ connect the Book of Judith with the Maccabean Crisis as does Jewish tradition.⁶⁷ Indeed there is a lot in the book to support this contention. The author of the Book of Judith places his tale in the reign of King Nebuchadnezzar, King of the Assyrians. Nebuchadnezzar, however, was King of the Babylonians and not the Assyrians, nor was his capital city 'Nineveh' as the Book of Judith asserts (1:1). He reigned from 605 to 562 B.C. There are many historical errors in the book,⁶⁸ and as most

scholars agree,⁶⁹ these are not to be explained by genuine ignorance on the part of the author. That the author of the Book of Judith was a Jew is beyond dispute. References to details of the law⁷⁰ and to figures in Israel's past such as Abraham, Isaac and Jacob (8:76) assure scholars of this. There is evidence to suggest that the author used the tradition of Nebuchadnezzar as the archvillain in Israel's past⁷¹ to refer to Antiochus Epiphanes, the archvillain in Israel's present, as he did not dare to refer to him openly. There are parallels between the actions of Nebuchadnezzar and Antiochus Epiphanes, but there are also differences and the author of the Book of Judith attributes many of Antiochus's actions to Nebuchadnezzar: Nebuchadnezzar was guilty of hubris (Judith 3:8, 6:3) as was Antiochus Epiphanes (Dan. 11:36) but the abolition of all ancestral religion attributed to Nebuchadnezzar in Judith 3:8 is not attested elsewhere. However I Maccabees 1:41 states that this happened under Antiochus Epiphanes. The political organisation in the Book of Judith also fits the time of the Maccabees. The people are united under a High Priest and Senate (4:6-9), Galilee and the Sea Coast do not belong to Israel (2:8). Likewise details of ritual also suggest a date of at least Second Century B.C. (8:6, 11:3). 11:17 indicates that a lunar calendar was also in use, as was the case during the Second Century B.C. but not during the reign of Nebuchadnezzar when a solar calendar was preferred.⁷²

It is clear then that the Book of Judith was written by someone who did not live in the time of Nebuchadnezzar and that the most probable time of writing was during the Maccabean Crisis. It is generally thought that the book was written as an edifying tale at a time of distress.⁷³

THE BOOK OF JUDITH ADVOCATES ACTIVE RESISTANCE AND POLITICAL INDEPENDENCE.

The Need for Active Resistance.

Nebuchadnezzar's Commander-in Chief, Holofernes, marched against all the countries in the west and left a trail of destruction in his wake in that those who dared to resist his relentless ad-

vance were slaughtered and their country plundered (2:11), while those who submitted to him were deprived of their ancestral religion. When the Israelites heard of all this they fortified themselves rather than submit to Holophernes (4:5-7) although their resolve to endure the siege weakened when water supplies reached a low level and they began to want to surrender to Holophernes (7:19f.). Ozias however, managed to persuade the people to wait another five days (7:30) before submitting. Judith at this stage berated the people saying that if they allowed themselves to be captured then not only would they lose their country and their temple but also their God would be dishonoured (8:21). At this stage some positive action was necessary and Judith conceived a plan to deliver Israel (8:34).

The Hostility of the Enemy.

The royal decree of Nebuchadnezzar gives a lurid description of what he will do to the peoples who disobey him: It says, 'Their dead will fill the valleys, and every stream and river will be choked with corpses....'. However he did not intend to completely destroy such peoples for some of their number he would send to 'captivity to the ends of the earth.' (2:8-9). In the case of Israel though, no remnant would be saved (6:4) and Holophernes forecast that 'their mountains would be drenched with blood and their plains filled with their dead' (6:14). For the Israelites then it was not a question of going into combat to prevent the outlawing of their religion, but of fighting for their very existence.

Allusion to Figures in the Past.

Judith's action in insinuating herself into the favour of Holophernes (11:5-19) and then killing him at the first opportunity (13:8), is reminiscent of a deed recorded in the Book of Judges:- that of Jael in killing Sisera, the Commander of the Canaanite forces.⁷⁴ The hymn of praise of what God was able to do through Judith has a certain resemblance to the Song of Deborah in Judges 5 which glorifies the deed of Jael. In both songs God is praised, the armies of Israel

could not withstand the enemy, yet a lone woman was able to prevail. It seems extremely probable then that the author of Judith not only had the deed of Jael in mind when he wrote his tale but that he patterned his narrative upon that ancient story. In both cases the siege and the deed which brings victory for Israel are related in prose and then again in verse. The end of the Book of Judith is also similar to the Jael story, for the latter states that 'the land was at peace for forty years' (Judges 5:31) and the former that 'No one dared to threaten the Israelites again in Judith's lifetime, or for a long time after her death.' (Judith 6:23). These statements are typical of what is said in the Old Testament after a Judge has rid Israel of its enemies.⁷⁵

The Repetition of the word 'Israel' and its meaning.

It is noticeable in the Book of Judith that the frequently used word 'Israel' and its derivative noun or adjective 'Israelite' is used to describe both the people and the country.⁷⁶ As in I Maccabees⁷⁷ there are occasions when the word 'Israel' is used where there is ambiguity as to whether the country or the people is meant. Such is the case in 8:33 where Judith says ἐπισχέυεται κύριος τὸν Ἰσραὴλ ἐν χειρὶ σου . It is likely that both elements are included in τὸν Ἰσραὴλ here for both the people and the country had been threatened by Nebuchadnezzar and Holofernes. Further, Achior's speech (5:5f.) shows that the term 'Israel' contains the idea of a community based on its relationship with its God.

There is also evidence to suggest that Judith personifies the people of Israel?⁷⁸ she was descended from Israel (8:1)⁷⁹; In the Song of Praise in Chapter 16 there is ambiguity as to whether Israel or Judith is speaking - 16:1 states that 'Judith struck up this hymn of praise and thanksgiving' but throughout the hymn 'me' can only refer to Israel, the people. For example in verse 3 it is stated that 'The Lord is a God who stamps out wars; he has brought me safe from my pursuers into his camp among his people'. Judith was not, as far as

one knows, pursued from the camp of the Assyrians. It may well be that this particular verse is an echo of Exodus 14: 4,8,9 and 13 where Israel, the people, is the speaker telling of the Egyptian pursuit of the Israelites.⁸⁰ It is clear in Judith 16:6-10 that Judith is not the speaker for she is spoken of in the third person. That the author is able to interchange the person of Judith and of the people Israel, in his writing supports the contention that Judith embodies Israel and is representative of it and takes action on its behalf. In other words 'Israel' takes positive steps to avert the threat of extinction to its religion and to its people.

The Beginning and the End of the Book of Judith.

The beginning and end of the Book of Judith show a remarkable similarity to the beginning and end of I Maccabees for both open with a description of the foreign power which is going to attack Israel and wipe it out. Both end with the one, or the descendant of the one, who has turned away this threat and brought independence and religious freedom to the people of Israel.

Israel was in a desperate situation and if she was to survive then vigorous action was required. Judith is reminiscent of a figure in the Book of Judges, a figure whose action was violent but justified in view of the severity of the situation facing Israel. Judith takes a similarly violent action not only on behalf of Israel, but as Israel personified. Thus the political outlook of the Book of Judith is similar to that of the First Book of Maccabees where Israel was threatened with extinction through the hostility of the Gentiles against whom positive action was taken by the Maccabees. This similarity extends to the framework of both books as they begin and end upon similar notes.

THEODICY IN THE BOOK OF JUDITH

Theodicy with reference to the Community.

As has been seen above Judith is likened to a Judge and to

a certain extent The Book of Judith is patterned upon the usual pattern of the Book of Judges in that Israel is beset with enemy attacks, a Judge is raised up, the Judge defeats the enemy and then Israel has peace during the lifetime of the Judge. In Judith though there is one notable deviation from the usual pattern of the Book of Judges. In the latter the troubles for Israel began because 'Israel did what was wrong in the eyes of the Lord.'⁸¹ In the Book of Judith however it is nowhere stated that Israel upon this occasion had done what was wrong. Despite this, the idea of divine retribution, i.e. the abandonment by God of his people to their enemies, is recognised as being valid both in the past and in the present. Achior is the first one to introduce it when he gives Holophernes a brief history of the people of Israel, saying that when they sinned against their God he punished them but if they did not sin, they prospered (5:17-18). This pattern, claims Achior, still holds true. He says to Holophernes that if Israel has sinned then he, Holophernes, will wage war against them with success, but if they have not sinned then their God will protect them (5:20-22). During the time of siege, whilst Holophernes and his army were encamped outside Bethulia, the people of that city felt that their hardship must be a punishment from God for their sins (7:28). Judith herself recognises that in the past punishment for infidelity to God had been one of the reasons why He had abandoned his people to their enemies.⁸² However divine retribution is not the reason in this particular instance for God's delay in ridding His people of their enemies. Indeed Judith asserts that God will not abandon his people because they have not sinned; they 'acknowledge no god but the Lord' (8:20). What then could be the reason for God's delay in giving his positive protection to his people? This is the question which must have presented itself to Judith's listeners after she had assured them that they were not being punished because of their sins. Judith does suggest a reason for their troubles, one which was not new to her listeners⁸³ but which had been the motive

in the past for the sufferings of Abraham, of Isaac and of Jacob; that of discipline, of a test of faith in God (8:25-27).

Judith berates the people for their lack of faith and for attempting to put a time limit on the mercy of God. God, she says, is inscrutable to the human mind and is free to assist his people if and when he chooses (8:11-17). Yet if God's decision seems arbitrary to the human mind it is not so, for as Judith confesses in her prayer, all that has happened was brought about by God, and more than that, God's ways are prepared in advance and his fore-knowledge determines his judgement (9:4-6).

The answer then to the disturbing problem of why God has delayed in defending his people is given in terms of a test of faith or a test in faith. That this is so is underlined by examples from the past. One must trust in God and not question his actions.

The arrogance of the enemy is underlined time and time again. Achior told the elders of Bethulia 'how Holophernes had boasted of what he would do to Israel' (6:17). Judith prayed to God to mark the arrogance of the Assyrians (9:9), their pride in their horses and riders, their boasts about the power of their infantry (9:7). The people of Israel cried out to God 'O Lord God of heaven, mark their arrogance; pity our people in their humiliation' (6:19). Not only are the people of Israel humiliated they also display humility before their God. When they heard that Holophernes controlled the passes to Judaea they put on sackcloth and ashes (4:11), indeed 'ferverently they humbled themselves before him' (4:9).⁸⁴ Judith herself is the epitome of righteousness and humility and as was seen above Judith represents Israel. A widow, she wore sackcloth and fasted every day apart from the Sabbath and Holy Days when to do so was forbidden by the law. When she was in Holophernes's camp she took great care not to eat any food except her own in case she broke the law (12:2). Judith was the one who urged the people not to test God (8:12f.); she prostrated herself before him, with ashes on her head, when she asked that he might

deliver Israel by her hand (9:1-14).

It is noticeable that the God of Israel is the 'God of the humble, the help of the poor, the support of the weak, the protector of the desperate, the deliverer of the hopeless'(9:11). He alone is 'Israel's shield' (9:14). The first of these descriptions recalls the God of the Book of Deuteronomy, the God who redeemed his people from Egypt⁸⁵ who led them through the great and terrible wilderness.⁸⁶ That this God had made Israel his people in the first place was because of his love for them⁸⁷ and because of the promise sworn to their forefathers,⁸⁸ one of whom was Isaac. In the light of what God had done for His people when they were completely at his mercy, He urged them to show similar consideration for those at their mercy; slaves,⁸⁹ levites, orphans and widows.⁹⁰ In other words they were to be what He was - the help of the poor, the support of the weak, ones who when they were powerful, were to show mercy. The law itself was part of the love of God and of his mercy towards his people Israel⁹¹ and the response required of Israel to this was to love God and to demonstrate His love through obedience to His will.⁹²

Judith, who represented Israel, lived her life according to the Law and thus was able to appeal to God's mercy and His love. Judith asserted that the people had not sinned so they were not to fear that God in his power would spurn them (8:20). Now, because their God was a God of love and mercy, He would not abandon them. In contrast to Judith and the people of Israel Nebuchadnezzar and Holofernes were exceedingly arrogant, not only in their attitude to Israel, but also in their attitude towards Israel's God. In that Nebuchadnezzar set himself up as a god, he set himself up in opposition to the God of Israel (6:2-3). Thus, as Judith suggests, the honour not only of Israel but also of her God was at stake (9:13-14). This then is another reason why God will not abandon His people.

All that Judith said about God not deserting His people and her assurance to them that what they were experiencing was merely divine discipline, a test of faith (8:25-27),

was vindicated when, through Him, she was able to kill Holophernes. She acknowledges both His power and His mercy when she says, 'God, our God, is with us, still showing his strength in Israel and His might against our enemies' (13:11) and 'Praise God who has not withdrawn His mercy from the House of Israel, but has crushed our enemies by my hand this very night!' (13:14). God's justice also asserts itself at this point for he vindicated righteous Israel and punished the arrogant enemy. The question of whether the punishment of wicked nations is limited to this life is uncertain in the Book of Judith. 16:17 says that 'The Lord Almighty will punish them on the day of judgement; he will consign their bodies to fire and worms; they will weep in pain forever.' Commentators are divided as to the correct interpretation of this verse,⁹³ some thinking that it refers to eternal punishment after death, others that it is based upon Isaiah 66:24 and as such merely represents the earthly destruction of the flesh of the enemy. There is perhaps no easy answer as to who is right but the verse does seem to strike a note which is not in accord with the rest of the book, which nowhere even hints at life after death. Although there is no proof it is possible that this verse which is at the very end of the song could be a later addition, made at the time when the idea of a double resurrection after death was popular. This possibility is strengthened when it is realised that the Book of Judith in the main draws its inspiration from Exodus, Deuteronomy and the Book of Judges.

Individual Retribution

Judith was an exceedingly righteous woman (8:4-8), who had risked her life for her country, and was rewarded in this life in that she lived to be a hundred and five years old (16:23), long life in the Old Testament being regarded as a mark of God's favour.⁹⁴ In contrast Holophernes, who was extremely arrogant and set himself up in opposition to God (6:17) died before the end of his natural life span.

CONCLUSION TO I MACCABEES AND TO THE BOOK OF JUDITH

Both I Maccabees and the Book of Judith advocate active resistance, basing their mode of operation upon the Book of Judges. Each book has a hero or a succession of heroes who fight on behalf of Israel. Israel which is more than simply a country or people is threatened with total extinction by the Gentiles. Both books begin with a foreign king in power and end with mention of an Israelite hero.

Theodicy is connected with the political scheme. In I Maccabees it is very clearly based upon the theodicy of the Book of Judges, as is the Book of Judith, although the latter admits that divine retribution can be a reason for suffering, seeing the present suffering of Israel as a test of faith in God, and in this follows what is said in the Book of Deuteronomy. Deuteronomy is also alluded to in I Maccabees where it is obvious that the rules of the Holy War are carried out. Both Deuteronomy and Judges are connected with the possession of the land and interpret continued possession in terms of obedience to God's will; and this is reflected in I Maccabees and the Book of Judith.

As in Deuteronomy and the Book of Judges, I Maccabees and the Book of Judith are more concerned with finding reasons for communal suffering than with that of the individual although both see the actions of an individual or of a small group of people affecting the whole community. In the case of I Maccabees a few renegade Jews brought great suffering upon the whole and the actions of the Maccabees reversed this. In the Book of Judith, Judith herself, through her sole action, reversed the situation for her people.

Punishment and reward in I Maccabees and the Book of Judith are seen as taking place on this earth whether this applies to the community or to the individual, and this again accords with what is said in the books of Deuteronomy and Judges.

LITERATURE WHICH ILLUSTRATES THE DESIRE FOR A THEOCRATIC COMMUNITY IN THIS ERA.

This chapter deals with books which recognise God as the Supreme Lord of all, and thus do not concern themselves over-much with who holds the reins of political power as long as such an individual allows freedom of worship and ultimate sovereignty to God. Three texts fall into this category - Daniel 1-6, I Esdras and II Maccabees.

DANIEL 1-6Is Daniel 1-6 relevant to the Maccabean Crisis?

The date of the composition of the first six chapters of the Book of Daniel has long been a subject of discussion amongst scholars, some asserting that they were written at the same time as chapters 7-12, i.e. during the period of the Maccabean Crisis, others that they were composed a century or a century and a half earlier.¹ There are good arguments both for and against composite authorship of the Book of Daniel during the Maccabean Crisis,² although imprecise evidence is occasionally used by advocates of both points of view to point to a precise verdict.³

It is clear that the background of the stories in Daniel 1-6 is the Persian period as they reflect conditions in the Royal court of that time,⁴ but that is not to say that they were put into writing then. There is a sense in which the precise dating of the literary composition of Daniel 1-6 is not relevant to the present question, suffice to say that the author of Daniel 7-12 based his narrative upon the first six chapters.⁵ This being the case, whether or not the same person or persons wrote 1-6 as well as 7-12, he must have thought that the material in 1-6 had a message for his own time.

The Political Outlook of Chapters 1-6 of the Book of Daniel.

The first six chapters of the Book of Daniel assert that God

is the supreme sovereign of all mankind, including powerful earthly rulers. Daniel has attained this knowledge through his relationship with God, but foreign rulers have to be brought to this knowledge through their experiences. Daniel's praise of God (2:20-23) shows that he knows that God is Lord over nature and history for 'He changes seasons and times; he deposes kings and sets them up.' (2:21) . To one of these kings, Nebuchadnezzar, Daniel says, 'You, O king, King of Kings, to whom the God of heaven has given the kingdom with all its power, authority and honour; in whose hands he has placed men and beasts and birds of the air, wherever they dwell, granting you sovereignty over them all.....(2:37-38). Thus Daniel knows that Nebuchadnezzar is powerful only because God has given him this power, despite the fact that Nebuchadnezzar himself did not recognise God's sovereignty. He did realise God's power intuitively though, when his servant, Daniel, was able to tell him the contents and interpretation of his dream, as can be seen from the following statement which he made to Daniel: 'Truly, your God is indeed God of gods and Lord over kings, a revealer of secrets, since you have been able to reveal this secret' (2:47). That this was no more than intuitive knowledge is illustrated by Nebuchadnezzar having to undergo a time of terrible suffering before he acted in accordance with the above statement that God is 'Lord over kings'. He tells the story of the dream which portended this suffering, of the interpretation of the dream given by Daniel, of the seven years of exile when he had lost his mind and his confession of the never-ending sovereignty of God. He brought his suffering upon himself because he was guilty of hubris when he said, 'Is this not Babylon the great which I have built as a royal residence by my own mighty power and for the honour of my majesty?' (4:30). At the end of the time appointed for Nebuchadnezzar to suffer he praised God saying, 'His sovereignty is never-ending and his rule endures through all generations; all dwellers upon earth count for nothing and he deals as he wishes with the host of heaven; no one may lay hand upon him and ask what he does.' (4:34-35). Nebuchadnezzar prefaced his account of his time of trial by saying, 'It is my pleasure to

recount the signs and marvels which the Most High God has worked for me' (4:2). He then praises God in the following words: 'How great are his signs, and his marvels overwhelming! His kingdom is an everlasting kingdom, his sovereignty stands to all generations.' (4:3). Thus the experience which he underwent impressed upon him that his own power was subject to the approval of God, who was Lord of all mankind. Nebuchadnezzar's suffering also illustrates the truth of this statement to all living creatures: 'Thereby the living will know that the Most High is sovereign in the kingdom of men; he gives the kingdom to whom he will and he may set over it the humblest of mankind' (4:17).

Darius is brought to acknowledge the power and the sovereignty of the God of Daniel when He saves the latter from the jaws of the lions. He issued a decree that all the people in his domains should fear and reverence the God of Daniel, '...for he is the living God, the everlasting, whose kingly power shall not be weakened; whose sovereignty shall have no end - a saviour, a deliverer, a worker of signs and wonders in heaven and on earth, who has delivered Daniel from the power of the lions' (6:26-27).

When Nebuchadnezzar and Darius acknowledge the sovereignty of God they do so as the two most powerful human beings on earth at the time in which they lived as this serves to emphasise God's total power.

Theodicy in Daniel 1-6

God is the supreme sovereign of all mankind and he cherishes and protects those who are obedient to Him and humbly acknowledge his power. On the other hand he brings low those who are arrogant and take personally the credit for their achievements. Sometimes God demonstrates his supreme power by natural means, sometimes by supernatural. Daniel and his friends are saved from having to eat the king's food through God's intervention in that He 'made the master show kindness and goodwill' (1:9) to them. Daniel and his friends asked the Master of the eunuchs that they be allowed to eat only vegetables and drink only water for ten days and then that their looks be

compared with those of the young men who had partaken of the king's food (1:12-13). At the end of ten days Daniel and his friends looked healthier than all the other young men (1:15) which demonstrated that the food which God allowed His people to eat was actually better for them than any other food. The narrative also shows that God is able to help those who wished to remain obedient to Him to do so in the face of opposition.

When Nebuchadnezzar was unable to find anyone to tell him the contents of his dream and the interpretation thereof he ordered all the wise men in his kingdom to be executed (2:12-13). Upon hearing this, Daniel told his three companions that 'They should ask the God of Heaven in his mercy to disclose this secret, so that they and he along with the rest of the wise men of Babylon should not be put to death' (2:18). This demonstrates the dependence of Daniel and his friends upon God and God in turn rewards this humility and trust in Him by revealing the secret to Daniel in a vision in the night (2:19). Daniel acknowledges this act of God's when he tells Nebuchadnezzar, 'The secret about which your majesty inquires, no wise man, exorcist, magician, or diviner can disclose to you. But there is in heaven a god who reveals secrets, and he has told King Nebuchadnezzar what is to be at the end of this age.' (2:27-28). Because Daniel, with God's help, was able to tell Nebuchadnezzar the contents of his dream and interpretation, he was rewarded with many rich gifts and made regent over the whole province of Babylon and chief prefect over all the wise men of Babylon (2:48). Thus Daniel displayed his faith in God and showed humility towards Him and in return was saved from death by divine intervention (through natural means) and was even rewarded by the king in an earthly fashion.

Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-Nego were willing to die rather than betray their God by worshipping an image which Nebuchadnezzar had set up. They said to the latter, 'If there is a God who is able to save us from the blazing furnace, it is our God whom we serve, and he will save us from your power, O King; but if not, be it known to your majesty that we will

neither serve your god nor worship the golden image you have set up.' (3:17-18). God indeed saved these three men who were prepared to demonstrate their loyalty to Him in such an extreme way, and the miraculous nature of their rescue from the blazing furnace is emphasised by the fact that the furnace was heated to seven times its usual heat (3:20), and that the men who were carrying Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-Nego to the furnace were themselves killed by flames which leapt out (3:22). While the three men were in the furnace Nebuchadnezzar saw a fourth man inside whom he said looked like a god (3:25). Nebuchadnezzar then ordered the original three men to come out of the fire and everyone watching gathered around and 'saw how the fire had had no power to harm the bodies of these men: the hair of their heads had not been singed, their trousers were untouched, and no smell of fire lingered about them' (3:27). The willingness then of Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-Nego to die rather than to deny their God by worshipping an image was rewarded by that God who saved their lives, who thereby displayed His justice in refusing to allow his innocent and loyal servants to die, and the supremacy of his power in his ability to over-ride the normal laws of nature.

Darius had to condemn Daniel to death because Daniel contravened a royal decree that no-one should present a petition to any god or any man other than the king for thirty days. He was unwilling to condemn Daniel for he was a loyal servant but he had been tricked into the position by ministers who were jealous of Daniel's authority, and Darius had no choice but to send Daniel to the lion pit. He, however, said to Daniel, 'your own God, whom you serve continually, will save you' (6:16). A stone was then put over the mouth of the pit to prevent anyone from entering to rescue Daniel. The next day the king went back to the pit and found Daniel was still alive. Daniel said, 'My God sent his angel to shut the lions' mouths so that they have done me no injury, because in his judgement I was found innocent; and moreover, O King, I had done you no injury.' (6:21-22). This statement of Daniel's serves to emphasise the justice

of his God who once again recognised the loyalty of a true servant and so allowed no harm to befall him.

In both the examples above, where the servants of the true God are saved through his supreme power, the King who had condemned His servants to death is impressed and brought to a recognition of His sovereignty. Nebuchadnezzar says, 'Blessed is the God of Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-Nego. He has sent his angel to save his servants who put their trust in him, who disobey the royal command and were willing to yield themselves to the fire rather than to serve or worship any god other than their own God. I therefore issue a decree that any man, to whatever people or nation he belongs, whatever his language, if he speaks blasphemy against the God of Shadrach, Meshach and Abed-Nego, shall be torn to pieces and his house shall be forfeit, for there is no other god who can save men in this way' (3:28-29). Darius, after he had seen proof of the power of the God of Daniel, said, 'I have issued a decree that in all my royal domains men shall fear and reverence the God of Daniel; for He is the living God, the everlasting, whose kingly power shall not be weakened; whose sovereignty shall have no end - a saviour, a deliverer, a worker of signs and wonders in heaven and on earth, who has delivered Daniel from the power of the lions' (6:26-27).

At other times these foreign rulers have to be brought low before they will acknowledge the sovereignty of the almighty God, the God of Daniel. Nebuchadnezzar is warned in a vision that he is to be humbled by God (4:4-27) and this indeed comes to pass. He congratulates himself upon the might of Babylon and as a punishment for his arrogance he is exiled, being allowed to return only when he acknowledged the sovereignty of God (4:28-35).

Belshazzar, Nebuchadnezzar's son disregarded any honour due to the God of Israel when he ordered that the vessels of silver and gold which had been taken from the sanctuary in Jerusalem be brought to him so that he and his friends might drink wine from them (5:3). Suddenly the fingers of a human hand wrote words upon the wall which were unintelligible to Belshazzar. Daniel alone of all the wise men at

the Royal Court could interpret the words. He told Belshazzar that even though he knew of his father's downfall because of his failure to recognise the sovereignty of the Most High God, he, Belshazzar, had set himself up against the Lord of Heaven. The words upon the wall proclaimed that God had numbered the days of Belshazzar's kingdom and that it was to be divided and given to the Medes and Persians, and that Belshazzar himself had been found wanting (5:5-28).⁶ What God foretold for Belshazzar and his kingdom did indeed come about, for Belshazzar was slain the very night upon which the prediction had been made, and Darius, the Mede, took the kingdom (5:30-31).

In short then, God appears as the protector of those who revere him, to the extent that He will save them from dangers which no human being would be able to. Those who disregard him and take upon themselves all credit for their achievements, He brings low.

Conclusion to Daniel 1-6 : The Inter-relationship of Politics/Theodicy

God is the Sovereign of all mankind, He is just and uses his power to ensure that individuals receive the reward due to them for the attitude which they have towards Him, whether this constitutes an improvement or a worsening of their lot. If He deems it necessary to punish or discipline an individual for their arrogance and irreverence over a long period of time He sets a limit to the duration of their suffering, as He did in the case of Nebuchadnezzar's sojourn amongst the wild beasts. Belshazzar is told in advance of the punishment which God has planned for him.

This message was doubtless deemed to be relevant for those suffering during the Maccabean Crisis by the author of Chapters 7-12 of Daniel, as he himself indirectly states, when he either composed Chapters 1-6 in their written form or joined his own chapters to them. The atmosphere of the Persian Court where Jews were well treated and held in respect was obviously not relevant to those suffering under Antiochus but the overall political schema that God is the Sovereign Lord of all mankind regardless of their earthly station, obviously was.

The message that God is just and deals with each individual in accordance with their attitude towards Him would hearten those who were torn between obedience to the law of the land and to the law of God. Daniel and his three friends had to face similar situations in that they had to choose whether to eat of the King's food or to eat the food which God prescribed for them; they had to choose whether to stop worshipping God and bow down to some man-made image or to the King himself. These very situations did in fact arise at the time of the Maccabean Crisis, and thus, even if Daniel 1-6 was not composed specifically with this era in mind it still had a message to give for the people of that era.

I ESDRAS

Was I Esdras written as a result of the Maccabean Crisis?

'The purpose and date of I Esdras are closely related. If either could be determined independently it would not be too difficult to fix upon the other.'⁷ This statement made in the most modern American commentary, admirably summarises problems of scholarship connected with a study of I Esdras, although the commentary does not suggest any solutions. The terminus ad quem for the writing of I Esdras is generally accepted to be 90A.D. as Josephus made use of it in The Antiquities of the Jews.⁸ The terminus a quo is not so easy to determine, although internal evidence such as the use of certain words and a similarity to parts of the book of Daniel tend to indicate that this should be placed some time in the Second Century B.C.⁹

Textual Relationship to the Canonical Books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah.

I Esdras appears to be a rather free version of II Chronicles 35 to Nehemiah 8:13 although its textual relationship to these books is difficult to determine due to omissions, additions and differently arranged material.

Additions

1:23-24 'All that Josiah did he did rightly and in wholehearted devotion to his Lord. The events of his reign are to be found in ancient records which tell a story of

sin and rebellion against the Lord graver than that of any other nation or kingdom, and of offences against him which brought his judgement down upon Israel.'

1:28 'He disregarded what the Lord had said through the Prophet Jeremiah.'

2:18 '..... and laying the foundation of the Temple.'

2:20 'Since work on the Temple is on hand...'

3:1-4:63 Story of the three guardsmen.

5:1-6 Darius sends people home to Jerusalem. These people include priests of the line of Aaron, and Zerubbabel of the line of David.

6:8b&c 'We visited the district of Judaea and entered the city of Jerusalem and there we found the elders of the Jews returned from exile.'

Omissions (Set out in condensed form)

Ezra 3:12 'But many of the priests and Levites and heads of families who were old enough to see the former house, wept and wailed aloud when they saw the foundation of this house laid, while many others shouted for joy at the top of their voice.'

Ezra 4:1-3 There was an offer of help from the Samaritans which the Jews refused.

Ezra 4:4-5 'Then the people of the land caused the Jews to lose heart and made them afraid to continue building; and in order to defeat their purpose they bribed officials to against them.'

Nehemiah Chapter 1 Nehemiah's confession of the sins of the people.

Nehemiah Chapter 2

1-10 Permission granted by Artaxerxes to Nehemiah to return to Jerusalem to begin building.

11-16 Nehemiah's arrival in and inspection of Jerusalem.

17-18 Nehemiah persuades the Jewish leaders to rebuild the city wall of Jerusalem.

19-20 Sanballat, Tobiah and Geshen mock the builders.

Nehemiah Chapter 3

List of people who repaired the wall and the gates.

Nehemiah Chapter 4

1-3 Sanballat and Tobiah jeer at the rebuilding efforts of the Jews.

4-5 Imprecation to God to turn the reproach of Sanballat and Tobiah upon their own heads.

6-9 Sanballat and Tobiah and their associates attack Jerusalem, therefore the Jews post guards.

10-15 Nehemiah foils the plans of the enemy to destroy their work.

16-28 Description of the defensive measures taken by Jewish workers.

Nehemiah Chapter 5

1-13 The rich are profiting at the expense of the poor. Nehemiah stops this.

14-19 Nehemiah did not draw his allowance as governor.

Nehemiah Chapter 6

1-14 Attempts of the enemy to draw Nehemiah into a trap.

15-16 Report about the completion of the wall.

17-19 Many nobles in Judah are in alliance with Tobiah.

Nehemiah Chapter 7

1-3 Nehemiah gives Jerusalem into the care of his brother and the governor of the citadel and gives orders for the defence of the citadel.

4-65 The contents of the Book of Genealogies and list of those who had returned from Exile.

66-69 The numbers of those who had returned.

70-72 List of contributions made towards the work.

Nehemiah Chapter 8

13-18 Regulations for and the carrying out of the feast of Tabernacles.

Nehemiah Chapters 9&10

1-37 A description of the Day of Atonement including a liturgical confession of the history of the people of Israel.

9:38-10:39 People (listed) make a written declaration not to marry Gentiles, to give a third of a shekel to the Temple each year. Priests, Levites and the people cast lots for the wood offering. First fruits to be given.

Nehemiah Chapter 11

One in ten people were to live in Jerusalem and these people are listed. Mentions where other people lived.

Nehemiah Chapter 12

1-21 Lists of priests and Levites who returned with Zerubbabel and Jeshua.

22-26 Details about recording of the heads of priestly and Levitical families.

27-43 Description of the dedication ceremony when the walls were rebuilt.

44-47 The service of the Levites, singers and doorkeepers.

Nehemiah Chapter 13

1-3 It was found when the Book of Moses was read to the people

that no Ammonite or Moabite should enter the assembly of God. 4-9 Tobiah had been given room in the Temple for his personal use by the High Priest Eliashib. Nehemiah threw Tobiah's belongings out of the room and ordered it to be purified. 10-14 Nehemiah found out that the Levites and singers had not been given their portion and he saw that this was rectified.

15-22 Nehemiah stopped the abuse of the Sabbath rest.

23-27 Nehemiah remonstrated with the Jews about mixed marriages and made them promise not to allow their sons or daughters to marry a Gentile in the future.

28-29 A son of the High Priest had married a daughter of Sanballat. Nehemiah drove him away.

30-31 Nehemiah's conclusion. He had purified the people from things foreign, had made the Levites and the priests resume the duties of their office, and had made provision for the wood-offering and the first fruits.

Scholars have attempted to resolve the problem of variations in the Massoretic text in various ways, the most plausible of which posits a common source for I Esdras and the canonical books.¹⁰ This suggestion, however, does not answer the question whether I Esdras is a complete book in its own right or whether it is merely the only remaining fragment of another version of the whole of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah. This question has never been satisfactorily resolved and opinion ranges on both-sides.¹¹ No doubt this is because no discernible purpose has ever been suggested to support I Esdras being complete in itself. However, the question of purpose aside, a comparison of the beginning and the end of the book shows that both centre around the same theme. At the beginning of the book Josiah lived according to the law (1:23) and the brotherhood of the Jewish people is illustrated in the Passover celebration (1:1-22, especially 1:5). At the end of the book Ezra read the law to the people and it was instilled into their minds (9:38-55). The last phrase in the book is 'And they gathered together', which many scholars think is too short and too abrupt to be the ending of a book and so assume that something is missing, perhaps even the rest of

the book of Nehemiah. However a short phrase is often clearer and more to the point than a long, rambling sentence. As the message contained in the final sentence in I Esdras matches the beginning of the book there is no need to assume that the text is incomplete.

The Relationship of the Contents of I Esdras to the Events and People of the Maccabean Crisis.

In the first chapter of I Esdras Nebuchadnezzar is introduced and it is stated that he took the sacred vessels from the Temple (1:41,1:45). Antiochus Epiphanes did the same thing during the Maccabean Crisis, indeed it is likely that Nebuchadnezzar is a cipher for Antiochus Epiphanes in the Book of Judith.¹² Likewise it is possible that in I Esdras Nebuchadnezzar's actions point to the actions of Antiochus.

I Esdras says that at the time of Nebuchadnezzar's sacrilege 'the leaders of the people and the chief priests committed many wicked and lawless acts, outdoing even the heathen in sacrilege, and they defiled the holy Temple of the Lord in Jerusalem.' (1:49). Similarly, at the time of the plunder of the Temple vessels by Antiochus, the High Priests, Jason and Menelaus, contravened the Torah in that they were Hellenists and encouraged Hellenistic practices among the people.¹³

Prior to the accession of Jason, and subsequently Menelaus, to the High Priestly office, Onias, who was 'a pious man and hated wickedness'¹⁴ held the position. At the time of Onias, Judaea was governed by the Seleucid Empire and therefore the High Priest was the highest ranking Jew in the land and as such wielded great power over his people. At the time of Nebuchadnezzar's assault upon the Jerusalem Temple there was still a Jewish king ruling over the land. This king, however, was wicked (I Esdras 1:47), as were his predecessors, the sons of Josiah (I Esdras 1:34-44). Josiah himself, like Onias in the time of Antiochus, 'did (everything) rightly and in whole-hearted devotion to the Lord' (1:23). A parallel then can be seen between Josiah the good king and his successors, the wicked kings, and Onias, the pious High Priest, and Jason and Menelaus, the sacrilegious High Priests. The theft of the

Temple vessels marked, both in the time of Nebuchanezzar and in the time of Antiochus, the effective loss of the Temple for the Jews. In the former case the Temple was actually destroyed, in the latter it was filled with forbidden things (II Maccabees 6:4-6) and in any case, even if the Temple had been maintained in its pure state it would have been valueless to the Jews as a place of worship as they had been forbidden to practise their religion. In the time of Antiochus and the Maccabees the Hellenisers amongst the Jewish people inter-married with the Gentiles (I Macc.1:15). A similar situation existed at the return from the Babylonian Exile (I Esdras 8:69-70) and it was necessary for Ezra to take steps to rectify this situation for as he points out to the people, God had warned their ancestors that continued possession of the land was dependent upon them not allying themselves with foreign nations through inter-marriage. There is then a parallel between the people and events described in I Esdras and those illustrated in the two books of Maccabees. The similarity though is closer between I Esdras and II Maccabees than it is between I Esdras and I Maccabees in that the former pair concentrate their attention upon the Temple and the obedience or disobedience of the people, in particular of their leaders, to the law. Both books commence their narrative by talking of a Jewish leader who is pious and whose piousness ensures the cohesiveness of his people. Josiah celebrates the Passover and tells the Levites to 'prepare the sacrifice for your brothers' (I Esdras 1:6). 'During the rule of the High Priest Onias, the holy city enjoyed complete peace and prosperity ...' (II Maccabees 3:1). I Maccabees, on the other hand, does not mention Onias at all but dwells instead upon the wickedness of the stock from which Antiochus springs (I Maccabees 1:1-10). I Esdras tells of the wickedness of the kings who succeeded Josiah (1:34-48) while II Maccabees describes the misdeeds of Jason and Menelaus, the two High Priests who took up office after Onias (II Maccabees 4:7-5:26). Once again I Maccabees does not mention these High Priests, contenting itself with a brief reference to the evil deeds of a group

of renegade Jews (1:11-15). Both I Esdras and II Maccabees end their narrative when the Temple is safe and the people are once again a cohesive unit whereas I Maccabees goes on to describe the struggle for independence, ending with the rule of John, who was destined to become the first king of Israel since the Exile.

The use of certain Greek words which appear nowhere else by both II Maccabees and I Esdras,¹⁵ also suggests that there is some kind of relationship between the two books, or at least that they both emerged from the same milieu.

The Possible Dating and Purpose of I Esdras, given its similarity to the people and events of the Maccabean Crisis.

If I Esdras is connected with the events of the Maccabean Crisis as the above analysis of the contents of the book would suggest, then it is possible that the author, like the author of Daniel, saw a need to encourage people to hold fast to their faith, to give them an explanation of why the crisis happened and to assure them that it was not the first time that the Temple had been taken from them and that in time God would restore it to them.¹⁶ If this was so then the book must have circulated in Hebrew or Aramaic before being translated into Greek at some later date.

The Political Outlook of I Esdras

I Esdras is not interested in who governs the country as long as freedom of religion is given and the religious leader encourages worship and the living of one's life in accordance with the law.

I Esdras begins with an account of Josiah's Passover which was held in the Jerusalem Temple. This account emphasises the centrality of the Temple in the life of the nation whose present is continuous with its past, as is illustrated by the description of the Temple as 'the house which was built by King Solomon, son of David' (1:3). In this house the Levites are commanded to make themselves ready 'family by family and clan by clan, to do service to the Lord your God and to minister to his people...and prepare the sacrifices for your brothers' (1:4-6). The last phrase illustrates the

community of the people when life is centered around the Temple.

After the destruction of the Temple the main aim of the Jewish people is portrayed in I Esdras as being its restoration. The purpose of the much disputed story of the three guardsmen in the court of Darius is doubtless to illustrate this very point i.e. that all the riches and power in the world are of no interest over against the rebuilding of the Temple.¹⁷ I Esdras emphasises the unity of the people after their return from the Babylonian Exile whenever they are concerned with the site of the Temple or the Temple itself. In the seventh month after the second return 'the Israelites ...gathered as one man...' for the purpose of sacrificing to their God (5:47). The Levites 'were active as one man on the works in the house of God' (5:58). 'All the people blew their trumpets and gave a loud shout, singing to the Lord as the building rose' (5:62). After the rebuilding of the Temple was completed the Passover was celebrated and 'All those Israelites participated who had returned from exile...' (7:13). The reading of the law took place at one of the gateways to the Temple (9:38).

The Temple then is a thread which runs throughout the book and which unites the people through worship or in their desire to rebuild it. That the Temple is an important theme in the Book of I Esdras is reinforced by the additions which it makes to Canonical Ezra (I Esdras 2:18,2:20).

Josiah died because he disobeyed the word of God which was relayed to him by the Prophet Jeremiah (1:28-31). Zedekiah, the last king of Judah also disregarded what Jeremiah had told him and committed other lawless acts as well including *breaking* an oath of allegiance to Nebuchadnezzar which he had sworn to keep in the name of the Lord (1:47-48). The author of I Esdras emphasises Zedekiah's wickedness by the addition of the phrase which states that he 'transgressed the commandments of the Lord, the God of Israel' (1:48). Zedekiah's predecessors also did what was wrong in the eyes of the Lord (1:39-44). The leaders of the people and the chief priests committed sacrilege and so ^{He} abandoned them to Nebuchadnezzar. *He*

One of the functions of Ezra was to take the law to the people in Judaea and Jerusalem and even Artaxerxes, a Persian King, issued an order to Ezra, saying, 'All who transgress the law of your God and of the king shall be punished with death, degradation, fine or exile'(8:24).

When Ezra arrived in Jerusalem he discovered that the people had inter-married with Gentiles (8:68-70) and to these people he cited the law of Deuteronomy (8:83-85) showing that what they had done was in disobedience to the will of God. Later he read to the whole assembled company the law of Moses and instilled it into their minds (9:37-48). Obedience to God, along with reverence for the Temple is of paramount importance for the survival and unity of the people of Israel.

Theodicy in I Esdras.

The disobedience of the people of Israel to God's prophets or to his law aroused his fury and as a consequence He allowed disasters to befall his people. This is the answer which I Esdras gives to the question of why the people of Israel suffer. Repeatedly the kings of Judah before the Exile 'did what was wrong in the eyes of the Lord' (1:39,44,47). Then 'the leaders of the people and the chief priests committed many wicked and lawless acts, outdoing even the heathen in sacrilege, and they defiled the holy temple of the Lord in Jerusalem' (1:49). Even at this point I Esdras says that God wished to save his people from disaster and so sent his messengers to persuade them to desist from their evil ways. However the people just mocked these prophets and God 'was roused to fury against his people for their impieties, and ordained that the kings of the Chaldeans should attack them' (1:52). Thus the people brought about the destruction of the Temple, of Jerusalem and their enforced stay in Babylonia upon themselves. During the actual rebuilding of the Temple in the time of Darius the governor general of Syria and Phoenicia wrote a letter to Darius reporting upon the progress of the rebuilding work and including a conversation held with some of the elders of the Jews. These elders gave the governor-general an explanation of why the Temple had been destroyed and their people had been sent into Exile. 'When our fathers sinned against the heavenly Lord of Israel and provoked him, he

delivered them over to Nebuchadnezzar, King of Babylon, King of the Chaldeans: and they pulled down the house, set it on fire, and took the people into exile in Babylon' (6:15-16). In these words the elders reiterated the explanation for the downfall of the Jewish people given by the author of I Esdras in chapter one of that book. When Ezra confessed the sins of the returned community in Jerusalem and lamented over them he also mentioned the sins of their fathers. 'Because of our sins and the sins of our fathers, we and our brothers, our kings and our priests, were given over to the kings of the earth to be killed, taken prisoner, plundered and humiliated down to this very day' (8:77). The sins of the present community consisted of a breaking of one of the laws of Deuteronomy which Ezra quoted, 'The land which you are about to occupy is a land defiled with the pollution of the heathen peoples; they have filled it with their impurities. Do not marry your daughters to their sons nor take their daughters for your sons; never try to make peace with them if you want to be strong and enjoy the good things of the land and take possession of it forever' (8:83-85). In other words Ezra feared that the Israelites would once more be dispossessed of the land if they persisted in their sinful ways. Even foreign kings recognised the power of the God of Israel to punish those people who contravened the law as is shown by the statement made by Artaxerxes to Ezra in a letter. He tells him that he has directed the treasuries of Syria and Phoenicia to furnish Ezra with whatever he might require and asked that Ezra might be allowed to 'fulfil in honour of the Most High God all the requirements of God's law, so that the divine displeasure may not befall the kingdom of the king and of his descendants' (8:21). God, however, never allowed his people to suffer permanently. This is strongly expressed in Ezra's confession. Speaking for the whole of Israel he said, 'Even when we were slaves we were not deserted by our Lord' (8:80). 'All our misfortunes have come upon us through our evil deeds and our great sins....But thou wast not so angry with us Lord, as to destroy us, root, seed and name; thou keepest faith, O Lord of Israel; the root is left, we are here today' (8:86-89). The people were allowed to return and rebuild the Temple because God had set a limit to the dur-

ation of their time in disgrace. This limit he had imparted to his people when he had first allowed disaster to strike them, through the prophet Jeremiah: 'Until the land has run the full term of its sabbaths, it shall keep sabbath all the time of its desolation till the end of seventy years' (1:58). At the end of this time Cyrus allowed the people of Israel to return home and rebuild the Temple. Cyrus was moved to permit this by God himself (2:1-2). After the Temple had been rebuilt the Israelites kept the feast of Unleavened Bread and rejoiced because God had 'changed the policy of the Assyrian King towards them and strengthened them for the service of the Lord the God of Israel' (7:15).

Jewish tradition and modern scholars recognise that the death of Josiah did not fit into the traditional scheme of retribution in accordance with obedience or disobedience to the will of God. According to the books of the Old Testament a man who lived his life in accordance with the law of God prospered on this earth and lived for a long time.¹⁸ Josiah by all accounts lived an exemplary life. He is credited with finding the law book in the Temple and with making a covenant with God to keep this law. It is to his credit that the people of Judah also pledged themselves to keep this law.¹⁹ Yet, despite his goodness, Josiah was only thirty-nine when he died. By way of contrast, Josiah's grandfather, Manasseh, the wickedest king that Judah had ever known, lived till the age of sixty-seven, having reigned in Jerusalem for fifty-five years.²⁰ Thus Manasseh, too, contradicted the usual pattern of retribution as portrayed in the books of the Old Testament, and it is interesting to note that later generations of Jews attempted to make the lives of both Josiah and Manasseh²¹ conform to the norm, or at least give some rationalisation in terms of God's judgement for the differing fates of the two men.

The Book of Kings suggests that although Josiah was totally righteous in his obedience to God, through the law of Moses, God's anger still burned against Judah because of the wickedness of Manasseh, and thus he was determined to cast it off (II Kings 23:25-27). Immediately after this suggestion is made there follows an account of Josiah's death at the hands of the Pharaoh - Necho. The Book of Kings mentions nothing

in Josiah's life which would account for his untimely demise, but merely indicates that Josiah was suffering for the sins of his fathers. This answer was unlikely to be satisfactory to later generations of Jews who knew of the proclamations of Jeremiah and of Ezekiel which said that a man suffered for his own sins and not for those of a previous generation.²²

II Chronicles says that Josiah suffered an early death because God had sent a message to him through Pharaoh Necho, warning him not to interfere with Necho while he was passing through the land on his way to attack Carchemish on the Euphrates (35:22). It is however unlikely that Josiah could have been expected to recognise that what Necho said was in accordance with the will of God. If God had really wanted to warn Josiah of the danger he would surely have chosen a spokesman whom Josiah would have recognised as being a likely person to convey his will.²³

I Esdras goes one step further in the attempt to explain away Josiah's death in terms of the doctrine of retribution in this life for although it emphasises Josiah's righteousness in every other respect and at every other time (1:23-24) it says that Josiah, 'disregarded what the Lord had said through the prophet Jeremiah and joined battle with Pharaoh in the plain of Megiddo' (1:28-29). Here Josiah is personally guilty of disobedience to the will of God, as it was expressed through one of his prophets. This kind of explanation would only be possible, in the event of it not being a true report of what actually happened, if it was given well after the events themselves and the contemporaries of the king were dead. Noticeably the Book of Kings which was written down closer in time to the events it describes than either Chronicles or I Esdras is unable to impute any personal blame to Josiah.

Rabbinic literature was also disturbed by the problem of Josiah's death for it gives at least four different reasons for it.²⁴ Again the multiplicity of reasons was only possible because of the length of time which had elapsed between the event itself and the rationalisation of it.

I Esdras, explains any disaster which befalls the people of Israel in terms of God's retribution for the sins of the people, and if he was writing, in veiled terms, an encouragement to his people at the time of the Maccabean Crisis, then he could

not allow God to appear irrational in his treatment of Josiah, the most righteous king that there had ever been in Judah.

The omissions from I Esdras, when it is compared to the canonical books of Chronicles, Ezra and Nehemiah become clear in view of the purpose for which it was written. I Esdras commences his narrative with Josiah's passover because it took place in the Temple, which was to be one of the central features of the book. This Passover ceremony illustrated Josiah's righteousness and his adherence to the Law, and showed the brotherhood of the people of Israel when they were living under a righteous leader. Josiah's life also paralleled that of Onias, the High Priest, whose overthrow marked the beginning of the dominance of those Jews whose Hellenistic practices were a direct cause of the Maccabean Crisis (II Macc.3:1f.). Thus Josiah and his Passover were a suitable beginning for a book which intended to encourage those people who were living through the Maccabean Crisis.

The omission of Ezra 3:12 which mentions that some of the people wept when they compared the new Temple to the old would hardly have been an encouragement to people who had lost their Temple. Neither would 4:4-5 which tells how the people of Jerusalem lost heart and were afraid to rebuild the Temple because of harassment by their neighbours. Ezra 4:1-3 detailing offers of help from the Samaritans in rebuilding their Temple was probably considered to be irrelevant or unthinkable in the Second Century B.C. as the Jews and Samaritans were two separate communities by then. Most of the material in the Book of Nehemiah was probably rejected as unsuitable for the purpose in hand. The building of the city walls was doubtless of little interest to the author of I Esdras whose main interests centered upon the Temple and the Law. Any harassment experienced by the Jews while engaged upon their rebuilding work would again be omitted because of its discouraging overtones. Social injustices which are highlighted by Nehemiah are not mentioned in the sources for the Maccabean Crisis and so would not be considered useful for his purpose by the author of I Esdras. Similarly descriptions of the Feast of Tabernacles, of the Day of Atonement, of tithes and first fruits were redundant in a time of Crisis. Nehemiah did inveigh against

foreign marriages which would be relevant to the situation prior to the Maccabean Crisis and this is omitted by I Esdras who instead includes Ezra's ruling on the subject, presumably because it was more stringent.

The additions to I Esdras are also clarified if the purpose of the book was to encourage people living through the Maccabean Crisis. Many of these have already been accounted for - the reason for Josiah's death,²⁵ the emphasis on the Temple,²⁶ the story of the three guardsmen.²⁷ The account in 5:1-6 of Darius sending the people back to Jerusalem was perhaps intended as an encouragement to people living through a time of crisis: the author of I Esdras is here emphasising the help which people had received, once God had withdrawn his anger, the last time the Temple had been threatened. The addition in 6:8b and c was probably made merely for the sake of clarity.

Conclusion to I Esdras.

I Esdras shows an overwhelming concern for the Temple as the meeting place of God with his people. But the possession of the Temple without obedience to God's law or to his prophets merely brought disaster to the people as was witnessed by the kings prior to the Exile and by Ezra's words in his confession of the sins of the returned exiles, particularly when he referred to the Law of Deuteronomy. I Esdras does point out, though, that even if God punishes his people he never deserts them for he has fixed a time limit to their sufferings. A message such as this delivered to people living through the Maccabean Crisis would have had a marked effect for it told them why God was angry with them and that in due time, if they were obedient to his law, He would rescue them from their troubles.

II MACCABEESWas II Maccabees written as a result of the Maccabean Crisis?

The title and contents of the book suggest that it was closely associated with the Maccabean Crisis. Assigning a date to the compilation of the book is no easy task as it is possible that three separate elements are involved. The first is the five books of Jason of Cyrene upon which the Epitomist based his work (II Macc.2:19), the second is the summary of the Epitomist (II Macc.2:23) and the third is the letters which preface the existing work (II Macc.1:1-2:18). There is some dispute amongst scholars as to whether this third category should in fact stand on its own in that the letters were added by a redactor who came after the Epitomist, or whether the letters belonged to the original work by Jason or were included by the Epitomist.²⁸ There is also dispute about the dating of Jason's work. The last event related in II Maccabees as it stands took place in 161 B.C. thus Jason could not have written his work before that date. However there is some disagreement amongst scholars as to whether Jason did actually end his work there, partly because II Maccabees 2:19 says 'In five books Jason of Cyrene has set out the history of Judas Maccabeus and his brothers' whereas II Maccabees ends before the death of Judas,²⁹ and partly because I Maccabees extends further. It is uncertain how long after Jason that the Epitomist abridged his work. Perhaps the only thing which can be said about dating II Maccabees as a whole is that the terminus a quo is 161B.C.³⁰ and the terminus ad quem is set by the use of the book in Philo, Four Maccabees and the Epistle to the Hebrews.³¹ Thus it is possible that the Epitomist wrote his work within ten years of the prohibition of the practice of the Jewish religion by Antiochus Epiphanes or over two hundred years later. It is not known then whether the 'ornamentation' (II Macc.2:29) of the Epitomist i.e. his interpretation of events is almost contemporary with the events or is the result of later reflection. Perhaps all that can be said is that the events related in the Book of II Maccabees are concerned with the prelude and results of Antiochus Epiphanes' attack on Jerusalem and proscription of the Jewish religion. For the purposes of this thesis II Maccabees will be

taken as a literary unity. Even if the letters are a later addition it will become clear that the distinctive features in them are in keeping with the distinctive features of the rest of the book.

A Comparison of II Maccabees with I Maccabees

The table below shows the differences between II Maccabees and I Maccabees. There are differences in events and in pericopae and these will have to be analysed at the end of the table. Phrases, vocabulary and emphases which are peculiar to II Maccabees are underlined.

II MACCABEES 1

1:1-10 Letter from the Jews in Jerusalem and Judaea to their kinsmen in Egypt. Letter asks them to celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles in remembrance of the rededication of the Temple after the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes. During the persecution they, i.e. the enemy 'shed innocent blood.'

I MACCABEES

1:10-12 Second Letter³² from the people of Jerusalem and Judaea to the Jews in Egypt. v.12 'It was God who drove out the enemy force in the holy city'

1:13-17 Tells of Antiochus's expedition to Persia and of his death - v.17 'Blessed in all things be our God, who handed over the evil-doers to death!' God even saved the Temple of Namaea in Persia.

1:18-23 Tells of the Feast of Tabernacles - history of the

II MACCABEESI MACCABEES

Temple fire. v.20 'In God's good time...'

1:24-29 Prayer when the fire was kindled - shows that God is the only ruler.

'O Lord God, creator of all things, thou the terrible, the mighty, the just, and the merciful, the only King, the only gracious one, the only giverPunish our oppressors for their insolent brutality and make them suffer torment; but plant thy people in thy holy place, as Moses said'.

1:30-32 Miraculous fire of the altar.

1:33-36 This induced the King of Persia to enclose the site and make it sacred.

2:1-3 Earlier Jeremiah had ordered the exiles to hide the fire - had charged them not to neglect the Law.

2:3-8 'Prompted by a divine message' Jeremiah took the tent, ark and incense altar to the mountain from which Moses had seen God's promised land. He hid everything in a cave and blocked up the entrance. Friends were unable to find the spot and mark it. Jeremiah had said that it would stay hidden 'until God finally gathers his people together and shows mercy to them. Then the

II MACCABEESI MACCABEES

Lord will bring these things to light again, and the glory of the Lord will appear with the cloud, as it was seen both in the time of Moses and when Solomon prayed that the shrine might be worthily consecrated.'

N.B. Touch of the miraculous.

2:9-12a At the dedication sacrifice at the completion of the Temple, Solomon prayed and fire came down and consumed the sacrifice. Moses had also done this.

2:13-15a 'As Nehemiah collected the chronicles of the kings, the writings of the prophets, the works of David..' so Judas has collected all the books that had been scattered...'

N.B. Judas is likened to Nehemiah.

2:16-18 It was their duty to celebrate the purification of the Temple because 'God has saved his whole people and granted to all of us the holy land, the priesthood and the consecration, as he promised by the law.'

They were confident that he would gather those scattered to the Holy Temple 'for he has delivered us from great evils and purified the Temple.'

N.B. Temple ends the Letter.

2:19-22 Preface to the abridgement. Describes Jason's five books. Tells of how the city was freed and the

II MACCABEESI MACCABEES

laws reaffirmed. 'All this they achieved because the Lord was merciful...'

-

2:23-32 The Epitomiser tells of his aims in summarising Jason's work.

-

3:1-3 Rule of High Priest Onias—the holy city had peace and prosperity. 'The Kings themselves held the sanctuary in honour and used to embellish the Temple with the most splendid gifts.' Seleucus bore all the expense of sacrificial worship.

-

3:4-7 Simon, the Temple administrator quarrelled with Onias over the regulation of the city market. Simon alleged to the governor of Coele-Syria that the Temple had untold riches and the King sent Heliodorus to remove these riches.

-

3:8-13 Onias explained to Heliodorus that the money was held in trust for widows and orphans apart from what was kept for Hyrcanus, son of Tobias.

-

3:14-21 Heliodorus went into the Temple to make an inventory. Everyone lamented. The priests 'prayed to Heaven, to the law-giver who had made deposits sacred, to keep them intact for their

-

II MACCABEESI MACCABEES

rightful owners.' The High Priest was in a state of terrible anguish and the people of Jerusalem supplicated Heaven.

3:22-28 When Heliodorus arrived at the Temple treasury 'the Ruler of spirits and of all powers produced a mighty apparition...' The apparition is described and Heliodorus is overcome and speechless.

3:29-30 The Temple 'now overflowed with joy and festivity, because the Lord Almighty had appeared.'

3:31-34 The miraculous recovery of Heliodorus is related. Heliodorus recovered because the High Priest made an expiatory sacrifice for him. The young man who had appeared to Heliodorus in the apparition now told him, 'For his (i.e. Onias's) sake the Lord has spared your life. You have been scourged by God; now tell all men of his mighty power.'

3:35-36 Heliodorus made a sacrifice and 'bore witness to everyone of the miracles of the supreme God which he had seen with his own eyes.'

3:37-40 Heliodorus reports to the King. He says 'there is a divine power surrounding the temple.'

'...those who approach the place with evil intent he strikes and destroys.'

4:1-6 Simon accuses Onias of having attacked Heliodorus and of conspiracy against the government - Onias is described as 'this benefactor of the holy-city, this protector of his fellow-Jews, this zealot for the laws.' Simon went to obtain the intervention of the King in this quarrel in order to secure peace in public affairs.

4:7-10 During the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes, Jason, the brother of Onias, obtained the High Priesthood by corrupt means. He arranged for the institution of a sports-stadium in Jerusalem and for the enrolling of a group to be known as the Antiochenes.

Very general in I Macc.
Cf. I Macc.1:11-15. No detail given about High Priestly quarrels.

4:11-17 Jason set aside the royal privileges for the Jews and 'abolished the lawful way of life and introduced practices which were against the law. Jason is described as 'impious' and 'no true high priest' 'Priests no longer had any enthusiasm for their duties...' Grievous misfortunes followed... 'To act profanely against God's law is no light matter...'

II MACCABEESI MACCABEES

4:18-20 Jason sent envoys to the games in Tyre. They took money for the sacrifice to Hercules but the bearers decided that it was improper to use this money for a sacrifice and so gave it for fitting out the triremes.

4:21-22 Antiochus heard that King Philometor was hostile therefore he went to Joppa. From there he went on to Jerusalem where he was welcomed by Jason and the city. He then quartered his army in Phoenicia.

I Macc.1:16-19 Antiochus made up his mind to be King of Egypt.

4:23-29 Menelaus outbid Jason for the High Priesthood. Jason had to flee. Menelaus had the royal mandate 'but nothing else to make him worthy of the High Priesthood; he still had the temper of a cruel tyrant and the fury of a wild beast.' Menelaus did not pay for the office so was summoned to the King.

4:30-34 Antiochus went to restore order in Tarsus and Mallus, leaving Andronicus as regent. Menelaus was able to bribe Andronicus to get himself out of trouble. Menelaus then persuaded Andronicus to kill Onias.

4:35-38 The Jews and many other nations were alarmed and angered

II MACCABEESI MACCABEES

by the killing of Onias. Antioch-
us also was deeply grieved and
had Andronicus killed. 'Thus the
Lord repaid him with the retribution
he deserved.'

4:39-42 Lysimachus with the con-
nivance of Menelaus committed many
acts of sacrilege. The people
revolted and Lysimachus armed
3,000 men to deal with them. Many
of these men were wounded and
Lysimachus himself was killed.

4:43-50 Three men representing
the Jewish Senate complained to
Antiochus about Menelaus in con-
nection with the above incident.
Menelaus was able to bribe his
way out of the situation. The
accusers of Menelaus were put to
death. '...even some of the Tyrians
showed their detestation of the
crime by providing a splendid
funeral for the victims.'

EVEN NON-JEWS DISAPPROVE

5:1-4 At the time of Antiochus's
second invasion of Egypt there
were apparitions in the sky all
over Jerusalem for nearly forty
days. N.B. MIRACULOUS ELEMENT.

5:5-10 Upon a false report of
the death of Antiochus, Jason
attacked Jerusalem. Menelaus
took shelter in the citadel and

II MACCABEES

Jason continued to 'massacre his fellow citizens without pity.' Jason had to flee to Ammonite territory. He fled from city to city, 'hunted by all, hated as a rebel against the laws, and detested as the executioner of his country and his fellow-citizens...' Eventually he died as an exile, was unmourned and had no funeral of any kind.

N.B. JASON WAS DETESTED BY EVERYONE, NOT ONLY JEWS, FOR WHAT HE HAD DONE.

5:11-14 Antiochus took Jerusalem by storm because it was clear to him that Judaea was in a state of rebellion. Many were killed.

5:15-16 Antiochus desecrated the Temple, 'the holiest temple on earth.'

Cf. I Macc.1:20-24

5:17-20 Antiochus was able to do this because the Lord allowed him to. 'He did not understand that the sins of the people of Jerusalem had angered the Lord for a short time, and that this was why he left the Temple to its fate.'
'The Lord did not choose the nation for the sake of the sanctuary; he chose the sanctuary for the sake of the nation.' 'It was abandoned when the Lord Almighty was angry,

 Cf. I Macc.1:20-24, No theodicy material.
 'Antiochus gloated over all he had done' (1:24).

I MACCABEES

but restored again in all its splendour when he became reconciled.'

5:21-26 Antiochus took money from the Temple. 'In his arrogance he was rash enough to think that he could make ships sail on dry land and men walk over the sea.' HUBRIS
 Antiochus left people to oppress the Hebrews. He also sent Apollonius to kill all the adult males and to sell the women and boys into slavery. Apollonius posed as a man of peace and then treacherously attacked on the sabbath - 'the holy sabbath day' 5:25.

 I Macc. 1:29-32 Antiochus sent a high revenue official. He behaved like Apollonius.

5:27 Judas and about nine others escaped to the desert and lived there 'so as to have no share in the pollution.'

 This did not happen before the Edict of prohibition of the religion Cf. I Macc. 2:29.

6:1-2 Antiochus sent an Athenian to force the Jews to abandon their ancestral customs. Also commissioned to dedicate the Jerusalem Temple to Olympian Zeus and the sanctuary on Mount Gerizim to Zeus, God of Hospitality.

 I Macc. 1:41-50 gives a universal decree - every nation to abandon their ancestral religion. No mention of Olympian Zeus. No mention of the Athenian.

6:3-9 The Temple was filled with forbidden things. It was forbidden to keep the Sabbath or to 'admit to being a Jew at all.' On the monthly celebration of the King's birthday the Jews were forced to eat the entrails of the sacrificial victims. Neighbouring Greek cities were

 I Macc. is more matter of fact. Less examples are given.

II MACCABEES

given an order to do the same and to kill those Jews who refused to change over to Greek ways.

I MACCABEES

This is not in I Maccabees.

6:10-11 Two women are killed for having their babies circumcised. Other Jews kept the Sabbath in secret and were burnt alive.

 Very general account of persecution cf. I Macc. 1:60-64.

MARTYRDOMS

6:12-17 The Epitomiser addresses a few words to his readers. He begs them not to be disheartened by these calamities.

'Lord ...inflicted retribution before our sins reached their height.'

This is different to the way in which God deals with other nations, with them he waits until their sins have reached their full height. 'He never withdraws his mercy from us; though he disciplines his people by calamity, he never deserts them.'

6:18-31 Martyrdom of Eleazer. Eleazer made an honourable decisionabove all worthy of the holy and God-given law.' He wanted to die bravely to give the young a good example 'to teach them how to die a good death, gladly and nobly, for our revered and holy laws.' When almost dead he said 'To the Lord belongs all holy knowledge.'

II MACCABEES

7:1-42 Martyrdom of the seven

brothers. v.2 'We are ready to die rather than break the laws of our fathers.' v.6 'The Lord God is watching and without doubt has compassion on us.' Moses denounced apostasy saying, 'He will have compassion on his servants'

vvs. 9,11,14,23,29,36 say that there is life after death for martyrs. vvs.23&29 show that this is part of God's mercy.

The fifth brother said to Antiochus 'Wait and see how his great power will torment you and your descendants.' The youngest of the seven brothers tells Antiochus that the Jews are suffering for their own sins and that Antiochus himself is not safe from God's judgement 'but you will pay the just penalty of your insolence by the verdict of God.' 'With me and my brothers may the Almighty's anger, which has just fallen on all our race, be ended!'

In the chapter God is described as the 'King of the Universe', Creator of the Universe', 'Almighty, all-seeing God'.

The seventh young man died, 'putting his whole trust in the Lord.'

8:1-4 Judas actively enlisted those who were still faithful to Judaism - about 6,000. They invoked God to help his people, his temple 'and to have mercy on Jerusalem.' 'They prayed to him also to give ear to the blood that

I MACCABEES

In I Macc. the Hasidaeans went to Mattathias after the Sabbath massacre Cf. 1:42-44

cried to him for vengeance, to remember the infamous massacre of innocent children and the deeds of blasphemy against his name, and to show his hatred of wickedness.'

8:5-7 'Once his band of partisans was organised, Maccabeus proved invincible to the Gentiles, for the Lord's anger had changed to mercy.' Judas was successful in guerilla warfare.

 Mattathias was successful in guerilla warfare before Judas cf. I Macc.2:45-48

X.
8:8-11 The governor of Coele-Syria sends Nicanor and his troops, also Georgias to Judaea. Nicanor determined to pay off the tribute due to the Romans from the sale of Jews captured in battle. 'But he did not expect the vengeance of the Almighty, which was soon to be at his heels.'

 In I Macc. Apollonius, then Seron, then Lysias (Lysias did not go in person, but sent Ptolemaus, with Nicanor and Georgias) to attack the Jews. Possibly this equals the attack of Lysias cf. I Macc. 3:38f., 3:41 shows that merchants from the region came expecting to buy Israelite slaves.

8:12-21 Judas and his men prayed to God to save them from Nicanor 'on the ground of the covenants God had made with their ancestors, and of his holy and majestic Name which they bore.' Judas encourages his followers saying they should have 'before their eyes the wicked crimes of the Gentiles against the Temple..' v.18 '..we rely on God Almighty, who is able to overthrow with a nod our present assailants, and, if need be, the whole world.'

 In I Macc. 3:42-60 Judas says to his followers that they are fighting for the nation and for the holy place. 'Better die fighting than look on while calamity overwhelms our people and the Holy Place.' Judas reminds his followers of the Red Sea and the Covenant.

II MACCABEES

e.g given of Sennacherib's army and of the fight against the Galatians in Babylonia. 'His words ... made them ready to die for their laws and their country.'

NB. LAWS FIRST

8:21-29 Judas divided the country into four. Eleazer appointed to read the holy book out aloud. He gave the signal for battle with the cry 'God is our help'. Engaged Nicanor. 'The Almighty fought on their side and they slaughtered over 9,000 of the enemy.' They plundered and then they kept the Sabbath. They praised the Lord 'who had kept the first drops of his mercy to shed on them that day.' They then divided the spoil and then made supplication to the merciful Lord, 'praying him to be fully reconciled with his servants.'

 In I Macc. the forces were divided according to the law of Deuteronomy cf. 3:55

No mention of the Sabbath.

8:30-33 Judas went against the forces of Timotheus and Bacchides. He defeated them and gained strongholds. 'They killed the officer commanding the forces of Timotheus, an utterly godless man who caused the Jews great suffering' '... they burnt alive the men who had set fire to the sacred gates, including Callisthenes ... he thus received the due reward of his impiety.'

 Bacchides was sent when Demetrius was King. This was after the rededication of the Temple cf. I Macc.7 Timotheus was defeated in the reign of Antiochus IV, cf. I Macc.5

8:34-35 'Thus by the Lord's help Nicanor ... was humiliated by the very people whom he despised above all others.' Nicanor 'showed the world that the Jews had a champion and were therefore invulnerable, because they kept the laws he had given them.'

NB. THEODICY.

9:1-4 Antiochus returns from Persia - thrown out of Persepolis by the population after plunder attempt. When he heard what had happened to Nicanor and Timotheus he had the idea of making the Jews pay for his forced flight from Persia.

 Cf. I Macc. 6:1-7 Did not intend to make the Jews pay.

9:4-28 'But riding with him was the divine judgement!' 'But the all-seeing God, the God of Israel, struck him a fatal and invisible blow.' Antiochus was inflicted with pain because of his intentions towards the Jews. He still did not abate his insolence.

 I Macc. 6:8-13 Antiochus was ill with grief at the miscarriage of his plans. He admitted that he had done wrong in Jerusalem (much briefer). No great description of his torments.

v.8 shows that he was guilty of hubris. Made 'God's power manifest to all.' 'In this broken state, Antiochus began to abate his great arrogance.' He said, 'It is right to submit oneself to God and, being mortal, not to think oneself equal to him.' he decided to make Jerusalem 'the holy city, a free city and to adorn the 'holy temple'. However his pains did not abate 'because the just judgement of God had fallen on him.'

II MACCABEESI MACCABEES

He was in despair and wrote a letter to the Jews, vv.19-27. v.28 'Thus this murderer and blasphemer, suffering the worst of agonies, such as he had made others suffer, met a pitiable end in the mountains of a foreign land.'

10:1-8 Maccabeus ... led by the Lord, recovered the Temple and the city of Jerusalem.

N.B. TEMPLE FIRST.

Purified the Temple etc.

'They prostrated themselves and prayed the Lord not to let them fall any more into such disasters, but, should they ever happen to sin, to discipline them himself with clemency and not hand them over to blasphemous and barbarous Gentiles.'

Eight day celebration.

'They chanted Hymns to the One who had so triumphantly achieved the purification of his own Temple'.

 Cf. I Macc. 4 - a lot about the defilement of the Temple by the Gentiles. The purification was done 'according to the law' No Theodicy.

10:9-13 Antiochus V appoints Lysias as vice-regent. Ptolemaus, the former governor of Coele-Syria had been denounced because he had tried to reverse the former unfair treatment of the Jews. He was called a traitor and in despair he took poison.

10:14-17 Georgias, the governor, took every opportunity of attacking the Jews. The Idumaeans were also

II MACCABEES

harrassing them Maccabeus and his men 'Prayed to God to fight on their side.' '...killed all they met, to the number of at least 20,000.'

18:19-23 9,000 or more of the enemy took refuge in two towers. Judas went to other places which were hard pressed. He left Simon and Josephus and Zaccheus to continue the sidge. Some men in the tower were able to bribe Simon's men and make good their escape. Judas 'executed the men who had turned traitor and immediately the two towers fell to him.'

IMPLICIT ACTION OF GOD.

10:24-38 Another attack by Timotheus - prayed to God - put on sackcloth and ashes - begged God "to be an enemy of their enemies and an opponent of their opponents" as the law clearly states." v.28. 'For the Jews, success and victory were guaranteed, not only because of their bravery but even more because the Lord was their refuge, whereas the Gentiles had only their fury to lead them into battle.'

Vision of the five horsemen protecting Judas. MIRACULOUS.

20,500 infantry and 600 cavalry slaughtered (i.e. of the enemy). Timotheus went to the fortress called Gazara and was killed. (II Macc.12 Timotheus killed at Carnaim).

The Jews praised with hymns and thanksgiving the Lord who showered

I MACCABEES

Judas took revenge on the Idumaeans. cf. 5:3f.

 Cf. I Macc.5. Simon went to Galilee where he was successful. Josephus and Azarias, though, against the express orders of Judas went into battle but were defeated. Cf. 5:55-62.

 Cf. I Macc.5:37f. Timotheus took up a position on the other side of the ravine. Judas crossed to attack. The Gentiles fled and took refuge in Carnaim. Judas subdued Carnaim.

II MACCABEES

blessings on Israel and gives them victory.'

11:1-12 Lysias advances -camps at Bethsura. 'He reckoned not at all with the might of God.'

Judas and all the people prayed to the Lord to send a good angel to deliver Israel. A horseman in white with gold weapons appeared. Maccabeus and his army came on fully armed 'with their heavenly ally, under the mercy of the Lord.'

11:13-15 'Lysias ...realised that the Hebrews were invincible, because the mighty God fought on their side.'

Therefore Lysias proposed a settlement. (This was after the first campaign of Lysias.)

11:16-21 Letter of Lysias to the Jews. Says that if the Jews maintain their goodwill towards the Empire then he, Lysias, will promote their welfare for the future.

11:22-26 Letter of Antiochus to Lysias. He requests that the Jews be allowed to follow their own laws as they do not consent to

I MACCABEES

Cf. I Macc.5:37f. much briefer. No visions or theodicy.

 Cf. I Macc. 4:28-35 Lysias was disappointed 'because Israel had not suffered the disaster he had hoped for.' Judas prayed to God to 'humble their pride.' Reminds God that he had broken the attack of the giant by his servant David.

 I Macc.6:55f. Lysias proposed a settlement because he had heard of the advance of Philip and could not afford a war on two fronts. (This was after the second campaign of Lysias against the Jews.)

II MACCABEESI MACCABEES

live according to Greek ways.

11:27 Letter of Antiochus to the
 Jews. Amnesty - Jews allowed to
 follow their food laws.

11:34-38 Letter from the Romans
 to the Jews. The Romans assent to
 all that Lysias has granted the
 Jews. They ask for a messenger
 to be sent so that they might
 have suitable proposals to make
 to Antiochus when they meet in
 Antioch.

12:1-2 Some governors in the region
 could not let the Jews live in
 peace.

Comment In I Macc. it tends
 to be the Renegade Jews who
 cause trouble when times are
 peaceful cf. Chap.2.

12:3-7 Some of the inhabitants of
 Joppa invited the Jews of the city
 to go out in boats then the people
 of Joppa sank the boats. Judas
'invoked God, the just judge, and
 fell upon their murderers.'

12:8-9 The people of Jamnia intend-
 ed to do the same thing therefore
 Judas attacked them.

12:10-12 During their continued
 advance against Timotheus they were
 attacked by some Arabs; 'by divine
 help Judas and his men were victor-
 ous.' The defeated nomads asked
 Judas to make an alliance - he did
 so because they might be useful to
 him.

12:13-16 Judas attacked Caspin. The defenders were confident in their defences and tried to provoke Judas. But Judas and his men 'They invoked the world's great Sovereign who in the days of Joshua threw down the walls of Jericho without battering rams or seige-engines.' 'By the will of God' they captured the town.

This attack and the following ones probably are equivalent to I Macc.5 The details and the names of the towns are similar but there are numerous discrepancies. Caspin probably is the same as 'Casphor' in I Macc. 5:26 & 5:36. There are no details given of the battle there.

12:17-25 Judas and his men advanced to Charax. Timotheus was not there but had left a garrison. Two of Judas's generals destroyed the garrison. Judas pursued Timotheus. Timotheus sent the women and children on to Carnaim which was inaccessible. When Judas's first division appeared 'terror and panic seized the enemy at the manifestation of the all-seeing one.' A lot of the enemy were killed. Timotheus himself was captured by two of Judas's generals but persuaded them to set him free as he held many of their relatives whom they might never see again.

I Macc.5:34 when "the army of Timotheus recognised that it was Maccabeus (they) took to flight before him"

12:26-31 Judas attacked Carnaim and killed 25,000. Marched on Ephron. 'The Jews invoked the Sovereign whose might shatters all the strength of the enemy.' They made themselves masters of the town and killed 25,000 of the

I Macc. 5:43-44 The Gentiles took refuge in Carnaim. Judas captured it, and burnt it and its occupants.

defenders. In Scythopolis the Jews there said that the people of the town had been good to them before Judas spared them. Judas and his men then went to Jerusalem for the Feast of Weeks.

Ephron and Scythopolis not mentioned in I Macc.

12:32-37 Judas and his men then advanced to attack Georgias. A small number of Jews fell. A personal attack on Georgias failed. 'Judas invoked the Lord to show himself their ally and leader in battle.' Hymns were sung as a battle cry. Judas then put the forces of Georgias to flight through a surprise attack.

12:38-45 Judas and his men kept the Sabbath. The next day they collected the bodies of the fallen. They found under their tunics amulets sacred to the idols of Jamnia. 'It was evident to all that here was the reason why these men had fallen. Therefore they praised the work of the Lord, the just judge, who reveals what is hidden and turning to prayer, they asked that this sin might be entirely blotted out, for they had seen with their own eyes what had happened to the fallen because of their sin.'

Judas sent money to Jerusalem for a sin offering 'a fit and proper act in which he took due account of the resurrection.' 'For if he had not been expecting the fallen to

II MACCABEESI MACCABEES

rise again, it would have been foolish and superfluous to pray for the dead. 'Since he had in view the wonderful reward reserved for those who die a goodly death, his purpose was a holy and pious one.'

13:1-2 Antiochus Eupator and Lysias advance with a large army.

Cf. I Macc. 6:28-31.

13:3-8 Menelaus joined them and urged Antiochus on. 'However the King of Kings aroused the rage of Antiochus against Menelaus.'

Lysias said that Menelaus was responsible for all the trouble therefore he was executed. 'Many a time he had desecrated the hallowed ashes of the altar fire, and by ashes he met his death.'

13:9-17 Antiochus came with the 'intention of inflicting on the Jews sufferings far worse than his father had inflicted'. Judas ordered the people 'to invoke the Lord day and night and pray that now more than ever he would come to their aid.' ... 'for three days without respite they prayed to their merciful Lord, they wailed' etc.

Judas decided 'to march out and with God's help to bring things to a decision. He entrusted the outcome to the Creator of the world; his troops he charged to fight bravely to the death for the law, for the

 In I Macc.6:28 Antiochus came with an army because he was 'furious'. He was furious because he had heard that Judas and his men were besieging the citadel in Jerusalem and had fortified the Temple and Bethsura. The prayers and encouragement are not in I Macc.

II MACCABEESI MACCABEES

Temple and for Jerusalem, for their country and their way of life.'

They killed as many as 2,000 in the enemy camp and his men stabbed to death the leading elephant and its driver, 'It was all over by daybreak 'through the help and protection which Judas had received from the Lord.'

Cf. I Macc.6:43 Eleazer of Avaran killed the leading elephant although he lost his life in doing so.

13:18-26 Antiochus advanced on Bethsura. He was defeated. A Jewish traitor gave secrets to the enemy. He was however found out and killed. Antiochus attacked for a second time and again got the worst of it. He received news that Philip had gone out of his mind in Antioch so he made terms with the Jews.

 I Macc.6:33 Antiochus advanced on Bethzacharia. No mention of Jewish traitor.

I Macc. 6:5 Antiochus attacked the Temple. Those inside were short of food because of the Sabbatical year. They were only saved because Lysias was forced to make peace as Philip was seeking to take over the government.

14:1-2 Demetrius took the country, having disposed of Antiochus and Lysias.

 Cf. I Macc.7

14:3-10 Alcimus, a former High Priest who had submitted to the pollution, went to Demetrius and said that those of the Jews who are called Hasidaeans and are led by Judas Maccabeus are keeping the war alive.

 I Macc. 7:5f. Alcimus aspired to be High Priest.

14:11-14 The King sent Nicanor and a force to dispose of Judas

 Hasidaeans mentioned in I Macc.7:5f. in that they

II MACCABEES

and to install Alcimus as High Priest. The Gentile population of Judaea went to Nicanor and Alcimus.

I MACCABEES

made friendly overtures to Alcimus which were accepted, then he treacherously had them put to death. Bacchides was sent, not Nicanor.

14:15-19 The 'Jews prayed to the One who established his people forever, who never fails to manifest himself when his chosen people are in need of help.'

Knowing how brave the Jews were in battle Nicanor shrank from meeting them and instead wanted to negotiate a settlement.

In I Macc. Nicanor's friendship was always false. cf. I Macc. 7:27-28

14:20-25 Harmonious discussion.

14:26-30 Alcimus went to Demetrius and said that Nicanor was pursuing a detrimental policy. Demetrius ordered Nicanor to arrest Judas. Nicanor was dismayed. Judas realised what was happening and so collected a number of his followers and went into hiding.

14:31-36 Because Nicanor realised he was out manoeuvred he threatened the great and holy temple! The priests say 'Lord, thou hast no need of anything in the world, yet it was thy pleasure that among us there should be a shrine for thy dwelling place. Now, Lord, thou alone art holy, keep this house, so newly purified, forever free from defile-

 Cf. I Macc. 7:35

The priests remind God that he had chosen the Temple to bear his name (N.B. a more humble attitude in I Macc.) Beg God to take vengeance on Nicanor and his army.

ment. N.B. Prayer of priests is Temple orientated.

14:37-46 Martyrdom of Razis a patriot, who for his loyalty was known as 'Father of the Jews'.
'He preferred to die nobly rather than to fall into the hands of criminals and be subjected to gross humiliation.' 'And thus, invoking the Lord of life and breath to give these entrails back to him again, he died.'

N.B. MÄRTYRDOM, LIFE AFTER DEATH.

15:1-5 Nicanor decided to attack the Jews on the Sabbath because then there was no danger. The Jews said, 'Do not carry out such a savage and barbarous massacre, but respect the day singled out and made holy by the all-seeing One.'
'The living Lord himself is ruler in the sky, and he ordered the seventh day to be kept holy.'

N.B. The fact that the Jews term a Sabbath attack a massacre shows that they did not intend to fight on the Sabbath unlike I Maccabees Cf. I Macc. 2:40-41³³

15:6-11 Judas's confidence did not waver.- 'he had not the least doubt that he would obtain help from the Lord.'

He urged his men to remember 'the aid they had received from heaven in the past and so to look to the

II MACCABEESI MACCABEES

Almighty for the victory which he would send this time also. He drew encouragement from the Law and the prophets.....'

15:12-16 Judas had a vision of Onias, the former High Priest, who was praying for the Jewish community. Onias then introduced Judas to the prophet Jeremiah who was also praying for his fellow-Jews, 'and for the holy city.' Jeremiah then gave to Judas a golden sword, saying, 'Take this holy sword, the gift of God, and with it crush your enemies.'

N.B. MIRACULOUS VISIONS.

15:17-19 The words of Judas encouraged his men. 'Their fear was not chiefly for their wives and children but first and foremost for the sacred shrine.'

15:20-24 Judas 'invoked the Lord, the worker of miracles; for he knew that God grants victory to those who deserve it, not because of their military strength, but as he himself decides.'

Judas reminds God that he had sent an angel to kill 185,000 men in Sennacherib's camp. He asks God to do the same thing again. 'May they be struck down by thy strong arm, these blasphemers who are coming to attack thy holy people.'

I Macc. 7:39-42 also mentions the miracle in Sennacherib's camp.

15:25-27 Judas and his men 'praying to God in their hearts' killed 35,000 men 'and were greatly cheered by the divine intervention.'

There is not the same detail. 7:43 records that Nicanor was defeated.

15:28-36 Nicanor was found dead. 'They praised their maker'. They showed the men in the citadel the hand 'which the bragging blasphemer extended against the Almighty's holy temple.' 'They all made the sky ring with the praises of the Lord who had shown his power'. Judas hung Nicanor's head from the citadel 'a clear proof of the Lord's help for all to see.'

Reported in I Macc.7:43f. but not in the same detail. The theodicy material is omitted.

15:37 'From that time on Jerusalem has remained in the possession of the Hebrews.'

I Macc. continues on to tell of the struggle for national independence.

EVENTS WHICH ARE INCLUDED IN II MACCABEES BUT NOT IN I MACCABEES

Events which are included in II Maccabees but not in I Maccabees fall into several categories. There are those which centre around the temple; those which highlight the attitude of the Gentiles towards the Jews; those which contain an element of the miraculous; and those which show people suffering martyrdom rather than break the law.

Events which centre around the temple.

The events which centre around the temple which are included in II Maccabees but not in I Maccabees deal with the High Priestly quarrels, and these can be subdivided into those which illustrate the wickedness of Jason and Menelaus.

Onias's goodness and fidelity to duty are demonstrated when he refused to give Heliodorus the money which had been deposited in the temple for safe-keeping. The money was 'held in trust for widows and orphans, apart from what belonged to Hyrcanus son of Tobias' (3:11). Onias told Heliodorus that 'it was unthinkable that wrong should be done to those who had relied on the sanctity of the place, on the dignity and inviolability of the world-famous temple.' (3:12) This very temple was honoured by kings during the rule of the High Priest Onias, says the Epitomist (3:2). 'Even Seleucus, king of Asia bore all the expenses of the sacrificial worship from his own revenues,' (3:3), an event which was noteworthy because it illustrated the respect which Onias commanded because of his goodness. Not only the kings recognised the goodness of Onias, God did too when he accepted the expiatory sacrifice made by Onias on behalf of Heliodorus. (3:32-33).

By way of contrast Simon, the Temple administrator, Jason and Menelaus are shown to be wicked. Simon quarrelled with Onias over the regulation of the city market and was unable to get the better of him. In revenge Simon alleged to the governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia that Onias was concealing the amount of treasure contained in the temple. This matter was duly reported to the king who sent Heliodorus to obtain these riches (3:4-7). This ploy of Simon's was unsuccessful so he attempted further slander of Onias by accusing him of

having attacked Heliodorus and of conspiracy against the government. (4:1-2).

Jason was the first of the wicked High Priests. After the accession of Antiochus IV, or Antiochus Epiphanes, to the throne of the Seleucid Empire, Jason was able to buy the position of High Priest, at the expense of his brother Onias, and thereby institute a sports stadium and enrol a group known as the 'Antiochenes', in short he 'made the Jews conform to the Greek way of life' (4:7-10). This had an adverse effect upon traditional Jewish worship for 'the priests no longer had any enthusiasm for their duties at the altar, but despised the temple and neglected the sacrifices' (4:14). Jason appears though to have been more willing than some of his followers to totally reject the laws of his God in that he sent money for the sacrifice to Hercules at the quinquennial games in Tyre. This did not seem proper even to the bearers of the money, who must have conformed to the Greek way of life because they are called 'Antiochenes' (4:18-20). But Jason demonstrated his wickedness most conclusively when he attacked Jerusalem and massacred 'his fellow citizens without pity'. His attack was unsuccessful and he had to flee. He eventually died without a funeral (5:5-10).

Menelaus, Jason's successor to the High Priestly office, proved to be even more wicked. He gained the royal mandate for the office of High Priest through treacherous means (4:24) and his subsequent actions followed this pattern. Menelaus was summoned by the king to answer for non-payment of the money which he had promised in exchange for his appointment to exalted office but when Menelaus arrived Antiochus was elsewhere, dealing with two rebellious cities. Menelaus presented Andronicus, the king's deputy with gold plate which he had taken from the Jerusalem Temple and was denounced by Onias, the former High Priest for this sacrilegious act. Menelaus was able to persuade Andronicus to kill Onias (4:27-34). On another occasion Menelaus was able to extricate himself from a troublesome situation by bribery. Three men representing the Jewish Senate went to Antiochus to complain about Menelaus's part in the recent revolt in the city of Jerusalem in which the citizens had banded

together against Lysimachus, who had, with the connivance of Menelaus, 'committed many acts of sacrilegious plunder' (4:39). Menelaus realised that the king was likely to pronounce against him so he bribed a certain Ptolemaus to champion his cause with the king. As a result the king dismissed the charges made against Menelaus and put his accusers to death (4:43-48).

One result of the wicked acts of both Jason and Menelaus was to turn some of the citizens of Jerusalem against them to the point of armed combat which in its turn provoked Antiochus to go to Jerusalem and to punish the citizens (5:11-14).

The acts of the High Priests of the Jerusalem Temple thus affect the lives of their fellow Jews. Onias, whose actions were in accordance with the law of the God of Israel, was able to avert actions which were potentially dangerous for the citizens of Jerusalem whereas Jason and Menelaus brought trouble upon their countrymen.

The attitude of the Gentiles towards the Jews.

In contrast to I Maccabees where it was seen that the Gentiles were hostile to the Jews to the point of wishing to wipe them out,³⁴ II Maccabees records events which show that although some Gentiles were extremely wicked, this was by no means true in every case.

The inhabitants of Joppa belonged to the former category in that they invited the Jews of the city to go out in boats which they provided and which they later sank, drowning two hundred Jews (12:3-4). The people of Jamnia intended to repeat this atrocity but were prevented from doing so by Judas Maccabeus (12:8-9).

The examples given of Gentiles who respect goodness and whose sense of justice will not condone evil outnumber those cited above; Antiochus Epiphanes had Andronicus executed for his part in the murder of the righteous High Priest, Onias (4:38); The Tyrians provided a 'splendid funeral' for the three envoys from the Jewish Senate who were unjustly put to death by Antiochus for having brought charges to bear against Menelaus (4:49). Ptolemaus-Macron, governor of Coele-Syria took 'the lead in reversing the former unjust treatment of the Jews' (10:12); the

people of Scythopolis treated the Jewish inhabitants of their town with kindness when their neighbours were persecuting them (12:30).

Miraculous or visionary events.

When Heliodorus arrived at the Temple treasury to remove the wealth which had been deposited there for safe-keeping God produced an apparition. 'A horse splendidly apparitioned, with a rider of terrible aspect; it rushed fiercely at Heliodorus and, rearing up, attacked him with its hooves. The rider was wearing golden armour. There also appeared to Heliodorus two young men of surpassing strength and glorious beauty, splendidly dressed. They stood on either side of him and scourged him, raining ceaseless blows upon him' (3:25-26). Heliodorus was rendered unconsc^sious by all of this, and thus was unable to plunder the Temple. Onias, the High Priest at the time of this event, made expiation for Heliodorus and 'the same young men, dressed as before, again appeared to Heliodorus. They stood over him and said, 'Be very grateful to Onias the High Priest; for his sake the Lord has spared your life. You have been scourged by God; now tell all men of his mighty power.'" (3:33-34). Before doing battle with Nicanor who had threatened the Temple (14:33), Judas had a dream 'a sort of waking vision' (15:11), in which he saw the former High Priest, Onias, praying for the whole Jewish community. Onias then introduced Judas to the Prophet Jeremiah who was also praying for his people and for Jerusalem, and who gave Judas a golden sword saying, 'Take this holy sword, the gift of God, and with it crush your enemies' (15:12-16).

The power of God is evident in all these events which, curiously enough all centre around the Temple.

Martyrdoms

There is a brief reference in I Maccabees to people being put to death without offering resistance, for continuing to practice the Jewish law after it had been proscribed,³⁵ but II Maccabees gives three lengthy examples of the deaths of individuals who were given an opportunity to avoid this fate. The first is of

Eleazar, 'one of the leading teachers of the law' (6:18). Syrian officers tried to forcibly feed him pork but Eleazar spat this out, whereupon some officials took pity on him for the sake of old acquaintanceship and offered to allow him to eat his own permitted food and only pretend to eat the pork. Eleazar, however, refused to compromise in this way, saying, 'if I now die bravely, I shall show that I have deserved my long life and leave the young a fine example, to teach them how to die a good death, gladly and nobly, for our revered and holy laws' (6:27-28). Eleazar says further, 'To the Lord belongs all holy knowledge ... though I could gladly have escaped death; yet he knows also that in my soul I suffer gladly, because I stand in awe of him' (6:18-31).

The second example given of people who die rather than break the law is that of seven brothers and their mother (7:1-42). Once again they were asked to eat pork. When they announced that death would be preferable to this they were tortured. During their torture they showed tremendous courage in that they further defied the king by telling him why they were so willing to die and that fidelity to the law was more important than life (7:2,9,11). The brothers also believed that God would give them back their lives (7:9,11) and in this they were encouraged by their mother (7:23). The seven brothers also assured Antiochus that he would not escape punishment for what he had done (7:19,36) and frequently these assertions are linked to a statement saying why God was allowing the Jews to suffer in the first place.(7:18,32-33). Indeed just before the youngest brother died he made the plea 'With me and my brothers may the Almighty's anger, which has justly fallen on all our race, be ended (7:38).

The third example given of willing death for the sake of the law is that of Razis, a member of the Jewish Senate (14:37-46). Razis was a 'patriot who for his loyalty was known as 'Father of the Jews'' (14:37). It is further said of him that 'in the early days of the secession he had stood trial for practising Judaism, and with the utmost eagerness had risked life and limb for that cause' (14:38). Nicanor attempted to arrest Razis but Razis decided to commit suicide rather than allow his foes to

capture him. After an abortive attempt to kill himself with his sword, Razis jumped off a tower. This did not kill him immediately for he had time to dash to a rock, fling his entrails at the crowd and invoke God to give them back to him again.

The above deaths have a great deal in common. All of them are for the sake of fidelity to the law and to the One who had given this law to the Jews. In two of the examples those who were about to die trusted that God would give them back their lives. The seven brothers and their mother swore that their torturers would be punished in their turn and that the Jews were being allowed to suffer, not because God was powerless to stop their enemies from harming them but because God was disciplining them for their sins. There are details in the story of the martyrdom of Eleazar (II Macc.6) and of the seven brothers (II Macc.7) which parallel parts of the Servant poems of Deutero-Isaiah³⁶. Eleazar refused to pretend to eat the pork and thus deceive those watching (II Macc.6:21-25) and so he resembles the Servant who spoke 'no word of treachery' (Is. 53:9). The brothers were tortured with whips (μαστιγες) (II Macc.7:1) and the second brother's 'skin and hair of his head were torn off' (II Macc.7:7). Similarly the Servant offered his back to the smiters (μαστιγες) and his cheek to those who pluck out (hair) (Is. 50:6). The second brother put out his tongue saying that God had given it to him (II Macc.7:10-11) and the Servant stated that God had given him his tongue (Is. 50:4). The brothers were mutilated by the king (II Macc.7:4,7) and the Servant, also, was disfigured (Is.52:14,53:2).

EXTRA DETAIL GIVEN TO EVENTS WHICH ARE INCLUDED IN I MACCABEES

These extra details fall into several categories; an emphasis on the Sabbath day, the addition of miraculous or visionary elements, and the frequent mention of God in battles.

Emphasis on the Sabbath Day

After a battle with Nicanor^{which} is recorded in both I and II Maccabees, II Maccabees states that Judas and his men 'turned to keep the sabbath' (8:27). Later on, when Nicanor was threatening the Jerusalem temple he proposed to attack Judas

and his forces on the Sabbath Day as he knew they would refuse to fight back on this holy day (15:1). The Jews who had been forced to accompany Nicanor's army were well aware of the outcome of such an attack and begged Nicanor to change his mind saying, 'Do not carry out such a savage and barbarous massacre, but respect the day singled out and made holy by the all-seeing One' (15:2). In this exchange it is inferred that Judas and his men refused to profane the sabbath day by fighting even if they should lose their lives through it.³⁷ This is a direct contradiction of I Maccabees where Mattathias and his men took the decision to fight on the sabbath day rather than allow the Gentiles to wipe them out (I Macc. 2:40).

The addition of miraculous or visionary elements.

During a battle with Timotheus which is recorded in both I and II Maccabees, II Maccabees adds that 'As the fighting grew hot, the enemy saw in the sky five magnificent figures riding horses with golden bridles, who placed themselves at the head of the Jews, formed a circle around Maccabeus, and kept him invulnerable under the protection of their armour' (10:29). Similarly when Judas and his men were preparing to attack Lysias who was besieging their fortresses 'there appeared at their head a horseman arrayed in white, brandishing his golden weapons' (11:8).

God is mentioned in connection with battles.

There are numerous examples of God being invoked by name before battles in II Maccabees, whereas I Maccabees never mentions this. A comparison of the two accounts of the battle between Judas and Nicanor when Nicanor threatened the temple illustrates this very well. In I Maccabees Judas prayed in these words: 'There was a king whose followers blasphemed, and thy angel came forth and struck down one hundred and eighty five thousand of them. So do thou crush this army before us today, and let all men know that

Nicanor has reviled this holy place; judge him as his wickedness deserves' (I Macc.7:40-42). It is noticeable that the name of God is never mentioned. II Maccabees, however, says that 'Judas invoked the name of the Lord, the worker of miracles:' (15:21). He prayed in these words, 'Master thou didst send thy angel in the days of Hezekiah king of Judah, and he killed as many as a hundred and eighty five thousand men in Sennacherib's camp. Now, Ruler of heaven, send once again a good angel to go in front of us, spreading fear and panic. May they be struck down by thy strong arm, these blasphemers who are coming to attack thy holy people!' (15:22-24) Thus Judas directly addressed God, calling him firstly 'Master', secondly, 'Ruler of heaven'. It is also said that 'Judas and his men joined battle ... fighting with their hands and praying to God in their hearts' (15:26-27).³⁸

More details are given of abominations

II Maccabees states that the Jerusalem Temple was rededicated to Olympian Zeus (6:2) and also that 'on the monthly celebration of the King's birthday, the Jews were driven by brute force to eat the entrails of the sacrificial victims; and on the feast of Dionysius they were forced to wear ivy-wreaths and join the procession in his honour' (6:7). Neighbouring Greek cities were also given an order to put to death any Jews who would not conform to the Greek way of life. None of these details are given in I Maccabees and it is noticeable that they are all connected in some way with the Temple, with the Law or with God's role in events.

DETAILS OF EVENTS WHICH ARE OPPOSED TO THOSE GIVEN IN I MACCABEES

The Gentiles are not portrayed as being entirely wicked as they are in I Maccabees, but on the other hand there is less emphasis on the role of the Maccabees. The power of God is emphasised more strongly and a more humble attitude is displayed by those supplicating him in prayer.

The Gentiles are not portrayed as being entirely wicked

In I Maccabees 1:16 it is stated that 'Antiochus made up his mind to become king of Egypt and so to rule over both kingdoms. II Maccabees says that 'Antiochus heard that Philometor was now hostile to his state, and became anxious for his own safety' (4:21). Thus II Maccabees does not paint such a black picture of Antiochus as does I Maccabees. I Maccabees represents Nicanor as being totally treacherous when it says that he sent 'envoys to Judas and his brothers to make false offers of friendship' (7:27) whereas II Maccabees credits Nicanor with honourable intentions: 'When Nicanor learnt how brave Judas and his troops were he shrank from deciding the issue in battle. So he sent Posidonius, Theodotus and Mattathias to negotiate a settlement' (II Macc.14:18-19).

There is less emphasis placed upon the Maccabees in II Maccabees

Judas is the only Maccabee to lead his forces against the enemy in II Maccabees whereas he is only one of several in I Maccabees. In the latter book Mattathias was successful in guerilla warfare before Judas (I Macc.2:45-48). When Judas left Jerusalem to relieve other places where Jews were being attacked he sent Simon to Galilee where Simon successfully dealt with the opposition according to I Macc. 5:17-23. II Maccabees assigns Simon a less glorious role: Simon was left behind in Jerusalem and some of his men allowed themselves to be bribed by some of the enemy whom they were supposed to be guarding, but whom they instead allowed to escape (10:20).

There is more emphasis on the power of God in II Maccabees

Both I and II Maccabees record that Lysias decided to make a settlement with the Jews but they give entirely different reasons for the decision. I Macc.6:55f. says it was because Lysias had heard of Philip's advance and could not afford to have a war on both fronts, whereas II Maccabees 11:13 says that Lysias 'realised that the Hebrews were invincible, because the mighty God fought on their side.' Similarly I Maccabees gives a more earthly reason for the flight of the army of Timotheus before the Jewish forces. When

the army of Timotheus recognised that it was Maccabeus (they) took to flight before him' (I Macc.5:34). II Maccabees insists that 'when Judas's first division appeared, terror and panic seized the enemy at the manifestation of the all-seeing One (12:22). These two examples of the quite different reasons assigned to people's actions by I and II Maccabees show clearly that the latter book saw success for the Hebrews as being due to the presence of God with his people.

There is a more humble attitude displayed by those supplicating God in prayer in II Maccabees than in I Maccabees

This is demonstrated very well by a comparison of the prayers of the priests when the Temple was threatened by Nicanor. In I Maccabees the priests say, 'Thou didst choose this house to bear thy name, to be a house of prayer and supplication for thy people; take vengeance on this man and his army, and make them fall by the sword. Remember all their blasphemy, and grant them no reprieve' (7:37-38). In II Maccabees the priests make no mention of any desire for vengeance but humbly plead, 'Lord, thou hast no need of anything in the world, yet it was thy pleasure that among us there should be a shrine for thy dwelling-place. Now, Lord, who alone art holy, keep this house, so newly purified, forever free from defilement' (14:35-36).

LETTERS WHICH APPEAR IN II MACCABEES BUT NOT IN I MACCABEES

Several themes run through the two letters which preface the book.³⁹ These are a concern for the Temple, an interest in miracles, in figures in the past, in the law and in theodicy. The other letters serve to demonstrate that the Gentiles are not entirely wicked.

Concern for the Temple

The first letter from the Jews in Jerusalem to the Jews in Egypt asks the latter to observe the celebration of the Feast of Tabernacles and reminds them of the troubled times in Israel following 'the time when Jason and his partisans revolted from the holy land and the kingdom'. Part of the trouble was that those persecuting them set fire to the porch of the Temple (1:1-10).

The second letter shows a similar concern for the Temple. It informs the Jews in Egypt that the Jews in Judaea and in Jerusalem are about to celebrate the purification of the Temple and so the former might celebrate the Feast of Tabernacles, 'in honour of the fire which appeared when Nehemiah offered sacrifices, after he had built the Temple and the altar'. After this the letter gives the history of the Temple fire, followed by another request to observe the festival which was important because God had 'delivered us (his people) from great evils and purified the temple' (2:18).

Miraculous events are related in the letters

Miraculous events which are related in the letters concern the Temple fire. When Nehemiah was sent to Israel by the King of Persia he ordered the descendants of the priests who had hidden the altar fire to retrieve it. However what these priests found was not fire but a thick liquid. This, Nehemiah poured over the wood beneath the sacrifice. When the sun shone the wood started to blaze (1:20-22). Nehemiah later ordered the rest of the liquid to be poured over some large stones and once again flame appeared. The letter also points out that when Moses and Solomon prayed to God before offering sacrifice fire came down from heaven and consumed the sacrifice (2:9-11).

The letters mention some of the great figures from Israel's past.

Some of the great figures from Israel's past are mentioned in the letters in connection with the Temple fire. Nehemiah, mentioned above, was the one who brought the fire back to the Temple after the Exile (1:18-23). Jeremiah was the one who had hidden the fire before the Exile and Solomon and Moses were people who had had experience of this miraculous fire. Solomon of course was the king who had built the first temple in Jerusalem and Nehemiah instigated the building of the second. Moses was the instrument of God's law-giving. Jeremiah tried to prevent his brethren from deserting the law.

The Letters show the importance of the Law.

The Law is mentioned several times in both the first and second letters. One of the greetings from the Jews in Jerusalem and

Judaea to their brethren in Egypt is 'May he give you a mind open to his law and precepts.' (1:4). Jeremiah 'having given them the law ... charged them not to neglect the ordinances of the Lord ... In similar words he appealed to them not to abandon the law' (2:2-3). The end of the letter asserts that 'God has saved his whole people and granted to all of us the holy land, the kingship, the priesthood, and the consecration, as he promised by the law.'

The Letters point out the power and justice of God

The first letter is not as explicit about this as the second although it does state that when the people prayed to God he answered them. The second letter says, 'We have been saved from great dangers ... It was God who drove out the enemy force in the holy city' (1:11-12). This statement clearly shows the power of God. The justice of God as well as his power is illustrated in the death of Antiochus as is recognised by the people who say, 'Blessed in all things be our God, who handed over the evil-doers to death! (1:17). God's power and mercy were known to Jeremiah for he said that the Temple fire would remain hidden 'until God finally gathers his people together and shows mercy to them' (2:7). His power and mercy were actually demonstrated when he did bring the fire to light during the time of Nehemiah (1:19-23). God's power, justice and mercy are shown in the closing statements of the second letter, for He had the power to save his whole people and as he had promised by the law he granted them the holy land ... etc. In this God was showing his fidelity to the people and his justice for he kept his promise. The writers of the letter were confident that God would also show his mercy and gather the Jews from all parts of the world to the Temple (2:17-18).

The Gentiles are not altogether wicked

Five other letters are included in II Maccabees.⁴⁰ One is a letter from Antiochus to the Jews, another from Lysias to the Jews, a third from Antiochus to Lysias, a fourth from Antiochus to the Jews and a fifth from the Romans to the Jews. All these letters express an attitude of good-will towards the Jews.

PRAYERS WHICH ARE IN II MACCABEES BUT NOT IN I MACCABEES

The prayers fall into two basic sections; those of petition and those of praise. Each of these sections includes prayers which highlight the power, the justice and mercy of God.

Petitionary Prayer

Judas and his men attacked Caspin but the defenders there were confident of their strong position and so tried to provoke Judas. Judas and his men 'invoked the world's great sovereign who in the days of Joshua threw down the walls of Jericho without battering-rams or siege-engines' 'They attacked the wall fiercely and, by the will of God, captured the town' (12:15). When Nicanor was attacking the Jews they 'prayed to the One who established his people forever and never fails to manifest himself when his chosen are in need of help' (14:15). On this occasion also God showed the truth of this assertion, for Nicanor 'shrank from deciding the issue in battle' (14:18). When Heliodorus went to the Temple to make an inventory the priests 'prayed to heaven, to the lawgiver who had made deposits sacred, to keep them intact for their rightful owners' (3:15). God sent an apparition to prevent Heliodorus removing anything from the Temple (3:24f.) and so showed his power, but also his justice in that he refused to allow anything which had been placed under his protection to be removed. When Judas had enlisted those men who were still faithful to Judaism 'They invoked the Lord to look down and help his people, whom all were trampling under foot, to take pity on the Temple profaned by impious men, and to have mercy on Jerusalem...They prayed him also to give ear to the blood that cried to him for vengeance, to remember the famous massacre of innocent children and the deeds of blasphemy against his name, and to show his hatred of wickedness' (8:2-4). By aiding Judas and his men God showed his power and his justice in that he avenged the many innocent deaths. His mercy was also evident. God's justice and power were also evidenced when he helped his people against the forces of Nicanor. This was just for Judas and his men prayed to God to help them 'on the ground of the covenants ... made with their ancestors and of his holy and majestic name which they bore! (8:15) . They

also prayed when they were being attacked by Timotheus, begging God that he be "'an enemy of their enemies and an opponent of their opponents' as the law clearly states" (10:26). God showed his justice in that he kept his promise made in the law and also his power when he sent five horsemen to form a circle around Judas and protect him from enemy attack (10:29).

Several examples of petitionary prayer given above mention or show the mercy of God along with his justice. There are two more examples, though, which have not been cited. One such comes after the first successful battle against the Syrian troops, led by Nicanor, when Judas and his men 'all together made supplication to the merciful Lord, praying him to be fully reconciled with his servants' (8:29). The other imprecation comes after the rededication of the Temple when Judas and his men 'prostrated themselves and prayed the Lord not to let them fall any more into such disasters, but, should they ever happen to sin, to discipline them himself with clemency and not hand them over to blasphemous and barbarous Gentiles' (10:4).

Prayer which is Praise.

After a battle with Timotheus in which the Jews were successful they 'praised with hymns and thanksgivings the Lord who showers blessings on Israel and gives them the victory' (10:38). The victory had been won due to the help which God had given to the Jews in the form of five horsemen (10:29). During a battle with Georgias a small number of Jews fell (12:34). The reason for this was discovered when the bodies were collected and amulets sacred to the idols of Jamnia were found under the tunics of the dead men (12:40). The Jews therefore 'praised the work of the Lord, the just judge, who reveals what is hidden'.

After the first successful battle against the enemy Judas and his men praised the Lord 'who had kept the first drops of his mercy to shed on them that day' (II Macc. 8:27).

ENCOURAGEMENT GIVEN BEFORE BATTLE

Judas encouraged his troops in two main ways: he reminded them of what they were fighting for at the present time and he

pointed out how God had helped them personally or their ancestors in the past.

Judas reminded his troops of what they were fighting for at the present time

Before the first battle with Nicanor, Judas told his troops to fight 'nobly, having before their eyes the wicked crimes of the Gentiles against the Temple, their callous outrage upon Jerusalem, and, further, their suppression of the traditional way of life' (8:17). In this way Judas hoped to arouse the anger of his troops against those who had inflicted such evil upon them. Judas gives reason for the need to fight bravely in more positive terms before his troops did battle with the forces of Antiochus V. He charged his troops 'to fight bravely to the death for the law, for the temple and for Jerusalem, for their country and their way of life' (13:14). Noticeably the Temple, Jerusalem and the law (once in the guise of 'the traditional way of life') appear in both sentences.

Judas pointed out to his troops how God had helped them personally or their ancestors in the past.

After Judas encouraged his troops by telling them that they should have before their eyes the wicked crimes of the Gentiles, he reminded them that they relied 'on God Almighty, who is able to overthrow our present assailants and, if need be, the whole world.' He then went on to cite occasions in the past when God had helped his people when by mortal standards it had seemed certain that the Jews would be defeated. Judas specifically mentions that one hundred and eighty - five thousand of Sennacherib's army perished and that when the Jews were engaged in combat with the Galatians in Babylonia, the Jews had numbered only eight thousand and yet they had, 'by heaven's aid' destroyed a great number of the enemy and taken a lot of spoil.

When Nicanor had threatened the Temple, Judas prepared his troops to do battle with him. He told his men to remember the aid they had received from heaven in the past and so to look to the Almighty for the victory he would send this time also. He

drew encouragement from the Law and the prophets (15:8-9).

EDITORIAL COMMENT

There is a great deal of editorial comment in II Maccabees and this covers a considerable variety of subject matter, although the majority of it concerns the way in which God has made his presence felt in events.

The Epitomiser states his reason for summarising Jason's work

The primary reason for summarising Jason's work was that it was too complicated. The Epitomiser then makes a simile, likening himself to a painter 'who needs to discover only what is necessary for the ornamentation' and does not need to bother about the basic structure (2:23-32). This 'ornamentation' is, doubtless, the comments which he makes about the material.

Comments about the High Priests

The High Priests are singled out for attention: Onias is presented in extremely glowing terms (3:1,4:2) and because of his goodness everyone enjoyed peace (3:1); Jason, on the other hand, was impious (4:13) and this caused the priests to lose enthusiasm for their job (4:14); Menelaus is likened to a savage beast (4:25).

Not all Gentiles are wicked

The Epitomiser admits that individual Gentiles can be entirely wicked, as is the case with Timotheus's commanding officer whom he describes as 'an utterly godless man who caused the Jews great suffering' (8:32) but this is by no means true of all Gentiles. When Onias was assassinated by Andronicus 'His murder filled not only Jews, but many from other nations as well, with alarm and anger' (4:35). These other people then are credited with a sense of justice.

The Epitomiser comments on the preferability of martyrdom

When Eleazer decided to die rather than even pretend to eat forbidden food, the Epitomiser says that he 'made an honourable

decision, one worthy of his years and the authority of old age, worthy of the grey hairs he had attained to and wore with such distinction, worthy of his perfect conduct from childhood up, but above all, worthy of the holy and God-given law' (6:23). Of Razis, the Epitomiser comments that 'He preferred to die nobly rather than fall into the hands of criminals and be subjected to gross humiliation' (14:42).

Some of the Epitomiser's comments show that the law was important to him.

The comment which he makes about Eleazar's honourable decision, quoted above, shows that the law was of paramount importance to the Epitomiser. Judas's words of encouragement to his men before the first battle with Nicanor are commented upon to the effect that 'His words put them in good heart and made them ready to die for their country' (8:21). 'Laws' is placed before 'country' which increases its significance.

The Epitomiser comments upon God's actions.

These comments can be divided into four sections:(a) comments which highlight the power of God, (b) those which point out his punishment of the wicked, (c) those which highlight his mercy and (d) one about life after death.

(a) Many of these comments concern the help which God gave the Jews during battles with the enemy. In the first battle with Nicanor 'The Almighty fought on their side and they slaughtered over nine thousand of the enemy.' (8:24) In the battle with Timotheus, 'For the Jews, success and victory were guaranteed not only because of their bravery but even more because the Lord was their refuge, whereas the Gentiles had only their own fury to lead them into battle' (10:28). In a battle with Lysias the Jews 'came on fully armed, with their heavenly ally' (11:10). When Judas and his men were set upon by an Arab force 'by divine help (they) were victorious' (12:11). Even the enemy felt the power of God was working with the Jews, or if they did not at first, they soon found it was a force to be reckoned with. Lysias at first, 'reckoned not at all with the might of God' (11:4) but 'Lysias was no fool, and as he took stock of the

defeat he had suffered he reckoned that the Hebrews were invincible, because the mighty God fought on their side' (11:13).

God could even motivate Gentiles as he did with Antiochus. 'The King of kings aroused the rage of Antiochus against Menelaus' (13:4).

(b) Andronicus was put to death by Antiochus for his part in the murder of Onias and it is commented that '...the Lord repaid him with the retribution he deserved' (4:38). Jason, the former High Priest died without a funeral, so 'He who had cast out many to lie unburied, was himself unmourned' (5:10).

Nicanor 'did not expect the vengeance of the Almighty, which was soon to be at his heels' (8:11). In fact 'by the Lord's help, Nicanor, that double-dyed villain who had brought the thousand merchants to buy the Jewish captives, was humiliated by the very people whom he despised above all others' (8:34). Callisthenes, the man who had set fire to the sacred gates was burnt alive and 'thus received the due reward of his impiety' (8:33). As far as Menelaus was concerned 'Many a time he desecrated the holy ashes of the altar fire, and by ashes he met his death' (13:8).

All the examples which have been given so far concern the retribution of God which was carried out through the agency of other people. Antiochus, however, was inflicted with pain by God himself. He was so furious at his defeat in Persia that he decided to make the Jews pay for his humiliation. 'But riding with him was the divine judgement' (9:4) 'The all-seeing Lord, the God of Israel, struck him a fatal and invisible blow' (9:5). Even though Antiochus was racked with pain he did not lessen his arrogance. His illness, however, did make 'God's power manifest to all' (9:8). Eventually 'in this broken state, Antiochus began to abate his arrogance' (9:11) and to think that it was right to submit himself to God. It was too late though, for as the Epitomiser remarks 'the just judgement of God had fallen on him' (9:18). Eventually he died and the Epitomiser provides him with an obituary as follows: 'Thus this murderer and blasphemer, suffering the worst of agonies, such as he had made others suffer, met a pitiable end in the mountains of a foreign land' (9:28). The way in which

the Epitomiser describes Antiochus resembles the language used in Isaiah 14.⁴² Antiochus falls (πιπτειν) from his chariot to the earth (κχιτλ γης) (II Macc. 9:7 cf. Is. 14:8,11,12,15) he is eaten by worms (II Macc.9:9, cf. Is. 14:11) the people round about him cannot bear the stench from his body (II Macc.9; 12; Is. 14:19) he had felt that he could touch the stars of heaven (II Macc. 9:10, Is. 14:13). Thus the Epitomiser likens the downfall of Antiochus to the hoped for downfall of the King of Babylon, outlined in Isaiah 14.

The Epitomiser is greatly concerned with why the Jews had to suffer at the hands of the Gentiles. He says that 'the pride of Antiochus passed all bounds. He did not understand that the sins of the people of Jerusalem had angered the Lord for a short time, and that this was why he left the Temple to its fate...the Lord did not choose the sanctuary for the sake of the nation...It was abandoned when the Lord Almighty was angry, but restored again in all its splendour when he became reconciled' (5:17-20).

The Epitomiser says further that it' is a sign of great kindness that acts of impiety should not be let alone for long but meet their due recompense at once' (6:13). He continues that other nations are allowed to continue until their sins reach their height. The Jewish people were to be grateful that God showed his presence amongst them by acting quickly where they were concerned. 'He never withdraws his mercy from us; though he disciplines his people with calamity, he never deserts them' (6:16).

(c) The mercy of God is illustrated in a more positive form when 'Maccabeus proved invincible to the Gentiles' (8:5). This was because 'the Lord's anger had changed to mercy' (8:5). This mercy showed itself to be consistent and helped Judas and his men to win battles for as the Epitomiser comments on one occasion, 'They came on fully armed, with their heavenly ally, under the mercy of the Lord' (11:10). Indeed the whole struggle for the Temple, for Jerusalem and for Judaism was successful in the Epitomiser's opinion, because 'the Lord was merciful and gracious ...' (2:2)

(d) There is only one occasion when the Epitomiser makes any

reference to the idea of life after death and it is in connection with the sin offering which Judas made on behalf of the men who had fallen in battle as a result of wearing amulets sacred to the idols of Jamnia under their tunics. He said that the sin offering was 'a fit and proper act in which (Judas) took due account of the resurrection. For if (Judas) had not been expecting the fallen to rise again, it would have been foolish and superfluous to pray for the dead' (12:43-44).

VOCABULARY WHICH IS USED REPEATEDLY IN II MACCABEES OR WHICH IS USED IN A DIFFERENT CONTEXT FROM I MACCABEES

Holy The adjective 'holy' is used frequently in II Maccabees. The best starting point for giving examples of this is perhaps 'Lord, who alone art holy' (14:36). Everything else which is described as 'holy' is so because of its relationship to God: God's name is holy (8:15) and to him 'belongs all holy knowledge' (6:30). The Temple is holy⁴³ and this had been chosen by God as his dwelling place (14:35). Jerusalem is often described as 'the holy city'⁴⁴ and this is the place where God's Temple was. The land is called holy⁴⁵ and this is the country which God had chosen for his people who are also described as holy.⁴⁶ The people 'Israel' are holy because they are God's own (1:25-26) and he had established them forever (14:15). The law is described as holy⁴⁷ for it was 'god-given' (6:23) and the Sabbath day which was part of this law was holy⁴⁸ because it was the day 'singled out and made holy by the all-seeing One' (15:3). The book in which the law was contained is described as holy (8:23). When Menelaus was put to death it is said that 'Many a time he had desecrated the hallowed ashes of the altar-fire and by ashes he met his death' (13:8). The ashes of the altar-fire are designated holy because the altar upon which they burned was dedicated to God. Jeremiah gave Judas a 'holy sword' which was holy because it was 'a gift of God' (15:16). Judas's purpose in making a sin offering on behalf of those who had fallen in battle with Judas is described as 'a holy and pious one' 'since he had in view the wonderful reward reserved for those who die a godly death' (12:45).

The law always precedes the country: it is also more important than life.

There are two sentences where the law and the country are in juxtaposition. These are 8:21 and 13:14 and in both cases 'law' precedes 'country'. Both these examples show that the law was more important than life. Eleazer says that this was so when he explains that if he dies bravely he will be teaching the young 'How to die a good death, gladly and nobly, for our reward and holy laws' (6:28). One of the seven brothers said, 'We are ready to die rather than break the laws of our fathers' (7:2).

The various appellations for God

The variety and frequency of different names for God in II Maccabees shows the centrality of God. He is described or named as 'Almighty'⁴⁹, 'Creator'⁵⁰, 'the King of kings'⁵¹, 'King of the Universe'⁵², 'Ruler of heaven'(15:23), 'Master' (15:22,15:29), 'the living Lord' (15:4), 'the Sovereign' (12:28,12:15) and 'The Ruler of spirits and of all powers' (3:24).

THE POLITICAL OUTLOOK OF II MACCABEES

The additions and differences in II Maccabees when it is compared with I Maccabees show that the former believes God to be the ruler of all people and so his law and the Temple are of paramount importance and worth fighting for, but, not if doing battle for them means infringement of the God-given law; death is preferable to that. There is no attempt to foster hatred of the Gentiles for who rules the country is of little consequence as long as all Jews are given the freedom to worship their God in the traditional manner. Even Judas the Maccabee, is represented as a latter day Nehemiah who is greatly concerned with the holy books.

The Temple is introduced at the very beginning of II Maccabees whether one regards the letters or the summary of the Epitomiser as the real start of the book. The importance of the Temple is also underlined in the middle section of

the book in that the purification of the Temple occurs at the very centre of the persecution and ensuing struggle. II Maccabees ends after it has related the story of the last threat to the Temple during the Maccabean Crisis, that is with Nicanor's threatened assault upon the holy place. (14: 31f.)

The Temple and its concerns occurred in many of the sections where the material in II Maccabees differed from that in I Maccabees. The High Priestly struggles and quarrels were dealt with at great length whereas I Maccabees devoted no time to them at all, mentioning in four verses only, the upheaval caused by a group of renegade Jews who made a covenant with the Gentiles (I Macc. 1:1 1-15). The abominations committed in the Temple and in religious observance were dwelt upon in greater detail than in I Maccabees (II Macc.6:3-9) and when Judas was encouraging his troops before battle the Temple was always more important than life itself (8:17,13:14).

The law also is of paramount importance in II Maccabees. Examples of this have already been enumerated in the section which is concerned with vocabulary which is repeatedly used in II Maccabees.⁵³ The Epitomiser's remarks about events also show the importance of law⁵⁴. Eleazer was willing to die for the law (6:23) as were the seven brothers (8:21). Refusal to fight on the sabbath day even if it was a question of life and death (I Macc.2:40).

God is frequently invoked or called by many different names in II Maccabees⁵⁵ which points to a belief in God's direct connection with events. That this is indeed the case is upheld by the number of sections where God's appearance was found to be one of the major differences between I and II Maccabees. In the latter book God was frequently invoked before a battle.⁵⁶ The letters⁵⁷ which preface II Maccabees point out the power and justice of God as do the prayers⁵⁸ in the book and the encouragement given by Judas to his troops⁵⁹. The Epitomiser often commented upon the action of God in events and illustrated his power, His mercy and His acts of retribution.

Indeed II Maccabees sees God as the only true ruler, for he has power over Jews and Gentiles alike.

The Maccabees are not glorified to the same extent in II Maccabees as they are in I Maccabees. Simon is less successful⁶⁰ indeed Judas is the only Maccabee to organise resistance to the enemy, probably because II Maccabees has no interest in the struggle for national independence. Indeed it identifies Judas with the Hasidaeans (14:6) the group whom I Maccabees represents as wishing to make peace with Alcimus and Bacchides, one of the Syrian commanders, once the Temple had been rededicated (I Macc.7:13). Indeed the picture of Judas and his forces which is portrayed in II Maccabees agrees with what is said about the Hasidaeans in I Maccabees in that they were unwilling to fight on the Sabbath day (I Macc.2:29-44). Judas is likened to Nehemiah in II Maccabees because he collected all the books which had been scattered as a result of the troubles (2:13-14) whereas I have argued that in I Maccabees all the Maccabees were portrayed in terms of Judges.

II Maccabees does not portray all the Gentiles as wicked. There are several instances given where they do all they can to right a wrong or at least to show sympathy with those who have been wronged.⁶¹ Nicanor is represented as making a genuine offer of friendship to Judas (14:18-19), unlike his attitude in I Maccabees where the friendship offered was false from the start (7:27). Some of the letters included in II Maccabees also show that the Gentiles were prepared to co-operate with the Jews if the feeling was mutual.⁶² The Epitomiser would concur with what events demonstrated was the attitude of the Gentiles for he says that other nations aside from the Jews were alarmed and angry at the murder of the High Priest Onias (II Macc.4:35).

THEODICY IN II MACCABEES

Various elements go to make up the pattern of theodicy in II Maccabees. These elements have already been mentioned in the account of the differences between I and II Maccabees. There appear to be two main lines of theodicy: (a) that of communal retribution and (b) that of individual retribution. Communal retribution falls on the community either because of the actions of the community, or of a group in the community or of an individual in the community. God's wrath was changed to mercy through the vicarious sufferings of a few on behalf of the many. As far as individual retribution is concerned the wicked receive a punishment appropriate to their crime on this earth, but the good receive their reward in the life to come. Sometimes retribution comes directly from God, at other times he brings it about through the agency of human beings.

(a) During the rule of the High Priest Onias, who was, in the words of the Epitomiser, 'a pious man (who) hated wickedness' (3:1), 'the holy city enjoyed complete peace and prosperity' (3:1). God at this time protected his Temple from Gentiles as is shown when Heliodorus attempted to effect an entry to make an inventory of the riches held within (3:14). In order to prevent Heliodorus from carrying out his plan God produced an apparition which rendered Heliodorus unconscious (3:23-28). Onias made an expiatory sacrifice for his recovery. God granted this and sent the same young man who had appeared to Heliodorus in the apparition to tell him to 'Be very grateful to Onias the high priest; for his sake the Lord has spared your life. You have been scourged by God; now tell all men of his mighty power' (3:31-34). The result of this was that Heliodorus told the king that there was 'a divine power surrounding the temple. He whose habitation is in heaven watches over it himself and gives his aid; those who approach the place with evil intent he strikes and destroys' (3:38-39). It is made clear by the Epitomiser that this action of God's in preventing Heliodorus from gaining access to the Temple was not one of individual retribution, but was communal when he says that if the people

of Jerusalem had 'not already been guilty of many sinful acts, Antiochus would have fared like Heliodorus...' (5:18). The Epitomiser goes on to explain that 'the Lord did not chose the sanctuary for the sake of the nation. Therefore even the sanctuary itself had its part in the misfortunes that overtook the nation, and afterwards shared its good fortune. It was abandoned when the Lord Almighty was angry, but restored again in all its splendour when he became reconciled' (5:19-20). The Epitomiser further explains that God inflicted such suffering on the nation for its discipline 'and not for its destruction' (6:12) ... 'though he disciplines his people by calamity, he never deserts them' (6:16). After the rededication of the Temple the people prayed to God and asked him 'not to let them fall into any more such disasters, but, should they ever happen to sin, to discipline them himself with clemency and not hand them over to the blasphemous and barbarous Gentiles' (10:4-5). This prayer shows that the people accepted that it was necessary for God to discipline them, indeed that they had sinned. While God was angry with his people several individuals died rather than betray the law (6:28-7:2) and the last of the seven brothers to die made the plea 'With me and my brothers may the Almighty's anger, which has justly fallen on our race, be ended!' (7:38). This plea was granted by God for it is said that 'Maccabeus proved invincible to the Gentiles, for the Lord's anger had changed to mercy' (8:5). It is noticeable that in I Maccabees it was the actions of Mattathias and of Judas which averted the wrath of God and not the deaths of the martyrs for the law.⁶³ The deaths of the martyrs then atoned for the sins of Israel, although the martyrs themselves were personally blameless. Their suffering as such was vicarious and in this and other respects they may be being likened to the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah.⁶⁴ Once God's anger had changed to mercy he was present with his people in battle and responded favourably to all their invocations for help against the enemy.⁶⁵ On occasion God did not merely act through the agency of Judas Maccabeus and his forces but sent heavenly aid (10:29-30, 11:8, 15:12-16).

(b) There are many examples of individuals being punished for their sins. Jason, the high priest, 'who had cast out many to lie unburied was himself unmourned; he had no funeral of any kind, no resting place in the grave of his ancestors' (5:10). Menelaus had many a time 'desecrated the hallowed ashes of the altar-fire, and by ashes he met his death' (13:8). Timotheus, 'an utterly godless man who had caused the Jews great suffering (8:32) was killed and Callisthenes 'who had set fire to the sacred gates' (8:33) was burnt alive. Antiochus, 'suffering the worst of agonies, such as he had made others suffer, met a pitiable end in the mountains of a foreign land' (10:28). Judas ordered the hand of Nicanor to be cut off, 'the hand which this bragging blasphemer had extended against the Almighty's holy temple' (15:32). The punishment of all these evil-doers is this worldly and the punishment is made to fit the crime.

The reward of the good though is not this worldly. For the first time in any of the books which have so far been studied in connection with the Maccabean Crisis the conviction of life after death makes an appearance. On two occasions when the idea appears it is linked to the deaths of the martyrs, those people who had preferred death to disobeying the law. One of the seven brothers who died said, 'since we die for his laws, the King of the universe will raise us up to a life made everlastingly new' (7:9). Another taunted the King with 'Better to be killed by men and cherish God's promise to raise us again' (7:14). The mother of the seven brothers encouraged them to die bravely, saying, 'It is the Creator of the universe who moulds men at his birth and plans the origin of all things. Therefore he, in his mercy, will give you back life and breath again, since now you put his laws above all thought of self' (7:23).⁶⁶

The problem of the martyrs who had died, not because they were unfaithful to God, but because they were extremely zealous for his laws may have encouraged belief in life after death. Such a belief though is extended in II Maccabees to those who had sinned by wearing amulets sacred to the idols of Jamnia if God accepted the atoning sacrifice which Judas made on their behalf. (12:43-45).

THE INTER-RELATIONSHIP OF POLITICS AND THEODICY IN II MACCABEES

When II Maccabees is compared to I Maccabees the particular emphases which emerge as characteristic of the book centre around the advocacy of complete obedience to the law and of reverence for the Temple, which are the outward signs of communion with God, the sovereign Lord of all people. Disregard for his Lordship, displayed through self-aggrandisement, and neglect of the law and of the Temple, arouses his wrath and brings disaster. God's wrath is turned to mercy by the deaths of those who are faithful to him and to his law and who suffer on behalf of their errant fellow Jews. The merciful Lord displays his mighty power, sometimes by supernatural means, to gain victory for his people against the enemy. He ensures that each individual receives the just reward for his actions in this life, or in the next life in the case of those who sacrifice themselves for the sake of the whole community.

GENERAL CONCLUSION TO DANIEL 1-6, I ESDRAS, II MACCABEES

Daniel 1-6, I Esdras, and II Maccabees are all at pains to point out that God is the absolute sovereign over all mankind and that he is the Just Judge of all people, even of such powerful individuals as kings. The message of all three books is that obedience to God's law will be rewarded and disobedience to it punished. The three books differ in that they devote differing amounts of attention to communal retribution and to individual retribution and as to the time when individual retribution will take place but they all emphasise that it will take place and that it is just. As far as individual retribution is concerned Chapters 1-6 of Daniel assert that it follows closely upon the action of the individual, whether it be good or bad, and that it takes place upon this earth even if supernatural means have to be employed in order to ensure that it does occur. I Esdras has to reinterpret history in the case of Josiah's death in order to point out the justice of Josiah's apparently untimely death. II Maccabees says that in those instances where people die for their adherence to God's law, they can be assured that God will raise them to a new and glorious life.

Daniel 1-6 has nothing to say about communal retribution, contenting itself with the problems of individuals, but it does say, in the case of an individual being disciplined for his sins that God has fixed a limit for the duration of his sufferings. I Esdras, in the case of the communal discipline of Israel also says that God has set a limit to its sufferings. II Maccabees does not directly state that God has fore-ordained a time limit for the sufferings of his people, but does point out that God does not desert them and shows mercy to them when individuals have atoned for the sins of the many. Thus each book in its own way is stating that God does not totally discard those upon whom suffering is brought to bear in order to cleanse them, but accepts them anew at the end of a certain period.

The power of God to ensure that justice is done is heavily underlined in all three books but especially in Daniel 1-6 and II Maccabees where supernatural means are employed by God to

ensure this end.

Isaiah 14 influenced the account of the death of Antiochus in II Maccabees and the Suffering Servant passages of Deutero-Isaiah are the inspiration behind the sufferings of the martyrs in II Maccabees. The prophetic books of the Old Testament as a whole are concerned with the sovereignty of God and the attitude taken by communities and individuals to this. Obedience in spirit to the law of God, not merely observance of the externals of the law is what is required.⁶⁷ True obedience or disobedience to the law of God brings approval or discipline. Much of the prophetic work is concerned with the latter, with foretelling God's displeasure with acts of disobedience and his resulting punishment, thus giving an interpretation of the justice of the punishment or period of discipline.⁶⁸ Certain prophetic books are also concerned with the justice of the fate of the individual, as well as that of the community. The famous passages in Jeremiah and Ezekiel assert that each individual will be judged by God according to his or her own deeds and that the goodness or badness of their fathers will not be counted for or against them by God.⁶⁹

The overall structure of the books of Daniel 1-6, I Esdras and II Maccabees in so far as they deal with the total Lordship of God and the relationship of communities and individuals to Him is based upon the general scheme of the Prophetic books. Foreign nations and kings are not of necessity hostile to the people of Israel and if they are they may simply be the instrument of punishment.

CHAPTER FOURAPOCALYPTIC LITERATURE: DANIEL 7-12 and ENOCH 85-90Daniel 7-12 : Date

Few modern scholars would seriously reject the contention that the message contained in Daniel 7-12 is directed towards those people who were suffering at the hands of Antiochus Epiphanes. These chapters, along with chapters 1-6 form the whole of the Book of Daniel. That the two sections of the book are different is self-evident in that the former chapters are haggadic while the latter are eschatologically orientated, but they are intimately linked in that the visionary in the earlier chapters is identified with the visionary in the later ones. Further, chapter 2, which treats of four successive world empires, is linked with chapter 7 which also deals with four empires, commonly identified as the same ones.¹ It is not certain whether chapters 7-12 come from one hand or several² and I prefer, because the matter is exceedingly complex and does not affect the subject in hand, to leave the conclusion open and say with Andre Lacocque that if chapters 7-12 were not all written by the same person, they all came from the same literary circle for they embody the same ideas,³ and with Ginsberg⁴ that the time span of these chapters is 168B.C. to 164B.C.

The Political Outlook of Daniel 7-12

Daniel 7-12 contains a reflection upon history from the time of the Babylonian Exile to 164B.C. During this time the Gentiles are aggressive but Antiochus Epiphanes, who ruled from 175 to 163 B.C. is the most contemptible king of all. The ferocious character of the four Gentile empires which preceded 164 B.C. is indicated particularly in Daniel's first vision (7:3-8) where they are identified with wild beasts: the first, the Babylonian Empire, is a lion with eagles wings, although it actually lost the wings and became a man; the second, the Median Empire, is a bear who feasted upon flesh;⁵ the third, the Persian Empire, a leopard with four birds' wings on its back and four heads; the fourth beast was 'dreadful and grisly, exceedingly strong, with great iron teeth and bronze claws (which) crunched and devoured and trampled underfoot all that was left'. (7:7) In Daniel's second vision animals are again used as synonyms for the Median - Persian Empires and the Greek. This time

an exceedingly powerful ram with two horns against whom no one could prevail was overthrown by a he-goat. (8:3-9) In Daniel's fourth vision he sees the reigns of the last four kings of Persia and the advent of Alexander the Great and his warlike successors down to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. (11:2-20) As in the first two visions the Persian and Greek Empires are portrayed as aggressive.

Antiochus Epiphanes, the present ruler at the time of Daniel, is shown in every single vision to be the most contemptible king of all. The first vision describes him as a little horn on the fourth beast with 'eyes like the eyes of a man, and a mouth which spoke proud words.' (7:8) The acts behind these proud words are detailed in the interpretation of this vision in 7:25 where it is said of him that 'He shall hurl defiance at the Most High and shall wear down the saints of the Most High. He shall plan to alter the customary times and law; and the saints shall be delivered into his power...'. In the second vision it is said of him that he 'aspired to be as great as the host of heaven, and ...cast down to earth some of the host and some of the stars and trod them underfoot. (He) aspired to be as great as the Prince of the host, suppressed his regular offering and even threw down his sanctuary.' (8:10-11) In the third vision he is called an 'author of desolation' (9:27) and in the fourth 'a contemptible creature' (11:21) and his wicked deeds are outlined in detail. (11:21-45)

Despite the wickedness of the Gentiles and in particular of Antiochus, who was trying, and apparently succeeding in overthrowing the God, the religious rites and even the lives of the people of Israel, there is no advocacy of armed resistance as a means of ushering in the future rule of God and the faithful. That course of action is to be shunned for 11:14 warns that some hotheads who had previously tried to give substance to a vision (presumably by the taking up of arms) had come to disaster. Although it is conceded that fighting against Antiochus Epiphanes was in fact the right course of action for the faithful (11:32) and was of help to the victims, there is no guarantee that fighting in itself is a mark of sincerity (11:34), and Judas Maccabeus is dismissed as being of some little help. (11:33)

The only important thing is fidelity to the covenant which is equivalent to fidelity to God himself (11:32), and it is the yardstick by which a person's character is measured. The various Empires or kings of those Empires were described as wicked because of their disregard for God. The first Empire, the Babylonian, was illustrated as 'a lion (with) an eagle's wings' (7:4). This lion had its wings removed and 'it was lifted from the ground and made to stand on two feet like a man; it was also given the mind of a man.' (7:4) This description is probably related to the story of Nebuchadnezzar in Daniel 4, who, as a punishment for hubris, was stripped of his kingdom and made to live among the wild beasts for seven years and when he admitted his error and praised God was allowed to return to his former position. Antiochus Epiphanes is likewise condemned because he set himself above God (7:25,8:10). Obedience and submission to God, then, is the true aim in life, but not only do the Gentiles not achieve this, some Israelites do not either (11:32).

Theodicy in Daniel 7-12

History is divided into two eras in Daniel 7-12. The events of the first era, that of foreign domination for Israel, have been given a limited time span of ten jubilees (9:24). These are being directed by God, through the intermediacy of his angels, towards the time of their end (8:19,12:4). Earthly events are seen as being a mirror of struggles between Gabriel and the patron angels of various peoples as is indicated when Gabriel tells Daniel that he is going to fight with the Prince of Persia (10:20).

The events leading to the end of foreign domination have been written in the Book of Truth (11:1) and are communicated to Daniel, a member of the holy people, in a series of visions. Gabriel tells Daniel that the end is signalled by the death of Antiochus (11:45) of whom it is said elsewhere that he will 'be broken, but not by human hands' (8:25). 7:11 which follows the description of the Court of the Ancient in Years suggests that God will pass judgement upon Antiochus and entirely destroy him and his Empire.

There is an indication that some of the suffering endured by the holy people in the past was merited. Daniel's prayer to God (9:4-14) supposedly takes place at the time of the Babylonian Exile and includes a confession that the people of Israel had sinned in going against God's commandments therefore God had brought misery upon them.

Of particular interest to those suffering for their fidelity to God's laws during the Antiochean persecution must have been Gabriel's assertion that some of the wise leaders of the nation 'will themselves fall victim for a time so that they might be tested, refined and made shining white' (11:35). This testing was God's doing and thus reminds the people that all suffering must not be thought of in terms of God's punishment for some past misdeed.

The most comprehensive redress for past actions would take place after the death of Antiochus with the appearance of Michael who would usher in a new era (12:1). Michael appears to have had both a military and judicial function in that he defends Israel and stands up for it⁶ and yet according to Dan. 7:9-11 the ultimate judge is the Ancient in Years, God himself. At the time of the end 'many of those who sleep in the dust of the earth (would) awake, some to everlasting life and some to the reproach of eternal abhorrence' (12:2). That the criterion for who would awake to life and who to shame, was past fidelity or infidelity to the covenant is implied, if not explicitly stated, by reference to the Book (12:1)⁷.

The pattern of theodicy in Daniel has some points of contact with other Old Testament passages. Antiochus is guilty of hubris (8:10-11, 11:36) and thus is likened to the King of Assyria in Isaiah 10:12-19 and possibly to Lucifer in Isaiah 14.⁸ The idea of some people being awakened to eternal shame (12:2) is likewise probably based upon Isaianic passages; probably an amalgamation of 26:19 and 66:24 and of the general idea of earthly retribution for the wicked and righteous in Trito-Isaiah.⁹ The עֲבָדָיו of Daniel 12:3, are reminiscent of the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah where the Servant is described as a עֲבָדָיו. Indeed there is an analogy between the situation of

the Suffering Servant and the righteous in Daniel for both suffer, are condemned as law breakers, and put to death, yet are innocent in the eyes of God.¹⁰ The time span allotted from the time of the Exile to the beginning of God's rule on earth is based upon an amalgamation of Jeremiah 25:11-14 and 29:10 and Leviticus 25:8-18. There are thus a multitude of allusions to the Prophetic literature in Daniel 7-12 and yet there is also a similarity to the Urzeit/Endzeit pattern of ancient mythology,¹¹ as the following examples show. Beasts rise out of the sea, which is reminiscent of creation,¹² then the last is destroyed and the other three stripped of their power (7:4-8); The Son of Man may be the prototype of humanity and Antiochus Epiphanes the epitome of evil;¹³ The events of the earth are a mirror of the struggles of patron angels, an image which is extended in Chapter 7 if one accepts that the Community of the Saints of Israel¹⁴ corresponds to the Community of Holy Angels¹⁵; The enthronement of the Son of Man takes place amidst the Community of Saints, yet the natural Sitz im Leben for this event would be the Temple. For this reason the Community of Saints has been equated with a new spiritual Temple, inaugurated after the judgement.¹⁶ A full circle will then have been turned, with the Saints of the Most High holding power (7:18), presided over by the Son of Man (7:14), and the Gentiles in submission (7:14).

That God, in conjunction with his angelic council (7:9-10), was aware of what was happening, was in control of events and directing them towards their culmination must have been a great comfort to people living through the terrors of Antiochus, particularly as it is stated several times by the angelic interpreters of Daniel's visions that Antiochus was the last, if the most terrible, foreign ruler to be inflicted upon the holy people. He, like Israel at the time of the Exile, would be punished in this era, by dying with no one to help him. Those who were undergoing innocent suffering are assured that they are being purified now and will be vindicated in the future when indeed their enemies will suffer eternal torment.

The Inter-relationship of Politics and Theodicy in Daniel 7-12

The holy people, whose aim in life was obedience to God, live in a world dominated by four world empires, who believe themselves to be above God. The last ruler of the fourth empire, Antiochus Epiphanes, is particularly blameworthy in this respect and even won over some Israelites who were only too eager to forsake the covenant. All this, which mirrors angelic struggles, has been foreseen by God and communicated to Daniel in a series of visions which indicated that the life span of the Empires was limited, that they would be stripped of their power and the last one totally destroyed. Michael, the patron saint of Israel, would then appear and stand guard over his people, then all whose name had been written in the book would be resurrected, some to eternal life, others to the punishment of eternal shame. The former, the wise, would then be given kingly power and the Gentiles would come in submission to them (7:27). The holy people then are to understand themselves as part of the Urzeit/Endzeit pattern, so although they should resist the Gentile oppressor, it will not bring his power to an end because only God can do that.

Enoch 85-90 :Date

During the nineteenth and the first half of the twentieth centuries there were widely differing views about the date of Ethiopic Enoch, its authorship and language, but these have largely been superseded by the discovery at Qumran of Aramaic fragments of the book which hitherto had only existed in comprehensive form in Ethiopic and in partial form in Greek. Milik, who in conjunction with Matthew Black,¹⁷ edited the Qumran fragments, including the remains of four manuscripts of Enoch 83-90, thinks that the four visions can be dated quite precisely.¹⁸ He says that 90:16 is a clear reference to the political situation in Israel in 164B.C. when Judas Maccabeus had been victorious over the Syrians and the surrounding peoples were gathered against the holy nation.¹⁹ The apocalyptic part of the book begins at this point, thus 164B.C. is the most likely time of writing. There is nothing spectacularly new in Milik's dating of this part of Ethiopic Enoch,²⁰ but the discovery

of the fragments at Qumran upholds what was previously only theory.

The Political Outlook of Enoch 85-90

The Gentiles, characterised as various beasts of the field and birds of the air, have always been hostile to Israel, the sheep, but this hostility is more intense at the time of the author than it had been previously. During the sojourn in Egypt the children of Abraham, the sheep, were set upon by wolves, the Egyptians.²¹ The characterisation of Israel as 'sheep' and of the Egyptians as 'wolves' illustrates the nature of the relationship between the two peoples and highlights the aggressor. Throughout the rest of history up to the time of the author, the people of Israel continue to be described as sheep and her enemies, the Gentiles, by the names of creatures who are naturally predatory. During the time of settlement in the promised land the peoples who attack Israel are called 'dogs, foxes and wild boars'.²² Around the time of the fall of the two kingdoms of Israel and Judah 'lions and tigers, and wolves and hyenas and ...foxes and ...wild beasts' (89:55) set upon the sheep and when these sheep returned from Exile 'wild boars tried to hinder them' (89:73). Israel's enemies during the Greek period are characterised as birds of prey, as 'eagles, vultures, kites and ravens' (90:2). The nature of birds of prey, which in some respects is worse than that of wild beasts, in that the former have the advantage of attack from the air and so can retreat quickly with impunity, is illustrated when it is said that 'the ravens flew upon those lambs, and took one of those lambs, and dashed the sheep in pieces and devoured them.' (90:8). The lamb which was taken by the ravens is probably to be identified with Onias²³ the High Priest, who was removed from office to make way for Jason, and who was eventually killed by Andronicus, one of Antiochus Epiphanes' s ministers, apparently at the instigation of Menelaus.²⁴ Even after Judas Maccabeus appeared (90:9) the eagles, vultures, ravens and kites kept on attacking his flock, even though they were unable to prevail against Judas himself. (90:11-12). Finally the birds of prey all gathered together and made a concerted effort to overthrow Judas who

had to cry for help (90:13), which he indeed received from God, (90:15).

The Gentiles are extremely aggressive to Israel and latterly wish to destroy them totally but then not all the people of Israel are good throughout their history. At the time of the Exodus 'the sheep began to be blinded and to wander from the way which (Moses) had showed them' (98:32). Moses however was able to prevail against them so that 'they returned to their folds' (89:35). A similar situation ensued during the period of the Judges in that sometimes the eyes of the sheep were opened and sometimes they were blinded (8:41). In the time before the Exile the people of Israel strayed several times and it is said of them that during the reign of Ahab and Jezebel 'they again erred and went many ways, and forsook that their house' (89:51). On each occasion so far cited when the sheep strayed from the fold another sheep was able to guide them back: Moses in the first instance, then the Judges and finally Elijah. Immediately prior to the Exile though no sheep was able to prevail against those who forsook 'the house of the Lord and his tower, (for) they fell away entirely, and their eyes were blinded.' (89:54) Prior to the Maccabean Crisis there were some good Israelites who cried out to the sheep 'But they did not hearken to what they said to them, but were exceedingly deaf, and their eyes were exceedingly blinded.' (90:8) The use of intensifying adjectives with 'deaf' and 'blinded' emphasises the error of these sheep, who are probably to be identified with the leaders of the people of Israel, including Jason and Menelaus, who were willing to treat with Antiochus Epiphanes to the detriment of their own law.

Noticeably the blindness of the sheep is associated with their straying from their house or fold (8:35,8:51,8:54) or from the way which had been shown to them(8:32); that is from the house or the way of the Lord as is clearly evident from 8:54. Obedience to the Lord's will then is the rule for life and is what is required above all else. Active resistance to the oppressor, Antiochus Epiphanes, is supported, in that a sword is given to the sheep (89:19) but the passive tense here employed shows that active resistance was part of God's plan and thus constitutes

obedience to Him.

Theodicy in Enoch 85-90

Enoch had a vision of events both past and future which indicates that the author thought in terms of a history which was destined to happen. Enoch's vision gives an explanation for the wickedness prevailing during history and more particularly during the reign of Antiochus Epiphanes and an assurance that the Lord of the Sheep would soon come in person to punish the evil-doers, to justify the righteous and to renew creation within His own kingdom on earth.

At the beginning of the world Adam was born and he is described as a white bull (85:3), his son Cain however was black (85:3) and later killed his brother Abel. It may well be that the author used the colours black and white only in a symbolic way and didn't intend the simile to be enquired into too deeply for if it is, then the only conclusion that can be drawn is that Cain was predestined to be black and wicked and the responsibility for this must be placed at God's door. It is impossible for Cain's blackness to be accounted for in terms of free-will for he was born black and did not merely turn black when he committed fratricide.

When the first star or angel fell from heaven the various oxen began to live with one another (8:61-62). It is not explicit which cattle the black oxen began to live with but the only other type which so far have been mentioned are the white ones or the Sethites, and so it is logical to assume that they are the ones which are meant.²⁵ The offspring of the rest of the stars or fallen angels and the cows of the oxen began to devour mankind and consequently terrorised those who were left (86:6). In response to this terrible situation on earth seven beings²⁶ who were like white men (87:2) came down from heaven and between them bound the first fallen star hand and foot and cast it into an abyss which was 'narrow and deep, and horrible and dark' (88:1), caused the offspring of the stars and cows to smite one another, then cast the parent stars into an abyss. (88:2-3). The following deluge then rid the earth of the remaining offspring and the oxen

apart from one white bull (Noah) and his three sons (89:1-6). Theoretically then the harmful influence on earth had been removed, that is any descendants of the first black bull, the offspring of the fallen stars and the stars themselves. However the colours of Adam, the first man, and his two sons, Cain and Abel, who were white, black and red respectively were reproduced in the sons of Noah so the cycle started once more (89:9). Once again the reason for these colours is not stated overtly and so there is the choice of taking them as symbolic indications of the future deeds of these three sons and their offspring, or as an outward manifestation of their nature which had been predestined by God. In this instance though, it may be that the fallen stars who had been bound hand and foot were still exerting an evil influence upon the world. Indeed if this is what the author intended the reader to assume it may well help to explain the reference to the chasms of the earth which were levelled up by the flood in 89:7.²⁷

A partial explanation for the origin of the Gentiles and their enmity with Israel is given in that the three sons of Noah were at odds with one another and there was a breaking away of some of the offspring of the one good son, or white bull, in that a wild ass was born of him and one of his grandsons which was begotten by the white bull, the brother of the wild ass, was a black boar. (89:11,12)²⁸

Beginning with Isaac (89:12) the people of Israel are characterised as white sheep and throughout the rest of history some of these sheep were blinded.²⁹ The use of the passive tense 'were blinded' suggests that these sheep could not help their condition and that some force external to themselves caused their blindness. But who or what that force was is not explained, perhaps it was God or perhaps it was the still prevailing influence of the fallen stars or angels.³⁰

Throughout history God is seen to be just in that the fallen angels are bound, and their offspring are drowned along with all wicked mankind (88:1-89:7). When Israel 'betrayed his place' (89:54) God punished them by handing them over into the power of the Gentiles, 'the lions and tigers, and wolves and hyenas, and ...' He also corrected unmerited suffering to a certain extent in that he led the people of Israel out of Egypt where they were being

oppressed. (89:16f.) Exceptionally good people He rewarded during their lifetime; Noah, for instance, was warned about the coming flood(89:1).

At the time of the flood there was a thoroughgoing punishment of all evil-doers but afterwards wickedness started again and by the time of the author it was extremely bad. At the time of the Exile God had handed the sheep into the care of shepherds(89:59) but they exceeded their orders and slew more than they were supposed to (89:69). The time limit of their ascendancy is specified ³¹ and their excesses recorded in a book by one appointed to do just that (89:62). The Gentiles became steadily worse in that they were ready to totally destroy the sheep, or Israel, and the leaders of the Israelites themselves did not listen to members of their own people who warned them that their ways were erroneous. Thus almost a full circle had turned since the time before the flood, in that the shepherds³² may be compared to the fallen angels, the Gentiles to the offspring of the latter, and the blind and deaf sheep of Israel to the cattle before the flood who had consorted with other kinds of cattle. At the time of the flood God had acted to rectify the situation and the author is sure that God is about to act in a decisive way once more. The way that God will act this time will mean that never again will there be aggression, injustice or wickedness on earth again. God, accompanied by the keeper of the book would take his judgement seat in Israel and summon the seven angels who had bound the fallen angels and instruct them to bring their charges before Him. These he would condemn and send into a fiery abyss to be burnt along with the shepherds and blinded sheep (90:20-27). It is uncertain whether this punishment was completed quickly or was to last eternally. After carrying out these punishments He would institute the New Jerusalem - necessary because the bread which had been placed on the altar of the old one had been polluted (89:73) - bring back all the remaining Gentiles to do homage to and obey Israel and bring back all the good Israelites, who had been dispersed or destroyed.(90:30-33). This last deed means that some Israelites would be resurrected and so receive their reward for a righteous life. At this point the sword which had been given to the sheep

to fight against the Gentiles (90:19) was laid down, symbolising the beginning of a time of peace. The Messiah³³ now appears, although he has no particular function. His appearance may well be connected to Isaiah 11:1-9, upon which Enoch 85-90 appears to be based. Verses 6-9 of Isaiah 11 are particularly close in theme to the present chapters.

- 6 Then the wolf shall live with the sheep,
and the leopard lie down with the kid;
the calf and the young lion shall grow up together,
and a little child shall lead them;
7 the cow and the bear shall be friends,
and their young shall lie down together.
The lion shall eat straw like cattle;
8 the infant shall play over the hole of the cobra,
and the young child play over the viper's nest.
9 They shall not hurt or destroy in all my holy mountain;
for as the waters fill the sea, so shall the land be
filled with the knowledge of the Lord.

In verses 6-8 the gentle creatures, sheep, kids, calves, cows and human children are at peace with all kinds of wild beasts. In the early period in Enoch the forerunners and Patriarchs of Israel are symbolised as cattle (85,86,89:1,9,11) and from Jacob (89:12) onwards as sheep. Kids are not mentioned but in the ancient world sheep and goats were thought of in similar terms.³⁴ Verse 9 is similar in sense to Enoch 90:33-34 where all the sheep (Israel) and the beasts of the field and the birds of the air gathered in the Lord's house and the sword was laid down. However Isaiah 11:6-9 is part of a larger prophecy foretelling the coming of a shoot from the stock of Jesse (11:1) upon whom the spirit of the Lord will rest who will 'judge the poor with justice and defend the humble in the land with equity; (and whose word) shall slay the wicked.' (11:4). In Enoch God himself fulfils the functions mentioned in verse 4 and so a Messianic figure is redundant as indeed he is in Enoch, except in so far as he symbolises a return to the conditions at the beginning in that he and Adam are both described as white bulls.³⁵

Enoch 85-90 gives an explanation for the situation prevailing during the reign of Antiochus in terms of the whole sweep of world history. Once before, when there had been terrible wickedness on earth amongst angelic beings, their offspring and the oxen, God had punished them all. There is an assurance that

he would on this occasion come in person and dispense justice once and for all, punishing the wicked and bringing the righteous together in His house, the New Jerusalem, even if some of some of them had to be resurrected for this aim to be realised. This He would do in fulfilment of a prophecy in Isaiah, bringing a Messiah who is symbolic of a return to the whiteness of the first man, Adam.

The Inter-relationship of Politics and Theodicy in Enoch 85-90

The author of the present chapters thinks that the only truly important concern in life is obedience to God, the Lord of the sheep, but this is so disregarded in his own time by many of the sheep, and the Gentiles, the eagles, vultures, kites and ravens are so determined to tear the few good lambs, led by the ram with great horns to pieces, that he feels certain that the only way in which the disruptive elements in life can be decisively eliminated is by God's own presence on earth and His inauguration of His kingdom, in fulfilment of the prophecy in Isaiah 11:1-9. Then there will be real peace, and previous wrongs will have been righted in that good Israelites who had been dispersed or destroyed will be brought back to the New Jerusalem to worship in harmony with the remaining Gentiles who assemble there in submission and obedience. To complete the circle of history the Messiah is then born, a white bull like Adam, the first born of Creation.

A Comparison of the Politics and Theodicy of Daniel 7-12 and Enoch 85-90

The time of Antiochus Epiphanes and his attendant persecution of the Jews and their religion is regarded in both Daniel 7-12 and Enoch 85-90 as the worst in history and as a sign of the imminent coming of God to dispense justice (aided by Michael in Daniel and the seven angels in Enoch) according to what was written in the Book about each individual and to reverse the power structure of the world. Those who have been faithful and obedient to Him and suffered in this cause, i.e. the good Israelites, will now be resurrected and given authority over the surviving Gentiles. Those, whether they be Gentile or Israelite, who have disobeyed

God and caused suffering to others, will be punished eternally in Daniel and probably eternally in Enoch. Thus there is reward or punishment as a community vis-à-vis one's individual stance to God in the past. At this point a Messianic figure appears, at least in Enoch and it has been suggested that the Son of Man should be viewed in the same light in Daniel. Because these events have been foreordained by God, any active resistance to the oppressor, although regarded as praiseworthy and indeed in Enoch as God-ordained, would give only temporary relief to the sufferers but would not, of itself, overcome the power of the adversary, for only God could do that.

Both Daniel and Enoch explain some of the suffering of the Israelites throughout history as merited although they differ in their explanations of undeserved suffering. Daniel suggests that it was intended to purify the victims, while Enoch lays the blame at the feet of erring angels, whether they be described as fallen stars or shepherds. This Enochic explanation is incipiently dualistic in that heavenly beings other than God influence earthly events. Enoch may also contain the idea that some people are evil from birth in that Cain and others were born black.

Both books interpret the events of the Maccabean Crisis and the coming judgement and new kingdom in relation to Old Testament prophecies, particularly Isaiah 11:1-9 and the Suffering Servant passages which promise the inauguration of a new era with the advent of a particular figure. However both books contain many elements from mythology: in Daniel the beasts rising from the sea, the Son of Man imagery, the heavenly court and angelic struggles; in Enoch, the myth of the watchers and angelic discord. It seems overall that Daniel 7-12 and Enoch 85-90 are structured upon the *Urzeit-Endzeit* base of mythology in that the end brings a renewal of creation, a New Temple and a new world order centring around the Kingdom of God.³⁶

NOTE ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ATTITUDE OF EACH GROUP OF TEXTS TO THAT OF A PARTICULAR SOCIAL GROUP WHICH EXISTED BEFORE THE CRISIS.

Nationalistic Texts (I Maccabees, Judith)

Mattathias of Modin was a country priest (I Macc.2:1); Judith owned an estate and lived and worked there (8:7). The books of I Maccabees and Judith manifest a strongly nationalistic attitude where active resistance to the extremely hostile enemy is advocated. This attitude corresponds to that of the farming community, who held the land and ritual in the highest regard, as evidenced in the books of Obadiah and Joel, prior to the Crisis.¹

Judith and I Maccabees both make reference to the Conquest and Settlement, in particular to the book of Judges. The Patriarchs merit mention in both and many of Judith's ideals correspond to the book of Deuteronomy. Judith does go a little beyond the simple, nationalistic, ritualistic, stereotype in that she is extremely careful to keep the dietary laws, which links with the attitude of the urban artisans. However this does not necessarily mean that she was intimately connected with this group, but may indicate that there was a fluidity of ideas in the community of Israel and that the practices of one group might in part be used to supplement those of another group; possibly even on an individual basis. This frequently happens in twentieth century Britain for instance. A person who labels himself a 'Socialist' and who adopts most of the ideals and practices of this group may yet feel that the official Labour party's policy on education is not one which benefits society at large, or indeed the children involved in it, and so may formulate in this respect a view which happens to be more in line with that of the Conservative party.

Theocratic Texts (Dan.1-6, I Esdras, II Maccabees)

The absence of a central human figure or family in these books makes the task of assigning them to one particular social group slightly more difficult than was the case with I Maccabees and Judith. God is the central figure, the Sovereign of all mankind,

the All powerful and Merciful One to whom earthly rulers are subjugated. Freedom of religion, the Temple and God's Law are of paramount importance and take precedence over the land.

Daniel 1-6 is reminiscent of the time of the Exile in that Daniel is in the court of a foreign ruler and there is great concentration on his keeping of the food laws. In I Esdras God sent prophets to persuade the people to return to him before the Exile, and was extremely angry when they were rejected. Josiah's death is explained as a rejection of the message of Jeremiah. Judas in II Maccabees, is likened to Nehemiah and the martyrs to the Suffering Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. Reverence for the Sabbath is also important in II Maccabees.

The literature of the Exilic period which emphasised the importance of the Temple, the sanctity of the Sabbath and purity laws are recalled in these texts which makes it likely that they are the work of the descendants of the urban artisans who were able to develop their religion in Exile, independently of the land.²

Apocalyptic Texts (Dan.7-12, Ethiopic Enoch 85-90)

The Gentiles are increasingly hostile but the present historical era is coming to an end. Thus active resistance to the enemy is not of prime importance. God will intervene directly and transform the present situation. There will be comprehensive redress for individuals according to what has been written in the book concerning their adherence or non-adherence to the Covenant.

These two books have moved towards a cyclic view of history and have resuscitated Cosmic myths. - Daniel using the Son of Man imagery, probably based on a Canaanite myth³ and Enoch using the myth of the Fallen Angels which is referred to in Genesis 6:1-4.⁴ References which Daniel and Enoch make to Old Testament passages are to ones which contain unfulfilled prophecies; Daniel using Isaiah 14, Isaiah 26:19 and Isaiah 66:24 and Enoch utilising Isaiah 11:1-4. This would suggest, in line with Hanson,⁵ that the groups behind these two books are descendants of the followers of Deutero-Isaiah, who saw a rival programme to their master's plan

of restoration inaugurated and who became increasingly disillusioned with the status quo, possibly because they belonged to groups of Temple personnel who were given no active part in the day to day running of the Second Temple.⁶

CHAPTER 5III and IV Maccabees

This chapter is concerned with non-Palestinian Jewish literature which adopts elements of the Maccabean Crisis, in either an overt or covert way, to direct the reader towards an understanding of the secular government and of God, within his own environment.

An investigation of the works in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament shows that only III and IV Maccabees might be included in this category despite the usual clamour of scholars that these two works have been misnamed!

The Dating of III Maccabees.

III Maccabees opens with a description of the Battle of Raphia which took place in 217B.C. and this sets the upper limit for the date of the book. The lower limit must be before 70A.D. as the optimistic references to the sanctity of the Temple in the book are unlikely to have been written at a time when it had ceased to exist.¹ There have been many attempts to fix a more precise date within the limits of 217B.C. and 70A.D., and these can be divided into two groups: the first sees III Maccabees as a document written in a time of crisis and the second, which rejects this view, relies upon its literary relationship with other apocryphal books whose more precise dating is somewhat easier.

Ewald² thinks that III Maccabees was written in response to the attempt of Caligula to set up his image in the Temple but his view has been strongly criticised on the grounds that the distinctive feature of Caligula's administration is missing; namely the claim to be divine which could have been included, even if it was necessary in the face of persecution to be obscure,³ as the Ptolemies also claimed divine honours.⁴

M. Hadas,⁵ possibly building on the view of Wilcken,⁶ suggests the word 'laographia' (2:28) which meant 'poll tax' in the Roman era, indicates that III Maccabees was written in response to the suffering of Egyptian Jews when Egypt became a Roman province in 24B.C. This suggestion of Hadas's is rather surprising in view of the criticism which it received from Grenfell and Hunt⁷ over seventy years ago; namely that 'laographia' occurs in the Ptolemaic papyri in the sense of 'a taxing list of persons', and so its occurrence in

III Maccabees cannot on its own support the beginning of the Roman administration of Egypt as the time of writing.

Emmet rejects the view that III Maccabees is connected with any historical crisis saying that it 'belongs rather to the time when the nation is prosperous and its position has been triumphantly vindicated.'⁸ Hugh Anderson⁹ concurs with this statement. However although the nation has been vindicated the dangers which have faced them and the capriciousness of the Gentile rulers are heavily emphasised and thus must not be taken as a warning against abandoning one's God in favour of an earthly ruler.

The vocabulary and motifs of III Maccabees show a great similarity with those of both II Maccabees and the Epistle of Aristeas¹¹ and this has led some scholars to settle for similar dating. Bickermann,¹² dates the Epistle of Aristeas about 100B.C. on the basis of the form of the greeting used (chairein kai errosthai) which was in fashion at that particular time. The same salutation is used in III Maccabees (3:12 and 7:1). Hadas¹³ argues the similarity of III Maccabees and the Epistle of Aristeas because of the way in which both books elaborate official decrees. In both, the King responsible for the decree justifies his measure although the actual grounds for the justification differ. Both decrees ask that the measure prescribed be carried out with impossible haste, and also that informers be rewarded.¹⁴

Bickermann's argument appears to be fairly conclusive, a verdict which is confirmed by H. Anderson,¹⁵ and backed by Hadas's further elucidation of the similarity of III Maccabees to the Epistle of Aristeas. Thus the dating of approximately 100B.C. is tenable and also fits in with the dating of II Maccabees¹⁶ whose similarities have already been mentioned and which will be elaborated below.

The place of writing is usually accepted as Alexandria, in Egypt.¹⁷

The Similarity between II Maccabees and III Maccabees.

There are many similarities in vocabulary between II Maccabees and III Maccabees, including phrases which are rare elsewhere in Greek literature. A comprehensive list of these has been compiled by Emmet.¹⁸ Of greater interest in the present context is the similarity of themes. The most striking example is Philopater's attempted invasion of the sanctity of the Temple (III Macc. 2:21-24) which parallels that of Heliodorus (II Macc. 3:22-31). As in the II Maccabees story the

people of Jerusalem display signs of great grief (III Macc.1:16-29, II Macc.3:16-21) to which God responds by striking down the offender (III Macc.2:21-23, II Macc.3:23-28). The stories do diverge in that in II Maccabees Heliodorus only recovers because of the intercession of Onias, the High Priest (2:31-34), whereas in III Maccabees God strikes Philopater down because of the supplication of the people and the intercession of the High Priest, and Philopater later recovers of his own accord. The similarities in the two stories are, however greater than this difference which may have been introduced to explain the continued hatred of the King for the Jews and his attempt to persecute them in Egypt. Heliodorus, on the other hand, is left in no doubt that God was the One who had not only struck him down but also effected his cure, and so was unable to find any need for revenge upon the Jews. The description of Philopater as 'insolent' (2:2,6:12) parallels what is said about Antiochus Epiphanes in II Maccabees: 'In his arrogance...' (5:21) 'Still he did not in the least abate his great arrogance.' (9:11). In both II and III Maccabees there are attacks upon the religion of the Jews (II Macc.6:9, III Macc. 2:27f.3:21) and an attempt to force them to adopt an alien culture and citizenship (III Macc. 2:27-30, II Macc.4:9). In both books there are festivals to celebrate the overcoming of these difficulties (II Macc.10:6,15:36, III Macc.6:30-36). An old and virtuous man named Eleazar appears in both and sets the tone for the attitude which ought to be taken in both situations. The Eleazar of II Maccabees chooses to die rather than to deceive his audience into thinking that he had turned his back upon God (6:23-31) whereas in the face of death the Eleazar of III Maccabees turns to God in prayer (6:1-15).

The wealth of parallels between II and III Maccabees suggests to me the following hypothesis: That the author of III Maccabees deliberately modelled his narrative upon elements in the Maccabean Crisis because the story was well known. The Crisis itself made the author very aware of the need to uphold one's faith in God and to not allow oneself to compromise with alien cultures and religions. In order to communicate this need to his readers he deliberately transferred some of the major themes of the Maccabean Crisis to an Egyptian setting to show that orthodoxy was no

less essential for Egyptian Jews than it was for Palestinian Jews. The value of this hypothesis is that it explains the similarity of the themes of the two books and upholds the judgement of scholars that the purpose of the author of III Maccabees was to keep the lamp of orthodox faith burning.¹⁹ Obversely this purpose would illustrate to Gentiles the special nature of the Jewish people and the power of their God, even to the extent that the king comes to confess Him.(7:2,6,9).

The Political Outlook of III Maccabees.

The Pharoah is represented as being insolent (2:6,26), impious(3:1) and extremely hostile to the Jews. He left Israel after his divine repulsion from the Temple uttering 'bitter threats' (2:24) and later said of the Jews that they 'stand alone among nations in their stiff-necked resistance to kings and their own benefactors, they refuse to take anything in a proper spirit.' (3:9). Pharoah 'was even more bitterly hostile to those (Jews) in the country (3:2) and he wanted to exterminate all the members of that race in Egypt (4:14-15). Pharaoh's display of his hatred of the Jews encouraged others to make an active show of their similar hatred 'which had long before become inveterate in their hearts.' (4:1). Only one group in the city were indignant on behalf of the sufferings which the Jews were being forced to undergo but appear to have been unable to offer anything more constructive than sympathy, for although they said they would assist them, the following narrative shows that they cannot have had any swáy with the King (3:8-10).

The author of III Maccabees is exhorting his readers not to place too much reliance upon the secular powers whose hostile attitude to the Jews, even if it is normally well-hidden, is bubbling under the surface of consciousness and is ready to be ignited at the first opportunity.

The Theological Outlook of III Maccabees

The author of III Maccabees does not suggest that the Jewish people are totally at the whim of foreign rulers for their God is all powerful. If they live their lives in accordance with the will of God and if they humble themselves before Him during a time of suffering then He will help them. This is best illustrated by the

extended prayers of the High Priest Simon and of Eleazer, a virtuous old priest, and by their results.

Both prayers extol God: his power (2:11,2:6,6:2), his holiness (2:12,6:1) and his mercy (2:19,2:20,6:2) and illustrate the ways in which God has displayed these qualities in the past. The High Priest Simon points out that God manifested his 'mighty power' (2:6) when he destroyed the people of Sodom and punished the Pharaoh when he enslaved Israel. Conversely those people who trusted in Him, God brought 'safely through' (2:7). Eleazer also mentions God's destruction of Pharaoh who had enslaved Israel (6:4) and his punishment of Sennacherib, by means of which God made manifest his 'power to many nations' (6:5) and like Simon gives examples of the times when God saved His own people from destruction, by holding up Daniel (6:7) and Jonah (5:8) to display for this purpose. In both prayers God is reminded of His special election of the people of Israel, the factor which separated them from all other peoples. Simon says that God chose the city and sanctified the Temple for himself (2:9) and loved the house of Israel (2:10). Eleazer asks God to look upon the 'seed of Abraham, the children of Jacob (his) sanctified one, the people of (his) sanctified inheritance' (6:3). Simon and Eleazer ask God to deliver His special people Israel once more in their present dangers pleading with Him not to punish their sins by using 'the uncleanness of these men'(2:17) 'lest the transgressors boast in their wrath or the insolence of their tongue'(2:17) saying 'Neither has their God delivered them'(6:11).

There are other examples of supplication to God by the whole mass of the people but in comparison with the prayers of Simeon and of Eleazer these are extremely abbreviated, although similar in content. (e.g. 5:7f.)

Humility and supplication to God are the keynotes of the prayers and Simon's prayer is reinforced in these aspects by the abject misery of the people of Jerusalem who thought that the sanctity of their Temple was about to be violated. No matter what these citizens were doing at the time of this terrible threat they rushed to the Temple to join their prayers to those of others. (1:16-29) Each supplication is answered by God who acts to save His Temple, His holy Place and His people from profanation and destruction. God heard Simon's prayer which was 'spoken according to the law,'(2:21)

and 'scourged him who was greatly uplifted in violence and insolence' (2:21). He caused a heavy sleep to fall upon the king on another occasion (5:11) and on yet another made him forgetful (5:28).

The greatest manifestation of God's power comes after Eleazer's prayer when He caused 'two glorious angels of terrible aspect' to descend (6:18) and in the resulting confusion the elephants of the King's army turned upon their masters and trampled them underfoot. It is noticeable that the author of the book states that the two angels were visible to all the people except the Jews thus emphasising that the Jews did not need to be told who was the author of their help but their enemies did.

This manifestation of the power of God caused Ptolemy to set the Jews free and to praise God. He recognises that God directs even him (7:1) that He protects the Jews (7:6) and he confesses that God brings retribution. (7:9)

The Jews too praise God, 'the Saviour of Israel and doer of wonders' (6:33)

The author of III Maccabees then is directing his readers towards a proper attitude to God. They should be aware of their special place vis-a-vis God and of His care of their people in the past and present. When in difficulties God is the One to whom they should turn in prayerful humility and He will not fail them.

Conclusion to III Maccabees.

III Maccabees dates from approximately the same time as II Maccabees and much of the style and many of the ideas of the latter book are mirrored in the former. The author of III Maccabees saw that the situation which occurred in II Maccabees i.e. the persecution of Jews by a foreign ruler could easily happen in Egypt and wanted to make his compatriots aware of this and to direct them towards a proper way of living both in time of peace and of trouble. It may indeed be that the author chose the story of Ptolemy Philopater's persecution of the Jews²⁰ because of the similarity with the persecution of Antiochus Epiphanes and to underline this likeness he added the story of Ptolemy's attempted profanation of the Temple.

III Maccabees illustrates the capriciousness of the King in Egypt and contrasts his attitude with the steadfastness of the God of the Jews who has mercy on His people and aids them with His mighty power, thus pointing to the undesirability of trusting earthly power and the desirability of relying upon the God of the fathers²¹. Ptolemy's eventual confession of the God of the Jews may indicate the author's hope that Gentiles too would turn to God, but more likely he is pointing out that the power of God is mightier than that of the mightiest earthly ruler.

The Date of IV Maccabees.

There are few historical references in IV Maccabees which allow a precise date to be assigned to the composition of the book although a terminus a quo and a terminus ad quem can tentatively be given. The author of IV Maccabees explains to his readers that in the days of Seleucus IV, High Priests held their office for life (4:1) which suggests that at the time of writing this was no longer the case. Life-tenure of the office appears to have ceased after the fall of the Hasmonean dynasty in 63B.C. and this sets the terminus a quo.²² The terminus ad quem is likely to antedate the destruction of the Jerusalem Temple in 70A.D. as certain passages seem to presuppose that the Temple was still standing (e.g. 4:11-12). It has been suggested that the terminus ad quem should be set higher as some reference to Caligula's persecution would be expected if the book postdated 39A.D. but as IV Maccabees cannot be regarded as a crisis document²³ such a postulation is not necessary. This criticism can also be levelled at theories which connect IV Maccabees to a particular historical episode which was troublesome for the Jews.²⁴

Bickermann²⁵ suggests a date in the first century A.D. arising out of the use of certain words²⁶ which were in vogue from the time of Augustus onwards. He also points out that whereas II Macc. 3:5 describes Heliodoros as the 'stratēgos' of 'Syria, Phoenicia and Cilicia' (4:9). It is highly probable that the inclusion of 'Cilicia' is an anachronism coming from the author's own time. It is known from various sources that during the Roman Imperial administration Syria and Cilicia did indeed combine

Coele Syria and Phoenicia, III Maccabees describes him as 'stratēgos' of

to make one province²⁷ although according to Bickermann this amalgamation lasted only from 18 to 54A.D. As a consequence Bickermann places the composition of IV Maccabees between these two dates.²⁸

Author and Provenance.

It is impossible to name the author of the present book but certain things can be said of him. His defence of the Jewish faith strongly suggests that he was Jewish and his grasp and erudition in the Greek language as well as his knowledge make it likely that he lived somewhere in the diaspora, even though it has recently been shown that Palestinian Judaism was more influenced by Hellenism than was once thought.²⁹ It is unlikely though that a Palestinian Jew would have so completely absorbed the modes of thought of Greek civilisation as the author of IV Maccabees.³⁰ Eusebius ascribed the work to Flavius Josephus³¹ but there are several weighty objections to this ascription. Josephus correctly describes Antiochus Epiphanes as the brother of Seleucus IV (Antiq.XII,4) but he is called his son in IV Macc.4:15. In his historical works Josephus uses the Greek form of biblical names apart from one or two whereas the author of IV Maccabees uses the Hebrew indeclinable names.³²

Alexandria has been suggested as the place of writing for IV Maccabees³³, probably because of the large number of diaspora Jews who lived there and because it was the home of Philo whose works have certain things in common with IV Maccabees - namely the reconciliation of Judaism with Greek philosophy and a belief in the immortality of the soul. It is indeed possible that IV Maccabees did originate from Alexandria although the fact that the work is not referred to by the great Patristic scholars from there may tell against this location. Other parts of the Greek Empire in which Jews had settled are just as likely as places of origin. Antioch has been suggested, and deserves serious consideration in view of phrases in Jerome and John Chrysostom which suggest that a Christian cult of the veneration of the Maccabean martyrs was located there.³⁴

The Connection of IV Maccabees with the Maccabean Crisis.

IV Maccabees is not connected with the Maccabean Crisis as such except in so far as the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother, which our author uses as an example of the highest rationality of the Jewish faith, happened under the aegis of Antiochus Epiphanes.³⁵ Doubtless the author regarded the conduct of the about-to-be-martyred family as of the highest order and in his use of the tale may have had the subordinate motive of recommending their behaviour to any Jew who found himself in a similar situation. The author though states as his main purpose in writing the book - to discuss 'whether Inspired Reason is supreme ruler over the passions' (1:1). 'Inspired Reason' involves the linking of facets of Greek philosophy with Jewish faith leading to the conclusion that the latter embodies the highest principles and rationality of the former.

The Conjunction of Jewish Faith with Greek Philosophy.

The author of IV Maccabees argues that 'Inspired Reason' - logismos eusebēs - is master over the passions. 'Logismos' which in its original connotation signified 'arithmetic' was used by both Epicurean and Stoic philosophers to mean 'human reason' or the 'rational will'. In the present context however it is qualified by the adjective 'eusebēs' which indicates that the rational will is directly inspired by God.³⁶ The author of IV Maccabees himself further defines 'logismos' as the mind preferring 'the life of wisdom' (1:15). 'Wisdom', he says, is 'the knowledge of things divine and human and of their causes', all of which are 'acquired under the law' (1:16-17). There is thus almost an equation of Reason (logismos), Wisdom and Law. Wisdom and the Law are indeed identical and reason is the conscious choice for these over against submission to the passions. The passions are also defined by our author. The passions spring from both pain and pleasure, either of the body or of the soul (1:20), and were given to man by God. 'For in the day when God created man, he implanted in him his passions and inclinations.' (2:21) God did not leave man without a counter-balance to the passions for 'At the very same time (He) set the mind on a throne amidst the senses to be his sacred guide in all things;' (2:21) The mind was aided in its onerous task by the gift of the Law from God.(2:21)

According to our author the ways in which Reason manifests itself is 'under the forms of judgement and justice, and courage, and temperance' (1:18). The passions, on the other hand, when they are of the soul show themselves through such vices as 'ostentation, and covetousness, and vain-glory, and contentiousness, and back-biting,' (1:27) and when they are of the body, in the 'eating of strange meat, and gluttony and gōrmandizing in secret.' (1:27).

Examples of the conduct of various people in Israel's past show that they have been able to triumph over their passions because of their training in the Law. Eleazer says that 'the Law teaches us self-control, so that we are masters of all our pleasures and desires and are thoroughly trained in manliness so as to endure all pain with readiness; and it teaches justice ... and it teaches righteousness...' (5:22-25). Because of these virtues which the law taught and because Eleazer and his people believed that God, the Lawgiver, had commanded them to eat the things which were 'convenient for (their) souls' (5:26). Eleazer claimed that the Law was not contrary to reason but the opposite, and, even if the Law was not in accord with Reason it would be wicked to transgress it in any way because it was all believed to be divine; and even if it were not divine then it still ought to be followed because of the reputation of the Jewish people for piety (5:18). The wish to keep the Law, which had so thoroughly trained all its adherents in the most admirable of virtues, encouraged those who were threatened with intense but temporary pain, to resist the desire to avoid this suffering. Eleazer said to Antiochus Epiphanes that he would not break the sacred oath of his ancestors to keep the law even though his eyes be torn out and his entrails burnt, (5:29) and he reminds God that though he might have saved himself he is dying by fiery torments for his Law. (6:28) The seven brothers likewise declare, 'We are ready to die rather than to transgress the commandments of our fathers, for we should be putting our ancestors to shame, if we did not walk in obedience to the Law, and take Moses as our counsellor.' (9:1-12)

Our author says that those who make righteousness their first thought, believe that 'unto God they die not.' (7:19) The seven brothers state this belief (13:15-17) which is really a corollary

to the keeping of the Law. Alternatively those who transgress the Law are doomed to eternal torment, a thought which is reiterated many times (9:9,9:32,10:10,10:21,11:3,12:20).

Fear of intense pain and death is one of the strongest human emotions there is, and triumph over this fear which, if it were indulged, would have led to transgression of the law and consequently to eternal torment and lack of communion with God, is a triumph for inspired Reason as our author is at pains to point out (7:21f.,8:5,13:1,14:13).

The strongest pleasure and the most intense pain can be regulated by inspired reason which is able to come to the conclusions it does because of the long training which the subject has had in the divine law and because of the conviction that those who uphold the latter will 'not die unto God.' This holds true even for mother-love, where it is well recognised that questions of personal safety hold no sway over a mother whose child's life is in danger.(cf. 14:3f.)

Political Implications of the Treatise on the Supremacy of Inspired Reason

God is the ultimate ruler, for He it is who gave everyman his inclinations and passions, his mind set amongst the senses and the law to aid the mind (2:21). He it is who does not allow those who keep the law to die unto Him while abandoning its transgressors to eternal torment. This being the case obedience to an earthly ruler is unnecessary, indeed it is contrary to the divine will, if that ruler orders something which would transgress the divine law. Antiochus Epiphanes is represented as being totally subject to his own passions, and as such is described as 'an overweening terrible man' (4:15), as 'God's enemy' (11:8), as the 'enemy of the justice of heaven and bloody-minded...' (9:15). On the other hand those who oppose his attitude are praiseworthy and described as 'holy' (9:25,13:8).

Implications for Theodicy in the Treatise on the Supremacy of Inspired Reason.

The conviction that temporary suffering on this earth, brought upon a person because of his refusal to transgress the law, would be

redressed after death, runs through the statements of the seven brothers; similarly the conviction that someone who triumphed in this life even though his actions ran contrary to the requirements of the Law would suffer after death.

There are other examples of the outworking of divine justice which take place in this life in IV Maccabees which have not been mentioned above. These include the attack upon Apollonius by heavenly angels because of the attempt of the former to violate the Temple (4:10), and Antiochus's enmity to the Jewish people which was inspired by God because of Jason's defiance of the Law in instituting a gymnasium and abolishing the service of the Temple. (4:19-21) These examples are also in II Maccabees (3:8-40 and 5:17) although there it is Heliodorus and not Apollonius who attempted to steal the Temple treasure, although Apollonius had instigated it.

In II Maccabees the seven brothers expect to be physically resurrected whereas in IV Maccabees they seem to be looking forward to some kind of immortality of the soul. (Compare II Macc. 7:9, 11, 14, 22-23 with IV Macc. 9:22, 14:5-6, 16:13, 17:12). This is then a new development which accords better with Greek philosophy.³⁷

Eleazer's words in 6:28-29, 'Be merciful unto thy people, and let our punishment be a satisfaction in their behalf. Make my blood their purification, and take my soul to ransom their souls', have caused scholars to discuss whether there are traces of Christian influence here. To see Christian influence here is not necessary in view of the Jewish tradition of redemption³⁸ and also II Maccabees 7:38, in the context of the martyrdom of the seven brothers, expresses a similar wish, although it does not specifically mention the word redemption.³⁹

So God's justice is seen to work through the same means in IV Maccabees as in II Maccabees although the former book made more explicit the idea of vicarious atonement and has altered the conception of life after death from that of bodily resurrection to immortality of the soul and expects eternal torment after death for those who transgress the Law.

Conclusion to IV Maccabees

That the Jewish Law was not mere foolishness or superstition but

was in accord with Inspired Reason, the same reason which was the supreme virtue in the writings of the Greek philosophers appears to have been the main reason for the writing of IV Maccabees, both according to the author himself and to its prominent position in the work. What the author's motive was in writing in such a vein can only be surmised. The most likely hypothesis is that living in the Diaspora - probably Antioch - as he undoubtedly did, he was troubled by the sight of Jewish young men preferring Greek philosophy to their ancestral faith and so set out to show that the two were compatible. In doing so he allows the reader to catch glimpses of his own particular theological position; where law and God rule supreme, political obeisance to a ruler whose commands contradict the claims of the former is out of the question. As far as human suffering is concerned it is either a direct result of the transgression of the human will expressed in the Law as in the case of Apollonius and the Jewish people in the reign of Antiochus, or when the law has been scrupulously adhered to it may be that the sufferer is making vicarious atonement for the sins of others. In either case if the balance is not redressed in this life then it will be after death.

CONCLUSION

The years following the Maccabean Crisis saw an upsurge in literature, both in Israel and in the Diaspora. Books which previously have not been connected to the Crisis (or at least only tenuously so) can be seen to be very closely concerned with it and particularly with the question of God's justice which was at stake.

People were dying for their faith yet a matter of twenty years earlier Ecclesiasticus had asserted, in line with Deuteronomy, that retribution would quickly follow the sinner (7:16).

Why did God allow Antiochus to defile the Temple, why did He allow him to proscribe the faith, why were people dying who obeyed God rather than a human ruler, was there any retribution at all for the faithful or the wicked, what lessons could be drawn from the Crisis and its events. These are the kinds of questions with which our authors concern themselves.

Three socio-religious groups gave answers to these questions, and their answers are intimately linked to their own political stance. The country people, who figure in I Maccabees and Judith are nationalists, concerned with the land and ritual and thus refer to the parts of the Old Testament which deal with the Conquest and Settlement. They see the Book of Judges as the pattern, with God electing certain individuals such as Mattathias, Judas and family and Judith as the ones who repulse the extremely hostile enemy and gain political independence for Israel. Life and land in this group take precedence over the Temple and the Law. This is particularly evidenced by the call to fight on the Sabbath rather than lose one's life to the enemy. The pattern of the Book of Judges is further reflected in both I Maccabees and Judith in that disaster is recognised as a punishment from God for sins committed by the community or part of the community. In Judith though it is admitted that disaster was not always a punishment for sin but sometimes a test of faith sent by God. The ones who atone (Mattathias) and avert the wrath of God (Judas) and lead their kinsmen against the enemy (the family of Mattathias and Judith) are individuals who display right action to God and as such will win fame and honour and

their memory will continue after death. Wicked individuals however will get their just deserts on this earth. In common with the Old Testament books concerned with the time of the Conquest and Settlement no assurance of redress is given for individuals who are righteous and lose their lives in a time of distress.¹

The second group, the group behind Daniel 1-6, I Esdras and II Maccabees probably belong to the urban artisans, whose faith developed from prophetic teaching prior to the Exile and who returned from Babylonia with a new religious outlook centring on the Temple and the law. This group do not see the Gentiles as totally hostile and are not concerned with who governs the country as long as they have the freedom to worship the Supreme Sovereign of all mankind in His Temple and to follow his Law. The Temple and the Law are more important to them than the land and their lives, and in Daniel and II Maccabees death is preferable to breaking the Law. Disobedience to God or disregard of Him is the cause of suffering. In I Esdras the disobedience of the Kings of Israel and their disregard of His agents (including Josiah's of Jeremiah) brought about the Exile and in II Maccabees the wickedness of the High Priests brought about the prohibition of the worship of the true God. As in the Book of Jeremiah, I Esdras asserts that God set a limit to the length of the Exile. II Maccabees states that God's anger at the disobedience of the High Priests was turned to mercy through the deaths of martyrs for his Law, thus alluding to the vicarious suffering of the Servant of Deutero-Isaiah. However God cherishes and protects those individuals who are obedient to him and acknowledge his power. This he does through means which are sometimes within the laws of nature, sometimes without. Daniel is preserved in the lion's den and his friends are saved from the furnace. The faithful who died because of their fidelity to the law are given life after death in II Maccabees. Wicked or arrogant individuals are punished on this earth.

The third group who are responsible for Daniel 7-12 and Enoch 85-90 may well have been groups of Temple personnel who had not been given an active part in the running of the Temple after the Return and who indeed had favoured Deutero-Isaiah's programme of

restoration rather than Ezekiel's. This group, who saw obedience to God and fidelity to his covenant as the true aim in life had become disillusioned with the status quo. The Gentiles, they saw as increasingly hostile to Israel, reaching a zenith of intense ferocity at the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Active resistance was not urged although it was acceptable. Daniel asserts that in itself it was not a mark of sincerity, Enoch that it was only a part of God's plan and so not especially commendable in and of itself. They had continued in their belief in Deutero-Isaiah's vision but had increasingly detached it from reality and believed that God would soon intervene either personally or through his agent Michael, and bring about a new era with Israel at the centre of the nations. Then the dead would be resurrected and along with the living would be judged according to what was written in the Book about their adherence or non-adherence to the Covenant. The wicked would then be condemned to eternal punishment and the righteous given eternal life. Creation would be renewed (Daniel) and a New Jerusalem established (Enoch). The Messiah too would appear (Enoch) although without much apparent function. Suffering then is seen as part of God's eternal plan but there will be redress for both the community and individuals in the future.

That the Maccabean Crisis was of great import and had meaning for the people of Israel who lived outside their native land is shown by III and IV Maccabees and possibly by a section of The Rest of Esther². These books refer their readers to the Maccabean Crisis and draw lessons from that time to strengthen them in their ancestral faith and to comfort them in a time of distress.

APPENDIXTHE ADDITIONS TO THE BOOK OF ESTHER

The Additions to the Book of Esther were investigated as part of the preparation for this thesis and indeed a portion of it appears to be relevant to the subject in hand, although unfortunately of too brief a nature to allow its assignation to any particular chapter of the present work, hence its presence in an appendix.

The Book of Esther in the LXX and the so-called Lucianic¹ recension contain six major additions and a colophon over and above the Massoretic text. It is usually accepted that Bickermann² is correct in his hypothesis that the colophon is an official librarian's note which was affixed to the book when it was added to the library's collection. This note would fix the date of the book's inception if it were clearer which Ptolemy and Cleopatra were being referred to. Bickermann himself argues that there were only three Ptolemies associated with a Cleopatra in the fourth year of their reign, but in the case of two of them, Ptolemy IX Soter II Lathyros (114-3 B.C.) and Ptolemy XIII (49-88.C.) Cleopatra was a Regent acting on behalf of her son and brother respectively. On official documents during a regency the verb 'reign' was plural and the name of the Queen preceded that of the King whereas in Esther 'reign' is singular and the name Ptolemy is before that of Cleopatra. Thus Bickermann asserts that the Ptolemy to whom the colophon refers is Ptolemy XII Auletos and ^{the Cleopatra is} Cleopatra V, his sister and his wife in 78-7 B.C.³ Unfortunately not every scholar agrees with Bickermann on this issue, preferring one or the other of the above named figures.⁴

The six major additions in the Greek texts of Esther are traditionally indicated by the letters A-F.

A encompasses 11:2-12:6 and includes Mordecai's Dream, Mordecai's denunciation of the two eunuchs and Haman's intended revenge. It is noteworthy that Josephus and the Old Latin text omit 11:12-12:6.

B is 13:1-7. It tells of the Edict of Artaxerxes against the Jews. All versions based upon the Greek text include these verses.

C is 13:8-18 and 14:1-19. It relates the prayers of Mordecai and Esther. 14:6-12 are not in Josephus nor one codex of the Old Latin. D is 15:1-16, Esther's admission to the King. All versions based upon the Greek text include this addition.

E is 16:1-24, The decree of Artaxerxes on behalf of the Jews. All versions based upon the Greek include this.

F is 10:4-13, The interpretation of Mordecai's dream. Josephus omits F and the Aramaic Targum and the M.T. have considerable differences here.

The presence of these extra verses in the LXX raises the question of the latter's relationship to the Massoretic text. Is it merely a translation plus the additions? Apparently not. H.J. Cook⁵ has shown that text A - the so-called Lucianic text - which follows the Hebrew M.T. renders it even more closely than text B (LXX) up to 8:5 but then differs from it consistently for no apparent reason. The conclusion drawn from this is that the Greek texts and the Massoretic draw from different semitic Vorlagen. This was originally suggested by Torrey⁶ and followed by several scholars, including C.A. Moore⁷ to whose work Cook, in the present article, is consciously adding. The possibility is now raised, that the Additions in the Greek text may have been present in their semitic Vorlage either as part of the original tale or as a slightly later addition. For the purpose of this thesis it is extremely important to ascertain the original language and context of composition if any part of the additions is to be adduced as resulting from the Maccabean Crisis in Palestine or the Diaspora. Unfortunately scholars who have analysed additions A-F for semiticisms have drawn vastly different conclusions from similar results as can be shown from the table below.

	<u>TORREY</u> ⁸	<u>MOORE</u> ⁹	<u>BROWNLEE</u> ¹⁰	<u>MARTIN</u> ¹¹	<u>COOK</u> ¹²
<u>A</u>		11:1-3 probably Hebrew			11:1-11 Semitic flavour
Hebrew		11:4-11 Hebrew	-	Hebrew	but could be LXX style Greek.
		11:12- 12:6 Greek			11:12-12:6 Hebrew, a lot of Semiticisms.

	<u>TORREY</u>	<u>MOORE</u>	<u>BROWNLEE</u>	<u>MARTIN</u>	<u>COOK</u>
<u>F</u>	-	-	-	Greek or very free translation of Semitic Vorlage.	Similar to 11:1-11
<u>B</u>	Greek	Greek	-	Greek	-
<u>E</u>	Greek	Greek	-	Greek	-
<u>C</u>	Hebrew	Hebrew, 14:6-12 Greek	-	Hebrew	-
<u>D</u>	Hebrew	Hebrew/ Greek	Hebrew	-	-

That additions B and E were composed in Greek is unanimous. They must have been added before 94 A.D. as a paraphrased version of them appears in Josephus Antiquities (XI:6,6 and 12). One wonders though what opportunity there would have been to make additions to Esther once it had been deposited in the Library in Alexandria and so the possibility springs to mind that Dositheus and his son Ptolemaus who brought the Book from Jerusalem, according to the colophon, might themselves have made the additions. I suggest Dositheus and Ptolemaus rather than Lysimachus, the translator of the text, for in the words of C.A. Moore 'One can scarcely imagine a man so enamoured of producing the neo-classicalism of additions B and E being able - let alone content - to translate the rest of the book so simply and prosaically as Lysimachus had done.'¹³ It follows then that B and E were added in 78-77B.C. if one agrees with Bickermann that this is the date of the Book's incorporation into the Library at Alexandria.¹⁴

Addition C is thought to have been composed originally in Hebrew or in Aramaic, although Moore thinks that part of Esther's prayer - 14:6-12 - was probably written in Greek for two reasons: The first is that these verses do not appear in Josephus or in the Old Latin.¹⁵ The second is that whereas Mardocheaus's

prayer is similar in the Aramaic Targum to that in the LXX, Esther's is quite different.¹⁶ These difficulties may perhaps be reconciled. Josephus may not have found the telling of Esther's prayer to be in line with his purposes; the absence of 14:6-12 from the Old Latin turns out to be in one codex alone, not in every codex as Moore implies, and the differences in the Aramaic Targum may well point to a fairly long oral tradition for the tale of Esther to which additions accrued, eventually leading to the writing down of the whole (or almost the whole) by various people for various reasons, the result being differing versions. However these objections do not rule out the possibility that Moore is correct in saying that 14:6-12 is a later addition and was written in Greek.

As far as addition D is concerned, Moore is once again the only dissenter amongst the listed commentators in that he thinks it may have been written in Greek rather than in Hebrew or Aramaic. He does not, however, enter into the question in any detail and so his objection is not of great value.

William Brownlee¹⁷ has an ingenious theory which links additions C and D to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. He sees in Esther's audience with Artaxerxes many indications that Esther is in the presence of a divine figure.¹⁸ He searches for confirmation of this in the words of Esther and Artaxerxes, where indeed he finds that Esther is not afraid because she thinks that she will be put to death for coming into the presence of the King without permission, but because the King looked like an angel of God. (15:13)¹⁹ Antiochus Epiphanes claimed divinity and is here represented by Artaxerxes although his status, in keeping with Jewish sensibilities is lower than that of an angel. In 4:8 Mardocheaus sent word to Esther to 'Call upon the Lord, and then speak for us to the King and save our lives,' and Brownlee thinks that this message suggests that Antiochus was being duped into persecuting the Jews by his wicked counsellors (represented by Haman), and could be enlightened and his decrees changed by the intercession of someone with courage, a Jew with official duties in the Seleucid Empire. Esther is helped in her mission by the God of Israel (15:8) to whom she and Mardocheaus prayed so perhaps God would again help the person who would plead with Antiochus.²⁰

Brownlee dates these additions some time before the prohibition of the Jewish religion by Antiochus Epiphanes as by the time of the Edict itself there could have been no more hope of leniency from him.

This hypothesis is totally without support from any source dealing with the actions of Antiochus Epiphanes, and so its probability is lessened. H.J. Cook²¹ thinks that Greek text A (the so called Lucianic text) preserves the correct application of Esther's exemption from death. He says that the text assumes that the King knew all along that Esther was a Jewess, and thus was included in the King's decree. At Esther's audience with the King he had to expressly state that she was exempt. This interpretation of Esther's expectation of her imminent death seems a great deal more probable than that Antiochus Epiphanes was in any way regarded as divine by pious Jews and that elements of his divinity were similar to those of the God of Israel, particularly the belief that if one looked upon the face of God one would die.

Perhaps all that can be said about the additions (C and D) is that they were probably part of the Semitic vorlage of the Book of Esther. It is difficult to tell when they were written although a terminus ad quem is likely to antedate the translation of 'Esther' into Greek. As for the reason for their inclusion, C adds religious content to the narrative and D heightens the dramatic effect. Or perhaps, with Torrey,²² the omission of something like C in the Massoretic Text was deliberate, to harmonise the Book with the rather secular feast of Purim.

Additions A and F, the dream of Mardocheus and its interpretation, do not receive a unanimous verdict from our critics cited above. Nor according to them can A necessarily be taken as a whole. Moore and Cook produce results which are directly contradictory as far as 11:1-11 and 11:12-12:6 are concerned and this illustrates the very real difficulties of trying to reconstruct the literary history of the Book of Esther! Moore suggests a very attractive theory for the origins of A and F. He points out that its theological content suggests a Semitic origin; the two dragons are rather like the ram and the he-goat of Daniel 8, and they have even closer links with other texts where the dragon is

a symbol of evil.²³ The strong distress before deliverance is reminiscent of 'eschatological or Day of the Lord imagery'.²⁴ The interpretation of the dream (addition F) is different in the LXX and the AT²⁵ nor does it fit the dream very closely, for instance the identification of Mardocheus with a dragon is not appropriate as the dragon is usually a symbol for evil. In view of all these differences Moore suggests that the dream was originally a unit circulating independently and was later adapted to the Esther story because of a broad similarity in outline.²⁶ He is hesitant however about suggesting any particular situation in which the dream may have arisen, or indeed the interpretation of the dream.

After some reflection it seems to me possible that A and F come from the time of the Maccabean Crisis, and once again this will perhaps be clearest if set out in tabular form.

DREAM	LXX	AT	POSSIBLE INTERPRETATION
11:5 'din and tumult, peals of thunder and an earthquake, confusion upon the earth.'	-	-	-
11:6 'Then appeared two great dragons, ready to grapple with each other and the noise they made was terrible.'	Haman and Mardocheus	-	Ptolemaic and Seleucid Empires
11:7 'Every nation was aroused by it to prepare for war, to fight against the righteous nation.'	Nations gather to wipe out the Jews.	-	Shows the complete hostility of the Gentiles as found in e.g. I Maccabees. ²⁷
11:8 'It was a day of darkness and gloom, with distress and anguish, oppression and great confusion upon the earth.'	-	-	-
11:9 'And the whole righteous nation was troubled, dreading the evils in store for them, and they prepared for death.'	-	-	If one kept the Law, then death would be the result, because of the prohibition of the Religion by Antiochus Epiphanes.
11:10 'They cried aloud to God; and in answer to their cry there came as though from a little spring a great river brimming with water.'	River is Esther	River is Enemy nations.	The river could be the Maccabees

DREAM	LXX INTERPRETATION	AT INTERPRETATION	POSSIBLE INTERPRETATION
11:11 'It grew light, and the sun rose; the hum- ble were ex- alted and they devoured the great.'	-	Sun and light are manifest signs of God's presence.	Contrast to 11: 8. Those who had kept the law now triumph- ed over those who had not - Hellenisers tended to be wealthy.

It must be firmly stated though that while the interpretation of Mardocheus's dream in terms of the Maccabean Crisis is possible, it is by no means certain, the main factor militating against it is the very uncertain literary history of the text. If on the other hand the idea of the dream circulating originally as a separate unit approximates to the truth, I disagree with Moore that its interpretation i.e. addition F, accompanied it, or at least in the form in which it is found in the LXX or the AT, for these represent an accommodation of the dream to the story of Esther.

Conclusion to the Additions to Esther.

There is little that one can positively say about the additions to Esther except that perhaps part of addition A, the dream of Mardocheus, may have circulated as a separate unit relating to the Maccabean Crisis. The passage has points of contact with the Book of Daniel in the representation of foreign powers as beasts, and in its visionary structure. The total hostility of the Gentiles brings I Maccabees and Judith to mind, but unfortunately the passage is too short to permit its definite assignation to any particular chapter of the present work. If the above interpretation of it is correct though it shows the need for assurance that God was with his people during the Maccabean Crisis.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 1

- 1) R.H. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha, (Harper and Brothers, New York, 1949), p.5.
- 2) Nehemiah was the king's deputy and according to Josephus, Antiquities XI, 291f., Bagoas, Nehemiah's successor, appears to have ruled autocratically.
- 3) The Jews, Vol.I (Schocken Books, New York, 1972) p.76.
- 4) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XI, 317-347
- 5) V. Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilisation and the Jews, trans. S. Appelbaum (Atheneum, New York, 1970) p.59
- 6) The date of this battle is disputed cf. Tcherikover, op.cit. p.75, note 101.
- 7) Cf. pp.6-10.
- 8) Cf. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism, (trans. J. Bowden, London, 1974), pp.45-47. As products of Palestine he lists wheat, olive oil, wine, balsam, papyrus. Cf. also Rostovtzeff, Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World (Oxford, 1941), p.658 for the importance of Palestine in the caravan trade.
- 9) op.cit. p.47
- 10) Cf. Hengel, op.cit. pp.35-38
- 11) Cf. Rostovtzeff, op.cit., p.341
- 12) Op. cit., p.350
- 13) Housed in Vienna, cf. Rostovtzeff, op. cit., p. 340
- 14) Cf. Rostovtzeff, op.cit., pp.349, 467-70. For land tax Rostovtzeff refers to I Macc.10:29-30, 11:34. For royal taxes to Josephus, Antiquities XII, 138f.
- 15) Cf. Rostovtzeff, op.cit. p.1260; also note 49 to chapter 6 of Rostovtzeff which points out that only four of the slaves were Jews.
- 16) Op. cit. p.342
- 17) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities, XII, 11f. According to Josephus, Ptolemy Philadelphus redeemed 110,000 Jewish slaves, some of whom had been slaves in Egypt prior to Ptolemy Soter's invasion, but many of whom were taken there at that time.
- 18) Op.cit., p.344
- 19) The Tobiad family's ancestry can be traced back to the time of Isaiah of Jerusalem cf. Is. 7:6. Tobiah the Ammonite is mentioned in Neh. 2:19, 4:7, 13:4-9. II Macc. 3:10 shows that Hyrcanus, the son of Joseph, son of Tobiad, kept his money in the Temple.

- 20) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities, XII 224
- 21) Cf. Tcherikover, op.cit. p.133
- 22) Op.cit. p.133
- 23) Cf. Hengel, op.cit., p.115, for the dating of Ecclesiastes.
- 24) 'Time and chance govern all' (9:11)
- 25) Antiquities XII, 129f. - A battle near Lebanon in 221B.C.; in Lebanon and Decapolis (219-218B.C.); Battle of Raphia (S.W. of Gaza) in 217B.C. Philopator defeated Antiochus who had to withdraw to Lebanon 201B.C. Ptolemy Epiphanes on the throne (Only five years old and his guardians were not very strong). Antiochus went to Egypt and left garrisons in Palestine. Scopas, the Ptolemaic leader won back some areas. Antiochus was successful at the Battle of Paneion in 198B.C.
- 26) Cf. Hengel, op.cit., p.9 which says that Dan.11:14 possibly hints at the resistance of the people to Scopas and the punishment which was meted out. A fragment of Polybius in Josephus, Antiquities, XII, 135 also suggests this.
- 27) Cf. Rostovtzeff, op.cit., p. 658
- 28) Op.cit. p.47
- 29) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XII, 138
- 30) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XII 138-144. Rostovtzeff in C.A.H. Vol. 7, p.179 gives an example of tax exemption given to a Hellenistic city by Antiochus III
- 31) Cf. Hengel, op.cit., p.88
- 32) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XII 145-6
- 33) Cf. Tcherikover, op.cit. pp.84-87
- 34) Op. cit. p.272
- 35) In I Macc. the making of a covenant with the Gentiles is the prelude to the Antiochean persecution. I Macc. 1:11f.
- 36) Cf. Hengel, op.cit., p.12
- 37) Cf. Hengel, op.cit. pp.12-13
- 38) Cf. Hengel, op.cit. pp.17-18 Cf. Dan.7:7, Qumran War Scroll, LXX of Jeremiah 27 (M.T. 50):16 'the sword of the oppressor is a μάχαιρα ἑλληνική
- 39) Hengel, op.cit. pp.12,16,17
- 40) For further information on this topic cf. S. Liebermann, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine (New York, 1962).

- 41) Cf. I Macc. 1:41f.
- 42) Cf. Hengel, op.cit., pp.75-76
- 43) Cf. Gen. 9:22-25
- 44) Cf. Tcherikover, op.cit., pp.90-116
- 45) Rostovtzeff, op.cit., points out that the native populace in Egypt were so regarded and Hengel, op.cit., p.16 points out that the Jewish mercenaries in the Ptolemaic period took up Greek ways in order to avoid being identified with the downtrodden native populace.
- 46) Cf. Tcherikover, op.cit., p.33
- 47) Cf. II Macc.4:9-12 which links with I Macc.1:11f. where Jews went to make a covenant with Gentiles because disaster upon disaster had come upon them since they separated themselves from them.
- 48) Cf. Hengel, op.cit., p.103
- 49) Ἰουδαϊσμός appears for the first time in II Macc. and Hengel says that it has 'Political and genetic associations with the Jewish nation and exclusive belief in the One God of Israel, together with observance of the Torah given by him.' Op.cit. p.3
- 50) According to II Macc 4:9,12 Jason the High Priest instituted the gymnasium in Jerusalem. II Macc. 4:22 Jason welcomed Antiochus IV to Jerusalem. It is not certain whether adherents to the gymnasium learnt greek philosophy or not. Abel, Histoire de la Palestine, p.110 suggests that they did. Cf. also Hengel, op.cit., p.103f.
- 51) Cf. Zech.12-14, Is. 24-27, Joel.
- 52) Hengel, op.cit., p.48
- 53) Eccles. 4:1
- 54) Cf. above, footnote 25
- 55) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XII, 186f.
- 56) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XII, 196f.
- 57) Cf. Eccus. 50:4 and Hengel, op.cit., p.271.
- 58) Cf. Hengel, op.cit., p.270
- 59) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XII, 142
- 60) Cf. above, pp.8-9
- 61) W.W. Buehler, The Pre-Herodian Civil War and Social Debate, (Doctoral Dissertation, Basel, 1974). As the title of Buehler's thesis suggests, he is concerned with the pre-Herodian period

but he sees the origins of the two main aristocratic groups in the pre-Maccabean period. cf. p.117 Buehler, basing his argument upon Josephus's use of two different words to describe powerful groups sees the aristocratic section of society split into two in a similar way to the Patricians and Equites in Roman society. The Patricians were the landed aristocracy and the Equites the commercial aristocracy. The first group, οἱ Ἱερωτοὶ, whom Josephus mentions in both Antiquities and Life appear to be those who hold official positions of authority as rulers of the Jews. The word is used in this way in Antiquities XIII,17 which deals with the Maccabean period and on the occasion when Bacchides, who had taken Jerusalem and fortified the citadel, took τοὺς τῶν Ἱερωτῶν τῆς Ἰουδαίας as hostages. This group says Buehler, supported the least dictatorial leader because in this way they were most likely to retain power in their own hands. The second group whom Josephus calls οἱ Δυνατοὶ are the powerful men in a financial or military sense e.g. those who are bidding for tax farming rights are Δυνατοὶ (Antiq. XIII, 169). Buehler asserts that this group represent an aristocracy of power based on wealth, rather than birth, cf. p.35f. These Δυνατοὶ supported a strong leader because this was most likely to aid their economic interests. cf. p.74f.

- 62) Cf. S. Zeitlin, The Rise and Fall of the Judean State, Vol. I (Philadelphia, 1962) p.302.
- 63) Cf. L. Finklestein, The Pharisees, (Philadelphia, The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1938) p.194
- 64) Cf. above, p.3
- 65) Cf. above, p.3 and footnote 17
- 66) Antiquities XII,129
- 67) Cf. Buehler, op.cit. p.62f. Cf. above, footnote 61, Also Josephus, Jewish War 256,303,314,326. Antiquities XIV 413f., 432, 450. Also Von Rad, Studies in Deuteronomy (trans. D. Stalker, London, 1953) pp.42-48 who says that the farmer's relationship to his land was a covenantal one.
- 68) Buehler, op.cit., p.107f.
- 69) Cf. Finklestein, op.cit. p. 74
- 70) Cf. Rostovtzeff, op.cit., p.1105
- 71) Cf. above, p.2 and footnote 5.
- 72) Antiquities XII, 142

- 73) Cf. P.D. Hanson, Apocalyptic in Israel, (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1975) p.26
- 74) At this stage the socio-economic position of this group is uncertain. Most probably they were poor. Perhaps they worked in the Temple as secondary personnel or supported themselves as artisans.
- 75) Cf. Finklestein, op.cit. p.455-6
- 76) Cf. Finklestein, op.cit., p.459
- 77) Cf. Buehler, op.cit., p.62f
- 78) It may well be that Onias was popular by hindsight for Josephus, Antiquities XII, 229, suggests that at this stage the people were pro-Seleucid.
- 79) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XII, 196-222
- 80) Cf. above, pp. 2-6
- 81) It should be noted that Josephus, Antiquities XII, 241 attributes this to Menelaus.
- 82) Cf. II Macc. 4:23 & 3:4. Josephus says that Onias, Jason and Menelaus were all brothers Antiquities XII 237f. The majority of scholars think that Josephus is wrong here and prefer the version in II Macc. cf. Marcus edition of Antiquities, note g, pp.120-121.
- 83) Cf. C.A.H. Vol VIII, p.504
- 84) Cf. Hengel, op.cit. p.278
- 85) Cf. Marcus edition of Antiquities XII, note dp, p.123
- 86) Op. cit. p.191
- 87) Op. cit. p.280
- 88) Antiquities XII, p.237f.
- 89) Josephus, Antiquities XII, 248
- 90) Antiquities XII, 249
- 91) Cf. II Macc. 13:6
- 92) It is usually held that Josephus relied upon I and II Maccabees for his information but there are several places in his description of events leading to the Edict of Persecution where he differs significantly from them. This can still be said after making allowance for the reappearance of Josephus's personal biases or propagandist instincts. As mentioned in the text his attribution of the motive of greed for Antiochus's attacks on Jerusalem may well be partly true but certainly not primary.

- a) His timing of the taking of the vessels is different to that of I and II Maccabees, if, as thought above, the Jason incident in II Maccabees is connected to the first attack.
- b) His statement that when there was strife between Jason and Menelaus the people supported Jason and the Tobiads supported Menelaus.
- c) His statement that during the second attack by Antiochus on Jerusalem, Antiochus did not spare even those who opened the city gates to him.

It may well be that Josephus knew another Jewish source for events at this time.

- 93) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XII 253, Jewish War I; Daniel 11:31; II Macc. 6:1-3; I Macc. 1:37f.
- 94) Cf. Tcherikover, op.cit., p. 182.
- 95) Cf. Bickermann, Der Gott der Makkabäer, (Berlin, 1937) p.118
- 96) Cf. Bickermann, op.cit., p.125
- 97) Cf. Bickermann, op. cit., p.126
- 98) Cf. Tcherikover, op.cit., p. 176
- 99) Cf. Bickermann, op.cit. p.27
- 100) Cf. Bickermann, op.cit. p.124
- 101) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XII 257-261
- 102) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities XII 260, II Macc.11:16-21
- 103) Op. cit.
- 104) Op. cit., p.185
- 105) Cf. Hengel, op.cit., p.103
- 106) Bickermann, op.cit. p.134
- 107) Op.cit. p.192
- 108) Antiquities XII, 252
- 109) Cf. Hengel, op.cit., p.283
- 110) Op. cit. p. 134
- 111) Cf. II Macc. 6-7 & I Macc.1:57-64
- 112) Cf. The Deuteronomic History, The Prophetic Books.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 2

- 1) Some scholars place the composition of I Maccabees earlier than the date stated above. Bickermann, op.cit., for instance, regards 16:13f. and 13:30 as later interpolations arguing that the attitude of the author of I Maccabees fits an earlier time when the Maccabees were still held in high regard (cf. Dancy, A Commentary on I Maccabees, p.8). Schürer, Geschichte die Juden Volkes, pp. 139-41 and Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature, p.74, think that the author was a witness to the revolt because of the detail which he gives, which would mean that the book was written well before the end of the reign of John Hyrcanus. There are several scholars who agree with Bickermann, Schürer and Torrey and for more complete information cf. Abel, Les Livres des Maccabées, p.xxviii.
- 2) Others, notably Zeitlin, The First Book of Maccabees , think that I Maccabees was written much later - about the time of the fall of the second temple. Zeitlin says that there is strong evidence to support this contention: that the name of God or Lord is avoided (p.32) and that the name 'Israelite' is used to designate the members of the people of Israel and that the word 'Jew' is used only in documents sent to non-Jews or written by non-Jews (p.29). He says that the names 'Israelite' and 'Jew' were used in this particular way only after the destruction of the second temple. He further argues that a favourable attitude towards the Romans is not incompatible with the later date as Josephus blamed the Sicarii for the war and that Johanan ben Zakkai strongly opposed it (b.Git. 56a), Zeitlin, p.31. In these latter instances Zeitlin does not take into account the fact that Josephus was engaged in placating the Romans and therefore naturally put the blame on extremists amongst his own people or that Johanan ben Zakkai had a pacifistic attitude, For apologetic motifs of Johanan tradition cf. Neusner, Development of a Legend , (Leiden, 1970) and J.J.S. 1973, 'Development of a Legend', which updates the book. As for the suggestion that the inhabitants of Judaea are never called Israelites before the destruction of the second Temple it seems to me that Zeitlin, both in the commentary named above,

and in his article in J.Q.R. (1953), pp. 365-79, is regarding the term as purely racial, whereas, used in a religious-national sense, it appears earlier than the destruction of the Second Temple. cf. below, footnote 29.

The avoidance of the sacred name can also be seen earlier than 70 A.D. cf. Wis. Sol. 1:3, Dan. 4:23 (E. Vv. 26), cf. also A. Marmonstein, Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God, part 1 and E.E. Urback, The Sages, their Concepts and Beliefs, chapter 4.

- 3) Cf. above pp. 17-18
- 4) J. Goldstein, I Maccabees, (Anchor Bible, Doubleday and Co. Inc., New York, 1976), p. 7, points to a parallel between Mattathias and the two spies Joshua and Caleb (Numbers 13-14) in that all Israel were rebels against God but Joshua and Caleb remained loyal.
- 5) Cf. above, p. 44
- 6) Cf. above, p. 17f.
- 7) I Macc. 7:47, II Macc. 15:30
- 8) Cf. II Macc. 3-5
- 9) Cf. Ezra 9-10
- 10) II Macc. 10:1-8
- 11) Cf. II Macc. 10:1-8
- 12) II Macc. 11:22-26 says that the Jews can observe their own laws because they 'do not consent to adopt Greek ways'.
- 13) I Macc. 5:34, II Macc. 10:30-31
- 14) 8:18, 8:31, 9:51, 10:46, 11:41, 11:52-53, 12:53, 13:41
- 15) 8:18, 9:51, 10:46, 11:41
- 16) The picture of peace and prosperity during Simon's reign does not totally accord with reality cf. I Macc. 15-16
- 17) It is noteworthy that I Macc. 14:12 is very similar to I Kings 4:25, which talks about King Solomon saying, 'All through his reign Judah and Israel continued at peace, every man under his own vine and fig tree from Dan to Beersheba'. Simon then is being likened to King Solomon. I Macc. 14:12 is also similar to Micah 4:4 which is part of an idealised picture of the future when everyone recognises the Lord. I Macc. 14:4-15 then seems to be saying that with the advent of the Maccabees, this idyllic future has become reality in the present.
- 18) Lev. 26:4, Ezra 4:27, Zech. 8:12

- 19) Deut. 10:18-19
- 20) I Macc. 2:45-47, 3:5,8
- 21) I Macc. 2:45-47
- 22) Cf. Judges 3:12f, 3:31. It is usually stated though in the Book of Judges that the Israelites did what was wrong in the eyes of the Lord which caused God to abandon them to their enemies.
- 23) Cf. Judges 8:28-32
- 24) Cf. p.52
- 25) 1:11,1:20,1:25,1:30,1:36,1:42,1:53,1:58,1:62,1:64,2:16,2:36,2:42 etc.
- 26) Cf. 5:13,8:23,8:27,10:25,11:33,15:2
- 27) Cf. I Macc.1:36,1:53,1:64 etc.
- 28) Cf. above, p.43
- 29) I Maccabees is not the only work which uses the term 'Israel' for the reduced community. O. Plöger, Theocracy and Eschatology, (trans. S. Rudman, Oxford, 1968), points out that I and II Chronicles and Ezra and Nehemiah do this (p.37). Plöger is here accepting Von Rad's suggestion (cf. Von Rad, BWANT IV/3 (1930)pp.19f.,25f.,). Plöger refutes Von Rad's further suggestion that the usage of the term 'Israel' by the Chronicler is based upon the Deuteronomistic model rather than on that of the Priestly writing which is closer to the Chronicler in time. It seems to me possible though, that the Deuteronomistic usage may well be the basis for the use of the term 'Israel' by the author of the Book of I Maccabees as he does allude to Deuteronomy in other ways, cf. footnotes 60&61. It is also noticeable that the Book of Judges which is frequently alluded to in I Maccabees, uses the term 'Israel' to refer to both the country and the people of the country e.g. Judges 6:2,3:31,7:2 etc.
- 30) Cf. Josephus, Antiquities, Books XII-XIII:229; The Jewish War, I:1-55
- 31) The points at which Josephus does this are noted in the edition of Antiquities, translated and edited by Ralph Marcus.
- 32) G. A. Williamson, The World of Josephus, pp.267-8 says that Josephus was anxious to 'present his countrymen in the most favourable light before the eyes of Gentile readers'. He was also anxious to extol the greatness of Rome, cf. p.269
- (i) For Gentile readers: Part of Williamson's first point is

upheld by the fact that Josephus frequently omits Old Testament references which are included in I Maccabees (cf. XII: 271 - Mattathias is not likened to Phineas as he is in I Macc. 2:26; compare I Macc. 3:42-60 with Antiquities XII:229-304; I Macc. 4:6-11 with Antiq. XII 307 etc.) Josephus also omits other details relevant or meaningful to Jews alone e.g. Josephus says nothing about the disgrace of the profanation of the Temple which is in I Macc. 4:56-58. He does not describe the duties of the priests which are included in I Macc. 7:33-38. He omits I Macc. 9:27. He does, on the other hand, add detail for the benefit of non-Jews. Compare I Macc. 3:58-60 with Antiq. XII 302-304. Antiq. XII 325-6 gives an explanation for the origin of the name of the Festival of Hanukkah mentioned in I Macc. 4:59.

(ii) Attempts to present Jews in a favourable light and to extol the greatness of Rome: Josephus blackens Antiochus Epiphanes even more than I Macc. does. He gives extra details about Antiochus's motives for making war on Egypt cf. XII 242-4, compare I Macc. 1:16-19. He emphasises that the Romans prevented Antiochus from possessing Egypt cf. XII:244. In the following paragraph Josephus shows that the Jews were the victims of this same Antiochus (XII: 246f.)

(iii) Josephus does not extol the Maccabees as much as I Macc; e.g. He omits the eulogy of Simon which is in I Macc. 14:4-47.

- 33) Josephus recorded the date of the publication of Antiquities in the last paragraph of the work. It is 93A.D.
- 34) E.g. The Jewish War I;3 says that Mattathias killed Bacchides. Differences between The Jewish War, Antiquities, I Maccabees are noted in the edition of Antiquities by Marcus.
- 35) The Maccabees were praiseworthy but the primary objective in The Jewish War was to point out that the leaders of the revolt against Rome were sinners cf. W.R. Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus, (Columbia University Press, 1956), pp. 18-23
- 36) Cf. p.55
- 37) 6:62, 11:52-53, 12:46-48, 13:19
- 38) 7:28, 7:10, 10:46
- 39) 7:11, 10:46

- 40) 5:9,5:11,5:15,5:27
- 41) Cf. pp.43-44,48,49
- 42) Cf. pp.58-59
- 43) Cf. e.g. 3:10-11,5:9-17
- 44) Cf. 9:23-31,12:52-13:6
- 45) Bickermann, op.cit., p.29, suggests that the trustworthiness of the Maccabees over against the hostility of the Gentiles and the wickedness of renegade Jews is emphasised because of the political situation at the time when the book was written. The author, he thinks, was attached to the Hasmonean Dynasty.
- 46) J.C. Dancy, A Commentary on I Maccabees, p.1
- 47) II Sam.5:7
- 48) Cf. Ps. 48,50,65 etc.
- 49) Cf. I Macc.2:20-21,2:51
- 50) Cf. I Sam. 8f. Goldstein, op.cit. p.7 points out that the description of the flight Mattathias led to the mountains (I Macc. 2:27-28,42-43) is reminiscent of the similar act of David (I Sam.22:1-23:14) especially as both are followed by massacres of innocents (I Macc.2:44-48, I Sam.23:1-5, 25:14-16) This similarity is another pointer in the direction of the monarchy for Mattathias and his family.
- 51) Cf. Judges 3:7-11, 3:12-30
- 52) Cf. Cambridge Bible Commentary, p.37 Goldstein, op.cit. p.8 suggests that Mattathias, by claiming descent from Phineas, was claiming that his own priestly line was equal to that of the Oniads - something which was much disputed during the time of the Hasmonean Dynasty.
- 54) I Macc. 1:25-28
- 55) Cf. p.54
- 56) Judges 3:9-11, 3:15-30
- 57) Judges 3:12,4:1 etc.
- 58) P. Davies, 'Note on I Macc.3:46', J.T.S.,23 (1972),pp.17-21
- 59) Cf. I Macc. 4:13, 4:39-40, 5:34,11:71
- 60) Deut. 1:15
- 61) Deut. 20:5-8
- 62) E.g. I Macc.9:46
- 63) This theme appears in Wis. of Sol.4:5 and Ecclus. 10:8-11
- 64) Cf. I Macc.2:51,6:44
- 65) This may be a possible explanation of why the Divine name is

never invoked or mentioned, the circumlocution 'Heaven' being used frequently.

- 66) Cf. O. Eissfeldt, The Old Testament. An Introduction, p.587
Torrey, The Apocryphal Literature, pp.91-3, Cowley in R.H. Charles, ed., The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol.I, p.245, J.C. Dancy, The Shorter Books of the Apocrypha. (Cambridge Bible Commentary) p.70, Enslin/Zeitlin, The Book of Judith, pp.27-30
- 67) Cf. Cowley, op.cit. p.245
- 68) For a detailed list of the historical errors cf. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, pp.293-5. Cf. also J.C. Dancy, op.cit., pp.74-75. For a discussion of the historical difficulties and suggested solutions cf. A.M. Dubarle, Judith, (Institut Biblique Pontifical, Rome, 1966) pp.126f.
- 69) Cf. Eissfeldt, op.cit. p.587, Dancy, op.cit., p.68, Enslin/Zeitlin, op.cit., pp.27-28, H.Lamparter, Die Apokryphen II, p.138, Pfeiffer, op.cit., pp.292-7
- 70) E.g. 8:6. The law forbade fasting on these holy days cf. Taanith 2,10 and Megillath Taanith.
- 71) Cf. Enslin/Zeitlin, op.cit. p.58, Cowley, op.cit., p.246
- 72) Enslin/Zeitlin, op.cit., p.28
- 73) Cf. Pfeiffer, op.cit. p.297, Enslin/Zeitlin, op.cit., p.1, Eissfeldt, op.cit., p.586
- 74) Judges 4:21. Bruns in his article 'Judith or Jael', C.B.Q. 16, (1954), pp.12-14, likens Judith to Jael. Bruns suggests that the story of Jael was remembered by those who went to Elephantine in Egypt and later written down as an encouragement to their own people who were being harrassed by the Egyptians. After the temple at Leontopolis was beseiged in 146B.C. a new account was written of the Jael story and this time Jael was confused with Judith. Judith, says Bruns, judging by her genealogy (Judith 8:1) and by the name given to the ruins at Leontopolis - Tell el Yahudiyeh - was a real person. Bruns however does not explain the apparently confused historical details of the book. His explanation of the relationship between Judith and Jael appears rather far fetched and it seems more likely that the author of the Book of Judith wrote a piece of historical fiction to en-

courage his people in a time of trial pointing out that it was fiction by his deliberately confused historical account. It is likely that the tale of Jael was in his mind , cf. pp. 68-69.

- 75) Cf. Judges 3:11, 3:30 etc.
- 76) Judith 4:1,8,9,12,15,5:1,23,6:2,10 etc.
- 77) Cf. pp.55-56
- 78) Israel is often personified as a woman in the Old Testament. Hosea's unfaithful wife personifies the behaviour of Israel towards her God , Hosea 1-3. Lamentations personifies Jerusalem and Judah as a woman in her misery. Israel is once again acknowledged as the wife of the Lord in Is.54
- 79) Scholars have disputed the reasons for the inclusion of Judith's genealogy, the number and meaning of the names of her ancestors, indeed who these ancestors were, but no one suggests that the only important name is the last one. As was seen above, scholars are in common agreement that the author of Judith deliberately makes nonsense of the historical facts which he gives. These scholars also agree that Nebuchadnezzar is representative of the arch enemy of Israel but do not see that Judith is representative of Israel. It may well be that the author of the book does mean 'Jacob' by the name 'Israel', pointing out that Judith's position as a direct descendant is never tarnished for she married a man from the same clan (8:2) but to rationalise the line in a historical fashion as scholars do is unnecessary.
- 80) Cf. P.W. Skehan, 'The Hand of Judith', C.B.Q. 25(1963),pp.94-110
- 81) Judges 3:12,4:1 etc.
- 82) Judith 8:19,11:10-15
- 83) The idea of delay in God's action on behalf of the people because he is disciplining them is reminiscent of events surrounding the Exodus. There the wandering through the wilderness for forty years was because the people doubted whether God was acting through Moses for their good (Exod.14:11-12,16:3,17:3 etc.). In Judith people doubt God's intentions, saying, 'God has sold us into their power' i.e. into the power of the Assyrians (7:25). The Book of Deuteronomy interprets the forty years of wandering in the wilderness as God's way of humbling his people, an attempt

to find out whether the people had it in their hearts to keep his commandments (Deut. 8:2). This kind of discipline is likened to that which a father metes out to his son (Deut. 8:5). The idea of suffering as God's testing of his people or of an individual also appears in Deut. 8:16-17, Prov. 3:11-12, 10:17; Job 5:17-18, 36:15.

- 84) The wearing of sackcloth was not restricted to those who were praying for forgiveness. It could be worn when people wanted to appeal to God's compassion cf. N.B. Johnson, Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, (Society of Bib. Lit. and Exegesis, Philadelphia, 1948).
- 85) Deut. 4:32-38, 6:21-23, 7:18 etc.
- 86) Deut. 7:8, 23:6
- 87) Deut. 7:8
- 88) Deut. 7:8
- 89) Deut. 15:12-15
- 90) Deut. 14:28-29
- 91) Deut. 4:40, 5:53, 6:2 etc.
- 92) Deut. 6:4-5
- 93) Cowley, op.cit., pp.247,267, suggests that this punishment may be eternal as does Enslin, op.cit., p.175. R.H. Pfeiffer, op.cit., p.303, thinks that a more probable interpretation is that of the destruction of the flesh of Israel's enemies. In this he agrees with Fritsche, Judith, p.208 and André, Les Apocryphes, p.157f., whom he cites.
- 94) Cf. Job 42:16-17.

- 1) H.H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and other Essays, pp. 237-68, is the most noted exponent of the view that the Book of Daniel is a literary unity. In this he follows older scholars such as von Gall, Marti and Charles, not to mention the Church and the synagogue. For a fuller list of those in favour of this view cf. O. Eissfeldt, op.cit., pp.517-8; L. Ginsberg, Studies in Daniel, and 'The Composition of the Book of Daniel', V.T.4 pp. 246-75, advocates the dating of 1-6 to the period between 292 and 261^{B.C.}. Many scholars agree with Ginsberg that Daniel antedates the Maccabean Crisis. Again see O.Eissfeldt, op.cit. for a comprehensive list.
- 2) a) Reasons frequently advanced for dating 1-6 at the time of the Maccabean Crisis:- The book is not mentioned at all by Ben Sira who wrote about 190; 2:41b-43 are not compatible with an earlier date for they presume a matrimonial alliance between two Hellenistic Empires; the stories in 1-6 are thought to be exhortations to the Jews who were suffering under Antiochus Epiphanes in 167-163; 6:1 and 9:1 assume that Darius was Belshazzar's successor.
- b) Against unity of authorship it has been said that the stories in 1-6 assume a Persian origin (cf. below, footnote 4); that there is quite a marked difference in attitude to foreign rule in the two halves of the book; that there is nothing in the first six chapters to connect them to the time of Antiochus Epiphanes. Ginsberg, op.cit., (V.T.4) p.246, advances a great many arguments against unity of authorship, and for these he takes as his starting point for an analysis of the book chapters 2 and 7 which are quite similar but 'whose differences are also quite instructive.' Recently J.J. Collins, The Apocalyptic Vision of the Book of Daniel, has suggested that the court tales of Daniel belonged to the Babylonian period and originally had quite a different purpose than encouraging the people during the Maccabean Crisis, cf. pp. 27-54. Cf. also J.J.Collins, 'Court Tales in Daniel and the development of Apocalyptic', J.B.L. 94 (1975), pp. 218-234
- 3) This point is made by O. Eissfeldt, op.cit., p.519 with particular reference to the views of Ginsberg, op.cit. and Rowley, op.cit.

- 4) Chapter 1 shows the training of pages; 2:2,3:2 the titles of the officials: 6:2-3 the division of the Empire into satrapies, cf. O.Eissfeldt, op.cit., p.522
- 5) The reappearance of Daniel is an obvious link between chapters 1-6 and 7-12, as is the message that God is sovereign Lord and will deal justly with individuals e.g. 6:22,12:2.
- 6) The words on the wall were ~~wene~~, ~~wene~~, tekel u-pharsin.
- 7) Jacob M. Myers, I and II Esdras, (Doubleday and Co, Inc., New York, 1974) p.8
- 8) Josephus, Antiquities XI,3:2-6
- 9) Cf. J.M.Myers, op.cit., pp.6 &13 where he gives a list of words used in I Esdras but not in the parallel canonical passages. Many of these words appear in Egyptian texts of the third and second centuries B.C. Cf. also Myers, op.cit., p. 6 and foot-notes 11 & 12. For links with the Book of Daniel cf. Myers, op.cit., pp.36,51. Myers, p.55, also points out that the name 'Apame' is not found before the Maccabean period. For lists of the use of Greek words cf. H.B. Swete, An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, pp.310-3
- 10) It has been said that I Esdras is the original form of the Canonical books. This was suggested by Sir Henry Howarth, 'Some unconventional Views on the text of the Bible', PSBA 23 (1901) and 24 (1902). As R.H.Pfeiffer, op.cit., p.243 points out this view has little support amongst scholars as there are many difficulties associated with it. It has also been suggested that I Esdras is the result of revision and rearrangement of the Canonical books. This view has a lot of support amongst scholars and it is one which is followed by Eissfeldt, op.cit., p.574. A third suggestion is that I Esdras is a divergent form of the history included in the Canonical books and that there is a common source for this history from which both I Esdras and the Canonical books draw information. This view is supported by Torrey, Mowinckel, Höltscher and Pfeiffer, cf. Pfeiffer, op.cit., pp. 243-5 That I Esdras was not based on the LXX text was shown by E. Nestlé, Marginalien, pp. 23-29. Pfeiffer, op.cit., p.237 gives examples from Nestlé showing that the rendering in I Esdras of Hebrew words is not always the same as that given

- by the LXX. Also the LXX is a very literal translation of the Massoretic text whereas I Esdras is much freer cf. pp.246-7. For scholars views of the original language of I Esdras cf. Myers, op.cit., p.5f.
- 11) Eissfeldt, op.cit., p.574 thinks that I Esdras seems unfinished and that the latter part of the text has been lost. He does not, however, think that there is anything missing from the beginning. Pfeiffer, op.cit., p.249, sees the book as a fragment. Cook in R.H. Charles, op.cit., pp.1-2, lists those scholars who think that I Esdras is a complete work in itself and those who think it is a fragment of a larger work.
 - 12) Cf. above, p. 67
 - 13) II Maccabees 3-5
 - 14) II Macc. 3:1
 - 15) Cf. Cook, op.cit., p.3
 - 16) For more details about the purpose of I Esdras cf. p.92f.
 - 17) This appears to be the purpose of the story in its present context although its origin is thought to be Persian and its aim a different one at its conception. It is likely that it became gradually Judaized cf. Pfeiffer, op.cit., p.251f. Pfeiffer is in agreement in this with C.C. Torrey, Ezra Studies, pp.37-38, although Schürer, History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ, Vol III, 28 believes that it was composed in Greek.
 - 18) Cf. Job 42:16-17
 - 19) Cf. II Kings 22:8-23:3, II Chron. 34:14-33
 - 20) II Kings 21:1-8
 - 21) Cf. R.H. Charles, op.cit., pp.620-624.
 - 22) Jer. 31:29-30; Ezek. 18:30
 - 23) Cf. S.B. Frost, 'The Death of Josiah: A Conspiracy of Silence', J.B.L. 87 (1968), p.374. Frost also suggests that the Old Testament is embarrassed by Josiah's death as it contradicts the view of the Old Testament of retribution in this life and says that the absence of any comment upon it by the prophets and other texts of that era illustrates this.
 - 24) Cf. L.Ginsberg, The Legends of the Jews, Vol.I, pp.59-60. Some famous men had the physical characteristics of Adam; e.g. Samson had his strength. But these characteristics were no blessing to those who possessed them as is shown by the death of Samson who died through his strength. Josiah had Adam's nostrils and

the darts which killed him entered through his nostrils.
 Vol. IV, p.127 Before executing Joab, Solomon allowed him to defend himself. David had cursed Joab and his descendants because he had slain Abner. Joab had also killed Amasa and was condemned for this reason. Solomon agreed that Joab's case for killing Abner had been just and he, therefore had to remove the curse put on Joab on account of Abner's death and this was transferred to his own posterity. Amongst other things this curse caused Josiah to fall by the sword of Pharoah.

Vol. IV, pp.282-3 The godless generation of Josiah was to blame for his death. Josiah went against the advice of Jeremiah not to deny the Egyptians passing through his land.

Vol. VI, note 107, b. Sotah 106. Eight of David's sons died a premature death, corresponding to the eight times he cried out in agony about his son, the wicked Absalom. Eight rulers of the Davidic dynasty likewise died a violent death, including Josiah.

- 25) p.93
- 26) pp.90-91
- 27) p.91
- 28) Cf. R.H. Pfeiffer, op.cit., pp.507-509 for a list of the various explanations which scholars give for the origin of these letters. Pfeiffer points out that scholars even disagree as to the number of letters. For various suggestions which have been made concerning the division and dating of the letters cf. Bartlett, The First and Second Books of the Maccabees, (Cambridge, 1973)
- 29) Cf. Pfeiffer, op.cit., p. 509f.
- 30) It has been suggested that it is unlikely that Jason wrote his work before 113B.C. i.e. the probable date of writing of Greek Esther cf. Pfeiffer, op.cit., p.516; also Gregg in R.H. Charles, op.cit., Vol.1 pp. 683-4. However the reference to Mordecai's Day may not have been in Jason's original work, it could have been added by the Epitomiser.
- 31) Cf. Moffat in R.H. Charles, op.cit., p.128
- 32) Cf. above, footnote 28
- 33) II Macc.15:5 says that Nicanor 'did not succeed in carrying out his cruel plan', and it has been pointed out that this statement does not make it clear whether Nicanor went into battle or not. It is possible that the statement is deliberately obscure in order to save the author having to admit that Judas went into battle on the sabbath. cf. R. Marcus, Law in the Apocrypha, p.80

- 34) Cf. p. 59
- 35) Cf. I Maccabees
- 36) Cf. G.W.E. Nickelsberg Jr., Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism, p.103
- 37) Cf, above, footnote 33
- 38) For other places where God is invoked in II Maccabees but not in I Maccabees cf. II Macc. 12:28, 12:36, 13:10
- 39) Goldstein, op.cit., p.36 points out that the second letter teaches the illegitimacy of the temple at Leontopolis by calling on Jews in Egypt to observe the Feast of Dedication of the Jerusalem Temple.
- 40) 9:9-27, 11:16-21, 11:22-26, 11:27, 11:37-38. For an outline of the problem and possible solution to the chronology of the last four letters cf. V. Tcherikover, Hellenistic Civilisation and the Jews, p. 214f.
- 41) Some prayers which are in II Maccabees but not in I Maccabees have been included in the section entitled 'Extra detail given to events which are included in I Maccabees', p.130f.
- 42) Cf. G.W.E. Nickelsberg, op.cit. p.79
- 43) 2:18, 5:15, 9:16, 4:31, 15:32 and 15:18 'sacred shrine'
- 44) 1:12, 3:1, 4:2, 9:14, 15:14
- 45) 2:17
- 46) 15:24
- 47) 6:23, 6:28
- 48) 5:25, 15:4
- 49) 7:36, 7:38, 8:11, 8:18, 15:8, 15:32
- 50) 1:24, 7:23, 7:28, 13:14
- 51) 13:4
- 52) 7:9
- 53) p.55f.
- 54) p.141
- 55) p.145
- 56) pp.131-2
- 57) p.134f.
- 58) p.137f.
- 59) p.138f.
- 60) Compare II Macc. 10:20 with I Macc. 5:17-23
- 61) Cf. 4:38, 4:49, 10:12

- 62) II Maccabees 11:16-38
- 63) Cf. p. 65
- 64) Cf. Is. 53:11-12 and p. 130
- 65) 10:14-17, 10:38, 11:4-13, 12:13-16, 12:26-31, 12:32-37, 13:9-17, 14:15-19; 14:35-36 & 15:6-11 & 15:2-24 result in 15:25-37
- 66) For other examples of the hope of life after death by martyrs cf. II Macc. 7:36 and 14:46.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 4

- 1) J.J. Collins, op.cit., pp.27-45 points out that Daniel 2 was originally eschatological but became haggadic when it lost its eschatological point i.e. after the Return. It was later re-interpreted eschatologically at the time of the Maccabean Crisis by a redactor.
- 2) H.H. Rowley, The Servant of the Lord and other Essays, (London, 1952) pp.237-68, defends the unity of the book of Daniel whereas H.L. Ginsberg, Studies in Daniel and 'The Composition of the Book of Daniel', V.T. IV (1954), pp.246-75 suggests that several strands can be discerned in Daniel 7-12 cf. O. Eissfeldt, op.cit., pp. 517-8, for a comprehensive list of the views of other scholars.
- 3) op.cit., pp.20-22. Lacocque points out many points of contact between the ideas embodied in Daniel and those of the Qumran sectarians.
- 4) Op.cit., (V.T. IV) , p.275. Chapter 7 seems to have been written c. 168^{B.C.} i.e. at the time of persecution and profanation of the Temple cf. I Macc. 1:41-59 and II Macc.6:1-9 and chapter 11 which was written before 164/3 as the manner of Antiochus's death is not accurate (11:45).
- 5) For the lion and the bear as the most dangerous of animals in the Old Testament tradition cf. Montgomery, A Commentary in Daniel, p.288. For the lion, the bear and the leopard as indicative of Babylonia, Media and Persia in Babylonian astrology cf. E. Bickermann, Four Strange Books of the Old Testament, p.102
- 6) Michael is described as מַלְאָכִי (10:13&21) and it is said of him that he 'stands up for' לְעַמּוּדָא דְדַנְיֵאל Daniel's fellow countrymen (12:1). The N.E.B. here translates 'who stands guard over' taking לְעַמּוּדָא in a military sense cf. G.W.E. Nickelsberg, op.cit., pp.11-13
- 7) The names of the people who are to awake are written in the book of truth (12:1) and G.W.E. Nickelsberg, op.cit., p.16, points out that there are several references in the Old Testament to the book where the names of the righteous are written cf. Is. 4:2-6, Malachi 3:16-18, Ps. 69:26. Thus it appears that the book of truth not only records events and politically important figures (Daniel 11:1) but also the actions of less important individuals.
- 8) Cf. Nickelsberg, op.cit., p.15
- 9) Cf. Nickelsberg, op.cit., pp.17-22

- 10) Cf. Nickelsberg, op.cit., pp.24-25; L. Ginsberg, 'The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant', V.T. III (1953)pp. 400-404.
- 11) Cf. A. Lacocque, op.cit., p. 99. also J.J. Collins, op.cit., pp.95-118. Collins suggests that the mythic pattern should be understood in an allegorical way.
- 12) Cf. S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, pp.373 & 385
- 13) The identity of the Son of Man in Daniel has long been a problem for scholars. Emerton, 'The Origin of the Son of Man Imagery', J.T.S. IX (1958) pp.225-242 has thrown a great deal of light on the origin of the figure. He points out that the description of God as the 'Ancient of Days' in Daniel 7 recalls the description of El in Ugaritic mythology (p.229). He says that the language used of the Son of Man recalls Yahweh's description in Ezek.1:6 and that the act of coming with clouds suggests a theophany (p. 231). He agrees with Bentzen and Mowinckel that the Sitz im Leben of Daniel 7 is the Enthronement Festival and suggests that if Daniel 7 is connected with ideas which were Canaanite before they were Israelite, then it is difficult to disassociate the Son of Man from Baal in Ugaritic texts and that the latter's characteristics (vanquisher of the dragon and Yam were transferred to Yahweh (p.232). He says that by Maccabean times the imagery proper to Yahweh must have been transferred to some other being, for the Ancient of Days must have been understood to be Yahweh. There are three main lines of interpretation as to who is actually meant by the Son of Man in Daniel

- 1) That he is a Messianic figure
- 2) That he has a collective identity
- 3) That he is an individual, either angelic or human.

James Muilenburg, 'The Son of Man in Daniel and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch', J.B.L. 1960 gives an interesting summary of scholarship on the question.

The first line which was popular for centuries, is now thought to have been a reflection back from the New Testament to Daniel, cf. J.J. Collins, op.cit., on the question (p.124).

The second line is supported by several eminent modern scholars: H.H. Rowley, The Rise of Apocalyptic, (Lutterworth Press, 1944)p.29

suggests that the 'saints' of the interpretation is equated with the Son of Man of the vision.

S. Mowinckel, He that Cometh, (trans, G.W.Anderson, Oxford, 1956) p.350, says that 'In the present form of Daniel's visions of the beasts, the Son of Man is a pictorial symbol of the people of Israel...'

O. Pißger, Theocracy and Eschatology, (Oxford, 1968) p.21 and footnote 19, suggests that the Son of Man is not an individual but symbolic of the eschatological kingdom to which the 'Israel' of the book of Daniel is connected.

The third line is also supported by several eminent modern scholars, the majority of whom see the 'One like a son of man' as an angelic figure.

J.C. Collins, op.cit., p.144 thinks he should be identified with Michael, as did N. Schmidt, 'The Son of Man in the Book of Daniel', J.B.L. 19 (1900), pp. 22-28.

For other possible identifications of the figure with an angel cf. J.J. Collins, op.cit., p.149, footnote 7.

However none of the above lines is without objections. If Emerton's theory of the Origin of the Son of Man is accepted then it leads to the suggestion that the figure is an individual yet as H.H. Rowley, op.cit., points out the son of man of the vision is equated with the 'saints' of the interpretation, giving the figure, in its present context, a collective identity. J.J. Collins, op.cit. pp.95-118 has suggested that the mythic elements in Daniel should be understood in an allegorical way and this, along with the difficulties of the above lines of interpretation of the son of man leads me to agree with M.Black, The Son of Man Problem in Recent Research and Debate (John Rylands Library Pamphlet) and A .Lacocque, op.cit., p.102, that the Son of Man should be understood in a symbolic way as an individual/corporate representative of the remnant of Israel.

- 14) A. Lacocque, op.cit., pp.100-101. He points out that the imagery of chapter 7 has many points of correspondance with chapter 2 where the underlying meaning of verse 34 is that the Temple was not made by human hands; that the apparently celestial background of 7:13 is no real objection to his theory for the natural Sitz im Leben for the enthronement of the son of man as High Priest is in the Temple. He continues that if one makes allowance for other

developments in the later chapters of Daniel (e.g. 9:24) it is clear that the spiritual temple is also the community of saints, cf. A. Feuillet, 'Le fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition Biblique', R.B. (1953), pp. 170-202, 321-346, particularly 197-8.

- 15) Cf. A Lacocque, op.cit., pp.101-2. He says that contrary to the contentions of other scholars 'saints' can mean Israel - Ps. 34: 10 for instance has 'saints' meaning 'Israel'. He points out that in Qumran I Q.S. 11:7-8 there is a correspondance between the community and the community of holy angels. For a modern summary of the views of other scholars on the identity of the 'saints' cf. J.J. Collins, op.cit., p.123f.
- 16) Cf. above, footnote 14
- 17) Cf. 'Problèmes de la littérature Hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qûmran' H.T.R. 64 (1971) pp. 333-78, especially pp.354-60. This article is more or less duplicated in English in The Books of Enoch, Aramaic Fragments of Qumran, Cave Four. pp. 4-69.
- 18) Cf. Milik, op.cit., (The Book of Enoch) p.41. The earliest manuscript of Enoch 83-90 dates from the third quarter of the second century B.C.
- 19) Cf. I Macc.5 and II Macc. 10:14-38, 12:10-45
- 20) For example R.H. Charles, op.cit., Vol.II , pp.170-171 suggested this dating almost a century ago.
- 21) For the description of the Egyptians as wolves, cf. 89:13,27.
- 22) 89:42,43,47
- 23) Cf. Milik, op.cit., (H.T.R. 64), p.358.
- 24) Cf. II Macc. 4:33-38
- 25) Cf. 85:3 and 90:37. Also R.H. Charles, op.cit., p.260 and footnote to verse 38 suggests the same.
- 26) For an explanation of why there were seven beings cf. R.H. Charles, op.cit. p.251
- 27) I am aware that, for example, R.H. Charles, op.cit., p.252, in his footnote to this verse explains this reference as an indication of the way in which the author understands the action of the flood upon the earth.
- 28) The Ethiopic text gives an extended account of the origin of the Gentiles in 89:10 cf. R.H. Charles, op.cit., p.252 but fragment

4Q.En.e. omits this, cf. Milik, op.cit., pp.241-2. It is probable that the translators of the text into Ethiopic added this verse to harmonise with the later appearance in the book of Gentiles under the various guises cited in 89:10 - for the tendency of the Ethiopic version to do this cf. Milik, op.cit., (H.T.R.64) p. 354

- 29) Cf. 85:33,35,41,54; 90:8
- 30) The phrase 'were blinded' recalls Is.6:10 but this reference does not help to identify the one who caused the blindness.
- 31) I Enoch 89:65,90:1 Cf. also Milik,op.cit., (H.T.R. 64),p.356
- 32) The identification of the shepherds with angels is quite likely. R.H. Charles, op.cit., pp.199-200, footnote on verse 59, gives a list of interpretations of who the shepherds were up to his own day. He says that the only possible explanation is that they were angels.
- a) The seventy shepherds existed contemporaneously and are summoned together to receive commission 85:59
- b) The shepherds are appointed to protect the sheep 89:75 and to allow only a limited portion of them to be destroyed by the Gentiles.
- c) Jews and Gentiles and their kings are symbolised by animals, therefore shepherds cannot symbolise men.
- d) In earlier history God was the shepherd of Israel but on its apostasy he withdrew from it and committed its pasturing to 70 of his angels.
- e) The angel who recorded is simply called 'another' 89:61 in connection with them and so is naturally one of them.
- f) In the last judgement they are classed with the fallen angels, 90:21-25
- g) God speaks directly to the shepherds and not through the medium of angels as elsewhere in the book.
- (The shepherds are also used to answer a pressing theological problem - they exceeded their orders and so responsibility for the troubles is moved from God to them.)
- 33) Cf. 90:37 - The white bull with large horns is usually taken to be the Messiah cf. R.H. Charles, op.cit., p.260
- 34) Cf. Matt.25:32

- 35) Cf. 85:3, 90:37 and R.H. Charles, op.cit., p.260 and footnotes to verses 37 and 38
- 36) Some scholars argue for a Maccabean dating of the Testament of Moses and so some discussion of the question is necessary. As the text stands, chapter 6 is decisive for dating, in that it appears to refer to the time of Herod the Great. 6:7 which states 'And (Herod) he shall beget children, who, succeeding him, shall rule for a shorter period,' is the point where the facts of history merge into conjecture, as only one of Herod's children ruled for a shorter period than him. Thus the book can be dated between 7 and 30A .D., and chapters 8 and 9 are a prophecy of what will happen in the final days of the present age. However Jacob Licht, J.J.S. 12 (1961), 'Taxo, or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance', pp.95-103, G.W .E. Nickelsberg, Studies in the Testament of Moses, pp. 33-37, also Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism, pp.43-45, J.A. Goldstein, Studies in the Testament of Moses, pp.44-52, argue for a Maccabean dating on four main grounds. The first is that the story of Taxo in chapter 9 has affinities with stories of other martyrdoms in the Maccabean period. However, J.J. Collins, Studies in the Testament of Moses, pp. 24-5 says that such stories occur throughout the inter-testamental period. Chapter 9 then on its own cannot be taken as an indication of Maccabean dating.
- The second ground is that the Testament of Moses has affinities with other documents of the second century B.C. The argument of similarity though has been used to prove both datings and should therefore be approached with caution as all apocalyptic works of all ages have some similar features. I think that Daniel 7-12 and Enoch 85-90 should be taken as examples of second century apocalyptic as their time of writing has been verified, and then other texts compared with them to see whether they have a similar level of eschatological development.
- The results of such a comparison are as follows:-
- a) Over against Daniel and Enoch the Testament of Moses(10:7-8) foresees a complete eschatological disjunction of all Gentiles and Israel.
 - b) In Daniel and Enoch the wise and the white sheep remained on earth after God's judgement, but Israel is exalted to the stars in T.of M. (10:8-9).

c) The mention of Satan in T. of M. 10:1 may indicate an underlying intensification of the angelic struggles of Daniël and Enoch, moving towards a dualistic position, although it could be said that T. of M. 10:2 suggests that Satan is to be regarded as an angel or member of the heavenly council who acted in opposition to the interests of Israel.

The third ground is that chapter eight has certain affinities with the Antiochean persecution, cf. Nickelsberg, Studies in the Testament of Moses, pp.34-5 and the fourth is that additions have been made to the original document which account for the unmistakable reference to Herod, cf. Goldstein, op.cit., pp.45-47. That chapter eight describes the Antiochean persecution is not without serious objection, namely that verse 1 states that those who confess to their circumcision will be crucified, which did not happen during the Antiochean persecution, but did during the Herodian. Goldstein's suggestion of secondary additions is dependent upon acceptance of his assertion that the jump from the description of the High Priest Jason and Menelaus in Chapter 5 to either that of Herod in chapter 6 or the description of the (supposed) Antiochean persecution in chapter 8 is rather strange. Accordingly he reconstructs chapter 6 so that it describes Antiochus's attack on Israel, the sack of the Temple and Apollonius's expedition. One of the major difficulties with this idea of Goldstein's is that later works do not usually refer to the Maccabean struggles cf. Farmer, Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus, p. 126 f.

Even without the above two objections to Goldstein's reconstruction of the text, such massive alterations are not recommendable without strong prior grounds for thinking that the original text had been tampered with and in this case such grounds are not present.

FOOTNOTES TO THE NOTE ON THE RELATIONSHIP OF THE ATTITUDE OF EACH GROUP OF TEXTS TO THAT OF A PARTICULAR SOCIAL GROUP WHICH EXISTED BEFORE THE CRISIS.

- 1) Cf. p.13
- 2) Cf. pp. 12-13
- 3) Cf. chapter 4, footnote 13
- 4) Cf. B.S. Childs, Myth and Reality in the Old Testament, (S.C.M. 1960)pp.49-57
- 5) P.D. Hanson, Apocalyptic in Israel, (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1975)
- 6) M. Cohen, The Pursuit of the Millenium (Paladin, 1970) shows that in the Middle Ages it was the dispossessed who favoured millennial views. K. Mannheim, Ideology and Utopia, (Kegan Paul, London 1946)p.51 suggests that there is a correspondance between a given perspective and the social situation. G. Plüger, Eschatology and Theocracy,, Chapter 2, sees the hasidim as the group responsible for Daniel but as P.R. Davies, 'Hasidim in the Maccabean Period', J.J.S. 28, (1977), pp. 127-40 points out that there is little evidence to suggest that the Hasidim were a crystallised group of that they are to be radically differentiated from Judas Maccabeus and his followers.

FOOTNOTES TO CHAPTER 5

- 1) e.g. III Macc. 1:29
- 2) History of Israel, Vol.5p.468f. cf. Emmet in R.H. Charles, op. cit., I, p.158
- 3) This was first suggested by Grimm, cf. Emmet, op.cit., p.158
- 4) This very valid criticism is pointed out by both Emmet, op. cit., p. 158 and H. Anderson III and IV Maccabees (Forthcoming in the Doubleday Series.)
- 5) The Third and Fourth Book of Maccabees, (New York, Harper and brothers, 1953). For this reference cf. H. Anderson, op.cit. In an article Hadas restates this view 'Aristeas and II Maccabees' H.T.R. (1949), pp. 175-84. Hadas is in apparent agreement with V. Tcherikover, The Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic - Roman age in the light of the Papyri (Hebrew with English summary; Jerusalem 1945)p.91f.
- 6) Wilcken's view is cited by Emmet, op.cit.,p.165, footnote 18
- 7) Cf. Emmet, op.cit., p.165, footnote 28
- 8) Emmet, op.cit., p.158
- 9) op.cit., p.6
- 10) 3:11,3:19,4:14-15,5:47
- 11) For lists of these cf. Emmet, op.cit., pp.156-7
- 12) 'Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas', Z.N.W. . 29 (1930), 280-298. It is quite likely that Theckeray came to the same conclusions as Bickermann on this issue cf. Emmet, op.cit., p.156, footnote 6
- 13) 'Aristeas and II Maccabees', H.T.R. (1949), pp.175-84
- 14) Hadas, op.cit., cf. especially p.182
- 15) op.cit., p.7
- 16) Cf. pp. 97-98
- 17) Cf. Emmet,op.cit., p.158
- 18) Op.cit., p.156
- 19) Emmet, op.cit., p.156, H. Anderson, op.cit., p.10
- 20) The Jews in Egypt were probably already familiar with the story which appears to have been connected with some familiar festival cf. III Macc. 7:15. Josephus has a more sober version of the story which also gives rise to a festival cf. Contra Apionem 2:5 The author of III Maccabees probably deliberately used a familiar story concerning Egyptian Jewry to make them more aware of the parallel with the situation in Palestine.
- 21) Both H. Anderson, op.cit., and Emmet, op.cit., p. 162, think that the intention of the author of III Maccabees is to encourage

Egyptian Jews to adhere to their inherited faith.

- 22) Cf. Townshend in R.H. Charles, op.cit., II, p.654
- 23) Cf. H. Anderson, op.cit., The purpose of IV Maccabees will be outlined below.
- 24) Many historical crises have been suggested as the setting for IV Maccabees. Dupont-Sommer, Le Quatrième Livre des Maccabées (Paris, 1919) p.78f., assigns to IV Maccabees a date prior to Hadrian's persecution (117-8A.D.). M. Hadas, III and IV Maccabees, suggests the reign of Caligula 37-41A.D.
- 25) Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume, English section, (New York, 1945) P.105f.
- 26) e.g. threskia = religion and nomikos = expert in law.
- 27) Cf. Galatians 1:21 and Acts 15:23
- 28) Cf. Louis Ginzberg Jubilee Volume, p.108
- 29) S. Liebermann, Hellenism in Jewish Palestine and M. Hengel, Judaism and Hellenism show this.
- 30) Cf. Townshend, op.cit., p.657, H. Anderson, op.cit., pp.6-7
- 31) Cf. Townshend, op.cit., p.656
- 32) Cf. Townshend, op.cit., pp.656-7
- 33) Cf. Townshend, op.cit., p.657
- 34) For the suggestion of Antioch as the place of writing cf. H. Anderson, op.cit.
- 35) The death of the seven brothers is probably legendary, but it appears in II Macc.7 as happening at the time of the Maccabean Crisis.
- 36) For the definitions of λογιότης and εὐσεβείης I am indebted to Townshend, op.cit., pp.666-7. Further information regarding the two words can be obtained by consulting the cited pages.
- 37) e.g. Stoicism
- 38) Cf. Townshend, op.cit., p.663
- 39) Parts of the story of Eleazer and the seven brothers parallel the Suffering Servant passages in Deutero-Isaiah cf. II Maccabees p. 130.

FOOTNOTES TO THE APPENDIX - THE ADDITIONS TO THE BOOK OF ESTHER

- 1) C.A. Moore, 'A Greek Witness to a Different Hebrew Text of Esther', ZATW 1967, pp.351-8, throws considerable doubt upon the identification of Greek Text 'A' as Lucianic.
- 2) Cf. 'The Colophon of the Greek Book of Esther', J.B.L. 63 (1944), pp.339-362
- 3) Cf. Bickermann, op.cit., pp.346-7
- 4) Jacob, 'Das Buch Esther bei LXX', ZAW 10 (1890), pp.27-80 prefers Ptolemy Soter as do Willrich and Ewald (cf. Pfeiffer, History of New Testament Times, p.310). Jacob, Willrich and Ewald of course formed their hypotheses prior to Bickermann's article although Pfeiffer, who knew Bickermann's work, still thinks it possible that Ptolemy IX was intended.
- 5) 'The 'A' text of the Greek Versions of the Book of Esther', ZATW (1969), pp.396-76 . Cf. especially pp.374-5.
- 6) 'The Older Book of Esther' H.T.R. 37 (1944), 1-40
- 7) Op.cit.
- 8) Op.cit.
- 9) 'On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther', J.B.L. 72 (1973) pp. 382-393
- 10) 'Le Livre Grec d'Esther et La Royauté Divine' , R.B. 73 (1966), pp.161-185
- 11) 'Syntax Criticism of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther', J.B.L. 94 (1975) pp. 65-72
- 12) Op.cit.
- 13) Op.cit., (J.B.L. 92 (1973)), p.383
- 14) Cf. p.187 and note 2
- 15) Op.cit. p.393
- 16) Op.cit. p.392
- 17) Op.cit.
- 18) Brownlee, op.cit., pp.165-168
- 19) pp.168-9
- 20) pp.170-8
- 21) Op.cit., p.372
- 22) Op.cit., p.
- 23) Cf. Rev. 12:3, 13:2, 20:2; 2 Bar. 29:3-8; 2 Esd. 6:52
- 24) Cf. Joel 12:2, 10:11; Zeph. 1:15, Matt. 14:29 also Dan. 12:1-3
- 25) C.A. Moore, op.cit., pp.388-9
- 26) Op.cit., p.389
- 27) Cf., above, p. 58f.

FOOTNOTES TO CONCLUSION

- 1) Judith 16:17 does suggest that the wicked were punished eternally but this may be poetic licence or a later addition cf. above, p. 74, note 94
- 2) The Rest of Esther is dealt with in an appendix cf. p. 187f.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Abel, Le P. F.-M., Les Livres des Maccabées (Gabalda et Cie., Paris, 1949)
- Abel, Le. P. F.-M., Histoire de la Palestine (Gabalda et Cie, Paris, 1952)
- Ackroyd, P.R. 'Criteria for the Maccabean Dating of Old Testament Literature', V.T.III, pp.113-132
- Albright, W.F., From the Stone Age to Christianity, (Baltimore, 1940)
- Anderson, H., III and IV Maccabees (Forthcoming from Doubleday)
- André, L.E.T., Les Apocryphes de l'Ancien Testament, (Florence 1903)
- Baron, S.W., A Social and Religious History of the Jews (Jewish Publication Society, ^{New York,} 1937)
- Bartlett, J.R., The First and Second Books of the Maccabees, (Cambridge University Press, 1973)
- Barth, C., Diesseits und Jenseits im Glauben des Späten Israel, (Verlag, Stuttgart, 1974)
- Bevan, F.R., Jerusalem under the High Priests, (London, 1904)
- Bickermann, E., 'Zur Datierung des Pseudo-Aristeas', ZNW29 (1930)
- Bickermann, E. Four Strange Books of the Old Testament, (New York, 1968)
- Bickermann, E., 'The Colophon of the Greek Book of Esther', J.B.L.63
- Bickermann, E., Der Gott der Makkabäer, (Berlin, 1937)
- Bickermann, E., 'Un Document relatif à la persécution d'Antiochus IV Epiphane' R.H.R. 115, pp.188-223
- Black, M., The Son of Man Problem in Recent Research and Debate, (John Rylands Library Pamphlet) (Manchester, 1963)
- Bowker, J.W., 'Son of Man' J.T.S. 28 (1977), pp.19-48
- Brownlee, 'Le Livre Grec d'Esther et la Royauté Divine', R.B. 73 (1966)
- Bruns, 'Judith or Jael' CBQ16 (1954)
- Bruns, 'The Genealogy of Judith' CBQ 18 (1956)
- Buehler, W.W., The Pre-Herodian Civil War and Social Debate, (Doctoral Dissertation, Basel, 1974)
- Cambridge Ancient History , Vol VIII (Cambridge, 1924)
- Charles, R.H. (editor) , The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament (Oxford, 1913)
- Charles, R.H., 'I Enoch' in The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol.II, pp.163-281 (Oxford, 1913)

- Childs, B.S., Myth and Reality in the Old Testament, (S.C.M., ^{London} 1960)
- Cohen, N., The Pursuit of the Millennium, (Paladin, ^{London} 1970)
- Collins, J.J. 'Court Tales in Daniel and the Development of Apocalyptic', J.B.L. 94, (1975) pp.218-234
- Collins, J.J. 'Jewish Apocalyptic against its Hellenistic Near Eastern Environment' ASOR 220, pp.27-36
- Collins, J.J. 'Cosmos and Salvation: Jewish Wisdom and Apocalyptic in the Hellenistic Age' Hist. Rel. 17 (1977), pp.121-42
- Collins, J.J., The Apocalyptic Visions of the Book of Daniel, (Scholars Press, 1977) (Missoula, Mont.)
- Cook, H.J., 'The 'A' Text of the Greek Versions of the Book of Esther', ZA TW 1969
- Cook, H.J. 'Syntax Criticism of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther', JBL 94 (1975)
- Cook, 'I Esdras' in R.H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament, Vol.I, pp.1-58
- Cowley in R.H. Charles, op.cit., Vol I pp.242-267
- Coxon, P.W. 'Daniel 3:17; A Linguistic and Theological Problem', V.T. 26 (1976), pp. 400-409
- Dancy, J.C., A Commentary on I Maccabees, (Blackwell, Oxford, 1954)
- Dancy, J.C., The Shorter Books of the Apocrypha, (Cambridge Bible Commentary, 1972)
- Davies, P., 'Note on I Macc.3:46', JTS 23, (1972)
- Davies, P., 'Hasidim in the Maccabean Period', JJS 28 (1977) pp.127-40
- Davies, P., 'Daniel, Chapter Two', JTS 27 (1976) pp. 392-401
- Dubarle, A.M., Judith, (Rome, 1966)
- Dupont-Sommer, Le Quatrième Livre des Maccabées, (Paris, 1919)
- Eissfeldt, O., The Old Testament. An Introduction, (Blackwell, ^{Oxford,} 1966)
- Emmet, 'III Maccabees' in R.H. Charles, op.cit., Vol.I pp.155-173
- Emerton, 'The Origin of the Son of Man imagery', JTS IX (1958), pp.225-242.
- Enslin/Zeitlin, The Book of Judith (E.J. Brill, Leiden, 1972)
- Ewald, H., History of Israel, Vol.V (London 1874-8)
- Farmer, W.R. Maccabees, Zealots and Josephus, (Columbia University Press, New York, 1956)
- Feuillet, A., 'Le Fils de l'homme de Daniel et la tradition Biblique', R.B. 1953

- Finklestein, L., The Jews, Vol I, (Schocken Books, New York, 1972)
- Finklestein, L., The Pharisees, (The Jewish Publication Society of America, 1938)
- Frost, S.B., 'The Death of Josiah, A Conspiracy of Silence', JBL.87 (1968)
- Ginsberg, L., The Legends of the Jews, (Philadelphia, 1947)
- Ginsberg, H.L., Studies in Daniel, (New York, 1948)
- Ginsberg, L., 'The Composition of the Book of Daniel', VT.IV (1954) ; Louis Ginsberg Jubilee Volume, (English Section, New York, 1945)
- Ginsberg, L., 'The Oldest Interpretation of the Suffering Servant', V.T.III, (1953)
- Goldin, J., (editor) The Jewish Expression, (Bantam Books, 1970)
- Goldstein, J. I Maccabees, (Anchor Bible, Doubleday, New York, 1976)
- Goldstein, J., 'Hasmoneans; Dynasty of God's Resisters' H.T.R. 68, (1975), pp. 53-58.
- Gregg, 'Additions to Esther' in R.H. Charles, op.cit., Vol. I, pp.665-684.
- Hadas, M., 'Aristeas and III Maccabees', HTR 42 (1949), pp.
- Hadas, M., The Third and Fourth Books of Maccabees, (Harper and Brothers, New York, 1953)
- Hanson, P.D., The Dawn of Apocalyptic, (Fortress Press, Philadelphia, 1975)
- Hengel, M., Judaism and Hellenism, (Trans, J. Bowden, London, 1974)
- Hoenig, S.B., "The New Schürer", JQR 47 (1976) pp 47-54.
- Howarth, H., 'Some Unconventional Views on the Text of the Bible', PSBA 23 , (1901) and 24 (1902)
- Jacob, E., Theology of the Old Testament, (Hodder and Stroughton, ^{London} 1958)
- Jacob, 'Das Buch Esther bei LXX' ZAW 10 (1890)
- Johnson, N.B., Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, (J.B.L. Monograph Series, Philadelphia, 1948)
- Josephus, Antiquities of the Jews, XI, XII, XIII, (Ed., Marcus) (Loeb Classical Library, London 1926)
- Josephus, The Jewish War, (Penguin, ^{Hermondsworth, middlesex,} 1959)
- Josephus, Contra Apionem, (Ed. Thackeray, Heinemann, London, 1926)

- Lacocque, A., Le Livre de Daniel, (Delachaux et Niestle, Neuchatel-Paris, 1976)
- Lamparter, H., Die Apokryphen II. (Stuttgart, 1972)
- Licht, J., 'Taxo, or the Apocalyptic Doctrine of Vengeance', JJS 12, (1961) pp. 95-103)
- Liebermann, S., Hellenism in Jewish Palestine, (New York, 1962)
- Mannheim, K., Ideology and Utopia, (Kegan and Paul, London, 1946)
- Marcus, R., Law in the Apocrypha, (Columbia Univ. Press, New York, 1927)
- Marmonstein, A., Old Rabbinic Doctrine of God, Part I, (London, 1927)
- Milik, J.T., (in collaboration with M. Black) 'Problèmes de la littérature Hénochique à la lumière des fragments araméens de Qûmran', HTR 64 (1971) - more or less duplicated in English in The Books of Enoch, Aramaic Fragments of Qumran, Cave 4.
- Moffat, 'II Maccabees' in R.H. Charles, op.cit., Vol. I, pp. 125-54
- Moore, C.A., 'On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther', JBL. 72 (1973)
- Moore, C.A. 'A Greek Witness to a Different Hebrew Text of Esther', ZATW (1967)
- Montgomery, J.A., The Book of Daniel, (T.&T. Clark, Edinburgh, 1927)
- Mowinckel, S., He that Cometh, (Trans. G.W. Anderson, Oxford, 1956)
- Muilenburg, J., 'The Son of Man in Daniel and the Ethiopic Apocalypse of Enoch', JBL. (1960)
- Myers, J.M., I & II Esdras, (Doubleday, New York, 1974)
- Nestle, E., Marginalien und Materialien (Tubingen, 1893)
- Neusner, Development of a Legend, (Leiden, 1970)
- Neusner, 'Development of a Legend', JJS (1973)
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E., Resurrection, Immortality and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism, (Harvard Theological Studies, XXVI, Cambridge, Mass.) (1972)
- Nickelsburg, G.W.E., (editor) Studies in the Testament of Moses, (Society of Biblical Literature). (Missoula, Mont., 1973)
- Desterley, 'I Maccabees' in R.H. Charles, op.cit., Vol. I, pp. 59-124

- Pfeiffer, R.H., History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha, (Harper and Brothers, New York, 1949)
- Plöger, O., Theocracy and Eschatology, (Trans, S. Rudman, Oxford, 1968)
- Plöger, O., Das Buch Daniel, (Gütersloh, 1965)
- Ricoeur, P., Finitude et Culpaabilité, II, La Symbolique du Mal, (Aubier Montaigne, Paris, 1960)
- Rostovtzeff, M., Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World, (Oxford, 1941)
- Rowley, H.H., The Servant of the Lord and other Essays (London, 1992)
- Rowley, H.H., The Relevance of A pocalypitic, (Lutterworth Press, London and Redhill, 1944)
- Rowley, H.H., Darius the Mede and the Four World Empires in the Book of Daniel: a historical study of contemporary theories, (Cardiff, 1959)
- Rowley, H.H., The Rise of Apocalyptic, (Lutterworth Press, ^{Redhill,} 1944)
- Schmidt, N., 'The Son of Man in the Book of Daniel' JBL, 19 (1900) pp. 22-28
- Schneider, B., 'Esther Revised', Liber Annus Vol. XIII, 1962/3
- Schürer, E., History of the Jewish People in the Time of Christ, (Vol. I, New English Version) (Revised and edited by G. Vermes and F. Millar - Edinburgh, 1973)
- Skehan, P.W., 'The Hand of Judith', CBQ25(1963)
- Swete, H.B., An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek, (Cambridge, 1900)
- Tcherikover, V., Hellenistic Civilisation and the Jews, (Trans, S. Appelbaum, Atheneum, New York, 1970)
- Tcherikover, V., The Jews in Egypt in the Hellenistic - Roman Age in the light of the Papyri, (Jerusalem, 1945)
- Torrey, C.C., The Apocryphal Literature, : a Brief Introduction, (New Haven, 1946)
- Torrey, C.C., Ezra Studies, (Chicago, 1910)
- Torrey, C.C. 'The Older Book of Esther', HTR. 37 (1944)
- Townshend, 'IV Maccabees' in R.H. Charles, op.cit., Vol. II, pp.653-685;

Urback, E., The Sages: their concepts and Beliefs, (Trans. J. A brahams, Jerusalem, 1975)

Vriezen, Th. C., An Outline of Old Testament Theology, (Basil Blackwell, Oxford, 1970)

Von Rad, G., Wisdom in Israel, (Trans., J.D. Martin, S.C.M. ^{London,} 1972)

Von Rad, G., Old Testament Theology, Vols. I and II., (Trans., D. Stalker, Edinburgh, 1962)

Von Rad, G., 'Das Geschichtsbild des chronistischen Werkes', BWANT IV/3 (1930)

Williamson, G.A., The World of Josephus, (London, 1964)

Zeitlin, The Rise and Fall of the Jewish State, (Philadelphia, 1962)

Zeitlin/Tedesche, The First Book of the Maccabees, (New York, 1950)

QUOTATIONS

All quotations from the Old Testament and Apocrypha are from the New English Bible; those from the Pseudepigrapha are from R.H. Charles, The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament.