

The work entitled 2 Maccabees presents a host of challenges to conventional assumptions. First of all, the title itself is misleading. Second Maccabees is not a continuation of 1 Maccabees: its narrative component contains an account quite different in both style and content from that in 1 Maccabees. Second, this work is not a history of the Maccabees' revolt against their Seleucid overlords in the modern sense of the word "history." It is a highly rhetorical narrative that sets out not to give a blow-by-blow description of events but to move its audience to commit to faithfully following the ancestral traditions of Judaism. The narrative itself is paradoxical in that its author is the first we know to speak of Judaism and to contrast it with Hellenism, and yet he displays considerable awareness of Greek rhetorical style in his presentation. Finally, 2 Maccabees, a complex work, is not a single document. It has three components: the first two are letters and the third, which is the largest, is a narrative. What is the relationship between these letters and the narrative? Were the former meant to introduce the narrative or are they there haphazardly, simply because they mention some characters in the narrative? We begin our introduction with a treatment of these letters.

### The Letters and the Narrative

Clement of Alexandria wrote that Aristobulos, one of the recipients of the second prefixed letter, is mentioned by "the composer of the epitome of the Maccabees [ὁ συνταξάμενος τὴν τῶν μακκαβαλικῶν]" (*Strom.* 5.14.97.7).<sup>1</sup> Clement, writing at the end of the second century C.E., chose the participle of the verb whose root the author of the narrative had used in his prologue and epilogue to describe his work (2:23: δι' ἐνὸς συντάγματος ἐπιτεμεῖν; 15:38-39: τῆ συντάξει). Such a word choice

underscores that Clement saw the letters and the narrative as linked, but there has been considerable debate over what constitutes that link.

The number of letters before the prologue to the narrative has often been debated. Jochen Gabriel Bunge conveniently catalogued the opinions: one letter: Grätz, Niese, Kolbe; two letters: Grimm, Knabenhauer, Torrey, Winckler, Herkenne, Kugler, Abel, Penna, Zeitlin; three letters: Bruston, Willrich, Büchler, Laqueur, Kahrstedt, Bévenot, Buchers, Rinaldi.<sup>2</sup> Since the brilliant analysis of Elias Bickermann, a basic consensus has emerged that there were two letters.<sup>3</sup> But what is the relationship between these letters and the narrative? Benedikt Niese and Bunge were the strongest supporters of the notion that the same author wrote the letters and the narrative.<sup>4</sup> Bunge in particular pointed to the presence of the particle δέ in 2:19, which suggested that the letter led into the narrative. However, the different descriptions of Antiochus IV's death in the second letter and in the narrative in 2 Maccabees 9 spoke decisively against this position. So too did the hope expressed in the second letter that God's mercy would be shown in the end of the dispersion of Israel (1:27-29; 2:7, 18), an idea that is not at all present in the narrative, where the hope of those killed for the sake of the ancestral laws is for a renewal in resurrection. The major problems for the connection of the letters and the narrative were thus found in the second letter. This led to the suggestion by both Arnaldo Momigliano and Christian Habicht that the second letter had somehow been appended to the first.<sup>5</sup> Jonathan Goldstein suggested that since "the practice of Hellenistic scribes was to place at the end of a document earlier documents which were evidence or provided motivation," the author of the second letter had attached it to the first.<sup>6</sup> However, there are even problems with

1 Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 5.14.97.7. See also Eusebius *Praep. Ev.* 8.9.38.

2 Jochen Gabriel Bunge, *Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch. Quellenkritische, literarische, chronologische und historische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch als Quelle syrisch-palästinischer Geschichte im 2. Jh. v. Chr.* (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1971) 34 n. 7.

3 Elias Bickermann, "Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr. (II Macc. 1: 1-9)," *ZNW* 32 (1933) 233-53.

4 Benedikt Niese, "Kritik der beiden Makkabäer-

bücher nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der makkabäischen Erhebung," *Hermes* 35 (1900) 268-307, here 278; Bunge, *Untersuchungen*, 203-4.

5 Arnaldo Momigliano, "The Second Book of Maccabees," *CP* 70 (1975) 81-88, here 82-83; Christian Habicht, 2. *Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ 1; Historische und legendarische Erzählungen 3; Gütersloh: G. Mohn, 1976) 174-75.

6 Jonathan A. Goldstein, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 41A; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1983) 167.

connecting the first letter to the narrative: no mention is made of Antiochus IV's persecution; no mention is made of the Day of Nikanor. The linguistic argument based on the presence of *καταλλάσσειν* in 1:5b and in the narrative in 7:33 and 8:29, with *καταλλαγή* in 5:20, is not conclusive. The verb *καταλλάσσειν* is used in Paul to designate reconciliation with God and is also found with this meaning in Josephus *Ant.* 6.143, in which work it is also used to signify reconciliation between enemies and within families.<sup>7</sup> Philo, too, speaks of how transgressors have "three intercessors . . . to plead for their reconciliation with the Father" (*τῶν πρὸς τὸν πατέρα καταλλαγῶν*) (*Praem. peon.* 166). Since the verb and noun are used by three very different Jewish authors of the first century C.E., one cannot argue that the presence of the verb in the first letter and in the narrative proves satisfactorily that they were written by the same author.<sup>8</sup> While the use of this term as well as the technical term for feast of Tabernacles, *σκηνοπηγία*, evidences a knowledge of Greek and LXX usage, the convoluted greeting formula suggests someone more at home writing in Aramaic or Hebrew.

The common opinion is that the two letters were originally independent works that were later joined together.<sup>9</sup> Because the three works, the two letters and the narrative, have been side by side since before the time of Clement of Alexandria, the tendency has been to try to find some rationale for this arrangement. Jan Willem van Henten argued that the narrative was connected to the letters to provide an explanation for why the feast of Hanukkah should be celebrated.<sup>10</sup> However,

as noted in the commentary, the first letter contains no mention of either Antiochus IV or the martyrdoms. The rhetoric seems to be at odds with van Henten's explanation. Daniel Schwartz attempted to show that the author of the letters knew the narrative and, in fact, rearranged it. Schwartz removed the contradiction generated by the account of Antiochus IV's death in 1:13-16 in comparison with that of chap. 9 by claiming that the letter's account is a later interpolation, but he did not suggest who the interpolator might be.<sup>11</sup> He also claimed that "the Hasmonean authorities in Jerusalem . . . added a section on [the Hanukkah] festival's origins into the book at 10:1-8 and attached two accompanying letters at the book's outset."<sup>12</sup> I shall argue against both these positions in the commentary, but it is important to note how important Schwartz sees the role of the later "authorities" in settling the composition of the narrative.

All three works in 2 Maccabees hold that God's temple is holy and that God defends it against its attackers, and all call for the celebration of the rededication of the temple. However, these common elements remain very general connections. Bertram Herr, supporting his case on the presence of *καταλλάσσειν* in both the first letter and the narrative, stated that the epitomator connected the two works. Herr emphasized the importance of the martyrdoms in the narrative and argued that the letter had the same orientation. As a pastorally oriented theologian, the epitomator stressed the need to stand fast in belief precisely when in difficulties.<sup>13</sup> However, once one does not accept the linguistic basis

7 Within families: Josephus *Ant.* 7.184, 196; 5.138; 11.195; between enemies: *Ant.* 6.353; 14.278.

8 I earlier argued that the use of the verb pointed "to purposeful connections being made between the first letter and the epitome" (Robert Doran, *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* [CBQMS 12; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1981] 12).

9 Carl L. W. Grimm, *Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer* (Leipzig: S. Hirzel, 1857) 22-25; Richard Laqueur, *Kritische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch* (Strassburg: K. J. Trübner, 1904) 52-71; Elias Bickermann, "Makkabäerbücher (I. und II.)" *PW* 14:779-97, here 791; Hugo Bévenot, *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher* (Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testaments; Bonn: Peter Hanstein, 1931) 11; Diego Arenhoevel, *Die Theokratie nach dem 1. und*

*2. Makkabäerbuch* (Walberger Studien der Albertus-Magnus-Akademie, Theologische Reihe 3; Mainz: Matthias Gruenwald, 1967) 110-11; Victor Parker, "The Letters in II Maccabees: Reflections on the Book's Composition," *ZAW* 119 (2007) 386-402, here 386-89.

10 Jan Willem van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (JSJSup 57; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 57.

11 Daniel R. Schwartz, *2 Maccabees* (Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature; Berlin/New York: de Gruyter, 2008) 133, 146-47.

12 *Ibid.*, 37.

13 Bertram Herr, "Der Standpunkt des Epitomators: Perspektivenwechsel in der Forschung am Zweiten Makkabäerbuch," *Bib* 90 (2009) 1-31, here 28-31.

for his connecting the two pieces, one is left with two pieces exhorting steadfastness in the face of persecution. Rather than speculate on who put these three works together and for what reason, a better approach is to examine each piece in itself and see what insights it provides.

### The Narrative

The narrative of the events in Judea from 175 B.C.E. to 164 B.C.E. has been explored primarily for what it can tell about the Hasmonean revolt. As Schwartz has noted, there is very little evidence that the work was known by Philo, Josephus, or the rabbinic tradition.<sup>14</sup> What was interesting were the martyrdom stories, mentioned probably in Heb 11:35-38 and in the Apostolic Fathers.<sup>15</sup> John Chrysostom devoted three sermons to the topic “On the Maccabean Martyrs and Their Mother.”<sup>16</sup>

Until the work of Benedikt Niese,<sup>17</sup> the narrative of 1 Maccabees was preferred to that of 2 Maccabees in terms of reliability as a historical source. Niese’s analysis of the problems in the account of 1 Maccabees has brought about a greater sense of the literary and theological qualities in that work.<sup>18</sup> The explosion of inscriptions and papyrological evidence further emphasized

that the narrative in 2 Maccabees reliably reflects the language and institutions of the second century B.C.E.<sup>19</sup> But what kind of narrative is it?

### The Genre of the Narrative

When approaching the narrative of 2 Maccabees, scholars have tried to fit it into Hellenistic historiography. Niese set the stage by identifying it as “tragic,” part of the predominant genre of Hellenistic historiography. As I discussed thirty years ago,<sup>20</sup> this categorization is not sufficient. We have to be reminded that all Hellenistic historians were trained in rhetoric. As Thomas Wiedemann succinctly remarked, “Rhetoric may be used properly or not.”<sup>21</sup> As Frank Walbank has shown, Polybius himself could use emotional and vivid description.<sup>22</sup> The connection between tragedy and history “is in fact a fundamental affinity going back to the earliest days of both history and tragedy.”<sup>23</sup> Polybius’s attack on “tragic” historiography should therefore be seen as an attack on the inappropriate use of emotional rhetoric.

Rhetoric had to be tailored to one’s audience, purpose, and subject. If, as we will suggest, the author intended to move his audience both to follow the ancestral traditions of the Jews by narrating how the ancestral God of the Jews had defended his temple in Jerusalem

14 Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 85–90.

15 See Jan Willem van Henten, “Zum Einfluß jüdischer Martyrien auf die Literatur des frühen Christentums, II: Die Apostolischen Väter,” *ANRW* 2.27.1 (1993) 700–723. See also Marie-Françoise Baslez, “The Origin of the Martyrdom Images: From the Book of Maccabees to the First Christians,” in Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengeller, eds., *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology* (JSJSup 118; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 113–30.

16 *PG* 50:617–28. On the later history, see Daniel Joslyn-Siemiatkoski, *Christian Memories of the Maccabean Martyrs* (New York: Palgrave Macmillan, 2009); Raphaëlle Ziadé, *Les martyrs Maccabées: de l’histoire juive au culte chrétien. Les homélies de Grégoire de Nazianze et de Jean Chrysostome* (VCSup 80; Leiden: Brill, 2007).

17 Niese, “Kritik,” 268–307.

18 See the work of Nils Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Acta Academiae Aboensis: Humaniora 63.1; Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984); David S. Williams, *The Structure of 1 Maccabees* (CBQMS 31; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association, 1999).

19 Details are given throughout the commentary, but the work of Charles Bradford Welles on royal letters, Elias Bickermann on Seleucid institutions, and Victor Tcherikover on Jews in the ancient world stand out for the early twentieth century, as does the recent work by John Ma and Dov Gera.

20 Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, 84–94.

21 Thomas Wiedemann, “Rhetoric in Polybius,” in Herman Verdin, Guido Schepens, and Els de Keyser, eds., *Purposes of History: Studies in Greek Historiography from the 4th to the 2nd Centuries B.C. Proceedings of the International Colloquium, Leuven, 24–26 May 1988* (Studia Hellenistica 30; Louvain: [s.n.], 1990) 300.

22 Frank W. Walbank, “*ΦΙΛΙΠΠΙΟΣ ΤΡΑΓΩΙΔΟΤΜΕΝΟΣ*: A Polybian Experiment,” *JHS* 58 (1938) 55–68.

23 Frank W. Walbank, “History and Tragedy,” *Historia* 9 (1960) 216–34, here 233.

against attackers and also to celebrate the new festivals inaugurated in honor of this defense, then he would have needed to use highly emotional and dramatic rhetoric. I will therefore explore the style and organization of the narrative to see how he tried to achieve these results.

### The Style of the Narrative

The narrative of 2 Maccabees is known for its unusual words and its use of rhetorical figures. For example, the author uses adverbs like *λεοντηδόν* (11:11), *κρουνηδόν* (14:45), *ἀγεληδόν* (3:18; 14:14); poetic words such as *ῥωμαλέοι* (12:27), *οἰωνοβρώτους* (9:15), *ἀενάου* (7:36); and many words that are now extant only in this work, such as *δυσπέτημα* (5:20) and *συμμισοπονηρεῖν* (4:36).<sup>24</sup> In his syntax and attempt to avoid hiatus, the author can stand comparison with contemporary Greek writers.<sup>25</sup> He varies his word usage as in 5:16: *ταῖς μιεραῖς χερσὶ . . . ταῖς βεβήλοις χερσὶ* and as is particularly shown in his many ways of expressing “die”—*χειρώσασθαι* (4:34, 42), *παρέκλεισεν* (4:34), *ἀπεκόσμησε* (4:38), *προπέμπειν εἰς τὸν ἄδην* (6:23), *προωθοῦσιν εἰς ὄλεθρον* (13:6)—as well as the many epithets for “God.”

The author also uses many rhetorical figures:

1. litotes, for example, *οὐκ ὀλιγούς* (8:6; 10:24; 14:30), *οὐ μικρά, οὐ μικρῶς* (3:14; 14:8), and *οὐ ῥάδιον* (2:26; 4:17)
2. hendiadys, for example, 15:26, 29: *μετ’ ἐπικλήσεως καὶ εὐχῶν; κραυγῆς καὶ ταραχῆς*
3. chiasm, for example, 5:19 (*οὐ διὰ τὸν τόπον τὸ ἔθνος, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸ ἔθνος τὸν τόπον*)
4. homoioteleuton, for example, 2:25 (*ἐφροντίσαμεν . . . ψυχαγωγία, . . . εὐκοπία, . . . ὠφέλεια*)
5. hypallage, 7:9 (*αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς*)
6. parachesis, 4:27 (*ἐκράτει . . . εὐτάκτει*)

Frequently, the author shows his fondness for paronomasia: 3:24 (*αὐτόθι δὲ αὐτοῦ*) and 15:37 (*αὐτὸς*

*αὐτόθι*); 5:3 (*βελῶν βολάς*); the contrast between words beginning with the prefixes *ευ-* and *δυσ-* (5:6; 6:29); and the examples in 3:22 (*τὰ πεπιστευμένα τοῖς πεπιστευκόσι*), 4:26 (*ὑπονοθεύσας ὑπονοθευθεῖς*), 5:9 (*ἀποξενώσας ἐπὶ ξένης*), 6:18 (*πρόσοψιν τοῦ προσώπου*), 10:20-21 (*φιλαργυρήσαντες . . . ἀργυρίου*), 12:22 (*ἐπιφανείσης . . . ἐπιφανείας*), 12:42 (*ἀμάρτημα . . . ἀναμαρτήτους . . . ἀμαρτίαν*), 14:28 (*δυσφόρως ἔφερειν*), and 14:36 (*ἄγιε παντὸς ἀγιασμοῦ*). The paronomasia in 10:26 (*ἐχθρεῦσαι τοῖς ἐχθροῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἀντικείμενοις τοῖς ἀντικείμενοις*) stems from Exod 23:22.<sup>26</sup>

This enjoyment of words by the author is found also in the use of double entendre. When the king asks the mother to speak to her last son for his physical salvation (7:25: *ἐπὶ σωτηρία*), she speaks to him about what will bring about his death so that he may be resurrected (7:29). The same verbal delight is true of the author’s use of the term *εὐήμερηκώς* in 8:35: while Judas had been described at the beginning of the incident as having been successful in his military endeavors (8:8: *ἐν ταῖς εὐημερίαις προβαίνοντα*), Nikanor is sarcastically described as being successful in the destruction of his army. Tobias Nicklas notes well how in 9:4 the action of the defenders of the temple at Persepolis is described as “evil” or “injury” (*κακία*), whereas “the context makes it absolutely clear that the acts of the inhabitants of Persepolis are perfectly comprehensible. Although the narrator does not say any *direct* negative word about Antiochus, with just one word he manages to point to the Seleucid’s spiritual blindness.”<sup>27</sup>

One of the more important features of the author’s style is his use of asyndeton. This stylistic feature has often been seen simply as a method of shortening the narrative. This may be true in some cases, as, for example, at 14:21b-23a, where the author’s main concern is the confrontation between Seleucids and Jews and so he skips over a peace meeting. At other times, however, the author appears to use asyndeton skillfully, particularly

24 For a full listing, see Wolfgang Richnow, “Untersuchung zu Sprache und Stil des 2. Makkabäerbuches. Ein Beitrag zur hellenistischen Historiographie” (Ph.D. diss., Göttingen, 1967) 48–58; Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 67 n. 69.

25 See Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, 24–42.

26 Frank Shaw has given a thorough discussion of

paronomasia in 2 Maccabees in an unpublished essay, “Paronomasia in 2 Maccabees.”

27 Tobias Nicklas, “Irony in 2 Maccabees?” in Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér, eds., *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology* (JSJSup 118; Leiden: Brill, 2007) 101–11, here 106.

with participles, to show how events are closely interconnected: for example, in 11:13, Lysias's not being stupid is closely connected with his analysis of what had happened to him (*οὐκ ἄνους δὲ ὑπάρχων πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἀντιβάλλον*) and in 10:35, the young men burn with courage and so storm the wall (*πυρωθέντες τοῖς θυμοῖς διὰ τὰς βλασφημίας προσβαλόντες τῷ τείχει*). The use of asyndeton is particularly noticeable in the contrast between 13:10, where law, fatherland, and holy temple are syndetically connected, and 13:14, where laws, temple, city, fatherland, and constitution are asyndetically linked. Why the change? One cannot really ascribe it to the desire for a shortened narrative. Rather, I suggest that in 13:10 Judas asks the people to pray, while in 13:14 Judas addresses his troops and tries to arouse their emotions by the tight grouping of all that they are fighting for. Similarly, the asyndeton in 14:25 emphasizes how quickly Judas accepts Nikanor's proposal to bring order back to affairs.

#### Words and Narrative Structure

The author's concern for words leads him to use words to structure his narrative. We noted above, for example, how the root *εὐημερ-* is found both at the beginning (8:8) and end (8:35) of the first battle against Nikanor. Alcimus and Rhazis are both connected, but differently, with the time of *ἀμιξία* or "separation" (14:3, 38). Both the pious high priest Rhazis and the traitorous high priest Alcimus claim to be speaking for their citizens and seeking peace for the kingdom (4:6: *ἀδύνατον εἶναι τυχεῖν εἰρήνης ἐτι τὰ πράγματα*; 14:10: *ἀδύνατον εἰρήνης τυχεῖν τὰ πράγματα*), but they have contrasting notions of what such peace would entail. The author chooses to emphasize that the leader of the first conflict against Judas is named Nikanor and is called *τρισαλιτήριος* (8:34), and then the final opponent in the narrative also has the name Nikanor and is also called *τρισαλιτήριος* (15:3).

Repetition is also used to help structure the narrative.

The most glaring repetition is that found at the end of the institution of the feasts of Hanukkah and the Day of Nikanor:

10:8: *ἔδογματίσαν δὲ μετὰ κοινοῦ προστάγματος καὶ ψηφίσματος.*

15:36: *ἔδογματίσαν δὲ πάντες μετὰ κοινοῦ ψηφίσματος.*

The author by this repetition intends to organize his narrative around the events leading up to these two feasts. The author also uses markers in tracing out the narrative:

3:40: *καὶ τὰ μὲν κατὰ Ἡλιόδωρον καὶ τὴν τοῦ γαζοφυλακίου τήρησιν οὕτως ἐχώρησεν*

7:42: *Τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τούσ σπλαγχνισμούς καὶ τὰς ὑπερβαλλούσας αἰκίας ἐπὶ ποσοῦτον δεδηλώσθω*

10:9: *Καὶ τὰ μὲν τῆς Ἀντιόχου τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Ἐπιφανοῦς τελευτῆς οὕτως εἶχεν*

13:26: *οὕτως τὰ τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς ἐφόδου καὶ τῆς ἀναζυγῆς ἐχώρησεν*

15:37: *Τῶν οὖν κατὰ Νικάνορα χωρησάντων οὕτως.*

These concluding rubrics were noticed by Adolf Büchler and Diego Arenhoevel,<sup>28</sup> but Bunge went further and suggested that these rubrics reflected the hand of the supposed original author, Jason of Cyrene, and helped uncover the structure of his five-volume work. This suggestion is not convincing,<sup>29</sup> particularly as the last example, 15:37, betrays the hand of the author of the condensed narrative, for the main clause following the genitive absolute has the verb in the first person singular. The first three rubrics are in a *μὲν . . . δέ* construction and so lead on to the following events, while the fourth wraps up the events under Antiochus V and leads the narrative over to the reign of Demetrius. It is important to note here, as Reinhold Zwick has emphasized,<sup>30</sup> that

[AQ: could that be rephrased in a more specific way? It's not clear what else an author could have done than "use words."]

28 Adolf Büchler, *Die Tobiaden und die Oniaden im II. Makkabäerbuch und in der verwandten jüdisch-hellenistischen Literatur* (Vienna: Verlag der Israel-theol. Lehranstalt, 1899) 325; Arenhoevel, *Theokratie*, 108 n. 28.

29 See Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, 13-17, 76 n. 82.

30 Reinhold Zwick, "Unterhaltung und Nutzen: Zum

literarischen Profil des 2. Buches der Makkabäer," in Johannes Frühwald-König, Ferdinand R. Prostmeier, and Reinhold Zwick, eds., *Steht nicht geschrieben? Studien zur Bibel und ihrer Wirkungsgeschichte: Festschrift für Georg Schmuttermayr* (Regensburg: Pustet, 2001) 125-49, here 137-42.

31 Ibid., 143-45; Richnow, "Untersuchung zu Sprache,"

the hand of the author of the condensed narrative runs throughout the narrative. In the prologue and particularly in the epilogue, the author, using the first person singular, makes claim to the work as a whole. Within the narrative, not only in the explicit reflection found in 6:12-17 but also peppered throughout the work, the author unfolds for his audience the significance of what is happening and what will happen: for example, what will happen to those who hold ancestral traditions in contempt (4:16-17), what will happen to Jason (5:8), what caused the persecution and how it will end (5:18-20), the prophecy by the last brother of what will happen to Antiochus IV (7:35-38). Particularly interesting is the way he uses speeches—for example, the speeches of the brothers and Eleazar as well as the threat of Nikanor—as he seeks to engage and move his audience. Second Maccabees is thus a well-crafted work, not a simple, shortened version. This analysis does not entail, of course, that there was no work by Jason of Cyrene, as Zwick is tempted to conclude, in agreement with Wolfgang Richnow.<sup>31</sup> What the literary analysis does mean is that one has to take the narrative as a whole.

### A Subgenre of Local History

The narrative is thus not a universal history like the work of Polybius on the rise of Rome, but a local history, not of events of a mythic time, but of recent events concerning a particular city. As such, it is comparable to the works of local historians like Syriskos, who wrote the history of Chersonesus, or Eudemus, Myron, and Timocritus, who wrote the history of Rhodes.<sup>32</sup> These works also would have included epiphanies of the patron

god/goddess in defense of the city. There also exists the narrative of the defense of Delphi by Apollo against attacking Persians (Herodotus *Hist.* 8.35–39), but such epiphanic deliverances are attested also in inscriptions. From Panamaros is an inscription that tells how Zeus Panamaros defended the city,<sup>33</sup> and the Lindos Chronicle describes how Athena delivered the citizens from a siege by the Persians.<sup>34</sup> An account of how the Gauls were driven back from Delphi by Apollo in 279 B.C.E. is found in Pausanias (10.23.1–12) and also in an inscription from Cos in which cities are invited to celebrate this event.<sup>35</sup> I have termed this account a topos in which a general shared pattern is found: “The attackers approach, the defenders ask help of the deity, the deity responds, the attackers are repulsed, and the defenders rejoice.”<sup>36</sup> Justin’s comment after his discussion of the repulse of the Gauls is interesting: “Hence it happened that, of so great an army, which a little before, presuming on its strength, contended even against the gods, not a man was left to be a memorial of its destruction” (*Hist.* 24.8). Here the notion of a theomachy is present.<sup>37</sup>

This sense of a theomachy is pronounced in the narrative of 2 Maccabees. While at first Antiochus IV is portrayed somewhat benignly as he punishes the murderer of Onias (4:37-38), he soon is described as “haughty in spirit” (5:17), arrogantly supposing that “he could make the land navigable and the sea walkable” (5:21; see, similarly, 9:8), and “able to grasp the stars of heaven” (9:10). He thought himself to be godlike (9:12). In fact, Antiochus is accused of fighting against God (7:19: *θεομαχεῖν*).<sup>38</sup> Similarly, Nikanor is at first seen as reasonable and fair-minded (14:18-25) but is soon por-

41–42. See also Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, 81–83. Charles Mugler (“Remarques sur le second livre des Macchabées: La statistique des mots et la question de l’auteur,” *RHPhR* 11 [1931] 419–23) made a strong argument from the abundant use of participles by the author that the work was a condensation.

32 Syriskos at *FGH* 1:807; Eudemus at *FGH* 534; Myron at *FGH* 106; and Timocritus at *FGH* 522. See Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, 103–4.

33 Pierre Roussel, “Le miracle de Zeus Panamaros,” *BCH* 55 (1931) 70–116.

34 *FGH* 532.

35 Pausanias 10.23.1–12; Justin (Junianus Justinus, Latin historian) *Hist.* 24.7–8; Diodorus Siculus 24.9.1–3. See Georges Nachtergaele, *Les Galates en Grèce et les*

*Sôtéria de Delphes: Recherches d’histoire et d’épigraphie hellénistiques* (Mémoires de l’Académie royale de Belgique 63; Brussels: Palais des Académies, 1977).

36 Doran, *Temple Propaganda* 47; see also 104.

37 See Jan Coenraad Kamerbeek, “On the Conception of *ΘΕΟΜΑΧΟΣ* in Relation with Greek Tragedy,” *Mnemosyne*, 4th series, 1 (1948) 271–83.

38 A confrontation between God and Antiochus would seem to be at the heart of the story of the mother and her seven sons (2 Maccabees 7). See comment thereon.

[AQ: Are these references all to vol. 1 of *FGH*?—n32]

[AQ: n34 Volume?]

trayed as arraying himself against God as he threatens to tear down the temple of God (14:33) and claims to be master on earth (15:5), who can override the demands of God. He, too, is arrogant (15:6). Both of these men are killed, and in each case a festival is inaugurated in honor of the victory of God. This pattern—challenge to the deity, battle, victory of the deity, celebration concerning the temple—has a peculiar resonance in biblical literature. The work of Frank Moore Cross, Patrick Miller, and Paul Hanson has shown how pervasive this pattern is in the exodus story as well as elsewhere.<sup>39</sup> In using this particular pattern twice in the narrative, the author was deploying a powerful rhetorical tool from his audience's traditional literature to engage and move them. Once this traditional narrative pattern is recognized, one does not have to speculate as to why or by whom the rededication of the temple has been "inserted" between 9:29 and 10:9. The phrase "the events at the end of Antiochus" (10:9) includes by reason of the rhetorical pattern the celebration at his death.

#### Reorganization of the Narrative

To use this rhetorical pattern most effectively, with the death of the challenger against God, Antiochus IV, coming before the rededication of the temple, the author chose to rearrange the events of the narrative. To see what the author has done, it is necessary to provide some suggestions for the sequence of events from 165 B.C.E. to the arrival of Demetrius I.

The starting point is provided in the third letter in the collection of letters in 2 Maccabees 11. I take this letter (11:27-33) to be a genuine letter of Antiochus IV, although the date given at the end of the letter is unlikely. Antiochus IV responds to the request of Menelaus that the Jews be allowed to live by their ancestral customs, and the date of the thirtieth of Xanthikos is given. This month would fall in late March or early April. I suggest that Menelaus had approached Antiochus IV after the king's spectacular showcasing of his forces at

Daphne in 166 B.C.E., but before the king left on his eastern campaign in 165 B.C.E. I do not think that Menelaus would have traipsed after the king as he was campaigning. By this reckoning, the persecution would have lasted not quite a year and a half, but resistance was already under way and Menelaus was seeking to stop it early in its tracks. Antiochus IV agreed and allowed the return to ancestral traditions in March/April 165 B.C.E. Antiochus IV appointed his son, Antiochus V, as co-regent when he left to campaign. However, Judas did not desist from his insurgency, which led to the sending of troops by Ptolemy, governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia (8:8), in late 165 B.C.E. to quell the resistance. When this was unsuccessful and the insurgents began to gain a foothold even in Jerusalem (8:31), in response neighboring communities began to harass the Jews, as in 10:14-38. When these efforts failed, Lysias, as guardian of Antiochus V and in charge of affairs, came in person in 164 B.C.E. He recognized the extent of Judas's forces and his support and sought to come to terms with Judas, as in 11:16-21. Lysias wrote to the king, but in late 164 B.C.E. Antiochus IV died, before an answer had been received. The response to the peace negotiations is given by the letter of 11:22-26, on the inauguration of Antiochus V as sole ruler. In response to attacks on Jews outside the borders of Judea, Judas and his forces began to engage in battles outside their own territory. These military excursions led to the second invasion, by Lysias and Antiochus V, in 163/162 B.C.E.

My brief chronology shows that the events narrated in 10:14–11:15 took place while Antiochus IV was still alive and Antiochus V was co-regent. The author of the narrative in 2 Maccabees wanted Antiochus IV to be an arch-villain, a blasphemer who fought against God and was suitably punished. He did not want to have Antiochus repeal the harsh measures against the ancestral traditions of Judea or have Menelaus in any way try to ameliorate the situation. In conformity with the tradition of the victory enthronement pattern of the divine war-

39 Frank Moore Cross, "The Divine Warrior in Israel's Early Cult," in Alexander Altman ed., *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations* (Philip W. Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University: Studies and Texts 3; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1966) 11–30; Patrick D. Miller, *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel* (HSM 5;

Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press, 1973); Paul D. Hanson, "Jewish Apocalyptic against Its Near Eastern Environment," *RB* 78 (1971) 31–58; idem, *The Dawn of Apocalyptic: The Historical and Sociological Roots of Jewish Apocalyptic Eschatology* (rev. ed.; Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1979).

---

rior, Antiochus IV had to die fighting against God. The author thus rearranged the narrative so that events that took place while Antiochus IV was alive but were instigated by Lysias as guardian of Antiochus V were placed after the death of Antiochus IV. These events took place while Antiochus V was ruling, but only as co-regent. Rhetoric has shaped the structure of the narrative.

Such a rhetorical reorganization would mean that the sequence of the events in the narrative of 2 Maccabees is basically the same as that in 1 Maccabees, with two expeditions of Lysias, one while Antiochus V was co-regent and the second after the death of Antiochus IV.

### **The Scope of the Narrative: Beginnings and Endings**

The ability to control how one's history is told is a great boon not only for groups but also for individuals. Here the criticism of Thucydides by Dionysius of Halicarnassus is interesting. Thucydides should not have started where he did, but, as becomes a patriot (*φιλόπολις*), he should have begun when Athens was flourishing and then noted how the Spartans started the Peloponnesian War through envy and fear. He should have, and then narrated the setbacks of the Athenians.

But Thucydides made his beginning at the point where Greek affairs started to decline. This should not have been done by a Greek and an Athenian, especially an Athenian who was not one of the outcasts, but one whom his fellow citizens counted among their foremost men in appointing to commands and other offices of state. And such is his malice, that he actually attributes the overt causes of the war to his own city, though he could have attributed them to many other sources. He might have begun his narrative not with the events at Corcyra, but with his country's splendid achievements immediately after the Persian War (achievements which he mentions later at an inappropriate point and in a rather grudging and cursory way). After he had described these events with all the goodwill of a patriot, he might then have added that it was through a growing feeling of envy and fear that the Lacedaemonians came to engage in the war, although they alleged motives of a different kind. . . . The concluding portion of his narrative is dominated by an even more serious fault. Although he states that he was an eyewitness of the whole war and has prom-

ised to describe everything that occurred, yet he ends with the sea-battle which took place off Cynossema between the Athenians and the Peloponnesians in the twenty-second year of the war. It would have been better, after describing all the events of the war, to end his history with a climax, and one that was most remarkable and especially gratifying to his audience, the return of the exiles from Phyle, which marked the beginning of the city's recovery of freedom. (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Pomp.* 3)

For Dionysius, Herodotus knew how to tell history properly—he started with the problem of the barbarians injuring the Greeks and ended when punishment and retribution overtook the barbarians. One has to know when to start and when to end, and for Dionysius that meant choosing the most favorable beginning and ending. Cicero has basically the same advice for writing about individuals. The writing of history is to put forward one's hero, or one's native city to the best advantage. It is to construct an identity.

Not that I am unconscious of the effrontery of what I am about, first in laying such a burden upon you (pressure of work may refuse me), and secondly in asking you to write about me eulogistically. . . . If I prevail upon you to undertake the task, I persuade myself that the material will be worthy of your ready and skilful pen. I fancy a work of moderate length could be made up, from the beginning of the plot down to my return from exile. . . . Moreover, my experiences will give plenty of variety to your narrative, full of a certain kind of delectation to enthrall the minds of those who read, when you are the writer. . . . So I shall be especially delighted if you find it best to set my story apart from the main stream of your work, in which you embrace events in their historical sequence—this drama, one may call it, of what I did and experienced; for it contains various “acts,” and many changes of plan and circumstance. (Cicero *Ad Lucceium* [Fam. 5.12.2–4, 6])<sup>40</sup>

Dionysius of Halicarnassus might have been pleased with the structure of the condensed work, although hardly with its content or style. The opening shows

[AQ: is phrase in parentheses complete?]



Jerusalem prosperous and at peace; a problem is brought in through envy. After various disasters, the Hebrews once again gain control of the city where “Hebrew” is the traditional, honorable name. Not everyone has been pleased with this ending, as it raises questions for inquiring minds: Nikanor is beaten, but what will be the reaction of the king who sent him? If the Akra remains unconquered, is the city really in the hands of the Hebrews? Is not Alcimus still high priest? In the light of what really happened, the author would seem to have been at the very least misleading. In response to Nikanor’s defeat, Demetrius I sent Bacchides, who retook Jerusalem, defeated Judas’s army in an engagement in which Judas himself was killed, and reinstated Alcimus as high priest. Various answers have been proposed to explain why the work ends where it does:

1. Jason of Cyrene’s work, the author’s source, stopped at this point, even though the author knew of events that occurred later, for example, the embassy of Eupolemos and Jason to Rome. Niels Hyldahl even suggests that the diplomat Jason be identified with Jason of Cyrene, as this would explain why 2 Maccabees ends just before the diplomat’s mission to Rome.<sup>41</sup>
2. The *author* chose to end at this point, in contrast to Jason of Cyrene. Jonathan Goldstein stresses the “I” of 15:37. Such a suggestion maintains the reliability of Jason as a historian and blames the author for misleading.<sup>42</sup> This explanation would appear to be the opinion also of Daniel Schwartz, for whom the author “should want to leave them with the impression that the ideal situation continues until his and their own day.”<sup>43</sup>
3. Goldstein also supplies a theological motif: from the end of the narrative on, “believing” Jews are in charge of the temple. Goldstein admits that this interpretation would implicitly include Alcimus among the “believers,” as opposed to the “renegades,” Jason and Menelaus.<sup>44</sup>
4. Hermann Lichtenberger suggests that the author could not have continued the narrative and have Judas die in battle soon after the victory over Nikanor. Lichtenberger noted that according to the narrative in 12:39-46, “death on the battlefield is the consequence of sin; or, even more precisely, of idolatry. Judas had nothing to do with all that.”<sup>45</sup>

The first two suggestions do not touch the question of why Jason or the author ended at this juncture. As for Goldstein’s suggestion, Alcimus is not presented as a sterling character in 2 Maccabees. Lichtenberger’s proposal is seductive but neglects the central role that the defense of the temple plays in the narrative and the establishment of the festivals. The success of Judas comes because he fights for God, who is defending his temple. Judas, in this sense, is secondary to the main protagonist, God.

The first part of the sentence at 15:37, “As the actions at the time of Nikanor turned out this way,” is very similar to the phrase in 13:26, “So turned out the events of the king’s advance and return,” which ends events under Antiochus V Eupator. The author maintains that after the death of Antiochus IV, the city and temple remained in danger under Antiochus V and Demetrius I. Lysias came to make the city a home for Greeks and to levy tribute on the temple as he had done on the sacred places of other nations (11:2-3). His repulse forces him to allow the Jews to enjoy their ancestral laws (11:24-31).

40 Translation is from D. R. Shackleton Bailey, *Cicero’s Letters to His Friends* (Classical Resources Series 1; Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1996) 59–61.

41 Niels Hyldahl, “The Maccabean Rebellion and the Question of ‘Hellenization,’” in Per Bilde et al., eds., *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom* (Studies in Hellenistic Civilization 1; Aarhus: Aarhus University Press, 1990) 201.

42 Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 505.

43 Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 556.

44 Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 504.

45 Hermann Lichtenberger, “The Untold End: 2 Mac-

cabees and Acts,” in Alberdina Houtman, Albert de Jong, and Magda Misset-van de Weg, eds., *Empsychoi Logoi – Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van der Horst* (Leiden: Brill, 2008) 402.

Antiochus V comes with barbarous arrogance “to show forth to the Jews worse things than those committed at the time of his father” (13:9), but ends up honoring the temple and being generous to the place (13:23). Nikanor, too, threatens that he will “make this precinct of God into a plain and the altar I will raze to the ground and I will raise up a prominent temple there to Dionysos” (14:33). With God’s help, the place remains undefiled (15:34), the final reprieve from attempts to destroy the ancestral religion. At 15:37, then, the author is claiming not independence for the Jews but the cessation of attempts to dismantle their ancestral laws.

What I would suggest about the endpoint of the narrative goes back to Arnaldo Momigliano’s stress on the festal character of the epitome.<sup>46</sup> The author does not end because the sequence of events has reached its conclusion; he ends because the feast of Nikanor has been inaugurated. For the author, a central tenet of being a Judean is the ability to observe the ancestral feasts and customs of the Jews. After the defeat of Nikanor, that ability was no more in doubt. One might recall that later on, Antiochus VII Sidetes, while besieging Jerusalem, will accede to a request from John Hyrcanus for a truce during the festival of Tabernacles and will even send a sacrifice (Josephus *Ant.* 13.242–44). The epitome thus begins with the honor given to the temple (3:1–2) and ends with the festival of the deliverance of the temple. The observance of the festivals is central to the identity of the Jews. As regards the scope of the narrative, the author is governed by the rules of rhetoric.<sup>47</sup>

### Conundra

How many Timothys are there? In 1 Maccabees 5, a Timothy takes part in a battle near Jazer (5:6) and then reemerges in upper Gilead at Dathema, on the eastern side of the Jordan, to fight again (5:11, 34, 37, 40); these events take place after the cleansing of the temple. In 2 Maccabees, a Timothy fights against Judas around the time of the attack of Nikanor (8:30, 32; 9:3) and then

fights against Judas with cavalry near Gazara. This Timothy is at the head of a tremendous force (10:24) and is killed when he retreats to Gazara. Then later in 2 Maccabees, a Timothy is mentioned leading forces in Gilead (12:2, 10, 18–21, 24). Should one attempt to reconcile the accounts in 1 and 2 Maccabees and state either that the author of 2 Maccabees is hopelessly confused or that the author has deliberately changed Jazer to Gazara? Or were there two Timothys? The author of the narrative in 2 Maccabees certainly portrays them as two different commanders.

And how many Philips are there? In 1 Maccabees there is one: Antiochus IV, on his deathbed, appointed this Philip as ruler over all his kingdom and as guardian of his son (6:14). On his return to Antioch, this Philip took control of the city. When Lysias heard of this development (6:55–56), he withdrew from the assault on Jerusalem, returned to Antioch, and regained the city (6:63). In contrast, in 2 Maccabees Philip was simply one of Antiochus IV’s courtiers. He took the king’s body back to Antioch and then fled to Egypt because he feared Antiochus V (9:29). Later in 2 Maccabees, Lysias and Antiochus V break off their campaign when they hear that the Philip who had been left in charge of the government has lost his senses (13:23). The narrative here suggests that this Philip had been left in charge of the government by Antiochus V and Lysias. Are there two Philips?

Schwartz noted that there are problems in the account of 1 Maccabees. It dates the second campaign of Lysias to 150 S.E. [Seleucid Era] (1 Macc 6:20), either autumn 163/162 B.C.E. or 162/161 B.C.E. Bezalel Bar-Kochva argued that this campaign took place in 162 B.C.E.<sup>48</sup> However, since Antiochus IV’s funeral procession was in Babylonia in January 163 B.C.E.,<sup>49</sup> Philip would likely have arrived in Antioch in February of that year. That the campaign of Antiochus V and Lysias would have been mounted after the return of Philip seems unlikely. Schwartz, holding that the return of Philip caused the end of the siege of Jerusalem, redated the campaign of

46 Momigliano, “Second Book of Maccabees,” 81–88.

47 See also Eckhard Plümacher, “Cicero und Lukas: Bemerkungen zu Stil und Zweck der historischen Monographie,” in Jens Schröter and Ralph Brucker, eds., *Geschichte und Geschichten: Aufsätze zur Apostelgeschichte und zu den Johannesakten* (WUNT 170; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004).

48 Bezalel Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle against the Seleucids* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989) 543–51.

49 Dov Gera and Wayne Horowitz, “Antiochus IV in Life and Death: Evidence from the Babylonian Diaries,” *JAOS* 117 (1997) 240–52, here 249–52.

Lysias and Antiochus V to late 164 or early 163 B.C.E. and eventually was led to suggest that there was only one campaign of Lysias and Antiochus V.<sup>50</sup> The simplest suggestion would seem to be that 1 Maccabees is indeed wrong, but not about the date. Rather, the author of 1 Maccabees was misled as to who forced Antiochus V and Lysias to cut off their campaign.<sup>51</sup>

The author of the condensed narrative seems to enjoy having people of the same name in important positions – note the Nikanor of 2 Maccabees 8 and the Nikanor of 2 Maccabees 13-15. First and Second Maccabees seem to mention two Bacchides as well, one who was present in Judea early on (2 Macc 8:30) and one who is governor of the province Beyond the River during the reign of Demetrius I (1 Macc 7:8).

### The Work of Jason of Cyrene

Attempts to reconstruct the work of Jason of Cyrene have been many.

#### The Excision Route

Scholars have excised the prologue and epilogue, the reflections of the author (4:17; 5:17-20; 6:12-17), as well as the deaths of the mother and her seven sons and the references to resurrection.<sup>52</sup> Marcello Zambelli suggested that one should also exclude from Jason's work the last four chapters, as the prologue mentions only events from the reigns of Antiochus IV and V, and only in 13:1

do we find dates given.<sup>53</sup> However, this excision would mean that neither Judas's triumph over Nikanor and the feast of Nikanor nor the second invasion of Antiochus V would be mentioned by Jason. Zambelli also suggested that the description of the death of Antiochus IV (9:18-27) was added later to Jason's work.<sup>54</sup>

#### The Addition Route

Other scholars have suggested that Jason's work extended to the death of Judas, noting the reference to the work of Eupolemos in 4:11 and identifying the Bacchides of 8:30 with the general at the time of Demetrius I.<sup>55</sup> However, Bacchides is not an unusual name in Seleucid prosopography, and the reference to Eupolemos would seem, as Schwartz noted,<sup>56</sup> to come from the author of the condensed narrative.

Given the above arguments for the rhetorical style and structure of the condensed narrative as well as the author's express aim to embellish the work of Jason of Cyrene (2:25-31), one should recognize that there was a Jason of Cyrene, but that attempts to reconstruct his work or to date it are like tilting at Don Quixote's windmills.

#### The Structure of the Narrative

There have been numerous suggestions as to how one should see the structure of the work. George W. E. Nickelsburg proposed a Deuteronomic pattern:<sup>57</sup>

50 Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 30, 32.

51 Schwartz (*2 Maccabees*, 25–37) argued that the “original” work behind the author’s condensation did not contain the material in the present 2 Maccabees 10–11, but after the death of Antiochus IV in 2 Maccabees 9 had the sequence 2 Maccabees 13; 12; 14–15. Driving his argument are the two conundra mentioned above, as well as a sense that the “original” document reflects what actually happened. The linguistic features that he isolates to back up his argument are, as he himself acknowledges, not probative. For example, he notes that only in 2 Maccabees 10–11 are the Jews called ἀδελφούς, not πολίται as in the rest of the narrative. However, in 10:21, “brethren” is used in a case of betrayal where the term “brethren” highlights strongly the sense of outraged community. In 11:7, Judas is encouraging his forces to go to the aid of their “brethren.” Again, the term is used effectively where connections to those attacked are being noted. One can easily isolate terms that are found in 2 Maccabees 10–11 and in the rest of the narrative, e.g., κράτος in 11:4;

12:28; ὀχύρος in 10:18; 12:13, 18, 27; ὀχύρωμα is used five times in 2 Maccabees 10–11 and also in 12:14. The syntax of these chapters remains uniform.

52 For discussion and references, see Habicht, *2. Makkabäerbuch*, 171.

53 Marcello Zambelli, “La composizione del secondo libro di Maccabei e la nuova cronologia di Antioco IV Epifane,” in *Miscellanea Greca e Romana* (Studi pubblicati dall’Istituto di Storia Antica 16; Rome: [s.n.], 1965) 286–87.

54 Zambelli, “La composizione,” 287–99. Parts of 2 Maccabees 3 were excised in Elias Bickermann, “Héliodore au Temple de Jérusalem,” *Annuaire de l’Institut de Philologie et d’Histoire Orientales et Slaves* 7 (1939–44) 5–40, here 18–40.

55 See especially Bunge, *Untersuchungen*, 207.

56 Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 14–15, 221.

57 George W. E. Nickelsburg, *Jewish Literature between the Bible and the Mishnah* (Philadelphia: Fortress Press, 1981) 118.

[AQ: I don't find this word in 12:14.]

[AQ: punctuation not clear: is “reappearance of Onias in 15:12” a separate event (so a comma should follow) or is the meaning “reappearance of Onias in 15:12 and [the reappearances of] the individual Judean villains . . . .”?]

1. Blessing: the priesthood of Onias (3:1-40)
2. Sin: the innovations of Jason and Menelaus (4:1–5:10)
3. Punishment: the persecution of Antiochus IV (5:11–6:17)
4. Tipping point: the deaths of the martyrs and the people’s prayers (6:18–8:4)
5. Judgment and salvation: God brings about victory for his people (8:5–15:36).

Such a neat theological scheme, however, provides a very unbalanced structure, with the first four sections covering five chapters of the narrative and the fifth section covering eight.

John Bartlett argued for two main parts with two main climaxes: the defeat of Nicanor and the cleansing of the temple (8:1–10:8) and the defeat of Nicanor and the inauguration of the festival of the Day of Nicanor (15:6-36).<sup>58</sup> Jan Willem van Henten posited a fourfold structure: 3:1–4:6; 4:7–10:9; 10:10–13:26; 14:1–15:36.<sup>59</sup> David S. Williams has also proposed a fourfold structure:<sup>60</sup>

- A. God defends the temple because the people observe the laws (3:1–4:6).
- B. God punishes the people because of their sinfulness, but a turning point changes God’s wrath to mercy and God destroys the enemy, Antiochus IV; subsequently God’s people restore the temple and institute a festival (4:7–10:9).
- A’. God defends the people because they observe the laws (10:10–13:26).
- B’. God destroys the enemy, Nicanor, leaving the temple in the hands of the Jews, who celebrate by instituting a festival (14:1–15:37a).

Reinhold Zwick maintains a basic twofold structure (4:1–10:8; 10:9–15:36) introduced by an overture (3:1-40).<sup>61</sup>

History is always messy and cannot be fitted into

a neat, logical structure. The reason one is tempted to do so with the narrative in 2 Maccabees is that the author has skillfully repeated patterns throughout the work—for example, the Divine Warrior in 9:1–10:8 and 14:26–15:36, the martyrs in 6:18–7:42 and Rhazis in 14:37-46, the reappearance of Onias in 15:12 and the individual Judean villains like Simon (3:4) and Alcimus (14:3), who arrive on the scene to upset the applectart. So, while all the attempts at finding the structure of 2 Maccabees are instructive and enlightening, I find it interesting that the proposals of both van Henten and Williams follow the reigns of Seleucid kings: Seleucus IV in 3:1–4:6; Antiochus IV in 4:7–10:9; Antiochus V in 10:10–13:26; Demetrius I in 14:1–15:36. Although van Henten and Williams characterize each block of their fourfold structure differently, the underlying frame of the narrative would seem to be given by the reigns of the kings. Ulrike Mittmann-Richert noted this pattern as well and proposed a concentric structure for the narrative. The central turning point would be when the narrative begins to recount the deaths of those persecuted; on one side of this point would be the attack on the temple and ancestral constitution, while on the other side the narrative relates the deaths of the persecuted, the first victory of Judas, the death of Antiochus IV, and the rededication of the temple. Further out would fall the successful repulse of Heliodorus, which is mirrored by the defeat of Nicanor at the end of the narrative.<sup>62</sup> Such a concentric ordering would underscore the theatrical quality of the narrative, but there are so many differences in detail between the corresponding elements of the structure that it seems difficult to embrace.

The structure that I would therefore advocate follows the reigns of the four kings:

- Prologue, 2:19-32
- Events in the reign of Seleucus IV and the high priest Onias IV (3:1–4:6)
- Events in the reign of Antiochus IV (4:7–10:8)

58 John R. Bartlett, *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (CBC; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973) 47.

59 Van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 25–26.

60 David S. Williams, “Recent Research in 2 Maccabees,” *Currents in Biblical Research* 2.1 (2003) 69–83, here 77–78.

61 Zwick, “Unterhaltung und Nutzen,” 149.

62 Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, *Historische und legendarische Erzählungen* (JSRZ 6; Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus, 2000) 41–43.

- i. Events under Jason and Menelaus as high priests (4:7-50)
- ii. The “revolt” of Jerusalem and its consequences (5:1–7:42)
- iii. The deaths of the persecuted moves God to support Judas (chap. 8)
- iv. The death of the God-fighter, Antiochus IV (chap. 9)
- v. The restoration of the temple (10:1-8)
- C. Events in the reign of Antiochus V (10:9–13:26)
  - i. The defense of Judea against external threats and a treaty with the king (10:9–11:38)
  - ii. The defense of Jews living outside Judea and a second treaty with the king (chaps. 12–13)
- D. Events in the reign of Demetrius I and the high priest Alcimus (14:1–15:37)
  - i. First attack on Judas peacefully resolved (14:1-25)
  - ii. The attack of the God-fighter Nikanor defeated (14:26–15:37)
- Epilogue (15:37-39)

### The Goals of the Author

The rhetorical permeation of 2 Maccabees raises the question of the aims of the author. To what end did he use this rhetoric? What behavior did he want to persuade his audience to adopt?

First, the choice of the subgenre of a deity defending his/her temple from attackers and the inauguration of new festivals shows that the author wanted to impress on his audience the high honor in which the God of the Jews was to be held and the need to participate in the festivals inaugurated to commemorate these events. The audience is also moved to hold in high regard the ancestral traditions of the Jews and to follow them. How the author emphasizes this sense of “ancestral” is interesting. Jason and those who follow him in frequenting the gymnasium are despising “ancestral honors” (*πατρῴους τιμάς*) in favor of Hellenic honors (4:15). But it is after Antiochus IV has inaugurated his new policy toward Judea that one finds the stress on “ancestral traditions.” The king is shown throughout the narrative of 2 Maccabees to have the power to follow ancestral laws or to change them (4:11 [cf. Josephus *Ant.* 12.142]; 11:24, 31).

Antiochus IV compels the Jews “to change from their ancestral laws and not to be governed by the laws of God” (6:1: *μεταβαίνειν ἀπὸ τῶν πατρίων νόμων καὶ τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ νόμοις μὴ πολιτεύεσθαι*). From then on, the Jews could not observe the ancestral festivals (6:6), and the seven brothers prefer to die rather than transgress ancestral laws (7:2, 24, 37) and express their refusal using their ancestral voice (7:8, 27). The ancestral voice is raised in triumph at the defeat of Nikanor (15:29), while Jason (4:13) and Menelaus (5:15) are depicted as traitors to the fatherland (5:15). By describing the insurgency as a defense of ancestral laws, the author was appealing to the strong civic patriotism of local communities. Erich Gruen has said that ancestral law, like freedom, was a slogan that carried great emotional appeal and that opposing parties would both assert that they were the champions of the ancestral laws.<sup>63</sup> By using this emotion-laden phrase, the author strives to engage his audience and move them to maintain and follow ancestral traditions. Recognition of this motif also clarifies why the author expounds so much on the building of a gymnasium in Jerusalem. The gymnasium was the symbol of Greek education par excellence. The author warns his audience against full acceptance of Hellenistic culture and stresses instead the need for the traditional educational goals of a Judean community.

Second, the theme of the Jews as good citizens surfaces. Individual Jews like Simon, Jason, Menelaus, and Alcimus upset the smooth functioning of affairs through their desire for power; Jews who follow their ancestral laws can live in harmony with their Gentile neighbors. In my early analysis of 2 Maccabees, I noted and stressed this theme. I was struck by the opening greeting of Antiochus IV’s final letter to the Jews, which begins at 9:19: “to the well-deserving Jews, the citizens, much greeting, good health and prosperity” (*Τοῖς χρηστοῖς Ἰουδαίοις τοῖς πολίταις πολλὰ χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν*). Its message is revealing. This high estimation of the Jews continues throughout the letter. The king recalls with affection their esteem and goodwill. In the transfer of power to his son, Antiochus IV trusts that the Jews will

63 Erich Gruen, in a private communication. I have discussed this subject in “The Persecution of Judeans by Antiochus IV: The Significance of ‘Ancestral Laws,’” in Daniel C. Harlow et al., eds., *The “Other”*

*in Second Temple Judaism: Essays in Honor of John J. Collins* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2011), 423–33.

64 Felix-Marie Abel, *Les livres des Maccabées* (EtB; Paris:

make sure everything goes smoothly. He asks the Jews to continue their goodwill toward himself and his son. While it is true that in its present location the content of this letter jars with the king's earlier treatment of the Jews, which was certainly not "with mildness and benevolence" (9:27), the very fact that the author can present the Jews as esteemed citizens of a king underscores his desire to so portray them.

In 2 Maccabees, it is subverters of the peace such as Simon (3:4; 4:1), Jason (5:5), Antiochus himself (5:11, 22), Gorgias (10:14), the surrounding commanders (12:2), and Alcimus (14:3-10, 26) who start conflict, not the Jews, who are not allowed to live in peace (12:1-2). Scythopolis is not harmed by Judas, as it had treated its Judean inhabitants favorably (12:29-31). Non-Jews show their respect for the Judean victims of unjust outrages (4:35, 49). This theme resonates particularly with what one finds also in the Greek Additions to Esther and in 3 Maccabees. The accusation by Alcimus is the same as that found in the letter of Artaxerxes inserted in the Greek Esther at 3:13 (Addition B). This latter accusation, brought forward by Haman to the king in Esther, is proved false, and so too is the accusation of Alcimus. In 3 Maccabees, King Ptolemy uses the same language of Jewish malice toward Greek citizens to plot his campaign against the Jews (3 Macc 3:26), but he is later forced to repent of his folly and admit that it is the Jews who brought stability and glory to his kingdom (3 Macc 6:28). He claims that evil friends had persuaded him that the Jews would not allow his state to be stable because of the ill will they bear all nations (3 Macc 7:4). In the text of 2 Macc 14:25, with its string of verbs, ἐγάμῃσεν, ἐνστάθησεν, ἐκοινώνησε βίου, Judas Maccabeus is shown as quite content to live under the governorship of Nikanor. Ethnic identity can be maintained within the framework of an imperial power that can restrain, not unleash, anti-Judean sentiment.

The author thus has a twofold aim: he seeks to engage his audience in maintaining their ancestral traditions, and, at the same time, he insists that Jews can live in peace with local Gentile communities and with an imperial power.

### The Date and Place of Composition

Both date and place of composition have been hugely debated, complicated further by the fact that the narrative is a condensed version of an account by Jason of Cyrene. As noted above, the scope of Jason's work cannot be reclaimed, and therefore that work cannot be placed or dated with certainty, except to say that it came before the condensed narrative.

#### Date of the Narrative

If one connects the narrative to the prefixed letters, then one will be inclined to date the narrative in line with the date given to the prefixed letters, particularly to the first. F.-M. Abel and Christian Habicht saw the narrative as attached to the first letter and therefore dated the former to 124 B.C.E., in conformity with the date at the end of the latter (1:10a).<sup>64</sup> Only later, they suggested, was the second prefixed letter added by someone, who also, according to Habicht, inserted material into the narrative.<sup>65</sup> Momigliano saw the narrative as accompanying the first letter: when the Jerusalem council was writing to the Egyptian Jews encouraging them to celebrate the feast of Hanukkah, it had someone make a summary of Jason's work, which he appended.<sup>66</sup> Schwartz, however, dated the first prefixed letter to 143 B.C.E. and so dated the narrative before that date.<sup>67</sup>

If, however, the narrative is uncoupled from the prefixed letters, it can be dated, as Bartlett suggested, "almost anywhere in the last 150 years B.C."<sup>68</sup> Bickermann placed the work of Jason around 100 B.C.E. and

Gabalda, 1949) XLII-XLIII; Habicht, 2. *Makkabäerbuch*, 174-75.

65 Habicht, 2. *Makkabäerbuch*, 174-75.

66 Momigliano, "Second Book of Maccabees," 83. See also van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 50; idem, "2 Maccabees as a History of Liberation," in Menahem Mor et al., eds., *Jews and Gentiles in the Holy Land in the Days of the Second Temple, the Mishnah,*

*and the Talmud* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 2003) 68-86, here 83.

67 Schwartz, 2 *Maccabees*, 14-15.

68 Bartlett, *First and Second Books*, 215. Stephanie von Dobbeler (*Die Bücher 1/2 Makkabäer* [Neue Stuttgarter Kommentar: Altes Testament 11; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1997]) also dates the condensed narrative before 12 B.C.E.

the condensed narrative at 60 B.C.E.<sup>69</sup> Arenhoevel placed Jason's work earlier than the debate over the legitimacy over the Hasmoneans, so around 100 B.C.E. or even earlier,<sup>70</sup> while Hugo Bévenot placed it between 124 B.C.E. and 70 C.E., that is, before the fall of Jerusalem, and van Henten had it between 124 and 63 B.C.E., that is, before the capture of Jerusalem by Pompey the Great.<sup>71</sup> Solomon Zeitlin dated it to the time of Agrippa I (41–44 C.E.) and Werner Dommerhausen to the late first century B.C.E.<sup>72</sup> If the letters are detached, the condensed narrative must be dated from internal hints. The goals of the author as outlined above could apply to any time in the Hellenistic period. However, the tossed-off reference to the diplomatic activity of Eupolemos in 4:11 as something well known to the audience suggests, as Schwartz rightly noted, something about the date. According to 1 Macc 8:17, Judas Maccabeus chose Eupolemos as one of his envoys to Rome to establish friendship and alliance (*φιλίαν καὶ συμμαχίαν*), the very same terms found in 4:11. This event occurred after the defeat of Nikanor, which is the last incident in the condensed narrative of 2 Maccabees. Eupolemos, a diplomat from a distinguished Judean family, can likely be identified with the author of a work in Greek, fragments of which have been preserved in Eusebius of Caesarea's *Praeparatio evangelica*.<sup>73</sup> In the final fragment, Eupolemos gives the number of years from the time of Adam to the fifth year of the reign of Demetrius, while Ptolemy was in his twelfth year as king of Egypt. Despite problems with correlating the dates of both kings, the date would appear to be 158/157 B.C.E., the fifth year of Demetrius I. Eupolemos uses both the LXX and the Hebrew text, and since he dates his work by reference to Seleucid rul-

ers, he appears to be located in Jerusalem.<sup>74</sup> He would thus be writing in Jerusalem around the same time as an envoy named Eupolemos was sent to Rome on a diplomatic mission. It seems probable that the author of the fragments and the envoy are the same man. One does not know how long Eupolemos lived. His writing activity and his breakthrough diplomatic activity in making connection with Rome, however tenuous, would probably have made him well known to the audience for whom the author of the condensed narrative was writing, those who get involved in history's narratives and like to read (2:24-25). The history by Eupolemos, written in Greek, would have been ideal for educating young Jews who read Greek in their ancestral traditions. This assessment of Eupolemos unfortunately does not provide us with a hard time frame, as Eupolemos's work was still around to be excerpted by Alexander Polyhistor around 50 B.C.E. However, it does point again to the circles for whom the author of the condensed narrative was writing.

#### Place of Composition

The earlier scholarly consensus had been that the narrative stemmed from the Diaspora, most likely from Alexandria, although Zeitlin argued for Antioch.<sup>75</sup> Bévenot and Arenhoevel suggested that Jason came from Cyrene or Alexandria but went to Jerusalem, where he gathered information about the Hasmonean revolt.<sup>76</sup> Bévenot had the condensed narrative written in Alexandria.<sup>77</sup> The origin in Jerusalem has recently come into favor.<sup>78</sup> John M. G. Barclay does not include it in his list of works that definitely originated in the Diaspora;<sup>79</sup> for van Henten, "it is obvious that 2 Maccabees is of Judean origin."<sup>80</sup> Lee I. Levine holds that it was created "very likely in

69 Bickermann, "Makkabäerbücher," 791; idem, "Ein jüdischer Festbrief," 234.

70 Arenhoevel, *Theokratie*, 117.

71 Bévenot, *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher*, 11; van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 51–53.

72 Solomon Zeitlin, *The Second Book of Maccabees* (trans. Sidney Tedesche; New York: Harper & Brothers, 1954) 27–30; Werner Dommerhausen, *1 Makkabäer 2 Makkabäer* (NEchtB 12; Würzburg: Echter Verlag, 1985) 9.

73 For a critical edition and commentary on the fragments, see Carl R. Holladay, *Fragments from Hellenistic Jewish Authors*, vol 1: *Historians* (SBLTT 20; Chico, Calif.: Scholars Press, 1983) 93–156.

74 Francis Fallon, "Eupolemos," *OTP* 2:861–72, here 862–63.

75 Zeitlin, *Second Book*, 20–21.

76 Bévenot, *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher*, 9 (Jason came from Cyrene); Arenhoevel, *Theokratie*, 115–16 (Jason possibly brought up in Alexandria).

77 Bévenot, *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher*, 9.

78 An exception is Dommerhausen, *1 Makkabäer 2 Makkabäer*, 8.

79 John M. G. Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora: From Alexander to Trajan (323 B.C.E.–117 C.E.)* (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1996) 12.

80 Van Henten, *Maccabean Martyrs*, 50.

Jerusalem.”<sup>81</sup> Originally, I held that there was no reason why a work of this quality of Greek could not have been written in Jerusalem.<sup>82</sup> Schwartz has, however, strongly argued that 2 Maccabees is a “diasporan book.”<sup>83</sup> I too place the author in the Diaspora, and the question of education provides the main grounds for this placing of 2 Maccabees.

Second Maccabees has been mined for its more intensive narration of the events leading up to the Maccabean revolt. The one-line account in 1 Macc 1:14 of the building of a gymnasium cannot compare with the extended account in 2 Maccabees 4. In an earlier work<sup>84</sup> I stressed the relationship between gymnasium education and citizenship (πολιτεία) and drew particular attention to Plutarch’s description of how Philopoemen treated Sparta:

Now, glutting his anger at the Lacedaemonians and unworthily trampling upon them in their misery, he treated their constitution [τὴν πολιτείαν] in the most cruel and lawless [παρανομώτατον] fashion. For he took away and abolished the system of training which Lycurgus had instituted [τὴν Λυκουργεῖον ἀγωγὴν] and compelled their boys and their young men [τοὺς ἐφήβους] to adopt the Achaean in place of their ancestral discipline [τῆς πατρίου παιδείας μεταλαβεῖν] being convinced that while they were under the laws of Lycurgus [ἐν τοῖς Λυκούργου νόμοις] they would never be humble.

For the time being, then, owing to their calamities,  
The Spartans suffered Philopoemen to eat away, as

it were, the sinews of their city, and became tractable and submissive; but a while afterwards, having obtained permission from the Romans, they abandoned the Achaean polity [τὴν Ἀχαικὴν πολιτείαν] and resumed and reestablished that which had come down from their fathers [τὴν πατρίον], so far as was possible after their many misfortunes and ruin. (Plutarch *Philop.* 16.5–6)

The language of this passage resonates with the language of 2 Macc 4:10-17. The author deals with the setting up of the gymnasium in half a verse (4:9b) but spends eight verses (4:10-17) commenting on Jews’ going to the gymnasium as dissolving the Judean constitution/way of life. This subject appears very dear to his heart. Here is a writer well trained in the writing of Greek, who knows the technical terms of Greek historiographical writing, and who yet insists that Jews should not go to the gymnasium. I can only conclude from the author’s passionate dissent from the practice that some Jews were in fact going to gymnasia. While there is mention of a xystus in Jerusalem at the time of the Jewish revolt in 67 C.E., I do not think this reference means that there was a full-blown gymnasium in the city. Rather, the concern expressed by the author of the narrative would seem most at home with Jews going to gymnasia in Hellenistic cities. Inscriptional evidence for such participation surfaces at the beginning of the first century C.E. in Cyrene, where a catalogue of ephebes contains a few clearly Jewish names.<sup>85</sup> Later, Jewish names are found in lists of ephebes in Iasos, in Caria, and Korone, in Messenia.<sup>86</sup> At Hypaipa, near Sardis, a group of young men called themselves “younger

[AQ: Is this a sentence fragment in original?]

81 Lee I. Levine, *Judaism & Hellenism in Antiquity: Conflict or Confluence?* (Seattle: University of Washington Press, 1998) 79.

82 Doran, *Temple Propaganda*, 112–13.

83 Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 45–55; quotation from 45. I do not find some of Schwartz’s arguments probative. For example, he contrasts 1 Macc 5:54, where Judas’s men bring sacrifices, and 2 Macc 12:31-32, where they simply celebrate Pentecost. However, the sacrifices in 1 Macc 5:54 are mentioned specifically to contrast *Judas’s* men, who were unscathed, with the followers of Joseph and Azariah in the next incident, who are routed and of whom two thousand die, thus showing that they do not belong to the family through whom deliverance was given to Israel

(1 Macc 5:60-62). Schwartz notices many important elements, but they need not be diasporan.

84 Robert Doran, “Jason’s Gymnasium,” in Harold W. Attridge, John J. Collins, and Thomas H. Tobin, eds., *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday* (College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America, 1990) 99–109.

85 Gert Lüderitz, *Corpus jüdischer Zeugnisse aus der Cyrenaika* (Wiesbaden: Reichert, 1983) nos. 6 and 7.

86 Louis Robert, “Un corpus des inscriptions juives,” *REJ* 101 (1937) 73–86, here 85; *IG* 5.1:1398. See Louis Robert, *Hellenica: recueil d’épigraphie de numis-*



Judeans” *Ἰουδαῖοι νεώτεροι* according to the usual division of Greek ephebes.<sup>87</sup> Barclay has argued that the privilege mentioned in Josephus (*Ant.* 12.120) whereby Jews in the gymnasia could buy their own non-Gentile oil most probably refers to Jews training in the gymnasium.<sup>88</sup> I would suggest that Judean participation in the gymnasium had been going on before this date, and that the author of the narrative in 2 Maccabees holds that it destroys Judean identity. Such a theme would be most at home in the Diaspora.

But where in the Diaspora? Suggestions have centered mainly on Alexandria and Antioch. As we noted, however, Jews in Asia Minor also participated in the gymnasium, and in 8:20 there is mention of an otherwise unknown battle against Galatians. However, for an audience who enjoyed history’s narrative (2:20), this could have been known elsewhere. The main reason for preferring Alexandria lies in the abundance of Jewish-Hellenistic literature located there and particularly in the correspondences between the Greek Additions to Esther and 3 Maccabees. Furthermore, I have argued that some of this Jewish-Hellenistic material would find its home in a system of Greek education. The work of Demetrius and his rival Philo evidences a close reading of the biblical narrative and a concentration on the characters and the time frame of the events, features that parallel the basic curriculum of the Greek educational system, which focused on the Greek classics. Aristobulos concentrates on explaining the deeper significance behind the text of the Bible. Ezekiel the Tragedian writes a play on the encounter of Moses with God that shows the influence of Aeschylus and Euripides.<sup>89</sup> The author of the narrative in 2 Maccabees might thus be arguing that young Jews

should participate in this “traditional” education system, perhaps as he had when learning Greek, rather than in the civic gymnasium. One might also note the author’s emphasis on the value of the ancestral traditions of the Jews, particularly on observance of the Sabbath (6:6, 11; 8:26-28). Of special note is 5:25, where Apollonius deceitfully uses the day of the Sabbath to attack Jews. This view of the sanctity of the Sabbath stands in stark contrast to that of the Hellenistic historian Agatharchides, who was writing in Alexandria in mid-second century B.C.E. Agatharchides characterized the observance of the Sabbath as folly (*ἄνοια*) (Josephus *Ap.* 1.208–12). The narrative, with its emphasis on how God defends those who follow his laws, could be a response to such attacks on Judean traditions.

Conclusions about the dating and location of the work are therefore difficult to arrive at.

#### A Suggested Time Line from 2 Maccabees

Few dates are given in the narrative of 2 Maccabees. Often the author is content with “around this time” (5:1; 9:1), “after not much time” (6:1), “after an extremely short interval” (11:1), or “after three years” (4:23; 14:1). At the end of the letters in 11:21, 33, 38 is found the date 148 S.E. [Seleucid Era]; in 13:1, year 149 S.E. is given for the invasion of Lysias and Antiochus V; year 151 S.E. is given for the approach of Alcimus to Demetrius I (14:4). These dates are according to the Seleucid Macedonian system, where year 1 = autumn 312 B.C.E. to autumn 311 B.C.E., so 148 S.E. = autumn 165 B.C.E. to autumn 164 B.C.E.<sup>90</sup>

*matique et d'antiquités grecques XI–XII* (Paris: Maisonneuve, 1960) 3:100–101.

87 *CPJ* 1:30 n. 99.

88 Barclay, *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora*, 256 n. 63.

89 Robert Doran, “The High Cost of a Good Education,” in John J. Collins and Gregory E. Sterling, eds., *Hellenism in the Land of Israel* (Christianity and Judaism in Antiquity 13; Notre Dame, Ind.: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001) 94–115, here 103–5. The texts of Demetrius have been critically edited in Holladay, *Fragments*, 1:51–91; Ezekiel in Holladay, *Fragments*, 2:301–529; Aristobulus in Holladay, *Fragments*, vol. 3.

90 The main problems arise in the dating of events in

1 Maccabees, and various proposals have been raised to determine how events should be dated.

(1) There is one system of dating in 1 Maccabees that begins in autumn 312 B.C.E.; see Klaus Bringmann, *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa: Eine Untersuchung zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Geschichte (175–163 v. Chr.)* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-Historische Klasse 3/132; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983) 15–40. There would thus be no overlap between the date in 1 Maccabees (150 = spring 162 to spring 161) and that of 2 Maccabees (149 = autumn 164 to autumn 163), and one would have to decide which was most reliable.

What timetable of events would be found if one looked only at the data that can be gleaned from 2 Maccabees, without trying to gauge whether 1 or 2 Maccabees is more correct? My starting point for constructing the chronology is the information contained in the letter in 11:27-33, dated to March 165 B.C.E. = Xanthikos 148 S.E., which records that an amnesty was granted by Antiochus IV to the Jews at the instigation of Menelaus. This letter would have been written just before Antiochus IV left on his eastern campaign and appointed Antiochus V as co-regent under the guardianship of Lysias.

#### Seleucus IV Philopator (187–175)

187–75 Heliiodorus is chancellor of the empire. At some point there is a failed attempt to confiscate money from the temple in Jerusalem. In 178 Olympiodorus is appointed to regulate the temples of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia.

#### Antiochus IV Epiphanes (175–164)

Jason becomes high priest.  
 173/172 Antiochus travels through Coele-Syria and Phoenicia.  
 February 169 First Invasion of Egypt by Antiochus.  
 Spring 168 Second Invasion of Egypt.  
 July 168 Withdrawal from Egypt forced by the Romans. On his return, Antiochus plunders Jerusalem and its temple, as he thinks it is in rebellion.  
 Fall 167 Geron in Jerusalem to change the political structure.  
 December 167 Profanation of the temple.

166 The celebration of the festival at Daphne.  
 February/ March 165 Menelaus intervenes to ask for the restoration of ancestral laws in Judea (11:27-33).

#### Antiochus V Eupator co-regent

Spring 165 Antiochus IV sets off to Armenia and then on to his eastern campaign. He leaves Antiochus V as co-regent under the guardianship of Lysias.  
 The amnesty does not work.  
 Continued insurgency under Judas Maccabeus.  
 Ptolemy, son of Dorymenes, sends Nikanor to quell the uprising. Nikanor is defeated. Judas has some entry into Jerusalem (8:30-33).

164 Lysias makes his first expedition into Judea. Having noted the size of the insurgency, he proposes sending to Antiochus IV to suggest a further settlement.

November/ December 164 News in Babylonia that Antiochus IV has died. The Jews purify the temple.

#### Antiochus V Eupator

164 On his accession, Antiochus V agrees to a settlement, and the Jews are to live according to their ancestral laws.

(2) There are two systems of dating in 1 Maccabees, one for internal Jewish events, which would follow the Seleucid Babylonian system and begin in spring 311 B.C.E., and one for external events like Seleucid expeditions, which would begin in autumn 312 B.C.E.; see Elias Bickerman, *The God of the Maccabees: Studies in the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (trans. Horst R. Moehring; SJLA 32; Leiden: Brill, 1979) 155–58. In 1 Macc 10:21, for example, the feast of Booths is said to occur in Tishri, the sev-

enth month. This presupposes a calendar beginning in spring.

(3) There are two systems of dating in 1 Maccabees, where the calendar for dating internal Jewish events would have begun in spring 312 B.C.E., while external events would be dated beginning with autumn 312 B.C.E.; see Lester Grabbe, “Maccabean Chronology: 167–164 or 168–165 B.C.E.?” *JBL* 110 (1991) 59–74.

91 Donatien de Bruyne, *Les anciennes traductions Latines*

- 163 Harassment of the Jews living outside Judea drives Judas and his forces to fight outside the territorial limits of Judea (2 Maccabees 12).  
These outside forays lead to the second expedition of Lysias and Antiochus V Eupator (2 Maccabees 13), which ends in a settlement between the two sides.

### Demetrius I

- Late 162 Demetrius becomes king.  
Nikanor sent to Jerusalem to install Alcimus. Peaceful relationship with Judas.  
March 161 Nikanor defeated.

What is fascinating in this outline of events is the number of attempts to settle the uprising. Within two years of the decrees of Antiochus IV that changed the polity of Jerusalem, Menelaus succeeds in showing the king that this action has antagonized part of the population and that he should change back to the older ways. Lysias then recognizes that Judas's forces are capable of forging order, and so he sets out to make a settlement. Antiochus V agrees with this approach. Lysias and Antiochus

V have to intervene when Judas's forces range outside Judea, but another settlement is reached. Finally, Judas and Nikanor make an agreement. This time line reinforces the motif that the Jews are a peaceful people if left alone to follow their ancestral laws.

### The Text

The text of 2 Maccabees is found in the two uncial manuscripts, Alexandrinus from the fifth century C.E. and Venetus from the eighth century C.E., but not in Sinaiticus. It is also in more than thirty minuscules that are divided according to whether they are seen as having undergone "improvements" (attributed to Lucian of Samosata). There are translations into Latin, of which the most important is the *Vetus Latina*, edited by Donatien de Bruyne,<sup>91</sup> and into Syriac, Armenian, and Coptic. The critical edition of the text is by Robert Hanhart, who built on work begun by his predecessor, Werner Kappler.<sup>92</sup> The revised second edition of Hanhart's work is the basis for my translation.<sup>93</sup> The first edition of 1959 was roundly criticized, particularly by Peter Katz, and some of Katz's criticisms still remain valid,<sup>94</sup> even after the response by Hanhart.<sup>95</sup> Where I have departed from the edition by Hanhart is noted in the text-critical apparatus.

*des Machabées* (Anecdota Maredsolana 4; Maredsous: Abbaye de Maredsous, 1932).

92 Werner Kappler, "De memoria alterius libri Maccabaeorum" (Ph.D. diss., Göttingen, 1929).

93 Robert Hanhart, *Maccabaeorum liber II, copiiis usus quas reliquit Werner Kappler* (Septuaginta 9.2; 2nd ed.; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1976).

94 Peter Katz, "The Text of 2 Maccabees Reconsidered," *ZNW* 51 (1960) 10–30.

95 Robert Hanhart, *Zum Text des 2. und 3. Makkabäerbuches: Probleme der Überlieferung, der Auslegung und der Ausgabe* (Nachrichten der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 1961, 13; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1961).