

Rainer Albertz / Jakob Wöhrle (ed.)

# Between Cooperation and Hostility

Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism  
and the Interaction with Foreign Powers



Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht



# Journal of Ancient Judaism Supplements

Edited by  
Armin Lange, Bernard M. Levinson  
and Vered Noam

## Advisory Board

Katell Berthelot (University of Aix-Marseille), George Brooke (University of Manchester), Jonathan Ben Dov (University of Haifa), Beate Ego (University of Bochum), Ester Eshel (Bar-Ilan University), Heinz-Josef Fabry (University of Bonn), Steven Fraade (Yale University), Maxine L. Grossman (University of Maryland), Christine Hayes (Yale University), Catherine Hezser (University of London), Alex Jassen (University of Minnesota), James L. Kugel (Bar-Ilan University), Jodi Magness (University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill), Carol Meyers (Duke University), Eric Meyers (Duke University), Hillel Newman (University of Haifa), Christophe Nihan (University of Lausanne), Lawrence H. Schiffman (New York University), Konrad Schmid (University of Zurich), Adiel Schremer (Bar-Ilan University), Michael Segal (Hebrew University of Jerusalem), Aharon Shemesh (Bar-Ilan University), Günter Stemberger (University of Vienna), Kristin De Troyer (University of St Andrews), Azzan Yadin (Rutgers University)

Volume 11

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Rainer Albertz / Jakob Wöhrle (ed.)

# Between Cooperation and Hostility

Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism  
and the Interaction with Foreign Powers

Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

With 16 figures

Bibliographic information published by the Deutsche Nationalbibliothek

The Deutsche Nationalbibliothek lists this publication  
in the Deutsche Nationalbibliografie;  
detailed bibliographic data available online:  
<http://dnb.d-nb.de>.

ISBN 978-3-525-55051-9  
ISBN 978-3-647-55051-0 (e-book)

© 2013, Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht GmbH & Co. KG, Göttingen/  
Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht LLC, Bristol, CT, U.S.A.  
[www.v-r.de](http://www.v-r.de)

All rights reserved. No part of this work may be reproduced or utilized in any  
form or by any means, electronic or mechanical, including photocopying,  
recording, or any information storage and retrieval system,  
without prior written permission from the publisher.

Printed and bound in Germany by ⊕ Hubert & Co, Göttingen  
Printed on non-aging paper.

## Preface

The question of why the cooperation of Jews with the Persian and Ptolemaic empires achieved some success and why it failed with regard to the Seleucids and the Romans, even turning into military hostility against them, has not been sufficiently answered. The present volume intends to show, from the perspectives of Hebrew Bible, Judaic, and Ancient History Studies, that the contrasting Jewish attitudes towards foreign powers were not only dependent on specific political circumstances. They were also interrelated with the emergence of multiple early Jewish identities, which all found a basis in the Torah, the prophets, or the psalms. The wide range of theological and ethical concepts, which were already enshrined in the Torah and even enlarged by the prophets, helped different Jewish groups to construct their identities in a way that enabled them to conform to or put up resistance against the demands of foreign rule in a non-violent way. Their different interpretations, however, involved likewise the danger of violent internal and external quarrels, which became apparent under specific social and political conditions, especially when any public control of interpretation failed.

This volume evolved out of the papers presented at an international conference that took place on June 1-3, 2011, at the University of Münster. It was organized by the research group “Distinction and Integration in the Foundational Document of Israel” at the Cluster of Excellence “Religion and Politics in Pre-Modern and Modern Cultures”.

We want to thank all those who enabled the conference to take place and the conference volume to appear. The Cluster of Excellence generously sponsored the conference. Our students and doctoral candidates Ruth Ebach, Dagrun Pflüger and Svenja von Rönn provided magnificent help during the conference.

We thank the editors of the Supplements to the Journal of Ancient Judaism, Prof. Dr. Arming Lange, Prof. Dr. Bernard Levinson and Prof. Dr. Vered Noam, for accepting this volume in the series, and Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht for publishing it. We are very grateful for all the work Prof. Dr. Bruce Wells invested in correcting the English of this volume. Finally, we thank Vera Bongert and Corinna Pfannkuche for compiling the index.

Münster, November 2012

Rainer Albertz  
Jakob Wöhrle



## Contents

Abbreviations .....	9
Judeans, Jews, and their Neighbors: Jewish Identity in the Second Temple Period <i>Daniel R. Schwartz</i> .....	13
Conflicting Models of Identity and the Publication of the Torah in the Persian Period <i>Thomas Römer</i> .....	33
Joseph in Egypt: Living under Foreign Rule according to the Joseph Story and its Early Intra- and Extra-Biblical Reception <i>Jakob Wöhrle</i> .....	53
The Adversaries in Ezra/Nehemiah – Fictitious or Real? A Case Study in Creating Identity in Late Persian and Hellenistic Times <i>Sebastian Grätz</i> .....	73
“Genocide” in the Book of Esther: Cultural Integration and the Right of Resistance against Pogroms <i>Reinhard Achenbach</i> .....	89
Are Foreign Rulers Allowed to Enter and Sacrifice in the Jerusalem Temple? <i>Rainer Albertz</i> .....	115
The Construction of Samari(t)an Identity from the Inside and from the Outside <i>Stefan Schorch</i> .....	135
Manifest Identity: From <i>Ioudaios</i> to Jew: Household Judaism as Anti-Hellenization in the Late Hasmonean Era <i>Andrea M. Berlin</i> .....	151



Honor and Humiliation as a Factor in Hasmonean Politics according to the Narrator of 1 Maccabees <i>Doron Mendels</i> .....	177
From the “Master of the Elephants” to the “Most Ungracious Wretch”: The Image of Foreign Commanders in the Second Book of Maccabees <i>Johannes Schnocks</i> .....	205
Seduced by the Enemy or Wise Strategy? The Presentation of Non-Violence and Accommodation with Foreign Powers in Ancient Jewish Literary Sources <i>Catherine Hezser</i> .....	221
The High Priests and Rome: Why Cooperation Failed <i>Kai Trampedach</i> .....	251
Index of Ancient Sources .....	267
Index of Authors .....	277

## Abbreviations

AB	Anchor Bible
AGJU	Arbeiten zur Geschichte des antiken Judentums und des Urchristentums
AJEC	Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity
<i>ANET</i>	<i>Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament</i> , ed. J.B. Pritchard
<i>ANRW</i>	<i>Aufstieg und Niedergang der römischen Welt: Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung</i> , ed. H. Temporini/W. Haase
AOAT	Alter Orient und Altes Testament
AP	Anthologia Palatina
ASOR	American Schools of Oriental Research
ATANT	Abhandlungen zur Theologie des Alten und Neuen Testaments
ATD	Das Alte Testament Deutsch
atm	Altes Testament und Moderne
BBB	Bonner biblische Beiträge
BE	Biblische Enzyklopädie
BETL	Bibliotheca ephemeridum theologicarum lovaniensium
BKAT	Biblischer Kommentar. Altes Testament
<i>BN</i>	<i>Biblische Notizen</i>
BThSt	Biblich-theologische Studien
BZAR	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte
BZAW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft
BZNW	Beihefte zur Zeitschrift für die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft
CBQMS	Catholic Biblical Quarterly. Monograph Series
CEJL	Commentaries on Early Jewish Literature
CRINT	Compendia rerum iudaicarum ad Novum Testamentum
CSJH	Chicago Studies in the History of Judaism
EHS.T	Europäische Hochschulschriften. Theologie
<i>EvT</i>	<i>Evangelische Theologie</i>
FAT	Forschungen zum Alten Testament
<i>FGH</i>	<i>Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker</i> , ed. F. Jacoby
FoSub	Fontes et Subsidia ad Bibliam pertinentes
FRLANT	Forschungen zur Religion und Literatur des Alten und Neuen Testaments

HAT	Handbuch zum Alten Testament
HBS <sup>t</sup>	Herders biblische Studien
HCS	Hellenistic Culture and Society
HKAT	Handkommentar zum Alten Testament
HTKAT	Herders theologischer Kommentar zum Alten Testament
<i>HTR</i>	<i>Harvard Theological Review</i>
<i>HUCA</i>	<i>Hebrew Union College Annual</i>
ICC	International Critical Commentary
<i>IEJ</i>	<i>Israel Exploration Journal</i>
<i>INJ</i>	<i>Israel Numismatic Journal</i>
<i>JAJ</i>	<i>Journal of Ancient Judaism</i>
JAJS <sup>up</sup>	Journal of Ancient Judaism. Supplements
<i>JAOS</i>	<i>Journal of the American Oriental Society</i>
<i>JBL</i>	<i>Journal of Biblical Literature</i>
<i>JBTh</i>	<i>Jahrbuch für biblische Theologie</i>
<i>JJS</i>	<i>Journal of Jewish Studies</i>
<i>JNES</i>	<i>Journal of Near Eastern Studies</i>
<i>JQR</i>	<i>Jewish Quarterly Review</i>
JSHRZ	Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit
<i>JSJ</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of Judaism</i>
JSJS <sup>up</sup>	Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism
<i>JSOT</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Old Testament</i>
JSOTS <sup>up</sup>	Journal for the Study of the Old Testament. Supplement Series
<i>JSP</i>	<i>Journal for the Study of the Pseudepigrapha</i>
<i>JSQ</i>	<i>Jewish Studies Quarterly</i>
<i>JTS</i>	<i>Journal of Theological Studies</i>
KAT	Kommentar zum Alten Testament
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
<i>MGWJ</i>	<i>Monatschrift für Geschichte und Wissenschaft des Judentums</i>
MoBi	Le Monde de la Bible
NEchtB	Neue Echter Bibel
<i>NRTh</i>	<i>La Nouvelle Revue Théologique</i>
NSK.AT	Neuer Stuttgarter Kommentar. Altes Testament
NTOA	Novum Testamentum et Orbis Antiquus
<i>NTS</i>	<i>New Testament Studies</i>
OBO	Orbis biblicus et orientalis
OTL	Old Testament Library
OTM	Oxford Theological Monographs
<i>PEQ</i>	<i>Palestine Exploration Quarterly</i>
PVTG	Pseudepigrapha Veteris Testamenti Graece
QD	Quaestiones disputatae
<i>RB</i>	<i>Revue biblique</i>

RechBib	Recherches bibliques
RGG	<i>Religion in Geschichte und Gegenwart</i>
RTP	<i>Revue des théologie et de philosophie</i>
SAA	State Archives of Assyria
SAGA	Studien zur Archäologie und Geschichte Altägyptens
SBA	Studies in Biblical Archaeology
SBLDS	Society of Biblical Literature. Dissertation Series
SBLSCS	Society of Biblical Literature. Septuagint and Cognate Studies
SBLSP	<i>Society of Biblical Literature. Seminar Papers</i>
SBS	Stuttgarter Bibelstudien
SCI	<i>Scripta Classica Israelica</i>
SJOT	<i>Scandinavian Journal of the Old Testament</i>
SNTSMS	Society for New Testament Studies. Monograph Series
SVTP	Studia in Veteris Testamenti pseudepigraphica
TAD	<i>Textbook of Aramaic Documents from Ancient Egypt</i> , ed. B. Porten/A. Yardeni
TANZ	Texte und Arbeiten zum neutestamentlichen Zeitalter
TDNT	<i>Theological Dictionary of the New Testament</i> , ed. G. Kittel/G. Friedrich, transl. G.W. Bromiley
Teubner	Bibliotheca scriptorum Graecorum et Romanorum Teubneriana
THAT	<i>Theologisches Handwörterbuch zum Alten Testament</i> , ed. E. Jenni/C. Westermann
TRE	<i>Theologische Realenzyklopädie</i> , ed. G. Krause/G. Müller
TSAJ	Texte und Studien zum antiken Judentum
UTB	Uni-Taschenbücher
VT	<i>Vetus Testamentum</i>
VTSup	Supplements to Vetus Testamentum
VWGTh	Veröffentlichungen der wissenschaftlichen Gesellschaft für Theologie
WA	Weimarer Ausgabe
WMANT	Wissenschaftliche Monographien zum Alten und Neuen Testament
WUNT	Wissenschaftliche Untersuchungen zum Neuen Testament
ZAR	<i>Zeitschrift für Altorientalische und Biblische Rechtsgeschichte</i>
ZAW	<i>Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft</i>
ZBK	Zürcher Bibelkommentare
ZDMG	<i>Zeitschrift der deutschen morgenländischen Gesellschaft</i>
ZDPV	<i>Zeitschrift des deutschen Palästina-Vereins</i>
ZRGG	<i>Zeitschrift für Religions- und Geistesgeschichte</i>



Daniel R. Schwartz  
The Hebrew University of Jerusalem

## Judeans, Jews, and their Neighbors

### Jewish Identity in the Second Temple Period

In 1856 one of the greatest Jewish historians of all time, Heinrich Graetz (1817–91), published volume III of his *Geschichte der Juden von den ältesten Zeiten bis auf die Gegenwart*. This volume, devoted to the period from 160 BCE to 70 CE, was entitled, *Geschichte der Juden von dem Tode des Juda Makkabi's bis zum Untergang des jüdischen Staates*. Graetz was fascinated by this period, as is evident from the fact that the volume went through four editions in his lifetime, growing by 50% from 572 to 858 pages – more editions, and much more growth, than any of the other ten volumes of his eleven-volume *Geschichte der Juden*.<sup>1</sup> Indeed, that is only proper for, as Graetz wrote in the *Vorwort* to this volume, the period to which it is devoted is the richest and most interesting of all periods of Jewish history (“*die interessanteste und anziehendste, aber auch die reichste der ganzen jüdischen Geschichte*”).

I have taken Graetz's work as a point of departure because of a change he made in its title beginning with its third edition. If the first edition, in 1856, was dedicated to the history of the *Juden* since the death of Judas Maccabaeus and until the downfall *des jüdischen Staates*, and things were the same in the second edition (1863) too, beginning with the third edition, which appeared in 1878, the volume's title-page labeled it as dedicated to the history of the *Judäer* from the death of Judas Maccabaeus until the downfall *des judäischen Staates*. Correspondingly, throughout the hundreds of pages of the volume all occurrences of *Juden*, and of the corresponding adjective, *jüdisch*, were replaced by *Judäer* and *judäisch*. And that's the way, full of Judeans instead of Jews, Judean instead of Jewish, that the volume remained in subsequent editions. Graetz offers no explanation for this change, indeed, he makes no comment on it at all. But it is obvious that it points to an issue that was serious in his eyes.

I will return to Graetz later on, but first will note that the issue reflected here, in these deliberations in the middle of the nineteenth century, is one

---

<sup>1</sup> For a bibliography of Graetz's writings, including information on the editions of his *Geschichte*, see Brann, “Verzeichnis”.

that is alive and well today, particularly in a context in which it is of very practical import – the translation of ancient texts. For a prominent example, note that the Loeb Classical Library edition of Josephus' works, published between the 1920s and the 1960s, includes volumes of Josephus' *Jewish War* and *Jewish Antiquities*, but the new "Flavius Josephus: Translation and Commentary" series, being published by Brill since 2000, has volumes of *Judean Antiquities* and one on the *Judean War*. I myself am currently working on preparing another volume for that series, on Books 18–20 of Josephus' *Antiquities*, and the present lecture is, among other things, part of my debate, with myself and with others, as to whether I should leave my files as they are, with "Jew" and "Jewish" throughout, or perhaps change those references, or some of them, to "Judean".<sup>2</sup>

One can approach this issue in different ways. The most obvious way to begin seems to be with dictionaries of our modern languages. What does "Jew" (or *Jude*) mean, in contrast to "Judean" (*Judäer*)? Answering that should help us decide which best corresponds to what the ancient texts meant when they used *Yehudi* in Hebrew, *Judaïos* in Greek, or *Iudaeus* in Latin.

If we go that route, we will easily discover that "Jew"/"Jude" denotes a person of a particular descent and/or religion (Judaism), while "Judean" denotes a person of a particular place (Judea). Thus, for some very standard and authoritative examples:

*Judæan, Judean*. [adjective:] Of or pertaining to Judæa or southern Palestine. [noun:] A native or inhabitant of this region.<sup>3</sup>

*Jew*. A person of Hebrew descent; one whose religion is Judaism; an Israelite.<sup>4</sup>

*Judean*, also *Judæan*. [adjective]: Of, relating to, or characteristic of ancient Judea. [noun]: An inhabitant of ancient Judea.<sup>5</sup>

*Jew*. A person belonging to the worldwide group constituting a continuation through descent or conversion of the ancient Jewish people and characterized by a sense of community; esp. one whose religion is Judaism.<sup>6</sup>

*Judean*. [adjective:]: of or pertaining to Judea. [noun:] a native or inhabitant of Judea.<sup>7</sup>

---

<sup>2</sup> The editor of the Brill series, Steve Mason, points to this "Judean" vs. "Jew" issue as an example of differences among various translators; see his "Series Preface", xi–xii.

<sup>3</sup> Simpson/Weiner (ed.), *Oxford English Dictionary*, 8:291.

<sup>4</sup> Simpson/Weiner (ed.), *Oxford English Dictionary*, 8:228.

<sup>5</sup> Grove (ed.), *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, 1222–3.

<sup>6</sup> Grove (ed.), *Webster's Third New International Dictionary*, 1215.

<sup>7</sup> Stein (ed.), *Random House Dictionary*, 772.

*Jew*. 1. A person whose religion is Judaism. 2. one of a scattered group of people that traces its descent from the Biblical Hebrews or from post-exilic adherents of Judaism; Israelite.<sup>8</sup>

*Jude*. Angehöriger eines semitischen Volkes, einer religions- u. volksmässig zusammengehörenden, über die ganze Erde verstreuten Gemeinschaft.<sup>9</sup>

These definitions clearly indicate that when translating ancient Greek texts that refer to *Ioudaioi* we should use “Judean” when the text means to identify the person as a resident of Judea, or perhaps as a visitor or immigrant from Judea, but otherwise use “Jew”. Sometimes this is simple. Thus, for example, when Josephus has someone report that Herod’s grandson, Agrippa, was a *Ioudaios* and one of the most prominent people “there” (Ant. 18.196), it is evident that Josephus meant “Judean”. When, on the other hand, numerous passages in Josephus (such as B.J. 2.487 and Ant. 18.257, and Ant. 19.278ff) refer to the troubles experienced by the *Ioudaioi* in Alexandria although they were century-long residents of that city, it would seem obvious that Josephus meant they were Jews, not Judeans. After all, the whole point of his stories about the *Ioudaioi* of Alexandria is that they encountered difficulties despite the fact that they had lived in Alexandria for centuries. They, and Josephus, would probably be quite miffed if we were to term them Judeans rather than Alexandrians.<sup>10</sup>

True, there is nothing impossible or unnatural about describing someone by the use of two geographical identifiers. Thus, for example, when we encounter texts that refer to Thracians in Alexandria or Athenians in Rome we have no trouble in understanding or translating them that way, no more than we have with modern texts that refer to Americans in Paris or Pakistanis in London, for example. What makes Judeans in Alexandria problematic is the fact that, as opposed to Thracians, Athenians, Americans, and Pakistanis, for which our languages have only one term each, our modern languages supply us, for *Ioudaioi*, with *two* words – “Jews” and also “Judeans”. That means that any choice of one term amounts to a statement rejecting the other, especially since the word Judean is so rare in our modern languages (see note 9!) that anyone who chooses to use it, instead of Jew, is making a demonstrative statement, comparable, for example, to the statement made by someone who refers to a chairman as a “chairperson”. That is: If I refer to a Thracian in Alexandria or an Athenian in Rome I have not

<sup>8</sup> Stein (ed.), *Random House Dictionary*, 767.

<sup>9</sup> Drosdowski (ed.), *Duden Deutsches Universalwörterbuch*, 650. This dictionary has no entry for *Judäer* or *judäisch*.

<sup>10</sup> Compare the case of one Helenos, who in an official petition of 5/4 BCE (*Corpus Papyrorum Judaicarum* II, no. 151) first termed himself an Alexandrian but then thought better and changed it, or was forced to change it, to “*Ioudaios* from Alexandria”. See Modrzejewski, *Jews*, 164–5.



made any demonstrative statement about identifying the person in question in relation to his or her country rather than his or her ancestry or culture, because I did not have any choice about how to term the person. But if I choose to refer to ancient *Ioudaioi* as Judeans, as many urge us to do today, I am asserting that what made them *Ioudaioi* was their country, not their descent or their religion.

Indeed, the main exponents of using Judean throughout, in our discussion of ancient *Ioudaioi*, also argue that there was no such thing as religion in antiquity – not religion in general, and not Judaism in particular. Thus, for the prime examples, we find Steve Mason, who edits the Brill Josephus series that includes the volumes of *Judean Antiquities*, arguing in an important study in 2007 that it is not legitimate to speak of religion or of Judaism prior to the fourth century CE, when the Roman Empire adopted Christianity.<sup>11</sup> Daniel Boyarin goes even further and argues that Judaism as a “religion” did not exist in the premodern period.<sup>12</sup>

One type of response to these arguments is a very philological one. It entails a review of occurrences of the term *Ioudaios*, in Josephus and elsewhere, and an assessment, in each case, of what word available to us, today, best conforms to what the word connotes. Similarly, such a philological analysis would focus on the meaning of the term *Ioudaismos* in the few places it appears in ancient literature, asking whether its sense is not the same as that of our term “Judaism”, which denotes a religion. I have undertaken something of those tasks elsewhere.<sup>13</sup>

Here, in contrast, I would attack the subject another way, one that is suggested by Graetz’s experience.<sup>14</sup> Namely, Graetz’s introductions to the successive editions of vol. 3 of his *Geschichte* all focus on the following question: Was the period of Jewish history covered by the volume, from the death of Judas Maccabeus until 70 CE, mainly religious in character or, rather, mainly political? That is, the question focuses not on the use of the word *Ioudaios* in any particular context but, rather, upon the types of issues that interested *Ioudaioi* qua *Ioudaioi*, and asks whether they are of the type of issues we normally understand as issues of state or, rather, as issues of religion. Graetz debates this question, very obviously preferring to define the period as religious but realizing that there was a lot of political orientation as well. At first he thought he could resolve the problem by saying the *Grundcharakter* of the period was religious but nevertheless qualifying that by characterizing the period as “political-religious”. Eventually, apparently,

<sup>11</sup> Mason, “Jews”.

<sup>12</sup> Boyarin, “Rethinking”, esp. 8–12.

<sup>13</sup> See my “‘Judaean’”, and the appendix to my *Judeans*.

<sup>14</sup> For details about Graetz, see the fourth chapter of my *Judeans*.

Graetz realized that so much of what was happening in the period bespoke a political orientation – exemplified by the Hasmonean state, the Herodian state, and Jewish rebelliousness against Rome – that (beginning with the third edition) he changed all the *Juden* in the volume into *Judäer*.

Following in Graetz's footsteps, I propose that we revisit the question as to whether the *Ioudaioi* of whom we are speaking understood themselves more as residents of a country or as adherents of a religion. As a contribution to that, I propose to ask how some ancient works portrayed the *Ioudaioi* in contrast to others. I will focus on the first two Books of Maccabees, 1 Maccabees and 2 Maccabees – books that are full of reports of conflict between *Ioudaioi* and others, indeed, books that center upon Jewish rebellion and war against non-Jews and foreign powers. It seems likely that books with such contents will supply clear indications as to how their protagonists are defined, and upon examination it seems that the two books in fact give quite different answers.<sup>15</sup>

There is, of course, some basic similarity between the two books. They both begin by telling the story of the Hellenism, persecution, and rebellion – led by the Hasmoneans – in the days of the Seleucid king, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, down to the death of that king in 164 BCE and the Jewish restoration of the Temple of Jerusalem around the same time. After that, however, the respective scopes of the narratives differ greatly. While 2 Maccabees takes events down no further than 161 BCE, ending its story with Judas Maccabaeus's last great victory, 1 Maccabees gets to that point by ch. 7, but then continues, in chs. 8–16, to take the story down until the mid-130s, when the Hasmonean dynasty manages to achieve stability and more or less full independence. Thus, the first half of 1 Maccabees deals with the same period, and therefore with many of the same events, as the entirety of 2 Maccabees.

Apart from overlapping period and events, however, the differences between the two books are quite impressive. Here I would focus on some of those differences, and suggest that they culminate in the distinction between a Judean book and a Jewish book. Let us start with a very basic distinction. 1 Maccabees was originally in Hebrew, biblical Hebrew. That is plain from its Greek style, which is slavish translationese, as well as from other considerations. 2 Maccabees, in contrast, was originally composed in Greek. In fact, the editor (so-called Epitomator) who produced the work tells us (at 2 Macc 2:23) that it is based on a five-volume history by one Jason of Cyrene – a Jew of the Hellenistic Diaspora, part of the Ptolemaic kingdom, so the Greek is quite natural. 1 Maccabees, in contrast, was very evidently written by someone in Judea. That is clear both from the book's great interest in

<sup>15</sup> For a general comparison of the two books, see Nickelsburg, "1 and 2 Maccabees".

details of Judean geography as well as from the obvious closeness to the Hasmonean throne: 1 Maccabees is, basically, a dynastic history, that shows its readers how it happened, and why it is justified, that the Hasmonean family came to defeat the Seleucids and to rule Judea. The whole structure of the book is built to make that case. Thus, after ch. 1 presents the problem (foreign rule), chs. 2–16 tell the story of the Hasmonean solution, with successive sections of the book devoted to the tenures of the successive Hasmonean leaders: ch. 2 on Mattathias, chs. 3–9 on Judas, chs. 9–12 on Jonathan, and finally chs. 12–16 on Simon, including the long account in ch. 14 of how the people formally appointed Simon and his descendants to rule the country. When Simon was killed in ch. 16, he is succeeded by his son, John Hyrcanus, and with that the book ends – with the notice, in the work's very last words, that John inherited rule from his father. Thus, after a few rounds in which brother succeeded brother, the dynasty was finally established stably. Q.E.D.

2 Maccabees, in contrast, is not about the Hasmonean dynasty. Nor is the problem it addresses that of foreign rule. On the contrary, if the author of 1 Maccabees is very clear about just how bad foreign rule is, from its inception in the days of Alexander and especially in the period of Antiochus Epiphanes, the author of 2 Maccabees is just as insistent about Gentile rulers being, as a rule, just fine – and so Antiochus Epiphanes was just an unfortunate exception, a glitch. A comparison of the opening of the stories of the two books shows this clearly.<sup>16</sup>

Rather, the problem addressed by 2 Maccabees is one of sin, and the solution is one of atonement. After the first three chapters include introductory material and a story in ch. 3 about just how well God protects Jerusalem, ch. 4 reports Hellenization in Jerusalem, and that it led to negligence in the fulfillment of religious duties, and announces that this led to swift punishment, “for it is no trivial matter to be impious vis à vis the divine laws, as shall be shown by the next period” (4:17). Indeed, ch. 5 reports that Antiochus’ forces attacked Jerusalem, murdering and enslaving tens of thousands of Jews, and robbing the Temple, and that is followed by Antiochus’ decrees against Judaism, which result in much Jewish martyrdom – narrated in detail in chs. 6–7. The death of those martyrs worked atonement, and so, beginning in ch. 8, God again became reconciled with His people; 8:5, which announces that God’s wrath had turned into mercy, is the turning-point of the entire book. From this point on, the rest of the book is a story of

---

<sup>16</sup> Compare 1 Macc 1:1–10, where Greek kings in general are terrible, a century and a half of their rule being summarized as “and they caused many evils on the earth” (v. 9) and so the wicked Antiochus Epiphanes was a natural outgrowth of such antecedents (v. 10), to 2 Macc 3:1–3 – the idyllic beginning of the story (after two chapters of introductory material), in which the Greek kings’ benevolence, and respect for Judaism, is underlined.

how the Jews' fortunes improved: they became victorious in their wars against the Seleucids, Antiochus died a horrendous death, his successor revoked the decrees against Judaism, and after some more successful campaigning the Jews lived happily ever after. Thus, as Jan Willem van Henten put it in the title of his book about Second Maccabees, the Maccabean martyrs – not any rebels – were “the saviors of the Jewish people”.<sup>17</sup> It was the martyrs' deaths that made God's wrath turn into mercy (as is said in 8:5), and from that point on events on the ground just have to work out the details, as it were: Judas wins his first victories in ch. 8, Antiochus dies a terrible death in ch. 9, Judas' forces retake Jerusalem and restore the Temple cult in ch. 10, etc., on down to the final victory in ch. 15.

1 Maccabees, in contrast, has no use for martyrs. They do not bring about any solution to the Jews' problems. Rather, they only illustrate, by being killed, how bad those problems were. If for 2 Maccabees the spilt blood of martyrs is effective, comparable to a sacrifice that works atonement,<sup>18</sup> for 1 Maccabees it's just spilt blood.<sup>19</sup> For 1 Maccabees, after all, the problem is not sin; the problem is foreign rule, and the way to put an end to that is not by being killed but, rather, by killing and otherwise defeating the foreigners. There is no reference at all in 1 Maccabees to Jewish sin engendering Jewish suffering, or atonement for such sins reversing the Jews' fortunes. Rather, the Jews' troubles are caused by Gentiles. That point, however, brings us to our topic: who *are* those Gentiles, and who, accordingly, are the *Ioudaioi*?

Turning first of all to 1 Maccabees, it is clear that the Gentiles are foreigners in the most basic, geographic sense. At several points, the book refers to the Jews' enemies as “the Gentiles roundabout”.<sup>20</sup> Thus:

1 Macc 1:11 Come let us make a covenant with the Gentiles who are around us ...

3:25 Fear and terror of Judas and his brothers began to fall upon the Gentiles around them.

5:1 When the Gentiles roundabout heard ... they became very wrathful.

5:10 The Gentiles roundabout us have gathered together against us to wipe us out [cf. 5:38].

<sup>17</sup> See van Henten, *Martyrs*.

<sup>18</sup> See especially 7:37–38 – the hope that the martyrs' death will bring about reconciliation with God.

<sup>19</sup> See esp. the contrast of the suffering at the end of ch. 1 to the rebellion in ch. 2, also the way the pious who die in 2:29–38 and 7:13–16 are contrasted to the Hasmonean rebels. On this theme, see my “Foil”.

<sup>20</sup> On this theme, and its implications for the dating of 1 Maccabees, see Schwartz, “Israel”.

5:57 Let us too make ourselves a name; let us go and fight the Gentiles around us.

12:53 And all the peoples who were around them sought to wipe them out ...

Thus, the basic way this book defines non-*Ioudaioi* is as those who do not live in Judea, but only around it. Judea is conceived of as an isolated land, with borders, surrounded by regions inhabited by others who are very different from the *Ioudaioi*, and hostile to them. That implies that the *Ioudaioi* are what we would call Judeans.

However, things are more complicated than that, for 1 Maccabees is also very taken by the importance of *birth* in defining people. Thus, on the one hand, the Hasmoneans are the “seed” (*sperma*) that was chosen to save Israel (5:62), whereas those who are not of that “seed” are therefore doomed to defeat in battle; the Jews and the Spartans are said to be “brothers” because they are of “the *genos* of Abraham” (12:21). Similarly, on the other hand, when ch. 5 wants to explain what the Idumeans hoped to do, it refers to them as the sons of Esau and says they wanted to wipe out the seed (*genos*) of Jacob; etc.

If, then, we were to state what makes others others, for 1 Maccabees, the answer would be that they live elsewhere and are of different descent. That implies a world in which people who share common descent typically live each in their own lands. Probably “ethnic” or “national” is, accordingly, the best term to use for the criteria that distinguish people from one another.

If we now turn to the translation issue, however, and ask whether “Jew” or “Judean” best fits *Ioudaioi* whose world is defined that way, we get no clear answer. That is because, as we have seen, of the two parameters we are considering, geography and descent, English usage associates one, all by itself, with Judean, and the other, together with religion, with Jew. This requires us to go on and ask which of the two is more salient for 1 Maccabees. When we do that two criteria point to the geographic one:

1) *1 Maccabees makes no reference at all to the Jews of the Diaspora.* This is really quite striking: A book of history, which records delegations sent by the Hasmoneans as far as Rome and Sparta, and reports the Hasmoneans’ involvement in events in Syria and awareness of events in Egypt, makes no reference at all to *Ioudaioi* living abroad – neither generally nor specifically. The closest we get to anything of the kind is the citation, in ch. 15, of a Roman letter in support of the Judeans, which was circulated to the rulers of various regions; some scholars have suspected that the choice of cities reflects the fact that there were Jewish communities in them.<sup>21</sup>

<sup>21</sup> So, for example, Gruen, *Diaspora*, 110.

Perhaps they are right. But 1 Maccabees makes no mention of such, and I see no logic that urges us to infer them despite that silence.<sup>22</sup>

Now, in contrast, I should explain that the definition of the Jews as sharing common birth is something that became particularly apposite, and, therefore, particularly popular, in the Persian period – the period that saw the restoration of the Second Temple but also the continued existence of a large Diaspora. In such circumstances, the easiest way to explain how they could all be members of the same collective was by pointing to the fact that they were all of the same “seed”. Hence, it is no surprise to find, in the Persian period, Ezra calling the Jews “the holy seed” (Ezra 9:2), the Book of Esther referring to them as “the seed of the Jews” (Esther 6:13), and a prayer in the book of Nehemiah, that reviews biblical history, skipping directly from Creation to God’s selection of Abraham, thus focusing its story on his descendants (Neh 9). If 1 Maccabees makes no reference to the Diaspora, it had no need to define the Jews by their descent. Or perhaps we should phrase that the other way around, and suggest that the author of 1 Maccabees was bespeaking a point of view that so unambiguously defined *Ioudaioi* with reference to Judea that it simply left Jews of the Diaspora beyond its horizon and, therefore, out of its scope. True, there are plenty of passages in the Bible that do the same, but by and large they reflect the First Temple period, when indeed there was no Diaspora. What is remarkable about 1 Maccabees is that it bespeaks the same point of view at a time when there was a huge Diaspora.

2) The lack of interest in the Diaspora goes hand in hand with a second factor. 1 Maccabees is very much focused on the land of Israel.<sup>23</sup> This is obviously the case insofar as its story is one of the establishment of Hasmonean rule in that country. Thus, for a salient example, the poem that opens ch. 14, which summarizes Simon’s accomplishments, first summarizes that “And the land was quiet all the days of Simon” (14:4) and then goes on, later, to report that “he spread out the borders of his people, and conquered the land” (14:6), “and they were tending the land in peace, and the land gave its produce, the trees of the plain – their fruit” (14:8), “he made peace in the land, and Israel was joyous with great joy” (14:11). And so on; it is very clear that “Israel” and “the land” are essentially synonymous and coterminous. The same is also clear at the beginning of the story as well, where, in ch. 2, the author first reports that Mattathias and his men forcibly circumcised “all the uncircumcised children that they found within the

<sup>22</sup> As van Unnik roundly notes in his *Selbstverständnis*, 121: “In den Makkabäerbüchern spielt die Diaspora keine bedeutende Rolle. Aus dem Schreiben der Römer in I Makk. 15:16–24 lässt sich für unsere Frage nichts entnehmen ...”. That’s all van Unnik discusses with regard to 1 Maccabees.

<sup>23</sup> On the land in 1 Maccabees see Mendels, *Land*, 47–50.

borders of Israel” (2:46), just as at 3:35–36 Antiochus is said to have given orders “concerning the residents of Judea and Jerusalem”, namely, to “destroy the strength of Israel and ... settle foreigners in all their borders” – here too it is quite clear that “Israel” has its borders, and those are defined as “Judea and Jerusalem”. Similarly, when at 1 Macc 9:72–73 Jonathan came to an arrangement with the Syrian general, Bacchides, ideal circumstances were again restored:

1 Macc 9:72 And [Bacchides] returned to him the captives he had earlier taken in the land of Judah, and he departed, returning to his land; he never again came within their borders.

73 And the sword ceased in Israel, and Jonathan resided in Michmash; and Jonathan began to judge the people and make the impious disappear from Israel.

All of these passages make it very clear that “the people”, also known as “Israel”, has its territorial borders. And that corresponds, of course, to 1 Maccabees’ failure to relate to the Jews of the Diaspora. Accordingly, if above we saw that for this book *Ioudaioi* are defined by their land and their descent, now we may add that the land is the primary category, so Judeans would seem to be the appropriate term to use.

For 2 Maccabees, in contrast, things are very different. True, the book focuses, formally, upon the history of a place, Jerusalem. The story opens (in ch. 3) with everything being fine in the Holy City, and it ends with the restoration of wonderful conditions there; as the author puts it, at the very end of the story, “since ... ever since the city was taken over by the Hebrews it has been in their hands, here I too will conclude this account” (15:37).<sup>24</sup> But that should not mislead us into thinking that the main way the author understands his protagonists is as residents of a land. Rather, he refers to them as devotees of *Ioudaismos*, “Judaism” – a term for which this book is the earliest evidence. Three times in the book he characterizes his heroes as those who remained faithful to Judaism:

2 Macc 2:21 ... and the heavenly apparitions which occurred for those who nobly fought with manly valor for Judaism, so that although they were few in number they plundered the entire country and chased away the barbaric hordes.

8:1 Judas Maccabaeus and those with him ... had been going in and out and around secretly to the villages, summoning their kinsmen and those who remained in Judaism; growing in numbers, they gathered together about 6000 men.

<sup>24</sup> On the translation of this verse, see my *2 Maccabees*, 556–7.

14:38 In the foregoing times of strife he had brought in a decision for Judaism and with complete intensity had risked body and soul for Judaism.

That, on the face of it, and along with the fact that the author was a *Ioudaios* of the Diaspora, should be enough to tell us that, for this book, *Ioudaioi* are not Judeans but, rather, what we call *Jews*, adherents of Judaism.

There has been, however, some recent debate about the meaning of *Ioudaismos* in 2 Maccabees. Namely, in the context of the increasing popularity of the use of *Judeans*, a few scholars have claimed that *Ioudaismos* does not refer to what we call Judaism, namely the Jewish religion, but, rather, something else: Mason suggests it refers to the forcing of others to adopt Jewish practices or support the Jews' cause,<sup>25</sup> and Boyarin suggests that it "it doesn't mean Judaism the religion but the entire complex of loyalties and practices that mark off the people of Israel" – a more general conglomerate of Jewish practices and characteristics, perhaps what we call Jewish "culture".<sup>26</sup> I have no real quarrel about that with Boyarin; I consider the Jewish religion to be a part of Jewish culture, what Cohen calls "Jewishness",<sup>27</sup> and so as long as we agree that "Judaism" refers to the things Jews *do* because they are Jewish we can leave aside the question which of those things are part of their religion and which of other parts of their culture. Mason's argument, in contrast, appears to me to be unjustified, supported by little more than the demands of his general theory. In fact, "Judaism" in 2 Maccabees seems to mean what it means for us; something which one can practice, to which one can remain devoted; something to which a wicked king might forbid people to declare allegiance (6:6) but to which some, especially in villages outside of the king's supervision, might nonetheless remain loyal (8:1). There is no reason to turn it into doing something to others.

I have written about that elsewhere.<sup>28</sup> Here, in contrast, I would point to a few aspects of 2 Maccabees that illustrate just how religiously-oriented the book is. And I will do this by indicating, down the line, the contrast with 1 Maccabees, a contrast so thoroughgoing that it itself justifies, or perhaps demands, the use of different nomenclature for the protagonists of the two stories:

1) *Sin and atonement*: As noted above, 2 Maccabees tells a story of sin and atonement; 1 Maccabees has neither.

2) *Miracles and apparitions*: 1 Maccabees reports nothing supernatural – no miracles, no divine apparitions. 2 Maccabees is full of them: From the

<sup>25</sup> Mason, "Jews", 465–8.

<sup>26</sup> Boyarin, "Rethinking", 8.

<sup>27</sup> Cohen, *Beginnings*.

<sup>28</sup> For a detailed discussion, see the appendix to my *Judeans*.



horse and rider who descend from heaven (along with two handsome ruffians) to punish Heliodorus in 3:25–26 to the heavenly army over Jerusalem in 5:2–4, the heavenly horsemen that descend to protect Judas in 10:29–30 and another who leads his troops in 11:8, and finally to the appearance of Onias and Jeremiah in Judas Maccabaeus' dream reported at 15:12–16, which dream was so real that Judas actually received from Jeremiah the sword he then goes on to use to defeat the Syrian general, God is visibly active in the story from beginning to end. Nothing like those episodes appears in 1 Maccabees, and although it too reports that Judas acquired a special sword, it says he took it from a fallen enemy general after valiantly defeating him in battle (3:11–12).

3) *Poetic justice*: The assertion that the fate of villains corresponds to their crimes is a more subtle way of asserting God's providential and just control of events – and it too is absent from 1 Maccabees but frequently found in 2 Maccabees. Thus, for some examples: A temple-robber was killed by an angry Jewish mob near the Temple treasury (4:42);<sup>29</sup> Jason was exiled because he had exiled others (5:9);<sup>30</sup> Antiochus had persecuted the innards of others (by forcing them to eat impure foods) and so he died “very justly” with great pains in his innards (9:6); the only Jews who died in battle were discovered to have been wearing idolatrous amulets under their tunics, which shows that God “judges righteously and makes the hidden things visible” (12:40–41); and Menelaus died “very justly” in ashes because he had defiled the ashes of the altar (13:7–8).

4) *Prayer*: Here the picture is not as totally one-sided, for there are some prayers and references to prayer in 1 Maccabees. However, beginning with ch. 5 they are very few and far between, and usually no more than a brief reference that is not much more than pro forma.<sup>31</sup> In 2 Maccabees, in contrast, prayers are numerous and often long, throughout the book, and they

<sup>29</sup> For a similar point elsewhere in Jewish Hellenistic literature, note Philo's *In Flaccum* 115: the wicked Flaccus, who had destroyed innumerable hearths of his innocent victims, was arrested at his own hearth. See also *ibid.*, 170–4 and esp. 189: “Justice” saw to it that the number of Flaccus' wounds, in being executed, corresponded precisely to the number of his victims.

<sup>30</sup> Here the author uses paronomasia to underline the irony: *apoksenōsas epi ksenēs apōleto*.

<sup>31</sup> Prayers or references to prayer in 1 Maccabees after ch. 4: 5:33; 7:36–38, 40–42; 9:46 (a call to prayer); 11:71; 12:11 (mention of prayer in a diplomatic missive); 13:47, 51 (psalms in the wake of military success), 16:3 (a banal expression of hope for help from heaven). Note especially the contrast between the news of invasion in 3:42, which engenders twelve verses of prayer, and the prayer-less reception of similar news at 5:16, 6:28ff, 9:6, 10:74, 12:24, and 13:1; the closest we get to prayer in such contexts is the banal “may help from heaven be with you” in 16:3. Similarly, contrast the post-victory prayer at 4:24 with its absence at 7:47 (contrast the prayers at same occasion according to 2 Macc 15:34!), 10:87, 11:74, 12:33–35, and 16:10. As for why things change beginning with ch. 5 (although note the sacrifices at 5:54), see below, note 35.

are answered.<sup>32</sup> This, of course, corresponds to the book's emphasis upon God's active providence; time and again the book points out, explicitly, that it was God who made things happen.<sup>33</sup>

5) "*Luck/fate*": In contrast, 1 Maccabees clearly states, at three important junctures, that something blind exerts control over events. The term it uses for such luck or fate is *kairos*, literally "point in time, moment". Thus:

- at 9:10 Judas refuses to flee the field of battle despite overwhelming odds against him, saying that if his *kairos* had come to die he would rather do so without staining his honor;

- at 12:1 Jonathan realizes that the *kairos* was going his way and so he seized the opportunity to send ambassadors to Rome; and

- at 15:33–34 Simon notes that at some past *kairos* others had conquered the Judeans' ancestral lands and now when "we have the *kairos*" his forces had retaken them.

Whether this *kairos* is conceived of as blind uncontrolled luck or rather astrologically, or some other way,<sup>34</sup> what is important for the contrast with 2 Maccabees is that *kairos* has nothing to do with a providential God.

What all these points amount to is quite simple: 2 Maccabees, a work bespeaking the circumstances of diasporan Jews who, qua Jews, have no army and can depend only upon God to protect them, tells a story that focuses on the Jews' covenant with God and His protective care of them so long as they observe His laws or, if they sin, when they see to atoning for their sins via suffering and martyrdom. 1 Maccabees, in contrast, written on behalf of a dynasty that undertook to put an end to foreign domination of Judea, successfully did so, and was very impressed with its own accomplishments and saw them as justifying its claim to rule the newly established Judean state, tells a story that focuses upon that dynasty and leaves God, by and large, out of the picture. Indeed, beginning with ch. 5 the book hardly mentions Him.<sup>35</sup> But if 2 Maccabees is a book about God and those who are

---

<sup>32</sup> Prayers or references to prayer in 2 Maccabees 3–15 (the body of the story): 3:14–15, 18–21, 30; 5:4; 7 passim; 8:2–4; 10:16, 25–26, 38; 11:6; 12:6, 28, 41–44; 13:10–12; 14:15, 34–36, 46; 15:21–24, 26–27, 29, 34.

<sup>33</sup> Suffice it to say that the great power of God, and His providential care for the Jews, is the lesson learned by all those who attacked the Jews: 3:36–39; 8:36; 9:11–17; 11:13. For another dramatic presentation of the same point in another Hellenistic Jewish work, see Philo's *In Flaccum* 170.

<sup>34</sup> On the senses of *kairos* in the Septuagint see Delling, "*kairos*", 458–9. Finkelstein, "*Kairos*" points especially to Polybius 3.30.4 and 18.22.8 (another historiographical work of the second century BCE), where *kairos* appears in the sense of "fate"; the formulation of 3.30.4 is quite similar to that in 1 Macc 15:33–34.

<sup>35</sup> *Theos* ("God") is not mentioned at all in 1 Maccabees, and after the first few chapters, which may reflect a generation that was still more biblically oriented, there is hardly any other reference to the Deity ("the Lord" [*Kyrios*] appears for the last time in ch. 5, and even "Heaven" is mentioned only three times after that chapter). The difference between the first four chapters of the

# Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht

Journal of Ancient Judaism

Supplements 11

The question of why the cooperation of Jews with the Persian and Ptolemaic empires achieved some success and why it later failed, has not been sufficiently answered. The present volume intends to show, from the perspectives of Hebrew Bible, Judaic, and Ancient History Studies, that the contrasting Jewish attitudes towards foreign powers were not only dependent on specific political circumstances. They were also interrelated with the emergence of multiple early Jewish identities, which all found a basis in the Torah, the prophets, or the psalms. With contributions by Reinhard Achenbach, Rainer Albertz, Andrea M. Berlin, Sebastian Grätz, Catherine Hezser, Doron Mendels, Thomas Römer, Johannes Schnocks, Stefan Schorch, Daniel R. Schwartz, Kai Trampedach, Jakob Wöhrle.

## **The editors**

Dr. theol. Rainer Albertz was Professor of Old Testament Studies at the Protestant Faculty of the University of Münster and is Senior Professor at the Cluster of Excellence "Religion and Politics" in Münster.

Dr. theol. Jakob Wöhrle is Privatdozent at the Protestant Faculty of the University of Münster and Heisenberg Fellow of the Deutsche Forschungsgemeinschaft.

ISBN 978-3-525-55051-9



9 783525 550519

[www.v-r.de](http://www.v-r.de)