

Are the Hasmoneans Legitimised as Kings in 1 Maccabees?

Dongbin Choi

September 2013

Dissertation submitted as partial requirement for the degree of MRes in
Theology and Religious Studies at the University of Nottingham

Abstract

Concerning the belief about continuation of the Davidic dynasty in the Second Temple Jewish literature, the present study seeks to understand how the belief may have been understood in 1 Maccabees. Specifically, it asks whether the Hasmoneans are legitimised as kings in the book, replacing the Davidic dynasty. Through examining relevant passages such as 2:57, 5:62, 14:25–49, and 14:41, it is argued that the author of 1 Maccabees does not present the Hasmoneans as legitimate kings. Instead, he preserves the traditional belief that the Davidic dynasty will continue.

Acknowledgements

I would like to express my gratitude to my supervisor Professor Roland Deines for the important comments, suggestions and, most of all, his unceasing encouragement. I am responsible for any errors and defects in the present study. I should also thank those scholars with whom I made dialogues in the present study. Even if I disagree with some of them, I should acknowledge that I have learned a lot from them. I would also like to thank my parents for supporting me in many ways. Finally, I would like to thank my loving wife for her untiring support and unfailing love. Particularly, despite undergoing the first trimester of her pregnancy, she remained supportive to my study and I owe her so much. This work is dedicated to her.

Table of Contents

| | |
|---|-----------|
| 1. INTRODUCTION | 4 |
| 1.1. THE ISSUE..... | 4 |
| 1.2. SCHOLARSHIP ON THE HASMONEANS AND KINGSHIP | 9 |
| 1.3. PRELIMINARY REMARKS: PRO-HASMONEAN LANGUAGE IN 1 MACCABEES | 15 |
| 2. DISCUSSIONS ON 1 MACCABEES | 18 |
| 2.1. CONTINUATION OF THE DAVIDIC DYNASTY IN 2:57..... | 18 |
| 2.1.1. <i>Scriptural Tradition of 2:57 and Ben Sira</i> | 18 |
| 2.1.2. <i>Interpretation of 2:57</i> | 23 |
| 2.1.3. <i>Summary</i> | 27 |
| 2.2. 'SALVATION BY THE HAND OF THE HASMONEANS' IN 5:62 | 28 |
| 2.2.1. <i>Counter-Evidence to the Davidic Dynasty?</i> | 28 |
| 2.2.2. <i>Hasmoneans – Judges</i> | 30 |
| 2.2.3. <i>Hasmoneans – 'Heroic Acts and War'</i> | 33 |
| 2.2.4. <i>Summary</i> | 35 |
| 2.3. THE HONORARY DECREE FOR SIMON IN 14:25–49 | 36 |
| 2.3.1. <i>Overview of the Decree</i> | 36 |
| 2.3.2. <i>The Decree as a Compromise</i> | 37 |
| 2.3.3. <i>Summary</i> | 42 |
| 2.4. A COMING 'TRUSTWORTHY PROPHET' IN 14:41..... | 43 |
| 2.4.1. <i>'Prophet' in 1 Maccabees</i> | 43 |
| 2.4.2. <i>Expectation of a Future Prophet</i> | 46 |
| 2.4.3. <i>John Hyrcanus I as the Prophet?</i> | 50 |
| 2.4.4. <i>Summary</i> | 54 |
| 3. CONCLUSION | 55 |
| 4. BIBLIOGRAPHY | 57 |

1. INTRODUCTION

1.1. THE ISSUE

What does the Second Temple literature tell us about the concept of a Davidic messiah? Was the concept significant in forming the theology of that time? Or, did people even believe in the coming of a Davidic messiah? Many scholars in the field say there is reticence about a Davidic messiah in the Second Temple period, calling the period as a ‘messianic vacuum;’¹ although not all agree with this.² This reticence may be explained by the absence of the Davidic dynasty throughout the Second Temple period. Instead, various types of messiah such as priestly messiahs or supernatural figures are found in the literature so as to diminish any central importance of the presently absent Davidic dynasty.³ The underlining question we need to address in this context is this: Did people adapt the ‘kingless’ situation by replacing the destroyed dynasty with other available

¹ To name but a few, see W. V. Hague, “Eschatology of the Apocryphal Scriptures, I, The Messianic Hope,” *JTS* 12 (1911), 57–98, especially 64; Morton Smith, “What is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?,” in *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh: vol. 1: Historical Method, Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism*, Morton Smith (Edited by S. J. D. Cohen) (Leiden: Brill, 1996), 161–67; Marinus de Jonge, “Messiah,” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary – Vol. 4*, edited by David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 777–88, especially 781–86. Kenneth E. Pomykala, *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism: Its History and Significance for Messianism* (Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature, 1995), especially 265–71, argues that the concept of a Davidic messiah was not unitary nor continuous within the world of early Judaism.

² William Horbury, *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ* (London: SCM Press, 1998), 52–9, demonstrates that the claim for the absence of a Davidic messiah in this period is mistaken. He presents a thread of examples found in Apocrypha to show that the belief was well alive. See also, *ibid*, *Messianism Among Jews and Christians* (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 38–50; Antti Laato, *A Star Is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of the Jewish Messianic Expectations* (Georgia: Scholars Press, 1998), generally shares the same view with Horbury. John J. Collins, “Messianism in the Maccabean Period”, in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, ed. Jacob Neusner et al. (Cambridge; New York; New Rochelle; Melbourne; Sydney: CUP, 1987), 97–109, differs from Horbury and Laato and says that the messianic silence view may be correct in some passages. Nonetheless, he agrees with them that it does not mean the messianic belief was replaced or rejected. Collins’ view is perhaps more in line with that of Andrew Chester, *Messiah and Exaltation* (WUNT 207) (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007); 205–30; *ibid*, *Future Hope and Present reality: vol. 1: Eschatology and Transformation in the Hebrew Bible* (WUNT 293) (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012), 237–63. Chester calls for a middle ground between (in his terms) ‘minimalists’ such as Pomykala and ‘maximalists’ such as Horbury in regard to the biblical evidences for a Davidic messiah (but his thesis focuses on the Hebrew Bible exclusively rather than the extra-biblical literature).

³ For a brief summary of these figures in the Second Temple literature, see A. S. van der Woude and M. de Jonge, “Messianic Ideas in Later Judaism,” in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament: Vol. 9*, edited by Gerhard Kittel (Grand Rapids, Mich.; London: Eerdmans, 1964–76), 509–27; Collins, “Messianism,” 97–8; George W. E. Nickelsburg, “Eschatology (Early Jewish),” in *Anchor Bible Dictionary – Vol. 2*, edited by David Noel Freedman (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 579–94.

figures? Or, did they continue to believe in the restitution of the Davidic dynasty? Specifically, does the reticence of the Davidic mean a change of the belief, or not?

The belief in continuation of the Davidic dynasty is more difficult to be maintained in the literature that is produced when the Hasmoneans ruled in Judea. From the extant sources, we know that the Hasmoneans who were priests themselves rose up against the overload of the Syrian kingdom of Antiochus Epiphanes, brought religious preservation and political freedom to their people, and became the rulers and high priests to them. In the book of 1 Maccabees which preserves the 'memoirs'⁴ of the early Hasmoneans, we have ample evidences that the Hasmoneans acted for the people as did the pious figures of Israel in the past such as kings and priests. They are not only justified in their rebellion against the Syrian king but also portrayed as heroes who *saved* their nation.

Quite naturally, it has been claimed by some scholars⁵ that the Hasmoneans are legitimised for kingship in 1 Maccabees, supported by both internal and external evidences. Internally, the pro-Hasmonean language suffices to elevate the Hasmoneans to acquire the kingly status. In regard to the belief about the Davidic, 1 Maccabees seems to have little interest in the belief; it rather portrays the successful dynasty of the Hasmoneans for restoration of the nation. Externally, there was readiness already in the pre-Hasmonean period to make high priests political as well as religious leaders instead of kings,⁶ as evident in Ben Sira 50 and 2 Maccabees 3. Furthermore, Josephus informs us that from the time of Aristobulus,⁷ the Hasmoneans initiated using the title of king (Ant. 13:301; War. 1:70), thus giving us an indication that the Hasmoneans' ideology of their rule could have been associated with kingship even before Aristobulus. The implication of such a claim is that the hope of restoring Israel by the Davidic dynasty is

⁴ The expression is borrowed from Doron Mendels, "Memory and Memories: The Attitude of 1–2 Maccabees toward Hellenization and Hellenism," in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (TSAJ 130), edited by Lee I. Levine and Daniel R. Schwartz (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009), 41–54.

⁵ We will review the arguments of these scholars in the next section.

⁶ See David Goodblatt, *Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-government in Antiquity* (TSAJ 38) (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994), who argues that high priests officiated the role of king from the Persian period. For historical accounts of high priests of Judea, see James C. Vanderkam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004), chapters 2–4.

⁷ On the other hand, Strabo, 16.4.20, attributes this innovation to Alexander Jannaeus rather than Aristobulus.

now *replaced* with the dynasty established by the Hasmoneans. Thus, to this group of scholars, the reticence of a Davidic messiah is viewed as a *replacement* in 1 Maccabees.

However, there seem to be problems with the claim for the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees. Firstly, a close reading of those references to the Hasmonean kingship in the works of Josephus reveals that those late Hasmoneans who first used the sovereign title are depicted rather negatively. Both accounts of Aristobulus in *Antiquity* (13:300–319) and *Jewish War* (1:69–84)⁸ unfold the tragedy of desiring the throne between him and his beloved brother Antigonus, leading to bloodshed in the family. While Josephus does not explicitly make Aristobulus' use of the title as the cause of the tragedy, the flow of the narrative makes this clear: 1) He begins the tragic story with an introductory remark that reads, '...the story of their downfall is worth relating, to show how far they were from having their father's [John Hyrcanus] good fortune...' (*Ant.* 13:300; *War* 1:69). 2) It is then followed by the innovation of Aristobulus by turning his government into a kingdom and having a diadem (*Ant.* 13:301; *War* 1:70). 3) The narrative then unfolds the tragic incident with Antigonus (*Ant.* 13:302f; *War* 1:71f). The adoption of the sovereign title led to the downfall of the Hasmonean dynasty. Secondly, albeit generally pro-Hasmonean, 1 Maccabees is not entirely interested in the Hasmonean dynasty. In fact, not all Hasmoneans are described positively. For instance, it is Jonathan who first became the high priest rather than Simon, and the author should stress the high priesthood of Jonathan as the first Hasmonean who was called the leader and high priest; but he does not. The narrative rather heavily focuses on Judas and Simon for their heroic deeds, as evident from their eulogies, and Jonathan's eulogy is missing in 1 Maccabees. It does not seem coincidental that Mattathias has no mention about Jonathan but only Simon and Judas in his deathbed blessing (2:65–68).⁹ I do not claim that Jonathan is depicted purely negatively, but that not all Hasmoneans receive the equal focus in the narrative. If we observe other Hasmonean brothers, John the Hasmonean is mentioned only once and appears only to be killed (9:36) and Eleazar the Hasmonean, also appearing once, is depicted rather negatively, '...he gave himself up to save his people and to secure for himself an everlasting name' (περιποιήσαι ἑαυτῷ ὄνομα

⁸ I follow the versing system of Ralph Marcus, *Josephus: Vol. 2, The Jewish War, Books I–III* (LCL) (Reprinted) (London: William Heinemann, 1956); *ibid, Josephus: Vol. 7, Jewish Antiquities, Books XII–XIV* (LCL) (Reprinted) (London: William Heinemann, 1957).

⁹ For the same observation, see John R. Bartlett, *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (CBC) (Cambridge: CUP, 1973), 181.

αἰώνιον’, 6:44).¹⁰ Some Hasmoneans are not worthy of praise. One can even suggest from this that 1 Maccabees demonstrates the question of legitimacy *within* the Hasmonean family; i.e. who, of the five brothers, is the legitimate line for rulership and high priesthood? Thirdly, the role of the Gentiles in the success of the Hasmonean revolt is quite remarkable. The Romans are highly admired in the narrative. They have authority to protect the Judeans from the surrounding enemies (8:23), and even approve of Simon’s rulership and high priesthood (14:25–49) – a gentile sanction rather than a divine sanction.¹¹ And lastly, there has even been an argument that the Hasmoneans are not the only protagonists in the narrative.¹² Therefore, the claim that

¹⁰ NETS is used here and in other places for the English translation of 1 Maccabees, unless indicated otherwise. My reading of 1 Macc 6:44 can be controversial since the sentence is compounded of both positive (to save his people) and negative (to make name for himself) motives. Roger Tomes, “Heroism in 1 and 2 Maccabees,” *Biblical Interpretation* 15 (2007), 171–99, especially 184–85, calls this type of presentation as ‘balancing of the desire’ and suggests its similarity with Homeric heroes. However, making one’s name great is a recurrent motive in 1 Maccabees and has a negative connotation. Striking examples include Antiochus Epiphanes ‘making name for himself’ by having a war with Judas (‘Ποιήσω ἐμαυτῷ ὄνομα’, 3:14) and Joseph and Azariah ‘making name for themselves’ by engaging in battle with Gorgias (‘Ποιήσωμεν καὶ αὐτοὶ ἑαυτοῖς ὄνομα’, 5:57). On the contrary, the names of Judas and Simon were made great not by their own will but by people on the grounds of their piety to fight for their law, covenant and the people (5:63; 14:10; note that we have no reference to Jonathan in this regard). Josephus, in *Jewish War*, makes the negative tone of the verse clearer by saying:

‘Eleazar... concluding that it bore Antiochus, rushed out far beyond his own lines and, cutting through the enemy’s ranks, made his way to the elephant. Being unable to reach the supposed monarch because of his height from the ground, he struck the beast below the belly, brought its whole weight down upon himself, and was crushed to death; having achieved nothing more than to attempt great things, holding life cheaper than renown. The elephant-rider was, in fact, a commoner; yet, even had he happened to be Antiochus, his daring assailant would have gained but the reputation of courting death in the bare expectation of a brilliant exploit’ (*War*. 1:42–4).

For the text of 1 Maccabees that Josephus used, I follow Louis H. Feldman, “Josephus’ Portrayal of the Hasmoneans Compared with 1 Maccabees,” in *Josephus and the History of the Greco-Roman Period: Essays in Memory of Morton Smith* (Studia Post-Biblica 41), edited by Fausto Parente and Joseph Sievers (Leiden: Brill, 1994), 41n3, that it seems more plausible that Josephus used the Greek version rather than the Hebrew one of 1 Maccabees. See Feldman’s observation on how the author prefers the Greek version.

¹¹ This is not to overlook the fact that the sanction of Simon as the ruler and high priest of Judeans was primarily approved by Judeans – a way of democracy (see our discussion on the honorary decree for Simon).

¹² Robert H. Pfeiffer, *History of New Testament Times: With an Introduction to the Apocrypha* (London: Adam and Charles Black, 1949), 493. Interestingly, according to Pfeiffer’s reading of 1 Macc 5:62, the verse that is often considered to be cardinal for legitimacy of the Hasmonean dynasty, the Hasmoneans are, like the Judges who defeated the enemies of Israel, ‘mere tools in God’s hand for the deliverance of Israel.’ Instead, Pfeiffer regards the author’s description of the ‘people’ in the book significant in a way that they took part in important decisions (3:43f; 4:59; 5:16; 7:48f; 14:28). Although Pfeiffer downplays the conspicuously pro-Hasmonean language in the book, nor does he explain the complex issue of who the ‘people’ (λαός) are in 1 Maccabees, his insight is refreshing that the author’s focus could be not entirely on legitimacy of the Hasmonean dynasty. Likewise, Seth Schwartz, “Israel and the Nations Roundabout: I

the Hasmoneans are legitimate kings in 1 Maccabees requires a critical assessment, even if the belief about the Davidic dynasty is silent and contrary to the author's pro-Hasmonean perspective.¹³

The thesis of this paper is that in 1 Maccabees, the Hasmoneans are not depicted as kings nor intended to be legitimate for kingship, because of their consciousness of the belief about the Davidic dynasty. Throughout the paper, we will examine how the two quasi-contradictory themes of the heroic story of the Hasmoneans and the belief about the Davidic dynasty coexist in the narrative. Even taking the author's pro-Hasmonean perspective for granted, we will demonstrate that the Hasmoneans in 1 Maccabees are conscious of their tradition concerning the Davidic dynasty. Before constructing our discussion, let us review the scholarship on the issue of the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees.

Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 42 (1991), 16–38, argues that the main motive of 1 Maccabees is to reconcile those Hellenising priests in Judea with the Hasmoneans during the reign of John Hyrcanus I, reflecting an early dating of the composition of the book to 130 B.C.E. (Schwartz, "Roundabout," 33–8).

¹³ The notion of priestly leadership in the Hellenistic period should not be ignored and I do not claim to deny this in the Hasmonean period. True, our author of 1 Maccabees might not have needed to expect the Davidic dynasty to be restituted in his time. However, when it comes to the legitimation of the Hasmoneans, what kind of legitimation should we expect – permanent or temporary? It tends to be ignored in scholarship that the legitimacy of the Hasmonean dynasty can *either* be permanent *or* temporary/conditional.

1.2. SCHOLARSHIP ON THE HASMONEANS AND KINGSHIP

We have briefly glimpsed that the proponents of the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees find their evidence both inside and outside 1 Maccabees. We have also noted that their view is not without problems. In this section, we will review the scholarship of both sides – proponents and opponents of the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees – by presenting their arguments in more detail. In doing so, our aim is to frame those passages in 1 Maccabees that may be subject to controversy, for constructing our main discussion on 1 Maccabees with regard to the Hasmonean kingship. Let us begin with the proponents of the view.

Jonathan A. Goldstein offered the argument for kingship of the Hasmoneans, with a particular emphasis on a replacement of the Davidic dynasty. In his article on the relationship between Jewish messianic expectations and the Hasmonean dynasty, a short essay that mostly recapitulates his main arguments from his previous work, he says, ‘1 Maccabees is a history written to demonstrate the right of the Hasmonean dynasty’ as both high priests and princes for the Jews.¹⁴ The key point in his argument is that the author intends to demonstrate *fulfilment* of biblical prophecies in the Hasmonean story. It is conspicuous that the scriptural language frequently appears in 1 Maccabees. In multiple references, the author describes the course of the Maccabean revolt – the crisis in Judea under Antiochus Epiphanes, the revolutionary acts of the Hasmoneans, and their victories – in a way that reminds his readers of the stories of pious kings of Israel in the Hebrew Bible. What is more, numerous prophecies concerning Israel’s restoration in Prophets such as Isaiah and Zechariah are almost *realised* by the Hasmoneans’ deeds (see the Preliminary Remarks). Now, it is a conundrum to interpret such language because the author only writes similarly rather than actually referring to them. This unusual way of writing is, for Goldstein, the author’s intention of *indirectly* propagating legitimate kingship of the Hasmoneans. According to his dating of 1 Maccabees, the author who is a Hasmonean propagandist defended the kingship of Alexander Jannaeus from the internal opposition to him. But he had to avoid the danger of wrongly associating him with the promised figure, in the

¹⁴ Jonathan A. Goldstein, “How the Authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees Treated the ‘Messianic Promises,’” in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, edited by Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, and Ernest Frerichs (Cambridge: CUP, 1987), 69–96; *ibid*, *1 Maccabees* (The Anchor Bible) (Garden City, NY: Doubleday & Company, 1976).

Prophets, who is supposed to be in the line of David. Instead, by presenting the deeds of the Hasmoneans in the style of the language for the promised Davidic messiah, he is propagating the legitimacy of the Hasmoneans' kingship, i.e. 'the Hasmoneans did what the promised messiah was going to do.' Goldstein says,

'[the author] did not wish to give up completely the possibility of leading his readers to believe that Mattathias' sons fulfilled the words of the prophets. Without echoing the words of the prophecies, he could tell of the deeds of his heroes that looked as if they were fulfilments and he could then leave it to Jewish Bible-readers to infer the point.'¹⁵

On the reference to the Davidic dynasty in 1 Maccabees, Goldstein limits the quality and duration of the Davidic dynasty. So when it comes to 1 Maccabees 2:57, he interprets David's kingship as to last *temporarily* rather than permanently. Likewise, in 1 Maccabees 5:62, he reads the verse as an echo of 2 Samuel 3:18 and regards it as a decisive reference to a replacement of the Davidic dynasty with the Hasmoneans. We will discuss his arguments on these two verses in the next section.

Tessa Rajak also wrote an article in which she attempts to construct a tradition of legitimising the Hasmoneans as kings. She sets out two principles in the beginning of her discussion: 1) the authority of Israel's kingship is limited in the Hebrew Bible; subordinate to the law and temporal/conditional rather than permanent; 2) High priests were political as well as religious leaders when kings were absent.¹⁶ She draws a particular attention to Deuteronomy 17:14, 1 Samuel 8:5, and Ben Sira 47:6; 50:1–21, which, she believes, provide a thread of evidence for her argument. In Deuteronomy 17, we find Israel's kingship to be a concession from God (1 Sam 8:5), subordinate to the authority of the law and the priests who officiate it. Thus, she can say, 'the function of God's endorsement [of a king in Israel] was not to elevate the king but to cut him down to size'.¹⁷ Ben Sira provides a view that the Davidic dynasty was accredited on the grounds of his military achievements, and was not meant to be permanent (Sir 47:1–11). Most of the descendant kings of David abandoned the law (Sir 49:4) and were labelled as sinners and lost their power.¹⁸ Instead of the 'failed' Davidic kingship, there emerged a 'priestly ruler' in the place of the traditional kingship – Simon the son of Onias in Ben

¹⁵ Goldstein, "Messianic Promises," 80.

¹⁶ Tessa Rajak, "Hasmonean Kingship and the Invention of Tradition", in *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*, edited by Tessa Rajak (Boston, Mass.; Leiden: Brill, 2001), 39-60 (this article was first produced in 1996).

¹⁷ Rajak, "Hasmonean Kinship", 39.

¹⁸ Rajak finds in 4QMMT 23–6 a correspondence for her analogy of the subordinate kingship to the law.

Sira 50. When it comes to 1 Maccabees, Rajak presents the Hasmoneans who, coming from a priestly family, achieved military successes for their nation, and became high priests, and had roles that kings used to possess. They were recognised by the foreign kings so that they received not only honorary titles but also gifts of a gold clasp and a purple robe (in the honorary decree for Simon, 1 Macc 14:25–49).¹⁹ These evidences convince Rajak that there was a ‘tradition’ in which Israel’s royal throne could move from the Davidic descendants to the Hasmoneans.

Recently, Arie van der Kooij has offered the same line of argument for the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees.²⁰ He finds his evidence from the honorary decree for Simon and the rest of 1 Maccabees,²¹ with supporting evidence from the Greek version of Ben Sira and LXX Ezekiel. The honorary decree, for him, demonstrates legitimisation of the Hasmonean kingship by the ‘national assembly’ as a result of their glorious deeds to fight for their people and gain the national freedom from the Gentiles. This legitimising perspective is proved from the rest of 1 Maccabees, specifically the reference to the Davidic dynasty in Mattathias’ deathbed blessing,²² in a way of presenting a ‘monarchic paradigm.’²³ For his supporting evidences from outside 1 Maccabees, he argues that the so-called ancestral passages in Ben Sira (the Greek version which he dates to the reign of John Hyrcanus I) elevates the high priest rather than the king as the ruler of people. Likewise, a passage in LXX Ezekiel (also dated contemporary to John Hyrcanus I) alludes to a replacement of the Davidic leadership with that of the Hasmoneans (21:25–27).

It is generally agreed among the proponents of the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees that there was already readiness to replace kingship with high priesthood around the Hasmonean era. This is understandable given that there were no kings but

¹⁹ Rajak does not explain how the gifts of a gold clasp and a purple robe, symbols of the high priest, confirm the kingship of Simon. For giving gifts in ancient benefactions, see Paul Veyne, *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism* (Translated by Brian Pearce) (London: Penguin Press, 1990), 107–8, 122–4, 127–9.

²⁰ Arie van der Kooij, “The Claim of Maccabean Leadership and the Use of Scripture,” in *Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees to Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals* (JSJ Supp. 155), edited by Benedikt Eckhardt (Leiden: Brill, 2011), 29–49.

²¹ The separation of the decree in chapter 14 from the rest of 1 Maccabees reflects his view on the originally shorter version of 1 Maccabees which did not contain the decree passage.

²² This is in line with the arguments of Pomykala and Goldstein, although Goldstein differs in interpretation of the verse (2:57). See below our discussion on the verse.

²³ Van der Kooij, “Claim,” 49. This is contrary to Goldstein. See our discussion on 2:57.

high priests who officiated in political as well as in religious matters. What is questionable, however, is whether the currently available priestly rulership was considered as permanent, without a need of kingship in the future. When it comes to 1 Maccabees, these proponents aforementioned claim that the answer is 'yes,' since the pro-Hasmonean work propagates the legitimacy of the Hasmonean dynasty as a replaced dynasty. However, we will now see that not all agree with this claim, but consider the claim to be rather far-fetched.

There are a good number of scholars who disagree with the view of the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees. The implication of their disagreement is that continuation of the Davidic dynasty was preserved in the Second Temple period. When it comes to 1 Maccabees, however, their claim is either not sufficiently made or hardly put forward. Nevertheless, they still offer a counter-reading of 1 Maccabees with valuable insights in regard to the issue of kingship.²⁴

John J. Collins raised an objection to Goldstein in the same volume where Goldstein argued that the author of 1 Maccabees describes the Hasmonean dynasty as replacing the Davidic dynasty.²⁵ Recognizing the reticence about the Davidic descendant as God's agent for Israel's salvation in the Second Temple period, he nevertheless claims that the reticence does not mean a replacement.²⁶ In his reading of 1 Maccabees, Collins questions whether the author sees the Hasmonean dynasty as a 'full-fledged replacement' for the Davidic dynasty.²⁷ He argues that, in contrast to Goldstein who sees the Davidic dynasty as lasting for a limited time, the covenant is said to last forever, not for a limited time. Likewise, he claims that 5:62 is not necessarily evidence of a replacement of the Davidic dynasty with that of the Hasmoneans. Moreover, restoration of the Davidic kingdom may have been assigned to the future, since in the meantime, the Hasmoneans could save the Jewish nation. Collins' merit is that he distinguishes between reticence and rejection: The reticence about the Davidic kingdom does not mean rejection of it.

²⁴ In addition to the scholars in the following, Doron Mendels, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism* (Anchor Bible Reference Library) (New York et al: Doubleday, 1992), 60, claims in the same line. Mendels offers an insight that the early Hasmoneans may have been sensitive about the matter of kingship as a result of the Judeans' wish to dissociate themselves from the Hellenistic kingship (with evidence from their coins missing any figurate images).

²⁵ Collins, "Messianism", 97-109.

²⁶ Collins, "Messianism", 100, 104, 106.

²⁷ Collins, "Messianism", 104.

The same view is offered by Gregg Gardner in his comparative study on Greek *euergetism* (benefaction) in the honorary decrees to Jewish leadership around the Hasmonean era.²⁸ On the honorary decree for Simon (1 Macc 14:25–49), he argues that the decree has many differences compared to Greek decrees and is instead remarkably characteristic of Jewish literature: 1) Crowns, one of common elements in Greek decrees,²⁹ are conspicuously missing in the decree to Simon. This may reflect the priestly monarchy of the Hasmoneans as the current Jewish leadership in an awareness of the absent kingship. 2) The title σωτήρ (of the people) is missing in this decree, which is again unusual compared to the Greek decrees. Gardner suggests that the title may have been avoided according to the 'Jewish messianic beliefs.'³⁰ 3) The language of 1 Maccabees 14:41, '...until a trustworthy prophet comes' is not found in other honorary decrees and may again be characteristic of the Jewish literature of that period, by which Gardner may imply the belief about the coming of a 'future prophet.'³¹ Overall, what he sees in the honorary decree is the benefaction of Simon on the grounds of his honorary deeds, but not to the degree of replacing the traditional beliefs about kingship.

Joseph Sievers, in his book on the supporters of the Hasmoneans, also comments on the honorary decree in a similar way.³² He observes that the 'people' in the decree (14:35) are the 'the *Ioudaioi* and the priests'³³ who were an opponent group to the Hasmoneans, and the decree shows the compromise drawn between the group and Simon. The phrase, 'until a trustworthy prophet comes,' indicates the limitation of Simon's rule that it could even end during his lifetime if the prophet comes and appoints a king or/and a high priest.³⁴ In addition, Sievers also observes, as does Gardner, that the kingly title is omitted in the decree and this too reflects the compromise between the

²⁸ Gregg Gardner, "Jewish Leadership and Hellenistic Civic Benefaction in the Second Century B.C.E.," *Journal of Biblical Literature* no.2 (2007), 327–43.

²⁹ Gardner, "Jewish Leadership," 328; Veyne, *Bread*, 107–8, 122–24, 127–29.

³⁰ Gardner, "Jewish Leadership," 336. He does not explain his rendering of the term 'messianic beliefs,' but the point is clear that the author does not lose the subtlety of distinguishing the Hasmoneans from the promised messiah of Israel.

³¹ He does not specify which literature he has in mind. But, we will list the literature that reflects the belief about the coming prophet later in our discussion on the Trustworthy Prophet.

³² Joseph Sievers, *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters: From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism, no. 06) (Atlanta, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1990).

³³ Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 122–24, 126–27.

³⁴ Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 127, sees the prophet as a generic one rather than a future prophet.

two parties in order for Simon to receive the powers of being leader and high priest of the nation.

From the review of the scholarship, we can observe that the claim for the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees is not warranted. There is controversy surrounding the following passages in 1 Maccabees: 1) The reference to the Davidic dynasty in 2:57, 2) the quasi-replacement of the Davidic dynasty in 5:62, 3) the honorary decree for Simon in 14:25–49, and 4) a coming trustworthy prophet in 14:41. The first and fourth ones are stumbling blocks to the proponents of the Hasmonean kingship since these verses appear to be contrary to their claim. The second and third ones are some of the favourite passages to them because of their legitimising expressions. However, the quasi-replacement of the Davidic dynasty in 5:62 needs a reassessment of its interpretation because, as we will see, it is rather difficult to assume such a replacement. Likewise, while the nature of the honorary decree is clearly legitimising in some way, the details of the contents in the decree demand us to examine the decree more closely. Accordingly, our main discussion will focus on each of these four controversial passages in 1 Maccabees, aiming to understand what the author's view is on the Hasmonean kingship. But before that, we should now briefly take into account the pro-Hasmonean language in 1 Maccabees and how it contributes to the issue of the Hasmonean kingship in the book.

1.3. PRELIMINARY REMARKS: PRO-HASMONEAN LANGUAGE IN 1 MACCABEES

For the focus of our main task, it is necessary to set out the apparent and core characteristics that convey the pro-Hasmonean voice in 1 Maccabees. However, in doing so, we shall notice that there is consistent subtlety in those characteristics having an unambiguous voice towards the Hasmoneans, so the language falls short of explicit legitimisation of their kingship.³⁵

Let us start with the eulogies to Judas and Simon (3:1–9 and 14:4–15 respectively) that vividly evoke biblical images. These eulogies are pivotal in portraying the Hasmoneans, especially Judas and Simon, by whose hands religious and political restorations prospered in Judea. For instance, Judas is praised for his warrior-like image such as bearing of a lion's image (3:4), judging the ungodly (3:5), embittering kings (3:7), and gathering the dispersed (3:9). The eulogy of Simon further adds other descriptions such as prosperity in the land (14:8), peace in the street and in the land (14:9, 11–12), and further improvement of the Jerusalem temple (14:15). And most of these are written in a language that strongly resembles that of the Hebrew Bible – particularly the Prophets in the case of the eulogies.³⁶ As claims Goldstein,³⁷ the language gives an impression that biblical prophecies concerning restoration of Israel are now fulfilled by the Hasmoneans. Noticeable is the difference of focus in the two eulogies. While Judas is praised mostly for his warrior-like image and his military succession, Simon is praised mostly for his quality of peacemaking in the nation.³⁸ It is certainly not coincidental that in his deathbed blessing, Mattathias only mentions Judas and Simon and envisages what roles these two men would have in fighting for their nation.³⁹

However, interpretation of the author's use of the scriptural language is subject to controversy. It is conspicuous that 1 Maccabees contains this scriptural language

³⁵ I omit the most crucial among those elements here in order to separate them from the rest and bring them up in our main discussion. Those crucial elements include 1 Macc 5:62 and 14:25–49.

³⁶ For example, 1 Macc 14:12 is corresponded by Zech 3:10, 'In that day... every one of you will invite his neighbour to come under his vine and under his fig tree'; 1 Macc 14:8 by Zech 8:12, '...The vine shall give its fruit, and the ground shall give its produce, and the heavens shall give their dew...'

³⁷ See the section on the scholarship.

³⁸ Phrases such as '...farming their land in peace' (14:8), 'elders sitting in the city square' (14:9), and 'making peace in the land' (14:11) suggest Simon's excellence in establishing peace in the nation.

³⁹ 'And look, Simon your brother, I know that he is *a man of counsel*. Hear him all the days. He shall be as a father to you. And Judas Maccabeus has been *strong in power* since his youth. He shall be commander of the army and shall fight the war of the peoples. And you shall draw to you all those who observe the law and execute vengeance for your people...' (1 Macc 2:65–68; my italics).

throughout, and the eulogies are only one example. While it is tempting to consider this scriptural language as fulfilment of the prophecies, the matter of interpretation cannot be simplified. For instance, while scholars such as Goldstein saw the language as a sign of fulfilment of prophecies,⁴⁰ others have noted that the language is not so explicit as to express fulfilment; it is rather blended into the narrative and became almost stylistic or imitative.⁴¹ The problem with seeing the language as fulfilment is that if it were fulfilment, the author would directly quote it rather than writing it in a biblical style. In fact, very occasionally, the author does quote directly from the Scripture (7:16–17 which reads ‘...according to the word which was written...’ and quote from Ps 79:2–3). Hence, it is more plausible to assume that the author carefully differentiates his multiple motives behind using the Scripture, and most of the occurrences of such language should not be viewed as fulfilment of prophecies.

In addition to the eulogies and the scriptural language, there are also phrases and sentences within the narrative that may suggest the author’s intention of describing the Hasmoneans as a legitimate dynasty. 1) For three times, we have a statement that reads ‘I and my brothers and my house... fought for Israel...’ (13:3 and 16:2 are mentioned by Simon, and 14:26 by the Romans). This is a remarkable insertion from the author that he describes the family of the Hasmoneans as fighting heroically and successfully for Israel (with variations of ‘Israel’ with ‘the law,’ ‘the covenant,’ and ‘the people’). 2) As suggests Jan Willem van Henten, the author depicts a strong bond in father-son relationship of the Hasmoneans.⁴² For instance, the strong relationship between Mattathias and his sons is expressed in the deathbed blessing (2:49–70); and in a similar way, Simon prepares his two elder sons to succeed him by telling them about the fight that he and his family have done for the sake of Israel (16:1–3). 3) We also have annals of Judas and John Hyrcanus that resemble those of kings in the Hebrew Bible. For instance, 1

⁴⁰ Goldstein, “Messianic Promises,” 69–96.

⁴¹ For instance, see Uriel Rappaport, “The Use of the Bible in 1 Maccabees,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use & Interpretation of the Bible In Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center, 12 – 14 May 1996), edited by Michael E. Stone, Esther G. Chazon (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 175–79; Daniel R. Schwartz, “On Something Biblical about 2 Maccabees,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use & Interpretation of the Bible In Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls* (Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center, 12 – 14 May 1996), edited by Michael E. Stone, Esther G. Chazon (Leiden: Brill, 1998), 223–32.

⁴² Jan Willem Van Henten, “Royal Ideology: 1 and 2 Maccabees and Egypt,” in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Hellenistic Culture and Society, L), edited by Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James Aitken, and Jennifer Dines (Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2007), 265–82, especially 270–1.

Maccabees ends with a statement as follows, ‘and the rest of the stories about John and his wars and his heroic deeds which he did and the building of the walls which he built and his actions, look, these have been written in the book of days of his high priesthood from the time when he became high priest after his father’ (1 Macc 16:23–24). Scholars have noted that this statement echoes similar statements that appear in the chronicles of the kings, e.g. 2 Kings 20:20.⁴³

Here too, the phrases and sentences do not necessarily prove legitimation of the Hasmonean kingship. The positive depiction of the wars that the Hasmoneans fought and the expression of the strong bond between father and son cannot substantiate the view of the Hasmonean kingship; they can only be *additional*. If the view of the Hasmonean kingship is correct, these phrases can additionally support the view. If not, they are not significant points for the main argument. The same is the case of the annals of the Hasmoneans. We cannot by any means ignore that the annals of kings are recurrent in the Hebrew Bible, and it is possible that our author may have intended to impose the idea of legitimate kingship by describing the Hasmoneans in this way. However, the activity of recording and preserving annals is not limited to kings. With use of *λόγων* (translated as ‘annal’), annals of prophets such as Samuel and Nathan were evidently recorded and preserved too.⁴⁴ During the Hasmonean period, one can certainly expect this activity to have been carried out for preserving the story of the heroic family who were the priestly dynasty of the nation. Thus, the annals do not need to symbolise kings only.

Therefore, we need to specifically examine those four passages derived from our review of the scholarship, rather than replying on the aspect of the pro-Hasmonean language. This preliminary discussion on 1 Maccabees illustrates a point that will repeatedly be made in the main discussion: when we closely examine the view of the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees, our analysis shows that the quasi-evidence of this view is not substantial; they do not necessarily support it. With this point in mind, let us now turn to our main discussion on 1 Maccabees.

⁴³ Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 526.

⁴⁴ 1 Chr 29:29 reads, ‘Now the rest of the histories of King David, the earlier and the later, are written in the Histories of Samouel the Seer and in the Histories of Nathan the Prophet and in the Histories of Gad the Seer’; also 2 Chr 9:29; 2 Chr 13:22.

2. DISCUSSIONS ON 1 MACCABEES

2.1. CONTINUATION OF THE DAVIDIC DYNASTY IN 2:57

We begin our discussion with a reference to the Davidic dynasty in 1 Maccabees. It is fitting that this section is the first out of four sections because in this verse, we have the most explicit evidence for the belief about the continuation of the Davidic dynasty. The interpretation of the verse is, however, rather controversial. The implication of different interpretations is that the verse is either an evidence of the author's belief in the Davidic dynasty or a counter-evidence of that belief.

2.1.1. Scriptural Tradition of 2:57 and Ben Sira

At the end of a rather short story of Mattathias, the author places his deathbed blessing to his five sons, in which he encourages his sons to follow the pattern of pious figures of the Hebrew Bible such as Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, and Daniel. One of such examples is David. He says:

“David, by his mercy, inherited the throne of a kingdom forever.” (1 Macc 2:57)

“Δαυιδ ἐν τῷ ἐλέει αὐτοῦ ἐκληρονόμησεν θρόνον βασιλείας εἰς αἰῶνας.”

What does he mean by ‘inheriting the throne of a kingdom forever’? And why does the author have to mention this rather contradictory statement of Mattathias in such pro-Hasmonean writing, particularly if legitimacy of the Hasmoneans’ kingship is intended? But before discussing the verse, let us survey the Hebrew Bible and the literature produced in the Second Temple period with regard to this particular statement about David.

The key in the statement is the phrase, ‘inheriting the throne (θρόνος) of a kingdom (βασιλείας) forever.’ These two words – θρόνος (נֶסֶךְ in Hebrew) and βασιλείας (מַלְכוּת as its root form in Hebrew) – appear many times in the Septuagint⁴⁵ and, in several places, appear in combinations – a ‘throne of a kingdom’ or a ‘royal throne’ – like in our passage. The combined phrase is sometimes related to foreign kings,⁴⁶ YHWH’s heavenly

⁴⁵ The Greek words correspond to their Hebrew counterparts without any significant variations.

⁴⁶ Esth 1:2; 5:1; Jer 1:15; 43:10; Hag 2:22.

throne,⁴⁷ or kings in Israel, and it is in this third case that a ‘royal throne’ becomes particular. Except for one in Deuteronomy 17:18, which is related to an undetermined king of Israel, all other cases are related to the Davidic dynasty: David,⁴⁸ Solomon,⁴⁹ Joash,⁵⁰ undetermined sons of David,⁵¹ a prophesied Davidic descendant,⁵² a prophesied temple builder whose name is ‘the Branch’.⁵³ Thus, when the phrase of inheriting the throne of a kingdom is associated with David or his descendants, there appears a strong and consistent thread of an idea of the Davidic dynasty.

This recurrent concept of ‘the Davidic line – inheriting the royal throne,’ or ‘continuation of the Davidic dynasty’ is a result of a covenant that YHWH established with David. The covenant involves YHWH’s promise for David’s descendants to continue to rule in Israel, as most strongly expressed in 2 Samuel 7:12–16.⁵⁴

...I will raise up your offspring after you, who shall come from your body, and I will establish his kingdom. He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom forever... And your house and your kingdom shall be made sure forever before me. Your throne shall be established forever.⁵⁵

In consequence, the biblical tradition kept the promise. For example, one of the royal Psalms reaffirms the promise and says:

You have said, “I have made a covenant with my chosen one;
I have sworn to David my servant:
‘I will establish your offspring forever,
and build your throne for all generations.’⁵⁶

⁴⁷ Ps 45:6; 103:19.

⁴⁸ 2 Sam 3:10; 7:16.

⁴⁹ 2 Sam 7:13; 1 Kg 1:46; 2:12; 9:5a; 1 Chr 17:11–4; 22:10; 28:5; 2 Chr 7:18.

⁵⁰ 2 Chr 23:20.

⁵¹ 1 Kg 9:5b (Cf. 2 Chr 23:3, the expectation of continuation of the Davidic kingdom).

⁵² Isa 9:7.

⁵³ Zech 6:13; cf. 3:8; 4:12; see Isa 11:1; Jer 23:5; 33:15. David L. Petersen, *Haggai & Zechariah 1–8* (OT Library) (London: SCM Press, 1984), 276, notes that the title Branch is best understood as a future Davidic heir, and suggests Jer 33:15 as a paralleled passage. Also, John J. Collins, “The Eschatology of Zechariah,” in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships* (JSP Supp. 46), edited by Lester L. Grabbe, Robert D. Haak (London: T&T Clark, 2003), 74–84.

⁵⁴ As we have seen, Rajak claims that David’s throne of a kingdom was given on the grounds of his achievement, thus *conditional*. However, Chester, *Future Hope*, 176, notes that the passage is ‘the father-son adoption formula (and the setting out of the relationship between God and David), and it expresses the absolute and unconditional promise of an eternal dynasty to David.’

⁵⁵ ESV is used here and in other places for the Hebrew Bible unless indicated otherwise.

⁵⁶ Psalm 89:3–4.

The generations after David likewise continued to preserve this particular promise and it was reaffirmed. For instance, when the priest Jehoiada exhorts in the assembly of Israel to enthrone Joash, he says:

“Behold, the king’s son! Let him reign, as the Lord spoke concerning the sons of David.”⁵⁷

This does not mean all the passages in the Hebrew Bible attest to the belief about continuation of the Davidic dynasty. True, as Chester argues, we may not easily maximize the Davidic voice in all biblical passages where appearance of the Davidic messianic hope is demanded.⁵⁸ However, the recurrent phrase that associates the royal throne with David in the Hebrew Bible makes it sufficient to claim that our author in 1 Maccabees inserts the statement that is recurrent in the Bible and is strongly pro-Davidic. This insertion makes 1 Maccabees in line with the biblical tradition in affirming the continuation of the Davidic dynasty.

When it comes to the Second Temple period, as noted in the Introduction, the belief about the Davidic dynasty may be mentioned less, but is not completely silent. Among the exceptions,⁵⁹ we will particularly look at Ben Sira since it appears to testify to priestly rule as a political and religious leadership instead of kingship.

We have seen that Rajak and van der Kooij find evidences in Ben Sira for their arguments for the Hasmonean kingship. Where Ben Sira mentions the kingship of Israel, in chapters 47–49, the Davidic kingship is generally depicted as failed dynasty because of their disobedience to the law. This passage is then followed by praising the excellency of the high priest Simon the son of Onias in political and religious matters (chapter 50). However, to read these chapters as a story of a failed kingship which is then replaced by a praiseworthy high priest is rather simplistic. Let us consider the following references to David in Ben Sira.

But God *does not withdraw* his commitment,
Nor permit even one of his promises to fail—
He *does not uproot* the posterity of his chosen ones,
Nor destroy the offspring of his friends;
So he gave to Jacob a remnant,

⁵⁷ 2 Chr 23:3.

⁵⁸ For a full list of controversial passages with regard to a Davidic messiah, see Chester, *Messiah*, 205–30; *ibid*, *Future Hope*, 237–63.

⁵⁹ For the list of literature and their discussions, see footnotes 1–2.

to David a root from his own family.⁶⁰

This verse is placed in the middle of the story of Israel's kingship in chapter 47–49. And here, Ben Sira inserts a remark on the faithfulness of God. Notable and rather paradoxical is the insertion of the verse in the middle of, so to speak, the story of the failed kingship.⁶¹ So, after accusing Solomon of his sins (v18–21) and before continuing to criticise the subsequent kings (v23ff), he suddenly turns his voice to claiming God's mercy and faithfulness greater than the wrongdoings and weaknesses of human kings.⁶² The remarkably affirmative voice in our verse claims that God's promise for the continuation of the Davidic dynasty *will never fail*. This affirmation is emphasised by the repetitive use of negative verbs as italicised above. We cannot here examine the historical context that may have caused him to insert such claim. However, it is quite plausible that people struggled with the question of the Davidic dynasty in times of its absence, i.e. 'did it cease or is it only suspended?' By inserting such an ironic statement about faithfulness of God in keeping his promise, he implies that there will be a king, 'a root out of David,' who will restore Israel.

⁶⁰ Sir 47:22. Here and in other places, I follow the translation of P. W. Skehan and A. A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39) (New York: Doubleday, 1987) for the Hebrew version of Ben Sira.

⁶¹ However, not all kings in the Davidic line are called sinful by Ben Sira. 49:4 reads, 'Except for David and Hezekias and Iosias, all committed error, for they abandoned the law of the Most High...'

⁶² This is contradictory to Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 145–46. That this insertion is placed between Solomon and the subsequent Davidic kings means, says Pomykala, that although Solomon was sinful, God allowed the Davidic dynasty to continue after Solomon because of God's loyalty to David. The continuation of the Davidic dynasty, he says, then ended at the time of the Babylonian exile, as evident in Sir 49:4–5, '...and the kings of Judah abandoned the Torah of the most high, until they came to an end, for he gave their power to others, and their glory to a foolish foreign nation.' The implication of Pomykala's interpretation is that God's faithfulness, as vigorously expressed in the text, ends with the Babylonian exile; it does not last forever. However, this interpretation diminishes such energetic expression of God's *faithfulness* in the text. If Pomykala is correct, why does Ben Sira have to relate the continuation of the Davidic dynasty to God's character and express it so strongly? His argument does not explain the literary character of the verse.

The notion of a failed dynasty in Ben Sira's portrait of the Davidic dynasty can also be found in Rajak, "Hasmonean Kingship," 42–3; Benjamin G. Wright, "The Use and Interpretation of Biblical Tradition in Ben Sira's Praise of the Ancestors," in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18 – 20 May, 2006* (Supp. JSJ 127), edited by Géza G. Xeravits, József Zsengellér (Leiden: Brill, 2008), 205. However, what does 'coming to an end' mean? We can only be certain that this statement indicates the fall of the Judaic nation and the Babylonian exile. Does this have to be Ben Sira's political expression that the Davidic dynasty ended permanently and a priestly leadership replaced it (as in Sir 50)? From observing the two remarkable insertions about the Davidic covenant, such a political reading cannot be persuasive; only an assumption constructed by implicit clues. It is more plausible that although the concurrent priestly leadership may be the subject of praise, Ben Sira *preserves* the traditional notion of kingship.

Another passage, a few chapters earlier, provides the same line of thought. 45:25 reads:

...For even his covenant with David,
the son of Jesse of the tribe of Judah,
was an individual heritage through one son alone,
but the heritage of Aaron is for all his descendants.

Again, this passage is placed in between the deeds and covenants of Aaron/Phinehas and the deeds of Joshua; the Davidic covenant looks like a somewhat ironic insertion. Horbury rightly notes that 'its presence when the context did not demand it suggests the abiding importance of the Davidic tradition and hope even when the high priest is the supreme contemporary figure.'⁶³ Ben Sira's insertion of the Davidic covenant is to explain that the covenant of everlasting priesthood to Aaron (45:7f) is to pass on to his descendants only. The throne of a kingdom is, he stresses, to pass on to David's hereditary line. The last two lines should not be taken as if the Davidic dynasty is downplayed compared to the Aaronic priesthood. As Di Lella comments, Ben Sira seems to note difference of inheritance system between kingship and priesthood; the kingship is transmitted with direct succession whereas the priestly power is granted to all the male of the Aaronic line.⁶⁴ The Greek version of Ben Sira makes this point clearer.

...Also a covenant with David
son of Jesse from the tribe of Judah,
an inheritance of the king for *son from son only* (υἱοῦ ἐξ υἱοῦ μόνου);
Aaron's inheritance is also for his seed.⁶⁵

Thus, from these two ironically inserted references to the Davidic dynasty in Ben Sira, we can argue that the belief in the Davidic dynasty continued in the time of priestly rule.

It follows that the belief about the Davidic dynasty was well alive even when there were no kings but high priests with political and religious authority. This belief is expressed whenever the covenant of David is mentioned. In the same way, our verse in 1 Maccabees explicitly states the belief about the Davidic dynasty. Let us now come back and discuss the verse itself.

⁶³ Horbury, *Cult*, 57. He also observes that the description about David in 47:1–11 'ends with a reference to his royal covenant and his throne, once again emphasizing David's line, not just David's own achievement.'

⁶⁴ Skehan, *Wisdom*, 514.

⁶⁵ For the Greek version of Ben Sira, NETS was used here and in other places.

2.1.2. Interpretation of 2:57

As aforementioned, Goldstein views that the Davidic dynasty is replaced by that of the Hasmoneans.⁶⁶ When it comes to 2:57, he believes that this verse supports his view, saying:

[The author] took care at 1 Maccabees 2:57 to hint that God's election of David's dynasty might not be permanent...⁶⁷

...Our author, who writes to prove the legitimacy of the Hasmonean dynasty, would not wish to assert the eternal right of the dynasty of David to rule over the Chosen People. He appears to have selected his words carefully, and some Christian scribes found them strange enough to emend the text so that it would assert the eternal right of David's descendants.⁶⁸

With these assertions, he argues that the temporal marker εἰς αἰῶνας (a preposition + a plural noun) at the end of the verse should bear a sense of *temporariness* instead of a sense of *eternity* due to its plural construction, thus translating it as 'for ages' rather than 'forever' in order to differentiate the two different senses.⁶⁹ (Following Goldstein, we will call 'for ages' as temporary, and 'forever' as eternal in our discussion.) The singular αἰὼν (rendered from עולם) usually (but not always) means 'forever' (i.e. eternal) in the Septuagint, says Goldstein. Its plural form, on the other hand, appears relatively rare and it usually (again, not always) means 'lifetimes,' 'the remote past,' or 'the time since the Creation.'⁷⁰ His example is the authors' uses of the plural form in Kings and Chronicles when expressing Solomon's hope that YHWH would reside in the Jerusalem temple 'for ages.' When it comes to those passages concerning the Davidic covenant, he notes that the singular form of the word is used throughout. Likewise, he notes that the author of 1 Maccabees uses the singular and the plural with consciousness so that the reward of priesthood to Phinehas in a couple of verses earlier (v54) lasts for αἰὼν ('forever') while the reward of a royal throne to David in our passage lasts for αἰῶνας

⁶⁶ Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 240–41; *ibid.*, "Messianic Promises," 74–81. Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 152–59. Against this view, see Hornury, *Messianism*, 49; Laato, *Star*, 275–79.

⁶⁷ Goldstein, "Messianic Promises," 75.

⁶⁸ Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 240.

⁶⁹ The same line of argument in regard to εἰς αἰῶνας can be found in the new edition of Schürer. See Emil Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ, vol. 1–3*, a new English version edited and revised by Geza Vermes, Fergus Miller, and Martin Goodman (Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973–87), 2:500n6; Matthew Black, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins* (Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1961), 139n2. However, as Black himself acknowledges, the Hebrew word עולם can indeed mean 'everlasting' and 'eternal.'

⁷⁰ Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 240.

(‘for ages’). The fact that the majority of Christian scribes renders a singular form, an adjective form, and other forms of the word such as ‘εἰς αἰῶνα αἰῶνος’ (i.e. ‘forever and ever’) rather than the original plural form of the word proves his reading; ‘Christian scribes could hardly tolerate our author’s lack of faith in the eternity of the dynasty of David.’⁷¹

Pomykala and van der Kooij, the other proponents of the legitimacy of the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees, reject the reading of Goldstein because, for them, the verse does not determine whether the Davidic dynasty is replaced in 1 Maccabees.⁷² For instance, Mattathias’ mention of the Davidic covenant, together with the Phinehas’ covenant of everlasting priesthood, means that these biblical heroes are role models for the Hasmoneans to imitate. Like David and Phinehas, his sons will receive their rewards if they keep the law and live for it; and they did rule as ‘priest-kings.’⁷³ Instead of expressing its validity, the Davidic covenant in fact justifies the kingship of the Hasmoneans. Thus, they say, the issue concerning εἰς αἰῶνας is irrelevant to the interpretation of our verse, and the temporal marker could just mean ‘forever’ with a permanent sense.

However, their rejection of Goldstein’s view on the temporal marker εἰς αἰῶνας overlooks the significance of our verse. If our verse demonstrates the sense of ‘forever,’ then it is a stumbling block to the proponents of the Hasmonean kingship. As we have seen, in Ben Sira, the Davidic covenant is closely related to the character of the God of Israel – his faithfulness. The permanent quality of the Davidic covenant expresses the permanent quality of God’s faithfulness; God’s covenant cannot be replaced. Even within the world of 1 Maccabees, we see that people were still holding the Aaronic covenant of everlasting priesthood (1 Macc 7:14; cf. 2:54). That means, the matter of legitimacy concerning high priesthood or kingship is a delicate issue, and the concept of the Davidic covenant cannot be free from the question of its validity. Therefore, it seems that Goldstein is posing the right question between ‘forever’ and ‘for ages.’ In the following, I want to offer the opposite reading and suggest that the plural form ‘εἰς αἰῶνας’ in 1 Maccabees 2:57 should be read as meaning ‘forever,’ emphasizing a sense of eternity.

⁷¹ Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 241.

⁷² Pomykala, *Davidic Dynasty Tradition*, 154–55; van der Kooij, “Claim,” 44–7. Van der Kooij claims that Pomykala holds the same view with Goldstein (van Der Kooij, “Claim,” 44), but, in fact, Pomykala does not agree with Goldstein on interpretation of 2:57 and rather agrees with van der Kooij.

⁷³ Van der Kooij, “Claim,” 47.

To start with, 'εἰς αἰῶνας' in our passage is a combination of two words and there are variations of the combination in the Septuagint, mostly translated as 'forever' in English.⁷⁴ In the above passages regarding the belief about the Davidic dynasty, these combinations are multiply used. Consider some examples:

2 Sam 7:13 He shall build a house for my name, and I will establish the throne of his kingdom εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα.

1 Chr 22:10 He shall build a house for my name. He shall be my son, and I will be his father, and I will establish his royal throne in Israel ἕως αἰῶνος.

Ps 89:4 I will establish your offspring ἕως τοῦ αἰῶνος, and build your throne for all generations.

In these references, out of over 20 examples concerning the Davidic covenant, the infinite sense of time is stressed by using εἰς ὃ αἰῶν, ἕως αἰῶν, or ἕως ὃ αἰῶν, and there is no difference between them (all of the three examples correspond to עַד-עֶלְם in Hebrew). It is difficult to assume that some of them indicate that the throne will last only for a certain time.

Secondly, the purpose of using these temporal markers as above is to demonstrate the *thrust* that they create in the passages. Consider the following passage taken from the book of Isaiah:

Of the increase of his government and of peace
there will be *no end*,
on the throne of David and over his kingdom,
to establish it and to uphold it
with justice and with righteousness
from this time forth and *forevermore*.
The zeal of the Lord of hosts will do this.⁷⁵

In this reference, the promise of the Davidic government and peace *with no end* and of his justice and righteousness *forevermore* (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα χρόνον) are signified by these temporal markers so that the *zeal* of God of the hosts is rightly recognised. The same impression is expressed in the Davidic passages aforementioned. When David, his descendants, or the prophets received the promise of the eternal throne of a kingdom, it is a reward for David's merit and therefore he is as highly praised as receiving an *everlasting* kingdom. The same is the case in our passage which reads, '...by his mercy...'

⁷⁴ Their Hebrew counterparts are either עַד-עֶלְם, לְעֶלְם or other variations.

⁷⁵ Isa 9:7.

(ἐν τῷ ἐλέει αὐτοῦ). It is difficult to believe that David's achievement is praised and rewarded *only* in a temporary sense.

Thirdly, looking from the context to which 1 Maccabees 2:57 belongs, the content of Mattathias' blessing in 1 Maccabees 2:50–68 is that he encourages his sons to follow the pattern of their pious ancestors who gave up their lives for their covenant with God – Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Joshua, Caleb, David, Elijah, Daniel and his three friends. Here, αἰῶν is attributed three times: his sons may receive an everlasting name like their pious ancestors (an adjective αἰώνιον); Phinehas received a covenant of everlasting priesthood (an adjective αἰωνία); David received a royal throne forever (a noun with a preposition εἰς αἰωνα). In all these three temporal markers, the emphasis is on the rewards so great that his sons should be brave and courageous to fight for the law and the covenant, and receive their rewards. It is hard to conceive that Mattathias meant that the reward of David was temporary. If he did, it does not sound very encouraging to his sons and awkward to be a blessing.

Fourthly, even if the plural can sometimes mean temporary, unless the text provides additional information, e.g. 'until...', 'to the time of...', readers are not expected to detect such subtlety between singular and plural forms. Consider the following example from within 1 Maccabees:

'...the Judeans and the priests were pleased that Simon would be their leader and high priest forever (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα), *until* a faithful prophet would arise (my italic).'⁷⁶

The temporal marker is here attributed to the honour that Simon received and is written in a singular form so as to strengthen Goldstein's claim. The question is this: Which of the two – 1 Maccabees 2:57 or 14:41 – sounds more temporary and limited? It is clearly the latter due to the insertion of a conjunction 'until' (ἕως). However permanent and exaggerated the honour may be, the rule of Simon will end when a faithful prophet arises.⁷⁷ Only until then, Simon can rule in Judea as the ruler and high priest.

Lastly, it is too difficult to prove that the use of the plural form is intentional. It is true that the plural form is relatively less common than the singular form in 1 Maccabees and the Septuagint. However, in the book of Tobit, we find that the plural

⁷⁶ 1 Maccabees 14:41.

⁷⁷ Note that Goldstein interprets the prophet as Alexander Jannaeus. (For the discussion about the identity of the prophet, see the section on the Trustworthy Prophet.)

form of the temporal marker appears more frequently than its singular form whenever the author praises God. Then, the author must have known the plural form of the word as 'forever' with a sense of eternity. The same pattern can be observed from the Odes of Solomon.⁷⁸ The point is, unless there is any compelling reason to believe about the plural form of the temporal marker being intentional, we are only imagining that the author of 1 Maccabees could have used the plural form in order to allude to a failed dynasty. The imagination then becomes plausible only by constructing, in the first place, legitimacy of the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees; the interpretation is forced. In other words, the interpretation that the plural form of the temporal marker in our verse means temporary is an eisegesis rather than an exegesis.

2.1.3. Summary

The continuation of the Davidic dynasty is explicitly expressed in 2:57. The same expression concerning the Davidic covenant can be found in the Hebrew Bible and in Ben Sira. It is especially highlighted that the permanent sense of the covenant is clearly evoked in the verse, which may be explained by God's faithfulness to his promise. We can conclude, though provisionally, that the belief about the Davidic dynasty was well preserved when the Hasmonean dynasty resides concurrently as the ruler and high priest. By inserting the Davidic covenant in Mattathias' deathbed blessing, the author reminds his readers of the belief about a Davidic heir who would ultimately come to his throne in the future.

⁷⁸ The Odes have the plural form, εἰς αἰῶνας, outnumbering the singular ones. Although the identity of the author of the text – whether a Jew or a Christian – is disputed, the fact that it usually attributes the plural to YHWH rather than the singular contradicts to Goldstein's assertion about temporariness of the plural form and its recognition by Christian scribes.

2.2. 'SALVATION BY THE HAND OF THE HASMONEANS' IN 5:62

Now we turn to another crucial verse that affects our discussion on the Hasmonean kingship, particularly with regard to its replacement of the Davidic dynasty. As scholars generally note, a heavily pro-Hasmonean voice is conspicuous in this verse 5:62.⁷⁹ However, the question is whether this verse is evidence for a replacement of the Davidic dynasty with the Hasmoneans. We will first evaluate the interpretation that sees the replacement in the verse. Then, an alternative interpretation will be offered.

2.2.1. Counter-Evidence to the Davidic Dynasty?

Let us open our discussion by citing our verse:

But they [Joseph and Azariah] were not of the seed of those men to whom was given salvation to Israel by their hand.⁸⁰

αὐτοὶ δὲ οὐκ ἦσαν ἐκ τοῦ σπέρματος τῶν ἀνδρῶν ἐκείνων, οἷς ἐδόθη σωτηρία Ἰσραὴλ διὰ χειρὸς αὐτῶν.

Here is a brief summary of the context of the verse. When the three Hasmonean brothers – Judas, Jonathan, and Simon – set out for wars in Gilead and Galilee, Joseph and Azariah were appointed to lead and protect Judea, but not to engage in war (5:18–9). However, these two men wanted to ‘make their names great’ by imitating ‘the heroic acts and war’ of the Hasmoneans (5:56–7, 61). They engaged in war against Gorgias and his Syrian troops, but lost in the battle costing the lives of two thousand people. Then, we have our verse as a comment from the author: These two men, who wanted to imitate the Hasmoneans’ heroic deeds in order to gain their own fame, failed because they ‘did not belong to the Hasmoneans to whom were given salvation of Israel.’

⁷⁹ Goldstein, “Messianic Promises,” 80, 93–4n61–2; *ibid*, *1 Maccabees*, 305; Collins, “Messianism,” 103; Van der Kooij, “The Claim,” 46. Also, Rappaport, “Use of the Bible,” 176. Rappaport comments, ‘this phrase is very important in 1 Maccabees. It is the cornerstone of our understanding of the work as a “dynastic book” written by a “court writer,” an understanding about which, in general terms, there is a consensus among scholars.’ However, Rappaport does not indicate the subtle difference between being dynastic and being legitimate to be king. It may be true that this verse is cardinal in 1 Maccabees that salvation belonged to the Hasmoneans, but the narrative of 1 Maccabees is more complex than just being pro-Hasmonean (see the Introduction). In contrast to these scholars, J. C. Dancy, *1 Maccabees* (Oxford: Blackwell, 1954), 7, only talks about Joseph and Azariah’s disregard of Judas’ advice (adding v57 to support his point), without any note on the author’s legitimizing intention. In fact, he omits the verse in his Commentary section. Likewise, Bartlett, *The Maccabees*, 78, is rather reserved in claiming any significance for the verse.

⁸⁰ 1 Macc 5:62.

Goldstein, coming from his perspective of the Hasmonean kingship, reads the verse as an echo of 2 Samuel 3:18 and concludes that in this verse, ‘the author is at his most audacious in asserting for the Hasmoneans the prerogatives reserved for David’s line in earlier Jewish tradition.’⁸¹ His argument starts with the fact that the author habitually avoids mentioning ‘God’ directly.⁸² This avoidance makes our verse *passive*, ‘...to whom *was given* salvation to Israel by their hand,’ rather than ‘*God* saved Israel by their hand.’ If replaced with an active construction, our verse may correspond with 2 Samuel which reads, ‘...by the hand of David my servant, *I will* save my people Israel... (my italic).’ Goldstein argues that although an infinitive construct form, הוֹשִׁיעַ, is used in the Masoretic text, most scholars now accept that it is a mistake in writing for אֲוִשִׁיעַ, a first person Hiphil imperfect. What comes out from this analogy is that our author uses the wording of 2 Samuel 3:18 and legitimises the Hasmoneans’ replacement of the Davidic dynasty in bringing the promised salvation of Israel. Thus, by detecting and constructing the active voice (with God as subject), Goldstein reinforces the view that our verse is the crux of the author’s intention of legitimising the Hasmonean kingship, i.e. ‘they replaced the Davidic dynasty.’ In the following, I will present a different interpretation of our verse, and argue that our verse does not echo 2 Samuel 3:18 specifically, nor does it support the Hasmonean kingship. 2 Samuel 3:18 reads:

Now then bring it about, for the Lord has promised David, saying, ‘*By the hand* of my servant David *I will save* my people Israel from the hand of the Philistines, and from the hand of all their enemies.’

The claim made by Goldstein relies on the italicized phrases – ‘by the hand’ and ‘I will save (Israel).’ However, in Judges, we also find references similar to our verse. Consider the following:

Then Gideon said to God, ‘If *you will save* (בְּוִשִׁיעַ) Israel *by my hand*, as you have said, behold, I am laying a fleece of wool on the threshing floor. If there is dew on the fleece alone, and it is dry on all the ground, then I shall know that *you will save* Israel *by my hand*, as you have said.’ (Judges 6:36–7)

⁸¹ Goldstein, “Messianic Promises,” 80.

⁸² Rappaport, “The Use of the Bible,” 176; Goldstein, “Messianic Promises,” 80. However, concerning the author’s use of ‘salvation,’ note that Goldstein’s theory that the author habitually avoids using ‘God,’ thus changing verbal forms to noun forms, is not entirely convincing. In fact, the author seems to use a *noun* form of salvation ‘habitually.’ See, 3:6; 4:25, 56. Especially, 3:6 is striking because it says ‘salvation by the hand of Judas,’ using a noun form of salvation, and yet, Judas is the subject rather than God.

And he was very thirsty, and he called upon the Lord and said, 'You have granted this great *salvation* (הַתְּשׁוּבָה) by the hand of your servant, and shall I now die of thirst and fall into the hands of the uncircumcised?' (Judges 15:18)

Here, the phrase, 'saving (Israel) in the hand of...' in Judges is closer to our verse than 2 Samuel 3:18 is. In fact, that the second reference uses a noun is in agreement with our verse in 1 Maccabees. That means, despite the unusualness of the passive voice in our verse, the noun 'salvation' does not have to be a change from a verbal form. Instead, the active form of 'to whom was given salvation' would be 'to whom God *gave* or *granted* salvation,' as in Judges 15:18. However, this is not to argue that our verse echoes Judges rather than 2 Samuel simply on the grounds of detecting the active voice. We should not reply too much on detection, because, after all, neither Judges 15:18 nor 2 Samuel 3:18 perfectly matches our verse. All we have is the Greek version of the verse and a noun form of salvation. My contention is that if our author intended the verse to echo the Hebrew Bible, it should be the account in Judges rather than that of David. Notably, in Judges, God's saving act by the hand of Judges is, as many have noted,⁸³ the thrust of the book. Judges are heroic figures who are commanders as well as religious leaders in Israel *when there was no king*. In the following, we will consider the significance of Judges in 1 Maccabees and see how close their relationship is.

2.2.2. Hasmoneans – Judges

The first and main feature in common between the two books is the 'narrative pattern.' In 1 Maccabees, there are multiple incidents of *crisis* in Judea, both domestic and international. What this multiplicity means is that after one crisis is overcome (usually by the Hasmoneans' deeds but not always),⁸⁴ still another pops up, together leading to a *cycle*. In chapter 1, the author narrates the cause and the result of the calamity in Judea:

⁸³ Van Henten, "Royal Ideology," 272; also, Uriel Rappaport, "Use of the Bible," 177, whose focus is on differences between these two books, nevertheless assumes similarities between them. The major difference he notes is that in 1 Maccabees, the salvation of Israel by the hand of the Hasmoneans is a *post factum*, i.e. the text does not say it until they have actually done so, whereas in Judges, the salvation is designed *before* the events take place.

⁸⁴ It is appropriate to mention here the incident when Alcimus was struck miraculously (1 Macc 9:55–56). This is a very unusual and unique passage because it is the only occurrence of God's intervention in 1 Maccabees. In addition, the Romans sometimes intervene to protect the Judeans from their enemies (8:31–32).

In those days out of Israel came sons, transgressors of the law, and persuaded many, saying, "Let us go and make a covenant with the nations around us..."⁸⁵ ...[They] joined themselves to the nations and sold themselves to do evil.⁸⁶ ...[the chief tax collector of Antiochus Epiphanes] destroyed many people from Israel...⁸⁷ And there was a very great wrath upon Israel.⁸⁸

The rest of the narrative chapters 2–16 then repeat the cycle of salvation–crisis–salvation. To present but a few:

Crisis: A thousand Jews are killed on the Sabbath (2:38)

Salvation: Mattathias and his men defeats the enemy (2:47, '...and their mission was successful by their hand.')

Salvation: Judas rises as the leader after Mattathias dies (3:6, '...and salvation was successful by his hand.')

Crisis: Gorgias attacks Judas (4:1)

Salvation: Gorgias' army is crushed by Judas (4:25, '...And a great salvation came about in Israel on that day.')

Crisis: Surrounding Gentile nations are determined to destroy the Judeans and the diaspora (5:1–2, 'they were greatly angered and decided to annihilate the race of Jacob who were in their midst. And they began to kill among the people and to drive them out.')

Salvation: Judas and Simon save the diaspora and bring them back to Judea (chapter 5)

Crisis: Judas dies in battle (7:23, 'And there was a great affliction in Israel such as had not been since the day that a prophet was not seen among them.')

Salvation: Jonathan rises as the successor of Judas and defeats the enemy (9:49)

These two sets of references show a sequence of events: 1) The people of Judea abandon their religion by following the ways of the Greek. 2) And this kindles a great calamity starting in Jerusalem, then in Judea. 3) Then the Hasmoneans arise in Judea to save the people from their enemies (the main trigger being Mattathias' killing of the agent of the king and a fellow Judean in 2:15–26). 4) The rest of the narrative then reveals the repeated cycle of facing crisis and overcoming it by the hand of the Hasmoneans as presented above. This narrative pattern is characteristic in Judges, well expressed in these verses:

And they abandoned the Lord, the God of their fathers, who had brought them out of the land of Egypt. They went after other gods, from among the gods of the peoples who were around them, and bowed down to them. And they provoked the Lord to anger... So the anger of the Lord was kindled against Israel, and he gave them over to plunderers, who plundered them. And he sold them into the hand of their surrounding enemies, so that

⁸⁵ 1 Macc 1:11.

⁸⁶ 1 Macc 1:15.

⁸⁷ 1 Macc 1:30.

⁸⁸ 1 Macc 1:64.

they could no longer withstand their enemies... And they were in terrible distress. Then the Lord raised up judges, who saved them out of the hand of those who plundered them... Whenever the Lord raised up judges for them, the Lord was with the judge, and he saved them from the hand of their enemies all the days of the judge.⁸⁹

Here too, the motive of the calamity in Israel is the same as that of 1 Maccabees. Both are imbued with the Deuteronomistic perspective of keeping/abandoning the covenant of God. The calamity is then followed by God's compassionate act in raising Judges to save Israel. The story is then a repetition of facing crisis and receiving salvation by the hand of Judges.

Other features in common include the author's literary allusion to Judges. The first one is a concept of 'land becoming quiet.' After the Hasmoneans' acts of saving Judea, the text says the following:

7:50 And the land of Judah became quiet for a few days.

9:57 And Bacchides saw that Alcimus had died, and he returned to the king, and the land of Judah was quiet for two years.

14:4 And the land became quiet all the days of Simon...

The state in which 'the land became quiet' (ἡσυχασεν ἡ γῆ) indicates a time of peace.⁹⁰ The calamity and distress are now over. Likewise, in Judges, this same phrase is used whenever Israel experiences salvation by the Judges (3:11, 30; 5:31; 8:28; with its Hebrew equivalent being שקט הארץ). What this concept indicates in 1 Maccabees is that the land had peace when there was a Judge-like hero among them. And our author tells us that Judas, Jonathan, and Simon were those heroes to whom the salvation of Judea belonged; hence, our verse, 'those men to whom was given salvation of Israel...' (5:62).

The second literary allusion is the author's depiction of Jonathan as a judge. 9:73 reads, 'And the sword ceased from Israel, and Jonathan lived in Machmas and *began to judge the people* and removed the impious from Israel.' Some scholars relate this verse to Judges,⁹¹ and even some of the proponents of the Hasmonean kingship admit that in

⁸⁹ Judg 2:15–26.

⁹⁰ Interestingly, we have the same expression attributed to the Gentile kings (1:3; 11:38, 52) but in *opposite* contexts. Here the quiet states cause the kings to be uplifted in heart and cause troubles in Judea. This may be understood as the author's style of writing a contrasting image between the Gentile nations and the Judean nation.

⁹¹ Rappaport, "The Use of the Bible," 176; Jan Willem van Henten, "The Hasmonean Period," in *Redemption and Resistance*, edited by Markus Bockmuehl, James Carleton Paget (London: T&T Clark, 2007), 15–28, especially 21.

this verse the author painfully identifies Jonathan with Judges.⁹² While it is not only Judges but also kings or priests or others who can judge people,⁹³ the expression of ‘judging Israel’ is so heavily loaded on Judges that whoever (of our author’s intended readers) reads this verse will immediately identify Jonathan with Judges.⁹⁴

From this analogy, we can build up an idea that the author of 1 Maccabees intends to draw on the image of Judges to describe the heroic acts of the Hasmoneans. It is not enough to say that the Hasmoneans are not legitimised as kings but as judge-like heroes of Israel. But, it is sufficient to support the interpretation of our verse 5:62 as indicating Judge-like heroes rather than replacing the Davidic dynasty.

2.2.3. Hasmoneans – ‘Heroic Acts and War’

In addition to the interpretation of our verse in relation to Judges, there is another important element to be found within the passage (5:55–68) to which our verse belongs: It is the term, ‘heroic act and war’ (ἀνδραγαθία και πολεμος), that defines the Hasmoneans. This term appears in 5:56 and is a summative description of the three heroic Hasmoneans. Joseph and Azariah, the texts says, heard the ‘heroic acts and war’ that the Hasmoneans executed. So, by saying ‘let us make a name for ourselves also, and let us go to make war against the nations around us’ (5:57), the two men engaged in war with Gorgias and his army and caused distress in Judea. In other words, their envy of the *heroic acts and war* of the Hasmoneans was the cause of the incident in our passage. Moreover, it seems not coincidental that after a few verses the author reminds us of the phrase. Verse 61 reads, ‘and there was a great rout among the people, because they did not listen to Judas and his brothers, intending to *act heroically* (ἀνδραγαθήσαι).’ Although not identical, this clearly *reminds* us of the term aforementioned.

That the term *heroic act and war* characterizes the deeds of the Hasmoneans is substantiated when we consider the occurrence of the term in 1 Maccabees. The phrase

⁹² Goldstein, “Messianic Promises,” 78. Goldstein backs up his view on the Hasmonean kingship by commenting that the author nevertheless does not echo words of Prophets in regard to the coming of Judges such as Isa 1:26, ‘...I will set up your Judges as at the former time...’ However, does the author have to mention the scriptural language such as Isa 1:26? This is rather an argument from silence. Instead, this verse well locates the Hasmoneans in the paradigm of Judges.

⁹³ 1 Sam 4:18; 1 Kg 3:28; 2 Chr 19:8. In numerous places, God is also said to judge his people.

⁹⁴ Judg 3:10, 30; 4:4; 10:2, 3; 12:7, 8, 11, 13; 15:20; 16:31.

occurs five times in 1 Maccabees, and four of them are unmistakably attributed to the Hasmoneans.

5:56 Joseph the son of Zacharias and Azariah, commanders of the force, heard **τῶν ἀνδραγαθῶν καὶ τοῦ πολέμου** which they executed.

9:22 And the rest of the words of Judas and **τῶν πολέμων καὶ τῶν ἀνδραγαθῶν** which he did and of his greatness were not written down for they were very many.

10:15 And Alexander the king heard all the offers that Demetrius had sent to Jonathan, **τοὺς πολέμους καὶ τὰς ἀνδραγαθίας** and they recounted to him that he and his brothers had done and the troubles that they had had.

16:23 And the rest of the stories about John and **τῶν πολέμων αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀνδραγαθῶν αὐτοῦ** which he did and the building of the walls which he built and his actions,

This evenly distributed phrase roundly places the Hasmoneans in a distinctive position that no one can share; it is the Hasmonean family who saved the Jews. The most interesting one is the fourth, since we do not have much information about any heroic acts by John Hyrcanus in 1 Maccabees, except for one story in 16:4f. The point is, even though we do not know much about Hyrcanus, we can imagine his deeds being as heroic and praiseworthy as the three Hasmoneans by reading the term ἀνδραγαθία καὶ πολέμος.

While the term characterizes the Hasmoneans in this remarkable way, it is not only the Hasmoneans who possess the character. There is yet another reference to the term and it is attributed to the Romans:

...And they recounted to him **τοὺς πολέμους αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς ἀνδραγαθίας** which they were doing with the Galatians and that they prevailed over them and made them subject to tribute.⁹⁵

Here the term of *heroic act and war* is attributed to the Romans. We have seen that the term is a summative description of the Hasmoneans' deeds. Then, what would be the motive behind using the same term about both the powerful Romans and the Hasmoneans? I suggest that the term reflects the author's primary portrayal of the Hasmoneans in 1 Maccabees as heroic figures characteristic of the Greek heroes.⁹⁶ Like the Romans, the Hasmoneans were also heroic, brave enough to engage in war as the name Μακκαβαῖος, the 'Hammerer,' indicates (see the description about Judas

⁹⁵ 1 Macc 8:2.

⁹⁶ See the analogy of the Hasmoneans' heroic character with the Greek ones in Tomes, "Heroism," 171–99.

Maccabee in 2:66; cf. 2:4).⁹⁷ Also, the author constantly paints a positive portrait of the Romans, almost parenthetical to the Hasmoneans.

Coming back to our verse 5:62, the family (to whom was given salvation of Israel) is defined by the *heroic act and war*. Those two men sought to be worthy of the same term but failed. The main focus of our author in this verse seems to be a contradiction between two images – ‘those whose names are praised with *heroic acts and war*’ and ‘those who are not.’

2.2.4. Summary

In this section, we have seen that 5:62 does not necessarily support the view of the Hasmonean kingship in 1 Maccabees. In fact, a close reading shows that the verse seems to attest to rather different images of the Hasmoneans. Instead of legitimate kings, the ample evidence for the similarities between the Hasmoneans and biblical judges show that the Hasmoneans are judge-like figures. In addition, the verse characterizes the Hasmoneans with ‘heroic acts and war’; the character which the Romans share, while Joseph and Azariah do not. Therefore, our verse does not demonstrate a replacement of the Davidic dynasty, and the view of the Hasmonean kingship cannot be supported by this verse.

⁹⁷ I do not intend to make claims about the origin of the word *Maccabee*, which is controversial. For a brief summary about this issue, Pfeiffer, *History*, 461–63. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 231, suggests the word Maccabee as ‘hammerlike.’

2.3. THE HONORARY DECREE FOR SIMON IN 14:25–49

In this section, we will discuss the honorary decree in 1 Maccabees 14:25–49 where Simon’s authority as the high priest and leader of the Judeans is attested. This decree is located in the climax of the narrative of the Maccabean fighting and is therefore very important for our question on the legitimised kingship of the Hasmoneans.⁹⁸ The main question to be answered is this: does the decree tell us that the Hasmoneans, specifically Simon in this case, are legitimised as kings? We will see that certain elements in the decree suggest that Simon’s authority, though highly honourable, falls short of replacing the Davidic dynasty/Aaronic priesthood. I will first provide a brief summary of the decree, and then address certain elements that give a contrasting view of the Hasmonean kingship.

2.3.1. Overview of the Decree

In the third year of his rule in Judea, Simon renews the friendship with the Romans as his predecessors did (1 Macc 8:17, 12:1). After renewing the friendship and receiving ‘a large gold shield’ from Simon,⁹⁹ the Romans pay tribute of honours to Simon out of gratitude and in commemoration. As narrated by our author, the decree is over twenty verses long.¹⁰⁰ Since this legal document follows the author’s typical pro-Hasmonean

⁹⁸ Scholars have struggled to locate the decree in the right context. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 501, locates this decree in the Hebrew tradition with Nehemiah 9–10 as the evidence of influence. However, van Henten, with a detailed analysis on the form of the decree, relates the decree with Hellenistic Egyptian decrees and argues that 1 Maccabees follows the pattern of those Egyptian decrees which depict Egyptian kings in highly legitimizing way, Jan Willem van Henten, “The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee (1 Macc 14:25–49) in its Hellenistic Context,” in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, edited by John J. Collins and G. E. Sterling (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 116–45. Edgar Krentz then opposes this and claims that the decree is not only similar to those of Egypt but also Syria and Asia Minor, Edgar Krentz, “The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee,” in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, edited by John J. Collins and G. E. Sterling, (Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001), 146–53. More recently, Gregg Gardner related the decree to Greek *euergetism* where a city, in return of receiving gifts, honours a benefactor in a way that is similar to our passage, Gregg Gardner, “Jewish Leadership and Hellenistic Civic Benefaction in the Second Century B.C.E.,” *JBL* 126, 2 (2007), 327–43, especially 332–37. It should be underlined that all these claims, except for that of Gardner, are inclined to legitimation of the Hasmoneans as either kings or equivalent to kings. That means, they are less interested in finding differences between the decree and these compared documents. Gardner notes, though briefly, the differences between the decree and the Greek benefactions and suggests that the differences may be a result of Jewish ideology. We will discuss this in the present section.

⁹⁹ Gardner rightly notes this, Gardner, “Jewish Leadership,” 332–37.

¹⁰⁰ The author’s modification of the decree has been noted by scholars. With minor differences, there is a consensus in scholarship that the honorary decree in 1 Maccabees reflects the original decree. For

depiction – the eulogy of Simon – the impression of this official claim by the authority of the Romans is highly legitimising. Undoubtedly, its language is *institutionalizing*.

The decree starts with the date of issuing the decree (v27), its location (v27), and the assembly of people (v28). It then sets out preambles for the honours – the accomplishments of Simon in his brave and pious deeds to save his nation and secure the Jerusalem temple from desecration (v29–37). It continues with honours and titles that Simon received from Demetrius II (as the high priest and a friend of the king, v38) and ‘Judeans and priests’ (as the leader, high priest, and commander, v39–43).¹⁰¹ The decree then states that it is legally binding on the people and the priests that they must follow Simon as their leader and high priest (v44–45). The decree ends with both the assembly and Simon agreeing on the decree, writing it down on brass tablets, and placing one copy in a conspicuous place in the temple and giving another copy to Simon’s sons (v46–49).

2.3.2. The Decree as a *Compromise*

Our focus is on how this passage can testify to our discussion on the Hasmonean kingship. While this passage undoubtedly expresses the legitimacy of rulership and high priesthood of the Hasmoneans, scholars such as van der Kooij, Rajak, and van der Kooij¹⁰² believe that it also expresses the legitimacy of their kingship. I suggest that although the main point of the passage is that Simon and his family are honoured for their heroic deeds, the author carefully notes a *compromise* between the Hasmoneans and their opponents. This compromise precisely draws a line between the leadership/high priesthood of the Hasmoneans *for the time being* and the kingship/high priesthood of future persons *by a divine appointment*. In order to achieve this, the decree both omits and inserts necessary points for such a compromise. In the following, I will

instance, see Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 37–8, 501; Sievers, *The Hasmoneans*, 120–21; idem, “The Highpriesthood of Simon Maccabeus: An Analysis of 1 Macc 14:25–49,” *SBLSP* 20 (1981), 310–11; Erich S. Gruen, *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley, Calif.: California University Press, 1998), 22n89, 35; van Henten, “Honorary Decree,” 119–20; Krentz, “The Honorary Decree,” 151; Gardner, “Jewish Leadership,” 332n32; cf. Bartlett, *Maccabees*, 197 notes that the actual decree may be vv44–47 since verse 44 starts with a language that officially regularises the leadership of Simon and thus alters the high-priestly line of succession until the coming of a trustworthy prophet (14:41).

¹⁰¹ Gardner, however, sees verses 38–40 about Demetrius II as incorporation into an otherwise typical benefaction, Gardner, “Jewish Leadership,” 334.

¹⁰² See the section on the Scholarship.

first build up a case that the decree shows a compromise between opponents and supporters of the Hasmoneans. Then, we will see certain elements in the decree that are missing in order for the compromise to be reached.

In 1 Maccabees, our author carefully describes a complex situation regarding the people in Judea. Some were pro-Syrian and built a gymnasium and established Gentile worship in the Jerusalem temple. Later in the narrative, this group, or possibly another group, opposes the Hasmoneans during Jonathan's rule. This group was willing to recognise the Syrian king as their leader rather than Jonathan (11:21, 25). Another group of people are called *Asidaioi* (Ἀσιδαῖοι). We are not certain what exactly the author means by giving them such a title. But, it is probable that they were recognised as a group.¹⁰³ They appear to help the Hasmoneans in the early stage of the revolt (2:42) but later depart from them and join Alcimus (7:13–14). We cannot be sure about the motives behind the attitude of the *Asidaioi* to the Hasmoneans. But, we do know from the incident caused by Alcimus that they believed in the Aaronic priesthood. Then we have such collective terms as 'assembly' of people (συναγωγή) or just 'people' (λαός) who prepare for a battle, pray together, and make a decision (3:44, 4:59; 5:16, 7:48; 14:19, 28). We are not clear about who were involved and who were not.¹⁰⁴ It would be impossible for the anti-Hasmonean group to have joined in this gathering and agreed on the decisions made. What is more, even though the collective terms may have been used to indicate the unity of the people, it does not mean that all of them approved Jonathan's rulership and high priesthood which he received from Alexander Balas (10:20). Also, note that while the Hasmoneans were priests, they were not the only priests in Judea. According to 1 Maccabees, there were priests who are uncorrupted and devotees of the law (4:42) and priests who, being commanders of troops, acted shamefully (5:67). Other priests included those who, serving in the Jerusalem temple, offered sacrifices for the

¹⁰³ Schürer, *History*, 1:157; Victor Tcherikover, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, (Translated by S. Applebaum) (New York: Atheneum, 1959), 196–230; Martin Hengel, *Judaism and Hellenism*, vol. 1 (Translated by John Bowden) (Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974), 175–80; John Kampen, *The Hasideans and the Origin of Pharisaism: A Study in 1 and 2 Maccabees* (SBL Septuagint and Cognate Studies 24) (Atlanta; Georgia : Scholars Press, 1988), especially 65–150; Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 38–40.

¹⁰⁴ James C. Vanderkam, "People and High Priesthood in Early Maccabean Times," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (Biblical Judaic Studies 1), edited by William Henry Propp et al (Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990), 205–25, especially 214–29, suggests that λαός in 1 Maccabees often refers to a military group who supported the Hasmoneans.

Syrian king.¹⁰⁵ Lastly, it is indirectly evident throughout 1 Maccabees that there must have been ‘conformists’ who belonged to neither opponents nor supporters of the Hasmoneans but conformed to the environment that they faced. With this complexity, the assembly of people in the decree who *agreed* on the honours and titles given to Simon is not to be simplified.

Coming back to the honorary decree for Simon, we have again a reference to a gathering of people.¹⁰⁶ The uniqueness of the reference is that it expands the boundary of participants and includes virtually all parties and groups in Judea.¹⁰⁷ Verse 28 reads:

...in the great congregation of priests and of the people and rulers of the nation and of the elders of the country...

... ἐπὶ συναγωγῆς μεγάλης ἱερέων καὶ λαοῦ καὶ ἀρχόντων ἔθνους καὶ τῶν πρεσβυτέρων τῆς χώρας...

Borrowing Pfeiffer’s term, this verse vividly expresses that the authority of Simon is confirmed and approved in a *democratic* setting.¹⁰⁸ That means, this massive gathering of people, who consist of probably more than one group as we identified above, *agreed* that Simon acts as their ruler and high priest. This is not to overlook the fact that Simon succeeded Jonathan and became the ruler and high priest two years before the decree took place (13:7–9, 41), and the decree itself repeatedly makes this point clear (v35, 41, 44, 46). But on this particular occasion, a democratic atmosphere is reinforced by the great number of people who gathered themselves *at the beginning* of the decree (v28) and agreed on what is announced *at the end* of the decree (v46); they were actively participative in the decision made.¹⁰⁹

¹⁰⁵ Bartlett, *The Maccabees*, 101, notes that they were serving under Alcimus and loyal to Syria.

¹⁰⁶ Van Henten, “Royal Ideology,” 269–70, suggests a possibility that the gathering here indicates a festival held for the purpose of honouring their leader, an occasion that is often found in Egyptian honorary decrees.

¹⁰⁷ There is a puzzling term ἐν ἀσαραμελ or (ἐν σαραμελ) before the reference to the gathering. Many suggestions have been offered. Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 501–2, reads as ἐν σαραμελ and translates the term as ‘the prince of God’s people’; van Henten, “Honorary Decree,” 120, assumes the original Hebrew of ἀσαραμελ as אֱלֹהֵי עַם הַיְהוּדָה, and translates the term as ‘in the temple court surrounding the priestly court.’

¹⁰⁸ Pfeiffer, *History*, 493. For a brief survey of different views, see Krentz, “Honorary Decree,” 148; Schürer, *History*, 1:193n13.

¹⁰⁹ Rajak, “Hasmonean Kingship,” 54, thinks that this way of stressing the role of the assembled people, priests, and Jerusalem council is ‘in keeping with biblical patterns for appointing a king.’ However, one must question what might be the implication of such a large gathering, especially when the author has presented a number of (religiously and politically) diverse groups throughout the book.

The implication of the democratic setting is that this passage reflects where the compromise between opponents and supporters of the Hasmoneans is reached. Of course, not all opponents would have agreed.¹¹⁰ But, that is not the point. The point our author makes in this passage is that Simon's authority as the political and religious leader in Judea is agreed by Judeans who consist of both, those who opposed and those who supported the Hasmoneans (and, indeed, those who were of neither parties but conformists). For instance, after our passage on the decree, there is no sign of antagonistic voices in the narrative. In chapter 16, Simon's son-in-law, Ptolemy the son of Abubus, plots against Simon and his sons and kills them. But, as the text makes clear, his motive is taking control of Judea because 'his heart *was exalted* (ὕψωθη)' (16:13), a motive of an individual that leads to self-destruction.¹¹¹ Other than this, nowhere does the text suggest that anyone opposed Simon or wanted to contact the Syrian king for gaining power against Simon in Judea (cf. Alcimus and certain people against Judas in 7:5–6, certain people against Jonathan in 11:21). Furthermore, it is curious that the eulogy of Simon mainly focuses on his administrative excellence whereas the eulogy of Judas focuses on his militaristic excellence (see the Preliminary Remarks). The particularity with Simon's rule is that he established *peace* in the nation. The author's intention of writing his eulogy in this way is not explicit. But, this almost *ideal* state of the nation should indicate that Simon did not confront much opposition. In other words, if Simon and his opponents reached an agreement, the nation would certainly enjoy being in a peaceful state. Yet another clue indicating compromise can be found later in the decree. After stating with the honours and titles that Simon receives, it legally requires people and priests (τοῦ λαοῦ καὶ τῶν ἱερέων) not to 'dispute anything to be said by him' or 'convoke a gathering in the country without him,' nor to 'clothe themselves in purple or to wear a gold brooch,' i.e. installing themselves as high priests (v44). In short, everyone is now asked to *agree* on Simon's authority and not to oppose him. This echoes incidents caused by those who opposed the Hasmoneans as mentioned above (e.g. the opponents to Jonathan, and Alcimus who wanted to become the high

¹¹⁰ Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 119–27.

¹¹¹ Compare this motive with Simon as described in the honorary decree: '...And he sought in every way to *exalt* (ὕψωσαι) his people' (14:35). Our author seems to make a point that Ptolemy the son of Abubus wanted to exalt himself whereas Simon exalted people rather than himself. The motive of being exalted, with ὕψωθη, can also be found in two other places in 1 Macc: '...the earth became quiet before him [Alexander the Great], and he ὕψωθη, and his heart was uplifted' (1:3), 'And Alexander fled to Arabia to hide himself there, and King Ptolemy ὕψωθη' (11:16). Both verses are followed by their early deaths.

priest). Therefore, compromise is now reached between the Hasmoneans/their supporters and their opponents.

We should now ask a question. On what basis did those conflicting parties reach a compromise? I suggest that they agreed upon Simon's leadership on the basis that the non-hereditary family such as the Hasmoneans would only be their leader on the grounds that they did not replace the traditional offices such as Davidic kingship and Aaronic priesthood. There are two missing elements, as suggests Gardner,¹¹² which are associated with our discussion on kingship, and one element in the decree that functions as a limitation of Simon's leadership.

The first missing element is a crown as a gift. In Greek benefactions, giving honorands crowns as gifts is one of the most common features.¹¹³ The absence of such a common gift in the decree could indicate that the Judeans reserved crowns for the Davidic dynasty.¹¹⁴ This seems to be evident in Josephus' account of the sons of John Hyrcanus because Josephus also interprets negatively the Hasmoneans' self-crowning (with a diadem; see the Issue).

The second missing element is the word 'saviour' (σωτήρ). This is also an element that is commonly found in Greek benefactions.¹¹⁵ While the absence of such a particular term may be coincidental rather than intentional, it should be noted that nowhere in 1 Maccabees does the author attribute the personal noun σωτήρ to the Hasmoneans, and yet, it is attributed to God in 4:30, '...Blessed are you, *the savior* of Israel.' In all other places where the author could have surely attributed the personal noun to the Hasmoneans, he writes in indirect ways: '...salvation (σωτηρία) was successful by his [Judah] hand' (3:6), '...they were not of the seed of those men to whom was given salvation (σωτηρία) to Israel by their hand' (5:62), 'How the mighty one who saves (σώζων) Israel fell!'¹¹⁶ (9:21). The deliberate avoidance of attributing the personal noun

¹¹² See my summary of Gardner's view in the section on Scholarship on the Hasmoneans and Kingship.

¹¹³ See the documents listed in Gardner, "Jewish Leadership," 336n44.

¹¹⁴ Also, Gardner, "Jewish Leadership," 336n44.

¹¹⁵ Gardner, "Jewish Leadership," 336.

¹¹⁶ My own translation, since NETS makes it less clear that it is a participle used here rather than a noun.

σωτήρ to the Hasmoneans may imply that the term was reserved for a messianic figure.¹¹⁷

The last, but not least, element that indicates compromise between different groups of people in Judea is a conditional clause in 14:41 which reads ‘until a trustworthy prophet comes.’ We have discussed briefly in the previous section that the preposition ‘until’ (ἕως) functions as a boundary for the temporal marker ‘forever’ (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα) in the main clause. We will discuss what ‘a trustworthy prophet’ means separately in the next section. It is sufficient to say here that this conditional clause implies that the conservative party agrees with the reign of the Hasmonean dynasty as ruler/high priest. This may explain the narrative style of 1 Maccabees in that the portrait of Jonathan’s rule is in some way downplayed even though he was the first ruler/high priest and, by doing so, the author emphasises Simon’s rule as agreed by the people.

These three elements suggest that the compromise was reached between the Hasmoneans and their opponents on the grounds that the Hasmonean dynasty is not a permanent monarchy. The legitimacy of the Hasmonean dynasty (the descendants of Simon) is *limited* by terms such as ‘crown’ and ‘saviour,’ and the phrase ‘until a trustworthy prophet comes.’

2.3.3. Summary

In summary, the honorary decree does not necessarily support the idea of the Hasmonean kingship but contains a more complex motive about agreement among Judeans. The language of the decree is undoubtedly highly positive toward Simon. However, this should rather reflect his excellence in establishing the peace of the nation. The peace, in his context, was to preserve traditions concerning kingship/high priesthood, rather than replacing those traditional offices with his.

¹¹⁷ Gardner, “Jewish Leadership,” 336n46. Admittedly, this point may not easily be proved, since the personal noun is exclusively used to God in the Hebrew Bible. The word is only used to humans in Judges. However, it is still intriguing that the word is absent in the honorary decree, compared to the Greek decrees in which kings normally receive such title as ‘saviour.’ It is possible that the absence of the word in our decree implies the limited authority of Simon.

2.4. A COMING ‘TRUSTWORTHY PROPHET’ IN 14:41

In 1 Maccabees 14:41, after stating all the praiseworthy deeds of Simon and then announcing the honorary titles for him, the passage adds a conditional clause ἕως τοῦ ἀναστῆναι προφήτην πιστὸν, ‘until a trustworthy prophet comes.’ This is ironic, since the phrase immediately follows such an elevation of Simon to the people’s leader and the high priest ‘forever’ (εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα; note the use of a temporal marker as a recurrent element in Mattathias’ deathbed blessing).¹¹⁸ It is indisputable that our phrase here cannot annul the consistent praise of Simon in the decree. It is, however, still a conundrum that the author or the decree should have inserted this short clause in a document honouring Simon. As we will see, expectation of a future prophet is evident in the corpus of Jewish literature and 1 Maccabees expresses the same expectation, although such expectation of the divinely anointed leaders may have been assigned to a distant future.

2.4.1. ‘Prophet’ in 1 Maccabees

The focus of our discussion is whether we could formulate an expectation of a coming prophet in 1 Maccabees and in the wider contemporary Jewish world. Let us begin with what kind of expectation about the coming of a prophet could have been available from 1 Maccabees. The fact that the word prophet appears four times in the book is ignored by scholars because their relation to each other seems insignificant. The relation between the first (4:46) and the last (14:41) references received some attention since both references express a certain belief about the coming of a prophet in the future,¹¹⁹ although some still chose to ignore this relation.¹²⁰ It is my contention that ‘prophet’ was a significant concept to our author. These are the four references to ‘prophet’:

4:46 and put away the stones on the mount of the house in a suitable place until a *prophet* would come to give an answer concerning these things.

9:27 And there was a great affliction in Israel such as had not been since the day that a *prophet* was not seen among them.

¹¹⁸ See the section on 1 Maccabees 2:57.

¹¹⁹ For example, see Bartlett, *Maccabees*, 65; Dancy, *I Maccabees*, 2, 100; van Henten, “Hasmonean Period,” 20 (he at least mentions 9:27 along the same line).

¹²⁰ Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 285, lacks any interest in either this verse or a relation between this verse and the similar reference in 14:41.

9:54 ...Alcimus gave the command to tear down the wall of the inner court of the holy places, and he tore down the works of the *prophets*. And he began to tear it down,
14:41 and that the Judeans and the priests were pleased that Simon would be their leader and high priest forever, until a trustworthy *prophet* comes,

In 4:46, those priests who are called ‘uncorrupted and devotees of the law’ (v42) form a counsel and decide that they should tear down the defiled altar. But they need a prophet who could know how the stones of the altar should finally be sorted; presumably he would ask God about it. That means, since the present time is an age of ‘cessation of prophecy’ (as the next reference stresses), matters such as the stones of the defiled altar can only be sorted completely if a prophet who is genuine or trustworthy arises among them, like the prophets did in the past. What we can know in this reference is that their present age is far from their ideal future in a way that they cannot directly enquire to God about certain matters; they do not have a mediator.¹²¹

In 9:27, after Judas’ death, the affliction in Israel is said to be so great that there has not been such affliction since ‘prophet’ (προφήτης, singular in form but probably collective in meaning) ceased to appear among people. This can only mean the end of the Prophets, after Malachi.¹²² This verse does not tell us very much about a future prophet as envisaged in 4:46 and 14:41. However, we can at least say, as Bartlett puts it, ‘the author of 1 Maccabees thinks that the presence of prophets is a mark of the well-being of Israel, and that the present period was the lowest ebb of the post-prophetic age.’¹²³ Like the first reference, the imperfect nature of the present age is stressed by the author and he indirectly looks ahead to when there will be a prophet among them as there was in the past. In addition, the prophet(s) in this reference refers to biblical

¹²¹ It is interesting to note that certain decisions were made by the authority of the law (3:48; 12:9; Dancy, *I Maccabees*, 2), or by way of democracy (see above our discussion on the honorary decree for Simon; also, Pfeiffer, *History*, 493). And yet, people were able to overrule the law, as evident in 2:40–42 (the decision to fight on Sabbaths). And this variety of ideology even stresses the fact that for certain matters such as our references in 4:46 and 14:41, they could not manage; they required divine intervention.

¹²² Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 48, comments on the verse as follows: ‘Perhaps he [the author] attempts here, by use of an ironic paraphrase of Dan 12:1, to make vivid the falsity of Dan 12:7–12. Judas and his men, “the hand of the Holy People,” had been smashed. Yet no glorious resurrection and no kingdom of saints had followed... Prophecy had ceased; the seer of Daniel was a fraud.’ This interpretation is a result of his notion about 1 Maccabees’ ‘parody’ (in his term) of the book of Daniel, *ibid*, *I Maccabees*, 42–54; elsewhere he relates the verse to Enoch 90 in the same way as to Daniel, *ibid*, “Biblical Promises,” 75. However, similarity between 1 Maccabees 9:27 and Daniel 12:1 is doubtful. They sound similar when read in English, but in Greek, their wording does not really agree, other than both using the word θλίψις (affliction) which appears more than one hundred times in the Septuagint.

¹²³ Bartlett, *Maccabees*, 118.

prophets whose roles have to do with not just foreseeing/telling but also anointing leaders, interpreting the present, or even performing miracles. Biblical prophets can also approve of important projects like building a temple, as the next reference indicates.

In 9:54, Alcimus attempts to tear down ‘the walls of the inner court of the holy places’ (τὸ τεῖχος τῆς αὐλῆς τῶν ἁγίων τῆς ἐσωτέρας), a particular term which is then rephrased as ‘the works of the prophets’ (τὰ ἔργα τῶν προφητῶν).¹²⁴ The prophets are perhaps Haggai and Zechariah who led the rebuilding of the temple.¹²⁵ Goldstein is right to observe that there is no prophetic sanction indicated for the walls of the inner court.¹²⁶ I suggest that this is a unique way of mentioning prophet rather gives us a clue about the author’s use of the word prophet. Having seen the three references to prophet, we can say that the author understands the term in a particular way. Prophet, according to him, is a figure who has the authority to decide what to do with the stones of the defiled altar; whose absence is a mark of their present calamity; and to whom the work of the temple is attributed. This is a remarkable figure within the author’s worldview.

Finally, in 14:41, our verse tells us more about prophet. As I have argued earlier,¹²⁷ the prophet’s coming *limits* the rulership/high priesthood of Simon; it is a boundary marker for the authority of Simon. Having stressed this, the identity of the prophet has to do with *replacing* the Hasmonean dynasty *with a dynasty that is supreme*. The Hasmonean dynasty was established on the grounds of their deeds. That means, the new dynasty, that either the prophet himself will establish or anoint someone to do it, must be justified on the grounds of a divine legitimacy as it was in the biblical period.

¹²⁴ Josephus calls them ‘the ancient prophets’ (τῶν ἀρχαίων προφητῶν, *Ant.* 12:413). However, it is interesting that Josephus does not mention prophet in other contexts – the matter of the stones (4:46) is omitted; for 9:27, he inserts ‘since their return from Babylon’ instead of ‘since the day that a prophet was not seen...’ The last reference (14:41) cannot be found in Josephus either due to his use of a different source or due to the hypothetically shorter version of 1 Maccabees which ends at 14:15. For the hypothesis of a shorter version of 1 Maccabees, see Nils Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (ACTA ACADEMIAE ABOENSIS, Ser. A, vol. 63 nr 1) (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984); David S. Williams, *The Structure of 1 Maccabees* (Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999). Recently, Francis Borchardt, *The Torah in 1 Maccabees: A Literary Critical Approach to the Text*, electronically published (Helsinki: Unigrafia, 2012), went further than Martola and Williams and claimed there were several layers of edition in the book.

¹²⁵ Also, Dancy, *1 Maccabees*, 137; Bartlett, *Maccabees*, 124–25.

¹²⁶ Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 392.

¹²⁷ See the discussion on the interpretation of 2:57.

Simon was proven to be worthy of taking an office which is otherwise reserved for descendants of Aaron since it was Aaron who received an everlasting priesthood as a covenant from God (the very reason for the *Hasidioi* to depart from Judas and follow Alcimus, 7:13–14). This means, to be higher than Simon is to be hereditary as well as possessing a praiseworthy manner like him. The prophet then is either the heir of a dynasty to whom divine legitimacy is given, or someone who is able to anoint such person by the divine will.¹²⁸

This prophet in 14:41 coheres with those prophets mentioned in the other three references. With ‘prophet,’ the author both looks back to past biblical time to remind his readers of the former glory of their nation, and looks ahead for the future in which people will be able to communicate with their God through their prophet. This may explain why Josephus omits or modifies these references and makes the mention of prophet silent, because he does not share the same vision of the future with the author of 1 Maccabees.¹²⁹ (For more details on this issue, see below Josephus’ view on prophecy/prophet.)

2.4.2. Expectation of a Future Prophet

It is now necessary to locate our verse in the wider Jewish context and see whether any light might be shed on interpreting our verse.

It should be said at the outset that there are not many references to the belief about prophets or coming of a prophet in the corpus of Jewish literature. Moreover, they are scattered widely, appearing in the post-exilic prophet Malachi, later in Ben Sira of the early Greek period, and even in the sectarian Qumran documents. This admittedly make those texts difficult align for constructing a possibly shared belief about the coming of a prophet in the time around the Hasmonean rule. However, we have observed, from the references in 1 Maccabees, that people did have some kind of belief about the coming of a prophet in the future. From the conditional clause in 14:41 (‘until...’), and from the fact that Simon agreed to take this conditional power, we can claim that this belief was held by the early Hasmoneans. In other words, a certain belief could well have been shared among all parties of the Judeans regardless of their

¹²⁸ See below: some scholars have identified this prophet with John Hyrcanus.

¹²⁹ See, Marcus, *Josephus*, 7:164–65.

attitudes to the Hasmonean uprising. Therefore, it is worth taking into account how these scattered, but *not* dissipated, references to the coming of a prophet can shed light on our discussion. In the following, we will see that the belief about the coming of a prophet in the future was well alive around the time of the Hasmoneans.

Let us begin with Deuteronomy 15:15, 18 where Moses envisages the coming of an *ideal* prophet for Israel.

The Lord your God will raise up for you a prophet like me from among you, from your brothers—it is to him you shall listen... I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brothers. And I will put my words in his mouth, and he shall speak to them all that I command him.¹³⁰

The text does not specify when the prophet will come nor what specific role he will have. But, it is clear that this prophet has the character of being ideal, and had not arrived by the time the book was finally edited.¹³¹ The coming of this Moses-like prophet was then picked up by the Qumran community in their expectation of the future and in conjunction with the coming of the messiahs¹³² (see below).

The expectation of a prophet in the future is most explicit in the book of Malachi. 4:5–6 reads:

Behold, I will send you Elijah the prophet before the great and awesome day of the Lord comes. And he will turn the hearts of fathers to their children and the hearts of children to their fathers, lest I come and strike the land with a decree of utter destruction.

Here Elijah is said to come in ‘the day of the Lord’ (יום יהוה), the term which attests to the final restoration of Israel.¹³³ The hope for the prophet is that he will come to restore

¹³⁰ Deut 18:15, 18.

¹³¹ This is emphasised at the end of the book. Deut 34:10–12 reads, ‘And there has not arisen a prophet since in Israel like Moses, whom the LORD knew face to face, none like him for all the signs and the wonders that the LORD sent him to do in the land of Egypt...’

¹³² It is controversial whether the Qumran documents attest to one or two messiahs. See footnote 138.

¹³³ ‘The day of the Lord’ here could mean a future that is remote and distant rather than imminently coming, as Collins, *Scepter*, 105, suggests. The expectation of the day of the Lord as a remote future is evident in the Hellenistic period as well as in the Prophets. For instance, transformation of Israel into an ideal state in a distant future is expressed in Isa 2:2; cf. Mic 4:1; coming of Gog before the final age in Ezek 38:16; coming of an everlasting kingdom in the final age in Dan 2:28; and the time for final resurrection in Dan 10:14. In the Dead Sea Scrolls, expression of such a remote future is found in 1QpHab 7:1–5. The awareness of a remote future is also evident in the early Hasmonean period. In 2 Maccabees 12:39–45, Judas and his men discovered bodies of those who allegedly committed sins. For them, Judas decides to give a sin offering in Jerusalem in a hope that they may be saved in the final resurrection. These examples suggest that the future was perceived as remote; therefore the future as an *ideal* state. Whether the reference from Mal 4:5–6 expresses such remoteness cannot be established with certainty. However, the

Israel and restore people to YHWH (as expressed with the verb שׁוּב)¹³⁴ so that they will not be judged in the day of the Lord. The expectation of this future prophet Elijah continued to be held during the Second Temple period.¹³⁵ For instance, Ben Sira 48:10–11 reads:

You are destined, it is written, in time to come
to put an end to wrath before the day of the Lord,
to turn back the hearts of parents toward their children,
and to re-establish the tribes of Israel.
Blessed is he who shall have seen you before he dies.

This quotation is a part of a larger passage (48:1–11) in which Ben Sira gives lengthy praise of the biblical prophet Elijah. The praise ends with these verses in which he expresses a belief that the Elijah will come in the future. Notable is that he puts a strong hope in the Elijah for a future where the day of the Lord is approaching with judgment. In Ben Sira, it is significant to see this hope in association with the biblical prophet when the priestly text could celebrate the reign of the high priest Simon in chapter 50 without needing to wait for an ideal future. We have earlier discussed that Ben Sira, despite his priestly perspective, attests to the traditional belief about continuation of the Davidic dynasty. Here too, we find evidence for a belief about the coming of a prophet in the course of Israel’s final restoration/judgment. These two beliefs link the world of Ben Sira and the world of 1 Maccabees and enable us to see how traditions regarding ‘hope for the future’ may have continued. A prophet – indeed, one like the biblical prophets – needs to come in the future as a sign for the day of the Lord.

point is that both Malachi and Ben Sira place the coming of a prophet – who is as qualified as biblical – in the context of Israel’s hope for an ideal future. For the same view, see the analysis offered by Richard Bauckham, “The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts,” in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (Supp. JSJ 72), edited by James M. Scott (Leiden: Brill, 2001), 435–87, especially 439–46.

¹³⁴ The verb often bears a sense of restoration in the Hebrew Bible. See Bauckham, “Restoration,” 439–46.

¹³⁵ In addition to Sir 48:10–11, we can add *Sib Or* 2:187–89, although the text is subject to Christian redaction; for instance, see John J. Collins, “The Sibylline Oracles,” in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments* (Second edition), edited by James H. Charlesworth (Peabody: Hendrickson, 2011), 330–34. The coming of Elijah was also elaborated in the later Jewish tradition. For instance, L. Ginzberg, *An Unknown Jewish Sect* (New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976), 211–22, notes that Elijah appears more than eighteen times in the Talmud that he will come as a precursor of the messiah and resolve all the matters both ritual and juridical. This role of a future prophet may remind us of 1 Macc 4:46 where the prophet is expected to resolve the issue with the stones of the defiled altar. Also, see Collins, *Scepter*, 116, 130n53.

The belief about a future prophet is also evident in the Qumran documents. It should be noted that when a reference to a prophet appears, it is not clear what role the prophet is expected to have. He may be expected to anoint leaders or be anointed himself to be the leader.¹³⁶ Our focus, however, is not to resolve the issue of the identity of prophet(s) but to observe whether any similarity in regard to the expectation of a future prophet can be drawn between 1 Maccabees and the Qumran documents.

The first example is found in Testimonia. The document consists of biblical quotations concerning three figures – the prophet like Moses, the sceptre and the star (presumably the Davidic messiah), and Levites (presumably the Aaronic Messiah) – followed by a short commentary on Joshua 6:26. The quotations concerning the prophet like Moses are Deuteronomy 5:28–29 and 18:18–19. This prophet, who will speak to Israel the words from God, is expected to come in the last days. Another example of a future prophet is found in the Rule of the Community. It reads:

...and the goods of the men of holiness who walk in perfection. Their goods must not be mixed with the goods of the men of deceit who have not cleansed their path to separate from injustice and walk in a perfect behaviour. They should not depart from any counsel of the law in order to walk in complete stubbornness of their heart, but instead shall be ruled by the first directives which the men of the Community began to be taught until the prophet comes, and the Messiahs of Aaron and Israel.¹³⁷

The Prophet is said to come in a future where there will also appear ‘the messiahs of Aaron and Israel.’¹³⁸ It is not clear whether the combination of a prophet and two messiahs can be identified with the three figures in the Testimonia. Also, the prophet here seems not to be identified with the prophet like Moses in the Testimonia.¹³⁹ But, the phrase ‘until a prophet comes’ is almost identical with our phrase in 1 Macc 14:41. Moreover, the prophet’s coming is assigned to a distant future rather than imminently

¹³⁶ For an anointed prophet, Joseph A. Fitzmyer, *The One Who is to Come* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007), 99–102, lists passages such as 1QM 11:7–8, 6Q15 3:4; CD 2:12; CD 5:21–6:2; 4Q377 2 ii5; 4Q375 1 i 9; 4Q376 1 i 1. He finds evidences of the idea of an anointed prophet from 1 Chr 16:22; Ps 105:15. Also see Collins, *Scepter*, 112–22.

¹³⁷ 1QS 9:8–11. I follow the translation offered by Florentino García Martínez and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition, vols. 1–2* (Leiden: Brill, 1997).

¹³⁸ It has been disputed whether one or two messiahs are implied in this text (for the reference to ‘messiahs of Aaron and Israel,’ we can add CD 12:23; 14:19; and 19:10). For a review of the scholarship on this issue, see Collins, *Scepter*, 77–80.

¹³⁹ A future prophet figure appears to be more than one in the Qumran documents. For instance, see Collins, *Scepter*, 112–22.

expected.¹⁴⁰ The time will come, the text says, but meanwhile, the law is sufficient to guide the community to live in righteousness as opposed to the men of falsehood. In all cases, we can claim that the belief about the coming of an *ideal*, or indeed, *trustworthy* prophet was alive and well in the community.

To sum up, we can say that the belief about the coming of a prophet was widely held in the Second Temple period, inspired by the biblical tradition and passing on to the later Jewish tradition. By using the Moses-like prophet or Elijah, various communities held a common belief that there shall be an ideal, or indeed, trustworthy prophet who will prepare the day of the Lord. This belief is in line with those references to prophet in 1 Maccabees. The author lived in the same world of belief. He states, most emphatically in 14:41, that the prophet will come and his coming will mean the end of the Hasmonean rule. He did not need to insist on this point because the present Hasmonean rule would assign the coming of the prophet to a remote future.

2.4.3. John Hyrcanus I as the Prophet?

There has been a claim that John Hyrcanus the son of Simon is the prophet.¹⁴¹ According to Goldstein, 1 Maccabees is dated some time during the reign of King Alexander Jannaeus,¹⁴² and the author, a Hasmonean propagandist, intends to claim that the king's father, John Hyrcanus, is the awaited trustworthy prophet.¹⁴³ (In 1 Maccabees 16, Hyrcanus succeeds his father Simon and continues the Hasmonean dynasty in Judea.)¹⁴⁴

¹⁴⁰ However, see Gerbern S. Oegema, *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba* (JSPs Supp. 27) (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 91; *ibid*, "Messianic Expectations in the Qumran Writings: Theses on Their Development," in *Qumran – Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998), 53–82, especially 57. He claims that the figures of 'messiahs of Aaron and Israel' do not need to be eschatological, because in other references (CD 2:12; 6:1), they are figures from the past rather than eschatological. However, it is difficult to accept his claim because our passage in 1QS clearly denotes a sense in which an ideal future is evoked strongly; cf. George, W. E. Nickelsburg, Michael E. Stone, *Faith and Piety in Early Judaism: Texts and Documents* (Philadelphia: Trinity Press, 1991), 175, calls the context of the coming of two messiahs a 'terminus of the present time.'

¹⁴¹ Goldstein, "Biblical Promises," 80–1; *idem*, *1 Maccabees*, 8n8, 508.

¹⁴² Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 62–89.

¹⁴³ Goldstein, "Biblical Promises," 75.

¹⁴⁴ Compare the ending of chapter 13 when Simon prepares John as his successor, 'And Simon saw his son John, that he had become a man, and he made him commander of all the forces, and he resided in Gazara' (1 Macc 13:53).

His evidence comes from Josephus' accounts of John as well as some rabbinic sources which are worth quoting:

And so Hyrcanus quieted the outbreak, and lived happily thereafter; and when he died after administering the government excellently for thirty-one years, he left five sons. Now he was accounted by God worthy of three of the greatest privileges, the rule of the nation, the office of high-priest, and the gift of prophecy; for the Deity was with him and enabled him to foresee and foretell the future; so, for example, he foretold of his two elder sons that they would not remain masters of the state. And the story of their downfall is worth relating, to show how far they were from having their father's good fortune.¹⁴⁵

Now about the high priest Hyrcanus an extraordinary story is told how the Deity communicated with him, for they say that on the very day on which his sons fought with Cyzicenus, Hyrcanus, who was alone in the temple, burning incense as high priest, heard a voice saying that his sons had just defeated Antiochus. And on coming out of the temple he revealed this to the entire multitude, and so it actually happened. This, then, was how the affairs of Hyrcanus were going.¹⁴⁶

In the first quotation, Josephus emphasises that the gift of prophecy was a unique character of Hyrcanus. For instance, 'Now he was accounted by God worthy of three of the greatest privileges...' is changed as 'He was the *only* (μόνος) person to unite in his person three of the highest privileges...' (my italics) in the paralleled account in *Jewish War* 1:68–9. And the second quotation is another example of Hyrcanus' prophet-like character. Thus, according to Goldstein, knowing the unique character of the king's father as a 'prophet,' the author alludes to the condition of 'until...' in 1 Maccabees 14:41 being fulfilled within Simon's hereditary line. By this logic, the author is demonstrating the legitimacy of the Hasmonean kingship.

However, there are some major objections to identifying the coming prophet with John Hyrcanus. Firstly, close reading of Josephus' accounts of John Hyrcanus tells us that he is not the sort of prophet in 1 Maccabees. The quality of Hyrcanus' prophecy, according to Josephus, was 1) that he foretold that his two sons would not remain masters of the state, and 2) that he, hearing from God about the victory, revealed this to the entire multitude. Both of these incidents show that he was able to do foreseeing (πρόγνωσιν) and foretelling (προλέγειν). In the Hebrew Bible, we have ample examples of this type of prophet or a foreteller. However, we have seen that the type of prophet in

¹⁴⁵ *Ant.* 13:299–300. Its paralleled account is found in *War* 1:68–9, without any significant difference between the two except for attributing Hyrcanus' unity of three offices to God in *Antiquity* and not in *Jewish War*.

¹⁴⁶ *Ant.* 13:283.

14:41 has a future task. More crucially, the prophet, as in 4:46, has a quality of instructing people what to do with the stones. As Sievers notes,¹⁴⁷ if John Hyrcanus was the prophet we have referred to, the stones should have been removed during his reign. However, they had not been removed by the Mishnaic time.¹⁴⁸ This illustrates that the roles required of the prophet make it difficult to identify John Hyrcanus with the figure.

Secondly, as Ralph Marcus suggests, Josephus seems careful not to confuse the prophecy of John Hyrcanus with the biblical prophecy.¹⁴⁹ In fact, as Josephus is so conscious about the biblical prophecy/prophet that he even omits the references to prophet in 4:46 (regarding the matter of the stones) and 9:27 ('since prophets ceased to appear...').¹⁵⁰ Marcus suggests that in Josephus' time, it may have been generally believed that 'the true prophetic inspiration had ceased since the time of Haggai, Zechariah, and Malachi.'¹⁵¹ Although this is difficult to prove, Josephus' omissions of those references are clearly not random. Having said this, we should notice that Josephus never attributes the word 'prophet' to Hyrcanus. All these may cumulatively

¹⁴⁷ Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 149n51.

¹⁴⁸ *M. Middoth* 1:6 reads,

"There were four rooms in the Chamber on the Hearth, like cells opening into a hall, two within holy ground and two outside holy ground, and the ends of flagstones divided the holy from what was not holy. And what was their use? That to the south-west was the Chamber of the Lamb-offerings; that to the south-east was the Chamber of them that made the Shewbread; *in that to the north-east the sons of the Hasmonians had hidden away the stones of the Altar which the Grecian kings had defiled*; and by that to the north-west they went down to the Chamber of Immersion.'

¹⁴⁹ Marcus, *Josephus*, 7:378–79. For a view against cessation of prophecy in Josephus, see Rebecca Gray, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus* (Oxford: OUP, 1993), 7–34. Her thesis is that cessation of prophecy is one expression of 'a vague nostalgia that idealized the past as a time when people were, in some indescribable way, closer to God and holier than in the present' rather than being an absolute dogma (Gray, *Prophetic Figures*, 8, 34).

¹⁵⁰ As Marcus, *Josephus*, 7:164–65, notes. Lester L. Grabbe, *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh* (London: Routledge, 2000), 236–41, appears to contradict this view as he claims that Josephus uses prophecy/prophet for non-biblical figures such as Daniel, Joshua, and John Hyrcanus. Grabbe's stress is on non-distinction between 'prophecy' and 'apocalyptic' (as he exclusively argued elsewhere, *ibid*, *Knowing the End*, 2–43) and on non-cessation of prophecy after the early post-exilic period. However, the subtle issue I raise is rather a possible belief about the coming of a prophet who is as glorious and unique as the biblical prophets. In this regard, Josephus is interestingly careful in not confusing the biblical prophets with those post-biblical figures like Hyrcanus who were able to foretell but never called like the biblical prophets. I agree that it is quite likely that 'prophecy' itself did not completely cease after the early post-exilic period. But for 'prophet,' we have no evidence that there was anyone equivalent to biblical figures. In fact, 1 Macc 9:27, which Grabbe reads as 'the view that prophecy had ceased,' reads 'a *prophet* ceased to appear' rather than '*prophecy* ceased.'

¹⁵¹ Marcus, *Josephus*, 7:165.

suggest that Josephus' recognition of John Hyrcanus is far from the sort of prophet we understand from 1 Maccabees.

Thirdly, the John Hyrcanus in 1 Maccabees falls short of being the ideal leader who the people in the decree expect to come ultimately. If our author believed John Hyrcanus to be the expected trustworthy prophet, why does he portray Hyrcanus to be rather insignificant compared to Judas and Simon (even less than Jonathan who seems to be downplayed compared to the two)¹⁵²? All we know about John Hyrcanus in 1 Maccabees is that he was (intrinsically) chosen by Simon to be his successor (1 Macc 13:53);¹⁵³ that he fought against the army of Cendebeus courageously (1 Macc 16:4–10); and that he, after obtaining revenge for his father and his brothers, succeeds his father and is said to have ruled Judea. The quality of Hyrcanus' leadership is set out at the end of the book and in much abridged words.

And the rest of the stories about John and his wars and his heroic deeds which he did and the building of the walls which he built and his actions, look, these have been written in the book of days of his high priesthood from the time when he became high priest after his father.¹⁵⁴

The author seems to write his writing after Hyrcanus' rule because he uses a language that appears in the annals of kings and priests in the Hebrew Bible.¹⁵⁵ The quality of Hyrcanus' leadership is summarised as 1) having 'wars and heroic deeds' (the key feature of the Hasmoneans in the book, as discussed above), 2) fortification and defence in Judea. If the author intended to identify the prophet in 14:41 with Hyrcanus, it is most likely that he would insert either an event where Hyrcanus' prophetic character is evident, or a few words regarding his gift of prophecy as in Josephus' works. Instead, the impression one gets in 1 Maccabees 16 is that Simon's rule ends with tragedy because the narrative, after reaching its climax with the glorious Simon in chapters 14–15, declines sharply with the evil plot by Simon's son-in-law. Hyrcanus is not our author's interest.

¹⁵² Bartlett, *Maccabees*, 181.

¹⁵³ The verse reads, '... Simon saw his son Ioannes, that he had become a man, and he made him commander of all the forces, and he resided in Gazara.'

¹⁵⁴ 1 Macc 16:23–24.

¹⁵⁵ This is one of points Goldstein makes for his dating of 1 Maccabees (Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 62–89).

2.4.4. Summary

In summary, we conclude in this section that there was an expectation of a future prophet within the world of 1 Maccabees as evident in those four references to prophet. This expectation is in line with the wider Jewish world of the Second Temple period, and the origin of such expectation can be traced back to the Hebrew bible. The time for his coming may have been assigned to the future. It is, however, difficult to identify the prophet with John Hyrcanus I in 1 Maccabees. The reference to a prophet in the decree for Simon limits the duration of the rulership/high priesthood of Simon. It is more likely that our author held a view that the prophetic figure will come in a distant future where the coming of a Davidic heir and an Aaronic high priest is also anticipated.

3. CONCLUSION

Let us recall the main question we have raised in the Introduction: What can we understand about the belief in a Davidic messiah in the Hasmonean period? Specifically, does 1 Maccabees legitimise the Hasmoneans as kings? In order to answer these questions, we have discussed four relevant passages in 1 Maccabees (2:57, 5:62, 14:25–49, and 14:41) and arrived at a conclusion in each section.

1. Having discussed 2:57 in its tradition in the Hebrew Bible and in Ben Sira, we can claim that the validity of the Davidic covenant was still the currency in the world of 1 Maccabees. It reflects God's faithfulness to his promise.
2. The remarkably legitimising statement in 5:62 means that the Hasmoneans are judge-like figures by whose hands God allowed salvation of his people when there was no king among them. It also underlines that the Hasmoneans are heroic figures like the Romans by use of the term, 'heroic acts and war'; Joseph and Azariah did not share such a label.
3. The honorary decree for Simon in 14:25–49 indicates a compromise reached between the Hasmoneans/their supporters and their opponents on the grounds that Simon's leadership is conditionally legitimate; a solution for the ideological conflict between different groups over legitimacy of leadership when there was no divine appointment available for it.
4. The conditional clause in 14:41 expresses a belief in a future prophet whose coming will not only indicate the final restoration of Israel but also the end of the Hasmonean dynasty. This belief was the currency of the wider Jewish world and is not to be identified with John Hyrcanus I.

Our author of 1 Maccabees was careful and more balanced in his recording and preserving of the extraordinary story of Judeans' freedom fighting. Owing to their heroic acts and war, the Hasmoneans are depicted as heroes of their people, receiving all the due glories and honours in the narrative. Carefully, however, our author draws a line between the non-hereditary line of rulership and the Davidic. Never does he display that the Davidic dynasty is replaced by the Hasmoneans. Instead, we find indications that the continuation of the Davidic dynasty is upheld by the author. Restitution of the dynasty is assigned for the future – indeed, a remote future.

From the present study, we conclude that the author of 1 Maccabees does not legitimise the Hasmoneans as kings. He does not present the Hasmoneans as a replacement of the Davidic dynasty. Albeit recording the memoirs of the national heroes, he carefully preserves the belief that the Davidic dynasty will continue in the future.

4. BIBLIOGRAPHY

- Bartlett, John R., *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (Cambridge Bible Commentary), London: Cambridge University Press, 1973.
- Bauckham, Richard, "The Restoration of Israel in Luke-Acts," in *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (Supp. JSJ 72), 435–87, edited by James M. Scott, Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Black, Matthew, *The Scrolls and Christian Origins*, Edinburgh: Thomas Nelson and Sons Ltd., 1961.
- Bockmuehl, Markus, Carleton Paget, James (eds.), *Redemption and Resistance: The Messianic Hopes of Jews and Christians in Antiquity*, London: T & T Clark, 2007.
- Borchardt, Francis, *The Torah in 1 Maccabees: A Literary Critical Approach to the Text*, electronically published, Helsinki: Unigrafia, 2012.
- Charlesworth, James H. (ed.), *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, second edition, Peabody: Hendrickson, 2011.
- Charlesworth, James H., Hermann Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema (eds.), *Qumran – Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Chester, Andrew, *Future Hope and Present reality: vol. 1. Eschatology and Transformation in the Hebrew Bible* (WUNT 293). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2012.
- Chester, Andrew, *Messiah and Exaltation* (WUNT 207). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2007.
- Collins, John J., "Messianism in the Maccabean Period", in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, 97–110, edited by Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, and Ernest Frerichs, Cambridge: CUP, 1987.
- Collins, John J., "The Eschatology of Zechariah," in *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships* (JSP Supp. 46), 74–84, edited by Lester L. Grabbe, Robert D. Haak, London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Collins, John J., "The Sibylline Oracles," in *Old Testament Pseudepigrapha: Vol 1: Apocalyptic Literature and Testaments*, second edition, 330–34, edited by James H. Charlesworth, Peabody: Hendrickson, 2011.
- Collins, John J., *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature* (The Anchor Bible Reference Library), New York: Doubleday, 1995.
- Collins, John J. and Gregory E. Sterling (eds.), *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame, 2001.
- Dancy, J. C., *I Maccabees*, Oxford: Blackwell, 1954.

- de Jonge, Marinus, "Messiah," in *Anchor Bible Dictionary – Vol. 4*, 777–88, edited by David Noel Freedman, New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Eckhardt, Benedikt (ed.), *Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees to Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals* (Supplements to the Journal for the Study of Judaism, vol. 155). Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Feldman, L. H. "Josephus' Portrayal of the Hasmoneans compared with 1 Maccabees." *Josephus and the History of Greco-Roman Period*, 41–68, edited by F. Parente and J. Sievers (FS M. Smith; StPB 41). Leiden: Brill, 1994.
- Fitzmyer, Joseph, A., *The One Who is to Come*. Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2007.
- Freedman, David Noel, *Anchor Bible Dictionary – Vol. 2, 4*, New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Gardner, Gregg, "Jewish Leadership and Hellenistic Civic Benefaction in the Second Century B.C.E.," *JBL* 126, 2 (2007), 327–43.
- Ginzberg, L., *An Unknown Jewish Sect*, New York: Jewish Theological Seminary, 1976.
- Goldstein, Jonathan, A., "How the Authors of 1 and 2 Maccabees Treated the 'Messianic Promises,'" in *Judaisms and Their Messiahs at the Turn of the Christian Era*, 69–96, edited by Jacob Neusner, William S. Green, and Ernest Frerichs, Cambridge: CUP, 1987.
- Goldstein, Jonathan A., *1 Maccabees* (ABC). New York: Doubleday, 1976.
- Goodblatt, David, *The Monarchic Principle: Studies in Jewish Self-Government in Antiquity* (TSAJ 38). Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1994.
- Grabbe, Lester L., *Judaic Religion in the Second Temple Period: Belief and Practice from the Exile to Yavneh*, London: Routledge, 2000.
- Grabbe, Lester L., and Robert D. Haak (eds.), *Knowing the End from the Beginning: The Prophetic, the Apocalyptic and their Relationships* (JSP Supp. 46), London: T&T Clark, 2003.
- Gray, Rebecca, *Prophetic Figures in Late Second Temple Jewish Palestine: The Evidence from Josephus*, Oxford: OUP, 1993.
- Gruen, Erich S., *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*, Berkeley, Calif.: California University Press, 1998.
- Hague, W. V., "Eschatology of the Apocryphal Scriptures, I, The Messianic Hope," *JTS* 12 (1911), 57–98.
- Hengel, Martin, *Judaism and Hellenism, vol 1-2*, translated by John Bowden. Philadelphia: Fortress, 1974.
- Horbury, William, *Jewish Messianism and the Cult of Christ*. London: SCM Press, 1998.
- Horbury, William, *Messianism Among Jews and Christians*. London: T&T Clark, 2003.

- Kampen, J. *The Hasideans and the Origin of Pharisaism: A Study in 1 and 2 Maccabees* (Septuagint and Cognate Studies 24), Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1988.
- Kittel, Gerhard, *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament: Vol. 9*, Grand Rapids, Mich.; London: Eerdmans, 1973.
- Krentz, Edgar, "The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee," in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, 146–53, edited by John J. Collins and G. E. Sterling. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- Laato, Antti, *A Star Is Rising: The Historical Development of the Old Testament Royal Ideology and the Rise of the Jewish Messianic Expectations*, Georgia: Scholars Press, 1998.
- Levine, Lee I., Daniel R. Schwartz (eds.), *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Marcus, Ralph, *Josephus: Vol. 2, The Jewish War, Books I–III* (LCL), reprinted, London: William Heinemann, 1956.
- Marcus, Ralph, *Josephus: Vol. 7, Jewish Antiquities, Books XII–XIV* (LCL), reprinted, London: William Heinemann, 1957.
- Martola, Nils, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (ACTA ACADEMIAE ABOENSIS, Ser. A, vol. 63 nr 1), Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984.
- Martínez, Florentino García and Eibert J. C. Tigchelaar (eds.), *The Dead Sea Scrolls Study Edition, vols. 1–2*, Leiden: Brill, 1997.
- Mendels, Doron, "Memory and Memories: The Attitude of 1–2 Maccabees toward Hellenization and Hellenism," in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern* (TSAJ 130), 41–54, edited by Lee I. Levine and Daniel R. Schwartz, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2009.
- Mendels, Doron, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism*, New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Nickelsburg, George W. E., "Eschatology (Early Jewish)," in *Anchor Bible Dictionary – Vol. 2*, 579–94, edited by David Noel Freedman, New York: Doubleday, 1992.
- Nickelsburg, George, W. E., Michael E. Stone, *Faith and Piety in Early Judaism: Texts and Documents*. Philadelphia: Trinity Press, 1991.
- Oegema, Gerbern S., "Messianic Expectations in the Qumran Writings: Theses on Their Development," in *Qumran – Messianism: Studies on the Messianic Expectations in the Dead Sea Scrolls*, 53–82, edited by James H. Charlesworth, Hermann Lichtenberger and Gerbern S. Oegema, Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1998.
- Oegema, Gerbern S., *The Anointed and His People: Messianic Expectations from the Maccabees to Bar Kochba*. (JSPs Supp. 27). Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998.

- Petersen, David L., *Haggai & Zechariah 1–8* (OT Library), London: SCM Press, 1984.
- Pfeiffer, Robert H., *History of New Testament Times: With an Introduction to the Apocrypha*. London: Adam and Charles Black, 1949.
- Pomykala, Kenneth E., *The Davidic Dynasty Tradition in Early Judaism*. Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1995.
- Propp, William Henry, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman, *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California, San Diego, vol. 1), Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Rajak, Tessa, “Hasmonean Kingship and the Invention of Tradition” (1996), in *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*, 39–60, edited by Tessa Rajak. Boston; Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Rajak, Tessa (ed.), *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*. Boston; Leiden: Brill, 2002.
- Rajak, Tessa, Sarah Pearce, James Aitken, and Jennifer Dines (eds.), *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Hellenistic Culture and Society, L), Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2007.
- Rappaport, Uriel, “The Use of the Bible in 1 Maccabees,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use & Interpretation of the Bible In Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center, 12 – 14 May 1996*, 175–9, edited by Michael E. Stone, Esther G. Chazon. Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Schwartz, Daniel R., “On Something Biblical about 2 Maccabees,” in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use & Interpretation of the Bible In Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls (Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center, 12 – 14 May 1996)*, 223–32, edited by Michael E. Stone, Esther G. Chazon, Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Schwartz, Seth, “Israel and the Nations Roundabout: I Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion,” *Journal of Jewish Studies* 42 (1991), 16–38.
- Schürer, Emil, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ*, vol. 1–3, A New English Version Edited and Revised by Geza Vermes, Fergus Miller, martin Goodman. Edinburgh: T&T Clark, 1973–87.
- Scott, James M. (ed.), *Restoration: Old Testament, Jewish, and Christian Perspectives* (Supp. JSJ 72), Leiden: Brill, 2001.
- Sievers, Joseph, “The High Priesthood of Simon Maccabeus: an Analysis of 1 Macc 14:25–49”, *SBL Seminar Papers*, 20 (1981), 309–18.
- Sievers, Joseph. *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters: From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (SFSHJ 6). Atlanta, Ga.: Scholars Press, 1990.
- Skehan, P. W., and A. A. Di Lella, *The Wisdom of Ben Sira* (AB 39), New York: Doubleday, 1987.

- Smith, Morton, "What is Implied by the Variety of Messianic Figures?", in *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh: vol. 1: Historical Method, Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism*, Morton Smith, 161–67, edited by S. J. D. Cohen, Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Smith, Morton, *Studies in the Cult of Yahweh: vol. 1: Historical Method, Ancient Israel, Ancient Judaism*, edited by S. J. D. Cohen, Leiden: Brill, 1996.
- Stone, Michael E., Esther G. Chazon (eds.), *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use & Interpretation of the Bible In Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center, 12 – 14 May 1996*, Leiden: Brill, 1998.
- Tcherikover, Victor, *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*, translated by S. Applebaum, New York: Atheneum, 1959.
- Tomes, Roger, "Heroism in 1 and 2 Maccabees," *Biblical Interpretation* 15 (2007), 171–99.
- Van der Woude, A. S. and M. de Jonge, "Messianic Ideas in Later Judaism," in *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament: Vol. 9*, 509–27, edited by Gerhard Kittel, Grand Rapids, Mich.; London: Eerdmans, 1973.
- Van der Kooij, Arie, "The Claim of Maccabean Leadership and the use of Scripture," in *Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees to Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals* (JSJ Supp. 155), 29–49, edited by Benedikt Eckhardt. Leiden: Brill, 2011.
- Van Henten, Jan Willem, "Royal Ideology: 1 and 2 Maccabees and Egypt," in *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers* (Hellenistic Culture and Society, L), 265–82, edited by Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James Aitken, and Jennifer Dines, Berkeley, Calif.: University of California Press, 2007.
- Van Henten, Jan Willem, "The Hasmonean Period", in *Redemption and Resistance*, 15–28, edited by Markus Bockmuehl, James Carleton Paget. London: T&T Clark, 2007.
- Van Henten, Jan Willem, "The Honorary Decree for Simon the Maccabee (1 Macc 14:25–49) in its Hellenistic Context," in *Hellenism in the Land of Israel*, 116–45, edited by John J. Collins and G. E. Sterling. Notre Dame: University of Notre Dame Press, 2001.
- Vanderkam, James C., "People and High Priesthood in Early Maccabean Times," in *The Hebrew Bible and Its Interpreters* (Biblical and Judaic Studies from the University of California vol. 1), 205–25, edited by William Henry Propp, Baruch Halpern, and David Noel Freedman, Winona Lake, Indiana: Eisenbrauns, 1990.
- Vanderkam, James C., *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*, Minneapolis: Fortress, 2004.
- Veyne, Paul, *Bread and Circuses: Historical Sociology and Political Pluralism*, translated by Brian Pearce, London: Penguin Press, 1990.

Williams, David, S., *The Structure of 1 Maccabees*, Washington, DC: The Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999.

Wright, Benjamin G., "The Use and Interpretation of Biblical Tradition in Ben Sira's Praise of the Ancestors," in *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18 – 20 May, 2006* (Supp. JSJ 127), 205, edited by Géza G. Xeravits, József Zsengellér, Leiden: Brill, 2008.

Xeravits, Géza G., József Zsengellér, *Studies in the Book of Ben Sira: Papers of the Third International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Shime'on Centre, Pápa, Hungary, 18 – 20 May, 2006* (Supp. JSJ 127), Leiden: Brill, 2008.