

A Rhetorical Analysis of 2 Maccabees

E Coetzer
12862738

Thesis submitted for the degree *Doctor of Philosophy* in Greek
at the Potchefstroom Campus of the North-West University

Promoter: Prof PJ Jordaan

May 2015



**NORTH-WEST UNIVERSITY
(POTCHEFSTROOM CAMPUS)**

A RHETORICAL ANALYSIS OF 2 MACCABEES

by
EUGENE COETZER

**For the thesis submitted in fulfilment of the requirements for the Philosophiæ
Doctor degree in Greek of the North-West University (Potchefstroom Campus)**

Promotor: Prof. P. J. Jordaan

Potchefstroom
2014

ABSTRACT

The study, "A Rhetorical Analysis of 2 Maccabees", presents an investigation into the various strategies applied in 2 Maccabees in order to move the reader to adopt certain ideas. The chief objective is to provide a layout of the communicative strategies applied throughout the text. In order to reach a satisfactory conclusion to this objective, this study set as goals a structural and pragmatic analysis. The structural analysis consists of the delimitation of the various pericopes in 2 Maccabees, a syntactical and semantic analysis, and a formulation of the proposition and argumentation of the author in each pericope. The pragmatic analysis consists of an explication of the communicative strategy, real- and alternative text-world, and trans-universal relations.

The core findings of the study may be divided into four categories:

- the main ideas communicated
- the strategies applied in order to encourage the reader to adopt these ideas
- the elements which make up these strategies
- the possible impact of each of these elements on the reader

Interestingly, the author utilised a technique of creating a contract of trust between the reader and a specific group within the text. This is an exciting new development in such a study as the usual parties would be the reader and the author. In this case, the author employs a group of characters as spokespersons for certain ideas and concepts.

The main ideas of the text may be combined and formulated into one main theme: An alliance with the God of the Jews is stronger than an alliance with any other force. This theme overarches various elements within the text such as reward and punishment, wrath and mercy, reconciliation with God, success in battle, and the state of the Temple.

Lastly, the study has yielded useful results in terms of the function of the status of the Temple. The importance of a purified Temple takes a central position in the text of 2 Maccabees. This may imply that the state of the Temple may have an effect on the success or failure of the Jews. The study has, however, established that the text demonstrates a different relationship between the state of the Temple and the success of the Jews. The state of the Temple is merely a symptom of the Jews' relationship with God: If they are disobedient, God's mercy turns to wrath and the Temple is desecrated as a sign of this damaged relationship; if they are obedient, God's wrath turns to mercy and the Temple is purified as a sign of the mended relationship.

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

When I stumbled into the world of research, I became acquainted with two interminable sources of possibility. The first was the phenomenon that is rhetoric, a concept which this study deals with extensively and therefore not the subject of the current venture. The second source was the man that would one day be called *Doktorvater*. And here, under acknowledgements, there is an opportunity to express the smallest of thanks to this incredible man in a manner fitting the freedom provided by this section. Since no deed or phrase can ever repay your magnanimity, I will aim the rest of my life at honouring the method which you call life. Your thoughts were as gifts, your encouragements as sustenance, and your friendship as a symbol of the highest achievement of the human heart.

I have benefited from a number of fruitful interactions with Professor Jan Willem van Henten and Professor George W. E. Nickelsburg. Thank you for your thought-provoking remarks.

I am truly grateful for the opportunity to have built my capacity at the North-West University and for the support from the humble examples at the faculty of Theology. Dr. Nicholas Allen has spent a considerable amount of time to provide necessary and vital input to the study.

My wife has always been patient throughout all my impulsive and over-optimistic undertakings. This time she was my muse. You gave me a reason to aim at what is most certainly my best. Thank you for making it worthwhile to work as hard as I could for our future.

Many thanks to all my friends and family, who cared more than one would expect from mere mortals.

LIST OF TABLES

TABLE 1: Summary of key contributions.....	3
TABLE 2: Summary of the main ideas, strategies and their elements, and the possible impact on the reader.....	257

TABLE OF CONTENT

ABSTRACT.....	ii
ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	iv
LIST OF TABLES.....	v
CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION	
1.1. BACKGROUND TO THE PROBLEM.....	1
1.2. APPLICATION OF RHETORIC.....	4
1.3. THE INCORPORATION OF THEMES.....	5
1.4. COMPOSITION.....	6
1.5. PURPOSE.....	9
1.6. RESEARCH DESIGN/METHODOLOGY.....	11
CHAPTER 2:	
2.1. INTRODUCTION.....	14
2.2. STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	17
2.2.1. Delimitation.....	17
2.2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	17
2.2.3. Proposition and argumentation.....	20
2.3. PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	22
2.3.1. Communicative strategy	22
2.3.2. Real- and alternative text-world.....	22
2.3.3. Trans-universal relations.....	23
CHAPTER 3:	
3.1. INTRODUCTION.....	25
3.2. STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	25

3.2.1. Delimitation	25
3.2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	26
3.2.3. Proposition and argumentation.....	31
3.3. PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	32
3.3.1. Communicative strategy.....	32
3.3.2. Trans-universal relations.....	33

CHAPTER 4:

4.1. INTRODUCTION.....	36
4.2. STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	38
4.2.1. Delimitation.....	38
4.2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	38
4.2.3. Proposition and argumentation.....	44
4.3. PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	45
4.3.1. Communicative strategy.....	45

CHAPTER 5:

5.1. INTRODUCTION.....	47
5.2. STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	50
5.2.1. Delimitation.....	50
5.2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	51
5.2.3. Proposition and argumentation.....	57
5.3. PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	59
5.3.1. Communicative strategy.....	59
5.3.2. Real- and alternative text-world.....	60
5.3.3. Trans-universal relations.....	60

CHAPTER 6:

6.1. INTRODUCTION.....	62
6.2. STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	63

6.2.1. Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	63
6.2.2. Proposition and argumentation.....	73
6.3. PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	74
6.3.1. Communicative strategy.....	74
6.3.2. Real- and alternative text-world.....	76
6.3.3. Trans-universal relations.....	76

CHAPTER 7:

7.1. INTRODUCTION.....	78
7.2. STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	81
7.2.1. Delimitation.....	81
7.2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	82
7.2.3. Proposition and argumentation.....	90
7.3. PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	91
7.3.1. Communicative strategy.....	91
7.3.2. Real- and alternative text-world.....	92
7.3.3. Trans-universal relations.....	93

CHAPTER 8:

8.1. INTRODUCTION.....	95
8.2. STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	97
8.2.1. Delimitation.....	97
8.2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	97
8.2.3. Proposition and argumentation.....	109
8.3. PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	110
8.3.1. Communicative strategy.....	110
8.3.2. Real- and alternative text-world.....	111
8.3.3. Trans-universal relations.....	111

CHAPTER 9:

9.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	113
9.2.	STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	114
9.2.1.	Delimitation.....	114
9.2.2.	Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	115
9.2.3.	Proposition and argumentation.....	123
9.3.	PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	124
9.3.1.	Communicative strategy.....	124
9.3.2.	Real- and alternative text-world.....	125
9.3.3.	Trans-universal relations.....	125

CHAPTER 10:

10.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	127
10.2.	STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	128
10.2.1.	Delimitation.....	128
10.2.2.	Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	129
10.2.3.	Proposition and argumentation.....	137
10.3.	PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	139
10.3.1.	Communicative strategy.....	139
10.3.2.	Real- and alternative text-world.....	139
10.3.3.	Trans-universal relations.....	140

CHAPTER 11:

11.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	142
11.2.	STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	144
11.2.1.	Delimitation.....	144
11.2.2.	Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	144
11.2.3.	Proposition and argumentation.....	146
11.3.	PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	148
11.3.1.	Communicative strategy.....	148

11.3.2.	Real- and alternative text-world.....	148
11.3.3.	Trans-universal relations.....	149

CHAPTER 12:

12.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	151
12.2.	STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	152
12.2.1.	Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	152
12.2.2.	Proposition and argumentation.....	159
12.3.	PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	161
12.3.1.	Communicative strategy.....	161
12.3.2.	Real- and alternative text-world.....	161
12.3.3.	Trans-universal relations.....	162

CHAPTER 13:

13.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	164
13.2.	STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	166
13.2.1.	Delimitation.....	166
13.2.2.	Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	166
13.2.3.	Proposition and argumentation.....	175
13.3.	PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	176
13.3.1.	Communicative strategy.....	176
13.3.2.	Real- and alternative text-world.....	177
13.3.3.	Trans-universal relations.....	178

CHAPTER 14:

14.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	180
14.2.	STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	181
14.2.1.	Delimitation.....	181
14.2.2.	Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	181
14.2.3.	Proposition and argumentation.....	193

14.3.	PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	195
14.3.1.	Communicative strategy.....	195
14.3.2.	Real- and alternative text-world.....	196
14.3.3.	Trans-universal relations.....	196
CHAPTER 15:		
15.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	198
15.2.	STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	199
15.2.1.	Delimitation.....	199
15.2.2.	Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	200
15.2.3.	Proposition and argumentation.....	207
15.3.	PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	209
15.3.1.	Communicative strategy.....	209
15.3.2.	Real- and alternative text-world.....	210
15.3.3.	Trans-universal relations.....	210
CHAPTER 16:		
16.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	212
16.2.	STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	213
16.2.1.	Delimitation.....	213
16.2.2.	Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	214
16.2.3.	Proposition and argumentation.....	225
16.3.	PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	227
16.3.1.	Communicative strategy.....	227
16.3.2.	Real- and alternative text-world.....	229
16.3.3.	Trans-universal relations.....	229
CHAPTER 17:		
17.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	231
17.2.	STRUCTURAL ANALYSIS.....	232

17.2.1.	Delimitation.....	232
17.2.2.	Syntactical and semantic analysis.....	233
17.2.3.	Proposition and argumentation.....	242
17.3.	PRAGMATIC ANALYSIS.....	244
17.3.1.	Communicative strategy.....	244
17.3.2.	Real- and alternative text-world.....	244
17.3.3.	Trans-universal relations.....	245

CHAPTER 18:

18.1.	INTRODUCTION.....	247
18.2.	MAIN IDEAS COMMUNICATED THROUGH THE TEXT.....	247
18.3.	STRATEGIES APPLIED, THE ELEMENTS WHICH FORM EACH STRATEGY, AND THE POSSIBLE OUTCOME OF EACH ELEMENT.....	248
18.3.1.	STRATEGY 1: MAINTAINING THE READER’S ATTENTION.....	249
18.3.1.1.	Describing the benefits of reading the narrative.....	249
18.3.1.1.1.	Possible impact on the reader.....	250
18.3.1.2.	Suspense and relief.....	250
18.3.1.2.1.	Possible impact on the reader	250
18.3.1.3.	Presenting his strenghts as an author.....	250
18.3.1.3.1.	Possible impact on the reader.....	251
18.3.1.4.	Describing the status quo ante.....	251
18.3.1.4.1.	Possible impact on the reader.....	251
18.3.2.	STRATEGY 2: PRESENTING A SPECIFIC GROUP AS ULTIMATE EXAMPLE.....	252
18.3.2.1.	Unifying the heroes and villains respectively.....	252
18.3.2.1.1.	Possible impact on the reader.....	252
18.3.2.2.	Idealising the heroes and discrediting the villains.....	252
18.3.2.2.1.	Possible impact on the reader.....	253
18.3.2.3.	Highlighting the reward of the heroes and punishment of the villains.....	254

18.3.2.3.1. Possible impact on the reader.....	254
18.3.3.4. Communicating the ideas and actions of the heroes.....	255
18.3.2.4.1. Possible impact on the reader.....	255
18.3.3. STRATEGY 3: PRESENTING CERTAIN IDEAS AS AUTHOR DIRECTLY TO THE READER.....	256
18.3.4. STRATEGY 4: USING THREAT AND RESPONSE TO DEMONSTRATE THE IMPORTANCE OF CERTAIN CONCEPTS.....	257
18.4. SUMMARY OF THE RESULTS OF THE STUDY.....	258
BIBLIOGRAPHY.....	262

CHAPTER 1: INTRODUCTION

1. Background to the Problem

An investigation into the world of 2 Maccabees immediately reveals the attention this book has enjoyed through the years. There have been an abundant amount of modern contributions to the study of this book by a significant number of scholars. Among these scholars, some are specifically relevant when one considers the contemporary literature. Each has a specific focus and unique contribution which will be summarised after a brief discussion of each key scholar. The following key scholars are alphabetically arranged:

Bickerman¹ aims his book as a preliminary study for a commentary on 1 and 2 Maccabees. His book developed out of a philological interpretation and has a “purely historical” aim in order to understand the sequence of events and make them comprehensible.² Amongst his foci are the dating of the prefixed letters and the book, the differences of the various traditions, and the original aggressors of the persecutions.

Another leading scholar, Robert Doran³ highlights the author’s love for metaphors and wordplay. He focuses on worldview and the confrontation between Judaism and Hellenism. His research shows interest in some rhetorical aspects of the text and accordingly investigates the goals of the text.

Jonathan A. Goldstein⁴ follows his *doktorvater*, Bickerman, except in the dating of 2

¹ Bickerman, E. J. 1979. *The God of the Maccabees: Studies in the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*. SJLA 32; Leiden: Brill.

² Ibid. p. 1.

³ Doran, R., *Temple Propoganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees* (CBQMS 12; Washington, D. C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1981).

⁴ Goldstein, J. A., *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 41a; New York: 1983).

Maccabees. He examines the critical issues raised by 2 Maccabees. He discusses its language and style, its Hellenistic and Jewish inclination, its comparison and relationship to 1 Maccabees, its use of sacred writings (Torah and Prophets), its historical context, and the role of the miraculous.

Daniel R. Schwartz⁵ highlights 2 Maccabees as a second century BCE Jewish writing. He accentuates 2 Maccabees as a narration and interpretation of the events that took place in Jerusalem prior to and during the Maccabean revolt (167–160 BCE). He provides an important solution to the intricate discussion on the linkage between the letters and the narrative in arguing that the authors of the first letter took notice of the book and that the second letter is closely linked to the narrative concerning the fire in the Temple.⁶

Jan Willem Van Henten⁷ discusses the religious, political as well as the philosophical aspects of noble death in 2 and 4 Maccabees. In discussing the narrative, he distinguishes six elements which are a key facet in understanding the narrative pattern of 2 Maccabees.⁸ He argues that the theme of martyrdom is a very important part of the self-image of the Jews as presented by the authors of both works. Eleazar, the anonymous mother with her seven sons and Razis should, therefore, be considered heroes of the Jewish people.

⁵ Schwartz, D. R. 2008. 2 Maccabees (ed. L. T Stuckenbruck). Berlin, New York : Walter de Gruyter.

⁶ Ibid., 525-527.

⁷ Van Henten, Jan-Willem. 1997. The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees (ed. J. Collins). Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.

⁸ Ibid., 295.

Table 1: Summary of key contributions

Scholar	Focus
Bickerman	Philological and historical elements
Doran	Stylistic devices and the confrontation between Hellenism and Judaism
Goldstein	Philological elements, influence and context
Schwartz	Dating, authorship and Diasporan influence
Van Henten	Noble death and narrative pattern

An aspect of 2 Maccabees that has, however, not been placed as the main focus of any study is the communicative strategy. It is argued that such a strategy might well be applied by the author in order to aid the reader in adopting certain ideas. In this context, a discussion on the communicative strategy of 2 Maccabees would not only explicate certain ideas within the text, but also hopes to clarify the function of these ideas and themes within the whole of the text. This would require a study with a greater pragmatic emphasis and in turn implies a rhetorical analysis.

In an attempt to bridge this gap, the following questions will be addressed:

- Which deductions can be made in terms of content and formal aspects in order to delimit specific analytical units within 2 Maccabees?
- What is a proper interpretation of each analytical unit?
- What are the main ideas communicated in each analytical unit?
- What communicative strategy is applied in order to aid the reader in adopting certain ideas?
- What is the possible impact of each communicative strategy on the reader?

These questions will guide an investigation that will hopefully give a unique contribution to the discussion on the meaning and significance of 2 Maccabees. For the sake of a

clear understanding of the text, the use of rhetoric, incorporation of themes, and composition and goals of the text will now be discussed briefly.

2. Application of Rhetoric

An aspect that is inseparable to a clear understanding of 2 Maccabees is the way in which the author goes about affecting the audience in order to achieve a change in their point of view. Doran (2012:1) remarks that this work is “not a history of the Maccabees’ revolt against their Seleucid overlords in the modern sense of the word ‘history.’” He proceeds by stating that 2 Maccabees is a highly rhetorical narrative that sets out not to give a “blow-by-blow description of events but to move its audience to commit to faithfully following the ancestral traditions of Judaism” (2012: 1). Despite the emphasis on Judaism⁹, the text demonstrates a clear understanding and employment of Greek rhetorical style (Doran, 2012: 1).

Consequently, one of the main aims of this study is to set out in determining the motif of the text. If the subject of our book is as Schwartz (2008: 3) clearly describes it - “the history of the city of Jerusalem from the beginning of institutionalised Hellenisation under the high priest Jason around 175 BCE and until Judas Maccabaeus’ victory over the Seleucid general Nicanor in the spring of 161 BCE.” – then the function of a rhetorical investigation would be to ask “why” and “how” this history and theme is communicated. Why does the author provide a recount of this specific portion of Jewish history? The answer to this question will lead to the purpose of the text. The second question is how the author is persuading his audience to conform to this purpose. This question can be answered through studying types of explicit or implicit arguments (authoritative, emotional or logical) evident within the text.

⁹ The author of 2 Maccabees is the first we know to speak of Judaism.

3. The incorporation of themes

In 2 Maccabees, the mentioning of events of martyrdom seems more than the notation of historical events. It is interpreted, molded carefully into our text's structure and seems to be utilised as a rhetorical element in that it holds a patriotic-political function (Van Henten, 1997: 5). The text demonstrates a tendency for making sense of the horrid circumstances that perturb the Jewish people. This happens by means of the introduction of possible answers to questions that may arise concerning the significance of events. These seem to be questions on existence, the actions of God, the relationship between sin and circumstances, the purpose and effect of noble death and the outcome of good and evil. Therefore, the manner in which the text aims in providing these answers provides a motive for an investigation into 2 Maccabees' unique contribution amongst the corpus of texts that deal with the conceptualisation of suffering.

A second theme that has surprisingly not been broadly discussed is world-view in 2 Maccabees. The allusions to world-view in 2 Maccabees are so small that most of the monographs and articles relating to creation in deuterocanonical literature hardly mention these few texts. This can be explained primarily by the fact that the object of 2 Maccabees seems not a historical, but anthropological theme. Nowhere is there an explicit explanation of the emphasis of the movement between heaven and earth. The references to heaven and heavenly beings (2:10, 18, 21; 3:15, 20, 34, 39; 8:20; 9:10, 20; 10:29; 11:10; 14:34; 15:3, 4, 8, 21, 23, 34) is an important facet in understanding the intricate elements which produce the salvation of the Jewish people from their oppressor in 2 Maccabees. In this study, the significance of this movement between heaven and earth will be investigated and the possible implications thereof for the manner in which the author aims to move the readers in adopting specific ideas.

Another theme is that of the Temple and its protection by a coalition between Jewish combatants and the Lord as their ally. Van Henten (1997: 244) recognises a pattern that

reoccurs throughout 2 Maccabees. It is an element, which is paralleled by non-Jewish traditions, of an attack on a temple or city by a (foreign) aggressor and the rescue of this temple by its patron deity/s.

Van Henten (1997: 243-267) mainly emphasises the political significance of the martyrs in these verses. An aspect which is not equally treated is the defender of the Temple. He is considerably more eminent than his earthly opposition [σὺ δὲ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μμαστιγωμένος (you have been scourged from heaven, 3:34)]; [αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁ τὴν κατοικίαν ἐπουράνιον ἔχων (for he that has a dwelling place in heaven, 3:39)].

Finally, our book seems to propagate a positive attitude towards other cultures (1981: 109). The text demonstrates that individuals like Simon, Jason, Menelaus, and Alcimus disrupt the orderly arrangement between Jews and their Gentile neighbours, but that Jews who follow their ancestral laws can in fact live in harmony with another culture. This is made clear by the opening greeting of Antiochus IV Epiphanes's final letter to the Jews. Already in 9:19 one finds the words: "to the well-deserving Jews, the citizens, much greeting, good health and prosperity". The high estimation of the Jews continues throughout the letter. Doran (2012: 13) then states that "in the transfer of power to his son, Antiochus IV Epiphanes trusts that the Jews will "make sure everything goes smoothly." Of course this high estimation is also a literary devise that explicates the irony of the rise and fall of the enemies of God and his people, but the mention of Antiochus' son and the succession details in the letter (9:23-25) favors this view.

4. Composition

An aspect which has stimulated serious investigation is the composition of 2 Maccabees. It is a document consisting out of three main components: two letters (1:1-2:18)¹⁰ and a narrative (2:19-15:39) containing a history of the Jewish people and of the

¹⁰ After a short overview of the book, this demarcation is supposed. A more thorough process will be followed below in order to delimit the two letters individually. As far as the ending of the two letters (2:18) and beginning of

temple-state of Jerusalem and Judea. Even more perplexing, is the presence of a fragment of a third letter (Van Henten, 1997: 37). After the analysis of Elias Bickerman (1933: 233-253) there is unity amongst scholars that there were two letters. Prior to Bickerman, the number of letters was widely debated.¹¹

What is important for our study is the relationship between these components. In order to fully comprehend the significance, purpose and meaning of each component, the possible reasons for attaching the letters should be investigated.

Certain questions, which were recently discussed by scholars such as Schwartz (2008: 519-529), and Doran (2012: 1-3), arise. What is the number of prefixed letters? Did the same author write the letters and the narrative? Were these letters written with the text of 2 Maccabees 2:19-15:39 in mind? Were the letters modified for the sake of aligning them with the narrative? Does the problem for the connection of the letters and the narrative lie in the second letter, implying that the second letter had been appended to the first? Does the presence of the verb καταλλάσσω in the letter (1:5b) and in the narrative (7:33, 8:29) suggest conclusive proof of the one common author or just a purposed connection?

These questions have been discussed for a considerable amount of years and, as mentioned above, by many scholars. Despite the diversity, one fact remains: the common view is that the two letters were joined together, but were originally independent works (Bickerman, "Makkabäerbücher (I. und II.)," *PW* 14:779-97, here

the narrative (2:19) is concerned, there is unity amongst scholars such as Elias Bickerman, "Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr. (II Macc. 1: 1-9)," *ZNW* 32 (1933) 233-53; Jan Willem van Henten, *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (JSJSup 57; Leiden: Brill, 1997) 18-19; Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 16; Doran, *2 Maccabees*, 1.

¹¹ For a catalogue of these opinions, see Jochen Gabriel Bunge, *Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch. Quellenkritische, literarische, chronologische und historische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch als Quelle syrisch-palästinischer Geschichte im 2. Jh. V. Chr.* (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität, 1971) 34 n. 7.

791; Hugo Bénévot, *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher* (Die Heilige Schrift des Alten Testamentes); Victor Parker, "The Letters in II Maccabees: Reflections on the Book's Composition," *ZAW* 119 (2007) 386-402, here 386-89.). The letters and the narrative have been viewed as linked since late second century C.E. where Clement of Alexandria suggests that the composer of the epitome is the one that is mentioning Aristobulos in the second prefixed letter (Clement of Alexandria *Strom.* 5.14.97.7.; Doran, 2012: 1). The remaining task is thus to find a logical purpose for this arrangement (and therefore linkage).

The solution that Van Henten (1997:57) provides is that the connection lies in the institution of the feast of Hanukkah. Van Henten further states (1997:57) that chs 3-15 are closely linked to the festal letters at the beginning of the work through the element in 4:7-10:9 and 14:1-15:36 of the institution of a holiday to commemorate the victory of the Jews. Thus, for Van Henten, the narrative provides a further explanation for why the feast should be celebrated.

Schwartz also finds the answer, at least to the connection of the first letter, in the justification of the letter's invitation to the celebration of the Feast. For Schwartz, there is a possibility that those who wrote the first letter had access to the book and "both fit their letter to the book and fit the book to their letter" (2008:525). He notes three main points to support this view (2008: 525):

1. The presence of the rare verb καταλλάσσω in both the first letter (1:5) and the narrative (7:33; 8:29).
2. The first letter shares the narrative's interest in cultic details.
3. The letter seems to describe the narrative.

Concerning the second letter's linkage, the main objection is that there is a contrast between the account of Antiochus' death in 1:13-16 and that in Chapter 9. Schwartz (2008: 146-147), however, removes this contradiction by viewing the letter's account as

a later interpolation and claims that the author of the first letter added 10:1-8. The passage at 10:1-8, in turn, is closely linked to the second letter's details of the fire in the Temple in that its reference to the fire is inarticulate without being viewed together with the reference in the second letter (2008: 528). The meaning of the reference in 10:1-8 is completed in the first letter. This link completes a neat chain connecting the first and second letter to each other as well as with the narrative.

Contrarily, Doran (2012: 202) concludes his commentary on 10:1-8 by stating that "the use of terms that resonate with the rest of the narrative argues that this section was composed by the author." It is therefore only logical that Doran (2012: 202) suggests a better approach to examine each piece (each letter and the narrative) in itself.

This study will follow Doran in examining each part independently but with a slight different approach and without abandoning the possibilities suggested by Schwartz. A fact that cannot be undermined is that these documents, autonomous as they may be, are placed alongside each other in the manuscripts we now study. With this in mind, the aim of this study will be to understand how these components could have been viewed as a unity. They were put together by some party with some aspect of unity in mind. Consequently, the focus will be on the general connections such as the reconciliation between God and his people, the legitimacy of the Temple, the celebration of the rededication feast and the defense of the Temple against its attackers by God.

5. Purpose

Our text, as mentioned above, has a strong rhetorical tendency. The author applies various techniques in order to move the audience towards a more desired practice. Because of this rhetorical character, one needs to determine the purpose of this text. Why is this narrative presented with two attached letters, and with such a high level of persuasion?

A good starting-point is the rarities. As discussed above, the rare verb καταλλάσσω is used deliberately in the narrative and the letter. The employment of the verb in the independent letter shows its authors to have recognised the notions' centrality and revised the letter accordingly. This hints at a unique facet within the purpose of 2 Maccabees. The text is explicating the reconciliation that was worked between God and his people because of the actions of Jews. Consequently, by emphasising the 'cause and effect' of both Israel's sin and their obedience, the author is urging the audience to maintain this path of reconciliation and seize their actions of disobedience.

Another key to the purpose lies in the depiction of God. Doran (2012: 13) highlights the text's communication of the honor in which the God of the Jews was to be held. This is implied by the subgenre of a deity defending his/her temple from attackers as well as the inauguration of new festivals. Doran (2012: 13) also links the honoring of God to the keeping of the ancestral laws. One clear demonstration of the priority of this motif is the fact that the author expounds so much on the building of a gymnasium in Jerusalem.

Schwartz (2008: 3) again, in his discussion on the subject of our book, notes that the author concludes with the restoration of an idyllic situation and pays no attention to the Seleucid over-ruling. This further demonstrates the author's focus on Judaism and its institutions.

There is, however, a combined purpose of both the depiction of a mighty God and the focus upon ideal circumstances. That is the notion of Jewish supremacy. Unlikely as it may seem, every aspect of the ideal situation, depicted in 2 Maccabees, points to the physical dimensions of the Jewish nation and not the spiritual. The ultimate ideal is not the cleansing of sin, but the restoration of peace and governance. Nowhere is there a mention of the desecration of the Temple's effect on worship. It seems rather that the Temple should be restored as a symbol of Jewish independence. Even with the defeat of the enemies, nothing is mentioned of the restoration of worship. The inferiority of the Jewish enemy is rather exclaimed. With this in mind, a likely purpose of our text would

be to communicate that the Jews and their God are superior.

6. Research Design / Methodology

In an attempt to answer the questions presented above and construct a rhetorical analysis, the study will aim to stabilise and clarify each analytical unit within the text of 2 Maccabees, determine the communicative strategy applied to encourage the reader to adopt certain ideas and determine the function of these ideas.

A logical prerequisite for the stabilising and clarification of the text would be to identify analytical units/pericopes. These units will be delimited. For each analytical unit, reasons have to be provided for delimitation. These reasons will be based on content and formal aspects such as vocabulary, thought structure and structural markers.

Subsequently, the delimited texts will be stabilised and clarified. A syntactical and semantic analysis will be performed and variance will be demonstrated. Textfractures will be illustrated and their function will be specified. Intra- and intertextual references will be highlighted in order to stabilise semantic relations. Lexicons such as Louw & Nida (1988), Arndt & Gingrich (1975), Liddell & Scott (1992), Moulton & Milligan (2004) and Muraoka (2009) may be utilised. Regarding textfractures, the following questions are important:

- Why is a certain phrase or word used in such a way?
- Why are certain aspects not mentioned?
- Why are certain aspects subjectively emphasised?

Next, in order to establish the communicative strategy and the purpose of the progressive doctrinal ideas, a pragmatic analysis will be undertaken. Firstly, the communicative strategy will be determined through answering the following questions (a focus on the role of individual characters and specific groups within the text has been added to the existing method for the sake of an improved outcome):

- In which manner does the author project himself in order to generate a contract of trust between himself and the implicit reader?
- In which manner does the author create a contract of trust between individual characters or a specific group within the text and the implicit reader?
- In which manner is the culture, sub-culture and individuality of the author or individuals/specific group within the text implied?
- When, where and how is the communication taking place?
- Who is the intended reader/audience?

Secondly, the sensual and non-sensual dimensions of the real text world (unacceptable epistemic practice) and alternative text world (ideal epistemic practice) will be discussed in terms of their attributes.

Lastly, trans-universal relations will be specified in order to explicate the manner in which the reader is moved from the real text world towards the alternative text world.

CHAPTER 2: THE FIRST PREFIXED LETTER (2 Maccabees 1:1-1:10a)

1. Introduction

The book of 2 Maccabees truly starts with the third chapter. Preceding this chapter, are two chapters containing two prefixed letters (1:1-10a; 1:10b- 2:18) and a preface (2:19-32). This chapter will discuss the meaning and function of the first of these two prefixed letters within the larger aim of the book. Certain questions will be addressed such as:

- How is the mentioning of the two dates to be understood?
- What is the purpose of this letter?
- Why is this letter prefixed to our text?
- What is the significance of the exaggerated expressions of goodwill?

In attempting to answer these questions, the text needs to be delimited, analysed on a syntactical and semantic level, investigated for proposition and argumentation and analysed on a pragmatic level.

The first of these questions, however, may influence the rest of the analysis on this first letter. Consequently, the possible implications of the two dates mentioned in 1:7 and 1:10a will be explored first.

The letters prefixed to our narrative are structured in such a manner that no swift conclusion can be drawn in terms of dating and composition. It requires a strenuous process of identifying relevant data and eliminating variables. Genre, dating tendencies and differentiating manuscript readings are amongst the aspects to be taken into consideration. Therefore, it is suitable, firstly, to highlight the way in which different scholars have accounted for these elements in the past.

Alois Cigoj, in his study *Historisch-Chronologische Schwierigkeiten im zweiten Makkabäerbuche* (1868), argued against the predominant protestant view of that time for a more positive view towards 2 Maccabees. In the third chapter of his study, he discussed the two opening letters (1:1-2:18). Here, he expressed both his view that these letters need to be more thoroughly studied and vindicated and that considering 1:1-2:18 as one letter is unwarranted (Cigoj, 1968: 46).

Three decades later, Niese, in his *Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher* (1900), proposed exactly such an unwarranted view. Niese (1900: 9-26) argued, firstly, that 2 Maccabees 1:1-2:18 is a single letter of 125 BCE and, secondly, that this letter and the narrative is one united text. However, this view does not deal with a number of issues. There is a salutation in 1:1 and 1:10. The letters promote Hanukkah whereas the narrative leads up to the day of Nicanor. If the dating of this letter is 125 BCE, it is impossible to presume that Judas Maccabaeus is one of the authors (1:10). He died much earlier. The account of Antiochus' death in the letter (1:13-16) is different than that in the narrative in Ch. 9.

Thirty years later, Elias Bickerman gave an indispensable contribution to the study when he published "*Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v.Chr.*," in 1933. In this study, Bickerman argued two main points. Firstly, the letters are independent from the narrative. Secondly, 1:1-2:18 consists of two letters, the first (1:1-10a) dating from 188 SE (Seleucid era). This division into two letters was because of the question Bickerman asked: "Why should one letter have two dates?" Prior to this study, there have been two ways in dealing with this dilemma. Either 1:1-10a consists of two letters, or 1:1-9 is one letter and the second letter begins with its date in 1:10. Regarding the last mentioned option, Bickerman (1986: 2.138) argued, that it is impossible for an ancient letter to begin with the date. According to his experience in Hellenistic papyrology he then concluded that 1:1-10a is a single letter dating 188 (Seleucid Era – hereafter, SE) that quotes an earlier letter of 169 SE. This view was soon adopted by scholars as is evident

in the past tense translation Abel¹², Habicht¹³, Goldstein¹⁴ provide for the perfect γεγράφαμεν in v.7. Even a study as recent as Doran (2012: 33) concludes, on formal grounds, that “since the letter is quoting a letter from 169 SE, the date must be 188 SE.”

For Schwartz (2008: 519-529), there exists another option of making sense of the two dates up to 1:10a. He begins by stating that the letter and the verbs within it cannot be interpreted according to what is usual in Greek letters because the verbs render a Hebrew or Aramaic text (Schwartz, 2008: 522). Schwartz therefore follows Torrey (1940: 147), who translates the verb in v. 7 (γεγράφαμεν) in the present tense, “we Jews write to you.” Such a translation of the perfect tense within a letter would of course be warranted as an epistolary perfect (Dempsey, 1990: 7). Consequently, Schwartz (2008: 522) accepts 169 SE (1:7) to be the date of the first letter (1:1-10a). What remains is the second date mentioned in 1:10. As a letter of 169 clearly cannot cite a letter of 188, an earlier date has to be found. This fact drives Schwartz (2008: 522-523) towards the reading of codices 62 and 55 which read 148.¹⁵ He concludes that this is a letter of 169 SE that ends with an invitation to celebrate the “Tabernacles of Kislev 148.”

Bickerman, and scholars who follow him, provides no logical explanation or significance for the attachment of a letter dating 188 SE. Considering this, and that Schwartz indeed solves this dilemma through a very significant dating of the letter,¹⁶ the reading of 148 SE will be followed for 1:10a. The date of the first prefixed letter will be accepted as 169 SE.

¹² Abel, F. –M., *Les livres des Maccabées* (EB; Paris: Gabalda, 1949).

¹³ Habicht, C., *2. Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ I, 3; Gütersloh: Mohn, 1976).

¹⁴ Goldstein, J. A., *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (AB 41a; New York: 1983).

¹⁵ This was the year of the dedication of the altar according to 1 Maccabees 4:52..

¹⁶ Schwartz (2008: 139-140) argues that 169 SE was the first celebration of the holiday in conditions of Jewish independence.

2. Structural analysis

2.1. Delimitation

One finds at the beginning of the text of 2 Maccabees two letters (1:1-10a; 1:10b- 2:18). These letters are distinguished by their typical Hellenistic openings containing the addressee, χαίρειν and the writer/sending party¹⁷. The ending of the first letter is confirmed by both the dating in 1:10a¹⁸, and the standard salutation of the second letter (1:10b). Therefore, the first letter will be delimited as 1:1-1:10a, and the second letter as 1:10b-18).

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

The two letters have distinct features. The first has a paratactic Semitic style. This is highlighted by the appearance of καὶ three or four times in most verses, eight in v. 8. The flow of the argument in the first letter seems logical:

- A salutation (v. 1)
- Expressions of good will (vv. 2-5)
- A segue (v. 6) into a section (v. 7 - 10a) which summarises preceding events up unto the rededication of the Temple and a plea for the celebration of the holiday instituted.

The term *ιουδαῖοι* in v. 1 seems to refer to people that originally come from Judea and now find themselves in Egypt or across the known world of the text. Bickerman (1927: 223-225) holds that the term refers to the Ptolemaic practice of identifying people that

¹⁷ Perhaps there lies some significance in the order of this salutation. Exler (1923, 42-44, 65-67) notes the usual order puts the writer first. One finds this usual order in the letters in Chapter 11. The order in these first two letters might demonstrate the writer/writing party's desire to portray himself/themselves as less important than the recipient. The problem, however, is that these letters cannot be judged by the norm of standard Greek letters.

¹⁸A more elaborate discussion of this dating will be provided in the next section below, which implies that the first date in v. 7 is merely the date of a quoted letter and that, in this case, the date of the letter should be placed at the ending of the letter.

are not citizens by their point of origin. Doran (2012: 24), however, demonstrates that the term likely does not refer to point of origin. He translates this term as Jews and not "Judeans" regarding that the point of origin involves more than geography: "geography, ethnicity, and cultural practices – including religious ones – are intimately connected" (Doran, 2012: 24). The phrase οἱ ἐν τῇ χώρᾳ τῆς Ιουδαίας (1:1) demonstrates a specific political idea of Jerusalem and the Temple. It implies that the city of Jerusalem has its "country" (χώρα). Schwartz (2008: 135) states that "Judaea is the territory that surrounds Jerusalem and is defined by it." Van Henten (1997: 191) rightly argues that Judas, despite his annulment of the Greek ways of life, did not object to Jerusalem's political status as a *polis*. There is, however, a fuller extent to the territory that is influenced by Jerusalem. The influence stretches to whichever territory a Jew might find himself in. The Jews in Egypt are vitally connected to the Temple in Jerusalem. This is evident in the addressees of the two letters. The letters further emphasise the centrality of the Temple in Jerusalem and political significance of Jerusalem through their attachment to our text. This is a text which seems to stress the fact that the Jewish nation and Judaism cannot function without the Temple in Jerusalem being in its natural and perfect form.

A wish for peace (such as εἰρήνην ἀγαθήν, 1:1) is a prominent facet in most Aramaic letters. This phrase might very well be an allusion to Jeremiah 33:9, "for all the good and all the peace" (Goldstein, 1983: 140). This phrase will be separated from the initial greeting pattern of letters of petition and placed among the wishes for well-being (Goldstein, 1983: 141; Doran, 2012: 25). The phrase will open v. 2 instead of ending v. 1.

In vv. 2-5 one finds definite biblical verbiage (Enekmalm-Ogawa, 1987: 56-58; 135-136). It is paralleled to Jeremiah 32, especially in the light of our note on 1:2. This parallel between Jeremiah 32:26 onwards and vv. 2-5 is evident through the following aspects:

- Both involve a King who has a conquest of Jerusalem
- Both involve the abomination of the Temple

- Both express the hope that God will be beneficent (ἀγαθοποιήσαι) to the residents of the city
- Both express the desire that God will give the relevant Jews one heart to fear him.

A significant element surfaces when a comparison is drawn with Jeremiah 32-33. In Jeremiah the desecration of the Temple through Babylonian religious rituals is the result of God's punishment. However, this punishment was caused by Israel's practice of Babylonian religious rituals. Thus, because Israel worships Baal, the Baal-worshippers (Babylonians) will take over Jerusalem. The case in 2 Maccabees is similar. The Seleucid officials who are enforcing Hellenization would later enter and desecrate the Temple in Jerusalem because of the Jewish faction that is pushing for complete assimilation with the Hellenistic ways.

The choice for translation in 1:4 would be "the commandments" (προστάγμασι). This is based on the Semitic background of this letter. Elsewhere, as in 7:30, 10:8 and 15:3, a suitable translation would be "decree", acknowledging the contextual emphasis on the contrast between the Laws of God and those of the Hellenistic kings.

Important to our study, is the use of καταλλάσσω¹⁹ (1:5). It shows the way in understanding the specific interpretation our text provides of the events taken place. Reconciliation is one of its central motifs (Porter, 1994). Doran (2012: 27) links the use of this term to the specific attribute of God as the covenant partner that is "not to be angry with them (the Jews), but is to show mercy and not desert his covenant partners when they are in trouble. This becomes clear through the terminology that follows in 1:5: may He not abandon you in a bad/evil time (μὴ ὑμᾶς ἐγκαταλίποι ἐν καιρῷ πονηρῷ). Stanley Porter²⁰ highlights the fact that its use in speaking about a relationship with the

¹⁹ Jarvis, J. Williams (2013), in his book *Maccabean Martyr Traditions in Paul's Theology of Atonement*, discusses the interpretation of καταλλάσσω and other verbiage such as ἰλεως (mercy), καθάρσιον (purification) etc. as a means of communicating the atoning deaths of the Maccabean martyrs.

²⁰ Stanley E. Porter (1994) writes on καταλλάσσω in *Ancient Greek Literature with Reference to the Pauline Writings*.

gods is rare prior to the terms appearance in 2 Maccabees. Spicq (*Notes*, 1.407-411) shows that in the Septuagint, only 2 Maccabees employs this word in its various forms. What is even more important is the fact that this letter specifically, which is prefixed to our text, uses this word. Here, Schwartz' (2008: 138) argument is preferred that the "Judaean readers of the book, who wrote this letter to accompany it, correctly recognised the notion's centrality, and alluded to it here."

Regarding the dating in 1:7, as discussed above, it is reasonable to accept that the Jewish (Babylonian) method of reckoning the Seleucid era (from the spring of 311BCE onwards) is utilised. Therefore the modern dating of 143 BCE makes sense, seeing that Demetrius II ruled 145-139 BCE.

There is another facet which presents some problems in v. 7. The phrase ἐν τῇ θλίψει καὶ ἐν τῇ ἀκμῇ τῇ ἐπελθούσῃ ἡμῖν would be translated literally as: "in the (time of) the oppression and the crisis which came upon us". This would imply that it was a time of crisis and oppression in 169 SE. Yet, the rest of the verse implies a period twenty years or more prior to the writing - the period between Jason and the rededication of the Temple. Therefore, the path is taken where ἐν would mean "about" as in Deuteronomy 6:7 (Schwartz, 2008: 140).

The classic denotation of purpose (ἵνα ἄγητε) in v. 9 is similar to that in v. 18. The only difference is that the phrase in v. 9 depends on γεγράφαμεν in v. 7 and not on a verb in the same verse as in v. 18. Consequently, the phrase "we have written you" may be repeated parenthetically in v. 9.

Regarding the dating in 1:10, see the discussion on the dating of the letter above.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

Caution should be applied when investigating the proposition of these two letters. The manner in which one should work is different than that of the rest of the text. These two letters were written by different authors and are independently aimed (never been

noted). Their proposition and argumentation when separate is different than when interpreted as one with our text. In this study, these letters are viewed as part of our text. With this in mind, the question is what elements are present in the letters which are also central to our book and therefore the reason to be included.

Taking this unique place the letters hold within the rest of the text into account, the proposition may be formulated as follows:

IF (1:1-10a)

- the Jews in Jerusalem and those in the territory of Judaea are the brothers of the Jews throughout Egypt,
- the Jews in Jerusalem and those in the territory of Judaea wish the best for the Jews throughout Egypt,
- the Jews in Jerusalem and those in the territory of Judaea are praying for Jews throughout Egypt,
- extreme oppression came upon the Jews in Jerusalem and its territory, but the Lord heard them after they besought Him,
- the Jews in Jerusalem offered sacrifices and choice flour and kindled the lamps and set out the breads.

THEN (1:1-10a)

- the Jews in Egypt should also now celebrate this feast in the month of Kislev.

3. Pragmatic Analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

Firstly, both the first and second letter emphasise the unity between writer and reader. This is important in an attempt to convince the reader to practice the same rituals and feasts as the writer. The unity amongst the two parties calls for unity in practice. Along with explicating the good wishes the writing party has for the readers, the strategy utilises an emotional appeal in achieving the outcome.

Secondly, and less explicit, is the logical appeal of the demonstration of God's protection. God protects those in Jerusalem and hears their prayers. This means that the writing party has authority because they are proved to be sanctioned by God. The fact that God heard their prayers justifies them as well as their actions of initiating the feast of rededication. The receivers may now confidently follow these Jews in Jerusalem because the Jews in Jerusalem are celebrating this feast in the right relationship with God.

3.2. Real and alternative text-world

The text is dealing with the topographical problems that may arise due to the setting of some Jews in Egypt. They are far from Judaea and detached from community and ritual lifestyle of the Jews in Jerusalem. This detachment as well as the presence of a temple in Egypt may cause the Jews there to also detach themselves from certain celebrations of feasts and disregard the significance of the Temple in Jerusalem. There exists a chance that the Jews in Egypt might not celebrate the feast. For them, the specifics and legitimacy of the purification feast is debatable.

The desired alternative is a setting where there is complete unity between the Jews in Egypt, and those in Jerusalem. This unity implies a setting where both parties share the same interest in the relevance of the Temple and the feast and demonstrate this by celebrating the feast.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

The text provides a solution through suggesting an alternative setting, where the Jews in Egypt make a choice on the grounds of their bond with the Temple and Jews in Jerusalem as well as God's assertion of the feast. In this setting, the readers will wholeheartedly be able to join the Jews in Jerusalem and Judaea in their celebration of the feast.

CHAPTER 3: THE SECOND PREFIXED LETTER (2 Maccabees 1:10b-2:18)

1. Introduction

This letter (1:10b-2:18), as is the case with the first, is a call for the Jews in Egypt to celebrate the purification of the Temple. Following the initial greeting, is a formulaic concern about the recipients' well-being. A considerable part of the letter is organised as a clarification of the feast. Regarding this clarification it is important to understand the significance of the detail given. Consequently, the following questions need to be addressed:

- What is the correlation and difference between this letter, and the first prefixed letter?
- What is the significance of attributes mentioned of God and an elaborate recount of the history of the fire in the Temple?
- Why do characters such as Moses, Nehemiah and Jeremiah feature?
- What possible reasons exist for attaching this letter to our text?

In attempting to answer these questions, the text will now be delimited, analysed on a syntactical and semantic level, investigated for proposition and argumentation and analysed on a pragmatic level.

2. Structural analysis

2.1. Delimitation

As stated above, these letters are distinguished by their typical Hellenistic openings containing the addressee, $\chi\alpha\acute{\iota}\rho\epsilon\iota\upsilon$ and the writer/sending party. The second letter is rounded off by the concluding summary (2:16-18), which contains an invitation to join in the celebration of the holiday. This conclusion clearly ends with 2:18 as 2:19 starts a preface (2:19-32) which Schwartz (2008:171) portrays as the work of an anonymous

writer using the first-person to "employ some standard *topoi* about the pleasure and usefulness of historical literature."

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

In contrast to the first, the second letter is less fluent. Schwartz provides two reasons: "(a) its first section (1:11-17) seems to have suffered an extensive interpolation (vv. 13-16), and (b) the main body (1:18-2:15) tells its story in reverse order."

The phrase τοὺς παρα ταξαμένους ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλει (those who drew themselves up against the holy city – 1:12) stands directly opposite the phrase ὡς ἂν πρὸς βασιλέα παρατασσόμενοι [(we) who drew ourselves up against the king – 1:11]. Both the Jews and their enemy drew up, but the Jews were not alone. God drew up with them and achieved the results - an excellent example of the notion of dual causality (Seeligmann, 1963: 385-411; and Amit, 1987: 385-400). Not, only is dual causality important for understanding 2 Maccabees, the notion of God as Israel's ally is also a central theme in our book. Van Henten (1997:244) recognises this theme of the alliance between God and his people and highlights its explicit exposition in 3:34-39. Here, as is intertwined in the structure of our book, a pattern is evident which is paralleled by non-Jewish traditions. There is an attack on a temple or city by a (foreign) aggressor and a rescue of this temple by its patron deity/s. Van Henten (1997:26) summarises the pattern in 2 Maccabees as follows:

1. Betrayal of Judaism by individual Jews in leading positions with respect to their religious and political ideologies and practices;
2. Attack on Temple, city and Jewish people by the king or his general;
3. Absolute loyalty to the Jewish God and Jewish practice on the part of the martyrs and Rasis; description of their deaths;
4. Deliverance of the Temple, city and Jewish state under the guidance of Judas Maccabaeus and with the help of the Lord;

5. Vengeance against the enemies of the Jews;
6. The founding of a feast to commemorate the deliverance and as an expression of thanks to the Lord;

This pattern is already present in the two prefixed letters. It is clear that one of the main functions of these letters is to focus the reader upon these and other themes to come in the rest of the book.

The Temple of Nanaia, would be the temple of the Babylonian goddess identified by the Greeks with Artemis. Polybius (31.9.1) and Josephus (Ant. 12.358) confirm that the temple Antiochus IV Epiphanes wished to rob was of Artemis.

Schwartz (2008: 149) translates συνοικήσων αὐτῇ (1:14) as "to cohabit with her" and comments that "there was good ancient Mesopotamian precedent for marriage between a king and a goddess." This is an acceptable deduction, considering that Antiochus already married Atergatis in Hieropolis.

The definite article in τὴν ... κρυπτὴν θύραν (the hidden door) in 1:16 suggests the author to accept the customary use of such doors and the reader's knowledge of them in temples. The mentioning in Bel and the Dragon vv. 15 and 21 as well as Josephus (*Antiquities* 18.74; Weinreich, 1929: 407-410) supports this idea of the implication of customary use. The readers would have been well informed of the existence, and possibly the use, of these doors.

The word παρέδωκεν (1:17), as opposed to ἔδωκε in other witnesses, provides for the interpretation of not only handing over, but handing over to one's condign fate. This is logical, especially when regarding the subjects τοὺς ἀσεβήσαντας (those who did impiously) who are handed over.

A significant development is found in the phrase in 1:18: ἡγησάμεθα διασαφῆσαι ὑμῖν ἵνα καὶ αὐτοὶ ἄγητε σκηνοπηγίας καὶ τοῦ πυρός (we thought it necessary to inform you,

so that you yourselves might celebrate, about the *holiday of Tabernacles and of fire*).²¹ This classic denotation of purpose (ἵνα + subjunctive) is parallel to the depiction of the first letter's agenda (1:9), but with the addition of the element of fire. This focusses the reader on the succeeding text which will explain the sudden focus upon lights.

The phrase in 1:19 ἐνκοιλώματι φρέατος τάξιν ἔχοντος ἄνουδρον which is translated as "in the hollow of an empty cistern," would literally be translated: "in the hollow of a cistern, the structure being waterless" (Hanhart, 1961: 30-31)²².

There are some differences in opinion on the translation of the phrase in 1:20: διελθόντων δὲ ἐτῶν ἱκανῶν ὅτε ἔδοξεν τῷ θεῷ. It is not clear whether the writer means that God had fixed in advance the length of the Babylonian Exile. Doran (2012:46) translates it as "after a suitable number of years had elapsed, when it was decreed by God". Schwartz (2008: 152) provides a similar option: "enough years have passed as seemed appropriate to God." Others, such as Habicht (1976: 203), translate as if the text refers to "many years." Doran and Schwartz refer to the basic meaning of ἱκανός ("enough," "appropriate") (Mauersberger, 1956: 1.1172-1175). This basic meaning is preferred seeing that the latter part of the phrase: "as seemed appropriate to God," further supports the idea of ἱκανός as "enough."

In the translation of 1:21, ἀνηνέχθη should be carefully approached. The question here is, within sacrificial diction, should it be interpreted as more than "bringing along?"²³ In an attempt to answer this question, some authors²⁴ translate it as: "had been offered up". This is, however, only necessary if ἀνηνέχθη is connected to the general description τὰ τῶν θουσιῶν. Doran (2012: 47) rightly follows Wilhelm (1937:19-20) in

²¹ This translation follows Doran (2012: 46). It is a more logical solution for the translation of Schwartz, 2 *Maccabees*, 130.

²² As opposed to Wilhelm, (1937: 15-19) and Katz (1960: 12-13).

²³ As Katz (1960: 13) suggests.

²⁴ Such as Hanhart (1961: 31, n. 6); Spicq (1982:1.91-93); and Daniel (1966: 240,255).

providing an alternative. The general description τὰ τῶν θουσιῶν is not connected to ἀνηνέχθη, but specified by the mention of wood and other things necessary for the sacrifice. Thus, τὰ τῶν θουσιῶν is specified by ἐκέλευσεν. Consequently, the subject of the verb ἀνηνέχθη is the liquid of the previous verse that Nehemiah had commanded be brought (φέρειν).

The use of τῷ ὕδατι (Lit. "with the water") suggests two possible purposes. The context calls for the translation "with the liquid/watery substance", but there might be another purpose. It could be an allusion to the Elijah story at 1 Kings 18:33-35. In this case, the supernatural character of events is explicated. As with Elijah, the substance used should, like water, make it very hard to ignite a new fire. A fact that supports this is that the text does not employ what ancient Greek provides for "liquid" (ὕγρός). However, this might also imply a Semitic *Vorlage* - seeing that ancient Hebrew has no word for "liquid." It seems strange, however, that the translator would not have recognised the text's suggestion that it is not normal water. Consequently, the only logical deduction that can be made is that this word, in this context, should be translated as "liquid" and not "water."

In 1:24, the phrase ὁ πάντων κτίστης is translated as "creator of all." The usual Septuagintal use of κρίζω ("I create") is referenced here. Through this phrase, that which is created (all/everything) is emphasised. Zimmermann (*Namen des Vaters*, 350-351) demonstrates the link between the way God is addressed and the salvation he is expected to bring. Further links also need to be drawn between the attributes of God in the prayer (1:24-25) and the actions which are anticipated in the rest of the text. God is also called "the fearsome", "the powerful", "the just", "the merciful one", "the only king who is also benevolent", "the only leader of the dance"²⁵, "the only just", "the almighty and eternal one", "the one who preserves Israel from all evil" and "the one who chose our forefathers and sanctified them". Regarding the nature of the two prefixed letters

²⁵ Doran (2012: 50) notes the preservation of the nuances of involvement as well as bestowal, so that God not only is the creator of the cosmos but also governs it.

and the presence of this elaborate prayer, it could be expected that God will, in the rest of the book, act in accordance to every one of these attributes.

A facet which makes it hard to imagine that the prayer found in 1:24-29 is from the days of Nehemiah, is the phrase in 1:28 τοὺς κατα δυναστεύοντας καὶ ἐξυβρίζοντας ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ (those who oppress and outrage in arrogance). These adjectival participles, especially together with ὑπερηφανίᾳ seems so likely to refer specifically to Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who's arrogance and boasting is emphasised (5:21; 9:8-12). This suggests two possibilities. Either, the prayer is not at all from the days of Nehemiah, or the text is a witness of the redaction needed to align these two prefixed letters with the rest of our texts themes and nuances. The latter option is preferred on grounds of the other attempts on correlation such as our note on 1:5.

Exodus 15:17 is quoted in our text in 1:29 ("plant your people in Your holy place, as Moses said"). The significance of this allusion to the Song of the Sea is that it was the first step of the Israelites on their way from Egypt to the promised land. And now, again in the hope of gathering in the exiles from Egypt, it is applied effectively.

The relation between ἀντιλάμπαντος and ἔδαπανήθη (1:32), is adverbial: "after the light was reflected back, the fire went out (was consumed). The verb ἔδαπανήθη is probably referring to the fact that, as Schwartz (2008: 158) states, the fire "was consumed by the rocks; no longer needed for the present, the fire was stored in the rocks until needed again - at 10:3."

The words καὶ ὀφθήσεται ἡ δόξα τοῦ κυρίου καὶ ἡ νεφέλη (and the glory of the Lord and the cloud will be seen) in 2:8 is an excellent exposition of our text's usage of loaded terms. The definite article with νεφέλη implies that the reader would recall a cloud with specific contextual attributes. When the succeeding words ("as it was also evident in the days of Moses") are considered, it becomes clear that the answer lies in Exodus 40:34-35 ("Then the cloud covered the tent of meeting, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle; and Moses was not able to enter the tent of meeting, because the cloud abode upon it, and the glory of the Lord filled the tabernacle").

There is a total parallelism between Moses and Solomon in 2:8, 2:10 and 2:12 with the words ὡς καὶ (2:8), καθὼς (2:10) and ὡσαύτως καὶ ὁ Σαλωμων (2:12). This is to ensure the reader of the continuance of the supernatural and divine enforcement of the Temple and that what Solomon did was based on good precedent.

In 2:11, as in 12:43, the standard Septuagint term (περὶ τῆς ἁμαρτίας in 2:11 and περὶ ἁμαρτίας in 12:43) for the *hattat* (purification offering) is used (Daniel, 1966: 319-328).

It seems logical that τὰ τοῦ Δαυιδ (2:13) implies βιβλία (thus translated "the books of David"). Two facts that further substantiate this translation is the grouping in Luke 24:44 ("everything written about me in the Law of Moses and the prophets and the psalms must be fulfilled") and the grouping in Philo's *Contemplative Life* 25 ("laws...prophets...psalms and the other [books]").

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

The second letter has a similar proposition to that of the first, but with a stronger logical aim. The strong logical tendency demonstrates the attempt to provide a thorough description of the link between the First and second Temple. Doran (2012: 52) recognises the importance of this link in urging the receivers of the letter to celebrate the feast in stating "the senders set out to show the importance of the present temple and its divine stamp of approval." The 'fire from heaven' (2:10) places an emphasis on the parallelism between Moses and Solomon. Schwartz (2008: 164) deduces that the point of the present verse must be to show that what Solomon did was based on good precedent. Interestingly, the parallel in 1 Kings 8 to the dedication ritual of Solomon does not refer to the fire from heaven. Neither is there a parallel in 2 Samuel to 1 Chronicles 21:26's claim that fire also came down from heaven to David's altar in the threshing floor of Ornan the Jebusite. This demonstrates both our author and the Chronicler's aim to "underpin the legitimacy of the Temple by making it as parallel as possible to its predecessors (Schwartz, 2008: 164). This fact that the fire in use in the

first Temple descended from heaven guarantees the "ultimately heavenly and hence sacred origin of the fire in use in the second Temple" (Schwartz, 2008:134). Consequently, the mention of the fire's heavenly origin forms an important part of the argument for the appropriateness of celebrating the Temple's rededication. Doran rightfully summarises this linkage as follows: "The Second Temple is thus the place where God still meets his people, and the festival celebrates that" (Doran, 2012: 53).

This implies the following demonstration of the proposition and argumentation:

IF

- those in Jerusalem and Judaea wish greetings and good health to Aristobulos and the Jews in Egypt (1:10b),
- those in Jerusalem and Judaea were saved by God from great dangers (1:11-17),
- those in Jerusalem and Judaea are about to celebrate on the twenty-fifth Kislev the purification of the Temple (1:18),
- the Jews in Egypt and the Jews in Jerusalem are one,
- there is a definite continuity between the First Temple and that of Nehemiah through the presence of the fire in the Temple (1:19-36).

THEN

- the addressees will act well to celebrate the purification of the Temple (2:16).

3. Pragmatic analysis²⁶

3.1. Communicative strategy

Firstly, both the letters emphasise the unity between writer and reader. This is important in an attempt to convince the reader to practice the same rituals and feasts as the

²⁶ For the real- and alternative text-world, see the discussion in Ch. 2

writer. The unity amongst the two parties calls for unity in practice. This first strategy utilises a logical appeal in achieving the outcome. This is also done by explicating the good wishes the writing party has for the readers.

Secondly, the letter aims an authoritative appeal through focussing on the attributes of God in the quoted prayer. This assures the readers of the positive actions of God that can be expected in the rest of the book and therefore, as history, serves as a confirmation of God's blessing and agreement to whatever the Jews in Jerusalem are practicing.

Lastly, the letter is set apart through an elaborate logical appeal. Since the place of the lights within the purification feast is unclear, more than a claim for unity and good wishes are needed. Therefore, the text provides a thorough discussion that demonstrates a link between the origin of the sacred fire in the Temple, and the present situation.

Since the real and alternative text-world is parallel to that of the first letter because of the sending and receiving parties, the trans-universal relations will be discussed next.

3.2. Trans-universal relations

The receivers of this letter are informed on specific details: (1) the continuity between the First Temple and that of Nehemiah (1:18b-36); (2) the discontinuity between the First Temple and that of Nehemiah (2:1-12); and (3) the comparison between Nehemiah and Judas (2:13-15). The need for these details imply that the receivers of the letter need to be convinced/reassured of the importance of the present Temple in Jerusalem and, thus, the importance of its rededication.

They are moved from a possible view of disregard and separation from the Jerusalem Temple and the Jews who are living there, to a sense of unity and understanding. They are assured that:

- they are one with the Jews in Jerusalem,
- God certifies the rightful place of the Jews in Jerusalem,
- God certifies the legitimacy of the Temple in Jerusalem, even in the present, after Judas,
- and that God wishes for the Jerusalem Temple to maintain its significance and designated place within the life of every Jew.

This moves the receivers to hopefully do as the Jews in Jerusalem do. They need to honour the Temple in Jerusalem as a unique holy place designated, legitimised and sanctified by God.

CHAPTER 4: PROLOGUE (2:19-32)

1. Introduction

Right from the offset of the narrative the reader is engaged.²⁷ In this prologue, the reader is informed of the events to follow. Not only are these events introduced, but the author maximises the reader's interest through qualifying the events through descriptive language. The Temple is described as the greatest temple (τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ μεγίστου, 2:18) and renowned (περιβόητον) throughout the world (2:22). Furthermore, there are heavenly manifestations coming to the aid of those who acted strenuously and eagerly on behalf of Judaism (2:21). Surprisingly, the few conquered the many (2:21), the small number of Jews defeated the barbarian hordes (τὰ βάρβαρα πλήθη, 2:21). Doran (2 Maccabees: 73) demonstrates that this descriptive language alludes to Herodotus's description of Greek victories and barbarian defeats. One finds in Herodotus (1.4; 8.37) particularly the defeat of the barbarians when they attacked the temple at Delphi. Lastly, the tension is created by stating that the laws were about to be abrogated, but they were restored (2:22). At this stage, however, the details of these events are unknown to the reader. Through this anticipation, the author invites the reader to satisfy his/her curiosity by exploring the text further.

The danger, however, exists that the reader may view this prologue as a dismissal of the original work of Jason of Cirene. Therefore, the author provides a way of perceiving this epitome that does not affect the value of the larger five-volume work. The author does this by stating that both works have a specific and alternative focus. The larger work by Jason gives a precise clarification of each and every detail (2:28), but risks neglecting emotional detail and rhetorical exploitation. The epitome, on the other hand,

²⁷ On this preface, see Alexander, *Preface*, 148-151.

proceeds by means of the general description appropriate to a concise version, but decorates the events for the purpose of the reader's enjoyment (2:28-29). The reader is again drawn in by the author's promise to offer a concise and significant version of the events.

The author seems to present himself through both style and content as a proper Hellenistic historian. This is evident, firstly, in his use of terms that are frequently found in discussions by Hellenistic historians (Doran, 2012: 69-71).²⁸ Secondly, his presentation as a Hellenistic historian becomes clear, when highlighting the purpose which the author is providing for the narrative in this preface. The author is one who serves the reader as he clearly states that the work will benefit all types of readers (2:25): those who wish to read with a vivid imagination, as well as those who want to memorise the narrative. On this aim Schwartz (2008: 178) rightly states that that the work serves as "entertainment to readers, brevity to memorisers, and thus to all the benefit they are seeking."

To summarise: this preface engages the readers by informing them that the subject is noble, that the author has worked hard to finalise the product, and that it will be useful to them.²⁹ These elements will also now serve as motivation for investigating this text on a structural and pragmatic level.

²⁸ See also the note on 2:25 below.

²⁹ These aspects are discussed also in Lucian, *Hist. conscr.* 53-54.

2. Structural analysis

2.1. Delimitation

At the start of the preface, in 2:19, one finds a tactic of the author which builds the anticipation of the reader and will prove to be abundantly employed throughout the narrative. In this verse (2:19) the tactic is seen in the long sentence which is started here (τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὸν Ιουδαῖον...ἐπιτεμεῖν), and continues through to 2:23 only to state the authors purpose with the very last word (ἐπιτέμνω – “I epitomise”). This sentence shifts the reader’s attention to the events that will be recounted in the narrative as well as the method that will be applied (namely epitomising the original work). The introduction of this long sentence here in 2:18, together with its new subject and theme, marks the start of the preface of the narrative. This section continues in providing a brief contemplation on writing epitomes (2:24-31) and is concluded by means of the phrase ἐντεῦθεν οὖν (henceforth then) in 2:32. The structural marker ἐντεῦθεν, together with the cohortative subjunctive ἀρξώμεθα (let us begin) tells the reader that the next section is about to be introduced. The particle γὰρ (because, for) rounds off this concluding sentence by providing the reason for brevity not only in the epitome, but also in this preface. Consequently, the preface begins at 2:19 and ends at 2:32.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

The mentioning of Judas' brothers in 2:19 may be viewed in two ways. This can either refer to Judas' siblings, or it can refer to those who bravely stood and fought by his side (brothers in arms). The context here suggests the first option, namely brothers in a familial sense. This leaves the question why mention is made at all. It would only make sense if the focus will remain on Judas’ brothers throughout the narrative. If not the larger work by Jason could have explicated the role of the brothers and the author of 2 Maccabees is merely accounting for that. Doran (2012: 66) suggests that the epitome indeed highlights the role of the brothers in 8:22-23 where Judas installs his brothers as

leaders. However, in 10:19-20 and 14:17, the brothers get little attention. Furthermore, the reference in 8:22 does not expand on their role, character or place in the narrative plan. What remains then is the ostensible contrast in portrayal of the brothers between the original work and the epitome. For this there is a simple solution: the epitomiser could only be accounting for the emphasis of the brothers in 1 Maccabees (3:25, 42; 4:36, 59; 5:10). Thus, the reference to Judas' brother here is not telling us about the original work by Jason of Cirene, but of the emphasis in 1 Maccabees.

In 2:19 the term βωμός (altar) is used. This seems unnatural as the practice within the LXX is to prefer θυσιαστήριον for the Jewish altar (Muraoka, 2009: 728). The term βωμός is rather employed to refer to idolatrous altars. This is also the case in the narrative. There is, however, another example of the use of βωμός in our text to refer to the Jewish altar and not to an idolatrous altar in 13:8. For this conundrum, Daniel (1966: 24-25) provides the most probable solution. The narrative was written in a stage in the process where Jewish writers became comfortable with the usual Greek terminology as the matter became less sensitive. This fluent employment of Greek terms demands that caution be taken throughout the rest of the narrative in appointing meaning to words.

A term that is significant and key to understanding our narrative is Ιουδαϊσμός (Judaism) - 2:21). The term also features in 8:1 and 14:38 and seems to be used antithetically against Ἑλληνισμός (Hellenism) and ἄλλοφυλισμός (foreigner - 4:13). As there is no direct antithesis in the same verses where the opposite terms are used, Gruen (1998: 3-4) and *Bar Kokhba* (1994: 464-465) both suggest that the two terms are never set directly opposite each other. This is also true in terms of syntactical and grammatical rules, but does not discard the possibility that the terms are implicitly placed opposite each other. On this matter Schwartz (2008: 173) rightly states that "the facts that all of these words are new (our author's inventions?), or new in this sense, and of the same structure (X + -ισμός), seem fairly clearly to indicate that the author viewed each in the

light of the other." As further support Goldstein (1983, on his comment on 4:13) points to the fact that Ἑλληνισμός developed into the meaning of "loyal to the Greek cause" in the sixth and fifth centuries BCE in opposition to Μηδισμός (loyalty to the Persian cause)³⁰. With the use of the phrase τὰ βάρβαρα πλήθη (the barbarian hordes) the author is cunningly judging the Hellenists in the same manner they judge non-Greeks. The term βάρβαρος was used to refer to all non-Greeks (Doran, 2012: 68). Through employing this word the author is implying that the Greek King and his army are not behaving as the civilised institution they represent. Schwartz (2008: 174) denotes that the author is presenting himself as a good Greek, hoping to gain the sympathy of Greek readers. This might be possible. The text, as argued above does hold a positive attitude towards Greek ideas, but it does not seem to be the case here. Here, it would be safe to refer only to the ironic contrast between the Greek and Jews.

In this preface, the author uses the (authorial) first person plural as is the case in 3:24 with the adverbial participle συνορῶντες. The only exception is found in 2:29 [so I think also about us (οὕτως δοκῶ καὶ ἐπὶ ἡμῶν)]. Doran (2012: 68) calls this peculiar and notes that in the epilogue, the first person singular is consistently used.

In 3:25 our author invites the reader to come to knowledge of three aims of the text of 2 Maccabees. A construction of μὲν ... δὲ ... δὲ is employed with the aim placed at the end of each clause:

Aim 1 – verse 25a "we planned persuasiveness, on the one hand, for those who wish to read (ἐφροντίσαμεν τοῖς μὲν βουλομένοις ἀναγινώσκειν ψυχαγωγίαν),"

³⁰ See also Mason, "Jews, Judaeans," 460-70.

Aim 2 – verse 25b "on the other hand, ease for those who work hard, in order to recollect from memory (τοῖς δὲ φιλοφρονοῦσιν εἰς τὸ διὰ μνήμης ἀναλαβεῖν εὐκοπίαν),"

Aim 3 – verse 25c "and usefulness for all who study it (πᾶσιν δὲ τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν ὠφέλειαν)"

Schwartz (2008:178) notes the "fine balance within the verse, which turns first to these, then to those, then to all together (μὲν ... δὲ ... πᾶσιν δὲ)," and compares the style to that of Josephus' opening of his *Against Apion* (§3). The author is saying that the narrative is not only intended for technical readers, but in fact for anyone.

As stated above, these three aims carry a certain persuasiveness through promising reward to and flattering the reader. These aims also further communicate the author's desire to be portrayed as a proper historian according to the standard of Greek writings and rhetoric. Clare Rothschild (2004:1-23) demonstrated well how history was connected with rhetoric in ancient Greek and Hellenistic historiography. This is especially evident through the use of the term ψυχαγωγία (3:25; literally "the leading of souls").³¹ Doran (2012: 69-71) notes that ψυχαγωγία is intimately connected with rhetoric and that it is therefore significant that our author has chosen this term to describe one of his aims. For Plato, the terms ψυχαγωγία and rhetoric are the same thing: "Is it (rhetoric) not in its entire nature an art which leads the soul by means of words?" (Phaedr. 261A).

The two different terms used in 3:25 to refer to reading (ἀναγινώσκω and ἐντυγχάνω) leads to the logical deduction that the author is merely varying diction. Doran (2012: 70)

³¹ On this term, see Walbank, "History and Tragedy," 232 ; de Romilly, *Magic and Rhetoric*, 15, 74; Doran, 2 *Maccabees*, 69-71.

rightfully presses for the understanding that this text was also probably performed or at least publicly read and thus focuses on the broader meaning of "come into contact with." The interpretation for the term ἐντυγχάνω here, however, would be as Schwartz (2008:177) suggests: the term refers to the "checking and searching" that accompanies the careful reading of a text such as 2 Maccabees. This interpretation fits into the clear purpose of this preface to compliment the readers, "insofar it ascribes them a certain seriousness" (Schwartz, 2008:177).

Verse 26 in the book's preface plays a significant role amongst the various phrases the author employs in communicating the value of his works. In this verse (3:26), the wearisome tasks of the author is contrasted with that of the reader. This is done through the emphatic position of ἡμῖν ("for us") as the second word in the sentence as well as the particle μὲν placed with the adversative particle ὅμως (nevertheless). The text seems to argue the following: The work is of an excellent value, not only because it is aimed at competent readers who love to labour, but also because it was constructed by an author who worked hard to present the final product. Such a remark about the author's intense work as well as the use of the term ἀγρυπνία (sleeplessness – v.27) is, however, standard in ancient prefaces (Schwartz, 2008:178). It ensures the reader of the quality of the work that is about to be explored.

The comparison in 2:27 between the author and the one who prepares a symposium is found again in 15:39. This rounds off the book. Schwartz (2008:178) emphasises the place of the nourishments in a symposium by stating that the comparison means the work is an important one meant to "nourish the mind and the spirit." Yet, the comparison does not emphasise the eating and drinking, but the important work of the συμπροσάρχος (president of the drinking party) to keep the event organised and to put the guests at ease. Sirach (32:1-2) teaches that the one chosen to preside at a dinner was to see to all the needs of the guests before he may sit down.

In his discussion on 3:28, Doran (2012: 72) aims to determine a very specific interpretation for the term ὑπογράμμος (pattern/model). He states that the main argument for its translation as "rule," "contour," or "line" seems to derive from the way children in Greece were taught to write letters. This can be deduced from Plato (*Prot.* 326D)³²: "just as writing-masters first draw letters in faint outline [ὑπογράψαντες γραμμάς]. He asks whether there existed standardised rules for the appearance of an epitome.

The verb ζωγραφέω ("I paint from life" – *Liddell & Scott*, 1967: 758; "I portray in colours" – *Muraoka*, 2009: 315) in 2:29 may usually be interpreted as referring to painters in general. Here, it seems to have the specific meaning of "to paint animals." This specific meaning is merited by the fact that there are two verbs here that refer to painting (ζωγραφέω, and ἐγκαίω – "to burn in"). Therefore, the two verbs should refer to two types of painting. Those who prefer the general meaning of ζωγραφέω, such as *Habicht* (1976: 209), have no choice but to broaden the meaning of the previous verb ἐγκαίω (Literally: "to burn in", but in art it refers to painting by means of applying heat to coloured wax). *Doran* (2012: 72) takes the specific meaning, but does not make note of the general meaning. Taking these aspects into account, it seems only logical to translate the two verbs as "encaustically" and "to paint animals."

The verb πολυπραγμονέω ("I am busy about many things" – *Liddell & Scott*, 1967: 1442; "to enquire closely" - *Muraoka*, 2009: 574) in 2:30 is translated by *Schwartz* (2008:179) as "occupying oneself with each and every detail" and by *Doran* (2012: 73) as "inquire closely". Both translations rightfully carry the meaning of an acquisition into the detail of events. Although not clear in his translation, *Schwartz* (2008:179) that the

³² See also H. -I. Marrou, *A History of Education in Antiquity* (New York: Sheed & Ward, 1956) 152: "The master would draw one of the letters, probably very lightly - like the lines written with dotted lines in writing books - and then, before he let the child try it by himself, take his hand and make him go over it, so as to give him the feel of the letter."

author is "leaving out details not only because they are too numerous and would encumber readers, but also because they are not very important." This line of argumentation should, however, be rejected since it has already been established above that the author is discussing the sense in his conciseness, without devaluing the original historiography.

In the last verse of this preface (2:32), the author remarks on the proportion of the preface to the rest of the book. He states that it would be foolish to write on and increase the size of this preface and not move on to the body of the book. This remark of our author is in accordance to the complaint of Lucian of Samosata (hist. Conscr.) that some authors' prefaces are so extensive that it dwarfs the actual work.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

The main idea the author wants to communicate through this short and exact preface, is that the narrative that follows is according to standard. The author presents himself, through style and content as one who is familiar with proper Hellenistic historiography and the art of epitomising. Another aspect, as highlighted above is that, in accordance with proper Hellenistic historians, the author is a servant of the readers. In short, the aim is to convince the reader of the high quality of work by means of the following argumentation:

IF

- the narrative to come is:
 - o enjoyable to read,
 - o concise and to the point,
 - o easy to work through and memorise,

- the product of extremely hard labour,
- equal in value to this preface.

THEN

- the narrative is up to standard according to Hellenistic historiographical writings
- and the reader may gladly proceed in exploring the narrative

3. Pragmatic analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

The strategy behind this pericope, as is the case with all prefaces, is to engage and encourage the reader to proceed to the main body of the narrative. This effect is achieved through providing brief insight into and painting a vivid picture of the events to follow. This ensures the reader's interest. Furthermore, the preface holds the promise of a narrative that will demonstrate the honour of the Jewish nation. The descriptions of events such as the few Jews conquering the barbarian hordes, and the aid from heaven to those who acted strenuously and eagerly on behalf of Judaism ensures the emotional investment of the reader and a sense of patriotism and pride.

The preface encourages the readers to continue reading by stating that the book was made easier to read. The author does not limit his scope to those who delight in only reading his book, but also makes it a preferable source for the customary practice of that time to memorise a book by heart. Consequently, anyone is the ideal reader of this epitome and can only benefit from reading on. Due to the nature of the pericope, there will be no discussion on the real- and alternative text-world or the trans-universal relations.

CHAPTER 5 - THE FIRST THREAT TO THE TEMPLE UNDER HELIODORUS (3:1-4:6)

1. Introduction

The author immediately introduces the *status quo ante* for rest of the book. The reader gets a glimpse of a scenario where all is well with Jerusalem. The holy city dwelt amid complete peace (3:1), the nations were honouring the place and the Temple (3:2), and the financial system of the Temple was healthy (3:3). This ideal situation is ascribed to the fact that the laws were maintained and because of the piety of the high priest Onias³³ and his hatred of evil. This reason that is provided for the current situation of peace is a key in understanding the aim of the rest of the book. In the greater part of the narrative, there is no peace and no functioning temple. Since the piety of the city is the base for the current peaceful circumstances, the reader would know what element is missing when the peace subsides. When total loyalty to the Law of Moses is restored, the order will also be restored. A question, however, that needs to be answered is: what does it mean exactly to be totally loyal to the Law of Moses? Does the text of 2 Maccabees allow any place for the assimilation with a Hellenistic lifestyle?

This focus is made clear through that which is left out. The author does not elaborate on the details regarding Heliodorus' journey to Jerusalem (3:8) or his departure from the holy city (3:35b). The discussion between Seleucus and Heliodorus is limited to the somewhat humorous declaration of the power of God that is truly around the Temple

³³ There is knowledge of four high priests of this name. Two of these lived fourth and third centuries BCE and are therefore eliminated. Josephus reports that an Onias son of Onias immigrated down to Egypt and found a temple there about a generation later than the days of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (when the Onias of 2 Maccabees was murdered in Antioch). This implies that the Onias of 2 Maccabees is indeed Onias III (Schwartz, 2008: 187; Van derKam, 2004: 188-197, 204-208).

(3:39). There is also no detail provided for Hyrcanus, son of Tobias other than the fact that he was a man of authority (3:11). Through this, it becomes clear what the focal topic and place should be: the place is Jerusalem and its Temple, the topic is the sanctity and safety of that place (Schwartz, 2008: 184).

In this first scene of our book, the style of the author is introduced through various stylistic traits. The attention of the reader is focussed on the visual portrayal through the repetition of the root of the verb φαίνω (I appear). The variations of this verb is found throughout this first episode (3:1-39): ἐμφανισμοῦ (v.9); ἐνέφαινε (v.16); ἐπιφάνειαν (v.24); ἐφαίνετο (v.25); προσεφάνησαν (v.26); φανερώς (v.28); ἐπιφανέντος (v.30); ἐφάνησαν (v.33); and ἀφανεῖς (v.34). A similar emphasis on the power of God is found through the repetition of the root for "power" (κράτος) in v.22 (παγκρατῆ), v.34 (κράτος) and v.30 (παντοκράτορος). This same effect is also found in the repetition of the root for "to preserve" (τηρέω). Other stylistic devices are paronomasia in the same verse (3:15 - παρακαταθήκης ... παρακαταθεμένοις, 3:22 - τὰ πεπιστευμένα τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν, 3:33 - χάριτας ... κεχάρισται, and 3:35 - εὐχὰς μεγίστας εὐξάμενος), unusual words such as φρικασμὸς (v.17) and ἀγεληδὸν (v.18), and contrasts through the μὲν ... δὲ construction (3:8, 22, and 29).

The first verse in this pericope (3:1) tells of a time when the city of Jerusalem dwelt amid complete peace. The phrasing of this verse demonstrates some important views of the narrative regarding order and chaos. Firstly, Jerusalem is referred to as the Holy City (so too 1:12, 9:14, 15:14). The city of Jerusalem is holy because of the holiness of the Temple within it (Schwartz, 2008: 186). On this topic, Sirach (36:12) writes the following: "have mercy upon Your holy city - Jerusalem, the foundation of your residence."³⁴

³⁴ The term "Holy City" also appears in Isaiah 48:1 and Nehemiah 11:1.

Secondly, the Temple's status rests on the state of the people. Regarding this facet, Doran (2012: 78) states the following:

"the author holds to the principle, stated forcefully in 5:19-20, that the inviolability of the place is secured through the holiness of the people, not the other way around,"

The third view of the narrative is communicated through the mentioning of Onias' piety (εὐσέβεια). Not only is the city holy because of the Temple, but "the holiness of the people results from good leaders" (Doran, 2012: 78) such as Onias. These three aspects of order suggest the essential role of a mediator in 2 Maccabees who will both obey the statutes of the God of the Jews and enforce these laws upon the Jewish nation.

Other than the above mentioned function of term εὐσέβεια (3:1: "piety"), there is also broader the purpose of positively presenting the Jews in the Hellenistic arena (Mott, 1978: 23-26). Schwartz (2008: 186-87) notes that "by featuring this term alongside of *polis* in the first verse of his story, the author clearly situates himself, and his story, in the Hellenistic world."

The description of ideal circumstances/*status quo ante* is continued in 3:2-3. The significant aspect of this portrayal is that there is no objection to the state of dependence or the fact that pagan officials are funding the Temple and the sacrificial victims.

2. Structural analysis

2.1. Delimitation

The first official episode in the narrative is laid out from 3:1 onward. This is clear, as stated above, through the claim of the first sentence in the preceding verse (2:32) that the author will now enclose the preface and begin the narrative. The second sentence in 2:32 is clearly still part of the preface since the author connects it with the first sentence by means of the particle $\gamma\grave{\alpha}\rho$ (for/because). Various sub-narratives, which will continue throughout the narrative, are introduced such as that of the conflict between Onias and Simon; the tension between the of peace for the Temple and its desecration; the protection of the Temple, the conflict between Jerusalem and the Seleucid empire; and the God of the Jews working in wondrous ways to save his people.

Of these stories, as mentioned above, the text places the protection of the Temple at the fore. This implies that reasonable criteria for delimiting the scope of this chapter would be the characters involved in the threat and protection of the Temple. Applying this criteria, 3:1-4:6 forms an analytical unit, considering that 3:40-4:6 describes the aftermath of the situation with regards to Onias and Simon. The fact that 4:7 describes both the succession of Seleucus IV Philopator by Antiochus, and Onias by Jason, supports this delimitation. Schwartz (2008: 181-184) ends his discussion at 3:40 and starts a new Chapter at 4:1. The fact, however, that he does not delimit any other manner than according to the original Chapters of 2 Maccabees, his delimitation does not add to the discussion. Doran (2012: 75-78) treats 3:1-39 as a unit with Heliodorus at the centre and considers 4:1-6 to be a separate transition to chaos (2012: 91). This separation of 3:1-39 and 4:1-6 does not, however, take into account that these two sections are linked through the villain Simon, who will, after 4:6, disappear in order to make way for new villains such as Jason and Menelaus.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

The term συμβαίνω (3:2) is used impersonally and can have the meaning of "to come to pass/to result or follow" (Muraoka, 2009: 1024). The verb is employed to cause the transitioning from the broader context to the specific scenario. Here, however, the description in 3:2 is still part of the general context. It seems that the author suggests a link between the proper following of the law and the honouring of the Temple, the latter being a consequence of the obedience to/enforcement of the law.

The use of τόπος (place) in 3:3 to refer to the Temple is scarce in the LXX. This specific use of the term is found also in 3 Maccabees (1:9), but is not present prior to 2 Maccabees. In biblical and cognate literature, the term is however frequently employed in referring to temples (Vanderhooft, 1999: 628-30).

Not much is said about the conflict between Simon and Onias. In 3:4 a quarrel is mentioned and a reason is briefly described: Simon had some problems with the market regulation throughout the city. The intensity of the situation is, however confirmed in 4:3, where matters escalated to the point of murders being planned. The perpetrator, according to the text, is Simon, a member of the Judean society, of the priestly clan Bilgah³⁵. The term φυλή, which is found here in 4:3, is often used to refer to one of the twelve tribes of Israel. This explains why the Greek manuscripts would have the reading "of the tribe of Benjamin." If the Greek manuscripts are followed, it would mean that "our story's first troublemaker and its worst villain both lacked priestly descent" (Schwartz, 2008:95). The fact that the author does not employ this fact as a major stylistic device, makes the reading "of the tribe of Benjamin" unlikely. This study will therefore adopt, as

³⁵ According to the Vetus Latina.

does Hanhart, the reading of the Latin and Armenian manuscripts and assume that Simon was of the Priestly clan Bilgah.

In 3:6 a specific verb is used to refer to the action of Simon. Simon did not merely tell Apollonius, he sold out his own to the enemy. This negative use of the verb προσάγγελω (I announce/denounce) is also evident in 13:21, where it explicitly mentioned that the information was given to the enemy.

The use of ἐφοδεῦω in 3:8 is in line with what this verse is stating about the journey of Heliodorus. The verb can be literally translated as “I am on the march”, but in the context of 3:8 it has the sense of practicing the administrative duties. The journey of Heliodorus had to be presented as going from place to place to inspect the cities of Coele Syria and Phoenicia, and not as a march directly to Jerusalem. The verb evidences the plan of Heliodorus to avoid the Jews from knowing that Jerusalem is the main reason and destination for his journey.

In 3:10 παρακαταθήκη (“deposit”) is employed rather than παραθήκη (“deposit”), the first being classical and the latter the Hellenistic form. This choice firstly shows the competence of the author and secondly implies a more official meaning (Schubart, 1932: cols. 1077-1084 (col. 1080 on this verse)).

The name "Hyrcanus" in 3:11 may cause some problems. Is this the Hyrcanus son of Joseph of the clan Tobiad, or is it the Hyrcanus son of Tobias. Some scholars prefer to read "Hyrcanus, son of Tobias," as referring to the family name which Hyrcanus belonged to rather than the name of his father (Meyer, 1952: 2:134 n.1.; Schwartz, 2008: 194.). This view can be based on what Josephus writes of a Hyrcanus that lived in the days of Seleucus IV (*Ant.* 12.234) and has various political implications (Schwartz, 2008: 194-95; Doran, 2012: 82-84). Tcherikover (1959: 157) has built on this

in order to make some deductions such as that Onias could have been sharing Hyrcanus' pro-Ptolemaic tendency and that this could have been the real point of Simon's dilation to the Seleucids. These deductions are based on the facts that Hyrcanus had funds protected in the Temple while Onias was high priest, and that Onias particularly pointed to Hyrcanus' property. These deductions are however, as Schwartz (2008: 194) states, "building quite a lot on very little." The focus should remain on what this narrative of 2 Maccabees is saying about is Hyrcanus. The most obvious reading is that the father of this Hyrcanus was Tobias. Since there is no plausible evidence to prove otherwise, and since the text does not demonstrate any further use of this particular character, the obvious reading will be followed (Doran, 2012: 83).

In 3:12 one finds that the Temple is "honoured" (τετιμημένου) instead of 3:1 where the place is honoured (τιμᾶν). This further supports the parallel between τόπος ("place") and ἱερός ("temple"). The term τὸ βασιλικὸν in 3:13 is a formal and technical term which refers to the "royal treasury" (Welles, 1934: 321).

The next scene (3:14-23) is carefully phrased in order to stir up the perfect emotion in the reader, who is moved to compassion towards the high priest and the whole of the city. The ingressive function of the imperfect verb εἰσεῖμι ("I go into") in 3:14 heightens the feeling of anticipation. A valid translation for the term ἐπίσκεψις (3:14) is "audit" (Welles, 1934: 321; Mauersberger, 1956: 2.952; Bickerman, 1986: 2.171.). This corresponds with the meaning of "numbering" of the term ἐπίσκεψις in the LXX (Num 1:21; 1 Chr 21:5; 23:34) as this is a specific investigation of the funds in the Temple. In 3:14 the author uses litotes (the double negative) to underscore the emotional intensity of the scene. This device is also linked with a crisis scenario in 15:19, and is employed, as Doran (1981: 42) points out, nine times in 2 Maccabees as compared to the total absence in 1 Maccabees.

Verse 14b-20 is started off by the anguish of the whole city and then subdivided into categories of people in anguish: the high priest and other priests (3:15-17), men (3:18), married women (3:19a), and unmarried women (3:19b-20). In this section (3:14-23), a balance is maintained through a linkage of 3:15 and 3:22: Verse 22 has the same wordplay (πεπιστευμένα τοῖς πεπιστευκόσιν) as in 3:15 (παρακαταθήκης ... τοῖς παρακαταθεμένοις), both verses have the same form of the verb ἐπικαλέω (I call on/appeal to), both have some form of the verb διαφυλάσσω (I preserve/maintain).

The role of the unmarried women gathering at the doorways and peeking through the windows leads Doran (2012: 85) to assume that the view of the author that the unmarried women should not be present in public. This is, however, only one of the possible deductions that can be made from the sketched scene. The author could merely be keeping to the contemporary setting since the aim of the narrative is still to provide a historical overview, not reinventing history.

The function of the imperfect form of the verb ἐπιτελέω (“I accomplish”) in 3:23 is classified by Doran as conative (“attempting to accomplish”), emphasising the attempted action. This may be a correct interpretation, but an ingressive function (“beginning to accomplish”) seems to be more fitting. The verse that follows (3:24) classifies the action of Heliodorus that can be classified as the attempt to accomplish what had been determined. Heliodorus was already near the treasury. The fact that he was on his way to enter the Temple signifies the first step in achieving what has been planned.

The fact that our author frequently uses the term δυνάστης (“ruler”) for God (here, in 3:24 and in 12:25, 28; 15:3, 4, 29) is evidence of the tendency in 2 Maccabees to place God exactly opposite the earthly Seleucid enemy. It is a battle between a powerful ruler on earth and the ultimately powerful ruler in heaven.

There are three elements present in 3:26, 27 and 28 that lead Bickerman (1986: 2.173-174) and, following him, Schwartz (2008:202) to consider the possibility of the interweaving of two epiphanic traditions. Firstly, in 3:26 there is mention of another two youths. This gives the idea that youths have already been mentioned, which is not the case. Consequently, this could mean (especially when compared with a similar story in 3 Maccabees 6:18) that this could be a "remnant of an earlier version of this story, according to which other youths had already appeared from heaven. Secondly, 3:27 reads: "they gathered him up and put him on a litter." This makes for an ambiguous reading. It could be that the two floggers put Heliodorus into the litter, but the more logical interpretation would be that members of his retinue aided him. Lastly, Bickerman (1986: 2.173-174) made a case for the interlacing of two traditions based on the incompatibility of the pluperfect with the imperfect (ἔφερον – "they carried") used in 3:28 since Heliodorus' bodyguards had already carried him off.

Interestingly, it is noted that Heliodorus' men ask Onias to call upon God, and the way he reacts is by making a sacrifice (3:31). This evidences a Jewish Hellenistic point of view, namely that prayer is the main category, and one of the ways to pray is to bring a sacrifice (Schwartz, 2008: 203).³⁶

The term ὑψιστος (Most High) referring to God is a relative reference and was used by both Jews and Gentiles (Bertram, "ὑψιστος," *TDNT* 8 (1972) 614-20; Herbert Niehr, *Der Höchste Gott: Alttestamentlicher JHWH-Glaube im Kontext syrisch-kanaanäischer Religion des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.* (BZAW 190; Berlin: De Gruyter, 1990; Zimmermann, *Namen des Vaters*, 573-602).

³⁶ This view is also reflected in 2 Macc 12:44; Wis 18:21-22; Philo, *Life of Moses*, 2.5.

In 3:36 Heliodorus' reaction to the first and second epiphanies is to bear witness to all of the works of the greatest God. Here, by stating that Heliodorus had been an eyewitness (ὑπ' ὄψιν), the reality of the epiphany is exclaimed. This type of recognition of divine power is found in the Hebrew scriptures where Nebuchadnezzar and Darius bear witness of the works of the God of Israel after he has done supernatural works (Dan 2:47; 3:28-29; 4:37; 6:25-27)³⁷. This demonstrates the Israelites, particularly those in exile, to have non-Israelites respect their religion (Doran, 2012: 87).

Sentences of summary such as the one in 3:40 are also found at the end of Chapters 7, 9 and 13. The verb χῶρέω ("I turn out") used here is also found in some of the other summarising sentences and involves both the process and its end. The author is emphasising the outcome of scenarios where the God in heaven and his Temple is challenged. The μὲν ... δὲ construction applied here is a favourite for the author to link certain events as well as to demonstrate the progression of the narrative.

The use of the term πατρίς (fatherland) in 4:1 signifies the author's preference to portray the preceding events not only as an attack on the Temple, but also against the city Jerusalem. This evidences the metonymic character of the Temple. The Temple is a symbol for the stability of the rest of the land. On this verse, Doran (2012: 91) notes: "Here begins the theme of the defence of the fatherland and of the ancestral laws." The root "evil" (κακός) is found in both the verb κακολογέω (I speak evilly) and in the phrase, τῶν κακῶν δημιουργός, describing the accusation against Onias. This contrasts the real evil of Simon with Onias, who was blameless in reality.

Despite the idea that Simon was an isolated villain, 4:3 introduces one of Simon's followers (τοῦ Σιμωνος δεδοκιμασμένων). This phrase literally means "one of those

³⁷ This type of story is also found in epiphanic Greek narratives such as the Lindos Chronicle.

approved by Simon." In this manner, progress is achieved and anticipation intensified. There is a growing group of villains that have evil plans against the fatherland. This progression is furthered by the mention of Apollonius, son of Menestheus (4:4). In 3:5 it was merely mentioned that Simon had connections with the governor of Coele-Syria (Menestheus). Now Simon is explicitly supported by Menestheus' successor, Apollonius. This, together with 4:3, sketches a scene where the opposition party is growing in numbers and the threat intensifying.

The passive meaning of the verb used in 4:5 (διακομίζω) is "to cross over." Verses 5 and 6 imply that Onias was not only a model priest but also cunning politician. He had all the talents that are required for playing the game of politics. He sought out the right friends in order to control the threat of Simon's faction. Yet, even this action (that also has the meaning of going over into enemy territory) is qualified by the author as a selfless act that is only for the gain of Onias' fellow citizens.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

An important facet of this first scene in our book is the text's implicit statement of the worth of the Temple. Most of the chapter is dedicated to the threat and rescue of the Temple. For the duration of the threat, there is great despair. After the rescue, there is great joy. Through this effect, the author is demonstrating the indispensability of the Temple in Jerusalem. The reader is convinced of the Temple's worth since everyone in Jerusalem acts that way. As mentioned above, this notion of the Temple's indispensability is important for the rest of the narrative since, after the Temple's desecration, the events all aim at the purification and restoration thereof. What the Temple symbolises exactly, will be explored furthermore throughout the study.

Another facet of our author's communicative strategy is presenting Onias as flawless. Just as this short-lived period of peace will be desired throughout the narrative, so too will this high priest will be a figure that will be missed.³⁸ Onias is further idealised by placing him against an ideal villain. It is the poor righteous priest versus the sly conniving Simon.³⁹ In this manner, the reader is encouraged to choose the character of Onias above others and thus the actions and views of Onias above others.

Lastly, the power and supremacy of God is communicated. It is important for the author that Heliodorus, as other characters also (Nikanor in 8:36, Antiochus in 9:17), recognises God's power and sovereignty. The fact that is conveyed is that the Temple is only threatened when God allows it and only protected when God allows it. This, in turn, is linked closely to the actions of the citizens and officials of Jerusalem.

The proposition can be formulated as follows:

IF

- A threat to the Temple brings exaggerated despair to the Jews in Jerusalem,
- the rescue of the Temple brings exaggerated joy to the Jews in Jerusalem,
- the Temple is rescued while a high priest is appointed who is pious, hates evil, and ensures that the laws are maintained,
- and the Temple is rescued by means of a supernatural happening,

³⁸ This type of figure resurfaces in the character of Eleazar, the mother and her seven sons, Judas Maccabaeus, and Razis.

³⁹ What is significant is that this one man, Onias, is placed in opposition to many villains.

THEN

- the protection of the Temple is of great worth,
- the Temple is protected because the laws are maintained through the piety and mediation of the high priest,
- and the Temple is protected by God Himself

3. Pragmatic analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

The importance of the Temple and its liturgy is communicated through exclaiming the reaction of the Jews in Jerusalem to the threat posed by the Seleucid official. Nothing is said to explicate the consequences were Heliodorus to be successful. Yet, the reader has a definite grasp on the intensity of the situation. This happens by means of association. The reader associates with the priest and the Jerusalemites because of the vivid emotional description.

Secondly, the emotional appeal is established through punishment and reward. Although, implicit, there is a clear portrayal of the conditions: if the priest was not piously maintaining the laws, the Temple would not be protected. This also aims a warning at the reader. The reader is encouraged to choose the scenario where the Temple is protected and conflict is avoided. This scenario implies that the reader chooses the pious maintaining of the laws.

3.2. Real- and alternative text-world

The author recognises a situation where Jews are confronted with the assimilation with the Hellenistic way of life. This assimilation has the potential of leading Jews away from the Temple liturgy and obedience to the law.

Thus, the solution is to communicate that the only way for peace and protection of the Temple and the city is to maintain the laws and the Temple liturgy. This, according to the author, symbolises the Jews' loyalty to Judaism. In this way, the situation where the whole city, from the high priest through to the normal citizen, piously obeys the laws is the alternative text world. This becomes the *status quo ante* for rest of the narrative which provides an ideal situation to measure the rest of the text against.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

Through an exaggerated response of the community and a strong emotional appeal, the reader is moved away from the desire to assimilate with the Hellenistic lifestyle, towards loyalty to Judaism and a high estimation of the value of the Temple's sanctity.

CHAPTER 6 – THE DEATH OF ONIAS III AND THE GROWING HOPE OF A RIGHTEOUS OPPOSITION (4:1-50)

1. Introduction

After 2 Maccabees 3 sketched a scene where perpetuated peace and justice can be imagined and where no harm can come to the Temple or the city of Jerusalem, the reader soon learns otherwise. The events in 2 Maccabees 4 portray the complete opposite. These events demonstrate that the Temple, city, and citizens of Jerusalem are not invulnerable. On the contrary, injustice and violence is so close, that it is brought upon Jerusalem by the choices of a few greedy men.

According to the author the path of decay is introduced by the complete assimilation of Jews with the Hellenisation process. The deteriorating circumstances are driven by individuals whose greed overweighs their love for the Temple, the city and the citizens. Among these individuals is, firstly, Jason, who fraudulently acquires the position of high priest and leads the Jews into temptation through setting up a gymnasium. Klaus Bringmann, (2000: 127-33) and Ma, (1999: 179-242) share the view that the giving of money here is not bribery. However, despite their logical argumentation, the aspect for consideration here is not the tendencies of that time, but the author's view. He clearly places a negative value on the actions of Jason and depicts it as bribery. To add to these atrocities, the account is given of Menelaus, who follows suit in the bribery for the position of high priest, robs the Temple, and organises the murder of Onias. Lastly, Andronicus murders Onias in front of an international asylum and gets away with it.

Along with the author's presentation of villains, another theme is introduced namely appropriate punishment or divine retribution. In the text of 2 Maccabees, the villains

receive a just punishment that fits the nature of their crimes. Jason, who has defrauded his own brother, is himself defrauded and forced as a fugitive into the region of Ammon (4:26). Andronicus, who murders Onias with no warning, is himself swiftly executed at the very same place where he murdered Onias (4:38).

Despite the direness of the situation, the author provides just enough hope for the reader to proceed in reading the rest of the narrative. Within this pericope, there are individuals who make a stand against impiety even taking up arms⁴⁰ (4:33, 36, 41, 42, 44). The events in 4:1-50 hint at the only factor that will end the current situation, righteous men and women who are willing to make a stand for what is just.

2. Structural analysis

2.1. Syntactical and semantic analysis

The verb (μεταλλάσσω – lit.: I change/exchange,” *LSJ*) used in 4:7 was initially (prior to the second century BCE) used as a softer way of referring to the death of an esteemed person, but later on merely employed to refer to death (Welles, 1934: 348). Here, however, the addition of τὸν βίον (“the life”) signifies that the author does not merely want to refer to death, but uses the earlier metaphoric meaning of the term. There is a somewhat unsubstantiated account regarding the death of Seleucus IV in Appian *Syr.* 45. He claims that Seleucus was assassinated by Heliodorus. This is either untrue or insignificant for the author since 2 Maccabees 4:7 does not exaggerate on the circumstances of Seleucus IV's death. A fact that is substantiated is the dating of the death according to a Babilonian chronicle that exhibits the same brevity as 2 Maccabees 4 concerning the death of Seleucus IV (Sachs & Wiseman, 1954: 204, 208).

⁴⁰ The fact that there is already a group, here in 2 Macc. 4, who rebels through violence against unrighteousness gives the reader hope that a great battle against impiety might come.

The establishment of a gymnasium, institution of ephebic training (training of the student body of the gymnasium), and registering of Jerusalemites as Antiochenes (4:9) might seem as a mere mentioning of events. Yet, the contemporary readers would have understood the weight of Jason's endeavor. This establishment would have far-reaching consequences for the lifestyle of the Jews (Doran, 1990: 99-109). It signifies Jason's plan not only to tolerate Hellenistic practice, but to conform to, strive towards and usurp the Greek way of life into all facets of daily Jewish life. To clarify the intensity of the situation, the author dedicates the following seven verses (4:10-16) to set out an evaluation and possible repercussions of Jason's extreme assimilation.

The use of ἐπινεύω (“I nod (in token of approval),” *LSJ* - 4:10) signifies, firstly, the author's love for rare words and, secondly, his familiarity with other literature such as Hellenistic documents of formal nature. This verb is used here in a poetic sense and is rare in inscriptions ever since Homer used it in referring to the actions of gods (Jonnes & Rici, 1997: 16). Concerning the reason for Antiochus IV Epiphanes's approval, there are three possibilities. Antiochus IV Epiphanes could have had the need to express his benevolence and generosity as new king, he could have been solely driven by greed, or the presence of a gymnasium near the Southern border could have been a wise strategic option. In the context of the term φιλόνηπος (“royal privilege”) below, it seems that this token of approval is part of his benevolence.

The term φιλόνηπος (“royal privilege”) in 4:11 is less of a rare phenomenon. It is used in terms of the benevolent actions of a ruler towards his subjects (Welles: 1934: 373; Walbank, 1979: 2.332; Ma, 1999: 182-194). This is logically not what is expected of a king, rather an act of gracious goodwill. In 4:30, where citizens of Mallos and Tarsus are forcefully added to the royal concubine, this goodwill is absent.

Regarding the use of the term ἀκρόπολις (“citadel”) in 4:12, there exist many arguments for the positioning of this gymnasium. Doran (2012: 105) accepts the terms ἀκρόπολις and ἄκρα (“peak”) 4:28 as referring to the same place and follows Bar-Kochva (1989: 445-65) in suggesting the gymnasium to be constructed below the south eastern hill of Jerusalem. Schwartz (2008: 223), contrarily and convincingly, argues that there would be no need for dramatisation if the gymnasium was placed alongside the Akra, which was already the city's "most demonstrative expression of foreign rule." The term acropolis as reference in connection with the Temple of Jerusalem is also present in Strabo (*Geog.* 16.2.37). Therefore, it will be accepted that the reference is made to the Temple Mount, making the dramatic contrast effective.

The paring of the terms Ἑλληνισμός (“Hellenism”) and ἄλλοφυλισμός (“foreignism”)⁴¹ in 4:13 demonstrates the author's despising view of the total overtaking of the Hellenic type/Greek lifestyle as mentioned in 4:10. Schwartz (2008:224) rightly notes that the term Ἑλληνισμός is explicitly contrasted with "ancestral values in 4:15 and implicitly with "Judaism" (2:21; 8:1; 14:38).

The wordplay in 4:14 between λειτουργία (“public service/liturgy”) and χορηγία (“office”) intensifies the total abandonment of the Jewish way and the Law, and the hurried participation in the lawless activities in the palaestra. These two words have the meaning of "expenses", but since λειτουργία (4:14) refers to the service and ministry of the priests, χορηγία will take the general sense of actions or practices (Doran, 2012: 106). The idea here is to communicate that the priests were busy, but not with the right things. They were practicing the wrong liturgy. As if they had gone over to another religion. This same intensity is communicated through the contrast between the ancestral laws and Greek honours in 4:15 (Kennel, 2005: 19).

⁴¹ An abstract term for allofulos - used in the LXX to describe enemies

The term ἀγωγή can mean both "policy, conduct" and often "way (of life)" (Welles, 1934: 309), but can also refer to education. Here, it would refer to the education and experience in all Greek things that could be found at this new gymnasium.

The mention of the attendance of Jerusalem Antiochenes (or Antiochenes from Jerusalem) at the Quinquennial games in Tyre demonstrates the swift progression portrayed by the narrative. Bringmann (1983: 90) notes that the fact that these Antiochenes from Jerusalem are attending the games signifies the official recognition of their city.

Apollonius, son of Menestheus, was, as discussed above, the governor of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia under Seleucus IV. A problem arises when dealing with Polybius' statement (31.13.3) that Apollonius retired from the political sphere during Antiochus IV Epiphanes's succession to the throne. How could he have been sent by Antiochus IV Epiphanes when he was no longer in service? A possible solution is to read the text as if Antiochus IV Epiphanes did not send Apollonius and that Apollonius did not report back to Antiochus IV Epiphanes directly (Schwartz, 2008: 228). Another, more plausible option is to accept that the move of Apollonius out of office occurred only after Antiochus IV Epiphanes murdered Seleucus IV's son, who was co-ruler from 175 to 170 BCE (Doran, 2012: 110; Mørkholm, 1966: 38-50; Walbank, 1979: 3.481).

On the causal clause εἴθ' οὕτως ("thereupon") in 4:22, Schwartz (2008: 230) rightly notes that there are two possibilities for interpretation. Antiochus IV Epiphanes could have found no evidence for pro-Ptolemaic sympathy in Jerusalem, or the grandeur of the reception prevented him from conducting a thorough investigation. Despite evidence for pro-Ptolemaic factions among the Jews (Polybius 5.86.10; Daniel 11:14; Josephus, War 1.32.), the description of the reception communicates that the ceremony had a distracting effect on Antiochus.

The phrase δοξάσας αὐτὸν τῷ προσώπῳ τῆς ἐξουσίας in 4:24 referring to the action of Menelaus is translated by Doran (2012: 112) as "he magnified [the king] in posing as powerful" and by Schwartz (2008: 208) as "evincing respect for him in the manner of a person of authority." Goldstein (1983: 236-37) provides an alternative and less complicated reading in suggesting the accusative masculine singular pronoun (αὐτὸν) to be used in a reflexive way. Accordingly, the phrase would read: "he magnified himself in posing as powerful." The main question therefore is whether or not to interpret the term αὐτὸν (αὐτὸς "he/she/it", "himself/herself/itself") as reflexive. In reaction to Goldstein, Doran (2012: 112, footnote b) notes that the author uses the correct reflexive form (ἑαυτὸν) later in the same verse and that it would be strange not to use it earlier in the verse. This fact, together with a logical flow, suggests that the term αὐτὸν is not used in a reflexive manner. Thus, Menelaus magnified the king, while posing as powerful. The combination of these two actions with bribery is what secured the position of high priest for Menelaus.

The phrase for the royal orders (τὰς βασιλικὰς) in 4:25 is also present in 3:13. It might refer to both the kingly orders on matters of importance mentioned in 4:23 and the orders concerning the new office of Menelaus. The scenario sketched in v. 25, however, seems to only refer to the fact that Menelaus appears out of nowhere, and with a complete new status, while waving around his papers of legitimacy and royal approval.

In 4:26 Jason's story is placed within the larger theme of appropriate retribution. As mentioned earlier, quite a few characters receive a punishment that is in line with the unjust things they have done to other. Here, Jason himself, who defrauded his own brother and whose actions forced Onias to flee, is defrauded by Menelaus and is forced as a fugitive into the region of Ammon. Through employing the terms ὑπονοθεύσας and ὑπονοθευθεὶς (from the verb ὑπονοθεύω – "I supplant," *LSJ*), the author uses paranomasia to highlight the justice in what is happening to Jason.

At first glance, the sentence in 4:28 is problematic. The sentence seemingly has no main clause and starts off with a genitive absolute (ποιουμένου δὲ τὴν ἀπαίτησιν Σωστράτου – “even though Sostratos made a formal demand”) followed by an interlocution. This led Hanhart (2008) to conclude that the sentence is ungrammatical. Katz (1960: 13) suggested changing the particle "δὲ" to "ὁρῶν" This rendering was, however, rightly shown to be unlikely by George Dunbar Kilpatrick (1963). Contrary to Katz, Doran (2012: 112) provides a logical solution by suggesting that the genitive absolute clause should be connected to the previous sentence and retain δὲ as a particle that provides an adversative nuance.

Although Cypriots are not often mentioned in Hellenistic military history, we do know that the Cypriots mentioned here were some of the garrison troops that served as mercenaries under the Ptolemies in Cyprus and later defected (Bar-Kochva, 1989: 118-19; Doran, 2012: 116).⁴² The concern of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (4:30-31) and his reaction to leave to Cilicia (where the cities of Tarsus and Mallos were situated) has two explanations. Firstly, Cilicia was the only region in Asia Minor left to Seleucid rule after the peace treaty of Apamea (188 BCE) and any unrest there could mean losing this hold on Asia Minor.⁴³ Secondly, any type of unrest would be a sign of weakness for the Seleucid kingdom and should be dealt with immediately. Concerning the name Antiochus, there are many suggestions as to who it might have been. There were a few Seleucid princesses with this name, including the daughter of Antiochus III (Welles, 1962: 50-51; Schwartz, 2008: 234; Doran, 2012: 116). The only thing that is clear here, however, is that she is Antiochus IV Epiphanes's concubine, literally or metaphorically.

⁴² Doran sees no reason to reject the ethnic designation of the group.

⁴³ McDonald (1967: 1-8) elaborates on this region's influence under Seleucid rule, Welles (1962: 41-75) on Tarsus in the Hellenistic period and Houghton (1984: 97-102) on Mallos ties with the Seleucid government.

There are many examples of these cities given as grants in the Hellenistic period (Bickerman, 1938: 133-35).

Doran (2012: 116) follows Schwartz (2008: 235) in accepting that the author's arrangement of the material in 4:32 makes it seem as if it was only due to the absence of the king that attacks upon the Jewish Temple and high priest could be possible. In supporting this argument, Doran (Ibid.) focuses upon the use of two asyndetic participles – νομίσας ("believing") and νοσφισόμενος ("appropriating") - to convey the sense of close connection between the absence and the appropriation. This would imply that the author sketches a scene where things go wrong for the Jews when the king is absent. However, the text does not allow for such an unrestricted interpretation. The fact that Antiochus IV Epiphanes was away merely meant that Menelaus now had the opportunity to present a bribe to Andronicus. This, in turn, had a string of bad consequences.

There are some peculiarities regarding the mentioning of Onias III in 4:33. Firstly, he reappears from nowhere to act as the protector of the sanctity of the Temple and all that is within it. This sudden appearance since 4:6 points to a loss of material (Schwartz, 2008: 236). Secondly, the place of choice for Onias' asylum brings rise to some questions. The fact that he seeks asylum in Daphne, means that he probably took refuge in the temple of Apollo there, since Daphne was a park near Antioch dedicated by Seleucus I to Apollo, amongst other gods (Rigsby, 1996: 496-499; Downey, 1961: 110). Tcherikover is cautious for such an assumption and leans toward the possibility that Onias was seeking refuge in the synagogue at Antioch mentioned by Josephus (*Bell.* 7.44). However, the fact that there is no substantial evidence for the right of asylum in such a synagogue (Rigsby, 1996: 571-73), together with the fact that Jews and non-Jews alike were shocked by the murder, points to the nullification of the well-known asylum of a pagan temple (Doran, 2012: 117).

The murder of Onias III is both intensified and euphemised through metaphors for "kill" such as χειροῶ ("I am overcome") and παρακλειῶ ("I close in on") in 4:34. These euphemisms are the first of a series of terms through which the author prefers to depict the action of killing.

The verb used in 4:36 to describe the trait that causes unity amongst Hellenes and Jews alike is συμμίσσπονηρέω ("I hate evil together with...", *LSJ*). It is also used to describe the character of Onias III in 3:1, as a call for action to God in 8:4. Consequently, the author encourages all to unite in one common purpose.

Through the reference of the moderation and total discipline of Onias, which drives the mighty Antiochus IV Epiphanes to tears, the author praises Onias in Hellenistic style (Schwartz, 2008: 239). Onias is depicted, in Hellenistic terms and in the king's point of view, as a noble gentleman. In 4:38, Antiochus IV Epiphanes's unlikely reaction is stated. The king, who is yet to unleash his total fury and inhuman cruelty in the rest of the narrative, is here portrayed as compassionate and as an instrument of the appropriate punishment. What happens next is a series of events that led up to the execution of Andronicus.⁴⁴ The intensity of this series of events is heightened through the use of asyndeton (whereas the first action, burning with anger (πυρῶ), is linked asyndetically with the phrase περιελόμενος καὶ περιρρήξας ("he stripped off and tore"), and the third action of leading around, περιαγῶ, is linked asyndetically with the second action) and compacted through the repetition of the prefix περὶ. Another euphemism for "kill" (ἀποκόσμεω) is found in 4:38.⁴⁵

⁴⁴ Once again, the manner in which Andronicus dies is a reflection of his own unjust actions.

⁴⁵ *LSJ* and Muraoka (2009: 102) lists 2 Maccabees 4:38 alone for the use of ἀποκόσμεω for killing.

The phrase "in the city" (κατὰ τὴν πόλιν) in 4:39 (see also 5:2 and 10:27) refers to Jerusalem. The last episode occurred in Antioch. This signifies, together with the fact that robbery is described as happening in the city (instead of in the Temple), the author's main focus. The focus is the Jewish *polis*, Jerusalem.

The character Auranos is placed, through being described as foolish, amongst other villains in the narrative such as Simon (4:6), Alcimus (14:5) and Nikanor (15:33). The mentioning of foolishness, in combination with Auranos' age, contrasts him with Onias (4:37) and, Eleazar (6:23) the symbol of the perfect elderly.

The scenario sketched in 4:41-42 tells of the desperation of this group of Jews who's only aim is to defend righteousness itself. Some snatched up rocks, others stout pieces of wood, other grabbed the ashes lying around. The author depicts the Jews as unarmed and thus a group that does not premeditate violence or conflict. Lysimachus' group, however, are armed and fully prepared. They are the party who began the violence (Schwartz, 2008: 241). By the use of the term σποδός ("dust/ashes"), it would seem that the author means ashes. He discerns through referring elsewhere to dust as γῆ (10:26; 14:15). These ashes (which are referred to in 13:8 as hallowed) most probably refer to that of the altar. This would, in turn, explain also the wood they used as weapons. The fact that they used ashes from the altar would have the effect of some sense of a holy battle against those who are a threat to the Temple. Again the asyndetic conjunction of the participles (συνιδόντες ... συναρπάσαντες ... δρασσόμενοι) heightens the intensity and suddenness of the affair. The correlation between the acts of Lysimachos (of temple robbing) and his death by the Temple treasury points to the theme of appropriate punishment.

Schwartz (2008: 243) highlights the fact that, in 4:44, three men were sent by the council of elders and not three "Jerusalem Antiochenes" (as in 4:19). The fact that "the

traditional body (last heard of in the days of Antiochus III - *Ant.* 12.138, 142) continued to exist through the days of Jason and Menelaus, ... the royal privileges in 4:11, and that the king was willing to hear its delegates, confirms that traditional Jerusalem remained in existence despite the establishment, and alongside, "Antioch in Jerusalem" (Schwartz, 2008: 243).

The mention in 4:45 of Ptolemy, son of Dorymenes, leaves open the question of his status and level of influence at the time. This Ptolemy is said to be one of the friends of the king in 1 Macc. 3:38. The question amongst scholars is, however, whether this Ptolemy was the same as the one mentioned in 8:8 and thus the governor of Coele Syria at the time.⁴⁶ Gera (2009: 142-43) holds that Ptolemy, son of Dorymenes, a former governor of the area, would have had considerable influence at court even if he was not already governor at the time of the events in 4:43-50. For this study, this fact is sufficient and makes the bribery of Menelaus of this Ptolemy only logical.

The author demonstrates his contempt for the manner in which the Seleucid officials are delivering justice through the reference to the Scythians in 4:47.⁴⁷ The Tyrians are portrayed by means of an attributive participle in 4:49 as "those who hated injustice" (μισοπονηρήσαντες). This echoes the reaction the citizens in v.36 who hate injustice (συμμισοπονηρήσαντες – "those who together hated injustice"). So much so, that they funded the burial of the three who spoke on behalf of Jerusalem and the Jews (4:48-49). Doran (2012: 120) points to many contrasts drawn in 4:49-50 between Onias and Menelaus: Onias was accused of being the cause of the evils (4:1: τῶν κακῶν δημιουργὸς καθεστηκώς), whereas Meneleus is responsible for the whole evil (4:47: τὸν

⁴⁶ For differentiating opinions, see Cotton and Wörrle, "Seleukos IV," 200-201; Mitford, "Ptolemy Macron," 176-77; Schwartz, 2 *Maccabees*, 243, 331; Doran, 2 *Maccabees*, 120.

⁴⁷ The Scythians' extreme cruelty was highlighted by Herodotus (4.46-73), and referred to as the symbol of cruelty by Polybius (9.34.11) and Cicero *Verr.* 2.5.58 no. 150

μὲν τῆς ὅλης κακίας αἴτιον Μενέλαον). Onias was accused of being a betrayer of the state (4:2: ἐπίβουλον τῶν πραγμάτων), but Menelaus is a betrayer of the citizens (4:50: μέγας τῶν πολιτῶν ἐπίβουλος καθεστώς). Onias sought the public and private interests of the whole people (4:5), whereas Menelaus stayed in power because of the greediness of individuals.

2.2. Proposition and argumentation

Despite the bleak and seemingly hopeless picture that is painted in this chapter, the real proposition of the author lies in the moments of hope that is communicated when reading between the lines. The main circumstances speak of greed, betrayal, bribery and murder. Yet, for brief moments, the reader witnesses justice upon those who seemed to go unpunished for their heinous crimes, honor for those who remained righteous, the few against the many in fighting for a just cause.

Consequently, the argumentation can be divided into three main categories: appropriate punishment, the honoring of the just, and the lesser imposing force conquering the more imposing force. These categories seem to imply the application of three sets of conditional clauses that might be formulated as follows: if you are a bad person you will be punished; if you are a just person, you will be honored; if you fight for a just cause, you will win. This type of application is problematic, since it is simply not what the author is communicating. The situation depicted is not simple. Not all the bad people are killed or punished, and not only good things happen to the good people. Upon closer inspection there is one line of consistency running through all three categories. This is the line of God's providence. The following conditional illustration demonstrates the argumentation of 2 Macc 4:

IF

- the assimilation with Hellenism leads to the impious disloyalty of the law of Moses,
- corrupt Jewish officials go unpunished,
- and corrupt Jewish officials keep on leading the citizens away from the Temple to Hellenistic practices.

THEN

- God is not in control and evil will prevail

This, however, only reflects the concerns of the reader up unto this point. Therefore, the argumentation of the author should be portrayed as follows:

IF

- God is in control,
- there is a group of Jews that remain within the law,
- there is a group of Jews that stand up for a just cause,
- there is evidence of appropriate judgement

THEN

- God is in control and there is hope that good will prevail.

3. Pragmatic analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

The author constructs a setting where the reader is constantly brought before a choice. Hellenism or Law, temple or gymnasium, villain or pious hero. In addition to these

options, the reader is further aided in making a choice through values that are given to the cause (Hellenism or Judaism), place or character. This is done by means of the author's explicit positive and negative evaluation such as:

- "Jason...obtained the high priesthood fraudulently" (4:7)
- "Jason the polluted" (4:19)
- "bore nothing worthy of the high priesthood" (4:25)
- "legitimate citizen practices" (4:11)
- "unlawful usages" (4:11)
- "without respecting what is just" (4:34)
- "the Jews ... with the Hellenes also hating the wickedness" (4:36)

In is manner, the reader is shifted towards choosing the side of the Temple and the Jews who remain steadfast in the Law and who oppose complete assimilation with Hellenistic. There is, however, still one hurdle to be overcome. This obstruction is the current state of affairs. The chapter does not end well. To the contrary it ends with impious Menelaus, escaping punishment, cleaving to evil and having become a great betrayer of the citizens (4:50). Therefore, the reader needs one more element of encouragement. The author sees this need and addresses it by means of foretelling the consequences of the "impiousness toward the divine laws" (4:17). The reader is well aware of the consequences to follow, since these are briefly described in the previous verse: the very group the Jews want to emulate and assimilate to will become their enemies and avengers.

In this manner the reader is driven towards choosing the side of the Temple, the laws and Judaism out of fear of what is to come.

3.2. Real- and alternative text-world

The author sketches a scenario of complete deterioration. The Jews can no longer trust the integrity of the system that provided safety under the ruling power for Jerusalem and its way of life. Up to now, the terms of peace between the Jews and the Seleucid government was prolonged only through the just mediation of honourable priests and officials. On the side of the Seleucid government, the Jewish official had to pay what is due, and on the side of the Jews, the priest had to ensure that the laws of Moses were abided and the liturgical activities of the Temple was maintained. This was, however, not the case. The Jews were bribing their way into priesthood, planning murders, stealing from the Temple and leading the citizens away from the temple worship.

These circumstances, in turn, were leading to the extreme Hellenisation to come. A process already determined as punishment from God.

The author counters this state of affairs by suggesting an alternative. These corrupt and impious Jews have to be evaluated and their ways should be disapproved of. The author suggests a world where there is a group of Jews that piously follow the laws and are willing to make a stand for what is just. There is only a glimpse of this alternative world in 2 Maccabees 4, but it gives hope to the reader of what possibly follows.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

Through punishment and reward, the reader is moved to support the group of exemplary Jews who bravely take a stand for the sake of the Temple, the laws and Judaism.

CHAPTER 7: THE RAMPAGE OF THE JERUSALEM TEMPLE AND CITY AND THE START OF THE TOTAL HELLENISTIC REFORM – 2 MACCABEES 5:1-6:9a

1. Introduction

Throughout the narrative, the author has been raising the level of the anticipation of a disastrous event to follow. This has been done through a variety of warnings and estimations such as:

- the summary of events to follow in the attached letters (1:1-2:18) and the prologue (2:19-32),
- the threat to the Temple in 3:1-39,
- the warning of the dangers of the Hellenistic reform under Jason (4:15-17)
- and the death of Onias III (4:23-50)

Now, finally, disaster strikes. The cause is clear. As described in 4:17, it is the impiety towards the divine laws which brought about this period of time. Antiochus IV Epiphanes himself leads the massacre in Jerusalem and defiles the Temple by entering and plundering it with his polluted hands (5:16). By now, the reader has no doubt about the importance of the Temple's status as well as the devastation if it should be profaned. As mentioned above, the reaction of the city to the first threat to the Temple (3:1-39) alerts the reader that it is imperative that the Temple remains consecrate. Now, the defilement of the most holy Temple leads to questions: Why does Antiochus IV Epiphanes succeed where others have failed? Why was the wickedness of the Seleucid king allowed, but not that of Heliodorus? Here, unlike the case with Heliodorus, there is no supernatural phenomenon sanctioned by God that prevents this catastrophe. To these questions, the author supplies a direct answer, one of which the essence becomes a theme throughout 2 Maccabees: God allows misfortune due to the sins of the city, until He is again reconciled with his people. This is overarched by the larger theme that God is in control of history. The author states this explicitly, through the statement in 5:17-20 that

Antiochus IV Epiphanes is only a tool of God's punishment, but also implicitly, through the premonitory sign⁴⁸ in 5:2-4 and the divine/appropriate retribution of Jason (5:9-10)⁴⁹ which both point to the governance of the "All-Ruler" (5:20).

Linked with the governance of God in 2 Maccabees, is the role events play in that which God allows or prevents. In 5:20 it is stated that the Temple "was once more restored with all glory when the great Master was reconciled". This leaves a question which needs to be addressed in this study: How was the Master reconciled? In other words, what exact events within the text led to the reconciliation with God? Was it merely the repentance of the Jews, or could it have been that other factors such as the death of the martyrs play a vital role?

Once again, in this section (5:1-6:9), the author employs the technique of suspense and relief:

- SUSPENSE: The citizens of Jerusalem receive divine apparitions that could be interpreted as either good or bad (5:2-4), and Jason returns with a spree of violence.
- RELIEF: Menelaus flees the scene (5:5).
- SUSPENSE: Jason slaughters his own kinsfolk (5:6).
- RELIEF: Jason flees and perishes on the way, suffering a death under divine/appropriate retribution (5:7-9).
- SUSPENSE: Antiochus IV Epiphanes takes Jerusalem captive, slaughters countless Jews, and defiles the Temple (5:11-16).
- RELIEF: Antiochus IV Epiphanes proceeds to Antioch (5:21).

⁴⁸ This is a traditional trait of Hellenistic historians to engage the emotions of the reader (Doran, 2012: 139).

⁴⁹ As mentioned above, this form of divine retribution, where a person dies in a manner parallel to his transgressions is a clear theme throughout the narrative.

- SUSPENSE: Antiochus IV Epiphanes leaves behind overseers to maltreat the Jews (5:22-26).
- RELIEF: Judas Maccabaeus escapes to the wilderness (5:27).
- SUSPENSE: Geron, the Athenian, is sent to force the Jews to betray their faith and to abrogate the Jewish laws. Even the neighbouring cities are sharing in the persecution of the Jews (6:1-9).

In this manner, the author is ensuring that the reader knows that, in any instance of the narrative, worse things may happen. Consequently, since the subsequent events are not predictable, the reader stays focussed on continuing through to the rest of the narrative.

A second tool in keeping the reader's attention and devotion is the glimpse of hope in the midst of complete despair. After the negative ending of the preceding section, this chapter seems to leave even less of a promise that good things will come in the rest of the narrative. However, in order to stay true to the purpose of the book, the author hints at the possibility that lies within two things: firstly, the fact that these horrid circumstances are connected with the wrath of God and may possibly end when God is reconciled; secondly, the escape of Judas the Maccabee and his followers reminds the reader of the victorious battles to come.

In terms of content, this chapter can be compared to other texts such as 1 Maccabees, Josephus' Jewish War 1.31-35 and Antiquities of the Jews 12.239-54, 4Q248 and Daniel 11:28-31a. When compared by authors such as Broshi & Eshel (1997:120-29), Sievers (2001), Schwartz (2008: 533-36), Doran (2012: 139-142), it becomes clear that there are historical discrepancies between these texts which are hard to assimilate. These discrepancies have led scholars (who's arguments Schwartz, 2008: 534-536, discusses thoroughly) to try and bridge the gap between 2 Macc. 5:1 and 1 Macc. 1:20-

23. The account in 1 Maccabees mentions two invasions, while 2 Maccabees apparently mentions only one. In aiming to synchronise 1 and 2 Maccabees' versions of the Temple plundering, there are two ways of dealing with the problem: either 2 Macc. 5:1 refers to Antiochus IV Epiphanes's second visit to Egypt, but in reality the first invasion; or 2 Macc. 5:1 refers to the second phase of the first invasion. These attempts are, however, only based on a loose interpretation of the term ἔφοδος (generally: "approach"). This term is employed in the phrase τὴν δευτέραν ἔφοδον ("in the second approach"). This general interpretation ("approach"), however, becomes unlikely when considering that the term ἔφοδος is employed six times in 2 Maccabees, all referring to the hostile sense of "inroad," or "assault." A second facet which supports the hostile interpretation of the term is the fact that the term ἀναζεύγνύω ("I prepare to go away again") is found in 5:11 (a term also paired with ἔφοδος in 13:26 – where the hostile sense is implied). It is thus clear from the context of 2 Macc. 5 that ἔφοδος is to be translated in a hostile sense and means "inroad" or "assault."

2. Structural Analysis

2.1. Delimitation

The beginning of this pericope is clear. The classic transitional phrase περὶ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον ("about that time") is used in 5:1 which provides a connection for two sections that are quite dissimilar. The setting of the previous pericope was the different scenes of corrupt officials and their evil dealings. It ended off with the death of Onias III and the notion that Menelaus will not be eliminated soon. The current pericope jumps to a scene of Jerusalem in general and moves on to Antiochus IV Epiphanes' dealings. Thus, the new theme, setting, and transitional phrase mark 5:1 as the start of the new pericope. Regarding the ending, the main theme of this pericope has to be accounted. Schwartz (2008: 249) ends off the section at 5:27, but does not deviate from the original delimitation of second Maccabees, his sections being 5:1-5:27 and 6:1-6:31. Ending the section at 5:27, however, does not provide a plausible unifying factor, since the

martyrdom of Eleazar and that of the mother and the seven brothers would be separated. Ending the section at 5:27 also breaks the unity between the overseers Antiochus IV Epiphanes sent (that between Philip, Andronicus, Apollonius and Geron). A delimitation that acknowledges this unity, following Doran (2012: 122-125), is one that starts the section at 5:1 and ends it off at 6:9a. In this manner, the unity lies in the actions of Antiochus IV Epiphanes against Jerusalem and those he sent to torment the Jews. This would also allow the next pericope to unify the examples of maltreated and martyred Jews starting at 6:9b.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

The gold wrought armaments (διαχρύσους στολάς) mentioned in 5:2 are a typical element in ancient historiographical reference to supernatural beings (Doran, 2012:126) and is paralleled in Polybius (30.25.13). Through this reference, the reader is led to recall the epiphany in the events regarding Heliodorus and the Temple. The phrases in 5:2-3 are linked together by the particle “καί” (“and, also”) and forms one long sentence. In this sentence there is both paranomasia (βελῶν ... βολάς) and parachesis (χρυσέων κόσμων).

This premonitory sign in 5:2-3, especially in the light of 5:4, is open to both a positive and negative interpretation. This is typical for ancient historiographical signs prior to battle and pagan oracles (Doran, 2012:126). This type of ambiguous premonitory sign, here in 2 Maccabees 5, may very well be an ironic reference to the neutral and current state of the Jewish religion. The fact that is clear, however, is that this is an excellent stylistic trait evident of the author’s Hellenistic inclination. In tandem with the above mentioned element of suspense and relief, this ensures the reader’s anticipation. The uncertainty of the reader will only be elevated at 5:29.

In 5:6 the author uses three terms highlight the fact that Jason slaughtered his own people (πολιτῶν – “”, συγγενεῖς – “”, ὁμοεθνῶν – “”). The last two of these terms, unlike πολιτῶν, refer to the group's common descent. It is clear that these terms are strategically placed, as is the case with the correlating terms in 15:18, in order to heighten the emotional value. A fact that is vital in understanding the narrative is the pairing of this reference to Jason's people and the vilification of Jason. In this manner, the author creates in the reader both a sense of brotherhood with the victim and a common enemy to stand against. The two elements of patriotism and enmity work together in ensuring the reader's loyalty to the correct party. The reader votes for the “good guy” and follows his actions and choices.

The description of events in 5:7 fails to provide clarity. The reader is uncertain of the identity of the party that drove Jason out of the city because Menelaus fled the scene and Antiochus IV Epiphanes had not yet arrived. Tcherikover's (1959: 187-188) solution is that there was, besides Jason's followers and those of Menelaus, a third group of Jewish rebellions. Doran (2012: 128) does not agree with this view and suggests, following VanderKam (1981: 61 n. 29), that the author simply aims at linking Antiochus IV Epiphanes's attack with Jason's retrieval. The interpretation of a third group, however, is preferred since there has already been made mention of such a group in 4:39-41. Secondly, the author expresses his sympathy towards those who were struck down by Jason (consequently, the group that drove Jason away).

The unity of 5:8b-10 evidences the author's need to present the details of these verses as a whole. Their unity lies in the fact that 5:8b-10 forms one long sentence that describes the downfall of Jason. This sentence consists of five participial phrases which are followed by four main clauses conjoined by the particle καί. Both Schwartz (2008: 255) and Doran (2012: 128) follow Habicht (225) and Nestle (1903: 22) in reading ἐγκληθεῖς (from ἐγκαλέω - “I accuse”) instead of ἐγκλεισθεῖς (from ἐγκλείω - “I confine, I

imprison"). This reading is rightly so, since ἐγκλείω does not make sense together with the prepositional phrase πρὸς Ἀρέταν (translated together with ἐγκλείω as "imprisoned by Aretas"). Accordingly, the phrase should read "accused before Aretas."

In 5:10 mention is made of Jason's kinship with the Spartans. The idea of Jewish kinship with the Spartans is also known from the letter from Jonathan in 1 Macc. 12:5-23. This theme is also evident through the work of authors such as Erich Gruen (1996), who wrote an article "The Purported Jewish-Spartan Affiliation" and Stern (1995: 63-70). In the reference to this relationship lies both irony and humour. Firstly, irony, since the one who recently had no regard for such bonds as he massacred his own race, now seeks refuge with a group that he has very little union with. Secondly, the reader may find humour in the fact that Jason was laid low while having the haughty hopes that the great Spartans might count him as one of their own.

As mentioned above, the author vilifies the enemy in order to gain the reader's sympathy and loyalty towards the victims in 2 Maccabees. Here, in 5:11-16, the cruelty and mercilessness of Antiochus IV Epiphanes is emphasised (Doran, 2012: 129). Not only does the author provide a detailed account of every heartless deed, but the number of victims is highly exaggerated. Both Bar-Kochva (1996: 112) and Nahman Avigad (1993: 2:720-21) has shown pre-Maccabean Jerusalem to have been more or less a tenth of the numbers provided here in 2 Maccabees 5:14. Exaggeration is, however, only one part of the strategy. The second part is to provide a manner in viewing the group of villains in 2 Maccabees as one unified opposition. This is done through specific language that links together Antiochus, Jason and Menelaus. Jason and Menelaus are linked through referring to both as betrayers or rebels of the laws and fatherland (5:8-9; 5:15). Jason and Antiochus are linked through their actions of mercilessly slaughtering (5:6; 5:12) and acting with a haughty spirit (5:6, 17). Both Menelaus and Antiochus IV Epiphanes are unable to rule over their emotions. Menelaus has the passions of an

untamed beast (4:25) and Antiochus' emotions guide him into making contradicting choices: first he has empathy with Onias' death, but now is a victim of uncontrollable rage. This type of contradicting behaviour was not unattested by Antiochus' Greek contemporaries. Tcherikover (1982: 176-177) shows how Greek sources depicted Antiochus IV Epiphanes as "irritable and nervous, full of profound inner contradictions." These Greek sources (Polybius 26.10; 31.3-4; Livy 41.19-20; Diodorus 29, 32; 31,16) depicted him as someone who is impulsive and easily guided by his emotions, so much so that some referred to him as Epimanes ("mad") Epiphanes ("the god manifest"). Here, in 2 Maccabees, the author is not quite as daring, but rather highlights the fact that Antiochus IV Epiphanes did not make his decisions based on sound reasoning.

A clear theme in 2 Maccabees is that the God of the Jews rules over and governs history. The author makes sure the reader knows this through explicitly laying out the facts in 5:17-20. For the author, there are two important facts that will guide the reader in conceptualising the events. Firstly, Antiochus is not in control of Jerusalem's destiny. This is evident through the use of the verb *μετεωρίζω* ("I raise up") in 5:17. It can also have the meaning of "to buoy with false hopes." This is clearly the meaning implied by the author since the verb is accompanied by the adverbial participial phrase *οὐ συνορῶν* ("while he did not see"). Subsequently, the author is calling on the reader not to fall into the same trap, but to see the events in the right light and in terms of the greater picture. This leads to the second part which puts the events in the right light. The Lord is in control of Jerusalem's destiny. The term which refers to God in 5:17 is *δεσπότης* ("Master/Sovereign"). The notion of God's sovereignty is highlighted both through the repetition of this term (5:20; 6:14; 9:13; 15:22) and through the carefully balanced phrasing of 5:20.

After the parenthetic evaluation of events in 5:18-20, the term *μετεωρίζω* ("I raise up") in 5:21 signifies that the narrative is resumed. Antiochus IV Epiphanes's arrogance is

underlined by the fact that he aims to make the land navigable and the sea walkable. Unlike the God of the Jews, Antiochus IV Epiphanes is not the lord and master (ὁ δεσπότης) and is not seeing all (οὐ συνορῶν). He is not in control of history. This phrase can be more clearly understood in the light of one of Xerxes' attacks on Greece. The reference would have reminded the reader Xerxes, who dug a canal at Mount Athos for his ships to cross and built a bridge over the Hellespont (Herodotus 7.22-24, 33-36). The effectiveness of the allusion is clear when regarding the widespread popularity of the story (Schwartz, 2008: 263; Doran, 2012: 131). In 5:22 another reference is made to a well-known story, this time Exodus 1:11, where the Pharaoh appointed officials (ἐπιστάτας) to torment (ἵνα κακώσωσιν) the Jews. Here, in 5:22, almost the exact phrasing is used (ἐπιστάτας τοῦ κακοῦν). In referencing these events, the author is able to stir much emotion through little words. The reader immediately has a vivid picture of Antiochus' extreme arrogance and the persecution and tyranny that is about to befall the Jews.

In the description of these overseers (5:22-24) lies another attempt to convey information to the reader:

- the fact that Phillip is a Phrygian (people who were attested as mercenaries in Hellenistic armies) fits into the theme of depicting the Seleucid administrator as barbarian (Doran, 2012: 132);
- the fact that Menelaus is mentioned amongst those who were appointed by Antiochus IV Epiphanes, even though he does not belong there, signifies both his complete betrayal of the laws and the fatherland and the fact that he is actually working for Antiochus (as in 5:15).
- the fact that Apollonius is called a Mysarch (τὸν Μυσάρχην Ἀπολλώνιον) tells the reader that he is a commander of mercenaries in Asia minor (Wilhelm, 1931: 86; Walbank, 1979: 1.605).

Thus, these descriptions secure the readers' emotional investment: firstly, through their concern for safety of the Jewish victims of these terrifying overseers; secondly, through the growing enmity against the unified villains who are barbarians and traitors.

Another supportive fact for the exaggerated numbers in 5:14 is found in 5:25-26. Firstly, Apollonius had to reduce the number of Jews in Jerusalem. Secondly, he had to organise a surprise attack. This contradicts that the number could have been so vast of those slaughtered and taken captive. It seems that there still remained a considerable number of Jews in Jerusalem.

Concerning the term ὑποκρίνομαι ("I play the part"), Doran (2012: 132) rightly recognises the correlation and contrast between Apollonius' "playing the part" and Eleazar's refusal thereof (6:21, 24-25). This is part of the theme to create a unity between the enemies on the one side, and the heroes on the other and placing them against each other.

Through the mention of Judas in 6:27 the author is providing just enough hope for the reader to carry on through the succeeding events of torture. This hope is tied only to the name of Judas. As in 2:19, the names of his brothers or comrades are not provided. The author focuses the reader on the name that is well known and the rest would follow in the readers mind. This hope will only be fully realised in Chapter 8. On the fact that Judas' and his comrades limited themselves to eating grass, Doran (2012: 133) states that they did not want to participate in the pollution that is in Jerusalem. The text, however, links the pollution to the eating of grass in the wilderness and not to the fleeing. In other words, the phrase "so that they would not participate in the pollution" (Greek) is linked to what they do in the desert, not what they would have done in Jerusalem. Although this seems more unlikely, the meaning is far more significant. In

this manner, the author is showing that Judas' group does not want to add to Jerusalem being punished by eating unlawful food themselves in the desert.

Despite the possibility of reading γέροντα Ἀθηναῖον (6:1) as "the old Athenian," Wilhelm (1973: 73) provides a logical argument to read the phrase as "Geron the Athenian". Through this reference the author is now preparing the reader that the narrative is close to its *nadir*. Two verbs 6:1 describe Geron's role: ἀναγκάζω ("I compel") and the negative of πολιτεύω ("I conduct the government"). This dual purpose of Geron's appointment spells out what is about to happen: (1) the Jews are about to be forced to do unlawful things, and (2) the laws of Moses are about to be abrogated.

The naming of the two temples could be viewed as linked to the high esteem that Antiochus IV Epiphanes held for Zeus. He initiated the reconstruction of the Temple of Zeus Olympios (Polybius 26.1.11; Titus Livius 41.20.8) and donated a curtain to the temple of Zeus in Olympia (Pausanias 5.12.4). Zeus Olympios was also esteemed in Seleucia, Antiochus' birthplace. An explanation which, however, represents the process of Hellenisation more clearly is the fact that Zeus was the most logical Greek name for the Jewish God. Zeus was the father of the gods and of men. Pausanias (2.24.2) has mentioned: "that Zeus is king in heaven is a saying common to all men." Furthermore, Bickerman (1979: 62-63) effectively demonstrates that this effort was not a "re-naming, but rather the first naming of the divinity who until then had been 'anonymous.'" The Greek demands that every divinity has a personal name (Bickerman, 1979: 63). The naming of the Jerusalem Temple, despite the author's depiction of it as hostile, was thus a sign of tolerance rather than persecution.

Interestingly, the intricate relationship between people and Temple found in 5:18-20, is again demonstrated in 6:4-7. Verses 4-5 state the atrocities done in the Temple, and verses 6-7 state the maltreatment of the people. There is a parallel between Temple

and Jew which personifies the Temple. Concerning the Jews, they were forced to eat forbidden flesh at the festival of Dionysos. Thus, they were filled with unlawful things rejected by the laws. Concerning the Temple, the same language is used: it was filled (ἐπεπληροῦτο) with debauchery, they brought inside that which was unseemly (τὰ μὴ καθήκοντα). Both Temple and Jew is profaned through filling them with unlawful things.

Regarding the lawlessness in the Temple, Tcherikover (1959: 194-95) followed Bickerman (74-75) in regarding them as Syrian cultic practices mainly due to the mention of the prostitutes. According to Tcherikover (1959: 194), the cult was introduced by the Syrian military settlers. Contrarily, Doran (2012: 135-36) convincingly shows the possibility of a Syrian cult to be highly unlikely based on three aspects: (1) Mysian (not Syrian) soldiers are said to settle the garrison of Jerusalem (5:24) and the only other reference to soldiers is that of the Cypriots (4:29) and the Athenian (6:1); (2) the names given to both temples are proper Greek names; and (3) the sexual intercourse was a by-product of the banquets. Due to these deductions, this study will follow Doran and dismiss the possibility of a Syrian cult. Another aspect which dismisses a Syrian cult is the aim of author of 2 Maccabees. In the discussion above concerning Chs. 1-5 it is clear that the author establishes unity through identifying the threat as Greek. There is also unity in the aim of Antiochus IV Epiphanes to force the Jews to submit to the Hellenic lifestyle.

Verses 8-9a speak of a combined effort amongst the neighbouring cities to oppress the Jews. 1 Maccabees notes the ill-minded attitude of Greek cities such as Ptolemais, Tyre and Sidon (5:15) and Ptolemais acting against Jonathan (12:48). The question here, however, is whether the suggestion came from the citizens of Ptolemais or from Ptolemy. Authors such as Hanhart and Habicht ad loc., Stern (1991: 583) and Bringmann (1983: 102) follow the majority of the Greek witnesses in reading "at Ptolemy's suggestion." Contrarily, authors such as Abel (1949: 363-364) and Goldstein

(1983: 276-278) follow witnesses led by the Vetus Latina which read "the people of Ptolemais." There are a few aspects which make the last mentioned reading unlikely: (1) Ptolemy has already been mentioned, but not Ptolemais; (2) the witnesses which read "Ptolemais" are not as authoritative as the Greek witnesses; (3) it is unusual that a vote or decree be initiated by citizens in Ptolemais and not in a Capital such as Antioch or by an official (Schwartz, 2008: 279); (4) a combined effort amongst the Greek cities point to a central figure behind a decree or vote (Doran, 2012: 138). Furthermore, Doran (2012: 138) convincingly argues that it would not have been Ptolemy that forced a decree, but rather the Greek cities that voted because of the suggestion of Ptolemy. An aspect which is strangely overlooked by all of the above mentioned scholars is the fact the author of 2 Maccabees is presenting a centrifugal model of decay. The violation finds its origin in the Temple, moves outward to Jerusalem and Girizim, and moves further to the neighbouring cities.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

In this pericope, it is tempting to simply take 5:17-20, which states that these things happened because God is allowing them for the purpose of a brief chastising, as the author's main proposition. This, however, would render the rest of the pericope useless. In a text such as 2 Maccabees, where the author has been shown to carefully plan each term, each phrase and each structural element, this is clearly not the case. Consequently, the various elements of this pericope should be accounted for when constructing such a proposition. Through the abovementioned investigation a number of themes have surfaced: piety versus lawlessness; the relation between the sins of the Jews and the protection of the Temple; divine apparition; the rebellion against the laws and the fatherland; divine/appropriate retribution; the hope that lies in Judas Maccabaeus. A theme that overarches all of the abovementioned facets is that God is in control of history. All the elements of 5:1-6:9a point to his supernatural guidance. All is centred round what God decides. For example: The forces/individuals are not evaluated in terms of skill, but in terms of their relationship to God's laws. It's not about the

stronger or weaker party, but about the side that has God as their ally. The Temple's protection is based on God's choosing. God is the only one who can cause the death of a person to be appropriated to that person's actions during his life. Judas' escape brings hope, not because of his strengths, but because he is in the right relationship with God. God's decision, however, is based on the obedience of his people. The author presents a system of punishment and reward: punishment if the Jews are disobedient to the laws and reward if they are loyal to God's commandments.

IF

- there was a time when God protected the Temple,
- that time was when the high priest and the people were obedient to the laws of God,
- if something changed so that, now, inconceivable misfortune befalls the Jews and the Temple is not protected,
- these misfortunes are because of God's wrath,
- God's wrath is because the Temple and the people were involved in many sins,
- these bad things cannot happen without God's consent.

THEN

- the bad things will stop if God decides,
- God will decide when he is again reconciled with his people,
- God will decide to be reconciled when the people and the Temple refrain from being involved in many sins.

3. Pragmatic Analysis

3.1. Communicative Strategy

The author ensures, firstly, the effective communication of this proposition through conditioning the reader by means of punishment and reward. The reader has seen two exact opposite scenarios regarding the Temple: One where the Temple and the people

were protected and one where the Temple and the people were not protected. This leads the reader to ask what has changed and what needs to be done to return to the first, peaceful scenario.

Secondly, the attention and anticipation of the reader is maintained through the pattern of suspense and relief. The reader becomes accustomed to this pattern and therefore understands that at any moment, the relief may be interrupted by suspense or vice versa. The reader is also encouraged to proceed in reading the rest of the narrative through the brief reference of the escape of Judas and his followers. The reader knows that Judas is the one who will bring change and his escape incites the reader's curiosity as to when and how Judas will begin the path to victory.

Lastly, the author ensures the support of the reader through vilifying characters such as Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Jason and Menelaus. The enmity is made easier through unifying the villains. Jason is placed amongst other villains through his death as appropriate punishment. Menelaus and Antiochus IV Epiphanes are grouped together since Menelaus is described as working closely with Antiochus IV Epiphanes (5:15). Both Menelaus and Antiochus IV Epiphanes are also described as being haughty in spirit (5:17, 23). Consequently, the reader can focus on one common enemy: those unholy ones who are against the laws, the Temple and the people of God.

3.2. Real- and alternative text-world

The potential exists of a reader who does not understand the value of the *status quo ante*. The author therefore teaches the reader what is important: the guidance of a pious high priest (Onias III), a holy Temple, and obedient people means the safety of both Temple and city. A lawless high priest, corrupt officials and disobedience to the laws of God means an unsafe Temple and city.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

As explained above, the author sketches two scenes: one where the Temple and the city are protected, and one where the Temple and the city are defenseless and subject to all kinds of evil. Through an emotional appeal which promises either punishment or reward, the reader is guided away from an undesired path through fearing the punishment of disobedience.

This moves the reader to desiring a world such as the one which was presented in 3:1-39: The world of Onias III, where all is peaceful in the city and Temple of Jerusalem. Consequently, since this world cannot be separated from the state of the Jews' obedience, the reader is also moved to desiring a world of obedience to the laws of Moses and enmity towards any foreign system such as complete Hellenisation. It is no wonder then that Onias indeed reappears later on in the narrative (15:12).

CHAPTER 8: THE MARTYRDOM AND RESURRECTION OF SPECIFIC JEWS AS BASIS FOR THE AUTHOR'S APPEAL FOR JEWS TO JOIN THE HEROES OF 2 MACCABEES (6:9b-7:42)

1. Introduction

In this pericope, the great disaster that was anticipated by the reader finally strikes. Explicit descriptions are given of individuals that suffer humiliating and violent deaths as example to those who dare to stand against Antiochus IV Epiphanes' commands. Along with the progression of the concentric outspread of terror, as discussed above, there is also a progression in the affliction to the Jews. In the previous pericope there was only mention of the abrogated laws and compulsion at the banquet meals. Here, in 2 Macc. 6:9b-7:42, the scene shifts to the actual events concerning individuals. The circumstances these individuals succumb to are a direct demonstration of the effect of the abrogated laws under Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Under the new restrictions, it is impossible to be a Jew. The Sabbath may not be kept, circumcision is prohibited, and the Jews are forced to eat pig's meat. This was clearly forbidden (Lev. 11:7; Deut. 14:8; Isa. 65:4; 66:17). This could mean that the feasts and eating of pig's flesh were aimed directly at the Jews. Bickerman (1979: 88) notes that there were only three circumstances in which the Greeks would sacrifice a pig: "sacrifices that were considered unfit for human consumption...sacrifices to Demeter and those in the cult of Dionysus." This led him to conclude that the pig was chosen precisely for that reason to deliberately antagonise the Jews. There is also evidence against such deliberate behaviour. Both Burkert (1985: 13, 55) and Ekroth (2002: 150-169) has shown that the pig was sacrificed by Greeks, sometimes followed by a banquet. This would seem to demerit the specific intention of Antiochus IV Epiphanes to torment the Jews. It is, however, highly unlikely that these banquets were not aimed specifically at the Jews, since it fits so perfectly into the larger aim.

But in these descriptions of the deaths of faithful Jews lies more than just the demonstration of the outcome of Antiochus IV Epiphanes' decrees. The detailed discussion of each individual's death along with the space it takes up within the pericope suggests that these descriptions play a vital role within the narrative plan. This was also seen in the discussion above on 2 Macc. 3:1-4:6 regarding the emphasis on the role of the Temple. In the last-mentioned pericope the emphasis on the Temple highlighted the importance of its sanctity and its connection to the circumstances in Jerusalem. Here, in 2 Macc. 6:9b-7:42, the emphasis on the persecution of individuals signifies the author's exploitation of the emotional appeal of these deaths. The detailed account of the violent acts induces fear, anger, sympathy, admiration and loyalty. This is, however, not an isolated strategy. There are many similarities between these martyrologies and other stories of praiseworthy death (Kellerman, 1979: 46-52; Goldstein, 1983: 285; Scaer, 2005). Among these stories, motives emerge such as virtue, willingness to die, beneficence and the victory of the martyr (Scaer, 2005: 93). These are the similarities, but the question regarding 2 Maccabees would be: What is different in 2 Maccabees? Why are these motives present and how does the author apply them in order to communicate certain ideas?

In this pericope, the author adds his third main theological expression (6:12-17). This involves the reader through the use of the homiletic first person plural (6:12, 15, 16 - Doran, 2012: 164). The author links this expression to his aim of encouraging the reader to continue despite the negativity (6:12). Herein lies a dual purpose: to make sense of the tragedy, and to give hope that the narrative will have a positive outcome. Doran (2012:164) rightly notes the irony in the author's characterisation of the afflictions as παιδεία ("training"). The same idea of training and education was present in the goals of Jason when founding a gymnasium and ephebate in 4:9. Thereafter, in 4:16-17, the author mentions that the Jews ended up having those, whose training and education they received, as enemies. Thus, the irony lies in the fact that the education the Jews

wanted served as their destruction, but the education they would not want will serve as their redemption.

2. Structural Analysis

2.1. Delimitation

In the preceding Chapter, it has been established that the unity has to be maintained between the different overseers Antiochus IV Epiphanes sent. This had the implication that the previous pericope could not end at 5:27, but should end at 6:9a. This in turn implies that this pericope starts at 6:9b. Such delimitation is logical since the events described in 6:9b onward describe the consequences of the king's abrogation of the ancestral laws.

Regarding the ending of this succeeding section, delimitation is required that will allow the unification of the examples of maltreated/martyred Jews starting at 6:9b. Consequently, 7:42 will be accepted as the ending of this pericope. The phrase τὰ μὲν οὖν ... τοσοῦτον δεδηλώσθω ("that then, on the one hand, is enough set forth") is self-explanatory of the ending of this topic. The author returns to the main narrative in 8:1.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

The account of the two women and their babies in 6:10 is also found in 1 Macc. 1:60-61. The difference between these accounts evidences the author of 2 Maccabees' strong emotional inclination. Firstly, the women in 2 Maccabees circumcised their sons themselves as opposed to having their sons circumcised in 1 Maccabees. Schwartz (2008: 281) holds that this probably means that the mothers in 2 Maccabees had their sons circumcised and did not do the procedure themselves. There is, however, a theme in second Maccabees of women who are held responsible for circumcising their sons (Haber, 2006). Secondly, in 2 Maccabees the babies are hung from their mothers'

breasts as opposed to being hung around their mothers' necks in 1 Maccabees. These make for a more personal and dramatic portrayal.

The practice of Jewish customs in caves (6:11) nearby means that the essence of Jewishness has already been stripped away. Jews were no longer practicing their rituals publicly, in the form of a community, but in small discreet and private groups. This was also a problem according to Greeks. Plato made a case against shrines in private houses (*Leg.* 10.909-910). Aristotle recognised religion as a central part of city life (*Pol.* 1322b, 1328b). The account of the persecution of those in the caves is paralleled in 1 Macc. 2:29-38. The latter expands on the story, providing details on how it came to be that there were Jews in the caves and on their resistance and loyalty to the keeping of the Sabbath. Here, in 2 Maccabees, the brevity is clear. This is, however, not to avoid detail, since the following scenes of Eleazar and the mother and her sons are well elaborated. Thus, it is clear that the following scenes are prioritised by the author for some reason. In these following scenes, the author allows space for each martyr to state his/her opinion on the foreign practices and decrees. This is an excellent way of engaging the emotions of and influencing the reader's opinion. This explains the brevity regarding the first two instances, and the expansion on the martyrdom of Eleazar and the seven sons.

As stated above, the author sets out in 6:12-17 to explain the horrid events which befell the Jews through employing the term παιδεία ("discipline"). This notion of discipline through hardship is grounded in the LXX in Deut 8:5: "Know then in your heart that as a parent disciplines [παιδεύσαι] a child, so the Lord God will discipline [παιδεύσει] you." It is also found in Ps 118:18. The author expands on this notion and states that it is of great beneficence that the Jews are punished immediately (6:13). In 2 Maccabees, the villain is not punished immediately, but God waits patiently until he chastises them when they attain the full measure of sins (6:14). For Doran (2012: 164) this "underscores the

theme of us versus them.” He further mentions (2012: 164) that such a harsh attitude towards other nations seems at odds with the view of books such as Wisdom of Solomon and Sirach. This would be true if the view of 2 Maccabees was that God will not allow other nations to repent. But this is not the case. Firstly, there is no explicit reference to the waiting period regarding the other nations, only to the punishment which they will receive. It could be that the author, because it is known that Antiochus IV Epiphanes and others will not soon change their ways, merely foretells their outcome. This would entail that God would have even punished the other nations immediately if they were to change their ways. This leads to the second aspect which shows that the author of 2 Maccabees does not present such a harsh treatment of other nations: Heliodorus was immediately punished and he refrained from attacking the Temple.

The explicit transition through the transitional phrase (“however, let these things be said by us as a reminder” – πλὴν ἕως ὑπομνήσεως ... εἰρήσθω) in 6:17 evidences the contrast between the flow of the narrative and the author’s own evaluation of events. The same term for narrative (διήγησις) is used as in 2:32. Such a transitional phrase is also common in Polybius (1.35.10; 4.21.10-12; 4.33.11; 9.20.10; 9.37.1), a fact which again presents the author of 2 Maccabees as a capable Hellenistic writer.

In the next scene (6:18-31) the reader’s emotional investment is secured through a dramatic and graphic description of Eleazar’s martyrdom. Various facets heighten the emotional appeal and loyalty towards the martyr and the cause. Eleazar is:

- a man of “beautiful and honourable appearance” (τὴν πρόσοψιν τοῦ προσώπου κάλλιστος - 6:18). The term κάλλιστος (“most beautiful”) has the connotation of both beautiful and honourable. This type of description of a godly man is also employed by Josephus (*Ant.* 2.224, 231-32). Ludwig Bieler (1976: 51-54) has shown such a reference to beauty to be an important facet in demonstrating the closeness of certain individuals to God. The sense of honour is also depicted by

the author in the manner he describes the choice that is before Eleazar. The old man has to choose between a long life with pollution or death with prominence (6:19). Such a choice is paralleled in the story of Achilles (Homer, *Il.* 9.410-16) and depictions of heroes by Aeschylus (*Cho.* 349) and Sophocles (*Aj.* 465). This quest for honour idealises the hero who is, in this case, Eleazar.

- a man already advanced in years (ἀνὴρ ἤδη προβεβηκῶς τὴν ἡλικίαν) (6:18, 23) and described as both a Jewish scribe/official (γραμματεύς - 6:18) and a man of honourable conduct since he was a child (6:23). Schams (1998: 314) has demonstrated that there is a range of meanings (referring to Jewish officials) that may be ascribed to the term γραμματεύς. She further (1998: 314) concluded that, despite these possibilities, it is highly likely that Eleazar was a scribe. However, since there is no reference to Eleazar's ability to write, it is safe to adopt the broader meaning of "official."
- given a chance by friends to escape death (6:21-22). This has a dual emotional effect: The reader sees a chance for the beautiful and honourable old man to get free and is likely to join the friends of Eleazar in urging him not to lay down his life. Secondly, the fact that the author has Eleazar's friends, and not his enemy, encouraging him, makes so much harder to turn down the offer. Tessa Rajak (41-42) rightly notes that this account is reminiscent of that of Socrates.

Eleazar provides a statement of the motivation for his brave actions in 6:24-28a. Although the statement is that of Eleazar's, it is important to realise that this is an opportunity for the author to communicate certain ideas. This is clear since Eleazar's statement describes more than just his refusal. In the statement some elements of a worldview become apparent. Firstly, the term παντοκράτωρ ("all-powerful") is employed together with the notion of punishment and reward after death⁵⁰. In this manner, the author portrays a reality where the all-powerful God of the Jews will deal with individuals

⁵⁰ This notion of punishment or reward after death is clear through Eleazar's insistence that he can escape from the Almighty neither alive nor dead (Doran, 2012: 153).

after their deaths in a manner that fits their actions on earth. A facet which supports the idea of the author's view within this speech is that the ideas and terminology are not isolated. The term παντοκράτωρ ("all-powerful") also occurs in 5:20 and in the succeeding martyrology with the mother and her seven sons (7:35, 38). This demonstrates a theme which is incorporated by the author into the speeches of the martyrs. Furthermore, the same ideas regarding punishment and reward are evident in the succeeding martyrology.

In verses 27 and 28 two isolated references to death are provided. The phrase διαλλάξας τὸν βίον ("leave this life") and the term ἀπευθανατίζω ("I die well") are not otherwise attested (Grimm, 1853).

Regarding the circumstances under which Eleazar had to eat pig's meat (6:18), there exist different manuscript traditions and emendations (La^{LXVP} Armenian, V La^{BM} Syriac Achminic, L' 46-52 58 311, Katz's emendation (1961: 118-124)). These variants can be divided into two versions of the story, one where Eleazar is forced to open his mouth and one where he is forced to eat, but nothing is said about the opening of his mouth. What is important is thus that the eating of pig's meat was involuntarily.

Now the author moves on from the story of a brave and exemplary old man to seven youths and their mother (7:1-42). Thematically, there are two important facets to note. Firstly, as Schwartz (2008: 300) notes, the emphasis is on the seven sons and not the mother. This provides a link with the previous account. Eleazar set an example for the youth, and now these youths are following that example even unto death. Secondly, the sudden presence of Antiochus IV Epiphanes and the prominent place given to him in this section, points to the possible influence from traditional folktale patterns where a ruler is outwitted by a subject. The use of the infinitive ἐφάπτω ("I fix firmly/decreed") with the preposition ἀπὸ (7:1) instead of the simple genitive is an example of an evolving

language. Habicht labelled this usage as improper Greek. Yet, Doran rightly demonstrates the shift in the language towards a growing use of ἀπὸ and ἐκ to replace the partitive genitive. This supports the fact that the author of 2 Maccabees represented himself as a proper Hellenistic writer and thus one who is aware of the finer details of the language and its progression.

The event of the seven sons is also linked to the rest of the narrative through the phrase in 7:2 ἔτοιμοι γὰρ ἀποθνήσκειν (“for we are ready to die”). This phrase is also used to refer to Maccabaeus’ men before their first battle with Nikanor (8:21).

The term τήγανον (“pot/pan”) in 7:3 is also used in the LXX in 2 Kings 13:9 and Ezekiel 4:3. This term seems to refer to a cooking instrument which would be heated by cauldrons underneath it in which a fire would be started.

Amongst various other notations of torture, the author specifically mentions the scalping of the martyrs in 7:4. The term περισκυθίζω (“I scalp in Scythian fashion”) creates a graphic picture in the mind of the reader and creates emotions of fear and sympathy. The author heightens the pathos by the mentioning that the mother and the other brothers are watching (Doran, 2012: 156).

It is important for the author of 2 Maccabees to have God see when the Jews are in despair. This is clear in 7:6 as well as in 12:22 and 15:2 where God sees all. Such a theme is prominent throughout the LXX (Gen. 16:13; Exod. 2:25; Ps. 30:7; Job 22:12, 34:21-24; Zech. 9:1).

In 7:7 the phrase ἐπὶ τὸν ἔμπαιγμὸν (“for the purpose of mockery”) is used. Bertram (1967: 630-636) has shown that ἔμπαιγμὸς may also refer to torture or cruel treatment. Doran (2012:156), however, rightly objects to the notion that the author refers to torture here rather than mockery since the author employs the imperfect ἐπηρώτων (“they were questioning”) in this same verse.

Doran (2012: 156) notes that “while the first brother had been deprived of speech by having his tongue cut out, the remaining brothers get to give a last speech.” Doran (2012: 156) continues in stating that “the author thereby increases the emotion.” This is true of many texts where the dying hero is given a chance for a last speech (Ps. – Callisthenes 3.32-33; Gen 49:1-27; Deut 33; John 14-17). Through these speeches the reader gains deeper knowledge into the character of the hero. An aspect overlooked by Doran, however, is that these speeches are ideal vessels for the author to carry his message. This becomes evident through the content of the speeches, especially in these speeches of the brothers in 2 Maccabees 7. The speeches of these brothers contain detailed reflections on eternal life and resurrection.

In 7:11 certain ideas regarding the resurrection of the martyrs are communicated. The third brother regards the sufferings as nothing and states that he will receive back from God whatever he might lose from his body. Some manuscripts (LBM) leave out 7:11 completely. This, together with the fact that the story would make more sense without this verse, led Katz (1960: 19-20) to leave out 7:11. However, it seems that a version which includes v. 11 would be fitting since the author of second Maccabees employs every opportunity to incorporate the theme of punishment and reward after death. In support of the inclusion of 7:11, Van Henten (1997: 113) rightly argued that the verse should remain since a purely logical approach would not be fitting to a text such as 2 Maccabees. Thus, this study will follow the longer version which includes v. 11.

Some deductions may be made on the basis of 7:11. Two aspects are highlighted:

- Firstly, the fact that the brother will regain the same limbs is emphasised through the term ταῦτα (“these”) which is repeated thrice.
- Secondly, reference to hope is made several times both positively and negatively (7:11, 14, 20, 34). In this manner, the reader’s attention is focussed on the future life of the martyrs.

In 7:12 the king and his men are astonished at the courage of the third brother. Schwartz (2008: 305) and Doran (2012: 157) note that the astonishment of onlookers is a *topos* ancient literature: The followers of Alexander the Great marvelled at the fortitude of Calanus, the Indian gymnosophist, when he set himself on fire (Arrian *Anab.* 7.3.5; Diodorus Siculus 17.107.5); Hecataeus of Abdera at the willingness of the Jews to undergo any punishment rather than transgress the law (Josephus *Ap.* 1.190-193); and God at the fortitude of Job (Aristeas the Exegete in Eusebius *Praep. Ev.* 9.25.4). However, neither Doran (2012:157) nor Schwartz (2008:305) provides a reason for the presence of this *topos*. Through stating the astonishment of onlookers at the courage of the martyrs, the author of 2 Maccabees is also inviting the reader to be astonished. The martyrs are elevated to an unparalleled level of endurance and resilience and the author makes sure that this is clear to the reader.

Interestingly, the verb μεταλλάσσω (“I exchange/alter”) is used in 7:14 with the prepositional phrase ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων (“from humans”). This phrase seems to mean “to move over from amongst humans.” As discussed above, the verb frequently refers to death in a metaphorical sense in 2 Maccabees with or without τὸν βίον (“the living”) in the accusative. Here, the use of the phrase ἀπ’ ἀνθρώπων (“from humans”) instead, implies the notion of leaving behind what is known temporarily amongst humans, in exchange for what is unknown, but eternal, with God. This notion is highlighted through the phrase τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ ... ἐλπίδας (“what is hoped for from God”). In this verse

(7:14) new information is added to the topic of punishment and reward after death. Here, it becomes clear that the wretched Seleucid king, in contrast to the Jewish martyrs, will not be resurrected into life. This curse is elaborated on in 7:17 where the martyr states that God, in his magnificent power, will torture the king and his seed. This led Doran (2012:158) to ask whether this refers specifically to the deaths of Antiochus V (2 Macc. 14:2; 1 Macc. 7:2-4) and Alexander Balas, who claimed to be a son of Antiochus IV Epiphanes (1 Macc. 11:7). This, however, seems unlikely since the author of second Maccabees does not attempt to connect the curse in 2 Macc. 7 with the description of the death of Antiochus V (2 Macc. 14:2). Neither is there any reference within 2 Maccabees to the death of Alexander Balas.

The verb πύσχω (“I am affected by”) could be used in both a positive and a negative way. In the Hellenistic period the negative sense, “suffer,” came to predominate (Boreham, 1971: 231-244). This verb may even be used to denote death (BDAG, 785), but the presence of the term ταῦτα (“these”) makes it unlikely.

The author strategically places the scene of the mother and her words of encouragement (7:20-23) between the description of the first six brothers, and the last, youngest brother. This singles out the mother and the youngest son. The term used to refer to the brother is νεωτέρος (“the younger”). Although in the comparative form, this term is used in a superlative sense (Mayser, 1970: 49). The fact that the mother and her youngest child are given a separate place, heightens the emotional appeal. This happens by focussing on the mother, who is sympathised by the reader for having witnessed the death of all of her sons; and on the youngest brother, whose age makes his martyrdom the most shocking.

The author parallels the mother to her sons, Eleazar and Judas through specific terminology such as γενναῖος (“noble,” also in 6:28; 7:5, 11; 12:42) and λογισμὸς

(“reckoning,” as in 6:23). As argued above, this is part of a strategy to create unity amongst the heroes on the one hand, and the villains on the other.

As in the speeches of the other martyrs, the author utilises the mother’s speech of encouragement as a vehicle for important information regarding the God of the Jews. Through the words of the mother, the following traits of God become clear. God is:

- the one who gives breath and life (“τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν”) and will give it back to the brothers after their death (7:22-23);
- and the one who created out of nothing and weaves together all the elements of what is the human body (7:22-23).

These are not simply random traits, but are a key facet in the concept of resurrection and punishment or reward in 2 Maccabees. It provides a logical explanation for the possibility that the martyrs will be resurrected and given new bodies. Because God has already weaved together the body out of nothing and breathed into it the breath of life, he can logically do it again, even after death.

In 7:24 the same element of temptation is found as in the account of Eleazar. There is a way for the seventh brother to escape death (as is the case for Eleazar in 6:21-22). This way is presented by the king by means of urging/encouragement (παράκλησις). Through this action, the king is ironically contrasted with the brothers’ encouragement (v.5: παρεκάλουν), the mother’s encouragement (v.21: παρεκάλει), and God’s encouragement (v.6: παρακαλεῖται, παρακληθήσεται). Davies (1953: 35-38) has demonstrated the broad spectrum of possible applications of the term παράκλησις. Through the investigation of this term, it becomes clear that also the legal sense of the term is employed in this pericope. Thus, the author is exploiting the broad semantic field of this term, which “runs the gamut from encouragement and consolation all the way to

legal pleading” (Schwartz, 2008: 311). Amongst the promises of the king is the promise that the brother would be held as a friend of the king if he departed from the ancestral ways. Bickerman (1938: 40-50) has shown that in this context, the term φίλος (“friend”) is a title given to designated individuals who are entitled to certain privileges equal to that of members of the king’s court. The first book of Maccabees notes that such a position was offered to various Jews (1 Macc. 2:18; 10:16, 19-20, 65; 11:26-27, 57; 13:36). Again, as was the case with Eleazar, the martyr is tested to the limits of his loyalty and the reader’s sympathy and loyalty to the cause is optimised.

The events in 7:25-29 are ironic but also demonstrate the true devotion of the mother and her sons to the ancestral traditions. After the last son was “not at all interested” (μηδαμῶς προσέχοντος) in the king’s offer, the king urges the mother to persuade her son. Instead, the mother encourages her son to join his brothers in honourably dying for the laws. Indeed, now, the mother is mocking the king while the king remains unsuspecting. When the king was suspecting mockery, there was none. The king is depicted as unwise and out of control.

The mother’s encouragement is twofold. Firstly, she calls her son to loyalty. The son is indebted to his mother because she has gone through the enduring process of bearing and raising him (7:27). This is reminiscent of the reference to the child’s debt to his parents in Xenophon (*mem.* 2.2.3-4). Secondly, the mother aims a logical appeal at her youngest: If God has made everything in heaven and earth, including humans, out of nothing; he could easily reconstruct the young boy’s body and resurrect him to life. The phrase οὐκ ἐξ ὄντων ἐποίησεν αὐτὰ ὁ θεός (v.28: “God made these things not from what existed”) gave rise to a weighted discussion on whether it means that God created out of nothing (Winston, 1971; Shuttermayr, 1973; May, 1978; Goldstein, 1984; Winston, 1986; Copan, 1996). However, despite many attempts to prove that the doctrine of *creatio ex nihilo* is a post-biblical invention, this study supports the view of

Copan (1996: 85) that *creation ex nihilo* is present in this pericope. This becomes clear through the logical argument of the author. Without the concept of *creation ex nihilo* the basis for resurrection of these martyrs would fall apart.

Once again the author stresses the unity amongst the villains on the one hand, and the heroes on the other. Here, in 7:31, the young boy addresses the king as κακίας εὐρετῆς (“originator of damages”). This reference links the king with Menelaus, who is the “cause of all troubles” (τὸν ... τῆς ὅλης κακίας αἴτιον) in 4:47; 13:4, but also contrasts Antiochus IV Epiphanes with Onias, who was falsely accused as the author of evils (4:1: τῶν κακῶν δημιουργὸς).

The use of the terms βραχέως ἐπώργισται (“he has been angry for a little while”) and καταλλάσσω (“I reconcile”) reinforces the author’s reflection in 5:17-20, while the term παιδεία (“teaching”) emphasises the author’s reflection in 6:12-16. The difference, however, here is that these are the words of a martyr. This shows the importance of these elements for the author, but also the fact that the author exploits the speeches of the martyrs to underscore his ideas.

In 7:34 the author makes mention of the heavenly children (τοὺς οὐρανίους παῖδας). Schwartz (2008: 316) fittingly mentions that the notion that the Jews are God’s children is particularly useful in a chapter like this which is devoted to children and their mother, but ignores their father. Doran (2012: 162) rightly points to the context of this phrase for its meaning. In 7:11, “heaven” is a title for God. Doran (2012: 162) concludes by stating that the phrase τοὺς οὐρανίους παῖδας (“the heavenly children”) should be taken as equivalent to “children of God.” A fact that Doran oversees, however, is that this phrase cannot be separated from the larger theme in second Maccabees that portrays God as the victor in heaven. Through the use of this phrase, the author is reminding the reader of the heavenly advantage that the God of the Jews brings to his people.

In 7:39-40 the author employs a series of adverbs to describe both the king (χειρίστως: “more severely,” πικρῶς: “vindictive”) and the young boy (καθαρῶς: “undefiled,” παντελῶς: “completely”). This adds to the intrigue through painting a vivid picture of the specific scene. The ending of the perfect participle πεποιθῶς (πείθω - “I prevail/win over”) links with the adverbs that end with –ως.

In the last verse of this pericope (7:42), the author links together the persecutions by his use of “meal” (σπλαγχνισμός) and “tortures” (αἰκία). The term σπλαγχνισμός is found in 6:7-8 and 6:21, while the verb “to torture” (αἰκίζω) is found throughout the story of the seven brothers and their mother, in 7:1, 13, 15 (Doran, 2012: 164). The term σπλαγχνισμός is listed by LSJ (1992: 1628) as used only in 2 Maccabees (chapter 6 and 7). Apart from this verse (7:42), it appears only in 6:7 and 6:21 and not at all in Chapter 7. This led Habicht (1976: 171, 174) to argue that the whole of Chapter 7 was a secondary addition and that 7:42 originally concluded Chapter 6. This argument was convincingly rejected by Doran (1981: 22) since 7:42 is clearly meant to summarise both chapters.

Since the unity of this pericope (6:9b-7:42) is well established, essential deductions may now be made in terms of what the main proposition of the author is, and how he set out to convince his readers of this proposition.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

Whereas the preceding chapters dealt with implicit argumentation, the current pericope seems to deal more with the author’s explicit communication. Firstly, this is clear through the author’s own explicit theological reflection in 6:12-16. Secondly, the investigation above demonstrates that the author communicates by means of the martyrs speeches. In this manner, there is a two folded proposition: The pericope

explains why these tragic events occur, but also explains what the fruits are of those who endure in obeying the ancestral laws even unto death. This proposition may be presented as follows:

IF

- the words of the martyrs cannot be debated,
- martyrs say the persecution and martyrdom of the Jews is not for destruction, but for training,
- the martyrs say God punishes or rewards people after death according to their choices in life,
- the martyrs say the Jews who died for the sake of the law will be rewarded by resurrection and given new bodies,
- the martyrs say the persecutor and his descendants will be punished.

THEN

- what the martyrs say about life after death must be true,
- it is better to be a martyr than to be the King,
- it is better to die for the laws of Moses than to conform to the extreme Hellenistic practices,
- the Jews win because their God is stronger than King Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

3. Pragmatic Analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

The author provides an extremely graphic and violent description of events. This generates emotions of fear as well as admiration. The admiration for the martyrs serves as an ideal situation for incorporating ideas by means of the martyrs' speeches. The author moves the reader through the words of the martyrs. The argumentation is mainly emotional (although the concept of the resurrection is communicated through a logical

argument) and works with punishment and reward. The reader is moved to choose the side of the martyrs rather than the side of the king. This happens through creating a scenario where the current hardship of the Jews does not add up against the coming reward. Likewise, the current reward of the Hellenic practices does not add up against the coming punishment. In this manner, the reader is encouraged to choose the greater overall reward which is persecution because of the extreme loyalty to the laws of Moses, but eternal resurrection and a new body.

As with the previous periscopes, the reader is moved to join the cause of the heroes and to hate that of the villains.

3.2. Real- and Alternative Text World

The author is addressing a situation where there may be doubt concerning the loyalty to the laws of Moses. The process of Hellenisation may be appealing and therefore cause doubt about the observance of the laws of Moses. The problem is that Jews may ask to what extent the laws should be followed. The current pericope eliminates this doubt and suggests a world where there is absolute commitment to the laws, even unto death.

3.3. Trans-Universal Relations

Through the emotion of fear, the reader is driven away from the Helleniser and all he stands for. Through admiration, the reader is moved towards the martyr and all he does. The reader believes what the martyr is saying and therefore pursues the reward of which the martyrs are speaking through aiming at imitating the actions of the martyr. In this manner, the reader is moved to a world where he/she would be absolutely committed to the laws of Moses and would be willing to die for this cause.

CHAPTER 9: EXAMPLES OF THE PIETY AND VICTORIES OF JUDAS AND HIS FOLLOWERS AND THE COWARDICE, DEFEAT AND PUNISHMENT OF THEIR ENEMIES (8:1-36)

1. Introduction

In this ninth chapter of second Maccabees the martyr's plea in 7:38, that God's wrath comes to a halt in him and his brothers, is answered. The force for Judaism grows in numbers and victories are described. Whereas the previous three pericopes all ended with a sense of hopelessness, this pericope ends with a theme of appropriate retribution and Nicanor proclaiming that the Jews have a champion (8:36).

A prominent theme is the few conquering the many. A mere 6000 Jews were divided into four groups of 1500 each (8:22). One of these groups slaughtered above 9000 of Nicanor's men, wounded others, and forced the rest to flee (8:24). They also destroyed over twenty thousand of Timothy and Bachides' followers. The author further stresses this theme by dedicating 8:19-21 to the description of examples from the Jewish ancestry where the few had victory over the many. These victories are a symbol of God's providence and prove the fact that He Himself is fighting against the enemies of his people (8:18).

The sudden success of the Jewish force is based solely on the change of status in the relationship between the Jews and their God. The author makes clear that the wrath of the Lord had turned to mercy (8:5). As discussed in the previous chapters, this is a clear prerequisite for conquering the enemy. This, consequently, explains the explicit reference to the religious activities of Judas and his followers. They:

- pray to, and beseech God (8:2, 14),
- glorify God's name (8:15),

- give sermons (8:18),
- quote scriptures (8:19, 20, 23),
- give the slogan "God's help" (8:23),
- celebrate the Sabbath meticulously (8:26-28),
- and sing praises to the Lord (8:27).

In this manner, the heroes (Judas and his followers) are an example of this renewed relationship with God. Their piety and correct practice of essential elements is linked to that of the martyrs in the previous pericope. The author portrays this as the basis for the success on the battlefield, since the description of Judas' victories comes directly after the description of the martyrs' obedience and Judas' prayer. The author further explicates the role of the heroes' piety through stating in 8:6 that the wrath of the Lord has turned to mercy. This is exactly what the youngest brother proclaimed in 7:33 and 7:38 as he himself explicated the relation between his martyrdom and the mercy of God that will follow.

2. Structural Analysis

2.1. Delimitation

As discussed in the preceding chapter, the author returns to the main narrative in 8:1. The thematic change between 6:9b-7:42 and 2 Maccabees 8 is a clear indication that a new pericope starts at 8:1. This verse (8:1) is connected to the preceding by a μὲν οὖν ... ὁὲ construction, which Doran (2012: 170) shows to be often used by the author as he passes to another subject (3:22-23; 9:28-10:1; 10:22-23; 10:28; 11:18, 19). The previous pericope dealt specifically with the instances of martyrdom. The current section starts off with Judas' recruitment of those who are steadfast in Judaism. This picks up the sub-narrative of the hope that lies in the group of Judas Maccabeus, which started in 5:27. As mentioned above, the phrase τὰ μὲν οὖν ... τοσοῦτον δεδηλώσθω ("that

then, on the one hand, is enough set forth) is self-explanatory of the ending of the previous pericope at 7:42.

The ending of this pericope is made clear by the shift in theme between 8:36 and 9:1 onward. The author begins with the gathering of Judas' force and Nikanor's invasion (8:1-15) and returns to the description of Nikanor's flight and recognition of the Champion of the Jews in 8:34-36. Thereafter, a new theme is initiated by means of the phrase *περὶ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον* ("about that time") in 9:1. A similar phrase starts a new section in Chapter 5 (*περὶ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον* – "about this time"). From 9:1 onward the focus clearly shifts to Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Consequently, the current pericope may be delimited as 8:1-36.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic Analysis

In the prologue, the author states one of his aims as describing the resistance of those who fought eagerly on behalf of Judaism. This aim is interwoven into the text through the threat of Hellenism by Jason and Antiochus. As mentioned above, Hellenism is in direct opposition to Judaism. Now, in 8:1-36 the aim is further visible through the expanding force of Judas that is identified by their zeal for Judaism.

The verb *παρεισπορεύομαι* ("I enter" LSJ 1334) is employed in this verse only. This led Schwartz to provide a translation that takes the prefixed prepositions into account: "they had been going in and out and around". The fact that this form of the verb is only used here merits such a specific translation.

Verses 2-4 speak of Judas and his followers calling (*ἔπεκαλοῦντο*) on the Lord. The reader is reminded of the prayer of the seventh brother in 7:37 (*ἔπικαλούμενος*). Here,

God is called upon to see (έφοράω), to hear (είσακούω), and to remember (μιμνήσκω). God must see all the maltreated people, hear the cry of the blood, and remember the destruction of the infants. In Exodus 2:24-25 God also acts in this threefold manner (see, hear and remember). The prayer calls for God's vengeance. This, along with the mention of the blasphemies against his name (εις τὸ ὄνομα αὐτοῦ βλασφημιῶν), assures that God will act (Just as the He promised doom to blasphemers in Ezek. 35:12-14). At the same time, the prayer calls the reader to action. The reader is reminded of the horrid maltreatment of the good guys and is now anticipating retribution. The pairing of the verbs οἰκτεῖρω ("I have pity") and ἐλεέω ("I show mercy") is frequent in the LXX (Exod. 33:19; 3 Kgdms. 8:50; 4 Kgdms. 13:23; Ps. 76:9-10). The call to God "to hate evil" (μισοπονηρῆσαι) again is an attempt to unify the heroes.

In 8:5 Judas got his troops together (έν συστέματι). The term σύστημα ("that which is put together") is frequently employed by Polybius in terms of the organisation of military forces (1.81.11; 3.53.6; 8.26.8). The action of gathering followers is connected with the succeeding events through the adverb of time (ἤδη – "forthwith"). However, 8:5 mentions that Judas alone could not be withstood (άνυπόστατος). This marks the beginning of the authors plan to single out Judas and thus making him an effective heroic character.

As mentioned earlier, the fact that Judas' force cannot be withstood by the gentiles is due to the fact that the wrath of the Lord has turned to mercy (8:5). This is an explication of the author's previous theological reflections as well as an echo of the prayer in 7:38. It is a turning point of the entire narrative in terms of the success of the Jews and highlights the significance of the events which closely precede this chapter namely the persecution and blood flow of the martyrs.

In 8:6-7, mention is made of the surprise tactics of Judas. The sense of swiftness of this whole process is heightened through two asyndetic participle phrases ἀπολαμβάνων ...

τροπούμενος. Judas' strategy is also described through the use of the term ἐπικαίρους ("advantageous," 8:6). In the Septuagint, this adjective recurs only in 2 Maccabees (8:31; 10:15; 14:22). Elsewhere, the term is used with the sense of "strategic" (Xenophon, *Hier.* 10.5). Bar-Kochva (1989: 138-141) makes a convincing case for the fact that here, in 8:6, the term refers to Judas choosing his point of attack, rather than strategic positions. Nevertheless, no other details are provided regarding either strategic positions or point of attack. In this manner, the author shows the reader that such details are not the aim of this narrative.

When Onias III realised the threat of Simon's attacks in 4:4, the term συνοράω ("I detect") is used. Here, in 8:8 again, the term is used for Philip the Phrygian's realisation of Judas' threat. This detection on behalf of Philip is due to the progression of success made clear by the author through referring to Judas' gradually growing success (first κατὰ μικρὸν – "little by little," then πυκνότερον – "more and more"). In contrast to the parallel description in 1 Maccabees 3:10-25, the author of 2 Maccabees focuses on the victory over Nikanor. Thus, the focus is on the victory over this Nikanor, who is a high-ranking noble official (one of the First Friends) and "triple offensive" (8:34: τρισαλιπῆριος). In this manner, the author heightens the rhetorical effect, since this powerful man is no match for Judas and his God.

The tribute to the Romans (τοῖς Ῥωμαίοις ὄντα ταλάντων) mentioned in 8:10 seems most likely to be part of the moneys payable to the Romans according to the Treaty of Apamea in 188BCE after the Seleucid defeat at Magnesia. This treaty determined that the Seleucids should pay twelve thousand talents to the Romans over twelve years (one thousand per year, Polybius 21.42.19). Accordingly, these two thousand talents (8:10) would form part of that twelve thousand talents and would be worth two years of payments. The problem, however, is that these payments should have already been finalised in 176BCE. Mørkholm (1966: 65) argues that Antiochus IV Epiphanes had paid

off the indemnity in 173BCE. Mørholm's argument is, however, based on an ambiguous quote from Livy (42.6.7) which speaks of Antiochus IV Epiphanes's ambassador apologising to the senate for paying an overdue instalment and that he has brought the entire instalment. It is not certain whether the ambassador brought the entire instalment that was left from the twelve thousand or if he meant the entire instalment for that year. This uncertainty led Schwartz (2008: 544-45) and, following him, Doran (2012: 173) to leave this matter unresolved. A fact that is certain, however, is that the author has utilised this account as a rhetorical tool. The reader is provoked through the fact that Jews would be sold for the mere purpose of paying tribute to the Romans. The fact that ninety slaves are sold for a talent (8:11: which calculates into 67 drachmas per slave, (Schwartz, 2008: 333), means that the Jews were sold for half the normal rate. Reinhold Scholl, in his book *Corpus der ptolemäischen Sklaventexte* (1990: 213) provides prices ranging from 112 to 300 drachmas per slave. This drastic drop in price would have been due to the vast amount of slaves that Nikanor intended to sell. This further heightens the rhetorical effect, since that was even less than the price of an animal (Schwartz, 2008: 333).

Another rhetorical aspect is the fact that the author singles out a hero and a villain and places them against each other as antagonists. This happens through highlighting the fact that Nikanor alone (and not the usual slave traders) drives the process of enslaving the Jews and then immediately shifting the focus to Judas in 8:12. It is the brave and pious Judas against the haughty and foolish Nikanor.

In 8:13-14 the author allows for the purification of Judas' force. In Deuteronomy 20:5-9 preparations are made for certain persons to leave the battle ground and go back home. Amongst these who may legitimately leave battle are those who built new houses, those who planted new vineyards, those who have recently become engaged with to a woman, and those who are weak and afraid. In the first book of Maccabees these

prescriptions are explicated in the text. Here, in 2 Maccabees, there is no legitimate reason for leaving battle. They cowardly leave Judas group, but their action is not legitimised. Their action is judged negatively through the use of the verb διαδιδράσκω (“I run off”). They are cowards who run away (8:13), leaving only those who are fully committed to the cause of fighting for Judaism. Those who stay behind to fight must sell everything, since no possessions may hold them back.

It is significant then that, only after the weak has left the group, they beseech the Lord (8:14-15). It is a group that has recently been purified and they are now depicted as both strong and pious. The group calls on God to remember his covenants⁵¹ and his name that is upon the Jews (8:15). The author underpins certain important traits of the group, as is the case with other heroic figures in 2 Maccabees such as Onias III. Here, Judas’ force is described as selfless (they do not ask for their own victory, but for the return of the recently enslaved) and humble (since they have respect their ancestors more than themselves).

The speech of Judas to his followers in 8:16-20 is also a speech of the author to his readers. They are reminded, firstly, of the unholy actions against Jerusalem and its Temple as well as the dissolution of the ancestral laws (8:16-17). This provokes both the members of Judas’ force and the readers. They are assured of the just cause of the subsequent battle and the reader’s absolute loyalty to Judas and his force is secured. Secondly, both Judas’ followers and the reader are reminded that the Jews have a history full of examples where the few conquered the many (8:18-20). This braces Judas’ force and provides enough hope to proceed into battle. Furthermore, the reader’s anticipation is ensured by means of the promise of what is about to happen: the few is going to conquer the many. This speech contains many elements present

⁵¹ The plural “covenants” (διαθήκας) is rare in the LXX, appearing only in Wis 18:22; Sir 44:11, 18; 45:17.

also in the pre-battle speeches found in Herodotus, Thucydides, Xenophon, and Polybius (Kendrick, W. Pritchett, 1994: 101-105) such as:

- previous battle experiences,
- the goals set (amongst which is to take vengeance on those wishing to enslave them and to defend the country),
- a comparison of forces,
- and a call for help from the gods

The author of 2 Maccabees once again demonstrates his knowledge of Hellenistic literature through incorporating these well-known motifs and adding a unique perspective. Interestingly, as Doran (2012: 175) notes, the emphasis in this speech falls on God's help in contrast to the Greek tendency to focus upon the battle training of the soldiers.

Previously, Simon (4:1) and Jason (5:8) had been described as against the fatherland, while Menelaus was portrayed as a traitor to both the laws and the fatherland (5:15). Now, in 8:21, Judas and his followers prepare themselves to die for the laws and the fatherland. This, once more, is an example of the author placing the hero exactly opposite the villain. This same strategy is evident in the fact that the main hero, Judas, is pitting himself against Nikanor (8:23).

A comparison between 1 Macc. 8:21-23 and 1 Maccabees 4:1-22 shows the unique aim of the second book of Maccabees. The author is not interested in providing a detailed description of all the tactical facets. The text hurries towards the defeat of the villain, Nikanor, by the hero, Judas. The text of 2 Macc. describes the division of Judas' men into four groups of 1500. This type of grouping is not found in Hebrew Scriptures (Schwartz, 2008: 339). The account of 1 Maccabees, however, speaks of thousands,

hundreds, fifties and tens and finds precedent through the regulations in Exodus 18:21, 24. With this rough grouping of Judas' men in mind, Doran (2012: 177) rightly concludes that the term σπεῖρα in 8:23 must be given the general meaning of "unit," rather than the smaller group in a fully organised army, equivalent to a Roman maniple of two hundred men.

In 8:23 mention is made of a slogan: "God's Help" (θεοῦ βοηθείας). A similar slogan is noted in 13:15 (θεοῦ νίκην: "God's Victory"). Such phrases are commonly found in Greco-Roman writings (Xenophon, *Cyrop.* 3.3.58; *Anab.* 1.8.17; 6.5.26; Apian *Bell. civ.* 2.76). What is important here is that these slogans in 2 Maccabees represent one of the main themes within second Maccabees. As mentioned above, it is important for the author to underpin the fact that God controls the faith of the Jews. When He is angry, the Jews have no assurance of his protection; when He is reconciled with his children, no force can stop Him. Accordingly, these slogans state that it is God's help that ensures victory and therefore the victory is his.

The reference in 8:24 to God as the ally (σύμμαχος) of Judas' force represents the author's aim to legitimise their actions. The fact that they are fighting besides God Himself makes it hard for the reader to contest any of their actions. This, together with the emphasis of their piety, as mentioned above, guarantees the reader's loyalty to the group. The same strategy is also present in Josephus (*Antiquities* 12.285) where he contrasts the legitimacy of the Hasmoneans (who had God as their σύμμαχος) and the rebels of his own day (Gafni, 1989: 126-127).

As mentioned above, it is important for the author to depict Judas and his followers as pious. This makes it harder for the reader to criticise any of their actions. The group becomes an epithet for what is right. Another example for this strategy is seen in 8:25b-27. The author explicitly describes Judas' force taking part in the Sabbath, blessing and

singing praises to the Lord (8:27), and making communal supplication and beseeching the Lord (8:29). They abandon the pursuit of the enemy troops and risk losing their advantageous position (8:25-26). This move is explained by the author of 2 Maccabees as due to the Sabbath day drawing near. Thus, for Judas and his men, obedience to the law reigns over all other endeavours. Significantly, the author of 1 Maccabees (4:15) holds that the reason for abandoning the pursuit was that Judas' force was getting too close to the coastal cities (which was not strategically ideal). The author of second Maccabees clearly has an agenda to base the actions of the book's heroes theologically.

Two rare verbs are found in 8:26-27: μακροτονέω ("I stretch out") and όπλολογέω ("I collect weapons"). *LSJ* (1992: 1075) lists 8:26 alone for this specific meaning of μακροτονέω and the active usage of όπλολογέω is only found in 8:27 and 8:31 (*LSJ*, 1992: 1240).

In 8:30 the theme is explicated of the few conquering the many. Judas' force destroyed more than twenty thousand of Timothy and Bacchides' followers (8:30). This defeat is connected with the previous verse through the fact that they asked the Lord to be completely reconciled with his servants (εις τέλος καταλλαγῆναι τοῖς αὐτοῦ δούλοις - 8:29). According to the terms that the narrative has already determined, they were actually asking the Lord to give them complete victory. Amongst the rare verbs already mentioned which the author uses to achieve an artistic reading of the narrative, the verb συνερίζω ("I clash") is employed in 8:30. This verb is only found in the LXX in 8:30 (*LSJ*, 1992: 1712).

Adding to the list of their virtues, Judas' force shares the booty with the tortured, widows, orphans and elders. There are a few references in the Hebrew Scriptures providing details for dividing the spoils from battle (Num. 31:25-30; 1 Sam. 30:24-25;

The *Temple Scroll* from Qumran, 11QT [11Q19] 58.11-15). These texts also mention the priests, Levites, congregation, and the king among those who should receive a share of the booty. By focusing on the widows, orphans, elders, and the tortured, the author provides a link to those who had already been victims in the narrative.

Pritchett (1971: 3.186-189) cites evidence from Diodorus (16.86.6) and Polyaeus (1.43.2; 7.43) on the ἐπινίκια (“victory celebrations”) mentioned in 8:33. These celebrations also entailed sacrifices. Doran (2012: 180), however, rightly argues that the present order of 2 Maccabees, the term ἐπινίκια could not have included the meaning of sacrifices, since the Temple had not yet been restored. Therefore, the broader meaning of victory celebrations should be maintained.

The theme of appropriate retribution is articulated in 8:33-36. Those who had burnt the holy gates were set on fire (8:33) and Nikanor, who has vainly planned to destroy the Jews is made low (8:34-36). The irony is communicated through the fact that Nikanor, who aimed at enslaving the Jews, is now acting like a slave, removing his splendid raiment (τὴν δοξικὴν ἀποθέμενος ἐσθῆτα) and moving alone (ἔρημος) at everyone’s mercy. Through this ironic turn of events the author demonstrates that the God of the Jews is still in control.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

Throughout this pericope, the author is conditioning the reader to reevaluate the concept of strength:

- The circumstances change from horrid to hopeful because of God’s mercy, not human force.
- The battles are won because of the heroes’ relationship with the Lord and not because of their numbers.

This is explicated through the themes of the few conquering the many, and the piety of the heroes. The reader is taught that the heroes are only strong when God is merciful, and that God is only merciful when the heroes are obedient to God's commandments. The proposition that flows from the abovementioned can be formulated as possible:

IF

- good things start to happen because of a change in circumstances
- this change is due to the fact that the wrath of the Lord had changed to mercy
- the Lord's mercy is because of what the heroes do
- the heroes are ultimately obedient to the laws of Moses and extremely pious

THEN

- the reader should do as the heroes (the martyrs and Judas' force) do
- the reader should find his strength in piety and ultimate obedience to the laws of Moses

3. Pragmatic Analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

The pericope is introduced by Judas' recruitment of those who are steadfast in Judaism. As mentioned above, the hope that was created regarding the group of Judas (5:27) is now rewarded. Interestingly, the recruitment is also aimed at the reader. As the force of Judas grows in numbers and success, the reader is increasingly tempted to join the group of heroes. This happens throughout the narrative by means of association and dissociation. The heroes have desirable traits and rewards and the villains have despicable traits and punishments. Logically, the reader would want to be a part of the group that is winning. As the narrative promises, this group is Judas and all who follow him.

3.2. Real- and Alternative Text-World

The author recognises the tendency amongst the characters in the text as well as the readers to determine the state of a group's safety based on numbers and resources. For example: the group that has the best weaponry, the most soldiers, and the most cunning strategy will win the battle.

Therefore, the author suggests an alternative scenario where the group's chance of victory is not based on what is humanly possible, but on their obedience to the God of heaven and his laws.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

The reader is moved towards this renewed world-view through providing examples of victories where the victors are ultimately obedient to God and his laws. Secondly, the reader is drawn towards this group of obedient people through their desirable traits and rewards.

CHAPTER 10: THE FINAL BATTLE BETWEEN ANTIOCHUS IV EPIPHANES AND GOD (9:1-29)

1. Introduction

The author once again employs his strategy of suspense and relief in 9:1 onward. The reader is told that Antiochus IV Epiphanes is on his way back (9:1). By now, the reader waits in suspense, since he/she is well aware of the possible meaning of the return of the cruel tyrant. Antiochus IV Epiphanes will certainly aim to avenge what happened to Nikanor and the followers of Timothy. This suspense is relieved briefly by the notion that Antiochus IV Epiphanes made his way shamefaced because he was put to flight by the inhabitants of Persepolis (9:2). Yet, the suspense is regained through the communication of the tyrant's plans to destroy Jerusalem (9:4). Finally, the reader is greatly relieved by the description of Antiochus IV Epiphanes IV's last moments, his appropriate retribution, and his last wishes for the good of the Jews (9:5-28).

The author utilises the rhetorical value of the death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes through providing a vivid description. As mentioned previously, there are many accounts of the death of this king. Here, the author of 2 Maccabees uses the traditional pattern of the Divine Warrior. This persuades the reader of the power of God and the foolishness of trying to attack him (Doran, 2012: 198).

The death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes is linked with the martyrs in two ways. Firstly, as mentioned above, the description of the martyrs' death is the pivotal point in the narrative where-after the Jews are victorious. Now God, who is the ally of the Jews, will add the punishment of Antiochus IV Epiphanes to the victories He has given them.

Secondly, this description is linked to the martyrdoms through the fulfilment of the prophetic utterance of the seventh brother in 7:35-37.

It is important for the author to place Antiochus IV Epiphanes directly opposite God in this last battle. It is a battle between the one who had dared to enter God's holy Temple and touched the vessels (5:15-16) and the God who protects that place; between the king who regards himself as superhuman (5:21; 9:8) and the powerful, all-seeing God of the Jews. This personal feat between Antiochus IV Epiphanes and God is seen in two things: an unnatural death (not by human hand) and complete repentance and reversal.

2. Structural analysis

2.1. Delimitation

The start of this new pericope is clearly started off with the phrase *περὶ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον* ("about that time") in 9:1 which initiates a new scene and setting. A similar phrase marked the start of 5:1-6:9a (*περὶ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον* - "about this time"). Through this phrase in 9:1 the author links the events of the current pericope with preceding events. The death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes is tied to what just happened in Judea and specifically in Jerusalem. This is evidenced by the mention of the defeats of Nikanor and Timothy's men.

The ending of the pericope is as clear as the start. The author jumps to yet another scene in 10:1 with Judas and his companions at the center, marking 9:29 as the end of the current scene and pericope. Accordingly, this chapter will focus on 9:1-29 as basis for a rhetorical analysis.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

The author begins the pericope, which is clearly meant to portray the most negative image of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, with a fitting description of events. In 9:2 Antiochus IV Epiphanes attempts to rob a temple and secure the city of Persepolis. This enforces the enmity of the reader towards the king. Goldstein (1983: 349) holds that the name Persepolis is the result of a misreading of an original Hebrew source that read "in Persis, a city," However, as Doran (2012: 186) rightly argues, it seems more likely that the author simply mentioned the most renowned city in Persis in order to highlight the audacity of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The city Persepolis was the capitol of the Achaemenid Empire and was known for the fact that it had been looted and destroyed by Alexander the Great (Diodorus Siculus 17.20-22). It would seem that the author is merely applying a strategy to vilify Antiochus IV Epiphanes through referring to the temple-robbery. Therefore, the events in Persepolis do not necessarily have to be true. Mittag (2006: 309-317), however, provides convincing evidence for such events to have taken place. The remaining fact is that the author has, nevertheless, dedicated a section of this pericope to describe both the attempt of plundering the temple and the failure. In this manner, the author is negatively propagating Antiochus IV Epiphanes as well as achieving to add to his failures this failed attempt of robbing the temple.

The author's aim to utilise the rhetorical possibilities of the downfall of Antiochus IV Epiphanes is seen in the structure of 9:1-29. The rest of the pericope is dedicated to Antiochus IV Epiphanes' afflictions (9:3-10) and the complete reversal of his character and attitude towards the Jews (3:11-29). The author has Antiochus IV Epiphanes suffer a threefold just desert for his previous actions. The king is struck with extreme intestinal pains (9:5), falls off his chariot, maintaining serious injuries (9:7), and worms swarm from his eyes and flesh crumbles off him (9:9). This series of events is introduced by the author's link to what Antiochus IV Epiphanes did to others: the one who tormented the innards of others (9:6) was now tormented the same way. It is important to note that the

author underpins the direct battle between God and the king through starting off these events by God himself who afflicts Antiochus IV Epiphanes (9:5).

Antiochus IV Epiphanes' self-justification becomes clear through his rage about the events in Judea (9:4). The same use of θυμός ("anger") is found in 4:38; 10:35; and 14:45. Here, the king thinks that he has been wronged by the Jews, as if it would be unjust to protect your own city (Nicklas, 2002: 83). This attitude of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, in turn, fits into the theme of the stubborn king. Only at the last moment, after intense punishment, the king changes his opinion and humbles himself before the God of Israel. Through this, the author maintains suspense throughout this section and ensures the reader's attention, since the battle is not easily won. The fact that God is referred to as παντεπόπτης κύριος ("the all-seeing Lord") recalls the confession of Heliodorus in 3:39. The reader is reminded that a challenge against God is futile, since such a battle cannot be won. The reader anticipates the fact that Antiochus IV Epiphanes will end up the same way as Heliodorus, confessing the might of God.

The verb πατάσσω ("I strike") in 9:5 demonstrates that what God is doing to Antiochus IV Epiphanes is not merely physical, but also spiritual. It is connected with bending the will of man to God's commandments. In LXX Exodus the verb is abundantly employed (3:20; 7:20, 25; 8:17-17; 9:15, 25; 12:12, 23, 27, 29) where God is forcing the Egyptians to obey his will. In Deut. 28:21 the verb is used to describe what God will do to those who do not obey his commands. In 2 Chron. 21:18 the verb refers to God chastising the impious king Jehoram. The effect of God's smiting will soon be seen in 9:11-29 where Antiochus IV Epiphanes is brought to submission and conversion.

Antiochus IV Epiphanes' last stand against the God of the Jews is eloquently described in 9:7-11. This section starts off with the negation of the verb λήγω ("I cease") and ends in 9:11 with the same verb (λήγω) describing the king ceasing his haughtiness. This

rounds off this section and ensures that the reader understands the depth of this final battle: Antiochus IV Epiphanes' submission does not come easily. He is said to be boiling over/breathing fire (πῦρ πνέων, 9:7). The element of extreme rage adds to the dramatic effect of this last battle. On this aspect, Thompson (1966: 351, 473) did an important study exploring the folkloristic portrayal of dragons. For this study, however, it would make little difference whether this is indeed a reference to folklore. There is also no evidence in the context to further support of such notions. What is important is that the author utilises the anger of the king to make his fall more prolific. This verse (9:7) is the only verse listed by *LSJ* (220) for the verb ἀποστρεβλοῦμαι (“I am racked intensely”). The use of this unusual word, together with the use of ἐποξύνω and ῥοίζος (“a whistling or rushing sound”), heightens the dramatic effect (Doran, 2012: 188).

The author depicts two contrasting scenes in 9:8-10: one of utter arrogance, and one of utter disgrace. Firstly, the haughtiness of Antiochus IV Epiphanes is described. He opined that he could command the waves of the sea and weigh the mountain heights. This description either be an allusion to Xerxes (Herodotus 7.24, 36-37; Aeschylus, *Persians*, 744-751, 820) or to God in Isa. 40:12: “Who has measured the waters in the hollow of his hand ... and weighed the mountains in scales ... ?” In this regard, Schwartz (2008: 357) rightly mentions that “either allusion would justify the author’s assumption that Antiochus IV Epiphanes’ ultimate sin was equating himself with God.”

Secondly, the author provides a graphic description of Antiochus IV Epiphanes’ complete humiliation. He is down on the ground, worms swarm from his eyes, pieces of flesh crumbles off him and his stench becomes unbearable (9:8-9). There are many examples for the motif of worms at the death of those who have fought against a god (Herodotus 4.205; Pausanias 9.7.2-3; Justin 16.2; Josephus *Ant.* 17.168-170; Acts 12:23; Lucian *Alex.* 59-60). This mentioning of worms, together with the reference to Antiochus IV Epiphanes’ stench, serves as an effective humiliation of the former

persecutor. Doran (2012: 189) rightly points out that verse 10 sums up the previous description by its use of similar language: δοκέω in vv. 8, 10; ὁσμή in vv. 9, 10; φορεῖον/ἀφόρητον in vv. 8, 10; βαρύνω/βάρος.

In 9:11-12 the theme is found of the persecutor who is humbled and converted. This theme is also present in the court portrayals of Daniel (3:28-30; 4:25, 34-37; Bel 41) and the *Prayer of Nabonidus* (4Q242). The cruel tyrant, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, is forced to his knees by the God of the Jews and confesses that it is not good to be “godlike” (ισόθεος) minded (9:12). This scene (9:11-12) is the culmination of various others. Through mentioning the divine whip, the author is referencing the earlier account of Heliodorus (3:26, 38) as well as that of the martyrs (6:30; 7:1). As mentioned above, the youngest of the seven brothers foretells the God’s whipping of Antiochus IV Epiphanes in 7:38.

The polluted one (ὁ μιὰρὸς), Antiochus IV Epiphanes, is finally forced to make a vow to the Master (τὸν ... δεσπότην) in 9:13-17. His vow only comes after a series of ‘whippings’ by the Lord, who would not now be merciful to him (τὸν οὐκέτι αὐτὸν ἐλεήσοντα, 9:13). Through the attributive participle τὸν ... ἐλεήσοντα (“the One who will (not) be merciful”), the author ensures that the reader understands the cause of this Antiochus IV Epiphanes’ sudden change of heart. The author will not praise the actions of Antiochus IV Epiphanes. The vow is driven by God’s heavy hand upon the king. The vow progresses unto 9:17 from an impersonal and more logical to more personal and less logical commitments by the king. Firstly, Antiochus IV Epiphanes makes commitments that are beneficial for the city and the Jews (9:14-15). Secondly, he vows to adorn the Temple with votive offerings that he will personally fund (9:16). Lastly, he moves on to the personal undertaking of becoming a Jew and proclaiming the power of God in every region (9:17).

Amongst the benefits for the city is the fact that Antiochus IV Epiphanes will proclaim the city free (9:14). This is a weighted promise. Such freedom implied a legal status and commitment on the part of the Hellenistic king (Ma, 1999: 150-174) and had a long lasting effect throughout the Hellenistic period (Gruen, 1984: 156).

The author sees to it that Antiochus IV Epiphanes restores the honour of the Jews in 9:15. They would have been greatly dishonoured through being left u to the wild beasts, being unburied. This dishonour was thoroughly known in antiquity (Sophocles, *Antigone*; 1 Sam 17:44, 46; Ezek 39:4, 17-20). Now the Jews' honour is restored by being made equal to Athens (ἴσους Ἀθηναίοις ποιήσειν). It is uncertain what exactly this phrase means. What is certain is the high esteem the city of Athens still had for learning and culture. As mentioned above, the author of 2 Maccabees presents himself as a proper Hellenistic historian and is positive towards the idea of Jews living in a Greek world. This, together with the fact that the text does not provide any negative evaluation of Antiochus IV Epiphanes' vow, confirms that the author aims, here in 9:15, at restoring the honour of the Jews.

The author gives the reader hope through mentioning that Antiochus IV Epiphanes will supply the money required for the sacrifices out of his own expenses (τὰς δὲ ἐπιβαλλούσας πρὸς τὰς θυσίας συντάξεις ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων προσόδων χορηγήσειν, 9:16). The hope is generated by referencing the scene where all was well in Jerusalem and the Temple in 3:1-3. The wording, here in 9:16, is identical (leave out "expenses" (σύνταξις)) to that in 3:3 referring to Seleucus. Thus, the reader has hope that, now, peace will return to Jerusalem, as in the time of Onias III.

The most personal and less logical part of Antiochus IV Epiphanes' vow is that he will become a Jew and proclaim the power of God (9:17). Cohen (1999: 92-93, 129-130, 151) convincingly argues that this does not imply becoming "Judaean," but becoming a

“Jew by religion.” This is the most extreme action any of the Jewish enemies has planned. Neither Heliodorus, nor Nikanor had planned such things. The extreme nature of this pledge fits this important scene of the complete downfall and conversion of the worst villain of all.

The author uses 9:18 as a bridge to the letter from Antiochus IV Epiphanes to the Jews. There is a sharp contrast between Antiochus IV Epiphanes’ despair in 9:18 and his hope expressed in the letter (9:20, 22). The author uses this tension in exclaiming the permanence of God’s judgement upon Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Nothing Antiochus IV Epiphanes does is able to reverse the path of his demise, not even the declaration of his beneficence towards the Jews in the succeeding letter. Again, the verb λήγω (“I cease”) is used as in 9:7 and 9:11, thus, binding this section together.

Two aspects regarding the letter in 9:19-27 underpin the humble new status the author gives Antiochus IV Epiphanes. Firstly, the author explicitly mentions that the letter was in the form of a supplication (9:18). This signifies that the sender has a status inferior to that of the addressee (Welles, 1934: 57). Secondly, the form of this letter is: “To B χαίρειν (greetings) A.” As mentioned earlier, the usual form of royal correspondence in Hellenistic literature is “A to B χαίρειν (greetings).” Thus, in this letter (9:19-27) the superiority of the receiving party (B), being the Jews, is indicated.

The authenticity of the letter has been widely debated (Habicht, 1976: 5-6; Schwartz, 2008: 361-362; Doran, 2012: 191-196). However, for this study, the authenticity would make no difference to its rhetorical value and the author’s exploitation/construction thereof. Goldstein (1983: 359) has outlined the letter’s rhetorical aspects. The author of the letter:

- uses lavish language to gain the sympathy of the readers (9:19-21),
- demonstrates that it is in the reader's best interest to agree to what he proposes (9:21b-25),
- shows that his actions are not unprecedented (9:23, 25),
- reminds the reader of previous benefactions (9:26),
- provides promise of future benefactions (9:27).

The highly rhetorical construction of this letter can either be the product of the legitimate author of the letter, or the author of 2 Maccabees, who has already been proved to be educated in Hellenistic and rhetorical style.

In this letter the 'writer' adds to the standard greeting formula ("greetings," χαίρειν) good health (ὕγιαίνειν) and prosperity (εὖ πράττειν). The usual greeting in royal correspondence entails only the first of these three elements. There is no other example for the use of three infinitives being used in a greeting formula in Greek correspondence (Doran, 2012: 192). The use of these infinitives implies a friendly tone, rather than formal. This fits into the author's strategy to present Antiochus IV Epiphanes as a newly repented man, who thinks less of himself than before and who tries his best to make amends with the Jews.

The phrase in 9:20 directly after the greeting formula εἰ ἔρρωσθε ("if you are well") is standard style (Antiquities 12.148; Exler, 1923: 103-107). The combination of best wishes for children and for private affairs, however, points to informal correspondence (Doran, 2012:193). A fact which further supports this informality is the mention of the king's health, which is not expected in a formal letter concerning succession (Doran, 2012: 194). Through the form and content of this letter, the author stresses the personal tone.

The fact that Antiochus IV Epiphanes prays to God and places his hope in heaven is ironic, but proof of his promise to become a Jew. Yet, as the author made clear (9:13, 18), there is no chance for Antiochus IV Epiphanes to escape the judgement from God. This is also evident through the harsh manner in which Antiochus IV Epiphanes' death is summarised in 9:28. As in 2:21; 3:20, 34; 7:11; 8:20; 9:4 and 15:8, the term "heaven" is used metonymically for "God."

The letter demonstrates a euphemistic description of the king's illness in 9:21. The phrase in 9:21, περιπεσῶν ἀσθενεῖα δυσχέρειαν ἐχούση ("I experienced an unpleasant weakness"), underplays the severity of the king's situation, which is so severe, that he now makes plans for succession. It is unclear whether the author wants to use this as a negative depiction of the king, or whether the king regards it as a precaution to avoid panic. Nevertheless, in both cases tension is maintained between the words of the letter and the king's fate (already fixed by God). The same is true of the king's hope to escape the weakness (9:22). The reader knows the doomed fate of Antiochus IV Epiphanes through both Eleazar's (6:26) and the seventh brother's prediction (7:35).

In (9:23-27) Antiochus IV Epiphanes proclaims his son, Antiochus V, as his successor. Antiochus III indeed proclaimed his son Antiochus IV, and later on his son Seleucus, as successor during his campaigns to reassert Seleucid authority in the eastern part of his empire (Parker & Dubberstein, 1956: 22; Ma, 1999: 63-65). Again in 9:24, as in 9:21, a softer expression is used to describe the possible death of the king: "if something unexpected happened" (ἐάν τι παράδοξον ἀποβαίῃ). Such mildness of description is also found in the testament of Ptolemy VIII: "if something of what happens to humans should happen" (ἐάν δὲ τι συμβαίῃ τῶν κατ' ἄνθρωπον - *SEG* 9 (1944) no 7, lines 11-12), as well as in Herod's arrangements of his successor (Josephus, *Ant.* 15.184). With this in mind, it would seem that the euphemism in 9:21 is not an attempt by the author to depict Antiochus IV Epiphanes in a negative manner, but rather royal formality.

The adverb πολλάκις (“often”) in 9:25 can be problematic. Antiochus IV Epiphanes could not have traversed the upper satrapies often, since he only made one expedition there. Schwartz (2008: 364) aims at solving this historical fault through stating that the author again jokes with Antiochus IV Epiphanes through depicting him as exaggerating the truth. Goldstein suggested that the adverb πολλάκις does not qualify ἀνατρέχω (“I traverse”), but rather the verbs συνίστάω (“I recommend”) and (“I entrust”). Accordingly, Goldstein takes the two last-mentioned verbs as in the epistolary imperfect. Doran (2012: 195) convincingly argues against Goldstein on the grounds that the epistolary imperfect is very rare, and that the adverb qualifies the participle that immediately follows. It would seem that Schwartz’s (2008: 364) argument regarding the mockery of Antiochus IV would be most logical in this instance.

The writer of the letter speaks of the past and possible future benefactions and how it is linked to the community’s submission to the king. The author explicates the irony through the fact that the Jews experienced the complete opposite of beneficence and would not want Antiochus V to follow the same policy as his father. The irony is further communicated through the sharp contrast between the last line of the letter and the harsh description in 9:28.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

This pericope portrays the long awaited battle between king Antiochus IV and the God of the Jews. The author makes it clear that this event was only delayed because God has not yet decided to deal with Antiochus. But now, once God begins, he follows through. The moment he shows mercy to the Jews, the outcome is final to their enemies. But Antiochus was more than an enemy of the Jews. He was one who had fought against God. For this reason it is imperative that the author portrays this final conflict as a direct battle between the king and God. The outcome has already been

established. No matter what Antiochus IV Epiphanes vows, his end cannot be changed. This is why Antiochus IV Epiphanes does not get any credit for his repentance and conversion. It is not a chance to escape judgement. It is only God forcing Antiochus to kneel before he receives his penalty. He has to suffer a terrible death and, to make it clear that God is in control, Antiochus has to die in a manner similar to what he has done to others. This final battle is used by the author to convey the following:

IF

- Antiochus IV Epiphanes was a cruel tyrant
- Antiochus IV Epiphanes' cruel tyranny made him a human who fights against the God of the Jews
- this king who fought against the God of the Jews succumbed to a horrible illness and death
- this death was by no means natural
- this death was the fulfilment of the prophetic utterance of the seventh martyr brother in 7:35-37

THEN

- the suffering and death of Antiochus IV Epiphanes was supernaturally sanctioned by the God of the Jews
- the God of the Jews is the strongest
- the God of the Jews will deal the same way with anyone who fights against him
- no man should fight against the God of the Jews

3. Pragmatic analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

There is no doubt in the readers mind regarding the battle: it is the all-seeing Lord, the God of Israel against the haughty Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

Through setting up a battle between man and God, the author warns the reader not to fight against God. This happens by means of an emotional appeal through communicating punishment and reward. The reader is moved to fear the possible outcome of opposing God in any way.

The author convinces the reader of God's power through highlighting that the suffering of Antiochus IV Epiphanes comes directly from God. This happens in two ways. The author communicates that:

- the things that happen to Antiochus IV Epiphanes are linked to what he did to others and therefore has to come from God.
- Antiochus IV Epiphanes is brought to repentance and conversion only to demonstrate God's might.

3.2. Real- and alternative text-world

The author aims at moving the reader from an attitude of doubt and distrust in the God of the Jews because of the bad things that happened, to an attitude of trust and obedience in the God who just and powerful.

The danger exists that the reader lost hope in the God of the Jews, since the villains in 2 Maccabees were not prevented to execute their evil plans. Up until now, it seemed that Antiochus IV went unpunished for his cruelty against the Jews and that God has therefore either abandoned the Jews, or is not able to stop the enemies of the Jews.

This pericope reassures the reader that God is able and willing to protect the Jews. The author presents an alternative world where God is in control and more powerful than the enemies of the Jews. Antiochus IV wasn't punished earlier because God did not decide to punish him earlier.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

The battle between man and God provides a scene which is ideal for keeping the reader interested and maintaining tension. This scene also creates a scenario where the reader has to choose a side. The author makes this choice easier through presenting God as good and strong and Antiochus as bad and weak. The reader is aided to choose the All-powerful, omnipotent and just God of the Jews and to choose against Antiochus, the temple robber, the unwise, the shameful and the one who is full of hatred towards the Jews.

CHAPTER 11: THE PURIFICATION OF THE TEMPLE (10:1-8)

1. Introduction

The greatly anticipated purification of the Jerusalem Temple is finally described. There are a few aspects regarding this pericope which led Schwartz (2008:372-373) to suggest the hand of a redactor:

- The text exhibits the usage of infrequent terms and phrases or terms from a lower register such as κομίζω (10:1: “I provide for” – as opposed to παρακομίζω [“I carry beside/across”] and διακομίζω [“I carry over”] in 9:29), ἀλλοφύλοι (“foreigner”) in 10:2 and 10:5, and πυρώσαντες λίθους καὶ πῦρ ἐκ τούτων λαβόντες (10:3: “after they made rocks red hot and caught a flame from them”).
- The pericope has an apparent Hebrew vorlage.
- The pericope seems historically incorrect.
- 10:1-8 creates an unnatural separation between Antiochus' death at the end of the previous pericope and the summary of it at 10:9.

The pericope is, however, placed effectively after the vivid description of Antiochus IV's conversion and death, since the rededication of the Temple serves as an excellent conclusion to the narrative concerning events under Antiochus IV. Furthermore, the pericope is easily linked to the rest of the narrative through the use of:

- similar terms such as ἀλλοφύλοι (10:2, 5), ἀλλοφυλισμός (4:13; 6:24), and περιπίπτω (10:4 and 6:13);
- similar phrases such as μετὰ ἐπιεικείας in 10:4 (as μετὰ πάσης ἐπιεικείας, 2:22) and ἔδογμάτισαν μετὰ κοινοῦ ... ψηφίσματος in 10:8 (as in 15:36);

- similar themes such as God's training of his people, divine ordinance, the piety of Judas and his followers, and the oppression from blasphemous gentiles.

These aspects evidence the author's hand in aligning 10:1-8 with the aim of the rest of the narrative. Lastly, the structure of 2 Maccabees necessitates and authenticates the inclusion of 10:1-8. In its current order, the narrative follows a pattern where the God of the Jews is challenged by a villain, God responds by defeating the villain, and God aids the hero of 2 Maccabees to purify the Temple. This parallels the traditional literary pattern of the Divine Warrior (Cross, 1966: 11-30; Miller, 1973: 155-156).

The author uses a sentence that spans over three verses (10:1-3) to describe the recapture of the Temple and city, the demolishing of foreign altars and sacred places, sacrificial rituals, and the purification of the Temple. Through this, the author achieves two goals. Firstly, he demonstrates that the actions portrayed in 10:1-3 are almost simultaneous. Secondly, the author, through the fact that these actions are described in such a congested manner, reveals his aim with this section: he does not want to focus on the details of taking back the Temple and the city, the purification of the Temple, or the sacrificial rituals. Such is the focus of 1 Macc 4:42-53. Here, in 10:1-8, the author rather focuses on the attitude of the ones who purified the Temple and their decree to observe the newly found day of feast. This focus is also evidenced through the detailed prayer of Judas and his companions (10:4), which is not elaborated in 1 Macc. 4:36-61. It is important for the author to highlight the admirable attitude and piety of this group since they are the ones who will initiate the feast. They need to be portrayed as authoritative.

2. Structural Analysis

2.1. Delimitation

The previous pericope (9:1-29) focussed on the battle between Antiochus IV and God. The start of the current pericope is marked by the sudden shift of emphasis to Judas and his followers taking back the Temple and the city of Jerusalem. This theme ends in 10:8 where a decree is sanctioned for the Jews to observe the feast annually.

In 10:9-10 the author demonstrates that the sub-narrative regarding Antiochus IV is concluded and that he will now focus on the events concerning Antiochus V Eupator. This clearly marks the start of a new pericope, which will end in 10:38, since 10:39 has the transitional phrase μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ παντελῶς χρονίσκον (“after an extremely short period”). This phrase emphasises the shift from the defeats of 10:9-38 to the reaction of Lysias in 11:1 onward.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

The author exhibits an important usage of terms in 10:2-3. As in 2:19, the term βωμός (“foreign altar”) is employed, this time accompanied by θυσιαστήριον (“altar”). The first often refers both to altars made by foreigners (Exod. 34:13; Deut 7:5) and occasionally to the Jewish altar (Num 3:10). The term βωμός is also used positively in 2:19 and 13:8. The term θυσιαστήριον is commonly used as reference to the Jewish altar. Here, in 10:2, the two terms are placed against each other to heighten the sense of opposition. Another term which serves this same purpose is ἄλλοφύλος (“foreigner”) in 10:2. This term is frequent in the LXX, but is employed in 2 Maccabees only in 10:2 and 10:5. This too led Schwartz (2008: 375) to the conclusion that the pericope was not written by the author of 2 Maccabees. The author does, however, use the term ἄλλοφυλισμός (“foreign ways”) in 4:13 and 6:24. This, together with the fact that the term is used here

in the context of a general confrontation between Jews and non-Jews, allows for the same author as in the rest of the narrative. Finally, the uniqueness of the current pericope as well as the author's frequent alternation between terms allows for such a rare use of the term in 2 Maccabees.

The process of creating fire for the altar is described in 10:3. They made stones red hot and caught a flame from them (πυρώσαντες λίθους καὶ πῦρ ἐκ τούτων λαβόντες). Schwartz (2008: 376) convincingly argues that this depiction of catching a flame from the rocks is an attempt by the author/s to ensure the reader that the fire now on the altar of the Temple was the same fire that had come down from heaven in the days of Solomon. This indicates the relationship between the opening epistles and the present pericope. It, however, does not have to lead to the conclusion that the two texts have the same author. The similarities could simply be the work of the author of 2 Maccabees, who has recognised the importance of this theme. This recognition and application of important themes is also evident through the language of the prayer in 10:4 (περιπίπτω, "I meet with"; παιδεύω, "I train/discipline"; μετὰ ἐπιεικείας, "with fairness"). The terms are similar to that used in the author's preface and own theological reflections (2:22; 6:12-16; 7:33).

The author uses a favorite term συνέβη ("it happened") to describe a happening which points to God's supernatural providence. The term is frequently used in 2 Maccabees to refer to things that seem to have happened by chance, but in actuality was determined by God.

The motif of appropriate retribution, where the punishment matches the transgression, has become clear in 2 Maccabees. Here, a similar motif suffices. The author highlights the fact that the purification of the Temple matches the exact date it was defiled (as in 1 Macc. 1:59; 4:52-54). Through this 'coincidence' the author demonstrates God's divine

involvement. The motif of stating a coincidence and attributing it to destiny was common among Greco-Roman historians (*Ann.* 1.9; Eutropius 7.5; Josephus, *Bell.* 2.457).

As argued above, the scene of Heliodorus and the threat to the Jerusalem Temple (3:1-39) was to teach reader the value of the Temple's security and sanctity. The over-exaggeration of the Jews' reaction to the threat and their rejoicing when this threat was eliminated, anticipated events to follow. When reading this pericope, the reader already knows the horrors that occurred after the Temple's desecration and now understands the true significance of its purification. The reader thus celebrates with Judas and his followers. The manner in which they celebrate is found in 10:6-7 and is according to the standards which the Lord had set for the feast of tents in Lev. 23.

In 10:8 a communal ordinance is decreed for the Jews to observe the days of the purification of the Temple. A similar formulation is found for the decree concerning Nikanor's day in 15:36 and thus serves as structuring element of the book (Doran: 2012: 201). The Temple's significance to "all the nation of the Jews" (παντὶ τῷ τῶν Ιουδαίων ἔθνει) is stressed.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

The death of Antiochus IV and the purification of the Temple both form a part of the theomachy. The purification comes after Antiochus IV's death and after the death of the martyrs. This points to the fact that the state of the Epiphanes represents the state of the relationship between God and the Jews. Now that the relationship has changed between God and his people, the state of the Temple has also changed. The martyrs have shed blood for the sake of Judaism and Judas and his followers were obedient to the laws. God's wrath has turned to mercy. This has been made visible through making

Judas and his followers successful in battle and ending of the theomachy between Antiochus IV and God. This newfound favour is explicated through allowing the Temple to be purified. In this manner, the reader is guided to anticipate the progression of the text: battles will be won and the circumstances will return to the *status quo ante* described in 2 Macc. 3:1-39.

As mentioned above, the author stresses the fact that the whole nation is included in the purification and the celebration thereof. Consequently, the author's proposal can be formulated as follows:

IF

- the state of the Temple represents the relationship between the Jews and their God
- the Temple's desecration meant that God's mercy has turned to wrath and that bad things would happen to the Jews
- the Temple is not desecrated anymore but purified
- the ones who purified the Temple are legitimised and pious and have the Lord on their side
- the ones who purified the Temple enforced a decree to celebrate the feast of the purification
- the whole nation of the Jews is included
-

THEN

- Temple's purification means that God's wrath has turned to mercy
- good things will now happen to the Jews
- the Temple's purification is legitimate
- the feast of the purification is legitimate
- the feast should be celebrated by the whole nation of the Jews

3. Pragmatic analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

The author encourages loyalty towards the heroes and their cause. If Judas and his followers are proved to have authority amongst the people and to be pious, then what they do and what they value is unquestionable and acceptable to God. As mentioned above, this becomes clear through the detailed prayer of Judas and his companions (10:4), which is not elaborated in 1 Macc. 4:36-61. The authority of Judas and his followers is further enforced through the notion that the Lord is their ally (10:1). With the Lord helping them, they took back the Temple and the city. With the Lord as helper, they fight against the foreigners. The two sides are placed against each other through specific terms to heighten the sense of opposition.

The reader is thus moved to argue that, if the Lord is on the side of Judas and his followers, no one can be against them. Whatever they do and enforce, the reader should follow.

3.2. Real- and alternative text-world

As in the case of the attached letters, the author recognises the possibility that the reader may doubt the legitimacy of the purification of the Temple and its celebration and the authority of Judas and his followers.

The pericope suggests alternatively, that the purification is legit, the feast is rightfully instituted, and that Judas and his followers have full authority since they have the Lord as their ally.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

Through a mainly logical argument, the reader is moved from possible doubt in the purification and its celebration as well as in the legitimacy of Judas and his followers, to trusting Judas and his followers and the feast they institutionalised.

CHAPTER 12: THE INTRODUCTION TO THE EVENTS CONCERNING ANTIOCHUS V AND THE CONFIRMATION OF THE LEGITIMACY OF JUDAS' ENDEAVOURS (10:9-38)

1. Introduction

The author makes it clear that he is moving away from events concerning Antiochus IV Epiphanes and starting with that which concerns the events under Antiochus V. Immediately, the reader is informed of what to expect of the narrative that follows: battle accounts, treachery and ill will towards the Jews (10:9-13). Through this pericope, the author highlights the theme that the Jews are not rebellious in nature and that the conflict is due to the self-defense of the Jews. This theme is supported by the description of the two battles which the author chooses to recount. The first battle is in defence against continuous hostility against the Jews, the second a reaction to an invasion.

It is important to note that, despite the anticipation of these misfortunes, the reader is still hopeful that Judas and his companions will be successful in all they attempt, since the Temple has now been purified.

This hopefulness is indeed rewarded. The author ensures that Judas is depicted in the most powerful and honourable manner. Judas is described as “altogether successful in the sphere of arms” (τοῖς δὲ ὅπλοις τὰ πάντα ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν εὐοδούμενος). The fact that all is dissolved at the stronghold the minute Judas returns demonstrates his success. Judas' honour and justness is affirmed through the denouncement and punishment of those who have sold their kinsmen (10:21-22).

To insure that the reader will not lose focus of the theme of God's divine providence, God's help is stressed. The appearance serves as supports of the notion that Judas' success is only due to the fact that he has a supernatural ally.

2. Structural analysis

2.1. Syntactical and semantic analysis

The phrase καὶ τὰ μὲν τῆς Ἀντιόχου τοῦ προσαγορευθέντος Ἐπιφανοῦς τελευτῆς οὕτως εἶχεν (10:9: "such then were the events at the end of Antiochus Epiphanes") is similar to the phrases at the end of Chapters 3, 13 and 15. For Schwartz (2008: 379) this clearly demonstrates that this line should be seen as a conclusion for Chapter 9, thus making 10:1-8 a secondary intrusion. However, it has already been argued that 10:1-8 was written by the author of 2 Maccabees. For this apparent problem, Doran (2012: 206) provides a solution by translating τελευτή as "end" and not "death." The term τελευτή is also found at 15:39, where it has the meaning of "end of the narrative." This translation acknowledges that the author sees the death of Antiochus IV and the purification of the Temple as closely related since they are both part of the theomachy. Consequently, the author is saying, through 10:9, that the events which Antiochus IV had started are properly concluded and that a new topic will be introduced.

The author delights in the irony that Antiochus IV's son is referred to as Εὐπάτορα Ἀντίοχον (Antiochus V Eupator) in 10:10, with 'Eupator' meaning "born of a noble father." The reader knows that the exact opposite is true. This irony is explicated by the author's reference to him as "son of the ungodly one" (υἷόν ... τοῦ ἄσεβοῦς).

The author describes the succeeding narrative as briefly discussing the main points (συντέμνοντες τὰ συνέχοντα). This links back to the author's characterisation of his work

in his introduction (2:23ff.). The term τὰ συνέχοντα can mean "the main points" (*LSJ*: 1714) as used by Polybius (18.44.2).

The author starts off this narrative in 10:11 by some official actions taken by Antiochus V introduced by the phrase παραλαβὼν τὴν βασιλείαν ("receiving the kingdom"). The verb παραλαμβάνω ("I receive") is used in the sense of "to receive office" as in Thucydides 1.9; Polybius 1.8.4; 3.70.7; Aristotle *Pol.* 1285b. Interestingly, the author has Antiochus V, who was only nine at the time, "appointing" Lysias. In 1 Macc. 6:17 Lysias appoints Antiochus V as king. Through this depiction of Antiochus V, the author is placing him next to Antiochus III and Antiochus IV through using the same verb as in 9:23 and 9:25 in reference to the action of those previous kings. For the author it is important to portray all the villains in 2 Maccabees as worthy opponents to the Jewish heroes. The mention of Antiochus V's authority fits into this theme.

The mention in 10:12 of Ptolemy Makron, who had been friendly to the Jews, is a reminder that it is possible for the Judean community to have good relations with the larger non-Judean community (Doran, 2012: 207). It is uncertain why the author mentions the fact that Ptolemy Makron had been moved to commit suicide (10:13). It seems that the event has rhetorical value, but not for the current narrative. The term φίλος ("friend") in 10:13 refers to the select few who were chosen to be around the king. Here, it becomes clear that their loyalty to Nikanor, who was also one of the "friends," would have caused enmity towards Ptolemy Makron, who's actions did not reflect vengeance upon Nikanor. The author uses yet another euphemism to describe the death of Ptolemy Makron through the phrase ἐξέλιπεν τὸν βίον ("he left life behind") in 10:13.

Gorgias, who is mentioned in 10:14, will not feature again in the rest of the narrative. The same happens when Gorgias is mentioned in 8:9 without featuring again in that

story. Although he is mentioned in 12:32 as the governor of Idumaea and his involvement in the acts of the Idumaeans is implied, the author gives no explicit role to Gorgias in the narrative. Thus, the author uses this name as one of the guiding tools that show the reader that the book will have a new focus from here on further. The author continues his good style by using rare words such as πολεμοτροφέω (10:14: "I wage war"). The verb is referenced for 2 Maccabees alone in *LSJ* (1433). Another example is the use of the verb γυμνάζω ("I train/exercise"), which occurs only once in the Septuagint in 2 Macc. 10:15. The present context implies that the verb γυμνάζω should be translated as "I harass" (*LSJ*: 362), whereas the imperfect tense of the verb points to continuous hostility. The author links Gorgias to the Idumaeans by referring to the actions of both through the verb πολεμοτροφέω ("I wage war"). The Idumaeans took in "those who had fled Jerusalem" (τοὺς φυγαδεύσαντας ἀπὸ Ἱεροσολύμων, 10:15) in order to join them against the Jews. These were most probably those who supported Menelaus and Lysimachus, since 1 Macc. 4:41 notes that at the time of the purification, the citadel in Jerusalem was still garrisoned (Doran, 2012: 208-209). These followers of Menelaus were driven out of Jerusalem in 4:42. In this manner, the author maintains his strategy to group together the heroes and the villains.

The battle against the Idumaeans is described in a much more elaborated manner in 2 Maccabees (10:15-23) than in 1 Maccabees (5:3). This indicates that the author of 2 Maccabees sees an opportunity in the events of this battle for driving the reader's emotional investment.

In 10:16 Judas and his followers ready themselves to march against the Idumaeans. They prepare through making entreaty (ποιησάμενοι λιτανείαν) and praying that God would be their ally (as is the case in 8:24; 11:10; 12:36). As mentioned above, the author loves to depict the piety of the heroes in 2 Maccabees, thus affirming the authority of their actions. Judas and his followers are linked to the community, who did

the same (the middle form of ποιέσθαι + λιτανείαν) in 3:20 when Heliodorus threatened the Temple's sanctity.

As in 2 Macc. 8, Judas and his followers immediately start having progress after they performed pious actions. In 10:17-18 they regain control of those places previously controlled by the Idumaeans. They vigorously (εὐρώστως, as in 12:27 and 35) attack the enemy, destroy countless enemy soldiers and many of the Idumaeans are forced to flee and take refuge in two well secured towers. The adverbial clause εὖ μάλα (10:18) is found also in (8:30; 10:32) and refers, in all instances, to fortresses. Again the author applies the strategy of suspense and relief:

- Relief: There is promise of hope after the Temple in Jerusalem is purified and Antiochus V receives the kingdom (9:19-27; 10:1-8).
- Suspense: The hope is disrupted through the suicide of a Seleucid official that maintained a friendly policy toward the Jews, a suicide which was forced by the current Seleucid officials. (10:12-13).
- Relief: Judas and his followers make progress against the Idumaeans (10:16-17).
- Suspense: The Idumaeans find refuge in two towers, which is described as ideal for withstanding an enduring siege (10:18).

In this manner, the reader's interest in the narrative is assured.

The scene sketched in 10:19-22 adds to the theme of heroes and villains in 2 Maccabees. Judas, the main hero, departs for more pressing matters and leaves his

two brothers Simon and Joseph, identified in 8:23, in charge.⁵² A group of Simon's companions become traitors of the Jews for the sake of money (10:20). This group is announced to Judas (10:21) and receives the ultimate punishment of execution (10:22). The author exploits the rhetorical aspects of this scene by painting an extreme picture of the traitors and describing their immediate punishment. The author states that "they had sold their brothers" (πέπρακαν τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς). This is a most serious offense. Firstly, it is clearly denounced as an act that is particularly shameful in Exod. 21:2-11; Deut. 15:12-17. Secondly, it is amongst the acts which are associated with the main villains: Antiochus IV (5:14), Apollonius (5:24), Nikanor (8:10, 14). Once again, the villains of the narrative are unified and the reader is encouraged to choose the group of heroes led by Judas Maccabaeus.

After explaining the improbability of conquering the towers in 10:18, the author moves on to explain that Judas did just that (10:23) and more: he destroyed in the two strongholds more than twenty thousand. The term "strongholds" (ὀχύρωμα) is not to be confused with "tower" (πύργος). In 10:23 reference is rather made to two strongholds of which one was the two towers. In 10:18 it is mentioned that more or less nine thousand Idumaeans fled into the towers. Here, in 10:23, mention is made of more than twenty thousand conquered. Therefore the number, although probably exaggerated, represents the number of Idumaeans at the towers plus another number in another stronghold. What is important here is that the author gives a portrayal of an unstoppable Judas Maccabaeus.

The events regarding Timothy's attack on the Jews is the next episode (10:24-38). Timothy wants to take Judea at "spear point" (δοριάλωτον - 10:24). Through this phrase, the author reminds the reader of the dire events when Antiochus IV attacked

⁵² The character Zacchaeus, is otherwise unknown. Abel sees a connection between this Zacchaeus and the Zacharias mentioned in 1 Macc. 5:18, 56. Yet, as Doran (2912: 208) mentions: "the two situations are different, and there is no need to identify every person in 2 Maccabees with one in 1 Maccabees."

Jerusalem, desecrated the Temple and took the city captive. Again, the author sets the scene for a great and dramatic battle between heroes and villains. The strategy to achieve this is twofold. Firstly, the villains are described as a formidable force. The author loves the story of the underdog winning the contest. The grandeur of Timothy is shown both through the fact that he has a tribal chief under him (8:32) and that Antiochus IV deemed him so important that he swore vengeance on Jerusalem after he heard of the defeat over Timothy (9:3-4). Furthermore, the term ἵππους ("horses") is used. Grimm (162) and Bunge (1971: 283) translate the term ἵππους as "cavalry." Bar-Kochva (1989: 514), however, has convincingly shown that the term refers to horses and that the author wants to say that "Timotheus had at his disposal real war horses." Secondly, the author explicates the blasphemy of the villains on the one hand, and the piety of the heroes on the other. The pious rituals of Judas' forces are highlighted through one long sentence in 10:25-26 containing three participle phrases, each describing their dedication: they strewed (καταπάσαντες) dust on their face, girded (ζώσαντες) their loins with sackcloth, and prostrated (προσπεσόντες) themselves on the foundation before the altar. The last participle, which is joined asyndetically with the second participle phrase, is linked to the verb ἀξιόω ("I require/pray"). The reference to the law in 10:26 is to Exod. 23:22. Interestingly, in Exod. 23:23 God also protects the Israelites in a supernatural manner (Doran, 2012: 210). This parallels the connection between the pious actions of God's people and his protection found in 10:25-31.

Again, in 10:27, the author links two actions asyndetically (γενόμενοι ... ἀναλαβόντες). This does not only connect the actions, but also builds tension through a rapid sequence of events. The phrase ἐφ' ἑαυτῶν ἦσαν means, as in Josephus (*Against Apion* 2.227), "to keep to themselves" (i.e. they avoided contact).

The adversity between hero and villain is further communicated through the use of the μὲν ... δὲ construction to set the scene for the opposing sides (10:28). The term θυμός

("passion/courage/anger") is used in 2 Maccabees in both a positive and negative manner (4:25, 37; 9:4, 7; 10:35; 13:4; 14:45; 15:10). Here, in 10:28, the contrast between the two sides clearly suggests that the term which refers to the villains would be used with a negative meaning: "passion."

In 10:29-31 the first explicit description of an epiphany is found after that of 3:24-26. This description parallels that of 3:24-26 in that the riders of the horses are apparelled magnificently and influence the choices of the enemy. On the number of the horsemen (five) Grimm has noted the possibility that it represents the Maccabean brothers. Louis Ginzberg (1925: 6:251), again, suggested Abraham, Isaac, Jacob, Moses, and Aaron. The context of 10:29-31 does not, however, allow such speculation and these suggestions do not account for the fact that these riders are depicted as experienced combatants. If there was any doubt whether Judas Maccabaeus is singled out by the author, it would be dissolved by 10:30. Two of the heavenly warriors protect Judas, leaving him unharmed (ἄτρωτος). The actions of the warriors discharging arrows and thunderbolts at the enemy are unusual. Doran (2012: 210-211) has convincingly shown that, since this description is rather found in Greek epiphanic descriptions, the author of 2 Maccabees has been influenced by it.

The scene for the contest between Judas and Timothy is set in the same manner as with the Idumaeans (10:32-38). Timothy takes refuge in a stronghold called Gezer and Judas' forces besiege the citadel. The author utilizes the full rhetorical value of the situation through sharply contrasting Judas and his followers with those inside. Those inside, as opposed to the piety of Judas' forces, were "especially blasphemous" (10:34: ὑπεράγαν ἐβλασφήμουν). To demonstrate the severity of their sin, their punishment is immediate and with force. Judas' men, being unstoppable, attack those inside and Timothy is slaughtered after the distraction served as an opportunity to take over the stronghold (10:35-37). The term περισπασμός is usually used with the meaning of

“wheeling around” (Polybius 10.23.3; 12.18.3). Rigsberg (24-25) rightly shows that the meaning, here in 10:36, is “distraction.” Unlike the blasphemous enemy, Judas and his followers praise the Lord with hymns and confessions. The language in 10:38 is similar to that used in the scene of the defeat of Nikanor: ταῦτα δὲ διαπραξάμενοι (“after accomplishing this”) in 8:29 and 10:38; εὐλογοῦντες καὶ ἔξομολογούμενοι (“praising and confessing”) in 8:27 and μεθ’ ὕμνων καὶ ἔξομολογήσεων εὐλόγουν (“they were praising with hymns and confessions”) in 10:38. Here, the relief is of the same value. The author explicitly states in 10:38 that the Lord has been a benefactor to Israel (εὐεργετοῦντι τὸν Ἰσραηλ) and has given them the victory (τὸ νῖκος αὐτοῖς διδόντι). This legitimises the punishment of the blasphemers. The Lord himself sanctioned the slaughtering. This further legitimises Judas and his followers, since their actions are synonymous with the Lord’s will.

2.2. Proposition and argumentation

The author makes it clear that the book will have a new focus from here on further. The narrative will now focus on events under Antiochus V. With the opening scene it becomes clear that the Jews will still have to face hardship. The new government is not good-willed towards the Jews. Therefore, the narrative naturally continues to the description of new conflicts. The difference, however, is that the Lord’s wrath has turned to mercy. This has been enforced through the purification of the Temple in 10:1-8. Now, these conflicts will all be resolved and Judas and his followers will be victorious in all they attempt. This will happen despite the treachery of certain Jews (10:15) and the blasphemy of the enemy.

The pericope communicates a major theme in 2 Maccabees: the Jews are not rebellious in nature and the battles are only fought in self-defense. Here again, Judas and his followers take up arms only in reaction to the constant hostility toward the Jews (10:14).

The author connects the success of Judas and his followers with their piety. As in 2 Macc. 8, Judas and his followers immediately start having progress after they performed pious actions. The author highlights the fact that the Lord has been a benefactor to the Jews. God is on Judas' side.

The author combines the threat of the new government and Judas' growing success to imply a proposition that may be formulated as follows:

IF

- a new narrative is introduced as events under Antiochus V
- this new narrative starts off with the elimination of a Seleucid official who maintained justice toward the Jews
- the new government caused the death of that official
- in this new narrative, blasphemy and treachery is immediately punished
- Judas and his followers take up arms in self-defense
- Judas and his followers made an entreaty to God and asked Him to be their ally
- God helped Judas and his followers
- Judas and his followers are successful in everything they undertake
-

THEN

- the new government is against the Jews
- the new narrative will be filled with conflict
- the conflict is due to the ill-will of the enemies of the Jews and not because the Jews are rebellious in nature
- Judas will ensure that justice prevails
- God is with Judas and his followers

- Judas and his followers will be victorious

3. Pragmatic analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

Through immediately demonstrating the new government's ill-will toward the Jews, Antiochus V and all associated with him are vilified. Through the demonstration that the Judas acts only out of self-defense, the Jews are proven to be innocent and their actions are justified. It is again a case of good versus bad. The righteous Jews are rightfully waging war against the evil government.

Judas is depicted as just. He immediately punished the unjust actions of those who had sold their kinsmen and his men punished the blasphemers. Through the pious rituals of Judas and his followers and the Lord's answer, Judas is portrayed as in the right relationship with God. Everything Judas endeavours is sanctioned and legitimised by God, since God and Judas are working together.

3.2. Real- and alternative text-world

The possibility exists that the reader would assume that all conflict is resolved now that the Temple has been purified. The text shows that the narrative, despite its new focus, will still yield circumstances of hardship. This in turn may cause the reader to ask two questions:

- If peace is not restored, what is the significance of the purification?
- And, isn't the disruption of peace to be blamed on Judas' bloodlust?

To these questions, the author provides clear answers: Firstly, after the purification, Judas and his followers will be successful in all they do. Secondly, the Jews are not to blame for the continuous conflict; they are merely defending themselves.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

Through the proof of the justness and the fact that God is on the side of Judas and his followers, the reader is moved from doubt in the legitimacy of the battles, to trusting that what Judas is doing is sanctioned by God. Through the examples of the success of Judas, the reader is moved from hopelessness to anticipating the final victory of the Jews.

CHAPTER 13: THE CONFLICT WITH LYSIAS AND THE RESOLUTION THEREOF BY MEANS OF A TREATY (11:1-38)

1. Introduction

The author makes sure that the events of 2 Macc. 11:1-38 occur within the right setting. The previous pericope described how the wars were an act of self-defense. Judas' forces attacked the strongholds of the Idumaeans only after they were harassing the Jews (10:15) and Judas set out to meet Timothy only after an attempt was made to take Judea at spear point (10:24). Now the author starts off this pericope with Lysias' first expedition as a reaction to these local attempts at disrupting the territorial integrity of Judea. Lysias is clearly in the wrong. This account of Lysias' first expedition is paralleled by 1 Macc. (4:29-35). A comparison of these two accounts shows that the author of 2 Maccabees finds it important that negotiations took place between Lysias and Judas. The author of 1 Maccabees leaves out any such reference.

These negotiations found in 2 Maccabees are backed by the author through the inclusion of four letters (11:16-38). Although it had earlier been doubted (Grimm, 172-174; Schubart, 1920: 324-347; Kolbe, 1926: 74-107), the authenticity of these letters has now been accepted because of the growing knowledge of chancellery letters (Bickerman, 1979: 179-181; Mørkholm, 1966: 162-165; Tcherikover, 1959: 213-219; Bunge, 1971: 386-436; Habicht, 1976: 7-17; Goldstein, 1983: 426-428; Bringmann, 1983: 40-51; Gruen, 1984: 2.745-747; Bar-Kochva, 1989: 516-542; Gera, 1998: 239-247). Confirming the authenticity is, however, only a small step in the process of making sense of the letters. The dates which the author provides (11:21, 33, 38) for three of the letters are also problematic. The content of the letters are in conflict with these dates (Doran, 2012: 227-230). Therefore, Doran (2012: 227) rightly shows that the dates at

the end of the letters should not be trusted. A facet which further supports this notion is that the author of 2 Maccabees has previously only used general reference to dates:

- "around this time/about that time" (5:1; 9:1: περι ... τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον)
- "after not much time" (6:1: μετ' οὐ πολὺν ... χρόνον)
- "after an extremely short interval" (11:1: μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ παντελῶς χρονίσκον)

Thus, the author has previously avoided any specific dates for the narrated events. The reader has no way of referencing these events to a fixed timeline. Consequently, Doran (2012: 229) has convincingly drawn up a chronology of the first, second, and fourth letter:

1. The first letter was written sometime in the late autumn of 164 B.C.E. after Lysias' first expedition and withdrawal to Antioch.
2. The fourth letter was written during the ongoing negotiations between Judas' forces and Lysias.
3. The second letter was written not long after the death of Antiochus IV, when his son (Antiochus V) had gained the crown.

The third letter has also been widely debated and was considered previously to be the response of the king to Lysias' letter (Niese,1900: 484; Kolbe, 1926: 84; Bickerman, 1937:179-181; Tcherikover, 1959: 215; Bunge, 1971: 386-388). Accordingly, the letter has been placed after the first and fourth letters. Since Zambelli (1965: 213-234), however, the letter is viewed as the earliest of the four letters. It was thus addressed by Antiochus IV to the ruling party in Jerusalem as early as the date given at 11:30 - the thirtieth Xanthikos (Doran, 2012: 229).

The author avoids the fact that Antiochus IV was still involved in the events within 11:1-38, since there is no explicit reference to the former king. The author makes no attempt to clarify the ambiguity of the name Antiochus. For the sake of the narrative structure the reader need only know that the current narrative focuses on the events under Antiochus V.

2. Structural Analysis

2.1. Delimitation

The pericope is introduced through the transitional phrase at 11:1 μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ παντελῶς χρονίσκον (“after a totally short interval”). The focus now moves to Lysias’ reaction to the defeats of the previous chapter. The attack is more severe than the earlier conflict in that the one who is coming up against the Jews is the leader of the king’s forces. The mention of Lysias sets the scene for the peace talks later on between Judas and Lysias and therefore also for the letters, which take up a significant portion of the pericope.

The pericope is clearly ended off with the conclusion of the fourth letter in 11:38. This is confirmed through the new focus of 12:1 onward on some conflicts with local commanders. These conflicts happen after the Jews experienced a period of peace because of the agreements accounted in the current letters. Consequently, the pericope will be delimited as 11:1-38.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

As mentioned above, the author of 2 Maccabees loves to use long, well balanced sentences to start off different sections in the narrative. These sentences have a variety

of purposes: to give a summary of a sequence of events, to provide a fresh and exciting start to a new section, or to demonstrate the link between closely related actions. The first four verses of this pericope (11:1-4) serve all three purposes. This sentence consists of five participial phrases. The first two are linked asyndetically since Lysias' annoyance by the preceding events is related to his assembling of an army. Again the theme surfaces of the strength of an army and of weapons versus the power of God. This theme is highlighted by the contrast between λογίζομαι ("I reckon") in 11:2 and ἐπιλογίζομαι ("I consider") in 11:4. Lysias thinks (λογίζομαι) that he could conquer the city, but does not think (ἐπιλογίζομαι) about the power of God.

This verse (11:1) is the only one listed by *LSJ* for the use of χρονίσκος ("short time interval"). The fact that the author employs such a diminutive demonstrates that he aims at emphasizing the short period of time that has passed between the scenes. The term συγγενῆς is a well-known term in ancient Greek literature (Xenophon *Cyrop.* 1.4.27; 2.2.31; Diodorus *Siculus* 16.50; OGIS 104.2; BGU 1741.12) and was the fictive relationship title for high court officials. The description of Lysias' decision to attack is paralleled by 1 Macc. 4. In 1 Maccabees, however, the author elaborates on Lysias' reaction to preceding events. In both 1 and 2 Maccabees the sheer size of the enemy's force is exaggerated in order to make the victory of the Jews more prolific (Bar-Kochva, 1989: 42). The author heightens the intensity of Lysias' intentions by using scarce words such as οἰκήτος ("a place to live") and the *hapax legomenon*, ἀργυρολόγητος ("taxable"). By listing Lysias' objectives, the author is showing the reader that it is possible to surpass the evil of the times of Jason, Menelaus and even Antiochus IV. Both Jason and Menelaus had attained their positions as high priest through money, but now Lysias plans to repeat that process annually and not even Antiochus IV went as far as having Greeks inhabit Jerusalem.

The site Beth-Zur mentioned in 11:5 is identified by Bar-Kochva (1989: 285-287) as North of the Hebron on the border between Judaea and Idumaea. The fort would have been fortified in some way in the Persian and Ptolemaic periods (Bar-Kochva, 1989: 286) and has been destroyed, rebuilt and strengthened more than once (1 Macc. 4:49-50, 61; 9:52; 14:33). It was strategically imperative for Lysias to take control of such a position. The term *σχοῖνος* is a Persian measure used in particular in Egypt (Schwartz, 2008: 400). It could be interpreted as referring to thirty, forty, or sixty stadia (Strabo, 17.1.24, 41), but accounts to an accurate estimation when taken as thirty stadia (Bar-Kochva, 1989: 276). This term is used by the author of 2 Maccabees only here in 11:5. Otherwise, the author uses stadia to refer to distances (12: 9, 10, 16, 17, 29). The fact that this term is used only once in 2 Maccabees may evidence the interpretation of Egyptian redactors, implying a possible original reading without units (Nelis, 1983: 39)

The author highlights the compassion of Judas and his followers for their Jewish brethren. Firstly, the author states that the prayer in 11:6 was a communal one. This is in contrast to the account of 1 Macc. 4:30, which has Judas alone who prays. Secondly, the author explicates that Judas is driven by his compassion for his brethren at Beth-Zur. This fits into the overall theme of venerating the heroes, namely Judas and all who follow him.

In 11:8-10 Judas' forces indeed receive a good angel as they had requested in 11:6. The forces are strengthened emotionally through the appearance of their "heavenly ally" (*οὐρανοῦ σύμμαχον*). It is important to note, however, that Judas (being the first to take up arms) demonstrated his trust in the Lord through taking action prior to the divine assurance. This teaches the reader to have the same trust in the God of the Jews, since he/she is already moved to aspire to the traits of Judas and the other heroes of 2 Maccabees.

Again the heavenly being is identified with golden objects as noted in 3:25. This divine helper readies the Jews to destroy even the iron walls of the enemy. The verb *πιπρώσκω* could be translated as "I wound/kill," but the more general translation "I destroy" matches the context of the list given for that which will be destroyed: "not only humans, but also the fiercest beasts and iron walls" (οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώπους θήρας δὲ τοὺς ἀγριωτάτους καὶ σιδηρᾶ τείχη).

The author adds to his list of scarce words though the term *λεοντηδὼν* ("like lions"). It is a *hapax legomenon*, but is paralleled by the author's use of similar forms of adverbs in 3:18; 14:14, 45. The might of the Jews and their ally is demonstrated though the fact that the enemy flee naked. This means that the enemy soldiers fled hastily without their weapons (Polybius 3.81.2). The author does not hesitate to again have one of the villains recognise the superiority of the Jews and their God (11:13). Just as Nikanor, so too Lysias flees shamefully and recognises that the Jews and their heavenly ally are unstoppable.

The author introduces the four letters in the same manner as the author of 1 Macc. 11:29. The relation between the letters is demonstrated by a *μὲν ... δὲ* construction whereas *μὲν* is found in 11:16 and the corresponding *δὲ* is found in 11:22, 27 and 34. The first letter is addressed to the populace (*πλήθος*), and not the council (*γερουσία*) or the nation (*ἔθνος*). This term could refer to an unconstitutional body of people (Habicht, 1900: 68). This would have been the case if the term *γερουσία* ("council") was not employed in the address in 11:27. This means that the letter was sent to Judas' forces and not to the Jews in general.

Two terms in 11:17 make for an ambiguous reading: *ἐπιδόντες* (which is either the aorist participle of *ἐπιδίδωμι* - "I deliver," or the participle of *ἐπεῖδον* - "behold/see") and *ἠξίου* ("they were inquiring/requesting"). The contexts, however, provide elements

which guide the translation: firstly, the verb ἐπιδίδωμι has been used in 11:15 and, secondly, the succeeding sentence suggests that they were delivering a document which implied the requests. This suggests the translation: "After they delivered the attached document, they were requesting about the matters indicated by it." Welles (1934: 375) shows that, in the royal correspondence, the term for "document" is χρηματισμὸς.

In 11:18 Lysias explains that there are requests he himself can approve and other which need to be referred to the king. Against Hanhart, who follows the third person singular reading (συνεχώρησεν), the first person singular reading (συνεχώρησα) of the majority of manuscripts will be followed. This choice is dually based: Firstly, as Habicht (1976: 17) has shown, the fourth letter mentions that Lysias had "agreed" (συνεχώρησεν) to the requests by the Jews, and not someone else. This implies the first person singular here in 11:18. Secondly, a parallel distinction between that which the official/officials may allow and what needs to be referred to the king is found in a letter from an official of Ptolemy I to the city of Iasos (Doran, 2012: 220).

Through expressing the wish that the Jews will maintain their goodwill (11:19) toward the empire, Lysias is ignoring the present conflict "just as he ignores Judas" (Schwartz, 2008: 405). The letter demonstrates the classic diplomatic and reciprocal language of documents which deal with the relationship between the king and his subjects in the Hellenistic period (Welles, 1979: 390-391; Ma, 1999: 191). The context implies that the phrase τὰ πράγματα ("the affairs") be translated as "empire/state." Abel and Habicht include the term ὑμῖν ("to you"), following its insertion by some witnesses. Hanhart, however, omits the term. This seems rightly so since it is already implied in the context and it would seem more natural to have been added than to have been present at the offset, but omitted at a later stage.

As opposed to the wish for good health, which is usually found at the opening of private letters, one finds in 11:21 the wish to "be well" (ἔρρωσθε). This is a standard ending for a formal letter (Welles, 1934: 399).

The formulation of the introduction of the second letter (11:22) makes it clear that the second letter is the king's response to the matters Lysias referred to him (11:18). This correlates with the linkage of the author through the μὲν ... δὲ construction which binds the letters as mentioned above. The king addresses Lysias in a most honourable manner through the term ἀδελφός ("brother"). This was not an unknown honoring of high officials (1 Macc. 10:18; 11:30; Welles, 1934: nr 71, 2).

In 11:23 the writer of the letter refers to his father's (Antiochus IV) death through the phrase τοῦ πατρὸς ἡμῶν εἰς θεοὺς μεταστάντος ("after our father has passed over to the gods). After this genitive absolute construction, three participial phrases follow which compose a long sentence which spans over three verses (11:23-25). The two participles βουλόμενοι ("while wishing") and ἀκηκοότες ("after hearing") asyndetically capture the basis for the king's decision. The first two are linked asyndetically to convey the king's decision. The phrase "passed over to the gods" (εἰς θεοὺς μεταστάντος) can mean that Antiochus IV was honoured with cultic rituals as is seen in the decrees of the Teians (Ma, 1999: 308-311). The decrees tell of how they honoured Antiochus III and Laodike through putting up images in the temple of Dionysos next to the main god of the city. The phrase can also mean that Antiochus IV became a god (Habicht, 1970 : 177-178). None of these options are, however, too extreme for Antiochus IV. Antiochus IV was presenting himself as the connection between earth and heaven (Mittag, 2006: 130). The fact that Epiphanes authorised coins of himself with the inscriptions θεός ("God") and ἐπιφανής ("Manifest") further demonstrates this. The readers of 2 Maccabees would have been familiar with this extreme portrayal of Antiochus IV and would thus see

the sharp contrast between this reference to his death and the 'true' portrayal in 2 Macc. 9.

In 11:24 the second of the three participial phrases is employed which, together with the first, grounds the king's decision and outlines his argument. The verbiage in 11:25 conveys much hope. The Temple will be restored/re-established (ἀποκαθίστημι) and the Jews will be left in peace to conduct their polity (πολιτεύω) according to the ancestral customs (ἔθος). These terms are all used in the sense of restoring a community to its ideal functionality. The term ἀποκαθίστημι is used with the same sense as in 12:25, 39 and 15:20 and is used in the context of reunited families and the common goodwill of the inhabitants in Polybius (3.98.7). The term πολιτεύω serves as a counter for the decree given to Geron the Athenian in 6:1-6 which was to destroy all traces of that which defines a Jew. Now, this term refers to the fact that Jews are given back their identity both officially and legally. Lastly, the term ἔθος is used in the sense of "customs" as in Josephus (*Ant.* 4.213, 246, 260). This is a royal legalisation of the Jewish theocratic system. In short, this verse states that the Seleucid government sanctions the Jewish way of life as it were in the days of Onias III.

Prior to 11:27, the "council" (γερούσια) was last mentioned in 4:44, after which Menelaus succeeded through bribery to have three of its members executed. Since then, nothing was mentioned of its disassembly or reassembly. This means that throughout the alterations to the Jewish constitution under Geron this council remained a functioning unit (Doran, 2012: 223).

The formulaic pattern in 11:29 of the wish for well-being is standard for documents of royal correspondence (Josephus, *Ant.* 12.148; Welles, 1934: nos. 61, 1-2; 71, 2-3; 72, 3-4). This, together with the use of the verb ἐμφανίζω ("I explain") and παρενοχλέω ("I harass," although with the sense of "I hinder" in royal correspondence) is amongst the

many stylistic traits for official letters found in the four letters in 11:16-38 (Welles, 1934: 353). The author does not at all elaborate on the fact that Menelaus served as some kind of mediator for the good of the Jews. This is a perfect example of the author's strategy to unify the heroes, on the one hand, and villains, on the other. He does not allow for any good traits of the villains, or any bad traits of the heroes. In this manner, the author of 2 Maccabees idolises the heroes and vilifies the villains. The avoidance of this matter also further supports the authenticity of the letters (Mørkholm, 1966: 164).

Menelaus' request is approved by the king and a deadline is set (the thirtieth Xanthikos) on which the Jews are to have returned to their homes. Wilhelm (1937: 22) shows that this is the same deadline set in another royal command (Diodorus 18.56.3) where exiles may return home. The date was ideal since it was "early enough in the campaigning season to allow for renewed warfare if ignored" (Schwartz, 2008: 409).

In the context of the return from exile, the phrase in 11:31 μετὰ τῆς ἀδείας (lit.: "with fearlessness") can mean, according to Grimm, that the Jews may return "with permission." This specific nuance is also evident in Diodorus Siculus (20.41.5) and Demosthenes (*Cor.* 305) where the freedom and independence of the people is expressed and they would be "without any fear" (μετὰ πάσης ἀδείας). With these passages in mind, the last-mentioned translation would be more suitable.

The term ἀγνοέω ("I do in ignorance") used in 11:31 is important. Doran (2012: 224) asks whether this means that the king is providing an excuse for Judas or if the letter is aimed mainly at Jason who attacked Jerusalem in ignorance (5:5-7). In 1 Macc. 13:39 there is reference to both intentional and unintentional (ἀγνοήματα καὶ τὰ ἁμαρτήματα) crimes. This is also the case in the reference in Lenger (1980: no. 34.9) where both sides are stated: "of intentional things or unintentional things" (τῶν ἁμαρτημάτων καὶ τῶν ἀγνοημάτων). With this standard form in official amnesties it seems rather that the

writer of the letter is simply omitting the negative side (intentional things), not referring to specific circumstances. This fits into the general diplomatic tendency of the letters to soften the tone and avoid all incriminating evidence on the side of Judas' forces as in 11:19 ("maintain goodwill") and 11:24 ("the Jews did not agree with the change"). The author is leaving out even the slightest possibility that the heroes of the text could intentionally do anything wrong.

The timeframe between the date given at the end of the third letter in 11:33 (the fifteenth of Xanthikos) and the deadline given for Jews to return in 11:30 (the thirtieth of Xanthikos) is only fifteen days. Although this seems harsh, Gera (1998: 244), citing (*C.Ord.Ptol.* no. 49, 11), has shown that, in Ptolemaic Egypt, only twenty days were allotted for someone to reach Alexandria from anywhere in Egypt. This makes the timeframe reasonable for the much smaller Judea and Samaria. A facet which would have made it more difficult to relocate, however, is that the fifteenth of Xanthikos was equivalent to the fifteenth of Nisan, which was the first day of Passover. It is important that neither the author of this letter nor of 2 Maccabees utilises the rhetorical value of this coincidence (Schwartz, 2008: 410). Such a strict deadline would probably have made sense strategically, since it would focus the Jews on returning home and not planning further attacks.

There has been much debate regarding the names given for the Roman ambassadors in 11:34. Niese (1900: 72-74) was followed by Walbank (1979: 3.464-465) in arguing that the name Titus Manius should be replaced by Manius Sergius, since this would cause 11:34 to correlate with the mention of a delegation by Polybius (31.1.6). This view has been widely accepted, but criticised by Mørkholm (1966: 163-164), Gruen (1984: 2.746, n. 7) and Mittag (2006: 276). As mentioned regarding other names in 2 Maccabees, it is not wise to identify each name in 2 Maccabees, with its equivalent in 1 Maccabees.

The wording of 11:35-37 is self-explanatory. What is striking is the way the letter is presented. It would seem that the letter is an initiative of the Romans where the Romans are attending to the Jews' every need, but, in fact, it is a response to a Judean initiative (Gruen, 1984: 2.745-747; Doran 2012: 225).

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

The author sets up a battle where the few will conquer the many. The battle is not fought until the end. Instead the defeat of the enemy is demonstrated by means of a treaty between the Jews and the Seleucid government. This acknowledges the fact that the Jewish force was considered too strong for the Seleucid army. Lysias himself recognises the fact that Judas' force is unbeatable. This happens despite the fact that the Jews are horribly outnumbered. It is important for the author to compare the forces since this proves the success attributed to the Jews' alliance with God. With the help of the Lord, the vast numbers of the enemy are nullified. To support this aim, the enemy's forces are exaggerated. This increases the emotional value of the eventual victory over the enemy.

Through the content of the letters, the author explicates the fact that the Jews do not wish to be rebellious, but are fighting for the freedom to their "own way of life" (11:24). They are simply reacting to the "change toward the Hellenic lifestyle" and ask for the "customary usages" to be granted (11:24). This is a theme that will resurface frequently throughout the rest of the narrative. Through these terms, the reader is reminded of the Jewish way of life as it were in the days of Onias III. The fact that a letter from the Romans is also attached signifies the legitimacy of the Judas' proposition and that the request of the Jews is reasonable.

The proposition if the author may consequently be formulated as follows:

IF

- Lysias could not win the battle with his vast numbers,
- Judas overpowered Lysias' force,
- Lysias himself realised that the Hebrews are unbeatable,
- the Lord is on Judas' side,
- the Jews will maintain peace if they are allowed to their own way of life,
- even the Romans see the need for the Jews to keep to their customary usages independently.

THEN

- the Lord is more powerful than great numbers,
- Judas and his followers are more powerful than great numbers,
- the Jews are unbeatable if they maintain their alliance with God,
- the Jews are not trouble seekers,
- the Jews request for independence is substantiated.

3. Pragmatical analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

The author uses the reaction to the invasion to underpin the intensity of the situation. The reader understands that the possible consequences could be severe. If Judas and his men react with tearful laments, then the outcome of the eminent battle is not ensured. It could end badly for either of the sides. In this manner the reader is moved from thinking that Judas is unstoppable, to anticipating the worst, but hoping for victory. The reader is forced to continue reading the narrative in anticipation since the outcome of the situation is not certain. Secondly, the reader is taught how to react to such threats by presenting the piety of Judas' force and that of the populace. If they react by seeking

the Lord and if they are honourable examples, then it is also good for the reader to react to dire circumstances by seeking the Lord. The reader's hope is kindled through the people's request that God will send a valiant angel.

Throughout the text, Judas and his followers are growing in strength, authority and success. The author demonstrates that Judas' force is becoming unstoppable. In the previous pericope Judas was described as being altogether successful in the sphere of arms; here Lysias comes to the conclusion that the Hebrews are unbeatable. This is connected with the fact that Judas and his followers have God fighting as their ally. This encourages the reader, by means of presenting a reward, to choose the side of Judas. Moreover, having the Lord as their ally, Judas and his followers are legitimised since whatever they do is the will of God. The reader is convinced that he may trust in the behaviour of Judas and his followers.

3.2. Real- and Alternative text-world

The possibility exists that the reader does not fully trust in the Lord and therefore trusts in man's strength or that of man-made structures. Furthermore, the reader may doubt in the intentions of Judas and his followers since they seem to promote conflict with the government.

The author suggests an alternative scenario where it is rewarding to trust in the Lord only and where Judas and his followers will seize the conflict if they are allowed to practice the Jewish customs.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

By means of a logical argument, the reader is moved from doubting the legitimacy of Judas and his followers, to trusting and mimicking their behaviour as well as believing that they would maintain the peace if they are allowed to practice their own customs.

The reader is moved by means of an emotional argument from trusting in the might of an army to trusting the Lord, who is more powerful than the mightiest army.

CHAPTER 14: CONFLICTS BETWEEN JUDAS AND LOCAL COMMANDERS (12:1-45)

1. Introduction

The description of events in 2 Maccabees 12:1-45 is paralleled by 1 Maccabees 5. Both account for events in Gilead (2 Macc. 12:17-28; 1 Macc. 5:3-51). The two books also have common names for towns such as Καρνιόν (2 Macc. 12:21, 26) and Καρναίμ (1 Macc. 5:26, 43, 44), Εφρών (2 Macc 12:27; 1 Macc. 5:46) and the same characters such as Timothy, Gorgias and the Toubian Jews. Despite this similarity, the focus between 1 and 2 Maccabees is quite dissimilar. The aim of 2 Maccabees 12:1-45 becomes clear when it is compared to 1 Maccabees 5. Doran (2012: 248) highlights certain aspects which exhibit what the author of 2 Maccabees is trying to accomplish in this narrative:

- As throughout the rest of the narrative, the author portrays Judas as the star and hero of Judaism with God as his ally. Unlike 1 Macc. 5, where Judas divides his troops into those who should defend the homeland, those who move into Galilee, and those who move with him into Gilead, 2 Maccabees shows Judas in command in all instances;
- In 1 Maccabees, the trigger for the events is the rebuilding of the altar in Jerusalem (1 Macc. 5:1-2); in 2 Maccabees the trigger is the peace agreement with Lysias, which the Gentiles want to break and the Jews moving outside their territory only to assist their brothers who are being attacked;
- The author highlights the fact that Judas, recognising the advantage to the Jews, makes arrangements for peace with the Arabs and the Scythians. This reciprocity

is also found where Timothy is set free because of his promise not to harm the Jews (12:25).

Through all these elements, Judas is placed at the center of the pericope with his attributes of justness, selflessness and courage, which reminds the reader of a hero from a peaceful time: Onias III.

2. Structural analysis

2.1. Delimitation

After the previous pericope concluded the incursions of the main Seleucid government, the current pericope (12:1 onwards) deals with the conflict between Judas and the local leaders who are hostile towards the Jews. The difference between this pericope and 10:14-37 is that the first-mentioned is concerned with attacks on Jews outside (not within) Judaea. The pericope concludes in 12:43-45 with the atonement for the deaths of those who had died because of their sin. Thereafter, the narrative returns to the conflict between the Jews and the main Seleucid government in 13:1.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

The letters of the previous pericope sketched a scene where king Antiochus V's word was law. Although Judas and his followers, as well as the Roman delegates were part of the discussions, the letters portray a one sided communication of the king to the Jews. Here in 12:1, once more, the author is lifting the status of the Jews through the use of the term *συνθήκη* ("agreement"). This term is not employed in the previous pericope and thus serves the purpose of a summary of the author's point of view: that of a liberated status of Judas and his followers.

The pericope is linked with the rest of the narrative through two references: firstly, through the mention of the surrounding local communities' agitation by the Jews, just as in 10:14-38 and, secondly, through the mention of Nikanor the commander of Cypriot mercenaries, whereas the author had the Cypriots stationed in the Jerusalem citadel in 4:29.

The author stays true to his tendency to alternate between suspense and relief. The pericope starts off, although brief, with a picture of complete peace amongst the Jews through a reference to agricultural activity. A more detailed description of such peaceful circumstances can be found in 1 Macc. 14:8. However, the peace of 12:1 is immediately disrupted by the particle (ὁὐ) in 12:2 and the description of the local commanders' bad intentions.

As Doran (2012: 236) rightly remarks, the unusual noun δὐσσεβήματα ("impious act") reflects the author's use of the adjective δὐσσεβής ("impious"), which is mainly found in tragedy. This unusual term correlates with the author's frequent use of compounds with δὐσ- (2:24; 5:6; 6:13, 29; 6:3; 8:33, 35; 9:7, 21, 24; 12:3, 21; 13:11, 25; 14:11, 28, 35, 39, 45; 15:32) and highlights the personal character of the injustice that is about to be perpetrated.

In 12:3b-4 the author focusses on the innocence of the Jews, who unknowingly fall victim to the cruelty of the citizens of Joppa. The tension of the situation is evident through the structure of this long sentence found in 12:3b-4. It consists of five participles and five genitive absolutes before resolving into the verb βυθίζω ("I sink a ship"). In this manner, the reader is caused to anticipate the nature of the "impious act" until the last moment. The verb βυθίζω ("I sink a ship"), here in 12:4, has the sense of "I drown/throw overboard." Such an event, where an innocent group of people are thrown into the sea, is also described in Lactantius (*Mort.* 23.8-9). The author ascribes this act of cruelty to

the minor Seleucid officials, implicitly, through juxtaposing this event with the mention of the local commanders (Timothy, Apollonius, Heronomos, Demophon and Nikanor) in 12:2. This vilifies the commanders and unifies them with the main villainous group, the Seleucid force. On the other hand, the author idolises the Jews through depicting them as completely innocent and passive throughout the whole event. The author avoids any possibility of conflict between the Jews and the citizens of Joppa and sketches a scene where the Jews lived in harmony prior to the attack (Schwartz, 2008: 422). This heightens the emotional appeal of the event and increases the reader's enmity towards the villains.

The phrase τούτων ἐπιδεξαμένων (lit.: "these who welcomed") is problematic. It is unclear which party the phrase is referring to. Doran (2012: 236) rightly has the phrase τούτων ἐπιδεξαμένων referring to the citizens of Joppa ("these citizens of Joppa who welcomed the Jews"). This streamlines the sentence by requiring the citizens of Joppa to be the subject of the main verb βυθίζω ("I throw overboard"), the participle παρακαλέσαντες ("after (the citizens of Joppa) urged them"), and of the genitive absolute ἐπιδεξαμένων ... θελούντων ("these who welcomed as if they wanted peace"). This translation also fits into the larger theme of attributing unified traits to the villains, namely to have them deceive the Jews as in 5:25-26. Another such example is the fact that the citizens of Joppa are called foul murderers (τοὺς μαιφόνους) in 12:6 as is the murderer of Onias III in 4:38.

In 12:5-6, the author again constructs one long sentence, using four participles and three main verbs to create a heightened sense of action. As usual, Judas calls upon God before he sets out on a mission for righteousness. God is called the righteous judge (δίκαιον κριτὴν) and will indeed act as one since he will allow for another act of appropriate retribution: the harbor of Joppa is set ablaze and the ships are burnt.

The well organised city of Joppa closes its gates after the attack on the harbour and Judas is forced to leave (12:7), but with the purpose of returning. This purpose is

denoted by the use of the future participle (Smyth, 1920: 2065) and the returning of Judas' force is described in 1 Macc. 10, 13 and 14. Schwartz (2008: 423) notes the enthusiasm expressed through the phrase τὸ σύμπαν τῶν Ιοππιτῶν ἐκριζῶσαι πολίτευμα ("to root out the entire body of Joppites"). This is a usual element in 2 Maccabees (2:21; 8:9) and in pathetic historiography in general and heightens the intensity of the description.

Judas' second attack is on Jamnia, or Jabneh, with its port Jabneh-Yam. There exists an inscription of July 163 B.C.E. which recounts a request from the citizens of Jamnia for aid in return for previous assistance to the Seleucid government. However, at this stage, no relevant deductions can be made due to the fragmentary nature of this inscription. It could be that the Jamnians were asking aid because of the effects of the attack under Judas, but this would be speculation. The fact that Jamnia has given support to Seleucids in Judea is, however, supported by 1 Macc. 10:69 and 15:40.

Since the distance along the roads between Jamnia and Jerusalem is twice as far as the 240 stadia (around 45km) mentioned in 12:9, Bar Kochva (1989: 514, n. 14) criticises the accuracy of 2 Maccabees. Although he acknowledges the fact that "the straight-line distance between Jerusalem and Jamnia harbour is 55km (close to the distance given in 2 Macc. 12:9)," Bar-Kochva (1989: 514, n. 14) holds that the author would have referred to the road distance. Schwartz (2008: 424), however, argues that the author of 2 Maccabees (or his source) could have figured the amount of stadia in terms of straight-line distance. This is due to the fact that Strabo (*Geogr.* 16.2.28) and Josephus (*Bell.* 5.160) claim that one could see the coastal region from high points in Jerusalem. The option for the straight-line distance is especially convincing when comparing 12:9 with the claim of Appian (*Mith.* 12.67, 278) that one could see a great fire at a distance of one thousand stadia.

The two episodes described in 12:10-16 are joined together by the author since this section, as also the succeeding section (starting at 12:17), has the opening phrase ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀποσπᾶσαντες σταδίους ("after they withdrew ... stadia"). This section recounts two clashes, one with the Arabs (2 Macc. 12:10-12) and one where Judas besieges and captures Kaspin (2 Macc. 12:13-16). The first of these seems to be paralleled by 1 Macc. 5:24-25. The problem is that 1 Maccabees has Judas travel for three days beyond the Jordan before coming across the Arabs, whereas 2 Maccabees has Judas travel nine stadia from Jamnia. Nine stadia from Jamnia is still on the wrong side of the Jordan and therefore it seems unlikely to have come across Arabs. Scholars have had different solutions to this problem. Some accept that this scene has been drawn from another context (Abel; Habicht; Bar-Kochva, 1989: 514, n. 14). Schwartz (2008: 418) argues that 12:10-16 should come after 12:17-19, and Doran (2012: 237-238) argues that 12:10-12 should not be compared to 1 Maccabees. Doran (2012: 238) argues that the Arabs mentioned in 1 Macc. 5:25 could not be the same Arabs mentioned in 2 Macc. 12:10-12 since, in 1 Maccabees, they are said to meet peacefully with Judas (which is not the case in 2 Maccabees). However, despite this dissimilarity, Schwartz's (2008: 418) argument remains too strong to be ignored based on two facts: firstly, because both 12:10-16 and 12:17-19 begin identically (ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀποσπᾶσαντες σταδίους) and, secondly, since the 750 stadia mentioned in 12:17 would be the correct distance to bring Judas and his men from the coastal cities to Transjordan. The overall parallel of 2 Maccabees 12:1-45 to 1 Macc. 5:6-68 (Schwartz, 2008: 418) further supports this notion.

Doran (2012: 238) opposes Schwartz (2008: 403, 426) who states that 12:12, as well as 11:15, seems like an apology on behalf of Judas for entering into an agreement with Gentiles. Doran (2012: 238) points out that Judas is simply compared to Onias III, who was keeping in mind the public and private interests of the entire group (4:5). Yet, the two arguments do not need to stand in opposition. This verse fits into the author's aim to unify the heroes of the narrative through common traits, but also deals with the question

that arises due to the deals with Gentiles: Why are the heroes of this narrative, a narrative which stresses the sole loyalty to Judaism, striking deals with Gentiles and not solely trusting in their only ally, the God of the Jews? To answer this question, the author has to be apologetic. This is seen in the superfluous nature of the explanatory phrases in 4:5, 11:15 and 12:12. Here, in 12:12, the reciprocal language again surfaces (Ma, 1999: 196).

Despite many efforts (Avi-Yonah, 2002: 166-167, 170; Urman, 1995: 2.556-561; Abel; Habicht; Schwartz, 2008:426) to identify the town Kaspin mentioned in 12:13, the site of Kaspin remains unresolved (Doran, 2012: 238). As Doran (2012: 238) shows, the siege at Kaspin follows the usual pattern as in 2 Maccabees 10. Here, the strength of the Lord is again emphasised through the explicit mention of the strength of the city. The stronger the opposition, the greater the victory if they are destroyed.

The phrase in 12:13 *παμμειγέσιν ἔθνεσι* ("mixture of ethnic groups") could be interpreted as either expressing contempt as in Appian (*Bell. civ.* 2.120) or admiration as in Appian (*Hisp.* 6.75). Although the author of 2 Maccabees uses every opportunity to use derogative language to describe the villains, this is rather a case of building on the idea that all are against the Jews. It is Judas against the rest of the world.

The author utilises the full rhetorical potential of a scene such as the besieging of Kaspin. It is a perfect opportunity, as was the case with the besieging of Gezer in 10:32-37, to vilify the enemy, idolise the Jews, and demonstrate the power of the Jews' ally, the God of heaven. The author achieves this through three steps:

- He juxtaposes the piety of Judas' forces and the attitude of the enemies as in 8:18; 15:6-7, 25-26;
- uses language similar to that of 10:32-37 such as ἐρυμνότης ("security"), βλασφημῶ ("I speak profane words"), θηριώδης ("brutal"), ἀμύθητος ("an inexpressible thing/thing not to be told");
- and references Joshua 6:1-21 in order to demonstrate that the structural strength of a city is by no means a security against the "great Master of the universe" (τὸν μέγαν τοῦ κόσμου δυνάστην).

Doran (2012: 239) rightly follows Robert (1963: 79), Habicht, Bar-Kochva (1989: 510, n. 3), Gera (1990: 29-30) and Schwartz (2008: 428) in viewing the term Χάρακα (12:17) as a "stronghold" and not a place-name (as did Abel and Avi-Yonah, 2002: 166-167, 170). This is true since "the author evidences a sense of the distinction between the proposition εἰς (for place or state) and πρὸς (for persons)" (Doran, 2012: 240). In the section regarding the Toubians (12:17-19), the author reminds the reader of Judas' pursuit of Timothy, but keeps the anticipation until the scene of 12:20-26. Here, in 12:17-19, Timothy had withdrawn from the region (12:18) and left behind a strong garrison. In this description, Dositheos and Sosipater features instead of Judas. These were well-known Greek names amongst Jews in the Second Temple period (Ilan, 2002: 273-276). As suspected the author does not elaborate in this section (12:17-19), but waits for the rhetorically ideal situation where Judas resurfaces to take on Timothy (12:20-26) to provide a more vivid description of events.

As in 8:22-23, the term σπειρηδὸν ("into companies") does not refer to a specific unit of 256 men (Bar-Kochva, 1976: 66), rather a general grouping. The, term does, however, imply the small numbers of Judas' force compared to that of Timothy. Doran (2012: 241) notes the paronomasia between σπειρηδὸν ... σπειρῶν as well as the similar sounding στρατιὰν ("army") in 12:20, and the promoiosis of δυσπολιόρκητον ... δυσπρόσιτον in 12:21.

The growing reputation of Judas as a formidable force becomes clear through the reaction of Timothy in 12:21 when he learns of Judas' approach. Timothy sends away the women, children and other household belongings. The term ἀποσκευή refers to a wide range of things such as all that accompanies an army, service personnel, family members and slaves (Bar-Kochva, 1989: 45-46). Schwartz (2008: 431) notes the low level of status ascribed to the women and children by placing them in a category with "other household belongings" as also in Deut. 20:14; Judg. 18:21; Josephus *Ap.* 2.175.

In 12:22 the intricate balance between Judas' cunning and the Lord's might is exhibited through the careful construction of the Greek:

- On the one hand, there is a reaction to the appearance of Judas (ἐπιφανείσης δὲ τῆς Ιουδοῦ σπειράς πρώτης καὶ γενομένου δέους ἐπὶ τοὺς πολεμίους - "after Judas' company appeared, there was firstly dread on the enemy");
- on the other, there is a reaction to the appearance of God (φόβου τε ἐκ τῆς τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐφορῶντος ἐπιφανείας γενομένης - "and there was fear because of the appearance of the one who watches over all").

Both parts have the appearance (ἐπιφανείσης/ἐπιφανείας), and both have an aorist genitive absolute of γίνομαι ("to be/to happen"). The reaction, however, to this unstoppable collaboration is that the enemy flees, so hurriedly, that many were wounded by their own forces. Such a description is standard in ancient accounts of war and flight (Polybius 11.33.4; Diodorus 16.80.2; Livy 38.21.8; Josephus, *War* 1.383, 3.296).

Once again, the author unifies the villains through calling the enemies "offenders" (ἀλιτηρίους) in 12:23, as is Menelaus in 13:4 and those who attack Rhazis in 14:42. The

same unification happens through describing the cowardice of both Nikanor (8:35) and Timothy (12:24) who will negotiate rather than fight.

Timothy's plea is described in 12:24 as "with much bewitching" (μετὰ πολλῆς γοητείας). Although the reasons provided for his release are legitimate, the author cannot ascribe a positive attribute to a villain. The term can be used either negatively (Polybius, 4.20.5; 15.17.2; 33.18.11; Diodorus Siculus 1.76.1; 20.8.1), in the sense of "leading people astray," or positively (Dionysius of Halicarnassus *Ant. rom.* 11.25.4), in the sense of "demonstrating the charm of conversation." Here, the term is used derogatively implying Timothy's determination to escape the hands of Judas' forces. This is further enforced by Timothy threatening the families of the Jews, who will be mistreated if Dositheos and Sosipater do not let him go. The fact that Dositheos and Sosipater let Timothy go (12:25) for the sake of their kinsfolk, contrasts their actions with that of Simon's troops, who let the enemy escape in return for money (10:20-21). The verb ἀπολύω ("I let go") is found in both instances.

In 12:26 the author describes the effect of the victory as graphic as possible through the phrase σωμάτων δύο καὶ πεντακισχιλίου ("twenty-five-thousand bodies"). In 12:27-28 the author moves on to a description of the attack on Ephron. This city is again described as strongly defended. This time, the author adds virile youths in front of the walls and a great store of war machines and missiles to the challenge. As discussed above, such a description of the enemy's strengths builds tension and sets the scene for greater relief when the enemy is defeated. The elaborative description of the enemy and their utilities is matched by the description of the God of the Jews. God is described as the Master (as in 12:15) and is called the one who, "with power, shatters the forces of the enemy" (μετὰ κράτους συντρίβοντα τὰς τῶν πολεμίων ἀλκὰς). Although the verb συντρίβω ("I shatter") is frequently used in 1 Maccabees, it is only employed once in 2 Maccabees. It would seem that the author refers to the "Master" of the Jews in a

somewhat forceful manner. The fact that the author uses the attributive participle (συντρίβοντα) to implicitly imply the actions of God rather than explicitly mentioning them further supports this. Consequently, the reader is reminded (rather synthetically) that it is not Judas alone who achieves these victories. The reference to God aims to balance out the flamboyant description of Judas' combating capabilities.

Before the celebration of the festival of Weeks in Jerusalem (12:31), the author describes the peaceful encounter at the city of Scythians (12:29-31). Despite the reference in 7:4 to the cruelty of the Scythians, this is the second ironic reference to their goodwill towards the Jews. This fits into the aim of the author to depict a scenario where everyone in and around Judea, except the Scythians, is against the Jews. If the Scythians are known for their cruelty and they are for the Jews, then those against the Jews must be inconceivably cruel and unfair. Doran (2012: 243) notes that the language of this encounter reflects the reciprocal language between cities and sovereigns: εὐχαριστέω ("I thank") παρακαλέω ("I urge") εὐμενής ("good-willed"). The author is giving a portrayal of Judas and his followers that is increasingly authoritative and powerful. The distance given between Jerusalem and the city of Scythians is credible (Gera, 1990: 29, n. 37)

In 12:32 the position of Gorgias, which was not elaborated in 10:14-15, is explained as commander of Idumaea. The territory refers to the Southern part of Palestine (Schwartz, 2008: 436). Pentecost (πεντηκοστής) is the usual Greek name for the festival of Weeks (Tobit 2:1; Josephus, *War* 1.253; *Antiquities* 13.252).

Unlike the description of enemy casualties, the information on the Jewish casualties in 12:34 is very vague. This is the first mention made of Jewish casualties in 2 Maccabees. This evidences a specific purpose of this reference. This purpose becomes clear later on, in 12:39-45, where the author will indeed elaborate on the reason for the

Jewish deaths and on Judas' preparations concerning their burial. The author thus incorporates this reference into this section in order to teach the reader the effect and punishment of disobedience to God and his laws.

The description of Gorgias' flight to Marissa, the main city of Idumaea (Schwartz, 2008: 437), fits into the theme of unifying the villains as a group of cowards. The shameful act of Gorgias is especially highlighted since his men are said to fight on (12:36). Dositheos, who tried to capture Gorgias alive, was injured by a Thracian cavalryman. This Dositheos is not the officer mentioned in 12:24 since the use of τις ("a certain") in 12:35 indicates that it is a new figure. As mentioned there, the Greek name is common amongst Jews. The Thracians earned the reputation of being especially cruel to the extent that Josephus (*Antiquities* 13.383) notes that the cruel Alexander Jannaeus was "Thrakidas".

In 12:36-37 Judas reacts to the weariness of Esdris' troops through calling upon the Lord, starting a hymnodic war cry and charging unexpectedly. The intensity is kept through the asyndeton of the participles ἐπικαλεσάμενος ... καταρξάμενος ... and ἐνσεισας. Doran (2012: 244) notes that this grouping "also closely connects the activity of Judas with that of his heavenly ally." Unlike the war chants (μετὰ ... παιάνων) of the pagans mentioned in 15:25, the war cry by Judas' force is done in the ancestral language.

The piety of Judas and his followers is again emphasised in 12:38 where they purified themselves according to custom and spent the Sabbath in Adullam. As Goldstein (1983: 447-448) shows, the purification can either refer to the custom after battle (as in 1QM 14:2), or to the custom prior to the Sabbath (as in *b. Shabbat* 25b). The fact that Judas' force will not soon come into contact with the Temple further complicates things

(Schwartz, 2008: 439). What is certain is that the author is portraying these heroes as obedient even in the smallest of things.

The author adds to the long list of virtuous attributes by describing Judas as a commander who is concerned with the proper burial of the fallen soldiers in 12:39. This was the character of a good commander (Diodorus Siculus 13.61.6; 13.75.4; 17.68.4) and imperative for his soldiers' morale (Vaughn, 1991: 57). Moreover, this sets the scene for revealing the true reason for the death of the fallen, their idolatry.

The dedicated objects (ἱερώματα) mentioned in 12:40 could either refer to amulets for protection in battle (Lévy, 1965: 65-71), or to gold or silver ornaments dedicated to pagan gods that the Jews took as booty (Goldstein, 1983: 449), or to pendants (Schwartz, 2008: 439). The fact that is important for the author, however, is that this was prohibited by the Law to Jews, the Law for which the martyrs had given breath and life.

The author utilises the full potential of the scenario through allowing ample space in the pericope for the reaction of Judas and his followers (12:41-45). Judas is explicitly described as “the noble Judas”: (ὁ ... γενναῖος Ιουδας) and the reader is therefore reminded that whatever Judas does is legitimised and supported by his ally: the God of the Jews. The group’s reaction clearly labels the actions of the deceased as sinful and connects the sin with the failure of those deceased. The theme of God’s judgement is brought to the fore through the term δικαιοκρίτης (“just judge”). The term is otherwise listed by *LSJ* (428) only as a petition to a Roman prefect of Egypt in 133 B.C.E. found in Johnson, Martin & Hunt (1915: 96-97 – *P. Ryl.* 113.35). In this manner, the phrase τὸν δίκαιον κριτὴν (12:6) is echoed and God’s just judgement is highlighted. That which the Judge is judging is exclaimed by the use of different roots for “sin” (ἁμάρτημα, ἁναμαρτήτους, ἁμαρτίαν). The language in 12:45 referring to Judas’ atonement for the

deceased reflects the ritualistic language of Lev. 4:13-35. Here, the purification offering is intended to be effective even beyond death.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

Whereas the previous pericopes focussed on the alliance between God and Judas, the current pericope exhibits the difference between those who trust in the Lord, and those who trust in other things such as other gods or the strength of their army. Judas, with God as his ally, is unstoppable. As asserted, he can destroy enemy troops, crush any war machine or missile, break through any wall and humiliate those who haughtily blaspheme because of their reliance on their own strengths. The author continues his description of Judas and his followers becoming increasingly powerful and gaining authority. This is supported by a vivid description of:

- Judas' combat skills and dexterity,
- Judas' ability to negotiate deals as superior party,
- and the enemy's reaction to Judas' forces.

On the other hand, there are those Jews who fell in battle. The author explains that they fell because of their disobedience to God and his laws and their reliance on other gods, just as the enemy relied on their own strengths. This behaviour is immediately disapproved by the reaction of Judas and his followers:

- they bless the Lord for revealing the sin of those who had fallen,
- ask that the sin would be forgiven,
- link the idolatry with the casualties,
- and warn the populace that they should refrain from any such sin.

This reaction creates a clear division between the exemplary behaviour of the heroes and the foolishness of those who have died on either side. The author thus encourages the reader to denounce the behaviour of the deceased and to fully mimic that of the heroes. Building on this notion, the author again uses the heroes to become ambassadors for doctrinal ideas. Through the noble character of Judas, the idea of prayer and atonement for the deceased is introduced. The actions of Judas concerning the offering for the sins of the departed are grounded in the concept of resurrection already introduced. Since, the reader is already emotionally invested in that concept, this doctrine is easily adopted.

The author presents the following argument:

IF

- Judas is successful to the extent that he has a reciprocal relationship with other groups
- God's might is mentioned every time Judas accomplishes something
- the only time the reader hears of the casualties is when those deceased were trusting in other gods
- the noble Judas prays and brings a sacrifice for the sins of the deceased
- Judas does this because the deceased have the possibility of being resurrected

THEN

- Judas' authority and strength is constantly increasing
- Judas alone cannot be the reason for the Jews success
- having God as ally is better than having humans or other gods as allies
- it is right for Judas to pray and bring a sacrifice for the sins of the deceased
- others should pray and bring sacrifices for the sins of the deceased

3. Pragmatic Analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

The author again utilises the phenomenon of appropriate retribution, this time applying it to warn the reader. The casualties in battle are directly linked to the idolatry of those deceased. Through the concept of punishment, the reader is warned to refrain from any form of idolatry or trust in the strengths of man. Judas is rewarded for his obedience, but the soldiers are punished for their idolatry.

By means of reward, the prosperity of Judas and his followers encourages the reader to trust in the Lord as ally and obey his every command.

The author employs Judas as ambassador for doctrinal ideas through representing Judas as noble and fully legitimised. If Judas is a representation of God's will, then whatever he does is sanctioned and the atonement and prayer for the deceased is legitimised.

3.2. Real- and alternative text-world

The author recognises the tendency to want to trust in manmade structures or tools or in many gods rather than trust in the God of the Jews. Secondly, the author recognises the danger of the reader doubting the legitimacy of Judas' actions regarding the sins of the deceased.

Therefore, the author suggests an alternative scenario where God alone is the source for success and where the actions of Judas (concerning the sins of the deceased) are grounded Judas' legitimacy and in the already established doctrine of resurrection.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

Through an emotional appeal and concrete examples, the reader is moved away from the tendency to trust in human strengths and idols, towards trusting the "Just Judge" who is the ally of the Jews and giver of success.

Through a logical argument, the reader adopts the idea of praying and atoning for the sins of the departed.

CHAPTER 15: THE THREAT OF CONFLICT WITH ANTIOCHUS V AND ITS RESOLUTION (13:1-26)

1. Introduction

The pericope exhibits the author's intent to provide a compact description of Antiochus V's advance and retreat. Despite the amount of information crammed into a few verses, a considerable section of this pericope is still dedicated to the death of Menelaus. This emphasis on the appropriate retribution of the temple robber matches the author's commitment to portray Menelaus as one of the main villains throughout the narrative. The author further explicates his intentions with this pericope through dedicating nine verses to the description of Judas and his followers' piety and the Lord acting as their ally.

The author's aim is further explicated by the difference in style between the first section (regarding Menelaus' death and Judas' piety) and the second section (describing Antiochus V's Beth-Zur campaign). The first is described in the usual style of the narrative through employing the regular connecting particles, and the use of asyndeton, both emphatic and to describe the list of what the troops were fighting for. Such usage is normative in 2 Maccabees.

The norm is, however, broken by what Schwartz (2008: 34) calls, a "telegraphic, staccato style." The Beth-Zur campaign (13:18-26) is not descriptive at all. Here, the author uses a string of verbs to lay out the events of the campaign. For Schwartz (2008: 34) the style of this section evidences the author's view of the Beth-Zur campaign as "something of an embarrassment, or a puzzle" and that the style may possibly reflect that of notes rather than a proper recounting. Such an assumption is, however,

dismissed by various facets which prove that this section was well planned and rounded off (Doran, 2012: 261-262):

- The author distinguishes in his usage between the aorist and the imperfect tenses (13:19-20),
- a doublet is introduced in 13:23,
- and the author alternates between a staccato style, which describes the Seleucid actions (13:19, 22-23, 24b-26), and a more fluent style, which describes the Judean interests (13:18, 20, 21, 24a).

The style of this section is thus a witness to the author's aim to focus on Menelaus' death, the piety and victory of Judas and his followers, and the Lord as their ally. The author seems hasty to move on to the last dramatic peak of the narrative: the evilness of Alcimus, the attack on the temple and the defeat of Nikanor. The lack of detail in 13:18-26 also shows the author's avoidance of the besieging of the Temple and the weakness of Judas' force which is indeed found in 1 Macc. 6:30-63. It is important for the author to show that, after God's anger toward the Jews had seized and the Temple has been rededicated, Judas' forces are unstoppable and the Temple is safe.

2. Structural analysis

2.1. Delimitation

The start of this pericope is clearly marked by the shift in focus in 13:1 and the date given. The previous pericope recounted Judas' expeditions to safeguard the regions on the outskirts of Judaea and those in the Trans-Jordan. The current pericope starts off with a threat to the heart of Judaea. Antiochus V is marching against the Jews and plans to do even worse things than his father, Antiochus IV Epiphanes (13:9). The threat is briefly interrupted by a somewhat forced, but long-awaited account of

Menelaus' death (13:5-8). The author links this first scene to the king's Beth-Zur campaign through stating that the Jews' zeal caused Antiochus V to further test their abilities. The first section (13:9-17) is thus connected to the Beth-Zur campaign (13:18-26) through a relation of causality.

The start of a new pericope is marked through the phrase μετὰ δὲ τριετῆ χρόνον ("after a third-year period") in 14:1. From thereon forward, the focus shifts to the change in circumstances due to the arrival of a new king.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

The date given in 13:1 "in the year 149" (τῷ δὲ ἐνάτῳ καὶ τεσσαρακοστῷ καὶ ἑκατοστῷ ἔτει) is the first in the narrative of 2 Maccabees. Using the Seleucid Macedonian reckoning, 149 refers to 164/163 B.C.E. The problem, however, is that 1 Macc. 6:20 states that Judas' siege of the Acra is followed by the campaign of Lysias (the campaign identified with the one here in 2 Macc. 13). Judas' siege of the Acra is dated as 150 in 1 Macc. 6:20, which translates to 162/161 B.C.E. when using the Babylonian reckoning. The problem therefore is that 1 Maccabees provides a later dating for the event of 2 Macc. 13. Consequently there has been division amongst those scholars who follow the dating of 1 Maccabees (Tcherikover, 1959: 224-225; Schürer, 1987: 1:167, n. 14; Bar-Kochva, 1989: 543-551) and those who follow 2 Maccabees (Wellhausen, 1905: 151-152; Mørkholm, 1966: 153; Bringmann, 1983: 19-20; Goldstein, 1983: 458). Doran (2012: 252-253), referring to an inscription from Jamnia-on-the-Sea, argues for somewhere around June 163 B.C.E. Doran, however, admits that this deduction is based on the coincidence of events. Therefore, there can be no concrete answer to the problem of the date in 13:1.

Goldstein (1983: 459) rejected the term ἕκαστον ("each") although it is found in most of the manuscripts, since he argued that king Antiochus V would have been too young to command an army. True, Antiochus V would have been about 10 years old at the time (Doran, 2012: 253; Josephus, *Ant.* 12.296; Appian, *Syr.* 46, 66), but Bar-Kochva (1989: 304) has shown that participation in military actions by such young kings or princes was well-known in Hellenistic writings.

The author highlights the irony of Menelaus' ambition in 13:3-4. Menelaus counts himself amongst rulers but the King of kings is about to make him low through a punishment that will fit his transgressions. Doran (2012: 254) rightly notes the persistence of Menelaus' request, highlighted by the contrast between the aorist (συνέμειξεν) and the imperfect (παρεκάλει). This contrast between the villain's high aims and that which befalls him is also demonstrated in the case of Jason (5:9-10), Nikanor (8:36), and Antiochus IV (9:4-6, 28). The phrase ὁ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων ("the King of kings") is used in Ezek. 26:7; Dan. 2:37; Ezra 7:12. Here, it is used, however, to refer to God and not to earthly rulers. This reference to God fits the theme in 2 Maccabees of theomachy. It is the various villains who haughtily try and fight against the God of the Jews.

In 13:5-6 the contraption is described through which Menelaus reached his end. Schwartz (2008: 450) sees in this description a slight possibility of a parallel to Esther 6, especially "in the light of the Persian 'King of Kings'" mentioned. Schwartz also notes that the height of the gallows prepared by Haman was the same height (fifty cubits) and that in Esth. 4:16 reference is made to three days of fasting as here in 13:12. These similarities might be the subject for further study, but at this stage it is safe to say that all we know is that Persian kings were known to use this method of execution (Herodotus, 2:100).

Menelaus died without reaching the earth (μηδὲ τῆς γῆς τυχόντα, 13:7). This implies that he did not receive a proper burial. Some manuscripts explicate this aspect. Parker (1983: 45) shows that it was regular practice to deny temple robbers a burial. The law common to all Greeks implied that temple-robbers and traitors should be cast out and denied burial (Diodorus, 16.25.2; Thucydides, 1.138.6). The author uses two terms which places this description within the theme of appropriate retribution: πᾶνυ ("completely," as in 9:6) and κομίζω (which, in the medium, has the meaning of "I get back for myself") as in 8:33. Although Menelaus effected more than just the altar (4:32, 39; 5:15-16), the author is determined to find a perfect link between the evil actions of Menelaus and his death (Schwartz, 2008: 451). This is why the author singles out the altar. Just as the fire and ashes of the altar were hallowed, Menelaus got back for himself his death in ashes (13:8).

The author expresses Antiochus V's ill-willed intent toward the Jews through the verb ἔρχομαι + a future participle (which signifies intent). The perfect participle βεβαρβαρωμένος (βαρβαρώ – "I make barbarous") demonstrates that it is not merely an action of Antiochus V, but a state. Through this attribute, the author unifies Antiochus V with other villains in 2 Maccabees such as Philip, Antiochus IV and Menelaus (2:21; 4:25; 5:22; 10:14).

Once again, the author uses the technique of describing what is about to happen in order to heighten the reader's anticipation. In the guidelines for prayer, which Judas stipulates in 13:10-11, the people are told to pray that the Lord will help those who are about to be deprived of the law, fatherland and holy Temple. The reader now knows, if there was any doubt, what is at stake. The fact that "the people had only been revived a short while ago" (τὸν ἄρτι βραχέως ἀνεψυχότα λαὸν, 13:11) heightens the emotional appeal of the situation. Schwartz (2008: 452) points to a similar case in Judith 4:3 and Josephus (*Antiquities*, 8.128).

As in Chapter 3 of the narrative the whole community acts together in fasting, weeping and prostrating themselves before the Lord. Judas is the one who encourages (παρακαλέω) them. The author, as he so frequently does, focuses on the piety of Judas and his followers and their good example.

In 13:13 Judas meets with the elders (probably those mentioned in 4:44 and 11:27) to present a plan. The plan is to prevent the Seleucids from entering Judaea. This plan is not realised since Antiochus V still manages to enter at Beth-Zur in 13:19.

Despite the description in 1 Macc. 6:48-53 of Antiochus V's besieging the city and destroying the wall at Mount Zion, the author of 2 Maccabees sketches a scene where Jerusalem is untouched since the Temple was rededicated. In a narrative such as 2 Maccabees, this fits the theme where God is supernaturally in control and the state of the Temple signifies the relationship between God and his people. The phrase κρῖναι τὰ πράγματα ("to settle the matter") is often used in Polybius (1.15.4; 1.87.7; 5.82.1) in a battle setting. Schwartz (2008: 453) notes that πράγματα can also refer to "state" and suggests the possibility that, when taking the literal meaning of κρίνω ("I judge"), the phrase may mean "to judge the state." True, God is referred to as righteous judge (12:6, 41), but the immediate context shows no support for such a translation.

The author reminds the reader in 13:14 of the theme that God is the One in control. The events of history are dependent only on his decision. The emotional intensity is heightened through a coupling of five nouns that express Jewish patriotism. This grouping is typical in Greek prose style (Lycurgus 142; Antiphon 6.4) and is seldom less than three (Denniston, 1965: 105).

Judas again gives a slogan to his forces in 13:15: θεοῦ νίκην ("God's victory"). Gera (1985: 154-155) notes the use of νίκη as a motto in war. The author intensifies the account through employing two asyndetically linked aorist participles (ἀναδοὺς ... ἐπιβαλῶν). This creates a scene of rapid succession. The formulation ἀναδοὺς δὲ echoes δοὺς δὲ in the preceding verse. Schwartz (2008: 454) rightly notes that this demonstrates that Judas had finished his preparations: "having first turned to the true Fighter and given Him his due, he now turns to his flesh and blood fighters and gives them theirs."

The phrase τὴν βασιλικὴν αὐλὴν ("the royal courtyard") refers to the location of the king, even to a tent in times of battle (Polybius 5.25.3; 5.26.9).

The author balances out the effectiveness of Judas' force (13:16) through stating that this was only possible through the protection of the Lord aiding him (13:17). As in 10:30, the protection is for Judas only. Verse 16 is the only verse listed by *LSJ* (513) for the intransitive use of the verb ἐκλύω. The combination of fear and tumult (δέουσι καὶ παραχῆς) is also found in 3:30. Now the Seleucids are repaid and the situation is turned around.

The king reacted to the daring of the Jews through testing the places methodically (κατεπείρασεν διὰ μεθόδων). The verb κατεπείρασεν is often used in Polybius in the sense of "I attempt to take" but is used only in this verse in the Septuagint (Mauersberger, PL: 1.1320-1321). The term μέθοδος has been interpreted differently by different scholars. Abel and Habicht used the meaning found in Plutarch *Reg. imp. apophth.* 176a of "trick/stratagem." Schwartz (2008: 456), however, shows that this pericope does not demonstrate trickery on behalf of the king and suggests the meaning of "by devious routs." Doran (2012: 257), again, rightly notes that such a meaning would

also not fit the context. The meaning that is therefore preferred here is "method/system." Antiochus V's reaction was to test the places methodically.

The four asyndetic imperfect verbs in 13:19 along the vague description in 13:20 of what Judas sent to those inside (τὰ δέοντα, "that which is necessary") demonstrates that the author is moving on to a more important account.

As noted before, 13:21 is one of the verses where the intense succession of asyndetic verbs is alternated with a slightly more detailed description of the treachery of Rhodokos. Doran (2012: 258) sees in this difference of style that Rhodokos' treason is highlighted through the slower pace of 13:21. The problem with such a conclusion is that nothing is said about the implication of his treason as was the case in 10:20. What secrets did he disclose? How did it affect the conflict between the Jews and the Seleucids? What is the detail of Rhodokos' punishment? These questions are not answered. It therefore seems that the author did not seek to highlight the treason of Rhodokos any more than Judas' sending resources to those inside the stronghold. The nationality of Rhodokos and whether he was fighting for the Jews or the Seleucids (Schwartz, 2008: 457) is unknown. For the understanding of this pericope, which gives so little attention to the treachery of Rhodokos, nationality seems to make little difference. Regarding the question of the side Rhodokos was on, the term πολέμιος ("enemy") seems to provide clarity. Rhodokos is said in 13:21 to have disclosed secrets to the enemy. In 2 Maccabees the term πολέμιος is used only as reference to the enemies of the Jews. It is therefore most likely that Rhodokos was fighting for the Jews and selling secrets to the Seleucids and thus a true traitor.

In 13:22 Antiochus V addresses those in Beth-Zur for the second time ("δευτερολογέω"). This implies that the king had addressed them prior to the attack, offering a chance to surrender. Now the author describes the 'peace treaty', without

stating that those in Beth-Zur surrendered, through the phrase δεξιὰν ἔδωκεν ἔλαβεν (lit.: "he gave the right hand, received...").

The author returns to his staccato description of events in 13:23. He describes Antiochus V's attack on Judas, the events that led up to the final settlement, and the favourable welcoming of Judas in two verses (13:23-24). The reason for the sudden settlement is the news of Philip losing his senses. The verb used to refer to Philip's insanity is ἀπονοέομαι ("to be out of one's mind"). The root of the verb is also found in reference to what was thought about Eleazar in 6:29. Here, in 13:23, the perfect tense shows that insanity is the state in which Philip finds himself. Through placing 13:23 parallel to 1 Macc.6:55-56, the Philip mentioned should be identified with the one appointed by Antiochus IV in the place of Lysias. This would, however, place this verse in contrast to 9:29 where Philip was said to have crossed over to Ptolemy Philometor. The only logical deduction, therefore, is that in 2 Maccabees, there is two Philips, one under Antiochus IV, and one under Antiochus V.

The mention that the king honoured the Temple and was benevolent toward the place (13:23) reminds the reader of the time where the *status quo ante* was accounted in 3:2. There too the place was honoured and the Temple glorified. The use of the verb φιλανθρωπέω ("I show benevolence") in this context confirms that Antiochus V "bestowed some special benefit on the Temple, which would be parallel to the meaning in 3:2" (Doran, 2012: 260). The tension is further lifted through depicting Judas as someone who is now accepted by the king. This happens through the use of the verb ἀποδέχομαι ("I accept gladly") which is also used in 3:9 and 3:35.

It is significant that the author adds 13:25-26 to this account. Here, the author highlights the negative attitude of the citizens of Ptolemais toward the Jews through the phrase ἐδυσφόρουν ... ἐδείναζον ("they were horrified...they were very angry"). This vivid

description and combination is also found in 4:35. Here, however, it does not fit into the staccato style of 13:18-26. It seems, therefore, that the point of these verses is to show that all is not perfectly calm yet and that the reader may proceed with hope that the *status quo ante* will soon return.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

As so often in 2 Maccabees, the pericope opens with an imminent threat. IN this instance, it is the campaign of a teenage king with an exaggerated army.

This is however interrupted by the account of Menelaus' death. Despite the number of events and actions described in this congested pericope, the author still allows a significant portion for the description of Menelaus' death. God has the pleasure of dealing directly with Menelaus. As already established, it is important for the author to depict God as the One who is in control of history and therefore in control of justice. Accordingly, God arouses the anger of Antiochus V. In this manner, Antiochus V becomes an instrument of God's wrath.

After this significant section, the author returns to the approach of the vast numbers of enemy troops lead by a barbarous child king. The focus of the author is clear. He wants to communicate three major themes: the appropriate retribution of a villain, the piety of the heroes, and God as the ally of those heroes. As mentioned above, the focus on these themes is explicated by the structure and style of the pericope.

The threat is resolved (13:23-24) and the king becomes benevolent toward Judas, the Temple and the city. As mentioned above, this scenario is parallel to the *status quo ante* in 3:2. The author thus hints at the possibility that all would return to normal soon.

As so often in 2 Maccabees, the author communicates that which is important through the actions of the heroes. In this pericope, Judas encourages his men to fight nobly to death for the sake of laws, Temple, city, fatherland and constitution. This clearly conveys that the value of these things is higher than life itself.

Thus, through this pericope, the author communicates the following:

IF

- God supernaturally works the judgement of Menelaus,
- God aroused the anger of Antiochus V,
- the change to Menelaus' fate comes suddenly,
- the whole community prays, weeps and fasts in reaction to the threat,
- Judas forces are willing to fight till death for the laws, Temple, city, fatherland and constitution.

THEN

- God is still in control of history,
- God is in control of Antiochus V,
- the fate of the impious may change at any time,
- the reader should also react radically to the threat,
- the laws, Temple, city, fatherland and constitution are invaluable.

3. Pragmatic analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

The author exploits the emotional value of the events recounted in 2 Maccabees 13. The numbers and resources of Antiochus V's army is described in detail, the terror of Menelaus' execution is highlighted, and the pious rituals of Judas and his followers are elaborated. The reader is influenced through various emotions:

- Through the account of Menelaus' death, the reader experiences fear, pleasure, relief and reassurance;
- through the description of the piety of Judas and his followers, the reader experiences admiration and loyalty;
- through the detail of the enemy's resources, the reader experiences fear and doubt;
- through the victory over the enemy, the reader experiences pleasure, relief, reassurance and empowerment.

Through these various emotions, the reader is drawn, by means of reward, towards supporting Judas and his followers and all they value; by means of punishment, the reader is driven away from the villains and all they value.

Furthermore, the reader is encouraged to read on since he/she realises that the newly restored peace and purification of the Temple can be altered at any time. This brings the reader, together with the characters within the narrative, to a place of anticipation and dependence upon God's safekeeping since nothing is secure at this stage.

3.2. Real- and alternative text-world

The reader may doubt whether God is in control since Menelaus goes unpunished and since there is now an even greater threat to the laws, Temple, city, fatherland and constitution than in the time of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

The author reassures the reader that God is in control since Menelaus is appropriately and severely punished by God himself and since the Lord again defeats the enemy's forces.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

Through examples of the punishment of evildoers and victory over the enemy, reader is moved from doubting whether the Lord is in control to trusting that the Lord controls all and brings victory to his people.

CHAPTER 16: THE FINAL THREAT TO THE TEMPLE (14:1-46)

1. Introductions

This section is somewhat reminiscent of the description of the threat to the Temple in 3:1-39. Both sections:

- start off with the Jews at peace,
- involve a Seleucid official sent to Judaea,
- explicate the reaction of the people as appealing to God and practicing rituals of mourning,
- mention the epiphany of the Lord,
- have a Jew connected to the Temple, who sells out his brothers.

Since this forms an inclusio, the author is informing the reader that the narrative is coming to a close and that all will hopefully be resolved soon. Another theme which repeats an idea from earlier in the narrative is that of the Jews being good citizens. As mentioned before, the author argues that the unrest found its roots in some corrupt Jewish individuals, not the community as a whole. This in turn, sets the scene for the abrogated laws and the implication of war. The author argued that all would be calm in the kingdom as long as the Jews may practice their laws and constitution. Here, the author again argues against the idea that Jews are rebellious in nature and that Judas is leading a faction against the Seleucid government. This happens by means of an effective style of accusation and defence. The author uses the character of Alcimus to state an allegation: the Jews tend to cause unrest. The narrative, however, shows that Judas is seeking peace.

The author keeps to the style of alternating suspense and relief through rapidly changing Nikanor's attitude towards the Jews. The reader is gripped through the

change from a scenario where Judas and Nikanor acted in goodwill toward each other to one where Nikanor demonstrates his ill will toward the Jews through the pursuit of the honourable Rhazis and bringing about his death.

Doran (2012: 285) rightly notes that the author of 2 Maccabees omits certain scenes in order to streamline the narrative. The invasion of Bacchides (1 Macc. 7:8-20) as well as his return and Judas' death (1 Macc. 9:1-22) is omitted. This focuses the reader on the main villain Nikanor through creating a parallel between the first major invasion and his last battle. This too forms an inclusio. This pericope thus sets the scene for the conclusion of the narrative. Since the reader is reminded of the various instances where the Jews and their Temple were threatened, he/she is also reminded of the God of the Jews, who rescues his people through his might and his divine appearances. The reader now anticipates the final battle where the enemy will be made low, the Temple will be defended, God's glory will be proclaimed, and Judaism will prevail.

2. Structural analysis

2.1. Delimitation

Doran (2012: 278) notes that, after a series of asyndetic verbs, the author shifts to a new subject in style in 14:26. Doran also finds grounds for beginning a new pericope in the chiasm that is present in 14:26, which presents Alcimus' response to the arrangements between Nikanor and Judas.

This, however, only provides a stylistic motivation. Such a delimitation creates an unnecessary break in the flow of the narrative since Alcimus and his evilness is already introduced in 14:3-10. The author devotes eight verses to the setting of the plot and the rest of the events (Nikanor's appointment as governor of Judaea; Nikanor's attachment to Judas; Alcimus' response; the king's order to capture Judas; the threat to the Temple;

Rhazis' self-sacrifice) unfold from these verses. Therefore, thematically, it makes sense to delimit the current pericope as 14:1-46.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

Before setting the plot through the description of Alcimus' evil plan, the author introduces the pericope through providing background information. After peace had been restored in 2 Maccabees 13 between the Jews and the Seleucid king, a new potential threat is communicated. Demetrius had done away with Antiochus V and Lysias. This implies that the agreements of peace were possibly done away with as well. The background provided in 14:1-2 correlates with the events recounted in 1 Macc. 7:1-3.

The author states in 14:4 Alcimus brought gifts to Demetrius in the 151st year. This correlates to the phrase in 14:1 "in the third year thereafter" (μετὰ δὲ τριετῆ χρόνον), which translates literally as "after a third year period." Doran (2012: rightly notes that this means "after the third year had begun," which would be 151 S.E. (autumn 162 B.C.E. to autumn 161 B.C.E.).

The Demetrius in 14:1 is Demetrius I, born in 186 B.C.E. Until his hostile takeover of the Seleucid Empire, he lived as a hostage in Rome because of the agreements of the Treaty of Apamea. This Demetrius fled from Rome in order to take over the kingdom, which was in his opinion rightfully his and which the Roman senate gave to Antiochus V because of their best interest (Polybius 31.12).

Tripolis was a Greek coastal city North of Byblos which comprised out of three sections with a common constitution (Diodorus Siculus 16.41.1; Strabo 16.2.15; Pliny *Hist. nat.* 5.78).

As usual the author's aim can be deduced from the difference in focus of these two texts. In 1 Maccabees the account of the execution of Lysias and Antiochus V is more detailed. The author of 2 Maccabees, however, accounts these events in one sentence before moving on to the eight verses describing Alcimus' evil plan.

In 1 Macc. 7:1 Demetrius is described as having only a few men. Josephus (*Ant.* 12.389) writes that Demetrius gathered an army only after his arrival at Tripolis. Polybius 31.11-15 describes the undercover nature of Demetrius' escape from Rome. Schwartz, therefore, rightly argues that the author of 2 Maccabees exaggerated the size of Demetrius' forces when he arrived at Tripolis in order to meet the already exaggerated numbers of Antiochus V's army.

The author adds to his range of alternative terms in referring to death through the use of the verb ἐπαναιρέω ("I do away with").

The author ensures that Alcimus is grouped with the villains of 2 Maccabees. Alcimus is introduced in 14:3 by the phrase Ἄλκιμος δὲ τις ("but one Alcimus"). The same introduction for villains is used in 3:4 and 4:40. Furthermore, Alcimus is contrasted with heroes such as Onias and Judas through describing him as one who had willingly defiled (μεμολυσμένος) himself. Lastly, Alcimus is described as one who seeks only his own goodwill through dismissing his brothers as rebels and troublemakers in 14:4-10. This is similar to the behaviour of Simon (3:5-6; 4:1-6), Menelaus (13:3) and opposed to that of Onias, who had done all for the sake of the people (4:4-6).

Along with his deceptive words, Alcimus uses gifts as a means to convince the king in 14:4. He gave as gifts a "golden crown" (στέφανον χρυσοῦν), a "palm frond" (φοίνικα) and some of the customary gifts of the Temple. A golden crown was a customary gift to

kings (Bickerman, 1938: 111-112; Welles, 1934: 15, l. 4). A golden crown is also accompanied by a palm frond where Simon sends a gift to Demetrius II (1 Macc. 13:37). The particle ὡς together with the participle προσάγων (of προσάγω: "I bring/employ") indicates purpose.

The speech of Alcimus exhibits various literary techniques:

- two μὲν ... δὲ constructions (14:8-9)
- litotes (οὐ μικρῶς - "not little")
- the use of unusual verbs such as ἀκληρέω ("I suffer loss") in 14:8
- the parallelism of sound between ἅπαντας and εὐαπάντητον (14:9)

Doran (2012: 268) also highlights the theme of cleverness versus folly. First, the author contrasts Alcimus' cleverness with his folly. In 14:8, the author highlights the thoughtfulness of Alcimus (φρονῶν ... στοχαζόμενος) and then "contrasts, using μὲν ... δὲ, the unreasonableness (ἄλογιστία) of Judas with the knowledge and forethought (ἐπεγνωκῶς, προνοήθητι) of the king."

Davies (1977: 139) demonstrates that the term Ἀσιδαῖοι ("Hasidim") in 14:6 refers to the meaning of the term *ḥāsīd* in the Hebrew Scriptures: the Jews who are antagonistic to Hellenism which threatens their religion and practice of the law.

Doran (1981: 69-70, 107-108) shows that the language used to accuse Judas and his followers is similar to other Hellenistic Jewish apologetic texts. The description of Alcimus' accusation against Judas' group also uses the term πολεμοτρόφω ("I maintain an hostility"), which is ironically used earlier (10:14, 15) in reference to those against Judaism (Doran, 2012: 269).

In 14:9 Alcimus asks for the king's provision and benevolence in the matter of dealing with the "rebellion" of Judas. Both providence and benevolence were the trademarks of a good Hellenistic king (Schubart, *Königsideal*: 9-11, 18-19). The perfect participle (ἐπεγνῶκως) demonstrates that Alcimus calls for a state of action based on the information that has been given.

The term *δυσμενῶς* ("ill will") is frequently employed in 2 Maccabees in reference to the enemies of the Jews (6:29; 12:3; 14:39).

In 14:12-13 Nikanor, the former commander of a squadron of elephants, is appointed governor of Judaea and given orders to make away with Judas. Many problems arise when trying to identify the Nikanor mentioned here. There is a possibility of identifying this Nikanor with one of Demetrius' friends who assisted him in escaping from Rome (Polybius 31.14.4; Josephus *Ant.* 12.402). Doran (2012: 270) rightly notes that, in this case, the title of "elephant commander" (ἐλεφαντάρχης) would have been only "honorific," since the elephants were destroyed by a Roman embassy in 162 B.C.E. just before Demetrius gained power. Many scholars support the notion that this Nikanor was in fact the friend who helped Demetrius escape Rome (Habicht, 2 1976: 239 n. 9a; Schwartz, 2008: 473; Stern, 1972: 65; Grainger, 1997:107-108). Some scholars even state that this Nikanor, who is the friend of Demetrius, is the same Nikanor as mentioned in 2 Macc. 8 (Habicht, 2 Makk: 239; Schwartz, 2008: 473). Doran (2012: 270), however, rightfully warns against such connections regarding the frequency of the name Nikanor in contemporary literature. It seems logical to accept that Nikanor was the friend of Demetrius, who helped him flee Rome, especially since it is improbable that Demetrius I appointed another Nikanor just after his escape while he had a loyal friend with the same name who was a part of that process. Considering, however, similar problems with other names in 2 Maccabees, these possibilities remain only probable.

The author is preparing the reader for the concluding section of the narrative through the use of the phrase τοῦ μεγίστου ἱεροῦ ("the greatest temple"). This phrase was also used in 2:19 and will be used again in 14:39. It hints at the possible return of the *status quo ante*.

The meaning of the transitive verb φυγαδεύω as "flee" in the phrase "who had fled Judas" (14:14) is unusual. This adds to the author's use of rare terms and constructions to exhibit his good style. Habicht (2 Macc: 272) and Katz (1960: 17) see the noun ἔθνη ("nations/gentiles") as an intrusion. This is due to the fact that the term ἔθνη does not make grammatical sense here. Doran (2012: 264) follows in stating that the lack of concord between the article and its substantive is quite striking. Schwartz (2008: 476), however, refers to 8:9 and states that such a linkage between a masculine object and a neutral noun is "acceptable in a construction *ad sensum* referring to people." Doran (2012: 264) again, rightly notes that this case (14:14) is quite different from "the lack of concord between a noun and an attributive participle in 8:9 (ἔθνη οὐκ ἐλάπτους), which is to be explained as a construction according to sense" (Smyth, 1920: §1013). For the purpose of the study therefore, it will be accepted that the ones who fled Judas were a group of Jewish villains.

After setting the plot in 14:3-14, the author suddenly jumps to the reaction of the Jews to the threat imposed by Nikanor. Although the verb λιτανεύω ("I entreat") does not have a subject, the context clearly implies the Jews.

Through the phrase in 14:15 "His own people ... His own portion" (λαόν ... μερίδος) the author alludes to LXX Deuteronomy 32:9: "God's people is his inheritance" (μερίς ... λαός). Schwartz (2008: 477) rightfully notes that the threat here is against the people, not the land or the Temple. The actions attributed to God in 14:15 (He strengthens his people and aids them through appearances) links this pericope with the rest of the

narrative. God did indeed secure the future of his people through epiphany. The reader is also prepared for further possible supernatural occurrences and is thus encouraged to continue unto the concluding section of the text.

Judas is referred to as "the leader" (ὁ ἡγούμενος) in 14:16. Spicq (Notes: 1.348-352) demonstrates such usage of the participle ἡγούμενος in reference to rulers. This is the first instance in 2 Maccabees where this title is ascribed to Judas.

Doran (2012: 271) rightly notes that the lack of specificity here suggests that the whole community is involved.

The phrase ἐκεῖθεν εὐθέως ἀναζεύξας ("after they immediately went forth from there") is similar to that in 12:29 (ἀναζεύξαντες δὲ ἐκεῖθεν). In 14:14 the some Jews flocked to "join" (συμμίσγω) with Nikanor. Here the followers of Judas go to "clash" (συμμίσγω) with the enemy. Though the application of the contrasting meaning of the same verb the author sharply contrasts between those Jews who betrayed their brothers and those loyal to Judas.

Simon is connected, for a second time, with negative circumstances in 14:17. Despite the fact that his men had betrayed their brothers in 10:20 and Simon now stumbles before the enemy forces, the author does not exploit the weaknesses. The stumbling of Simon is justified through the suddenness of the enemy's appearance and explained as a minor setback. The author further downplays the situation by overshadowing it by the bravery of Judas' brothers (14:18) which causes Nikanor to rethink his position towards the Jews.

In 14:19, Posidonius, Mattathias and Theodotus is sent by Nikanor to "offer and receive truce" (δοῦναι καὶ λαβεῖν δεξιᾶς, lit.: "to give and receive the right hand as in 11:26, 30; 12:11, 12; 13:22). The reader would find delight in the fact that this is exactly opposite the orders that were given by Demetrius I to Nikanor. The names Mattathias and Theodotus are well attested as Jewish names (Doran, 2012: 272). These men could have been of those Jews who fled to Nikanor (14:14).

The involvement of the whole community is again emphasised in 14:20 in the description of the negotiation of peace. The unity of the community is further underlined by the terms employed in 14:20: the root κοινός ("shared in common"), the prefix ὅμο- ("one and the same"), the prefix σύν ("with").

The author sets up a powerful scene in 14:21-22 where Judas and Nikanor will meet. No one else is allowed. The situation is rhetorically powerful and sets the scene for a final power struggle between hero and villain. The scene causes a separation between the two characters and the rest of the community and members of both forces. This focusses the reader on the two sides: One hero against one villain.

The text does not provide a clear picture regarding the circumstances of the meeting. The two terms δίφραξ ("chair/litter") and δίφρος (usually "chariot") are confusing. Doran (2012: 273) follows Goldstein in translating δίφραξ as chariot. This makes sense and would be in accordance with Abel's (1949: 462-463) suggestion that the two leaders arrived on chariots and then used chairs that had been brought for them.

Doran (2012: 273) notes a series of five asyndetic clauses: προῆλθε ("came forth"), ἔθεσαν ("place") ... διέτακεν ("posted") ... ἐποίησαντο ("had") ... διέτριβεν ("was

residing") starting at 14:21b. This evidences the author's aim to highlight the other opportunities for conflict rather than this peaceful endeavour.

The adjective ἀγελαῖος ("herdlike") refers back to those who flocked to Nikanor in 14:14 "in flocks" (ἀγεληδόν). The fact that they are dismissed provides relief to the reader.

Despite the brevity, the author employs various tenses in 14:24-25 to provide depth to the text:

- the imperfect tense (εἶχε ... παρεκάλεσεν) to highlight the continuous action of Nikanor's hosting of, and encouragement to Judas.
- the pluperfect (προσεκέκλιτο) to show the fixed state of Nikanor's attachment to Judas

The fact that Judas married (14:25) is not otherwise known. Here, the author exploits the idyllic nature of Judas' resumption of normal social activity. In the light of Deut. 20:7 the marriage of Judas, who is a militant leader, implies stability and peace. This implication is further supported by the use of the verb εὐσταθέω ("enjoy stability"). Because of his position, Judas' stability represents the stability of the Jewish community.

Alcimus joins the group of villains by his use of an accusation (ταῖς ... διαβολαῖς) to disrupt the peace in Judea (14:27). This links Alcimus to Simon, who had accused (διαβάλλων) the hero Onias in 3:11.

Just as the character of Onias brought the people to react by being "angry at the unjust murder of the man" (ἐδυσφόρουν ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀδίκῳ φόνῳ), Nikanor is also now emotionally attached to Judas and struggles with the king's command to capture Judas in 14:28-29. This convinces the reader of the blameless character of Judas and encourages loyalty. Just as in 7:20, 39; 11:1; 14:27 the author employs φέρω + adverb in 14:28 in order to emphasise Nikanor's struggle.

The author justifies Nikanor's decision to try and capture Judas through demonstrating Nikanor's reasoning, which seems likely, that he cannot disobey a man as powerful as Demetrius I.

The suddenness of the change in Nikanor's attitude and Judas' reaction is highlighted through the asyndetic participles συνιδῶν ("noticing") ... νοήσας (... συστρέψας (

In 14:29 Nikanor tried to catch Judas through a maneuver (στρατήγημα). Now, in 14:31, Nikanor is outmaneuvered (στρατηγή). The author underpins Judas' predominance through adding the term γενναίως ("excellently"). This adds to the list of superior attributes of Judas in this pericope.

The pericope links back to the preface to the narrative through the reference to the "greatest" (τὸ μέγιστον) temple. This evokes hope that circumstances will hopefully return soon to the setting at the beginning of the narrative.

The battle between good and evil is stressed through the juxtaposition of the Nikanor stretching out his right hand (14:33: προτείνας τὴν δεξιάν) and the priests stretching out their hands toward heaven (14:34: ἱερεῖς προτείναντες τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν).

Doran(2012:280) notes that the more vivid conditional future is followed to report Nikanor's oath.

As opposed to the abovementioned anticipation of the *status quo ante*, the author has Nikanor pose a threat in 14:33 reminiscent to that of Antiochus IV in 9:4, 14 to make Jerusalem into a cemetery (ἰσόπεδον ποιῆσαι). In this manner, suspense is maintained up unto the end of the narrative. Nikanor's threat that he will raise up a temple to Dionysos in the place of the Jerusalem Temple further heightens the suspense since the Jews had to partake in the festival of Dionysos at the height of the persecution.

Another parallel to the first Nikanor account is the mention of the priests calling on the constant champion (ἔπεκαλοῦντο τὸν διὰ παντὸς ὑπέρμαχον). In 8:36 Nikanor was forced to confess that the Jews had a champion (ὑπέρμαχος).

The attributes of God is linked with that which the priests are asking of Him. God is described in 14:35 as the one who is not in need of anything (τῶν ὄλων ἀπροσδεής) and as holy Lord of all holiness (ἅγιε παντὸς ἁγιασμοῦ κύριε). This is connected with the priests appeal that God would keep his interest in the place that He alone chose without any encouragement and that He, who is holy, will keep the place holy.

In 14:37-46, the reader meets a new example of an ambassador for Judaism (just as Eleazar and the mother with her seven sons in 6:9b-7:42). If the importance of this Jewish way of life was forgotten, the reader is reminded that there is no price one shouldn't pay for the sake of Judaism. In this scene, Rhazis is said to have risked "both body and soul for the sake of Judaism" (καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ιουδαϊσμοῦ). The author ensures that the character of Rhazis is presented as ideal. Rhazis is described as "lover of his fellow citizens" (φιλοπολίτης), one who has goodwill (εὐνοίαν) towards

his people, and "father of the Jews" (πατήρ τῶν Ιουδαίων). The term φιλοπολίτης was well-known as a noble characteristic of leaders (Dio Chrysostom 1.28; Plutarch *Flam.* 13.8; *Lyc.* 20.4). Through this term, the hero (Rhazis) is once again unified with the heroes of 2 Maccabees through this term. Onias was also keeping in mind the interests of the whole group in 4:5 as well as Judas' men in 12:25. This contrasts Rhazis with the villains Menelaus and Alcimus who did not at all consider their people (4:50; 14:8). Van Henten (1997: 206-207) has shown that the Roman influence of the phrase "father of the Jews" (πατήρ τῶν Ιουδαίων) through titles such as *parens*, *pater patriae*, *parens plebis Romanae*, *parens omnium civium* and *parens rei publicae*. David Noy (1993: 114) notes that later inscriptions have the phrase πατήρ καὶ πάτρων τῆς πόλεως ("father and patron of the city") or πάτρων τῆς πόλεως ("patron of the city").

Certain scholars' (Abel, Habicht and Goldstein) interpret the participle εἰσενηνεγμένος (14:38) as passive. Grimm, however, convincingly argues for the middle use of the verb through referencing Polybius' (5.74.9; 11.10.2, 5; 21.29.12) use of the verb εἰσφέρεισθαι, where the middle use has the meaning of "to bring forward publicly." Accordingly, Doran (2012: 282) rightly translates the verb as "pronounce."

Nikanor sends "over five hundred soldiers" (στρατιώτας ὑπὲρ τοὺς πεντακοσίους) to seize Rhazis (14:39) and thus aims to bring "misfortune" (συμφορά) to the Jews (14:40). The number of soldiers sent, although seemingly exaggerated, makes sense since this could have been necessary either to make a public display, or as precautionary method for a public rebellion.

The mention of Nikanor's forces setting fire to the doors (14:41) serves a dual purpose. Firstly, since fire was not necessary (as the forces was already able to break through the outer door), it serves as support for the depiction of Nikanor's men as a mob (τῶν ...

πληθῶν). Secondly, the vivid picture of fire heightens the intensity of the situation and the suspense of the reader.

The term ὑποχείριος (“under the control”) in 14:42 reminds the reader of Judas’ encouragement in 13:11 to pray to the Lord that he would not put the people under the control (ὑποχειρίου) of the abusive Gentiles (Doran, 2012: 283). Through that instance the reader knows the value of the Jewish independence. The author exploits the emotional value of Rhazis’ death through drawing out the death scene. Doran (2012: 283) notes that the author employs various techniques to place the events of 14:45-46 in one sentence: two participles (ὑπάρχων καὶ πεπυρωμένος: “breathing and enflamed”) are followed by an asyndetic participle (ἔξαναστὰς: “he stood up”), two genitive absolute participles (φερομένων ... ὄντων: “going forth ... being”) and another asyndetic participle (διελθὼν: “went through”). Before resolving into the main verb ἐνσεΐω (“I drive into”), there is yet another participle, two asyndetic participles and another participle phrase. In this manner, the actions are bound together tightly in order to maintain the intensity and to portray the most vivid picture of Rhazis’ death. This effort to highlight the death and fully utilise the emotional value demonstrates the importance of Rhazis’ perseverance.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

Throughout the narrative the author sketches an evolving picture of Judas and his followers. As the narrative progresses, Judas becomes increasingly successful on the battlefield and gains authority among the Jews. This pericope shows that the whole community of Jews follows Judas. He is the leader of the people. This fits into the aim of the author to secure the position of Judas as the uncontested hero of the Jews and the champion of Judaism.

To add consistency to the narrative, the author shows that Judas is not acting alone, but achieved all through the help of the ally of the Jews. God is called the constant champion (14:35). In this manner, the author aligns the pericope with the theology presented throughout 2 Maccabees: Nothing happens unless God allows it. This eliminates the idea that Judas is the main defender of the Temple and source of peace.

Through the conduct of both Judas and Rhazis, the author proves his argument that the Jews seek the stability of the kingdom as long as they are allowed to practice their laws and uphold their constitution. Alcimus accused Judas and his followers of maintaining an inimical pose and being in revolt. This accusation was refuted by the author's example of Nikanor's realisation that Judas desires to return to normal social life. Finally, the friendship between Nikanor and Judas nullifies the possibility of Judas seeking unrest.

As mentioned above, the nobility of Rhazis' actions is underpinned through various techniques. This demonstrates the prominence of this instance and reminds the reader of the perseverance of the martyrs in 6:9b-7:42, since they also gave up breath and life for the sake of Judaism. In 6:28 Eleazar chose to die nobly (γενναίως) which would in turn serve as a noble example (ὑπόδειγμα γενναῖον), which the seven brothers followed through encouraging each other to die nobly (7:5 γενναίως τελευτᾶν).

With these elements taken into account, the author's proposition may be outlined as follows:

IF

- Demetrius' takeover provides a new opportunity for the Jews to prove that they seek the peace of the kingdom
- The only aspect that can prove this wrong is Alcimus and his accusations

- Alcimus is proven to be evil and completely without credibility through the relationship between Judas and Nikanor
- The only reason for the unrest is the treachery of Alcimus
- Rhazis' actions are the product of Alcimus' deceit
- Rhazis' and Judas' attributes are synonymous with the noble leaders in 2 Maccabees
- Rhazis is willing to lay down his life rather than to fall into the hands of the enemy

THEN

- the reader should renounce Alcimus' arguments
- the Jews are not rebellious in nature
- the Jews will maintain peace in the kingdom if they are allowed to practice their laws and uphold their constitution
- the newly acquired freedom is invaluable
- the reader should follow the example of Judas, Rhazis and the others who were persecuted for the sake of Judaism
- the reader should give body and soul for the sake of Judaism

3. Pragmatic analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

Tension is built through the opening notion of the execution of Antiochus V and Lysias. The reader realises the potential threat: if the ones who negotiated peace are executed, the peace agreement may also be obsolete. Tension is further built through the mention of yet another corrupt high priest. The reader knows that no good can come of the high priest's dealings with Demetrius. This ensures that tension is maintained. At the same time, the author employs various techniques to demonstrate to the reader that the narrative is coming to a close. Despite the fact that conflict is eminent, the reader is thus assured that the author will soon resolve matters through the Lord's defence of his

Temple and his people. The parallel to the opening of the narrative generates hope that circumstances will return to the *status quo ante*.

As in the rest of the narrative, the author employs trustworthy characters as ambassadors for his arguments. Judas is further exemplified. His courage brings Nikanor to halt his attacks. His noble character brings about a friendship which causes Nikanor to consider disobeying the king's command. This relationship between Judas and Nikanor serves a specific purpose. It proves that Judas' honourable character is irrefutable. In this manner the reader is convinced that he/she too cannot refuse the character of Judas and should respect Judas and his cause. This notion is further enforced through presenting an accusation through the character of Alcimus. When Alcimus is discredited and unified with the other villains of 2 Maccabees, the reader is moved away from the thought that Judas and his followers are rebellious in nature. Since the narrative has shown that horror awaits characters such as Alcimus, the reader is guided, through an emotional appeal, into strengthening his/her choice for Judas and all he represents.

In this pericope, the noble character of Rhazis is added to the many heroes of the text. The reader is reminded of Eleazar and the seven brothers who bravely gave up both body and soul for the sake of Judaism. Through the bravery of the character, the author encourages the reader to admire Rhazis and thus to follow his example in fighting for Judaism. The graphic style and intensity of his death convinces the reader that what Rhazis is fighting for must be invaluable. Consequently, the reader is aided into making the conclusion: Judaism and the freedom to practice the laws and Jewish constitution is invaluable. Rhazis' actions are linked to the scene of Judas, Nikanor and Alcimus through demonstrating that the only reason the Jews are rebellious is to fight for their independence. They are not the origin of the conflict. Instead, the conflict originates

through the deceit of corrupt Jewish individuals and attempts of extreme Hellenistic reform.

3.2 Real- and alternative text-world

The danger exists that the reader, as did other Jews, would ask whether the conflict in the text was necessary. This would lead to the question whether the unrest in Judaea was due to Judas and his followers being rebellious in nature. Secondly, the reader may question the value of the newfound freedom and if the Jews should not rather conform to all the practices of the empire.

The text addresses these doubts through providing an example where such accusations (by means of the character of Alcimus) are refuted. In this manner, an alternative is suggested where the reader does not doubt the actions of Judas and other ambassadors for Judaism. The legitimacy of this alternative world is enforced by the integrity of the characters of Judas and Rhazis. The value of the newfound freedom is stressed by the drastic behaviour of Rhazis.

3.3 Trans-universal relations

The reader is moved from doubt regarding the actions of the heroes in 2 Maccabees and the value of the freedom, to trusting the heroes, and understanding that the recently established freedom is invaluable. This happens through the example of the relationship between Judas and Nikanor, the integrity of the characters who choose Judaism and the reminder of the martyrs who fought for Judaism and religious freedom.

CHAPTER 17: THE FINAL LIGITIMISATION OF JUDAS AND HIS FOLLOWERS AND THE EFFICIENCY OF THEIR ALLIANCE WITH THE GOD OF HEAVEN (15:1-39)

1. Introduction

The author aims to end off the narrative at an emotional peak. Firstly, this is achieved through the utterings of Nikanor. Although there are many accounts of blasphemy in 2 Maccabees, the author explicitly mentions the content of Nikanor's profanity. In this manner the scene is set for the final theomachy: that between the triply offensive Nikanor, who has authority on earth, and the one who observes everything from heaven. Secondly, the author saved the most appalling behaviour for last. Nikanor plans to attack the Jews on the Sabbath.

The theme of the Lord as helper resurfaces, this time with a slight difference. The author binds the narrative together through having Judas encourage his men to look back on the times the Jews had help from heaven. This serves as confirmation that the Lord will again aid his people in battle. The author provides a detailed description of the piety of Judas' force, the aid of the Lord, and the impiety of the enemy. As usual, the author's aim is clearly communicated through the fact that this is drastically contrasted by the lack of detail in the description of the actual battle.

The author adds to the list of supernatural instances by describing Judas' dream. The content of the dream connects the current pericope with the rest of the narrative. The high priest Onias III re-enters and his noble and gentle character reminds the reader of the *status quo ante*. Furthermore, Judas' intent to destroy his opponents is sanctioned through the appearance of the prophet Jeremiah himself, who hands Judas a sword as a gift from God to break down his opponents.

In this pericope, the second festival, Nikanor's Day, is inaugurated (15:36). Just as the narrative has drastically changed after the inauguration of Hanukkah (10:8), the narrative now implies a change of circumstances. After 10:8, the author insisted that Judas is unstoppable, and the Temple remains untouched. Now the author portrays a scenario where all will return to the *status quo ante* after 15:36. The return of Onias III, the symbol of an era of peace, enforces this idea.

If there was any doubt whether the author achieved his aim of focussing on the Temple (2:19), the current pericope reaffirms just that. This happens by means of a radical statement in (15:18) that the safety of the dedicated Temple was far more important than the safety of the wives, children, family and kin.

2. Structural analysis

2.1. Delimitation

The new pericope commences in 15:1 where the theme is introduced of Nikanor's last barbaric plan to attack the Jews on the Sabbath. From this verse, the plot unfolds into the description of the response of the Jews, Judas' dream, the victory of the Jews and the inauguration of Nikanor's day in 15:36. Each of these elements forms part of the main theme of the pericope to contrast the heroes with the villains.

The epilogue clearly starts at 15:37. There, the author summarises the events concerning the last conflict with Nikanor and the period thereafter when the Hebrews controlled the city. Moreover, in 15:37 the author switches to the first person singular to round off the narrative with a personal declaration of ownership. The narrative comes full circle through the analogy of the drinking party that is re-introduced in 15:39 (first introduced in the prologue in 2:27). The author concludes with the phrase "let the end be here" (ἐνταῦθα ... ἔσται ἡ τελευτή) in 15:39.

2.2. Syntactical and semantic analysis

Nikanor plans to attack the Jews in “all safety” (πάσης ἀσφαλείας) and “on the day of rest” (τῇ τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέρᾳ). The latter is found also in Exod. 34:21 and 35:2. The mention of the Sabbath reminds the reader of Apollonius’ attack on the Sabbath (5:25), those who did not defend themselves on the “most august day” in 6:11 and Judas’ observance of the day in 8:25-26. Before the Hasmonean period, there was no official ban on self-defense on the Sabbath (Goodman & Holladay, 1986: 165-171).

In 15:2 reference is made to those who accompanied Nikanor under force (κατ’ ἀνάγκην). This refers to those Jews who did not support the Seleucids or Alcimus, but were drafted into Nikanor’s force (Schwartz, 2008: 497). Those Jews beg Nikanor not to destroy Judas’ force in such an “uncivilised and barbaric” (ἀγρίως καὶ βαρβάρως) manner. The term ἀγρίως links with the theme in the narrative to present the enemy as barbaric (5:22; 10:4; 13:9; 14:30).

In Ezek. 9:9 reference is made to those who say that God has forsaken the land, and that the Lord does not see (οὐκ ἐφορᾷ ὁ κύριος). Here, Nikanor’s main argument is that the Lord is in heaven and therefore not present on earth. The fact that the Lord is called “the one who observes everything” (τοῦ πάντα ἐφορῶντος) in 15:2 thus confirms his presence among his people on earth.

In 15:3-5 the theomachy is set up between Nikanor and God. This happens by means of Nikanor’s argument: The God of the Jews is in heaven, so He cannot do anything to stop Nikanor on earth. The author cleverly contrasts that which the Lord commands (the observance of the Sabbath) and that which Nikanor commands (to take up arms). The latter seems far more powerful and concrete, since the observance of the Sabbath doesn’t win wars. The author then moves on to prove to the reader that this isn’t true.

The author achieves his aim through a similar tactic than in 2 Macc. 14 where Alcimus accuses Judas, but the circumstances prove him wrong. Here, Nikanor accuses the Lord of being limited in power and the outcome of the battle proves him wrong. Accordingly, the theme of God being the "Master" (δυνάστης) is again established in 15:3 as in the rest of 2 Maccabees (3:24; 12:15; 12:28). The term is also employed in the rest of the pericope (15:4,5,23,29). Consequently, the reader is reminded, as in 3:24 and 12:28, that God is Master of the universe and thus also of the earth.

In 15:5 the failure of Nikanor is foretold. For the author, it is important to stress the fact that the enemy does not succeed in that which they attempt. Through the use of the term ἐπιτελέω ("I discharge"), the reader is also reminded of where the term was employed in the context of the failure of a villain (3:8, 23; 12:8; 14:29).

The author sets the scene for Nikanor's appropriate retribution in 15:6. Just as his hand (which pointed to the Temple in 14:33) will be cut off, so too his outstretched neck (ὑψαυχενέω: "I carry the neck high") readies the scene where his head will be cut off (15:30). The term ἀλαζονεία ("cockiness") is also employed in reference to Antiochus IV just before his fall.

Nikanor haughtily celebrates beforehand by erecting a trophy. It seems that the author refers here to the Greek custom of setting up a suit of armor collected from the enemy in order to celebrate victory (Lammert, 1948: 663-673).

This behaviour of Nikanor is sharply contrasted, by means of a μὲν ... δὲ construction of which the first part was introduced in 15:6. Judas, on the other hand, trusts not in human strength, but in the support of the Lord.

The adverb ἀδιαλείπτως ("constantly") in 15:7 reinforces the state conveyed by the perfect participle πεποιθῶς (πείθω: "I trust"). The phrase μετὰ πάσης ἐλπίδος ("with all hope") contrasts the phrase referring to Nikanor μετὰ πάσης ἀλαζονείας ("with all vain-boasting").

The author underlines the theme of the Lord as helper through the term βοήθημα ("help") in 15:8. In 15:35 Judas' victory is a clear sign of God's help (φανερὸν τῆς τοῦ κυρίου βοηθείας σημεῖον). This reminds the reader of the Lord as helper in 3:39; 8:35; 12:11; 13:13). God is again called παντοκράτωρ ("Almighty") as in 3:30; 5:20; 6:26; 7:35, 38; 8:11, 18, 24. This is an important trait in the current context since God's might is proven not to be limited to heaven as Nikanor claims.

In 8:19 the story of Sennacherib is referenced. There, the author does not explicate that it refers to a prophet (Isa. 37:36). The mention of the prophets in 15:9 is thus the first in 2 Maccabees. Doran (2012: 219) is right to state that "as the author intends to relate now the vision Judas had of Jeremiah the prophet (15:13-16), he mentions the prophets here." As mentioned before, Judas' reminder of past performances is a topos in pre-battle exhortations (Pritchett, 1994: 102-105).

Interestingly, the author has Judas pointing out the faithlessness (ἄθεσία) of the enemy's forces in 15:10. This, in context, proves their weakness as opposed to the strength of the Jews' hope in their helper.

Since the enemy is faithless, the only thing they trust in is the strength of their weapons. This is again contrasted with the Jews' trust in God as in 8:18; 10:28; 12:14-15, 27-28.

The content of Judas' trustworthy dream (ὄνειρον ἀξιόπιστον) is described in 15:12-16. Judas first sees Onias, the noble high priest from a time of peace. Onias stretches out his hands to pray for the whole community (συστήματι) of Jews. Since the term is used in 8:5 to refer to Judas' military organisation, Schwartz (2008: 501) prefers to translate the term with that meaning. In the context of the author's intention to present a picture where the whole community follows Judas, however, the translation "community" seems fitting. The latter meaning is also used in Josephus (*Ap.* 1.32).

The prophet Jeremiah joins Onias in prayer (15:14) and is described as a kin-loving person (φιλάδελφος). Jeremiah's appearance links this pericope with the attached letter which described the legitimacy of the Temple through tracing back the fire to the days of Jeremiah. Here, Jeremiah's presence thus legitimises the current Temple. Even this prophet is unified with the heroes of the text through the attribute: kin-loving (φιλάδελφος). This unifies him with Rhazis, who was a lover of his fellow citizens (14:37: φιλοπολίτης), Onias who protected his kindred (4:2: ὁμοεθνής), and Judas' men, who acted for the benefit of their kinsmen (12:25: ἀδελφός). Judas will also be described as having goodwill towards his kinsfolk in 15:30.

The author links this scene to the rest of the narrative through the reference of the golden sword which is handed to Judas (15:15-16). The idea of golden armaments was found in 3:25 and 11:8 where the gold represented the divine support. Here, Judas is further legitimised through receiving the sword directly from the prophet Jeremiah, the prophet who was also connected to the origin of the fire in use in the Jerusalem Temple (2:1). Through the phrase θραύσεις τοὺς ὑπεναντίους ("you will break down the enemy") the author links the scene to that of Antiochus IV in 9:11, who had been broken down (τεθραυσμένος) by God himself, thereby ending off that Theomachy. Here the verb is again used in the context of a Theomachy, that between Nikanor and God. The reader already knows the outcome.

The prominence of the Temple in this pericope is further highlighted through 15:17. Judas' men, after being strengthened by his words, are ready to fight for the city, the holy things, and the Temple (τὴν πόλιν καὶ τὰ ἅγια καὶ τὸ ἱερόν). The importance of this cause is underpinned through the statement in 15:18 that the fear over the dedicated Temple was greater than the fear over wives and children, family and kin.

Judas aims to make the souls of (his) young men courageous (ψυχὰς νέων ἐπανδρῶσαι). This goal is accomplished. Thus, the young men are unified with the other heroes. Judas' forces had "bravery" (ἀνδραγαθία) in 14:18 and Rhazis acts "courageously" (ἀνδρωδῶς) in 14:43.

The whole community of Jews is involved in this scene. Those who stay behind are also terrified (οὐ πάρεργος ἀγωνία lit.: "their anguish is not secondary" - whereas the double negative emphasises the emotional intensity) because of the attack in the open air (15:19). This involvement of the community parallels with the response to the threat of Heliodorus in 3:14-21.

The author sketches a powerful scene in 15:20-21. Firstly, the reader is drawn through the description of the crowd who awaits the outcome of the battle. The reader joins the crowd who sees the enemy in their full glory. The formation described here was standard for Hellenistic armies (Bar-Kochva, 1989: 366). The author seems to have exaggerated with the mention of elephants since, as mentioned earlier the elephants were banned by Gnaeus Octavius before Demetrius' arrival. The fact that 1 Macc. 7:39-43 does not mention elephants, further supports this notion. The reader joins the crowd in awaiting the outcome. This scene also creates space to focus all the attention on Judas and his response. Judas sees the same picture, but responds in wisdom. Accordingly, the author fully utilises this opportunity to communicate the final aspect regarding legitimisation of Judas and his followers: The Lord gains the victory for the

worthy. Judas and his followers are worthy and they will be victorious. The idea that the Lord is a worker of wonders is known in Jewish literature (Exod. 15:11; Jer. 32:20), although the term *τερατοποιός* ("wonder-working") is found in the LXX only here (15:21) and in 3 Macc. 6:32.

In 15:22-24 the theme of the few conquering the many is picked up. Here, it is combined with the theme of divine aid. God's angel struck down Sennacherib's army in Isa. 37:36. Sennacherib was also referenced in Judas' prayer in 8:19. The heavenly aid comes from the "Master of the heavens" (*δυνάστα τῶν οὐρανῶν*). The author references Moses' hymn in Exod. 15:16 through Judas' appeal to the Lord to strike down the blasphemers with his arm's might (*μεγέθει βραχίονός σου*). These many references to earlier Jewish literature evoke in the reader a sense of Jewish patriotism.

As usual, the author sacrifices the detail of the actual battle in order to create space for more important themes. The battle itself is described in a summarising fashion in 15:25-29. The author employs a *μὲν ... δὲ* construction to describe a pairing between the physical and emotional action of the Jewish soldiers. This is similar to that of Ps. 149:6 where they have praises of God in their throats and two edged swords in their hands. This forms part of the author's aim throughout 2 Maccabees to bring balance between what the people need to do, and what God in fact does. Here, the fact that the Jews are praying to God in their hearts while they are fighting is the reason for their success. They lay low no fewer than thirty-five thousand enemy soldiers, a number probably exaggerated in the light of Josephus' (*Ant.* 12.411) nine thousand (Bar-Kochva, 1989: 362-363). The Jewish forces recognise that Nikanor has fallen, probably by his armor as commander (Wheeler, 1991: 140-141). They react by praising the Master with a tumultuous shout (*κραυγῆς καὶ παραχῆς*). These terms are usually employed with a negative meaning. Here they are used in a positive manner where the soldiers are celebrating. Schwartz (2008: 508) refers to Exod. 14:30-15:1 and argues that the

phrase (κραυγῆς καὶ ταραχῆς) could be interpreted in a negative sense: the soldiers will first react with fear and only thereafter with joy. Such a loaded interpretation in a context which expresses briefly the joy after a victorious battle, however, seems to be off point for the author. Regarding the unique usage of various terms throughout the narrative, it seems that the author implies the positive meaning of the terms.

The author crowns Judas among the heroes through ascribing a combination of traits (15:30) which individual heroes had already exhibited throughout 2 Maccabees. Judas is described as:

- the chief struggler (πρωταγωνιστής) by body and soul (one of the martyrs had earlier given up body and soul (7:37) and Rhazis had risked body and soul in 14:38);
- acting on behalf of the citizens as was Onias (4:2) and Rhazis (14:37);
- having goodwill toward kinsfolk like the two men at (12:25) and Rhazis in 14:37.

This is contrasted with the polluted (μιαρός), abusive (δυσφήμος) and godless (δυσσεβής) Nikanor. Through these terms Nikanor is unified with other villains in 2 Maccabees (4:19; 5:16; 7:34; 9:13; 13:11).

Judas summons the people (15:31) to witness a clear and manifest sign to all of the Lord's aid (15:35). Doran (2012: 297) notes that the use of the adjective φανερός ("clear") and its adverb are used in 9:8 and 3:28 to indicate God's power and states that "Nikanor had wanted to make manifest (14:39: πρόδηλος) his enmity toward the Jews, but now his head is a clear sign of God's help." The sign is the head of Nikanor hanging from the citadel. Cutting off and taking the head of defeated enemies is frequently found in Jewish literature (Judg. 7:24; 1 Sam. 17:54; 1 Sam 31:9; Jdt. 13:8; 14:1, 11). The author allows for ample space (15:31-35) for this last demonstration of the victory over

evil. The cutting off of Nikanor's tongue serves as just dessert for his blasphemies. The summoning of the people causes the reader also to focus on what happens next. Both the Jews and their enemies (in the citadel - ἄκρα) are summoned (15:31). The term ἄκρα is also employed in 15:35. These are the only two instances in 2 Maccabees, although it is clear that Seleucid forces were stationed in the citadel (4:28; 8:31). Here, those Seleucids are forced to see the trophy of defeat.

As in 10:8, the day of the defeat over Nikanor is inaugurated in 15:36. The opening words of the inauguration are similar to that in 10:8. Just as the words of 10:8 introduced to the reader a new period of success, these words in 15:36 introduce a new period of peace.

The genitive absolute construction in 15:37 (κρατηθείσης τῆς πόλεως - "the city was controlled") is problematic. The city was retaken by Bacchides a few months later. Scholars such as Grimm and Habicht have consequently considered it a lie. Goldstein (1983: 504) views it as referring to the sanctuary and therefore not conflicting. Schwartz (2008: 556-557), however, convincingly argues that the aorist participle (κρατηθείσης) should be interpreted as with the meaning of a simple occurrence, translating the verb (κρατέω) as "to take over." Accordingly the phrase would mean that the city was taken over by the Hebrews, but leaves space for Bacchides' retaking it later on. The fact that the verb κρατέω is used with this sense in 4:10, 27; 5:7; 14:2 further supports this notion.

Harvey (2001: 104-127) has asserted that the term Εβραῖος ("Hebrew") is linked with the fight for Judaism. The term is used in 7:31 in the context of the martyrs who gave breath and life for the sake of Judaism. Here, in 15:37, the author reminds the reader of the sacrifices that were made for the Jewish way of life and not to be misled by the temptations of the Hellenistic lifestyle.

The author humbly expresses his limitations in 15:38. This is similar to Josephus (*War* 7.445) and Aelius Aristidus (§ 109). This is purely a formality and probably false humility, especially in the light of the author's layout of his own superb style in the prologue.

The term εὐτελῶς (“cheaply”) refers to poor style and composition as well as unnecessary detail (Polybius 32.11.6). Walbank (1979: 3.532) translates the term as “trivial.” The author keeps to his aim expressed in 2:30 not to occupy himself with each and every detail.

The author refers to the formalities of drinking wine in order to communicate the aim of the text. The text provides pleasure to the reader and is contrasted with the drinking of unmixed wine, which was considered barbaric in antiquity (Hagenow, 1982: 111-122). The author rounds off the narrative through linking the last verse to terms and phrases employed in the prologue:

- the phrase τὸ τῆς κατασκευῆς τοῦ λόγου (“the construction of the narrative”) is similar to the phrase τῷ παρασκευάζοντι (“to the one who prepares”) in 2:27;
- the adjective ἐπιτερπῆς (“pleasurable”) and the verb τέρπω (“I please”), parallels the use of frequent Hellenistic historiographical terms in the prologue (Doran, 2012: 301);
- the author speaks of the ears of those who encounter the composition (“τὰς ἀκοὰς τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων τῇ συντάξει”) just as he discussed the usefulness to those who encounter/read (2:25: τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν) the work.

In this manner the author demonstrates that the narrative has come full circle and that he has indeed succeeded in all he has planned.

2.3. Proposition and argumentation

The author finalises his process of proving to the reader that Judas and his followers are fully legitimised and that their values and convictions should therefore be adopted by the reader. Judas' role as main hero of 2 Maccabees reaches its peak. He is crowned as the chief struggler for the sake of Judaism and is portrayed as a confident and exemplary leader.

The pericope proves that the God of the Jews, who is in heaven, is also on earth and is victorious in all realms. The author achieves this through the accusation of Nikanor, and the refutation thereof through the outcome of the battle. The author realises the possibility that the reader has doubts that God, who is in heaven, is also active on earth. The dialogue between Nikanor and the Jews therefore relay the possible thoughts of the reader.

Once more, the few conquers the many. The author makes it clear that the reason for the Jews' victory is because of their alliance with God. In this pericope the alliance is asserted through the supernatural occurrence of Judas' dream and the appearance of the Lord. Judas' personal alliance with God is confirmed by the sword as gift from God through Jeremiah and in the presence of Onias. Judas is proven to be accepted by God, the high priest and the prophet and thus has irrefutable authority.

The text focuses on Nikanor's negative attributes in order to intensify the contrast between the two sides. Nikanor exhibits barbaric behaviour through attempting to attack the Jews on the Sabbath. Judas, on the other hand, trusts steadfastly in the Lord's aid and continues his pious leadership. Through this contrast, the author shows more clearly the outcome of the actions and attitude of the heroes as opposed to that of the villains.

The author points out to the reader that the goals of the narrative, set out in the prologue, were achieved and that the Jews were indeed victorious through obedience to the laws and to the God of the heavens.

Lastly, the epilogue reminds the reader that the author intended to provide a colourful presentation of events rather than excessive detail. This in turn convinces the reader that what he/she experienced was pleasurable.

The author's proposition may be outlined as follows:

IF

- the villains, who are barbaric and trust in their armies, are destroyed;
- the heroes, who are pious and trust in the Lord, are victorious;
- Onias reappears;
- Judas is accepted in the presence of Onias, Jeremiah and God;
- the victory over Nikanor is more important than other victories;
- all the Jews agreed that the day needs to be remembered;
- the Jews' obedience caused the critical times to be over and the circumstances return to the *status quo ante*;

THEN

- it is better to be pious and trust in the Lord than to be barbaric and trust in your own strength
- Judas is irrefutable and should be followed as an ultimate example
- the day of the victory over Nikanor should be celebrated
- the reader should also be obedient to God and the laws in order to enjoy circumstances similar to the narrative's *status quo ante*.

3. Pragmatic analysis

3.1. Communicative strategy

The author saved the scene with the most emotional potential for last. Explicit and detailed reference is given to Nikanor's blasphemy. The reader is shocked and his/her anger is provoked. Yet, by now the narrative has asserted that such behaviour will not go unpunished. Consequently the reader's shock and anger is accompanied by the anticipation of Nikanor's well-deserved punishment. The outcome of this theomachy is certain: God will be revealed as ultimate victor.

The horrendous plan of Nikanor to attack the Jews on the Sabbath further incites the reader. The author cleverly utilises the dialogue between Nikanor and the Jews around him to involve the reader. The words of the Jewish group reflect the possible reaction of the reader to Nikanor's suggestions.

Throughout the narrative, the author established disparity between the nobleness of the heroes and the wickedness of the villains. This encouraged the reader to sympathise with the heroes, as they are the true victims of meaningless violence and hatred. Here, the evil of Nikanor's character is over-emphasised and the reader is moved to total sympathy and support of the innocent and pious group of Jews who fight for Judas.

Through full emotional investment in the events of this pericope, the reader supports the group of Jews represented by Judas and his followers and accordingly approves all they stood for in the duration of the narrative.

3.2. Real- and alternative text-world

Throughout the narrative, the author has recognised the possibility that the reader might doubt in the goodness of God and his ability to protect his people due to the horror of the events described. This was accompanied by the recognition of the possibility that the reader may doubt whether it is good to obey God and his laws. The reader may also

doubt whether this narrative was accurate enough and therefore whether the ideas communicated may be adopted.

Through this pericope, the author suggests an overview of an alternative world where the God of the heavens is omnipresent, omnipotent, and provides his full support in the times of his mercy. Secondly, the reader is informed of an alternative world where these powerful attributes work for the benefit of those who have God as their ally. These are the ones who are completely obedient to God and his laws. Lastly, the author assures the reader of the quality of the narrative and therefore the quality of the ideas communicated through it.

3.3. Trans-universal relations

By means of an emotional appeal, which relates the punishments or rewards of certain actions, the reader is moved towards trusting completely in the governance and might of the God of the Jews and the attitude of unquestionable devotion to the God of the heavens and his laws.

By means of a contract of trust between the reader and the author, the reader is moved to total confidence in the quality of the narrative and the ideas communicated throughout the text.

CHAPTER 18: CONCLUSION

1. Introduction

A rhetorical analysis as specific approach to the text of 2 Maccabees has proven to be highly effective. Since no study has been done as of yet with a focus on the communicative strategy of the author of 2 Maccabees, this study has yielded promising results in regards to the ideas the author communicated and the manner in which he aimed to move the reader to adopt these ideas. The results of the study may be divided into four main categories:

- The main ideas the author aimed to communicate
- The strategies the author applied to move the reader to adopt these ideas
- The elements which form each of these strategies
- The possible impact of each of these elements on the reader

The findings within each of these categories will now be discussed briefly. Thereafter, a table will be provided which serves as a summarisation of the study.

2. Main ideas communicated through the text

The study has confirmed the communication of various important ideas in the text of 2 Maccabees. Although the identification of most of these ideas in itself is not a new contribution to the field, the process of identification is essential in determining the communicative strategy of the author. To study the strategy of the author to move the reader to adopt certain ideas, the ideas have to be clarified first. The following main ideas were identified:

- The sanctity of the Temple is vital to the health of Judaism
- The piety of the high priest is vital to the health of Judaism
- The celebration of Hanukkah and the Day of Nikanor is important for all Jews

- Obedience to the Lord and his laws keeps the Lord's mercy over his people
- Jews may live in a Hellenistic world, but without conforming to its standards
- God allows bad things to happen in times of his wrath
- God drives the success of his people in times of his mercy
- God is in control of history
- The God of the Jews is stronger than any ruler
- There is a resurrection unto eternal life which entails the creation of a new body
- The state of the Temple reflects the state of God's relationship with his people
- The Jews are not rebellious in nature
- The Jews are able to live in peace with other nations as long as they are able to uphold their laws, customs and constitution
- It is right for people to pray and bring a sacrifice for the sins of the deceased
- The laws, Temple, city, fatherland and constitution are invaluable

The author chose to provide a description of a specific period in the history of the Jews to elaborate on and incorporate these abovementioned ideas. Through this, a main theme becomes evident: An alliance with the God of the Jews is stronger and more beneficial than an alliance with any other force. This, in turn, explains the prominent place given to Judas as the leader of the alliance with God. His personal alliance with the Lord signifies that of the larger group of heroes of 2 Maccabees.

3. Strategies applied, the elements which form each strategy, and the possible outcome of each element

After identifying the ideas and main theme of the narrative, it is now possible to discuss the strategies applied by the author to aim at persuading the reader to adopt them. The study discovered the following strategies:

- Strategy 1: Maintaining the reader's interest
- Strategy 2: Presenting a specific group as ultimate example
- Strategy 3: Presenting certain ideas as author to the reader directly
- Strategy 4: Using threat and response to demonstrate the importance of certain concepts

These strategies, the elements they consist of, and their possible impact on the reader will now be discussed.

3.1. Strategy 1: Maintaining the reader's attention

Throughout the narrative, the author employs different techniques to encourage the reader to continue reading the narrative. The aim to keep the reader's interest becomes clear through the author's description of the narrative in his prologue. He explains that the narrative is not exhaustively detailed, but colourful and easy to read and memorise. The intention of keeping the reader's interest and attention is also communicated implicitly through the following techniques:

- Alternating between situations which cause suspense and those which bring relief
- Describing himself as an able Hellenistic historian
- Sketching the *status quo ante* at the offset of the narrative

These techniques and their possible impact are elaborated below.

3.1.1. Describing the benefits of reading the narrative

In his prologue, the author informs the reader that the narrative will be useful, since the subject is noble and since the author has worked hard to produce the document.

3.1.1.1. Possible impact on the reader

The possible impact of this technique on the reader is that the reader will be convinced of the quality and significance of the document and proceed in reading through the narrative.

3.1.2. Suspense and relief

The narrative constantly shifts between suspense and relief. This shift is prominent in 2 Maccabees 3 where the reader anticipates the desecration of the Temple, but experiences relief after Heliodorus is punished. Later in the narrative (5:6-9; 9:1-10:18; 12:1-2) the alternation between suspense and relief is more frequent and with shorter intervals.

3.1.2.1. Possible impact on the reader

Through this pattern of suspense and relief the attention and anticipation of the reader is maintained. The fact that this pattern is repeated throughout the narrative warns the reader that at any moment, the relief may be interrupted by suspense or vice versa. Through inciting the curiosity of the reader, he/she is encouraged to continue reading the narrative and explore the dynamics of the plot.

3.1.3. Presenting his strengths as an author

The author presents himself through style and content as a proper Hellenistic historian. This is evident through (1) his use of terms that are frequently found in discussions by Hellenistic historians and (2) the purpose for the narrative which he provides in the prologue. The author is one who serves the reader as he clearly states that the work will

benefit all types of readers. The author also demonstrates his abilities through rare verbs and stylistic devices such as chiasm, asyndeton, litotes and euphemism. Furthermore, he incorporates well-known themes in ancient Greek literature into the narrative such as the protection of the temple by the deity and appropriate retribution.

3.1.3.1. Possible impact on the reader

The implication of this technique is that the reader gains trust in the author's ability to construct a document which is of high standard. This, in turn, encourages the reader to continue reading since the content would be significant, authoritative and useful. If the author may indeed be valued amongst popular contemporary authors, the reader may be assured that he/she is reading a text of which the style has been approved by society.

3.1.4. Describing the *status quo ante*

As discussed in the study, the author describes an ideal scenario of peace and order at the offset of the narrative. The situation soon changes and only returns to peace at the end of the text. The text does, however, hint at the possibility of change at various stages in the narrative. The scene of the escape of Judas and his followers from Jerusalem and the scene of the purification of the Temple are amongst these hints of hope.

3.1.4.1. Possible impact on the reader

This causes the reader to proceed in reading the narrative with anticipation of the return of the *status quo ante*. The hints of hope encourage the reader to continue unto the very end of the narrative where Onias resurfaces, the Jews are in control of the sanctified Temple, and all is resolved.

3.2. Strategy 2: Presenting a specific group as ultimate example

The most prominent strategy of the author of 2 Maccabees is to create the sense of a unified group of ideal people who may serve as ultimate examples. Such a group enables the author to employ them as ambassadors for a specific cause such as Judaism.

3.2.1. Unifying the heroes and villains respectively

The first element of this strategy is the technique of unifying the group of exemplary people/heroes on the one hand, and to unify an alternative group of antagonists/villains on the other hand. As discussed in the study, the author achieves this by means of ascribing certain attributes to the heroes and certain alternative attributes to the villains which provide a linkage between the different characters within the respective groups.

3.2.1.1. Possible impact on the reader

This technique simplifies the process of accepting or rejecting the actions and ideas of different characters. The reader can more easily focus on a unified group. Moreover, the technique enables the reader to predetermine the nature of a character prior to any actions of that character. Through specific attributes, the reader knows beforehand whether the character might act as a hero or as a villain. Consequently, the reader may either trust the character blindly, or suspect atrocious behaviour. This involves the reader and drives his/her anticipation.

3.2.2. Idealising the heroes and discrediting the villains

As the two groups have been identified and unified respectively, the author now moves on to ascribe a positive value to the heroes and a negative value to the villains. The negative actions of the heroes are disregarded and downplayed and the positive actions

are underlined. In contrast, the negative actions of the villains are overemphasised and the positive actions are ignored. The author idealises the heroes through the following aspects. The heroes are described as:

- extremely pious,
- noble,
- just,
- brave,
- selfless,
- and pleasant

Secondly, the heroes are fully legitimised through their association with the high priest Onias, the prophet Jeremiah and the God of the heavens. The author especially focuses on the alliance between the heroes and God. Judas plays a prominent role in establishing this partnership. The Lord personally ensures the success of Judas on the battlefield and protects him through divine support.

Throughout the text, the alliance between God and his people is asserted by means of supernatural appearances. These occurrences provide proof that God is showing mercy to the heroes, subsequently presenting them as completely justified. If God directly supports his people in battle, he also agrees with all there doing.

3.2.2.1. Possible impact on the reader

Through the legitimisation of the heroes and the focus on their positive attributes, the reader is moved to complete trust in the character of each hero. Since the heroes are fully legitimised, they cannot do anything wrong. This readies the reader for supporting their actions and adopting their ideas.

3.2.3. Highlighting the reward of the heroes and punishment of the villains

A rhetorical device that is essential to the author's strategy of moving the reader to adopt the ideas of the text is the employment of emotional appeals. These appeals work through punishment and reward. The heroes are rewarded for their loyalty towards God and his laws. The villains are punished for their ungodly deeds by means of appropriate retribution. The fact that these punishments are appropriated to the transgressions of the villains implies that God is directly dealing with the ungodly and is therefore in control.

In terms of the reward of the heroes, the martyrs of 2 Maccabees play a vital role. Since they disregarded their bodies and lives for the sake of Judaism, they will receive back all they've lost for the cause. They will be resurrected unto eternal life and receive new bodies. The persecutors, on the other hand, will be defeated in the present and receive eternal tormenting together with their descendants in the future.

3.2.3.1. Possible impact on the reader

Through punishment and reward, the reader is driven away from the actions and ideas of the villains and towards supporting the attitude of the heroes. The reader is comforted through the fact that God is in control and will not allow the enemy to go unpunished. Through the expression of rewards, the reader is reassured that the horrifying results of persecution and war are not without cause. The overall effect of these emotional appeals is the strengthening of the desirability of supporting the group of heroes. Their rewards enforce their function as ultimate examples.

3.2.4. Communicating the ideas and actions of the heroes

The final element of creating a desired group of ultimate examples is to communicate their cause. The reader has to be informed of that which needs to be adopted and imitated. This compliments the fact that the heroes are already unified, idealised, and presented as a group who is constantly rewarded. The author now utilises the ideal position of the group of heroes to incorporate a certain ideology. The ideology is communicated through what the heroes say and do. As explored in the study, the speeches of the heroes, especially that of the martyrs, serve as vehicle for the ideas of the author. The actions of the heroes serve as further support for these principles. The doctrines of resurrection, eternal life, punishment after death, and prayer for the deceased are among the ideas communicated through the ideal status of the heroes.

Another facet of highlighting the ideas and actions is the radical behaviour of the heroes. They are willing to sacrifice their lives for the following causes:

- the laws,
- the temple,
- the city,
- the fatherland,
- the constitution,
- and Judaism

3.2.4.1. Possible impact on the reader

Through communicating the ideas and actions of this desired group of heroes, the reader is encouraged to adopt these ideas and actions. The heroes become spokespersons for the author's aimed theme since they are already idealised and legitimised.

3.3. Strategy 3: Presenting certain ideas as author directly to the reader

As support for the ideas already incorporated through the characters of the text, the author speaks to the reader in a direct manner. In these sections, the author provides vital information on the significance and meaning of events within the text. The following sections represent the authors' direct communication with the reader:

- 2:22: the text will, at some point, describe the favourable actions of God towards his people
- 5:17-20: Antiochus IV Epiphanes (or any earthly ruler) is not in control of Jerusalem's destiny. The Lord is in control of Jerusalem's destiny.
- 5:19: the state of the Temple is only a symptom of the ill fortune of the Jews and will be purified again when their relationship with their God is restored
- 6:12-16: the horrid circumstances that are described should be seen as a sign of beneficence and God's training of his people because He deals with them immediately
- 9:18: Antiochus IV Epiphanes cannot do anything to escape his horrible fate
- 15:5: Nikanor will not be victorious

In this manner, the reader is motivated to proceed in reading the narrative through understanding the significance of events. In other words, if there is a greater cause behind the tragedies which befall the Jews, and if this greater cause will be demonstrated, then it is favourable to continue reading. Moreover, the reader is encouraged to adopt certain themes because of the contract of trust that was already established between the author and the reader through the prologue. Since the author is an able Hellenistic historian, hard and detailed worker, and careful planner and since the subject of the author is noble, the reader may easily adopt the ideas communicated directly by the author.

3.4. Strategy 4: Using threat and response to demonstrate the importance of certain concepts

As discussed in the study, the author highly exaggerates the events in 3:1-39. Two major elements were identified: (1) a major threat and (2) a dramatic response. The whole community is involved. The threat is that the Temple may be defiled and the response is that every man, woman and child is horrified and appeals to God. The author utilises this technique right at the start of the narrative in order to guide the reader in evaluating the circumstances throughout the text.

The possible impact on the reader is that he/she is also moved in reacting dramatically to this threat. This, in turn, causes the reader to place an extremely high value on the sanctity of the Temple and thus to experience emotions such as suspense, shock, anguish, relief and joy through the course of the narrative as this same Temple is desecrated, taken back, and purified once more. Since the state of the Temple is intertwined in the narrative plan, this strategy involves the reader in every section of the narrative.

4. Summary of the results of the study

Table 2: Summary of the main ideas, strategies and their elements, and the possible impact on the reader

MAIN IDEAS	STRATEGIES	ELEMENTS WHICH FORM EACH STRATEGY	POSSIBLE IMPACT ON THE READER
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The sanctity of the Temple is vital to the health of Judaism - The piety of the high priest is vital to the health of Judaism - The celebration of Hanukkah and the Day of Nikanor is important for all Jews - Obedience to the Lord and his laws keeps the Lord's mercy over his people - Jews may live in a Hellenistic world, but without conforming to its standards - God allows bad things to happen in times of his wrath 	<p>STRATEGY 1: Keeping the reader's interest</p>	<p>ELEMENT 1: Describing the benefits of reading the narrative</p>	<p>The reader reads on since the content and process of working through the narrative will prove to be useful</p>
		<p>ELEMENT 2: Suspense and relief</p>	<p>The reader reads on because of his/her interest in unknown events</p>
		<p>ELEMENT 3: Presenting himself as an able Hellenistic historian</p>	<p>The reader reads on since others already approved the particular style of this text, thus making the text authoritative.</p>

<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - God drives the success of his people in times of his mercy - God is in control of history 		<p>ELEMENT 4: Describing the <i>status quo ante</i></p>	<p>The reader reads on in anticipation of the return of the <i>status quo ante</i></p>
<ul style="list-style-type: none"> - The God of the Jews is stronger than any ruler - There is a resurrection unto eternal life which entails the creation of a new body - The state of the Temple reflects the state of God's relationship with his people - the Jews are not rebellious in nature - the Jews are able to live in peace with other nations as long as they are able to uphold their laws and customs - it is right for people to pray and bring a sacrifice for the sins of the deceased - the laws, Temple, city, fatherland and constitution are 	<p>STRATEGY 2: Presenting a specific group as ultimate example</p>	<p>ELEMENT 1: Unifying the heroes and villains respectively</p>	<p>The reader's choice to support either the heroes or the villains is simplified</p>
		<p>ELEMENT 2: Idealising the heroes and discrediting the villains</p>	<p>The reader supports the heroes since they cannot do wrong</p>
		<p>ELEMENT 3: Highlighting the reward of the heroes and the punishment of the villains</p>	<p>The reader supports the heroes since they have a favoured position</p>
		<p>ELEMENT 4: Communicating the ideas and actions of the heroes</p>	<p>The author adopts the ideas and actions of the heroes because of their legitimacy</p>

invaluable - Jews will maintain peace in the kingdom if they are allowed to practice their laws and uphold their constitution	STRATEGY 3: Presenting certain ideas as author to the reader directly		The reader adopts these ideas and is encouraged because of the author's authority
	STRATEGY 4: Using threat and response to demonstrate the importance of certain concepts		The reader places a high value on certain concepts since the heroes do the same

BIBLIOGRAPHY

Classical literature

Aelius Aristides

To Rome

109 p. 241

Aeschylus

Choephoroi

349 p. 100

Persae

744-751 p. 131

820 p. 131

Antiphon

6.4 p. 203

Appian

Mithridatia

12.67 p. 184

12.278 p. 184

Syriaca

45 p. 63

46 p. 201

66 p. 201

Bella civilian

2.120 p. 186

Hispanica

6.75 p. 186

Aristotle

Politica

1285b p. 153

1322b p. 98

1328b p. 98

Arrian

Anabasis

7.3.5 p. 104

Callisthenes

3.32-33 p. 103

Cicero

In Verrem

2.5.58 no 150 p. 72 n. 47

Demosthenes

De Corona

305 p. 173

Dio Chrysostom

1.28 p. 224

Diodorus Siculus

17.107.5 p. 104

17.20-22 p. 129

16.50 p. 167

20.41.5 p. 173

1.76.1 p. 189

20.8.1 p. 189

13.61.6 p. 192

13.75.4 p. 192

17.68.4 p. 192

16.41.1 p. 214

Dionysius of Halicarnassus

Antiquitates Romanae

11.25.4 p. 189

Herodotus

Histories

1.4 p. 36

8.37 p. 36

4.46-73 p. 72 n. 47

7.22-24 p. 86, 131

7.33-36 p. 86, 131

7.37 p. 131

4.205 p. 131

2.100 p. 201

Homer

Iliad

9.410-416 p. 100

Justin

16.2 p. 131

Lactantius

De mortibus persecutorum

23.8-9 p. 182

Livy

41.19-20 p. 85

42.6.7 p. 118

38.21.8 p. 188

Lucian

Quomodo historia conscribenda sit

p. 44

53-54 p. 37 n. 29

Alexander

59-60 p. 131

Lycurgus

142 p. 203

Papyri

P. Rylands

113.35 p. 192

Pausanias

2.24.2 p. 88

5.12.4 p. 88

9.7.2-3 p. 131

Plato

Phaedrus

261A p. 41

Protagoras

326D p. 43

Leges

10.909-910 p. 98

Pliny

Naturalis historia

5.78 p. 214

Plutarch

Regum et imperatorum apophthegmata

176a p. 204

Life of Flaminus

13.8 p. 224

Polybius

31.9.1 p. 27

31.13.3 p. 66

5.86.10 p. 66

9.34.11 p. 72 n. 47

30.25.13 p. 82

26.10 p. 85

31.3-4 p. 85

26.1.11 p. 88

1.35.10 p. 99

4.21.10-12 p. 99

4.33.11 p. 99

9.20.10 p. 99

9.37.1 p. 99

1.81.11 p. 116

3.53.6 p. 116

8.26.8 p. 116

21.42.19 p. 117

18.44.2	p. 153
1.8.4	p. 153, 154
3.70.7	p. 153, 154
10.23.3	p. 159
12.18.3	p. 159
3.81.2	p. 169
3.98.7	p. 172
3.1.6	p. 174
11.33.4	p. 188
4.20.5	p. 189
15.17.2	p. 189
33.18.11	p. 189
1.15.4	p. 203
1.87.7	p. 203
5.82.1	p. 203
5.25.3	p. 204
5.26.9	p. 204
31.12	p. 214
31.11-15	p. 215
31.14.4	p. 217
5.74.9	p. 224

11.10.2 p. 224

11.10.5 p. 224

21.29.12 p. 224

32.11.6 p. 241

Sophocles Ajax

465 p. 100

Strabo

Geographie

16.2.37 p. 65

17.1.24 p. 168

17.1.41 p. 168

16.2.28 p. 184

16.2.51 p. 214

Thucydides

1.9 p. 153

1.138.6 p. 202

Xenophon

Anabasis

1.8.17 p. 121

6.5.26 p. 121

Cyropaedia

3.3.58 p. 121

1.4.27 p. 167

2.2.31 p. 167

Hiero

10.5 p. 117

Memorabilia

2.2.3-4 p. 107

Modern literature

Abel, F. -M. 1949. *Les livres des Maccabées* (EB; Paris: Gabalda).

Amit, Y. 1987. "The Dual Causality Principle and Its Effects on Biblical Literature," VT 37. pp. 385-400.

Arendt, W. F. & F. W. Gingrich, 1957. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature: A Translation and Adaptation of Walter Bauer's Griechisch-Deutsches*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.

Avigad, N. 1993. "Jerusalem: The Second Temple Period," in Ephraim Stern, ed., *The New Encyclopedia of Archaeological Excavations in the Holy Land* (4 vols.; Jerusalem: The Israel Exploration Society and Carta) 2.217-25.

Avi-Yonah, M. 2002. *The Holy Land, from the Persian to the Arab Conquests, 536 B.C. to A.D. 640: A Historical Geography* (rev. ed.; Jerusalem: Carta).

- Bar-Kochva, B. 1976. *The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).
- Bar-Kochva, B. 1989. *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle against the Seleucids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Bar-Kochva, B. 1993. "Judaism and Hellenism – Between Scholarship and Journalism," *Tarbiz* 63. 451-480.
- Bévenot, H. 1931. *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher* (HSAT IV/4; Bonn: Hanstein).
- Bertram, G. 1967. "ἐμπαίζω," *TDNT* 5. 630-636.
- Bertram, G. 1972. "ὑψιστος," *TDNT* 8. 614-20.
- Bickerman, E. J. "Makkabäerbücher (I. und II.)," *PW* 14:779-97.
- Bickerman, E. J. 1927. "Beiträge zur antiken Urkundengeschichte, I: Der Heimatsvermerk und die staatsrechtliche Stellung der Hellenen im ptolemäischen Ägypten," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 8. pp. 216-239.
- Bickerman, E. J. 1933. "Ein jüdischer Festbrief vom Jahre 124 v. Chr. (II Macc. 1: 1-9)," *ZNW* 32. pp. 233-53.
- Bickerman, E. J. 1937. *Der Gott der Makkabäer: Untersuchungen über Sinn und Ursprung der makkabäischen Erhebung*. Berlin: Schocken Verlag/Jüdischer Buchverlag.
- Bickerman, E. J. 1938. *Institutions des Séleucides*. Bibliothèque archéologique et historique 26; Paris: Geuthner.

Bickerman, E. J. 1976-86. *Studies in Jewish and Christian History*. 3 vols; AGJU 9; Leiden: Brill.

Bickerman, E. J. 1979. *The God of the Maccabees: Studies in the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt*. SJLA 32; Leiden: Brill.

Bieler, L. 1976. *Das Bild des "göttlichen Menschen" in Spätantike und Frühchristentum*. (Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft).

Bringmann, K. 1983. *Hellenistische Reform und Religionsverfolgung in Judäa: Eine Untersuchung zur jüdisch-hellenistischen Geschichte (175-163 v. Chr.)* (Abhandlungen der Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philologisch-historische Klasse, 3. Folge, 132; Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 1983).

Bringmann, K. 2000. *Schenkungen hellenistischer Herrscher an griechische Städte und Heiligtümer, part 2: Historische und archäologische Auswertung, vol 1: Geben und Nehmen. Monarchische Wohltätigkeit und Selbstdarstellung im Zeitalter des Hellenismus* (Berlin: Akademie).

Broshi, M. & Eshel, E. 1997. "The Greek King Is Antiochus IV (\$QHistorical Text = 4Q248)," *JJS* 48. pp120-29.

Bunge, J. G. 1971. *Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch: Quellenkritische, literarische, chronologische und historische Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch als Quelle syrisch-palästinensischer Geschichte im 2. Jh.v.Chr.* (Bonn: Rheinische Friedrich-Wilhelms-Universität).

Burkert, W. 1985. *Greek Religion*. trans. John Raffan; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press.

Cigoi, A. 1868. *Historisch-chronologische Schwierigkeiten im zweiten Makkabäerbuche* (Klagenfurt: Leon).

Coetzer, E. "A Rhetorical Analysis of Allusions to Heaven in 2 Maccabees," unpublished.

Cohen, S. J. D. 1999. *The Beginnings of Jewishness: Boundaries, Varietys, Uncertainties* (HCS 31; Berkeley: Univ. of California).

Copan, P. 1996. "Is Creatio Ex Nihilo a Post-Biblical Invention? An Examination of Gerhard May's Proposal," *Trinity Journal* n.s. 17. pp. 75-93.

Cross, F. M. 1966. "The Divine Warrior in Israel's early cult," in Alexander Altman, ed., *Biblical Motifs: Origins and Transformations* (Philip Lown Institute of Advanced Judaic Studies, Brandeis University, Studies and Texts 3; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press) pp. 11-30.

Daniel, S. 1966. *Reserches sur le vocabulaire du culte dans le Septante*. (Paris: Klincksieck).

Davies, P. R. 1977. "Hasidim in the Maccabean period," *JJS* 28. pp. 127-140.

Dempsey, D. 1990. "The 'Epistolary Perfect' in Aramaic Letters," *BN* 54. pp. 7-11.

Doran, R. 1981. *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of 2 Maccabees*. CBQMS 12; Washington D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association.

Doran, R. 1990. "Jason's Gymnasion," in Harold W Attridge, John J. Collins, Thomas H. Tobin, eds., *Of Scribes and Scrolls: Studies on the Hebrew Bible, Intertestamental*

Judaism, and Christian Origins Presented to John Strugnell on the Occasion of His Sixtieth Birthday (College Theology Society Resources in Religion 5; Lanham, Md.: University Press of America) 99-109.

Doran, R. 2012. *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary*. Minneapolis: Fortress Press.

Downey, G. 1961. *A History of Antioch in Syria*. Princeton, N.J.: University Press.

Dümmler, F. "Athena," PW 2.1941-2020.

Ekroth, G. 2002. *The Sacrificial Rituals of Greek Hero-cults in the Archaic to the Early Hellenistic Periods*. Kernos Supplément 12; Liège: Centre international d'étude de la religion grecque antique.

Enermalm-Ogawa, A. 1987. *Un langage de prière juif en grec: Le témoignage des deux premiers livres des Maccabées* (Stockholm: Almqvist and Wiksell).

Exler, F. X. J. 1923. *The Form of the Ancient Greek Letter of the Epistolary Papyri (3rd c.B.C. - 3rd c.A.D.): A Study in Greek Epistolography* (Washington D.C.: Catholic University of America Press).

Gafni, I. M. 1989. "Josephus and I Maccabees," *Josephus, the Bible, and History* (ed. L. H. Feldman and G. Hata; Leiden: Brill) pp. 116-131.

Gera, D. 1990. "On the Credibility of the History of the Tobiads (Josephus, *Antiquities* 12, 156-222, 228-236)," in A. Kasher, U. Rappaport and G. Fuks, eds., *Greece and Rome in Eretz Israel: Collected Essays* (Jerusalem: Yad Ben-Zvi, 1990) 29-30.

Gera, D. 1998. *Judaea and Mediterranean Politics 219 to 161 B.C.E.* (Jewish Studies 8; Leiden: Brill).

- Gera, D. 2009. "Olympiodoros, Heliodoros and the Temples of Koilê Syria and Phoinikê," *ZPE* 169. pp. 125-55.
- Ginzberg, L. 1925. *Legends of the Jews* (trans. Henrietta Szold; 7 vols.; Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society).
- Goldstein, J. A. 1983. *II Maccabees*. AB 41A (Garden City, New York: Doubleday).
- Goldstein, J. A. 1984. "The Origins of the Doctrine of Creation Ex Nihilo," *JJS* 35. pp. 127-135.
- Goodman, M. & Holladay, A. J. 1986. "Religious Scruples in Ancient Warfare," *Classical Quarterly* 36. pp. 151-171.
- Grainger, J. D. 1997. *A Seleukid Prosopography and Gazetteer* (Mnemosyne Supplement 172; Leiden: Brill).
- Grimm, C. L. W. 1853. *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer*. (Leipzig: Hirzel).
- Grimm, C. L. W. 1857. *Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Mäkkabäer* (Leipzig: Hirzel).
- Gruen, E. S. 1984. *The Hellenistic World and the Coming of Rome* (2 vols.; Berkeley: University of California Press).
- Gruen, E.S. 1996. "The Purported Jewish-Spartan Affiliation," *Transitions to Empire: Essays in Greco- Roman History, 360-146 BC.*, in Honor of E. Badian (ed. R.W. Wallace and E.M. Harris; Norman: Univ. of Oklahoma) 254-269.
- Gruen, E. S. 1998. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. (Hellenistic Culture and Society 30; Berkeley: University of California Press).

Habicht, C. 1976. *2. Makkabäerbuch*. JSHRZ I, 3: (Gütersloh: Mohn).

Habicht, C. 1976. "Royal Documents in Maccabees II," HSCP 80. pp. 1-18.

Hagenow, G. 1982. *Aus dem Weingarten der Antike* (Mainz: von Zabern). pp. 111-122.

Hanhart, R. 1961. *Zum Text des 2. und 3. Makkabäerbuches: Probleme der Ueberlieferung, der Auslegung und der Ausgabe, Nachrichten von der Akademie der Wissenschaften in Göttingen; Philologisch-Historische Klasse* (Göttingen) pp. 427-487.

Harris, W. V. 1989. *Ancient Literacy* (Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press) 30-33.

Van Henten, Jan-Willem. 1997. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees* (ed. J. Collins). Leiden, New York, Köln: Brill.

Van Henten, Jan Willem. 1999. "The Ancestral Language of the Jews in 2 Maccabees," *Hebrew Study from Ezra to Ben-Yehuda* (ed. W. Horbury; Edinburgh: Clark) pp. 53-68.

Houghton, A. 1984. "The Seleucid Mint of Mallus and the Cult Figure of Athena Magarsia," in Leo Mildenberg and Arthur Houghton eds., *Festschrift für Leo Mildenberg: Numismatik, Kunstgeschichte, Archäologie-Studies in Honor of Leo Mildenberg: Numismatics, Art History, Archeology* (Weteren: Editions NR). pp. 97-102.

Ilan, T. 2002. *Lexicon of Jewish Names in Late Antiquity, I* (TSAJ 91; Tübingen: Mohr [Siebeck]).

Isaac, B. 1991. "A Seleucid Inscription from Jamnia-on-the-Sea: Antiochus V Eupator and the Sidonians," *IEJ* 41. pp. 132-144.

Jonnes, L. & Rici, M. 1997. "A New Royal Inscription from Phrygia Paroreios: Eumenes II Grants Tyraion the Status of a Polis." *Epigraphica Anatolica* 29. 1-30.

Johnson, J. de M., V. Martin & A. S. Hunt (eds.). 1915. *Catalogue of the Greek Papyri in the John Rylands Library, Manchester, II* (Manchester: Manchester Univ., & London: Longmans Green).

Katz, P. 1960. "The Text of 2 Maccabees Reconsidered," *ZNW* 51. pp. 10-30.

Katz, P. 1961. "Eleazar's Martyrdom in 2 Maccabees: The Latin Evidence for a Point of the Story." *Studia Patristica* 4 (TU 79; Berlin: Akademie) pp. 118-124.

Kellermann, U. 1979. *Auferstanden in den Himmel: 2 Makkabäer 7 und die Auferstehung der Märtyrer*. SBS 95; Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Kennell, N. M. 2005. "New Light on 2 Maccabees 4:7-15," *JJS* 56. 10-15.

Kilpatrick, G. D. 1963. Review of Hanhart, *2 Maccabees*; and Hanhart, *Text*, in *Göttingische gelehrte Anzeigen* 215. pp10-27.

Kolbe, W. 1926. *Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte: Kritische Untersuchungen zur Seleukidenliste un zu den beiden ersten Makkabäerbüchern* (Stuttgart: Kohlhammer).

Lammert, F. 1948. "Tropaion," (*PW* series 2) 7.663-673.

Lenger, M. 1964. *Corpus des Ordonnances des Ptolémées (C.Ord.Ptol.)* (1964; reprinted Brussels: Palais des académies).

Lévy, I. 1965. *Recherches esséniennes et pythagoriciennes* (Haute études du monde gréco-romain 1; Geneva: Droz).

Liddell, H.G. & Scott, R. (compilers). 1992. *A Greek English Lexicon* (Oxford: Clarendon. (repr. of rev. 9th ed. by H. S. Jones et al.).

Ma, J. 1999. *Antiochus III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor* (Oxford: Oxford University Press).

Mason, S. 2007. "Jews, Judaeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History," *JSJ* 38. 457-512.

Marrou, H. -I 1956. *A History of Education in Antiquity* (New York: Sheed & Ward).

Mauersberger, 1956. *Polibios-Lexikon*. Berlin: Akad. – Verlag.

May, G. 1978. *Schöpfung aus dem Nichts: Die Entstehung der Lehre von der creation ex nihilo*. Arbeiten zur Kirchengeschichte 48; Berlin: de Gruyter.

Mayser, E. 1970. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri, I-II*. (Berlin: de Gruyter).

Mcdonald, 1967. "The Peace of Apamea (186 BCE)," *JRS* 57. pp. 1-8.

Meyer, E. 1952. *Ursprung und Anfänge des Christentums* (2vols.; Stuttgart: J. G. Cotta).

Miller, P. D. 1973. *The Divine Warrior in Early Israel* (HSM 5; Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).

Mittag, P. F. 2006. *Antiochus IV Epiphanes: Eine politische Biographie* (Berlin: Akademie).

Mørkholm, 1964. "The Accession of Antiochus IV of Syria: A Numismatic Comment." *The American Numismatic Society Museum Notes* 11. 63-76.

Mørkholm, 1966. *Antiochus IV of Syria* (Classica et mediaevalia, dissertationes 8; Copenhagen: Gyldendal, 1966).

Mott, S. C. 1978. "Greek Ethics and Christian Conversion: The Philonic Background of Titus II 10-14 and III 3-7," *NovT* 20 23-26.

Muraoka, T. 2009. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. (Leuven: Peeters).

Nelis, J. T. 1983. "La distance de Beth-Sur à Jérusalem suivant 2 Mac. 11,5," *JSJ* 14. pp. 39-42.

Nicklas, T. 2002. "Der Historiker als Erzähler: Zur Zeichnung des Seleukidenkönigs Antiochus in 2 Makk. IX," *VT* 52 (2002) 80-92.

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

Niehr, H. 1990. *Der Höchste Gott: Alttestamentlicher JHWH-Glaube im Kontext syrisch-kanaanäischer Religion des 1. Jahrtausends v. Chr.* (BZAW 190; Berlin: De Gruyter).

Noy, D. 1993. *Jewish Inscriptions of Western Europe* (2 vols.; Cambridge: Cambridge University Press).

Parker, R. A. and Dubberstein, W. H. 1956. *Babylonian Chronology 626 B.C. – A.D. 75* (Brown University Studies 19; Providence, R.I.: Brown University Press).

Parker, R. 1983. *Miasma* (Oxford: Clarendon).

Pax, E. 1950. "Epiphanie," in Theodor Klauser, ed., *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt* (23 vols.; Stuttgart: Hiersemann) 5.832-909.

Porter, S. E. 1994. *καταλλάσσω in Ancient Greek Literature, with Reference to the Pauline Writings* (Estudios de filología Neotestamentaria 5; Cordoba: El Almendro de Cordoba).

Pritchett, W. K. 1971-1991. *The Greek State at War, I-V* (Berkeley: University of California Press).

Pritchett, W. K. 1994. "The General's Exhortations in Greek Warfare," in idem, *Essays in Greek History* (Amsterdam: Gieben) pp. 102-105.

Rajak, T. 1997. "Dying for the Law: The Martyr's Portrait in Jewish-Greek Literature," in M. J. Edwards and Simon Swain, eds., *Portraits: Biographical Representation in the Greek and Latin Literature of the Roman Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon Press. pp. 39-67.

Rigsberg, B. 1918. "Textkritische und exegetische Anmerkungen zu den Makkabäerbüchern," *Beiträge zur Religionswissenschaft* 27. pp. 6-13.

Rigsby, K. J. 1996. *Asyilia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World* (Hellenistic Culture and Society 22; Berkeley: University of California Press).

Romilly, J. de. 1975. *Magic and Rhetoric in Ancient Greece*. (Carl Newell Jackson Lectures 1974; Cambridge, Massachusetts: Harvard University Press).

Robert, L. 1963. "Review of *Somothrace. Vol. 2 part 1: The Inscriptions on Stone* by

Karl Lehmann; P. M. Fraser," *Gnomon* 35.

Rothschild, C. K. 2004. "Luke-Acts and Rhetoric of History: An Investigation of Early Christian Historiography" (WUNT 175; Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck) 1-23.

Sachs, A. J. & Wiseman, D. J. 1954. "A Babylonian King List of the Hellenistic Period," *Iraq* 16 (1954) 202-12, here 204, 208): 2/3 September 175 BCE.

Scaer, P. J. 2005. *The Lukan Passion and the Praiseworthy Death* (New Testament Monograph 10; Sheffield: Sheffield Phoenix).

Scholl, R. 1990. *Corpus der ptolemäischen Sklaventexte*. I (Stuttgart: Steiner).

Schubart, W. 1932. "παρακατατίθεσθαι in der hellenistischen Amtssprach," *PW* 52 .

Schubart, W. 1937. "Das hellenistische Königsideal nach Inschriften und Papyri," *Archiv für Papyrusforschung und verwandte Gebiete* 12. pp. 1-26.

Schürer, E. 1987. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C. – A.D. 135)* (rev. and ed. Geza Vermes and Fergus Millar; 3 vols.; Edinburgh: T&T Clark).

Schwartz, D. R. 2008. *2 Maccabees* (ed. L. T Stuckenbruck). Berlin, New York : Walter de Gruyter.

Seeligmann, I. L. 1963. "Menschliches Heldentum und göttliche Hilfe: Die doppelte Kausalität im alttestamentlichen Geschichtsdenken," *TZ* 19. pp. 385-411.

Shuttermayr, G. 1973. "'Schöpfung aus dem Nichts' in 2 Makk 7,28?" *BZ* 17. pp. 203-222.

- Sievers, J. 2001. *Synopsis of the Greek Sources for the Hasmonean Period: 1-2 Maccabees and Josephus, War 1 and Antiquities 12-14* (Subsidia Biblica 20; Roma: Pontificio Istituto Biblico).
- Smyth, H. W. 1920. *Greek Grammar* (Cambridge, Mass.: Harvard University Press).
- Speyer, W. 1980. "Die Hilfe und Epiphanie einer Gottheit, eines Heroen und eines Heiligen in der Schlacht," *Pietas: FS B. Kötting* (eds. E. Dassmann & K. S. Frank; JAC Ergänzungsband 8; Münster) pp. 55-77.
- Spicq, C. 1982. *Notes de lexicographienéo-testamentaire*, I-II + Supplément (OBO 22/1-3; Fribourg, Suisse: Éditions universitaires, and Göttingen: Vandenhoeck&Ruprecht).
- Tcherikover, V. A. 1959. *Hellenistic Civilisation and the Jews*. (Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society).
- Torrey, C. C. 1940. "The Letters Prefixed to Second Maccabees," (*JAOS* 60). pp. 119-150.
- Urman, D. 1995. "Public Structures and Jewish Communities in the Golan Heights," in Dan Urman and Paul V.M. Flesher, eds., *Ancient Synagogues: Historical Analysis and Archeological Discovery* (2 vols.; SPB 47; Leiden: Brill).
- Vanderhooft, D. 1999. "Dwelling Beneath the sacred Place: A Proposal for Reading 2 Samuel 7:10," *JBL* 118. pp. 628-30.
- Van derKam, J. C. 2004. *From Joshua to Caiaphas, High Priests After the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, and Assen, the Netherlands: Van Gorcum).
- Vaughn, P. 1992. "The Identification and Retrieval of the Hoplite Battle-Dead," in Victor D. Hanson, ed., *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience* (London: Routledge) pp. 38-62.
- Walbank, F. W. 1960. "History and Tragedy." *Historia* 9. pp 216-234.
- Walbank, F. W. 1957-79. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. 3 vols.; Oxford: Clarendon Press.
- Weinreich, O. 1929. "Türöffnungim Wunder-, Prodigien- und Zauberglauben der Antike,

des Judentums und Christentums," Genethliakon Wilhelm Schmid (Tübinger Beiträge zur Altertumswissenschaft 5; Stuttgart: Kohlhammer) 200-452.

Welles, C. B. 1934. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A study in Greek Epigraphy* (New Haven: Yale University Press).

Welles, C. B. 1962. "Hellenistic Tarsus." *Mélanges offerts au Père René Moutard II. Mélanges de l'Université Saint Joseph* 38. pp 41-75.

Wellhausen, J. 1905. "Über den geschichtlichen Wert des zweiten Makkabäerbuchs, im Verhältnis zum ersten," *Nachrichten von der Königl. Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen*, Phil.-hist. Kl. pp. 117-163.

Wheeler, E. L. 1991. "The General as Hoplite," in Victor D. Hanson, ed., *Hoplites: The Classical Greek Battle Experience* (London and New York: Routledge).

Wilhelm, A. 1931 "Zwei Epigramme aus Delphi," *Anzeiger der AWW* 68. 78-96.

Wilhelm, A. 1937. "Zu Einigen Stellen der Bücher der Makkabäer," *Akademie der Wissenschaften in Wien, Philosophisch-historische Klasse: Anzeiger* 74. pp 15-30.

Williams, J. J. 2013: *Maccabean Martyr Traditions in Paul's Theology of Atonement: Did Martyr Theology Shape Paul's Conception of Jesus's Death?* (Eugene, Ore: Wipf & Stock).

Winston, D. 1971. "The Book of Wisdom's theory of Cosmogony," *History of Religions* 11. 185-200.

Winston, D. 1986. "Creation Ex Nihilo Revisited: A Reply to Jonathan Goldstein," *JJS* 37. 88-91.

Zambeli, M. 1965. "La composizione del secondo libro dei Maccabei e la nuova cronologia di Antioco IV Epifane," in *Miscellanea Graeca e Romana* (Studi pubblicati dall'Istituto per la Storia Antica 16; Rome: n.p.). 195-299.

Zeitlin, S. 1954. *The Second Book of Maccabees* (Eng. trans. Sidney Tedesche; New York: Harper).

Zimmermann, C. 2007. *Die Namen des Vaters: Studien zu ausgewählten neutestamentlichen Gottesbezeichnungen vor ihrem frühjüdischen und paganen Sprachhorizont* (AJEC 69; Leiden: Brill).