

JOSEPHUS'S USE OF SCRIPTURE TO DESCRIBE HASMONEAN TERRITORIAL EXPANSION

KENNETH ATKINSON*

Josephus and His Influences

Although Josephus primarily employs Jewish traditions to shape his narratives of the Hasmoneans, his writings are complex because of his connections to multiple traditions. He sought to write apologetic historiography that accurately described the Jewish people based on their accomplishments as a means to correct Hellenistic misconceptions of the Jews. Yet, he also intended his works to be understandable to the wider Greco-Roman world.¹ In the process, Josephus created a truly unique version of Israel's past. His concept of Hellenized-Judaism was largely connected with the unique circumstances of his life as a leader in the First Jewish Revolt. He selectively drew upon Jewish Scripture in light of this experience and his life in Rome. As a Roman citizen, Josephus was exposed to Greco-Roman conceptions of

* Department of History, University of Northern Iowa,

¹ Josephus does not name any of his Jewish sources apart from Scripture. See further, N. Walter, "Zu Überlieferung einiger Reste früher jüdisch-hellenistischer Literatur bei Josephus, Clemens, und Esuebius," *Studia Patristica* 7 (1966): 317-38. For recent studies of Josephus's sources, his methods of history writing, and past scholarship about the Hasmonean era, see further K. Atkinson, *A History of the Hasmonean State: Josephus and Beyond* (London: Bloomsbury T and T Clark, 2016); 1-22; *idem*, *The Hasmoneans and Their Neighbors: New Historical Reconstructions from the Dead Sea Scrolls and Classical Sources* (London: Bloomsbury T and T Clark, 2018), 1-19; K. Berthelot, *In Search of the Promised Land?: The Hasmonean Dynasty Between Biblical Models and Hellenistic Diplomacy* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2018), 19-53; 100; E. Dąbrowa, *The Hasmoneans and their State: A Study in History, Ideology, and the Institutions* (Kraków: Jagiellonian University Press, 2010), 13-17; L. L. Grabbe *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian Volume 1: The Persian and Greek Periods* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 1992), 222-46; E. Nodet, *La crise maccabéenne. Historiographie juive et traditions bibliques* (Paris: Cerf, 2001), 407-31; E. Regev, *The Hasmoneans: Ideology, Archaeology, Identity* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 12-15; E. Schürer, *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.-A.D.135)*, E. G. Vermes, F. Millar, and M. Black, eds. rev. ed. (Edinburgh: T. & T. Clark, 1987), 1.17-122; N. Sharon, *Judea Under Roman Domination: The First Generation of Statelessness and its Legacy* (Atlanta: SBL Press, 2017), 9-11.

historiography, which greatly contributed to his imaginative account of Hasmonean land conquests.

Josephus's narratives are not only shaped by his own background and understanding of Scripture, but they also incorporate Jewish exegetical traditions and apocalyptic beliefs. His method of using Scripture is marked by a method of harmonistic editing, by which he frequently combines biblical passages with concepts from other Jewish traditions, as well as concepts drawn from Hellenistic historiography.² His accounts of the Hasmoneans are perhaps the best examples of this creative exegetical approach of Scripture in all his writings. Josephus used non-biblical traditions to shape his narratives about the size and nature of the land each Hasmonean leader occupied. For Josephus, geography describes sacred space as he judges all Hasmonean rulers by the amount of land they added to the country, especially marked in his account of the beginning of the Hasmonean family's resistance movement against the Seleucid Empire's monarchs.

In his account of Mattathias's rebellion, for example, against the religious decree of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Josephus draws heavily from the Hebrew Bible as well as other Jewish books not included in today's biblical canon.³ Like many Jewish writings often referred to under the rubric "Rewritten Scripture," Josephus re-contextualizes biblical materials in light of later exegetical traditions to reflect upon later situations and events than those envisaged by biblical authors.⁴ In many instances, Josephus took his scriptural passages and stories from 1 Maccabees. The accounts of Mattathias's revolt in 1 Maccabees and Josephus are both reminiscent of the biblical narrative of Joshua's wars against pagans. It is not surprising that both writers turned to this biblical source as many of Joshua's wars took place in territory that later became of part of the Hasmonean state. The description of Mattathias's forced circumcision of Jews in these books, for example, appears to be a re-enactment of Joshua's circumcision of the Israelites at Gilgal (Josh 5:1-9; 1 Macc 2:46 *Ant.* 12.278). By alluding to this biblical book and the event it recounts, Josephus and 1 Maccabees portray Mattathias's revolt as a new conquest of the land. Yet, although Joshua appears to be the perfect character upon which to model Mattathias, he occupies only a marginal role in Hasmonean ideology in 1 Maccabees and Josephus.⁵ This not only tells us something about how 1 Maccabees influenced

² See further, G. E. Sterling, *Historiography and Self-Definition: Josephos, Luke-Acts and Apologetic Historiography* (Leiden: Brill, 1992), 235-310.

³ Josephus sometimes appears to have relied on oral knowledge about ancient texts and their contents he acquired from others. For this evidence, see M. Pucci Ben Zeev, "Josephus' Ambiguities: His Comments on Cited Documents," *Journal of Jewish Studies* 57 (2006): 1-10.

⁴ For a succinct discussion of this controversial term and interpretations of Jewish Scriptures by Second Temple Jews, see S. White Crawford, *Rewriting Scripture in Second Temple Times* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), esp. 1-18.

⁵ For these parallels, see further Thomas R. Elßner, *Josua und seine Kriege in jüdischer und christlicher Rezeptionsgeschichte* (Stuttgart: W. Kohlhammer, 2008), 56-71; Fredrich T. Schipper,

Josephus, but also about how Second Temple exegetical traditions and other writings shaped Josephus's use of Scripture to inflect his recounting of the Hasmoneans.

There is no doubt that 1 Maccabees strongly influenced Josephus's understanding of the early Hasmonean period as well as his shaping of the narratives of Mattathias's descendants. Unfortunately, it is uncertain to what extent the edition of 1 Maccabees Josephus relied upon differs from our present text, or even if he had access to a Hebrew edition of it.⁶ The numerous parallels between the accounts of the Hasmoneans in 1 Maccabees and Josephus's writings does demonstrate that Josephus often incorporated material preserved in our present version of 1 Maccabees. These similarities allow us to compare Josephus and 1 Maccabees to see how he altered some of this earlier book's content, particularly its use of Scripture, in order to offer his unique representation of the Hasmoneans. A comparison of the two reveals that Josephus employed later traditions to interpret 1 Maccabees and the biblical narratives when he wrote his accounts of the Hasmonean family. Yet, although Josephus adopts much material from 1 Maccabees, he did not slavishly follow the texts of this book or Scripture. Rather, he reinterprets it and the biblical passages upon which he relies in light of his understanding of Greco-Roman history.

Indeed, classical historians had a significant influence upon Josephus. The most notable include Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Thucydides, Julius Caesar, Posidonius, Nicolaus of Damascus, Polybius, and the *Philippic Histories* of Pompeius Trogus.⁷ Josephus was particularly influenced by Polybius's understanding of fate and his belief that historians should emphasize the relationship between cause and effect.⁸ Other classical historians shared Polybius's emphasis on the rise and fall of great powers in the aftermath of Philip II's conquest of the Greek cities. The successful campaign of his son, Alexander the Great, into the heart of the Persian Empire, marked the first time the Greeks experienced the consequences posed by the appearance of a new empire and the collapse of the previous world power. They were consequently obsessed with explaining these cycles in world hegemony, and

⁶ "Mattatias und Josua: eine Beobachtung zur Typologie in der jüdisch-hellenistischen Geschichtsschreibung," *Biblische Notizen* 125 (2005): 95-96.

⁷ The frequent Semitisms in 1 Maccabees suggest that it was composed in Hebrew and translated into Greek. For this evidence and ancient references that point towards a Semitic original, see F. M. Abel and J. Starcky, *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Cerf, 1961), 15; J. R. Bartlett, *1 Maccabees* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998), 17-18; J. A. Goldstein, *1 Maccabees: A New Translation, With Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City: Doubleday, 1976), 14-16.

⁸ See further, Sterling, *Historiography*, 240-52; P. Villalba I Varneda, *The Historical Method of Flavius Josephus* (Leiden: Brill, 1986), 65-156.

⁹ Polybius 3.1-4.

attempted to understand, through historical narratives, why empires unexpectedly disappeared to be replaced by other kingdoms.⁹

The classical historians themselves differed in their efforts to explain their contemporary world and the succession of powers following the rise of Macedon. Writers such as Theopomitus attempted to account for Philip's rise while Clearchus sought to understand the collapse of the Persian Empire, the latter attributing the fall to the luxury of the Medes and the kings of Persia.¹⁰ The Seleucid Empire also features prominently in most Hellenistic writers. Of all monarchs who ruled this kingdom, none was more important than Antiochus VII Sidetes. His reign has been called the "swan song of the Seleucid Empire" because he was the last Syrian ruler to have made a concerted effort to halt Syria's political decline.¹¹ Josephus, like other writers such as Pompeius Trogus, focus on Sidetes's decline to contrast the collapse of his empire with the rise of the Roman Republic. The lesson for a Roman audience was to avoid the vice of their predecessors. In a similar vein, Trogus's contemporary Livy, as well as Sallust and other Roman writers, emphasized the decline of the Roman Republic as a warning to citizens to return to the values that had formally made the Romans the most formidable nation on earth. The Hasmoneans play an important role in Josephus's writings, for they too were a great power that collapsed like the Seleucid Empire and the Jewish state of his day. Josephus was convinced that the Seleucid Empire and the Jewish states of the first century B.C.E. and C.E. had ended in part because they had abandoned their alliances with the Romans.

In his *War*, Josephus begins his history of the tragic Jewish Revolt of 66-70 C.E. with Mattathias to show that his family had created a state that had long been an ally of the Roman Republic (*War* 1.38).¹² He later expands this earlier narrative of the Hasmonean family in his *Antiquities* to include Roman decrees that honored the Jews, doing so to show that the Roman Empire had conquered Judea in the First Jewish Revolt of 66-70 C.E. not on account of its military might, but its poor Jewish leadership. The later Hasmonean rulers and Jewish tyrants of the first century C.E.,

⁹ See further, B. Bar-Kochva, *The Image of the Jews in Greek Literature: The Hellenistic Period* (Berkeley, University of California Press, 2010), 66-67.

¹⁰ See Athenaeus 12.514d; 529D; 539D; M. A. Flower *Theopomitus of Chios* (Oxford, Clarendon Press, 1994), 71-130.

¹¹ Quotation from Bar-Kochva, *Image of the Jews*, 427. See further K. Ehling, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der späten Seleukiden* (164-63 v. Chr.) (Stuttgart: Steiner, 2008), 178-216; Daniel R. Schwartz, "על מושן הפרט של אנטיגון סידטוס ובעית הפיצול בחקר ההיסטוריה" ("On Antiochus VII Sidetes' Parthian Expedition and the Fragmentation of Historical Research,") in *The Jews in the Hellenistic-Roman World: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*, edited by Isaiah M. Gafni, Aharon Oppenheimer, and Daniel R. Schwartz (Jerusalem 1996), 83-102.

¹² Throughout this book, Josephus emphasizes that he is only describing verifiable events that can be documented through other sources. See further, B. Niese, "Der jüdische Historiker Josephus," 40 *Historische Zeitschriften* (1896): 193-27. In his *Antiquities*, he expands the scope of his enterprise to record the entirety of Jewish history. He also highlights what he considered the Jewish political constitution found in Scripture. See *Ant.* 1.5, 26; 2.347; 4.36; 8.159; 10.218.

Josephus emphasizes, had severed the longstanding alliance between the Jews and the Romans. This, Josephus was convinced, provoked divine punishment that ended the Jewish state in the first century B.C.E. and again in the first century C.E.¹³ His method of recounting these two disasters can partly be traced back to the causal emphasis found in Polybius.

Josephus's reading of Polybius led him to view individual moral virtue and vice as a driving force of history. Like Polybius and other ancient historians, including the biographer Plutarch, Josephus focuses on personalities and their impact on the historical process.¹⁴ Josephus's accounts of the Hasmoneans are largely character studies that combine the Greco-Roman tradition of biography with scriptural interpretations. The Hasmoneans, particularly Mattathias, stand out in his books as an example of moral qualities worthy of emulation. Like Polybius, Josephus in his *Antiquities* presents past events—particularly the history of the Hasmonean state—to understand the present. Both writers believed their accounts could serve as models to guide present and future political activity.¹⁵

Although Josephus is primarily influenced by Jewish writings, his unique background as a Roman citizen in the heart of the Roman Empire strongly influences both his understanding and presentation of the Hasmonean family. Greco-Roman traditions shape his narrative and his retelling of his sources. As a creative historian, he combined Jewish and Greco-Roman traditions to shape his narratives of the past. Josephus, moreover, did not follow his sources uncritically. The vocabulary in the passages that likely came from 1 Maccabees and other works he consulted, including Scripture, display Josephus's distinctive vocabulary,¹⁶ showing how he reshaped his materials, by his own interpretive lights,

¹³ *War* 1.9-10. Josephus also stresses that internal factionalism destroyed Judea and the temple. See also, *War* 1.10-12. Sulpicius Severus (*Chronica* 2.30.3, 6, 7) also contrasts the moderation of the Romans with the undisciplined actions of the Jewish rebels, who had failed to respect their own sanctuary. Cf. *War* 3.501; 4.92, 96; 5.334, 450, 519; 6.324, 383; 7.112.

¹⁴ As Varneda (*The Historical Method*, 1-4) observes, this type of history, with its focus on causes, substantially differs from annalistic history (ἐφημερίδες) and commentaries (ὑπομνήματα).

¹⁵ Polybius, 3.31; 12.25b; 30.6.4. For the theme of world history through character studies in Polybius and other writers, see further A. B. Breebaart, "Weltgeschichte als Thema der antiken Geschichtsschreibung," *Acta Historiae Neerlandica* 1 (1966): 1-21.

¹⁶ The common vocabulary in many of Josephus's presumed excerpts from his sources, particularly passages often attributed to Nicolaus of Damascus, should largely be attributed to him since he determined what materials to insert, to omit, and to ignore. A comparison of these sections with his writing style suggests that he has extensively reworked them to such an extent that he is as much an author as a compiler of earlier materials. This is particularly true of his *Antiquities*. For a discussion of Josephus's distinctive vocabulary in his presumed sources, see further S. Mason, *Flavius Josephus on the Pharisees: A Composition-Critical Study* (Leiden: Brill, 1991), 216-45, 248-51. For the purpose of this study, I regard the *Antiquities* and the *War* as products of Josephus. They not only reflect his views, but he has also rewritten his source materials about the Hasmonean period in light of his situation in Rome during the last half of the first century C.E.

to produce a seamless narrative.¹⁷ His uniqueness as a writer lies in his dual grounding in his Jewish faith as well as in the world of the Greco-Roman culture. This perspective strongly influences his recounting of the lives and history of Mattathias and his sons.

Mattathias and Judas

The events that took place when Mattathias started the Maccabean Rebellion are widely known.¹⁸ Although scholars debate their historicity, Josephus and many ancient writers considered the accounts of this revolt truthful.¹⁹ Neither he nor the author of 1 Maccabees viewed the rebellion as unique, however, but saw it through the lens of Scripture, in the process showing how current events are in fact a repetition of Israel's past. This overlap of ancient and more recent history is most evident in the beginning of his story of Mattathias's reaction to the edict of Antiochus IV Epiphanes.

¹⁷ For the importance of this observation for understanding and using Josephus's books to reconstruct Hasmonean history, see further Atkinson, *History*, 166-79; H. Eshel, "Josephus' View on Judaism without the Temple in Light of the Discoveries at Masada and Murabba'at," in B. Ego, A. Lange, and P. Pilhofer (eds.), *Gemeinde ohne Tempel: zur Substituierung und Transformation des Jerusalemer Tempels und seines Kults im alten Testament, antiken Judentum und frühen Christentum* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 1999), 229-38.

¹⁸ Mattathias and his descendants, especially his sons who participated in his rebellion against the Seleucid Empire, are commonly known as the Maccabees, and their revolt against the Seleucid Empire as the Maccabean Revolt. However, the name Maccabee is the nickname that was given to Mattathias's son, Judas (Judah), for his prowess in battle. The present study uses the name Hasmonean for Mattathias's descendants and the Maccabean Rebellion for their early revolt against the Seleucid Empire. Although the meaning of the name Hasmonean is unknown, Josephus claims it derives from a family patriarch named Asamonaeus. The name is conspicuously absent from both 1 and 2 Maccabees, although Josephus and the rabbis use it frequently. See further K. Atkinson, "Hasmoneans." in H. J. Klauck, *et al.* (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception Volume 11* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2015), 373-77; Goldstein 1 *Maccabees*, 17-20. It is possible that Hasmonean in Hebrew (הַשְׁמוֹנָא) is a nickname of unknown meaning, or possibly a corruption of the name of Mattathias's grandfather, Simeon (=Shim'on; שִׁמְעוֹן), mentioned in 1 *Maccabees* 2:1. See J. Sievers, *The Hasmoneans and their Supporters: From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 1990), 28-29.

¹⁹ Most studies assume the accounts of the Maccabean Rebellion, although clearly polemical, reflect historical events. There is, however, considerable debate concerning why the family fought the Seleucid Empire's rulers. See further Atkinson, *Neighbors*, 21-26; E. J. Bickerman *The God of the Maccabees* (Leiden: Brill, 1979), 9-23; Goldstein, 1 *Maccabees*, 90-103, 175-86; Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 1-10. A notable exception regarding the reliability of the sources for this revolt is Keel, who believes the incident in 1 Macc 2:15-28 has no historicity and was merely written to legitimate the family's dynasty. See O. Keel, "1 Makk 2-Rechtfertigung, Programm und Denkmal für die Erhebung der Hasmonäer. Eine Skizze," in O. Keel and U. Stab (eds.), *Hellenismus und Judentum. Vier Studien zu Daniel 7 und zur Religionsnot unter Antiochus* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2000), 123-33. Although 1 Maccabees and Josephus are often polemical, their retelling of the Maccabean Rebellion through the lens of Scripture does not mean that their narratives are devoid of historicity.

Mattathias and his sons fought a nearly twenty-five-year war against the Seleucid Empire. According to the traditional accounts preserved in the extant sources, the Maccabean Rebellion began when Mattathias defied the decree of the Seleucid monarch Antiochus IV Epiphanes that banned the observance of Jewish Law.²⁰ When a man from his village of Modein stepped forward to perform an offering, Mattathias killed him along with the supervising official. Josephus and his major source, 1 Maccabees, use passages from Scripture to frame this story.

Like the author of 1 Maccabees, Josephus appeals to the story of Phinehas's murder of the idolatrous Israelites in Numbers 25 as a way of justifying Mattathias's killing of a Jew from his hometown. In a direct echo of the biblical story, Josephus's Mattathias cries out, "Whoever is zealous for our country's laws and the worship of God, let him join me!"²¹ For Josephus, the incident is important for his narration of subsequent Hasmonean territorial conquests as he portrays Mattathias, like Phinehas, purifying the land and his community by eradicating paganism, murdering apostates, and seizing territory towards the eventual goal of creating an independent state.²² With the land as the major focus for both Josephus and the writer of 1 Maccabees, and with Mattathias's descendants successfully capturing land to create an independent state, it is unsurprising that both 1 Maccabees and Josephus appeal to biblical conquest traditions.

Josephus draws upon these narrative traditions to depict Mattathias as a modern-day reincarnation of Phinehas; there is, however, a significant difference between his account and that of the biblical story. In Josephus's narrative, not God, but Mattathias and his son and successor, Judas, control events, liberate Jews, and begin to take possession of the Promised Land. Just as Phinehas was rewarded with a perpetual priesthood for his violence, Mattathias's successors obtained a special priesthood, in this instance the office of high priest, also achieved through an act of violence. Josephus's use of the Phinehas tradition may explain his controversial claim that Judas became high priest and held the office for three years.²³ This claim clearly contradicts the chronology of his narrative and poses problems for the later account of the installation of Judas's brother, Jonathan, as high priest. But Josephus sought to portray Mattathias's revolt as successful by showing that his violence, like that of Phinehas, was approved by God, resulting in his descendants receiving a special priesthood as well as the land.

²⁰ Five major sources document this revolt led by the Hasmonean patriarch Mattathias against this edict. See 1 Macc. 1-2; 2 Macc. 3-7; Dan. 7-12; *War* 1.31-3; *Ant.* 12.237-64.

²¹ *Ant.* 12.271. For this story, see Num 25:6-8; Sir 45:23-26; Dąbrowa, *Hasmoneans*, 17-18; Berthelot, *In Search of*, 100; Regev, *Hasmoneans*, 107-08. For the use of the Phinehas tradition by the Hasmoneans, see J. J. Collins, "The Zeal of Phinehas: The Bible and the Legitimation of Violence," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 122 (2003): 12-14.

²² *Ant.* 12.278; Dąbrowa, *The Hasmoneans*, 18-19.

²³ *Ant.* 12.434; cf. *Ant.* 12.419. However, Josephus in *Ant.* 20.237 states that after the death of Alcimus there was no high priest for seven years.

At times, the gaps in Josephus's accounts of the Maccabean Rebellion suggest that he omitted considerable information about the deeds of the early Hasmoneans, a practice most evident in his account of the succession from Judas to Jonathan. It is plausible that Josephus tried to suppress the memory of an unknown high priest who officiated from 159-152 B.C.E. and that he intentionally obscured this in claiming that Judas became the first high priest in his family. The existence of such an anonymous priest would explain why his sibling Jonathan later had to be appointed high priest: if the office had been left vacant, it should have been easier for the Hasmoneans to supplant the line of Zadok with Joarib.²⁴ Jonathan may have, however, removed the high priest to take the position for himself, which may account for some of the opposition to his holding this office expressed in the extant narratives. Moreover, this earlier usurpation would explain the difficulties Simon later faced in gaining public recognition from his citizens when he assumed the office of high priest.²⁵

Josephus's accounts of Simon and Jonathan show that his exegetical retelling of Hasmonean history through the lens of Scripture introduces chronological errors into his account. He sacrifices chronology in order to frame early Hasmonean land acquisition as a repetition of the biblical conquest led by succession of priest-warriors from the same family. Like Phinehas, Judas's priestly office was passed on

²⁴ There is a discrepancy in the extant sources as to when Simon acquired his unpreceded positions and the length of Jonathan's tenure as high priest, and whether he was preceded by an unknown high priest. Josephus in *Ant.* 20.238 mistakenly writes that Jonathan was high priest for seven years. Alexander Balas recognized Jonathan as high priest in 152 B.C.E., which gives him a term of ten years. The author of *1 Maccabees* 13:41-42 synchronizes the first year of the political rule of Simon, his brother and successor, with 170 of the Seleucid Era (S.E.) This Seleucid date indicates that Tryphon murdered Jonathan in 143/2 B.C.E. The following scholars accept this date: Ehling, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte der späten Seleukiden*, 175-6; J. A. Goldstein, "The Hasmonean Revolt and the Hasmonean Dynasty," in W. D. Davies and L. Finkelstein (eds), *The Cambridge History of Judaism Volume Two: The Hellenistic Age* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989: 316-9); James C. VanderKam, *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile* (Minneapolis: Fortress Press, 2004), 264. The chronology of Josephus complicates matters. He both states that the office of high priest was vacant for seven years following the death of Alcimus (*Ant.* 20.237) and that the position was not filled for three years (*Ant.* 12.414). His statement that the high priesthood was vacant for four years in *Ant.* 13.46 is clearly an error. The claim of Wise that Judas may have been recognized as high priest during the interregnum, traditionally dated between 159-152 B.C.E., is largely based on the restoration of the names "Judah, Jonathan, Simon" (יהודה יונתן שמעון) in line 10 of 4Q245. See M. Wise, "4Q245 (PSDAN^c AR) and the High Priesthood of Judas Maccabaeus," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 12 (2005): 313-62. While the names Jonathan and Simon are plausible restorations of these lines, the name Judah is a mere conjecture. It is unlikely it was in this text since the extant historical evidence identifies Jonathan as the first Hasmonean high priest. See further, V. Babota, *The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood* (Leiden: Brill, 2014), 131-4; H. Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls and the Hasmonean State* (Grand Rapids: Eerdmans, 2008), 54-55; VanderKam, *From Joshua*, 2644-51.

²⁵ For a detailed discussion of the problems Simon faced in gaining legitimacy as high priest and a discussion of the difficulties in reconstructing his reign, see further, Atkinson, *Hasmoneans*, 32-44.

to his descendants. Similarly, in his account of the Hasmoneans, Josephus shows each major Hasmonean inheriting his predecessor's position as high priest in unbroken succession.

Josephus's use of the Phinehas tradition serves another purpose beyond explaining the success of Mattathias's family in capturing land, also legitimating the Hasmonean high priesthood and offering a biblical justification for the violence of the family in their acquisition of land. Mattathias and his sons frequently violate Deuteronomy's laws regarding the treatment of strangers. Yet, for Josephus, God had blessed Mattathias and his sons for their zealous actions when they murdered apostates just as God had blessed Phinehas in the parallel Biblical circumstances.²⁶ Seeking to rationalize early Hasmonean violence, Josephus uses the story of Joshua to justify the militant acts of Mattathias and Judas. Joshua fought to conquer the Promised Land and waged *herem* warfare against the Canaanites. Like Joshua, Josephus stresses that Judas employed guerrilla warfare and ambushes to kill pagans (*Ant.* 12.327-31). Likewise, Mattathias and his sons murdered apostates and pagans who function in Josephus's narrative as modern Canaanites. In *Antiquities* 12.286, Josephus cites Deuteronomy 13:14-15, which prescribes *herem* warfare against apostates, and Numbers 25:11, in which Phineas is praised for his violent zeal, connecting the defilement of the land and Mattathias's murder of apostates. Just as Joshua and the Israelites had employed violence against the indigenous inhabitants of the land, Mattathias and his sons likewise killed the contemporary pagans who lived there.²⁷

Mattathias, as well as Judas and his brothers, drove out and exterminated those pagans who had failed to observe biblical law – in order to purify the land of defilement. To make this clear and give their murders a religious meaning, Josephus uses the verbal noun of μαίνω, often used in the Hebrew Bible, especially in Leviticus, for ritual defilement.²⁸ For Josephus, this adds a priestly overtone to his narrative and further justifies the early militancy of the Hasmonean family. The account of Judas's conquests, in which his brother Simon plays a prominent role, are intentionally exaggerated, designed to show that, from the beginning of the Maccabean Rebellion, the family conquered most of the Promised Land. The early narratives make this clear in their descriptions of the Hasmonean family's early

²⁶ See Deut 13 and 20. The early Hasmoneans, especially Judas, appeared to bring back the biblical *herem* and implement the Deuteronomic laws by modelling their violence after the wars of Joshua against both Canaanites and Jews who had transgressed the Law. See further, C. Bautsch, *La guerre et les rites de guerre dans le judaïsme du deuxième Temple* (Leiden: Brill, 2005), 204; Israel Shatzman, "Jews and Gentiles from Judas Maccabaeus to John Hyrcanus According to Contemporary Jewish Sources," in S. J. D. Cohen and J. J. Schwartz (eds.), *Studies in Josephus and the Varieties of Ancient Judaism*, (Leiden: Brill, 2007), 255.

²⁷ This section of Josephus is similar to 1 Maccabees 3:8. See further Berthelot, *In Search of*, 86-92.

²⁸ *Ant.* 12.286. See, for example the following LXX passages: Lev 7:8; Jer 39:34; Ezek 33:31; 1 Macc 13:50.

conquests. After fortifying Beth-Zur to the south, Judas punishes the Edomites and the Ammonites;²⁹ later, Judas and Simon fought in the Galilee and Gilead; they subsequently moved towards Judea, and then to the coastal cities.³⁰ As is clear from the narratives which follow in 1 Maccabees and Josephus, Judas and his brothers held little territory when Jonathan became leader of his family's movement as attested by the fact that they had to reconquer it. The claim that Judas conquered these lands and rededicated the temple functions in Josephus's narrative to recall the glory days of Israel under Solomon when this territory belonged to the united monarchy with the Jerusalem temple its central shrine.

Because Judas captured Jerusalem, purified the temple, and restored the sacrifices, Josephus frames his character through the language and imagery of the biblical stories about Solomon. According to Josephus, Judas, just like this famed biblical king and the son of David, 'builds' as it were the temple. Josephus stresses Judas in this role emphasizing that he had entirely new vessels made for Jerusalem's sanctuary, including the menorah, table, a gold altar of incense, and even erected a new sacrificial altar.³¹ Then, having celebrated the temple's purification and its restoration with a holiday as Solomon had, Judas fulfills the biblical laws in the covenant code of Exodus 23 and 24, which calls for exterminating gentiles, who again serve, in his account, as modern Canaanites.³² Josephus's omits any reference to Solomon's father, David, who, according to the Hebrew Scriptures, fulfills Moses's goal of conquering all the Promised Land, perhaps showing his reticence to make an explicit reference to David in his stories of the Hasmoneans.³³

²⁹ 1 Macc 4:60-1; 5:1-8; 2 Mac 10:24-38; 12:10-31; *Ant.* 12.326-31. The Transjordan campaign of Judas in 1 and 2 Maccabees, which takes place shortly after his purification of the Temple, is full of geographical and chronological errors. See further B. Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle Against the Seleucids* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1989), 185, 508-515; 543.

³⁰ 1 Macc 5:21-54; 5:18-19, 55-68; 2 Macc 12:10-31; *Ant.* 12.335-52.

³¹ *Ant.* 12.317-22; 1 Macc 4:47-49, 56-57. For these and additional Solomonic parallels, see D. Arenhoevel, "Die Eschatologie der Makkabäerbucher," *Trier Theologische Zeitschrift* 72 (1963): 257-69.

³² Judas is depicted as a new Solomon in his dedication of the temple and his eight-day celebration. Like the returned exiles, who consecrated the altar, and Nehemiah, who concluded the covenant, Judas reinstates the Temple rites around the time of Sukkot. The debate over the discrepancy between the duration of Solomon's festival in 1 Kings 8 and Hanukkah is beyond the limits of the present study. Nevertheless, the sources for Judas portray his activities in light of the Solomonic narrative. See further, K. Atkinson, "Hanukkah: Second Temple and Hellenistic Judaism," in H. J. Klauck, *et al.*, (eds.), *Encyclopedia of the Bible and Its Reception Volume 11*, 253-55; Berthelot, *In Search of*, 118-122; V. Noam, "The Miracle of the Cruse of Oil," *Hebrew Union College Annual* 73 (2003): 191-226; Regev, *Hasmoneans*, 45-46.

³³ The borders of the biblical Promised Land are not actually specified in Scripture, but it generally is held to extend from Dan to Beersheba. See Gen 15:18; Exod 23:31; Num 33:50-51; Deut 1:7 Judg 20:1; 1 Sam 3:20; 2 Sam 3:10; 1711; 24:2; 1 Kgs 4:21; 5:5; Amos 8:14. The Transjordan was not originally included in the lands allocated to the twelve tribes. See further, N. Na'amani, *Borders and Districts in Biblical Historiography* (Jerusalem: Simor 1986), 39-73; M. Weinfeld, *The*

By largely appealing to the biblical stories of Phinehas and Joshua rather than David, Josephus avoids the issue of lineage, a problem the Hasmoneans faced through the entirety of their reign.³⁴ The family belonged to the priestly course of Joiarib, which made them legally qualified to hold the office of high priest.³⁵ However, they effectively ruled as monarchs long before Judah Aristobulus I first used the title king. Many Jews found the family's illicit combination of secular and religious rule problematic because they were not descendants of David.³⁶ By using

Promised Land: The Inheritance of the Land of Canaan by the Israelites (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1993), 52-60. For the maximum extent of the Promised Land, which was expanded over time to include lands east of the Jordan River, see further M. Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (New York: Doubleday, 1991), 132-34.

³⁴ Several scholars have understood Judas as closer to David than any other biblical figure. See, for example, A. Van der Koij, "The Claim of Maccabean Leadership and the Use of Scripture," in B. Eckhardt (ed.), *Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba: Groups, Normativity, and Rituals* (Leiden: Brill, 2012), 29-49; H. Lichtenberger, "Geschichtsschreibung und Geschichtserzählung im 1. Und 2. Makkabäerbuch," in E.-M. Becker (ed.), *Die antike Historiographie und die Anfänge der christlichen Geschichtsschreibung* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 2005), 197-212. Neither 1 Maccabees nor Josephus explicitly describes Judas like David. In 1 Maccabees, from which Josephus largely copied his information, there are no clear biblical allusions to this king except for a reference to the battle between David and Goliath (1Macc 4:40 citing 1 Sam 17:4-54 and 14:1-23). Despite the presence of possible brief allusions to David, with the exception of this combat reference, the writer of 1 Maccabees prefers to compare Judas to Solomon. For this observation, see further Berthelot, *In Search of*, 109-18.

³⁵ According to Josephus, it is the elite of the priestly courses (*Life* 2). See also 1 Macc. 2:1; 14:29. Josephus explains the origin of the priestly day-courses in *Ant.* 7.365-67, which is a paraphrase of 1 Chron. 24:1-19. According to biblical tradition, Joiarib is the first clan recognized by lot. Josephus may have emphasized Joiarib's prominence to justify the Hasmoneans' usurpation of the high priesthood from the family of priests that previously held the office. See further, Atkinson, *History*, 23-24; Babota, *Institution*, 269-84. Several scholars have disagreed with Josephus to propose that the Hasmoneans were actually Zadokites. See A. Schofield and J. C. VanderKam, "Were the Hasmoneans Zadokites?," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 124 (2005): 73-87; VanderKam, *From Joshua*, 270 n. 90; D. W. Rooke, *Zadok's Heirs: The Role and Development of the Priesthood in Ancient Israel* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2000), 281-82. Because there is no explicit statement in Josephus's writings or any surviving Second Temple Period text that the Hasmoneans were Zadokites or that Zadokite descent was a particularly important issue at that time, there is no convincing evidence to contradict Josephus's assertion the Hasmoneans traced their descent to Joiarib. See further, Eshel, *The Dead Sea Scrolls*, 55; J. Klawans, *Josephus and the Theologies of Ancient Judaism* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2012), esp. 18-23.

³⁶ The combination of the high priesthood and the monarchy under Aristobulus has a precedent in the Aramaic *Levi* text from Qumran (1Q21 7 2; 4Q213 2 10-18), which states that "the kingdom of priesthood is greater than the kingdom" (1Q21 1). Kugel believes that such a claim could not have been made about Levi before the rise of the Hasmonean dynasty; he dates the composition no earlier than the second half of the second century B.C.E. See J. Kugel, "How Old is the Aramaic *Levi Document*?," *Dead Sea Discoveries* 14: 292. The Hasmoneans apparently appealed to the tradition preserved in this text to seek the office of high priest first because they believed it gave them the right to reign as kings. See further Regev, *Hasmoneans*, 171-72. In the Aramaic *Levi* document,

the stories of Joshua and Phinehas to shape his narrative, Josephus cautiously avoids the issue, for like the Hasmoneans, these two biblical leaders lack a prominent lineage. Joshua is from the tribe of Ephraim while Phinehas has no noteworthy ancestor. Neither Joshua nor Phinehas based their zealous acts of violence on their pedigree, but solely on their election and their loyalty to God.

Like the biblical conquest narratives, Josephus's accounts of Mattathias and his sons are violent; they kill pagans like Joshua did in order to occupy the land. The Hasmoneans, however, forcibly Judaized their newly conquered territories. They accomplish this by purging areas of non-Jewish inhabitants, by resettlement, and by forced circumcision. Although Josephus's narratives may sound exaggerated, Ptolemy the Historian and 1 Maccabees both insist that the Hasmoneans forcibly circumcised Jews.³⁷ Even if not accurate, these parallels show that the stories about the Hasmoneans engaging in this form of violent behavior were widespread, serving to explain how the family acquired the lands upon which they created their state. However, for Josephus, Mattathias's rebellion against the Seleucids was only the beginning of a story of land conquest. In his account, each successive Hasmonean is expected to continue Mattathias's policy of violently seizing additional land until the family occupies all the territory that had once belonged to the famed Kingdom of David.

Jonathan

Josephus continues his use of biblical traditions to portray Judas's successor, his brother Jonathan, also as a violent conqueror. Jonathan avenges Judas's death by murdering a wedding party, an atrocity which Josephus justifies by calling the victims 'Arabs,' portraying them as parallel to the Canaanites Joshua had killed

moreover, Levi clearly states that kingship is not limited to the tribe of Judah (Gen 49.10). The Hasmoneans likewise held that they had the right to assume the monarchy (*Ant.* 14.78. Cf. *Ant.* 14.404). This suggests that writers other than Josephus appealed to Scripture to justify the Hasmonean's apparent defiance of Scripture in combining the offices of high priest with secular rule. See further the discussion and extensive primary and secondary references that challenged the legitimacy of Aristobulus's use of the title king in the Qumran writings, especially 4QTestimonia, and other texts, in Atkinson, *Neighbors*, 65-72.

³⁷ Ptolemy the Historian, *History of Herod* in M. Stern, *Greek and Latin Authors on Jews and Judaism* (Jerusalem: Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities, 1974), 356 no. 146. See also *Ant.* 13.257-58; 15.254-55. See further, Atkinson, *Hasmonean*, 67-69; Dąbrowa, *Hasmoneans*, 75-6; *idem*, "The Hasmoneans and the Religious Homogeneity of Their State," *Scripta Judaica Cracoviensia* (2016): 7-14. Strabo (*Geography*, 16.2.34) preserves a conflicting tradition. Mattathias's earlier appeal to strict Torah observance, which included the forced circumcision of the sons of those Jews who had obeyed the Seleucid prohibition against circumcision, formed the basis for his opposition to the Seleucid Empire. See 1 Macc. 2:46. According to 1 Maccabees 2:48, through such violent acts, he and his followers saved the Torah from the hand of the gentiles. His example of religious zealotry and military resistance became the foundational story to legitimate the entire Hasmonean dynasty. It later served as a model for the zealots who opposed Rome during the First Jewish Revolt. See further Regev, *Hasmoneans*, 107-0

(*Ant.* 13.19).³⁸ Like his late brother Judas, Jonathan waged a campaign of conquest in territories formerly included in the biblical Promised Land as well as in lands beyond the Jordan River. For Josephus, the regions east of the Jordan River are of particular importance in his narrative, which he present through a biblical lens, even when in contradiction to historical reality.³⁹ Jonathan engaged the forces of Demetrius II and defeated them on the plain of Hazor, and then traveled to threaten the Seleucid army in the district of Hamath.⁴⁰ He then fought the Arab tribe of the Zabadeans, moved towards Damascus, and returned to Jerusalem where he erected a wall to prevent all communication between the Seleucid garrison there and the city.⁴¹ Jonathan went on to fortify Adida in the Shephelah, all of which for Josephus turn him into a successful military conqueror, very much like Solomon.⁴²

Indeed, Josephus depicts Judas and Jonathan as wise rulers like Solomon. Just like the biblical king, Jonathan also formed treaties with foreigners for his own benefit, leading them to seek a relationship with the Hasmoneans.⁴³ Jonathan continued his successful conquests to extend the land to the coastal territory of Joppa and to the regions south of Judea. He also seized land in the north by defeating Demetrius II in the Galilee (*Ant.* 13.154-62). After Tryphon murdered Jonathan, his brother Simon, who had fought in many early battles, assumed leadership of the family's movement. It was largely because of Jonathan's military successes that the Roman Republic decided to favor the Hasmoneans by recognizing their right to the land (*Ant.* 13.163-70). During Simon's reign, the Hasmoneans begin to make unique claims concerning their territory.

Simon

³⁸ The parallel passage in 1 Macc 9:37 refers to a bride they killed as a daughter of an official of Canaan from Nadabath to show that she came from east of the Jordan River. Josephus omits the allusion to Amos 8:10 in the parallel passage in 1 Macc 9:40-41 where Jonathan and Simon murder many people. Instead, Josephus presents this as a *herem* by emphasizing that Jonathan and Simon exterminated everyone, including women and children. His account is similar to the *herem* against the Amalekites in *Ant.* 6.136. See also, *Ant.* 4.97, 192, 300, 305; 5.26, 67-68. See further Abel and J. Starcky, *Les Livres des Maccabées*, 268; Berlthelot, *In Search*, 149-53; Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 384-85. A look at Jonathan's campaigns reveals that they were carefully planned to prepare for the creation of an independent state by securing and enlarging Jewish territory at strategic locations. See further Atkinson, *History*, 26-32; Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 97-99.

³⁹ See further the discussions of the Hasmonean family's conquests of the Transjordan and Josephus's use of Scripture to describe them in the section below on John Hyrcanus in the present study.

⁴⁰ 1 Macc 12:24-30; *Ant.* 13.174-78.

⁴¹ 1 Macc 12:31-37; *Ant.* 13.179-83.

⁴² 1 Macc 12:33-38; *Ant.* 13.180.

⁴³ *Ant.* 13.35-58, 83-85. This is most evident in Jonathan's decision to supply troops to help Demetrius II subdue a revolt in Antioch and then switching sides to back Antiochus VI and Tryphon. See further Atkinson, *History*, 30-31.

Simon, the founder of the Hasmonean state, made peace with the Seleucid monarch Demetrius II in 143/142 B.C.E. to gain independence.⁴⁴ According to Josephus, Simon continued the family policy of conquering pagan territories, first campaigning against Gezer, often called Gazara, which, according to 1 Maccabees 9:52, possessed a Seleucid garrison. Simon resettled Gezer with observant Jews and stationed his son, John Hyrcanus, there as commander of all his forces.⁴⁵ Simon then used Gezer as a base to attack gentile cities in the coastal plain and conquer new territories. The Seleucid monarch Antiochus VII Sidetes dispatched his envoy, Athenobius, to demand Simon restore Joppa, Gezer, the Akra, and other lands to him.⁴⁶ He also insisted that Simon pay an indemnity of 1,000 talents for having taken them from the Seleucid Empire. Simon asserted his right to these lands as Jewish territory and, according to First Maccabees 15:33-34, claimed they were, “the inheritance of our fathers” which had been “held unjustly by our enemies for a certain time.” Simon does offer Sidetes one hundred talents as compensation for these cities, a fact which Josephus omits from his account.

In this we see a difference between Josephus’s understanding of the land and that represented in 1 Maccabees. According to the writer of 1 Maccabees, Simon justified his seizure of Gezer and Joppa from the Seleucid Empire because their inhabitants had caused problems for the Jews. For this reason, Simon offered to pay a hundred talents for these cities, also recognizing that they were not part of biblical

⁴⁴ According to *1 Maccabees* 13:41-42, the letter of Demetrius II to Simon marks the beginning of the Hasmonean State: “In the year 170 (=143/2 B.C.E.), the yoke of the gentiles was lifted from Israel and the people began to write as the dating formula in bills and contracts, ‘In the first year, under Simon, high priest, commander, and chief of the Jews.’” It is plausible this new system of dating began with the liberation from Seleucid rule and taxes. The *Megillat Ta’anit*, *1 Maccabees*, and Josephus suggest it marks the beginning of Simon’s tenure as high priest and political leader of an independent state. See further, Atkinson, *History*, 23-46; Ehling, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte*, 175-6; Regev, *Hasmoneans*, 113-17; Sievers, *Hasmoneans*, 110-12; Schürer, *History*, 1.190-91. The author of *2 Maccabees* 1:7 dates this event to the Seleucid year 169 B.C.E. This book begins the Seleucid Era in 311 B.C.E., while *1 Maccabees* counts the commencement of the Seleucid year from spring 312 B.C.E. See further, Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 145-8; *ibid.*, *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary* (Garden City, NJ: Doubleday, 1983), 41-47, 145-48; Babota, *Institution*, 237-38. Schwartz comments that the date in *2 Maccabees* correlates to the year that began in the spring of 143 B.C.E. See further D. R. Schwartz, *2 Maccabees* (Berlin: Walter de Gruyter, 2008), 139.

⁴⁵ According to *1 Maccabees* 9:52 the site already possessed a Seleucid garrison. Simon expelled the pagans from the city and resettled it with observant Jews. See also *1 Macc.* 13:43. A graffiti found at Gezer from this time has been translated to read: “Pamphras, may he bring down (fire) on the palace of Simon.” See J. D. Seger, “The Search for Maccabean Gezer,” in *Proceedings of the Sixth World Congress of Jewish Studies held at the Hebrew University of Jerusalem, 13-19 August 1973 under the Auspices of the Israel Academy of Sciences and Humanities* (Jerusalem: World Union of Jewish Studies, 1977), 1.390. Simon’s eviction of Jews from Gezer marked the beginning of a new Hasmonean policy of forcibly removing pagans from lands the Hasmoneans considered part of their territory. See Dąbrowa, *The Hasmoneans*, 167-68.

⁴⁶ For these events, see further Dąbrowa, *The Hasmoneans*, 59-60

Israel.⁴⁷ Josephus, however, believed these cities to be a legitimate part of biblical Israel because the Hasmoneans, like Joshua, had conquered them from pagans. According to Josephus, during the time of Simon's successor, John Hyrcanus, the Hasmoneans had successfully appealed to Rome to have these cities included in their territory as part of their ancestral lands.⁴⁸ Josephus portrays Simon's policies as a continuation of those of his predecessors and identical to those of his successors, for, like his father and brothers, Simon sought to reconquer all the biblical Land of Israel, affirming that all lands confiscated from pagans were part of it. Josephus portrays his reign as a time of prosperity and peace for the Hasmonean state as the rulers of the Seleucid Empire were no longer able to trouble the Jews.

According to Josephus, Simon had become so powerful that he became a threat to the Seleucid Empire, having conquered Gazara, Joppa, Beth-Zur, and the Akra fortress in Jerusalem.⁴⁹ In the representations of Simon's campaigns, Josephus departs considerably from the account of 1 *Maccabees*. According to the author of 1 *Maccabees* 15.26-31, Sidetes rejected Simon's offer of military assistance; Josephus, by contrast, claims that the Hasmonean army helped him besiege Tryphon at Dor. In *War* 1.50, however, Josephus suggests that Simon was hostile to Sidetes, leading him to capture Gazara, Joppa, Beth-Zur, and the Akra from Sidetes. Yet, in this passage Josephus claims that Simon actually helped Sidetes besiege Tryphon at Dor such that Sidetes became jealous of Simon's successes, and subsequently sending Cendebaeus to ravage Judea. Yet, Simon survived the efforts of Sidetes and Demetrius II to remove him. Given these discrepancies, it is difficult to reconcile Josephus's contradictions concerning Simon's relationship with Sidetes.

Dąbrowa, noting the problem in Josephus's accounts regarding Sidetes's dealings with the Hasmoneans, observes with evident surprise that the extant sources are silent about the response of Demetrius II to Simon's extensive territorial conquests since they were directed towards gentiles.⁵⁰ Josephus, in his account, emphasizes that Simon had become such a threat to the Seleucid Empire that all its

⁴⁷ 1 Macc 15: 28-34. Mendels notes that beginning with Simon the author of 1 *Maccabees* describes possession of the land as a goal of the Hasmoneans. See further, D. Mendels, *The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History in Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land* (Tübingen: J. C. B. Mohr [Paul Siebeck], 1987), 47-49.

⁴⁸ See *Ant.* 12.247-55; 13.259-66; 14.145-48. Josephus's three accounts of Hasmonean diplomatic missions to the Romans and the Senate's decrees favoring the Jews are out of chronological order and should be placed during the reign of Hyrcanus. For the evidence in support of this interpretation, see the astute analysis of these passages by M. Stern, *על היחסים בין יהודה ורומא בימי יוחנן הורקנוס* ("The Relations Between Judea and Rome During the Reign of John Hyrcanus") *Zion* 26 (1961): 3-19.

⁴⁹ In *Antiquities* 13.215 Josephus makes it clear that Simon took the Akra, and razed it to the ground, as well as Gezer, Joppa, and Jamnia. Some manuscripts of *Antiquities* 13.215, as well as 1 *Maccabees* 13.43, state that Simon captured Gaza. Gazara (=Gezer) is certainly the correct reading. See B. Niese, ed., *Flavii Iosephi Opera. Vol. III: Antiquitatum Iudaicarum Livri XI-XV* (Berlin: Weidman, 1892), 187.

⁵⁰ Dąbrowa, "The Hasmoneans and the Religious Homogeneity," 59.

leaders vying for control of Syria (Sidetes, Demetrius II, and Tryphon) sought to make alliances with him. Yet, as clear from Josephus's subsequent narrative, the Hasmonean state was not strong at this time. During the reign of his son, John Hyrcanus, the Hasmoneans abandoned Hellenistic arguments to legitimate their military conquests, instead turning to scriptural models to argue that it was their religious duty to capture territory belonging to the Seleucid Empire. For Josephus, Hyrcanus successfully recreated the biblical Promised Land.

John Hyrcanus

In his representation of the reign of John Hyrcanus, Josephus shows the greatest parallels between the Hasmoneans and scriptural antecedents. His accounts of the expansion of the Hasmonean state, like the narrative in 1 Maccabees, closely parallels the biblical description of Nehemiah's defeat of his adversaries. Four enemies appear in the Book of Nehemiah to challenge the post-exilic community and their leader: Samaria, Ammon, the Arabs, and Ashdod. This list was likely inserted into the Nehemiah Memoir during the Hasmonean period since these rivals can be identified with personalities of the mid to late second century B.C.E.⁵¹ Sanballat stands for Samaria in the north; Ammon represents the Tobiads who were the supporters of Hellenistic culture and the opponents of the Hasmoneans in the east; Geshem denotes the desert populations beyond Idumea in the south; and the Ashdodites signify the coastal plain gentiles bordering on Hasmonean Gezer and Ekron.⁵² These biblical figures represent real rivals of the Hasmoneans in Judea during the reign of Hyrcanus and thus provide for Josephus, a biblical justification for the expansion into these regions.

It was during Hyrcanus's time in power that Josephus claims the Hasmoneans conquered several neighboring territories that threatened the post-exilic Jerusalem community: Madaba in Transjordan, Samaria, and Idumea.⁵³ The

⁵¹ For the evidence that the list of enemies surrounding Judea was inserted during the Hasmonean period when major adaptations to the Book of Nehemiah occurred, see further the discussions in D. Böhler, *Die heilige Stadt in Esdras a und Esra-Nehemia: Zwei Konzeptionen der Wiederherstellung Israels* (Freibourg: Universitätsverlag, 1997), 382-97; D. M. Carr, *The Formation of the Hebrew Bible: A New Reconstruction* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2011), 169; S. Grätz, "Adversaries in Ezra/Nehemiah—Fictitious or Real?," in R. Albertz and Wöhrle, (eds.), *Between Cooperation and Hostility: Multiple Identities in Ancient Judaism and the Interaction with Foreign Powers* (Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht, 2013), 82, 85; Grabbe, *Judaism*, 36-38; A. Sérandour, "Histoire du judaïsme aux époques perse, hellénistique et romaine: de Cyrus à Bar Kokhba," in R. Albertz and Wöhrle, (eds.), *Introduction à l'Ancien Testament* (Geneva: Labor et fides, 2009), 93-94.

⁵² This does not mean that these persons did not exist in the Persian Period. Rather, they were likely inserted in the biblical narrative during the mid to late second century B.C.E. as symbols of their homelands. See further, Grätz, "Adversaries in Ezra/Nehemiah," 82, 85; H. G. M. Williamson, *Ezra, Nehemiah* (Waco, TX: Word Books, 1985), xxxv; Böhler, *Die heilige Stadt*, 382-97.

⁵³ Samaria (*Ant.* 13.275; *War* 1.64-66); Ammon and Arabs in the Transjordan (*Ant.* 13.393; *War* 1.89); Ashdod (*Ant.* 13.254; *War* 1.62). For these conquests and the chronological errors in

listing of these regions in the Nehemiah Memoir is closely followed by the writer of 1 Maccabees. Yet, 2 Maccabees, which was likely composed a half century earlier, does not refer to the conflicts with these neighbors of Judea, suggesting that the author of 2 Maccabees wrote before the Hasmoneans had conquered these territories.⁵⁴ Capturing the lands reflected in the Nehemiah Memoir was essential to restore biblical Israel. 1 Maccabees, one of Josephus's sources, emphasizes as much with Simon declaring that the Hasmoneans had never taken anyone's land, but that the family only reclaimed the inheritance of their fathers. Simon, however, stated that his surrounding enemies had unjustly held many of his family's rightful lands (1 Macc 15:33). Hyrcanus, according to Josephus, attempted to remedy this situation by retaking these biblical lands from foreigners.

Studying the territory Hyrcanus controlled as documented by Josephus shows that it closely parallels the genealogical list provided in 2 Chronicles 2-9. Moreover, an examination of the archaeological evidence of all the cities in this biblical list reveals that it depicts the nucleus of the Hasmonean state from Beth-Zur to Mizpah, the expansion during Simon's reign to Gezer, and Hyrcanus's enlargement of his state to Mareshah and Idumea, to Shechem, as well as the region of Madaba. Archaeology reveals that the cities in this biblical list we can identify with confidence were largely inhabited only during two periods: the Iron Age II and the Hasmonean periods. Most of the others were either sparsely inhabited or unoccupied during the Persian Period.⁵⁵ The genealogical lists in 2 Chronicles were likely meant to legitimize Jewish rule over these areas by giving them a biblical pedigree as gentiles inhabited these areas before the Hasmonean had conquered them.⁵⁶

Josephus's accounts of them, see further Atkinson, *History*, 67-79. For the similarities between Hyrcanus's accounts of these lands in the sources and the archaeological evidence for dating the biblical narratives about them to the Hasmonean period, see further I. Finkelstein, *Hasmonean Realities behind Ezra, Nehemiah, and Chronicles: Archaeological and Historical Perspectives* (Atlanta: Scholars Press, 2018), 103.

⁵⁴ For the enemies depicted in Nehemiah, see 1 Macc. 1:11; 3:10, 24, 41; 4:15, 22, 29, 61; 5:3, 66-68; 6:31; 10:78-84; 11:4; 13:20; 14:34; 16:10. The Book of 2 Maccabees has been dated to 143/42 B.C.E. For this evidence, see Goldstein, *II Maccabees*, 71-83; Schwartz, *2 Maccabees*, 11-19, 519-29.

⁵⁵ For evidence of a postexilic date of the lists, see further Finkelstein, *Hasmonean Realities*, 83-108; R. Zadok, "On the Reliability of the Genealogical and Prosopographical Lists of the Israelites in the Old Testament," *Tel Aviv* 25 (1998): 244. This evidence does not mean that the 2 Chronicles were composed in its entirety in the Hasmonean period, but merely that the work was updated and reshaped at this time. For additional evidence in support of this thesis, see P. R. Ackroyd, "Criteria for the Maccabean Dating of Old Testament Literature," *Vetus Testamentum* 3 (1953): 113-32; G. Steins, *Die Chronik als kanonisches Abschlussphänomen: Studien zur Entstehung und Theologie von 1/2 Chronik* (Weinheim: Beltz Athenaum, 1995), 491-99; *ibid.*, "Zur Datierung der Chronik: Ein neuer methodischer Ansatz," *Zeitschrift für Alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 109 (1997): 84-92.

⁵⁶ For this observation, see further Sara Japhet, *The Ideology of the Book of Chronicles and Its Place in Biblical Thought* (Frankfurt: Lang, 1997); D. Mendels, *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism* (New York: Doubleday, 1992), 81-99.

The account of Rehoboam in 2 Chronicles, shows further parallels with the reign of Hyrcanus. In the Chronicles account, Rehoboam's reign began well until he "forsook the law of the Lord" (2 Chron 12:1) when God punished him by allowing the Pharaoh Shishak to invade his land, though in the end he humbled himself, saving Judea from destruction. At the beginning of Hyrcanus's reign he faced a similar threat. The Seleucid king Antiochus VII Sidetes invaded Judea in 134 B.C.E.; Hyrcanus barely survived, forced to humble himself by becoming a Seleucid vassal. The list of fifteen towns Rehoboam fortified from Adoraim and Ziph in the south to Ayalon in the north, and from Lachish-Azekah in the Shephelah in the west to Tekoa in the east were all inhabited during the Hellenistic period. The list of Rehoboam's borders appears to reflect Hyrcanus's territorial expansion after he had recovered from Sidetes's invasion.⁵⁷

The list of cities in 2 Chronicles shows several other overlaps with territory under the control of John Hyrcanus at the end of his reign. This book's account of Hezekiah, moreover, contains many parallels with Hyrcanus. Hezekiah and Hyrcanus both ruled over the same territory west of the Jordan and the entire central hill country. Josephus and 2 Chronicles, however, do not mention the Galilee as under Jewish control.⁵⁸ The Transjordan tribes appear in the biblical listing only in a generic sense; no specific towns are listed. Israel Finkelstein comments on these parallels:

The fact that no king of Judah—not even Josiah—is credited with the conquest of the northern valleys and the Galilee (to achieve the ideal goal of reconstructing the kingdom of David and Solomon) may be revealing, hinting that Chronicles reflects the expansion of the Hasmoneans before the days of Aristobulus and Alexander Jannaeus.⁵⁹

This may provide a date when this biblical text was reworked, as it appears to reflect Hyrcanus's goal of conquering these lands, formally part of the United Monarchy. Yet notwithstanding Josephus's claims to the contrary, the historical evidence shows the Transjordan was not part of the Hasmonean state by the time of Hyrcanus.

For Josephus, it was paramount to show that the Hasmoneans had conquered all the pagan lands that had once belonged to biblical Israel, with the Transjordan central to his narrative. Although not included in the original Land of Israel, it

⁵⁷ See further, Finkelstein, *Hasmonean Realities*, 109-158. The list in 2 Chronicles examined in the present study does not reflect utopian concerns. Rather, it appears to describe an actual historical situation. Josephus's detailed account in the *Antiquities* (13.236-53) of the siege of Jerusalem by Antiochus VII Sidetes at the beginning of the reign of John Hyrcanus reflects the historical reality of the city lists in 2 Chronicles. For this event and the relationship between Sidetes and John Hyrcanus, see the extensive discussion of the literary and archaeological evidence in Atkinson, *History*, 55-57; Ehling, *Untersuchungen zur Geschichte*, 190-216.

⁵⁸ Mendels, *Land of Israel*, 95-96

⁵⁹ Finkelstein, *Hasmonean Realities*, 148.

became part of the territory allotted to the Twelve Tribes when Moses allowed the tribes of Ruben, Gad, and Manasseh to settle there. This area became a legitimate portion of Israel when, at Joshua's request, the Israelite tribes occupying the Transjordan sent warriors across the Jordan River to help the remaining tribes conquer the Canaanites.⁶⁰ These tribes then returned beyond the Jordan River to live in the Transjordan. The insistence in Josephus's writings that the Hasmoneans not only conquered the Transjordan but had a right to it echoes the statement Antiochus III made when he declared that the former lands of Lysimachus's kingdom were now a rightful part of the Seleucid Empire because Seleucus I Nicator had conquered them.⁶¹ By appealing to the biblical tradition of land conquest, Josephus makes the same claim that the Hasmoneans' Hellenistic neighbors were using to defend their land annexations but also basing their territorial acquisitions in Scripture.

Although the biblical accounts preserve an idealized picture of Israelite land possessions east of the Jordan River, for Josephus it was essential to demonstrate that each Hasmonean had attempted to conquer this land because it was part of the ancient lands of Israel from the time of the conquest. Josephus fashioned his narrative of the Hasmonean family after the conquest narratives as he sought to portray their attempt to recreate biblical Israel from the earliest days of their rebellion against Seleucid rule which necessitated the inclusion of the Transjordan. He was not alone; indeed, according to 1 Maccabees, Judas and Jonathan campaigned in the Transjordan. This book even states that Jonathan defeated Arabs and sold them as slaves in Damascus. The geographical descriptions of these early Hasmonean Transjordan campaigns in Josephus and 1 Maccabees do not accord with the historical record. Josephus' representations, however, without any definitive archaeological records to support them, serve the narrative of Hasmonean conquests he portrays throughout his work.⁶² Because the Transjordan was of great

⁶⁰ See, Deut 3:3-17; 29:7-8; Num 21:21-35; 32:1-42; 34:14-15 Josh 12:1-6; 13:8-31; 17:1, 5-6; 18:7; Judg 11:21-22, 26; 1 Chr 5:1-23. For these biblical texts, which contain an idealized picture of Israelite land possessions east of the Jordan River, see B. McDonald, "East of the Jordan": *Territories and Sites of the Hebrew Scriptures* (Oxford: Oxbow, 2001), 101-55; Weinfeld, *Deuteronomy 1-11*, 132-34.

⁶¹ Polybius, *Histories*, 18.51.1-6. For Antiochus II's claim that these lands were his right by conquest, see further A. Mehl, "Δορικτητος χωρα: Kritische Bemerkungen zum 'Speererwerb' in Politik und Völkerrecht der hellenistischen Epoche," *Ancient Society* 11/12 (1980/81): 173-77.

⁶² Ant. 13.179. Judas's Transjordan campaign in 1 Maccabees 5.24-34 is not only incorrect in its geographical descriptions, but it is clearly fictional. According to Josephus, Judas and Jonathan crossed the Jordan River (Ant. 12.335). The author of 1 Maccabees 11.57 states that Jonathan campaigned in the Transjordan, defeated the Arabs there, and sold them as slaves in Damascus. Seeligmann believes that the LXX of Isa 11:34 alludes to Jonathan's conquests in these regions. See further I. L. Seeligmann, *Septuagint Version of Isaiah and Cognate Studies* (Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck, 2004), 245. According to 1 Maccabees 11:57, Jonathan campaigned in the Transjordan. There is no historical evidence for such an expedition. See further Goldstein, *1 Maccabees*, 438-49. See Bar-Kochva, *Judas*, 141, 153-54.

importance to many Jews, the biblical traditions about that area, play a central narrative in Josephus's accounts of Simon's successor, his son John Hyrcanus. According to Josephus, he achieved the family's goal of conquering all the lands that had once comprised biblical Israel. His claim that Hyrcanus captured this region was not his own, but is also reflected in the Dead Sea Scrolls, suggesting that Josephus incorporated an ancient Hasmonean period tradition into his narrative.

Josephus's use of the biblical conquest model may not be his own creation; indeed, the author of 1 Maccabees may have relied upon an earlier source. The Qumran texts *4QTestimonia* (4Q175) and *4QApocryphon of Joshua^b* (4Q379), written earlier than both, appears to allude to Hyrcanus's conquests.⁶³ These texts suggest that it was the Hasmoneans, and not Josephus and the author of 1 Maccabees, who first appealed to the conquest traditions to justify Hasmonean land conquests. The writers of these Dead Sea Scrolls believed Hyrcanus's two sons, Antigonus and Aristobulus, had died prematurely because Hyrcanus had ignored the curse in Joshua 6:26 when he had rebuilt Jericho.⁶⁴ Josephus similarly mentions their premature deaths while the Hasmonean construction of Jericho appears to date to Hyrcanus's reign.⁶⁵ Some Jews undoubtedly thought that God must have cursed his two sons since one murdered the other while the eldest died under mysterious

⁶³ The document *4QTestimonia* (4Q175) was copied at the end of the second century B.C.E. or the beginning of the first century B.C.E. For the *editio princeps*, see J. Allegro, *Qumran Cave 4, I: (4Q158-4Q186)* (Oxford: Oxford University Press, 1968), 57-60, pl. XXI. See further, *ibid.*, "Further Messianic References in Qumran," *Journal of Biblical Literature* 75 (1956): 182-87. Cf. J. Strugnell, Notes en marge du volume V des 'Discoveries in the Judaean Desert of Jordan,'" *Revue de Qumran* 26 (1970): 225-29. The scribe of 4Q175 also produced 1QS. For the *editio princeps* of *4QApocryphon of Joshua^b* (4Q379) and the related *4QApocryphon of Joshua^a* (4Q378), see Carol Newsom, "378-379. 4QApocryphon of Joshua^{a-b}," in G. Brooke, *et al.* (eds.), *Qumran Cave 4.XVIII: Parabiblical Texts, III* (Oxford: Clarendon, 1996), 237-88.

⁶⁴ The phrase "instruments of violence" (*ונּוּכְלָה*; 4Q175 25; 4Q379 22 ii 11) is likely an allusion to Jacob's description of Simeon and Levi in Genesis 49:5. This biblical passage is also found in *4QApocryphon of Joshua^b* (4Q379), which was formerly named "*The Psalms of Joshua*." The passage interpreting Josh 6:26 survives only in 4Q379. It is uncertain which of these Qumran documents is the oldest, or whether one copied from the other. A Greek inscription from Samaria may refer to the capture of Samaria by Antigonus and Aristobulus. See A. D. Tushingham, "A Hellenistic Inscription from Samaria-Sebaste," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 114 (1972): 63.

⁶⁵ *4QTestimonia* and *4QApocryphon of Joshua^b* denounced Hyrcanus as the "man of Belial" because he ignored the curse in Joshua 6:26 and rebuilt Jericho. Eshel, *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 87. Both *4QTestimonia* and *4QApocryphon of Joshua^b* omit words from Joshua 6:26, including the identification of the city as Jericho. This, as previously noted by Strugnell ("Notes en marge," 228), is due to the Septuagintal character of the text used by the authors of these documents. This text preserves a shorter version than the Masoretic Text and does not mention Jericho. Newsom ("379.4QApocryphon of Joshua^{a-b}," 280) comments on this issue in 4Q379: "In the context of the Apocryphon of Joshua, the identity of the city is unquestionably Jericho. For the archaeological evidence from Jericho, see E. Netzer, "The Winter Palaces of the Judean Kings at Jericho at the End of the Second Temple Period," *Bulletin of the American Schools of Oriental Research* 228 (1977): 1-13; *ibid.*, *Hasmonean and Herodian Palaces at Jericho I* (Jerusalem: Israel Exploration Society, 2001), 1-49.

circumstances. Both of these works use the death of the sons to denounce Hyrcanus, by showing that biblical prophecy was being fulfilled in their day. The writers of these texts apparently believed Antigonus and Aristobulus, like the offspring of Hiel of Bethel in 1 Kings 16:34, died because their father had rebuilt Jericho in defiance of Joshua's curse.

The authors of these Qumran texts associate the capture of Samaria by Hyrcanus's sons—called the instruments of violence—with the taking of Shechem by Simeon and Levi. Although this campaign is mentioned by Josephus, and supported by the archaeological findings, the Transjordan evidence is not as clear. However, the Dead Sea Scrolls suggest that Hasmoneans were using the biblical conquest traditions to provide a Scriptural justification of their plan to conquer the Transjordan. This is perhaps most evident in *4QTestimonia*, which cites Deuteronomy 18:18 to describe Hyrcanus's anticipated conquests: "I will raise up for them a prophet like you from among their brethren." The writer also cites the "Oracle of Balaam son of Beor" and discusses Balaam's prophecy about the star and scepter from Numbers 24:17-29 that is expected to "crush the temples of Moab and destroy all the Children of Seth" (4Q175 lns. 12-13).⁶⁶ The writer of this text sets a precedent for seeing the Hasmoneans through the lens of biblical texts by emphasizing that Hyrcanus's conquest of Moab, which Josephus mentions, fulfills Balaam's prophecy.

Josephus in his account of Hyrcanus's Transjordan campaign claims he captured Medaga and the unknown city of Samaga (*Ant.* 13.25405). His narrative, however, is not in accord with the historical record. Although Josephus states that Hyrcanus began his successful campaigns to conquer land immediately after the death of Sidetes (129 B.C.E.), the archaeological evidence shows that none of the cities he purportedly conquered were destroyed before 111/112 B.C.E.⁶⁷ Josephus

⁶⁶ This passage is also found in *4QApocryphon of Joshua*^b (4Q379), which was formerly named "*The Psalms of Joshua*." The passage interpreting Josh 6:26 survives only in 4Q379. There are some minor differences between these texts, most notably a *vacat* of approximately 10 letter-spaces separating the exposition of the curse in lines 8-9 of 4Q379. Newsom notes that 4Q379 is written in a Hasmonean semi-cursive hand. The editor of this text believes the author of *4QTestimonia* copied the curse of Joshua from 4Q379, which may suggest that the Qumran community considered *4QApocryphon of Joshua*^b canonical. If the Qumran sectarians viewed this text as authoritative, this would explain why it was quoted together with pentateuchal passages in *4QTestimonia*. For the use of Balaam's oracle in Jewish literature, see further J. J. Collins, *The Scepter and the Star: The Messiahs of the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Ancient Literature*, 2d ed (New York: Doubleday, 2010), 62-73.

⁶⁷ This evidence is consistent and includes such locations Hyrcanus as Marisa, Mount Gerizim, Shechem, Scythopolis, and important cities such as Ascalon, Tel Beer Sheva, and others. For detailed examinations of the archaeological and numismatic evidence that Josephus's accounts of Hyrcanus's campaigns are not in chronological order, and occurred approximately seventeen years after he took power, see further, Atkinson, *Hasmonean*, 67-69; G. Finkelsztein, "More Evidence on John Hyrcanus I's Conquests: Lead Weights and Rhodian Amphora Stamps," *Bulletin of the Anglo-Israel Archaeological Society*, 16 (1998): 33-63.

has placed Hyrcanus's Transjordan campaign in conjunction with his military expeditions in Samaria and Idumea to portray him as a successful warrior from the start of his reign. His later statement that Hyrcanus's son, Alexander Jannaeus, captured Medaga from the Arabs shows that his story of the victory of Hyrcanus in the Transjordan is not factual.⁶⁸ However, it does indicate that Hyrcanus planned to campaign there, possibly to fulfill the biblical prophecies that a messianic-like figure would capture it. For the author of *4QTestimonia*, his failure to do so demonstrated that he was a false messiah and a false prophet.

The Dead Sea Scrolls suggests that Josephus likely used an ancient tradition to shape his accounts of the conquests of Hyrcanus to further his goal of shaping Hasmonean conquest through the lens of biblical narratives, but at the expense of historical accuracy. Through a careful juxtaposition of incidents that occurred at various times, Josephus portrays Hyrcanus's conquests of Seleucid lands as unstoppable, implying that Hyrcanus's conquests of new lands, like his biblical ancestors, had God's blessing. In Josephus's accounts, the Hasmonean state reached its greatest territorial expansion during the reign of Hyrcanus. His successors, however, were not so blessed as God turned against them.

Hyrcanus's Successors

During the reign of Judah Aristobulus, Hyrcanus's son and successor, Josephus claims the Hasmoneans expanded their kingdom to the north in Iturea, though there is no archaeological confirmation of such a conquest.⁶⁹ The Hasmoneans never fully

⁶⁸ Sievers (*Hasmoneans*, 142) notes this connection and considers Josephus's account of the conquest of Medaga by Hyrcanus dubious. There is no archaeological evidence from the Transjordan that can be associated with Hyrcanus's supposed attacks there. See A. M. Berlin, "Between Large Forces: Palestine in the Hellenistic Period," *Biblical Archaeologist* 60 (1997): 30-31. Foerster's attempt to connect one of the towns conquered by Hyrcanus with Mt. Nebo is largely conjectural. See G. Foerster, *"על כיבושי יוחנן הורקנוו במוֹאָב וצִיהוּה שֶׁל סְמָגָה"* ("The Conquests of John Hyrcanus I in Moab and the Identification of Samaga-Samoge") *Eretz-Israel* 15 (1981): 353-55.

⁶⁹ In *War* 1.176, Josephus alludes to some military campaign that his brother, Antigonus, had conducted in the Galilee. This information is missing in the parallel in *Antiquities* 13. In his *Antiquities*, Josephus mentions that he obtained from Timagenes, through a citation in Strabo, information that Aristobulus had compelled the Itureans to be circumcised and live according to Jewish law (*Ant.* 13.318.). Nevertheless, there is no archaeological evidence to support the claim of Josephus that Aristobulus forcibly converted the Itureans. None of the sites associated with the Itureans shows any evidence of attack or destruction. Local pagan cult traditions persisted uninterrupted throughout the Hasmonean period. The Hasmoneans acquired the Galilee and Golan regions over time through a gradual and organized colonization, and not conquest. If there was any military activity there during the reign of Aristobulus it was at most a minor engagement that left no discernible trace in the archaeological record. Simon fought in the region (ca. 164 B.C.E.) to help Jews there (1 Mac. 5:14-23), which suggests that there was already a significant Jewish presence in the area. The battle of Ptolemy Soter against the Jewish population of Asochis (Talmudic Sikhnin), five miles north of Sepphoris, around 103 or 102 B.C.E. on the Sabbath provides additional evidence for some Jewish settlements in the Galilee (*Life* 207.233, 384).

integrated the Iturean region into their state. Herod later fought to pacify the Itureans and settled large numbers of Jews and Idumeans in their territory. Josephus suggests that several Iturean leaders opposed Hasmonean expansion in the Galilee and the Golan (*War* 1.115; *Ant.* 13.418). Ptolemy, son of Mennaeus, attempted to block Jewish settlement in these regions. Zenodorus urged his followers to raid commercial caravans and rob the territory of Damascus.

It appears that during his short reign, Aristobulus was ill and unable to expand the Hasmonean state, but Josephus exaggerates his deeds to show the Hasmoneans continued to conquer lands to expand their kingdom. It was with Aristobulus's brief reign, his sickness, and his possible madness in his final hours, that for Josephus marked the beginning of the decline and fall of the Hasmonean state. His accounts emphasize that beginning with Jannaeus, the Hasmoneans no longer made alliances with Rome.⁷⁰ Josephus regards the reign of Jannaeus's wife and successor, Shelamzion Alexandra, as a shameful period.⁷¹ Upon her death, her two sons fought one another, which gave the Roman general Pompey the opportunity to capture the Hasmonean state. With that, the Jews lost control over all their land as the Romans in 63 B.C.E. conquered the Hasmonean state and annexed it to the Republic.

It is probable that Josephus inherited his chronology of Hasmonean rise and fall from Scripture. The Qumran text *4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C* contains an interpretation of Daniel 9:24-27 that may provide useful background for understanding Josephus's conception of Hasmonean history and the land. This biblical passage is a reinterpretation of Jeremiah's prophecy in the Book of Jeremiah 25 and 29 that the exile would last only seventy years. Daniel reinterprets the seventy years to mean seven seventy-year periods, 490 years.⁷² The author of this

Numismatic data offers further evidence to support the thesis that there was a Jewish presence in the Galilee and the Golan before the supposed annexation of these areas to the Hasmonean state during the reign of Aristobulus. For extensive discussions of the archaeological and numismatic evidence in support of this thesis, see further Atkinson, *History*, 86-97; Berlin, "Between Large Forces," 2-57; E. M. Meyers and M.A. Chancey, *Alexander to Constantine* (New Haven: Yale University Press, 2012), 33-34; D. Syon, "Numismatic Evidence of Jewish Presence in Galilee Before the Hasmonean Annexation?," *Israel Numismatic Research*, 1 (2006): 21-24.

⁷⁰ For a detailed reconstruction of his accomplishments and the events that likely took place during his reign, see further Atkinson, *Hasmoneans*, 80-99; Sharon, *Judea*, 209-53.

⁷¹ See further, Atkinson, *History*, 102-42; *ibid.*, *Queen Salome: Jerusalem's Warrior Monarch of the First Century B.C.E.* (Jefferson, NC: McFarland, 2012), 141-60.

⁷² For the use of sabbatical chronology in 4Q390, see further D. Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI: Parabiblical Texts, Part 4: Pseudo-Prophetic Texts* (Oxford: Clarendon, 2001), 113-16, 235-53; Eshel *Dead Sea Scrolls*, 102-10; 2008, 25-27; C. Werman, "Epochs and End-Time: The 490-Year Scheme in Second Temple Literature," *Dead Sea Discoveries*, 13 (2006): 229-55. Similar calculations reflecting a periodization of history are found in the following texts: 1 Enoch 89.59-90.19 (4Q204-207); 4Q212; 4Q247; 4Q558; 4Q181; 4Q243. Eusebius's *Demonstratio Evangelica* (8.2.394b-d) calculates the length of time from Cyrus to the death of Jannaeus as 482 years. The similarity between and similar calculations in Second Temple Period Jewish writings may indicate that Eusebius had access to a Hasmonean chronograph or a work based on one.

Qumran text believed the eschatological countdown, the 490 years, in the prophecies of Daniel and Jeremiah began with Judas's rededication of the temple. The final seventy-years ended with the reign of Jannaeus.⁷³ This Dead Sea Scroll suggests that many Jews looked to Daniel to explain the decline and demise of the Hasmonean state. It is probable that Josephus knew the exegetical tradition found in *4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C* which he used to shape his account of Hasmonean decline and which helped form his view that God had terminated the Hasmonean state.

Conclusion

Josephus's accounts of Hasmonean land expansion and the history of the Hasmonean dynasty while largely based on Scripture also shows the influence of traditions from the Greco-Roman world. Josephus shows himself to be a creative author who combines elements from Jewish and Hellenistic traditions with Jewish exegetical interpretations to create an epic history of the Hasmonean family.

The chronological traditions in both the Dead Sea Scroll and Josephus shows that Jews of the Second Temple Period derived the lengths of the reigns of some of the Hasmonean rulers from Scripture, particularly the chronology of the Book of Daniel. These traditions also show that Second Temple Jews employed the idea of periodization to explain the rise and fall of the Hasmonean monarchy. Although Josephus was influenced by Scripture in his use of periodization, his reliance upon this tradition is also firmly rooted in Hellenization. The concept of a succession of empires became popular in the Greco-Roman age as part of anti-Greek propaganda.⁷⁴ The calculations in the Dead Sea Scrolls and Josephus regarding the duration of the Hasmonean rulers reflect the belief that the establishment of the Hasmonean dynasty marked the beginning of the final age of history as foretold by the biblical prophets. Aristobulus's creation of the Hasmonean monarchy marked the termination of this apocalyptic countdown. For Josephus, the Hasmonean state effectively ended with Jannaeus's death as, for him, the king's wife and successor was not a legitimate ruler. Consequently, he no longer depicts her or her sons as conquering lands, but only losing them to the Romans.

⁷³ For the evidence, see in K. Atkinson, "Understanding the Relationship Between the Apocalyptic Worldview and Jewish Sectarian Violence: The Case of the War Between Alexander Jannaeus and Demetrius III," in L. L. Grabbe, G. Boccaccini with J. M. Zurawski (eds.), *The Seleucid and Hasmonean Periods and the Apocalyptic Worldview* (London: Bloomsbury T & T Clark, 2016), 45-57; *idem*, *Neighbors*, 94-98. For the *editio princeps* of *4QApocryphon of Jeremiah C* see Dimant, *Qumran Cave 4.XXI*, 91-260,

⁷⁴A fragment of the early second century B.C.E. Roman chronicler Aemilius Sura describes a similar schema of four kingdoms. Sura drew upon the earlier schemas of writers such as Eratosthenes and Ctesias that divided history up to the defeat of Antiochus in 190 B.C.E. into five periods. Cf. Diodorus 2.22.2. For similar chronologies that sought to account for the rise of the Roman Republic, see T. Mommsen, "Mamilius Sura, Aemilius Sura, L. Manlius." *Rheinisches Museum für Philologie* 16 (1861): 282-87.

Through a careful juxtaposition of accounts, creative reinterpretations of Scripture, influence from classical historiography, and by rearranging the chronology of events, Josephus presents a continuous narrative of Hasmonean land expansion that ended with the failed reigns of Hyrcanus's successors that mirrors events of his day.⁷⁵ Josephus's reading of Scripture had convinced him that history had repeated itself. The Hasmoneans had proven themselves unworthy to hold the land just as the Jews in his day had proven themselves to be unworthy custodians of the land. The difference was that with the most recent loss of the land, God had continued to favor the Romans. Because of this, the days of land conquests were over and, as Josephus emphasizes, the Jews were forced to live peacefully among new masters, but under the guidance of Jews like Josephus whom God has blessed by placing them in prominent positions. From this perspective, those Jews who accept God's will, and reside in the Diaspora, are not necessarily cursed. Josephus believes they reside in the lands that God intends them to inhabit, but with their dream of occupying the Promised Land at an end.

⁷⁵ See further, Atkinson, *History*, esp. 166-79.