Undue Praise: The Secondary Nature of the *Priesgedichte* in 1Maccabees 3.3-9; 14.4-15

Presented to OTSEM Annual Meeting December 2008

By Francis Borchardt, University of Helsinki

The final form of 1Maccabees presents a narrative centered around the efforts of early members of the Hasmonean family and their allies (domestic and foreign) to regain autonomy from their Seleucid overlords and their Jewish conspirators, and to bring Judea and Jerusalem under their control[1]. However, this impression of 1Maccabees appears to be only the last of a series of editions that came out over the course of nearly seventy years of Hasmonean rule. In the course of composition, a number of passages seem to have been added to the text for various reasons and with diverse results. Some of these can be grouped together into larger collections based on form, content, theme, and vocabulary.

Two such passages are the *priesgedichte* (poems of praise) that are attributed to Judas (3.3-9) and Simon (14.4-15). Each poem sits uneasily in its context, and each has a certain degree of similarity to the other. Further, the two have been treated together throughout much of the history of scholarship on 1Maccabees. The consensus on these passages up to now has been that they are integral parts of the structure of the book. In this paper we will challenge that view with special concentration on literary critical arguments, which seem to show that these poems do not fit their contexts at all. We aim to prove that these poems are added secondarily and are part of a late addition to the text. We will further examine just how similar the poems are in order to test the practice of treating them together in any study of 1Maccabees.

3.3-9: The Praise of Judas

This *priesgedicht* is the only passage in 1Macc 3 that stands out as a possible addition. Otherwise, a relatively unified report of Judas Maccabeus' early military career is the subject of the narration. Three battle scenes dominate the account. The first (3.10-12) introduces Judas as a warrior in the mold of David, through his use of his opponent's sword throughout his life (1Sam 17.51, 54). The second battle (3.13-

[1] E.J. Bickerman *The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt* (SJLA 32; Leiden: Brill, 1979), 94.

26) builds on the first, pitting Judas against a more powerful general and a larger army. There is considerably more detail in the second account, as well as a lengthy pre-battle introduction in the form of an exhortatory speech. The result is that Judas' fame reaches the king. This sets up the third battle account wherein the king appoints Lysias, his surrogate in the western empire, and orders him to destroy Israel (3.27-36). Lysias, in turn appoints two members of the royal court as commanders of an army and sends them into Judea (3.38-41). Judas then reacts by convening his body of followers and asking aid from heaven before finally marching out to battle and encouraging his troops (3.42-60).

The three accounts logically build upon one another and make many internal references to each other. Seron, in the second battle account, reacts to Judas' victory in the first battle. King Antiochus in the third, hears reports of the previous two battles, and reacts to them. Even the third battle account, which contains numerous parts, is internally tied together by the logical delegation of duties from the higher to lower rulers and internal links.

Two poetic passages (3.45, 50-53), though abruptly changing form, continue and confirm themes from the rest of the chapter. The statements of the first poem are basically a repetition of Antiochus' orders to Lysias concerning Israel (3.35-36). The second poem ties both to its immediate context (3.46-49), and to the broader context of the chapter. Verse 51 recalls v.45 and anticipates v.59. The gentile army encamped in the land at vv.40-41 is recalled by v.52, which is further duplicated in v.58. Moreover, the theme of double-causality[2] displayed by the poem echoes the speech of Judas in the second battle account (3.17-22) and also foreshadows his speech at the close of chapter 3 (3.58-60). Though the change of form is a clue that might have suggested a secondary insertion, it appears the links are too strong for this to be the case.

Even the narrative introduction to Judas' career (3.1-2) fits the content of the rest of chapter 3 well. Judas is highlighted as the commander of the forces in the first verse, thus focusing the reader on the central figure of the chapter. The second verse stresses not only the participation of his brothers and the other followers of his father, which are later recalled (3.13, 14, 25, 42), but also the military nature of Judas'

[2] That is, events displayed as the result of both human efforts *and* divine power, as explained by D.S. Williams *The Structure of 1Maccabees* (CBQMS 31; Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999), 99-101.

campaign. Further the implication that Judas is fighting on behalf of Israel is repeated numerous times (3.21, 43, 59). The introduction provided by 3.1-2 is entirely appropriate.

The problematic passage remains. 3.3-9 strikes the reader as problematic on a number of levels. The first clue is the formal difference; 3.3-9 is a poetic passage, technically a *priesgedicht*, which is surrounded by narrative prose. There is no narrative introduction to the poem that gives it a clear context, and similarly the succeeding narrative makes no reference to it. Though poetry makes two other appearances in the chapter, one poem (3.50-53) has a clear narrative introduction that suggests the content of the verses are utterances of the characters mentioned throughout its context. The other poem (3.45), like 3.3-9 does not have a narrative introduction, but does have numerous links to the surrounding text.

This leads to the second problem with 3.3-9: there are very few connections that can be made between its contents and the immediate context. Certainly none of the verses are precise enough to tie to any event in chapter 3 specifically, but even if one uses a generalizing principle one finds very few and very weak ties to the context. The proclamation of v.3 that the subject of the poem extended the glory of his people could be interpreted as relating to the spread of fear achieved by Judas among the gentiles, referenced in v.27, or Seron's knowledge of Judas and his companions (3.13-14), but the connection might be a stretch. Also in verse 3, the fact that Judas waged battles can certainly be seen throughout Judas' reign, including in the rest of the chapter, but this too is quite general given the circumstances of rebellion. Verses 5 and 6, which speak of Judas' efforts against the apostate Jews, can be tied only to 7.21-25, the sole instance in which Judas attacked his Jewish opponents. The kings Judas is reported to have embittered in v.7 must be seen as Antiochus IV, Antiochus V and Demetrius I, though it must be said that Judas hardly achieved outstanding results against the second two. The two comments in v.9 have different references; the first part of the verse, about Judas' renown, can be tied to 3.25; 5.1, 63; 8.1-32. The second comment about gathering in the perishing can be seen as relating to chapter 5. However, nothing is specific in the verses. Every phrase is exceedingly general, and skirts the truth.

The generalities even extend to the subject of the poem. On the first reading it seems as though the text has connections to vv.1-2, by sharing the same subject. However, if one reads these verses closely there is a clear disconnection: While verse

1 has Judas as its subject, verse 2 has a third person plural subject (ἐβοήθουν, ἐπολέμουν) in both of its clauses. Verse 3, the first verse of the poem then has a third person singular subject. One expects that a change in subject requires the name to be restated once it is brought up again, but here it is not. Judas' name is not mentioned in v.3 or at any other point in the poem. This creates a disconnection between the poem and the narrative frame, which implies that the poem may be secondary.

Further confirmation of the hypothesis of the secondary nature of 3.3-9 comes from the discrepancies between the poem and the narratives. This can particularly be seen in v.8 where it is reported that "he went through the cities of Judah and destroyed the ungodly out of it" (καὶ διῆλθεν ἐν πόλεσιν Ιουδα και ἐχωλέθρευσεν ἀσεβεῖς ἐξ αὐτῆς). The report is entirely wrong. Judas never removes his opponents entirely from the land. From beginning (3.10) until end (9.23) there is a strong presence of Judas' opponents in Judah. They continually cause problems for him, and, in fact, kill him. Further inconsistencies can be seen in the lion metaphor carried out twice in the poem (3.4) but never revisited in the rest of the book, and his turning away wrath from Israel (3.8), which is never stated in the text. These discrepancies coupled with the general nature of the poem, and its disconnection from the surroundings make it so that the poem certainly does not have to be about Judas, but could be about any of the Hasmoneans.

The point is carried home by the close relationship which appears to exist between 3.1-2 and 3.10-11. In v.2 it is reported that all of Judas' followers gathered to fight Israel's fight (καὶ ἐπολέμουν τὸν πόλεμον Ισραηλ). This is echoed in the attack of Apollonius when he gathers troops to fight against Israel (τοῦ πολεμῆσαι πρὸς τὸν Ισραηλ). Once Judas' troops are introduced as eager to fight for Israel, they are immediately confronted by foreign soldiers attacking Israel. Judas' military command is then the subject of the rest of the passage (3.11-12). The two pairs of verses follow on each other very well, both in content and in verbal similarities. There is little question they can be read together.

Due to the isolated nature of 3.3-9, scholars have, since very early on tried to explain its function and presence in the text. C.F.W. Grimm wrote that the poem was an apologia for Judas' reign that preceded it and summarized it[3]. He however found no problems with its place in the text or lack of connections. A number of scholars

[3] C.F.W. Grimm *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer* (Leipzig: S.Hirzel, 1853).

have followed his initial report more or less[4]. They all see the function as a sort of summary-before-the-fact for Judas' reign, and tie it to the whole of 1Macc in that way. Nils Martola adds to this that it is not only a framing summary for the account of Judas, but also for the entire story of the work of liberation[5]. Martola makes this statement despite recognizing that the poem has little to do with the immediate context[6].

The problem with the above arguments is that while they hypothesize a specific function for the poem that would work, they fail to explain the problematic way in which the poem is associated to the text of 1Macc. While the poem can be seen as a summary of Judas' reign, it could also summarize the reigns of Jonathan or Simon, given the lack of any stated subject. Though the poem is seen by Martola as a framing poem for the work of liberation, it is clear that the process of liberation has been started before the poem (2.45-48; 3.1-2). Combining this with Martola's notice that the poem has no bonds with its context, it is impossible to firmly state that the poem is original to chapter 3. Moreover, the fact that the poem's only hypothesized function is as a summary also allows for the fact that it is additional to the main story.

A second proposal is made by J.R. Bartlett[7] and J.A. Goldstein[8]: the poem is a contemporary poem added to the text. This would seem likely based on the information at hand. It would explain the discrepancies between the poem and the story itself. However, the fact that there is no stated subject in the poem would require that the narrative already existed and that the poem is either only partial, or was about someone else and edited to fit the existing context. This is certainly possible, but may suggest that the poem is an entirely new composition added to 1Macc at a later time by an editor. However, when a reason for the poem's addition is hypothesized, an already existing source again seems more likely. If a copyist or editor knew this poem about Judas (or perhaps another hero) and thought it fit the literary situation, he may well have been eager to insert it into the account in an way he could, trying to find an appropriate place for it. However, it is difficult to see why

---

[4] F.-M. Abel *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1949); J.C. Dancy *A Commentary on 1Maccabees* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954); N. Martola *Capture and Liberation: A Study of the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984).
[5] N. Martola *Capture and Liberation*, 37, 237, 263.
[6] *Ibid.*, 263.
[7] J.R. Bartlett *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees* (Cambridge: Cambridge University Press, 1973), 45.
[8] J.A. Goldstein *I Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City, N.Y.: Doubleday, 1976), 100.

the poem would be composed by a later editor of the book and placed so poorly in the text.

In the end, it is not possible to arrive at a definite conclusion regarding this poem's provenance. It has some connections, but other discrepancies. It has been seen by some as original to the composition, and by others as a secondary addition from an outside source. While both arguments are incomplete it seems that more questions are answered by the hypothesis that the poem was already in existence and secondarily inserted.

14.4-15: The Praise of Simon

There are a number of problems with connecting this *priesgedicht* with its surrounding context. 14.1-3 has no bearing on 14.4-15, and in fact seems awkward in relation to it. After three verses, which talk about the fall of Demetrius, one would not imagine that a song in praise of Simon would be fitting. Some commentators acknowledge this fact and make the argument that the praise of Simon belongs immediately after 13.53 and the defeat of the citadel[9]. This would appear to make sense; Simon might deserve praise immediately following the act that brings independence to Judea (the cleansing and resettlement of the gentile strongholds at 13.43-53), and at least the character of Simon would remain central throughout.

However, the details of the poem do not necessarily agree with chapter 13; this agreement would be necessary for its connection to the chapter. The statement in v.4 that the land had peace all the days of Simon can only be understood in the most strict and technical sense of the land of Judah[10]. It is reported that after Simon took power (13.1-9), Trypho went out from Ptolemais and tried to invade the land of Judah (13.12-16, 20-22). Further, in v.33 the narrator clearly states that Trypho "brought great calamity on the land" (καὶ ἐποίησεν πληγὴν μεγάλην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς). Furthermore, v.5 seems to attribute the taking of Joppa to Simon, while 13.11 makes it clear that it was Jonathan son of Absalom who took Joppa and remained in it. Granted, he was sent by Simon, but the proud place the victory holds in the poem suggests that it was Simon himself who took the harbor, according to the poet. Verse 13 is also suspicious in its claim that "the kings were crushed" (οἱ βασιλεῖς

[9] F.-M. Abel *Les Livres* , 248 and J.C. Dancy *Commentary*, 179.
[10] J.C. Dancy *Commentary*, 181. It should be pointed out that some manuscripts (S, V, La) include the reading "of Judah" though most support a broader "land".

συνετρίβησαν). Not only is Demetrius II, one of the two kings around, Simon's ally at this point (13.34-40), but Trypho, far from being crushed, is still in power and wreaking havoc on the land (13.31-32). These disagreements with chapter 13 raise serious doubts as to whether one can view this as a direct continuation of 13.52.

There are no fewer problems connecting the poem to the other additional material in chapter 14 and beyond[11]. While some links may be seen in Simon's worldwide fame (14.10/16-24), and his general praise (14.4-15/ 25-49), there are enough discrepancies between the poem and the following material to also make this doubtful. Many of the same passages that caused problems relating to chapter 13 and the beginning of Simon's reign, also bring trouble with linking the poem to the end of Simon's reign. The peaceful land for Simon's whole reign, mentioned at verse 4, is proved false by 15.39-41; 16.1-17, which ends with Simon's murder by treachery[12]. 14.7, which states that there was none to oppose Simon is also disproven by the reports regarding Antiochus VII (15.28), Cendebeus (15.38-41; 16.4-10), and Ptolemy son of Abubus, son-in-law of Simon (16.11-22)[13]. Further, v.13, which proclaims that all the kings were crushed is starkly contrasted with chapter 15, which reports on Antiochus VII and his rise against Simon after the former's victory over Trypho (15.37-41)[14].

In addition to the lack of continuity displayed in the verses above, there is also the glaring fact that the change of form from a narrative report to a *priesgedicht* is abrupt. In the face of this evidence, scholars have tried to explain its link to either the rest of the additional material[15], the remainder of the original level[16], or to the whole of 1Maccabees in a variety of ways[17]. The two most recent and most pertinent cases to this study, those of Martola and Williams deserve a closer look.

---

[11] N. Martola *Capture and Liberation*, 268-271; D.S. Williams *Structure*, 122-125. Both scholars consider 14.16-16.24 to be additional based on formal and rhetorical studies of 1Maccabees respectively.
[12] J.R. Bartlett *The First and Second*, 191.
[13] C.F.W. Grimm *Das erste Buch*, 208; F.-M. Abel *Les Livres*, 248; however see the counter argument of Keil *Commentar*, 224 which states that the verse means "Kein Gegner ihm erfolg reichen Wiederstand konnte". The Greek and v.12b, 13, 14c seem to support the arguments of Grimm and Abel.
[14] J.R. Bartlett *First and Second*, 191.
[15] J. Dancy *Commentary*, 6-8, 179; S. Tedesche and S. Zeitlin *First Book*, 221.
[16] J. Destinon *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Arch. Buch XII-XVII = Jüd. Krieg Buch I* (Keil: Lipsius and Tischer, 1882), 11; E. Kautsch Das erste Buch der Makkabäer," 29; and J. Wellhausen, *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin: W. de Gruyter, 1921), 257.
[17] F.-M. Abel *Les Livres*, 248; C.F.W. Grimm *Das erste Buch*, 208 J. Goldstein *I Maccabees* (Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976), 488; C. Keil *Commentar*, 223.

Nils Martola first comes to one conclusion about the poem at 14.4-15, and then changes course to another opinion. Initially, Martola states: "I cannot but classify this unit [14, 16-24; 15, 15-24; 14, 25-49] including the poetic passage 14, 4-15 as an 'island'"[18]. He marks off these texts as being secondary to the main story, and related to each other because they mark a break in the story and go on reporting different circumstances[19]. Though, as we have seen, it is troublesome to find links between 14.4-15 and the rest of the material surrounding chapter 14, the basic point that Martola notices is correct. Despite this original deduction, Martola changes course and sees the poem as an integral part of the original 1Macc, acting as the closing half of a poetic frame, which in 3.3-9 introduces and in 14.4-15 closes the work of liberation[20]. Though Martola tries to prove this new hypothesis, he fails to show how the poem, once considered an island, can all of the sudden be tied to the main story. The doubts he had about continuity of content and form persist, and this new connection with 3.3-9 as a poetic frame is weak.

First, 3.3-9 does not precede the work of liberation; chapter 2 consists of a whole series of attempts by Mattathias and others to liberate the Jews from the oppressive Seleucid cult (2.19-22, 29-38, 39-41, 45-48). Even if some of these attempts are unsuccessful, the last two passages deal with successful attempts at liberation, so much so that 3.1 claims Judas took command of the work of Mattathias "in his place" (καὶ ἀνέστη Ιουδας ὁ καλούμενος Μακκαβαῖος υἱὸς αὐτοῦ ἀντ' αὐτοῦ). 3.2 also states that "all who had joined his father" (πάντες ὅσοι ἐκολλήθησαν τῷ πατρὶ αὐτοῦ) helped him. Thus, the claim that the work of liberation begins with Judas after the "framing poem" is not supported by the text.

Second, the work of liberation does not end with the poem at 14.4-15, or even immediately before it. Rather, as Martola himself points out, the work of liberation ends at 13.53:

> Seen from the horizon of the first chapter, 1M is thus, above all, the story of the liberation of Jerusalem, in the first hand the liberation of the temple temporarily occupied by foreign powers, secondly the liberation and sanctification of the Acra, built and inhabited by foreign heathens. Seen from this point of view 1M ends with the thirteenth chapter[21].

---

[18] N. Martola *Capture and Liberation*, 186.
[19] *Ibid*, 187.
[20] *Ibid*., 201.
[21] *Ibid.*, 201.

14.1-3 clearly has nothing to do with liberation, and as discussed elsewhere[22], may even hinder the work of liberation, and the poem at 14.4-15, for all its praise, only discusses works related to liberation in two verses, v.7 and v.13. Otherwise the poem is more of a general praise of Simon's reign. Despite this recognition of the work of liberation ending in the thirteenth chapter Martola insists still that 14.4-15 is part of a poetic frame.

Some of the same criticisms lobbed at Martola can be applied to David Williams' analysis as well. Williams shares Martola's view of the book as a story of liberation, first of the temple and cult and second of the citadel[23]; hence, one might also question why the poem he has ending the main story does not comment on this work more than twice. But, Williams' argument is different from Martola's, and in some ways more sophisticated. Williams argues that the poem forms connections through statements and motifs with various previous parts of 1Macc, as if summarizing what has come before[24]. Though Williams proceeds with the argument basically making connections in vocabulary between the poem and other points in the book, instead of showing any sort of summary, he does succeed in raising the possibility that the poem is related to the main story. The problem with Williams' analysis however, is that most of it is superficial, accomplished with somewhat common terms (πάσας τὰς ἡμέρας, καὶ ἡσύχασεν ἡ γῆ, πρεσβύτεροι… νεανίσκοι)[25], and takes little account of the possibility that the poem might imitate vocabulary in the rest of the book or of the more important fact that the whole composition is a translation into Greek, which could easily have been harmonized by the translator. Williams further makes no mention of the discrepancies between the poem and the material that comes before it. This especially weakens his thesis.

Williams continues his argument for 14.15 being the end of the original story with a number of side notes: He points out that 14.15 is a chiasm, which he deems appropriate for an ending to the book[26], and sees 14.13 as signaling double causality through the use of the term συνετρίβησαν (crush)[27], which he sees as especially

---

[22] Briefly: 14.1-3 discuss the capture of Demetrius II, Simon's ally (13.34-40), by the king of Persia Media, leaving Trypho, Simon's main opponent (13.31-32; 15.10-14, 25) with no opposition. This allows Trypho to attack Simon unfettered by fear of attack from his rival to the Seleucid throne.
[23] D.S. Williams *Structure*, 107.
[24] *Ibid*., 66.
[25] *Ibid*., 67-68.
[26] *Ibid*., 68.
[27] *Ibid*., 101.

applicable to divine power's effect of Israel's foes. Williams also relates the poem to that of Judas, though differently from Martola, perhaps seeing the flaw in Martola's structure with regard to the work of liberation. He sees the poems as given to their particular heroes because each played a major role in the work of liberation[28]. While this could be an explanation for why Jonathan does not receive a poem of praise, it is hardly convincing, especially since Mattathias and his friends are also praised (2.47-48) but do not have a major feat in the struggle for liberation (i.e. liberation of the temple or liberation from the akra). Finally, Williams too uses the poem as part of a frame, though not with 3.3-9 but a frame with 1.2-4[29]. He relates the two passages through vocabulary and content. Williams sees the crushing of kings in 1.2 as echoed by the defeat of the kings in 14.13, and the quieting of the earth before Alexander (1.3) as echoed by the peace of the land (14.4) under Simon. Third, Williams sees that Alexander's domination of *countries* and *nations* (1.4)is echoed by Simon's extension of the borders of his *nation* and his gaining full control of the *country* (14.6). The problem of course is that this takes no account of the difference in form between the two passages, nor the fact that no structure is displayed by his recognition of like terms. These are haphazard similarities in what amount to terms commonly used of political subjects.

Though Williams and Martola both make interesting observations, and are both correct that the thirteenth chapter ends the work the main story discusses, it seems they have missed the points of inconsistency between 14.4-15 and its surrounding. It appears that the answer for the time and place and occasion for the composition of 14.4-15 is betrayed by the poem itself. The poem is meant to treat the whole of Simon's reign[30]. This is clear from the statement in v.4 that the land had rest "all the days of Simon". It is also the case that much of the vocabulary in the poem is idealized and presents Simon's time as a golden age along the lines of that promised in various points in the Hebrew scriptures[31]. In view of this idealization it may be that the poem was composed well after the time of Simon, and entirely separately from 1Macc, as an idealized praise of the reign of Simon. It could then have been inserted into the text by an editor who was making other alterations or by a copyist who knew

[28] *Ibid.*, 107.
[29] *Ibid.*, 68, n. 18.
[30] J.C. Dancy *Commentary*, 181.
[31] *Ibid.*, 181; J.R. Bartlett *First and Second*, 191; J.A. Goldstein *I Maccabees*, 488. These scholars draw particular attention to vv. 8: Lev 26.3-4; Zech 8.12; 9: Zech 8.4; 12: Micah 4.4, Zech 3.10.

the poem, and thought it appropriate before the praises of Simon coming from the Spartans, Romans and Jews. This would explain not only the poem's idealization of Simon in an otherwise sterile and factual account of his reign in both the original story (e.g. 13.17-19, 46) and the addendum (e.g. 16.16), but also the contradictions between the poem and both the main story and addition.

What is the relationship between these two poems?

As we mentioned at the start of the paper, these two *priesgedichte* are often treated as a set. We also saw in the investigations of each particular poem that Martola believes they are structural markers for the "main story" of 1Maccabees, and Williams believes they identify each of the two Hasmonean heroes who play a major role in the process toward liberation. Each of these theories however, is rather subjective. As we pointed out above, the work of liberation begins before the reign of Judas with Mattathias and the other Judeans who refused to defile themselves. Martola's theory loses weight by ignoring this.

Williams' theory has a different problem. While he is correct in stating that the two major events in the theme of liberation are 1) liberation of the sanctuary from the gentile cult and 2) liberation of Jerusalem from the influence of the akra, he fails to show how these events are connected to the *priesgedichte*. Judas' main feat of reclaiming, rebuilding, and cleansing the temple is nowhere mentioned in 3.3-9. Nothing in the poem can even be tied to it. It would seem odd that the very reason for the poem's existence, according to Williams, is overlooked in its verses. At 14.4-15, Simon's feat gets greater attention. His act should likely be more broadly understood than simply liberation from the akra; it should more likely be seen as liberation from gentile presence in the land, especially in the various strongholds. When we look at this broad liberating act of Simon, there are three verses in his *priesgedicht* that celebrate his feat, vv. 6, 7, and 13. These all rejoice in Simon's victory over the gentiles, and his dominance over the strongholds. Even so, the main theme of the poem seems to be the peace in the land that was brought by Simon's rule, as opposed to his victories over the gentiles. Again, one must question whether Williams' theory for the existence of these two poems (and the lack of a *priesgedicht* for Jonathan or John Hyrcanus) really stands up to scrutiny. It appears that these poems are not concentrated on the major acts of liberation at all, but other parts of the reigns of their subjects. One is still left wondering why these poems should be associated.

The solution may come in simply disassociating the poems. Other than a formal similarity, there is not much about these poems that is similar. 3.3-9 is a general poem that cites few specifics about the reign of Judas, and does not even name him. 14.4-15 begins by emphasizing the setting as Simon's reign and lists specific deeds throughout the poem (14.5, 7, 10, 14, 15). Further, while 3.3-9 is largely devoid of any biblical allusion or citation, 14.4-15 has at least four instances (vv. 8, 9, 12, 13) with direct reference to pentateuchal and prophetic texts. Finally, Judas' poem celebrates his military character and ability (3.3, 4, 5, 6, 7, 8), while Simon's focuses on the peace his reign brought to the land (14.4, 7, 8, 11, 12, 13). The differences could not be more astounding.

Despite this, one is still left with a sense that the poems are related. Though this does not come from any internal evidence. It comes more from tangential aspects of the *priesgedichte*. Placement is a major one. If one reads 1Maccabees as an unadulterated unity then Judas is praised immediately after the reader is introduced to him. The reader has no idea what the character has done or will do to merit the praise, yet is treated to a song in Judas' honor. Similarly odd, Simon's song comes not at the end of his reign, nor like Judas, at the beginning, but in the midst of his rule. Each of these placements has drawn attention to the poems because they invite the reader to discern why the poems appear where they do. Another peripheral aspect that makes the poems similar is that they are belied by their surroundings. Each poem makes claims for its respective Hasmonean hero that are patently proven untrue by the narrative text. Even when one allows for a bit of poetic hyperbole specific claims are proven wrong by the text.

This evidence all points to the likelihood that 3.3-9 and 14.4-15 are independently composed *priesgedichte* that were similarly attached to an already existing Maccabean history, perhaps at the same time as other similar material was attached. Their function, other than to heap praise on members of the Hasmonean family remains a mystery. Still a puzzle as well is the reason for which these poems would be placed in such odd contexts in 1Maccabees. 14.4-15 is possibly set in its place because it sings of specific victories just achieved by Simon, but 3.3-9 has little reason for its location. These questions will have to remain open.

Bibliography

Abel, F.-M. *Les Livres des Maccabées* (Paris: Gabalda, 1967)

Arenhoevel, D. *Die Theokratie nach dem 1. und 2. Makkabäer* (Mainz: Matthias Grünewald, 1967)

Bar-Kochva, B. *Judas Maccabeus: The Jewish Struggle against the Seleucids* (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1988)

Bartlett, J.R. *1 Maccabees: An Introduction* (Sheffield: Sheffield Academic Press, 1998)

Jews in the Hellenistic and Roman Cities (London: Routledge, 2002)

The First and Second Books of the Maccabees (Cambridge: Cambridge University, 1973)

Baumgarten, Albert I. *The Flourishing of Jewish Sects in the Maccabean Era: An Interpretation* (SJSJ 55; Leiden: Brill, 1997)

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

Cohen, S.J.D. *From the Maccabees to the Mishnah*; second edition (Louisville; London: Westminster John Knox Press, 2006)

Dancy, J.C. *A Commentary on 1 Maccabees* (Oxford: Basil Blackwell, 1954)

Derfler, S.L. *Hasmonean Revolt: Rebellion or Revolution* (ANETS 5; Lewiston: Edwin Mellen Press, 1989)

Destinon, J. *Die Quellendes Flavius Josephus in der Jüd. Arch. Buch XII-XVII = Jüd. Krieg Buch I (*Keil: Lipsius and Tischer, 1882).

Dommershausen, W. *1 Makkabäer 2Makkabäer* (Würzburg: Echter, 1985)

Doran, R. *The First Book of Maccabees: Introduction, Commentary, and Reflections* (New Interpreter's Bible 4; Nashville: Abingdon, 1996)

Ettelson, H.W. "The Integrity of 1Maccabees" *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences 27* (1925) 249-384.

Farmer, W. *Maccabees Zealots and Josephus: An Enquiry into Jewish Nationalism in the Greco-Roman Period* (New York: Columbia University Press, 1956)

Fischer, T. *Seleukiden und Makkabäer* (Bochum: Brockmeyer, 1980)

Gauger, J.-D. *Beiträge zur jüdischen Apologetik* (Cologne; Bonn: Hanstein, 1977)

Goldstein, J.A. *1Maccabees* (AB 41; Garden City, NY: Doubleday, 1976)

Peoples of an Almighty God: Competing Religions in the Ancient World (New York: Doubleday, 2002)

Grabbe, L.L. *Judaism from Cyrus to Hadrian* (Minneapolis: Fortress, 1992)

Grimm, C.F.W. *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer* (Leipzig: S.Hirzel, 1853)

Gruen, E. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition* (Berkeley: University of California Press, 1998)

Harrington, D. *The Maccabean Revolt: Anatomy of a Biblical Revolution* (Wilmington: Glazier, 1988)

Hieke, T. "The Role of 'Scripture' in the Last Words of Mattathias (1Macc 2:49-70)" *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology. Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuteroncanonical Books, Papa, Hungary, 9-11 June 2005* Xeravits, Geza; Zsengellér, József, eds. (Boston: Brill, 2007)

Johnson, N. B. *Prayer in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha: A Study of the Jewish Concept of God* (SBLMS volume II; Philadelphia: Society of Biblical Literature and Exegesis, 1948)

Kautzsch, E. "Das erste Buch der Makkabäer" *Die Apokryphen und Pseudepigraphen des Alten Testaments* (Tubingen: Mohr, 1900)

Keil, C. *Commentar über die Bücher der Makkabäer* (Leipzig: Dörffling und Francke, 1875)

Martola, N. *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo: Åbo Akademi, 1984)

Mendels, D. *The Rise and Fall of Jewish Nationalism* (New York: Doubleday, 1992)

The Land of Israel as a Political Concept in Hasmonean Literature: Recourse to History of Second Century B.C. Claims to the Holy Land (Tübingen: Mohr, 1987)

Neuhaus, G.O. "Quellen im 1. Makkabäerbuch?: Eine Entgegung auf die Analyse von K.-D. Schunck" (JSJ, vol. V, no. 2; Leiden: Brill, 1975) 162-175.

Studien zu den Poetischen Stücken im 1. Makkabäerbuch (Würzburg: Echter, 1974)

Nongbri, B. "The Motivations of the Maccabees and the Judean rhetoric of Acestral Tradition" *Ancient Judaism in Its Hellenistic Context*, Bakhos, Carol ed. SJSJ 95 (Leiden: Brill, 2005) 85-111

Oesterley, W.O.E. *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Schocken Books, 1948)

Renaud, B. *La Loi et Les Lois dans Les Livres des Maccabées* RB 63 (1961)

Schunck, K.-D. *1. Makkabäerbuch* (JSHRZ 1 /4; Gütersloh: Gerd Mohn, 1980)

Die Quellen des I. und II. Makkabäerbuches (Halle: Niemeyer, 1954)

Schürer, E., et al. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ* (Edinburgh: Clark, 1973; 1987)

Schwartz, S. "Israel and the Nations Roundabout: 1 Maccabees and the Hasmonean Expansion" JJS 42; (1991) 16-38

"A Note on the Social Type and Political Ideology of the Hasmonean Family" JBL 112/2 (1993) 305-317

Scolnic, B.E. *Alcimus, Enemy of the Maccabees* (Lanham: University Press of America, 2005)

Sievers, J. *The Hasmoneans and Their Supporters. From Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (South Florida Studies in the History of Judaism 6; Atlanta: Scholar's Press, 1990)

Tedesche, S. and Zeitlin, S. *The First Book of Maccabees* (New York: Harper & Brothers, 1950)

Von Dobbeler, S. *Die Bücher 1 / 2 Makkabäer* (Verlag Katholisches Bibelwerk, 1997)

Wellhausen, J. *Israelitische und jüdische Geschichte* (Berlin: de Gruyter, 1921)

Will, E., et Orrieux, C. *Ioudaïsmos – Hellenismos: essai sur le judaïsme judéen à l'époque hellénistique* (Nancy: Presses Universitaires de Nancy, 1986)

Williams, D.S. " A Literary Encircling Pattern in 1Maccabees 1" JBL 120 140-142

"Recent Research in 1Maccabees" CR:BS 9 (2001) 169-184

The Structure of I Maccabees (CBQMS 31; Washington, D.C.: Catholic Biblical Association of America, 1999)