

Hasidim in I Maccabees 2:42?*

Daniel R. Schwartz

I. Hasidim in I-II Maccabees: The Problem

The reference to a group of Hasidim (*synagôgê Asidaiôn*) in I Macc. 2:42 has caused notorious difficulties. Hasidim ("Pious") are mentioned in only three passages in Hellenistic Jewish literature, and the other two passages — I Macc. 7:13 and II Macc. 14:6 — both refer to them in the days of Alcimus, Demetrius I's appointee to the Jerusalem high priesthood, ca. 162 BCE. I Macc. 2:42, in contrast, reports their activity in the days of Mattathias at the very outset of the Maccabean revolt, about half a decade earlier, thereby creating the question of their whereabouts and activities in the meantime. More troublesome is the fact that I Macc. 7:13 portrays the Hasidim as seekers of peace who accept the Seleucid appointee, and II Macc. 14:6 may amount to the same, for it is a villain, Alcimus, who there characterizes the Hasidim as rebels.¹ The conclusion that they were pietist pacifists is obvious and may seem natural for a group termed "pious", but it is flatly contradicted by I Macc. 2:42, which characterizes the Hasidim as *ischyroi dynamei* ("mighty warriors" — Heb. *gibborei hayyil*) who join Mattathias' band of guerrillas. Similarly, for the many scholars who would expand the dossier on Hasidim by assuming that they stand behind much of the apocalyptic literature (such as that represented by the contemporary book of Daniel),² the notion of Hasidim taking their future into their own hands is also quite a problem.

* My thanks to Prof. Uriel Rappaport (Haifa) and Professor Joseph Sievers (Rome) for their comments on an earlier draft of this paper.

¹ For that interpretation of the author's intention, see J. Kampen, *The Hasideans and the Origin of Pharisaism: A Study in 1 and 2 Maccabees* (Atlanta 1988), 144. In general, on "The Hasideans in Modern Study" see *ibid.*, 1-43. T. Fischer assembled much literature in a long note which begins with the all-too-true remark that "Die umfangreiche Lit. zu den Asidäern steht im umgekehrten Verhältnis zur Dürftigkeit der Quellen" (*Seleukiden und Makkabäer* [Bochum 1980], 102, n. 248). The present study suggests that the ratio might be even lower.

² O. Plöger was the major modern exponent of the Daniel-Hasidim link (*cf.* below, n. 8), but it was especially M. Hengel who popularized the theme — in a long chapter on "The Hasidim and the First Climax of Jewish Apocalyptic" in his *Judaism and Hellenism I* (Philadelphia 1974), 175-218. For the debate, see Kampen (above, n. 1), 22-31.

Of course, solutions are not lacking. Geiger denied the Hasidim are mentioned in I Macc. 2:42, thus leaving the field open for his case that I Maccabees portrays them only (in ch. 7) as naive or pusillanimous non-rebels (in contrast to the sensible Maccabees), a claim which II Maccabees answered (at 14:6) by portraying the Hasidim as Judas' followers in rebellion.³ Hitzig agreed with Geiger in believing II Macc. 14:6 despite it being in a villain's mouth, but retained the Hasidim in I Macc. 2:42 and resolved the problem posed by I Macc. 7:13 by excising it as an interpolation — thus leaving the Hasidim rebels plain and simple.⁴ Wellhausen, responding to both, put forth the reconstruction suggested by many of "the theologians, who have arrogated to themselves a monopoly of the study of Jewish history": he retained both verses in I Maccabees, explained away the characterization of the Hasidim as "mighty warriors" (I Macc. 2:42) as meaning they were respected and diligent in the observance of Jewish law, and rejected II Macc. 14:6 as a polemic response to I Maccabees. Wellhausen's thesis, accordingly, was that the Hasidim at first supported the Hasmoneans so long as the struggle was for religious rights, but later left them after the decrees against Judaism had been rescinded and the Hasmoneans' struggle had become "only" a political one.⁵ Against this theological reconstruction, those who would rather not separate Jewish religion from Jewish state have also refused to disassociate the Hasidim from the Hasmoneans: they have taken our verse and II Macc. 14:6 (despite the fact that it is in Alcimus' calumnious mouth) at face value and argued that the Hasidim remained associated with the rebels through the whole period; the Hasidic-Seleucid *rapprochement* of I Macc. 7 is reduced to tactics or to mid-struggle negotiations.⁶ As for the contrast between militant activism and a pious dependence on God of the type bespoken, for example, by Daniel 11:33-35, those who insist on viewing Daniel as an expression of Hasidic views may either simply conclude that the Hasidim bent the rules in a good cause,⁷ or else

³ See A. Geiger, *Urschrift und Uebersetzungen der Bibel* (Breslau 1857), 216, 223. At 216 n. *, Geiger rejects the reference to the Hasidim in I Macc. 2:42 as being based on inferior textual evidence; cf. below, Part II.

⁴ F. Hitzig, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel II* (Leipzig 1869), 417, n. *: "Vers 13. ist offener Einschub, fussend auf dem Grundtexte von V. 17. (Ps. 79,2.); vgl. 2 Macc. 14,6" (my emphasis).

⁵ See J. Wellhausen, *Die Pharisäer und die Sadducäer* (Greifswald 1874), 79-86. The quoted characterization of the monopolist theologians is V. Tcherikover's: *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews* (Philadelphia 1959), 206. For references to them, see the next note.

⁶ See J. Efron, *Studies on the Hasmonean Period* (Leiden 1987), 1-32, esp. 20-27 (with much bibliography and criticism for the theologians), also B. Bar-Kochva, *Judas Maccabaeus* (Cambridge 1989), 59 n. 101.

⁷ So, for example, S.L. Derfler, *The Hasmonean Revolt: Rebellion or Revolution* (Lewiston, NY 1990), 54-55.

speculate that the Hasidic movement split into factions⁸ or that the Hasidim believed, within their apocalyptic world-view, that the time had come to fight.⁹

In recent years there has been a widespread recognition of the severe limits on our knowledge of this ancient Jewish sect, including, in particular, the doubtfulness of the notion that Daniel — where the word *hasid* never appears — is a Hasidic work.¹⁰ Nevertheless, there is still more to be done. For one thing, it is remarkable that virtually no notice has been taken of the precarious textual evidence for Hasidim in I Macc. 2:42, the verse which causes the difficulties surveyed above, and that of those few who noticed the precariousness, apparently no one since Geiger has been willing to draw the obvious conclusion.

All recent editions of I Maccabees (Swete, Rahlfs and — more importantly — Kappler and Abel¹¹) read *synagôgê Asidaïôn* at I Macc. 2:42, virtually all commentaries assume the same text and make no mention of any problem,¹² and, correspondingly, even elaborate studies of such topics as I Maccabees, the Hasidim or the supporters of the Hasmoneans take *synagôgê Asidaïôn* for granted.¹³ True, in 1954 K.-D. Schunck argued briefly that the true reading is *synagôgê Ioudaïôn*,¹⁴ but his suggestion, when not ignored, was considered to be sufficiently rebutted by a few *ex cathedra* condemnations (“extremely improba-

⁸ So esp. O. Plöger, *Theocracy and Eschatology* (Oxford 1968), 8-9; *idem*, *Das Buch Daniel* (Gütersloh 1965), 39, 165.

⁹ So J. Bright, *A History of Israel* (Philadelphia, 1981³), 425-426. This apparently means they thought the *eschaton* had come.

¹⁰ For a review of the scholarship, see above, n. 1. Among the skeptics and agnostics of the fairly recent past, note especially P. Davies, “*Hasidim* in the Maccabean Period”, *JJS* 28 (1977), 127-140, and J. Sievers, *The Hasmoneans and their Supporters from Mattathias to the Death of John Hyrcanus I* (Atlanta 1990), 38-40 (“Who were the Asidaioi?”).

¹¹ *Maccabaeorum Liber I* (Septuaginta IX/1, ed. W. Kappler; Göttingen 1936; 1967²); F.-M. Abel, *Les livres des Maccabées* (Paris 1949).

¹² Abel (*ibid.*, 42-44) cites the problematic evidence in his textual apparatus but ignores it in his extensive commentary; so too A. Penna, *Libri dei Maccabei* (Torino-Roma 1953), 60-64. The textual problem is not at all mentioned in the commentaries on I Maccabees by Bévenot (German - 1931 — see below, n. 38), Dancy (English - 1954), Laconi (Italian - 1960), Starcky (French - 1961), Sisti (Italian - 1968), Nelis (Dutch - 1972), Bartlett (English - 1973), Goldstein (English - 1976) and Schunck (German - 1980 — see below, n. 16), although several of them go on at great length about the Hasidim.

¹³ So, for example, all the works cited above in notes 1 and 7-10, also, *inter alia*, N. Martola, *Capture and Liberation: A Study in the Composition of the First Book of Maccabees* (Åbo 1984 — see esp. p. 157, where a detailed account of the obscurities of the identities of the actors in I Macc. 2:42-44 says nothing about the textual doubt) and E. Will & C. Orrieux, *Ioudaïsmos-Hellénismos: Essai sur le judaïsme judéen à l'époque hellénistique* (Nancy 1986 — see esp. p. 158).

¹⁴ K.-D. Schunck, *Die Quellen des I. und II. Makkabäerbuches* (Halle 1954), 60.

ble”; “zu Unrecht”).¹⁵ This appears to have had its effect: in his 1980 translation of I Maccabees, Schunck himself gave “eine Gruppe Asidäer”, and a detailed footnote supplying much information about the Hasidim says nothing about any textual problem.¹⁶

There is, nevertheless, a problem. The evidence for the text of this verse is quite varied, and its interpretation is not without ambiguity. In this brief study we shall review the evidence, the possibilities and their pros and cons — both for the sake of the text and its implications concerning the shadowy Hasidim, and as a case-study in the modern editing of the Septuagint.

II. I Macc. 2:42: The Textual Evidence

Kappler’s text, which has a *synagôgê Asidaiôn* joining “Mattathias and his friends”, is based upon the Alexandrinus (fifth century).¹⁷ The other two uncials, however, have not *Asidaiôn* but, rather, *Ioudaiôn*. The Sinaiticus (fourth century) reads *pasa synagôgê Ioudaiôn*, while the Venetus (eighth century) has *synagôgê pasa Ioudaiôn*. Five of the miniscules too have *Ioudaiôn* — including Ms. 55, which, exceptionally among the miniscules, is said to be an independent witness of value tantamount to that of the uncials.¹⁸ Given this direct evidence, one would expect that the widespread reading would be *Ioudaiôn* or, at least, that the question would be open and debated. That this is not the case seems to be only a result, as so often, of the piecemeal discovery of evidence allowing for the formation of a consensus before all the data became available.

¹⁵ So, respectively, Hengel (above, n. 2), II, 116 n. 453; J.G. Bunge, *Untersuchungen zum zweiten Makkabäerbuch* (Bonn 1971), 231 n. 70. Bunge refers here to Tcherikover (above, n. 5), 125, but Tcherikover takes Hasidim for granted in I Macc. 2:42 with no discussion. Similarly, *Ioudaiôn* is rejected out of hand as a “substitute and inferior reading” by Efron (above, n. 6), 20, just as S. Zeitlin, in his commentary to S. Tedeschi’s translation (*The First Book of Maccabees* [New York 1950], 85), was satisfied by the mere pronouncement that “the reading Hasidim is preferable”.

¹⁶ K.-D. Schunck, *I. Makkabäerbuch* (Jüdische Schriften aus hellenistisch-römischer Zeit I/4; Gütersloh 1980), 306.

¹⁷ The Alexandrinus’ reading is in fact *Asideôn* (so according to Baber’s copy of it) or *Asidoôn* (so it seems to appear in the British Museum’s photographic facsimile edition — vol. IV [1957], p. 472r). We will ignore this point, except insofar as it contributes to the ease with which the Syriac mistranslation may be explained away; see below, at n. 30.

¹⁸ For miniscules with *Ioudaiôn*, see Kappler (above, n. 11), 59; with *Asidaiôn* — below, n. 39. As for Ms. 55, see R. Hanhart, *Maccabaeorum liber II* (Septuaginta IX/2; Göttingen 1976²), 37.

Aldus' 1518 edition and the 1522 Complutensian Polyglot gave *Asidaïôn*, apparently based upon the Vulgate (see below).¹⁹ In 1587, however, the Sixtine edition — apparently based upon the Venetus — read *Ioudaiôn*.²⁰ Although the Alexandrinus became available a few decades later, most editors during the next three hundred years were content to follow the Sixtina, although many noted the Alexandrinus' variant, *Asidaïôn*.²¹ But in the mid-nineteenth century, even apart from the general renaissance of textual criticism and the accompanying taste for novelty, and even apart from the proliferation of theories about ancient Jewish sects, theories which were hungry for texts about the Hasidim,²² two specific factors made for the greater popularity of *Asidaïôn*. The first was the 1853 publication of C.L.W. Grimm's commentary, which remains, until today, by far the most thorough commentary on the book's text; Grimm raised the problem directly and, after citing some textual evidence for *Asidaïôn* but only the Syriac (!) for *Ioudaiôn* (see immediately below), he offered a pair of arguments, to be discussed in Part III, which led him to decided acceptance of *synagôgê Asidaïôn*.²³

¹⁹ I have not seen either edition, and know their text only due to later citations, such as Grimm's (below, n. 23). For the centrality of the Vulgate for the editors of the Complutensian Polyglot, see F.G. Kenyon, *The Text of the Greek Bible* (ed. A.W. Adams; London 1975³), 59.

²⁰ I used *Vetus Testamentum graecum iuxta Septuaginta interpretes ex auctoritate Sixti V. Pont. Max. editum...* (ed. L. van Ess; reprinted Lipsiae 1908), 957. For the Sixtina's dependence upon the Venetus, because there is no Vaticanus for the Maccabees, see Kenyon (above, n. 19), 46.

²¹ Thus, for some examples: *Vetus Testamentum versione Septuaginta interpretum*, II (ed. L. Bos; Franequæ 1709), 1259; *Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi* (ed. J.C.W. Augusti; Lipsiae 1804), 277; *Vetus Testamentum graecum cum variis lectionibus*, V (edd. R. Holmes and J. Parsons), Oxford 1827, *ad loc.*; *Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*, II (ed. C. Tischendorf; Lipsiae 1850¹ = 1860³), 511 (cf. below, n. 32!). So too the Oxford editions of 1848 (III, p. 1911) and 1875 (III, p. 495). For *Asidaïôn* in the eighteenth century, note the edition based explicitly upon the Alexandrinus (*Vetus Testamentum ex versione Septuaginta interpretum olim ad fidem codicis ms. Alexandrini ... à J. E. Grabe ... nunc vero diversis Vaticanis exemplaribus lectionibus ... edidit J. J. Breitingerus*, II [Tiguri (Zürich) 1731], 527), also J. D. Michaelis, *Deutsche Übersetzung des ersten Buchs der Maccabäer* (Göttingen-Leipzig 1778), 9.

²² On the intense and highly-charged nineteenth-century interest in ancient Jewish sectarianism, motivated in part by contemporary movements to reform Judaism, see *inter alia*, S. Wagner, *Die Essener in der wissenschaftlichen Diskussion vom 18. zum Beginn des 20. Jahrhunderts* (Berlin 1960), and D.R. Schwartz, *Studies in the Jewish Background of Christianity* (Tübingen 1992), 66-79. On the Hasidim, see esp. Wagner, pp. 83-88, also above, notes 1 and 6. As for the nineteenth-century taste for textual novelty, cf. Schwartz, *ibid.*, 249.

²³ C.L.W. Grimm, *Das erste Buch der Maccabäer* (Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testaments, 3; Leipzig 1853), 44.

From the start, Grimm's commentary enjoyed well-deserved authority and prestige.²⁴

The second major mid-nineteenth-century boost for *Asidaiôn* came a few years later with the appearance of a new Syriac text of I and II Maccabees. Today, three versions of the Syriac text are known.²⁵ Until 1861, however, only the mid-seventeenth century Paris and London Polyglots' Syriac text (now termed Sy III) was known, and it gives *'isralaya* ("Israelites"), which seems to support the Greek *Ioudaiôn* and in any case offers no support for *Asidaiôn*. The textual basis of that edition is unknown.²⁶ In 1861 Lagarde published a text (Sy I) based upon a British Museum manuscript, which at 2:42 reads *'asiraya*,²⁷ and about two decades later Ceriani published the third version (Sy II), which reads *'ashdaya*.²⁸ Both are clearly meant as transliterations of *asidaiôn*,²⁹ just as the Syriac's *meshabhane* (singers) at I Macc. 7:13 and II Macc. 14:6 clearly indi-

²⁴ For a glimpse of how the post-Grimm consensus grew, note that his commentary appeared in a series edited by O.F. Fritzsche; so it is not surprising that when Fritzsche published a manual edition of the Apocrypha he gave *Asidaiôn* and textual evidence such as that cited by Grimm: *Libri Apocryphi Veteris Testamenti graece* (ed. O.F. Fritzsche; Leipzig 1871), 210. Next came C.F. Keil, who pronounced Grimm's commentary the only one up to contemporary standards (*Commentar über die Bücher der Makkabäer* [Leipzig 1875], 27); at I Macc. 2:42, correspondingly, he retained Grimm's text although rejecting his arguments (see below, n. 41)! Then came E. Schürer who, merely depending upon Fritzsche, canonized this text for the historians: *Geschichte des jüdischen Volkes im Zeitalter Jesu Christi*, I (Leipzig 1890²), 157, n. 41 (= 1901³⁻⁴, 203, n. 44). In general, note Schürer's characterization of Grimm's commentary as "bei weitem die gediegenste Arbeit, die wir haben" (*ibid.*, II [1886²], 584; in III [1909⁴], 199, the only change is the substitution of "noch immer" for "bei weitem").

²⁵ On some unpublished manuscripts, see A. Penna, "I libri dei Maccabei nei manoscritti siriaci della Biblioteca Vaticana", *Mélanges Eugène Tisserant*, I (Città del Vaticano 1964), 325-343.

²⁶ So Kappler (above, n. 11), 17. It may be noted, however, that the reading *'isralaya* is now known to be found also in Vat. Syr. 7, which was produced in Rome, on the basis of an unknown Vorlage, in the early seventeenth century; see Penna (above, n. 25), 326.

²⁷ Not *'asidaya*, as is erroneously stated by Abel (above, n. 11), p. LVII. See *Libri Veteris Testamenti Apocryphi Syriace* (ed. P.A. de Lagarde; Lipsiae-Londinii 1861), 167.

²⁸ See *Translatio Syra Pescitto Veteris Testamenti ex codice Ambrosiano sec. fere VI* (ed. A.M. Ceriani; Mediolani 1876-), 594 (287v). My thanks to Prof. Joseph Yahalom for help in reading this text. This is a typical case of what seems to be usual for Sy II, namely, it corrects Sy I on the basis of a Greek text. See Abel (above, n. 27).

²⁹ As is pointed out by G. Schmidt, "Die beiden Syrischen Übersetzungen des 1. Maccabäerbuches", *Zeitschrift für die alttestamentliche Wissenschaft* 17 (1897), 5, 237.

cates it misread AOIDOI instead of ACIDAIOI, mistaking an uncial sigma for an omicron.³⁰ That is, the Syriac translator(s), having failed to recognize the Hebrew term represented by the Greek text, either transliterated it or — having misread its second letter — translated it. In both cases, the Syriac vouches nicely for the Alexandrinus' reading.

Thus, while the most and the earliest uncial evidence points to *Ioudaiôn* instead of *Asidaiôn*, in the mid-nineteenth century an authoritative exegete and some new Syriac evidence pointed toward the latter, and that swept the field. If in 1857 Geiger was already aware of the problem and still argued for *Ioudaiôn*, by 1874 Wellhausen, disagreeing with Geiger and arguing with him about almost everything else, took *Asidaiôn* for granted and saw no need even to argue about it.³¹ The same could be said of many of Wellhausen's contemporaries and successors, just as we saw concerning their most recent heirs (see nn. 12, 13, 24). But three more recent developments in the textual evidence seem not to have been given their due.

First, beginning the very next year after Lagarde published his Syriac text, Tischendorf published a facsimile edition of the Sinaiticus, "le plus ancien et le meilleur de nos manuscrits" of the Maccabees. As mentioned above, at I Macc. 2:42 it reads *pasa synagôgê Ioudaiôn*.³²

Second, publication of Lagarde's and Ceriani's Syriac texts led to intense study of that translation, and it was quickly determined that it is based on a Lucianic Greek text.³³ But studies of that third-century recension agree that one of its major preoccupations was the specification of actors alluded to only generally in its Vorlage.³⁴ Obviously, *synagôgê Asidaiôn* is much more specific than *synagôgê Ioudaiôn*, and the reference to *synagôgê* and *Asidaioi* in I Macc. 7:12-13 could easily explain the editing at 2:42.

The third textual development was the publication of the evidence for the ancient Latin translations of I-II Maccabees, thought to go back to a Greek version available in the second century CE. D. de Bruyne began to publish articles about it in the 1920s, and his synoptic edition of them appeared in 1932 (see n.

³⁰ This explanation was already offered by R. Payne Smith, *Thesaurus Syriacus*, II (Oxonii 1901), col. 4027; cf. *ibid.* I (1879), col. 306.

³¹ See above, notes 3, 5.

³² And it is this reading which Tischendorf henceforth adopted in his editions of the Septuagint, from the fourth (1869) to the seventh and last (1887); for the title and page reference, see above, n. 21. For the first publication of the Sinaiticus, see *Bibliorum Codex Sinaiticus Petropolitanus*, II (ed. C. Tischendorf; Petropoli 1862), 17*. For the quoted characterization of the Sinaiticus of I-II Maccabees, see D. de Bruyne, *Les anciennes traductions latines des Machabées* (Maredsous 1932), p. v, followed *verbatim* by Abel (above, n. 11), p. LIII.

³³ See Schmidt (above, n. 29), 252-262; Kappler (above, n. 11), 29; Hanhart (above, n. 18), 19, 29-31.

³⁴ See de Bruyne (above, n. 32), p. v; Abel (above, n. 11), p. LIV.

32); it is, in our case, “good for the `Jews’”. Namely, of the three versions he cites (p. 13), only the Vulgate version (which is “d  ja loin de la traduction primitive latine et du texte grec qu’elle suppose” — p. xxix) reads “synagoga asidaeorum” — and that only in about half of its witnesses. The other half read “Iudeorum”. “Synagoga Iudaeorum” is also the reading of the Bologna manuscript, which represents the second main type of Latin text. As for the best text (De Bruyne’s reconstructed L), two of its four witnesses read “Iudeorum”, one — the two literal citations of our verse in the writings of fourth-century Lucifer of Cagliari — gives only “conventus” but no complement, and one gives “tunc congregati sunt ad eos conventus in auxilia eorum fortes viribus ab israel...”, which apparently means that some unnamed group of heroic Jewish people joined Mattathias’ troops.³⁵ Now since its publication the ancient Latin evidence has widely been acclaimed, for good reason, as highly dependable for the reconstruction of the original Greek.³⁶ In our case, however, it is only its weakest branch, the Vulgate, which gives any support for *Asidai  n*, while even about half of the witnesses for that branch, as well as just about all of the evidence for the other and better branches, support *Ioudai  n* either directly or by default, i.e., by failing to refer to anything specific.

To the versional evidence presented above we may add the indirect testimony of Josephus: although he follows I Maccabees quite closely, *AJ* 12.278 has no reference to Hasidim. Josephus reports only in a general way that a large force gathered about Mattathias. This is naturally more congenial to the assumption that his text had nothing more specific than “Jews”, although this indirect evidence and *argumentum ex silentio* should not be pressed. Nor, probably, should we make too much of the third-century Hippolytus’ failure to mention the Hasidim between his citation of I Macc. 2:39-41 and his paraphrase of vv. 45-47.³⁷

Be that as it may, it appears clear, to summarize the textual evidence, that it is heavily in favor of *Ioudai  n*. In Greek it is found in two of the three uncials, including the oldest and best (Sinaiticus); in Latin it dominates the two better branches of the tradition; in Syriac it is reflected in the witness(es?) followed by

³⁵ It seems to be little more than *petitio principii* which allows De Bruyne and Kappler *ad loc.* to suggest that “in auxilia eorum” is a corrupted version of “asilaeorum,” which in turn would be a Latinized transliteration of the unintelligible Greek *asilai  n*, which, in turn, would be a misreading of *asidai  n* (confusion of the uncial lambda and delta — Λ/Δ). It is probably such an assessment which led Abel *ad loc.* to ignore this suggested aetiology and, more simply and reasonably, to list the ancient Latin text, in his critical apparatus, as supporting *Ioudai  n*.

³⁶ See, for example, Kappler (above, n. 11), 33-36; Abel (above, n. 11), pp. LV-LVII; P. Katz, “The Text of 2 Maccabees Reconsidered”, *Zeitschrift f  r die neutestamentliche Wissenschaft* 51 (1960), 11-12, 18-21.

³⁷ In *Danielem* 3:44 (ed. G.N. Bonwetsch; Leipzig 1897), 300-301.

the Paris and London Polyglot. *Asidaiôn*, in contrast, is supported in Greek by only one uncial manuscript (the Alexandrinus); but that manuscript, we may now add, has been shown to reflect a special concern for clarity and specification and even Grimm remarked, correspondingly, that its variants frequently appear to be no more than overly clever corrections.³⁸ The specification of I Macc. 2:42 with the aid of the biblicalizing "congregation of pious" (familiar from Ps 149:1) need be no more than one of those. As for the versional evidence, "Hasidim" is supported only by some of the witnesses for the least reliable branch of the Latin tradition (Vulgate) and by Syriac witnesses which reflect a recension of the Greek affected by a concern similar to that of the Greek Alexandrinus. It is difficult to escape the conclusion that, had the Sinaiticus and the Latin evidence been published before Grimm had done his work, and had the nature of the Lucianic recension become clear before Lagarde and Ceriani published what amount only to additional witnesses to it, our standard twentieth-century text would not differ here from that of the Sixtina; it would only be better established. If one is to read *synagôgê Asidaiôn* in I Macc. 2:42, justification for doing so had better come from internal considerations, for it hardly may be said to come from the manuscripts.

III. I Macc. 2:42: Grimm's Internal Considerations

As noted above (n. 23), in 1853 Grimm offered two arguments in favor of *Asidaiôn*. After presenting some of the textual evidence, but — apart from the Polyglot Syriac — only that for *Asidaiôn*,³⁹ he characterizes this reading as "jedenfalls das Richtige":

Denn wie hätte *Ioud. oder Israël. — apo Israël* gesagt werden können? Die Seltenheit des Namens *Asid.* veranlasste die Aenderungen in *Ioud.* und *Israël*.

³⁸ Grimm (above, n. 23), p. xxxii ("*bietet nicht selten Varianten, die den Charakter vorwärtiger Correctur tragen*"). For the stated characterization of the Alexandrinus, see also F. Gryglewicz, "Le *Codex Alexandrinus* du premier livre des Macchabées", *Annales Theologico-Canonicae* (= *Roczniki Teologiczno-Kanoniczne*) 8/1 (1961), 23-37; Gryglewicz's historical deductions from his data need not concern us here. In general, for the Alexandrinus as the worst of the uncial texts, see also B. Niese, *Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher* (Berlin 1900), 109 (= *Hermes* 35 [1900], 522), and H. Bévenot, *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher* (Bonn, 1931), 44.

³⁹ Namely, the Alexandrinus, four miniscules (44, 62, 106, 243), the Vulgate, and the two early editions mentioned at n. 19. Fritzsche (above, n. 24) adds one more miniscule (64) to Grimm's list. All of this data was supplied by Holmes and Parsons (above, n. 21). Some further miniscule evidence may be deduced by deducting the evidence for *Ioudaiôn* in Kappler's apparatus (above, n. 11) from the fuller list *ibid.*, 8-11; cf. *ibid.*, 43.

That is, Grimm first argued that there is a stylistic problem with the reading *Ioudaiôn*, then explained its origin as a scribal substitution for an unfamiliar term: in the LXX *Asidaioi* appear only in our three passages in I-II Maccabees, while *Ioudaioi* appear scores of times, including many in I Maccabees.

However, the stylistic problem is not very grave and the identification of a *lectio difficilior* is rarely without ambiguity. First the style: our verse is written in semi-poetic style, in which parallel phrases, frequently one repeating but somewhat specifying the other, are *de rigueur*.⁴⁰ Read with the intervening text Grimm omitted, the verse, reading *Ioudaiôn*, would tell us that "there then joined them a congregation of Jews, men of valor of Israel, each one who volunteered for the law" — a successive narrowing down. Who joined? A congregation of Jews. Which Jews? (Note that the last time the reader read of a Jew, at 2:23, the reference was to a renegade!) The men of valor in Israel. What type of "men of valor"? Those who "volunteered" (were zealous) for the law. Were it not for the other reading, *Asidaion*, it is doubtful that anyone would see a problem here.⁴¹ Moreover, for those who think *Ioudaiôn* is redundant, reading *Asidaioi* hardly resolves it: is it not clear that *Asidaioi* are of Israel?⁴²

We note, finally, that a recent scholar writing on our verse found himself driven to suggest that its Greek text (characterizing as *Asidaioi* "all who volunteered for the law") is either "a mistranslation or a tendentious overstatement, because there were people other than the *Asidaioi* who were zealous for the law (e.g., the Hasmoneans; cf. I Macc. 2:50)".⁴³ Now, it is clearly not in accordance

⁴⁰ Compare, for example, the parallel phrases in v. 44 ("they struck down sinners in their anger and lawless men in their wrath") and in vv. 47-48. This point poses a question mark alongside Bar-Kochva's argument (above, n. 6: 483) that "verbosity and repetitiveness" are "quite foreign to the author's condensed, forceful style" so the decision reported in vv. 40-41 must deal with two separate problems.

⁴¹ "...die von Grimm dafür [= for *Asidaion*] innern Gründe nichts beweisen. Denn wie *apo Israêl* mit *Ioudaiôn* unvereinbar sein sollte, ist gar nicht abzusehen. Oder enthält der Ausdruck: ein Haufe Juden — tapfere Männer von Israel, eine Tautologie oder irgend eine Unzuträglichkeit?" (Keil [above, n. 24], 63-64). Keil nevertheless voted for *Asidaion*, but only due to the textual witnesses to it (those cited by Grimm); he seems not to have been aware of the Sinaiticus' reading. In passing, we may note the possibility that either *Ioudaiôn* or *apo Israêl* has the sense of non-priests, which would mitigate the problem or eliminate it; cf. 14:41,47 and 11:23. But neither usage is standard in I Maccabees.

⁴² For a comparable case, see *Acts* 2:5, where some exegetes are upset at the reference to *Ioudaioi*, *andres eulabeis*, and argue for the suppression of *Ioudaioi*: "Why should it be said that they were devout men; would not this be taken for granted from the fact they were Jews?" (B.M. Metzger, *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament* [London-N.Y. 1971], 290). Nevertheless, the text is fairly secure. On this passage, cf. Schwartz (above, n. 22), 122-127.

⁴³ Sievers (above, n. 10) 40, n. 55.

with the author's *Tendenz* to deny the Hasmoneans' zeal for the law, but assuming mistranslation should be the last option. Reading *Ioudaiôn* would eliminate the problem.

As for Grimm's explanation that copyists replaced *Asidaiôn* by *Ioudaiôn* because they didn't understand the former,⁴⁴ it is difficult to accept, because the same copyists had no difficulty with the Hasidim in I Macc. 7:13 and II Macc. 14:6.⁴⁵ Moreover, the consideration of *lectio difficilior* can cut both ways. If a copyist was bothered by *synagôgê Ioudaiôn* because he (as Grimm) viewed it either as engendering redundancy or as insufficiently specific, he might well have looked to the only other place in I Maccabees where a specific *synagôgê* is mentioned, and found there a *synagôgê* of scribes, of whom the first were *Asidaioi* (I Macc. 7:12-13). Especially for a scribe such as that of the Alexandrinus, which is said to be generally clearer and more specific than other manuscripts of I Maccabees (see n. 38), what would be more natural than to clarify by substituting the *Asidaioi* here?⁴⁶ Indeed, a copyist might even convince himself that he was only correcting a scribal error in his Vorlage: *Asidaiôn* and *Ioudaiôn* are both eight-letter words and share the same last five letters, and their second letters — as we saw in connection with the Syriac version — are very easily confused in uncials (C/O).

Thus, Grimm's arguments appear to be nugatory, and do not change the basic picture painted by the evidence, even in his own day, and certainly today. Indeed, one could even point to an internal argument against reading *Asidaiôn* in I Macc. 2:42: the fact that "the *synagôgê*" is again mentioned at I Macc. 3:44, but not defined, is an indication that the author depends upon the reader to know that the allusion is to the group introduced at 2:42; so the need for an explicit reference to *Asidaioi* in 7:13, in connection with scribes and Hasidim, would appear to be the introduction of a new *synagôgê*, previously unknown to the reader. This point would argue for *Ioudaiôn* in 2:42, if anyone cared or dared to press it.

IV. Conclusion

Although the reading *Asidaiôn* instead of *Ioudaiôn* is attested by a few witnesses, it remains, for the present, more than doubtful; its ubiquitousness seems

⁴⁴ So too, more recently, J. Mejía, "Posibles contactos entre los manuscritos de Qumran y los libros de los Macabeos", *Revue de Qumran* 1 (1958/59), 54 n. 7.

⁴⁵ So too Keil (above, n. 41). The Sinaiticus, which Keil did not see, reads — after a correction — *aseidonaioi* at I Macc. 7:13.

⁴⁶ So Geiger (above, n. 3). For an example of such logic, see L. Herzfeld, *Geschichte des Volkes Israel von Vollendung des zweiten Tempels...*, II (Leipzig 1863²), 384: "die Variante: 'ein Haufe von Asidäern' scheint zwar nicht die richtige Lesart zu sein, aber den rechten Sinn zu treffen". One wonders how many copyists would make such distinctions.

only to reflect nineteenth-century factors which should carry little weight today. The historical implication is that we should not make any assumptions about the Hasidim's role in the rebellion between the time they joined it in Mattathias' days and the days of Alcimus a half-decade later; perhaps they only appeared at the later date. Moreover, we need not be bothered about the contradiction between the rebels of I Macc. 2:42 and the collaborators of I Macc. 7:12-13, much less about that between the apocalypticists of Daniel and the rebels of I Macc. 2:42. Nor, finally, should we allow I Macc. 2:42 to force us to the conclusion that the author of II Macc. 14:6 wants us to believe the wicked Alcimus' characterization of the Hasidim as rebels. Rather, of the only two secure pieces of evidence we have regarding the Hasidim of the Maccabean period, one (I Macc. 7:12-13) shows them accepting the Seleucid appointee and one (II Macc. 14:6) portrays a villain as calumniating them as if they were rebels against the Seleucids. The two statements converge, and I Macc. 2:42 should no longer stand firmly, if at all, in their way.

The Hebrew University of Jerusalem