VII

REVISITING THE TOMB OF THE MACCABEES

Samuele Rocca
(Ariel University)
roccasam@netvision.net.il

Abstract

The main purpose of this article is to trace the sources of inspiration for the Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in and to see how it fits into the Hasmonean ruling ideology. While the building did not survive the ravages of time, 1 Maccabees (13:27–29) describes it in detail. A further ekphrasis of the Tomb of the Maccabees is given by Josephus in Jewish Antiquities (13.211–212), but it contains many disagreements with the earlier version. Some scholars, such as Steven Fine and later Andrea Berlin and Geoffrey Waywell, trace its prototype to the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, the most preeminent model for successive monumental tombs erected in the Hellenistic period. Thus, the main purpose of the monumental tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in would have been to glorify the feats of its occupants. Other scholars, such as Sylvie Honigman and Gilles Gorre, on the other hand, look to the Tomb of Alexander the Great, erected by the Ptolemies at Alexandria, as its primary source of inspiration. Therefore, the main purpose of the monument was dynastic, to associate Simon and John Hyrcanus with Judas Maccabaeus (Judah the Maccabee). This would have allowed the later Hasmonean rulers to claim a share in the achievements of their warlord forebears, thereby enhancing their prestige and that the dynasty.

However, a careful study of the literary evidence combined with the archeological remains from Judea demonstrate the presence of native architectural elements, such as the cavetto and the pyramid, first attested in the Iron Age. These features, also present in the monumental tombs erected in Jerusalem during the Late Second Temple period and attested in monumental tombs erected in Seleucid Syria and in mausolea erected in Punic North Africa, mirror an earlier Phoenician-Aramaic architectural tradition. These elements present on the Tomb of the Maccabees link the Hasmoneans to the biblical past and thereby substantiate their claims to legitimacy as Jewish rulers. As made clear by 1 Maccabees, the Hasmoneans adopted biblical paradigms in order to promote their legitimacy as rulers and to justify their territorial policy. This is made clear by Simon's speech to the Seleucid ambassador Athenobius, which endorses the Hasmonean's claim to rule the territories that once belonged to the biblical Kingdom of David and Solomon, and by the Eulogy of Simon, which was charged with biblical overtones and endorsed the leader's claims to legitimacy as ruler of the Jewish people.

No less important are the reliefs depicting the weapons taken from the enemy that characterize Hellenistic public monuments, such as the Temple of Athena at Pergamon, as well as paintings and reliefs depicting similar scenes set on various tombs. Among the most important qualities associated with the Hellenistic kings was victory. Thus, the frieze of the Tomb first and foremost echoes the military achievements of the Maccabees. Moreover, the use of expensive stone as well a Greek architectural framework mirrors the ideal of wealth, possibly indicating the rulers' beneficence and euergetism. All this fulfills the purpose of legitimating the Hasmoneans as bona fide Hellenistic rulers.

Thus, it is clear that two main elements of the Tomb at Modi'in, the cavetto and the pyramid, which stemmed from the native biblical tradition, and the frieze depicting weapons, attested all over the Hellenistic world, served to promote the Hasmoneans' claim to legitimacy and mirror the two facets of the dynasts as Jewish and Hellenistic rulers.

Keywords: Alexander the Great; *ekphrasis*, Greek architecture; Hasmoneans, John Hyrcanus, Mausoleum of Halicarnassus; Simon the Maccabee, Tomb of the Maccabees.

1.- Introduction: The State of the Question

The Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in was probably one of the most impressive funerary monuments erected in Judea toward the end of the Second Temple period. The main source for reconstructing its appearance is 1 Maccabees (13:27–29). This description, or *ekphrasis*, is partly corroborated by Josephus in his *Jewish Antiquities* (13.211–212), although there are serious discrepancies between the two. It seems that the monument was still standing a few years before the Jewish War (66–74 CE), but it was probably razed to the ground in its wake.

Today, rather unsurprisingly, its location is disputed. The area known as "Moditha" is mentioned by Eusebius in the *Onomasticon* and later by Jerome and is depicted on the Madaba Map.[1] The area was initially explored in the nineteenth century on three separate occasions, first by the missionary Carl H. Sandreczki, then by English antiquarian Claude Reignier Conder, and finally by Orientalists and explorers Victor Guérin and Charles S. Clermont-Ganneau, who claimed to have found remains of the Tomb or at least a structure erected on the same spot in the Late Roman period at El-Qal'a near the Tomb of Sheikh el-Gharbawi. It turns out that the mausoleum they identified stood at Horbat Ha-Gardi and was fused with some monumental structure possibly indicating a pilgrimage station.[2] In 2006, almost twenty years ago, the archeologist Amit Re'em claimed to have discovered the Tomb at Horbat Ha-Gardi, not far from the area explored by Guérin and Clermont-Ganneau, but it now seems that the ruins so identified belong to a different structure. The Israel Antiquities Authority subsequently released a formal rectification. According to Boaz Zissu and Lior Perry, the real Tomb of the Maccabees remains unexcavated. The two archeologists argue that Khirbet el-Hummam / Khirbet Midieh is the site where the town of Modi'in/Moditha once stood, inasmuch as "the site is located in the required geographical area; the ancient name has been preserved at the site; substantial remains of an ancient settlement from the Hellenistic, Roman, and Byzantine periods have been preserved; and the site is located on a major road from the Roman and Byzantine periods."[3]

Therefore, the two literary sources remain our only clue for the reconstruction of the building. It comes as no surprise that the most important recent studies focus on its relationship with Jewish art or with the surrounding Hellenistic world. Thus, Steven Fine dedicated a whole chapter to the topic, "The Hasmonean Royal Tombs at Modi'in," in his *Art and Judaism in the Greco–Roman World*. The monumental tomb thus becomes a pretext for discussing the attitude(s) of Jews to Hellenistic and Roman art. Accordingly, Fine argues rather convincingly that classical art was integrated into Jewish architecture provided that it was not considered "idolatrous", or explicitly identified with pagan worship or religious ritual. However, this attitude shifted with time, becoming more and more restrictive. This probably explains the discrepancies between the *ekphrasis* of the monument in 1 Maccabees and the much later description of Josephus, who by then was much more sensitive to features of Hellenistic and Roman art, which in his eyes—but by no means in the eyes of his predecessor—could be considered iconic. On the other hand, the article of Geoffrey Waywell and Andrea Berlin apparently focuses on the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus as the main source of inspiration for the Tomb of the Maccabees. Yet, as they are well aware, that building was too far away to be considered a direct influence on the monumental tomb in Modi'in. Their main contribution, however, is that both monuments were erected with the same purpose, namely, to extol the achievements of their occupants, the satrap Mausolus on one hand and the Hasmonean family on the other.

---

[1] Eusebius, *Onomasticon* 73; Jerome, in Eusebius, *Onomasticon* 73–74.

[2] C. H. Sandreczki, "The Rock Tombs of El Medyeh," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 2.5 (1870): 245–251; C. R. Conder, "Jerusalem and El Midyeh," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 5.3 (1873): 93–96; C. Clermont-Ganneau, *Archaeological Researches in Palestine*, London, 1896, 358–374; V. Guérin, *Description of Samaria*, Paris, 1869, 286–289.

[3] B. Zissu and L. Perry, "The Locations of Hasmonean Modi'in and Byzantine Modita: Clarifying an Historical-Geographic Issue," *Cathedra* 125 (2008): 5–20; B. Zissu and L. Perry, "Hasmonean Modi'in and Byzantine Moditha: A Topographical-Historical and Archaeological Assessment," *Palestine Exploration Quarterly* 147.4 (2015): 316–337; A. Re'em, "Horbat Ha-Gardi, Final Report," *Hadashot Arkheologiyot, Excavations and Surveys in Israel* 123 (2011).

No less important is the contribution of Sylvie Honigman and Gilles Gorre, who trace in the *Sema*, the Tomb of Alexander the Great erected in Alexandria by the Ptolemies, the main source of inspiration for the tomb that the Hasmoneans built in Judea. Like Waywell and Berlin, Honigman and Gorres do not linger on the appearance of the tomb, but explore the ruling ideology behind the monument's erection. A close comparison between the dynastic policies of the Ptolemies and those of the Hasmoneans demonstrate that both rulers were not afraid of making "genealogic manipulations" to strengthen their legitimacy. While the Ptolemies "invented" a dynastic relationship that linked them first with Nectanebus II, the last native pharaoh, and then with Alexander the Great, the Hasmonean ruler strove to associate his rule with the achievements of Judah the Maccabee. In both cases, this association was emphasized through the appropriation of the monumental tomb of their predecessors.[4]

Yet, while these contributions are very important, it seems to me that, once the Hasmoneans' ruling ideology is considered, an important element is missing, namely the claim to the biblical heritage, which is made explicit in Simon's answer to Athenobius, the ambassador of Antiochus VII (1 Macc 15:33–34), and the main thematic of Simon's Ode (1 Macc 14:4–15). Indeed, a close look at the description of the monumental Tomb of the Maccabees as well as some of the monumental tombs erected in Jerusalem at the end of the Second Temple period, such as the Tomb of Jason, the Tomb of the Bene Hezir, and the Tomb of Zechariah, demonstrates the presence of three architectural elements, the cubic structure, the cavetto, and the pyramid that topped it, whose origins can be traced back to the biblical period. The Tomb of Pharaoh's Daughter is also a good example of this trend. This claim is strengthened when the geographic area is widened and various monumental tombs erected in Syria, such as the one at Kalath Fakhra, and Punic North Africa, for example at Sabratha and Simitthus, are considered. All these funeral monuments integrate the cube, the cavetto, and the pyramid, which stem from the Phoenician-Aramaic architectural tradition and demonstrate the close connection between these Hellenistic-Roman funerary monuments and the architectural traditions of the local populations of the Levant. In addition, in the Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in the native tradition is combined with Greco-Hellenistic architectural features, such as the portico of columns topped by a pediment, which surrounds the plain cube, and with Macedonian architectural features such as the friezes depicting weapons, whose purpose was to emphasize the military achievements of the structure's occupants. In conclusion, the two architectural traditions – the native, Greco-Hellenistic – that come together in the Tomb of the Maccabees mirror the main elements of the Hasmonean ruling ideology, namely, the biblical ancestral heritage, Hellenistic culture, and a militaristic form of kingship inspired by Alexander the Great.

2.- The *Ekphrasis*: 1 Maccabees versus Josephus

The only contemporary description of this mausoleum is the *ekphrasis* found in 1 Maccabees. Toward its very end (13:27–29), this document gives quite a detailed description of the mausoleum erected by Simon, the second brother of Judah the Maccabee:

> καὶ ᾠκοδόμησεν Σιμων ἐπὶ τὸν τάφον τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτοῦ καὶ τῶν ἀδελφῶν αὐτοῦ καὶ ὕψωσεν αὐτὸν τῇ ὁράσει λίθῳ ξεστῷ ἐκ τῶν ὄπισθεν καὶ ἔμπροσθεν. καὶ ἔστησεν ἑπτὰ πυραμίδας μίαν κατέναντι τῆς μιᾶς τῷ πατρὶ καὶ τῇ μητρὶ καὶ τοῖς τέσσαρσιν ἀδελφοῖς. καὶ ταύταις ἐποίησεν μηχανήματα περιθεὶς στύλους μεγάλους καὶ ἐποίησεν ἐπὶ τοῖς στύλοις πανοπλίας εἰς ὄνομα

[4] S. Fine, "Art and Identity in Latter Second Temple Period Judea: The Hasmonean Royal Tombs at Modi'in," in *Art and Judaism in the Greco-Roman World: Toward a New Jewish Archaeology*, Cambridge, 2005, 60–80; G. Waywell and A. Berlin, "Monumental Tombs: From Maussollos to the Maccabees (How Would the Maccabean Tomb at Modi'in Have Looked Like?" *Biblical Archaeology Review* 33 (2007): 54–65; S. Honigman and G. Gorre, "Dynastic Genealogies and Funerary Monuments: Nectanebo, Alexander, and Judas Maccabee and the Evidence of Ptolemaic Influence on the Hasmoneans," *Journal of Ancient History* 10 (2022): 68–98; E. Regev, *The Hasmoneans: Ideology, Archaeology, Identity*, Göttingen, 2013, 72.

αἰώνιον καὶ παρὰ ταῖς πανοπλίαις πλοῖα ἐγγεγλυμμένα εἰς τὸ θεωρεῖσθαι ὑπὸ πάντων τῶν πλεόντων τὴν θάλασσαν. οὗτος ὁ τάφος ὃν ἐποίησεν ἐν Μωδεϊν ἕως τῆς ἡμέρας ταύτης.

Over the tomb of his fathers and his brothers Simon constructed a monument impressive for its height, built of hewn stones on both its front and rear sides. He sets up seven pyramids, one in front of the other, for his father, his mother, and his four brothers. For the pyramids he contrived an elaborate setting: he surrounded them with massive pillars on which he placed full suits of armour, there were carved ships, intended to be seen by all who sailed the sea. This tomb, which he erected in Modi'in, still exists today.

Josephus also describes in detail the funerary monument set up by Simon the Maccabee in Modi'in (*AJ* 13.211–212). However, his description differs from that of 1 Maccabees:

Σίμων δὲ καὶ μνημεῖον μέγιστον ᾠκοδόμησεν τῷ τε πατρὶ καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἐκ λίθου λευκοῦ καὶ ἀνεξεσμένου. εἰς πολὺ δ᾽ αὐτὸ καὶ περίοπτον ἀναγαγὼν ὕψος στοὰς περὶ αὐτὸ βάλλεται καὶ στύλους μονολίθους θαυμαστὸν ἰδεῖν χρῆμα ἀνίστησιν, πρὸς τούτοις δὲ καὶ πυραμίδας ἑπτὰ τοῖς τε γονεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς ἀδελφοῖς ἑκάστῳ μίαν ᾠκοδόμησεν εἰς ἔκπληξιν μεγέθους τε ἕνεκα καὶ κάλλους πεποιημένας, αἳ καὶ μέχρι δεῦρο σώζονται. καὶ περὶ μὲν τῆς Ἰωνάθου ταφῆς καὶ τῆς τῶν μνημείων οἰκοδομίας τοῖς οἰκείοις Σίμωνος τοσαύτην σπουδὴν οἴδαμεν γενομένην. ἀπέθανεν δὲ Ἰωνάθης ἀρχιερατεύων ἔτη τέσσαρα προστὰς τοῦ γένους. καὶ τὰ μὲν περὶ τῆς τούτου τελευτῆς ἐν τούτοις ἦν.

And Simon also built for his father and brothers a very great monument of polished white marble, and raised it to a great and conspicuous height, made porticoes around it, and erected monolithic pillars, a wonderful thing to see. In addition to these he built for his parents and his brothers seven pyramids, one for each, so made as to excite wonder by their size and beauty; and these have been preserved to this day. Such was the zeal which we know to have been shown by Simon in burying Jonathan and building monuments to his family.[5]

Scholars, then, have been left with these detailed visual descriptions. However, regarding the description given by 1 Maccabees, Jonathan A. Goldstein in his commentary is right in saying that it is not detailed enough and that it leaves us with many questions. According to the passage, the monument was so high that it could be seen "by all who sail the sea." This is clearly hyperbole, but we can glean from this statement that the structure was of a rather impressive size. However, as Goldstein argues, it may be a misreading of the text. The original text was corrupted, and the original meaning of the sentence may have been different. In fact, the area is too far from the sea, and even a very big funerary monument in no way could be seen from as far away as the Mediterranean. In any case, the passage ends by stating that the tomb "remains to this day," which probably indicates a late date during the reign of John Hyrcanus I (134–104 BCE), as 1 Maccabees itself can be dated to the last years of his rule.[6]

An important question is why Simon made seven pyramid-shaped roofs. One was for Matthias, the priest from Modi'in who started the rebellion against the Seleucid ruler Antiochus IV, and one was made for his wife, and then there were four pyramids for the four fallen Maccabees: the eldest brother Jochanan Gadi, Judah the Maccabee, Eliezer, and Jonathan. That makes six. Some have suggested that the seventh pyramid was made by Simon for himself to celebrate his own achievements together with those of his brothers.[7]

---

[5] The respective texts and translations are from J. A. Goldstein, *I Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary,* New Haven, 2008, 471; and R. Marcus, *Josephus, Jewish Antiquities V, Books 12–13*, Cambridge, 1943, 471.
[6] Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, cit., 475.
[7] Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, cit., 474.

Furthermore, according to the description cited above, the pyramids were set "opposite" or "in front of" each other, but this would create an insurmountable aesthetic problem, as the number of the pyramids was uneven. So, it therefore seems more logical to suppose that all seven pyramids were set in a straight line. First Maximilian Kon and then Steven Fine published detailed studies on the monument, in which they made this argument. According to Kon, for example, the tomb was "apparently a very high rectangular structure built from ashlars which served as a base for the upper story of the monument, consisting of seven base structures in the form of towers surrounded by pilasters and crowned by pyramidal or conical tops. The wall-surfaces between the pilasters were decorated with reliefs of weapons and ships."[8]

Moving on to Josephus, a careful reading of his description demonstrates that he made additions to the original, with some probably coming from the historian's personal acquaintance with the monument. As stated in the *Life*, Josephus's "autobiography," he was descended, on his mother's side, from a collateral branch of the Hasmonean family. Therefore, he possibly had various occasions to visit the monument.[9] Josephus, as does his source, states that Simon erected a memorial monument celebrating his family "for his father and brothers," although later, once he describes the seven pyramids, which topped the building, he corrects himself, adding "his parents and his brothers," thus including Simon's mother. However, in the description of the building itself there are some important differences. For example, Josephus states that the whole structure was covered by blocks of polished white marble, while 1 Maccabees describes a structure made of stone. Moreover, Josephus adds that the columns were monolithic. Here, it is probable that 1 Maccabees is the more accurate of the two accounts: we know that elsewhere Josephus describes monuments to be covered with marble slabs when in reality they were built using polished stone. Last but not least, Josephus adds that Simon erected the mausoleum to bury Jonathan, a piece of information not related by 1 Maccabees. Although this statement does not really date the monument, it can be taken as evidence that the monument was erected after 143 BCE and before 135 BCE.

Yet in Josephus's description, there is no mention whatsoever of the figurate frieze that decorated the architrave. The differences between the version of 1 Maccabees and Josephus's *Jewish Antiquities* can stem from the fact that during this time the tomb was altered and that the frieze by then did not display any more the set of weapons and the warships' rams. Yet, although this a possible explanation—that the monument was reshaped or modified to fit the needs and ideology of a new ruler—it is quite improbable. A more plausible explanation is provided by Fine, who argues that the different depiction of the monument provided by Josephus mirrors a different, probably more extreme attitude toward images that was widespread among some groups of Jews toward the end of the Second Temple period. Thus, the fact that Josephus does not mention "suits of armor" or "carved ships" ought to be seen as an intentional omission. Clearly once more, the version given by 1 Maccabees, which describes the frieze in detail, ought to be preferred to that of Josephus.[10]

3.A. Sources of Inspiration: The Mausoleum of Halicarnassus

Most scholars, including Andrea Berlin and Steven Fine, who tried to reconstruct the appearance of the monumental tomb of the Maccabees argue that the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus was its primary source of inspiration. This was the most important model for Hellenistic funerary monuments in general, which is hardly a surprise, as it was one listed among the seven wonders of the ancient world. The structure did not survive the ravages of time, but it can be reconstructed. First, we have a detailed *ekphrasis* given by Pliny the Elder and passage of the work of Hyginus.

[8] See M. Kon, "Jewish Art at the Time of the Second Temple," in *Jewish Art*, ed. C. Roth, London 1971, 53; Fine, "Art and Identity in Latter Second Temple Period Judea," cit., 60–80.
[9] Josephus, *Vita* 1.2.
[10] Fine, "Art and Identity in Latter Second Temple Period Judea," 60–80.

Pliny the Elder's description, which focuses on the frieze, gave only a general idea of the appearance of the monumental tomb. [11] Although the Mausoleum was widely researched, only the careful excavations of Kristian Jeppsen between 1966 and 1977 allowed a relatively accurate reconstruction of the monument. The monumental tomb was erected on a hill overlooking the city in the middle of the fourth century BCE in an enclosed courtyard. The foot of the monument consisted of a stone platform, which had a stairway in the middle, flanked by stone lions, which led to its top. Surrounded by various statues, a tall square-shaped narrowing cubic structure, no less than one-third of the Mausoleum's 45 m height, was topped by a huge Ionic portico of ten columns on each of the four sides, like a temple would be. The temple-like structure was separated from the lower portico by a running frieze depicting a Centauromachy and an Amazonomachy. On the top of a plain entablature stood a stepped pyramid crowned by a *quadriga* with on it a statuary group portraying Mausolus and Artemisia.[12]

This funerary building typology was quite widespread in the Hellenistic and Roman Mediterranean. The earliest and most important example is the Mausoleum of Belevi, located near Ephesus, which was commissioned by Lysimachus (r. 306–281 BCE), King of Thrace, Asia Minor, and Macedon. The structure is quite similar. The steps surrounding the structure lead to a cubic socle with a central gate, topped by a Doric frieze. On it stands a temple-like structure, which is set in the Corinthian order. Each of the four façades presents a portico of eight columns. The monument is crowned by a stepped pyramid with a *quadriga* on its top. Later, it became the final resting place of the Seleucid ruler Antiochus II Theos (261–246 BCE). No less interesting, because of its late date, is the Monument of C. Memmius, grandson of Sulla, at Ephesus, which dates to the third quarter of first century BCE. Once more, the source of inspiration for the architectural design of the mausoleum is evident. The steps lead to a socle topped by two storeys. The lower, and larger, storey presented a façade with a gate decorated with an upper arch, while the upper, and smaller, storey is shaped as a temple with a façade consisting of six plain Corinthian columns. The entablature of the upper storey was topped by four receding tapering steps which support a drum and is decorated with reliefs depicting *bucrania* alternated with garlands supporting a *patera*. A stepped pyramid crowns the whole structure. Yet the use of arches and the Corinthian order, as well as the decoration of the drum, point to the introduction of Roman elements. Similar monuments stood at Cnidos and Lymira.[13] As Fine has pointed out, the main elements of the tomb—a stereobate, a cubic-rectangular structure decorated with columns, and a crowning pyramid—can be traced back to the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, which was a primary source of inspiration for the Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in. Indeed, the two tombs share much in common, including a basic structure that included a lower stereobate and a socle at the bottom, a cubic structure surrounded by columns like those of a Greek temple in the middle, and pyramids at the top: the Tomb of the Maccabees had seven, while the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus had just one.[14]

However, as is well argued by Berlin, the main source of inspiration for this monument was not so much its structure, but the message that it conveyed, namely, that the achievements of its occupant, King Mausolus of Caria, were glorious. Indeed, Lucianus in his *Dialogues of the Dead*, written many centuries afterward, states in a fictional conversation between the cynic philosopher Diogenes and Mausolus that the latter replied, when asked why he was so proud and why he pretended

[11] Pliny the Elder, *Naturalis Historia* 36.30–31 (translation of J. Bostock and H. T. Riley (1855) at Perseus); Vitruvius, *De Architectura* 7.13 states that some of the sculptures were created by Praxiteles; however, modern scholarship does not accept Vitruvius's claim. On the Mausoleum, see also Strabo, *Geographica* 14.2.16 on the dimensions of the Mausoleum.

[12] K. Jeppeson, *The Maussolleion at Halikarnassos: Reports of the Danish Archaeological Expedition to Bodrum: The Superstructure, A Comparative Analysis of the Architectural, Sculptural, and Literary Evidence*, 4 vols, Aarhus, 2002; Waywell and Berlin, "Monumental Tombs," cit., 54–65.

[13] On the Mausoleum of Belevi, see P. Scherrer, *Ephesus: The New Guide*, rev. ed., Istanbul, 2000, 234–235. Scherrer also talks about the Monument of C. Memmius (96–97). On the funerary monuments from Cnidos and Lymira, see Pierre Gros, *L'architecture romaine II: Maisons, palais, villas et tombeaux*, Paris, 2001, 458. 14 Fine, "Art and Identity in Latter Second Temple Period Judea," cit., 60–80.

[14] Fine, "Art and Identity in Latter Second Temple Period Judea," cit., 60–80.

to receive more honors than other human beings, that “I was a king; king of all Caria, ruler of many Lydians, subduer of islands, conqueror of well-nigh the whole of Ionia, even to the borders of Miletus. Further, I was comely, and of noble stature, and a mighty warrior.”[15]

If we are to consider now the Hasmoneans’ ideology of commemoration, then Mausolus’s boast can possibly be associated with the outlook of the Sadducees, who, according to Josephus, denied the resurrection of the body as well as that of the soul.[16] John Hyrcanus, one of the Hasmonean rulers who had a hand in the erection of the mausoleum in Modi'in, had a disagreement with the Pharisees in the last years of his rule and, as consequence, decided to embrace the beliefs of the Sadducees. The monumentality of the family tomb in Modi'in could have been associated with the outlook of the Sadducees, which was epitomized by the emphasis given to the sepulcher as a site of memory of the deceased. The wish to be remembered by posterity through the erection of a monumental tomb, which probably was one of the motivations behind the erection of the Tomb of the Maccabees, is mirrored, for example, by the inscription in Hebrew set on the monumental Herodian period Tomb of Bene Hezir, which mentions the priests of the family of Hezir, a priestly family who were possibly Sadducees.[17]

3.B. Sources of Inspiration: The Tomb of Alexander at Alexandria

And yet Berlin also points to the existence of many dissimilar features between the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus and the Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in. The Mausoleum of Halicarnassus was very far away, built many years earlier, and while the basic structure was similar, it presented also many dissimilarities, first and foremost its huge dimensions, its huge, tall cubic structure set on the pediment, as well as the step pyramid, which topped the whole structure. Therefore, it is necessary to search elsewhere for a more similar source of inspiration, and that brings us to Judea. According to Sylvie Honigman and Gilles Gorre, the monumental tomb of Alexander the Great, erected by the Ptolemies at Alexandria, was probably a more direct source of inspiration for the monumental tomb erected by Simon than the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus. However, in turn the Tomb of Alexander’s main source of inspiration can be traced to the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus. Thus, anyway, it is not possible to deny that the latter influenced the architectural settings of the Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in.

Lately, the Tomb of Alexander in Alexandria was the subject of an important study conducted by Andrew Chugg. The first step in the funeral of Alexander the Great was the escorting of the wooden catafalque that carried his body from Babylon to Alexandria. The wish of Alexander the Great, who died in 323 in Babylonia, was to be buried in the Temple of Ammon at Siwa. However, the regent Perdiccas decided to bury the body at Aegae in Macedonia, and thus there was a need for a carriage. This object did not survive the ravages of time, but it was very impressive. Hieronymus of Cardia provided a description, which Diodorus quoted in his *Library of History*. Accordingly, the coffin was put on a wooden ornamented carriage. The body of the rectangular carriage was surrounded by an Ionic colonnade topped by a frieze. A vault, decorated on each corner with a statue of Nike, topped the frieze. A golden net set in the colonnade was used to suspend various paintings that reminded the bystander of the deeds of Alexander. The chariot was pulled by sixty-four mules. However, when the funeral procession reached Damascus, the body was stolen by Arrhidaeus, who

---

[15] Lucian, *Dialogi Mortuorum* 289.24; Waywell and Berlin, “Monumental Tombs,” cit., 54–65.

[16] Josephus, *AJ* 18.15 states that “the soul perishes along the body” (trans. L. H. Feldman); a similar passage in the *Jewish War* (*BJ* 2.165, trans H. St. J. Thackeray) states: “As for the persistence of the soul after death, penalties in the underworld, and rewards, they will have none of them.”

[17] On the Tomb of Bene Hezir, see N. Avigad, *Ancient Monuments in the Kidron Valley* [In Hebrew], Jerusalem, 1954. On the conflict between John Hyrcanus, I and the Pharisees, see Josephus, *AJ* 13.289–296; BT *Kiddushin* 66a; and R. Kalmin, “Josephus and Rabbinic Literature,” in *A Companion to Josephus*, ed. H. H. Chapman and Z. Rodgers, Oxford, 2016, 293–304.

was then joined by Ptolemy and his army.[18] The body was buried first in the empty sarcophagus of the last pharaoh of Egypt, Nectanebus II, which stood inside the Serapeum of Memphis. According to Sylvie Honigman, the seizure of the body of Alexander the Great and its burial at Memphis in the tomb of the last native ruler of Egypt was the first step in the endorsement of the new rulers of Egypt. The appropriation of Nectanebus II and Alexander the Great and their incorporation among the ancestors of the Ptolemies was a form of "genealogical manipulation." Yet the purpose was clear. While the claim to kinship with Nectanebus II served the new rulers to strengthen their claim to the throne of Egypt as new pharaohs in the eyes of the native Egyptians, the appropriation of the body of Alexander would uphold their claim as the most important of his successors, or *diadochs*, granting them legitimacy among the Macedonian veterans and supremacy among the warlords who fought for the control of the Hellenistic world.

The second step came when the body was transferred from Memphis to a funerary monument erected in Alexandria by Ptolemy II, son and heir of Ptolemy I. The primary purpose of this monument, known as the *Sema*, was to associate perpetually the memory of Alexander, presented as the "father" of Ptolemy I, to the royal family. Moreover, now, the monumental tomb became an inseparable element of the cityscape of Alexandria, no less than the Pharos or the Library. Additionally, as with the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, *ekphraseis*, or extended literary *descriptions*, which would have been widely circulated by the Ptolemies, would have strengthened their claim to a mythical ancestorship and to their "right" to be seen as the legitimate and unique heirs of the great Macedonian. Andrew Chugg suggests that the *Sema* was located at the center of ancient Alexandria near the harbor and the royal palace as well as the Alpha quarter. The building, which lay at the center of a compound surrounded by walls, was not so dissimilar to its primary source, the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, and it was still standing in 361 CE. Based on vague descriptions by Zenobius and Lucan, Chugg argues that the building consisted of a cubic structure, surrounded by a colonnade, set on a high pedestal or dado, which furthered its dominant position in the cityscape, extending its height, and that it was topped by a pyramid. However, the frieze would have included among its decorations reliefs depicting trophies of weapons. This element, which served to emphasize the military glory achieved by its occupant, Alexander the Great, and which would have promoted the dynastic claims of the Ptolemies, his "successors," is an element that did not appear in the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus. The existence of these reliefs depicting weapons is possibly corroborated by the existence of a relief depicting an aspis, the Macedonian round shield, decorated with the eight-pointed Argead star, found in the Basilica of St. Mark in Venice. This relief could have been a fragment from the *Sema*.[19]

Sylvie Honigman and Gilles Gorre maintain that the *Sema* was not only a source of inspiration for the architecture of the Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in, but also for the message that the latter wanted to spread. The erection of a monumental tomb allowed Simon and his descendants, the Hasmonean dynasty, to manipulate their genealogical background and claim a closer association with

[18] On the funeral procession and the wooden chariot carrying the catafalque, see Pausanias, *Graeciae descriptio* 1.6.3; Arrian, *History of Events after Alexander* fr. 1.25, summarized by Photius, *Bibliotheca* 92.69; Diodorus Siculus, *Bibliotheca Historica* 18.26.3–28.2; R. M. Geer, trans., *Diodorus Siculus, Library of History, Books 18–19.65, Volume IX,* Cambridge, 1947, 88–93. On the burial of Alexander's body at Memphis, see Pausanias, *Graeciae descriptio* 1.6.3; Curtius Rufus, *Historiae Alexandri Magni* 10.10.20; Pseudo-Callisthenes, "The Romance of Alexander," in *The Greek Alexander Romance*, trans. R. Stoneman, Harmondsworth, 1991, 3.34.

[19] While the term *Sema* is used here, which indicates a symbolic spot, the term *Soma*, associated with the body of Alexander the Great, was also in use. A vague description of the monument by Zenobius, *Proverbia* 3.94.81 L-S and by Lucan, *Pharsalia* 8.694–697 and 10.14–20 is the only element that can help in the reconstruction of the tomb; Ammianus Marcellinus, *Res Gestae* 22.11.7 mentions that in 361 CE the *Sema* was still standing. According to Chugg, when the public performances of paganism became illegal, in the second half of the fourth century CE, the mummified body of Alexander was altered and became the body of St. Mark the Evangelist. Both bodies, according to the tradition, were conserved with aromatic spices. In fact, his church, shaped as a martyrium, stood very close to the *Sema*. Then, when the Venetians stole the holy relic, they also took away some fragments associated with the evangelist, among them the relief depicting the shield. See A. Chugg, "The Tomb of Alexander the Great in Alexandria," *American Journal of Ancient History, New Series* 1.2 (2002): 75–108.

Judah the Maccabee than they really had. Judah the Maccabee, the brother of Simon, had become the dominant character in the creation of Hasmonean memory after his death. Thus, Simon and his son John Hyrcanus, once they could claim a share in the memory of the glorious deeds of Judah and his brothers, such as the purification of the Temple or their military achievements, such as Judah's victory at Adasa against the Seleucid general Nicanor, later celebrated with a holiday, the Day of Nicanor, could boast of their legitimacy. Thus, the glory of Judah and his brothers was routed to the advantage of Simon and the later Hasmoneans. Besides, this "manipulated" kinship would have strengthened the "symbolic" bond with Onias III, the last legitimate high priest of Judea, which in turn served to uphold their legitimacy as high priests in the eyes of the Jews. Moreover, as with the Tomb of Alexander, the sealing of the Tomb, which meant that the Hasmoneans from John Hyrcanus onward had to be buried elsewhere, converted the tomb into a public monument, allowing them to share in the glory of Judah, which by now was closely associated, as it was appropriated, with the ruling Hasmonean dynasty. As in the case of the Mausoleum of Halicarnassus and the *Sema*, written descriptions of the Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in, such as that given in 1 Maccabees, would have been sent out far and wide with the purpose of furthering the Hasmoneans' claims to legitimacy among the Jews living in the Hellenistic Diaspora.[20]

4.A. The Tomb of the Maccabees as a Source of Inspiration for the Monumental Tombs in Jerusalem

Another possible source of inspiration for the Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in could be the mausolea erected in Jerusalem at the end of the Second Temple period, whose primary source of inspiration, in turn, can be traced back to the Tomb of the Maccabees. Berlin convincingly argues that the Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in strongly influenced the funerary architecture of Judea in the Late Second Temple period. Accordingly, the Tomb of the Maccabees presented an important novelty in the panorama of Jewish funerary architecture, as it was the first monumental tomb erected after a long period of time. Earlier funerary structures were quite simple, often just caves, whose entrances were simple and undecorated. An analysis of the architectural elements of these structures can provide important clues about the origin of some of those present in the Tomb of the Maccabees that have, till now, been overlooked. A careful analysis of some of the surviving monuments in Jerusalem, some quite similar, can be helpful in focusing on some of the characteristic elements described by 1 Maccabees and Josephus that are lacking in the faraway Mausoleum of Halicarnassus.[21]

By the end of the Second Temple period, monumental tombs were built right into the hills surrounding Jerusalem and its environs. The architecture of the earliest funerary monuments blended native elements that go back to biblical times with other elements stemming from Hellenistic funerary architecture. The cubic structures topped by a cavetto and a pyramid, dating to the Iron Age, were by now set on a dado, or a wide and high platform. Moreover, the façade, set on a flight of steps that surrounds the building, was reframed with the use of a *monostyle in antis*, a column set between two corner pillars, or, more often, a *distyle in antis*, two columns set between corner pillars. Sometimes half columns, carved on the stone block, surrounded the entire monumental structure. The columns and the capitals, in the Doric or Ionian order, respectively, were always topped by a Doric entablature. However, the two local elements, the cavetto and the pyramid, were kept and blended together with the new Hellenistic features. The Egyptian cavetto crowned the Doric architrave and frieze, and was topped by a pyramid. The covering structure, shaped like a pyramid or, in the early Roman period, as a cone, was identified by archeologists with the *nefesh*, which is mentioned in Rabbinic literature. This term, literally meaning "soul," refers to a monumental funerary structure that contains the people buried inside. Most of the Jewish monumental tombs have a single *nefesh*, which symbolized the family as a whole. Yet, there are two known exceptions to this trend. The first is the Tomb of the

[20] Honigman and Gorre, "Dynastic Genealogies and Funerary Monuments," cit., 68–98.
[21] Waywell and Berlin, "Monumental Tombs," cit., 54–65.

Maccabees in Modi'in, and the second is the Tomb of the Kings in Jerusalem. In these cases, the *nefesh* symbolized each individual buried inside the tomb, as against the collectivity, the clan, or the whole family.[22]

While the Tomb of John Hyrcanus, which stood near by the Antonia Fortress outside the eastern tract of the First Wall, as well as the funerary monument of King Alexander Jannaeus, located north of the Bethesda Pools, also east of the city, did not survive the ravages of time, it is probable that they were similar to the Tomb of the Maccabees erected in Modi'in. At least many years ago, it was the conjecture of the archeologist and art historian Michael Avi-Yonah.[23]

The Tomb of Jason, which was found in Rechavia and dates to the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, is possibly the earliest monumental tomb from the Jerusalem area, and it is the one that possesses almost identical features to the Tomb of the Maccabees. Hewn into the rock, its façade consists of a single unfluted Doric column flanked by two pilasters, topped by an Egyptian cavetto entablature, and crowned by a pyramid. Gideon Foerster dates the construction of the tomb to the first half of the second century BCE, drawing a parallel between the fragments of the Corinthian capitals found on the Tomb of Jason and similar capitals found in Cyprus that can be dated to this period. In addition, the use of a Doric capital points to an earlier Hellenistic date.[24]

The Tomb of Bene Hezir in the Kidron Valley shares some of these characteristics. The façade, a Doric *distyle in antis* topped by an entablature without the gable, is cut into the rock. It seems, according to Meir Ben Dov, that the monumental structure was topped by a pyramid. Yet the *nefesh* of the Tomb of Bene Hezir was never found. According to some scholars, the adjacent so-called "Tomb of Zechariah" was the *nefesh* of the Tomb. However, the monument is from a later period.[25]

The adjacent Tomb of Zechariah, although from a later date, as it has been shown to have been made in the Herodian period, is structurally similar to the Tomb of the Maccabees, even if it seems that the source of inspiration for this tomb was Roman, namely, the *aedicula* type. The tomb was hewn into the rock and is freestanding. The cube is ornamented with engaged columns topped by Ionic capitals and pillars set at the four corners bearing an Egyptian cavetto cornice. The cube is crowned by a pyramid.[26]

Last, but not least, the so-called "Tomb of the Kings," located north of the Old City, undoubtedly the most well-known and impressive monumental tomb of Jerusalem, was clearly influenced by the architecture of the Tomb of the Maccabees. Described in detail by Josephus, the Tomb of Queen Helen of Adiabene and of her two sons, Monobazus and Izates, was hewn into the rock. Set in an artificial sunken courtyard, the monument was approached by a broad staircase. The façade consists in a *distyle in antis*. Two facing pillars face two plain Ionian columns. A decorative band, which consists of fruits and pinecones, divides the columns from the frieze. A Doric frieze decorated in its center by a bunch of grapes and flanked by wreaths and leaves of acanthus, tops the

---

[22] N. Avigad, "The Architecture of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period," in Y. Yadin, ed., *Jerusalem Revealed: Archaeology in the Holy City, 1968–1974*, Jerusalem, 1976, 14–20, here 17. Fine, "Art and Identity in Late Second Temple Period," 60-80, argues rather convincingly that in the Syriac version of 1 Maccabees the monumental tomb is described using the term *nafshan*, a plural probably stemming from the fact that the tomb possessed seven pyramids or *nefeshot*.

[23] On the Tomb of John Hyrcanus, see Josephus, *BJ* 5.259–260; 304; 468; on the Tomb of Alexander Jannaeus, see Josephus, *BJ* 5.304; and D. Amit, *Model of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period*, Jerusalem, 2009, 23.

[24] Jason's Tomb is situated in the Rechavia quarter of Jerusalem. A long court leading up to the porch was divided into a forecourt, a built outer court, and an inner court. The tomb includes two burial chambers—a *kokhim* chamber (Room A) and a charnel chamber (Room B)—and a porch. See L. Y. Rachmani, "Jason's Tomb," *Israel Exploration Journal* 17.2 (1967): 61–100. See also G. Foerster, "Architecture Fragments from Jason's Tomb," *Israel Exploration Journal* 28.3 (1978): 152–156.

[25] The burial cave consists of a porch, chambers with loculi, a flight of steps leading up to the ground level, and a passage connecting the cave with the area to the south, where the so-called "Tomb of Zechariah" stands. See Avigad, *Ancient Monuments in the Kidron Valley*, cit.

[26] The Tomb of Zechariah consists of two parts, a cube that measures and a pyramid atop. See Avigad, *Ancient Monuments in the Kidron Valley*, cit.

band. A rolling stone closed the tomb. As stated above, the *nefesh* consisted of three straight pyramids, which crowned the tomb.[27]

4.B. The Tomb of the Maccabees and the Syrian-Phoenician Architectural Tradition

As mentioned above, two architectural elements, the pyramid, present in the *ekphrasis* of 1Maccabees, and the cavetto, which features in various tombs, such as the Tomb of Jason, the Tomb of Bene Hezir, and the Tomb of Zechariah, are not only associated with the mausolea erected in the last years of the Second Temple period, but they are also connected to earlier funerary monuments dating to biblical times, specifically those in the Kingdom of Israel, whose glories were for the Hasmoneans an important source of inspiration. Indeed, there were earlier monumental funerary structures, which could have provided, even for the Maccabees, not only a source of inspiration, but also a tangible link to their glorious biblical past.

The Tomb of Pharaoh's Daughter in Jerusalem, located in the village of Silwan, dating to the Iron Age, the time of the Kingdom of Judah, is exactly that. The tomb, still standing, is a monolithic structure cut into the rock, which originally consisted of a cubic structure, with a large door in the middle, topped by an Egyptian cavetto and crowned by a pyramid, which was later removed for quarrying.[28] This monument presents two architectural elements, the Egyptian cavetto topped by the pyramid, so characteristic of Phoenician architecture, which also features in tombs dated to the late Second Temple period, such as the Tomb of Jason, the Tomb of Bene Hezir, and the nearby structure known as the Tomb of Zechariah. Going back to the Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in, while neither 1 Maccabees nor Josephus mention the Egyptian cavetto, both describe the pyramid, or more exactly the pyramids. However, just because both sources do not mention the cavetto does not mean that it was not an integral part of the monumental funerary structure erected by the Maccabees. In fact, it is not surprising that we find earlier native elements becoming an integral part of funerary monuments elsewhere, monuments that, on the whole, followed contemporary fashion and were not discarded. A close look at the evidence demonstrates that the same Mausoleum of Halicarnassus, erected by native rulers, also traced its primeval shape to buildings erected in an earlier period. Thus, the Mausoleum, no less than the monumental tombs in Jerusalem, was just an indigenous monumental tomb framed with the trappings of Greek architecture. The Tomb of Pharaoh's Daughter is in fact an integral part of the monumental buildings erected in the Levant, blending Mesopotamian, local, and Egyptian elements and characterized not only by the architecture of Israel and Judah but also by that of the Phoenician city-states, the Punic foundations, and the Aramaic kingdoms, till the end of the Achaemenid period, if not beyond.[29]

The monumental rock-cut tombs from late Second Temple period Jerusalem were not the only ones that conserved elements of the pre-Hellenic, Phoenician-Aramean past. Good examples are the earliest Nabatean tombs, which were carved into the rock at Petra and Hegra. The façade of each tomb, which originally consisted of a rectangle with a simple indentation cut on the entranceway, was topped by a band of crow steps, sometimes doubled, reminiscent of Mesopotamian architecture, or by a cavetto topped by a much bigger single-divide crow step. At a later point in time, some of the monumental tombs began to include Hellenistic elements, such as columns, architraves, and pediments.[30]

---

[27] See Josephus, *AJ* 20.95. See also Avigad, "The Architecture of Jerusalem in the Second Temple Period," cit., 17.

[28] On the Tomb of Pharaoh's Daughter, see Avigad, *Ancient Monuments in the Kidron Valley*; D. Ussishkin, "The Necropolis from the Time of the Kingdom of Judah at Silwan, Jerusalem," *The Biblical Archaeologist* 33.2 (1970): 34–46, here 42–44; D. Ussishkin, *The Village of Silwan: The Necropolis from the Period of the Judean Kingdom*, Jerusalem, 1986, 47–63; and G. Barkay, "Who Was Buried in the Tomb of Pharaoh's Daughter?", *Biblical Archaeology Review* 39.1 (2013), 41–49.

[29] On Israelite architecture, see E. Stern, "The Phoenician Architectural Elements in Palestine during the Late Iron Age and the Persian Period," in *The Architecture of Ancient Israel: From the Prehistoric to the Persian Period*, ed. A. Kempinski and R. Reich, Jerusalem, 1992, 302–309.

[30] I. Browning, *Petra*, London, 1982, 78–89, classifies the development of the façade of the tombs in various phases.

Additionally, native elements that went back to the Phoenician city-states and the Aramean kingdoms, which occupied the area in biblical times, are present in the funeral architecture of Seleucid and Roman Syria.[31] Good examples are the so-called "dado tombs." These monuments presented a socle fashioned with steps all around it leading to a dado, or a cube, often decorated with engaged columns, topped with an Egyptian cavetto, and crowned by a stepped pyramid. Just like the Tomb of the Maccabees, these tombs are decorated with friezes depicting trophies of weapons. The best example of this trend is a monumental tomb from Suweida, still visible and photographed in the nineteenth century, maybe Nabatean, which can be dated by its bilingual inscription, in Greek and Aramaic, to the end of the first century BCE. The Doric entablature is crowned with a stepped pyramid.[32]

A similar mausoleum, built at about the turn of the second century BCE, was erected at Hermel in Lebanon in what was once Phoenicia. The structure has been restored with certainty with its original materials. The massive structure, built of well-cut stone, rests on a pedestal of three steps and has two high storeys slightly tapering toward the top. The lower storey with four flat corner pilasters is decorated with reliefs depicting hunting scenes. The upper storey has four flat corner pilasters as well. A tall pointed pyramid surmounts the structure. The tomb was probably built at about the turn of the second century BCE.[33]

The Tomb of Kalat Fakra in Syria probably dates to the first century CE. It is a massive structure, two storeys high, topped by a cavetto with a band of crow steps and a pyramid. A monumental flight of steps leads to the façade. The first storey is simply shaped. The second storey, separated from the first by a socle, consists of a *distyle in antis* composed of two proto-Aeolic columns and four pilasters, two of them in the corners. The frieze topping the columns is Doric.[34]

Similar dado tombs topped by a stepped pyramid can be found in Hellenistic Cyrene, such as the tomb from Zawani. Here, steps surround the pediment of a cubic structure topped by a monumental architrave and a stepped pyramid.[35] Among various tombs from Punic North Africa, the Mausoleum of Ateban, probably a Numidian prince who lived during the third or second century BCE, in Dougga is probably the most important example of a dado tomb. The monument consists of a three-storey structure set on a socle. The first storey has four entranceways. The second storey, also set on a socle, is decorated by fluted Ionic half-columns and is topped by a cavetto frieze. The third storey, set on a stepped socle, is a simple cubical structure topped by a cavetto frieze and a pyramid. The corners of the cavetto frieze are decorated with sculptures depicting lions.[36]

Another similar tomb is the Lybico-Punic Mausoleum of Bes in Sabratha, which dates to either the third or second century BCE. The five-step-shaped socle leads to the first storey, a triangular structure with three Corinthian columns in the corners that is topped by a cavetto frieze. The upper storey, also a triangular structure, is decorated with three statues in Egyptian style, while in the corners stand three proto-Aeolic half columns. A cavetto frieze and a pyramidal structure crown the monument.[37]

---

[31] A. Ciasca, "Fenicia," in *I Fenici, Palazzo Grassi*, ed. S. Moscati, Milan, 1988, 140–151, esp. 149–150 on Amrit.

[32] The last pictures were taken in 1905. The inscription, which names the monument as a stele, refers to the occupant of the tomb as a woman, for whom her husband Odeinath built the mausoleum. See D. M. Krencker and W. Zschietzschmann, *Römische Tempel in Syrien I*, Berlin, 1938, 52–54. See also E. M. Meyers, "Suweida," in *The Oxford Encyclopedia of Archaeology in the Near East*, ed. E. M. Meyers, Oxford, 1997, 111–112; and A. Sartre, "Architecture funeraire en Syrie," in *Archéologie et histoire de la Syrie II: La Syrie de l'époque acheménide à l'avènement de l'Islam*, ed. J. M. Dentzer and W. Orthmann, Saarbrück, 1989, 423–446, here 439.

[33] See Krencker and Zschietzschmann, *Römische Tempel in Syrien I*, cit., 52–54.

[34] See Krencker and Zschietzschmann, *Römische Tempel in Syrien I*, cit., 52–54.

[35] N. Bonacasa and S. Ensoli, eds., *Cirene: Centri e monumenti dell'Antichità*, Milan, 2000, 162.

[36] The inscription in Lybian and Punic reads that the monument of "Ateban, son of Iepmatath, son of Palu, was built by a Punic architect, Abarish son of Abdashtart, and his two assistants, Zamar and Mangi, as well as joiners and smiths." On the monumental tomb of Ateban, see H. Lauter, *Die Architektur des Hellenismus*, Darmstadt, 1986, 216–217.

[37] On the Mausoleum of Bes in Sabratha, see Gros, *L'architecture romaine II*, cit., 417. Other examples of monumental tombs come from Sigga and Suma'a, although they are simpler.

When it comes to the Tomb of the Maccabees, the Numidian monument from Simitthus can be seen as a particularly apt source of comparison. Scholars attribute this monument to King Micipsa (148–118 BCE). The monument itself, not a tomb, is a rectangular structure two storeys high and stood on a three-stepped stereobate. The first storey featured a central gate with a *distyle in antis* set between two Corinthian columns. There are two engaged Corinthian square pilasters set in the corners. Flanking the gate, on each side, stood a relief depicting a trophy topped by an acanthus frieze that runs all along the façade. The second storey, which was designed according to the Doric order and which stood on an Egyptian cavetto, consisted of ten unfluted columns topped by an entablature. The fragments of the decoration are among the most precious examples of Numidian royal architecture, which shows a strong Ptolemaic—and more precisely Alexandrine—influence. It is important to emphasize that the façade of the upper storey is probably the most similar structure to the Tomb of the Maccabees.[38]

4.C. The Tomb of the Maccabees as a Bond to the Biblical Past

The presence of native architectural elements that can be associated with Judea's biblical material heritage, common also in the funerary architecture of Seleucid Syria and Punic North Africa, brings up an important element of the Hasmonean ruling ideology, especially as it pertains to Simon, which is the identification with and the use of the biblical past. While there is an important difference between the Deuteronomic historian, who put God at the center of the historical narrative, and the author of 1 Maccabees, who instead put the Maccabees there (after they were chosen by God), the Hasmoneans adopted biblical paradigms in order to promote their legitimacy as rulers and to substantiate their territorial policy. Biblical models are almost omnipresent in 1 Maccabees, and the deeds of the Maccabees are often associated with those of biblical figures.[39]

Once the first facet of the Hasmonean ideology is considered, that is, the endorsement of their legitimacy as Jewish leaders, 1 Maccabees immediately associates Matthias with biblical models. The old priest's speech to his sons on his deathbed is not only related through the scene to the testament of Jacob the patriarch, but it is explicitly related to biblical figures such as Abraham, Joseph, Phinehas, Caleb, Joshua, David, Elijah, Hananiah, Azariah, Mishael, and Daniel as models worthy of imitation should one want to achieve eternal glory.[40] According to Katell Berthelot, while in 1 Maccabees the narration progresses and the book assumes the tone of a dynastic history, biblical references that apply mainly to Matthias and Judah become less frequent. And yet Arie van der Kooij clearly demonstrates that biblical references indeed focus in the first part of the narration on Judah but that in the last two thirds of the book the emphasis switches to Simon. Both brothers are depicted as the two elected leaders chosen by God.[41]

The Eulogy of Simon, so central in the second part of 1 Maccabees, which is charged with biblical overtones and references, is another important source for understanding the ruling ideology

---

[38] Masinissa, the father of Micipsa, an ally of Rome during the Second Punic War, took possession in 152 BCE of the upper valley of the Medjerda, where the monument is located. Micipsa dedicated to his father in 139 BCE an altar located on the highest point of the mountain, possibly to celebrate the new acquisition. F. Rakob, *Simitthus I: Die Steinbrueche und die antike Stadt*, Mainz, 1993.

[39] 1 Macc 5:62: "Indeed they did not belong to that family of men to whom it had been granted to be the agents of Israel's deliverance"; U. Rappaport, "A Note on the Use of the Bible in 1 Maccabees," in *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, ed. M. E. Stone and E. G. Hazon, Leiden, 1998, 175–179; K. Berthelot, *In Search of the Promised Land: The Hasmonean Dynasty between Biblical Models and Hellenistic Diplomacy,* Göttingen, 2018, 101.

[40] 1 Macc 2:49–61: "Remember the deeds of our ancestors, which they did in their generations, and wins for yourself great glory and undying renown"; Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, cit., 238–248.

[41] A. van der Kooij, "The Claim of Maccabean Leadership and the Use of Scriptures," in *Jewish Identity and Politics between the Maccabees and Bar Kokhba*, ed. B. Eckhardt, Leiden, 2012, 29–49, argues that, inasmuch as the Maccabees had usurped the legitimate Oniad dynasty, they legitimized their claims to leadership with the use of "ancestral books," the Scriptures. Moreover, the last two-thirds of the book evince the strong influence of the Deuteronomic historian and incorporate various references to the kings of Israel and Judah.

of the Hasmoneans and their claims to legitimacy.[42] Simon, the last of the Maccabees, is depicted as a ruler who, after winning immortalizing military glory, brought peace and prosperity to his people. He took care of his people and as a result enjoyed their consensus and could count on their support. The biblical sources of inspiration are evident in every part of the eulogy. Goldstein rightfully contends that the ideals of 1 Kings, which lionizes the Kingdom of Israel at the time of Solomon, set at the end of the eulogy and echoed by the words of the prophets Micah and Zechariah, frame the whole poetic composition. The idea of glory, or *kavod*, associated with the civil and military leadership of Simon, described at the beginning of the poem, is also rooted in biblical models, such as the account of the glory achieved by Joseph in Egypt as well as a verse of Isaiah that associates the idea of glory with the King of Assyria. Likewise, the narration of Simon's military successes mirrors a theme that appears in various passages of the Bible, for example in Exodus, Deuteronomy, and Joshua—namely, the reconquest of territories claimed by the Jews as theirs since they were promised to them by God. In a similar way, the uprooting of the impurities from Judea, that is, the pagans, fulfilled the Deuteronomic ideal, present in Joshua, of the Land of Israel as the exclusive possession of the Jews and therefore uncontaminated by the impurity associated with Gentile oppressors. Also, the prosperity achieved by Judea under the government of Simon is described in idyllic tones, which is reminiscent of the Bible. Once again, Simon successfully realizes a vision that promises peace, the creation of a perfect agreement between God and the Chosen People, and the fertility of the Land of Israel as described in Leviticus. More than that, this vision is shared by the prophets Zechariah and Ezekiel. Likewise, the description of the Jewish people living in harmony under the wise rule of Simon echoes the verses of the prophets Zechariah and Isaiah. The safeguarding of the Temple as well as the donations made to the Temple matches that of King Solomon, who is described in 1 Kings. Besides, it seems that the boast that Simon lived in conformity with the laws of the Torah, fulfilling the law of the land, echoes a passage in 2 Chronicles. At the end of the eulogy, the association between the peace and prosperity achieved by the Maccabee and the happiness and joy that come with it takes up a biblical ideal described by the prophet Isaiah and the Psalms.[43]

Eyal Regev persuasively argues that the military achievements of the Maccabee, so preeminent in the eulogy, are also one of the main claims to leadership, which was recognized and upheld by the assembly that confirmed Simon as high priest and *strategos* of Judea. For Regev, Simon's claims to authority were rooted in his close relationship with his brother Judah and his father Matthias, his charisma and leadership, and the recognition given by the Seleucid overlord and by the Roman Republic as the legitimate ruler of Judea. Furthermore, Simon's pledge to guard and defend the Temple and the Torah, preeminent at the end of the eulogy, echoed his position as high priest and supreme judge.[44]

The speech of Simon to the Seleucid ambassador Athenobius is the most important mention of the Hasmoneans' claim to the Land of Israel, which was promised by God to the Israelites in the Bible. The term used by Simon in his answer, "our ancestral heritage," has been the source of various interpretations throughout the course of the twentieth century. Most historians, including Jonathan Goldstein, believe that the term indicates the area reached by the Kingdom of Israel when it was at

---

[42] 1 Macc 14:4–15; see Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 484–485, cit., for the text of the ode.

[43] See Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 490–492, cit., for the commentary. 1 Kgs 5:5 set the tone for the whole eulogy. See 1 Macc 14:4 for the idea of glory (*kavod*); compare to Gen 45:13 and Isa 8:7. 1 Macc 14:5–7 on the conquest of the Promised Land parallels Exod 34:24; Deut 19:8; and Josh 18:1. On the Land of Israel as the exclusive possession of the Jews, see Deut 7:24, 11:25; and Josh 1:5. 1 Macc 14:8–9 talks about the interdependence between peace and fertility: see its parallels in Lev 26:4; Zech 8:12; and Ezek 34:27. On concord, see Zech 8:4; Isa 52:1, and maybe Isa 61:10. 1 Macc 14:11–15, which talks about the relationship between peace and happiness, parallels Isa 27:5–6 and Psalms 37, 11. For the praise of individual happiness, see 1 Kgs 5:5; Mic 4:4; and Zech 3:10. 1 Macc 14:14–15 talks about the fulfilling of Torah: see 2 Chron. 19:3, which, however, refers to God and not to the laws of the Torah. On the donations to the Temple, see as a parallel 1 Kgs 6–7.

[44] On the decree of the assembly, which confirmed the appointment of Simon as *strategos* and high priest, see 1 Macc 14:25–49; and Regev, *The Hasmoneans*, cit., 113–117; on the Temple and the Torah as the main components of Hasmonean ideology, see Regev, *The Hasmoneans*, cit., 62–66.

its greatest size. The aim of the wars of conquest conducted by Simon and the successive Hasmonean rulers was to reconquer the land promised by God to Israel, as sanctioned by the covenant on Mount Sinai, and to recreate the Kingdom of David and Solomon.[45] On the other hand, David Goodblatt argues that Simon's aim was the enlargement of the borders of biblical Judea, which is made clear once his eulogy is compared to a passage from Strabo, and not the restoration of the Kingdom of Israel. Simon, therefore, draws a clear distinction between "our ancestral heritage," Judea, and the recently conquered territories outside Judea—Gazara and Joppa—claimed by the Seleucid ambassador.[46] Even more subtle are the arguments of Berthelot, who maintains that for Simon the term "our ancestral heritage" indicates only the historical right of the Jews to the possession of a territory associated with a mode of hereditary transmission, a notion accepted in the Hellenistic world. Simon's reasoning, therefore, even if it reflects the claims of the Jews, nevertheless sticks to legal concepts rooted in Hellenistic diplomacy. The term "inheritance of our fathers" indicated Judea proper, the territory of the biblical Kingdom of Judah, which remained with Rehoboam, the son of Solomon, after Jeroboam's rebellion and did not include the area of the Northern Kingdom of Israel.[47] However, since the original Hebrew version of 1 Maccabees was probably composed in the last years of the reign of John Hyrcanus I, or, according to Jonathan Goldstein, during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, the use of the term "our ancestral heritage" could also be contextualized differently. Accordingly, the term "our ancestral heritage" reflected the reality at the time of John Hyrcanus and his son Alexander Jannaeus, when Judea had expanded to include vast territories such as Samaria, Galilee, Idumea, Perea, part of the Transjordan, and a long strip of the Paralia, or the coast. In this case, "our ancestral heritage" reflects the territorial conquests realized by the Hasmonean rulers after Simon, when Judea had extended its frontiers, reaching the borders of the Promised Land or the Kingdom of David and Solomon. Therefore, as 1 Maccabees was written well after the conquests of John Hyrcanus and Alexander Jannaeus, the term "our ancestral heritage" in no way should be understood as an ideological justification aimed at motivating subsequent conquests. Besides, in these territories, for example Galilee, conquered only by the late Hasmoneans, dwelled communities of Jews who had established themselves long before the start of the Maccabean Revolt. The support and protection of these Jewish communities outside Judea assumed importance already at the time of Judas Maccabeus and could have served as an *a priori* justification for the subsequent territorial expansion.[48]

However, once *Realpolitik* is taken into consideration, it is clear that the territorial ambitions of the Hasmoneans corresponded to those of other peoples, such as the Parthians or the Nabateans, but also the tiny Aramean and Phoenician city-states, which saw in the dissolution of the Seleucid kingdom an opportunity to obtain first autonomy and then independence, and to take over neighboring territories. In short, the Hasmoneans were one of the many centrifugal forces that ended the process of decomposition of the Seleucid kingdom, which began when Antiochus III was defeated by the Roman Republic. Thus, in this optic any justification that the Hasmoneans gave to their foreign policy, which was similar to that of their neighbors, was given in the wake of their political achievements, not before.

[45] 1 Macc 15:33–34; Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, 1–26. On Gazara (Gezer) and Joppa as part of the Promised Land, see 2 Chron 2:15; Josh 21:21; and 1 Kgs 9:15–17.

[46] D. Goodblatt, "The Israelites Who Reside in Judah" (Judith 4:1): On the Conflicted Identities of the Hasmonean State," in *Jewish Identities in Antiquity: Studies in Memory of Menahem Stern*, ed. L. I. Levine and Daniel R. Schwartz, Tübingen, 2009, 74–89 and Strabo, *Geography* 16.2.21.

[47] Berthelot, *In Search of the Promised Land*, cit., 153–184.

[48] Judas "said to Simon, his brother: 'Choose men for yourself, and go, rescue your kindred in Galilee; my brother Jonathan and I will go to Gilead'" (1 Macc 5:15).

5.A. The Frieze of the Tomb of the Maccabees

The frieze depicting weapons set on the Tomb of the Maccabees is no less charged with an important propagandistic message than the cavetto and the pyramid; however, its recipient, the surrounding Hellenistic world, was different. While the core of the message is almost the same, to endorse the legitimacy of Simon and his descendants as rulers, the artistic language, the choice of depicting images, had to be different. The rationale behind the carving of a frieze depicting weapons goes back in ancient Greece to the erection of *tropaia*, the weapons and the armor of the enemy commander that, after a battle, was set on a wooden pole with the purpose of commemorating a military achievement. In the Hellenistic period, the erection of a "trophy" followed the acclamation of the victorious warlord by the army. These two gestures symbolized the achievement of victory over the enemy. From the Hellenistic period onward, together with real trophies, friezes depicting the enemy's armor were constructed in civic spaces or on temples. When it came to sea battles, however, following a naval victory the rams of the sunken or captured enemy ships were collected and set up as a monument on the seaside close to the battle site, or, as in Rome, set up in the forum. While the Hasmoneans could not claim any naval victories, Simon did have several military achievements, which included the conquest of Joppa. According to Goldstein, Simon set up not just a tomb but also a public monument, similar to a Greek *tropaion* and later Roman *trophaeum*, with the purpose of commemorating the military achievements of Judah the Maccabee and his brothers.[49]

Fine emphasizes that trophies depicted on monumental tombs or on civic or religious monumental structures such as porticoes and temples were widespread in the Hellenistic and Roman world. The most renowned Hellenistic public monument decorated with reliefs depicting weapons is the Temple of Athena at Pergamum, which was erected in 180 BCE by the Attalid ruler Eumenes II. The massive *propylaea* and the *stoa* were decorated with reliefs depicting sets of armor and rams taken from enemy ships, and it had a celebrative purpose, namely, to rejoice in the defeat of the Galatians and of the Seleucids.[50] The earliest depiction of armor from a funerary context comes from the Macedonian Tomb of Lyson and Callicles from Levkadia. Stella Miller argues that the set of armor on this structure belongs to the owner of the tomb, and that in no way could it be considered a trophy taken from an enemy. Therefore, the purpose of the painting was decorative and not celebrative. Besides, the painting stood in a private space.[51] The frieze of the above-mentioned monumental tomb from Suweida is apparently the most similar counterpart to the frieze on the Tomb of the Maccabees.[52] The sets of armor depicted on the frieze can be interpreted as loot taken from the enemy and as being displayed on the walls of the tomb to remind future generations of the prowess and bravery displayed on the battlefield by the occupant of the tomb. Also, the frieze that decorated the above-mentioned contemporary Numidian monument from Simitthus bears resemblance to that of the Tomb of the Maccabees. The sets of armor, which decorated the first storey, are set under the frieze. However, the trophies depicted suggest a Roman influence. Besides, the setting was different, as the monument from Simitthus was probably a shrine.[53] In the context of the artistic panorama of late Second Temple Judea, the depiction of trophies on the Tomb of the Maccabees was in fact an exception, standing almost alone, save for the theater erected in Jerusalem by King Herod. This public building, according to Josephus, was also decorated with trophies.[54]

5.B. The Tomb of the Maccabees as a Mirror of the Ideals of Hellenistic Royalty

---

[49] On the conquest of Joppa, see 1 Macc 11; 14:5; 34; and Goldstein, *I Maccabees*, cit., 474.

[50] Fine, "Art and Identity in Latter Second Temple Period Judea," 60–80; W. Radt and F. Pirson, *Pergamon: Geschichte und Bauten einer antiken Metropole*, Mainz, 2016, 159–165. The sanctuary was finished by his successor Eumenes II, who dedicated it.

[51] S. G. Miller, *The Tomb of Lyson and Kallikles: A Painted Macedonian Tomb*, Mainz, 1993.

[52] Meyers, "Suweida," cit., 111–112; Sartre, "Architecture funeraire en Syrie," cit., 439.

[53] Rakob, *Simitthus I*, cit.

[54] On the trophies set in the theatre of Jerusalem, see Josephus, *AJ* 20.268–272.

Behind the depiction of trophies that celebrated the military achievements of Judah the Maccabee and his brothers as well as the timid military expansion of Judea stood two of the most important guiding tenets that outlined the perfect Hellenistic monarch, namely, victory in battle and the display of wealth. These two ideals are outlined by Polybius in his funerary oration on Attalus II as being among the most important traits that characterize the ideal Hellenistic king. For Polybius, together with the martial prowess and possession of wealth, a good ruler was recognized by his love for his family, his loyalty to his allies, and his support of Hellenism.[55]

According to Claire Préaux, the ideal Hellenistic ruler is first and foremost a victorious warrior. The ability to defeat the enemy reveals not only the support of the gods, but also the warlord's royal nature as a savior. Hellenistic rulers chose various epithets to promote their glorious deeds on the battlefield such as Nicator ("Victor"), Nicephorus ("Victory Bringer"), Callinicus ("Beautiful Victor"), and Soter ("Savior"). While the signet ring and the purple mantle or *chlamys* indicated his authority, the diadem, the helmet, the *aspis* (round shield), often decorated with the Argead star, were in fact objects that symbolically indicated the idea of victory. None of these symbolically charged objects was alien to the Maccabees and later on to the Hasmoneans. The author of 1 Maccabees associates more than once the purple with Jonathan. Moreover, Hellenistic symbols of rule appear on coins minted by the Hasmoneans, such as the helmet, depicted on coins minted by John Hyrcanus I, and the diadem and a star with eight rays, almost identical to the Argead star, which are depicted on coins minted by Alexander Jannaeus. Also correlated to the ideal of victory is the possession of territory, both disputed and (previously) conquered by the enemy, and the ability of the king to extend the borders of the territories where he rules. No less important is the loot taken by the victorious king, which becomes one of the sources of his wealth. Victory and wealth are closely related. This close bond between military achievement and plunder, is mirrored on the Tomb of the Maccabees by the frieze and the use of hewn and carved stones, expensive building materials. Additionally, the frieze mirrors one of the most important tenets of the Hellenistic warlord, as well as the Hasmoneans, which is their close association with their army. This was even more important than the control of a territory and the capability to levy tribute on it. By the Hellenistic period, the warlord and his army were perceived as the core of the state, just as how in the Classical period the nucleus of the polis was its citizens. Finally, the moral and material obligations incumbent on the king as protector, liberator, and savior are also associated with victory. The trophies depicted on the frieze celebrate Judah and his brothers, but also Simon, not only as victorious warriors but also as liberators and saviors of their people, and they served to successfully promote this message to the surrounding Hellenistic world.[56]

For the Hellenistic ruler, his skills as a promoter of peace are no less important than his ability to achieve victory. As such, the Hellenistic king is the guarantor of the fertility and the prosperity of the lands over which he rules. Associated with the ideal of peace is first and foremost wealth, this time coming from his wise administration of the resources of his kingdom. Also closely associated with the ideal of peace is the display by the Hellenistic ruler of favor toward his Greek subjects, first and foremost those living in the cities. Hellenistic rulers willingly assumed the title of "Philhellene" to emphasize their attachment to Greek culture and the favor displayed to their Greek and Macedonian subjects. Among all the Hasmoneans, only Aristobulus I could boast this title. And yet the doubtful

---

[55] On the ideal Hellenistic ruler, see Polybius, *Histories* 18.41.3. Together with Polybius, other sources that discuss the profile of the ideal Hellenistic king are Isocrates in his *Nicocles* and in his biography of King Evagoras of Cyprus; the *Letter of Aristeas to Philocrates*; and later Plutarch in his *Apophthegmata regum atque imperatorum*. C. Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique I*, Paris, 1997, 184, lists among the roles of the Hellenistic ruler that of victorious warrior, that of the protector and feeder of the civil population, and that of the supreme judge (further explored on 271–279).

[56] On the missive of Alexander Balas and his gifts, see 1 Macc 10:15–21; and Josephus, *AJ* 13. 43; on Alexander Balas' invitation to Jonathan, see 1 Macc 10:51–66; and Josephus, *AJ* 13.80–85. See Y. Meshorer, *A Treasury of Jewish Coins: From the Persian Period to Bar Kokhba* (Jerusalem: Keter, 2001) for the coin minted by John Hyrcanus (pl. 18) and for the coins minted by Alexander Jannaeus (37–38, pls. 25–26). On victory as a royal attribute, see Préaux, *Le monde hellénistique*, cit., 181–201.

claimed kinship between Judea and Sparta, and their alliance, renewed by Jonathan, can be understood as a sort of philhellenism.[57]

The benevolence, indulgence, and mercy of the king are realized through his *euergetism*, for example his ability to provide gifts. However, the king's *euergetism* depends on his accumulation of wealth. The splendor of the Tomb of the Maccabees possibly echoed the Hasmonean rulers' potential and means to provide *euergetism*. Coins, which depict the cornucopia on their obverse, minted by the Hasmoneans rulers, first by John Hyrcanus I, then by Alexander Jannaeus, Hyrcanus II, and Matthias Antigonus, as single or double, often together with a pomegranate, associated the Hasmoneans with prosperity, which in part mirrored the ideal of *euergetism*, closely associated to the Hellenistic ruler. The cornucopia, associated to Demeter, the goddess of agriculture and fertility, symbolized bounty and therefore wealth, and it became one of the royal dynastic symbols of the Seleucids and the Ptolemies.[58] Yet here, as well argued by Seth Schwartz, caution is necessary, as the relationship between classic *euergetism* and Judaism is quite complicated.[59]

Finally, in the Hellenistic world also the sending or the reception of foreign ambassadors by the ruler with the purpose of promoting the interests of the kingdom as well as avoiding wars is associated with the ideal of peace. And here, there is no motivation to think that the Tomb of the Maccabees in Modi'in was not displayed to diplomats who visited Judea. The view of the monument would have impressed the Gentile viewer not only because its frieze hinted at the military prowess and power of the Hasmoneans, but also because its opulence, the choice of precious materials, and the details of Greek architecture were all elements that implied the wealth accumulated by the rulers and their ability to be seen as powerful *euergetai*. Sylvie Honigman argues that in the early days of Hasmonean rule Jerusalem was still a very small and modest city. Thus, the monumental tomb erected at Modi'in, even if far away from the capital, would have been an important asset to impress foreign visitors.[60]

6. Conclusion

In conclusion, the main architectural elements of the Tomb of Maccabees, and especially the decorative frieze displaying the armor and weapons of defeated enemies, mirrored the main elements of Hasmonean ideology — namely, military power and wealth – with the not-so-veiled purpose of justifying their legitimacy. Yet the use of different elements, which stems from two different architectural traditions, native and Greco-Hellenistic, has the purpose of sending the same ideological message to the Jews of Diaspora as well as to the surrounding Hellenistic world. The cavetto and the pyramid, which were quite impressive, would have associated the Hasmonean rulers with the glories of David and Solomon, vindicating their legitimacy as Jewish rulers in the eyes of their subjects, while the frieze, the expensive stone, and the intricacies of the Greek architectural elements would have validated their claim to be *diadochs* of Alexander. The message, which emphasized the military successes and the wealth of the rulers of Judea, was roughly the same.

[57] On Aristobulus I as philhellene, see Josephus, *AJ* 13.318; on the letter of Jonathan to the Spartans, see 1 Macc 12:5–23 and Josephus, *AJ* 13.166–170; on the Spartan reply, see 1 Macc 14:16–23 (however, its authenticity is doubtful). See A. Momigliano, *Prime linee di storia della tradizione Maccabaica,* Turin, 1931, 148–150.

[58] Meshorer, *A Treasury of Jewish Coins*, cit., 33–34.

[59] See S. Schwartz, *Were the Jews a Mediterranean Society? Reciprocity and Solidarity in Ancient Judaism*, Princeton, 2010, on Jewish *euergetism* (166–170), on Ben Sira 16:24–17:23 (45–79); on Josephus (80–109), and on the Rabbis (110–165). On Josephus' attitude to *euergetism*, see *AJ* 4.213, 317; 6.211; 7.206, or, for example, his description of Herod's building projects (e.g., *BJ* 1.400–428), or the benefactions of Queen Helena of Adiabene (*AJ* 20.17–99). Regarding the Rabbis, see JT *Peah* 8.7 (21a); JT *Nazir* 5.4 (54b); JT *Berachot* 7.2 (11d).

[60] Honigman and Gorre, "Dynastic Genealogies and Funerary Monuments," cit., 96–98.