LUND UNIVERSITY

The neologisms in 2 Maccabees

Domazakis, Nikolaos

2018

Link to publication

Citation for published version (APA):
Domazakis, N. (2018). *The neologisms in 2 Maccabees*. [Doctoral Thesis (monograph), Centre for Languages and Literature]. Lund University (Media-Tryck).

Total number of authors:
1

General rights
Unless other specific re-use rights are stated the following general rights apply:
Copyright and moral rights for the publications made accessible in the public portal are retained by the authors and/or other copyright owners and it is a condition of accessing publications that users recognise and abide by the legal requirements associated with these rights.
• Users may download and print one copy of any publication from the public portal for the purpose of private study or research.
• You may not further distribute the material or use it for any profit-making activity or commercial gain
• You may freely distribute the URL identifying the publication in the public portal

Read more about Creative commons licenses: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/

Take down policy
If you believe that this document breaches copyright please contact us providing details, and we will remove access to the work immediately and investigate your claim.

LUND UNIVERSITY

PO Box 117
221 00 Lund
+46 46-222 00 00

The neologisms in 2 Maccabees

NIKOLAOS DOMAZAKIS
FACULTY OF HUMANITIES AND THEOLOGY | LUND UNIVERSITY

Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 23

The neologisms in 2 Maccabees

Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 23

The neologisms in 2 Maccabees

Nikolaos Domazakis

LUND
UNIVERSITY

DOCTORAL DISSERTATION
by due permission of the Faculty of Humanities and Theology,
Lund University, Sweden.
To be defended at the Centre for Languages and Literature, A339,
17 March 2018, at 10.15.

Faculty opponent
Dr. James K. Aitken

Organization
LUND UNIVERSITY
Centre for Languages and Literature
Helgonabacken 12
222 62 Lund

Document name
Doctoral dissertation

Date of issue
March 17, 2018

Author
Nikolaos Domazakis

Sponsoring organization

Title and subtitle
The neologisms in 2 Maccabees

Abstract
This thesis investigates a hitherto under-researched topic in Septuagint studies, the Septuagint neologisms, that is, the words which are first attested in the Septuagint, taking as a case in point a deuterocanonical/apocryphal book originally written in Greek, the Second Book of Maccabees (2 Maccabees).

The thesis first examines how the neologisms have so far been treated in Septuagint studies and lexicography and proposes a method for their identification based on a thorough search of the electronic databases of ancient Greek literary and non-literary texts rather than of the existing Greek lexica. It also discusses the significance of neologisms for identifying a Septuagint book's intertextual relationships and for determining the approximate time of its translation/composition.

The main part of the thesis consists of a detailed commentary on some sixty neologisms of various types that occur in 2 Maccabees: neologisms first attested in this book, which do not recur anywhere else in the Septuagint (Septuagint *hapax legomena*) or anywhere else in Greek (absolute *hapax legomena*); neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and other deuterocanonical/apocryphal books, or parts of books; neologisms first attested in the canonical books of the Septuagint, which were taken up by 2 Maccabees; neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and roughly contemporary extra-Septuagintal literary and non-literary texts; and neologisms of 2 Maccabees which recur in later Jewish and secular Greek texts.

The examination of these multifarious neologisms seeks to trace the intertextual connections that link 2 Maccabees with such texts as the Greek Pentateuch, the Greek Psalter, Old Greek Daniel, 1 Esdras, 3 and 4 Maccabees, Addition E to Esther, and the Alpha Text of Esther, and explores the possible influence on the deuterocanonical book's diction of secular Greek literary and non-literary texts such as Polybius' *Histories* and the Hellenistic honorific decrees. It also provides chronological clues that suggest a date of composition or final redaction of 2 Maccabees in the first century BCE, or around the turn of the Common Era, rather than in the last third of the second century BCE, as is commonly believed.

Key words
2 Maccabees, neologisms, *hapax legomena*, Septuagint lexicography, deuterocanonical/apocryphal books, Alpha Text of Esther, Polybius

Classification system and/or index terms (if any)

Supplementary bibliographical information

Language
English

ISSN and key title
1100-7931 Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 23

ISBN
978-91-7753-541-6

Recipient's notes

Number of pages
412

Price

Security classification

I, the undersigned, being the copyright owner of the abstract of the above-mentioned dissertation, hereby grant to all reference sources permission to publish and disseminate the abstract of the above-mentioned dissertation.

Signature Date 2018-02-02

Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 23

The neologisms in 2 Maccabees

Nikolaos Domazakis

LUND
UNIVERSITY

Copyright: Nikolaos Domazakis

Faculty of Humanities and Theology | Centre for Languages and Literature |
Lund University

ISBN 978-91-7753-541-6 (print)
ISBN 978-91-7753-542-3 (online)

Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 23
ISSN 1100-7931

Printed in Sweden by Media-Tryck, Lund University
Lund 2018

Media-Tryck is an environmentally
certified and ISO 14001 certified
provider of printed material.
Read more about our environmental
work at www.mediatryck.lu.se

Table of Contents

Acknowledgements 12
List of works cited 13
Abbreviations 49
Online databases and lexica 51
Bible software programs 51
Texts and translations 51

Chapter 1. Introduction 53

1.1 Aim and structure of the study 53
1.2 2 Maccabees 56
1.2.1 The author 56
1.2.2 The embedded letters 60
1.2.3 The prefixed letters 61
1.2.4 The date of the prefixed letters and the date of the epitome 65
1.2.5 Language and vocabulary of the epitome 67
1.3 Definitions of neologism in Septuagint studies and lexicography 71
1.3.1 Definitions put forward in various Septuagint studies 71
1.3.2 Definitions put forward in Septuagint lexicography 73
1.4 Identification of neologisms in the Septuagint lexica 78
1.4.1. Rehkopf's *Septuaginta-Vokabular* (*SV*) 78
1.4.2 Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie's *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (LEH) 79
1.4.3 Muraoka's *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (*GELS*) 82
1.4.4 Chamberlain's *The Greek of the Septuagint: A Supplemental Lexicon* (*GS*) 84
1.5 The *hapax legomena* 86
1.6 Final considerations on the neologisms and the *hapax legomena* as treated in Septuagint lexicography 92
1.7 Definition of neologism and *hapax legomenon* employed in this study 95
1.8 Neologisms as chronological and intertextual indicators. Some previous studies 96
1.8.1 Neologisms as chronological indicators 96

1.8.2 Neologisms as intertextual indicators 100
1.9 Method 106

Chapter 2: The neologisms of 2 Maccabees 111

2.1 Introduction 111
2.2. Discussion of a sample of neologisms of 2 Maccabees 113
2.2.1 ἀργυρολόγητος 'to be subject to exaction of money' 113
2.2.2 ἀρρενωδῶς 'bravely' 122
2.2.3 δεινάζω 'to be indignant' 123
2.2.4 δοξικός 'glorious,' 'splendid' 125
2.2.5 δυσπέτημα 'misfortune' 127
2.2.6 κρουνηδόν 'like a spring' 129
2.2.7 λεοντηδόν 'like a lion' 130
2.2.8 μετάφρασις 'paraphrase' 132
2.2.9 ὁπλολογέω 'to collect arms from' 139
2.2.10 παρεισπορεύομαι 'to enter furtively' 144
2.2.11 περισκυθίζω 'to scalp in the Scythian manner' 145
2.2.12 πολεμοτροφέω 'to keep up war' 154
2.2.13 προοδηγός 'one who goes before to show the way' 155
2.2.14 τιμωρητής 'he who punishes' 159
2.2.15 ὑπονοθεύω 'to obtain by underhand means,' 'to deceive' 163
2.2.16 φρικασμός 'shudder' 164
2.2.17 χρονίσκος 'brief time' 166
2.3 Summary 169

Chapter 3: The doubtful neologisms 171

3.1 Introduction 171
3.2 First type of doubtful neologisms 171
3.2.1 ἀπαρασήμαντος 'unmarked,' 'without commemoration' 171
3.2.2 ἀπροσδεής 'not in need of' 176
3.2.3 ἐντινάσσω 'to hurl' 178
3.2.4 ἐπιλυπέω 'to cause somebody grief,' 'to harass' 179
3.2.5 λεληθότως 'secretly' 180
3.2.6 φιλοπολίτης 'loving one's fellow citizens' 184
3.3 Second type of doubtful neologisms 189
3.3.1 ἐπανδρόω 'to make manly' 189
3.3.2 ἐφηβία 'ephebic institution' 190
3.3.3 ἱέρωμα 'figurine representing a deity' 191
3.4 Third type of doubtful neologisms 199
3.4.1 παρεπιδείκνυμι 'to point out besides' 199
3.4.2 τετραμερής 'divided into four parts' 201
3.4.3 ὑπεράγαν 'exceedingly' 201

3.5 Fourth type of doubtful neologisms 202
3.5.1 διεξίπταμαι 'to fly off in different directions' 202
3.6 Summary 206

Chapter 4: Neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and one more deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book 209

4.1 Introduction 209
4.2 Discussion of the neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and one more deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book 211
4.2.1 δειλανδρέω 'to be cowardly' 211
4.2.2 δυσσέβημα 'impious act' 213
4.2.3 ἔσθησις 'garment' 220
4.2.4 οἰωνόβρωτος 'to be eaten by birds' 227
4.2.5 τερατοποιός 'wonder-working' 232
4.2.6 τρισαλιτήριος 'thrice impious' 236
4.2.7 ὑψαυχενέω 'to carry the neck high,' 'to behave haughtily' 244
4.3 Summary 248

Chapter 5: Neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and the Alpha Text of Esther 249

5.1 Introduction 249
5.2 Discussion of the neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and the Alpha Text of Esther 250
5.2.1 δικαιοκρίτης 'righteous judge' 250
5.2.2 ἔκθυμος 'enraged' 255
5.3 2 Maccabees and Esther 267
5.4 Summary 274

Chapter 6: Neologisms of the canonical books of the Septuagint that occur in 2 Maccabees 275

6.1 Introduction 275
6.2 Discussion of a sample of neologisms of the canonical books of the Septuagint that occur in 2 Maccabees 278
6.2.1 ἁγιωσύνη 'holiness' 278
6.2.2 ἐλαττονόω 'to defeat' 280
6.2.3 ἐμπαιγμός 'humiliating mistreatment' 282
6.2.4 ἐποργίζομαι 'to become angered at' 290
6.2.5 καθαγιάζω 'to consecrate,' 'to sanctify' 296
6.2.6 παραδοξάζω 'to treat with distinction,' 'to render illustrious' 296
6.2.7 σαββατίζω 'to keep the Sabbath' 298
6.2.8 σαπρία 'rottenness' 299
6.2.9 τροφοφορέω 'to sustain by providing food' 301

6.3 Summary 303

Chapter 7: Polybian neologisms in 2 Maccabees 305

7.1 Introduction..... 305

7.2 Polybius and 1 and 3 Maccabees..... 306

7.3 Polybius and 2 Maccabees..... 308

7.4 Similarities of diction and style between Polybius and 2 Maccabees..... 311

7.5 Polybian neologisms in 2 Maccabees..... 315

7.5.1 ἀναστρατοπεδεύω 'to break camp'..... 315

7.5.2 ἐναπερείδομαι 'to vent upon' 317

7.5.3 προεξαποστέλλω 'to send out before'..... 319

7.5.4 προσυπομιμνήσκω 'to remind in addition' 319

7.5.5 σπειρηδόν 'divided into σπεῖραι'..... 320

7.6 Polybian semantic neologisms in 2 Maccabees..... 334

7.6.1 παρακλείω 'to kill'..... 334

7.6.2 ῥύδην 'with a rushing motion' 335

7.6.3 συνερείδω 'to meet in close conflict' 336

7.7 Combinations of words shared by Polybius and 2 Maccabees 337

7.8 Summary 340

Chapter 8: Excursus: some remarks on 2 Maccabees 7 341

Chapter 9: Summary and conclusion.....351

Appendices.....359

Appendix 1: A tentative chronology of the books of the Septuagint 359

Appendix 2: List of the neologisms of 2 Maccabees..... 364

Appendix 3: List of the doubtful neologisms 366

Appendix 4: List of the neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and one more deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book 367

Appendix 5: Combinations of words shared exclusively between 2 Maccabees and at least one deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book 368

Appendix 6: List of the neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and the Alpha Text of Esther..... 372

Appendix 7: List of the neologisms of the canonical books of the Septuagint that occur in 2 Maccabees..... 373

Appendix 8: Combinations of words which first occur in one of the canonical books of the Septuagint and then recur in other canonical and deuterocanonical books, the epitome of 2 Maccabees included..... 374

Appendix 9: Words with a single attestation prior to 2 Maccabees..... 381

Appendix 10: Words attested in two or three authors/texts prior to 2 Maccabees 382
Appendix 11: Combinations of words attested in only one or two authors/texts prior to 2 Maccabees 383
Appendix 12: Combinations of words shared by Polybius, 2 Maccabees, and a few subsequent authors 387
Appendix 13: Combinations of words shared by 2 Maccabees, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, et al., but not found in Polybius 393
Appendix 14: Combinations of words which occur and recur in chapter 7 397
Appendix 15: Combinations of words which occur in chapter 7 and recur in other chapters of the epitome 398
Appendix 16: Combinations of words which occur in chapter 9 and recur in other chapters of the epitome 400
Appendix 17: 2 Maccabees and Philo 402
Appendix 18: Final list of the neologisms of 2 Maccabees 404
Appendix 19: Final list of the doubtful neologisms 406
Index of the chief Greek words discussed in this study 407
Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 409

Acknowledgements

I gratefully acknowledge the receipt of a doctoral studentship from Lund University, which enabled me to write this dissertation, and a grant from the Hjalmar Gullberg and Greta Thott Scholarship Fund, which contributed to the completion of my project.

My thanks are due to the staff of the Lund University Library, the LUX library, and the library of the Centre for Languages and Literature, for always responding promptly to my requests for books and interlibrary loans.

I owe a debt of gratitude to the following people, who were closely involved with the development of my project: professor emeritus Jerker Blomqvist, who first incited my interest in 2 Maccabees and followed my work over the years; my main supervisor, professor Karin Blomqvist, for her scholarly and practical support; my second supervisor, professor emeritus Sten Hidal, for his help with biblical literature and with Hebrew; docent Johanna Akujärvi for her comments and suggestions; my 'mock opponent,' docent Georg Walser, for his critical remarks, which helped me improve the final draft of this dissertation; and the participants of the Greek seminar in Lund. I am also thankful to Sarah Hussell for proofreading the final manuscript and to Jonas Palm for the layout of this book. All errors remain mine.

List of works cited

Abel, Felix-Marie. 1927. *Grammaire du grec biblique suivie d'un choix de papyrus*. *EBib*. Paris: Gabalda.

—. 1949. *Les livres des Maccabées*. *EBib*. Paris: Gabalda.

Adontz, Nicolas. 1937. "Quelques étymologies arméniennes." AIPHOS 5:5–12.

Aitken, James K. 2009. "Context of Situation in Biblical Lexicons." In *Foundations for Syriac Lexicography III: Colloquia of the International Syriac Language Project*, edited by Janet Dyk and Wido Van Peursen, 181–201. Piscataway, NJ: Gorgias.

—. 2013. "Neologisms: A Septuagint Problem." In *Interested Readers: Essays on the Hebrew Bible in Honor of David J.A. Clines*, edited by James K. Aitken, Jeremy M.S. Clines, and Christl M. Maier, 315–29. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

—. 2014. *No Stone Unturned: Greek Inscriptions and Septuagint Vocabulary*. Winona Lake, IN: Eisenbrauns.

—, ed. 2015. *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint*. London: Bloomsbury.

Albrektson, Bertil, 1981. "Difficilior lectio probabilior: A Rule of Textual Criticism and its Use in Old Testament Studies." In *Remembering All the Way . . . A Collection of Old Testament Studies Published on the Occasion of the Fortieth Anniversary of the Oudtestamentisch Werkgezelschap in Nederland*, 5–18. Leiden: Brill.

Alexander, Philip S. 2001. "*3 Maccabees*, Hanukkah and Purim." In *Biblical Hebrew, Biblical Texts: Essays in Memory of Michael P. Weitzman*, edited by Ada Rapoport-Albert and Gillian Greenberg, 321–39. JSOTSup 333. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Allen, Stephen. 2001. *Celtic Warrior: 300 BC–AD 100*. Oxford: Osprey.

Allison, Dale C. Jr. 2003. *Testament of Abraham*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Alon, Gedalyahu. 1977. *Jews, Judaism and the Classical World: Studies in Jewish History in the Times of the Second Temple and Talmud*. Translated from the Hebrew by Israel Abrahams. Jerusalem: Magnes.

Amigues, Suzanne, ed. 1988. *Théophraste. Recherches sur les plantes*. Vol. 1, Books 1–2. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Ammon, Georgius. 1889. *De Dionysii Halicarnassensis Librorum Rhetoricorum Fontibus*. Munich: Kutzner.

Anderson, Arnold A. 1972. *The Book of Psalms*. Vol. 1. *Psalms 1–72*. NCB. London: Oliphants.

Andreades, Andreas M. 1994. Excerpt from "A History of Greek Public Finance." In *War Finance*. Vol. 1. *War from Antiquity to Artillery*, edited by Larry Neal, [58–71, 306–49] 3–60. London: Elgar.

Aperghis, Gerassimos G. 2004. *The Seleukid Royal Economy: The Finances and Financial Administration of the Seleukid Empire*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Ardizzone, Teresa. 1967. "Proagori in città siceliote." ΚΩΚΑΛΟΣ 13:155–76.

Argentieri, Lorenzo. 2007. "Meleager and Philip as Epigram Collectors." In *Brill's Companion to Hellenistic Epigram*, edited by Peter Bing and Jon Steffen Bruss, 147–64. Leiden: Brill.

Arnim, Hans von, ed. 1964. *Stoicorum Veterum Fragmenta*. 4 vols. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Aster, Shawn Z. 2012. "The function of the City of Jezreel and the Symbolism of Jezreel in Hosea 1–2." *JNES* 71, no. 1:31–46.

Atkinson, Kenneth. 2004a. *I Cried to the Lord: A Study of the Psalms of Solomon's Historical Background and Social Setting*. JSJSup 84. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2004b. "Herod the Great as Antiochus *Redivivus*: Reading the *Testament of Moses* as an Anti-Herodian Composition." In *Of Scribes and Sages: Early Jewish Interpretation and Transmission of Scripture*. Vol. 1. *Ancient Versions and Traditions*, edited by Craig A. Evans, 134–49. SSEJC 9. LSTS 50. London: T&T Clark.

Attali, Maureen. 2013. "Jour de Mardochée, Jour de Nikanor, Jour de Trajan et Jours d'Hérode: Du nom de personne au nom de fête dans le judaïsme hellénisé." *Camenulae* 10:1–9.

Attridge, Harold W. 1984. "Historiography." In *Jewish Writings of the Second Temple Period: Apocrypha, Pseudepigrapha, Qumran Sectarian Writings, Philo, Josephus*, edited by Michael E. Stone, 171–84. CRINT 2. Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress.

Aubreton, Robert, with Félix Buffière, and Jean Irigoin, eds. 1994. *Anthologie Grecque. Première partie: Anthologie Palatine*. Vol. 11 (Book 12). Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Aujac, Germaine, and Maurice Lebel, eds. 1981. *Denys d'Halicarnasse, Opuscules Rhétoriques*. Vol. 3. *La Composition stylistique*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Austin, Michel. 2006. *The Hellenistic World from Alexander to the Roman Conquest: A Selection of Ancient Sources in Translation*. 2nd ed. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Avi-Yonah, Michael. 1952. "The 'War of the Sons of Light and the Sons of Darkness' and Maccabean Warfare." *IEJ* 2, no. 1:1–5.

—. 1976. "The Hasmonean Revolt and Judah Maccabee's War Against the Syrians." In *The World History of the Jewish People. First Series: Ancient Times*. Vol. 6: *The Hellenistic Age: Political History of Jewish Palestine from 332 B.C.E. to 67 B.C.E.*, edited by Abraham Schalit, 147–82. London: Allen.

Baayen, Harald, and Antoinette Renouf. 1996. "Chronicling the Times: Productive Lexical Innovations in an English Newspaper." *Language* 72, no. 1:69–96.

Bäbler, Balbina. 1998. *Fleissige Thrakerinnen und wehrhafte Skythen: Nichtgriechen im klassischen Athen und ihre archäologische Hinterlassenschaft*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

—. 2005. "Bobbies or Boobies? The Scythian Police Force in Classical Athens." In *Scythians and Greeks: Cultural Interactions in Scythia, Athens and the Early Roman Empire (sixth century BC–first century AD)*, edited by David Braund, 114–22. Exeter: University of Exeter Press.

Babota, Vasile. 2013. *The Institution of the Hasmonean High Priesthood*. Leiden: Brill.

Baesens, Viviane. 2006. "Royal Taxation and Religious Tribute in Hellenistic Palestine." In *Ancient Economies, Modern Methodologies: Archaeology, Comparative History, Models and Institutions*, edited by Peter F. Bang, Mamoru Ikeguchi, and Hartmut G. Ziche, 179–99. Bari: Edipuglia.

Baker, Paul. 2006. *Using Corpora in Discourse Analysis*. London: Continuum.

Baladié, Raoul, ed. 1989. *Strabon, Géographie*. Vol. 4 (Book 7). Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Balland, André, ed. 1981. *Fouilles de Xanthos*. Vol. 7. *Inscriptions d'époque imperiale du Létôon*. Paris: Klincksieck.

Barclay, John M.G. 1996. *Jews in the Mediterranean Diaspora from Alexander to Trajan (323 BCE–117 CE)*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Bardtke, Hans. 1971. "Der Mardochäustag." In *Tradition und Glaube: Das frühe Christentum in seiner Umwelt. Festgabe für Karl Georg Kuhn zum 65. Geburtstag*, edited by Gert Jeremias, Heinz-Wolfgang Kuhn, and Hartmut Stegemann, 97–116. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

—. 1977. *Zusätze zu Esther*. JSHRZ. 1, 1. 2nd ed. Gütersloh: Mohn.

Bar-Kochva, Bezalel. 1976. *The Seleucid Army: Organization and Tactics in the Great Campaigns*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 1989. *Judas Maccabaeus: The Jewish Struggle against the Seleucids*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Barr, James. 2014a. "Did the Greek Pentateuch Really Serve as a Dictionary for the Translation of the Later Books?" In *Bible and Interpretation: The Collected Essays of James Barr*. Vol. 3: *Linguistics and Translation*, edited by John Barton, 87–105. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

—. 2014b. "Aramaic-Greek Notes on the Book of Enoch." In *Bible and Interpretation: The Collected Essays of James Barr*. Vol. 3: *Linguistics and Translation*, edited by John Barton, 130–52. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Bartlett, John R. 1973. *The First and Second Books of the Maccabees*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Baslez, Marie-Françoise. 2004. "Polémologie et histoire dans le livre de Judith." *RB* 111, no. 3:362–76.

Bauer, Johannes B. 1958. "Drei Tage." *Bib* 39, no. 3:354–58.

Bean, George E., and Terence Bruce Mitford. 1970. *Journeys in Rough Cilicia 1964–1968*. Österreichische Akademie der Wissenschaften, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, Denkschriften, 102. *Ergänzungsbände zu den Tituli Asiae Minoris no. 3*. Vienna: Hermann Böhlaus.

Beekes, Robert S.P., with the assistance of Lucien van Beek. 2010. *Etymological Dictionary of Greek*. 2 vols. Leiden: Brill.

Bellmann, Simon. 2017. "The Theological Character of the Old Latin Version of Esther." *JSP* 27, no. 1:3–24.

Berkowitz, Luci, and Karl A. Squitier. 1990. *Thesaurus Linguae Graecae: Canon of Greek Authors and Works*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Bévenot, Hugo. 1931. *Die beiden Makkabäerbücher. HSAT* 4.4. Bonn: Hanstein.

—. 1934. "The Armenian Text of Maccabees." *JPOS* 14:268–83.

Bickerman, Elias. 2007a. "The Dating of Pseudo-Aristeas." In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including* The God of the Maccabees, edited by Amram Tropper, vol. 1, 108–33. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2007b. "The Septuagint as a Translation." In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including* The God of the Maccabees, edited by Amram Tropper, vol. 1, 163–94. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2007c. "The Colophon of the Greek Book of Esther." In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including* The God of the Maccabees, edited by Amram Tropper, vol. 1, 218–37. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2007d. "Notes on the Greek Book of Esther." In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including* The God of the Maccabees, edited by Amram Tropper, vol. 1, 238–65. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2007e. "A question of authenticity: the Jewish privileges." In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including* The God of the Maccabees, edited by Amram Tropper, vol. 1, 295–314. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2007f. "A Jewish Festal Letter of 124 B.C.E. (2 Macc 1:1–9)." In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including* The God of the Maccabees, edited by Amram Tropper, vol. 1, 408–31. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2007g. "Heliodorus in the Temple in Jerusalem." In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including* The God of the Maccabees, edited by Amram Tropper, vol. 1, 432–64. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2007h. "The God of the Maccabees: Studies on the Meaning and Origin of the Maccabean Revolt," translated by Horst R. Moehring. In *Studies in Jewish and Christian History: A New Edition in English including* The God of the Maccabees, edited by Amram Tropper, vol. 2, 1025–1149. Leiden: Brill.

Bikerman [=Bickerman], Elias. 1938. *Institutions des Séleucides*. Paris: Geuthner.

Bile, Monique. 1988. *Le dialecte crétois ancien: Étude de la langue des inscriptions. Recueil des inscriptions postérieurs aux IC*. École française d'Athènes. Études crétoises 27. Paris: Geuthner.

Bingen, Jean. 1981. "Le règlement samothracéen sur le fonds d'achat de blé." *AC* 50:38–44.

Biran, Avraham, and Joseph Naveh. 1993. "An Aramaic Stele Fragment from Tel Dan." *IEJ* 43, no. 2/3:81–98.

Bird, Michael F. 2012. *1 Esdras: Introduction and Commentary on the Greek Text in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill.

Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Robert W. Funk. 1961. *A Greek Grammar of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Blass, Friedrich, Albert Debrunner, and Friedrich Rehkopf. 2001. *Grammatik des neutestamentlichen Griechisch*. 18th ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Bloch, Heinrich. 1879. *Die Quellen des Flavius Josephus in seiner Archäologie*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Blomqvist, Jerker. 1985. "Textual and Interpretational Problems in Sirach." *Eranos* 83:33–43.

Bludau, August. 1897. *Die alexandrinische Übersetzung des Buches Daniel und ihr Verhältnis zum massorethischen Text*. Freiburg: Herder.

Blume, Marianne. 1989. "À propos de P.Oxy. I, 41. Des acclamations en l'honneur d'un prytane confrontées aux témoignages épigraphiques du reste de l'empire." In *Egitto e storia antica dall'ellenismo all'età araba: Bilancio di un confronto*, edited by Lucia Criscuolo and Giovanni Geraci, 271–90. Bologna: Clueb.

Blümel, Wolfgang. 1992. *Die Inschriften von Knidos*. Vol. 1. Bonn: Habelt.

Bogaert, Pierre-Maurice. 2009. "Les formes anciennes du livre d'Esther. Réflexions sur les livres bibliques à traditions multiples à l'occasion de la publication du texte de l'ancienne version latine." *RTL* 40, fasc. 1:66–77.

Bond, Helen K. 1998. *Pontius Pilate in history and interpretation*. SNTSMS 100. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Botterweck, Gerhard J., Helmer Ringgren, and Heinz-Josef Fabry, eds. 1974–2006. *Theological Dictionary of the Old Testament*. Translated by John T. Willis, Geoffrey W. Bromiley, David E. Green, and Douglas W. Stott. 15 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Bowersock, Glen W. 1995. *Martyrdom and Rome*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Bremmer, Jan N. 2008a. "The Scapegoat between Northern Syria, Hittites, Israelites, Greeks and Early Christians." In *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East*, 169–214. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2008b. "Close Encounters of the Third Kind: Heliodorus in the Temple and Paul on the Road to Damascus." In *Greek Religion and Culture, the Bible and the Ancient Near East*, 215–33. Leiden: Brill.

Briggs, Charles A., and Emilie G. Briggs. 1906–1907. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Psalms*. 2 vols. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Brinkmann, August. 1909. "Der älteste Briefsteller." *RhM* 64:310–17.

Brooten, Bernadette J. 1982. *Women Leaders in the Ancient Synagogue: Inscriptional Evidence and Background Issues*. BJS 36. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Brown, Francis, Samuel R. Driver, and Charles A. Briggs. 1996. *The Brown-Driver-Briggs Hebrew and English Lexicon: With an Appendix Containing the Biblical Aramaic*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Brown, John P. 1995–2001. *Israel and Hellas*. 3 vols. BZAW 231, 276, 299. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Bruneau, Philippe. 1970. *Recherches sur les cultes de Délos à l'époque hellénistique et à l'époque impériale*. Paris: Boccard.

Brunt, Peter A. 1980. "On Historical Fragments and Epitomes." *ClQ* 30, no. 2:477–94.

Buitenwerf, Rieuwerd. 2003. *Book III of the Sibylline Oracles and its Social Setting*. Leiden: Brill.

Bunge, Jochen G. 1974. "'THEOS EPIPHANES': Zu den ersten fünf Regierungsjahren Antiochos' IV. Epiphanes." *Historia* 23, no. 1:57–85.

Buresch, Carl H. 1886. *Consolationum a graecis romanisque scriptarum historia critica*. Leipzig: Hirschfeld.

Burns, Joshua E. 2006. "The Special Purim and the Reception of the Book of Esther in the Hellenistic and Early Roman Eras." *JSJ* 37, no. 1:1–34.

Burstein, Stanley M. 1989. *Agatharchides of Cnidus*: On the Erythrean Sea. London: Hakluyt Society.

Butera, Curt J., and David M. Moffitt. 2011. "P.Duk. inv. 727: A Dispute with "Proselytes" in Egypt." *ZPE* 177:201–6.

Cadbury, Henry J. 1919. *The Style and Literary Method of Luke. I. The Diction of Luke and Acts*. HTS 6. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Caird, George B. 1969. "Towards a Lexicon of the Septuagint. II." *JTS* 20(1):21–40.

Cameron, Alan. 1993. *The Greek Anthology from Meleager to Planudes*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Cancic, Hubert, Helmuth Schneider, et al., eds. 1996–2003. *Der Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike*. 16 vols. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Canessa, André. 1995. "De l'originalité d'Esdras A′" In *Κατὰ τοὺς ο′ "Selon les Septante": Trente études sur la Bible grecque des Septante en hommage à Marguerite Harl*, edited by Gilles Dorival and Olivier Munnich, 79–101. Paris: Cerf.

Canfora, Luciano, ed. 2001. *Ateneo, I Deipnosofisti: I Dotti a Banchetto*. 4 vols. Rome: Salerno.

Carmignac, Jean. 1956. "Les citations de l'Ancien Testament dans 'La guerre des fils de lumière contre les fils de ténèbres.'" *RB* 63:234–60, 375–90.

Casey, Eric. 2013. "Educating the Youth: The Athenian Ephebeia in the Early Hellenistic Era." In *The Oxford Handbook of Childhood and Education in the Classical World*, edited by Judith Evans Grubbs, Tim Parkin, and Roslynne Bell, 418–43. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Castiglione, Luigi. 1961. "Zur Frage der Sarapis-Kline." *AAntHung* 9:287–303.

Cavalier, Claudine. 2003. "Le 'colophon' d'Esther." *RB* 110, no. 2:167–77.

—. 2009. "La quatrième face de l'histoire d'Esther (La Vieille Latine)." In *La Septante en Allemagne et en France: Textes de la Septante à traduction double ou à traduction très littérale*, edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Olivier Munnich, 90–99. OBO 238. Fribourg: Academic Press/Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

—. 2012. *La Bible d'Alexandrie 12: Esther*. Paris: Cerf.

Cavallin, Hans C.C. 1974. *Life After Death: Paul's Argument for the Resurrection of the Dead in I Cor 15. Part I: An Enquiry into the Jewish Background*. Lund: Gleerup.

Cazelles, Henri. 1961. "Note sur la composition du rouleau d'Esther." In *Lex tua veritas: Festschrift für Hubert Junker zur Vollendung des siebzigsten Lebensjahres am 8. August 1961*, edited by Heinrich Gross and Franz Mussner, 17–29. Trier: Paulinus.

Chamberlain, Gary A. 2011. *The Greek of the Septuagint: A Supplemental Lexicon*. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Chamoux, François, 1993. "Introduction générale. Diodore: L'homme et l'oeuvre." In *Diodore de Sicile: Bibliothèque historique. Livre I*, vii–lxxvi. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Chantraine, Pierre. 1933. *La formation des noms en grec ancien*. Paris: Champion.

Chantraine, Pierre et al. 1968–1980. *Dictionnaire étymologique de la langue grecque. Histoire des mots*. 4 vols. Paris: Klincksieck.

Charles, Robert H., ed. 1913. *The Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha of the Old Testament in English with Introductions and Critical and Explanatory Notes to the Several Books*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.

—. 1929. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Charlesworth, James H., ed. 1983–1985. *The Old Testament Pseudepigrapha*. 2 vols. New York: Doubleday.

Charlesworth, James H. et al., eds. 1995. *The Dead Sea Scrolls: Hebrew, Aramaic, and Greek Texts with English Translations*. Vol. 2. *Damascus Document, War Scroll, and Related Documents*. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck)/Louisville: Westminster John Knox.

Chevalier, Jacques. 1915. *Étude critique du dialogue pseudo-platonicien L'Axiochos sur la mort et sur l'immortalité de l'âme*. Paris: Alcan.

Chiron Pierre, ed. 1993. *Démétrios, Du style*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

—. 2001. *Un rhéteur méconnu: Démétrios (Ps.-Démétrios de Phalère). Essai sur les mutations de la théorie du style à l'époque hellénistique*. Paris: Vrin.

Clines, David J.A. 1984. *The Esther Scroll: The Story of the Story*. JSOTSup 30. Sheffield: JSOT Press.

Cohen, Shaye J.D. 1982. "Josephus, Jeremiah, and Polybius." *HistTh* 21, no. 3:366–381.

Cohn, Leopold, ed. 1906. *Philonis Alexandrini opera quae supersunt*. Vol. 5. Berlin: Reimer.

Collins, Billie Jean, proj. dir. 2014. *The SBL Handbook of Style For Biblical Studies and Related Disciplines*. 2nd ed. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press.

Collins, John J. 1993. *Daniel: A Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.

—. 2000. *Between Athens and Jerusalem: Jewish Identity in the Hellenistic Diaspora*. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Collins, Nina. 1992. "281 BCE: The Year of the Translation of the Pentateuch into Greek under Ptolemy II." In *Septuagint, Scrolls and Cognate Writings: Papers Presented to the International Symposium on the Septuagint and Its Relations to the Dead Sea Scrolls and Other Writings (Manchester 1990)*, edited by George J. Brooke and Barnabas Lindars, 403–503. SBLSCS 33. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Comparetti, Domenico. 1921. "Iscrizioni inedite di Gortyna." *ASAA* 3:192–202.

Connelly, Joan B. 2007. *Portrait of a Priestess: Women and Ritual in Ancient Greece*. Princeton: Princeton University Press.

Connolly, Peter. 1998. *Greece and Rome at War*. London: Greenhill Books.

Cook, Johann. 2002. "The Translator(s) of the Septuagint of Proverbs." *TC: A Journal of Biblical Textual Criticism*. 7. Retrieved from: https://rosetta.reltech.org/TCvol107/Cook2002.html

Corradi, Giuseppe. 1929. *Studi ellenistici*. Turin: Società Editrice Internazionale.

Cotton, Hannah M., and Michael Wörrle. 2007. "Seleukos IV to Heliodoros: A New Dossier of Royal Correspondence from Israel." *ZPE* 159:191–205.

Cox, Claude E. 2006. "The Historical, Social, and Literary Context of Old Greek Job." In *XII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Leiden, 2004*, edited by Melvin K.H. Peters, 105–16. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Craigie, Peter C. 1983. *Psalms 1–50*. WBC 19. Waco, TX: Word.

Craik, Elizabeth M. 2015. *The 'Hippocratic' Corpus: Content and Context*. London: Routledge.

Cramer, Frederick H. 1954. *Astrology in Roman Law and Politics*. Philadelphia: Memoirs of the American Philosophical Society 37. Philadelphia: American Philosophical Society.

Creelman, Harlan. 1892. "Are there Maccabean Psalms? I." *The Old and New Testament Student* 15, no. 3/4:94–104.

Crenshaw, James L. 1995. *Joel: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 24C. New York: Doubleday.

Crönert, Guilelmus [Wilhelm]. 1903. *Memoria Graeca Herculanensis cum titulorum Aegypti papyrorum codicum denique testimoniis comparatam*. Leipzig: Teubner.

—. 1910. "Die beiden ältesten griechischen Briefe." *RhM* 65:157–60.

Croy, N. Clayton. 2006. *3 Maccabees*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill.

Cumont, Franz. 1932. "À propos d'un décret d'Anisa en Cappadoce." *REA* 34:135–38.

Curtius, Ernst. 1894. "Ein Decret der Anisener zu Ehren des Apollonios." In *Gesammelte Abhandlungen*, 2:429–33. Berlin: Hertz.

Daly, Gregory. 2002. *Cannae: The Experience of Battle in the Second Punic War*. London: Routledge.

Danker Frederick W., ed. 2000. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature*, 3rd ed., based on Walter Bauer's *Griechisch-deutsches Wörterbuch zu den Schriften des Neuen Testaments und der früchristliches Literatur*, 6th ed., ed. Kurt Aland and Barbara Aland, with Viktor Reichmann, and on previous English editions by W.F. Arndt, F.W. Gingrich, and F.W. Danker. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Davies, Philip R. 1977. *IQM, the War Scroll from Qumran: Its Structure and History*. BibOr 32. Rome: Biblical Institute Press.

Deas, Henry T. 1931. "The Scholia Vetera to Pindar." *HSCP* 42:1–78.

Debord, Pierre. 1982. *Aspects sociaux et économiques de la vie religieuse dans l'Anatolie gréco-romaine*. Leiden: Brill.

Debrunner, Albert. 1917. *Griechische Wortbildungslehre*. Heidelberg: Winter.

—. 1930. "*σπεῖρα*=manipulus." *IF* 48:244.

de Bruyne, Donatien. 1921. "Notes de philologie biblique." *RB* 30:400–409.

—. 1922. "Le texte grec des deux premiers livres des Machabées." *RB* 31:31–54.

—, in collaboration with Bonaventure Sodar, eds. 1932. *Les anciennes traductions latines des Machabées*. Anecdota Maredsolana vol. 4. Abbaye de Maredsous.

de Foucault, Jules-Albert. 1972. *Recherches sur la langue et le style de Polybe*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Deissmann, Adolf. 1908. *Licht vom Osten: Das Neue Testament und die neuentdeckten Texte der hellenistisch-römischen Welt*. Tübingen: Mohr.

de Jong, Albert. 1997. *Traditions of the Magi: Zoroastrianism in Greek and Latin Literature*. Leiden: Brill.

Delcor, Mathias. 1967. "Le livre de Judith et l'époque grecque." *Klio* 48:151–79.

Denis, Albert-Marie. 1970. *Introduction aux pseudépigraphes grecs d'Ancien Testament*. Leiden: Brill.

Denniston, John D. 1952. *Greek Prose Style*. Oxford: Clarendon.

de Romilly, Jacqueline. 1956. "La crainte dans l'oeuvre de Thucydide." *Classica et Mediaevalia* 27:119–27.

Descamps, Albert. 1948. "La justice de Dieu dans la Bible Grecque." *Studia Hellenistica* 5: 69–92.

deSilva, David A. 2002. *Introducing the Apocrypha: Message, Context and Significance*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

De Troyer, Kristin. 2000. *The End of the Alpha Text of Esther: Translation and Narrative Technique in MT 8:1–17, LXX 8:1–17, and AT 7:14–41*. SBLSCS 48. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

—. 2003. *Rewriting the Sacred Text*. SBLTCS 4. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

d'Hamonville, David-Marc. 2000. *La Bible d'Alexandrie 17: Les Proverbes*. Paris: Cerf.

Dhorme, Edouard. 1923. *L'emploi métaphorique des noms de parties du corps en hébreu et en akkadien*. Paris: Geuthner.

—. 1967. *A Commentary on the Book of Job*. Translated by Harold Knight. London: Nelson.

Dickey, Eleanor. 2007. *Ancient Greek Scholarship: A Guide to Finding, Reading, and Understanding Scholia, Commentaries, Lexica, and Grammatical Treatises, from Their Beginnings to the Byzantine Period*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Diels, Hermann, and Walther Kranz, eds. 1992. *Die Fragmente der Vorsokratiker*. 3 vols. Zürich: Weidmann.

Dignas, Beate. 2002. *Economy of the Sacred in Hellenistic and Roman Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Dimant, Devorah. 1986. "The problem of non-translated Biblical Greek." In *VI Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies*. Jerusalem 1986. SBLSCS 23. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

—. 1988. "Use and Interpretation of Mikra in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha." In *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by Martin J. Mulder and Harry Sysling, 379–419. Assen/Maastricht: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress.

Dines, Jennifer M. 2004. *The Septuagint*. London: T&T Clark.

Dogniez, Cécile, and Marguerite Harl. 1992. *La Bible d'Alexandrie 5: Le Deutéronome*. Paris: Cerf.

Dölger, Franz Joseph. 1934. "Das Apollobildchen von Delphi als Kriegsamulett des Sulla: Götterbildchen als Reiseamulette." In *Antike und Christentum: Kultur- und Religionsgeschichtliche Studien*. Vol. 4, 67–72. Münster: Aschendorf.

Doran, Robert. 1979. "2 Maccabees and 'Tragic History'." *HUCA* 50:107–14.

—. 1980. "The Martyr: A Synoptic View of the Mother and her Seven Sons." In *Ideal Figures in Ancient Judaism: Profiles and Paradigms*, edited by John J. Collins and George W.E. Nickelsburg, 189–221. SBLSCS 12. Chicago, IL: Scholars Press.

—. 1981. *Temple Propaganda: The Purpose and Character of* 2 Maccabees. CBQMS 12. Washington, DC: Catholic Biblical Association.

—. 1987. "The Jewish Hellenistic Historians Before Josephus." In *Aufstieg und Niedergang der Römischen Welt (ANRW): Geschichte und Kultur Roms im Spiegel der neueren Forschung*. Part 2: *Principat*. Vol. 20.1, edited by Wolfgang Haase, 246–97. Berlin: de Gruyter.

—. 2006. "Emending 1 Macc 7,16." *Bib* 87:261–62.

—. 2012. *2 Maccabees: A Critical Commentary*. Edited by Harold W. Attridge. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Dorival, Gilles, Marguerite Harl, and Olivier Munnich. 1988. *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*. Paris: Cerf/C.N.R.S.

Dorival, Gilles. 1996. "'Dire en Grec les choses juives': Quelques choix lexicaux du Pentateuque de la Septante." *REG* 109:527–47.

—. 2016. "La lexicographie de la Septante." In *Die Sprache der Septuaginta/The Language of the Septuagint*. Handbuch zur Septuaginta/Handbook of the Septuagint. LXX.H. Vol. 3, edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten, 271–305. Gütersloh: Gütersloher Verlagshaus.

Dorothy, Charles V. 1997. *The Books of Esther: Structure, Genre and Textual Integrity*. JSOTSup 187. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Dover, Kenneth. 1997. *The Evolution of Greek Prose Style*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Draper, Jonathan A. 2015. "Conclusion: Missing Pieces in the Puzzle or Wild Goose Chase? A Retrospect and Prospect." In *The Didache: A Missing Piece of the Puzzle in Early Christianity*, edited by Jonathan A. Draper and Clayton N. Jefford. SBLECIL 14. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press.

Drew-Bear, Thomas. 1980. "Recherches épigraphiques et philologiques." *REA* 82, no. 3–4:155–82.

Drexler, Hans, trans. 1961–1963. *Polybios: Geschichte*. 2 vols. Zürich: Artemis.

Dubuisson, Michel. 1985. *Le latin de Polybe: Les implications historiques d'un cas de bilinguisme*. Paris: Klincksieck.

—. 1992. "Le grec à Rome à l'époque de Cicéron: Extension et qualité du bilinguisme." *Annales ESC* 47, no. 1:187–206.

—. 2005. "Le grec de la correspondance de Cicéron: Questions préliminaires sur un cas de bilinguisme." *La Linguistique* 41.2:69–86.

Dupont-Sommer, André. 1945. "Le syncrétisme religieux des Juifs d'Éléphantine d'après un ostracon araméen inédit." *RHR* 130:17–28.

Easterling, Patricia E., and Bernard M.W. Knox, eds. 1985. *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature*. Vol. 1. *Greek Literature*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Eckstein, Arthur M. 1990. "Josephus and Polybius: A Reconsideration." *ClAnt* 9, no. 2:175–208.

Edenburg, Cynthia. 1998. "How (not) to murder a king: Variations on a theme in 1 Sam 24; 26." *SJOT* 12, no. 1:64–85.

Eide, Tormod, Tomas Hägg, Richard Holton Pierce, and László Török, eds. 1996. *Fontes Historiae Nubiorum: Textual Sources for the History of the Middle Nile Region Between the Eighth Century BC and the Sixth Century AD*. Vol. 2. *From the Mid-Fifth to the First Century BC*. Bergen: Bergen University.

Elgavish, David. 2002. "The Division of the Spoils of War in the Bible and in the Ancient Near East." *ZABR* 8:242–73.

Enermalm-Ogawa, Agneta. 1987. *Un langage de prière juif en grec: Le témoignage des deux premiers livres des Maccabées*. ConBNT 17. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Engelmann, Helmut, Dieter Knibbe, and Reinhold Merkelbach, eds. 1980. *Die Inschriften von Ephesos*. Part 4: Nr. 1001–1445 (Repertorium). *IGSK* 14. Bonn: Habelt.

Epstein, Isidore, ed. 1936. *The Babylonian Talmud: Seder Nashim*. 4 vols. London: Soncino.

Epstein, Mikhail. 2012. *The Transformative Humanities: A Manifesto*. Translated and edited by Igor Klyukanov. New York: Bloomsbury.

Erim, Kenan T. 1982. "A New Relief Showing Claudius and Britannia from Aphrodisias." *Britannia* 13:277–81.

Evans, Trevor V. 2010. "The Potential of Linguistic Criteria for Dating Septuagint Books." *BIOSCS* 43:5–22.

Eynikel, Erik. 1999. "La lexicographie de la Septante: aspects méthodologiques." *RevScRel* 73.2:135–50.

Feldman, Louis H. 1998. *Studies in Josephus' Rewritten Bible*. JSJSup 58. Leiden: Brill.

Fernández Marcos, Natalio. 2014. "The Septuagint Reading of the Samson Cycle." In *Samson: Hero or Fool? The Many Faces of Samson*, edited by Erik Eynikel and Tobias Nicklas, 87–99. TBN 17. Leiden: Brill.

Fernoux, Henri-Louis. 2004. *Notables et élites des cités de Bithynie aux époques hellénistique et romaine (IIIe siècle av. J.-C.–IIIe siècle ap. J.-C): Essai d'histoire sociale*. Collection de la Maison de l'Orient et de la Méditerranée 31. Série épigraphique et historique 5.

Feuer, Avrohom Chaim. 1985. *Tehillim/Psalms: A New Translation with a Commentary Anthologized from Talmudic, Midrashic, and Rabbinic Sources*. 2 vols. New York: Mesorah.

Fewster, Gregory P. 2012. "Testing the intertextuality of ματαιότης in the New Testament." *BAGL* 1:39–61.

Feyel, Michel. 1935. "Un nouveau fragment du règlement militaire trouvé à Amphipolis." *RAr* 6:29–68.

Field, Fridericus [Frederick], ed. 1875. *Origenis Hexaplorum quae supersunt; sive veterum interpretum graecorum in totum Vetus Testamentum fragmenta*. 2 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.

Fields, Nic. 2007. *The Roman Army of the Punic Wars 264–146 BC*. Oxford: Osprey.

Figueira, Thomas J. 1986. "Xanthippos, Father of Perikles, and the 'Prutaneis' of the 'Naukraroi'." *Historia* 35, no. 3:257–79.

Finkenstaedt, Thomas, Ernst Leisi, and Dieter Wolff. 1970. *A Chronological English Dictionary: Listing 80000 Words in Order of their Earliest Known Occurrence*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Fischer-Bovet, Christelle. 2014. *Army and Society in Ptolemaic Egypt*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Fitzmyer, Joseph A. 1974. "Some Notes on Aramaic Epistolography." *JBL* 93, no. 2:201–25.

Flacelière, Robert, and Émile Chambry, eds. 1966. *Plutarque: Vies*. Vol. IV. *Timoléon-Paul Émile, Pélopidas-Marcellus*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

—. 1976. *Plutarque: Vies*. Vol. XI. *Agis-Cléomène, Les Gracques*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Fohrer, Georg. 1963. *Das Buch Hiob*. KAT 16. Gütersloh: Mohn.

Forsdyke, Sara. 2005. *Exile, Ostracism, and Democracy: The Politics of Expulsion in Ancient Greece*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Fossum, Andrew. 1931. "Hapax Legomena in Plato." *AJP* 52, no. 3:205–31.

Foster, Benjamin R. 1996. *Before the Muses: An Anthology of Akkadian Literature*. 2 vols. Bethesda, MD: CDL.

Fox, Michael V. 1991. *The Redaction of the Books of Esther: On Reading Composite Texts*. SBLMS 40. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Fraenkel, Ernst. 1910. *Geschichte der griechischen Nomina agentis auf -τήρ, -τωρ, -της (-τ-)*. Erster Teil. *Entwicklung und Verbreitung der Nomina im Epos, in der Elegie und in den ausserionisch-attischen Dialekten*. Strasbourg: Trübner.

Fraenkel, Max, ed. 1902. *Corpus inscriptionum graecarum Peloponnesi et insularum vicinarum*. Vol. 1. *Inscriptiones graecae Aeginae, Pityonesi, Cecryphaliae, Argolidis*. Berlin: Reimer.

Frankel, Ellen, and Betsy Platkin Teutsch. 1992. *The Encyclopedia of Jewish Symbols*. Northvale, N.J.: Aronson.

Fraser, Peter M., ed. 1960. *Samothrace: Excavations Conducted by the Institute of Fine Arts of New York University*. Vol. 2, Part 1. *The Inscriptions on Stone*. Bollingen Series 60.2.1. New York: Pantheon.

Freedman, David N., ed. 1992. *The Anchor Bible Dictionary*. 6 vols. New York: Doubleday.

Friend, John L. 2009. *The Athenian Ephebeia in the Lycurgan Period: 334/3–322/1 B.C.* PhD diss., University of Texas at Austin.

Frisk, Hjalmar. 1960–1970. *Griechisches etymologisches Wörterbuch*. 2 vols. Heidelberg. Winter.

Frohwein, Eugenius. 1868. *De adverbiis graecis*. PhD diss. Leipzig: Melzer.

Gardner, Anne E. 1986. "The Purpose and Date of 1 Esdras." *JJS* 37:18–27.

Gardner, Gregg. 2007. "Jewish Leadership and Hellenistic Civic Benefaction in the Second Century B.C.E." *JBL* 126, no. 2:327–43.

Gärtner, Bertil. 1955. *The Areopagus Speech and Natural Revelation*. ASNU 21. Lund: Gleerup.

Gauger, Jörg-Dieter. 2002. "'Der Tod des Verfolgers': Überlegungen zur Historizität eines Topos." *JSJ* 33:42–64.

Geller, Markham J. 1991. "New Information on Antiochus IV from Babylonian Astronomical Diaries." *BSOAS* 54, no. 1:1–4.

Gera , Deborah Levine. 2014. *Judith*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Gera, Dov, and Wayne Horowitz. 1997. "Antiochus IV in Life and Death: Evidence from the Babylonian Astronomical Diaries." *JAOS* 117, no. 2:240–52.

Gera, Dov. 1998. *Judea and Mediterranean Politics, 219 to 161 B.C.E.* Leiden: Brill.

Gerleman, Gillis. 1946. *Studies in the Septuagint. I. Book of Job*. Lund: Gleerup.

—. 1966. *Studien zu Esther: Stoff–Struktur–Stil–Sinn*. BibS(N) 48. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

Gigante, Marcello. 2002. *Philodemus in Italy: The Books from Herculaneum*. Translated by Dirk Obbink. Ann Arbor: University of Michigan Press.

Gil, Luis. 1958. "Sobre el estilo del Libro Segundo de los Macabeos." *Emerita* 26/1:11–32.

Gmirkin, Russell. 1996. "The War Scroll and Roman Weaponry Reconsidered." *DSD* 3, no. 2:89–129.

—. 1998. "Historical Allusions in the War Scroll." *DSD* 5, no. 2:172–214.

Goldstein, Jonathan A. 1976. *I Maccabees*. AB 41. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

—. 1983. *II Maccabees: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 41A. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Gomme, Arnold W. 1956. *A Historical Commentary on Thucydides*. Vol. 2. Oxford: Clarendon.

Gonis, Nikolaos et al., eds. 1999. *The Oxyrhynchus Papyri*. Vol. 66. Greco-Roman Memoirs 86. London: Egypt Exploration Society.

Gow, Andrew S.F., and Denys L. Page, eds. 1965. *The Greek Anthology: Hellenistic Epigrams*. 2 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Grabbe, Lester L. 1998. *Ezra-Nehemiah*. London: Routledge.

Gray, George B. 1920. "The Additions in the Ancient Greek Version of Job." *The Expositor* 19:422–38.

Greenspahn, Frederick E. 1984. *Hapax Legomena in Biblical Hebrew: A Study of the Phenomenon and Its Treatment Since Antiquity with Special Reference to Verbal Forms*. SBLDS 74. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Grelot, Pierre. 1974. "La Septante de Daniel IV et son substrat sémitique." *RB* 81:5–23.

Grenfell, Bernard P., Arthur S. Hunt, and J. Gilbart Smyly, eds. 1902. *The Tebtunis Papyri*. Part 1. London: Frowde.

Griffin, Jasper. 1980. *Homer on Life and Death*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Griffiths, John G. 1953. "βασιλεὺς βασιλέων: Remarks on the history of a title." *CP* 48, no. 3, 145–54.

Grilli, Alberto. 1974. "Nota su due frammenti poetici arcaici." In *Poesia Latina in Frammenti: Miscellanea Filologica*, 281–85. Genoa: Istituto di Filologia Classica e Medievale.

Grimm, Carl L.W. 1857. *Das zweite, dritte und vierte Buch der Maccabäer. Kurzgefasstes exegetisches Handbuch zu den Apokryphen des Alten Testamentes* 4. Leipzig: Hirzel.

Grotius, Hugo. 1776. *Annotationes in Vetus Testamentum*. Vol. 3. Halle: Curt.

Grube, George M.A. 1961. *A Greek Critic: Demetrius On Style*. *Phoenix* Supp. vol. 4. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Gruen, Erich S. 1998. *Heritage and Hellenism: The Reinvention of Jewish Tradition*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

—. 2002. *Diaspora: Jews amidst Greeks and Romans*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Gryglewicz, Felix. 1950. "Paradoxes of the First Book of Maccabees." *Scr* 4:197–205.

Guarducci, Margherita. 1942. "Due iscrizioni e una presunta pestilenza di Gortyna." *Epigraphica* 4:177–90.

—. 1950. *Inscriptiones Creticae. Opera et Consilio Friderici Halbherr Collectae*. IV. *Tituli Gortynii*. Rome: Libreria dello Stato.

Gundel, Wilhelm, and Hans G. Gundel. 1966. *Astrologoumena: Die astrologische Literatur in der Antike und ihre Geschichte*. Sudhoffs Archiv, Beiheft 6. Wiesbaden: Steiner.

Gutzwiller, Kathryn J. 1998. *Poetic Garlands: Hellenistic Epigrams in Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

—. 2013. "Genre and Ethnicity in the Epigrams of Meleager." In *Belonging and Isolation in the Hellenistic World*, edited by Sheila L. Ager and Riemer A. Faber, 47–69. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Haacker, Klaus. 2001. "Methodische Probleme einer Septuaginta-Übersetzung." In *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Offerhaus, 51–59. BWANT 153. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Haas, Christopher. 2007. *Alexandria in Late Antiquity: Topography and Social Conflict*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Habicht, Christian. 1976. "Royal Documents in Maccabees II." *HSCP* 80:1–18.

—. 1979. *2 Makkabäerbuch*. JSHRZ. 1, 3. Gütersloh: Mohn.

—. 1994. "Iasos und Samothrake in der Mitte des 3. Jahrhunderts v. Chr." *Chiron* 24:69–74.

Hacham, Noah. 2007. "3 Maccabees and Esther: Parallels, Intertextuality, and Diaspora Identity." *JBL* 126, no. 4:765–85.

Haelewyck, Jean-Claude. 1985. "Le texte dit 'Lucianique' du livre d'Esther. Son étendue et sa cohérence." *Mus* 98.1–2:5–44.

—, ed. 2003–2008. *Vetus Latina: Die Reste der altlateinischen Bibel nach Petrus Sabatier neu gesammelt und herausgegeben von der Erzabtei Beuron unter der Leitung von Roger Gryson*. 7/3 *Hester*. Fascicules 1–5. Freiburg: Herder.

—. 2006. "The relevance of the Old Latin version for the Septuagint, with special emphasis on the Book of Esther." *JTS* 57, Pt. 2: 439–73.

Hajdas, I., G. Bonani, I.Y. Slusarenko, and M. Seifert. 2004. "Chronology of Pazyryk 2 and Ulandryk 4 kurgans based on high resolution radiocarbon dating and dendrochronology—a step towards more precise dating of Scythian burials." In *Impact of the Environment on Human Migration in Eurasia*, edited by E.M. Scott, A.Y. Alekseev, and G. Zaitseva, 107–116. NATO Science Series 4. Vol. 42. NewYork: Kluwer Academic.

Halleux, Robert, ed. 1981. *Les Alchimistes grecs*. Vol. 1. *Papyrus de Leyde, Papyrus de Stockholm, fragments de recettes*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Halm-Tisserant, Monique. 1998. *Réalités et imaginaire des supplices en Grèce ancienne*. Collection d'études anciennes 125. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Hammond, Nicholas G.L. 2003. "The Meaning of οἱ ἀργυρολογέοντες and the Beginning of the Third Sacred War." *Historia* 52:373–77.

Hanfmann, George M.A. 1987. "The Sacrilege Inscription: The Ethnic, Linguistic, Social and Religious Situation at Sardis at the End of the Persian Era." *Bulletin of the Asia Institute* 1:1–8.

Hanhart, Robert. 1961. *Zum Text des 2. und 3. Makkabäerbuches: Probleme der Überlieferung, der Auslegung und der Ausgabe*. MSU 7. *NAWG* 13. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

—, ed. 1983. *Esther*. Septuaginta VIII,3. 2nd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

—, ed. 2008. *Maccabaeorum liber II, copiis usus quas reliquit Werner Kappler*. Septuaginta 9.2. 3rd ed. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Harding, Mark. 1994. "Making Old Things New. Prayer Texts in Josephus's *Antiquities* 1–11: A Study in the Transmission of Tradition." In *The Lord's Prayer and Other Prayer Texts from the Greco-Roman Era*, edited by James H. Charlesworth, Mark Harding, and Mark Kiley, 54–72. Valley Forge, PA: Trinity Press International.

Harl, Marguerite, Gilles Dorival, and Olivier Munnich. 1988. *La Bible grecque des Septante: Du judaïsme hellénistique au christianisme ancien*. "Initiations au christianisme ancien." Paris: Cerf/C.N.R.S.

Harl, Marguerite. 1992. "Un groupe de mots grecs dans le judaïsme hellénistique: à propos d'ἐμπαιγμός dans le Psaume 37,8 de la Septante." In *La langue de Japhet: Quinze études sur la Septante et le grec des chrétiens*, 43–58. Paris: Cerf.

Harl, Marguerite, Cécile Dogniez, Laurence Brottier, Michel Casevitz, and Pierre Sandevoir. 1999. *La Bible d'Alexandrie: Les Douze Prophètes, 4–9: Joël, Abdiou, Jonas, Naoum, Ambakoum, Sophonie*. Paris: Cerf.

Hartman, Louis F., and Alexander A. Di Lella. 1978. *The Book of Daniel*. AB 23. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Hartung, Kaspar. 1886. *Septuaginta-Studien: Ein Beitrag zur Gräcität dieser Bibelübersetzung*. Bamberg: Gärtner.

Hastings, James, ed. 1898–1904. *A Dictionary of the Bible Dealing with its Language, Literature, and Contents Including the Biblical Theology*. 5 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Hastings, James et al., eds. 1908–1926. *Encyclopaedia of Religion and Ethics*. 13 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Hatch, Edwin, and Henry A. Redpath. 1897–1906. *A Concordance to the Septuagint and the Other Greek Versions of the Old Testament (Including the Apocryphal Books)*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.

Hatch, William H.P. 1908. "The Use of ΑΛΙΤΗΡΙΟΣ, ΑΛΙΤΡΟΣ, ΑΡΑΙΟΣ, ΕΝΑΓΗΣ, ΕΝΘΥΜΙΟΣ, ΠΑΛΑΜΝΑΙΟΣ, and ΠΡΟΣΤΡΟΠΑΙΟΣ: A Study in Greek Lexicography." *HSCP* 19:157–86.

Hatzopoulos, Miltiades B. 1996. *Macedonian Institutions under the Kings*, vol. I: *A Historical and Epigraphic Study*. Vol. 1. Research Centre for Greek and Roman Antiquity. National Hellenic Research Foundation. Μελετήματα 22. Athens.

—. 2001. *L'organisation de l'armée macédonienne sous les Antigonides: Problèmes anciens et documents nouveaux*. Centre de recherche de l'antiquité grecque et romaine. Fondation nationale de la recherche scientifique. Μελετήματα 30. Athens.

Hauspie, Katrin. 2001. "Neologisms in the Septuagint of Ezekiel." *JNSL* 27/1:17–37.

—. 2004. "The LXX Quotations in the LSJ Supplements of 1968 and 1996." In *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*, edited by Bernard A. Taylor, John A.L. Lee, Peter R. Burton, and Richard E. Whitaker, 108–25. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Heckel, Waldemar, and Ryan Jones. 2006. *Macedonian Warrior: Alexander's Elite Infantryman*. Oxford: Osprey.

Heidel, William A. 1896. *Pseudo-Platonica*. Baltimore: Friedenwald.

Henderson, Jeffrey. 1991. *The Maculate Muse: Obscene Language in Attic Comedy*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Hengel, Martin. 1974. *Judaism and Hellenism: Studies in their Encounter in Palestine during the Early Hellenistic Period*. 2 vols. London: SCM.

Hershbell, Jackson P. 1981. *Pseudo-Plato*, Axiochus. SBLTT 21, Graeco-Roman Religion Series 6. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

Hiller de Gaertringen, Fridericus [Friedrich], ed. 1929. *Inscriptiones Graecae*. Vol. 4, fasc. 1. *Inscriptiones Argolidis*. Fasc. 1. *Inscriptiones Epidauri*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Hillers, Delbert R. 1964. *Treaty-Curses and the Old Testament Prophets*. Rome: Pontifical Biblical Institute.

Himmelfarb, Martha. 1998. "Judaism and Hellenism in 2 Maccabees." *Poetics Today* 19, no.1:19–40.

—. 2008. "'He was Renowned to the Ends of the Earth' (1 Maccabees 3:9): *Judaism and Hellenism in 1 Maccabees*." In *Jewish Literatures and Cultures: Context and Intertext*, edited by Anita Norich and Yaron Z. Eliav, 77–97. Providence: Brown.

Hinterberger, Martin. 2014. "Between simplification and elaboration: Byzantine metaphraseis compared." In *Textual Transmission in Byzantium: between Textual Criticism and Quellenforschung*, edited by Juan Signes Codoñer and Immaculada Pérez Martín, 33–60. Turnhout: Brepols.

Hock, Ronald F. 2012. *The Chreia and Ancient Rhetoric: Commentaries on Aphthonius's* Progymnasmata. WGRW 31. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Hoey, Michael. 2007. "Lexical priming and literary creativity." In *Text, Discourse and Corpora: Theory and Analysis*, edited by Michael Hoey, Michaela Mahlberg, Michael Stubbs, and Wolfgang Teubert, 7–29. London: Continuum.

Høgel, Christian. 2014. "Symeon Metaphrastes and the Metaphrastic Movement." In *The Ashgate Research Companion to Byzantine Hagiography*. Vol. 2. *Genres and Contexts*, edited by Stephanos Efthymiadis, 181–96. Farnham/Burlington: Ashgate.

Holleaux, Maurice. 1916. "Études d'histoire hellénistique (*Suite*)." *REA* 18, no. 2:77–102.

Horbury, William. 1991. "The Name Mardochaeus in a Ptolemaic Inscription." *VT* 41, fasc. 2:220–26.

Hornblower, Simon. 1996. *A Commentary on Thucydides*. Vol. 2, *Books IV–V.24*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Hornblower, Simon, Anthony Spawforth, and Esther Eidinow, eds. 2012. *The Oxford Classical Dictionary*. 4th ed. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Horsley, Greg H.R. 1983. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. Vol. 3: *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1978*. North Ryde: Macquarie University.

—, et al., ed. 1987. *New Documents Illustrating Early Christianity*. Vol. 4. *A Review of the Greek Inscriptions and Papyri published in 1979*. North Ryde: Macquarie University.

Hunter, Virginia J. 1994. *Policing Athens: Social Control in the Attic Lawsuits, 420–320 B.C.* Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Hurowitz, Victor, and Joan Goodnick Westenholz. 1990. "LKA 63: A Heroic Poem in Celebration of Tiglath-pileser I's Muṣru-Qumanu Campaign." *JCS* 42, no. 1:1–49.

Hyldahl, Niels. 1990. "The Maccabean Rebellion and the Question of 'Hellenization'." In *Religion and Religious Practice in the Seleucid Kingdom*, edited by P. Bilde, T. Engberg-Pedersen, L. Hannestad, and J. Zahle, 188–203. Aarhus: Aarhus University Press.

Ilberg, Johannes. 1908. "Kommentar zum Fragment d'un Traité de Chirurgie." *APF* 4:271–83.

Immisch, Otto. 1896. *Philologische Studien zu Plato*, I: *Axiochus*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Innes, Dorreen, ed. 1995. "Demetrius *On Style*." In *Aristotle* Poetics, *Longinus* On the Sublime, *Demetrius* On Style. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Isaac, Benjamin. 1991. "A Seleucid Inscription from Jamnia-on-the-Sea: Antiochus V Eupator and the Sidonians." *IEJ* 41, nos. 1–3:132–44.

Ivantchik, Askold I. 2006. "'Scythian' Archers on Archaic Attic Vases: Problems of Interpretation." *Ancient Civilizations from Scythia to Siberia* 12, nos. 3–4:197–271.

—. 2011. "The Funeral of Scythian Kings: The Historical Reality and the Description of Herodotus (4, 71–72)." In *The Barbarians of Ancient Europe: Realities and Interactions*, edited by Larissa Bonfante, 71–106. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Jacoby, Felix, ed. 1923–1958. *Die Fragmente der griechischen Historiker*. Leiden: Brill.

Janko, Richard, ed. 2000. *Philodemus* On Poems. Book 1. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Jannaris, Antonios N. 1897. *An Historical Greek Grammar Chiefly of the Attic Dialect as Written and Spoken from Classical Antiquity down to the Present Time: Founded upon the Ancient Texts, Inscriptions, Papyri and Present Popular Greek*. London: Macmillan.

Janson, Tore. 1964. *Latin Prose Prefaces: Studies in Literary Conventions*. Studia Latina Stockholmiensia 13. Stockholm: Almqvist & Wiksell.

Jenny, Laurent. 1982. "The strategy of form." In *French literary theory today: A reader*, edited by Tzvetan Todorov. Translated by R. Carter. 34–63. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press/Paris: Éditions de la maison des sciences de l'homme.

Jensen, Christian. 1911. "Ariston von Keos bei Philodem." *Hermes* 46, no. 3:393–406.

Jensen, Kjeld. 1941. "Indledningsspørgsmaal i Joels Bog." *DTT* 4: 98–112.

Jobes, Karen H. 1996. *The Alpha-Text of Esther: Its Character and Relationship to the Masoretic Text*. SBLDS 153. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Jobes, Karen H., and Moisés Silva. 2000. *Invitation to the Septuagint*. Grand Rapids, MI: Baker Academic.

Johannessohn, Martin. 1926. *Der Gebrauch der Präpositionen in der Septuaginta*. Nachrichten von der Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen. Philologisch-historische Klasse, 1925, Beiheft. Berlin: Weidmann.

Johnson, Allan C., Paul R. Coleman-Norton, and Frank C. Bourne. 2003. *Ancient Roman Statutes: A Translation with Introduction, Commentary, Glossary, and Index*. Clark, NJ: Lawbook Exchange.

Jonquière, Tessel M. 2007. *Prayer in Josephus*. Leiden: Brill.

Joosten, Jan. 2006. "Le milieu producteur du Pentateuque grec." *REJ* 165, 3–4:349–61.

—. 2010. "The Aramaic Background of the Seventy: Language, Culture and History." *BIOSCS* 43:53–72.

—. 2012. "The Original Language and Historical Milieu of the Book of Judith." In *Collected Studies on the Septuagint*, 195–209. FAT 83. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

—. 2015. "Reflections on the Original Language of the Psalms of Solomon." In *The Psalms of Solomon: Language, History, Theology*, edited by Eberhard Bons and Patrick Pouchelle, 31–47. Atlanta, GA: SBL Press.

Jouanna, Jacques. 1992. *Hippocrate*. Fayard.

Kaelker, Friedrich. 1880. *Quaestiones de elocutione Polybiana cum epimetro de hiatu in libris Diodori Siculi*. Leipzig: Hirschfeld.

Kallet-Marx, Lisa. 1993. *Money, Expense, and Naval Power in Thucydides'* History *1–5.24*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Kannicht, Richard, and Bruno Snell, eds. 1981. *Tragicorum Graecorum Fragmenta*. Vol. 2. *Fragmenta adespota; Testimonia volumini 1 addenda; Indices ad volumina 1 et 2*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Kappler, Vernerus [=Werner]. 1929. *De memoria alterius libri Maccabaeorum*. PhD diss. Academia Georgia Augusta. Göttingen: Dieterich.

Katz, Peter. 1960. "The Text of 2 Maccabees Reconsidered." *ZNW* 51:10–30.

—. 1961. "Eleazar's Martyrdom in 2 Maccabees: The Latin Evidence for a Point of the Story." StPatr. 4:118–24.

Kellermann, Ulrich. 1979. *Auferstanden in den Himmel: 2 Makkabäer 7 und die Auferstehung der Märtyrer*. SBS 95. Stuttgart: Katholisches Bibelwerk.

Kennell, Nigel M. 2005. "New Light on 2 Maccabees 4:7–15." *JJS* 56, no. 1:10–24.

—. 2006. *Ephebeia: A Register of Greek Cities with Citizen Training Systems in the Hellenistic and Roman Periods*. *Nikephoros* 12. Hildesheim: Weidmann.

Keppie, Lawrence. 1994. *The Making of the Roman Army: From Republic to Empire*. New York: Barnes and Noble Books.

Keyes, Clinton W. 1935. "The Greek Letter of Introduction." *AJP* 56, no. 1:28–44.

Keyser, Paul T., and Georgia L. Irby-Massie, eds. 2008. *The Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists: The Greek Tradition and Its Many Heirs*. London: Routledge.

Kilpatrick, George D. 1963. "Septuaginta, Vetus Testamentum Graecum." GGA 215:10–22.

Kittel, Gerhard, and Gerhard Friedrich, eds. 1964–1976. *Theological Dictionary of the New Testament*. Translated by Geoffrey W. Bromiley. 10 vols. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Klauck, Hans-Josef, with the collaboration of Daniel P. Bailey. 2006. *Ancient Letters and the New Testament: A Guide to Context and Exegesis*. Waco, TX: Baylor University Press.

Klauser, Theodor et al., eds. 1950–. *Reallexikon für Antike und Christentum: Sachwörterbuch zur Auseinandersetzung des Christentums mit der antiken Welt*. Stuttgart: Hiersemann.

Kleijwegt, Marc. 1991. *Ancient Youth: The Ambiguity of Youth and the Absence of Adolescence in Greco-Roman Society*. Amsterdam: Gieben.

Knabenbauer, Joseph. 1907. *Commentarius in duos libros Machabaeorum*. Paris: Lethielleux.

Knögel, Wilhelm. 1933. *Der Peripatetiker Ariston von Keos bei Philodem*. Klassisch-Philologische Studien 5. Leipzig: Harrassowitz.

Kohler, Kaufmann. 1901. "Abba, Father. Title of Spiritual Leader and Saint." *JQR* 13, no. 4:567–80.

Kolbe, Walther. 1926. *Beiträge zur syrischen und jüdischen Geschichte: Kritische Untersuchungen zur Seleukidenliste und zu den beiden ersten Makkabäerbüchern*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Koller, Aaron. 2014. *Esther in Ancient Jewish Thought*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Konstan, David, Diskin Clay, Clarence E. Glad, Johan C. Thom, and James Ware, eds. and trans. 1998. *Philodemus: On Frank Criticism*. SBLTT 43. Graeco-Roman Series 13. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Konstan, David. 2006. *The Emotions of the Ancient Greeks: Studies in Aristotle and Classical Literature*. Toronto: University of Toronto Press.

Kopidakis, Michalis Z. 1987. *Τὸ Γ΄ Μακκαβαίων καὶ ὁ Αἰσχύλος. Αἰσχύλειες μνήμες στὸ λεκτικὸ καὶ στὴ θεματογραφία τοῦ Γ΄ Μακκαβαίων* [3 Maccabees and Aeschylus: Aeschylean Reminiscences in the Vocabulary and Thematics of 3 Maccabees]. Herakleion: Vikelaia Vivliothiki.

Koskenniemi, Heikki. 1956. *Studien zur Idee und Phraseologie des griechischen Briefes bis 400 n. Chr.* AASF Ser. B, 102.2. Helsinki: Akateeminen Kirjakauppa.

Kraus, Hans-Joachim. 1988. *Psalms 1–59: A Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

—. 1989. *Psalms 60–150: A Commentary*. Translated by Hilton C. Oswald. Minneapolis: Augsburg.

Kraus, Wolfgang, and Martin Karrer, eds. 2009. *Septuaginta Deutsch: Das griechische Alte Testament in deutscher Übersetzung*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Kreissig, Heinz. 1977. "Tempelland, Katoiken, Hierodulen im Seleukidenreich." *Klio* 59:375–80.

Kromayer, Johannes. 1903. *Antike Schlachtfelder in Griechenland: Bausteine zu einer antiken Kriegsgeschichte*. Vol. 1. Berlin: Weidmann.

Kromayer, Johannes, and Georg Veith. 1928. *Heerwesen und Kriegführung der Griechen und Römer*. Munich: Beck.

Kühner, Raphael, and Friedrich Blass. 1890–1892. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Erster Teil: *Elementar- und Formenlehre*. 2 vols. Hannover: Hahn.

Kühner, Raphael, and Bernhard Gerth. 1898–1904. *Ausführliche Grammatik der griechischen Sprache*. Zweiter Teil: *Satzlehre*. 2 vols. Hannover: Hahn.

Kuiper, Taco. 1925. *Philodemus: Over den Dood*. Amsterdam: Paris.

Kumpf, Michael M. 1984. *Four Indices of the Homeric Hapax Legomena: Together with Statistical Data*. Hildesheim: Olms.

Kvasnica, Brian. 2008. "Shifts in Israelite War Ethics and Early Jewish Historiography of Plundering." In *Writing and Reading War: Rhetoric, Gender, and Ethics in Biblical and Modern Contexts*, edited by Brad E. Kelle and Frank Ritchel Ames, 175–96. SBLSymS 42. Atlanta, GA: Society of Biblical Literature.

Lacocque, André. 1999. "The different versions of Esther." *BibInt* 7, no. 3:301–22.

Lampe, Geoffrey W.H., ed. 1961. *A Patristic Greek Lexicon*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Lanata, Giuliana. 1968. "Linguaggio scientifico e linguaggio poetico. Note al lessico del 'De morbo sacro'." *QUCC* 5:22–36.

Landes, George M. 1967. "The 'Three Days and Three Nights' Motif in Jonah 2:1." *JBL* 86, no. 4:446–50.

Landfester, Manfred, ed. 2007. *Geschichte der antiken Texte: Autoren- und Werklexikon*. Der Neue Pauly, Supplemente Band 2. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Lange, Armin, and Matthias Weigold. 2011. *Biblical Quotations and Allusions in Second Temple Jewish Literature*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Lange, Armin. 2012. "The Text of Jeremiah in the *War Scroll* from Qumran." In *The Hebrew Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*, edited by Nóra Dávid, Armin Lange, Kristin De Troyer, and Shani Tzoref, 95–116. FRLANT 239. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Langslow, David. 2012. "The Language of Polybius since Foucault and Dubuisson." In *Imperialism, Cultural Politics, and Polybius*, edited by Christopher Smith and Liv Mariah Yarrow, 85–110. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Larson, Erik W. 2005. "The LXX and Enoch: Influence and Interpretation in Early Jewish Literature." In *Enoch and Qumran Origins: New Light on a Forgotten Connection*, edited by Gabriele Boccaccini, 84–89. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

Lasserre, François, ed. 1966. *Strabon: Géographie*. Vol. 2 (Books 3 and 4). Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

—. 1975. *Strabon, Géographie*. Vol. 8 (Book 11). Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Lazenby, John F., and David Whitehead. 1996. "The Myth of the Hoplite's Hoplon." *ClQ* 46, no. 1:27–33.

Le Boulluec, Alain, and Pierre Sandevoir. 1989. *La Bible d'Alexandrie 2: L'Exode*. Paris: Cerf.

Lee, John A.L. 1983. *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch*. SBLSCS 14. Chico, CA: Scholars Press.

—. 2004. "The Present State of Lexicography of Ancient Greek." In *Biblical Greek Language and Lexicography: Essays in Honor of Frederick W. Danker*, edited by Bernard A. Taylor, John A.L. Lee, Peter R. Burton, and Richard E. Whitaker, 108–25. Grand Rapids, MI: Eerdmans.

—. 2008. "A Lexicographical Database for Greek: Can it be Far Off? The Case of *amphodon*." In *Die Septuaginta–Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, edited by Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus, and Martin Meiser, 214–20. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Le Moigne, Philippe. 2012. "Le caractère hétérogène du grec de la LXX: l'exemple de 2M." In *Die Septuaginta—Entstehung, Sprache, Geschichte: 3. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 22.–25. Juli 2010*, edited by Siegfried Kreuzer, Martin Meiser, and Marcus Sigismund, 249–72. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Leonard, Jeffery M. 2008. "Identifying Inner-Biblical Allusions: Psalm 78 as a Test Case." *JBL* 127 no. 2:241–65.

Leoni, Tommaso. 2016. "The Text of the Josephan Corpus." In *A Companion to Josephus*, edited by Honora Howell Chapman and Zuleika Rodgers, 305–21. Chichester: Wiley-Blackwell.

Le Rider, Georges. 1965. *Suse sous les Séleucides et les Parthes: Les trouvailles monétaires et l'histoire de la ville (Mémoires de la mission archéologique en Iran, Tome XXXVIII)*. Paris: Geuthner.

Lesquier, Jean. 1973. *Les institutions militaires de l'Égypte sous les Lagides*. Milan: Cisalpino-Goliardica.

Leutsch, Ernst L., and Friedrich W. Schneidewin, eds. 1839–1851. *Corpus Paroemiographorum Graecorum*. 2 vols. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Levine, Lee I. 2005. *The Ancient Synagogue: The First Thousand Years*. 2nd ed. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Lévy, Isidore. 1955. "Les deux livres des Maccabées et le livre hébraïque des Hasmonéens." *Sem* 5:15–36.

—. 1965. *Recherches esséniennes et pythagoriciennes*. Hautes Études du Monde Gréco-Romain 1. Geneva: Droz/Paris: Minard.

Lewy, Julius. 1939. "The Feast of the 14th Day of Adar." *HUCA* 14:127–51.

Lichtenberger, Hermann. 2007. "History-writing and History-telling in First and Second Maccabees." In *Memory in the Bible and Antiquity*, edited by Loren T. Stuckenbruck, Stephen C. Barton, and Benjamin G. Wold, 95–110. WUNT 212. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

Liddell, Henry G., Robert Scott, Henry S. Jones, and Roderick McKenzie. 1996. *A Greek-English Lexicon*. 9th ed. Revised Supplement by P.G.W. Glare. Oxford: Clarendon.

Lieberman, Saul. 1974. *Texts and Studies*. New York: Ktav.

Limberger, Georg. 1923. *Die Nominalbindung bei Polybios*. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Lindenberger, James M. 1994. *Ancient Aramaic and Hebrew Letters*. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Lindhagen, Curt. 1950. "Die Wurzel ΣΑΠ im NT und AT." UUA 1950:5:27–69.

Lipiński, Edward. 1965. *La royauté de Yahwé dans la poésie et le culte de l'ancien Israël*. Brussels: Paleis der Academiën.

Longo Auricchio, Francesca, ed. 1988. *Ermarco. Frammenti: Edizione, traduzione e commento*. La scuola di Epicuro 6. Frammenti dei Katheghemones 1. Naples: Bibliopolis.

Löning, Karl. 1973. *Die Saulustradition in der Apostelgeschichte*. Münster: Aschendorff.

Lonsdale, Steven H. 1990. *Creatures of Speech: Lion, Herding, and Hunting Similes in the Iliad*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Louw, Johannes P., and Eugene A. Nida, eds. 1989. *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Based on Semantic Domains*. 2 vols. 2nd ed. New York: United Bible Societies.

Lucius, Ernst. 1881. *Der Essenismus in seinem Verhaeltniss zum Judenthum: Eine kritische Untersuchung*. Strassburg: Schmidt.

Luckenbill, Daniel D., ed. 1926. *Ancient Records of Assyria and Babylonia*. Vol. 1. *Historical Records of Assyria from the Earliest Times to Sargon*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Lupu, Eran. 2009. *Greek Sacred Law: A Collection of New Documents (NGSL)*. 2nd ed. Leiden: Brill.

Lust, Johan, Erik Eynikel, and Katrin Hauspie. 2015. *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Third Corrected Edition. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Ma, John. 1999. *Antiochos III and the Cities of Western Asia Minor*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Magliano-Tromp, Johannes. 2009. "The Relations between Egyptian Judaism and Jerusalem in Light of 3 Maccabees and the Greek Book of Esther." In *Feasts and Festivals*, edited by Christopher Tuckett, 57–76. Leuven: Peeters.

Malherbe, Abraham J. 1988. *Ancient Epistolary Theorists*. SBLSBS 19. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Malitz, Jürgen. 1983. *Die Historien des Poseidonios*. Munich: Beck.

Malosse, Pierre-Louis. 2004. *Lettres pour toutes circonstances: Les traités épistolaires du Pseudo-Libanios et du Pseudo-Démétrios de Phalère*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Manganaro, Giacomo. 1963. "Tre tavole di bronzo con decreti di proxenia del Museo di Napoli e il problema dei proagori in Sicilia." ΚΩΚΑΛΟΣ 9:205–20.

—. 1978. "Epigrafia e istituzioni di Creta." In *Antichità Cretesi: Studi in onore di Doro Levi*, vol. 2, 39–58. Catania: Università di Catania, Istituto di Archeologia.

Mann, Thomas W. 1977. *Divine Presence and Guidance in Israelite Traditions: The Typology of Exaltation*. Baltimore: Johns Hopkins University Press.

Marcotte, Didier. 2000. *Géographes grecs*. Vol. 1. *Introduction générale. Ps.-Scymnos: Circuit de la Terre*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Marcus, Ralph. 1931–1932. "Divine Names and Attributes in Hellenistic Jewish Literature." *Proceedings of the American Academy for Jewish Research* 3:43–120.

Markoe, Glenn E. 1989. "The 'Lion Attack' in Archaic Greek Art: Heroic Triumph." *ClAnt* 8, no. 1:86–115.

Martin, Raymond A. 1975. "Syntax Criticism of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther." *JBL* 94, no. 1:65–72.

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

Mason, Hugh J. 1974. *Greek Terms for Roman Institutions: A Lexicon and Analysis*. *ASP* 13. Toronto: Hakkert.

Mason, Steve. 2007. "Jews, Judeans, Judaizing, Judaism: Problems of Categorization in Ancient History." *JSJ* 38:457–512.

Masson, Olivier. 1987. "L'inscription d'Éphèse relative aux condamnés à mort de Sardes (*I. Ephesos 2*). *REG* 100:225–39.

Mauersberger, Arno et al. 1956–2004. *Polybios-Lexikon*. 3 vols. Berlin: Akademie.

Mayser, Edwin. 1936. *Grammatik der griechischen Papyri aus den Ptolemäerzeit mit Einschluss der gleichzeitigen Ostraka und der in Ägypten verfassten Inschriften*. Band 1: *Laut- und Wortlehre*. III. Teil: *Stammbildung*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

McClellan, Daniel O. 2009. "A Reevaluation of the Structure and Function of 2 Maccabees 7 and its Text-Critical Implications." *Studia Antiqua* 7, no. 1:81–95.

McLean, Bradley H. 2002. *An Introduction to Greek Epigraphy of the Hellenistic and Roman Periods from Alexander the Great down to the Reign of Constantine (323 B.C.–A.D. 337)*. Ann Arbor, MI: University of Michigan Press.

Mednikova, Maria B. 2002. "Scalping in Eurasia." *Anthropology and Archaeology of Eurasia* 40.4:57–67.

Meecham, Henry G. 1935. *The Letter of Aristeas: A Linguistic Study with Special Reference to the Greek Bible*. Manchester: Manchester University Press.

Meiggs, Russell. 1972. *The Athenian Empire*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Mélèze Modrzejewski, Joseph. 2008. *La Bible d'Alexandrie 15.3: Troisième livre des Maccabées*. Paris: Cerf.

Merkelbach, Reinhold, and Josef Stauber, eds. 1998. *Steinepigramme aus dem Griechischen Osten*. Vol. 1. *Die Westküste Kleinasiens von Knidos bis Ilion*. Stuttgart: Teubner.

Merkle, Stefan, and Andreas Beschorner. 1994. "Der Tyrann und der Dichter: Handlungssequenzen in den Phalaris-Briefen." In *Der griechische Briefroman: Gattungstypologie und Textananlyse*, edited by Niklas Holzberg, 116–68. Classica Monacensia 8. Tübingen: Narr.

Metzger, Bruce M. 1994. *A Textual Commentary on the Greek New Testament: A Companion Volume to the United Bible Societies' Greek New Testament*. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Migne, Jacques P., ed. 1857–1886. *Patrologia graeca* [=*Patrologiae cursus completus: Series graeca*]. 162 vols. Paris: Imprimerie Catholique.

Mihailov, Georgius, ed. 1958. *Inscriptiones Graecae in Bulgaria repertae*. Vol. 2. *Inscriptiones inter Danubium et Haemum repertae*. Sofia: Academia Litterarum Bulgarica.

Milik, Józef T. 1992. "Les modèles araméens du livre d'Esther dans la grotte 4 de Qumrân." *RevQ* 15, no. 3(59):321–406.

Miller, Tricia. 2015. *Jews and Anti-Judaism in Esther and the Church*. Cambridge: Clarke & Co.

Mittag, Peter F. 2006. *Antiochos IV. Epiphanes: Eine politische Biographie*. Berlin: Akademie.

Moffitt, David M., and Curt J. Butera. 2013. "P.Duk. inv. 727r: New Evidence for the Meaning and Provenance of the Word Προσήλυτος." *JBL* 132, no. 1:159–78.

Mollenhauer, Gustav. 1888. *De eis verbis cum praepositionibus compositis, quae a Polybio ipso novata sunt*. Merseburg: Hottenroth & Schneider.

Momigliano, Arnaldo. 1975. "La portata storica dei vaticini sul settimo re nel terzo libro degli Oracoli Sibillini." In *Forma Futuri: Studi in onore del Cardinale Michele Pellegrino*, 1077–84. Turin: Bottega d'Erasmo.

—. 1994. "The Second Book of Maccabees." In *Essays on Ancient and Modern Judaism*, edited and with an introduction by Silvia Berti. Translated by Maura Masella-Gayley, 36–47. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

Montanari, Franco. 2015. *Greek-English: The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek*. Edited by Madeleine Goh and Chad Schroeder. Leiden: Brill.

Montevecchi, Orsolina. 1957. "PANTOKRATOR." In *Studi in onore di Aristide Calderini e Roberto Paribeni*. Vol. 2. *Studi di papirologia e antichità orientali*, 401–32. Milano: Ceschina.

—. 1973. *La papirologia*. Turin: Società editrice internazionale.

Montgomery, James A. 1927. *A Critical and Exegetical Commentary on the Book of Daniel*. ICC. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Moore, Carey A. 1973. "On the Origins of the LXX Additions to the Book of Esther." *JBL* 92, no. 3:382–93.

—. 1977. *Daniel, Esther and Jeremiah: The Additions*. AB 44. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

—. 1985. *Judith: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 40. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Moore, Mary B. 1998. *Corpus Vasorum Antiquorum*. Fascicule 8 [U.S.A. Fascicule 33]. Malibu, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum.

Mortley, Raoul. 1996. *The Idea of Universal History from Hellenistic Philosophy to Early Christian Historiography*. Texts and Studies in Religion 67. Lewiston, N.Y.: Mellen.

Motzo, Bacchisio. 1924. *Saggi di storia e letteratura giudeo-ellenistica*. Firenze: Felice Le Monnier.

—. 1928. "Il testo di Esther in Giuseppe." *SMSR* 4:84–105.

Moulton, James H. 1899. "Über die Überlieferung und den textkritischen Werth des dritten Esrabuchs." *ZAW* 19:209–58.

Moulton, James H., and George Milligan. 1914–1929. *The Vocabulary of the Greek Testament Illustrated from the Papyri and other Non-Literary Sources*. London: Hodder & Stoughton.

Moulton, James H., and Wilbert F. Howard. 1929. *A Grammar of New Testament Greek*. Vol. 2. *Accidence and Word-Formation with an Appendix on Semitisms in the New Testament*. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Moussy, Claude. 1969. *Recherches sur τρέφω et les verbes grecs signifiant "nourrir."* Paris: Klincksieck.

Mugler, Charles. 1931. "Remarques sur le second livre des Macchabées: La statistique des mots et la question de l'auteur." *RHPR* 11:419–23.

Müller, Karl, ed. 1841–1870. *Fragmenta Historicorum Graecorum*. 5 vols. Paris: Didot

Munnich, Olivier. 1982. *Étude lexicographique du Psautier des Septante*. PhD diss., Université de Paris-Sorbonne.

Muraoka, Takamitsu. 1989. "Hebrew Hapax Legomena and Septuagint Lexicography." In *VII Congress of the International Organization for Septuagint and Cognate Studies. Leuven 1989*, edited by Claude E. Cox, 205–22. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

—. 1993. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)*. Leuven: Peeters.

—. 2008. "Recent Discussions on the Septuagint Lexicography With Special Reference to the So-Called Interlinear Model." In *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Kontexte, Lebenswelten*, edited by Martin Karrer, Wolfgang Kraus, and Martin Meiser, 221–35. WUNT 219. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

—. 2009. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint*. Leuven: Peeters.

Murphy, Eileen, Ilia Gokhman, Yuri Chistov, and Ludmila Barkova. 2002. "Prehistoric Old World Scalping: New Cases from the Cemetery of Aymyrlyg, South Siberia." *AJA* 106, no. 1:1–10.

Myers, Jacob M. 1985. *I and II Esdras: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 42. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Nestle, Eberhard. 1905. "Miscellen 3. Die himmlischen Reiter im zweiten Makkabäerbuch." *ZAW* 25:203–4.

Neugebauer, Otto, and Henry B. van Hoesen. 1987. *Greek Horoscopes*. Philadelphia: The American Philosophical Society.

Newman, Jacob. 1969. *Halachic Sources: From the Beginning to the Ninth Century*. Pretoria Oriental Series 8. Leiden: Brill.

Newton, Charles T. 1863. *A History of Discoveries at Halicarnassus, Cnidus and Branchidae*. Vol. 2. London: Day & Son.

Nickelsburg, George W.E. 1972. *Resurrection, Immortality, and Eternal Life in Intertestamental Judaism*. HTS 26. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

—. 2001. *1 Enoch 1: A Commentary on the Book of 1 Enoch, Chapters 1–36; 81–108*. Edited by Klaus Baltzer. Hermeneia. Minneapolis: Fortress.

Nicklas, Tobias. 2007. "Irony in 2 Maccabees?" In *The Books of the Maccabees: History, Theology, Ideology. Papers of the Second International Conference on the Deuterocanonical Books, Pápa, Hungary, 9–11 June, 2005*, edited by Géza G. Xeravits and József Zsengellér, 101–11. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2015. "Metaphern im 2. Makkabäerbuch." In *The Metaphorical Use of Language in Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature*, edited by Markus Witte and Sven Behnke. Deuterocanonical and Cognate Literature Yearbook 2014/2015, 173–84. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Niese, Benedikt, ed. 1885–1895. *Flavii Iosephi opera*. 7 vols. Berlin: Weidmann.

—. 1900. "Kritik der beiden Makkabäerbücher nebst Beiträgen zur Geschichte der Makkabäischen Erhebung." *Hermes* 35/1:268–307.

Nikiprowetzky, Valentin. 1970. *La Troisième Sibylle*. Études Juives 9. Paris: Mouton.

Nissen, Heinrich. 1863. *Kritische Untersuchungen über die Quellen der vierten und fünften Dekade des Livius*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Nisula, Timo. 2005. "'Time has passed since you sent your letter': Letter Phraseology in 1 and 2 Maccabees." *JSP* 14.3:201–22.

Norden, Eduard. 1913. *Agnostos Theos: Untersuchungen zur Formengeschichte religiöser Rede*. Leipzig: Teubner.

Olley, John W. 2009. *Ezekiel: A Commentary based on Iezekiēl in Codex Vaticanus*. Septuagint Commentary Series. Leiden: Brill.

Owen, Edward C.E. 1929. "ἀποτυμπανίζω, ἀποτυμπανισμός (τυμπανισμός), τυμπανίζω, τύμπανον (τύπανον)." *JTS* 30:259–66.

Page, Denys L., ed. 1970. *Select Papyri*. Vol. 3. *Literary Papyri: Poetry*. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Palm, Jonas. 1955. *Über Sprache und Stil des Diodoros von Sizilien: Ein Beitrag zur Beleuchtung der hellenistischen Prosa*. Lund: Gleerup.

—. 1957. "Polybios und der Kanzleistil." *Årsberättelse. Bulletin de la Societé Royale des Lettres de Lund 1956–1957*:63–93.

Palmer, Leonard R. 1945. *A Grammar of the Post-Ptolemaic Papyri*. Vol. 1, *Accidence and Word-Formation*. Part 1: *The Suffixes*. Publications of the Philological Society 13. London: Oxford University Press.

Panagopoulos, Cécile. 1977. "Vocabulaire et mentalité dans les *Moralia* de Plutarque." *Dialogues d'histoire ancienne* 3:197–235.

Panayiotou, George. 1987. "Addenda to the *LSJ* Greek-English Lexicon: Lexicographical Notes on the Vocabulary of the *Oracula Sibyllina*." *Hellenica* 38, nos. 1:46–66 and 2:296–317.

Paribeni, Roberto, and Pietro Romanelli, eds. 1914. "Studii e ricerche archeologiche nell'Anatolia meridionale." In *Monumenti antichi pubblicati per cura della Reale Accademia dei Lincei*, 23:5–274. Milan: Hoepli.

Parker, Robert. 1983. *Miasma: Pollution and Purification in Early Greek Religion*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Parker, Robert, and Dirk Obbink. 2000. "Aus der Arbeit der 'Inscriptiones Graecae' VI. Sales of Priesthood on Cos I." *Chiron* 30:415–49.

Parker, Victor. 2007. "The Letters in II Maccabees: Reflexions on the book's composition." *ZAW* 119, no. 3:386–402.

Passoni dell'Acqua, Anna. 1976. "Euergetes." *Aeg* 56:177–91.

—. 1992. "Alcune osservazioni sugli ἅπαξ λεγόμενα del Libro della Sapienza in margine al commentario di G. Scarpat." *RivB* 40:459–65.

—. 2002. "Gli editti di liberazione nella letteratura giudaico-ellenistica: intento storico ed apologetico." *Materia giudaica. Rivista dell'associazione italiana per lo studio del giudaismo*. 7.1:55–66.

—. 2004. "The Liberation Decree of 'Addition' E in Esther LXX. Some Lexical Observations Starting from a New Papyrus (POxy LXVI, 4443): New Evidence for the 'Egyptian flavour' of this 'Addition'." *Adamantius* 10:72–88.

—. 2010. "Translating as a Means of Interpreting: The Septuagint and Translation in Ptolemaic Egypt." In *Die Septuaginta—Texte, Theologien, Einflüsse: 2. Internationale Fachtagung veranstaltet von Septuaginta Deutsch (LXX.D), Wuppertal 23.-27.7.2008*, edited by Wolfgang Kraus and Martin Karrer, with the collaboration of Martin Meiser, 322–39. WUNT 252. Tübingen: Mohr Siebeck.

—. 2012. "L'attributo divino ἐπόπτης in Est 5,1 LXX." In *Quasi vitis* (Sir 24,23)*: Miscellanea in memoria di Antonino Minissale*, edited by Dionisio Candido and Carmelo Raspa, 45–97. *Quaderni di Synaxis*. Numero speciale 2. Catania: Studio Teologico S. Paolo.

Patillon, Michel, and Giancarlo Bolognesi, eds. 1997. *Aelius Théon: Progymnasmata*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Paton, William R., trans. 2010. *Polybius: The Histories*. Revised by Frank W. Walbank and Christian Habicht. 6 vols. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Pauly, August, Georg Wissowa, et al., eds. 1894–1978. *Paulys Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft*. 83 vols. Stuttgart: Metzler.

Pearson, Alfred C., ed. 1917. *The Fragments of Sophocles*. 3 vols. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Pédech, Paul. 1964. *La méthode historique de Polybe*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

—. 1969. *Polybe: Histoires*. Book 1. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

—. 1970. *Polybe: Histoires*. Book 2. Vol. 2. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

—. 1974. "La culture de Polybe et la science de son temps." In *Polybe: neuf exposés suivis de discussions*, edited by Emilio Gabba, 39–60. Fondation Hardt. Entretiens sur l'antiquité classique, 20. Geneva: Vandoeuvres.

Pelletier, André. 1962. *Lettre d'Aristée à Philocrate*. SC 89. Paris: Cerf.

—. 1975. "La nomenclature du calendrier juif à l'époque hellénistique." *RB* 82:218–33.

Peppler, Charles W. 1902. *Comic Terminations in Aristophanes and the Comic Fragments. Part I: Diminutives, Character Names, Patronymics*. Baltimore: Murphy.

—. 1916. "The Suffix -μα in Aristophanes." *AJP* 37, no. 4:459–65.

Perkins, Larry. 2011. "'Glory' in Greek Exodus: Lexical Choice in Translation and Its Reflection in Secondary Translations." In *"Translation Is Required": The Septuagint in Retrospect and Prospect*, edited by Robert J.V. Hiebert, 87–106. SBLSCS 56. Leiden: Brill.

Petersen, Walter. 1913. "The Greek Diminutive Suffix -ΙΣΚΟ- -ΙΣΚΗ-." *Transactions of the Connecticut Academy of Arts and Sciences*, 18:139–207.

Pfeiffer, Robert H. 1949. *History of New Testament Times with an Introduction to the Apocrypha*. New York: Harper & Row.

Piejko, Francis. 1988. "Letter of Eumenes II to Tralles Concerning Inviolability and Tax Exemption for a Temple. After 188 B.C." *Chiron* 18:55–69.

—. 1989. "Two Attalid Letters on the *Asylia* and *Ateleia* of Apollo Tarsenus. 185 B.C." *Historia* 38:395–409.

Pietersma, Albert, and Benjamin G. Wright, eds. 2007. *A New English Translation of the Septuagint and the Other Greek Translations Traditionally Included Under That Title*. New York: Oxford University Press.

Pingree, David. 2001. "From Alexandria to Baghdād to Byzantium. The Transmission of Astrology." *IJCT* 8, no. 1:3–37.

Platt, Arthur. 1920. "Apollonius III." *The Journal of Philology* 35:72–85.

Pohlmann, Karl-Friedrich. 1970. *Studien zum dritten Esra: Ein Beitrag zur Frage nach dem ursprünglichen Schluss des chronistischen Geschichtswerkes*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Pope, Maurice. 1985. "A nonce-word in the *Iliad*." *ClQ* 35, no. 1:1–8.

Powell, Iohannes [John] U., ed. 1925. *Collectanea Alexandrina: Reliquiae Minores Poetarum Graecorum Aetatis Ptolemaicae 323–146 A.C. Epicorum, Elegiacorum, Lyricorum, Ethicorum*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Pritchard, James B., ed. 1955. *Ancient Near Eastern Texts Relating to the Old Testament*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.

Pritchett, William Kendrick. 1974–1991. *The Greek State at War*. 5 vols. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Propp, William H.C. 1999. *Exodus 1–18: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 2. Garden City, NY: Doubleday.

Pruvost, Jean, and Jean-François Sablayrolles. 2012. *Les néologismes*. 2nd ed. Que sais-je? Paris: PUF.

Radermacher, Ludwig. 1925. *Neutestamentliche Grammatik: Das Griechisch des Neuen Testaments im Zusammenhang mit der Volkssprache*. HNT 1. 2nd ed. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).

Rahlfs, Alfred, and Robert Hanhart, eds. 2006. *Septuaginta: Id est Vetus Testamentum graece iuxta LXX interpretes*. Edidit Alfred Rahlfs. Editio altera quam recognovit et emendavit Robert Hanhart. 2 vols. in one. Stuttgart: Deutsche Bibelgesellschaft.

Rajak, Tessa. 2001. "Dying for the Law: The Martyr's Portrait in Jewish-Greek Literature." In *The Jewish Dialogue with Greece and Rome: Studies in Cultural and Social Interaction*, 99–133. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2007. "The Angry Tyrant." In *Jewish Perspectives on Hellenistic Rulers*, edited by Tessa Rajak, Sarah Pearce, James Aitken, and Jennifer Dines, 110–27. Berkeley: University of California Press.

—. 2009. *Translation and Survival: The Greek Bible of the Ancient Jewish Diaspora*. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Ranocchia, Graziano. 2007. *Aristone* Sul modo di liberare dalla superbia *nel decimo libro* De vitiis *di Filodemo*. Florence: Olschki.

Raup Johnson, Sara. 2004. *Historical Fictions and Hellenistic Jewish Identity: Third Maccabees in Its Cultural Context*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Rehkopf, Friedrich. 1989. *Septuaginta-Vokabular*. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Reinach, Adolphe. 1913. "Les têtes coupées et les trophées en Gaule." *Revue Celtique* 34:48–60.

Resh, Daria D. 2015. "Toward a Byzantine Definition of Metaphrasis." *GRBS* 55:754–87.

Reynolds, Joyce. 1981. "New Evidence for the Imperial Cult in Julio-Claudian Aphrodisias." *ZPE* 43:317–27.

Richnow, Wolfgang. 1966. *Untersuchungen zu Sprache und Stil des zweiten Makkabäerbuches: Ein Beitrag zur hellenistischen Historiographie*. PhD diss., University of Göttingen.

Richter, Johanna. 1909. *Ursprung und analogische ausbreitung der Verba auf -αζω. Exkurs: Die germanischen Verba auf -atjan, -itjan im Vergleich mit den griechischen Verba auf -αζω*. PhD diss., Münster. Leipzig: Drugulin.

Riedlberger, Peter. 1996. "Skalpieren bei den Skythen. Zu Herodot IV 64." *Klio* 78.1:53–60.

Riemann, Karl-August. 1967. *Das herodoteische Geschichtswerk in der Antike*. PhD diss., Munich.

Riessler, Paul. 1899. *Das Buch Daniel: Textkritische Untersuchung*. Stuttgart: Roth.

Rigsby, Kent J. 1996. *Asylia: Territorial Inviolability in the Hellenistic World*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Robert, Jeanne, and Louis Robert. 1950. *Hellenica: Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*. Vol. IX. *Inscriptions et reliefs d'Asie Mineure*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

Robert, Louis. 1935. "Rapport sommaire sur un premier voyage en Carie." *AJA* 39, no. 3:331–40.

—. 1948. *Hellenica: Recueil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'antiquités grecques*. Vol. IV. *Épigrammes du Bas-Empire*. Paris: Maisonneuve.

—. 1963. *Noms indigènes dans l'Asie-Mineure gréco-romain*. Part I. Paris: Maisonneuve.

—. 1965. *D'Aphrodisias à la Lycaonie: Compte rendu du volume VIII des Monumenta Asiae Minoris Antiqua. Hellenica: Recueuil d'épigraphie, de numismatique et d'épigraphie grecques*. Vol. 13. Paris: Maisonneuve.

—. 1966. *Documents de l'Asie Mineure méridionale: Inscriptions, monnaies et géographie*. Geneva: Droz/Paris: Minard.

—. 1981. "Le serpent Glycon d'Abônouteichos à Athènes et Artémis d'Éphèse à Rome." CRAI 125, no. 3:513–35.

Roberts, Michael. 1985. *Biblical Epic and Rhetorical Paraphrase in Late Antiquity*. ARCA 16. Liverpool: Cairns.

Roberts, William R. 1932. "Demetrius *On Style*." In *Aristotle* The Poetics, "*Longinus*" On the Sublime, *Demetrius* On Style. Cambridge, MA: Harvard University Press.

Rochette, Bruno. 2002. "Remarques sur le vocabulaire grec de la traduction." *RBPH* 80, no. 1:25–34.

Rodríguez Adrados, Francisco et al. 1980–. *Diccionario Griego-Español*. 7 vols. Madrid: CSIC.

Rofé, Alexander. 1985. "The Covenant in the Land of Moab (Dt 28,69–30,20): Historico-literary, Comparative, and Formcritical considerations." In *Das Deuteronomium: Entstehung, Gestalt und Botschaft*, edited by Norbert Lohfink, 310–20. BETL 68. Leuven: Leuven University Press.

Rolle, Renate. 1989. *The World of the Scythians*. Translated by F.G. Walls. Berkeley: University of California Press.

—. 1991a. "Haar- und Barttracht der Skythen." In *Gold der Steppe: Archäologie der Ukraine*, edited by Renate Rolle, Michael Müller-Wille, and Kurt Schietzel, 115–26. Archäologisches Landesmuseum, Schleswig.

—. 1991b. "Skythen in Griechenland–Griechen im Skythenland." In *Gold der Steppe: Archäologie der Ukraine*, edited by Renate Rolle, Michael Müller-Wille, and Kurt Schietzel, 203–5. Archäologisches Landesmuseum, Schleswig.

Roloff, Gustav. 1903. *Probleme aus der griechischen Kriegsgeschichte*. Berlin: Ebering.

Rose, Herbert J. 1921. "The Greek of Cicero." *JHS* 41.1:91–116.

Rostovtzeff, Michail. 1941. *The Social and Economic History of the Hellenistic World*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.

Roueché, Charlotte. 1979. "A New Inscription from Aphrodisias and the Title πατὴρ τῆς πόλεως." *GRBS* 20:173–85.

Roux, Georges. 1979. *L'Amphictionie, Delphes et le temple d'Apollon au IVe siècle*. Collection de la Maison de l'Orient Méditerranéen, no. 8. Série Archéologique 6. Lyon: Maison de l'Orient.

Rudenko, Sergei I. 1970. *Frozen Tombs of Siberia: the Pazyryk Burials of Iron Age Horsemen*. Translated by M.W. Thompson. London: Dent & Sons.

Russell, Donald A. 1988. "The Ass in the Lion's Skin: Thoughts on the Letters of Phalaris." *JHS* 108:94–106.

Rutgers, Leonard V. 1995. *The Jews in Late Ancient Rome: Evidence of Cultural Interaction in the Roman Diaspora*. Leiden: Brill.

Rutherford, Richard B. 2012. *Greek Tragic Style: Form, Language and Interpretation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Şahin, Sencer, ed. 1999. *Die Inschriften von Perge*. Part 1. *Vorrömische Zeit, frühe und hohe Kaiserzeit*. Inschriften griechischer Städte aus Kleinasien 54. Bonn: Habelt.

Samuel, Alan E. 1962. *Ptolemaic Chronology*. Munich: Beck.

Scarpat, Giuseppe. 1967. "Ancora sull'autore del Libro della Sapienza." *RivB* 15:171–89.

—. 1988. "Ancora sulla data di composizione della *Sapientia Salomonis*: Il termine διάγνωσις (*Sap* 3,18; *At* 25,21)." *RivB* 36:363–75.

Schäfer, Gerd. 1974. *König der Könige–Lied der Lieder: Studien zum Paronomastischen Intensitätsgenitiv*. Heidelberg: Winter.

Schaper, Joachim. 1995. *Eschatology in the Greek Psalter*. WUNT 2.76. Tübingen: Mohr (Siebeck).

—. 2014. "The Septuagint Psalter." In *The Oxford Handbook of the Psalms*, edited by William P. Brown, 173–84. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Schenkeveld, Dirk M. 1964. *Studies in Demetrius* On Style. Amsterdam: Hakkert.

—. 1991. "Figures and tropes. A border-case between grammar and rhetoric." In *Rhetorik zwischen den Wissenschaften: Geschichte, System, Praxis als Probleme des "Historischen Wörterbuchs der Rhetorik,"* edited by Gert Ueding, 149–60. Tübingen: Niemeyer.

Schmidt, Johann H.H. 1876–1886. *Synonymik der griechischen Sprache*. 4 vols. Leipzig: Teubner.

Schröder, Christian. 2001. "Alphabetische Zusammenstellung auffäliger Neologismen der Septuaginta." In *Im Brennpunkt: Die Septuaginta. Studien zur Entstehung und Bedeutung der Griechischen Bibel*, edited by Heinz-Josef Fabry and Ulrich Offerhaus, 61–69. BWANT 153. Stuttgart: Kohlhammer.

Schulten, Adolf. 1911. "Polybius und Posidonius über Iberien und die Iberischen Kriege." *Hermes* 46:568–607.

Schürer, Emil. 1973–1987. *The History of the Jewish People in the Age of Jesus Christ (175 B.C.–A.D. 135)*. Revised and edited by Geza Vermes, Fergus Millar, and Martin Goodman. 3 vols. Edinburgh: T&T Clark.

Schwartz, Daniel R. 1998. "On Something Biblical about 2 Maccabees." In *Biblical Perspectives: Early Use and Interpretation of the Bible in Light of the Dead Sea Scrolls*. Proceedings of the First International Symposium of the Orion Center, 12–14 May 1996, edited by Michael E. Stone and Esther G. Chazon, 223–32. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2003. "Divine Punishment in Second Maccabees: Vengeance, Abandonment or Loving Discipline?" In *Der Mensch vor Gott: Forschungen zum Menschenbild in Bibel, antikem Judentum und Koran. Festschrift für Hermann Lichtenberger zum 60. Geburtstag*, edited by Ulrike Mittmann-Richert, Friedrich Avemarie, and Gerbern S. Oegema, 109–16. Neukirchen-Vluyn: Neukirchener Verlag.

—. 2007. "Why did Antiochus have to fall (II Maccabees 9:7)?" In *Heavenly Tablets: Interpretation, Identity and Tradition in Ancient Judaism*, edited by Lynn LiDonnici and Andrea Lieber, 257–65. JSJSup 119. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2008. *2 Maccabees*. CEJL. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Schwarze, Woldemar. 1891. *Quibus fontibus Plutarchus in vita L. Aemilii Paulli usus sit*. Leipzig: Hirschfeld.

Schweighäuser, Johann. 1822. *Lexicon Polybianum*. Oxford.

Schwyzer, Eduard, ed. 1923. *Dialectorum Graecarum exempla epigraphica potiora*. Leipzig: Hirzel.

—. 1953. *Griechische Grammatik auf der Grundlage von Karl Brugmanns Griechischer Grammatik*. Vol. 1. *Allgemeiner Teil. Lautlehre, Wortbildung, Flexion*. Munich: Beck.

Segal, Charles. 1971. *The Theme of the Mutilation of the Corpse in the* Iliad. *Mnemosyne* Supp. 17. Leiden: Brill.

Sekunda, Nick. 1994. *Seleucid and Ptolemaic Reformed Armies 168–145 BC*. Vol. 1: *The Seleucid Army under Antiochus IV Epiphanes*. Stockport: Montvert.

Shackleton Bailey, David R., ed. 1970. *Cicero's Letters to Atticus*. Vol. 7. *Indices to volumes 1–6*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shaw, Frank. 2016. "The Language of Second Maccabees." In *Die Sprache der Septuaginta/The Language of the Septuagint*. Handbuch zur Septuaginta/Handbook of the Septuagint. LXX.H. Vol. 3, edited by Eberhard Bons and Jan Joosten, 407–15. Munich: Gütersloh.

Shepkaru, Shmuel. 2006. *Jewish Martyrs in the Pagan and Christian Worlds*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Shutt, Rowland J.H. 1961. *Studies in Josephus*. London: SPCK.

Sider, David. 2009. "The Special Case of Herculaneum." In *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, edited by Roger S. Bagnall, 303–19. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Siegert, Folker. 2001. *Zwischen Hebräischer Bibel und Altem Testament: Eine Einführung in die Septuaginta*. Münsteraner Judaistische Studien 9. Münster: LIT.

Simotas, Panayotis. 1969. *Αἱ ἀμετάφραστοι λέξεις ἐν τῷ κειμένῳ τῶν Ο΄* [*The untranslated words in the text of the LXX*]. Thessaloniki.

Smith, Roland R.R. 2006. *Aphrodisias II: Roman Portrait Statuary from Aphrodisias*. Mainz: von Zabern.

Smyth, Herbert W. 1920. *A Greek Grammar for Colleges*. New York: American Book Company.

Souilhé, Joseph, ed. 1930. *Platon. Oeuvres complètes*. 13, part 3. *Dialogues apocryphes*. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Spence, Iain G. 1993. *The Cavalry of Classical Greece: A Social and Military History with Particular Reference to Athens*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Spicq, Ceslas. 1994. *Theological Lexicon of the New Testament*. Translated and edited by James D. Ernest. 3 vols. Peabody, MA: Hendrickson.

Stanton, Greg R. 1968. "The Oriental Background of the Compound γονυπετεῖν." *Glotta* 46, nos. 1/2:1–6.

Steele, Robert B. 1900. "The Greek in Cicero's Epistles." *AJP* 21, no. 4:387–410.

Steyn, Gert, J. 2015. "The Maccabean literature and Hebrews: Some intertextual observations." *JSem* 24, no. 1:271–91.

Stiebel, Guy D. 2005. "Scalping in Roman Palestine—'*minime Romanum sacrum*'?" SCI 24:151–62.

Stowers, Stanley K. 1986. *Letter Writing in Greco-Roman Antiquity*. LEC 5. Philadelphia: Westminster.

Strawn, Brent A. 2005. *What is Stronger than a Lion? Leonine Image and Metaphor in the Hebrew Bible and the Ancient Near East*. OBO 212. Göttingen: Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Swain, Simon. 2002. "Bilingualism in Cicero? The Evidence of Code-Switching." In *Bilingualism in Ancient Society: Language Contact and the Written Text*, edited by J.N. Adams, Mark Janse, and Simon Swain, 128–67. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Swanson, Donald C. 1958. "Diminutives in the Greek New Testament." *JBL* 77, no. 2:134–51.

Swete, Henry B. 1914. *An Introduction to the Old Testament in Greek*. Revised by Richard R. Ottley. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taatz, Irene. 1991. *Frühjüdische Briefe: Die paulinischen Briefe im Rahmen der offiziellen religiösen Briefe des Frühjudentums*. NTOA 16. Freiburg/Göttingen: Universitätsverlag/Vandenhoeck & Ruprecht.

Talshir, Zipora. 1999. *I Esdras: From Origin to Translation*. SBLSCSS 47. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

—. 2001. *I Esdras: A Text Critical Commentary*. SBLSCSS 50. Atlanta: Society of Biblical Literature.

Tarn, William W. 1930. *Hellenistic Military and Naval Developments*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Taylor, Alfred E. 1960. *Plato: The Man and His Work*. London: Methuen.

Tcherikover, Victor A. 1959. *Hellenistic Civilization and the Jews*. Translated by S. Applebaum. Philadelphia: Jewish Publication Society of America.

—. 1961. "The Third Book of Maccabees as a Historical Source of Augustus' Time." ScrHier 7:1–26.

Thackeray, Henry St.J. 1909. *A Grammar of the Old Testament in Greek according to the Septuagint*. Vol. 1: *Introduction, Orthography, and Accidence*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Thayer, Joseph H. 1889. *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament Being Grimm's Wilke's Clavis Novi Testamenti*. New York: American Book Company.

Theiler, Willy, ed. 1982. *Poseidonios: Die Fragmente*. Vol. 1. *Texte*. Vol. 2 *Erläuterungen*. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Thesleff, Holger. 1954. *Studies on Intensification in Early and Classical Greek*. Helsingfors.

—. 1961. *An Introduction to the Pythagorean Writings of the Hellenistic Period*. Åbo: Åbo Akademi.

—. 2009. *Platonic Patterns: A Collection of Studies*. Las Vegas, NV: Parmenides.

Tilly, Michael. 2005. *Einführung in die Septuaginta*. Darmstadt: Wissenschaftliche Buchgesellschaft.

Torrance, Isabelle. 2009. "Euripides' *IT* 72–5 and a *Skene* of Slaughter." *Hermes* 137.1:21–27.

Torrey, Charles C. 1910. *Ezra Studies*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

—. 1940. "The Letters Prefixed to Second Maccabees." *JAOS* 60, no. 2:119–50.

Tov, Emanuel. 1973. "Transliterations of Hebrew Words in the Greek Versions of the Old Testament: A Further Characteristic of the *kaige*-Th. Revision?" *Textus* 8:78–90.

—. 1988. "The Septuagint." In *Mikra: Text, Translation, Reading and Interpretation of the Hebrew Bible in Ancient Judaism and Early Christianity*, edited by Martin Jan Mulder, 161–88. CRINT 2.1. Assen: Van Gorcum; Philadelphia: Fortress.

—. 1999. "Compound Words in the Septuagint Representing Two or More Hebrew Words." In *The Greek and Hebrew Bible: Collected Essays on the Septuagint*, 131–52. VTSup 72. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2008. "The LXX Translation of Esther: A Paraphrastic Translation of MT or a Free Translation of a Rewritten Version?" In *Empsychoi Logoi: Religious Innovations in Antiquity: Studies in Honour of Pieter Willem van der Horst*, edited by Alberdina Houtman, Albert de Jong, and Magda Misset-van de Weg, 507–26. Leiden: Brill.

Trapp, Michael, ed. 2003. *Greek and Latin Letters: An Anthology, with Translation*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Tréheux, Jacques. 1986. "Le règlement de Samothrace sur le fonds d'achat du blé." *BCH* 110:419–23.

Trench, Richard C. 1901. *Synonyms of the New Testament*. London: Kegan Paul, Trench, Trübner.

Tromp, Johannes. 1995. "The Formation of the Third Book of Maccabees." *Hen* 17:311–28.

Usener, Hermannus [Hermann], and Ludovicus [Ludwig] Radermacher, eds. 1899. *Dionysii Halicarnasei Opuscula*. Vol. 1. Leipzig: Teubner.

van der Horst, Pieter W. 1991. *Ancient Jewish Epitaphs: An introductory survey of a millennium of Jewish funerary epigraphy (300 BCE–700 CE)*. CBET 2. Kampen: Kok Pharos.

—. 2003. *Philo's* Flaccus: *The First Pogrom*. PACS 2. Leiden: Brill.

VanderKam, James C. 2004. *From Joshua to Caiaphas: High Priests after the Exile*. Minneapolis: Fortress.

van der Kooij, Arie. 1999. "The Use of the Greek Bible in II Maccabees." *JNSL* 25/2:127–38.

van der Spek, Robert J. 1994. "*... en hun machthebbers worden weldoeners genoemd.*" *Religieuze en economische politiek in het Seleucidische Rijk*. ["... and those in authority upon them are called benefactors." Religious and economic policy in the Seleucid Empire]. Amsterdam: Vrije Universiteit Uitgeverij.

—. 2000. "The effect of war on the prices of barley and agricultural land in Hellenistic Babylonia." In *Économie antique: La guerre dans les économies antiques*, edited by Jean Andreau, Pierre Briant, and Raymond Descat, 293–313. *EAHSBC* 5. Saint-Bertrand-de-Comminges: Musée archéologique départemental.

van der Toorn, Karel. 1990. "The Nature of the Biblical Teraphim in the Light of the Cuneiform Evidence." *CBQ* 52, no. 2:203–22.

van der Toorn, Karel, Bob Becking, and Pieter W. van der Horst, eds. 1999. *Dictionary of Deities and Demons in the Bible*. Leiden: Brill.

van Henten, Jan W. 1986. "Datierung und Herkunft des vierten Makkabäerbuches." In *Tradition and Re-interpretation in Jewish and Early Christian Literature: Essays in Honour of Jürgen C.H. Lebram*, edited by J.W. van Henten, H.J. de Jonge, P.T. van Rooden, and J.W. Wesselius, 136–49. StPB 36. Leiden: Brill.

—. 1996. "ΠΑΝΤΟΚΡΑΤΩΡ ΘΕΟΣ in 2 Maccabees." In *YHWH-KYRIOS-ANTITHEISM or The Power of the Word: Festschrift für Rochus Zuurmond*, edited by Bernd J. Diebner and Claudia Nauerth, 117–26. DBAT.B 14. Heidelberg: Selbstverlag der DBAT.

—. 1997. *The Maccabean Martyrs as Saviours of the Jewish People: A Study of 2 and 4 Maccabees*. JSJSup 57. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2006. "Ruler or God? The Demolition of Herod's Eagle." In *The New Testament and Early Christian Literature in Greco-Roman Context. Studies in Honor of David E. Aune*, edited by John Fotopoulos, 257–86. NovTSup 122. Leiden: Brill.

—. 2010. "The reception of Daniel 3 and 6 and the Maccabean martyrdoms in Hebrews 11:33–39." In *Myths, Martyrs, and Modernity: Studies in the History of Religions in Honour of Jan N. Bremmer*, edited by Jitse Dijkstra, Justin Kroesen, and Yme Kuiper, 359–77. Leiden: Brill.

van Hook, Larue. 1905. *The Metaphorical Terminology of Greek Rhetoric and Literary Terminology*. Chicago, IL: University of Chicago Press.

van Minnen, Peter. 2009. "The Future of Papyrology." In *The Oxford Handbook of Papyrology*, edited by Roger S. Bagnall, 644–60. Oxford: Oxford University Press.

Van 't Dack, Edmond. 1988. *Ptolemaica Selecta: Études sur l'armée et l'administration lagides*. Studia Hellenistica 29. Leuven.

Veligianni, Chryssoula. 2001. "*Philos* und *philos*-Komposita in den griechischen Inschriften der Kaiserzeit." In *Aspects of Friendship in the Graeco-Roman World: Proceedings of a Conference Held at the Seminar für Alte Geschichte, Heidelberg, on 10–11 June, 2000*, edited by Michael Peachin, 63–80. Portsmouth, RI.: *JRA* Suppl. 43.

Vermeule, Emily. 1979. *Aspects of Death in Early Greek Art and Poetry*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Viale, Vittorio. 1929. "Relazione sull'attività della Missione Archeologica di Adalia." *ASAA* 8-9:357–92.

Vian, Francis. 1970. "Notes critiques au chant I des 'Argonautiques' d'Apollonios de Rhodes." *REA* 72, no. 1–2:80–96.

Vigouroux, Fulcran, ed. 1912. *Dictionnaire de la Bible*. 5 vols. Paris: Letouzey et Ané.

Vogliano, Achilles, ed. 1928. *Epicuri et Epicureorum scripta in Herculanensibus papyris servata*. Berlin: Weidmann.

Von Rad, Gerhard. 1966. *Deuteronomy: A Commentary*. London: SCM.

Vooys [Vooijs], Cornelis J. 1934–1941. *Lexicon Philodemeum*. 2 vols. Purmerend: Muusses/Amsterdam: Swets.

Wagner, Christian. 1999. *Die Septuaginta-Hapaxlegomena im Buch Jesus Sirach: Untersuchungen zu Wortwahl und Wortbildung unter besonderer Berücksichtigung des textkritischen und übersetzungstechnischen Aspekts*. BZAW 282. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Wajdenbaum, Philippe. 2014. "The Books of the Maccabees and Polybius." In *The Bible and Hellenism: Greek Influence on Jewish and Early Christian Literature*, edited by Thomas L. Thompson and Philippe Wajdenbaum, 189–211. London: Routledge.

Walbank, Frank W. 1940. *Philip V of Macedon*. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

—. 1957–1979. *A Historical Commentary on Polybius*. 3 vols. Oxford: Clarendon.

—. 1972. *Polybius*. Berkeley: University of California Press.

Waldman, Nahum. 1976. "A Comparative Note on Exodus 15:14–16." *JQR* 66, no. 4: 189–92.

Walters, Peter. 1973. *The Text of the Septuagint: Its Corruptions and their Emendation*. Edited by D.W. Gooding. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.

Waltz, Pierre, ed. 1931. *Anthologie Grecque. Première partie. Anthologie Palatine*. Vol. 3. Book 6. Paris: Les Belles Lettres.

Weiser, Artur. 1962. *The Psalms: A Commentary*. Translated by Herbert Hartwell. London: SCM.

Weitzman, Steven. 1997. *Song and Story in Biblical Narrative: The History of a Literary Convention in Ancient Israel*. Bloomington, IN: Indiana University Press.

Welles, Charles B. 1934. *Royal Correspondence in the Hellenistic Period: A Study in Greek Epigraphy*. New Haven: Yale University Press.

Wellhausen, Julius. 1905. "Über den geschichtlichen Wert des zweiten Makkabäerbuchs, im Verhältnis zum ersten." Nachrichten von der königlichen Gesellschaft der Wissenschaften zu Göttingen, Philosophisch-historische Klasse, 117–63.

West, Martin L. 1963. "Critical Notes on Apollonius Rhodius." *CR* 13, no. 1:9–12.

—. 1997. *The East Face of Helicon: West Asiatic Elements in Greek Poetry and Myth*. Oxford: Clarendon.

Wevers, John W. 1990. *Notes on the Greek Text of Exodus*. SBLSCS 30. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

—. 1995. *Notes on the Greek Text of Deuteronomy*. SBLSCS 39. Atlanta, GA: Scholars Press.

Wilhelm, Adolf. 1913. *Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*. Part 3. SAWW 175/1. Vienna: Hölder.

—. 1932. *Neue Beiträge zur griechischen Inschriftenkunde*. Part 5. SAWW 214/4. Vienna: Hölder-Pichler-Tempsky.

Williams, Dyfri. 1991. "Onesimos and the Getty Iliupersis." In *Greek Vases in the J. Paul Getty Museum*. Vol. 5. *Occasional Papers on Antiquities*, *7*, 41–64. Malibu, CA: J. Paul Getty Museum.

Williams, Tyler F. 2001. "Towards a Date for the Old Greek Psalter." In *The Old Greek Psalter: Studies in Honour of Albert Pietersma*, edited by Robert J.V. Hiebert, Claude E. Cox, and Peter J. Gentry, 248–76. JSOTSup 332. Sheffield: Sheffield Academic.

Willrich, Hugo. 1900. *Judaica: Forschungen zur hellenistisch-jüdischen Geschichte und Litteratur*. Göttingen: Dandenhoed & Ruprecht.

Wills, Lawrence M. 1995. *The Jewish Novel in the Ancient World*. Ithaca, NY: Cornell University Press.

Windisch, Hans. 1932. "Die Christusepiphanie vor Damascus (Act 9, 22 und 26) und ihre religionsgeschichtlichen Parallelen." *ZNW* 31, no. 1:1–23.

Winston, David. 1979. *The Wisdom of Solomon: A New Translation with Introduction and Commentary*. AB 43. New York: Doubleday.

Wolcott, John D. 1898. "New Words in Thucydides." *TAPA* 29:104–57.

Wolff, Christian. 1979. "A Note on Lions and Sophocles, *Philoctetes* 1436." In *Arktouros: Hellenic Studies presented to Bernard M.W. Knox on the occasion of his 65th birthday*, edited by Glen W. Bowersock, Walter Burkert, and Michael C.J. Putnam, 144–50. Berlin: de Gruyter.

Wolff, Hans W. 1977. *Joel and Amos: A Commentary on the Books of the Prophets Joel and Amos*. Translated by Waldemar Janzen, S. Dean McBride, Jr., and Charles A. Muenchow. Philadelphia: Fortress.

Wrenhaven, Kelly L. 2012. *Reconstructing the Slave: The Image of the Slave in Ancient Greece*. London: Bloomsbury.

Wright, Benjamin G. III. 2015. *The Letter of Aristeas: 'Aristeas to Philocrates' or 'On the Translation of the Law of the Jews*.' Berlin: de Gruyter.

Youtie, Herbert C. 1948. "The *Kline* of Sarapis." *HTR* 41, no. 1:9–29.

Zeitlin, Solomon. 1919–1920. "Megillat Taanit as a Source for Jewish Chronology and History in the Hellenistic and Roman periods." *JQR* 10, no. 2/3:237–90.

—, ed. 1954. *The Second Book of Maccabees*. Translated by Sidney Tedesche. New York: Harper & Brothers.

Zelson, Louis G. 1927. "Les *hapax legomena* du Pentateuque hébraïque." *RB* 36:243–48.

Zimmermann, Christiane. 2007. *Die Namen des Vaters: Studien zu ausgewählten neutestamentlichen Gottesbezeichnungen vor ihrem frühjüdischen und paganen Sprachhorizont*. AJEC 69. Leiden: Brill.

Abbreviations

The names of ancient Greek authors and the titles of their works are abbreviated, with occasional modifications,[1] according to Liddell, Scott, Jones, and McKenzie's *A Greek-English Lexicon* (LSJ), pp. xvi–xxxviii. For titles that do not appear in LSJ, the abbreviations used in Rodríguez Adrados' (ed.) *Diccionario Griego-Español* (*DGE*), vol. 1, pp. xlix–cxxii, are followed. Abbreviations of the books of the Hebrew Bible and the Septuagint, the New Testament, and the Old Testament Pseudepigrapha, as well as of the works of Philo, are as in *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Collins 2014, 124–26, 129–30). Abbreviations of Patristic works follow the ones given in Lampe's *A Patristic Greek Lexicon* (*PGL*), pp. xi–xlv. Inscriptions are cited and abbreviated as in the Searchable Greek Inscriptions: A Scholarly Tool in Progress by The Packard Humanities Institute (PHI) and the Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (SEG), and papyri as in the Papyrological Navigator (PN). Abbreviations for journal titles given in the preceding "List of works cited" follow *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Collins 2014, 171–260) or, if not included there, *L'Année Philologique*. General abbreviations follow those of *The SBL Handbook of Style* (Collins 2014, 118–21). The abbreviations of the lexica, encyclopaedias, reference works, and electronic databases and lexica, which are frequently referred to in this study, are given below.

ABD	Freedman 1992.
ANET	Pritchard 1955.
APOT	Charles 1913.
BDAG	Danker et al. 2000.
BDB	Brown, Driver, and Briggs. 1996.
BGS	Harl, Dorival, and Munnich 1988.
CCS	Aitken 2015.
CPG	Leutsch and Schneidewin 1839–1851.
DB	Vigouroux 1912.
DDD	van der Toorn, Becking, and van der Horst 1999.
DELG	Chantraine et al. 1968–1980.
DGE	Rodríguez Adrados et al. 1980–.
D.-K.	Diels and Kranz 1992.
DNP	Cancik, Schneider, et al. 1996–2003.
EANS	Keyser and Irby-Massie 2008.
EDG	Beekes and van Beek 2010.
ERE	Hastings et al. 1908–1926.
FGrH	Jacoby 1923–1958.

[1] E.g. the abbreviation Ph.Mech. is used to disambiguate between Philo Mechanicus and Philo Judaeus, for which LSJ and *DGE* use the same abbreviation (Ph.).

FHG	Müller 1841–1870.
GAT	Landfester 2007.
GE	Montanari 2015.
GELS (TP)	Muraoka 1993.
GELS	Muraoka 2009.
GS	Chamberlain 2011.
HDB	Hastings 1898–1904.
LBG	Lexikon zur byzantinischen Gräzität. Fascicles 1–7. Editor: Erich Trapp. ÖAW (see infra, online databases and lexica)
LEH	Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie. 2015.
LCL	Loeb Classical Library
LSJ	Liddell, Scott, Jones, and McKenzie. 1996.
NETS	Pietersma and Wright 2007.
NRSV	New Revised Standard Version.
OCD	Hornblower, Spawforth, and Eidinow 2012.
OTP	Charlesworth 1983–1985.
PG	Migne 1857–1886.
PGL	Lampe 1961.
PHI	The Packard Humanities Institute. Searchable Greek Inscriptions: A Scholarly Tool in Progress (see infra, online databases and lexica)
PL	Mauersberger et al. 1956–2004.
PN	The Papyrological Navigator (see infra, online databases and lexica)
PW	Pauly, Wissowa, et al. 1894–1978.
RAC	Klauser et al. 1950–
SD	Kraus and Karrer 2009.
SEG	Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (see infra, online databases and lexica)
SGS	Schmidt 1876–1886.
SV	Rehkopf 1989.
SVF	Arnim 1964.
TDNT	Kittel and Friedrich 1964–1976.
TDOT	Botterweck, Ringgren, and Fabry 1974–2006.
TLG	Thesaurus Linguae Graecae © Digital Library. Ed. Maria C. Pantelia. University of California, Irvine (see infra, online databases and lexica)
TLNT	Spicq 1994.
TrGF	Kannicht and Snell 1981.

Online databases and lexica

LBG	<http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu/lbg>
PHI	<http://epigraphy.packhum.org>
PN	<http://www.papyri.info>
SEG	<http://www.brill.com/publications/online-resources/supplementum-epigraphicum-graecum-online>
TLG	<http://stephanus.tlg.uci.edu>

Bible software programs

Accordance Bible Software. Version 10.4.5. 2014. OakTree Software, Inc.
Logos Bible Software 7.8. 2017. Faithlife Corporation.

Texts and translations

Ancient Greek texts are quoted from the editions used in the TLG, unless otherwise noted. The text of the Septuagint is quoted according to the Göttingen edition (*Septuaginta. Vetus Testamentum Graecum auctoritate Academiae Scientiarum Gottingensis editum*), for the books that have so far been published,[2] and according to Rahlfs' and Hanhart's *Septuaginta* (2006), for the books that have not yet appeared in the Göttingen series. The translations of Aquila and Symmachus are quoted from Field (1875) and the Old Latin translations of 2 Maccabees from de Bruyne (1932). Epigraphical texts are quoted from the editions used in PHI and SEG and papyrological texts from the editions used in PN, unless otherwise indicated. Translations of ancient Greek texts are mainly from the LCL and translations of the Septuagint from NETS, unless otherwise indicated.

[2]These books are: Genesis, Exodus, Leviticus, Numbers, Deuteronomy, Ruth, 2 Chronicles, 1 and 2 Esdras, Esther, Judith, Tobit, 1, 2, 3 Maccabees, Psalms and Odes (Rahlfs' edition), Job, Wisdom of Solomon, Sirach, Twelve Prophets, Isaiah, Jeremiah, Baruch, Lamentations, Epistle of Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Susanna, Daniel, Bel and the Dragon. See 1.9.

Chapter 1. Introduction

1.1 Aim and structure of the study

One of the innovations introduced in Septuagint lexicography by the four lexica published in the past thirty years, Rehkopf's *Septuaginta-Vokabular* (1989), Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie's *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (1992–1996; 2015), Muraoka's *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (2009), and Chamberlain's *The Greek of the Septuagint* (2011), was the marking of the neologisms, that is, the words which are first (and sometimes exclusively) attested in the Septuagint. Although the aforenamed lexica may vary in the ways in which they have defined, identified, and measured the neologisms, they seem to converge in estimating that about one-tenth of the words that constitute the vocabulary of the Septuagint are not previously attested.

Yet, despite the lexicographical evidence for the prominence of this phenomenon in the Septuagint, and although the neologisms have long since been a fruitful topic of research in the fields of linguistics and literature, they have still not really emerged as a topic of investigation in Septuagint scholarship. So far, only a handful of studies have either been devoted exclusively to the neologisms of individual books of the Septuagint, or dealt parenthetically with them. To give an idea of the different perspectives under which the Septuagint neologisms have been studied up until now, we can cite here Olivier Munnich's *Étude lexicographique du Psautier des Septante* (1982), which examines the neologisms that occur in the Greek Psalter and attempts to establish whether their recurrence in other books of the Septuagint and its revisions attests to the lexical influence that the latter received from the former; John A.L. Lee's *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (1983), part of which is devoted to a discussion of lexical innovation in the Greek version of the Pentateuch in light of the development of the Greek language in the third century BCE, when the Pentateuch was translated into Greek; Katrin Hauspie's *Neologisms in the Septuagint of Ezekiel* (2001), which examines the neologisms occurring in the Greek version of Ezekiel in connection with the lexical choices made by the translator of this book vis-à-vis his Hebrew *Vorlage* and the Greek vocabulary of his time; and *Neologisms: A Septuagint Problem* (2013), in which James K. Aitken addresses some of the methodological issues that arise in the investigation of the Septuagint neologisms and looks at a number of neologisms that occur in the Greek version of Ecclesiastes from a translation studies perspective.

Although informed by the aforementioned studies, and especially by the way neologisms have been treated in them as stylistic, intertextual, and chronological

markers, the present study differs from them in that it is not concerned with the neologisms occurring in the Greek translation of one of the canonical books of the Hebrew Bible, but with those found in a deuterocanonical/apocryphal book included in the Septuagint, the Second Book of Maccabees (henceforth 2 Maccabees). The latter is not a translation of a Semitic original, but was composed in Greek sometime in the second or first century BCE by an anonymous author (known as the epitomator) who abridged a now lost multivolume historiographical work written by a Diaspora Jew named Jason of Cyrene.

The reason for choosing this particular book has to do with the fact that, being an original Greek composition, it employs an especially rich and varied vocabulary and is distinctive in its use of the many novel and/or unique words that it contains. Second Maccabees has the second highest number of different words of all the books of the Septuagint and the highest number of Septuagint *hapax legomena* (words that occur once in this book and nowhere else in the entire Septuagint corpus). It also hosts a considerable number of words—estimatedly the highest of all the books of the Septuagint—that have no previously recorded instances in Greek. Some of these neologisms are absolute *hapax legomena* (words attested only once in the Greek language); a few others also appear in other deuterocanonical/apocryphal books of the Septuagint, assumed to have been translated or written after 2 Maccabees, or perhaps roughly contemporaneously with it; the rest recur, with varying frequency, in extra-Septuagintal Jewish-Greek (and, later, Christian) literature, in secular Greek literary works, as well as in inscriptions and papyri. One can also trace in 2 Maccabees, on the one hand, words whose first attestation is found in canonical books of the Septuagint assumed to have been translated at a time prior to the deuterocanonical book's composition, and, on the other hand, words whose earliest recorded occurrence is found in secular Greek literary works, which are slightly anterior to or roughly contemporary with 2 Maccabees. The abundance and diversity of the neologisms that occur in the latter book make them an interesting area of investigation and motivate the following questions:

How can one account for the distinctively high number of previously unattested words that occur in 2 Maccabees? Do they constitute neologisms coined by its author or were they more or less current in the oral and/or the written language of the time, but owing to the vagaries of preservation and survival of ancient Greek texts happen to be first attested in this book? To what semantic domains do they belong? Can one establish intertextual connections between 2 Maccabees and other books of the Septuagint on the basis of the neologisms that they share? Further, can one trace intertextual links between 2 Maccabees and contemporary, extra-Septuagintal literary works, the neologisms of which happen to occur in 2 Maccabees? What was the reception of these neologisms? Why have some of them remained solitary *hapaxes* in the Greek language, whereas others recur in subsequent literary or non-literary texts? Can these neologisms serve as chronological markers that may furnish us with clues to the approximate date of composition of 2 Maccabees?

In order to address these questions, this study has set the following objectives:

Firstly, to identify, by using a method more precise than that hitherto employed in Septuagint lexicography, the neologisms that occur in 2 Maccabees, and to provide a detailed commentary on a sample of them. The purpose of the commentary will be to examine the formation and the semantics of these neologisms, to determine, if possible, whether they are coinages of the author of 2 Maccabees or words whose earliest recorded occurrence in Greek happens to be found in this book, to seek the motivation behind their coinage or their use in a particular context in the book (e.g. the possible stylistic effects that the author aimed to produce or the intratextual and intertextual connections that he sought to generate), and to examine their recurrence in subsequent literature.

Secondly, to identify and examine the neologisms of other Septuagint books which are presumed to have been translated prior to 2 Maccabees and which were taken up by the author of the latter book, as well as the neologisms of 2 Maccabees that were taken up by the translators/authors of Septuagint books that are assumed to be chronologically posterior to 2 Maccabees. The purpose of the examination of these intra-Septuagintal borrowings will be to trace the intertextual connections between 2 Maccabees and other books of the Septuagint, both translated and original Greek compositions, to determine as securely as possible the direction of lexical influence among these books, and to establish a relative chronology between them based on the neologisms that they share.

Thirdly, to identify and examine the neologisms of roughly contemporary, extra-Septuagintal literary works that appear in 2 Maccabees. Of particular interest are the neologisms of Polybius, who may have been a contemporary of Jason of Cyrene. The examination of these neologisms will attempt to determine whether their occurrence in 2 Maccabees is an indication of the latter's acquaintance with and lexical influence from Polybius' *Histories* or whether it is to be attributed to the fact that both historiographical works originated in the same linguistic milieu.

Lastly, considering that there is no strong consensus regarding the date of composition of 2 Maccabees, which has been placed anywhere in the last one hundred and fifty years BCE, the final objective of the study is to assess whether the linguistic evidence provided by the above-sketched multifaceted examination of the neologisms that occur in the book can corroborate any of the dates that have heretofore been proposed for its composition.

The study is structured as follows. Section 1.2 of the Introduction presents to the reader the Septuagint book chosen for the investigation of the neologisms in this study, namely 2 Maccabees, and discusses issues related to its author, date, composition, language, and vocabulary. Sections 1.3–1.7 introduce the linguistic feature under investigation, namely the neologisms, as well as the related feature of *hapax legomena*; they survey how neologisms and *hapax legomena* have thus far been defined, identified, and measured in Septuagint studies and lexicography, point out the shortcomings of previous research, and provide the rationale for the definition and method of identification of the neologisms and the *hapax legomena* proposed in the present study. Section 1.8 gives an overview of previous studies which have discussed whether the neologisms can be used to identify a Septuagint book's intertextual connections and to

determine the time of its translation/composition. The methodological section 1.9 outlines the procedures followed for the identification of the neologisms that occur in 2 Maccabees and exposes the criteria used for assessing issues of intertextuality and chronology related to the neologisms.

The main part of the study consists of seven chapters. Chapter 2 is devoted to the words which are first attested in 2 Maccabees and discusses in detail a sample of them. The focus is on determining whether these words are coinages of the author of the book or chance first attestations; on explaining what prompted their coinage or their use in a particular context; and on detecting the Septuagintal or extra-Septuagintal intertexts that may underlie their usage in 2 Maccabees. Chapter 3 deals with a number of 'doubtful neologisms,' for which it cannot be established with certainty whether their first attestation occurs in 2 Maccabees or in some other literary or non-literary text. Chapter 4 is concerned with the Septuagint neologisms shared exclusively between 2 Maccabees and one more deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book, and seeks to determine whether they betray the lexical dependence of one book upon the other. Chapter 5 deals with the neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and a variant Greek form of a canonical book of the Septuagint with deuterocanonical additions, the Alpha Text of Esther. Chapter 6 identifies the neologisms of the canonical books of the Septuagint that occur in 2 Maccabees and examines how and why the author of the latter book picked up and embedded them in the text of his epitome. Chapter 7 focuses on a number of Polybian neologisms that occur in 2 Maccabees and seeks to establish whether or not their presence in the deuterocanonical book denotes the lexical influence exerted on it by the *Histories*. Chapter 8 (Excursus) discusses whether chapter 7 of 2 Maccabees is a later interpolation, as often suspected, and provides lexical clues to the date of its composition. Lastly, Chapter 9 summarizes the conclusions reached in the preceding chapters and provides an overall assessment of the insights into the language, the intertextual relationships, and the chronology of 2 Maccabees that were obtained from the examination of the neologisms in this study.

Each chapter is supplemented with appendices containing lists of neologisms and other supporting material. These appendices are attached at the end of the book together with an index of the chief words discussed in this study.

1.2 2 Maccabees

1.2.1 The author

Second Maccabees is an abridgement of a now lost five-volume historiographical work written by a certain Jason of Cyrene. Aside from his name, provided by the abridger of his work (2 Macc 2:23), we have no other information on this author. A Greek graffito inscribed on a column of the South Temple in Buhen (in present-day Sudan) and dated

between the fourth to second centuries BCE preserves the name Ἰάσων Κυρηναῖος, yet, it is unlikely that the temple visitor under that name was the author in question.[3] The name Ἰάσων (Greek form of the Hebrew name Joshua or Jesus) and the epithet Κυρηναῖος indicate a Hellenized native of the city of Cyrene, or the region of Cyrenaica, which had become an "island of Hellenism" early on in North Africa.[4] Internal evidence in his epitomized work indicates that Jason was a Jew whose primary or only language was Greek.[5] The ethnic designation attached to his name may imply, as in the case of another Cyrenean mentioned in the New Testament, Simon (Mark 15:21), that he had moved away from his native place, presumably to Judaea, where the events narrated in his history took place.[6] His precise knowledge of the Seleucid administration, institutions, prosopography, and chancery terminology makes this supposition likely.[7] On the other hand, commentators have noted that he does not seem to have been well acquainted with the geography and topography of Judaea.[8]

The considerable rhetorical skill exhibited in 2 Maccabees has led some scholars to surmise that Jason (if this skill is to be attributed to him and not to the abridger of his work) may have been trained in Greek rhetoric in Alexandria.[9] Attempts to identify him with Jason, son of Eleazar, whom, 1 Maccabees (8:17) informs us, Judas Maccabaeus sent, together with Eupolemus, son of John, in Rome, in 161 BCE, to negotiate a treaty with the Romans, remain conjectural.[10] Conjectural but not implausible is the identification of the aforenamed Eupolemus, whose participation in the Jewish embassy to Rome is also mentioned in 2 Maccabees (4:11),[11] with the author of a work on Jewish history going down to 158/7 BCE,[12] that is, roughly the time of the embassy referred to in 1 and 2 Maccabees. On the assumption that Jason was contemporary with the Maccabean events and perhaps acquainted with some of their protagonists, his writing activity has been placed between the death of Judas, in 160 BCE, and the accession of the latter's brother, Jonathan, to the office of high priest, in

---

[3] See Eide, Hägg, Pierce, and Török 1996, 538–39. On the frequency of the name Ἰάσων in inscriptions from Cyrenaica, see Habicht 1979, 170n12.

[4] See Barclay 1996, 232.

[5] See Pfeiffer 1949, 515; Habicht 1979, 170. Hengel (1974, 1:96) supposes that Jason knew Hebrew or Aramaic.

[6] See Bévenot 1931, 9; Hengel 1974, 1:96–98; Schwartz 2008, 175.

[7] See Niese 1900, 1:294–96; Abel 1949, xxxiii; Habicht 1976, 2; id. 1979, 178, 190; Schürer 1973–1987, 3.1:532.

[8] See Bar-Kochva 1989, 180–81.

[9] See Hengel 1974, 1:95.

[10] See Tcherikover 1959, 385; Hengel 1974, 1:98; Hyldahl 1990, 201. The possibility of this identification is utterly rejected by Bar-Kochva 1989, 181.

[11] At 4:11 reference is made to Eupolemus' father, who is designated as "John, the father of Eupolemus." The uncommon designation of a father by the name of his son seems to indicate that Eupolemus' name and person were familiar to the author and to his readers. See Tcherikover 1959, 384–85.

[12] See Habicht 1979, 175, 177–78; Schwartz 2008, 221; Doran 2012, 15, 104.

152 BCE.[13] Some scholars have posited later dates, though, pushing Jason's floruit down to as late as 100 or the 80s BCE.[14]

The abridgment of Jason's history was made (likely after Jason's death) by an anonymous writer, usually designated as the "epitomator," who speaks in the first plural (switching to the first singular, δοκῶ, at 2:29) in the prologue of his epitome (2:19–32) and in the first singular in the epilogue (15:37–39), and whose reflections are thought to be interspersed in various parts of the narrative (4:16–17, 5:17–20, 6:12–17).[15] The aim of the epitomator, as exposed at 2:24–31, was to condense into a single book the voluminous history written by Jason, in order to make it easier to go through and to memorize, as well as more agreeable and beneficial for the reader. He likens himself to an encaustic and fresco painter who undertakes the decoration of a house after the master builder has finished its construction. The epitomator tells us that the primary author, namely Jason, was responsible for the exhaustive and detailed treatment of the historical material, whereas he, in his recasting of the original work, strove for brevity.

In the form that it has come down to us, the epitome relates events that took place in Judea between 175 and 161 BCE, under the reign of four successive Seleucid kings: Seleucus IV, Antiochus IV Epiphanes, Antiochus V Eupator, and Demetrius I. It is structured around three attacks on the Temple of Jerusalem. The first is attempted by Heliodorus, Seleucus IV's emissary, who is fended off by divine intervention. The second is led by Antiochus IV, who desecrates the Temple, suppresses the observance of the Torah, and attempts to introduce Greek institutions into Jewish life. His persecution produces the first Jewish martyrs, the elder Eleazar and a mother with her seven sons, as well as a resistance movement headed by Judas Maccabeus, who, after a series of military victories, restores the Temple and Jewish worship. The third attack is attempted by Nicanor, Demetrius I's general, who is defeated by Judas' army. The narrative breaks off just a year before Judas' death (160 BCE), either because Jason's history ended there or because the epitomator chose to stop at that point.[16]

Jason's original history being lost, it is impossible to know how much of it, in terms of content and diction, survived the epitomator's editing and restyling. Efforts to reconstruct it remained inconclusive,[17] although the epitomator, in his prologue (2:19–23), gives a sketchy outline of its contents. Scholars have oscillated between the

---

[13] See Niese 1900, 1:304; Tcherikover 1959, 383–84; Hengel 1974, 1:97; Schürer 1973–1987, 3.1:532; Habicht 1979, 175; Schwartz 2008, 15. Pfeiffer (1949, 516) argues against this early dating.

[14] See Bickermann [*sic*], "Makkabäerbücher," PW 14, col. 793 ("um das J. 100 v. Chr.") and id. 2007g, 461n181: "Since the subject of Jason's five volumes was the history of Judas and his brothers (Jonathan and Simon) . . . we may affirm that he wrote after the death of Simon (135 B.C.E.) and before the end of the rule of his successor, John Hyrcanus (105 B.C.E.)"; Pfeiffer 1949, 515 ("about 100 B.C.E."); Goldstein 1983, 83 ("Jason wrote his work by 86 B.C.E.").

[15] See Habicht 1979, 171; Schwartz 2008, 24. Goldstein (1983, 6n4) also suggests that 3:40, 7:42, 10:9–10, 13:26, and 14:46 (end) originate with the epitomator.

[16] See Pfeiffer 1949, 509–10; Habicht 1979, 173–74; Bar-Kochva 1989, 178; Doran 2012, 9–10.

[17] See Doran 2012, 11.

opinion that the epitomator was a "beschränkter Kopf"[18] who, aside from abbreviating and ornamenting Jason's text, made no major alterations to its content, and the opinion that he had a rather dynamic role in the editing process, permitting himself to rearrange the sequence of events and to add material from external sources.[19] Accordingly, in the literature on 2 Maccabees the term 'author' is variously used to indicate Jason alone, Jason and the epitomator in tandem, or, more often, exclusively the epitomator. Thus, Abel (1949, xxxiv), acknowledging the difficulty of distinguishing what is original to the epitome from what derives from its base text, employs the general term 'author' ("l'Auteur"), without referring specifically to either Jason or the epitomator. Goldstein (1983, 5, 6) maintains that the epitomator made no additions to Jason's history, so that "we may speak of the content of the abridgement as indeed the work of Jason of Cyrene." Moreover, he argues that the epitomator's attitudes, as expressed in the few passages earlier cited, "may have been identical to those of Jason." Consequently, it is only when the peculiarities of a passage make it impossible to discern whether it originates with Jason or the epitomator that he uses the general term 'the writer' or 'our writer.' Van Henten (1997, 19, 20) considers the epitome (2 Macc 2:19–15:39) "a historical work in its own right," "a unity," whose 'author' is the epitomator. For Parker (2007, 401) the epitomator "emerges as a genuine author—even historian—who not only abridged and occasionally added, but who also reworked and rewrote extensively." Schwartz (2008, 25, 37) similarly asserts that the "anonymous craftsman" did not only abridge Jason's work and make it more readable, but also added new material and gave the book its "basic interpretive scaffolding." Therefore, he prefers to term him 'author' rather than merely 'epitomator.' The issue of authorship may be even more complicated if one accepts with Habicht (1976, 2; 1979, 175–77) and others that a third hand may have been involved in the composition of 2 Maccabees, that of a final redactor/editor ("der letzte Bearbeiter") who revised the epitome sometime after it was published.[20]

With regard to the place of composition of the epitome, scholars waver between Judea (Jerusalem)[21] and the Diaspora (Alexandria or Antioch).[22]

In the present study, unless otherwise specified, we will be using the term 'author' in a general sense, without distinguishing between Jason and the epitomator, although we acknowledge that the epitome of 2 Maccabees, in the form that has come down to us, is

---

[18] So Grimm 1857, 17; Cf. Pfeiffer 1949, 520: "He [sc. the epitomator] is a well-intentioned, somewhat pompous, devout Jew who, after graduation from an Alexandrian school, sought fame as a writer in summarizing and popularizing the work of a scholar after discovering that he lacked the talent for original research and independent literary production."

[19] See Schwartz 2008, 25, 37.

[20] See infra 1.2.4.

[21] Doran 1981, 113 (but id. 2012, 16–17 places the epitomist in the Diaspora); van Henten 1997, 50, 53.

[22] Bévenot 1931, 9 (Alexandria); Abel 1949, xxxiv (Alexandria); Pfeiffer 1949, 519–20 (Alexandria); Zeitlin 1954, 20 (Antioch); Schwartz 2008, 45–55 (Diaspora). Cf. Bar-Kochva 1989, 185: "The map of Eretz Israel was entirely foreign to the epitomist."

preponderantly the product of the epitomator's "labour, sweat, and sleepless nights" (2:26). Moreover, we will be using the designation 'the author of 2 Maccabees/our book' with reference to the author of the epitome (2:19–15:39), the two texts that precede the latter (1:1–1:10a, 1:10b–2:18; see infra 1.2.3) having not been penned by him.

Since the book that we now call 2 Maccabees is of a composite nature, incorporating the last-mentioned texts, as well as a few others, that presumably did not come from the pen of either Jason or the epitomator, it is necessary to look briefly at them before we address the issue of the date of composition of the book as a whole.

1.2.2 The embedded letters

Embedded in the epitome are five letters, one in chapter 9 and the rest in chapter 11. The first letter (9:19–27) purports to have been written by King Antiochus IV shortly before his death in November/December 164 BCE. It is addressed to his Jewish subjects, informing them of his severe illness and recommending to them his son, Antiochus V, as his successor. This letter, written "in the form of a supplication" (9:18), is considered to be a forgery, a "stylistic exercise" (*progymnasma*),[23] based perhaps on a genuine letter of Antiochus IV to the citizens of Antioch or on a Seleucid royal letter, by which a king designated his son as co-regent or successor.[24] It has been suggested that the regime of the vice-regent Lysias,[25] Jason of Cyrene,[26] or the epitomator, who would here "show himself to be a virtuoso in spoofing a royal deathbed epistle,"[27] may have been responsible for its fabrication.

The dossier of letters in chapter 11 contains four diplomatic documents dealing with the negotiations of the Jewish rebels with the Seleucid rulers in 164–163 BCE. Letter 1 (11:17–21), dated to 148 of the Seleucid Era (SE) [=Oct. 165–Sept. 164 BCE], when Antiochus IV was still alive, is addressed by the vice-regent Lysias to the rebels around Judas in response to a petition that the latter had sent him. The vice-regent grants them

---

[23] See Nisula 2005, 217.

[24] Momigliano 1994, 40; Habicht 1976, 5–7; id. 1979, 246n18a; Parker 2007, 390–97. Bickerman (2007e, 306–7n24) considers the letter to be "indubitably authentic" except for its opening address, which he believes was retouched by the author (Jason?) in order to present King Antiochus as humbling himself towards his Jewish addressees: his name comes after the address and the greeting in token of inferiority. On the phraseological similarities between Antiochus IV's letter and authentic Seleucid documents, such as the recently discovered letter of Seleucus IV to Heliodorus, see Cotton and Wörrle 2007, 196n27. Gauger (2002, 58n29), who considers chapter 9 an interpolation made after 70 CE, suggests that Antiochus' letter may have been modelled on Herod I's deathbed letter to his troops asking them to show εὔνοια to his successor Archelaus (see J. *BJ* 1.667; *AJ* 17.194).

[25] Goldstein 1983, 357–58. Momigliano (1994, 40–41) conjectures that the letter may have circulated independently, along with other forged letters, before being incorporated into Jason's or the epitomator's work.

[26] See Parker 2007, 400–401.

[27] So Schwartz 2008, 351. See also van Henten 1997, 28 and Parker 2007, 401n62.

the requests that fall within his competence and refers others to the king. Lysias is the addressee of the undated letter 2 (11:23–26), written by Antiochus V, Antiochus IV's son, probably early in 163 BCE, shortly after the death of his father. The new king authorizes his guardian Lysias (who must have actually authored the letter, the king being a minor) to implement the new policy vis-à-vis the Jews that would allow them to restore their Temple and live by their ancestral customs. The author of letter 3 (11:27–33), dated to Xanthicus 15, 148 SE [=mid-March 164 BCE], is Antiochus IV, who informs the Jewish council of elders that he grants amnesty to the rebels who would return within a fortnight and freedom to the Jews to observe their own laws. Letter 4 (11:34–38), bearing the same date as the preceding, is by two Roman envoys who express their approval with regard to Lysias' concessions to the Jewish rebels and inquire about the stance that the latter will adopt towards the issues that had been referred to the king. By general consensus, these documents are authentic,[28] although their sequence is disturbed (the correct chronological order is 3, 1, 4, 2) and some of the dates they bear are mistaken (letter 4 has the same date as letter 3, although it was evidently written closely after letter 1).[29] The insertion of these documents (which originally may have been preserved in the archives of Jerusalem)[30] into chapter 11 can be assigned to either Jason of Cyrene[31] or the epitomator, who, on the erroneous assumption that they all dated from the reign of Antiochus V, would have juxtaposed them incorrectly, and subsequently reorganized his narrative to make it conform to their content and chronology, as he (mis)understood them.[32]

1.2.3 The prefixed letters

The epitome has two letters prefixed to it. Since Bickerman (2007f), it has been generally accepted that the first (1:1–10a) is a genuine letter, a festal one in genre, addressed by the Jews of Jerusalem and Judea to their brothers in Egypt, exhorting them to observe the feast of the rededication of the Temple of the year 188 SE [=124 BCE].[33] This letter quotes a probably similar missive (1:7–8), dated to 169 SE [=143 BCE], when, as Bickerman hypothesizes, the Jerusalem Jews had first exhorted their brethren in Egypt to celebrate the rededication feast, which had been instituted by Judas Maccabeus twenty years earlier, in 164 BCE.[34] The letter may originally have been

[28] See Habicht 1976, 12; id. 1979, 179; Schwartz 2008, 42; Doran 2012, 227.

[29] See Habicht 1976, 11–13; id. 1979, 179–82; Gera 1998, 242–47; Doran 2012, 227–30.

[30] See Momigliano 1994, 41; Goldstein 1983, 407; Parker 2007, 400.

[31] See Pfeiffer 1949, 509; Goldstein 1983, 407.

[32] See Parker 2007, 398–401; Schwartz 2008, 396.

[33] Zeitlin (1954, 19, 32) has questioned the authenticity of the letter on the grounds that, in 124 BCE, when Judea was an independent state, the Jews of Jerusalem would not have sent to Egypt an official document dated according to the Seleucid era.

[34] See Bickerman 2007f, 429–30.

written in Hebrew or Aramaic and then officially translated into a Semitizing Greek.[35] Bickerman's theory was challenged by Schwartz (2008, 143–44, 519–29), who claimed that 1:1–10a is in fact a single continuous letter, containing no reference to an earlier missive. Schwartz takes as the date of composition of this letter the year 169 SE [=143 BCE], the date that Bickerman assigned to what he thought to be an embedded, quoted document. As to the date given at the end of the letter, Schwartz argues that it is not to be read as 188 SE [=124 BCE] but as 148 SE [=164 BCE]; the latter date, discarded by Bickerman as an ancient Jewish or Christian editor's correction,[36] is supported by two minuscule manuscripts (55, 62). Thus, according to Schwartz's interpretation, in 143 BCE, the first year of Hasmonean independence, the Jews of Jerusalem sent a letter to the Jews in Egypt inviting them to celebrate the feast of rededication of the year 164 BCE. This theory is attractive indeed, yet, even if one accepts that the date given at the end of the letter (v. 10a) is corrupt, one has to account for the date of composition of the letter being placed in its middle (v. 7): as far as we know, not only Greek but also Hebrew and Aramaic letters were usually dated at the end.[37] On the whole, Bickerman's analysis, combined with insights provided by recent scholarship,[38] offers a more persuasive framework for the interpretation of the first prefixed letter.

The lengthy second prefixed letter (1:10b–2:18) is addressed by the people of Jerusalem and Judaea, the council of elders, and Judas (presumably Maccabeus) to Aristobulus (probably the Jewish-Egyptian writer) and the Jews in Egypt. Although it bears no date, the events it narrates place it after the death of King Antiochus IV (of whose end it offers a version contradicting that given in the epitome) and shortly before the first celebration of the rededication of the Temple, in December 164 BCE. Bickerman (2007f, 409) has pronounced the letter a forgery on the basis of its *praescriptio*, χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν, which, bar a single fourth-century BCE instance, gained currency only between ca. 60 BCE and the last quarter of the first century CE, being especially in vogue under Augustus. Accordingly, he gave 60 BCE as the *terminus post quem* for the fabrication of the letter. Schwartz (2008, 144–46), though, has rightly observed that, greeting formulas being easily altered or adapted in transmission,[39] the letter may in fact preserve a "kernel" of an authentic missive of 164 BCE, originating with Judas Maccabeus himself. Scholars who accept this possibility have designated the opening and closing parts of the letter (1:10b–12 or 1:10b–18a, 2:16–18) as genuine and

[35] So Bickerman 2007f, 421–22. See also Hanhart 1961, 28 [450]. Torrey (1940, 134–35) argues for an Aramaic original.

[36] See Bickerman 2007f, 410.

[37] See Fitzmyer 1974, 217–18 and Lindenberger 1994, 8. There is a single exception in Aramaic epistolography, the letter known as the "Passover Papyrus" (Lindenberger 1994, no. 30a, b, 56–58), addressed to the leader of the Jewish community at Elephantine and dated to 419 BCE, in which the date comes right after the initial greeting, but is incorporated in the message: "This year, year five of King Darius, the king sent to Arshama [saying: . . .]." See on this point Doran 2012, 28n29.

[38] See Doran 2012, 33–38.

[39] Cf. Bickerman 2007a, 1:116 and id. 2007d, 1:307; Goldstein 1983, 164.

the version of the death of Antiochus IV that disagrees with the one in the body of the epitome (1:13–16)[40] and the long digression explaining the origin of the Temple's sacred fire (1:18b–2:15)[41] as potential interpolations. Advocates of the letter's inauthenticity have put forward the serious objection that the news of Antiochus' death in Persia, which became known in Babylon between November 20 and December 18, 164 BCE, could not have arrived in Jerusalem in time to be reported in a festal letter supposedly sent to Egypt before the celebration of the reconsecration of the Temple on Kislev 25 [=December 14 or 15) of the same year.[42] Doran (2012, 62–63) has also made a strong point in arguing that the stable situation in Judaea reflected in the letter—the danger has been overcome, the Temple restored, and Nehemiah's library recovered—could hardly have been that of the turbulent December of 164 BCE; it would be more likely to have occurred after Judea gained independence, perhaps in the time of John Hyrcanus or Alexander Jannaeus.

By declaring the letter to be wholly inauthentic, one is obliged to assign it a date other than 164 BCE. The validity of Bickerman's dating to ca. 60 BCE at the earliest, based on the *praescriptio* χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν, has been rather unjustly doubted. Doran (2012, 39–40), after quoting White (1986, 200) ("by the mid-second century BCE, and into the late first or early second centuries CE, letter writers began to combine the health wish with the address/salutation in the form: . . . χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρῶσθαι (or ὑγιαίνειν)"), asserts that "since the survival of ancient letters depends on chance, scholars such as White are now agreed that such an address could have occurred in the second century BCE" (p. 40). However, a search in the Papyrological Navigator (PN) shows that, between 300 and 100 BCE there are some twenty-five instances of χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρῶσθαι but none of χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν, which becomes current from the 60s BCE onwards. The epigraphical corpus (PHI) records two instances of the formula χαίρειν καὶ ἐρρῶσθαι, one from 75 BCE (*Prose sur pierre* 36.2) and another from 47 BCE, in a letter of Julius Caesar to Mytilene (*IG XII,2* 35, col. b.8; *IG XII,2* 35[1], col. b.8), but none of χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν. The single instance of χαίρεν καὶ ὑγιαίνεν in a fourth-century BCE private letter written on lead from Attica,[43] in which a certain Mnesiergos asks his family to send him a covering, the cheapest possible, does not constitute proof that the formula could have been used in the 60s of the second century BCE in the translation of a Jewish festal letter that the authorities of Jerusalem sent to the renowned scholar Aristobulus and the Jews in Egypt. The Jerusalem *gerousia* would have undoubtedly made sure that the appropriate greeting formula that was current at the time was employed in an official document issued by it. Goldstein (1983, 165), too, claims that "the formula in Ep. 2 would be neither unprecedented nor unique in the second century BCE. In fact, it is attested earlier in the Athenian letter on lead and

[40] See Schwartz 2008, 133, 147.

[41] Momigliano and Bunge cited in Habicht 1979, 199.

[42] See Habicht 1979, 199–201; Goldstein 1983, 157–58.

[43] See Crönert 1910, 157–58; Klauck 2006, 19.

appears also at the head of a royal Seleucid letter written late in 164 (II 9:19–27). Special circumstances probably explain the use of the formula there."[44] The "royal Seleucid letter" referred to here is the deathbed epistle of Antiochus IV (9:19–27), which, as mentioned previously (1.2.2), is generally considered to be falsified, contra Goldstein, who believes that "whether authentic or forged, [it] is a real Seleucid document" (p. 360).[45] In fact, it does not seem improbable that the same hand that tampered with Antiochus' letter in chapter 9 also tampered with the second prefixed letter. Goldstein further argues against a date in the period 67 BCE–73 CE, during which the formula χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν was in use (pp. 540–45), and suggests instead a date in the reign of Alexander Jannaeus, more precisely 103/2 BCE (pp. 163–64). Schwartz (2008, 529) has proposed a much earlier date, sometime before 143/142 BCE, when, as he believes, both the first and second letters were added to the epitome. Avoiding pinpointing a precise date, Parker (2007, 387) considers the letter to be an "early first century B.C. forgery," a supposition that cannot be very far from the truth.

As regards its language, the second letter, like that which precedes it, is currently thought to be a translation of a Semitic original, although some scholars have suggested that it might have been written in an "idiomatic Greek"[46] or in a "translation-Greek" style.[47] Goldstein (1983, 164) claimed Hebrew as the underlying language.[48] Torrey (1940, 130–35) made a case for both prefixed letters having an Aramaic *Vorlage* (Aramaic being the language usually used in this type of correspondence between Jews in Judea and Egypt at the time) and offered a complete retroversion of them into that language (pp. 141–46).[49]

---

[44] The arguments adduced by Goldstein (1983, 361–63) to explain the use of the formula in Antiochus' letter (the king's "strange greeting behavior" and the influence of Epicureanism) are not really convincing.

[45] Similarly, Taatz (1991, 31) argues that all the evidence showing that the formula χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν is attested only in the first centuries BCE and CE is of Greek-Egyptian origin, whereas the second prefixed letter comes from an area under Seleucid influence, which offers one more example of a letter bearing the formula, namely the letter of the Seleucid king Antiochus IV in 2 Macc 9:19–27. Taatz does not make any comment on the authenticity of the latter document other than that it was originally a "Zirkularschreiben." The fact is that the formula in question is not attested in any authentic Seleucid or non-Seleucid royal letter (see Welles 1934) or in any other letter written in an area under Seleucid influence. Taatz (1991, 31–32) also argues that the translator of the second letter, by using the formula χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν, may have sought to render the extended Aramaic Shalom-formula "peace and health," which is attested in a fifth-century BCE ostracon from Elephantine (Dupont-Sommer 1945, 20, 22) The chronological distance between the two documents makes this possibility unlikely. On this issue, see also Goldstein 1983, 165–66.

[46] So Bickerman, cited in Goldstein 1983, 164. See also Grimm 1857, 23–24.

[47] So Hanhart 1961, 29 [451].

[48] However, on page 25 he asserts that "Ep. 2 is written in idiomatic Hellenistic Greek."

[49] Schwartz (2008, 522) also cites a retroversion of the two letters in Hebrew by M. Hack ("Two Hanukkah Letters," *Sinai* 12 (1942/43), 92–99 (in Hebrew)).

1.2.4 The date of the prefixed letters and the date of the epitome

The most difficult question that the two prefixed letters give rise to is by whom and when they were attached to the epitome. Various—indeed all—possibilities have been advanced.[50] We shall confine our review to the opinions of some recent scholars.

Momigliano's (1994, 38–40) theory is that in 124 BCE an officer of the Jerusalem Council commissioned the writer that we designate as the epitomator to produce an abridgement of Jason's work; the abridgement was sent to Egypt together with a festal letter (written by the officer), which referred to a previous missive of 143 BCE, as well as with the transcription of a letter purportedly written by Judas Maccabeus in 164 BCE, to which the officer, in collaboration with the epitomator, may have added the long excursus between 1:18 and 2:16.

For Habicht (1979, 174–76), the epitome and the first prefixed letter date from 124 BCE, whereas the second letter was added at a later phase by a redactor/editor ("Bearbeiter") who reworked the epitome and gave it the form in which we know it today. The time of the addition of the second letter and the reworking of the epitome, Habicht argues, cannot be determined with precision; it can be roughly placed between 124 BCE and 70 CE.

Goldstein (1983, 25–26, 167) maintains that around 103 BCE the author of the forged second letter appended it to the authentic first letter of 124 BCE and published them together; sometime after 78/77 BCE, when the epitome of Jason's work was made, someone prefixed both letters to the epitome and sent them to Egypt to promote the feast of the rededication of the Temple in the same way that Greek Esther was sent to the Jews of Egypt to promote Purim.

As mentioned earlier, Schwartz (2008, 11, 14, 527–29) posits that as early as 143 BCE some Jerusalemite Jews sent the epitome to Egypt as an attachment to two letters, the first penned by them and the second supposedly written by Judas Maccabeus; at the same time, they slightly edited the epitome by inserting a passage (10:1–8) that recounts the rededication of the Temple and justifies its celebration.

Doran (2012, 14–15) avoids presenting a scenario about the date of composition of the epitome in connection with the time and the conditions under which the two letters were written and prefixed to it; on the basis of the previously discussed (1.2.1) possible identification of Eupolemus the diplomat (2 Macc 4:11) with Eupolemus the writer, he argues that the epitomator wrote for an audience familiar with Eupolemus' work, admitting that this "does not provide us with a hard time frame" (p. 15) and finally stating that "conclusions about the dating and location of the work are difficult to arrive at" (p. 17).[51]

---

[50] For references to older literature, see Pfeiffer 1949, 507–8.

[51] In his *Temple Propaganda* (1981, 112), Doran had argued for a date of composition early in the reign of John Hyrcanus I (134–104 BCE). For a review of the various suggestions which have so far been put forward about the date of composition of the epitome, ranging from the second half of the second century BCE to the first half of the first century CE, see Doran 2012, 14–15.

Here, we will basically accept as a working hypothesis Habicht's (1979, 175–77) theory about the stages of composition of 2 Maccabees, according to which three layers can be distinguished in the book. The first is that of Jason of Cyrene's history, datable broadly to between 161 BCE (the date of the last event narrated in the epitome, the sending of a Jewish embassy to Rome shortly after Judas' victory over Nicanor [4:11]) and 124 BCE and, more narrowly, between 161 and 152 BCE. The second is that of the epitome, which must have been produced not long before 124 BCE, when it was sent to Egypt as an attachment to the first letter, which bears that date. This is the only layer, according to Habicht (p. 175), that can be dated with high probability. The third layer is datable to sometime between 124 BCE and the destruction of the Temple in 70 CE, when an unknown redactor/editor reworked the epitome into the form that has come down to us by shifting the sequence of some events but preserving to the greatest extent possible its diction, and appended to the first letter the partly or wholly fabricated second letter.

Habicht postulates that the most significant intervention on the part of the redactor/editor was the insertion of chapter 7,[52] which recounts the martyrdom of the seven Jewish brothers and their mother, and possibly the passages 12:43–45 and 14:37–46 (the death of Razis), which put forward the same belief in corporal resurrection as that expressed in chapter 7. He also wonders whether the final redactor/editor may have tampered with those passages in which two competing versions seem to have been worked together (the Heliodorus episode in chapter 3, Eleazar's martyrdom in chapter 6, and the end of Antiochus IV in chapter 9); the primary version underlying these passages may belong to Jason and the secondary version to the final redactor/editor. Lastly, he expresses uncertainty about whether the final verse of the epitome (15:36)— right before the epitomator's epilogue—which mentions the feast of Purim, is to be assigned to Jason, the epitomator, or the final redactor/editor. As Habicht notes (pp. 176–77), if we manage to establish the authorship and the date of composition of the aforecited moot sections of 2 Maccabees, putatively ascribed to the final redactor/editor, we will be able to determine with more precision when the book took its final form.[53]

---

[52] On the various theories about the origin of chapter 7, see van Henten 1997, 17–18n1 and Schwartz 2008, 20–25. Proponents of a late date for the martyrologies of chapters 6 and 7 are Bowersock 1995, 12 (second half of the first century CE), Shepkaru 2006, 31 (first century CE), and McClellan 2009, 92 (after 70 CE and before the second half of the second century CE). A late date for chapter 9 (after 70 CE) has been posited by Gauger (2002, 60). Lévy (1955, 33) has dated the entire epitome to as late as the latter half of the first century CE.

[53] A similar three-layer, or, more precisely, three-hands theory has more recently been proposed by Parker (2007), based on the analysis of the seven letters contained in 2 Maccabees. Parker posits that Antiochus IV's letter in chapter 9 was forged close to the 160s BCE by Jason of Cyrene, the authentic official letters in chapter 11 were inserted sometime between the mid- to late-second century BCE and the mid-first century BCE by the epitomator, who also reworked the narrative so as to adapt it to the content of the letters, as he understood them, and the two prefixed letters (the first genuine, the second forged by an unknown person in the early first century BCE) were ultimately added after the first half of the first century BCE by a revisor who, aside from shifting chapter 9 to its present position, made no changes to

Since a fixed chronological point is needed for the examination of the neologisms occurring in 2 Maccabees, we will take, as a working hypothesis, following Habicht (1979, 175) and others,[54] the year 124 BCE as the most likely date of composition of the epitome by the epitomator, on the assumption, posited by Habicht, that, even if a subsequent redactor/editor gave the book the final form in which it has come down to us, the adjustments that he made did not alter significantly the diction of his base text, except perhaps in those passages (cited in the previous paragraph) in which his intervention may have been more dynamic.[55]

1.2.5 Language and vocabulary of the epitome

Since St. Jerome,[56] there has been no doubt that the epitome of 2 Maccabees (and presumably Jason's history before it) was originally composed in Greek.[57] Its author demonstrates a good command of the Hellenistic Koine of his day. Its vocabulary, syntax, and style clearly distinguish it from the Septuagint versions of the canonical historical books of the Bible, and even from thematically related deuterocanonical /apocryphal books such as 1 Maccabees, and affiliate it not only with other original Greek compositions included in the Septuagint, like 3 and 4 Maccabees and the Wisdom of Solomon, but also with extra-Septuagintal Jewish-Greek writings like the Letter of Aristeas.[58] Even more pronounced are its linguistic affinities with non-Jewish historiographical works of the second and first centuries BCE, such as Polybius' *Histories* and Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History*,[59] as well as with the epigraphical documents of the period, especially those bearing decrees of the public assembly and

---

the text. Parker, however, does not explain why a revisor who supposedly worked as late as after the mid-first century BCE would have chosen to add to the epitome a festal letter from 124 BCE (Parker, following Bickerman, accepts that the letter is dated to that year) and not from any other year, considering that festal letters were presumably sent from Jerusalem to Egypt on an annual basis, "whatever may have been the number actually sent out from Jerusalem" (Torrey 1940, 122).

[54] Niese 1900, 292; Abel 1949, xliii; Momigliano 1994, 39; Schürer 1986, 3.1:532; van Henten 1997, 53.

[55] Habicht 1979, 175: "Daher verdient nach näherer Prüfung der Umstände die Annahme den Vorzug, dass die im Jahre 124 entstandene Epitome in späterer Zeit, als ihr der zweite Einleitungsbrief vorangestellt wurde, nochmals umgestaltet wurde, wobei *unter möglichster Bewahrung des Wortlauts* [emphasis ours] die Reihenfolge mancher Begebenheiten verschoben wurde."

[56] See *Praef. in libr. Sam. et Mal.*, PL 28.602–3: "Machabaeorum primum librum, Hebraicum reperi; secundus Graecus est: quod ex ipsa quoque φράσει probari potest."

[57] See Grimm 1857, 6; Goldstein 1989, 20n54. This is not the case for the two prefixed letters, whose originals, as previously noted (1.2.3), were most likely written in Hebrew or Aramaic. A Semitic *Vorlage* has also been posited by some scholars for chapter 7, which is written in a plainer and more paratactic style, marked by a few Hebraisms, than the other chapters (see Habicht 1979, 171, 233). See, however, Doran 1981, 22.

[58] See van Henten 1997, 20–21.

[59] See Grimm 1857, 7; Niese 1900, 298; Mugler 1931, 420; Palm 1955, 199–200; id. 1957, 65–66; Habicht 1979, 190; van Henten 1997, 21; Schwartz 2008, 67.

royal letters.[60] As Habicht (1976, 1; cf. id. 1979, 185) has appositely observed, "from the theological point of view [2 Maccabees] is purely Jewish, from the literary point of view it is almost entirely Greek."

Commentators have, on the one hand, pointed out the "dearth of echoes of Scripture at the level of style and diction"[61] and the paucity of Hebraisms[62] and, on the other hand, identified the "influence of Attic literary models"[63] and detected echoes of Classical Greek writers such as Plato, Euripides, and Aeschines.[64] The author (Jason, the epitomator, or both) had apparently received training in Greek rhetoric, evidenced in the abundance of rhetorical figures and stylistic embellishments that he employs: antithesis, parallelism, chiasmus, homoioteleuton, tricolon, parison, litotes, alliteration, paronomasia, gradation, variation, hyperbaton, hypallage, personification, hyperbole, irony,[65] periphrastic and abstract expressions, metaphors,[66] and occasional prose rhythm.[67] The ornate rhetorical style and the use of emotional language aiming at arousing pathos[68] has led scholars to categorize 2 Maccabees into such genres as 'Asianic' writing[69] and 'pathetic'[70] or 'tragic'[71] historiography.

The epitomator achieves the concision that he aims at (see 2:31) through an excessive use of participles (1,026),[72] passive verbs,[73] and several asyndeta.[74] His prologue, by contrast, consists of a series of long periods, displaying rare words, verbal adjectives in -τέος, and homoioteleuton,[75] which attest to his striving after an elevated style.

The vocabulary of the book is especially rich and diverse. It comprises 2,343 different words (2,176, if proper nouns are excluded) out of a total of 11,921 words (11,385 not

---

[60] See Niese 1900, 298; Habicht 1979, 190; Kennell 2005.

[61] deSilva 2002, 272; cf. Schwartz 2008, 61–63.

[62] Grimm 1857, 6; Doran 1981, 22n68, 34–36; Le Moigne 2012, 254–55, 258–59, 261.

[63] Doran 1981, 27.

[64] Goldstein 1984, 21. Cf. Le Moigne 2012, 269. On the possible direct or indirect influence of Euripides, see van Henten 1997, 145–46, 157–58, 185 and Bremmer 2008a, 201–3, 213.

[65] According to Habicht (1979, 190), "Ironie ist dem Buch fremd und wäre auch dem Ernst der Erzählung nicht angemessen." See, however, Doran 1981, 58n28 and especially Nicklas 2007. On the author's "satirical bite" and "wry sense of humor," see Schwartz 2008, 81 and (less convincingly) Gruen 2002, 177–80, respectively.

[66] See Richnow 1966, 192–95 and Nicklas 2015.

[67] See examples of these figures in Grimm 1857, 6–7; Palm 1955, 199; Gil 1958, 21–30; Richnow 1966, 192–95; Doran 1981, 42–45; Le Moigne 2012, 268–71.

[68] See Schwartz 2008, 78–80.

[69] See Gil 1958, 30–31, Richnow 1966, 190, and the objections raised by Doran 1981, 45n92.

[70] See Bickerman 2007h, 1129–30; Abel 1949, xxxvi–xxxvii; Habicht 1979, 189.

[71] 2 Maccabees' adherence to the 'tragic' school of Hellenistic historiography is defended by Bar-Kochva 1989, 172–78. For a different view, see Doran 1981, 84–89; cf. Schwartz 2008, 78–79n181.

[72] See Mugler 1931, 422; Bar-Kochva 1989, 178; Schwartz 2008, 73–74.

[73] See Schwartz 2008, 74–75.

[74] See Gil 1958, 21; Le Moigne 2012, 262–65.

[75] See Doran 1981, 33–34; id. 2012, 74.

counting proper nouns).[76] It has the second highest number of different words of all the books of the Septuagint after Sirach (2,401/2,329), which, however, has a higher total number of words (18,668/18,529).[77] Moreover, it has the highest number of Septuagint *hapax legomena* (339, if proper names are excluded), that is, words that occur once in this book and nowhere else in the entire Septuagint corpus,[78] followed by 4 Maccabees (328), Wisdom (251), Sirach (219), and 3 Maccabees (198). This lexical distinctiveness is undoubtedly due to the fact that 2 Maccabees (bar the two prefixed letters) is not a translated text but an original Greek composition, whose literary and linguistic models were mainly profane Greek and not Septuagintal works. Thus, it is not surprising that it teems with words common in profane Greek literature but alien to the spiritual world of the Bible.[79]

This is not to say that 2 Maccabees does not exhibit lexical affinities with other books of the Septuagint, especially the original Greek compositions and the literary translations. If one examines the vocabulary that is exclusively common to 2 Maccabees and a single other book of the Septuagint, one sees that our book shares 54 words exclusively with 3 Maccabees, 40 words with 4 Maccabees, 16 words with Proverbs, 14 words with Wisdom, 1 Maccabees, and Sirach, 11 words with 1 Esdras, 8 words with Esther, 7 with Job, 5 with Isaiah, Jeremiah, Daniel, and Judith, 4 with Joshua, the Psalms, and Tobit, and 3 with Exodus, 3 Kingdoms, and Ezekiel. There are also 154 words that 2 Maccabees shares exclusively with two other books of the Septuagint: of these, 48 are common between 2 and 3 Maccabees, and one more book, 33 are common between 2 and 4 Maccabees, and one more book, and 10 are shared exclusively by 2, 3, and 4 Maccabees. The similarities in the vocabularies of 2, 3, and 4 Maccabees are due to the linguistic influence exerted upon them by profane Greek rather than Septuagintal works;[80] they are also, to some degree, indicative of the influence exercised by the first of these books over the other two.

What characterizes the vocabulary of 2 Maccabees most of all is its variety. The author seems to possess an inexhaustible reservoir of, inter alia, divine epithets,[81]

---

[76] The numerical data given here were gathered using the Accordance Software Program, on the basis of the text of 2 Maccabees contained in Rahlfs' Septuagint (see infra 1.9). The respective data, on the basis of Hanhart's text in the Göttingen Septuagint, are insignificantly different: 2,344 different words (2,192, if proper nouns are excluded) in a total of 11,925 words (11,402 not counting proper nouns).

[77] With regard to the type/token ratio, which reflects the diversity and density of the vocabulary of a text, it has to be noted that some Septuagint books that have a smaller number of tokens than 2 Maccabees appear to have a higher type/token ratio (hence, greater vocabulary diversity and density) than the latter's 19%, e.g. 3 Maccabees (1,413 types/5,039 tokens, ratio 28%), Wisdom (1,728 types/6,948 tokens, ratio 25%), 4 Maccabees (1,589 types/7,757 tokens, ratio 20%). This is because as the size of a corpus increases, the type/token ratio tends to decrease due to the repetition of high frequency function words. It is thus suggested to calculate the type/token ratio every *n* (say, 1,000 or 2,000) words and then compute the average of all the individual ratios ('standardized type/token ratio'). See Baker 2006, 52.

[78] Cf. the graph showing the distribution of the Septuagint *hapax legomena* in Wagner 1999, 5.

[79] See Gil 1958, 28–29; Himmelfarb 1998, 28, 33–36.

[80] See Hanhart 1961, 59–60 [481–82].

[81] See Gil 1958, 29–30; Doran 1981, 43; Schwartz 2008, 71.

vituperative epithets addressed to the enemies of the Jews or to villainous Jews,[82] words that denote fear and related emotions,[83] and verbs that denote 'to die' and 'to kill.'[84] He also has a fondness for double and triple compounds formed with various prefixes, δυσ- and ευ- being among his favourite, appearing in 15 and 55 different words, respectively, more than in any other book of the Septuagint.[85]

Another characteristic of the book's vocabulary, noted by most commentators,[86] is that it hosts a high number of poetic or rare words, of *hapax legomena* and neologisms, and words used in an uncommon or novel sense. So far, the most extensive (but by no means comprehensive) treatment of these features is found in Richnow (1966). Richnow lists 27 *hapax legomena*-cum-neologisms[87] and 16 words rarely attested anywhere else other than in 2 Maccabees, as well as a small number of poetic words.[88] With regard to the *hapax legomena*, he notes that they do not so much attest to the author's pursuit of lexical originality as to his effort to enhance expressivity; more than half of them are compound verbs whose prefixes are intended either to strengthen the meaning of the simplex or to express an adverbial concept (pp. 49, 52).

The neologisms of 2 Maccabees are, of course, not as few in number as the approximately two dozen *hapax legomena* tracked by Richnow and others,[89] many, if not most, of which, one may assume, were coined by the author of the book. There are also numerous other words which, albeit not unique in ancient Greek literature, are attested for the first time in 2 Maccabees—without our knowing whether they were coined by the author of this book or not—and then recur with varying frequency in other Jewish-Greek works, within or outside the Septuagint, and later in Christian literature, or in profane Greek literary and non-literary texts. There are also words, fewer in number, whose first attestation is found in Septuagint books assumed to have been translated at a time prior to the composition of the epitome or, given the uncertainty that prevails as to the chronology of the books of the Septuagint, perhaps contemporaneously to it. Lastly, one can identify a handful of words which are first found in profane Greek works which are chronologically close to the posited date for the composition of the epitome, e.g. in Polybius' *Histories*. Before launching into an examination of all these different types of neologisms, which, as stated in 1.1, are the

---

[82] See Knabenbauer 1907, 266; Pfeiffer 1949, 513.

[83] δέος (3:17, 30; 12:22; 13:16; 15:23), φόβος (6:30; 12:22; 15:18), φοβερός (1:24; 3:25), τρόμος (15:23), φρικασμός (3:17), φοβέομαι (7:29), καταπλήσσομαι (8:16), εὐλαβέομαι (8:16), διευλαβέομαι (9:29).

[84] See de Bruyne 1921, 408–9; Hanhart 1961, 36 [485]; Schwartz 2008, 70–71.

[85] See Shaw 2016, 410.

[86] See Grimm 1857, 7; Niese 1900, 300; Abel 1949, xxxvi; Gil 1958, 28–29; Hanhart 1961, 35 [457], 59 [481]; Doran 1981, 42; Schwartz 2008, 67–68.

[87] A few of these words are not really *hapax legomena*, although LSJ cites only their instances in 2 Maccabees, e.g. ὑπευλαβέομαι (also in Memn. *FHG* 3:42.5), προσεξηγέομαι (also in Ph. *Legat.* 197), προοδηγός (also in Sib. Or. 8.24).

[88] See pp. 48–52 for the *hapax legomena* and the rare words and pp. 53–57 for the poetic words.

[89] See, e.g., Schwartz (2008, 67–68), who lists 26 words "for which Liddell-Scott-Jones refers to our book alone."

object of the investigation undertaken in the present study, it is first necessary to define what constitutes a Septuagint neologism and survey the ways in which neologisms have been previously treated in Septuagint scholarship.

1.3 Definitions of neologism in Septuagint studies and lexicography

As a starting point for our discussion of the Septuagint neologisms we will take a number of definitions that have been proposed over the years within Septuagint literature. First, we will look at some of the definitions that have been put forward in various Septuagint studies; then, we will examine the definitions that have been formulated within Septuagint lexicography.

1.3.1 Definitions put forward in various Septuagint studies

> a) A neologism of the LXX[90] is a Greek word which, to the best of our knowledge, was coined either by the translators of the LXX or by a previous generation, in order to express biblical words which, in their view, could not be expressed adequately by the existing Greek vocabulary. Neologisms are either compounds which use elements existing in the Greek language or are derivatives of known roots. (Tov 1999, 139)

> b) La partie nouvelle du lexique de la LXX,[91] par rapport au grec classique ou au grec profane des papyrus, a deux sources principales: des termes anciens pris dans des sens nouveaux (néologismes sémantiques) par suite de leur adoption en milieu juif pour nommer ce qui est spécifique du culte et des convictions du judaïsme à cette époque; des termes nouveaux, forgés pour mieux correspondre à la forme des mots hébreux ou pour désigner des réalités juives que ne pouvait nommer aucun mot grec usuel. Ces néologismes-là sont assez rares. (Harl, *BGS*, 246)

> c) Les néologismes sont des mots nouveaux qui sont créés par les auteurs de la Septante . . . parce que le stock de mots de la langue grecque n'avait rien pour exprimer le sens de l'hébreu. (Eynikel 1999, 146)

> d) Hatten hebräische Ausdrücke keine passende Entsprechung im zeitgenössischen griechischen Wortschatz oder wollte man ihre unvergleichliche Einzigartigkeit zum

[90] In the study in which this definition is given, the term 'LXX' refers broadly to the corpus of Greek translations of the canonical books of the Hebrew Bible and not narrowly to the Greek translation of the Pentateuch.

[91] Throughout the chapter "La langue de la Septante" (*BGS*, 223–66), Harl uses the term 'LXX' only with reference to the Greek versions of the books of the Hebrew canon. The language of the original Greek compositions included in the Septuagint is not discussed at all.

> Ausdruck bringen, bildeten die Übersetzer zuweilen Neuschöpfungen. . . . Es ist allerdings auch in Betracht zu ziehen, dass manche dieser angeblichen biblischen Neologismen (Wörter, die vor bzw. ausser ihrer biblischen Verwendung nicht belegt sind) in Wirklichkeit geläufige Wörter waren, die ausser in der Septuaginta an keiner anderen Stelle mehr bezeugt sind. (Tilly 2005, 72–73)

A point on which most of the above-quoted definitions converge is that the Septuagint neologisms are 'new' words coined by the translators of the Hebrew Bible in order to render Hebrew terms for which no adequate equivalent (or no equivalent at all) existed in Greek. The objection that one might want to raise against this statement, as well as against the definitions that it summarizes, concerns the assumption underlying it, namely that the Septuagint is a *translation* from end to end, and, further, that the coinage of the Septuagint neologisms is related exclusively to the translation technique of the Greek translators of the Hebrew Bible. This is a narrow way of treating the phenomenon of neologisms in the Septuagint. It is true, of course, that as much as approximately 95 percent of the corpus that we commonly call the Septuagint (LXX)[92] consists of translated texts that have a Hebrew or Aramaic *Vorlage*, either preserved or posited. There are, however, a small number of books, or portions of books, which form part of the Septuagint but have no Semitic *Vorlage* since they were originally written in Greek: 2 Maccabees (except for the prefixed letters, 1:1–2:18), 3 and 4 Maccabees, the Wisdom of Solomon, Additions B and E (3:13a–g; 8:12a–x Rahlfs) and the colophon (F:11=10:31 Rahlfs) to Esther, and the translator's prologue to Sirach (Prol. 1:1–36).[93] This list could be extended to include more books or portions of books, the original language of which is a matter of debate, e.g. Baruch 3:9–5:9 and the Epistle of Jeremiah, or even Judith, the Additions to Daniel, and the Psalms of Solomon, for which it has been claimed that they may have been written in a Septuagintizing Greek rather than translated from a Semitic

[92] In Septuagint studies the term 'Septuagint' has been used either narrowly or broadly to denote: (a) the 'Septuagint proper,' that is, the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek by seventy (actually seventy-two) Jewish elders in Alexandria in the third century BCE, according to the legend preserved in the Letter of Aristeas; (b) the 'extended Septuagint,' that is, the Greek translations of the twenty-four canonical books of the Hebrew Bible, plus the so-called deuterocanonical or apocryphal books, which include both translations of books or portions of books outside the Hebrew canon and Jewish writings originally composed in Greek. To distinguish the original or oldest recoverable translations of the books of the Hebrew canon, which were made after the translation of the Pentateuch, from the latter and from later revisions and new translations, the term Old Greek (OG) is used; (c) the modern diplomatic or reconstructed editions of the texts mentioned in (b); (d) the Greek version of a particular book of the Septuagint corpus. See Tov 1988, 161–62, 181; Jobes and Silva 2000, 30–32; Dines 2004, 1–3. Unless otherwise specified, the present study will be using the term 'Septuagint' with reference to the Göttingen critical edition of the Septuagint, supplemented, for the books not yet published in this series, by Rahlfs' partially critical edition of the Septuagint from 1935, as revised by R. Hanhart in 2006. See 1.9.

[93] See *BGS*, 84–85. Dorival (*BGS*, 84) adds to the list of original Greek compositions contained in the Septuagint the neo-testamentary Odes 9 and 13, and the slightly posterior Ode 14. He does not include Ode 12 (Prayer of Manasseh), which may be an original Greek composition rather than a translation (see *CCS*, 336–38). One may also mention here the Greek 'pluses' to be found in some Septuagint books, e.g. the ca. 130 verses in the Septuagint of Proverbs (see d'Hamonville 2000, 43, 48–56) and vv. 2:9a–e and 42:17a–e in the Septuagint of Job (see Gray 1920), which have no equivalent in the Masoretic Text.

Vorlage.[94] The original Greek compositions form a subgroup within the so-called deuterocanonical or apocryphal books, which themselves occupy a somewhat marginal position within the Septuagint.[95] Yet, this is no reason to consider them negligible when Septuagintal linguistic features such as the neologisms are discussed, although the occurrence of the latter in the original Greek books is apparently due to different reasons than those that account for their occurrence in the translated ones.[96] It may even be that this particular linguistic feature is much more prominent in the original Greek compositions than it is in the translated books of the Septuagint.[97] Accordingly, a definition of what constitutes a Septuagint neologism should not leave out of account the new coinages that occur in the non-translated books of the Septuagint.

1.3.2 Definitions put forward in Septuagint lexicography

> a) Neubildungen der LXX oder Wörter, welche dem Sprachschatze dieser Übersetzung allein eigentümlich sind. Zu diesen zählen diejenigen Vokabeln, welche, so weit bis jetzt nachgewiesen, von keinem Schriftsteller früherer Zeit gebraucht worden sind und nur von

---

[94] For the original language of Baruch and the Epistle of Jeremiah, see *CCS*, 488, 492–93 and 522–25, respectively; for Judith, see *CCS*, 227–28 and Joosten 2012; for the Additions to Daniel, see *CCS*, 557, 559–61; for the Psalms of Solomon, see Joosten 2015.

[95] The deuterocanonical/apocryphal books are included, indiscriminately from the Greek translations of the canonical books of the Hebrew Bible, in the earliest Christian manuscripts that contain the whole of the Greek Old Testament, namely the uncial codices Vaticanus (B), Sinaiticus (א), and Alexandrinus (A) from the fourth and fifth centuries CE. B contains all the deuterocanonical books bar 1–4 Maccabees, which are found in A. א includes 1 and 4 Maccabees but lacks 1 Esdras, Baruch, and the Epistle of Jeremiah. See Swete 1914, 201–2. Rather arbitrarily, certain modern scholars leave out of any discussion of the Septuagint those deuterocanonical/apocryphal books that have no known Semitic *Vorlage*. Cf., for example, Melvin K.H. Peters, "Septuagint," *ABD* 5:1094: "Despite the long-established contrary practice (such as found in Rahlfs' manual edition), whole books without known Hebrew equivalents are not considered Septuagint. They are usually listed also as Apocrypha and even Pseudepigrapha, and again, since much of LXX discussion concerns translation technique, that question is moot in such books."

[96] On the reasons that may motivate the creation of neologisms in a translated book of the Septuagint, e.g. the book of Psalms, see Munnich 1982, 159–206, esp. 202–6, and 535–36.

[97] Although there are no statistical data concerning the number of 'new' words to be found in each and every book of the Septuagint, one can postulate that some of the non-canonical books, and especially some of the original Greek compositions among them, have a very high proportion of neologisms—if not the highest of all the books of the Septuagint. This supposition rests on the large number of Septuagint *hapax legomena* (words that occur only once in the Septuagint) to be found in these books and on the correlation between *hapax legomena* and neologisms that studies measuring the productivity of affixes in text corpora of present-day languages have demonstrated to exist (see Baayen and Renouf 1996, 76). Indeed, five deuterocanonical books (2, 3, 4 Maccabees, Sirach, and Wisdom), four of which were originally composed in Greek, exhibit the highest number of Septuagint *hapax legomena* of all the books of the Septuagint (see 1.2.5). If the above-mentioned correlation between *hapax legomena* and neologisms can be proved to be valid for an ancient, mixed corpus of translation- and composition-Greek texts such as the Septuagint, then it is expected that the aforenamed deuterocanonical/apocryphal books will exhibit a very high number of neologisms—if not the highest in the Septuagint.

solchen späteren, welche in sachlicher Abhängigkeit zur LXX stehen, wie das Neue Testament, Philo, Josephus oder Kirchenschriftsteller. (Hartung 1886, 22)[98]

b) Vokabeln, die nur in der LXX oder erstmalig in der LXX belegt sind und für die spätere Literatur prägend geworden sind, werden mit * gekennzeichnet. (Rehkopf 1989, viii)[99]

c) When a word appears to be proper to the LXX and the literature depending on it, it is characterized as a neologism. If it occurs in the LXX as well as in the contemporary papyri and literature (beginning with Polybius, 2nd c. BCE), it is also labelled as a neologism but a question mark is added. The label "neol." suggests then that the word in question was probably not used before the time of the composition of the LXX.[100] (Lust in LEH, xiv)

d) The asterisk, *, signifies that the word is not attested earlier than the Septuagint. The decision in this regard, mostly dependent on Liddell, Scott, and Jones's dictionary, can be debatable. Many papyri and other epigraphical material are undated or cannot be dated with confidence. Words so marked do not have to be neologisms created by Septuagint translators. When a word or usage marked with an asterisk is attested in Polybius, for instance, it is likely that its absence prior to the Septuagint is due to incomplete attestation, for Polybius is hardly under direct influence of the Septuagint. In this connection it may be interesting to know whether an etymologically and semantically related word or words are attested earlier than the entry word. . . . These neologisms amount to about 1,900, roughly one fifth of the total LXX vocabulary. The asterisk is also used in the main body of the entry . . . where the uncertainty equally prevails, and perhaps to a greater degree. (Muraoka in *GELS*, xiii)

In most of the above-quoted definitions, the main criterion for the designation of a word occurring in the Septuagint as a neologism seems to be its being proper to the Septuagint, and, further, to the literature depending on it. These definitions practically equate the neologisms with what in older literature was known as *voces solum biblicae et ecclesiasticae*. They imply that the neologisms were coined by the translators/authors of the Septuagint, were used exclusively in the Septuagint and other Jewish-Greek writings, the New Testament, and, later, the writings of the Church Fathers, which were based on or influenced by the Septuagint, and did not infiltrate the general language, as they are not attested in secular texts. It cannot be denied, of course, that

[98] Hartung's *Septuaginta-Studien: Ein Beitrag zur Gräcität dieser Bibelübersetzung* (1886) is mentioned along with the modern Septuagint lexica because, being, to the best of our knowledge, the first study which attempted to identify the neologisms of the Septuagint, it anticipated the efforts of modern-day Septuagint lexicographers to treat this linguistic feature.

[99] To be precise, Rehkopf here does not give a definition of neologism, since he does not use the term 'neologism,' yet the words that he marks with an asterisk correspond to the ones designated as neologisms in other Septuagint lexica, e.g. in LEH.

[100] Cf. LEH, ciii: "The qualifier neol. at the end of a lemma indicates that the word in question is a neologism. In other words, that lemma occurs only in the LXX and in the literature based on it."

words that are peculiar to the Septuagint have a good chance of having been coined by the translators/authors of the books that belong to this corpus.[101] However, the designation of a word as a neologism cannot depend solely on its occurring exclusively in a specific corpus or a specific type of literature; this may, after all, be due to pure chance in some cases. The most striking example one can adduce to illustrate this last point is the word προσήλυτος, which until recently was thought to be peculiar to the Septuagint and the literature depending on it. The publication in 2011 by Butera and Moffitt of a fragment of papyrus (*P.Duk.* inv. 727r) found in a Faiyum mummy cartonnage, which mentions a commotion caused by some newcomers (προσήλυτοι) who took possession of a piece of land, shows that the term belonged to the vernacular language of the mid-to-late third century BCE (that is, close to the time of the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek)[102] and did not, at that time, have the religious signification ("Gentile convert to Judaism") that the Septuagint scholarship attributed to it, but rather denoted an alien resident.[103]

A definition like that proposed by Muraoka, which gives pre-eminence to the chronological factor (somewhat downplayed in the other definitions), comes closer to what the term 'neologism' commonly denotes: a word (but also a meaning, usage, etc.) perceived as new at a particular time, its novelty being made evident by the lack of any attestations of it before this particular time.

To be sure, at a distance of more than two thousand years from the nearly four-century-long period of composition of the Septuagint, it is impossible to pronounce with any certainty whether a word occurring in one of the books of the Septuagint corpus was 'new' at the time of translation/composition of this book, let alone to determine with confidence whether it was coined by the translator/author of this particular book.[104] Our knowledge of the Greek language of that period is so fragmentary, the amount of perished works so incommensurable, that the modern

---

[101] This is apparently the case with the words coined to express Jewish realities that had no common Greek equivalent. As Harl (*BGS*, 246) points out, these neologisms are quite rare. Already Swete (1914, 307) had noted five characteristic examples of words "coined or adopted to express Semitic ideas": ἀκροβυστία, ἀναθεματίζειν, ὁλοκαύτωμα, σκανδαλίζειν, σπλαγχνίζειν (see the discussion of these terms in Dorival 2016, 291–92). The same can be said of the words that are "precise replicas" of the Hebrew (see Tov 1999, 140).

[102] The papyrus has been dated on palaeographical grounds to between 260 and 220 BCE, "though a date as late as 150 BCE cannot be ruled out" (Butera and Moffitt 2011, 202).

[103] See Butera and Moffitt 2011, 202 and Moffitt and Butera 2013. Cf. the example of διασάφησις discussed by Lee 1983, 47 and Aitken 2014, 72–75.

[104] See on this point Barr's (2014a, 100) important remark: "The fact that the LXX is the earliest quotable evidence does not necessarily mean that it created the word as a neologism. In many cases it is more likely that the term in question is a *koine* term which happens by chance not to be registered at any date before the third century. . . . I cannot see any reason why the LXX would have 'coined' words like κυνόμυια (κυνάμυια) or χοιρογρύλλιος. One could see some sense where some specific Jewish motivation could be discerned, as in θυσιαστήριον perhaps, but hardly in ῥοΐσκος, a term for the 'little pomegranates' of ritual garments." Cf. the remarks of Dover (1997, 117) on the difficulty of determining the paternity of a word attested for the first time in an author of the Classical period.

lexicographers' endeavour to distinguish between what is 'new' and what is 'old,' what is conscious coinage and what is accidental first attestation in the vocabulary of certain works that have haphazardly survived from the centuries around the turn of the Common Era, may at first blush seem to be hopeless. A word that may appear to us to be a neologism of a text written, say, in the second century BCE may in fact be an archaism that the author of the text had gleaned from a non-surviving work of, say, the fifth century BCE. Moreover, due to our knowledge of the ancient Greek language being based exclusively on *written* texts, we are not in the position to know if, and for how long, a word was in use in the *oral* language before its first recorded instance in a text known to us. Deissmann's (1908, 45) note of caution, that words that we think of as 'new' in biblical texts are often "little discoveries" of the lexicographers rather than inventions of the authors of these texts, should always be borne in mind.[105]

Such considerations make us wonder whether it would be more apposite to use a term other than 'neologism' to designate those words that appear to us to be novel because we find them attested for the first time in a given ancient text. The term 'protologism' would have been more appropriate had it not already been introduced in linguistics by M. Epstein to designate something quite different, namely a "freshly minted word not yet widely accepted."[106] *Proton legomenon*, a term originating in Classical philology, seems to us to be the most apt choice, as it places emphasis not on the real or presumed novelty of a word, but on the chronological fact of its being attested for the first time in extant Greek literature. A *proton legomenon* in one of the books of the Septuagint (either a translation or an original Greek composition) may be a word coined by the translator/author of this book, or a more or less recently coined word that the translator/author picked up from his linguistic milieu (a 'protologism' *sensu* Epstein), or an old word that existed in the oral and/or the written language for quite a long time—centuries, even—but, owing to the vagaries of preservation of ancient texts, left no traces in any other extant text earlier than the Septuagint book in which we encounter it for the first time; it may even be a word that the translator/author reinvented or coined independently, unaware of its previous instances. A Septuagint *proton legomenon* can be a Septuagint *hapax legomenon* or an absolute *hapax legomenon*, a word recurring exclusively in Jewish-Christian literature or a word recurring in both Jewish-Christian and secular texts. Due to the term 'neologism' being

[105] "Ebenso natürlich ist es, dass viele Wörter in sämtlichen auf uns gekommenen Texten nur selten, oft nur ein einziges Mal konstatiert werden können. Dass diese alle von den betreffenden Verfassern im Augenblick neu gebildet worden seien, wird kein verständiger Mensch glauben: es sind Fündlein der Lexikographen, nicht Erfindungen der Autoren." Cf. Harl (*BGS*, 247–48), who speaks of the 'pseudo-neologisms' of the Septuagint.

[106] See Epstein 2012, 101: "Protologisms and neologisms are different age groups of verbal population. Along with the decrepit, obsolescent archaisms facing death, and strong, thriving middle-aged words that make up the bulk of the vocabulary, we should recognize neologisms as the youngsters vigorously making their way into public spaces, and protologisms as the newborns still in their cradles and nurtured by their parents. Once a protologism has found its way into common usage, it becomes a neologism." On this term see also Aitken 2013, 316 and Haacker 2001, 56n17.

established in Septuagint literature as well as in studies in other fields dealing with texts from a range of historical periods, it is rather difficult to use *proton legomenon* as its substitute. Yet, when discussing the neologisms occurring in historical corpora, it is useful to keep in mind that what we are actually talking about is *proton legomena*.

Another point that can be made in relation to the definitions presented in both 1.3.1 and 1.3.2, is that, in most of them, the term 'neologism' is used with regard to new *words*. Only two definitions, those by Harl (1.3.1b) and Muraoka (1.3.2d), are broader and include new *meanings* and new *usages* of existing words, respectively.[107] Indeed, the typologies proposed by modern linguists to account for the neology production in various present-day languages usually go beyond the bipartite distinction of formal and semantic neologisms and encompass other categories as well. Of the numerous typologies that have been put forward over the years, we may mention here the typology of neologisms in French proposed by Pruvost and Sablayrolles (2012, 95–117), which, mutatis mutandis, seems relevant to the discussion of the Septuagint neologisms. This typology distinguishes between four internal matrices, which are responsible for the creation of neologisms within a language, and one external, which is associated with the borrowing of loanwords from other languages. Of the four internal matrices (the morpho-semantic, the syntactic-semantic, the purely morphological, and the semantic-pragmatic), the most relevant to the discussion of the Septuagint neologisms are the first two: the morpho-semantic matrix, which produces neologisms by affixation, composition, blending, onomatopoeia, paronymy, etc., and the syntactic-semantic matrix, which has to do with changes of syntactic function (e.g. conversion or recategorization, transitivisation of intransitive verbs, etc.), on the one hand, and semantic changes undergone by words via extension or restriction of their meaning, metaphor, metonymy, and other figures, on the other hand.

The only Septuagint lexicon that sought to come up with a convenient taxonomy of the Septuagint vocabulary, and of its neologisms in particular, is Chamberlain's *The Greek of the Septuagint*.[108] The most relevant categories presented in it are the "hapax legomena," the "words first found in the LXX," and the "words with no parallel meanings attested in secular Greek."[109] Yet, as we shall have the opportunity to point out in the following (1.4.4 and 1.5), the way in which this lexicon has dealt with some of these categories leaves a lot to be desired.

---

[107] Muraoka (2008, 230) interestingly elaborates further on this, apropos of the neologisms listed in the LEH lexicon: "LEH have counted only new *lexemes*, not new *senses* or *constructions, phraseologies, collocations* of the already known lexemes. LEH, of course, does not list, for example, inflected forms of nouns, especially verbs, which are attested for the first time in the LXX." Cf. Aitken (2013, 321), who calls for "more descriptors of so-called new words, identifying them as semantic extensions, unattested compounds, morphological extensions, foreign loans, and so on."

[108] See *GS* xi–xxix.

[109] See *GS*, xvi–xxii.

1.4 Identification of neologisms in the Septuagint lexica

Unlike other lexical features, such as the Septuagint *hapax legomena* (unique attestations in the Septuagint), which can nowadays easily and speedily be detected and quantified with the help of computer software programs, the Septuagint neologisms demand painstaking investigation in order to be identified. As a result, although we have at our disposal precise statistical data concerning the occurrence and the distribution of the Septuagint *hapax legomena* in the individual books of the Septuagint,[110] we lack analogous data with regard to the neologisms.[111] Greek lexicography lacks the equivalent of the *Chronological English Dictionary* (Finkenstaedt, Leisi, and Wolff 1970), which lists some 80,000 words in order of their earliest known occurrence in written English, or the *Oxford English Dictionary*, which dates the first recorded uses of English words. One might, of course, have recourse to the four lexica of the Septuagint,[112] which have commendably made the endeavour, unprecedented in Greek lexicography, to mark the neologisms, yet, for reasons that we will explain further below, the data that they offer are not always accurate and reliable.

In the following, we will attempt to briefly survey and evaluate the ways in which the compilers of these lexica have identified and measured the neologisms that occur in the Septuagint.

1.4.1. Rehkopf's *Septuaginta-Vokabular* (*SV*)

In his *Septuaginta-Vokabular*, Rehkopf marks with an asterisk the words that are attested only in the Septuagint[113] or that first appear in the Septuagint and subsequently recur in the literature dependent on it (see 1.3.2b). The number of words thus marked amounts to 944. It has to be noted, though, that about one-sixth of them are Greek transliterations of Hebrew or Aramaic words.[114] Rehkopf further uses a double asterisk

---

[110] See, e.g., the graph in Wagner 1999, 5.

[111] At best, we can find non-exhaustive lists of neologisms and *hapax legomena* in introductions to editions or translations of individual books of the Septuagint or in specialized lexical studies. The volumes of *La Bible d'Alexandrie* are especially informative in this regard.

[112] Rehkopf's *Septuaginta-Vokabular* [*SV*] (1989), Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie's *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* [LEH] (first edition, with the collaboration of G. Chamberlain, 1992–1996; revised edition, 2003; third corrected edition 2015), Muraoka's *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* [*GELS*] (first edition, covering only the Twelve Prophets, 1993; revised edition, covering the entire Septuagint, 2009), and Chamberlain's *The Greek of the Septuagint: A Supplemental Lexicon* [*GS*] (2011).

[113] Rehkopf's textual base is Rahlfs' *Septuaginta*; his Septuagint vocabulary list was established on the basis of the Hatch and Redpath *Concordance to the Septuagint*.

[114] The transliterated words are mainly proper names, technical terms relating to religion, architecture, measures and weights, etc., for which the translators could not find exact equivalents in Greek, as well as words which were contextually difficult or totally unknown to them (e.g. rare Hebrew words or *hapax legomena*) or which they mistook for proper names. Left untranslated and phonetically transcribed into

to mark twenty words, which, at the time of *Vokabular*'s compilation, were not registered in LSJ.[115] Most of these words are Septuagint neologisms, many of which remained unrecorded in LSJ's Revised Supplement of 1996.[116]

To identify the words that fall under the above-mentioned description, Rehkopf relied on LSJ,[117] a dictionary that has often been criticized for its inadequate treatment of the Septuagint lexical material.[118] As a result, his list of asterisked words is neither exhaustive nor free from error. To give just a few examples, μονοφάγος (4 Macc 2:7) is attested as early as the Attic Old Comedy (Ar. *V.* 923; Amips. fr. 24 Kock), as LSJ informs us; ἀποσκυθίζω, which in 4 Macc 10:7 denotes "to scalp," is first found in Euripides (*Tr.* 1026) in the sense "to close crop or shave the head"; γνωριστής, in 4 Kgdms 23:24, is previously attested in Antipho (5.94), albeit in a different sense; σκηνοπηγία, a cultic term in the Septuagint (9x), shows up first in Aristotle, who uses it of a swallow's nest-building (*HA* 612^{b}22). Evidently, Rehkopf's list of asterisked 'new' words comprises a certain number of Septuagint semantic neologisms, which should have been flagged in a different way.

1.4.2 Lust, Eynikel, and Hauspie's *Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (LEH)

In his "Introduction" to LEH, J. Lust explains that the lexicon uses two qualifiers to mark the neologisms that occur in the Septuagint, "neol.," for the words that are proper

---

Greek characters, they are indeclinable, except for a few which were hellenized by being integrated into the Greek morphological system (e.g. ὁ γειώρας, of Aramaic origin); some of the latter (as well as some others, e.g. the religious terms πασχα and σαββατα, both Aramaic loanwords) were probably in use among Greek-speaking Jews before the Pentateuch was translated into Greek (Thackeray 1909, 32; Tov 1988, 171–72; Joosten 2006, 358; id. 2010, 59). Bar very few, which were taken over into the New Testament and entered the language of Christian worship (e.g. αμην, αλληλουια), the transliterated words, being for the most part "translations of embarrassment," occur only in the Septuagint, once or passim, and did not gain any currency as loanwords in the general language (see Thackeray 1909, 31–36; Tov 1973, 81; id. 1999, 174–82; *BGS*, 261–62; Dorival 1996, 529–30; *GS*, xv–xvi, 188). Their number is hard to estimate accurately. Simotas (1969) gives a non-exhaustive list of 485 transliterated words, which includes a few of the most characteristic proper names. Rehkopf's *SV* lists 147 transliterations, LEH some 190, Chamberlain's *GS* 176, which do not recur in Christian literature, whereas Muraoka's *GELS*, with few exceptions, does not record the transliterated words. Transliterations are, strictly speaking, neologisms. Cf. Hauspie 2001, 19n5.

[115] However, a few of these words (e.g. ἀναπηδύω, ἀνδρογύναιος, διαμαχίζομαι, πάρινος) had already been added in the 1968 Supplement. μήνισις was added in the 1996 Revised Supplement.

[116] E.g. ἐκκόλαμμα (Exod 36:13), κοσμοφορέω (4 Macc 15:31), προσερυθριάω (Tob^{GII} 2:14), πυρόπνους (3 Macc 6:34), ῥάγμα (Amos 6:11), ὑποκαλύπτω (Exod 26:12). A few of the doubly asterisked words in *SV* are readings recorded in the Hatch and Redpath *Concordance to the Septuagint* and adopted by Rahlfs but relegated to the critical apparatus in the Göttingen Septuagint. E.g. ἐπαινεστός Rahlfs/ἐπαινετός Göttingen (Ezek 26:17), φρουρόω Rahlfs/φρουρέω Göttingen (Jdt 3:6).

[117] See *SV*, viii.

[118] See LEH, xi–xii, with further references; *GELS*, vii; *GS*, ix and xiiin21; Lee 2004, 68; Hauspie 2004; Dorival 2016, 271.

to the Septuagint and the literature based on it, and "neol.?" for the words that occur both in the Septuagint and in contemporary literary and documentary texts, beginning with Polybius (see 1.3.2c). Lust sounds a note of caution concerning the uncertainty that prevails with respect to the dating of both the books of the Septuagint and their contemporary documentary texts, which makes the labelling of any Septuagint word as "neol." or "neol.?" only tentative and doubtful.[119] Although LEH does not claim to be exhaustive in its tracking down of the Septuagint neologisms,[120] the number of the latter that it gives is impressive: 1,280 words are marked as "neol." and 398 as "neol.?".[121] These 1,678 neologisms with or without question mark constitute about 17 percent, or nearly one sixth, of the total 9,864 headwords contained in the lexicon.

An objection that one may raise about LEH's treatment of the Septuagint neologisms regards the qualifier "neol.?". Taking the second century BCE, and more specifically Polybius' time (ca. 200–ca. 120 BCE), as a boundary for distinguishing the words that occur in the Septuagint, as well as in literary and non-literary texts contemporary to, but not dependent upon it, from those Septuagint words that do not occur in any secular texts seems to be a questionable choice. As generally accepted, the composition of the Septuagint started in the first half of the third century BCE (perhaps as early as 280 BCE);[122] at the time when Polybius completed his *Histories* (composed over the course of nearly half a century, between ca. 167 and 151 and ca. 146 and 120 BCE),[123] the Pentateuch and the bulk of the other canonical books of the Hebrew Bible had probably already been translated into Greek;[124] a number of canonical and most of the deuterocanonical/apocryphal books were translated/composed after 120 BCE and as late as the second century CE (see Appendix 1). The phrases "not used before the time of the composition of the LXX" and "beginning with Polybius," in the definition quoted at 1.3.2c, imply that, in the LEH lexicon, the term 'Septuagint' is used in a restricted sense to designate only the canonical books, which were presumably translated into Greek between the early third century BCE and Polybius' time. One would have wished that a more refined chronological categorisation and labelling of the Septuagint neologisms had been made.[125]

---

[119] LEH, xiv.

[120] LEH, xxiv.

[121] The ca. 190 Greek transliterations of Semitic words recorded in LEH are not treated as neologisms.

[122] See Collins 1992.

[123] See Appendix 1 and 7.3.

[124] According to the translator's prologue to Sirach (vv. 24–25), the Greek translations of "the Law, the Prophecies, and the rest of the books" were already in existence before his arrival in Egypt in 132 BCE. See *BGS*, 86–89.

[125] Cf., for example, the classification of the vocabulary of the New Testament proposed in Thayer's *A Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament* (1889, 687–88): words first used between 322 and 280 BCE are labeled as "Later (i.e. post-Aristotelian) Greek"; words first used between 280 and 150 BCE are also registered as "Later Greek," but with "Sept." appended to them, if they also occur in the Septuagint; words which first appear between 150 and 100 BCE in the Septuagint as well as in secular authors are enrolled as "Biblical Greek" with the name of the secular author added; words first used between 100

Furthermore, despite a lexicographical research based on LSJ, *DGE*, Preisigke-Kiessling, and other specialized works,[126] the labelling of the Septuagint neologisms in LEH is often confusing. Even the rule of thumb for distinguishing between the words attested only in the Septuagint and the literature dependent on it and the words attested in the Septuagint as well as in secular texts from the second century BCE onwards does not seem to be followed consistently in the lexicon. We may take as an example the word ἀμνάς, which is marked as "neol.," although the reader is referred to Lee (1983, 108), who provides the extra-Septuagintal attestations of the word in Theocritus (8.35) and in a third-century BCE papyrus (*P.Cair.Zen.* 3.59406 [256–248 BCE]); LSJ's Revised Supplement provides the same information. We shall give a few more examples taken from 2 Maccabees, the Septuagint book under examination in the present study: μεταγίνομαι (2 Macc 2:1, 2) is characterized as "neol.," although the reader is referred to the Revised Supplement of LSJ, which cites the first attestation of the verb in Hesiod (*Th.* 607); δᾳδουχία (2 Macc 4:22) is also marked as "neol.," although it occurs in second- and first-century BCE honorific decrees (*Priene* 51, XII.167 [ca. 120 BCE]; *SEG* 30:93 [20/19 BCE]); the same goes for προήγορος (2 Macc 7:2, 4), whose first instance is found in an inscription dated to the fourth century BCE (*Ephesos* 572.1), as well as for ἀπαρασήμαντος (2 Macc 15:36) and φιλοπολίτης (2 Macc 14:37), which are attested in second-/first-century BCE honorific decrees (*IK Perge* 12.46 and *Ephesos* 116.3, respectively); πολυπλάσιος (2 Macc 9:16) has the qualifier "neol.," although it occurs outside of 2 Maccabees in an epigram (*AP* 6.152) written by Agis, a poet datable to the late third or early second century BCE;[127] φορεῖον (2 Macc 3:27, 9:8; Song 3:9) is also labelled as "neol.," although it is found in Polybius (30.25.18) and, before him, in Dinarchus (1.36); the same goes for ἐναπερείδομαι (2 Macc 9:4), which is a Polybian neologism (22.13.2); τηγανίζω (2 Macc 7:5), first found in a fragment of the third-century BCE comic poet Posidippus (fr. 5 Kock), and διαρρυθμίζω (2 Macc 7:22), attested in an Attic inscription (*IG I3* 475.70) as early as 409/8 BCE (i.e. prior to Polybius), are marked as "neol.?"; the same label is attached to κατάκλειστος (2 Macc 3:19; 3 Macc 1:18; Wis 18:4), first recorded in the third-century BCE poet Callimachus (fr. 401 Pfeiffer); δυσπέτημα, which, aside from 2 Macc 5:20, only recurs in the ecclesiastical writer Macarius (fourth–fifth century CE), and even later in the *Life of Theodore the Studite* (PG 99:296A), is also characterized as "neol.?"; ἀκατάγνωστος, a neologism of 2 Maccabees (4:47), is regarded neither as "neol." nor as "neol.?"; this is also the case with the absolute *hapax legomena* ἀναγνεία (2 Macc 4:13) and ἀρρενωδῶς

BCE and 1 CE are registered as "Later Greek," and so forth. Since the term 'Septuagint' is used narrowly in this classification to designate only the canonical books of the Greek Old Testament, a word registered as "Biblical Greek" has "Apocr." appended to it if it occurs in one of the Apocryphal books.

[126] LEH, xvi.

[127] See Waltz 1931, 183.

(2 Macc 10:35).[128] Be it noted that, for all these words, LSJ and its Revised Supplement (1996) provide the information that would have permitted their correct labelling.

Similar inconsistencies have been detected with respect to other Septuagint books,[129] suggesting a large-scale mislabelling of the neologisms in LEH.

1.4.3 Muraoka's *A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint* (*GELS*)

In Muraoka's Septuagint lexicon, neologisms are marked by an asterisk. As can be deduced from the statement quoted in 1.3.2d and from the explanation of the symbols used in the lexicon (on page xxii of the "Introduction"), the asterisk in *GELS* serves to denote both new words (* at the end of the first line of a given entry) and new senses or usages (* in the main body of the entry) unattested prior to the Septuagint. Muraoka's imprecise statement on page xiii of his "Introduction" may lead to the mistaken assumption that the very high number of neologisms recorded in his lexicon ("1,900, roughly one fifth of the total LXX vocabulary")[130] includes only new *words*.[131] The

[128] Here is a sample of words which in LEH are qualified as "neol.," although they are attested outside the Septuagint and the literature dependent on it, in most of the cases prior to the second century BCE: ἀδυναμέω (E. fr. 156.3 Austin); ἄμοιρος (A. *Th.* 733 and elsewhere); ἀποργίζομαι (Men. *Sam.* 683); ἀφρόνως (Isoc. 5.7 and elsewhere); διαμάχομαι (Hdt. 4.11.12 and elsewhere); διασκορπίζω (Plb. 1.47.5); ἐκγεννάω (Eup. fr. 99.1 Kock); ἔλασμα (Ph.Mech. *Bel.* 69.51 Thevenot; *ID* 1417.60 [155/4 BCE]); see Aitken (2014, 56–57), who, however, considers the epigraphical attestation of the word earlier than the one in Philo, probably because he takes Philo Mechanicus (ca. 240–200 BCE) for the first-century CE philosopher Philo Judaeus; LSJ uses the same abbreviation (Ph.) for both Philos; ζηλοτυπία (Aeschin. 3.81); καταβλέπω (Call. *Del.* 303); κατανύω (Hdt. 4.86 and elsewhere); κατατιτρώσκω (X. *HG* 2.4.16); κατατυγχάνω (D. 18.178); κατάφοβος (Plb. 1.39.12); κοράσιον (Philipid. fr. 36 Kock); μεγιστάν (Men. fr. 1035 Kock); μελανόομαι (Hp. *Epid.* 7.1.47 [*Epidemics* 7 is dated to ca. 375–350 BCE. See *EANS*, 409 and Craik 2015, 91]); μιαιφονία (D. 25.84); οἰνοποτέω (Call. *Aet.* 178 Pfeiffer); πατράδελφος (Is. 4.23); πολύθρηνος (A. *Ag.* 711 and elsewhere); προσαναφέρω (*Chr.Wilck.* 250.10 [225 BCE]); ὑπερτιμάω (S. *Ant.* 284); φιλάγαθος (Arist. *MM* 1212^{b}18); φιλομήτωρ (Antiph. fr. 220 Kock); ψιθυρισμός (Men. *Mis.* 140). ὁμοζηλία and πολύπαις, which in the Septuagint occur only in 4 Maccabees (13:25, 16:14), which is of a late date, are previously attested in Philodemus (*Po.* fr. 151.10 Janko) and in Strabo (17.3.19), respectively; ὁπλοποιέω and πανηγυρισμός occur in Wisdom (5:17 and 15:12, respectively) but also in Strabo (15.3.18) and in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (7.71.3), respectively, who may have been roughly contemporary with the author of the sapiential book. For all these words (bar ἀδυναμέω, μελανόομαι, and ὁμοζηλία), LSJ and its Revised Supplement (1996) provide information regarding their extra-Septuagintal, secular attestations.

[129] See, e.g., Cook (2002: § 23 and 72) who, in presenting a list of the neologisms occurring in the Septuagint of Proverbs, pinpoints 16 words which have been marked as "neol.?" by LEH, although they are attested prior to Polybius.

[130] The total number of headwords contained in the lexicon, is, according to Muraoka (*GELS*, xiii), 9,548.

[131] Cf., for example, the following comment by Aitken (2013, 319): "In Muraoka's *Lexicon* we are told that there are 9,548 headwords, of which 1,900 are marked by an asterisk, indicating that the word is not attested earlier than the Septuagint." Aitken justifiably expresses his wonder at the high number of neologisms postulated by the LEH and *GELS* lexica, which may lead one to assume that "one in five (25 percent) Septuagint words could be a neologism. This clearly cannot be the case" (p. 320). Cf. id. 2014, 5: "Such a high percentage cannot be meaningful as it implies an artificial language to an extent

truth, however, is that the rounded number 1,900 includes both new words and new senses or usages. Our manual counting yielded that the asterisk in *GELS* has been used 1,830 times to mark 1,159 headwords and 671 new senses/usages.

In order to determine whether a word is "not attested earlier than the LXX," Muraoka relied mainly on LSJ, acknowledging, however, that, since the dating of many ancient texts (especially those which are papyrological and epigraphical) is uncertain, "the decision in this regard . . . can be debatable." Muraoka does not specify what "not attested earlier than the LXX" means, but in the pilot volume of his Septuagint lexicon which was confined to the books of the Minor Prophets [*A Greek-English Lexicon of the Septuagint (Twelve Prophets)*, 1993] and where he uses the same phrase, he explains in a footnote that he means the third century BCE.[132]

If one looks closely at how the asterisk symbol has been employed in *GELS* (flagging a headword, not in the main body of an entry), one finds out that it signals (a) words unattested prior to the Septuagint, which occur exclusively in it; (b) words unattested prior to the Septuagint, which are used by the translators/writers of the Septuagint, and are also found in secular writers of the last three centuries BCE, e.g. in Polybius, or in the inscriptions and the papyri of that period;[133] and (c) words erroneously considered to be neologisms, as they are attested before the Septuagint either in the same sense as in the Septuagint or in a different sense.[134] In the latter case, the mislabelling is probably due to the lexicographer's reliance upon the authority of LSJ. The user of the lexicon cannot distinguish between these categories, especially between (a) and (b), since they are uniformly marked with the same symbol, the asterisk. Omissions are unavoidable, too. A sample checking of how many neologisms of 2 Maccabees have been registered in the lexicon shows that more than fifteen words that make their first appearance in surviving Greek literature in this book have not been asterisked.[135]

---

unimaginable." Dorival (2016, 279, 292), too, assuming that the number 1,900 refers exclusively to new lexemes, finds it to be "sûrement erroné."

[132] *GELS (TP)*, xiiin19.

[133] E.g. ἀλυσιδωτός, ἀναζυγή, βελόστασις, διαβούλιον, διεκβολή, ἐξηχέω, ἐπαποστέλλω, κωπηλάτης, παραδειγματίζω, προσαναφέρω, σπαταλάω, φορεῖον, χειραγωγέω are found in Polybius and in the Septuagint. However, other words such as ἐναπερείδομαι, μεγαλομερῶς, προεξαποστέλλω, and σπειρηδόν, which also occur in Polybius and in the Septuagint, are not asterisked.

[134] E.g. ἀδυναμέω (E. fr. 156 Austin); ἀποπομπή (Isoc. 5.117); ἀσύνθετος (in the sense of "faithless," D. 19.136); ἀφρόνως (S., Isoc., X., Pl., Arist.); γωνιαῖος (*I.Eleusis* 151.21 [ca. 342 BCE]); δυσκολία (Pl. *Lg.* 757e); ἐκγεννάω (Eup. fr. 99 Kock); ἐκθηλάζω (Arist. *HA* 587^{b}27; Hp. *Mul.* 1.73); ἐπίσαγμα (S. *Ph.* 755); ἱερατεύω (*Lindos II* 58.1 [311 BCE]); καταδαμάζω (Th. 7.81.5); μονοφάγος (Ar. *V.* 923; Amips. fr. 24 Kock); ξενιτεία (Democr. fr. 246 D.-K.); πρόγνωσις (Hp. *Art.* 41.48); προήγορος (*Ephesos* 572.1 [ca. 340–320 BCE]); προσκήνιον (*IG XI,2* 153.14 [297–279 BCE]); τυμπανίζω (Eup. fr. 77 Kock; used figuratively in 1 Kgdms 21:14); φιλοφρόνως (S., Hdt., X., Pl.); χλωρότης (Hp. *Hum.* 9.10); ψύλλος (Arist. *HA* 537^{a}6); ὡραιότης (X. *Oec.* 7.43).

[135] ἀλλοφυλισμός, βαρβάρως, δεξιάζω, διάσταλσις, δυσπέτημα, ἐλευστέον, ἐνενηκονταετής, ἐποξύνω, ἱεροσύλημα, Ἰουδαϊσμός, κατευθικτέω, οἰωνόβρωτος, πρόπτωσις, σπλαγχνισμός, συσσύρω, ὑψαυχενέω, ψυχικῶς.

1.4.4 Chamberlain's *The Greek of the Septuagint: A Supplemental Lexicon* (*GS*)

The Greek of the Septuagint has been conceived of as a supplement to Bauer, Danker, et al.'s *Greek-English Lexicon of the New Testament and Other Early Christian Literature* (BDAG).[136] Its author claims that it "represents the first systematic attempt to acknowledge every [Septuagint] word or use that conforms to ordinary expectations for fundamental/classical or Κοινή Greek on the one hand, and on the other hand to account for all the instances in which 'in manifold and diverse ways' the LXX vocabulary confronts us with unprecedented challenges."[137] What Chamberlain considers to be "the distinctive contribution" of his lexicon to Septuagint studies is that it offers "a taxonomy of a limited number of specific categories which will account for nearly all the exceptions to common usage."[138] These categories are presented and discussed in the "Introduction" (pp. xii–xxix) and in Appendix I at the end of the book (pp. 187–201). The category that is most relevant to our discussion here is IV, "Words first found in the LXX" (xix–xx, 192–94).[139] Chamberlain has drawn up two lists of such words, lists IV.A (pp. 192–94) and IV.B (p. 194).

Word list IV.A contains 423 words, marked in the lexicon with the notation "LXX+," which, "by the evidence, appear for the first time in the LXX, but are attested in later texts (Imperial papyri and inscriptions, or authors such as Plutarch) that do not seem to be influenced either by the LXX or by the Jewish or Christian communities."[140] Chamberlain admits that most of the words that fall in this category are not listed in *GS* because "in all their LXX meanings they appear in early Christian literature and are adequately treated in BDAG." He also "in general" excludes "words that appear, with the same meanings, in the substantial Hellenistic corpuses of Polybius, Strabo, and Diodorus Siculus, or in papyri and inscriptions that predate the Common Era," on the grounds that "it is highly improbable that any LXX neologism would so quickly penetrate the secular culture."

If we check the words included in list IV.A against LSJ, which, together with BDAG, was used as a "lexical resource" by the lexicographer,[141] we find that a number of them are attested prior to the translation of the Pentateuch into Greek (which, as previously noted, can be assigned a *terminus post quem* of ca. 280 BCE): these words first occur in the fragments of the tragic poets of the Classical period and the poets of the Middle and

---

[136] *GS*, vii.

[137] *GS*, xii.

[138] *GS*, xii.

[139] Another category that is relevant to our discussion of neologisms, the *hapax legomena*, will be discussed in the immediately following section (1.5).

[140] *GS*, xix.

[141] *GS*, vii.

New Comedy,[142] in Epicurus and Theophrastus,[143] and in the Hippocratic corpus.[144] We also find a number of words which, outside the Septuagint, are not attested in "later texts" but in pre-Common Era literary texts, for example in Hellenistic poetry of the third and second centuries BCE.[145]

If we further check the same list against the electronic databases of ancient Greek literary, epigraphical, and papyrological texts (TLG, PHI, PN), we can track down even more words, which are attested prior to the Septuagint[146] or prior to the Common Era.[147] We can also see that, despite the lexicographer's wish to exclude words that

---

[142] E.g. ἀπογαλακτίζω (Diph. fr. 74–75 Kock); βοτρύδιον (Alex. fr. 172 Kock); εὐπάρυφος (Nicostr.Com. fr. 9 Kock); σφυροκόπος (title of a tragedy by Sophocles, fr. 482–486 Radt); δορατοφόρος occurs in a lyric *adespoton* quoted by Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Comp.* 17.38).

[143] E.g. ὅρμημα (Epicur. fr. 34.29 Arrighetti) and ἐπιβρέχω (Thphr. *HP* 2.6.5; Theophrastus' botanical treatises were written around the turn of the third century BCE [see Amigues 1988, xii, xviii–xx]).

[144] E.g. ἐκπικραίνω (*Mul.* 133.21; in a different sense than in the Septuagint); ἔξαρθρος (*Art.* 10.6; in a different sense than in the Septuagint); περιξύω (*Nat.Mul.* 109.69). Although one may share Chamberlain's cautiousness as regards the possibility of providing a precise chronology of the Hippocratic writings (p. xix: "The Hippocratic corpus is extensive and provides many parallels to LXX usage, but it was a developing tradition of which little can be dated with assurance"), one cannot ignore the approximative datings that have been proposed by scholars specializing in this literature, e.g. Jouanna (1992, 527–63), Craik (2015), and Jouanna, Laskaris, Craik, et al. (*EANS*, 404–20). The dates assigned to the Hippocratic treatises in which the aforecited words occur range from the mid-fifth to the mid-fourth centuries BCE. See Craik 2015, 111, 206, 217.

[145] E.g. ἀδρανής (Posidipp.Epigr. 133.8 Austin-Bastianini [=*AP* 9:359]); ἀνυψόω (Antip. Sid. *AP* 7:748); δυσσέβημα (Scymn. *GGM* 1:684); καταβλέπω (Call. *Del.* 303); παραθλίβω (Arat. 1.993); περισκυθίζω (Mel. *AP* 12:95); σκεπεινός (Scymn. *GGM* 1:336); συσφίγγω (Herod. 5.25).

[146] E.g. ἀδυναμέω (E. fr. 156 Austin); ἀπελέκητος (Thphr. *HP* 3.8.7); διορθωτής (*Gonnoi II* 112.2 [late 3rd c. BCE?]); ἐναλλαγή (Thphr. *CP* 4.4.9); λιθουργέω (*SEG* 18:726.48 [4th c. BCE]); μακρότης (Ps.-Arist. *Phgn.* 813ᵃ8; Ps.-Aristotle's *Physiognomics* is dated to 320–280 BCE [see *EANS*, 149]); μελανόομαι (Hp. *Epid.* 7.1.47); προήγορος (*Ephesos* 572.1 [4th c. BCE]); ῥακώδης (*IG II²* 1627.345 [330/329 BCE]); ῥωποπώλης (title of a comedy by Epicrates, fr. tit. 7–8 Kock); τειχιστής (*SEG* 18:36, face B.col.III.344 [ca. 330–310 BCE]).

[147] E.g. ἀκιδωτός (*ID* 1421, frg.cd.col.II.18 [ca. 156/155 BCE]); ἀκριβάζω (*BGU* 8.1846.9 [50/49 BCE]); ἀνεμόφθορος (*P.Koeln.* 6.275.14 [104–100 BCE]); ἀποποιέω (*P.Cair.Zen.* 2.59152.18 [256 BCE]); ἀροτρίασις (*P.Tebt.* 3.1.704.21 [232 BCE]); ἀρχιμάγειρος (*IvO* 62.17 [36–24 BCE]; see Aitken 2014, 71–72); ἄστεγος (*IG XI,2* 199 A.105 [273 BCE]); δᾳδουχία (*Priene* 51.XII.167 [ca. 120 BCE]; partially reconstructed reading); δαψιλεύομαι (*IScM I* 54.34 [ca. mid 1st c. BCE]); δεκαμηνιαῖος (*IK Kyme* 41.19 [1st c. BCE]; see Aitken 2014, 49–50); διπλοῖς (*Psi.* 6.569.11 [252 BCE]); διώροφος (*SB* 6.9556.3.10 [245 BCE]); εἰσοδιάζω (*IK Knidos I* 31,Kn, [C] V.42, 43 [100 BCE]); ἐνεχύρασμα (*P.Mil.* 2.27.24 [158 BCE]); ἔνθεσμος (*BGU* 8.1848.7 [ca. 47 BCE]); ἐπιλυπέω (*IK Knidos I* 154.21 [2nd/1st c. BCE]); ἐπισπουδάζω (*P.Yale* 1.32.3 [ca. 257 BCE]); ἐργατεία (*BGU* 4.1159.9, 21 [30 BCE–14 CE]); ἐσώτατος (*P.Col.* 4.81.19 [246–240 BCE]); ἰδιόγραφος (*BGU* 10.2006.8 [150–100 BCE]; in a different sense than in the LXX); κάλλυνθρον (*BGU* 4.1120.17 [5 BCE]); καταβόησις (*P.Hels.* 1.1.18 [194–180 BCE]); καταδεσμεύω (*Epigr. tou Oropou* 745a.20 [late 3rd–early 2nd c. BCE]; in a different sense than in the LXX); κερατίζω (*SB* 20.14183.11 [198 BCE]); κοίλασμα (Ph.Mech. *Bel.* 75.29, 31); λάγανον (*P.Cair.Zen.* 4.59707.6 [263–229 BCE]); λαογραφία (*P.Ryl.* 4.667, fr.2.4 [125–100 BCE]); μεσοπόρφυρος (partially reconstructed reading in *ID* 1473.7–8 [after 166 BCE]); ξενιτεία (*P.Polit.Iud.* 9.31 [132 BCE]; the word is first attested in Democr. fr. 246 D.-K.); περίθεμα (*P.Koeln.* 8.347.20 [193 BCE]); στολισμός (*OGIS* 56,A.4 [238 BCE]); στολιστής (*P.Lond.* 7.2188.65 [148 BCE]); σύννυμφος (*TAM V,1* 775.13–4 [46/45 BCE]); σύντριψις (Ph.Mech. *Bel.* 60.39); τροφεύω (*P.Tebt.* 3.1.815, fr.9,2.18 [228–221 BCE]); χαιρετίζω (*IG X,2 2* 159.6 [2nd/1st c. BCE]).

occur, with the same meanings, in the Septuagint as well as in Diodorus Siculus and in Strabo, his list contains words that occur in these writers, as well as in their contemporaries Philodemus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus.[148] Three of the words which, according to IV.A, make their first appearance in the Septuagint (in 4 Maccabees, a work assumed to have been written in the first or second century CE), are actually first attested in Diodorus Siculus, in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and in Strabo.[149]

Chamberlain's second word list, IV.B, comprises 63 words, "(a few of which are certainly earlier than the LXX), for which LSJ suggests just one other occurrence *anywhere* in pre-Christian Greek."[150] A close look at these words reveals that Chamberlain's statement is partly inaccurate. For some fifteen words in list IV.B, the one other occurrence that LSJ and Revised Supplement suggest is actually found not in *pre*-Christian Greek but in texts *post*-dating the New Testament.[151] The lexicographer seems to have erred in the chronology of certain authors and texts. If we consult TLG, we further see that statements such as "Hippocrates . . . offers the only instance of ἑβδομηκοστός" (p. xix) do not hold true. The numeral is in fact attested in Aristotle (*Mete.* 362ᵃ24), in Polybius (23.12.2), in Diodorus Siculus (11.53.1, passim), in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (4.6.5, passim), and in second- and first-century BCE inscriptions and papyri (*UPZ* 1.119.16 [156 BCE]; *IG IV², 1* 66.21–22 [74 BCE]).

1.5 The *hapax legomena*

The Septuagint *hapax legomena*, that is, the words that occur once in the Septuagint, are related to the neologisms: many Septuagint *hapax legomena* are also neologisms; the absolute *hapax legomena*, that is, the words which have no other instance in Greek apart from their single instance in the Septuagint, are all neologisms. In the following,

---

[148] ἀπάτησις, ἀσταθής, γαυρίαμα, διάπτωσις, ἐκπαίζω, and στιλβόω occur in Philodemus; ἄπαρσις, λειτούργημα, οἰωνισμός, πανηγυρισμός, ποικιλτικός, προασπίζω, σιτοδοσία, σκυβαλίζω, ὑψαυχενέω, ὠμοτοκέω, and ὡραϊσμός occur in Dionysius of Halicarnassus; διανθίζω, καταφράσσω, πολυπλασιάζω, and συγκλύζω occur in Diodorus Siculus; ἀνατροφή and ἐνεξουσιάζω occur in both Diodorus and Dionysius, and ἀνέφικτος in both Diodorus and Philodemus; εὐπειθέω, καθοδηγέω, and φιλόκοσμος occur in Strabo; αὐθωρ(ε)ί occurs—in Greek—in Cicero (*Att.* 33.1 [59 BCE]).

[149] ἀνατροφή (D.S. 32.15.2; D.H. *Rh.* 5.3), εὐπειθέω (Str. 6.3.4), προασπίζω (D.H. 6.93.3).

[150] *GS*, xix.

[151] [The dates assigned to the following authors and works are according to LSJ ("Authors and Works," pp. xvi–xxxviii) and Revised Supplement 1996:] ἄνισχυς (*SEG* 35.216.18 [iii CE]); ἀπολεπίζω (*Gp.* 10.58 [x CE]); δευτέρωσις (Just. *Nov.* 146.1.2 [vi CE]); ἐνδελεχέω (Steph. *in Hp.* 1.136 D [vii CE]); ἠθολογέω (Longin. 9.15 [iii CE]); κακοφροσύνη (Opp. [=Oppianus Anazarbensis] *H.* 3.363 [ii/iii CE]); κατατρυφάω (Luc. *JTr* 53 [ii CE]); μακροημέρευσις (*SEG* 34.1515 [vi CE]); ὀνοματογραφία (S.E. *M.* 11.67 [ii CE]); παραβασιλεύω (Eun. *VS* p. 476 B [iv/v CE]); παρακαθεύδω (Ael. *VH* 1.13 [ii/iii CE]); τερατοποιός (Procl. *Par.Ptol.* 225 [v CE]); ὑπερόρασις (M.Ant. 8.26 [ii CE]); ὑψηλοκάρδιος (Sm. *Ec.* 7.9(8) [ii/iii CE]); φωταγωγέω (Iamb. *Myst.* 3.14 [iv CE]). For ἀπειράγαθος and χιονόομαι, LSJ does not cite any other occurrences than the ones in the Septuagint (it only cites D.S. 15.40 for the adverb ἀπειραγάθως).

we will touch upon some issues related to the definition and identification of the *hapax legomena* that occur in the Septuagint. The way in which the latter have been identified and classified in the only Septuagint lexicon that has taken care to mark them, Chamberlain's *The Greek of the Septuagint* (*GS*), will be used to frame our discussion.

Chamberlain has drawn up two lists of *hapax legomena* (*h.l.*, marked in the lexicon with the notation "LXX"), that is, "Greek words that occur, so far as we know, only in the LXX itself."[152] Word list III.A (pp. 189–91) comprises 464 "*h.l.* proper," and word list III.B (pp. 191–92) contains 230 "words that occur in our texts more than once but nowhere else outside the LXX unless in texts (e.g. Philo Judaeus) directly commenting on the LXX passage, or in the later Greek versions such as Aquila."[153]

With regard to the first of these two lists, Chamberlain explains that "the *h.l.* . . . occur only once in the LXX and have no citation in LSJ apart from the LXX instance (about a dozen, printed in bold, do not appear in LSJ at all)."[154]

With respect to this statement, one may remark that the term *hapax legomenon* can be used in either a relative or an absolute sense, but always with reference to a text corpus. A word may be designated as a 'relative *hapax legomenon*,' if it is unique within a delimited corpus, consisting, for example, of the works of an author (e.g. Homer), a single work (e.g. the *Iliad*), all the texts belonging to a genre (e.g. epic poetry), a field (e.g. medical literature), a canon (e.g. the LXX or the NT), a period (e.g. the Attic or the Koine period), etc.[155] A word may be designated as an 'absolute *hapax legomenon*,' if it is attested only once in the entire corpus of Greek texts that have come down to us from the fourteen-centuries-long period that begins with Homer and goes up to about 600 CE.[156] The latter is the conventional cut-off date separating ancient from Byzantine Greek; it is the boundary adopted by the editors of the LSJ[157] and the *DGE*[158] lexica, and was also the limit that the editors of the TLG had initially set up for their database.[159] For the designation of a word as an 'absolute *hapax legomenon*' or '*hapax legomenon totius graecitatis*' one may even want to go beyond the limit of the sixth century CE and take into consideration the surviving texts from subsequent periods of

---

[152] *GS,* xvi.

[153] *GS*, xvi.

[154] *GS*, xvin35.

[155] See Wagner 1999, 77 and Passoni dell'Acqua 1992, 463–65.

[156] Pope (1985, 4–5) remarks that 70 to 95 percent of the words that occur only once in an ancient Greek or Latin author recur in later literature. With regard to the *hapaxes* that are not re-employed in later literature, he distinguishes between those that are previously attested, which he likens to "ageing actors, taking their final bow before retiring from the linguistic scene altogether," and those that do not occur in previous literature (absolute *hapax legomena*). The latter are likely to be ad hoc coinages of an author (nonce-words), especially if they seem to be tailor-made for the specific context in which they occur.

[157] See LSJ, x–xi.

[158] *DGE* vol. 1, x and xv.

[159] See Berkowitz and Squitier 1990, viii, x, and xii. The TLG canon has now been extended to include "most extant authors and works up to the 16th century," with the ambition "to fill in any gaps left and to expand the corpus into the modern era" (http://stephanus.tlg.uci. edu/history.php).

the Greek language, e.g. the Byzantine period,[160] as recorded (less comprehensively than the texts from the Classical and the Hellenistic periods) in the TLG and the other currently existing electronic databases of Greek texts.

According to the above, a word that has a single instance in the Septuagint is a relative *hapax legomenon* vis-à-vis the specific corpus in which it occurs. But the fact that a word "has no citation in LSJ apart from the LXX" does not necessarily mean that it "occurs nowhere else outside the LXX." LSJ is a lexicon, not a text corpus or a text database. It does not claim to cite all the instances of a given word in the texts that have been taken into consideration for the compilation of its lemmas, neither would this have been possible owing to restrictions in size. Moreover, and despite the considerable new material that has been added in its 1968 and 1996 Supplements, it does not cover all the texts that have been handed down to us from Greek antiquity up to the sixth century CE. Therefore, in order to designate a word as a *hapax legomenon* in the Greek of a given historical period up to ca. 600 CE, one cannot rely exclusively on LSJ, but should have recourse to the major, often updated and ever-growing electronic databases of ancient Greek literary and documentary texts (TLG, PHI, PN). A word which, when checked against these databases, is proved to have a single instance in the texts of a clearly delimited chronological period is the closest we can come to a *hapax legomenon* in the Greek of this specific period. This said, even the most extensive, present-day electronic databases do not claim completeness,[161] so that the addition of new material or the discovery of new texts at some point in the future may change the frequency status of a word considered to be unique.[162] The designation of a word as *hapax legomenon* has

[160] See the discussion in Wagner 1999, 65–77. With regard to the term *hapax legomenon totius graecitatis*, it is necessary to clarify what one means by 'tota graecitas.' We here refer to Wagner (1999, 77n56), who makes a rough division of the "Gesamtgräzität" into "antike oder/und byzantinische oder/und neugriechische Gesamtgräzität."

[161] To give an example, as late as 2015, only seven of Philodemus' treatises (which constitute a significant resource for the language of the first century BCE, especially since "his vocabulary can often be paralleled in the LXX or Polybius" [Janko 2000, 193]) were partially available in digital form in the TLG database. This gap has been partially filled by the release of three more works in 2016 and another five in early 2017.

[162] To give an idea of the amount of documentary texts still awaiting publication—texts that will certainly contribute new material to Greek lexicography—we quote here the estimations of van Minnen (2009, 644–45): "Even if only half of all unpublished texts in the more than 1,400 known collections worldwide from 'Aachen to Zutphen' (an estimated 1,000,000–1,500,000, of which almost half are held by the Egypt Exploration Society) are publishable, it would still take papyrologists ten times as long as it took them to publish the estimated 72,500 published texts in the hundred years since about 1895 (broken down into 50,000 Greek and Latin documents; 7,500 Greek and Latin literary texts; as well as 7,500 Coptic; 3,500 demotic and abnormal hieratic; 3,000 Arabic; and 1,000 Aramaic and Pehlevi texts). Hence, the 'millennium of papyrology.' . . . Editing the unpublished texts in collections worldwide and republishing texts in need of revision will keep papyrologists busy for centuries at least." Cf. Evans 2010, 12n20. As regards the literary papyri, the some eight hundred unopened papyrus rolls from Herculaneum, which can now be read by means of computer tomography, are expected to bring to light new texts (hopefully more writings by Philodemus) that will enrich our knowledge of the literary Greek of the first century BCE (see Sider 2009, 314).

thus by necessity a provisional, non-definitive character.[163] Moreover, it has to be noted that, although chances are high that a Septuagint absolute *hapax legomenon* is a coinage of the translator/author of the Septuagint book in which it occurs, this should not be taken for granted.

In the case of the *GS*, it is not explicitly stated which is the upper chronological limit for the designation of a word that occurs "nowhere else outside the LXX" as a *hapax legomenon*. Is it the one assumed for the Early Christian literature covered by the BDAG (roughly 200 CE),[164] which is the lexicon that *GS* aims to complement? Or is it the same as that set by the LSJ (i.e. the sixth century CE), given that Word List III appears to have been checked against this dictionary? The definition given on page 189 ("*Hapax legomena (h.l.)*: This list contains words whose sole known occurrence in Greek literature is in the LXX") seems rather to imply the latter.

The 464 words in Chamberlain's word list III.A are all Septuagint *hapax legomena*, that is, they occur only once in the Septuagint (some as variant readings). If we check them against LSJ and its Revised Supplement, we see that more than twenty-five of them should not have been included in the list, as the lexicon cites at least one more instance outside the Septuagint, in secular Greek literary and non-literary texts.[165] If we further check them against the TLG, the PHI, and the PN databases, we see that only a little more than half of them are, sensu stricto, absolute *hapax legomena*, in the sense that they occur nowhere else outside the Septuagint, except in verbatim quotations in Patristic literature or in ancient and Byzantine lexicographical works.[166] The rest recur,

---

[163] Cf. Deissmann's (1908, 45n5) comment apropos of the term *hapax legomena*: "Es sind ἅπαξ εὑρημένα, nicht ἅπαξ εἰρημένα."

[164] See BDAG, ix and xii.

[165] ἀμείδητος, ἀμφιβολεύς, ἀνάμ(ε)ιξις, ἀνείκαστος, ἀντάμειψις, ἀργυροχόος, βαρύγλωσσος, γονορρυέω, διασυρίζω, εἰδέχθεια, ἐκλογιστία, ἐμποδοστατέω, ἐπανδρόω, ἐπαξονέω, εὐδράνεια, ἐχθρία, καταμιμνήσκομαι, μαδαρόω, μελετητικός, νέωμα, περιχαλκόω, προσοδύρομαι, σανιδωτός, στρεβλωτήριον, τιμογραφέω, ὑπερφερής, ὑπευλαβέομαι, χειρονομία.

[166] In the strict, quantitative sense of the term, a *hapax legomenon* cannot designate anything else but a unique occurrence. However, in studies on *hapax legomena* scholars have used the term in both a strict (single occurrence) and a loose sense (multiple occurrences). In his study on the *hapax legomena* in Plato, for instance, Fossum (1931, 206) explains that, although his intention was to treat only the words occurring once in the 26 dialogues that he examined, he was forced to deviate from his methodological principle owing to practical difficulties: "Occasionally a word occurred two or more times within a small space and nowhere else in the 26 dialogues. If the distance was not great and there was a close connection, I thought I might look upon the word as a *hapax legomenon*." As a limit for the recurrence of a *hapax* he set the space of three pages; however, he admits that in a few cases he was obliged to change the limit to seven pages (p. 207). In his study on the Homeric *hapax legomena,* Kumpf (1984, 6–12) preferred, on the contrary, to adhere to the strict definition of the term and treat as *hapax legomena* words that occur literally only once in the Homeric poems. In the field of Biblical Studies, there have been a variety of methodological choices. In his study on the *hapax legomena* in the Hebrew Pentateuch, Zelson (1927, 244), aside from the absolute *hapaxes*, considers as *hapax legomena* "les mots uniques répétés dans les passages parallèles composés de phrases à peu près identiques . . . et ceux employés plusieurs fois dans un alinéa." In his study on the *hapax legomena* in biblical Hebrew, Greenspahn (1984, 26–27), on the other hand, excludes from his list of absolute *hapax legomena* those *hapaxes* that recur in identical or similar passages or in close proximity to one another, arguing that "to treat such words as occurring only once is

albeit rarely, in the writings of the Church Fathers, or even in earlier writers, e.g. in the Letter of Aristeas and in Philo,[167] in passages that neither quote nor comment directly on the Septuagint verses in which these supposed *hapax legomena* occur. There are also a few words that are found in secular texts, both literary and non-literary, which are dated roughly to the period of formation of the Septuagint, or a little later, but have no apparent dependence on it;[168] the secular instances of some of these words definitely predate the Septuagintal ones.[169]

It has to be noted that even a word that has one and only one instance in such an extensive database as that of the TLG is not necessarily an absolute *hapax legomenon*. The adjective μυροβρεχής, [LSJ]"wet with unguent," for example, which, according to the TLG, occurs only in 3 Macc 4:6, has one more instance, not in a Greek but in a Latin literary text: in a passage of Suetonius (*Aug.* 86.2), Augustus refers jestingly to Maecenas' prose style affectations as "myrobrechis cincinnos." Since it is at least unlikely that either Augustus or Suetonius picked up this word from 3 Maccabees, we are to

---

to modify the definition of *hapax legomena* so as to contradict itself and to include cases where repetition not only exists but is intentional" (p. 27). Lastly, in his study on the *hapax legomena* in Sirach, Wagner (1996, 86) accepts as Septuagint *hapax legomena* even those words that appear more than once in the Septuagint so long as they occur within only *one* Septuagint book.

[167] E.g. ἀντάμειψις (Ps. 118:112; Let. Aris. 259); κραταιότης (Ps 45:4; Ph. *Leg.* 3.115.9); προσεξηγέομαι (2 Macc 15:11; Ph. *Legat.* 197.5); καθίπταμαι (Sir 43:18; Ph. *Ios.* 93).

[168] E.g. ἀβοηθησία (*P.Köln* 5.222.11 [145 BCE]); ἀβουλεύτως (Phld. *Elect.* 16.2); διαπαρατηρέομαι (*P.Hels.* 1.31.11 [160 BCE]); διαστράπτω (Plu. *Mor.* 954E); δωροδέκτης (Men.Rh. 416.15 Russell and Wilson); ἐκθλιβή (possibly in *P.Mich.* inv.920.24 [2nd–3rd c. CE]; see *ZPE* 56 [1984], pp. 5 and 7n24); ἔντριτος (*SEG* 55:723.8 [2nd–1st c. BCE]; cf. Aitken 2013, 326); ἐνυποτάσσω (possibly in Phld. *Mus.* 4 90.33 Delattre); ἐξέλευσις (Polyaen. 54.8); ἐξερεύνησις (Poll. 9.117); ἐπισυνέχω (*IGLSyr* 3,2 992.9 [189 BCE]); εὐκοσμέω (Phld. *Po.* 24, 185 Janko; Str. 15.1.53.3); θραυσμός (Heph.Astr. 1:189 Pingree); καθίπταμαι (Luc. *DIud.* 5.20); καταγογγύζω (Polyaen. 47.1); καταχαλάω (Harp. *pi.* 64); λαφυρεύω (*UPZ* 1.108.32 [99 BCE]); νηστός (Ariston. *Il.* 5.113, 21.31); νύμφευσις (Doroth. 392.9 Pingree); ὁμοζηλία (Phld. *Po.* 151.10 Janko); προσανοικοδομέω (Hero *Dioptr.* 6.116); συμβραβεύω (Men.Rh. 406.23 Russell and Wilson). A few words in Chamberlain's list III.A should have been included in his list V instead, since they are attested outside the Septuagint but with a different meaning. E.g. κοσμοφορέω, meaning "to carry the world" in 4 Macc 15:31, is attested in the meaning "to carry ornaments in a procession" in *SEG* 38:1220.5–6 [Rom. Imp. period].

[169] E.g. ἀμείδητος is attested as early as the third century BCE in Apollonius Rhodius (2.908) and in an epigram by Theodoridas (*AP* 7.439), that is, much earlier than its instance in Wisdom (17:4), which was probably written in the late 1st c. BCE; ἐμποδοστατέω is attested some hundred and fifty years prior to the Septuagint of Judges (11:35), in Epicurus' *Letter to Herodotus* (45.8), dated to ca. 305 BCE; the possible instance of ἔντριτος in a 2nd/1st c. BCE inscription from Macedonia (see previous footnote) precedes the instance in the Septuagint of Ecclesiastes, which dates to the early 2nd c. CE; likewise, the instances of ἐπισυνέχω in a Syrian inscription (see previous footnote) dated to 189 BCE and of ὁμοζηλία in Philodemus' *On Poems* (151.10 Janko) are anterior to those in 1 Esd 9:17 and 4 Macc 13:25, respectively; the same goes for ψηφολογέω, attested as early as 280 BCE in a Delian inscription (*IG XI,2* 165.42; also in *ID* 2288.2–3 [105/104? BCE]), more than a century earlier than in the Septuagint of Tobit (13:17), as well as for ἐκλοχίζω and τιμογραφέω, whose first attestations (*Hermoupolis Magna* 5.239 [80/79 BCE]—see Aitken 2014, 30–31 and 55–56—and *P.Col.* 4.98.4 [261–229 BCE], respectively), precede those in Canticles (5:10), which was probably translated in the 1st c. CE, and in 4 Kingdoms (23:35), which was probably translated in the 2nd c. BCE, respectively.

assume that both the anonymous author of the latter text and Augustus/Suetonius drew it independently from a (possibly poetic) source that is lost to us.

Equally problematic is the classification under the rubric '*hapax legomena*' (p. xvi) of the 230 words contained in list III.B, which, as explained earlier, occur more than once in the Septuagint[170] but nowhere else "unless in texts (e.g. Philo Judaeus) directly commenting on the LXX passage, or in the later Greek versions such as Aquila." Chamberlain is honest in admitting that he did not check his list against Patristic sources or against Lampe's Patristic lexicon: "Consulting the latter will doubtless show that some words unknown from secular sources down to Plutarch, or from the NT or other early works covered in BDAG, were later taken up into the language of the Church."[171] Indeed, for some twenty of the words contained in the list, LSJ and its Revised Supplement cite at least one extra-Septuagintal instance.[172] A search of the TLG and the epigraphical and papyrological databases further shows that only less than a dozen of the words included in the list can be taken as *hapax legomena* in the loose sense of the term, that is, they have more than one occurrence in a single book or in more than one book of the Septuagint, but are found "nowhere else outside the LXX."[173] A few other words have multiple occurrences in the Septuagint and then recur only in a couple of verbatim or quasi-verbatim quotations in Patristic literature.[174] All the other words recur with varying frequency in Patristic literature, not only in passages quoting, paraphrasing or commenting on Septuagint verses, but also in passages which do not relate directly to any specific Septuagint verse. For the word πρωτογένημα, for instance, Chamberlain (p. xviin37) states that "LSJ can cite only Philo—commenting precisely on the texts in question—beyond the LXX itself." The truth is that πρωτογένημα occurs seventeen times in the Septuagint in nine different books. Outside the Septuagint, it is found ten times in Philo, three times in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, and some thirty times in Patristic writings up to the sixth century CE. Not all of these extra-Septuagintal instances of πρωτογένημα are verbatim quotations of Septuagint verses. Lastly, some fifteen words also occur in secular Greek texts contemporary with or slightly posterior

[170] A few of these words have actually a single occurrence in the Septuagint and should have been included in list III.A instead: ἀγαυριάομαι, δεκαπλασιάζω, ἐξακονάω, ἐξιχνιασμός, κληδονισμός, σύμβλησις, χλεύασμα.

[171] *GS*, xvii–xviiin37.

[172] ἀμνάς, ἀναφορεύς, ἀπαντή, ἀποκαθαρίζω, ἀσυνθεσία, ἀτεκνόω, ἀφόρισμα, βηρύλλιον, γαμβρεύω, ἐπικαταράομαι, ἑτασμός, κάρπωμα, καταδυναστεία, καταπάτησις, λαξεύω, στηλογραφία, στίλβωσις, στιπ(π)ύϊνος, σύμβλησις, ὑπεράνωθεν, χήρευσις. In their secular attestations, some of these words (e.g. ἀναφορεύς, ἀσυνθεσία, σύμβλησις) have a different meaning than the one they have in the Septuagint.

[173] δωροκοπέω, κληρωτί, κοιλοσταθμέω, παθοκράτεια, πλεοναστός, πολεμοτροφέω. A few other words such as δεινάζω, κολλυρίζω, and μάκρυμμα recur only in lexicographical works.

[174] E.g. ἀλλοφυλισμός, ἀρχιπατριώτης, ἀναφαλάντωμα, ἀποκιδαρόω, ἐμφραγμός, καρπωτός, καρυΐσκος, κατακάρπωσις, παρόργισμα, περισπόριον, πρόσκαυμα, σπλαγχνισμός, etc.

to the Septuagint;[175] ἡ παλαιστή, "handbreadth," is even attested prior to the Septuagint, as early as Xenophon (*Cyn.* 2.7, 9.13).[176]

As can be seen from the above, the words included in *GS*'s word list III.A are all relative *hapax legomena* with respect to the Septuagint, but, technically speaking, are not all absolute *hapax legomena*; many of them should instead have been labelled *dis legomena*, *tris legomena*, and so on. Word list III.B contains words that can be labelled *voces solum Septuagintales* or *voces Septuagintales et ecclesiasticae*, but which can hardly be placed under the heading '*hapax legomena*.'

1.6 Final considerations on the neologisms and the *hapax legomena* as treated in Septuagint lexicography

By way of conclusion to this section, and before we formulate the definition of neologism and *hapax legomenon* that we will employ in this study, we may highlight a few points that arose from the foregoing discussion of the ways in which the neologisms and the *hapax legomena* have been identified and marked in Septuagint lexicography and suggest ways of overcoming some of the shortcomings that we detected in the course of that discussion.

The first point concerns the number of the Septuagint neologisms. Despite the efforts of the Septuagint lexicographers to mark them in their respective lexica, their number remains elusive: in *SV* one counts 944 words which occur only in the Septuagint or that first appear in the Septuagint and recur in the literature dependent on it, in LEH 1,280 words marked as "neol." and 398 marked as "neol?," in *GELS* 1,900 (but in reality 1,159) words are identified as neologisms, while in *GS* the *hapax legomena* and the "words first found in the LXX" amount to about 1,180. Dorival (2016, 279, 292) estimates the number of the Septuagint neologisms to be about 850.[177] The discrepancy

[175] E.g. ἀπάνωθεν (*BGU* 16.2603.28 [21 BCE–5 CE]); ἀποσκοπεύω (Ariston. *Il.* 16.361); ἀσυνθετέω (Chrysipp.Stoic. *SVF* 2:197; *PSI* 4.418.23 [263–229 BCE]); ἀχρειότης (Theano *Ep.* p. 196.34 Thesleff); βάδος (*P.Oxy.* 41.2982.9 [150–299 CE]); ἐκλικμάω (*P.Mil.Congr.* xviii.pg6.16 [143/142 BCE]); ἑξακοσιοστός (Ptol. *Alm.* 1.1:197.5); ἠρεμάζω (D.L. 9.113.5 Long); θελητός (Epict. 4.1.101); κατάβρωμα (*P.Lips.* 2.129.15, 34 [8 CE]); κατάβρωσις (*P.Athen.* 14.19 [22 CE]); καταθλάω (Ctes. *FGrH* 3C, 688, fr. 45q.48); κολλύριον (*P.Hib.* 2.271.6 [230 BCE]); κωφεύω (MoschioTrag. *TrGF* 1:6); ὀλιγόω (Polyaen. 15.4.4, 29.1.5); συγκάλυμμα (Demetr. *Eloc.* 100); χωνευτήριον (Antig. *Mir.* 84a.2 Giannini).

[176] Also in Arist. *HA* 606ᵃ14; Hp. *Nat.Mul.* 33.39; *P.Cair.Zen.* 3.59484.11 [263–229 BCE].

[177] Dorival extrapolates this number by comparing the number of neologisms listed for the letter α in *GELS* and in Schröder (2001, 61–62). It is to be remarked, though, that this comparison cannot provide a valid estimate of the Septuagint neologisms, because Schröder's alphabetical list contains only the 287 most notable neologisms (about one-sixth of the total 1,678 words listed in LEH) that occur more than three times in the Septuagint (ib. 61n2). It relies entirely on LEH, both for the choice of the lexical items included, and their labelling as "neol." and "neol.?," and for the numerical data concerning the distribution of instances of these items in the Septuagint books. Muraoka, on the other hand, marks with

between these various figures is, of course, attributable to the different methodological choices (as regards the definitions, the chronological boundaries set for the designation of a word as a neologism, the inclusion or exclusion of variants and transliterations, etc.) adopted by the compilers of the Septuagint lexica. The prospect of arriving at an approximate number on the basis of these lexica seems even more elusive if we consider that quite a few words in them have erroneously been characterized as neologisms, whereas other words, which are indeed neologisms, have passed unnoticed. Yet, one would probably not be too far from the truth if one estimated their number to be roughly 1,000, that is, a little more than 7 to 10 percent of the total number of 13,770/9,628[178] different words contained in the Septuagint.[179] As for the distribution of these neologisms in the various Septuagint books, we still lack precise numerical data.

Another point worth noting is that the compilers of the previously discussed Septuagint lexica, while duly acknowledging the shortcomings and insufficiencies of the LSJ lexicon, rely predominantly, if not exclusively, upon it for the identification of the neologisms and the *hapax legomena* that occur in the Septuagint. It is understandable, of course, that for the lexicographers who produced or started working on their lexica in the last decades of the twentieth century there was practically no other reliable resource except LSJ. Yet, one would have expected that the lexica published or re-edited in the first and second decades of the twenty-first century would have profited from the new scholarship tools produced in the interim. It is true that the *Diccionario Griego-Español (DGE)*, still far from completion, cannot yet present itself as a full-fledged alternative to LSJ. One may, however, have recourse to the electronic databases of ancient Greek texts (the TLG, the PHI, and the PN), which we repeatedly referred to in the foregoing discussion. These databases cover all types of texts from all periods of the ancient Greek language and can provide lexical information of an ampleness and variety that cannot be claimed by any existing printed Greek lexicon. The material that they offer is, of course, in raw form, and it takes considerable effort and time to sort through it in order to trace the first attestation of a given word. Yet, any serious lexicographical research in any field of the Greek language can no longer afford not to use these powerful electronic tools.[180]

A third point that has to be made is that the chronological boundaries set by most Septuagint lexica for the characterization of a word as a neologism of the Septuagint are inadequately defined. Designations such as "not used before the time of composition of the LXX" or "not attested earlier than the LXX" would be appropriate if the Septuagint was a homogeneous work translated/written at a specific point in time and not a corpus of texts translated/written over a period spanning four centuries (third century

---

an asterisk not only new lexemes but also new senses and constructions, which results in an inflated number of neologisms.

[178] The number after the slash is the total number of different words, if proper names are excluded.

[179] By way of comparison, one may note that Thucydides' vocabulary of circa 7,500 different words contains, according to an old study by Wolcott (1898, 157), 957 words (12.8%), which are attested for the first time in the *Histories*.

[180] This point has been emphasized by Lee (2004, 67; 2008, 214–15) and by Evans (2010, 13).

BCE–second century CE). Such designations are valid when applied to particular books of the Septuagint, but not when applied to the Septuagint as a whole. In order to be able to draw up a list of the 'neologisms of the Septuagint,' it is therefore first necessary to identify the neologisms of the individual books of the Septuagint. For this to be done, an approximate date of translation/composition has to be assigned to each and every book of the Septuagint corpus. A justified caveat posed by most Septuagint lexicographers regards precisely the difficulty of assigning confident dates not only to the books of the Septuagint, but also to the literary and non-literary Greek texts that survive from the extended period of formation of the Septuagint corpus. This is a serious difficulty indeed.

With regard to the dating of the Septuagint books, as a look at the chronology suggested in *BGS* (pp. 85, 96–97, 111) and in the "Time and Place of Composition" sections in *CCS* shows, in a number of cases, a relative consensus permits a dating within a few decades of a century or even to particular years (e.g. Sirach); in other cases, divergence of opinion permits no more precise a dating than within the range of a century or, at best, half a century. It is certainly a desideratum to draw up a relative chronology of the Septuagint books—a much more refined one than that offered in *BGS*—that would incorporate the latest suggestions put forth by Septuagint scholarship about the possible dates of translation/composition of the Septuagint books and in the direction of establishing points of consensus rather than of calling attention to the divergence of views.[181]

The situation is comparatively better with regard to secular Hellenistic Greek literary works, for many of which a date can be pinpointed quite accurately; but even for doubtful works, such as certain pseudo-Hippocratic or pseudo-Aristotelian treatises, scholarship has suggested plausible dates. When it comes to inscriptions, things are arguably not as desperate as T. Evans has presented them in his *Potential of Linguistic Criteria for Dating Septuagint Books* (p. 12), where he states that "the inscriptions . . . are very often extremely hard to date even within a range of three or four centuries. Many modern editors have shown reluctance to attempt even that." For many of the non-self-dating inscriptions, epigraphists can in fact establish dates within ranges much narrower than "three or four centuries"; McLean (2002, 176–77) and Aitken (2014, 39–41) explain the means by which an epigraphist or a philologist can establish plausible dates for undated inscriptions. The same goes for the non-internally dated papyri, which can be assigned dates on palaeographical grounds. One may wonder, indeed, if the number of undated/undateable inscriptions and papyri is so large as to constitute an insuperable hindrance for the lexicographer who strives to establish the first attestations of words that happen to occur in them as well as in the Septuagint.[182]

---

[181] See Appendix 1.

[182] It may be noted here that, for a highly literary book originally composed in Greek like 2 Maccabees, the importance of the linguistic evidence provided by the Egyptian documentary papyri is not so cardinal as it is for, say, the Pentateuch and other books of the Septuagint that were translated/written in Egypt (although Jason of Cyrene may, of course, have produced his work in Egypt). The language of 2

According to the above, a suggested procedure for the lexicographer or the philologist who wants to establish the first attestation of any given Septuagint word is the following: first of all, he/she should take pains to check the word that he considers to be a neologism-candidate not only against the major Greek lexica but also against all the available electronic databases of ancient Greek texts; on the basis of the dates proposed in these databases,[183] he/she should then pick out the texts that bear the earliest attestations and identify the very earliest among them. In case of uncertainty, he/she should resort to every specialized study available that might help him/her elucidate the date of a particular text. It is only after having exhausted all possible means of determining whether one or another text carries the first recorded instance of a word, without having reached any certainty, that one should declare a *non liquet* and relegate the word in question to the category of "doubtful neologisms."

1.7 Definition of neologism and *hapax legomenon* employed in this study

In light of the discussion conducted so far, we will now specify how we will be using the terms neologism and *hapax legomenon* in the present study:

a) A neologism of 2 Maccabees is a word not attested prior to this book, that is, a word which, from the evidence of the electronic databases of Greek texts listed in 1.9, does not occur in any extant Greek literary, epigraphical, or papyrological text dated to before 124 BCE, which is the date accepted as a working hypothesis in this study[184] for the composition of the epitome of Jason of Cyrene's work. Such a word may be either a morpho-semantic coinage of the author of 2 Maccabees or a word that existed in the written and/or the oral language of the time of composition of the epitome, but does not happen to have been recorded in any literary or non-literary text predating 2 Maccabees that has come down to us.[185] Semantic and other types of neologisms[186] have not been taken into consideration in this study.

Maccabees does not have so many affinities with the vernacular Koine of the non-literary papyri as with the language of the inscriptions.

[183] In the case of the TLG, which records—sometimes erroneously—only the century in which an author lived, one is obliged, of course, to take recourse to reference works (e.g. the PW or the *DNP*) or specialized philological studies, in order to establish a more precise date (actual or conjectural) for any given literary work. The PHI and the PN databases furnish, for the inscriptions and the papyri, respectively, the dates assigned to them by the editors of the printed editions that they have digitized.

[184] See 1.2.4.

[185] Cf. the definition of *proton legomenon* in 1.3.2.

[186] E.g. constructions, collocations, inflected forms of nouns or verbs, which are attested for the first time in this book, etc. See 1.3.2.

b) In light of the discussion in 1.5, we characterize as *hapax legomenon* a word which, from the evidence of the electronic databases of Greek texts listed in 1.9, occurs in 2 Maccabees and nowhere else in Greek up to around 600 CE, and as absolute *hapax legomenon* a word which, outside 2 Maccabees, has no other attestations in Greek, either before or after 600 CE. We consider a word to be a *hapax legomenon* even if: (a) it has more than one instance in 2 Maccabees, but occurs nowhere else in Greek, (b) it recurs in an identical or quasi-identical context (a verbatim quotation or a paraphrase of 2 Maccabees in Patristic literature), (c) outside 2 Maccabees, it is only cited in ancient and Byzantine lexica. A word which, outside 2 Maccabees, has one or two more instances in Greek before ca. 600 CE is characterized as a *dis* or *tris legomenon*, respectively.

1.8 Neologisms as chronological and intertextual indicators. Some previous studies

Before concluding our Introduction, we will refer to some previous studies that have dealt with two issues that are central to our investigation, namely the use of the neologisms as a means for determining the approximate time of translation/composition of a Septuagint book and for identifying its intertextual connections with other Septuagint books. The insights drawn from these studies have informed the methodological choices that will be exposed in the immediately following section (1.9).

1.8.1 Neologisms as chronological indicators

In "The God of the Maccabees," Bickerman (2007h, 1130) expressed the following desideratum: "An examination of the style and language of II Maccabees would be a rewarding enterprise, from which we could probably also learn further details about the date of origin of this work." Can the examination of the neologisms and the rare words that occur in this book contribute to establishing the date of its composition? In his dissertation on the language and style of 2 Maccabees, Richnow (1966, 71) pronounces negatively on this possibility:

> Für eine eventuelle Datierung der Schrift können sie [die 'Neuerungen' im Wortschatz und in der Formenlehre] kaum dienen. Überhaupt erscheint es mir sehr gewagt, außergewöhnliche Formulierungen in unserem Buch für die Datierung in Anspruch zu nehmen.

However, a number of studies published after Richnow's dissertation showed that the neologisms can indeed offer valuable clues about the date of translation/composition of some of the books of the Septuagint.

Scarpat (1967) attempted to establish an approximate date of composition of the Book of Wisdom on the basis of a number of Septuagint *hapax legomena*, rare words, and neologisms (new words, meanings, or constructions) that occur within it. To refute the opinions of previous scholars who supported a second-century BCE dating of Wisdom, Scarpat adduced some thirty such words, which, outside the Septuagint, are not attested earlier than around the turn of the Common Era; the occurrence of so many of them in Wisdom, he argued, shows that the sapiential book cannot have preceded by a century or more the extra-Septuagintal texts in which these words are next attested:

> La *Sap[ientia]* precederà di quasi un secolo Filone e di due secoli il IV dei *Mac[cabbei]*? Noi non lo crediamo. Queste domande sollevano gli *hapax* che enumereremo più avanti creando ognuno una perplessità e tutti insieme producendo la convinzione che è impossibile che la *Sapientia* abbia preceduto altri testi greci, di un secolo e più, non in un solo termine ma in numerosi termini e in costrutti e in significati particolari. Ciò costituirebbe un caso unico nella storia della lingua greca.[187]

Scarpat drew particular attention to the term κράτησις (Wis 6:3), which, albeit attested in the papyri from the second century BCE, became a technical term for the Roman dominion in Egypt, when Octavian captured Alexandria in 30 BCE. Scarpat posited the latter date as the *terminus post quem* for the composition of Wisdom since the term κράτησις in this book seems to allude to the Roman conquest of Egypt. In a later study (Scarpat 1988), the Italian scholar adduced another term, διάγνωσις (Wis 3:18), in support of his dating. This term, attested already in the Classical period, came to be used in the Greek-speaking areas subjugated to Rome as the equivalent of the Roman juridical term *cognitio extra ordinem*, which designated a trial in which the emperor himself, or an official appointed by him, could directly decide a case outside the regular court proceedings. Its earliest attestations in this particular sense are from the second half of the first century CE (NT Acts, Josephus). This led Scarpat to posit that its instance in Wisdom, where it is used of the Day of Judgement (ἡμέρα διαγνώσεως), in which God will administer final justice in the way the Roman emperor does in a *cognitio extra ordinem*, cannot be much earlier. On the basis of the evidence from the above-cited semantic neologisms and the thirty or so other Septuagint *hapax legomena* and rare words that occur in Wisdom, Scarpat fixed the date of the book in the reign of Caligula.

Following the same line of reasoning, Winston (1979, 22–23) similarly dated Wisdom to the first half of the first century CE on the strength, inter alia, of some thirty-five words and usages that first appear in this book—most of which actually overlap with those cited by Scarpat (1967)—and have no instances in secular Greek literature prior to the first century CE. As he argues (p. 23), the neologisms that he adduces provide

[187] Scarpat 1967, 172.

> very strong evidence that the date of Wisd cannot be earlier than the Augustan age, and that very likely (though by no means decisively) it was written in the first half of the first century CE. Although much of the literature of the first century BCE has been lost, a fact which virtually converts our inference into an argument of silence, the occurrence of so large a number of such words within so small a compass is not likely to be due to chance. When used in conjunction with the evidence for dating adduced above, it makes the beginning of the Roman period in Egypt (30 BCE) the only acceptable *terminus post quem* for the composition of the book.

The validity of Winston's dating depends, of course, on the validity of his claim concerning the occurrence of the thirty-five words first attested in the Wisdom in secular Greek texts dating from not earlier than the age of Augustus. The lexicographical resources that Winston had at his disposal forty years ago may have provided him with evidence that justified his conclusion, yet it is doubtful whether a search of the electronic databases and other resources available nowadays would fully support the same conclusion. Indeed, Aitken (2014, 50; cf. *CCS*, 403–4) has pointed out that one of the words adduced by Winston, the adjective δεκαμηνιαῖος (Wis 7:2), is in fact attested in an inscription (*IK Kyme* 41.19) dated as early as the first century BCE. "One wonders how many more from Winston's examples require reexamination," comments Aitken. A random check proves the latter scholar's point: ἐμμελέτημα (Wis 13:10) recurs in Origen (who quotes from Wisdom) and a few other ecclesiastical writers, as well as in an epigram of the sixth-century CE poet Macedonius Consul (*AP* 6.83); it was likely a coinage of the author of Wisdom, to whom all its subsequent users were indebted. σπλαγχνοφάγος (12:5) recurs in the pseudo-Plutarchian treatise *On Rivers*, possibly dating from the third century CE.[188] πηλουργός (15:7) recurs in Lucian (*Prom.Es* 2.13), but its earliest attestation is found in an *adespotum lyricum* preserved in a literary papyrus dating from around 100 BCE.[189] εὐδράνεια (13:19) recurs in a Phrygian inscription (*MAMA V Lists* I(i):182,43.9) dating to the beginning of the second century CE or later and in the fourth-century CE *Vision of Dorotheus*. These words do not in any way support the dating of Wisdom in the first half of the first century CE. This does not necessarily invalidate Winston's claim, as other words may indeed lend credence to it, but it certainly calls for a re-examination and re-evaluation of the evidence that the neologisms of Wisdom provide.

Neologisms and other linguistic innovations have also been used as a means of establishing the approximate time in which some of the translated books of the Septuagint came into existence. Lee's *A Lexical Study of the Septuagint Version of the Pentateuch* (1983) is a case in point. Lee sought to trace the affinities between the vocabulary used by the translators of the Pentateuch and the vernacular Greek of the time in which the Pentateuch is generally thought to have been translated into Greek, namely the third century BCE. More specifically, he investigated certain innovations in

[188] See *EANS*, 676–77.

[189] See Grenfell, Hunt, and Smyly 1902, 1–5; Powell 1925, 185–86; Page 1970, 410–13.

the Koine vocabulary of the time, which are reflected in the lexical choices of the translators. These innovations are mainly attested in:

a) Words already found in the literature of the Classical period, which assume new senses in the Koine (semantic neologisms). In their instances in the Greek Pentateuch, these words exhibit the new senses, in which they are attested in papyri and inscriptions from the third century BCE onwards (pp. 53–84).
b) Formations which are new in the Koine (or formations that have isolated instances in the Classical period, but only become common in the Koine), produced through affixation and composition. These new formations are attested in the Greek Pentateuch, as well as in papyri and other literary and non-literary texts from the third century BCE onwards (pp. 85–113).
c) Words that drop out of use in the Koine, as they are replaced by new ones, or incoming words that compete for a while with older words for the same meaning, before being eclipsed by them. The first three examples adduced by Lee concern the obsolescence of ἄρδω, ὕω, and ἀπέρχομαι and their replacement by ποτίζω, βρέχω, and ἀποτρέχω, respectively. On the strength of the evidence from the papyri and other texts of the period, this development appears to have taken place by the third century BCE and is reflected in the lexical choices of the Pentateuch translators (pp. 118–28). The other two examples advanced by Lee concern the terms that denote "to see" (ὁράω/βλέπω) and "donkey" (ὄνος/ὑποζύγιον). In the third-century BCE papyri, ὁράω is still the standard word for the meaning "to see," but, around the middle of the second century BCE, βλέπω begins to compete with it as a synonym; in the first century BCE, βλέπω becomes the standard word for "to see," and by the mid-first century CE it has almost totally ousted ὁράω. In the Greek Pentateuch, ὁράω is still the standard word for "to see," which points to a date of translation of the Torah sometime before 150 BCE. As regards the other pair of terms, in the third-century BCE papyri, ὄνος, an old word for "donkey," and ὑποζύγιον, originally "beast of draught or burden," which now comes to denote specifically the donkey, are attested with almost equal frequency; from the second century BCE onwards, the use of ὑποζύγιον in the sense of "donkey" gradually recedes, so that in the first century CE it is totally eclipsed by ὄνος. The translators of the Pentateuch use both terms, which indicates that their translation likely came into existence before the gradual obsolescence of ὑποζύγιον as a term for "donkey," attested from around 150 BCE onwards (pp. 131–44).

The last two pairs of terms discussed by Lee, albeit providing no clear evidence for the Pentateuch's translation in the third century BCE, can at least set the mid-second century BCE as a *terminus ante quem*. Lee is aware of the fact that the linguistic processes that he discusses occurred over an extended period of time, which makes it impossible to pinpoint exact dates for them. As he admits, by using them as a chronological criterion one cannot assign the Pentateuch to a date-range narrower than a century (p. 131). Moreover, although he believes that his method of approximate dating

can be applied to other books of the Septuagint, he considers it unfit for the literary books because, unlike the Greek Pentateuch which reflects the contemporary vernacular, they "retain features obsolete in the living language" (pp. 4, 131, 148).[190]

1.8.2 Neologisms as intertextual indicators

A study that has given a very prominent place to the examination of the neologisms as indicators of the lexical dependence of one Septuagint book on another is Olivier Munnich's doctoral dissertation entitled *Étude lexicographique du Psautier des Septante* (1982). Munnich examines eighty-two words of the Greek Psalter, which, on the basis of his lexicographical resources, appear for the first, or only, time in the Septuagint. His endeavour consists in distinguishing the words that were coined by the translators of the Septuagint, and the translator of the book of Psalms, in particular, from the words that simply happen to be attested for the first time in the Septuagint, and in establishing whether the recurrence of the Greek Psalter's neological vocabulary in the translations of other Septuagint books, in the *kaige* revision of the Septuagint, and in the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion attests to the literary influence that the Greek Psalter exerted on them. To determine whether these eighty-two words were lexical coinages of the Septuagint, Munnich examines their formation, the existence or not of cognate words, the possible influence that the underlying Hebrew text might have had on their coinage or usage by the translators of the Septuagint books, and their attestation not only in the Septuagint and its revisions but also in Jewish and Christian literature, as well as in profane Greek literary and non-literary texts.

Munnich begins with the thesis that the book of Psalms was one of the first books of the Hebrew Bible to be translated into Greek, and that no other books than the Pentateuch or Isaiah influenced the language of its translation. Thus, he assumes that the words that are first attested in the Septuagint of the Pentateuch and Isaiah and recur in the Septuagint of Psalms are lexical borrowings of the latter from the former. For the rest of the Septuagint neologisms, he posits that their occurrence in the Psalms, as well as in other books of the Septuagint and its revisions, but hardly elsewhere in secular Greek, is not a matter of chance, but attests to the lexical/literary dependence of one Septuagint book on another, and, more specifically, of the books of the Septuagint and its revisions on the Greek Psalter.

Munnich identifies thirty words which are first attested in the Septuagint of Psalms and recur in twenty-six other books of the Septuagint and its revisions. He manages to establish with a certain degree of confidence the literary dependence of sixteen of these books on the Greek Psalter. His analysis thus confirms his initial hypothesis that the book of Psalms was one of the first books of the Hebrew Bible to be translated into Greek, and that its translation exerted a substantial influence on the subsequent

[190] See also Evans 2010, 6–12.

translations of other biblical books, as well as on the *kaige* revision and the versions of Aquila, Symmachus, and Theodotion.

Munnich is not interested in determining with any sort of precision the date of translation of the book of Psalms. Indeed, his initial, and eventually confirmed, hypothesis, that the latter was translated into Greek right after the Pentateuch and Isaiah, perhaps as early as the end of the third century BCE,[191] runs the risk of being a *petitio principii*, as he himself is aware.[192] Subsequent studies on the Greek Psalter have actually challenged this early dating. Schaper (1995, 42, 45, 150; 2014, 174) saw in LXX Pss 59:9c and 107:9c Ιουδας βασιλεύς μου a possible allusion to Judas Maccabaeus, which led him to date the translation of the Psalms to the second half of the second century BCE, the *terminus post quem* being 166–161/160 BCE, the period of Judas' military leadership.[193] Williams (2001, 264–68) has questioned the dependence of the Greek Psalter on Isaiah, which Munnich accepts almost axiomatically. He adduces five instances of possible intertextual connection between the two books. For two of these instances, he considers more likely an influence running from the Septuagint of Psalms to the Septuagint of Isaiah, rather than the other way round; for the rest, he cannot ascertain with certainty the direction of dependence.[194] The convergence of evidence from the intertextual links that he traces between the Psalms and Isaiah, the Proverbs, and 1 Maccabees leads him to date the translation of the Psalms to the second century BCE; a more precise dating to the first or the second part of the century depends, as he cautiously points out, upon how one assesses the aforementioned Maccabean reference in the Psalms (pp. 275–76).

Another debatable point in Munnich's study is whether a very limited number of words, however rare they might be, can sufficiently prove the intertextual relationships that exist between the books of the Septuagint. Munnich, as previously noted, establishes the literary dependence of sixteen Septuagint books on the Greek Psalter on the basis of only thirty words.[195] In some cases, the dependence is established on the basis of a single word. The lexical influence of the Greek Psalms on 2 Maccabees, for example, is posited

---

[191] Cf. p. 257: "La *Septante des Juges* et celle des *Psaumes* ont peut-être été composées avant cette date [sc. 183 BCE]; ib. 421–22: "Le fait que de nombreux livres septantistes réemploient *plusieurs* traductions assez originales de la *Septante des Psaumes* et spécifiques à celle-ci incite à supposer que cette traduction fut composée à une date relativement ancienne et nous souscrivons au jugement porté à ce sujet par R. Schwab: 'la version grecque des Septante daterait de la fin du IIIe siècle.'"; ib. 437: "L'influence qu'exerça le *Psautier* grec sur cette traduction [sc. Sirach, translated shortly after 132 BCE] révèle que le deuxième tiers du IIe siècle avant notre ère constituait, sinon le 'floruit' de la *Septante des Psaumes*, du moins son 'florebat.'"

[192] See p. 156.

[193] Williams (2001, 262–63) downplays the significance of the phrase Ιουδας βασιλεύς μου as a clue to the date of translation of the Psalms, arguing that Judas Maccabeus never held any royal title. However, a similar rendering in the Septuagint of Zechariah (14:14) seems to corroborate the Maccabean allusion in the LXX Psalms. See Schaper 2014, 175.

[194] However, in the conclusion to his paper (p. 275), Williams unambiguously situates the translation of the Psalms "prior to the translation of both Isaiah and Proverbs."

[195] Munnich is aware of this problem. See pp. 484–85.

solely on the strength of the word ἐμπαιγμός. Munnich goes to great lengths to prove his point (pp. 426–29), yet his argument is complex and far-fetched rather than convincing, as we will have the opportunity to show further on in this study.[196] This is not to say that there are no intertextual links between the Greek Psalms and 2 Maccabees, but only that it takes more evidence than a single word to establish them with a certain degree of confidence.

Theoretical texts on intertextuality usually deny that an intertextual relationship can be established at the level of the word. Jenny (1982, 40), for example, proposes "to speak of intertextuality only when there can be found in a text elements exhibiting a structure created previous to the text, *above the level of the lexeme* [emphasis ours], of course, but independently of the level of that structure." In the field of Biblical Studies, it is also commonly accepted that the various types of intertextual reference (quotation, allusion, and echo or reminiscence) can be identified on the basis of a parallel of at least two or three words to another text. In their discussion of the typology of intertextual references in Second Temple Judaism, Lange and Weigold (2011, 23–35) suggest that, for the identification of the explicit and implicit quotations and allusions, which are the most objectively verifiable forms of intertextual reference, the following requirements need to be fullfilled: a parallel of at least three words (and, "in exceptional cases," of two rare words) for the identification of an implicit allusion (p. 25); an "uninterrupted verbal parallel of at least four words which does not alter the quoted text but is not introduced by a quotation formula or otherwise explicitly identified" for the identification of an implicit quotation (p. 26); and a "verbal parallel of at least two words which is explicitly identified by a quotation formula or other means" for the identification of an explicit quotation (p. 27).[197]

Lange and Weigold also discuss the claims made by certain biblical scholars that an allusion of a posterior to an anterior biblical text can be established on the basis of a single word. As an example, they adduce van der Ploeg's suggestion that the word כַּעֲנָנִים ("like clouds") in the War Scroll from Qumran (1QM 12.9) is an allusion to Jer 4:13. The fact that the comparison with clouds is attested elsewhere in pre-rabbinic Jewish literature (e.g. in the pseudepigraphic psalm 4Q381 46.4) leads Lange and Weigold to dismiss the existence of an intertextual relationship between the two texts on the grounds that "the author of the *War Scroll* was very likely able to construe his comparison of horsemen with clouds without the guidance of Jer 4:13" (pp. 30–31).

Although the caution of the aforenamed scholars is understandable, one cannot help obseving that in both 1QM 12.9 and Jer 4:13 (but not in 4Q381 46.4), the word כַּעֲנָנִים is used in a martial context, where horsemen and horse-drawn chariots are mentioned, respectively. The contextual similarity makes the intertextual connection between the two texts not totally unlikely. Moreover, the fact that the War Scroll contains six

[196] See 6.2.3.

[197] Cf. Dimant 1986, 3–4; ead. 1988, 355, 401; van der Kooij 1999, 128, 132; van Henten 2010, 360–62; Lange 2012, 99–101.

(according to Lange 2012, 103–10) or nine (according to Carmignac; see Lange 2012, 110–13) implicit allusions to Jeremiah shows that the latter book was definitely one of the former's intertexts, which makes van der Ploeg's assumption at least justifiable. Be it also noted that, with regard to 1QM 12.9, Carmignac (1956, 256) has suggested a different intertextual connection: the author of the Qumranic text, argues the French scholar, drew the poetic image contained in 12.9 ("like rain clouds and like mist clouds covering the earth")[198] from Ezek 38:9 (כָּעָנָן לְכַסּוֹת הָאָרֶץ, "like a cloud covering the land" NRSV), in which he embedded two words from Isa 18:4 (כְּעָב טַל, "like a cloud of dew" NRSV), and then put the resulting phrase in the plural. As can be seen, the candidate intertexts for 1QM 12.9 are more than one; given this, to assert that the author of the War Scroll "was able to construe his comparison without the guidance of Jer 4:13" does not settle the issue of 12.9's intertextual reference, because the author may have had the guidance of some other, or of more than one, biblical text. The question, then, is not whether a single lexeme like כַּעֲנָנִים may suffice to establish an intertextual relationship between the two texts, but whether one, faced with a multiplicity of possibilities, can confidently identify this relationship.

Lange and Weigold further examine other alleged allusions of the War Scroll and the Hodayot (IQH[a]) to the Book of Jeremiah. These allusions have been proposed by biblical scholars on the basis of linguistic parallels of two, three, or more words. Lange and Weigold dismiss some of them, on the grounds that the lexemes involved in the parallels are common or their combination occurs in other texts of Second Temple Jewish literature; some others they confirm, if the lexemes involved in the parallels are rare or if they are common, but their combination does not occur elsewhere in pre-rabbinic Hebrew literature (pp. 30–35).[199] The idea seems to be that the greater the number of lexemes from which a linguistic parallel consists, and the rarer their combination is, the more likely it is that they attest to an intertextual relationship between the texts that share them, whereas the fewer in number the lexemes are, or the more common, the more uncertain or unlikely the intertextual relationship is.

Especially pertinent to our discussion are also the criteria put forward by Leonard (2008) for identifying inner-biblical allusions and for determining the direction of influence between biblical texts. These criteria arose in the context of investigating whether or not Psalm 78 MT is dependent on the Hebrew Pentateuch and its sources, but they can, for the most part, be very well applied to similar investigations in the area of the Septuagint. The first and foremost criterion is, according to Leonard, the existence of shared language. Lexical links between two texts provide a more "objective and verifiable" criterion for the identification of allusions than, say, the existence of thematic or other connections. The use of non-shared language should not, however, be taken as evidence against the existence of an allusion, since a biblical author may have adapted a borrowing to his own diction and purposes or used more than one source (pp. 245–50).

[198] Trans. J. Duhaime in Charlesworth et al. 1995, 121.

[199] See also Lange 2012, 102–13.

Moreover, shared language that includes "rare or distinctive" terms reinforces the possibility that one text alludes to another. This said, an allusion may be contained even in common shared terms, yet in that case it is more difficult to prove that a connection between two texts exists (pp. 251–52).[200] Leonard further points out that shared phrases are more likely to attest to a textual connection than individual shared terms and that the greater the cumulative evidence coming from shared terms and phrases, the stronger the likelihood of a connection. Strong evidence for an allusion in one place may even strengthen the likelihood of an allusion that seems doubtful in another place (pp. 252–55). The similarity of the context, in which the shared terms or phrases occur, further increases the probability that one text intentionally alludes to another. It follows from the above that the combination of shared rare or distinctive terms and a similar or identical context provides a strong indication of one text's lexical dependence on another (p. 255). Leonard lastly argues that shared language does not go hand in hand with shared ideology or shared form, so that the absence of the latter is no reason to deny the existence of an allusion (pp. 255–57).

Once a connection through allusion between two biblical texts has been established, it remains to determine the direction of the allusion, when a relationship of anteriority/posteriority between the texts cannot be established with certainty. According to Leonard, some ways of dealing with this issue are to check whether one text claims to draw on the other, to detect internal datable features (e.g. morphological, syntactical, lexical, etc.), and to observe any "general pattern of dependence," e.g. if one of the two texts tends to borrow from other texts, or whether there are rhetorical and stylistic patterns that indicate that one of the two texts might have used the other "in an exegetically significant way," etc. (pp. 257–64). Leonard duly warns that the criteria that he presents do not have an axiomatic character, but are simply guidelines that should be applied carefully across individual cases.

As a supplement to Leonard's criteria for identifying inner-biblical allusions, we can add two of the criteria proposed by Edenburg (1998, 72–73) for establishing literary interrelation between Hebrew biblical texts: the "unique recurrence of peculiar formulations," such as "otherwise unattested forms, words, or phraseology, as well as more common expressions which are utilized in a uniquely peculiar way" and the "'ungrammatical' actualization of a common element," that is, the use, in a given text, of an expression outside the norm of linguistic correctness, whose ungrammaticality is not a result of textual corruption, and whose re-employment in another text may be meant as an allusion to the former text.

The last study that we would like to mention here is Fewster's "Testing the intertextuality of ματαιότης in the New Testament" (2012). Fewster establishes an intertextual connection between Rom 8:20 and Eccl 11:9–12:1, and, further, between Rom 8:19–21 and 2 Pet 2:18–19, via the word ματαιότης, 'futility.' ματαιότης is a

[200] Cf. Munnich 1982, 413: "La rareté d'un mot n'est pas plus marque d'une influence littéraire, que sa fréquence marque d'une absence d'influence littéraire."

Septuagint neologism that occurs fourteen times in the Psalms, once in Proverbs, and thirty-nine times in Ecclesiastes; in the New Testament, it occurs only in Rom 8:20, in Eph 4:17, and in 2 Pet 2:18. Fewster's study is informed by Hoey's theory of lexical priming, which accounts for the phenomenon of collocation. Hoey (2007) explains collocation by arguing that, every time we encounter a word, we keep a mental record of it, as well as of the words with which it co-occurs, so that, after having repeatedly been exposed to it and its various contexts, we are "primed" to use it ourselves in one of the typical contexts that we have stored in our mental lexicon. Moreover, we are primed to identify and subsequently replicate other more subtle features associated with it, such as the grammatical positions and functions in which it occurs (its colligations), its semantic and pragmatic associations, its positioning within the discourse (its textual colligation), the types of semantic relation in which it occurs (its textual semantic associations), and so on (pp. 7–8).

Building on Hoey's theory, Fewster presents "a linguistic model that tests for intertextuality, particularly as triggered through individual lexemes" (p. 39). He sees intertextuality as "a result of primed associations with an antecedent text" made through particular lexemes (keywords) that occur in "particular repetitive or memorable contexts" (p. 41). By being exposed to such keywords, a reader is primed to recognize them and "re-experience" their associations in future encounters with them. Common lexemes, e.g. function words, are unlikely to invoke any significant primed associations; uncommon or rare lexemes, on the other hand, are especially suited to function as keywords capable of "jolting the reader" (p. 42n9). Since a single lexeme is subject to fewer lexical and syntactical constraints than a larger portion of text, e.g. a phrase or a quotation, Fewster regards it necessary to establish a number of specific criteria, like the aforementioned features put forth by Hoey to account for lexical priming, that can help determine whether a keyword in a given text is meant to invoke associations with an anterior text. In the case studied by Fewster, for example, there are three primed relationships that suggest an intertextual connection between Rom 8:20 (τῇ γὰρ ματαιότητι ἡ κτίσις ὑπετάγη, οὐχ ἑκοῦσα, ἀλλὰ διὰ τὸν ὑποτάξαντα) and Eccl 11:10–12:1 (ὅτι ἡ νεότης καὶ ἡ ἄνοια ματαιότης. καὶ μνήσθητι τοῦ κτίσαντός σε ἐν ἡμέραις νεότητός σου) through the use of the keyword ματαιότης: the semantic association of ματαιότης with collocates that belong to the domain of creation (ἡ κτίσις–τοῦ κτίσαντος), the grammatical association of ματαιότης with collocate verbs in the aorist (ὑπετάγη–μνήσθητι), and the textual semantic association of ματαιότης with collocates that express the tension/contrast between creation and its futility.

Fewster posits that Paul's encounter with ματαιότης in Eccl 11:10–12:1 primed the use of this word in Rom 8:20 and the repetition of its grammatical, semantic, and textual semantic associations; the author offered the latter as clues that would enable those of his readers acquainted with Ecclesiastes to recognize his source text. Following Hoey, Fewster emphasizes that highly valued texts, such as works that have achieved literary greatness or religious texts, are more apt to generate intertextually primed associations than less highly-regarded or unnoteworthy works. This remark is valid not only as

regards the impact of certain Septuagint books on the New Testament, e.g. of Ecclesiastes on Romans, in the case discussed by Fewster, but also as regards the impact of certain early Septuagint books on subsequent translations and compositions that belong to the Septuagint corpus, e.g. of the Greek Psalter on the posterior books of the Septuagint, in the case discussed by Munnich. An important implication of Fewster's model is that highly marked words that occur in these texts, such as the neologisms and the Septuagint *hapax legomena*, are more likely than others to be involved in intertextual primings. Hoey's criteria, which Fewster proposes as a means of constraining and measuring single-lexeme intertextuality, are thus very relevant to the discussion of the Septuagint neologisms and *hapaxes*.

1.9 Method

In order to identify the neologisms occurring in 2 Maccabees, we undertook the following procedures.

First, we created a list of the vocabulary of 2 Maccabees using the Accordance Bible software program (version 10.4.5). Accordance offers the "LXX Göttingen with Apparatus-2 Maccabees" module, which includes the grammatically tagged critical text of R. Hanhart's second corrected edition of 2 Maccabees (1976). Since the digitized text featured in this module is marred by more than a hundred small errors, we had to check and correct it against the printed text of the third revised edition of the book (Hanhart 2008).

We then searched for the 2,192 different words (proper names excluded), of which the book's vocabulary consists, in the Thesaurus Linguae Graecae (TLG), the Searchable Greek Inscriptions (PHI), the Supplementum Epigraphicum Graecum (SEG), and the Papyrological Navigator (PN) databases.[201] On the basis of this search, we drafted seven word lists, which include respectively: (a) the words whose earliest recorded instance in Greek is found in 2 Maccabees (see Appendix 2 and the final list in Appendix 18); (b) the words which are first attested in the canonical books of the Septuagint and recur in 2 Maccabees (see Appendix 7); (c) the words which are first attested in 2 Maccabees, as well as in one more non-canonical book, or part of book, roughly contemporary with or posterior to 2 Maccabees (see Appendix 4); (d) the words which are first attested in 2 Maccabees and recur in the Alpha Text of Esther (see Appendix 6); (e) the words which, prior to 2 Maccabees, have a single attestation in extra-Septuagintal literature or are attested in only two or three secular authors/texts (see Appendices 9 and 10); and (f) the words whose first instance in Greek cannot be nailed down with certainty (see Appendix 3 and the final list in Appendix 19).

[201] Very common words (e.g. grammatical words), as well as the *variae lectiones* contained in the critical apparatus, were not included in the search.

An issue that we had to deal with during the above-described search was that both the Accordance program and TLG have encoded Rahlfs' *Septuaginta*, an edition that is on its way to being superseded by the major critical edition produced by the Göttingen Septuaginta-Unternehmen.[202] Thus far, twenty-four volumes, corresponding to about two thirds of the Septuagint corpus, have appeared in this series. The two most comprehensive Bible software programs, Accordance and Logos, offer the searchable, grammatically tagged text of eighteen and twenty-three of these volumes, respectively. The reader of the present study should be aware that we were obliged to use either Rahlfs' text or the Göttingen text of the Septuagint, depending on the type of search that we wanted to perform. In counting the frequency of occurrence of the words in the Septuagint, for example, we could not but utilize Rahlfs' complete *Septuaginta*, digitally accessible and searchable through the Accordance and the TLG, whereas for lexical searches in individual books of the Septuagint, which have appeared in the Göttingen series, we utilized the Göttingen edition, as digitized by Logos. In our experience, Logos offers a more reliable digitized text than Accordance, but the tagging of the texts is better in the latter and the lexical search results more accurate.

As can be easily understood, in order to identify the first attestations of the words that make up the vocabulary of 2 Maccabees, it was of paramount importance to have the dates of a great number of Greek literary and non-literary texts established as precisely as possible. For this purpose, we consulted reference works such as the *Real-Encyclopädie der classischen Altertumswissenschaft* (PW), the *Neue Pauly: Enzyklopädie der Antike* (*DNP*), the *Geschichte der antiken Texte: Autoren- und Werklexikon* (*GAT*), *The Cambridge History of Classical Literature* (Easterling and Knox 1985), the *Encyclopedia of Ancient Natural Scientists* (*EANS*), as well as numerous specialized philological studies. For the much-debated dates of translation/composition of the books of the Septuagint, we relied on the suggestions put forward by G. Dorival in chapter 3 of *La Bible grecque des Septante* (*BGS*, pp. 85–97, 110–11), the contributors to the volume *The T&T Clark Companion to the Septuagint* (*CCS*), and the authors of specialized Septuagint studies. In order to provide the reader with a chronological framework of the Septuagint corpus, we drew up a tentative chronology of the books of the Septuagint, based mainly on *BGS* and *CCS* (see Appendix 1). For the epigraphical and papyrological texts, we relied on the dates provided by the PHI, the SEG, and the PN, although it was very often deemed necessary to consult the printed editions of inscriptions and papyri, as well as other specialized epigraphical and papyrological studies.

For the identification of the phraseological parallels between 2 Maccabees and other Septuagintal and extra-Septuagintal texts, we had again recourse to the TLG, the PHI, and the PN databases, which allow searching for word combinations (TLG's features 'Browse' and 'N-Grams' are especially helpful in detecting intertextual phrase matches),

[202] See https://adw-goe.de/en/research/completed-research-projects/akademienprogramm/septuaginta-unternehmen/

and to the Accordance and Logos software programs, which likewise allow for identifying multiple word parallels.

In addition to the methodological issues concerning the definition and the identification of the neologisms, which we dealt extensively with in the previous sections of the Introduction, we will here summarily expose some of the criteria that we used for making judgements about issues such as determining whether a neologism of 2 Maccabees is a coinage of the author of this book or a chance first attestation, establishing whether 2 Maccabees relates intertextually with other Septuagintal and secular Greek texts via shared neologisms, as well as determining the direction of an intertextual dependence, and deriving chronological clues from the neological vocabulary of the book. These rule-of-thumb rather than hard-and-fast criteria derive, for the main part, from the discussion in the immediately preceding section (1.8).

Firstly, to establish whether a word first attested in 2 Maccabees is a coinage of the author of this book or a chance *proton legomenon*, we mainly take into account the number of its subsequent instances and the type of texts in which it recurs. The rarer the neologism is, within and outside the Septuagint, the higher the chances are that it is a lexical coinage of the author of our book. A neologism that is a Septuagint *hapax legomenon* with no attestations in profane literature, or with subsequent attestations only in the literature dependent on the Septuagint, and, *a fortiori*, a neologism that is an absolute *hapax legomenon*, have the highest chances of being lexical coinages of the author of 2 Maccabees. The non-attestation of any cognate words in any literary and non-literary texts anterior to and contemporary with 2 Maccabees increases the chances that the neologism is a lexical coinage of the author of this book. The occurrence of other neologisms of similar formation in the same book reinforces this assumption. However, due to the severe lacunae in our knowledge of the ancient Greek language, no certainty can be claimed about the paternity of a given Septuagint word, even if it is an absolute *hapax legomenon*.

Secondly, when seeking to establish whether there is lexical dependence of 2 Maccabees on another Septuagint book, or vice versa, on the basis of a shared neologism, we examine whether the neologism in question (a) is shared exclusively by the two books, (b) is not attested outside the Septuagint, (c) is used in both books in the same sense or in the same construction, and (d) occurs in a similar context. We also examine whether the two books share other rare or distinctive words and phraseology. The more of these conditions that are fulfilled, the stronger the likelihood is that there is an intertextual connection between the two books via the neologism that they share (see 1.8.2).

Thirdly, to establish the direction of dependence between 2 Maccabees and another Septuagint book with which it shares a neologism, if it is unclear which of the two books is anterior and which is posterior, we take into consideration such criteria as the books' originality of vocabulary and diction (a book that contains lexical borrowings from various sources is more likely to be indebted, for a neologism, to another book that exhibits lexical individuality and originality), how well integrated the neologism is in the

contexts in which it occurs in the two books (a neologism may fit naturally into the context for which it was originally created, but may not fit organically into the context in which it was transplanted), as well as the existence of other points of verbal contact between the books and their distribution in the latter (shared lexical items or phraseology that are clustered in one place in one book but are widespread in distribution in the other may indicate that the former is indebted to the latter for them).

Fourthly, with regard to the use of the neologisms as chronological indicators, we take into account the following:

a) The 'lifespan' of a neologism, that is, the period demarcated by its first and last recorded instances. The dates of first and last attestation do not necessarily correspond to the dates of 'birth' and 'demise' of the neologism, respectively, as the latter may have existed in the oral and/or the written language before the first and after the last recorded instances, but they certainly give a precise date-range, within which all the surviving instances of the neologism are attested.

b) The time from which the attestations of a given neologism start clustering. This time may be different from that of the first recorded instance. An isolated first instance in a Septuagint book, separated by a century or more from the next immediate instances in literary and/or non-literary texts, is not an extremely uncommon phenomenon, yet an elevated number of such neologisms may give grounds for questioning the date assigned to or posited for the book in which these neologisms first occur, especially if the neologisms in question do not seem to have been coinages of the author of this book (see 1.8.1). An argument often advanced in this case is that the gaps in the attestation of such words are due to the fragmentary and lacunary survival of ancient Greek texts and that the words in question might have existed in the oral language or in written sources that have not come down to us. This is, of course, a serious caveat that should always be kept in mind. However, we here agree with Edenburg (1998, 71) in acknowledging the importance of "taking a methodological stand which undertakes to consider all *known* evidence. Unknown witnesses cannot be considered evidence; in the eventuality that a new witness is uncovered, then it becomes potential evidence, but until then it cannot be other than a non-entity."

c) The existence of neological technical terms (e.g. legal, military, religious, etc.) that can be used as dating 'yardsticks' (see 1.8.1).

d) The relative chronology that results from the establishment of the network of intertextual connections between a Septuagint book and other Septuagintal or extra-Septuagintal texts that share the same neologisms.

Lastly, a note on the phraseological parallels between 2 Maccabees and other Septuagintal as well as secular Greek works, which we adduce in almost every chapter:[203] these parallels are not offered as any sort of a priori proof of lexical influence and dependence between the texts that share them—although this may indeed hold true in

[203] See Appendices 5, 8, and 11–17.

some cases (e.g. in exclusively shared phraseology) which need to be carefully assessed individually—but rather as evidence of the lexical, stylistic, and literary affinities and affiliations of 2 Maccabees with other texts within and outside the Septuagint. The fact, in particular, that our book exhibits phraseological parallels with texts from secular Greek authors, whose works can be more or less confidently assigned to specific periods and dates, is to be taken into account for the dating of the book, together with the evidence from the examination of the neologisms.

Chapter 2: The neologisms of 2 Maccabees

2.1 Introduction

In this chapter we will present a list of the neologisms that occur in 2 Maccabees and will examine a selection of them in detail. In Appendix 2, we list fifty-nine words whose earliest recorded occurrence in Greek is found in 2 Maccabees and which do not recur in any canonical or deuterocanonical/apocryphal book of the Septuagint.[1] Twenty-two of these words are absolute *hapax legomena*, six are non-absolute *hapax legomena*, seven are *dis legomena*, and three are *tris legomena*. The remaining twenty-one words recur with varying frequency in literary and non-literary texts from 124 BCE (the putative date of composition of 2 Maccabees, according to our working hypothesis) onwards. Most of them recur in the same sense that they have in 2 Maccabees, yet a few (e.g. βαρβάρως, πρόπτωσις) reappear in subsequent literature in a different sense. Of the neologisms that are not (absolute or non-absolute) *hapax legomena*, four recur from the first century BCE onwards,[2] eleven from the first century CE onwards,[3] and fourteen do not recur earlier than the second century CE;[4] only two have instances so early as the last quarter of the second century BCE.[5] It can be noted that the adjectives, from which a small number of adverbs were derived and which first appear in 2 Maccabees (βαρβάρως, εὐθίκτως, ψυχικῶς), are attested before 124 BCE,[6] and that a couple of other adjectives recorded in the list (αὐλαῖος, ὁμοιόψηφος) are variants of words which are attested much earlier than 2 Maccabees.[7]

---

[1] This list will later be supplemented by a few more neologisms which occur in 2 Maccabees as well as in other deuterocanonical/apocryphal books, or parts of books, that postdate 2 Maccabees. See 4.3 and Appendix 4. Two more neologisms, which occur in 2 Maccabees and the Alpha Text of Esther, are discussed in Chapter 6. The final list of the neologisms of 2 Maccabees is given in Appendix 18.

[2] ἐνενηκονταετής, πρόπτωσις, ὑπευλαβέομαι, ὑπονοθεύω.

[3] ἁγιότης, ἀκατάγνωστος, βαρβάρως, κρουνηδόν, μετάφρασις, ὁπλολογέω, παντεπόπτης, προσεξηγέομαι, ὑπογραμμός, χορτώδης, ψυχικῶς.

[4] ἀναβίωσις, δεξιάζω, δευτερολογέω, δυσπέτημα, ἐλευστέον, ἐποξύνω, εὐθίκτως, θωρακισμός, Μαρδοχαϊκός, προοδηγός, συμφλογίζω, συνεκκεντέω, συσσύρω, τιμωρητής.

[5] δᾳδουχία, περισκυθίζω (?).

[6] βάρβαρος (Alcm. fr. 10a.42 Page); εὔθικτος (Arist. *HA* 616^{b}22); ψυχικός (Arist. *GA* 726^{b}22, passim).

[7] αὔλειος is attested as early as Homer (*Od.* 1.104) and ὁμόψηφος as early as Herodotus (6.109, 7.149).

A cursory glance at Appendix 2 shows that chapter 4 has the highest concentration of neologisms of all the chapters of the book (13), followed by chapters 14 (7+2), 15 (5+3), 5 (7), 6 (7), and 8 (4+3).[8] None of the neologisms listed in this Appendix occur in the prefixed or the embedded letters.[9] Two neologisms (μετάφρασις, ὑπογραμμός) occur in the epitomator's prologue,[10] one (εὐθίκτως) in the epitomator's epilogue, and four (δυσπέτημα, ἐλευστέον, προενέχομαι, τιμωρητής) in passages thought to contain the epitomator's reflections. One notes the slight preponderance of verbs (23) over nouns (21) and the overwhelming preponderance of the *composita* (21 verbs, of which 10 have a double prefix, 15 nouns) over the *simplicia* (2 verbs, 6 nouns). One can also identify the main semantic domains into which these neologisms can be sorted: 'moral and ethical qualities and related behaviour,'[11] 'military activities,'[12] 'violence, harm, destroy, kill,'[13] 'religious beliefs and activities,'[14] 'attitudes and emotions,'[15] and 'divine attributes.'[16]

Owing to the large number of the neologisms listed in Appendix 2, we had to make a selection of the ones to treat in detail here. We abstained from discussing trivial words (e.g. ἐνενηκονταετής) or words that have previously been discussed at some length in lexica, commentaries, or other studies.[17] We tried to include in our sample different types of neologisms (absolute and non-absolute *hapax legomena, dis legomena*, and *proton legomena* that recur more than twice in the period between 124 BCE and ca. 600 CE), belonging to different parts of speech and to different semantic domains, and occurring in different chapters of the epitome. The examination of the seventeen neologisms that we selected is mainly aimed at elucidating their meaning, at explaining the motivation behind their coinage or their use in a particular context in 2 Maccabees,

---

[8] '+2' and '+3' indicate that in a given chapter there occur two and three more neologisms, respectively, which are not listed in Appendix 2, but in Appendices 4 and 6, as, aside from 2 Maccabees, they also occur in one more deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book, and in the Alpha Text of Esther. Note also that some neologisms occur in more than one chapter of the epitome of 2 Maccabees.

[9] The only neologism that occurs in the prefixed letters, κατασφαλίζομαι (1:19), is listed in Appendix 4. F. Shaw (*CCS*, 279; 2016, 408), following LEH, takes συγκεραυνόω (1:16) and μεταγίνομαι (2:1, 2) to be the only two neologisms occurring in the prefixed letters. Yet, the first is a poetic verb, previously attested in Archil. fr. 120.2 West and in Cratin. fr. 187.4 Kock, and the second is first attested, although in a different sense than the one it has in 2 Maccabees, in Hes. *Th.* 607.

[10] A third neologism, Ἰουδαϊσμός, which occurs in the epitomator's prologue (2:21), as well as in two other chapters of the epitome (8:1, 14:38), and recurs in another deuterocanonical book, 4 Maccabees (4:26), is listed in Appendix 4.

[11] ἀκατάγνωστος, ἀναγνεία, ἀπευθανατίζω, ἀρρενωδῶς, συμμισοπονηρέω, ὑπονοθεύω.

[12] θωρακισμός, Κυπριάρχης, Μυσάρχης, ὁπλολογέω, πολεμοτροφέω.

[13] ἀποστρεβλόω, περισκυθίζω, συμφλογίζω, συνεκκεντέω.

[14] ἀναβίωσις, ἱεροσύλημα, σπλαγχνισμός, πρόπτωσις.

[15] δεινάζω, ὑπευλαβέομαι, φρικασμός, ψυχικῶς.

[16] ἁγιότης, παντεπόπτης. The labelling of the above-cited semantic domains is mainly based on Louw and Nida 1989.

[17] E.g. on ἁγιότης see O. Procksch, "ἅγιος, ἁγιάζω, κτλ," *TDNT* 1:114, on ἀκατάγνωστος see C. Spicq, "ἀκατάγνωστος," *TLNT* 1:58, on Μαρδοχαϊκός see Bardtke 1971 and 5.3 in the present study, on παντεπόπτης see Passoni dell'Acqua 2012, 50, 69–73, on προπτύω see Katz 1961, and on πρωτοκλήσιον see Bunge 1974, 70–72.

and at exploring the intertextual connections between the epitome and other Septuagintal or profane Greek texts that they were possibly meant to generate.

2.2. Discussion of a sample of neologisms of 2 Maccabees

2.2.1 ἀργυρολόγητος 'to be subject to exaction of money'

> 11:2–3 λογιζόμενος [sc. ὁ Λυσίας] τὴν μὲν πόλιν Ἕλλησιν οἰκητήριον ποιήσειν, τὸ δὲ ἱερὸν ἀργυρολόγητον καθὼς τὰ λοιπὰ τῶν ἐθνῶν τεμένη, πρατὴν δὲ κατ' ἔτος τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην ποιήσειν

Second Maccabees uses fifty-five verbal adjectives in -τος. Sixteen of these are not found in other books of the Septuagint;[18] twelve occur exclusively in Septuagint books, or parts of books, originally written in Greek (2, 3, 4 Maccabees, Wisdom, Additions B and E to Esther);[19] ἀκατάγνωστος, ἀργυρολόγητος, and οἰωνόβρωτος are first attested in 2 Maccabees; ἀργυρολόγητος is a *unicum* in the Greek language.

The verb ἀργυρολογέω, from which ἀργυρολόγητος derives, has less than a dozen instances in the literature predating 2 Maccabees and even fewer instances in a number of fourth-century BCE inscriptions. Rarer still are the related adjective ἀργυρολόγος and the substantive ἀργυρολογία. ἀργυρολογέω and ἀργυρολόγος first appear in Thucydides, who mentions four expeditions of Athenian "money-collecting" ships (ἀργυρολόγοι νῆες) to the north and west coasts of the Aegean and the Euxine in the winters of 430/29,[20] 428/27,[21] 425/24,[22] and in the summer of 424 BCE.[23] The aim of these expeditions was not to collect regular tribute or arrears from the allies, as older commentators on Thucydides have argued,[24] but to extort extra money urgently needed

---

[18] ἀκατάγνωστος, ἀπαρασήμαντος, ἀπένθητος, ἀργυρολόγητος, ἀφόρητος, δυσπολιόρκητος, δυσπρόσιτος, ἐπίκτητος, εὐαπάντητος, ἐφικτός, θεόκτιστος, κατάρρυτος, περιβόητος, περικατάλημπτος, πρατός, ὕποπτος.

[19] ἄγνωστος, ἀθέμιτος, ἀμίαντος, ἀνήκεστος, ἀνίκητος, ἀπήμαντος, ἄτρωτος, δοριάλωτος, κατάκλειστος, κατάρατος, οἰωνόβρωτος, πορευτός.

[20] 2.69.1 ἑτέρας δὲ ἓξ [sc. ναῦς ἔστειλαν] ἐπὶ Καρίας καὶ Λυκίας . . . ὅπως ταῦτά τε ἀργυρολογῶσι.

[21] 3.19.1–2 ἐξέπεμψαν καὶ ἐπὶ τοὺς ξυμμάχους ἀργυρολόγους ναῦς δώδεκα . . . ὁ δὲ [sc. Λυσικλῆς] ἄλλα τε ἠργυρολόγει καὶ περιέπλει.

[22] 4.50.1 Ἀριστείδης ὁ Ἀρχίππου, εἷς τῶν ἀργυρολόγων νεῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγός, αἳ ἐξεπέμφθησαν πρὸς τοὺς ξυμμάχους.

[23] 4.75.1 οἱ τῶν ἀργυρολόγων νεῶν Ἀθηναίων στρατηγοί. Thucydides also uses ἀργυρολογέω once with regard to the Spartans. In 413 BCE, King Agis levied money from Sparta's allies to finance a fleet (8.3.1 τά τε τῶν ξυμμάχων ἠργυρολόγησεν ἐς τὸ ναυτικόν).

[24] See Gomme 1956, 202.

to address the emergencies of the Archidamian war.[25] The Sausage-Seller in Aristophanes' *Knights* (produced in 424 BCE) alludes to similar forays as a convenient means of obtaining quick cash to pay the warship crews.[26] Modern historians have no hesitation in describing these operations as "a sort of legalized plundering,"[27] "piratical undertakings,"[28] and "a kind of state piracy, officially authorized and organized plundering raids."[29] In Xenophon's *Hellenica*, where we first meet with the noun ἀργυρολογία, further such money-exacting incursions are mentioned: that of the Athenian ships outside the Hellespont in 411 BCE,[30] of Thrasybulus and Theramenes in Macedonia and Thasos in 410 BCE,[31] of Thrasybulus, again, in Pamphylia, and of Iphicrates in the Hellespont in 389 BCE.[32] As late as 330 BCE, Aeschines accuses Demosthenes of having taken a trireme and "having levied money" upon the Greeks after the battle of Chaeronea.[33]

But already in the mid-fourth century BCE the verb ἀργυρολογέω appears in a quite different context. A set of Delphic inscriptions dealing with the reconstruction of the temple of Apollo destroyed in 373 BCE record the term ἀργυρολογέοντες, designating a board of initially three and later two magistrates appointed from among the ναοποιοί, the "temple builders," a college established by the members of the Delphic Amphictyony to oversee the building of the new temple. During the Amphictyonic meetings at Delphi, the ἀργυρολογέοντες, attested in the Delphic epigraphical records from 357 to 336 BCE,[34] were charged with collecting the funds (consisting of donations and contributions from the member states) required for the reconstruction of the temple.[35] Hammond (2003) has connected the establishment of the office of the ἀργυρολογέοντες with the crisis that preceded the outbreak of the Third Sacred War in 356 BCE, maintaining that the three ναοποιοί appointed late in 357 as ἀργυρολογέοντες were actually "money-levying officials" assigned to negotiate with the Lacedaemonians,

---

[25] For a discussion on whether the ἀργυρολόγοι νῆες mentioned by Thucydides were sent out to collect tribute or to exact extra money, see Meiggs 1972, 254; Kallet-Marx 1993, 134–38, 160–64, and 200–202; Hornblower 1996, 206.

[26] *Eq.* 1071 ναῦς ἑκάστοθ' ἃς / αἰτεῖ ταχείας ἀργυρολόγους οὗτοσί.

[27] Andreades 1994, [68] 13.

[28] Andreades 1994, [68] 13. See also ib. [317–19] 28–30, where the "exactions of money (ἀργυρολογία)" are among the "irregular revenues" in time of war that the author discusses.

[29] Kallet-Marx 1993, 200.

[30] *HG* 1.1.8 πλὴν τετταράκοντα νεῶν ἄλλαι ἄλλῃ ᾤχοντο ἐπ' ἀργυρολογίαν ἔξω τοῦ Ἑλλησπόντου.

[31] 1.1.12 ἐπεισπλεῖ Θηραμένης . . . ἀπὸ Μακεδονίας, ἅμα δὲ καὶ Θρασύβουλος . . . ἐκ Θάσου, ἀμφότεροι ἠργυρολογηκότες.

[32] 4.8.30 [ὁ Θρασύβουλος] ἐξ ἄλλων τε πόλεων ἠργυρολόγει; 4.8.35 τὰς δὲ τριήρεις . . . ἐκέλευε [sc. ὁ Ἰφικράτης] παραπλεῖν . . . παρὰ τὴν Χερρόνησον τῆς ἄνω, ὅπως δοκοίη, ὥσπερ εἰώθει, ἐπ' ἀργυρολογίαν ἐπαναπεπλευκέναι.

[33] 3.159 τριήρη προσλαβὼν ὑμῶν, καὶ τοὺς Ἕλληνας ἀργυρολογήσας.

[34] *CID* 2:7 [357 BCE?]; *CID* 2:10 frg. A, col. I.9 [356 BCE]; *CID* 2:11 frg. A.3–4, frg. B.4–5 [342/341 BCE]; *CID* 2:12 col. II.13–14, 44 [341/340 BCE]; *CID* 2:23.3–4 [ca. 341/340 BCE]; *CID* 2:24 col. I.11–12 [336 BCE].

[35] See Roux 1979, 104, 113–15, 150–51.

the Phocians, and other member states that had not paid the heavy fines imposed on them by the Amphictyonic Council for various religious offenses. Hammond, referring to Thucydides' and Xenophon's use of the verb, contends that the meaning of ἀργυρολογέω in the Delphic context is "to exact" and not "to receive" the monies owed to Apollo.[36] This interpretation has been questioned by Rousset (*REG* 117:620–23), who points out that the establishment of the office of the ἀργυρολογέοντες has to be dissociated from the Third Sacred War, as these magistrates are first mentioned in an inscription (overlooked by Hammond) that might date to as early as the spring of 357 BCE.

From the third century BCE only two epigraphical instances of ἀργυρολόγος have been preserved. The first is found in an inscription from Samothrace containing a decree regulating the city's grain-purchase.[37] The decree, dated to the second half of the third century BCE, or somewhat later,[38] specifies that, in the event of a deficiency, the ἀργυρολόγοι are to provide the σιτοθέται with the necessary funds from the general revenue of the city for the purchase of grain. Both ἀργυρολόγος and σιτοθέτης as titles of officials are nowhere else attested. Fraser (1960, 27, 31, and 32) assumes that the ἀργυρολόγοι were the city's "highest financial officials," who "exercised control over the expenditure of subordinate financial officials" such as the σιτοθέται. Along the same lines, Tréheux (1986, 421) calls them the "receveurs-payeurs généraux de la cité," and assumes that they were the ἄρχοντες to whom the σιτοθέται had to report the quantity of wheat that they sold. Another decree from Samothrace found in Iasos and dated to the same period as the aforementioned grain-provision decree[39] also mentions the ἀργυρολόγοι, who in this case are to pay from the allocated funds the cost of the dinner in the πρυτανεῖον offered to two Iasian θεωροί.[40] Whatever their exact functions, these ἀργυρολόγοι seem to have been a class of magistrates peculiar to Samothrace and unrelated to money-levying or money-collecting activities.

In the second century BCE only the verb ἀργυρολογέω is attested in Polybius, who uses it in the same sense as Thucydides and Xenophon.[41] In its three instances in the

---

[36] Hammond 2003, 373 and 375.

[37] *SEG* 36:788 [text as established by Tréheux 1986, 423] ll. 1–2 ἀπα[γγέλλειν τοῖς] | [ἀργυρολόγο]ις τὸ πλῆθος τοῦ σί[του τοῦ] | [πεπραμένο]υ; ll. 12–17 τοὺς δὲ σιτο|[θέτας, ἐάν τις] γένηται ἔκγδεια, ἀπαγ[γ]έλ|[λειν αὐτοῖς τὸ πλ]ῆθος, τοὺς δὲ ἀργυρολόγους | [ἐκδιδόναι τοῖς] σιτοθέταις ὅ τι ἂν αὐτοῖς | [περίηι παραχρῆ]μα ἐξ ἁπάσης τῆς π[ροσό]|[δου ἥτις ἂν συν]αχθῆι.

[38] The editor of the *editio princeps* (Fraser 1960, 32) dated the inscription to the "early or mid-second century B.C." L. Robert (cited in Tréheux 1986, 423), followed by Bingen (1981, 39n5) and Tréheux (1986, 423), have suggested a date in the second half of the third century BCE on the basis of the decree's similarities with two other mid-third-century BCE Samothracian documents, the honorific decrees for Epinikos and Hippomedon.

[39] See Habicht 1994, 71.

[40] *SEG* 43.715.14 [ca. 250 BCE] καλέσαι αὐ|[τοὺς ἐπὶ] ξένια εἰς τὸ πρυτανεῖον· τὸ δὲ ἀνάλωμα δοῦ|[ναι τοὺς] ἀργυρολό[γους] ἐκ τοῦ κατατεταγμένου | [ἀργυρίου].

[41] Compare, especially, Th. 3.19.2 ὁ δὲ ἄλλα τε ἠργυρολόγει καὶ περιέπλει with Plb. 4.16.8 περιπλέων τινὰς μὲν ἠργυρολόγει.

Histories the verb is applied to Hannibal, who after subjugating the tribe of the Olcades levied money from their cities (3.13.7 ἀργυρολογήσας δὲ [sc. ὁ Ἀννίβας] τὰς πόλεις καὶ κυριεύσας πολλῶν χρημάτων), to Demetrius of Pharos, who launched piratical raids on the Cyclades (4.16.8 [Δημήτριος ὁ Φάριος] ὥρμησεν ἐπὶ νήσων, καὶ περιπλέων τινὰς μὲν ἠργυρολόγει, τινὰς δ' ἐπόρθει τῶν Κυκλάδων), and to the Lacedaemonians, who imposed tribute on the islanders and exacted contributions from all the Greeks (6.49.10 ἠναγκάσθησαν [sc. οἱ Σπαρτιᾶται] . . . φόρους τοῖς νησιώταις ἐπιτάττειν, ἀργυρολογεῖν δὲ πάντας τοὺς Ἕλληνας). The last-quoted passage, in particular, makes clear the distinction between the imposition of tribute (φόρους ἐπιτάττειν) and the forceful exaction of money (ἀργυρολογεῖν).[42]

In subsequent writers of the first century BCE and CE, ἀργυρολογέω occurs in the sense "to extort money." Diodorus Siculus uses it three times in this sense;[43] Strabo uses it of the agents of the Roman governor Labienus (12.8.9.6 τοὺς ἀργυρολογοῦντας Λαβιηνῷ), who exacted money from the inhabitants of Asia Minor, and Philo (*Spec.* 2.94.2) of the tax collectors (φόρων ἐκλογεῖς) sent out by the governors of cities to exact taxes and tributes (φόροι καὶ δασμοί) from the citizens; in Josephus the verb occurs only in a "Table of Contents" (*AJ* 15p.6 τὴν πόλιν ἠργυρολόγησεν) probably written by one of the author's assistants or by a late editor. We should also note here the earliest of the two papyrological instances of the verb (the other is from the fourth century CE) in a first-century CE Roman edict, in which the prefect of Egypt Lucius Aemilius Rectus imposes a heavy penalty on the soldiers and officials who use force against or levy money from the provincials (*Chr.Wilck.* 439.10 [42 CE] ἐὰν δέ τις μηνυθῇ . . . ἢ βεβιασμένος τινὰ τῶν ἀπὸ τῆς χώρας ἢ ἀργυρολογήσας). The following passage of Dio Cassius, the author who uses the verb more often than any other writer (22x), eloquently illustrates the practice of ἀργυρολογία:

> 42.50 There, too, he [sc. Caesar] collected large amounts (ἠργυρολόγησε), partly in the shape of crowns and statues and the like which he received as gifts, and partly by 'borrowing,' as he styled it, not only from individual citizens but also from cities. This term 'borrowing' he applied to those levies of money for which there was no other reasonable excuse; for he exacted these sums also in a high-handed way and no less by force than he collected money actually due him, and it was his intention never to repay them. (Trans. E. Cary, LCL)

Second Maccabees uses the neologism ἀργυρολόγητος with regard to the Jerusalem Temple. At 11:2–3, Lysias, the vice-regent and guardian of the boy-king Antiochus V, envisages to turn Jerusalem into a Greek settlement, to make the Temple ἀργυρολόγητον, like the rest of the sanctuaries of the Gentiles, and to put up the high

[42] Cf. *PL* s.v. ἀργυρολογέω: "j-n unter Kontribution stellen, von j-m Geld eintreiben."

[43] 31.31.1.11 τοὺς μὲν φονεύων, τοὺς δὲ φυγαδεύων καὶ τὰς οὐσίας δημεύων οὐ μόνον τοὺς ἄνδρας ἠργυρολόγησεν, ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας; 31.32.1.5 ἀργυρολογῶν δὲ καὶ πολλοὺς ἐπαναιρούμενος πεντήκοντα μὲν ταλάντοις ἐστεφάνωσε Τιμόθεον; 31.32.1.11 ἐνήρξατο πάντας ἀργυρολογεῖν καὶ τὰς οὐσίας τῶν ἐπιφανεστάτων εἰς τὸ βασιλικὸν ἀναλαμβάνειν.

priesthood for sale annually. Most modern translators render ἀργυρολόγητον in this verse as "subject to tribute," or "taxable."[44] Commentators have wondered whether Lysias' intention to impose taxes on "the sanctuaries of the Gentiles" reflected an actual and widespread Seleucid practice of temple-taxation. Goldstein (1983, 404), for instance, notes that

> Jason [of Cyrene] was well informed on practices in Hellenistic kingdoms, so he is probably right in asserting that pagan temples were ordinarily taxed. Nevertheless, we do not know what taxes were levied upon them in the Seleucid empire.

Goldstein refers to Bikerman (1938, 114–15) and Rostovtzeff (1941, 1:467 and 3:1440n282), who both assumed that the taxes were imposed on the property belonging to the sanctuaries. This seems to have been the case with the sanctuary of Apollo at Tralleis as evidenced by a letter, assigned a date after 188 BCE, of the Attalid king Eumenes II confirming the ἀσυλία and the exemption from the δεκάτη which the temple enjoyed under the previous ruler, the Seleucid king Antiochus III.[45] Two other Attalid letters attest to the exemption from the tax on sheep conceded to the κάτοικοι (sacred dependents) of Apollo Tarsenus in 185 BCE.[46] A few earlier documents testify to the tax-exempt status of certain other sanctuaries: an honorary decree of 302 BCE makes known that the general Prepelaus acknowledged the ἀτέλεια of the Artemision at Ephesos, a privilege that was probably renewed later by the Seleucids;[47] a letter of King Seleucus I and his son Antiochus to the Athymbrians in 281 BCE confirms the ἀτέλεια

---

[44] See Moffatt, *APOT* 1:146: "levy tribute on the temple"; Abel 1949, 423: "soumettre le Temple à un impôt"; Zeitlin 1954, 199: "levy a tribute on the Temple"; Bartlett 1973, 302: "subjecting the temple to taxation"; Goldstein 1983, 400: "to make their temple subject to tribute"; Doran 2012, 213: "he thought he would make . . . the temple taxable." Cf. Bévenot 1931, 222: "den Tempel zu einer Einnahmequelle zu benützen"; Habicht 1979, 255: "den Tempel zu einer Geldquelle [zu machen]"; Schwartz 2008, 393: "thinking to make . . . the Temple a source of money"; Brodersen and Nicklas, *SD*: "das Heiligtum . . . zu einem Anlass, Geld zu erheben." Cf. also the Old Latin translations: La^{LX} templum uero in pecuniae quaestum; La^{B} templum etiam locari; La^{M} templo dato in locationem; La^{P} porro autem uectigali obnoxium templum.

[45] The original assumption (see Welles 1934, 172–75) that the document was Seleucid and that its author was Antiochus III was rebutted by Piejko 1988, who assigned it to Eumenes II, to whom Tralleis was transferred in virtue of the treaty of Apamea in 188 BCE. Lines 8–9 of the inscription, as restored by Piejko, read: [ἀφίημι ὑμῖν τὴν προσοφειλομένην εἰς τὸ] βασιλικὸν δεκάτην | τῶ[ν ἀπὸ] | [τῆς ἱερᾶς γῆς γενομένων προσόδων].

[46] See Welles 1934, 190–93 and Piejko 1989. Piejko has restored lines 5–7 of the first letter to read [ἡμεῖς μὲν οὖν δίδομ]εν αὐτοῖς ἀτέλειαν προβά|[των ὥστε μηκέτι τελ]εῖν [τ]ὴν ἀπὸ τούτων προσ|[πίπτουσαν πρόσοδον] and lines 4–5 of the second letter to read ὑπάρχειν τῶι θεῶι ἀτέλει]αν καὶ προβάτων | [καὶ τῶν ἄλλων, καθάπερ αὐτοῖς πρότερον Ἀντίοχ]ος ἔδωκεν. Piejko (1989, 400) points out that the ἀτέλεια προβάτων here means "a remission of a sales tax on sheep, or possibly a special tax on sacrificed sheep" rather than "property tax on sheep."

[47] *Ephesos* 17.4–5 ἀποσταλείσης πρεσβείας πρὸς Πρεπέλαον . . . ὑπὲρ τοῦ σταθμοῦ τοῦ ἱεροῦ καὶ τῆς ἀτελεί|ας τῆι θεῶι συνδιοίκησεν [sc. Εὐφρόνιος] μετὰ τῆς πρεσβείας ὅπως ἂν ἡ ἀτέλ[ει]α ὑπάρχηι τῆι θεῶι. See Debord 1982, 446n76.

of the Plutonium at Nysa;[48] in 208 BCE, a letter of King Philip V to the people of Abae in Phokis grants that the sacred land of their sanctuary of Apollo remains tax-free.[49] Accordingly, it is only through indirect evidence (grants of tax-exemption) that we can infer the tax-status of certain Hellenistic temples.[50]

From a similar tax-remission promised by Demetrius I in a letter (the authenticity of which has been questioned)[51] of 152 BCE to the "nation of the Judeans" (1 Macc 10:25–45), we may deduce that a tax was imposed on the Temple of Jerusalem, too. The Temple tax-exemption was part of a number of extravagant concessions that Demetrius was willing to make to the Jews in order to gain their favour over Alexander Balas, who had raised claims to his throne. The king offered to remit "five thousand shekels of silver, as much as they received from the revenues of the holy place out of the account every year" (NETS),[52] for that money belonged to the ministering priests. It has been surmised that it was Lysias, in 164 BCE, who, acting on behalf of Antiochus V, carried out his plan to make the Temple subject to tribute and imposed the 5,000 shekel tax.[53] It seems more likely, though, that the tax pre-existed[54] and that Lysias' intention to make the Temple ἀργυρολόγητον was a rhetorical threat[55] in the same way that his idea to offer the office of the high priest of the Jews, at the time held by Menelaus, to the highest bidder every year was never carried out.[56]

We may now discuss our author's choice to use the novel term ἀργυρολόγητος in the context of Lysias' intentions concerning the Temple. If the meaning of the phrase τὸ ἱερὸν ἀργυρολόγητον ποιήσειν is that Lysias had in mind to make the Temple taxable, then a term from the φορολογ- word group would have been a more evident choice. The

---

[48] *Nysa* 4.2–3 [ἀποστειλάντων πρ]ὸς ἡμᾶς Ἀθυμβριανῶν περὶ τῆς [ἱκεσίας καὶ ἀσυ]|[λίας καὶ ἀτελείας]. On this letter see Welles 1934, 54–60 and Rigsby 1996, 400–401.

[49] *IG* IX, 1.78.10 ὅπως ὑπάρχηι ὑμῖν | τῆς ἱερᾶς χώρας ἡ ἀτέλε[ια] | καθὰ καὶ πρότερον.

[50] See Bikerman 1938, 114–15; Debord 1982, 271; Ma 1999, 134n101; Aperghis 2004, 151.

[51] See Babota 2013, 147–49.

[52] 1 Macc 10:42 καὶ ἐπὶ τούτοις πεντακισχιλίους σίκλους ἀργυρίου, ὅσα ἐλάμβανον ἀπὸ τῶν χρειῶν τοῦ ἁγίου ἀπὸ τοῦ λόγου κατ' ἐνιαυτόν, καὶ ταῦτα ἀφίεται διὰ τὸ ἀνήκειν αὐτὰ τοῖς ἱερεῦσι τοῖς λειτουργοῦσι. Josephus gives a different figure and currency ("ten thousand drachmas") and indicates that the recipients of the money were "the kings" (*AJ* 13.55 τὰς δὲ μυρίας δραχμάς, ἃς ἐλάμβανον ἐκ τοῦ ἱεροῦ οἱ βασιλεῖς, ὑμῖν ἀφίημι διὰ τὸ προσήκειν αὐτὰς τοῖς ἱερεῦσιν τοῖς λειτουργοῦσιν τῷ ἱερῷ).

[53] See Bartlett 1973, 137 and Aperghis 2004, 151. To be sure, Demetrius did not relinquish the tribute, because the Jews did not accept his propositions (1 Macc 10:46).

[54] Cf. J. *AJ* 13.55 quoted supra, footnote 52.

[55] Cf. the unfulfilled threats of Antiochus IV at 9:4, 14–15 and of general Nicanor at 14:33.

[56] According to Josephus (*AJ* 20.235–238), after putting to death Menelaus at Beroea (2 Macc 13:3–8), Antiochus V and Lysias appointed high priest Iacimus [=Alcimus]. The historian reports that it was Lysias who persuaded Antiochus to assign the high priesthood to Alcimus (*AJ* 12.387 ὑπὸ Λυσίου πεισθείς), yet he makes no hint at profit being involved in the assignment. Alcimus retained the post for three years, until his death in 160/159 BCE (1 Macc 9:54–57). There followed an *intersacerdotium* of seven years, before Jonathan the Hasmonean took the office of high priest in 152 BCE (see VanderKam 2004, 240–50). It is only much later, between 5/4 CE and 44 CE, that seven high priests were appointed and subsequently displaced within a single year in the time of Herod the Great, Valerius Gratus, and Agrippa I (see Alon 1977, 61–69).

verb φορολογέω is attested as early as 303 BCE in a letter of Antigonus I to Teos[57] and occurs twice in the Septuagint[58] along with synonymous periphrases;[59] in Greek Deuteronomy we find the term φορολόγητος, "tributary,"[60] an adjective that was fated to remain a *hapax* not only in the Septuagint but also in the entire Greek language.[61] ἀργυρολόγητος was probably coined after the model of φορολόγητος and its opposite ἀφορολόγητος,[62] and on the analogy of πρατός, with which it is collocated at 11:3. One may justify its use by assuming that its first component was meant to specify that the tax that Lysias planned to levy would be paid in silver shekels (σίκλοι ἀργυρίου), Yahweh's Temple in Jerusalem, unlike most pagan temples, possessing no tithable land.[63]

Yet, it seems unlikely that the author of 2 Maccabees was unaware of the connotations of forceful exaction of money, over and above regular taxation, that ἀργυρολογέω and its cognates carried when used by the historiographers of the Classical period, Thucydides and Xenophon, and, later, by Polybius and probably other writers contemporary with the author of 2 Maccabees. Could it be that he wanted to convey here similar connotations? Are we perhaps to understand the phrase τὸ ἱερὸν ἀργυρολόγητον ποιήσειν as referring not to the imposition of a regular tribute on the Temple but to a periodic extortion of money serving the Seleucid need for extra quick cash in times of hardship?

To be sure, ἀργυρολογέω would have been appositely used of the money-levying raids on pagan temples launched by some Seleucid kings when faced with financial straits or when engaged on costly military campaigns. Examples are not lacking: Antiochus III plundered the gold and silver from the temple of Aene in Ecbatana and minted coins amounting to 4,000 talents;[64] in 187 BCE he lost his life in his attempt to plunder the temple of Bel in Elymais;[65] some ten years later, his son, Seleucus IV, authorized his minister Heliodorus to extract money from the Temple treasury in Jerusalem.[66]

---

[57] *Teos* 59.83 τῆς φορολογουμέ[νης χώρας]. See Welles 1934, 15–32.

[58] 2 Chr 36:4[a] τότε ἤρξατο ἡ γῆ φορολογεῖσθαι τοῦ δοῦναι τὸ ἀργύριον ἐπὶ στόμα Φαραω; 1 Esd 2:23 βασιλεῖς ἰσχυροὶ καὶ σκληροὶ ἦσαν ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ κυριεύοντες καὶ φορολογοῦντες Κοίλην Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην.

[59] 2 Chr 8:8 ἀνήγαγεν αὐτοὺς Σαλωμων εἰς φόρον; 36:3 ἐπέβαλεν φόρον ἐπὶ τὴν γῆν; Judg[A] 1:28 ἔθετο τὸν Χαναναῖον εἰς φόρον; 3 Kgdms 5:27 ἀνήνεγκεν ὁ βασιλεὺς φόρον ἐκ παντὸς Ισραηλ; 1 Macc 8:2 ἤγαγον αὐτοὺς ὑπὸ φόρον.

[60] Deut 20:11 πᾶς ὁ λαὸς οἱ εὑρεθέντες ἐν αὐτῇ [sc. τῇ πόλει] ἔσονταί σοι φορολόγητοι καὶ ὑπήκοοί σου.

[61] Only Hesychius glosses it in his lexicon: φ 786 φορολόγητοι· ὑποτελεῖς, λειτουργοί.

[62] ἀφορολόγητος is first attested in a decree containing a treaty between Iasos and Ptolemy I (*Iasos* 83.7, 30–31, 51, 55 [309/304 BCE]) and in a letter of King Antiochus (I or II) to Erythrai (*Erythrai* 37.23, 26–27 [ca. 270–260 BCE]). See Welles 1934, 319. In the Septuagint it occurs in 1 Esd 4:50 καὶ πᾶσαν τὴν χώραν, ἣν κρατήσουσιν, ἀφορολόγητον αὐτοῖς ὑπάρχειν and in 1 Macc 11:28 καὶ ἠξίωσεν Ιωναθαν τὸν βασιλέα ποιῆσαι τὴν Ἰουδαίαν ἀφορολόγητον.

[63] See Kreissig 1977, 375 and Baesens 2006, 183.

[64] Plb. 10.27.12–13.

[65] D.S. 28.3; 29.15; Str. 16.1.18.

[66] 2 Macc 3:7–40.

Antiochus IV outdid both his father and his brother. He despoiled temples in Egypt during his campaign against Ptolemy VI Philometor (Plb. 30.26.9), attempted to despoil the temple of Artemis-Nanaia in Elymais (Plb. 31.9; 1 Macc 6:1–4; 2 Macc 1:13–17, J. *AJ* 12.354, 358–359), as well as temples at Persepolis (2 Macc 9:2), and in 169 BCE plundered the Temple in Jerusalem (1 Macc 1:20–24; 2 Macc 5:15–16).[67] As late as the 20s of the second century BCE, Alexander II Zabinas attempted to plunder the temple of Zeus in Antioch (D.S. 34/35.28).[68]

It also seems that on certain occasions the temples were forced to yield considerable sums of money to Seleucid kings, either in cash or in the form of gifts. A Babylonian astronomical diary records the return, in 302/1 BCE, of 113 talents of silver and two talents of gold belonging to the god Nabu, which had been withdrawn from the temple of Borsippa and put at the disposal of Seleucus I.[69] In that case, the temple treasure seems to have served as a sort of bank, providing the king with ready cash.[70]

In other cases, the withdrawal of temple funds was probably tantamount to confiscation. An entry of the astronomical diary of 168 BCE records the removal, in November/December 169 BCE, of "a great deal of property" from the old and new treasuries of the Esagil-temple in Babylon in the presence of the administrator (who, a previous entry informs us, had all too recently been appointed by royal decree) and the assembly of the temple. This withdrawal of funds chronologically coincides with the plundering of the Jerusalem Temple by Antiochus IV described in 1 Macc 1:19–24.[71] The Babylonian diaries' entries, combined with the evidence from Greek and Jewish historical sources, testify to Antiochus IV's eagerness to assume control over the temple treasuries by appointing compliant temple administrators in Babylon or high priests in Jerusalem, who could serve his "concerted policy to confiscate temple funds."[72] Lysias may have wanted to continue the policy of his protégé's father and make the funds of the Jerusalem Temple treasury subject to requisition and expropriation. To this aim, he also envisaged putting up for sale every year the office of the high priest, so as to make the latter subservient to the Seleucid government.

It is to be noted that, with regard to the sale of the high priesthood, the author of 2 Maccabees does not use a term such as ὠνητός, "that may be bought," attested in literary texts in connection with the sale of offices, priesthoods included,[73] but the adjective

---

[67] See Rostovtzeff 1941, 2:695–96 and 3:1282; Aperghis 2004, 173–75.

[68] See Debord 1982, 271 and 447n82.

[69] See van der Spek 2000, 302; Aperghis 2004, 175.

[70] van der Spek 1994, 23 and 54; Aperghis 2004, 174.

[71] Geller 1991, 2–3.

[72] Geller 1991, 3.

[73] Pl. *R.* 544d ὠνηταὶ βασιλεῖαι; Arist. *Pol.* 1273ᵃ36 φαῦλον τὸ τὰς μεγίστας ὠνητὰς εἶναι τῶν ἀρχῶν, τήν τε βασιλείαν καὶ τὴν στρατηγίαν; D.H. 2.21.3 ἐκεῖνος [sc. ὁ Ῥωμύλος] οὔτε ὠνητὰς χρημάτων ἐποίησε τὰς ἱερωσύνας οὔτε κλήρῳ μεριστάς; Chrys. *hom. 1–4 in Ac. princ.* PG 51.74.29 κατῄσχυνον γὰρ τὸ τῆς ἱερωσύνης ἀξίωμα, ὠνητοὺς ποιήσαντες ἀρχιερέας; *hom. 1–88 in Jo.* PG 59.361.37 οὐκέτι γὰρ τὸν χρόνον ἅπαντα τῆς ζωῆς ἱεράτευον, ἀλλ' ἐνιαυτόν, ἐξ οὗ γεγόνασιν ὠνηταὶ αἱ ἀρχαί; Cyr. *Os.–Mal.*

πρατός, "for sale," derived from πέρνημι, the verb occurring in many epigraphical documents dealing with the sale of priesthoods in Hellenistic Greek cities. This indicates that, in ascribing to Lysias the idea of putting on sale the Jewish high priesthood, he had in mind the contemporary practice of selling priesthoods in many Greek cities on the Asian coast and the Aegean islands[74] and was familiar with the relevant terminology.[75] It seems reasonable to assume that his use of ἀργυρολόγητος likewise reflects the use of ἀργυρολογέω in authors roughly contemporary with him, such as Polybius and Diodorus Siculus, who, as we saw, employ this verb to denote the forceful exaction of money other than tribute.

1.118.4 Pusey ὠνητὴν ἔχοντες τὴν ἱερωσύνην. Cf. the adjective ὤνιος, "bought by bribery," in Plu. *Cat. Mi.* 21.3 τὰς ὑπατικὰς ἀρχαιρεσίας ὁρῶν ὠνίους οὔσας.

[74] The sale of priesthoods was common practice in a number of cities of southwest Asia Minor and east Aegean islands between the early fourth century BCE and the third century CE. It especially flourished in the third century BCE and started to wane after the first century BCE (see Debord 1982, 63–65; Dignas 2002, 251–52, 261; Connelly 2007, 50 and 302). It is surmised that it originated at Miletus, where the earliest examples are attested, and thence spread to neighbouring cities and as far as the Milesian colonies of Tomoi and Sinope on the Black Sea (see Debord 1982, 63–64). Yet, it was never introduced to mainland Greece, where priesthoods were either hereditary or assigned by election or allotment (see W.J. Woodhouse in *ERE* 10.305 and Lupu 2009, 44–48), or to eastern Anatolia. The purchasers bought the priesthoods (ἱερατεῖαι, ἱερωσύναι) for life and, as attested by a number of inscriptions from Erythrai, could transfer them to a member of their family (διασύστασις) or sell them to others (ἐπίπρασις) (see Dignas 2002, 253–54, 256–57). Tenures for a limited term of years are also recorded (cf. *Miletos* 12.7–8 [ca. 130 BCE] ὁ δὲ ἀπογραφεὶς ἱερήσεται ἔτη | τρία καὶ μῆνας ὀκτώ), but there is no evidence that a priesthood could be sold as often as annually, as Lysias most avariciously intended to do in Jerusalem (see Dignas 2002, 255–57).

[75] In the epigraphical documents dealing with the sales of priesthoods (see a list in Parker and Obbink 2000, 421n16 and in Lupu 2009, 48) we encounter formulas invariably containing forms and derivatives of the verbs πέρνημι, "to sell" (*Erythrai* 60, a.1 [300/260 BCE] αἵδε ἱερητεῖαι ἐπράθησαν; d.13–14 ἱερατέαι αἱ πραθεῖσ[αι] | καὶ ἐπιπραθεῖσαι; *Miletos* 11.4 [165/158 BCE] ὅπως ἱερωσύνη πραθ[ῇ]; *SEG* 50:766.35–36 [Kos, late 2nd–early 1st c. BCE] ἐπὶ τᾶι πράσει τᾶς ἱερω[σύ]|νας), πωλέω, "to sell" (*Priene* 210.2–3 [2nd c. BCE] ἐπὶ τοῖσδε πωλοῦμεν τὴν ἱε|ρωσύνην τοῦ Διονύσου τοῦ Φλέου; *Iscr. di Cos* ED 62, face B, back 1 [1st c. BCE] [ἁ ἱερωσύ]να πωληθήτω τ[οῦ . . .]; *Erythrai* 60.65–66 [300/260 BCE] ἱερητεῖαι αἱ ἐπιπωλη|[θεῖσ]αι; *Herakleia Latmia* 27.5 [100/ca. 75 BCE] πωλοῦντι [sc. τῷ δήμῳ] τῆς προειρη|μένης θεᾶς τὴν ἱερωσύνην; *SEG* 55:931.31–32 [Kos, ca. 150–100 BCE] ἁ ἱερωσύνα ἀνα|πωληθήτω ὑπὸ τᾶν πωλητᾶν), πρίαμαι, "to buy" (*IMT Scam/NebTaeler* 390.2 [2nd c. BCE] ὁ πριάμενος τὴν ἱερατείαν τοῦ Δι|ονύσου τοῦ Βαμβυλείου; *IScM* II 1, col. II. [Tomis, late 2nd/early 1st c. BCE] 1–2 ὁ πριάμενος τὴν ἱερω|[σύνην τῶ]ν μυστῶν θεῶν τῶν ἐν | [Σαμοθρά]κῃ; *Priene* 211.1.1 [2nd c. BCE?] ἐπρία[το τὴν ἱερωσύ]|[νην τοῦ Ποσ]ειδῶνος τοῦ Ἑλι[κωνίου]; *Hyllarima* 16.21 [ca. 188 BCE] τῶ[ν] προπεπραμένων ἱερατειῶν), and ἀγοράζω, "to buy" (*Erythrai* 60.38 [300/260 BCE] [τὴν ἱ]ερητείαν ἣν ἐπηγοράκει; ib. 43–44 ἱερητείαν ἣν ἠγόρα|σεν Ἀριστομένης). Of the adjectives formed from these verbs only πωλητός occurs a single time on an inscription from Kos (*HGK* 17.6 [Kos, shortly after mid-4th c. BCE] καθάπερ καὶ πρὶν πωλητὰν γενέσθαι | τὰν ἱερωσύναν συνετάχθη).

2.2.2 ἀρρενωδῶς 'bravely'

10:35 προσβαλόντες τῷ τείχει ἀρρενωδῶς καὶ θηριώδει θυμῷ

Manly qualities are particularly emphasized in 2 Maccabees. They characterize Judas and his soldiers as well as the martyrs of the Maccabean revolt. Judas acquires fame because of his manly valour (8:7 λαλιὰ τῆς εὐανδρίας[76] αὐτοῦ διεχεῖτο πανταχῇ); his words fill the souls of the young with a manly spirit (15:17 τοῖς Ἰούδου λόγοις . . . δυναμένοις . . . ψυχὰς νέων ἐπανδρῶσαι); his soldiers exhibit bravery (14:18 ἀνδραγαθία) and fight as befits men (10:35 ἀρρενωδῶς; 15:17 μετὰ πάσης εὐανδρίας). Among them there are a few cowards (8:13 δειλανδροῦντες) who are sharply opposed to those who manfully fight for Judaism (2:21 τοῖς ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ φιλοτίμως ἀνδραγαθήσασιν). The martyrs and other persecution victims are not lacking in manly virtue either: the sage Eleazar endures torture unto death with manly bravery (6:27 ἀνδρείως διαλλάξας τὸν βίον) equivalent to that of the elder Razis, who throws himself off a wall in a manly manner rather than let himself be arrested by Gentile soldiers (14:43 κατεκρήμνισεν ἑαυτὸν ἀνδρωδῶς). Even the mother of the seven martyrs is filled with manly courage (7:21 ἄρσενι θυμῷ). The author not only appropriates terms and values embedded in Greek culture to extol his Jewish heroes,[77] but also enriches the vocabulary of manliness/bravery, and its converse, cowardice, with the neologisms ἀρρενωδῶς and, possibly, δειλανδρέω.[78] ἀρρενωδῶς, an absolute *hapax legomenon*, is apparently modelled on the precedent of ἀνδρωδῶς, a rare adverb attested in Xenophon (*Mem.* 4.8.2),[79] in Isocrates (12.31), in Teles (*apud* Stob. 4.44.83.87), in Polybius (9x),[80] in 1 and 2 Maccabees (1 Macc 6:31 ἐπολέμησαν ἀνδρωδῶς; 2 Macc 14:43), in Diodorus Siculus (19.96.1), and then only in a couple of ecclesiastical writers.[81]

---

[76] εὐανδρία is not to be understood here in the sense of "abundance of men," or "good-sized force," as Doran (1981, 55; 2012, 172) argues. The word may, indeed, have this meaning when it refers to a city. With reference to an individual, however, it denotes manly worth, courage, or valour, as, for example, in E. fr. 1052, 1–5, 7 Nauck and in *Ephesos* 110.16 [2nd c. BCE]. Cf. Grimm 1857, 136.

[77] See Himmelfarb 1998, 32–38 and ead. 2008, 94–95.

[78] See the comment on this verb at 4.2.1. ἐπανδρόω may also be a neologism of 2 Maccabees. See 3.3.1.

[79] The adverb is used in the superlative for Socrates who bore his condemnation to death in a most manly way: τὴν κατάγνωσιν τοῦ θανάτου . . . ἀνδρωδέστατα ἐνέγκας. The deaths of Eleazar and Razis, in 2 Maccabees, have often been compared to the death of Socrates. See Goldstein 1983, 285; van Henten 1997, 209; Rajak 2001, 120–22.

[80] Note the verbal similarities between the passage describing the suicide of Razis (2 Macc 14:42–43 εὐγενῶς θέλων ἀποθανεῖν ἤπερ τοῖς ἀλιτηρίοις ὑποχείριος γενέσθαι καὶ τῆς ἰδίας εὐγενείας ἀναξίως ὑβρισθῆναι . . . ἀναδραμὼν γενναίως ἐπὶ τὸ τεῖχος κατεκρήμνισεν ἑαυτὸν ἀνδρωδῶς εἰς τοὺς ὄχλους) and a passage in Polybius recounting the noble stand that the Carthaginian Senate took when faced with the demands of the Roman general Regulus (1.31.8 οὕτως ἀνδρωδῶς ἔστη καὶ γενναίως, ὥστε πᾶν ὑπομένειν εἵλετο . . . ἐφ' ᾧ μηδὲν ἀγεννὲς μηδ' ἀνάξιον τῶν πρὸ τοῦ πράξεων ὑπομεῖναι).

[81] Cf. the cognate adverb ἀνδρικῶς: Ar. *Eq.* 81 ἀλλὰ σκόπει, / ὅπως ἂν ἀποθάνωμεν ἀνδρικώτατα; Pl. *Tht.* 177b ὅταν . . . ἐθελήσωσιν ἀνδρικῶς πολὺν χρόνον ὑπομεῖναι καὶ μὴ ἀνάνδρως φυγεῖν.

At 10:35, ἀρρενωδῶς is conjoined with θηριώδει θυμῷ (reminiscent of the ἄρσενι θυμῷ at 7:21), which is echoed in the adverb θηριωδῶς at 12:15 (ἐνέσεισαν θηριωδῶς τῷ τείχει). The implied association between valiant soldiers and wild beasts recalls another neologism of the book, the adverb λεοντηδόν at 11:11 (λεοντηδὸν δὲ ἐντινάξαντες εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους).[82] Manly valiance (or its absence) appears, then, to be one of the motifs that trigger the creation of neologisms in 2 Maccabees. The uniqueness of the adverb ἀρρενωδῶς and the fact that it predates the sole surviving attestation of the adjective from which it derives[83] make it likely that it was a coinage of the author of 2 Maccabees, which arose from his need to come up with a variant of the two other synonymous adverbs that he uses to denote "in a manly manner," ἀνδρείως and ἀνδρωδῶς.

2.2.3 δεινάζω 'to be indignant'

> 4:35 πολλοὶ δὲ καὶ τῶν ἄλλων ἐθνῶν ἐδείναζον καὶ ἐδυσφόρουν ἐπὶ τῷ τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀδίκῳ φόνῳ
> 13:25 ἐδυσφόρουν περὶ τῶν συνθηκῶν οἱ Πτολεμαεῖς—ἐδείναζον γὰρ ὑπεράγαν

The neologism δεινάζω (from δεινός) is unattested in Greek outside 2 Maccabees. Ancient lexicographers gloss it as δεινῶς φέρω.[84] Modern lexica provide a variety of meanings: LSJ has "to be in straits" and is followed by Frisk (s.v. δεινός) "in Bedrängnis sein"; *DGE* gives "irritarse, indignarse" and is followed by *GELS* "to become angry"; LEH offers a combination of the aforecited meanings ("to be in straits, to take offense, to be indignant"); *GE* proposes "to be in distress, be troubled," and *EDG* (s.v. δεινός) "to be in fear." Translations vary accordingly: Abel (1949, 343) "furent indignés et affligés," (ib. 456) "s'indignaient"; Habicht (1979, 222) "lärmten . . . und waren erbittert," (ib. 270) "waren erzürnt . . . lärmten gewaltig"; Goldstein (1983, 218) "were scandalized and outraged," (ib. 453) "were angry . . . indeed, they were indignant"; Schwartz (2008, 209) "were outraged and vexed," (ib. 446) "hardly tolerated the covenants—they were very upset"; Doran (2012, 113) "were horrified and angry," (ib. 252) "were horrified . . . for they were very angry"; Schaper (NETS, p. 509) "were grieved and displeased," (ib. 518) "were indignant . . . in fact, they were so furious." The sense "to be angry, indignant," which most translators assign to δεινάζω, seems to

[82] See infra 2.2.7.

[83] It is found in one of the bT scholia to the *Iliad* (8.39a ἀρρενώδεις γὰρ αἱ τοιαῦται γυναῖκες), which go back to a late antique commentary or even to Didymus (second half of the 1st c. BCE). See Dickey 2007, 19–20.

[84] Hsch. ε 430; Phot. ε 121; Suid. ε 216 ἐδείναζον· δεινῶς ἔφερον. Ps.-Zonaras adds the gloss "to revile, to abuse" (δ p. 489 δεινάζειν. λοιδορεῖν; ε p. 615 ἐδείναζον. δεινῶς ἔφερον, ἢ ἐκακολόγουν), probably because he confused δεινάζω with the rare and poetic δεννάζω, which has this meaning.

originate from the Old Latin versions of 2 Maccabees, most of which render the verb by "indignor."[85]

The only other verb that derives from δεινός is δεινόω, "to exaggerate" (Th. 8.74.3), which does not help elucidate the meaning of δεινάζω. More illuminating are the rare compounds δεινολογέομαι, [LSJ]"to complain loudly," and δεινοπαθέω, [LSJ]"to complain loudly of sufferings," as well as periphrastic expressions such as δεινὸν ποιοῦμαι, [LSJ]"take ill, complain of, be indignant at a thing," or δεινὰ ποιῶ, [LSJ]"make complaints."[86] All of these verbs and expressions convey the notion of indignation, which may be expressed in strong complaints, and it is in their semantic group that δεινάζω should be included. A non-cognate verb that offers an especially apt comparandum in terms of both formation and meaning is σχετλιάζω, [LSJ]"complain of hardship, utter indignant complaints," which is often attested in conjunction with ἀγανακτέω or βαρέως/δυσχερῶς φέρω, just as δεινάζω forms a hendiadys[87] with δυσφορέω in its two instances in 2 Maccabees.[88]

The suffix -άζω, with which δεινάζω is supplied, is productive in the Koine. Of the 105 verbs in -άζω occurring in the Ptolemaic papyri, 33 are new formations. [89] It is also productive in the Septuagint, wherein some 20 verbs in -άζω, out of a total of 169, are neologisms.[90] Second Maccabees employs 29 verbs with this suffix, three of which (ἁγιάζω, καθαγιάζω, παραδοξάζω) are Septuagint neologisms and two (δεινάζω and δεξιάζω) which are neologisms of this book. Unlike δεξιάζω, which possibly existed in the vocabulary of the second century BCE,[91] δεινάζω, unattested outside 2 Maccabees, is more likely to have been coined by Jason or the epitomator.

As regards the choice of the suffix, δεινάζω appears to have been coined by analogy to verbs in -άζω denoting what Richter (1909, 106–8) aptly terms "subjective emotional states" ("subjektive Gemütszustände"). Similar Septuagint neologisms are the verbs στυγνάζω, [LEH]"to be horrified by sb or sth, to be appalled at sb or sth"[92] (Ezek 26:16;

---

[85] 4:35 La^{LV} indignabantur et moleste ferebant; La^{X} indignate sunt et moleste tulerunt; La^{BM} fremebant et indigne sustinebant; La^{P} fremebant et aegre portabant. 13:25 La^{L} grauiter ferebant . . . et indignabantur; La^{X} grabiter tulerunt . . . et indignati sunt; La^{V} grauiter ferebant . . . indignantes; La^{B} grauiter sustinebant . . . et cum ingenti angustia minabantur; La^{P} aegre ferebant . . . et fremebant cum ingenti angustia.

[86] Cf. Suid. ε 217 ἐδεινολόγουν: ἐσχετλίαζον . . . καὶ ἐδεινοπάθουν, ἀντὶ τοῦ δεινὰ πεπονθέναι ἔλεγον.

[87] On the verbal hendiadys, see Abel 1927, 337 and 366 and Denniston 1952, 62–63.

[88] Cf. Pl. *Grg.* 519b ἀγανακτούντων καὶ σχετλιαζόντων ὡς δεινὰ πάσχουσι; D. 34.19 ἀγανακτοῦντος δέ μου καὶ σχετλιάζοντος; 35.45 ἠγανάκτει ἂν αὐτὸς καὶ ἐσχετλίαζε; 40.53 σχετλιάζων καὶ δεινοπαθῶν; Aeschin. 2.57 δεινῶς ἐσχετλίασε; Plb. 3.82.3 ἐσχετλίαζε, δεινὸν ἡγούμενος τὸ γινόμενον; 4.45.8 σχετλιάζουσι καὶ βαρέως φέρουσι τὸ συμβαῖνον; 5.26.6 ἐσχετλίαζε καὶ δυσχερῶς ἔφερε τὸ γινόμενον; D.H. 10.12.7 ἀγανακτῶμέν τε καὶ σχετλιάζωμεν. Compare, also, 2 Macc 13:25 with Plb. 15.2.2 βαρέως μὲν ἔφερον τὰς ἐν ταῖς συνθήκαις ἐπιταγάς, δυσχερῶς δ' ἀνείχοντο τὴν τῶν πρεσβευτῶν παρρησίαν.

[89] See Mayser 1936, 151–52.

[90] ἁγιάζω, ἀναβαστάζω, ἀποσταλάζω, γελοιάζω, δεινάζω, διαπειράζω, ἐκπειράζω, ἐνταφιάζω, ἐξηλιάζω, ἐπινυστάζω, ἐπισκεπάζω, ἐπιστοιβάζω, ἠρεμάζω, καθαγιάζω, καταστενάζω, παραδοξάζω, σκολιάζω, στυγνάζω, συμβαστάζω, συμφοράζω, ὑπερπλεονάζω, ὑποσχάζω, φιλιάζω.

[91] The compound ἐκδεξιάζομαι, "to salute," is attested in *P.Tebt.* 1.43.11 [117 BCE]; the simplex δεξιάζω recurs in *CPR.* 25.1.5 [2nd–3rd c. CE] and in *Chr.Mitt.* 300.5 [4th c. CE].

[92] On this verb, see Walters 1973, 131.

27:35; 28:19; 32:10) and συμφοράζω, *GELS*"to bewail" (Isa 13:8). It may also be that the suffix -άζω was attached to the stem δειν- under the influence of δεξιάζω, which occurs at 4:34, that is, in the verse immediately preceding the first of the two instances of δεινάζω in 2 Maccabees.

2.2.4 δοξικός 'glorious,' 'splendid'

8:35 τὴν δοξικὴν ἀποθέμενος ἐσθῆτα

Of the eighty adjectives in -ικός occurring in the Septuagint, nine are neologisms: ἀρτοκοπικός (1 Chr 16:3), δοξικός, ἐρημικός (Ps 101:7a; 119:4b), λαμπηνικός (Num 7:3), Μαρδοχαϊκός (2 Macc 15:36), πενθικός (Exod 33:4; 2 Kgdms 14:2; the adverb is already found in Xenophon), ποικιλτικός (Job 38:36), προβατικός (2 Esd 13:1, 32; 22:39), and προφασιστικός (Deut 22:14, 17). δοξικός is one of the two neologisms in -ικός appearing in 2 Maccabees and a unique word not only in the Septuagint but also in all extant Greek literature. It derives from δόξα, in the non-Classical sense of *GELS*"external splendour, magnificent appearance,"[93] which is occasionally used in the Septuagint with respect to splendid, honorific garments.[94] At 8:35, δοξικός modifies ἐσθής, which here denotes the πορφύρα, the purple cloak that the general Nicanor wore as one of King Antiochus Epiphanes' 'First Friends' (2 Macc 8:9).[95] After the

[93] δόξα underwent a significant semantic shift from conveying the meaning of "opinion, expectation, repute," in secular Greek, to expressing the Hebrew concept of כָּבוֹד, "weightiness, glory, honour, splendor," which is related to God, in biblical Greek. This shift is attested even in the Apocrypha and Pseudepigrapha, where δόξα, in the secular sense, is quasi-absent. See G. Kittel, "δόξα in the LXX and Hellenistic Apocrypha," *TDNT* 2.242–45; C. Spicq, "δόξα, etc.," *TLNT* 1.362–76.

[94] Cf. Exod 33:5 ἀφέλεσθε τὰς στολὰς τῶν δοξῶν ὑμῶν; Add Esth C:13 ἀφελομένη τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης αὐτῆς; Add Esth D:1 ἐξεδύσατο τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς θεραπείας καὶ περιεβάλετο τὴν δόξαν αὐτῆς; Isa 3:18 ἀφελεῖ κύριος τὴν δόξαν τοῦ ἱματισμοῦ αὐτῶν; 1 Macc 14:9 οἱ νεανίσκοι ἐνεδύσαντο δόξας καὶ στολὰς πολέμου; Sir 6:29b καὶ ἔσονταί σοι . . . οἱ κλοιοὶ αὐτῆς [sc. τῆς σοφίας] εἰς στολὴν δόξης; 6:31a στολὴν δόξης ἐνδύσῃ αὐτήν; 27:8b καὶ ἐνδύσῃ αὐτὸ [sc. τὸ δίκαιον] ὡς ποδήρη δόξης; 45:7d καὶ περιέζωσεν αὐτὸν περιστολὴν δόξης; Pss. Sol. 11:7a ἔνδυσαι, Ιερουσαλημ, τὰ ἱμάτια τῆς δόξης σου. Cf. also Let. Aris. 96 μεγάλην δὲ ἔκπληξιν ἡμῖν παρέσχεν ὡς ἐθεασάμεθα τὸν Ἐλεάζαρον ἐν τῇ λειτουργίᾳ, τά τε τοῦ στολισμοῦ καὶ τῆς δόξης, ᾗ συνίσταται διὰ τὴν ἔνδυσιν οὗ φορεῖ χιτῶνος. The cognate adjective ἔνδοξος occurs sixty-nine times in the Septuagint, but is never applied to garments. Cf., however, T. 12 Patr. 3.8.5 περιέθηκέ μοι στολὴν ἁγίαν καὶ ἔνδοξον; NT Luke 7:25 οἱ ἐν ἱματισμῷ ἐνδόξῳ; *A.Phil.* 144.15 Bonnet ἀλλ' ἔνδυσόν με τὴν ἔνδοξόν σου στολήν.

[95] Cf. 2 Macc 4:38, where another of Antiochus' Friends, Andronicus, is humiliatingly stripped of his purple cloak by the king himself before being executed for the murder of the ex-high priest Onias III (τὴν τοῦ Ἀνδρονίκου πορφύραν περιελόμενος καὶ τοὺς χιτῶνας περιρρήξας), and 1 Macc 10:20, 62, 64, where Alexander Balas appoints Jonathan high priest and Friend of the king and gives him a purple vestment to wear (10:20 καθεστάκαμέν σε σήμερον ἀρχιερέα τοῦ ἔθνους σου καὶ φίλον βασιλέως καλεῖσθαί—καὶ ἀπέστειλεν αὐτῷ πορφύραν; 10:62 καὶ ἐξέδυσαν Ιωναθαν τὰ ἱμάτια αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐνέδυσαν αὐτὸν πορφύραν; 10:64 ὡς εἶδον οἱ ἐντυγχάνοντες τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ . . . καὶ περιβεβλημένον αὐτὸν πορφύραν). Cf. also the purple robes that Mordecai and Daniel each receive as a reward from the kings Artaxerxes and Balthazar, respectively (Esth 8:15; OG Dan 5:29). For the πορφύρα worn by the Macedonian kings' Friends, cf. Plu. *Eum.* 8.12 and see Corradi 1929, 341–42 and Bikerman 1938, 42–44.

overwhelming defeat of his army at the battle of Emmaus, Nicanor had to take his cloak off in order to flee undetected to Antioch.

δοξικός was apparently coined by analogy to other adjectives in -ικός used as modifiers of garment-denoting nouns.[96] Even its conjunction with ἐσθής and the participle ἀποθέμενος appears to have been modelled after similar combinations to be found in profane Greek historiographical works.[97] Especially noteworthy is the verbal similarity (including the hyperbaton separating adjective from noun) of 2 Macc 8:35 with a passage in Polybius (26.1.5), in which the historian gives an example of Antiochus Epiphanes' eccentric behaviour: τὴν βασιλικὴν ἀποθέμενος ἐσθῆτα τήβενναν ἀναλαβὼν περιήει κατὰ τὴν ἀγοράν. On the other hand, the choice to create a garment-modifying adjective from δόξα, a noun which, outside the Septuagint and related literature, is not used in connection with splendid garments, indicates that the author had in mind the specific use of this noun in Jewish-Greek writings. Yet, unlike the translators of biblical books, who employ Hebraizing constructions involving a garment-denoting noun modified by δόξα in the genitive (στολή/ἱμάτια/ποδήρης δόξης)[98] or by the prepositional phrase εἰς δόξαν (Exod 28:2 ποιήσεις στολήν . . . εἰς τιμὴν καὶ δόξαν), he opted for the standard Greek construction—attributive adjective plus noun—which necessitated his coining an adjective from δόξα.[99] Similarly, in 2 Macc 3:15, as well as in 1 Esd 4:54 and 5:44, we meet with the combination ἱερατικὴ στολή, which is equivalent to the Hebraizing constructions to be found in the Septuagint Exodus (35:19 τοὺς χιτῶνας τῆς ἱερατείας; 39:18 τὰς στολὰς εἰς τὴν ἱερατείαν).[100]

---

[96] Cf. Hdt. 1.135 τὴν Μηδικὴν ἐσθῆτα; Ar. *Ec.* 846 ἱππικὴν στολήν; X. *An.* 4.5.33 βαρβαρικαῖς στολαῖς; Lycurg. 1.86 πτωχικὴν στολήν; Pl. *Lg.* 833b τοξικὴν στολήν; *SEG* 43:212(B).29 [Boiotia, ca. 260–250 BCE] χιτῶνα κορικὸν γευματικόν; Phylarch. *FGrH* 2A.81.30; Esth^{AT} (8):39(15) τὴν βασιλικὴν ἐσθῆτα; Callix. *FHG* 3:2.270 χιτῶνας ἡνιοχικούς; Plb. 10.26.2 δημοτικωτέραν ἐσθῆτα; 14.1.13 δουλικὰς ἐσθῆτας; 31.14.6 ἐσθῆτας ὁδοιπορικάς (a Polybian neologism); D.H. 3.73.2 ποιμενικαῖς στολαῖς; 5.35.1 θριαμβικὴν ἐσθῆτα; 8.59.3 τὴν αὐτοκρατορικὴν ἐσθῆτα; Str. 3.4.20.28 τῇ τηβεννικῇ ἐσθῆτι; J. *AJ* 11.231 πενθικὴν ἐσθῆτα; *BJ* 2.176 ἐσθῆσιν ἰδιωτικαῖς; 4.164 τὴν ἀρχιερατικὴν ἐσθῆτα; 7.127 ἐν ἐσθήσεσιν σηρικαῖς.

[97] Cf. Hdt. 4.78 τὴν στολὴν ἀποθέμενος τὴν Σκυθικὴν λάβεσκε ἂν Ἑλληνίδα ἐσθῆτα; D.S. 17.97.2 ὁ μὲν Ἀλέξανδρος ἀποθέμενος τὴν ἐσθῆτα γυμνῷ τῷ σώματι τῆς ἐνδεχομένης ἀντείχετο βοηθείας; 20.34.3 ἀποθέμενος τὴν πορφύραν καὶ μεταλαβὼν ἰδιωτικὴν καὶ ταπεινὴν ἐσθῆτα παρῆλθεν εἰς τὸ μέσον; 20.104.4 ἀποθέμενος γὰρ τὴν Λακωνικὴν ἐσθῆτα διετέλει τρυφῶν; J. *AJ* 8.266 τὴν στολὴν ἀποθεμένην καὶ σχῆμα λαβοῦσαν ἰδιωτικόν; 20.217 συνεχώρησεν τοῖς ὑμνωδοῖς ἀποθεμένους τὴν προτέραν ἐσθῆτα φορεῖν λινῆν. Cf. also Duris *FHG* 2:31.3 καταθέμενος τὸν πάτριον τρίβωνα, τὴν Περσικὴν ἐνεδύετο στολήν; D.S. 29.32.1 τὴν βασιλικὴν ἐσθῆτα καταθέμενος περιεβάλλετο τήβενναν; Plu. *Cic.* 19.3 τὴν περιπόρφυρον ἐν τῇ βουλῇ καταθέμενος, διήλλαξεν ἐσθῆτα τῇ συμφορᾷ πρέπουσαν.

[98] See Blass, Debrunner, and Funk 1961, § 165: "The genitive of quality provides in many combinations an attributive which would ordinarily be provided by an adjective. Hebrew usage is thus reflected, in that this construction compensates for the nearly non-existent adjective. Classical Greek exhibits very sparse parallels in poetry only."

[99] Likewise, when Josephus paraphrased the verse referring to Esther's change of clothing, in Addition C to Esther, he turned the genitival construction in the phrase ἐνεδύσατο ἱμάτια στενοχωρίας καὶ πένθους (C:13 [4:17^{k}]) into an adjectival one, πενθικὴν ἐσθῆτα περιθεμένη (*AJ* 231), employing the adjective πενθικός, used elsewhere in the Septuagint (Exod 33:4; 2 Kgdms 14:2).

[100] See 4.2.2.

Apropos of the priestly garments, we may note here that at 31:10 and 39:12, the translator of Exodus uses the adjective λειτουργικός (στολὰς λειτουργικάς) as a monolectic variant of the Hebraizing periphrasis that he employs elsewhere as a modifier to στολή (35:19 τὰς στολάς, ἐν αἷς λειτουργήσουσιν ἐν αὐταῖς; cf. 39:11 ἐποίησαν στολὰς λειτουργικὰς Ααρων ὥστε λειτουργεῖν ἐν αὐταῖς).

The phrase τὴν δοξικὴν ἀποθέμενος ἐσθῆτα appears thus to have been modelled after both profane Greek and Septuagintal lexical patterns.

2.2.5 δυσπέτημα 'misfortune'

> 5:20 ὁ τόπος συμμετασχὼν τῶν τοῦ ἔθνους δυσπετημάτων γενομένων ὕστερον εὐεργετημάτων ἐκοινώνησε

Of all the books of the Septuagint, the deuterocanonicals/Apocrypha have the highest concentration of compounds prefixed with δυσ-: 2 Maccabees has fifteen, which occur twenty-six times,[101] 3 Maccabees has ten, which occur fifteen times,[102] Wisdom has three, 1 Esdras, 1 Maccabees, and Addition B to Esther two each, and 4 Maccabees one;[103] six others are found in six different canonical books.[104] Most of these compounds are first attested in Greek poetry; the members of the δυσσεβ- and δυσφημ- word-groups, favoured by 1, 2, and 3 Maccabees, are almost exclusively encountered in poetic texts.

Among the total of thirty-two δυσ- compounds that occur in the Septuagint are a few neologisms: δυσαίακτος (3 Macc 6:31), δυσδιήγητος (Wis 17:1), δυσνοέω (Add Esth B:5; 3 Macc 3:24), δυσπέτημα (2 Macc 5:20), and δυσσέβημα (1 Esd 1:49; 2 Macc 12:3).

δυσπέτημα presumes the verb δυσπετέω (from πίπτω), which is unattested in Classical and Hellenistic literature.[105] This verb, which Hesychius glosses as the equivalent of δυστυχέω, κακῶς ἔχω, δυσανασχετέω, δυσχεραίνω, σχετλιάζω,[106] is first recorded as late as the fourth century CE in Eusebius of Caesarea.[107] Other members of the δυσπετ- word-group, however, are attested much earlier, in the tragic poetry and the Ionic prose of the fifth and fourth centuries BCE: the adjective δυσπετής, which Hesychius explains by δυσχερής, δύσκολος,[108] occurs in Sophocles (*Aj.* 1046) and in the

---

[101] δυσημερία, δυσμένεια (3x), δυσμενῶς, δυσπέτημα, δυσπολιόρκητος, δυσπρόσιτος, δυσσέβεια, δυσσεβέω, δυσσέβημα, δυσσεβής (4x), δύσφημος (2x), δυσφορέω (2x), δυσφόρως, δυσχέρεια (2x), δυσχερής (4x).

[102] δυσάθλιος, δυσαίακτος (absolute *hapax legomenon*), δυσκατάπαυστος, δυσκλεής, δυσμένεια (2x), δυσμενής (3x), δυσνοέω, δυσσεβής (3x), δυσφημία, δυσφόρως.

[103] Wis δυσάλυκτος, δυσδιήγητος, δύσχρηστος; 1 Esd δυσσέβεια, δυσσέβημα; 1 Macc δυσφημέω, δυσφημία; Add B Esth δυσμενής (2x), δυσνοέω; 4 Macc δυσώδης.

[104] Gen δυστοκέω; Exod δύσκωφος; Jer δύσκολος; Isa δύσχρηστος; Prov δυσβάστακτος; Job δυσκολία.

[105] See *DELG* s.v. πίπτω and Stanton 1968, 3n4.

[106] Hsch. δ 2520 δυσανασχετεῖ; δ 2630 δυσπετοῦντα; δ 2648 δυσπετεῖ; σ 2989 σχετλιάζει.

[107] *Const. or. ad coetum sanct.* PG 20:1304C.

[108] Hsch. δ 2650 δυσπετές and δ 2651 δυσπετέστερος.

Hippocratic writings (*Morb.* 1.17; *Ep.* 27.267); the adverb δυσπετῶς is found in Aeschylus (*Pr.* 752), in Herodotus (3.107), and in two Hippocratic treatises (*Prog.* 15.19; *Morb.* 1.22); ἀποδυσπετέω, for which Hesychius gives the gloss ἀποδύρομαι and equates it with σχετλιάζω,[109] occurs in one of Aristotle's early works (*Top.* 163[b]19) and, some two centuries later, in Polybius (33.17.2). δυσπέτημα, which is to be understood here as meaning "misfortune,"[110] is possibly a coinage of the author of 2 Maccabees, unless the latter picked it from a (probably poetic) text that has not come down to us. Its two other occurrences in literature are found in the *Apocriticus seu Μονογενής* of the fourth-century CE Christian apologist Macarius Magnes[111] and in the *Life of Theodore the Studite* from the ninth century CE.[112] Both texts may be indebted to 2 Maccabees for this word.

The suffix -μα, characteristic of the Ionic vocabulary, was particularly favoured by the tragedians, especially Euripides, and remained very productive in the Koine.[113] We find it in another neologism of 2 Maccabees, the absolute *hapax legomenon* ἱεροσύλημα (4:39), as well as in δυσσέβημα, which is first attested in 1 Esdras and in 2 Maccabees, and, outside the Septuagint, in the *Circuit of the Earth*, a geographical poem attributed to Scymnus.[114] δυσπέτημα was apparently supplied with this suffix in analogy to εὐεργέτημα, with which it is juxtaposed at 5:20, so as to produce antithesis and homoioteleuton.[115] A similar rhetorical effect is produced at 5:6 by the proximity of the nouns εὐημερία and δυσημερία: οὐ συννοῶν τὴν εἰς τοὺς συγγενεῖς εὐημερίαν δυσημερίαν εἶναι τὴν μεγίστην.[116] In both cases, the author pairs a more or less frequent noun (εὐεργέτημα, εὐημερία) with a very rare (δυσημερία)[117] or perhaps novel one (δυσπέτημα), which originates in poetic diction. As for the πετ- stem, Schwartz (2008, 263) has suggested that it echoes the noun πέτασος, at 4:12, and the wordplay involved there (τοὺς κρατίστους τῶν ἐφήβων ὑποτάσσων ὑπὸ πέτασον ἤγαγεν). It is more likely, though, that it is meant to associate the idea of a misfortune, resulting from a transgression, with that of a fall, either a literal or a metaphorical one: King Antiochus'

---

[109] Hsch. α 6324 ἀποδυσπετεῖ and σ 2990 σχετλιαζέτω. LSJ gives as its meaning "to desist through impatience" and *GE* "to desist in disgust, be disheartened." The noun ἀποδυσπέτημα, LSJ"discouragement," in *Scholia in Lucianum* 25.3 Rabe, is an absolute *hapax legomenon*.

[110] So LSJ and *GE*. *DGE* gives "desgracia." Hesychius (δ 2649 δυσπετημάτων) glosses it as ἀποτύχημα, "failure."

[111] Book 3, page 113.17 Blondel.

[112] PG 99:296A.

[113] See Peppler 1916, 459–60 and Chantraine 1933, 181–90.

[114] See 4.2.2. In 2 Macc 5:20, a single witness, the minuscule 370, reads δυσσεβηματων in place of δυσπετημάτων.

[115] Cf. Lys. 31.17 ἑτέροις ἡγούμενος οἷς τὰ ὑμέτερα δυστυχήματα εὐτυχήματα ἐγεγόνει.

[116] Cf. 6:29 τὴν μικρῷ πρότερον εὐμένειαν εἰς δυσμένειαν μεταβαλόντων; 14:14 τὰς τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀτυχίας καὶ συμφορὰς ἰδίας εὐημερίας δοκοῦντες ἔσεσθαι.

[117] Prior to 2 Maccabees, δυσημερία is found only in a line of Aeschylus quoted by Aristophanes (*Ra.* 1287=A. fr. 236 Radt), in a Sophoclean fragment (591 Radt), and in a saying of the orator Demades (fr. 60 de Falco). Its verbal form is attested in the comic poet Pherecrates (fr. 98 Kock).

punishment takes the form of a severe fall from a chariot (9:7 δυσχερεῖ πτώματι περιπεσόντα); in his letter of repentance to the Jews, the same Antiochus says of himself that he has fallen into a grave disease (9:21 περιπεσὼν ἀσθενείᾳ δυσχέρειαν ἐχούσῃ); the author warns that divine chastisement befalls the impious without delay (6:13 τὸ μὴ πολὺν χρόνον ἐᾶσθαι τοὺς δυσσεβοῦντας, ἀλλ' εὐθέως περιπίπτειν ἐπιτιμίοις μεγάλης εὐεργεσίας σημεῖόν ἐστιν); and, in a paronomastic wordplay involving the literal and the figurative sense of πίπτω, the Jews who have fallen upon their bellies pray that they may no longer fall into misfortunes (10:4 ἠξίωσαν τὸν κύριον πεσόντες ἐπὶ κοιλίαν μηκέτι περιπεσεῖν τοιούτοις κακοῖς).[118]

2.2.6 κρουνηδόν 'like a spring'

14:45 φερομένων κρουνηδὸν τῶν αἱμάτων

κρουνός is a poetic word used from Homer onwards to refer to springs of water[119] and, figuratively, to gushes of lava[120] and blood[121] or to streams of words.[122] Up to the second century BCE it is very exiguously attested in prose.[123] In poetry, there are two instances, both in Euripides, in which κρουνός refers to blood gushing in torrents from a wound. In *Hecuba* 568, streams of blood spurt out of the cut throat of Polyxena sacrificed by Neoptolemus (κρουνοὶ δ' ἐχώρουν), and in *Rhesus* 790 a stream of warm blood gushes from the body of the slain Thracian king (θερμὸς δὲ κρουνός . . . αἵματος νέου). The adverb κρουνηδόν first appears in literature in 2 Macc 14:45, in one of the goriest scenes of the book, the heroic suicide by sword of the Jewish elder Razis. The blood flows in torrents from the old man's wounds (14:45 φερομένων κρουνηδὸν τῶν αἱμάτων) until he is totally bloodless (14:46 παντελῶς ἔξαιμος). The dramatic character of this scene is verbally highlighted through the use of the absolute *hapax legomenon* κατευθικτέω (14:43), LSJ"to hit exactly," and of rare words such as ἀναποδίζω (14:44), LSJ"to step back," and κενεών (14:44), attested here in the novel sense of LSJ"vacant space." Similarly, in another blood-spattered scene of the book, the rare, poetic adjective κατάρρυτος, LSJ"irrigated, watered," first attested in Euripides, is figuratively and hyperbolically applied to a lake filled with the blood of the inhabitants of Kaspin, who were slaughtered by the soldiers of Judas (12:16 ὥστε τὴν παρακειμένην λίμνην . . .

[118] Cf. the use of πτῶσις, κατάπτωσις, and πτῶμα with regard to the misfortunes and downfall of the Jews in Add Esth C:22 μὴ παραδῷς, κύριε, τὸ σκῆπτρόν σου τοῖς μὴ οὖσιν, καὶ μὴ καταγελασάτωσαν ἐν τῇ πτώσει ἡμῶν, in Jdt 13:20 οὐκ ἐφείσω τῆς ψυχῆς σου διὰ τὴν ταπείνωσιν τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν, ἀλλ' ἐπεξῆλθες τῷ πτώματι ἡμῶν, and in 3 Macc 2:14 ἐν τῇ ἡμετέρᾳ καταπτώσει.

[119] Hom. *Il.* 4.454; 22.147, 208; Pi. *O.* 13.63; S. *Tr.* 14; Pl. *Epigr.* 26 Diehl; Men. *Phasm.* 55.

[120] Pi. *P.* 1.25.

[121] E. *Hec.* 568; *Rh.* 790.

[122] Ar. *Ra.* 1005. Cf. the compound κρουνοχυτρολήραιος in *Eq.* 89.

[123] Hp. *Aph.* 7.85; Arist. *Mir.* 841ᵃ22; Callix. *FHG* 3:2.243.

κατάρρυτον αἵματι πεπληρωμένην φαίνεσθαι). It is hard to say whether κρουνηδόν is a coinage of the author of 2 Maccabees, as is probably the *hapax legomenon* λεοντηδόν (11:11), or a borrowing from an unknown, lost, earlier source. The first author to use it after 2 Maccabees was Philo in the *Life of Moses* (1.99, 211) and in *Flaccus* (190). Its instance in the second-mentioned book, in the description of the execution of Flaccus, persecutor of the Alexandrian Jews (ὁ μὲν τόπος ἅπας αἵματι κατερρεῖτο . . . κρουνηδὸν ἐκχεομένῳ), may be a verbal reminiscence of 2 Macc 14:45.[124] In its later occurrences, κρουνηδόν came to be used with respect not only to water and blood but, mainly, to tears.

2.2.7 λεοντηδόν 'like a lion'

11:11 λεοντηδὸν δὲ ἐντινάξαντες εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους

Frohwein (1868, 52–58) lists some 120 Greek adverbs with the manner-denoting suffix -ηδόν. They occur in poetry, mainly epic, tragic, and comic,[125] but are also favoured by prose writers, especially those of the Hellenistic period.[126] A small number among them, chiefly attested in tragic and comic poetry, are formed from nouns denoting or referring to animals: βοηδόν, "like oxen" (Agatharch. *GGM* 1:38), ζῳηδόν, "like beasts" (Plb. 6.5.9), ἱππηδόν, "like a horse" (A. *Th.* 328; *Supp.* 431; Ar. *Pax* 81), κριηδόν, "like a ram" (Ar. *Lys.* 309), κτηνηδόν, "like beasts" (Hdt. 4.180), κυνηδόν, "like a dog" (S. fr. 722 Radt; Ar. *Eq.* 1033; *Nu.* 491), λυκηδόν, "like a wolf" (A. fr. 39* Radt), μοσχηδόν, "like a calf" (Nic. *Al.* 357), and ταυρηδόν, "like a bull" (Ar. *Ra.* 804; Pl. *Phd.* 117b; Nic. *Al.* 496). Half of these adverbs are absolute *hapax legomena*.

λεοντηδόν was apparently coined by the author of 2 Maccabees on the model of the aforecited adverbs.[127] The lion simile contained in it is applied to Judas' valiant soldiers,

---

[124] On whether Philo knew 2 Maccabees, see Appendix 17.

[125] Hom. ἀγεληδόν, κλαγγηδόν, κρυφηδόν, πυργηδόν, σφαιρηδόν, φαλαγγηδόν; Hes. ὁμιληδόν, ἑλκηδόν; A. ἱππηδόν, λυκηδόν, μολπηδόν; S. κυνηδόν; *TrGF* 2:705b.15 μυκηδόν; Ar. ἱππηδόν, κυνηδόν, κριηδόν, πινακηδόν, ταυρηδόν, τετραποδηδόν; Theoc. ἀγεληδόν; Call. εἰληδόν; Arat. ἀγεληδόν, κλαγγηδόν, σφαιρηδόν; A.R. ἀγεληδόν, βομβηδόν, βρυχηδόν; Lyc. ῥοιζηδόν; Nic. μετρηδόν, μοσχηδόν, πανσπερμηδόν, ῥοιζηδόν, ταυρηδόν; *AP* (Hellenistic epigrammatists): Anyt. 7.202 λαθρηδόν; Leon. 6.45 σφαιρηδόν; 6.131 στοιχηδόν; 9.24 ἀγεληδόν; Antip.Thess. 7.531 κοναβηδόν; Antip.Sid. 7.713 σωρηδόν.

[126] Hdt. ἀγεληδόν, ἐπαναβληδόν, ἡβηδόν, κρεοργηδόν, κτηνηδόν, μετωπηδόν, ὀρχηδόν, πλινθηδόν; Th. ἐθελοντηδόν, μετωπηδόν, ὑπονομηδόν, φορμηδόν; Pl. ταυρηδόν; Hp. ἀμοιβηδόν, ἑλικηδόν, σκεπαρνηδόν, ὑγρηδόν; Arist. ἀγεληδόν, πυγηδόν, στοιχηδόν; Thphr. ἑλικηδόν, στοιχηδόν; Plb. ἀγεληδόν, ζῳηδόν, μετωπηδόν, σπειρηδόν, σωρηδόν, φαλαγγηδόν; Posidon. ἀγεληδόν, κυκληδόν, κυματηδόν, κωμηδόν, μεληδόν, σπειρηδόν, φαλαγγηδόν; D.S. ἀγεληδόν, ἡβηδόν, κωμηδόν; D.H. ἀγεληδόν, γνωμηδόν, ἡβηδόν, κωμηδόν, πυργηδόν, στοιχηδόν, σωρηδόν; Str. ἀγεληδόν, ἡβηδόν, κωμηδόν, σπειρηδόν; Ph. ἀγεληδόν, ἡβηδόν, κρουνηδόν, κωμηδόν, μετωπηδόν, στοιχηδόν, σφαιρηδόν, σωρηδόν, φαλαγγηδόν, φορμηδόν; J. ἡβηδόν, σπειρηδόν, σωρηδόν; NT ῥοιζηδόν.

[127] In the Septuagint, adverbs in -ηδόν are found only in the books originally written in Greek: in 2 Maccabees occur ἀγεληδόν (3:18; 14:14), the Polybian neologism σπειρηδόν (5:2; 12:20), and the neologisms λεοντηδόν (11:11) and κρουνηδόν (14:45), in Wisdom we are met with σωρηδόν (18:23), first

who on more than one occasion are represented as fighting like wild animals: at 10:35 they cut down everyone they meet with the fury of a savage beast (θηριώδει θυμῷ τὸν ἐμπίπτοντα ἔκοπτον); at 12:15 they attack the walls of Kaspin like wild animals (ἐνέσεισαν θηριωδῶς τῷ τείχει); and at 11:9 they are ready to wound not only men but also the most ferocious beasts (οὐ μόνον ἀνθρώπους, θῆρας δὲ τοὺς ἀγριωτάτους . . . τιτρώσκειν ὄντες ἕτοιμοι), a hyperbole that anticipates their comparison with lions just two verses further down, at 11:11. In the world of the Bible, the lion is the mightiest animal (Judg 14:18 τί ἰσχυρότερον λέοντος;), against which Samson (Judg 14:5–6) and David (1 Sam [LXX 1 Kgdms] 17:34–36) dared to measure their strength. In Greek literature, the warrior-as-lion imagery has its prototype in Homer, where the heroes are often likened to lions in their scenes of *aristeia*.[128] It is possible that by coining the adverb λεοντηδόν, which adds an epic and poetic flavour to the battle narrative, the author of 2 Maccabees wanted to create the equivalent of a Homeric lion simile and equate the martial prowess of Judas' soldiers to that of the Iliadic heroes. Yet, the lion being a very common oriental motif, leonine similes are also to be found in ancient Near Eastern literature,[129] where, however, the attribution of leonine qualities to humans in military contexts appears to be a royal prerogative.[130] The Bible supplies a number of examples of valorous warriors who are assigned leonine attributes:[131] in 2 Sam [LXX 2 Kgdms] 1:23, David says of Saul and Jonathan fallen in battle that they were "stronger than lions" (Σαουλ καὶ Ιωναθαν . . . ὑπὲρ λέοντας ἐκραταιώθησαν); in 2 Sam [LXX 2 Kgdms] 17:10, a valiant man is said to be "lion-hearted" (υἱὸς δυνάμεως, οὗ ἡ καρδία καθὼς ἡ καρδία τοῦ λέοντος);[132] in 1 Chr 12:9, the mighty Gadite soldiers who go over

---

attested in Polybius, and in 4 Maccabees we encounter ταυρηδόν (15:19) and the neologism ἐθνηδόν (2:19).

[128] On the lion similes in Homer see Lonsdale 1990, 39–70 and 137–43; on lion comparisons in Homer and the tragedians see Wolff 1979. Markoe 1989, 89 and 114–15 gives a list of twenty-eight extended lion similes in the *Iliad*, in which the most prominent Achaean and Trojan warriors are compared to lions attacking cattle, sheep, goats, boars, and deer. There are also five abbreviated similes, in which the aggressiveness or the speed of the warriors is compared to that of a lion. Cf. *Il.* 5.782 [Achaeans], 15.592 [Trojans], 7.256 [Aias and Hector] λείουσιν ἐοικότες ὠμοφάγοισιν; 5.299 [Aeneas] λέων ὣς ἀλκὶ πεποιθώς; 11.129 [Agamemnon] ὃ δ' ἐναντίον ὦρτο λέων ὡς / Ἀτρεΐδης; 12.293 [Sarpedon] ὦρσεν ἐπ' Ἀργείοισι λέονθ' ὡς βουσὶν ἕλιξιν; 16.752 [Patroclus] ἐπὶ Κεβριόνῃ ἥρωϊ βεβήκει / οἶμα λέοντος ἔχων; 20.164 [Achilles] ἐναντίον ὦρτο λέων ὡς / σίντης. It is the last-quoted line that Aristotle, in his definition of a simile, chooses as a prototypical example: *Rh.* 1406^{b}20–24 ἔστι δὲ καὶ ἡ εἰκὼν μεταφορά· . . . ὅταν μὲν γὰρ εἴπῃ [sc. ὁ Ὅμηρος] τὸν Ἀχιλλέα "ὡς δὲ λέων ἐπόρουσεν" [Aristotle probably quotes the line from memory], εἰκών ἐστιν, ὅταν δὲ "λέων ἐπόρουσε," μεταφορά· διὰ γὰρ τὸ ἄμφω ἀνδρείους εἶναι, προσηγόρευσε μετενέγκας λέοντα τὸν Ἀχιλλέα.

[129] Cf. the following lines from the Assyrian *Tukulti-Ninurta Epic* (thirteenth century BCE): "The valiant warriors of [Assur] espied / the Kassite king's preparations, / They did not have their armor on, / but sprang forward like lions." Trans. B.R. Foster in Foster 1996, 1.225. See also West 1997, 246–47 and 388.

[130] See Strawn 2005, 174–81.

[131] For a list of the passages in the Hebrew Bible that mention lions, see Strawn 2005, 357–74.

[132] Cf. the Homeric epithet θυμολέων (*Il.* 5.639; 7.228; *Od.* 4.724, 814; 11.267) and Tyrt. fr. 13 West αἴθωνος δὲ λέοντος ἔχων ἐν στήθεσι θυμόν.

to David in the desert are described as having the "faces of lions" (ἰσχυροὶ δυνατοὶ ἄνδρες παρατάξεως πολέμου . . . καὶ πρόσωπον λέοντος πρόσωπα αὐτῶν); and in 1 Macc 3:4, Judas Maccabeus himself is likened to a lion due to his heroic deeds, and to a lion's cub roaring for his prey (καὶ ὡμοιώθη λέοντι ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις αὐτοῦ καὶ ὡς σκύμνος ἐρευγόμενος εἰς θήραν), a comparison originating in Gen 49:9, where Jacob calls the tribe of Judah "a lion's whelp" (σκύμνος λέοντος Ἰούδα), and prefiguring Rev 5:5, where Christ is identified as "the lion from the tribe of Judah" (ὁ λέων ὁ ἐκ τῆς φυλῆς Ἰούδα).[133]

λεοντηδόν is glossed in Hesychius as ἰσχυρῶς κατὰ τὸν λέοντα and in Ps.-Zonaras as φοβερῶς· δίκην λέοντος.[134] LBG, s.v., cites two more instances of this adverb in Byzantine hagiographical texts.

2.2.8 μετάφρασις 'paraphrase'

> 2:31 τὸ δὲ σύντομον τῆς λέξεως μεταδιώκειν καὶ τὸ ἐξεργαστικὸν τῆς πραγματείας παραιτεῖσθαι τῷ τὴν μετάφρασιν ποιουμένῳ συγχωρητέον

The epitomator's prologue (2:19–32) features three neologisms: Ἰουδαϊσμός (2:21, recurring at 8:1 and 14:38), ὑπογραμμός (2:28), and μετάφρασις (2:31). All three of them do not recur earlier than the first century CE.[135] Did the epitomator coin these words some one and a half centuries before their next attested instances in surviving Greek literature? Could they have been current in the epitomator's linguistic milieu as early as the last third of the second century BCE? Or did the epitomator produce his epitome and compose its prologue near the period when these words appear in biblical as well as in non-literary texts? We shall seek to answer these questions only with regard to the term μετάφρασις, which, together with the terms ἐπιτέμνω/ἐπιτομή (2:23, 26, 28, 32),[136] designates the epitomator's work vis-à-vis his *Vorlage*, Jason of Cyrene's history.

LSJ lists seven nouns composed of a prefix and φράσις. μετάφρασις aside, they are all first attested chiefly in grammatical and rhetorical treatises dating mainly from the first century BCE onwards: ἀντίφρασις first occurs in the pseudo-Aristotelian treatise *On Marvelous Things Heard* (846^{b}27), dated to 250 BCE–200 CE,[137] and in the first-century BCE grammarian Tryphon (*Trop.* 204.4); περίφρασις is first found in

---

[133] On the lion as a symbol of the tribe of Judah and of the Jewish people see H. Lesêtre, "lion," *DB* 4:1, 276, and Frankel and Teutsch 1992, 85 and 98–100.

[134] Cf. the absolute *hapax legomenon* λεοντωδῶς, used by Posidonius to describe the lion-like dining manners of the Celts (*FGrH* 2A:87, fr. 15.8 προσφέρονται δὲ ταῦτα [sc. τὰ κρέα] καθαρείως μέν, λεοντωδῶς δέ).

[135] Ἰουδαϊσμός: NT *Gal* 1:13, 14; 4 Macc 4:26. ὑπογραμμός: NT 1 Pet 2:21; *TAM V,1* 688.12 [Ioulia Gordos, 1st c. CE].

[136] The term ἐπιτομή is not a neologism; as a book title, it is attested from the fourth century BCE onwards, although it is uncertain who was the first author to use it. See I. Opelt, "Epitome," *RAC* 5, col. 944.

[137] See *EANS*, 152.

Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Dem.* 5.24, passim; *Th.* 29.34, 31.27; *Pomp.* 2.5) and in Tryphon (*Trop.* 197.4); ἔκφρασις in Ps.-Dionysius of Halicarnassus (*Rh.* 10.17.3) and in Theon (*Prog.* 60.19, passim); παράφρασις in Theon (*Prog.* 62.10, passim), σύμφρασις in Herodianus (Hdn.Gr. 3.1.7.12), and ἐπίφρασις as late as in the sixth-century CE rhetor Phoebammon (*Fig.* 1.1.76, passim).

The verb μεταφράζω, already in its first attestations in Dionysius of Halicarnassus,[138] appears in the sense "to translate," either interlingually (e.g. from Latin into Greek)[139] or intralingually ("to reword, to rephrase")[140]—to use Roman Jakobson's terms. Philo uses it in conjunction with παραφράζω to refer to the manifold possibilities of expressing a thought that every language, and especially Greek, offers.[141] Josephus uses it solely of interlingual translation.[142] Plutarch does the same,[143] but uses the noun μετάφρασις with regard to intralingual translation. One of Demosthenes' exercises, he writes, was to correct and rephrase his speeches or those of others.[144] A slightly earlier attestation of the noun is to be found in a passage of the grammarian Herennius Philo (second half of the first century CE), quoted verbatim in Eusebius' *Preparatio Evangelica*; Herennius uses the term μετάφρασις of the translation of Phoenician names into Greek.[145] A still earlier attestation occurs in Latin literature, in Seneca the Elder's *Suasoriae*, written in the 30s of the first century CE; the Roman rhetorician uses it (in Latinized form) of a paraphrase of Homer's *Odyssey* made by the Greek rhetor Dorion.[146]

Between the third and ninth centuries CE, we have sparse evidence of literary μεταφράσεις, the term variously denoting translations from one language into another (e.g. from Greek into Latin, or the reverse),[147] translations from one literary genre into another (e.g. translations of Greek poetic works into prose),[148] or translations within the

---

[138] The middle μεταφράζομαι is already found in Homer (*Il.* 1.140) in the sense LSJ"consider after."

[139] D.H. 3.32.1 θεᾶς Φερωνείας ὀνομαζομένης, ἣν οἱ μεταφράζοντες εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶσσαν οἱ μὲν Ἀνθοφόρον . . . οἱ δὲ Φερσεφόνην καλοῦσιν.

[140] D.H. *Th.* 45.19 ὁ δὲ δημαγωγός . . . ἐπεξεργάζεταί τε τούτοις καὶ μεταφράζει τὰ ῥηθέντα.

[141] Ph. *Mos.* 2.38 πᾶσα μὲν διάλεκτος, ἡ δ' Ἑλληνικὴ διαφερόντως, ὀνομάτων πλουτεῖ, καὶ ταὐτὸν ἐνθύμημα οἷόν τε μεταφράζοντα καὶ παραφράζοντα σχηματίσαι πολλαχῶς, ἄλλοτε ἄλλας ἐφαρμόζοντα λέξεις.

[142] *AJ* 8.144 ὁ μεταφράσας ἀπὸ τῆς Φοινίκων διαλέκτου . . . εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν φωνήν; 9.283 τὰ τῶν Τυρίων ἀρχεῖα μεταφράσας εἰς τὴν Ἑλληνικὴν γλῶτταν; 10.218 μεταφράζειν τὰς Ἑβραίων βίβλους . . . εἰς τὴν Ἑλλάδα γλῶτταν; *Ap.* 1.73 γέγραφεν γὰρ [sc. Μάνεθως] Ἑλλάδι φωνῇ τὴν πάτριον ἱστορίαν ἔκ τε τῶν ἱερῶν [δέλτων] . . . μεταφράσας.

[143] *Cic.* 40.2; *Oth.* 18.1.

[144] Plu. *Dem.* 8.2.4 ἐπανορθώσεις τε παντοδαπὰς καὶ μεταφράσεις ἐκαινοτόμει τῶν εἰρημένων ὑφ' ἑτέρου πρὸς ἑαυτὸν ἢ ὑφ' ἑαυτοῦ πάλιν πρὸς ἄλλον.

[145] Eus. *PE* 1.10.8.4=*FGrH* 3c, 790 fr. 2.52 ἅπερ [viz. the Phoenician names] οἱ Ἕλληνες ἀγνοήσαντες ἄλλως ἐξεδέξαντο, πλανηθέντες τῇ ἀμφιβολίᾳ τῆς μεταφράσεως.

[146] *Suas.* 1.12 in metaphrasi Homeri.

[147] Julius Caesar authored a μετάφρασις of Aratus' *Phaenomena* into Latin (Suid. γ 10); Zenobius translated Sallust's *Histories* into Greek (Suid. ζ 73); the epic poet Arrianus translated Vergil's *Georgics* into Greek hexameters (Suid. α 3867).

[148] Demosthenes Thrax authored a μετάφρασις of the *Iliad* in prose (Suid. δ 457).

same genre (e.g. translations of prose works into prose or of poetic works from one metre to another).[149]

From the ninth century onwards, μετάφρασις acquires a rather specialized, technical sense. It denotes a specific type of hagiographical text, rewritten in a higher level of style. The rewriting involves not only the stylistic upgrading, through the use of a classicizing vocabulary and syntax, of old, often anonymous, lives of saints and martyrologies, originally couched in plain ecclesiastical language, but also the occasional addition or omission of details, the introduction of material from external sources, and the imposition of the rewriter's name on the new text. This genre knows its floruit in the tenth century, when Symeon Metaphrastes produces a substantial corpus of stylistically reworked hagiographical texts.[150] The Palaiologan period offers some examples of historiographical μεταφράσεις, which, however, involve a stylistic rewriting from a higher to a lower register.[151]

The only extant definitions of μετάφρασις come from the ninth, the eleventh, and the twelfth centuries. The earliest is found in John of Sardis' commentary on Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* (p. 65 Rabe); John actually gives the definition of παράφρασις, which he equates to that of μετάφρασις: "Paraphrase is the alteration of expression preserving the same meaning; the same thing is called also *metaphrasis*; for we must articulate the meaning in such a way, so that we neither depart from what was said or done, nor retain precisely the same words."[152] The second definition is given by the eleventh-century rhetorician John Doxapatres in his commentary on Aphthonius' *Progymnasmata* (p. 222 Hock): "Change of style [μετάφρασις] is twofold: either exalted and lofty subjects are transformed into the more exalted, as the *Metaphrases* of the Logothete [sc. Symeon Metaphrastes] do, <or . . . >."[153] Doxapatres distinguishes μετάφρασις from παράφρασις, which is "changing what has been said to something that is neither plainer nor loftier but is on a par with it."[154] The third definition is found in the longer of the two redactions of the treatise *On Rhetorical Figures* (p. 251 Spengel), which is attributed to the ninth-century grammarian Choeroboscus, but likely dates from the latter half of the twelfth century.[155] There, μετάφρασις is "the alteration in diction in terms of quantity (using either more or fewer words) along with rhetorical beauty, as Metaphrastes shows

[149] Gregory Thaumaturgus authored a μετάφρασις of Ecclesiastes; Marianus translated the hexametric poetry of Theocritus, Callimachus, Apollonius Rhodius, and other Hellenistic poets into iambics (Suid. μ 194).

[150] See Høgel 2014.

[151] See Hinterberger 2014.

[152] παράφρασις δέ ἐστιν ἑρμηνείας ἀλλοίωσις τὴν αὐτὴν διάνοιαν φυλάττουσα. τὸ αὐτὸ δὲ καὶ μετάφρασις προσαγορεύεται· δεῖ γὰρ ἡμᾶς οὕτω ταύτην προφέρειν, οὔτε τοῦ λεχθέντος ἢ πραχθέντος ἀφισταμένους οὔτε ἐπ' αὐτῶν ἀκριβῶς τῶν λέξεων μένοντας. Trans. D.D. Resh in Resh 2015, 757. The first period of this definition is given as the gloss for μετάφρασις in Ps.-Zonaras' lexicon (μ 1345.18 Tittmann).

[153] Trans. R.F. Hock in Hock 2012, 223.

[154] ἡ δὲ μετάφρασις διττή ἐστιν, ἢ γὰρ τὰ ὑψηλὰ καὶ ἀνηγμένα μεταβάλλει εἰς ὑψηλότερα, ὡς αἱ τοῦ Λογοθέτου ἔχουσι Μεταφράσεις . . . <ἢ . . .> . . . παράφρασις δέ ἐστι τὸ τὰ εἰρημένα μεταβάλλειν εἰς ἕτερα μήτε εὐτελέστερα μήτε ὑψηλότερα. Trans. R.F. Hock in Hock 2012, 223.

[155] See Resh 2015, 764–81.

us in his *Metaphraseis*"; it is distinguished from παράφρασις, which is "alteration in diction but using the same number of words, such as in paraphrasing 'Goddess, sing me the anger' someone said 'Muse, tell me the rage.'"[156]

As can be seen, the second and third definitions, which are informed by the metaphrastic practice of Symeon Metaphrastes, differentiate μετάφρασις from παράφρασις on the basis of the higher style and the rhetorical embellishment used in the former, the variation of diction being a feature common to both. John of Sardis, on the other hand, who wrote before the burgeoning of the hagiographical μεταφράσεις, uses the two terms indistinguishably, to denote variation of diction unaffected by any rhetorical elaboration, and stresses the preservation of the original meaning in the reworked text. John's definition seems to be informed by a long tradition of παράφρασις practice that goes back at least to the first century CE, when the Alexandrian orator Aelius Theon discussed it in his *Progymnasmata* (first half of the first century CE) and the Roman rhetorician Quintilian in his *Institutio Oratoria* (93–96 CE).[157]

Theon's treatise presents fifteen preparatory exercises (*progymnasmata*) to be used by teachers of rhetoric for the practice of their students. One of these exercises is the παράφρασις, discussed in a section that survives only in Armenian translation. This section begins with a definition of παράφρασις, which is identical to the above-quoted definition of John of Sardis, and which treats παράφρασις and μετάφρασις as equivalent;[158] it continues with the exposition of the modes through which παράφρασις is conducted, the main being the change in the order of words, and the addition, subtraction or substitution of words; and it ends with the presentation of two types of paraphrastic exercises, the mental reproduction in the same words and word order of a text read and the reformulation of a given author's text in the manner of another author, e.g. of a speech of Lysias in the manner of Demosthenes, or vice versa.[159] Theon also refers to the παράφρασις in the introduction to his treatise, which is preserved in Greek, as a practice sanctioned by all ancient poets and historians, who used to rephrase both their own writings and those of others.[160]

Theon was in all likelihood neither the originator of παράφρασις nor the first to include it among the *progymnasmata* used in the schools of rhetoric.[161] In Cicero's *De oratore* (1.34.154), the orator Lucius Crassus (140–91 BCE) mentions an exercise that

---

[156] μετάφρασις δὲ ἡ ἐναλλαγὴ τῶν λέξεων κατὰ τὸ ποσὸν ἢ πλειόνων ἢ ἐλαττόνων μετὰ ῥητορικοῦ κάλλους γινομένη, ὡς ὁ Μεταφραστὴς ἡμῖν δείκνυσιν ἐν ταῖς μεταφράσεσι· παράφρασις δὲ ἡ ἐναλλαγὴ τῶν λέξεων κατὰ τὸ ποσὸν τῶν αὐτῶν, ὡς τὸ μῆνιν ἄειδε θεά, παραφράζων εἶπε, τὴν ὀργὴν εἰπὲ ὦ Μοῦσα. Trans. D.D. Resh in Resh 2015, 765, 779.

[157] On the dates of these works see Patillon and Bolognesi 1977, ix and xvi.

[158] See the French translation in Patillon and Bolognesi 1997, 107: "La paraphrase consiste à changer la formulation tout en gardant les mêmes pensées; on l'appelle aussi métaphrase."

[159] See Patillon and Bolognesi 1997, civ–cvii and 107–10.

[160] *Prog.* 62.23–25 Spengel πάντες οἱ παλαιοὶ φαίνονται τῇ παραφράσει ἄριστα κεχρημένοι, οὐ μόνον τὰ ἑαυτῶν ἀλλὰ καὶ τὰ ἀλλήλων μεταπλάσσοντες.

[161] See Roberts 1985, 10n21.

he practised in his youth, which consisted in reproducing in different words the content of a poetic text or a speech that he had read. Crassus does not call this exercise (already practised by Demosthenes) παράφρασις nor can it be inferred from Cicero's text that the exercise was included in the curricula of the rhetorical schools of his time. However, Suetonius, in *De grammaticis et rhetoribus*, informs us that the early *grammatici* taught rhetoric, too, and that their successors retained or created themselves certain types of exercises for the preparation of their students in oratory; among these exercises figures the *paraphrasis*.[162] A letter of Cicero quoted by Suetonius (*Gram. et rhet.* xxvi.1) further informs us that the first to teach rhetoric in Latin as a subject independent from grammar was Plotius Gallus; his innovation must have been introduced around 92 BCE, which means that the *progymnasmata* formed part of the rhetorical instruction at least as early as the beginning of the first century BCE.[163]

Quintilian treats παράφρασις in books 1 and 10 of his *Institutio Oratoria*. At 1.9.1–3, he presents it as a *progymnasma* taught by the *grammaticus*: the young student is expected to turn a piece of poetry into prose, first by resolving its metrical form, then by converting it into simple prose, and finally by abbreviating and embellishing parts of it, without altering its meaning. At 10.5.1–11, he discusses the best exercises through which an advanced student can develop his skills; παράφρασις of Latin poetry and prose, next to translation from Greek, is one of them. At this level, the παράφρασις of Latin poetry goes beyond the simple recasting of verse into prose, as the student strives to emulate or even surpass the formulation of the original text while retaining its thought, whereas the παράφρασις of Latin prose involves the rephrasing of someone else's (or one's own) *sententiae* in as many ways as possible. παράφρασις is envisaged as a worthwhile exercise not only for the beginner and advanced student of rhetoric but also for the accomplished orator, who might even find himself challenged by its difficulty.[164]

Aside from the grammatical and the rhetorical paraphrases[165] that were at home in the schoolroom, late antiquity also produced literary paraphrases, which can be distinguished into two types: exegetical paraphrases of literary works, whose difficulty of language or subject did not make them readily accessible to the reader (e.g. Themistius' paraphrase of Aristotle and Eutecnius' paraphrases of Nicander), and rhetorically stylized poetic versions of prose texts, which often stand as independent literary works (e.g. the biblical epics).[166]

---

[162] *Gram. et rhet.* 4.7 Secundum quam consuetudinem posteriores quoque existimo, quanquam iam tum discretis professionibus, nihilominus uel retinuisse uel instituisse et ipsos quaedam genera meditationum ad eloquentiam praeparandam, ut problemata, paraphrasis, adlocutiones.

[163] See Patillon and Bolognesi 1997, ix–xii and cf. Roberts 1985, 7n9, who quotes M.L. Clarke: "Our knowledge of the προγυμνάσματα comes from the writers of the Empire, but the system no doubt took shape earlier, perhaps in the second century B.C."

[164] *Inst.* 1.9.3 quod opus, etiam consummatis professoribus difficile. On Quintilian's treatment of paraphrasis, see Roberts 1985, 13–18.

[165] On these two types of paraphrase, see Roberts 1985, 37–53.

[166] See Roberts 1985, 54–60.

From the foregoing discussion we may note the following points: παράφρασις is the standard term used for various types of intralingual translation; μετάφρασις, a fairly rare term, is used as equivalent to παράφρασις with regard to grammatical paraphrases, that is, intralingual translations that do not involve any rhetorical embellishment (Theon, John of Sardis), and, from the ninth century onwards, with regard to rhetorical paraphrases that involve stylistic embellishment (Symeon Metaphrastes, Choeroboscus); yet, unlike παράφρασις, it is also used of interlingual translation (Herennius Philo); its cognate verb is also often used to denote the latter type of translation (Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Josephus). We also note that the first attestations of μετάφρασις, aside from that in 2 Maccabees, start clustering from the first century CE onwards (Theon, as translated in the Armenian version, Seneca the Elder, Herennius Philo, Plutarch), whereas those of its cognate verb are not earlier than the late first century BCE (Dionysius of Halicarnassus).

The first question that arises with respect to the use of μετάφρασις in 2 Macc 2:31 is whether it is used of an interlingual or an intralingual translation. The epitomator appears to be 'translating' (τὴν μετάφρασιν ποιούμενος), as well as abridging, the five books of a historiographical work that is now lost and about whose author, Jason of Cyrene, we know nothing. Although it cannot be entirely excluded that, like the author of the *Vorlage* of 1 Maccabees, Jason wrote his history in Hebrew, there is no compelling evidence that would allow us to oppose the *communis opinio* that he was anything other than a Greek-speaking Diaspora Jew, who wrote his history in Greek. Had the epitomator produced an interlingual translation of Jason's history, he would most likely have referred in his prologue to the difficulties that this type of translation entails and have used a term similar to those found in other texts dating to the same period. In the prologue to the Greek translation of the book of Ben Sira, for example, the translator makes special mention of the difficulty inherent in translating a Hebrew text into another language.[167] The terms that he uses for his interlingual translation are ἑρμηνεία and μεθερμηνεύω (Pro:20, 30). The second letter prefixed to 2 Maccabees uses a similar term (διερμηνεύω) to denote an interlingual rendering.[168] In the Septuagint, as well as in other Jewish-Greek writings, but also in the papyri, the terms that denote the translation from one language into another belong to the lexical family of ἑρμηνεύω.[169]

If, then, the epitomator uses μετάφρασις of an intralingual translation, the question that can be posed is why he preferred it to παράφρασις, which is the standard term for this type of translation, according to the evidence from the texts that have reached us. The answer can be as simple as that the two terms, as previously noted, were generally used interchangeably, at least prior to the Middle and Late Byzantine periods. There can

[167] Sir Pro:22 οὐ γὰρ ἰσοδυναμεῖ αὐτὰ ἐν ἑαυτοῖς Ἑβραϊστὶ λεγόμενα καὶ ὅταν μεταχθῇ εἰς ἑτέραν γλῶσσαν.

[168] 2 Macc 1:36 νεφθαρ, ὃ διερμηνεύεται καθαρισμός.

[169] See C. Spicq, "διερμηνεύω, ἑρμηνεία, ἑρμηνεύω," *TLNT* 1:312–17, and Passoni dell'Acqua 2010. Other verbs, less frequently attested in Koine texts, which denote translation from one language into another, are μεταβάλλω, μεταβιβάζω, μεταγράφω, μετάγω, μεταπλάττω, and the already discussed μεταφράζω. See Rochette 2002, 32–33.

be little doubt that the epitomator was familiar with the terminology employed in the schools of rhetoric of his time. The fact that he undertook to produce a new version of a voluminous work that would not only be shorter but also transposed to a higher stylistic register[170] shows the measure of his ambition, if not of his literary and rhetorical capacity. His endeavour strangely prefigures that of the Byzantine *metaphrastai*, who, as Choeroboscus puts it, changed the diction of their source texts "using either more or fewer words, along with rhetorical beauty."

It is easy to discern in the latter part of his prologue the epitomator's debt to the Greek rhetorical tradition. Phrases such as τὴν κακοπάθειαν ὑποίσομεν (2:27) and τὸ διακριβοῦν περὶ ἑκάστων (2:28) are previously attested only in Isocrates;[171] the phrase ἐντεῦθεν οὖν ἀρξώμεθα τῆς διηγήσεως (2:32) also has previous parallels in the orators.[172] Terms such as περίπατος, ὕλη, ψυχαγωγία, and the comparisons from architecture and painting belong to the metaphorical terminology of Greek rhetoric.[173] Moreover, the second half of the prologue teems with rhetorical figures such as simile, diaeresis, periphrasis, antithesis, litotes, homoioteleuton, and parisosis.

It seems, thus, that the author of 2 Maccabees did not coin the term μετάφρασις, but simply borrowed it from the vocabulary of rhetoric of his time. It remains to determine whether the term could have been used as early as the last third of the second century BCE or whether we should posit for the composition of 2 Maccabees a date later than 124 BCE. It is impossible to say how early or when the terms μετάφρασις/παράφρασις acquired currency within and outside the schools of rhetoric; the immeasurable loss of the rhetorical works written between Aristotle and Dionysius of Halicarnassus leaves space only for speculation. The fact is, as we have already emphasized, that both terms are not recorded earlier than the first half of the first century CE in both Greek and Latin literature.

Is there enough evidence to posit that the epitomator might have written his prologue (and his epilogue) close to that period? We have already mentioned the other two neologisms of the prologue, Ἰουδαϊσμός and ὑπογραμμός, which, outside 2 Maccabees, have their first recorded instances in the same period as μετάφρασις. We may adduce here a few phrases used in the prologue and the epilogue of 2 Maccabees, which elsewhere are attested from the first century BCE onwards: the combination δηλόω διὰ

---

[170] Cf. his concern to embellish his text in the way a painter adorns with his frescoes the plain walls of a house: 2 Macc 2:29 τῷ δὲ ἐγκαίειν καὶ ζωγραφεῖν ἐπιχειροῦντι τὰ ἐπιτήδεια πρὸς διακόσμησιν ἐξεταστέον. Cf. also the phrase τὸ τῆς κατασκευῆς τοῦ λόγου τέρπει τὰς ἀκοὰς τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων in the epilogue (15:39); the term κατασκευή, which is usually translated as 'construction,' was, according to Theophrastus, quoted by Cicero (*Or.* 79), one of the four qualities of style. It refers to the ornamentation of speech, *ornatum illud suave et affluens*, in Cicero's words. See D.L. 7.59 ἀρεταὶ δὲ λόγου εἰσὶ πέντε, Ἑλληνισμός, σαφήνεια, συντομία, πρέπον, κατασκευή. . . . κατασκευὴ δὲ λέξις ἐκπευφευγυῖα τὸν ἰδιωτισμόν. On the stylistic changes that an epitomator permitted himself to make vis-à-vis his *Vorlage*, see I. Opelt, "Epitome," *RAC* 5, col. 962.

[171] Isoc. 6.55 ὑπενεγκεῖν κακοπάθειαν; 15.173 διακριβοῦσθαι περὶ ἑκάστου.

[172] Cf. Lys. 13.4 ἐντεῦθεν ὑμῖν ἄρξομαι διηγεῖσθαι; Isoc. 19.4 ἐντεῦθεν ἄρξομαι διηγεῖσθαι.

[173] See van Hook 1905, 24, 31, 40–43.

βιβλίων (2:23 δεδηλωμένα διὰ πέντε βιβλίων) does not recur earlier than Philo;[174] the combination of ψυχαγωγία, ὠφέλεια and ἀναγινώσκω (2:25 τοῖς μὲν βουλομένοις ἀναγινώσκειν ψυχαγωγίαν . . . πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν ὠφέλειαν) recurs only in Posidonius *apud* Diodorus Siculus;[175] the phrase πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν ὠφέλειαν (2:25) has no earlier parallels than in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and in Philo;[176] the phrase τὸ πλῆθος τῆς ὕλης (2:24) occurs in Theophrastus (*HP* 3.1.6.12; *CP* 1.10.3.3), in Polybius (14.4.6), and in Diodorus Siculus (20.23.1; 20.48.1, 6) in the literal sense of 'abundance of wood'; the figurative sense in which it is used in 2 Macc 2:24, 'abundance of material,' is next exhibited in Dioscorides Pedanius (first century CE);[177] the combination εὐτελῶς καὶ μετρίως in the epilogue (15:38) has parallels in Plutarch and in Dio Cassius;[178] the phrase τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων τῇ συντάξει (15:39) has a parallel in Vettius Valens (second century CE).[179]

How likely is it that all the above-cited words and phrases would occur in the short prologue of 2 Maccabees about a century or a century and a half before their next recorded instances? The answer depends, of course, on the amount of credit one is willing to grant to an argument from silence: the non-attestation of these words and phrases in the surviving records of Greek language prior to the first centuries BCE and CE does not entail their non-existence or non-usage prior to these centuries. It also depends on the amount of cumulative evidence from the vocabulary of the main part of the epitome. As we will see in this and the following chapters, there are other words, too, that would appear to be *verba nova*, if the epitome was composed in the second century BCE, but that would be *verba usitata*, if the epitome was composed in the first centuries BCE or CE. We will thus defer our verdict till we have gone through all the relevant evidence.

2.2.9 ὁπλολογέω 'to collect arms from'

8:27 ὁπλολογήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς καὶ τὰ σκῦλα ἐκδύσαντες τῶν πολεμίων
8:31 ὁπλολογήσαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐπιμελῶς πάντα συνέθηκαν εἰς τοὺς ἐπικαίρους τόπους, τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τῶν σκύλων ἤνεγκαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα

[174] Ph. *Sacr.* 51.10 διὰ τῶν προτέρων βιβλίων ἐδηλώσαμεν; Gal. 6.568 Kühn διὰ τοῦ προτέρου βιβλίου δεδήλωται; 11.246 ἐδήλωσε δι' ἑνὸς τούτου βιβλίου; D.C. 56.28.6 διὰ βιβλίων τῷ Αὐγούστῳ ἐδηλώθη; *SB* 18.13764.23 [148–161 CE] ὡς διὰ δημοσίων βιβλίων δηλοῦται.

[175] Posidon. fr. 85.114 Theiler [=D.S. 32.12.1] οὐ ψυχαγωγίας ἀλλ' ὠφελείας ἕνεκα τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων.

[176] D.H. *Imit.* Fr. 31.5.7.2 εἰς ὠφέλειαν τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων; Ph. *Mut.* 126 ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ τῶν ἐντευξομένων.

[177] Dsc. 5.162.2 Wellmann μήκους τῆς συντάξεως καὶ πλήθους ὕλης.

[178] Plu. *Ages.* 14.1 εὐτελείας καὶ μετριότητας; *Mor.* 150D 6 σὺν εὐτελείᾳ καὶ μετριότητι; D.C. 72.8.3 μέτριος καὶ εὐτελής.

[179] Vett. Val. 4.11.57 τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας ταύτῃ τῇ συντάξει; 4.11.236 οἱ δὲ μέλλοντες ἐντυγχάνειν τῇδέ μου τῇ συντάξει.

In 1 and 2 Maccabees we encounter two compound verbs, both neologisms, having ὅπλον as their first constituent:[180] ὁπλοδοτέω, *GELS*"to equip with weapons," which occurs for the first and only time in surviving ancient Greek literature in 1 Macc 14:32 (καὶ ὡπλοδότησε [sc. ὁ Σίμων] τοὺς ἄνδρας τῆς δυνάμεως τοῦ ἔθνους αὐτοῦ),[181] and ὁπλολογέω, which occurs twice within the space of a few verses in 2 Maccabees and recurs in the aorist passive participle in Philo in the sense LSJ"to be disarmed" (*Flacc.* 92 τῶν κατὰ τὴν χώραν Αἰγυπτίων ὁπλολογηθέντων ὑπὸ Βάσσου τινός).

ὁπλολογέω was coined after the model of a few other, mostly Hellenistic, verbs ending in -λογέω (from λέγω in its original sense "to collect, to gather"), which can roughly be categorized into four groups: (a) agricultural terms,[182] (b) military terms,[183] (c) terms related to the collection or exaction of money,[184] and (d) miscellaneous terms.[185] Most of these verbs are very rare and a few are unique in the Greek language. The Septuagint furnishes a small number of neologisms in -λογέω: ἐλαιολογέω, *GELS*"to pick olives" (Deut 24:20),[186] ἐπικαρπολογέομαι, *GELS*"to overdo in gathering" (4 Macc 2:9), ἐπιρρωγολογέομαι, *GELS*"to overdo in harvesting grapes" (4 Macc 2:9), and ὁπλολογέω (2 Macc 8:27, 31). There is also ψηφολογέω, *GELS*"to pave with cobble-stones" (Tob 13:17), which is previously attested in an inscription from Delos.[187]

---

[180] In the Septuagint we also find the compound ὁπλοποιέω, which occurs in the sense *GELS*"to use as weapon" in Wis 5:17 (ὁπλοποιήσει τὴν κτίσιν εἰς ἄμυναν ἐχθρῶν). The verb recurs in Strabo, who uses it in the sense "to make weapons" (15.3.18 φυτουργεῖν καὶ ῥιζοτομεῖν ἀσκοῦσι καὶ ὁπλοποιεῖν). Since the date of the Wisdom of Solomon is not certain, the verb cannot be securely taken to be a Septuagint neologism.

[181] Its single other occurrence is in the *History* (2.1.357.3) of the Byzantine historian Nicetas Choniates (12th–13th c. CE).

[182] ἀκρολογέω*h.l.*, "gather at top" (*AP*), ἀνθολογέω, "to gather flowers or honey from flowers" (Arist., Thphr.), βλαστολογέω, "pick off young shoots" (Thphr.), βοτανολογέω, "gather herbs" (Hp.), ἐκλιθολογέω*h.l.*, "clear by picking off the stones" (Thphr.), καρπολογέω, "gather fruit" (inscr.), καρφολογέω, "to gather dry twigs" (Thphr.), ποηλογέω, "gather herbs" (J.), σιτολογέω, "to collect corn, forage" (Plb.), σταχυολογέω, "glean ears of corn" (sch. Theoc.), συκολογέω, "gather figs" (Ar.), χορτολογέω, "collect fodder" (App.).

[183] ἀνδρολογέω, "to enlist soldiers" (D.H.), ἀποξενολογέω*h.l.*, "hire for mercenary service" (J.), ξενολογέω, "to enlist foreign troops, esp. mercenaries" (orators, Plb., LXX, inscr., pap.), στρατολογέω, "to enlist soldiers" (D.S.).

[184] ἀργυρολογέω, "to levy money" (Th., X., Plb., inscr.), δασμολογέω, "collect as tribute" (orators), ἐνοικολογέω, "receive rent" (pap.), πεντηκοστολογέω*h.l.*, "collect the πεντηκοστή" (Poll.), τριτολογέω*h.l.* and τεταρτολογέω, "have one third/one fourth of one's property confiscated" (pap.), χαλκολογέω*h.l.*, "collect or exact copper money" (inscr.), φορολογέω, "to levy tribute" (Plb., LXX, inscr.).

[185] ἐθημολογέω*h.l.*, "gather customarily," or θημολογέω*h.l.*, "collect in a heap" (*AP*), κοπρολογέω*h.l.*, "collect dung" (Ar.), κροκυδολογέω*h.l.*, "pick loose flocks off a garment" (Hp.), ὀστολογέω, "gather bones" (Is., Men.), σκνιπολογέω*h.l.*, "catch fleas" (Ar.Byz.), σπερμολογέω, "pick up seeds, like birds" (Hp.), etc. All the aforequoted definitions of verbs in -λογέω are from LSJ.

[186] Tov (1999, 134) thinks that this compound was probably not a coinage of the translator of Deuteronomy, but existed in the Greek language before the time of the translation of the Pentateuch (although there are no earlier preserved instances of it).

[187] *IG XI,2* 165.42 [ca. 280 BCE].

ὁπλολογέω pertains to the vocabulary of despoliation and booty,[188] which in 2 Maccabees comprises the verb σκυλεύω and the periphrasis τὰ σκῦλα ἐκδύω, and the nouns ὠφέλεια, λάφυρα, and σκῦλα.[189] σκυλεύω, ordinarily meaning [LSJ]"to despoil a slain enemy, esp. of his arms," is used at 9:16 (ἐσκύλευσεν ἅγιον νεώ) instead of συλάω, which is the regular verb for the plundering of a sanctuary or of sacred property.[190] The periphrasis τὰ σκῦλα ἐκδύω, equivalent to σκυλεύω, is elsewhere unattested. ἐκδύω, normally applied to clothes, is used in the *Iliad*, in the middle voice, of soldiers taking off their battle-gear[191] and in the Septuagint of the stripping of a slain foe's armour;[192] the neologism ἐκδιδύσκω is also used in the Septuagint in the sense "to despoil."[193] ὠφέλεια in the military sense of "booty" is attested from the early second century BCE onwards.[194] As regards the other two nouns denoting booty, ancient lexicographers usually distinguish between the σκῦλα (corresponding to Latin *spolia*), the weapons and armour stripped from the corpses of the vanquished enemies, and the λάφυρα (corresponding to Latin *praeda*), the spoils taken from the living.[195] The author of 2 Maccabees seems to be using the two nouns indiscriminately: at 8:28, after the battle at Emmaus against Nicanor, Judas' soldiers give a share of the σκῦλα to the tortured, the widows, and the orphans, whereas at 8:30–31, after the victory over Timothy and Bacchides, the same groups of people are allotted the same portion of the captured

---

[188] The booty-related vocabulary in the Septuagint consists of ἀπαρτία (Num 31:17, 18), ἁρπαγή (Isa 10:2), ἅρπαγμα (Isa 42:22), διαρπαγή (16x), διαρπάζω (37x), καταπρονομεύω (Num 21:1), λαφυρεύω (Jdt 15:11), λάφυρον (3x), λεία (4 Macc 8:2), προνομεύω (41x), προνομή (43x), σκυλεία (1 Macc 4:23), σκυλεύω (30x), σκῦλον (100x), συλάω (Ep Jer 17:4), ὠφέλεια (2 Macc 8:20). On the terminology for the taking and the distribution of spoils in the Hebrew Bible, see Elgavish 2002, 242–45; on plundering and war booty in the Bible, see Kvasnica 2008.

[189] 8:20 ὠφέλειαν πολλὴν ἔλαβον; 8:27 τὰ σκῦλα ἐκδύσαντες τῶν πολεμίων; 8:28 μερίσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν σκύλων; 8:30 λάφυρα πλείονα ἐμερίσαντο; 8:31 τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τῶν σκύλων ἤνεγκαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα; 9:16 ἐσκύλευσεν ἅγιον νεώ.

[190] Cf. Jdt 4:1 ἐσκύλευσεν πάντα τὰ ἱερὰ αὐτῶν. For examples of interchangeable usage of συλάω and σκυλεύω, see Pritchett 1974–1991, 5:116–17.

[191] *Il.* 3.114 τεύχεά τ' ἐξεδύοντο ("[the Achaeans and Trojans] took off their battle gear"). In Homer the cognate verb used for stripping a slain enemy of his arms is ἀποδύω: *Il.* 4.532 τεύχεα δ' οὐκ ἀπέδυσε ("but of his armour he stripped him not"); 18.82–83 τεύχεα δ' Ἕκτωρ / δηώσας ἀπέδυσε ("and his armour Hector who slew him has stripped from him"). Trans. A.T. Murray, LCL.

[192] 1 Kgdms 31:8–9 καὶ ἔρχονται οἱ ἀλλόφυλοι ἐκδιδύσκειν τοὺς νεκροὺς καὶ εὑρίσκουσιν τὸν Σαουλ . . . καὶ ἐξέδυσαν τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ; cf. 1 Chr 10:8–9 καὶ ἦλθον ἀλλόφυλλοι τοῦ σκυλεύειν τοὺς τραυματίας καὶ εὗρον τὸν Σαουλ . . . καὶ ἐξέδυσαν αὐτὸν καὶ ἔλαβον τὴν κεφαλὴν αὐτοῦ καὶ τὰ σκεύη αὐτοῦ.

[193] 2 Kgdms 23:10 καὶ ὁ λαὸς ἐκάθητο ὀπίσω αὐτοῦ πλὴν ἐκδιδύσκειν.

[194] It occurs in the military code of Amphipolis dating to ca. 200 BCE (*Meletemata 22, Epig. App.* 12., frg. B. col. I.10–11 εὐταξίας τῆς ἐκ τῶν ὠφελιῶν. | [ἐὰν] δὲ ὠφελίαν ἄγωσί τινες εἰς τὸ στρατόπεδον), in an inscription from Gortyn (*IC IV* 180.2 [ca. 200–150 BCE] τῶν δ' ἐκ τῆς πολεμίας ὠ[φ]ελιῶν), in the Letter of Aristeas (23 ἱκανὴ γὰρ ἦν ἡ παρὰ τό γε δέον γεγονυῖα ἐκ τῶν στρατιωτῶν ὠφέλεια), and in Polybius (43x), on whom see Pritchett 1974–1991, 5:149–50.

[195] Cf. Hsch. λ 440 λάφυρα· τὰ ἐκ τῶν πολεμίων ἔτι ζώντων λαμβανόμενα. τὰ δὲ τεθνεώτων αὐτῶν, σκῦλα; Suid. σ 707 σκῦλα: τὰ ἀπὸ τῶν πολέμων ἀνῃρημένα. τὰ ἐκ τῶν νεκρῶν, λάφυρα δὲ τὰ ἐκ τῶν ζώντων; Eust. 2:245.14 λάφυρα τὰ ἐκ τῶν πολεμίων σκηνῶν καὶ πόλεων ἐκκενούμενα. See Pritchett 1974–1991, 1:55–56; 5:132–47.

λάφυρα as the combatants, while the remainder of the σκῦλα is taken to Jerusalem.[196] At 8:30, however, λάφυρα may refer specifically to the spoils taken from the captured fortresses.

The first question that the participle ὁπλολογήσαντες poses has to do with its object, αὐτούς. Is it an anaphoric pronoun, referring back to the enemies slaughtered or wounded, as well as to the slave-traders, who were put to flight by Judas' soldiers? (Note the chain of participles having the same object: 8:25 συνδιώξαντες αὐτούς, 8:26 κατατρέχοντες αὐτούς, 8:27 ὁπλολογήσαντες αὐτούς.) Or should we take it to be reflexive (ἑαυτούς), "they gathered their own weapons"? Indeed, at 8:31, the Codex Venetus reads ὁπλολογήσαντες ἑαυτούς[197] and one of the Old Latin translations seems to have understood this to be the reading at 8:27, too: La^{L} arma autem ipsorum collegerunt et spolia eorum exuerunt.[198] The only modern translator who has adopted this reading at 8:27 is Schaper (NETS, p. 513), who translates: "When they had gathered their own arms together and had stripped the arms off their enemies." The advantage of this choice is that it makes the genitive τῶν πολεμίων not seem tautological and otiose after αὐτούς, which also refers to the defeated enemies. One may wonder, though, why the author would have deemed it worth mentioning that the Jews gathered their own weapons together before stripping their enemies of their arms.

If, on the other hand, one accepts, as most translators and commentators do, that αὐτούς refers to the adversaries of the Jews, one has to account for the mention of both ὅπλα (contained in ὁπλολογήσαντες) and σκῦλα in verse 8:27. Is there an overlap of meaning between these two terms, as evidenced, for instance, in Doran's (2012, 169) translation, "After collecting the weapons from them and stripping the arms off their enemies," or are they to be clearly distinguished, and how?

At first sight, the juxtaposition of ὁπλολογήσαντες and τὰ σκῦλα ἐκδύσαντες might appear to be an example of pleonastic construction or of synonymic parallelism, typical of the biblical language,[199] given that ὅπλα and σκῦλα are often used as synonyms.[200]

---

[196] 8:28 τοῖς ᾑκισμένοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις καὶ ὀρφανοῖς μερίσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν σκύλων τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ παιδία διεμερίσαντο; 8:30 ὑπὲρ τοὺς δισμυρίους αὐτῶν ἀνεῖλον καὶ ὀχυρωμάτων ὑψηλῶν εὖ μάλα ἐγκρατεῖς ἐγένοντο καὶ λάφυρα πλείονα ἐμερίσαντο ἰσομοίρους αὑτοὺς καὶ τοῖς ᾑκισμένοις καὶ ὀρφανοῖς καὶ χήραις . . . ποιήσαντες; 8:31 τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τῶν σκύλων ἤνεγκαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα. See Grimm 1857, 144.

[197] Zeitlin and Tedesche (1954, 179), who at 8:31 have adopted the reading of the Venetus, translate: "they stacked their own arms." The author of 2 Maccabees uses elsewhere constructions with the reflexive pronoun: 3:15 ῥίψαντες ἑαυτούς; 8:13 ἐξετόπιζον ἑαυτούς; 8:35 ἔρημον ἑαυτὸν ποιήσας; 10:13 φαρμακεύσας ἑαυτόν; 12:42 συντηρεῖν αὑτοὺς ἀναμαρτήτους; 14:43 κατεκρήμνισεν ἑαυτόν.

[198] At 8:27, the other Old Latin translations run thus: La^{X} arma uero uulneratorum collegerunt secum et spolia illorum exuerunt; La^{V} arma autem ipsorum et spolia congregantes; La^{BM} ablatis armis eorum et spoliis et praedis; La^{P} armisque eorum lectis, et spoliis hostium exutis. At 8:31, the Greek text that the translator of La^{L} had before his eyes must have read ὁπλίσαντες ἑαυτούς, for he translated the participial phrase as "et cum armassent se."

[199] Cf. Ezek 29:19, 30:24 καὶ προνομεύσει τὴν προνομὴν αὐτῆς καὶ σκυλεύσει τὰ σκῦλα αὐτῆς; 38:13 εἰ προνομὴν τοῦ προνομεῦσαι σὺ ἔρχῃ καὶ σκυλεῦσαι σκῦλα; 39:10 καὶ προνομεύσουσι τοὺς προνομεύσαντας αὐτοὺς καὶ σκυλεύσουσι τοὺς σκυλεύσαντας αὐτούς; Isa 8:3 ταχέως σκύλευσον, ὀξέως προνόμευσον; Jdt 4:12 τοῦ μὴ δοῦναι εἰς διαρπαγὴν τὰ νήπια αὐτῶν καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας εἰς προνομήν; 16:4 καὶ τὰ νήπιά μου

Habicht (1979, 241) seems to make a distinction between the weapons that Judas' men took from the living enemies (apparently the ones who fled for life, most of them wounded or crippled, as mentioned at 8:24) and the armours stripped from the bodies of the slain: "Sie sammelten nun deren Waffen ein und nahmen den (erschlagenen) Feinden die Rüstungen ab." This is very likely to be the case, considering that at 11:11–12, after the defeat of Lysias by Judas at Beth-Zur, the soldiers of the Seleucid army are described as fleeing wounded and "without arms" (γυμνοί).[201] Yet, one would have expected the author to use a term more specific than οἱ πολέμιοι to refer to the slain enemies (cf., for example, the participles οἱ προπεπτωκότες at 12:42, 44 and 15:28 and οἱ τεθνηκότες at 12:45); moreover, it is not self-evident that σκῦλα is used here in the specialized sense of "armours."[202] Verse 8:31 makes a clear distinction between the ὅπλα and the *rest* of the σκῦλα, suggesting that σκῦλα is a generic term, which includes the ὅπλα. Further, verse 8:28, specifying that Judas and his men gave some of the σκῦλα to the victims of torture, the widows, and the orphans, while they distributed the rest among themselves and their children,[203] would appear puzzling if σκῦλα referred narrowly to arms: as Goldstein (1983, 338) remarks, why would the warriors give part of the arms that they badly needed to people who could make no use of them?

It makes more sense to understand the phrase τὰ σκῦλα ἐκδύσαντες as implying that Judas' soldiers stripped the corpses of the fallen foes not only of their panoplies but also of all the valuables that they might have had about them: rings, ornaments, or even the χιτῶνες worn beneath the armour. This practice was seemingly not uncommon among the Greeks, as can be inferred from sporadic references in the historiographers and a disapproving comment in Plato's *Republic*.[204] It was also not unknown to the Israelites,

---

δώσειν εἰς προνομὴν καὶ τὰς παρθένους μου σκυλεῦσαι. See Abel 1927, 367 and Kühner-Gerth 1898–1904, 2.2:585–86.

[200] See Pritchett 1974–1991, 3:277.

[201] τοὺς δὲ πάντας ἠνάγκασαν φυγεῖν. οἱ πλείονες δὲ αὐτῶν τραυματίαι γυμνοί διεσώθησαν. γυμνοί here does not mean "naked," as usually translated, but "without arms," "ohne Waffen und Rüstung" (Grimm 1857, 167). Cf. Arr. *An.* 1.6.11 γυμνοὶ τῶν ὅπλων διεσώθησαν.

[202] As Pritchett (1974–1991, 5:68) notes, "the Greeks frequently designated the captured armor by the word σκῦλα, as attested by the lexicographers, using the word in a specialized sense, although, like all other words for plunder, booty, etc., it may have a general meaning." In 2 Macc 8:28, however, σκῦλα is juxtaposed to ὅπλα (contained in the compound ὁπλολογήσαντες), a generic term which encompasses both arms and armour (see Lazenby and Whitehead 1996, 27 and 31). ὅπλα occurs many times in 2 Maccabees (3:28, 5:26, 8:18, 9:2, 10:23, 10:27, 11:7, 15:5, 15:21), but it is not clear to what pieces of military equipment it refers. The use of καθοπλίζω at 15:11 (ἕκαστον δὲ αὐτῶν καθοπλίσας οὐ τὴν ἀσπίδων καὶ λογχῶν ἀσφάλειαν) seems, however, to suggest that the author uses ὅπλα with regard to both offensive and defensive weapons.

[203] τοῖς ᾐκισμένοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις καὶ τοῖς ὀρφανοῖς μερίσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν σκύλων τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ παιδία διεμερίσαντο.

[204] Cf. Hdt. 9.80 ἀπό τε τῶν κειμένων νεκρῶν ἐσκύλευον ψέλιά τε καὶ στρεπτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀκινάκας, ἐόντας χρυσέους, ἐπεὶ ἐσθῆτός γε ποικίλης λόγος ἐγίνετο οὐδείς; Th. 5.74.2 οἱ δὲ Λακεδαιμόνιοι προθέμενοι τῶν πολεμίων νεκρῶν τὰ ὅπλα τροπαῖον εὐθὺς ἵστασαν καὶ τοὺς νεκροὺς ἐσκύλευον; X. *HG* 2.4.19 καὶ τὰ μὲν ὅπλα ἔλαβον, τοὺς δὲ χιτῶνας οὐδενὸς τῶν πολιτῶν ἐσκύλευσαν (Cf. Nep. *Thr.* 2 [Thrasybulus] neminem jacentem veste spoliavit: nil attigit, nisi arma, quorum indigebat, et quae ad victum pertinebant); Pl. *R.*

as attested in Judg 8:24–26, for example: after the victory over Midian, Gideon requested from each of the men who had engaged in plunder to give him a golden earring taken from the slaughtered Midianites, who used to wear such ornaments. The weight of the earrings thus collected was one thousand seven hundred shekels of gold; this, we are told, was apart from the crescents, the pendants, the purple robes worn by the kings of Midian, and the collars on the necks of their camels.[205]

First Maccabees (4:16–4:25), followed by Josephus (*AJ* 12:309–12), does not report any arms captured by Judas' men after the defeat of Gorgias' and Nicanor's army at Emmaus.[206] It makes mention, though, of the valuable booty that the Jews took from the enemy camp: "much gold and silver, blue and sea purple cloth and great wealth" (NETS).[207]

2.2.10 παρεισπορεύομαι 'to enter furtively'

8:1 παρεισπορευόμενοι λεληθότως εἰς τὰς κώμας

In the Septuagint πορεύομαι forms eleven double and three triple compounds, ἐκπορεύομαι and εἰσπορεύομαι being the most frequent (161 and 157 instances, respectively). Three of these compounds occur in 2 Maccabees: ἐπιπορεύομαι, in the figurative sense *GELS*"to adhere to" (2:28), καταπορεύομαι, *GELS*"to return home" (11:30), and παρεισπορεύομαι. The latter is a neologism[208] and an absolute *hapax legomenon*.[209] The notion expressed by the prefix παρά is that of "to get in by the side,

469c τί δέ; σκυλεύειν, ἦν δ' ἐγώ, τοὺς τελευτήσαντας πλὴν ὅπλων, ἐπειδὰν νικήσωσιν, ἦ καλῶς ἔχει; See Pritchett 1974–1991, 5:181.

[205] Judg^{A} 8 ^{24}καὶ δότε μοι ἀνὴρ ἐνώτιον τῶν σκύλων αὐτοῦ· ὅτι ἐνώτια χρυσᾶ πολλὰ ἦν αὐτοῖς ^{26}καὶ ἐγενήθη ὁ σταθμὸς τῶν ἐνωτίων τῶν χρυσῶν, ὧν ᾐτήσατο, σίκλοι χίλιοι καὶ ἑπτακόσιοι χρυσοῦ πλὴν τῶν σιρώνων καὶ τῶν ὁρμίσκων ενφωθ καὶ τῶν περιβολαίων τῶν πορφυρῶν τῶν ἐπὶ τοῖς βασιλεῦσιν Μαδιαμ καὶ πλὴν τῶν κλοιῶν τῶν χρυσῶν τῶν ἐν τοῖς τραχήλοις τῶν καμήλων αὐτῶν. See Elgavish 2002, 247–48.

[206] Bar-Kochva (1989, 274) notes that the author of 1 Maccabees makes no mention of the arms that the Seleucids had left in their camp because of his "reluctance to disclose the gradual improvement in the Jewish armaments."

[207] 4:23 καὶ 'Ιούδας ἀνέστρεψεν ἐπὶ τὴν σκυλείαν τῆς παρεμβολῆς, καὶ ἔλαβον χρυσίον πολὺ καὶ ἀργύριον καὶ ὑάκινθον καὶ πορφύραν θαλασσίαν καὶ πλοῦτον μέγαν. Cf. J. *AJ* 12.312 ὁ δὲ 'Ιούδας . . . ὑποστρέψας ἀνῃρεῖτο τὰ σκῦλα, πολὺν δὲ χρυσὸν καὶ ἄργυρον καὶ πορφύραν καὶ ὑάκινθον λαβὼν εἰς τὴν οἰκείαν ὑπέστρεψεν.

[208] The type παρεισεπορεύετο occurring in a passage of Phylarchus quoted by Athenaeus (4.21.35 Kaibel=*FGrH* 2A, 81, fr. 44.53 ἀκρόαμα δὲ οὐδὲν οὐδέποτε παρ<εισ>εποροεύετο) is Kaibel's unnecessary emendation for the MSS reading παρεπορεύετο. This emendation was rightly dismissed by C.B. Gulick in his LCL edition of *The Deipnosophists* (1927–41), but was adopted by S.D. Olson in his recent edition (2006) of Atheneaus for the LCL. LSJ and *GE* cite Phylarchus' passage s.v. παραπορεύομαι, under the meaning "to accompany."

[209] The verb παρεσπορεύω, for which LBG gives the meaning "weitermarschieren," occurs in a late tenth-century CE anonymous military treatise on campaign organization and tactics (*Anonyma Tactica Byzantina, De re militari* 6.52 Dennis κινείτω . . . τὸ στρατόπεδον καὶ μικρὸν παρεσπορευέτω).

to sneak in,"[210] reinforced by the adverb λεληθότως, "secretly," which stands adjacent to the participle παρεισπορευόμενοι.[211] Caird (1969, 27), commenting on LSJ's definition of this verb ("to enter"), rightly remarks that the extra prefix (παρά) is not otiose here as in many Hellenistic triple compounds. His suggested rendering "to infiltrate" was adopted by both LEH and *GELS*. Schwartz (2008, 320 and 326), on the other hand, striving to give the compound "a fuller meaning than the unimaginative 'enter' offered there [viz., in LSJ]," has translated παρεισπορευόμενοι as "had been going in and out and around," which does not really convey the exact meaning of the verb, well captured in Bévenot's German translation: "drangen Judas und seine Leute auf Nebenwegen heimlich in die Ortschaften."

2.2.11 περισκυθίζω 'to scalp in the Scythian manner'

> 7:4 τὸν γενόμενον αὐτῶν προήγορον προσέταξε γλωσσοτομεῖν καὶ περισκυθίσαντας ἀκρωτηριάζειν

The notorious cruelty of the Scythians is alluded to twice in 2 Maccabees. At 4:47, King Antiochus IV sentences to death three innocent Jews, "who would have been freed uncondemned, if they had pleaded even before Scythians" (NETS) (εἰ καὶ ἐπὶ Σκυθῶν ἔλεγον, ἀπελύθησαν ἀκατάγνωστοι). It is likely that the author is using here a proverbial expression, one of the several which the customs of the Scythians had given rise to among the Greeks.[212] We may conjecture that its origin lies in Herodotus 4.68, where the historian relates that, when the Scythian king fell ill, he summoned the three most renowned diviners and asked them to find out the person who, by having forsworn himself to his hearth, had caused his illness. If the person held culpable by the diviners denied the accusation, the king summoned six other diviners, who either confirmed the guilt of the accused (in which case the latter was immediately beheaded) or acquitted him (in which case more and more diviners were summoned, as required). Undoubtedly, even if innocent, the victim of the Scythian diviners had very few, if any, chances to be acquitted. The assumption that some proverbial saying underlies the reference, in 2 Maccabees, to the Scythian judicial severity seems to be corroborated by a similar

---

[210] Cf. Grimm 1857, 134: "auf einem Nebenwege eingehend, furtim ingredientes."

[211] Compounds prefixed with παρεισ- (παρεισάγομαι, παρεισδύνω, παρεισέρχομαι, παρεισπίπτω, παρεισρέω) are favoured by Polybius and other Hellenistic writers. They are often conjoined with adverbs signifying furtiveness (κρύφα, λάθρᾳ, λεληθότως) or with the verb λανθάνω. Cf. Antig. *Mir.* 52a.4 ἐὰν λάθωσιν παρεισελθόντες; Hermipp.Hist. fr. 38 Wehrli λαθραίως παρεισδὺς εἰς τὴν πατρίδα; Plb. 2.55.3 παρεισῆλθε . . . λάθρᾳ νυκτὸς ἐντὸς τῶν τειχῶν; D.S. 33.21.1 ἔλαθον εἰς τὴν σκηνὴν παρεισελθόντες; D.H. 7.11.2 παρεισπεσόντες ἔλαθον; Ph. *Prov.* 2.26 ἵνα μὴ λάθῃ ποτὲ παρεισερπύσασα; J. *BJ* 4.241 λεληθότως παρεισέρρευσαν εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν πόλιν; 5.498 εἰ δέ τι λάθρα παρεισκομισθήσοιτο; Plu. *Cic.* 28.2 εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ παρεισῆλθε κρύφα. See also the comment on λεληθότως at 3.2.5.

[212] See, e.g., *CPG* 1:453 Σκυθῶν ἐρημία; 2:166 ἐπισκύθισον; 2:221 τὸν ἵππον ὁ Σκύθης; 2:438 ἡ ἀπὸ Σκυθῶν ῥῆσις.

rhetorical formulation in one of Cicero's Verrine speeches (2.5.150), delivered in 70 BCE. Bewailing the unjust execution of Roman citizens by Verres, governor of Sicily, the orator exclaims: "If I were addressing an audience of Scythians, . . . even so my words would be arousing indignation, even in those barbarian souls"[213] (Si haec apud Scythas dicerem, . . . tamen animos etiam barbarorum hominum permoverem). The identical expression (εἰ καὶ ἐπὶ Σκυθῶν ἔλεγον/si haec apud Scythas dicerem) occurring in these two unrelated literary texts can only be pointing to a common origin, presumably a proverbial expression turned into a rhetorical topos,[214] anticipating Shakespeare's "Was never Scythia half so barbarous!" (*Tit.* 1.1.131). The only other reference to the summary justice of the Scythians can be found in 3 Maccabees, which is most likely indebted to 2 Maccabees for this motif. In a letter supposedly addressed to his generals, King Ptolemy Philopator contrasts the innocence of the Jews, led to execution without any prior investigation, with the cruelty of their enemies, which surpasses that of the savage Scythians (7:5 ἄνευ πάσης ἀνακρίσεως καὶ ἐξετάσεως ἐπεχείρησαν ἀνελεῖν νόμου Σκυθῶν ἀγριωτέραν ἐμπεπορπημένοι ὠμότητα).[215]

The second reference to the cruelty of the Scythians in 2 Maccabees is found in the martyrological account of chapter 7. At 7:4, King Antiochus orders that the tongue of the first of the seven brothers who refused to eat pagan sacrificial meat be cut out and that he be scalped and mutilated. The scalping is designated by the participle περισκυθίσαντες and, a little further on (7:7), when the second brother is submitted to torture, by the descriptive circumlocution τὸ τῆς κεφαλῆς δέρμα σὺν ταῖς θριξὶ περισύραντες. Both the practice and the term designating it invoke one of the gruesome war customs of the Scythians as described by Herodotus (4.64): after decapitating his slain foe, the Scythian warrior would make a circular cut around the ears (περιταμὼν κύκλῳ περὶ τὰ ὦτα), and then grasp the scalp and shake it off from the head (λαβόμενος τῆς κεφαλῆς ἐκσείει). He would then turn the flayed skin into some sort of napkin or handkerchief (ἅτε χειρόμακτρον ἕκτηται), which he would hang on the bridle of his

[213] Trans. L.H.G. Greenwood, LCL.

[214] Cf. also Cic. *Pis.* 8. Quis hoc fecit ulla in Scythia tyrannus, ut eos, quos luctu adficeret, lugere non sineret? "What despot in Scythia ever acted thus—to forbid the signs of mourning to those whom he had forced to mourn?" Trans. N.H. Watts, LCL. We may note here that Cicero provides one more interesting parallel with 2 Maccabees in the *De Oratore* (2.5.21), where Crassus relates that the young men who attended the Greek gymnasia of his time "would rather listen to the discus than to the Master, and the moment its clink is heard, they all desert the lecturer . . . in order to anoint themselves for athletic exercise" (trans. E.W. Sutton and H. Rackham, LCL) (tamen eorum auditores discum audire quam philosophum malunt: qui simul ut increpuit . . . philosophum omnes unctionis causa relinquunt). Cf. 2 Macc 4:14 τῶν θυσιῶν ἀμελοῦντες [sc. οἱ ἱερεῖς] ἔσπευδον μετέχειν τῆς ἐν παλαίστρῃ παρανόμου χορηγίας μετὰ τὴν τοῦ δίσκου πρόσκλησιν. See Wilhelm 1932, 46–47.

[215] The savagery of the Scythians is a topos that 2 and 3 Maccabees share with other Jewish-Greek literary works. Cf. Ph. *Legat.* 10 τὰ Σαρματῶν γένη καὶ Σκυθῶν, ἅπερ οὐχ ἧττον ἐξηγρίωται τῶν Γερμανικῶν; J. *Ap.* 2.269 Σκύθαι δὲ φόνοις χαίροντες ἀνθρώπων καὶ βραχὺ τῶν θηρίων διαφέροντες. As early as the third century BCE, an idealized representation of the Scythians in Greek literature, evidenced, e.g., in the Cynic *Letters of Anacharsis*, had started to run up against this well-established stereotype. See Bäbler 1998, 170–73.

horse as a war trophy, or he would sew many scalps together into a cloak. Archaeological findings from the Pazyryk burial tumuli in the Altai mountains and the Aymyrlyg cemetery in south Siberia, dated to the late fourth–early third centuries BCE and the third–second centuries BCE, respectively,[216] have been adduced as evidence corroborative of Herodotus' account; [217] yet a caveat should be raised with respect to these findings, namely that they are representative of a culture belonging not to the Scythians about whom Herodotus wrote, but to a people akin to them.[218]

The verb that Herodotus uses to designate scalping is ἀποδέρω (τὴν κεφαλήν). The first appearance of the ethnic verb σκυθίζω, and the compound ἀποσκυθίζω, is recorded in the literature postdating the publication of Herodotus' *Histories* (430–424 BCE).[219] Both verbs are mainly attested in the sense "to shave the head" or "to crop the hair close to the head":[220] in Euripides' *Electra* (417 or 413 BCE), the heroine has her head and hair shaved with a razor in the Scythian fashion (l. 241 κρᾶτα πλόκαμόν τ' ἐσκυθισμένον ξυρῷ); in the *Trojan Women* (ca. 415 BCE), tattered garments and a head shaved *à la Scythe* (l. 1026 κρᾶτ' ἀπεσκυθισμένην) are signs of degradation and humiliation for a woman; in a passage of the fourth/third-century BCE philosopher Clearchus of Soli, transmitted by Athenaeus (12.27 Kaibel), we read that the people of the nations outside the Scythian territory used the term "to be Scythized" to refer to the cutting of the hair that the Scythians inflicted on them as a token of insult (τὴν ἐφ' ὕβρει κουρὰν ἀπεσκυθίσθαι προσηγόρευσαν);[221] and in a late third-century BCE funerary epigram

---

[216] Originally, the Pazyryk graves had been dated to 430–382 BCE, that is, relatively close to Herodotus' time (see Rudenko 1970, xxxvi). Recent analyses based on high-resolution radiocarbon dating and dendrochronology have lowered the dates to ca. 300–250 BCE (see Hajdas et al. 2004). On the date of the burials at the Aymyrlyg cemetery, see Murphy et al. 2002, 2.

[217] One of the mummies found in Pazyryk barrow 2 belongs to an approximately sixty-year-old man of high status, whose skull bears battle-axe wounds, indicative of death in battle, as well as cutmarks suggestive of scalping. The loss of head-hair must have been seen as a dishonour for a Scythian warrior, since a substitute scalp, taken from another individual, was sewn with horsehair to the head of the Pazyryk man before he was buried (see Rudenko 1970, 104–105; Rolle 1989, 83–85; ead. 1991b, 115–16; Murphy et al. 2002, 4). Another three cases of scalping have been documented in skulls found at the Aymyrlyg cemetery; one of them dates to the Scythian period (ca. third–second centuries BCE) and the other two to the Hunno-Sarmatian period (ca. first century BCE–second century CE). See Murphy et al. 2002, 2–4.

[218] See Ivantchik 2011, 92 and 99n5. Riedlberger (1996, 58–59), too, underplays the significance of these findings as evidence verifying Herodotus' description of the Scythian war customs on account of the great geographical distance that separates the Siberian burial sites from Olbia, where the Greek historian collected his Scythian information, and because scalping was also practiced outside the Scythian territory, e.g. in Neolithic, Bronze, and Iron Age northern Europe (see Murphy et al. 2002; Mednikova 2002, 59–66). He stresses, instead, their significance as ethnological parallels.

[219] On the date of publication of Herodotus' work see F. Jacoby, "Herodotos," PW Supp. 2, cols. 231–32.

[220] Cf. Hsch. ε 6253 ἐσκυθισμένης· κεκαρμένης; α 6050 ἀπεσκύθισται· κέκαρται; Hdn.Gr. 3.1.62 Lentz τὸ ἀποσκυθίσαι τὸ τῷ σιδήρῳ τὰς τρίχας τεμεῖν; *Scholia in Iliadem (scholia vetera)* 2.11b1 Σκύθαι δὲ πρῶτοι ἐκείραντο· διὸ καὶ ἀπεσκυθισμένοι λέγονται. σκυθίζω is also attested in the sense (a) [LSJ]"drink immoderately" (Ath. 11.101.10 Kaibel; cf. ἐπισκυθίζω, [LSJ]"pour out drink in Scythian fashion, i.e. with unmixed wine" (Hdt. 6.84)) and (b) [LSJ]"talk Scythian" (Clem.Al. *Strom.* 1.16.77.4).

[221] Cf. Eust. 4.701.18 ἦν, φασί, καὶ φορτικὴ κουρά, ὡς καὶ ἣν ἔπασχόν τινες ὑπὸ Σκυθῶν, ἣν καὶ μισοῦντες τὸ οὕτω πάσχειν ἀπεσκυθίσθαι προσηγόρευον. Canfora (2001, 3:1305) argues that Clearchus may have

commemorating Polystratos, Hercules sheds tears and close-crops his hair with his sword as a sign of his grief at the death of the young man (*Rizakis, Achaïe III* 22.8 [χαλκέῳ χαίτην δ' ἄπλ]εκτον ἐσκύθιζε φασγάνῳ).

Also of relevance here are two derivatives of σκυθίζω, the noun σκυθισμός and the adverb σκυθιστί. The first occurs in a tragic *adespoton* (*TrGF* 2:663, ll. 25–26 μηδὲ σκυθισμὸς [. . .] / κεύθῃ σιδήρῳ κρ[. . .]), coming perhaps from an *Iphigenia*; in so far as the corrupt context allows us to understand, it denotes the shaving of the head or the cutting of the hair close to the head. The second is found in a line surviving from Sophocles' tragedy *Oenomaus*, transmitted by Athenaeus (9.79.12 Kaibel; S. fr. 473 Radt), wherein a head, probably belonging to one of the suitors of the king's daughter, is described with "grim irony," as Pearson (1917, 2:127) remarks, as "shorn for a napkin in the Scythian fashion"[222] (σκυθιστὶ χειρόμακτρον ἐκκεκαρμένος).[223] If indeed Oenomaus, in the play that bore his name, not only decapitated his victims, but also scalped them prior to nailing their skulls to the wall of his palace, then Sophocles may have been the first after Herodotus to offer a literary elaboration of the Scythian scalping motif in Greek literature.[224]

As can be seen from the above quotations, in their surviving instances in Greek literature (mainly poetry) from the fifth to the third centuries BCE, neither the verb σκυθίζω, nor its compound ἀποσκυθίζω, and its derivative σκυθισμός, ever display a sense explicitly related to scalping.[225] It is only the adverb σκυθιστί, in the aforequoted line σκυθιστὶ χειρόμακτρον ἐκκεκαρμένος, that allows for a connection with it, but again, in the total absence of context, we cannot determine with certainty whether the Sophoclean expression refers to a totally shaven head or a scalped skull. It is possible that

---

confounded two different Scythian customs described by Herodotus, which does not seem very probable: "Clearco confonde la pratica di scalpare i nemici—cosi tipica degli Sciti che il verbo 'scalpare' (aposkythizein, alla lettera 'schizzare') deriva dal loro stesso nome—con l' usanza scitica dei capelli rasi in segno di lutto (cfr. Erodoto, iv 71)."

[222] Trans. A.C. Pearson in Pearson 1917, 2:127.

[223] Cf. Hsch. σ 1157 σκυθιστὶ χειρόμακτρον· οἱ Σκύθαι τῶν λαμβανομένων πολεμίων τὰς κεφαλὰς ἐκδέροντες [ἦσαν] ἀντὶ χειρομάκτρων ἐχρῶντο.

[224] The only other possible reference to scalping in Greek tragedy may be found in E. *IT* 73, where the blood-stained Taurian altar on which Greeks are sacrificed is described as being topped with blond locks of hair (ἐξ αἱμάτων γοῦν ξάνθ' ἔχει τριχώματα [emended to θριγκώματα by most editors]). See Torrance 2009. On Scythia and the Scythians in Greek literary sources, see Rolle 1991a and Bäbler 1998, 163–74.

[225] The only literary text in which one of these terms (ἀποσκυθίζω) is used in relation to scalping is 4 Maccabees (first or second century CE), whose martyrological vocabulary is to a certain extent dependent on 2 Maccabees. Thus, ἀποσκυθίζω in 4 Macc 10:7 is the counterpart of περισκυθίζω in 2 Macc 7:4. Yet, late lexicographers, such as Photius and Suidas, give "to scalp" as the main meaning of ἀποσκυθίζω and "to cut the hair" as a secondary meaning (cf. Phot. α 2658 ἀποσκυθίσαι· κυρίως μὲν τὸ ἐπιτεμεῖν τὸ ἐν τῇ κεφαλῇ δέρμα σὺν θριξί, καταχρηστικῶς δὲ τὸ ἀποκεῖραι). In any case, on the basis of surviving literary evidence, the assertion that "the Greeks considered scalping to be so typical an activity of the Scythians that they invented a special verb—*aposkythizein*—to denote the process" (Murphy et al. 2002, 8, repeating Rolle 1989, 82 and Rolle 1991b, 115) is inaccurate. Cf. O. Michel, "Σκύθης," *TDNT* 7:448: "Ref. is made to their [sc. the Scythians'] practice of scalping fallen enemies and this is called σκυθίζειν, Eur. El. 241; Epigr. Graec., 790, 8."

all the above-mentioned terms originated from what the Greeks knew, through the mediation of Herodotus or perhaps other sources, of the Scythian scalping, and that the "Scythian haircut" had become a euphemistic way of alluding to that practice.[226] It is just as likely, though, that the shaving or close cropping of the head as a sign of mourning, disgrace or servility was associated with the Scythians owing to practices unrelated to scalping, which were thought to appertain to these people. Herodotus notes, for instance, that, when a Scythian king died, the Royal Scythians expressed mourning by, inter alia, shaving their heads in a circular form (4.71 τρίχας περικείρονται). If Clearchus' previously quoted testimony is to be trusted, the Scythians enforced tonsure on the people they enslaved. Also, partial shaving of the head may have been customary among men and women of certain Scythian tribes, as can be inferred from archaeological evidence obtained from the Pazyryk mummies.[227]

One may also express reservations as regards the generally held assumption that it was through Herodotus' ethnographic excursus on Scythia that the Greeks were first acquainted with the Scythian practice of scalping. It is possible that knowledge of this practice had reached Athens prior to the publication of the *Histories*, via other, non-literary channels. A fragment of a bowl signed by Euphronios as potter and attributed to the painter Onesimos, now in the Getty Museum [86.AE.311],[228] depicts a Greek warrior wearing a Corinthian helmet, on top of which is fixed a wreathed scalp.[229] Williams (1991, 47) has dated the fragment to the later 490s BCE and has made the bold conjecture that the warrior depicted is Miltiades the Younger, or one of his companions, who, during their expedition in the Chersonese (Hdt. 6.39–40), may have come into contact with the Scythian war practices and even been tempted to employ some of them themselves. Williams speculates that, on their return to Athens, Miltiades and his men imparted to the Athenians "detailed knowledge of the Scythian custom of

---

[226] See Riedlberger (1996, 55–56), who asserts that σκυθίζω in the sense "to shave the head" or "to cut the hair" is a clear reference to the Scythian scalping and that it was precisely through the effect of Herodotus' account of the Scythian military practices that the verb took up this meaning.

[227] The heads of two men and two women buried in Pazyryk barrows 2 and 5 are entirely or partly shaven (Rudenko 1970, 104–5; Rolle 1991b, 116). Rudenko (loc. cit.) remarks that it is not clear whether those high-status Pazyrykers had their heads shaven post-mortem, in order to facilitate the trepanation necessary for the excerebration, or whether they wore a shaved-head style when alive. He relates the Pazyryk findings to Herodotus' description of the tribe of the Argippaei, who lived in the vicinity of the Scythians: "Shaving the head was a custom among men, as the especially interesting observation of Herodotus [4.23] about the Argippaei, close neighbours of the Altaian tribes, recorded: 'They say that all of them, men and women, are bald-headed from birth.'" The Argippaei may have had the custom of shaving their heads from a very early age, which might have given outsiders the impression that they were bald by birth.

[228] See Moore 1998, 31–32.

[229] This artistic depiction brings to mind later testimonies from the Roman world. If Silius Italicus (*Pun.* 5.133–34) is to be trusted, the Roman general Flaminius had decorated his helmet with a Gallic scalp; Reinach (1913, 59–60) adduces evidence that the Gauls, too, used to wear on their heads scalps taken from their enemies; and the Babylonian Talmud and the *Tosefta* attest that legionaries in Roman Palestine donned scalps (see Stiebel 2005, 154–55 and 158).

scalping."[230] Moreover, from 477 to ca. 390 BCE, or even later, the Athenians had the opportunity to encounter actual Scythians in the streets of Athens, as a corps of three hundred Scythian slaves were purchased by the city in order to serve as a police force.[231] A certain amount of information about the Scythian military practices may have passed on to the Athenians through these Scythian τοξόται, who were capable of linguistically interacting with the natives, using their broken Greek that Aristophanes didn't miss the opportunity to mock.[232] One may further conjecture that the verb σκυθίζω was associated with close-cropped hair because of the haircut of these policemen who, being slaves, probably had their heads shorn.[233]

The first time that the ethnic verb σκυθίζω appears in preserved literature as a term clearly associated with scalping is in 2 Maccabees. The prefix περί, with which it is compounded at 7:4, unmistakably links the verb and the Maccabean passage with the Herodotean description of the Scythian scalping: it is meant to evoke the quasi-chirurgical precision of the circular cut made by the Scythian warrior around his victim's skull (Hdt. 4.64 περιταμών . . . περὶ τὰ ὦτα). Yet, in 2 Maccabees, περισκυθίζω does not denote a barbarian military custom, but a method of torture instigated by the Seleucid Greek king Antiochus IV, whom the author of the book, in his effort to invert the established stereotypes about Greeks and barbarians, portrays as a sadistic ogre, who out-savages the savages.[234] The verb reappears in the same sense only

---

[230] In Scythian art there is no depiction of scalping. There is, however, at least one depiction of a warrior holding a severed head. See Rolle 1989, 82; ead. 1991b, 122; Stiebel 2005, 153.

[231] See Hunter 1994, 145–48 and 235n56; Bäbler 1998, 166. Bäbler (1998, 174; 2005, 117–20) traces the presence of Scythian (public or private) slaves in Athens well into the fourth century BCE.

[232] See Wrenhaven 2012, 28–29; Bäbler 1998, 167–69; ead. 2005, 116–17.

[233] On hair shorn short as a sign of slavery, see Bäbler 1998, 24–25. No depictions of the North Pontic Scythians who served as a police force in Athens can be identified with certainty in Attic vase painting. As Ivantchik (2006) has convincingly argued, the so-called 'Scythian' archers depicted on archaic Attic vases from ca. 570 to ca. 470 BCE are not, as previously thought, ethnical Scythians, but rather were modelled after archers serving in the Median and Persian armies. Scythian iconography, on the other hand, represents Scythian warriors as having long hair. See Rolle 1991a.

[234] It is very difficult to assess the veracity of the description of the tortures inflicted on the Jewish martyrs by Antiochus IV, especially when one knows how highly biased against the king the author of 2 Maccabees is—not that it would have been unthinkable for a Seleucid Greek king to inflict especially cruel punishments. Antiochus IV's father, Antiochus III, had punished the rebel and usurper general Achaeus by amputating his limbs, cutting his head off and sewing it up in an ass's skin, and by impaling his body on a stake (Plb. 8.21.3–4). The cutting off of the ears, nose, tongue, and hands, and the impaling of the body were punishments meted out to rebels and traitors by Near Eastern kings (see Walbank 1957–1979, 2:97; Ma 1999, 61). Judging from Arrian's comment (*An.* 4.7.3–4) on the punishment of Bessus by Alexander (the latter ordered that the nose and ear lobes of the rebel and murderer of King Darius should be cut off and that he should be sent to Ecbatana to be executed), the mutilation of the extremities was seen by the Greeks as barbaric: καὶ ἐγὼ οὔτε τὴν ἄγαν ταύτην τιμωρίαν Βήσσου ἐπαινῶ, ἀλλὰ βαρβαρικὴν εἶναι τίθεμαι τῶν ἀκρωτηρίων τὴν λώβην (see Halm-Tisserant 1998, 29). Flaying as a form of punishment of rebels was practised by the Assyrians. An inscription of Ashurnasirpal II runs thus: "I flayed all the chief men who had revolted, and I covered the pillar with their skins. . . . Many within the border of my own land I flayed, and I spread their skins upon the walls. . . . Ahiababa I took to Nineveh, I flayed him, I spread his skin upon the wall of Nineveh" (Luckenbill 1926, 145). That a second-century BCE Seleucid king would have cut off the limbs and tongues of some of his rebel subjects

in ecclesiastical writers paraphrasing 2 Maccabees[235] and in one of Ps.-Phalaris' letters (dating from the first/second to the fourth/fifth centuries CE)[236] enumerating methods of torture and execution implemented by the notorious Acragantine tyrant.[237] Byzantine lexicographers (Photius and Suidas, s.v. περισκυθίσαντες) gloss it as σπαράσσω, a verb that may be used with reference to the tearing of flesh or hair. We also note the absolute *hapax legomenon* περισκυθιστής, which in Strabo's *Geography* is used of the Saraparai, a savage Thracian tribe that lived above Armenia and, like the Scythians, practised scalping and decapitation of their enemies.[238] Lasserre (1975, 13–15) asserts that the Strabonian passage in which περισκυθιστής occurs comes from the *Parthica* of Apollodorus of Artimita, a historian who flourished in the first third of the first century BCE. If this attribution is correct, Apollodorus may have been the original coiner of the noun. περισκυθίζω and the derivative περισκυθισμός also appear in the Galenic corpus

---

does not seem unlikely, but that he would have inflicted on a group of boys and their mother such an unusual and sadistic punishment as scalping, which is a form of flaying, is hard to believe. It is true that at the festival at Daphne, Antiochus introduced games *à la Romaine*—gladiatorial fights and staged wild beast hunts (Plb. 30.26.1 μονομαχίαι καὶ κυνηγέσια)—which must have been particularly gory spectacles. Yet, according to Livy (41.20), the king was aware of the shocking effect that these spectacles had on the audience, and for this reason "by sometimes allowing the fighters to go only as far as wounding one another, sometimes permitting them to fight without giving quarter, he made the sight familiar and even pleasing, and he roused in many of the young men a joy in arms" (trans. E.T. Sage and A.C. Schlesinger, LCL). It seems that the author of 2 Maccabees attributed to Antiochus IV all the perverse tortures that popular imagination, followed by more or less credulous writers, attributed to notorious tyrants of the past such as Phalaris and Agathocles (see Halm-Tisserant 1998, 61–67). It is not by chance that Antiochus' counterpart in 3 Maccabees, King Ptolemy Philopator, is compared to Phalaris (3 Macc 5:20, 42). It must have taken some time, after the historical events associated with Antiochus IV's suppression of the Jewish faith took place, for the demonization of the king by the Jewish authors of 2 and later of 4 Maccabees to have occurred. The very sparse non-fictionalized evidence for the practice of scalping that has come down to us stems from a period considerably posterior to that of the Maccabean revolt and concerns the Roman army and its barbarian opponents, the Gauls and the Germans (see Reinach 1913 and Stiebel 2005). In historiographical literature, we find a single, late testimony by Paulus Orosius (fifth century CE), according to which, after the defeat of the Cimbri by Marius at Campi Raudii (Vercellae) in 101 BCE, the women of this Germanic tribe were scalped by the Romans (5.16.17 abscisis enim cum crine uerticibus inhonesto satis uulnere turpes relinquebantur, "for their scalps were cut off together with the hair and they were left unsightly with a very disgraceful wound" [trans. R.J. Deferrari, FC 50:204]). On later written accounts of scalping, see Mednikova 2002, 58–59. To our best knowledge, scalping is not attested in Christian martyrologies. However, some female Christian martyrs had their hair shaved or plucked out. See Lieberman 1974, 52n6.

[235] Or. *mart.* 23.12 Koetschau περιεσκυθίσθη τὴν κεφαλήν, καὶ οὕτως ἤνεγκε τὸν περισκυθισμὸν ὡς ἄλλοι τὴν διὰ τὸν θεῖον νόμον περιτομήν; Hipp. *Dan.* 2.20.4 Lefèvre ἐκέλευσεν γλωσσοτομεῖσθαι καὶ περισκυθίσαντας ἀκρωτηριάζειν.

[236] See Russell 1988, 96–97 and Merkle and Beschorner 1994, 164n112.

[237] Phalar. *Ep.* 147.3 Hercher τινὲς δ' ἄκρα περιεκόπησαν καὶ κατὰ τροχῶν ἐλυγίσθησαν, καὶ κεφαλὰς ἄλλοι περιεσκυθίσθησαν.

[238] Str. 11.14.14 φασὶ δὲ καὶ Θρᾳκῶν τινάς, τοὺς προσαγορευομένους Σαραπάρας, οἷον κεφαλοτόμους, οἰκῆσαι ὑπὲρ τῆς Ἀρμενίας, πλησίον Γουρανίων καὶ Μήδων, θηριώδεις ἀνθρώπους καὶ ἀπειθεῖς, ὀρεινούς, περισκυθιστάς τε καὶ ἀποκεφαλιστάς.

(second century CE) as medical *termini technici* designating scalping as a surgical operation.[239]

Closer to the putative date of the epitome of 2 Maccabees, we find περισκυθίζω used in an unexpected figurative sense. An amatory epigram by Meleager (*AP* 12.95) describes an erotic extravaganza involving eight boys imagined to be offering various types of pleasure to the poet's friend Philocles. Two of the boys are fantasized as being occupied with the man's "horn," one warming it and stretching it out in his hand (ll. 5–6 ἰαίνοι δὲ Δίων τόδ' εὔστοχον ἐν χερὶ τείνων / σὸν κέρας), the other granting it a service allusively designated by the verb under discussion here (l. 6 Οὐλιάδης δ' αὐτὸ περισκυθίσαι). LSJ, citing this epigram, prudishly refrains from offering a gloss for περισκυθίζω in its *hapax* use as a sexual term ("sens. obsc."). In their commentary on the epigram, Gow and Page (1965, 2:650) only note the metaphorical use of the verb and adduce for the reader's enlightenment a rather disorienting scholion to Callimachus.[240] Aubreton (1994, 34 and 110) aptly renders it into French by "dégainer," "unsheathe," noting that the term is chirurgical and citing Galen. Indeed, περισκυθίζω in Meleager's poem seems to denote "to peel back the foreskin from a man's penis prior to performing fellatio on him." Yet, it is unclear to us whether the poet transferred to the sphere of the erotic a term pertaining to the vocabulary of surgery or a term previously used in association with barbarian war practices or excruciating methods of torture, as is the case with 2 Maccabees.

As a surgical term περισκυθίζω is not attested before the second century CE, although it cannot be excluded that the verb and its derivative noun had passed into specialized medical literature at a much earlier date.[241] If we accept the Meleagrian metaphor as medical, we are confronted with the disturbing connotations of circumcision that it evokes.[242] Similar connotations of genital mutilation are also conjured up if we take the metaphor's source domain to be, as seems more likely, that of war or torture. One cannot help recalling, apropos of such an association, the biblical story of David who, in order to marry Saul's daughter Michal, had to slay a hundred Philistines, cut off their foreskins, and offer them to the king in lieu of a dowry.[243] The obscene language of Attic comedy offers examples of words transferred from the realm of physical violence to that of sex.[244] To give but one, the verbs δέρω, "to flay," and ἀποδέρω, "to flay,

---

[239] περισκυθίζω occurs in the *Book on Bandages* (18a.790 Kühn) and περισκυθισμός in the *Introduction or The Physician* (14.781.9, 15; 14.784.13, 16 Kühn). Both terms also appear in a third-century CE papyrus containing a fragment of a chirurgical treatise. See Ilberg 1908. In its single instance as a non-medical term, in Origen's paraphrase of 2 Maccabees 7 (*mart.* 23.13 Koetschau), περισκυθισμός designates scalping as a method of torture.

[240] *Scholia in Aetia*, fr. 110, sch. 48 Χάλυβ(ες) Σκυθί(ας) . . . παρ' οἷς πρώτοις εὑρέθη ἡ ἐργασία τοῦ σ[ιδ]ήρου κ(αὶ) ἴσως ἐντεῦθεν [λέγετ(αι) τὸ περιτεμεῖν τὸ περισκυ[θίσαι] [σι]δήρῳ.

[241] See M. Michler, "Periskythismos," PW Supp. 11, cols. 1055–61.

[242] In Ps.-Galen's *Introduction* (14.781.16 Kühn), περισκυθισμός denotes an operation performed not only on the head but also on the prepuce, if it turns black (ἐπὶ πόσθης μελανθείσης).

[243] 1 Sam [LXX 1 Kgdms] 18:25; 2 Sam [LXX 2 Kgdms] 3:14.

[244] See Henderson 1991, 44–45, 120–24, 170–73.

skin"—the latter is precisely the verb used by Herodotus (4.64) to designate the Scythian scalping—take on sexual connotations in Aristophanes' *Lysistrata*: in line 158, female masturbation with the help of a dildo is alluded to by the phrase κύνα δέρειν δεδαρμένην, "to flay a flayed dog,"[245] and in line 953 the participle ἀποδείρασα seems to refer to Myrrhine's having enticed Kinesias to an erection and peeled back his foreskin prior to her leaving him unsatisfied.[246]

Be that as it may, Meleager apparently did not coin περισκυθίζω; most likely he picked it up from an earlier or contemporary source, now lost to us, in which it may have been used with respect to the Scythian scalping, and audaciously employed it in a risqué metaphor alluding to a practice that had no particular connection with the Scythians. Still, the chronology of Meleager's amatory epigram may help us establish a *terminus* for the verb's first surviving instance. Meleager's *Garland*, in which the epigram *AP* 12.95 was originally included, is thought to have been published between 100 and 90 BCE.[247] The date of the epigram's composition has to be pushed back to perhaps 115–105 BCE, given that (a) Meleager's floruit is assigned to 96/95 BCE, which, considering that the age at which an ancient author was said to have "flourished" was conventionally taken to have been that of forty years, implies a date of birth of ca. 135 BCE,[248] and (b) the boys named in the epigram (as well as in *AP* 12.94 and 12.256), and possibly Philocles himself, are Tyrian, which suggests that the epigram was written in Tyre, where Meleager spent his youth, before moving to Cos.[249] Thus, the instance of περισκυθίζω in Meleager's epigram could be nearly contemporary with that in 2 Macc 7:4, supposing that the epitome, including chapter 7, was composed as early as 124 BCE.

However, one should also consider the possibility that chapter 7 was inserted in the epitome at a later date by a redactor/editor, as Habicht has posited,[250] or a "final author," according to Doran's (1980, 191) term. Such an addition could have been made at any time between 124 BCE and the destruction of the Second Temple in 70 CE.[251] Bowersock, who argues that martyrdom did not emerge in Judaism but in the Greco-Roman sociocultural context of early Christianity, maintains that the stories of Eleazar and the mother with the seven sons in 2 Maccabees "arose in the world of mid

---

[245] See Henderson 1991, 133.

[246] ἀποδέρω in *Lys.* 953 has to be understood in the light of its previous instances in the play, in lines 739–40, where a woman hurries home from the Acropolis under the pretext that she had "to shuck her flax" (ἔγωγ' ἀποδείρασ' [sc. τὴν ἄμοργιν] αὐτίκα μάλ' ἀνέρχομαι), an expression that carries a sexual innuendo. See Henderson (1991, 167), who characterizes the metaphor as "agricultural." LSJ, s.v. ἀποδέρω, citing *Lys.* 953, abstains, as usual, from giving an explicit definition ("sens. obsc."). *DGE*, on the contrary, s.v., 2, is quite straightforward: "c. juego de palabras, simultáneamente *pelar* el lino y *levantar la piel* del prepucio, e.d., *joder* las mujeres, Ar. *Lys.* 739, 953." Cf. the use of ἐκδέρω in Ar. *V.* 450.

[247] See Gow and Page 1965, 1:xiv–xvi; Cameron 1993, 56; Gutzwiller 1998, 15n1.

[248] See Gutzwiller 1998, 276–77; ead. 2013, 47.

[249] See Gutzwiller 2013, 47–48 and 51–52.

[250] See 1.2.4.

[251] See Habicht, 1979, 176.

first-century Palestine or slightly later."[252] Admittedly, the mention of scalping as a method of torture in 2 Macc 7:4 accords well with the evidence furnished by rabbinic sources for scalping being practised in second-century CE Palestine, either as a civic punishment or as a punitive act inflicted on the local population by Roman soldiers.[253] It may not be accidental that this method of torture, designated by the term περισκυθίζω, is elsewhere attested in Greek literature only in the fictional *Letters of Phalaris*, a collection whose earlier stratum is dated to the first–second centuries CE, and in 4 Maccabees (where the cognate term ἀποσκυθίζω is used), which is dated roughly to the same period. The martyrological account of 2 Maccabees 7, as well as the rest of the epitome, may have been written or taken its final form at a time closer to these two works rather than to Jason's original history of the Maccabean persecution.[254]

2.2.12 πολεμοτροφέω 'to keep up war'

10:14 Γοργίας δὲ γενόμενος στρατηγὸς τῶν τόπων ἐξενοτρόφει καὶ παρ᾽ ἕκαστα πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐπολεμοτρόφει
10:15 οἱ Ἰδουμαῖοι . . . πολεμοτροφεῖν ἐπεχείρουν
14:6 οἱ λεγόμενοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων Ασιδαῖοι . . . πολεμοτροφοῦσι καὶ στασιάζουσιν

LSJ lists some fifty compounds having -τροφέω as their second component. Of these, ten are Classical,[255] six first appear in Aristotle and in Theophrastus,[256] and six are first attested in the first century BCE, in Posidonius and in Diodorus Siculus.[257] The rest first appear after the turn of the Common Era. All these compounds can be sorted into three main semantic groups, which respectively comprise verbs related to (a) the breeding or keeping of animals, (b) the rearing of children or the nursing of old people, and (c) the provision of food and nourishment. In a fourth group we may include a number of

[252] Bowersock 1995, 13. More recently, Shepkaru (2006, 25–33) and McClellan (2009) have advanced further arguments to defend the dating of the stories of voluntary death in 2 Maccabees 6 and 7 in the first century CE, or even later, in the early second century CE.

[253] See Stiebel 2005, 157. Cf. *bHullin* 123a: "Our Rabbis taught: If a [Roman] legion which passes from place to place enters a house, the house is unclean, for there is not a legion that does not have [on its head] several scalps. And be not surprised at this; for R. Ishmael's scalp was placed upon the heads of kings" (Rabbi Ishmael was one of the Ten Martyrs who, according to Talmudic tradition, were executed under Hadrian. The "scalp" referred to here is the skin that the Roman executioners flayed off from the Rabbi's face); *tShehitat Hullin* 8:16: "A legion which is passing from place to place—that which shelters it is unclean. You have no legion in which there are no scalps." Both quotations are from Stiebel 2005, 154–55.

[254] See our remarks on 2 Maccabees 7 in Chapter 8.

[255] ἁρματοτροφέω, γηροτροφέω, ἱπποτροφέω, καθιπποτροφέω, καταζευγοτροφέω, νεοσσοτροφέω, ξενοτροφέω, παιδοτροφέω, σκιατροφέω, τεθριπποτροφέω.

[256] ἀτροφέω, εὐτροφέω, ζῳοτροφέω, κακοτροφέω, συντροφέω, τεκνοτροφέω.

[257] θρεμματοτροφέω, καμηλοτροφέω, κομοτροφέω, κτηνοτροφέω, μονοτροφέω, πωγωνοτροφέω. On the denominatives in -τροφέω, see Moussy 1969, 74–77.

miscellaneous terms such as the two -τροφέω compounds occurring in 2 Maccabees, ξενοτροφέω and πολεμοτροφέω.

ξενοτροφέω, [LSJ]"to maintain mercenary troops," is very sparingly attested in the literature prior to the Common Era: it only occurs in Thucydides (7.48.5), in Isocrates (8.46), in Aeneas Tacticus (13.1, 4), and in Ps.-Demosthenes (11.18). Polybius does not use it, and it is a *hapax* in Diodorus Siculus and in Dionysius of Halicarnassus.[258] The semantically related verb ξενολογέω, [LSJ]"to enlist foreign troops, esp. mercenaries," is, on the contrary, relatively frequent in Hellenistic historiographical works (13x in Polybius, 24x in Diodorus Siculus), and is used thrice by the translator of 1 Maccabees (4:35; 11:38; 15:3). Second Maccabees uses instead the periphrastic expression συνάγειν ξένας δυνάμεις (10:24).

πολεμοτροφέω is evidently formed on the analogy of ξενοτροφέω, with which it is juxtaposed at 10:14, so as to produce a rhyming effect through homoioteleuton. Its three instances in 2 Maccabees are unique in all of surviving Greek literature. This allows us to surmise that it was coined by Jason or the epitomator and did not happen to be taken up by any subsequent writer. The adjective from which it derives, πολεμοτρόφος, [PGL]"fomenting war," an absolute *hapax legomenon*, appears as late as 204 CE in the *Commentary on Daniel* written by Hippolytus of Rome (4.49.1 Lefèvre ἔσται [sc. ὁ ἀντίχριστος] ἀναιδὴς καὶ πολεμοτρόφος καὶ τύραννος), who was likely indebted to 2 Maccabees for coining this neologism.[259]

The periphrasis πόλεμον τρέφειν is unattested, yet τρέφω, in the sense "to maintain," is occasionally used figuratively by Greek historiographers in conjunction with military terms such as ναῦς (Th. 8.44.1; X. *HG* 5.1.24), ναυτικόν (Th. 1.81.4; X. *HG* 4.8.12), ξενικόν (Ar. *Pl.* 173; X. *HG* 5.4.36), στρατιάν (*Cyr.* 1.16.17), στράτευμα (X. *Hier.* 4.11), and στρατόπεδον (Plb. 5.3.5; Str. 5.2.7).

2.2.13 προοδηγός 'one who goes before to show the way'

12:36 ἐπικαλεσάμενος Ἰούδας τὸν κύριον σύμμαχον φανῆναι καὶ προοδηγὸν τοῦ πολέμου

The substantive ὁδηγός, "guide," "one who shows the way," is unknown to Classical Greek, which uses instead ἀγωγός, ἡγεμών, and καθηγεμών in prose,[260] and ποδηγός, ἡγητής/προηγητής/ὑφηγητής, and ἡγητήρ/προηγητήρ in poetry.[261] Its first attestations

[258] A Cretan decree dating from 201 BCE (*IC I* iii.1.10 [ἐξ]ενοτροφήθεν δὲ καὶ οἱ | πρειγευταὶ καθὼς καθέσταται) preserves a different sense of the verb: "to offer hospitality to guests." See Rigsby 1996, 308.

[259] Hippolytus refers to 2 Maccabees in *On the Antichrist* (33–50) and even takes up the neologism σπλαγχνισμός, which appears nowhere else in Greek literature (2 Macc 6:7, 21; 7:42; Hippol. *Antichr.* 49.38).

[260] Hdt 3.26 ἐπορεύοντο ἔχοντες ἀγωγούς; 7.128, 197 κατηγεμόνες τῆς ὁδοῦ; 8.31 ἐγένοντο ἡγεμόνες τῷ βαρβάρῳ τῆς ὁδοῦ; Th. 3.98.1 ὁ ἡγεμὼν αὐτοῖς τῶν ὁδῶν; X. *An.* 3.1.2 ἡγεμὼν δ' οὐδεὶς τῆς ὁδοῦ ἦν. Cf. E. *El.* 669; *Hec.* 281.

[261] S. *Ant.* 990; *OT* 1260; *OC* 502, 1521; E. *Ph.* 1715; fr. 816.2 Nauck.

are from the third century BCE.[262] Polybius uses it three times of the guides employed in reconnoitering. In the Septuagint, it occurs in its literal sense in 1 Macc 4:2 (οἱ υἱοὶ τῆς ἄκρας ἦσαν αὐτῷ ὁδηγοί), in 2 Macc 5:15 (κατετόλμησεν εἰς τό . . . ἱερὸν εἰσελθεῖν ὁδηγὸν ἔχων τὸν Μενέλαον), in 2 Esd 8:1 (οἱ ὁδηγοὶ ἀναβαίνοντες μετ' ἐμοῦ ἐν βασιλείᾳ Ἀρθασασθά), and figuratively in Wis 7:15 (τῆς σοφίας ὁδηγός) and 18:3 (πυριφλεγῆ στῦλον ὁδηγὸν ἀγνώστου ὁδοιπορίας), the latter an allusion to Exod 13:21 and Deut 1:33, which, as we will see in the following, also underlie 2 Macc 12:36. The verb ὁδηγέω has forty-four instances in the Septuagint, in most of which it has God as its subject.[263]

The *dis legomenon* προοδηγός is a neologism of 2 Maccabees. As is the case with τερατοποιός, another new coinage of the book, designating Yahweh's wonder-working power,[264] προοδηγός bears allusion to a Pentateuchal verse in its Septuagint rendering.

In the Old Testament, the conception of Yahweh as warrior and military leader fighting for Israel is mainly expressed in Exodus[265] and in Deuteronomy.[266] Second Maccabees endorses this conception, as is evidenced by its allusions to the relevant passages in these two books.

Firstly, in Judas' pre-battle prayer at 15:22–24, there are distinct allusions to the Septuagint Exodus. At 15:23, Maccabeus pleads that Yahweh send an angel before his army to inspire terror and trembling to the enemies (ἀπόστειλον ἄγγελον ἀγαθὸν ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν εἰς δέος καὶ τρόμον). The allusion here is to Exod 14:19, where an angel of God goes ahead of the Israelite army (ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ προπορευόμενος τῆς παρεμβολῆς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ) together with a pillar of cloud, which is a manifestation of Yahweh Himself (ἐξῆρεν δὲ καὶ ὁ στῦλος τῆς νεφέλης ἀπὸ προσώπου αὐτῶν; cf. Exod 13:21 ὁ δὲ θεὸς ἡγεῖτο αὐτῶν, ἡμέρας μὲν ἐν στύλῳ νεφέλης δεῖξαι αὐτοῖς τὴν ὁδόν, τὴν δὲ νύκτα ἐν στύλῳ πυρός).[267] The conclusion of the prayer (15:24 μεγέθει βραχίονός σου καταπλαγείησαν) contains an implicit quotation from the Song of the Sea in Exodus (15:16 μεγέθει βραχίονός σου ἀπολιθωθήτωσαν), where Yahweh is envisaged as a warlord shattering the enemies of the Israelites (cf. Exod 15:3 κύριος συντρίβων πολέμους; 15:6 ἡ δεξιά σου χείρ, κύριε, ἔθραυσεν ἐχθρούς).

Secondly, at 12:36, when presenting Judas as invoking Yahweh, mid-battle, to appear as σύμμαχος and προοδηγός of the Jews, the author of 2 Maccabees seems to allude to passages in Deuteronomy, where Yahweh appears going ahead of the Israelites and

---

[262] *P.Cair.Zen.* 4.59770.14 [275–226 BCE] ὁδηγῷ (διώβολον); *P.Tebt.* 3.2.937.2 [ca. 243 BCE] δοῦναι Ἀριστοτέλει . . . ὁδηγὸν ἕως τῆ[ς . . .].

[263] See W. Michaelis, "ὁδός, ὁδηγός, etc.," *TDNT* 5:97–98.

[264] See 4.2.5.

[265] Exod 13:21; 14:14, 25; 15:3; 17:16.

[266] Deut. 1:30, 33; 3:22; 9:3; 20:1; 20:4; 31:3; 31:6. Cf. Josh 10:14, 42; 23:3, 10; 1 Chr 14:15; 2 Chr 32:8; 2 Esd 4:14; Ps 43:10; Mic 2:13.

[267] Phraseologically, 2 Macc 15:23 matches Gen 24:7 (ἀποστελεῖ τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ ἔμπροσθέν σου), the only other Septuagint verse in which ἔμπροσθεν is used prepositionally to denote the angel of God's leading or guiding role.

fighting with and for them. The most pertinent Deuteronomic verses are 1:30 (κύριος ὁ θεὸς ὑμῶν ὁ προπορευόμενος πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν, αὐτὸς συνεκπολεμήσει αὐτοὺς μεθ' ὑμῶν) and 1:33 (ὃς [sc. κύριος ὁ θεὸς] προπορεύεται πρότερος ὑμῶν ἐν τῇ ὁδῷ ἐκλέγεσθαι ὑμῖν τόπον, ὁδηγῶν ὑμᾶς ἐν πυρὶ νυκτός, δεικνύων ὑμῖν τὴν ὁδόν, καθ' ἣν πορεύεσθε ἐν' αὐτῇ, καὶ ἐν νεφέλῃ ἡμέρας), both referring back to Exod 13:21 and 14:14, 19. The phrases ὁ προπορευόμενος πρὸ προσώπου ὑμῶν and ὃς προπορεύεται πρότερος ὑμῶν . . . ὁδηγῶν ὑμᾶς correspond to προοδηγός and the phrase συνεκπολεμήσει αὐτοὺς μεθ' ὑμῶν is equivalent to σύμμαχος. The author of 2 Maccabees turned the participle ὁδηγῶν[268] into the cognate substantive ὁδηγός, and attached to the latter the prefix προ-, which is emphatically repeated in the Deuteronomic phrases προπορευόμενος πρὸ προσώπου and προπορεύεται πρότερος.

The significance of these Deuteronomic verses for the author of 2 Maccabees is attested by the fact that he not only encapsulated the aforequoted phrases from 1:30 and 1:33 into the neologism προοδηγός, but also borrowed from the intervening verse 1:31 the verb τροφοφορέω (ὡς ἐτροφοφόρησέν σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου, ὡς εἴ τις τροφοφορήσει ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ), a neologism of the translator of Deuteronomy, occurring nowhere else in the Septuagint except in 2 Maccabees, where it is placed in the mouth of the mother of the seven martyrs, at 7:27 (τὴν θηλάσασάν σε . . . καὶ ἐκθρέψασάν σε . . . καὶ τροφοφορήσασαν).[269]

The only other instance in 2 Maccabees in which Yahweh appears leading Judas and his men is found in the non-battle context of the recovery of Jerusalem and the Temple (10:1 Μακκαβαῖος δὲ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ τοῦ κυρίου προάγοντος αὐτοὺς τὸ μὲν ἱερὸν ἐκομίσαντο καὶ τὴν πόλιν).

The concept of the Divine Warrior, who leads the army of the people he protects and fights alongside it—the "divine vanguard motif," as Mann (1977, 27) has called it—has parallels in Near Eastern literary and annalistic texts,[270] as well as in Greek literature.[271]

---

[268] The Greek translator of Deuteronomy seems to have rendered 1:33 on the basis of the parallel text in Exod 13:21. In Deut 1:33, the Masoretic Text reads לַחֲנֹתְכֶם, "to pitch the tents," a reading which possibly resulted from a metathesis of consonants in לִנְחֹתָם, "to lead," in Exod 13:21. See Dogniez and Harl 1992, 119 and Wevers 1995, 20.

[269] See the comment on this verb at 6.2.9.

[270] Cf., for example, the following lines from: (a) an Old Babylonian epic about Naram-Sin, obv. ii, ll. 2–5: "Naram-Sin proceeds on his way. The God of the Land—they (the gods) go with him. In front Ilaba, the pathfinder. Behind Zababa, the sharp-horned one" (quoted in Hurowitz and Westenholz 1990, 31); (b) the Sumerian Nur-Adad Letter, ll. 154–60: "The great gods who had committed themselves as the vanguard of the battle (and) the attack . . . Nur-Addad, my father, . . . restored them to their place"; (c) the Assyrian inscriptions of Tukulti-Ninurta, text 5, ll. 48–56: "With the help of the gods Assur, Enlil, and Shamash, the great gods . . . (who) march at the fore of my army, I approached Kashtiliash, king of Karduniash, to do battle" (quoted in Mann 1997, 59–60); (d) the Tel Dan Aramaic Stele, l. 5: "I [fought against Israel?] and Hadad went in front of me" (quoted in Biran and Naveh 1993, 90). See Lipiński 1965, 407–9; Mann 1977, 30–73; West 1997, 209–10.

[271] Cf. Hom. *Il.* 5.592, 595 ἦρχε δ' ἄρα σφιν Ἄρης καὶ πότνι' Ἐνυώ, . . . φοίτα δ' ἄλλοτε μὲν πρόσθ' Ἕκτορος, ἄλλοτ' ὄπισθε; 15.260–1 [Apollo speaking] αὐτὰρ ἐγὼ προπάροιθε κιὼν ἵπποισι κέλευθον / πᾶσαν λειανέω, τρέψω δ' ἥρωας Ἀχαιούς; 15.306–8 ἦρχε δ' ἄρ' Ἕκτωρ / . . . πρόσθεν δὲ κί' αὐτοῦ / Φοῖβος Ἀπόλλων / εἱμένος ὤμοιν νεφέλην. See West 1997, 209–10; Doran 1981, 48; id. 2012, 218.

With regard to the latter, apart from the numerous instances cited in the relevant literature, one may quote here a couple of passages from Xenophon's *Cyropaedia*, which provide verbal parallels to the expression σύμμαχος καὶ προοδηγός used in 2 Macc 12:36. At 3.3.21, as Cyrus the Elder is about to invade Assyria, he beseeches Zeus and the other gods to lead his army and be their defenders and co-fighters (ὁ Κῦρος ἔθυε πρῶτον μὲν Διὶ βασιλεῖ, ἔπειτα δὲ καὶ τοῖς ἄλλοις θεοῖς, καὶ ἠτεῖτο ἵλεως καὶ εὐμενεῖς ὄντας ἡγεμόνας γενέσθαι τῇ στρατιᾷ καὶ παραστάτας ἀγαθοὺς καὶ συμμάχους καὶ συμβούλους τῶν ἀγαθῶν). At 3.3.58, before launching his attack against the Assyrians, Cyrus passes the watchword "Zeus, co-fighter and leader" (παρηγγύα ὁ Κῦρος σύνθημα Ζεὺς σύμμαχος καὶ ἡγεμών).[272] Similarly, prior to the battle against Croesus, he prays to the ancestral Zeus to take the vanguard and fight with them (7.1.1 αἰτησάμενος Δία πατρῷον ἡγεμόνα εἶναι καὶ σύμμαχον).

In the Septuagint, σύμμαχος occurs exclusively in 1 and 2 Maccabees, but it is only in the second book that it is used, together with ὑπέρμαχος, with respect to Yahweh.[273] The verb συμμαχέω is also used in 2 Maccabees of Yahweh's fighting alongside the Jews.[274] In contrast to these two words, which the author employs in a martial sense, the noun συμμαχία at 4:11 refers to the secular alliance of the Jews with the Romans.[275]

Thus, in 2 Macc 12:36 we find juxtaposed a novel term (προοδηγός), which harks back to Septuagint Deuteronomy, and, ultimately, to Septuagint Exodus, with a common Greek military and political term (σύμμαχος), which is nearly absent in the Septuagint and is only in 2 Maccabees employed in relation to Yahweh. This, combined with the fact that προοδηγός has as equivalent, in Classical Greek, ἡγεμών, a term characteristically coupled with σύμμαχος in the above-quoted passages of Xenophon, makes the phrase σύμμαχος καὶ προοδηγός resonate, on the one hand, with echoes of

---

[272] Cf. the watchword Ζεὺς σωτήρ, Ἡρακλῆς ἡγεμών (*An.* 6.5.25) used by the Greeks before attacking Pharnabazus. 2 Maccabees records two watchwords that Judas gives to his soldiers: θεοῦ βοηθείας (8:23) and θεοῦ νίκην (13:15). See Bar-Kochva 1989, 221.

[273] 8:24 γενομένου δὲ αὐτοῖς τοῦ παντοκράτορος συμμάχου; 10:16 ἀξιώσαντες τὸν θεὸν σύμμαχον αὐτοῖς γενέσθαι; 11:10 τὸν ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ σύμμαχον ἔχοντες. Cf. 8:36 κατήγγελλεν [sc. ὁ Νικάνωρ] ὑπέρμαχον ἔχειν τοὺς Ἰουδαίους καὶ διὰ τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον ἀτρώτους εἶναι; 14:34 ἐπεκαλοῦντο τὸν διὰ παντὸς ὑπέρμαχον τοῦ ἔθνους ἡμῶν. ὑπέρμαχος is first attested in inscriptions that may be roughly contemporary with the epitome (*TAM V,1* 468b.13 [Lydia, 129 BCE ?] πρόκριτον πάτρας καὶ ὑπέρμαχον ἀε[ί]; *ABSA* 56 (1961) 29, 76 l. 2 [Cyprus, 127–124 BCE] Λόχου . . . [τ]οῦ συγγενοῦς καὶ ὑπερμάχου . . . καὶ στρατηγοῦ αὐτοκράτορος; *IC I* xix 3.29 [Crete, end 2nd c. BCE] σωτῆράς τε καὶ [β]ο[α]|θὸς καὶ ὑπερμάχος τᾶς ἁμᾶς πόλεος). In the Septuagint, aside from 2 Maccabees, it occurs in Wisdom (10:20; 16:17), which is of a later date.

[274] 11:13 τοῦ δυναμένου θεοῦ συμμαχοῦντος αὐτοῖς. In the Septuagint, the verb occurs twelve times, but it is only in 3 Macc 7:6 that it refers to a divine alliance (τὸν ἐπουράνιον θεὸν ἐγνωκότες ἀσφαλῶς ὑπερησπικότα τῶν Ἰουδαίων ὡς πατέρα ὑπὲρ υἱῶν διὰ παντὸς συμμαχοῦντα).

[275] τὴν πρεσβείαν ὑπὲρ φιλίας καὶ συμμαχίας πρὸς τοὺς Ῥωμαίους. Of the sixteen instances of the noun in the Septuagint, only one, in 3 Macc 3:14, refers to the alliance offered by the gods to Ptolemy Philopator (τῇ τῶν θεῶν ἀπροπτώτῳ συμμαχίᾳ). Schwartz (2008, 341), commenting on 2 Macc 8:24, writes that "the term [sc. σύμμαχος] compares God to a political power whose relationship with the Jews is similar to their συμμαχία with Rome." It has to be noted, however, that σύμμαχος, in 2 Maccabees, occurs invariably in battle contexts and is used in a martial, not in a political sense.

Scripture, and, on the other hand, with the language of Greek pre-battle prayers and συνθήματα.

To refer to the divine guidance of the Israelites in the wilderness, Philo, in his retelling of the Exodus story, uses terms drawn from the Classical language, thus verbally distancing himself from his Septuagint source text: the pillar of cloud and fire he designates as ἡγεμὼν ὁδοῦ, a phrase found in Greek historiographers and in Euripides, and the angel of Yahweh as προηγητήρ, a poetic word, elsewhere known to us only from Euripides.[276] Alluding to the same biblical story and to the role assumed by Yahweh in it, the author of 2 Maccabees preferred to coin a term that would clearly point back to his Septuagint source text. His neologism did not find favour with subsequent Jewish and Christian writers. It is attested once more in preserved Greek literature, in the eighth book of the Sibylline Oracles (8.24 ἀταξίης προοδηγός), which has been dated to the second century CE.[277] Its figurative use there, in a context that presents no similarities with that of 2 Macc 12:36, does not permit us to assume that the author of Sibylline Oracles 8 was indebted to 2 Maccabees for this lexical item.[278]

2.2.14 τιμωρητής 'he who punishes'

> 4:16 ὧν ἐζήλουν τὰς ἀγωγὰς καὶ καθ' ἅπαν ἤθελον ἐξομοιοῦσθαι, τούτους πολεμίους καὶ τιμωρητὰς ἔσχον

In the Septuagint the τιμωρ- word-group is relatively sparely attested: τιμωρία (15x) and τιμωρέω (11x) occur mainly in the deuterocanonical/apocryphal books (11x and 7x, respectively), ἀτιμώρητος occurs four times in Proverbs, and τιμωρητής is found only in 2 Maccabees. κολάζω and its derivatives and compounds occur slightly more frequently: the verb (22x) is found almost exclusively in the deuterocanonical/apocryphal books (21x), the noun κόλασις occurs fifteen times, eight of which occur in the deuterocanonical/apocryphal books, and ἀκολασία and ἀκόλαστος occur in 4 Maccabees (1x) and in Proverbs (3x), respectively. The semantic differentiation between τιμωρέω (punish in order to vindicate the victim) and κολάζω (punish in order to correct the

[276] *Mos.* 1.166 ἀπλανεστάτῳ ἕπεσθαι ἡγεμόνι ὁδοῦ . . . ἀφανὴς ἄγγελος, ἐγκατειλημμένος τῇ νεφέλῃ προηγητήρ. Later in the text (1.178), Philo designates the pillar of cloud as ἡ ὁδηγὸς νεφέλη. Josephus, in his retelling of Exodus, omits any reference to the guidance of Yahweh, but has Moses invoking Him before the crossing of the Red Sea as "ally and helper" (*AJ* 2.334 τὸν θεὸν ἱκέτευε καὶ σύμμαχον καὶ βοηθὸν ἐκάλει).

[277] See J. J. Collins, "Sibylline Oracles," *OTP* 1:416.

[278] The very rare verb προοδηγέω is attested much later, in a passage of the recension β of the Alexander Romance (dated between the third and the fifth centuries CE), which is contextually reminiscent of the Maccabean passage in which προοδηγός occurs (1.34.11 Bergson εἶδε διὰ τῆς μαγικῆς δυνάμεως τοὺς θεοὺς τῶν Αἰγυπτίων τὰ στρατόπεδα τῶν ἐναντίων προοδηγοῦντας), and in Stobaeus (2.31.122.9 Hense and Wachsmuth).

offender),[279] and their cognates, often appears levelled out in Hellenistic Greek.[280] In 2 Maccabees, τιμωρία and κόλασις are used *promiscue*: at 4:38, the killing of Andronicus, murderer of the pious Onias, is seen as a deserved divine κόλασις, whereas at 6:12 the divine punishments aiming not to destroy but to discipline the Jews (πρὸς παιδείαν τοῦ γένους ἡμῶν) are termed τιμωρίαι.

τιμωρητής derives from another *nomen agentis*, τιμωρός, which is relatively well attested in Classical and Hellenistic poetry and prose, mainly in the sense of "avenger" and secondarily in the sense of "helper." In an oracle preserved by Herodotus (5.80) we also meet with τιμωρητήρ, which is an absolute *hapax legomenon*.

Second Maccabees 4:16 states that the Seleucid Greek occupiers of Jerusalem, whose ways of living the Jewish Hellenizers strove to imitate, eventually became the enemies and avengers of the latter. To designate the "avenger" or "punisher," the author of 2 Maccabees had the option of employing either τιμωρός or one of the semantically related *nomina agentis* κολαστής and ἐκδικητής. He came up with a coinage that combines the stem of the first of these nouns with the suffix of the latter two. It may even be that he intentionally coined τιμωρητής analogically to ἐκδικητής, which is a neologism of the Greek Psalter. The combination πολεμίους καὶ τιμωρητάς at 4:16 may have been intended to reflect LXX Ps 8:3, where ἐχθρός and ἐκδικητής are conjoined to denote collectively the enemies of Yahweh:[281] ἐκ στόματος νηπίων καὶ θηλαζόντων κατηρτίσω αἶνον ἕνεκα τῶν ἐχθρῶν σου τοῦ καταλῦσαι ἐχθρὸν καὶ ἐκδικητήν. The combination אוֹיֵב וּמִתְנַקֵּם, "the enemy and the avenger," which lies behind ἐχθρὸν καὶ ἐκδικητήν, occurs once more in the Hebrew Bible, in Ps 44:17(16), yet the Septuagint translator of the Psalms rendered מִתְנַקֵּם, hitpael participle of נָקַם, "to avenge," in this verse, not by the substantive ἐκδικητής, as he did in Ps 8:3, but by the present participle of ἐκδιώκω, "to chase away, to persecute," a verb that sounds similar to ἐκδικέω, so that a scribal error (ἐκδιώκοντος for ἐκδικοῦντος) is not to be excluded: [LXX Ps 43:16b–17] καὶ ἡ αἰσχύνη τοῦ προσώπου μου ἐκάλυψέν με ἀπὸ φωνῆς ὀνειδίζοντος καὶ παραλαλοῦντος, ἀπὸ προσώπου ἐχθροῦ καὶ ἐκδιώκοντος. In his more literal Greek rendering of Psalms 8 and 44, Symmachus used the verb τιμωρέω instead of ἐκδικέω: 8:3 ὥστε παῦσαι ἐχθρὸν καὶ τιμωροῦντα ἑαυτῷ; 43:17 ἀπὸ προσώπου ἐχθροῦ καὶ τιμωροῦντος ἑαυτῷ.

Psalm 44, appropriately characterized as a "communal lament in a time of great distress"[282] or a "national lament after defeat in battle,"[283] was associated with the Maccabees as early as the Antiochene Church Fathers of the fourth-fifth centuries CE.[284]

---

[279] Arist. *Rh.* 1369^{b}12–14 διαφέρει δὲ τιμωρία καὶ κόλασις· ἡ μὲν γὰρ κόλασις τοῦ πάσχοντος ἕνεκά ἐστιν, ἡ δὲ τιμωρία τοῦ ποιοῦντος, ἵνα πληρωθῇ. Cf. Pl. *Prt.* 324a–b.

[280] See *SGS* 4:172–77 and Trench 1901, 23–24.

[281] These enemies have variously been understood by scholars to be "the primeval opponents of Yahweh," e.g. Rahab, the sea, the great deep, the floods, Leviathan, and the dragons (Anderson 1972, 1:102), "skeptics and atheists" (Weiser 1962, 141), or "self-willed, anarchic godless creatures" (Kraus 1988, 181).

[282] Anderson 1972, 1:336.

[283] Craigie 1983, 330.

[284] See Chrys. *exp. in Ps.* PG 55:167; Thdr. Mops. *exp. in Ps.* 43 Devreesse; Thdt. *Ps.* PG 80:1177.

However, modern scholarship has cast doubt on the contention that the psalm originated during the period of persecution of the Jews by Antiochus Epiphanes, who is, presumably, the "enemy and the avenger" alluded to in verse 17(16). Several commentators have tried to identify other historical events from the pre- or post-exilic era that might have inspired it. Most admit, however, that its *Sitz im Leben* remains elusive and that the psalm may very well have been used in worship over a long period, extending from the pre-exilic monarchy to the Maccabean time, updated and adapted to fit various historical situations involving national misfortunes.[285] Of particular interest in this regard is the testimony of the Babylonian Talmud (Tractate *Sotah* 48a), which asserts that verse 24(23) of Psalm 44 ("Awake, why sleepest Thou, O Lord?") was recited daily by the Levites during the Maccabean period, until Johanan the high priest, that is, John Hyrcanus, abolished this practice.[286] Whatever the actual validity of this tradition, preserved in a source of late date, it seems not unlikely that the Jews under Seleucid oppression and persecution found in Psalm 44 a fitting vehicle to express their suffering and lament, and that a literary work such as 2 Maccabees, evoking the hardships that the Jewish people endured during Antiochus Epiphanes' reign, would contain verbal echoes, however dimly perceptible, of this often-recited psalm.

As mentioned already, the expression "enemy and avenger" in the Hebrew Bible is encountered exclusively in Pss 8:3(2) and 44:17(16) and has been rendered variously by the translator of the Psalms as ἐχθρὸς καὶ ἐκδικητής (LXX Ps 8:3c) and ἐχθρὸς καὶ ἐκδιώκων (LXX Ps 43:17b). If indeed the combination πολεμίους καὶ τιμωρητάς in 2 Macc 4:16 reflects this expression, then one may wonder why the author of 2 Maccabees did not quote literally one of its two renderings offered in the Greek version of the Psalms,[287] or why 2 Macc 4:16 is verbally closer to LXX Ps 8:3c than to the "Maccabean" LXX Ps 43:17b.

A possible explanation is that the author of 2 Maccabees had no knowledge of the Greek version of either of the two psalms in question. This may have been due to the fact that, at the time when Jason composed his history or the abridger his epitome, the Septuagint of the Psalms had not yet come into existence. However, there seems to be lexical evidence that the author of 2 Maccabees was acquainted with the Greek version of the Psalms and intertextually referred to it on at least one occasion.[288]

---

[285] See Weiser 1962, 354–55; Craigie 1983, 332; Kraus 1988, 445–46. For arguments in favour of a dating in the Maccabean period, see Creelman 1892, 101–4. For arguments against the dating in the Maccabean period, see Briggs and Briggs 1906–1907, 1:375–76 and Anderson 1972, 1:336–37. Briggs and Briggs (1906–1907, 1:376–81) argue, however, that a number of verses in Psalm 44 are glosses inserted by a Maccabean editor.

[286] See Epstein 1936, 3:255. Elsewhere in the Babylonian Talmud (Tractate *Gittin* 57b), verse 23(22) of Psalm 44 ("for thy sake we are killed all the day long") is associated with chapter 7 of 2 Maccabees: "Rab Judah said that this refers to the woman and her seven sons." See Epstein 1936, 4:267.

[287] On the use of quotations from the Greek Bible in 2 Maccabees, see Dimant 1986 and van der Kooij 1999.

[288] See the comment on ἁγιωσύνη at 6.2.1.

A more likely possibility is that the author of 2 Maccabees knew the Greek version of Psalm 44,[289] but deliberately bypassed the slightly inaccurate rendering of אוֹיֵב וּמִתְנַקֵּם by the translator of this psalm and produced an accurate rendering of his own, taking care not only to express the notion of punishment and revenge carried by the participle מִתְנַקֵּם, but perhaps also to convey the distinction that occasionally exists in Greek between ἐχθρός, "personal enemy," and πολέμιος, "foreign, military enemy," the Seleucid Greeks being πολέμιοι rather than ἐχθροί of the Jews during the Maccabean revolt.[290] Such an assumption presupposes, of course, that the Jewish author of 2 Maccabees was not monolingual in Greek, but also well versed in the Hebrew language and familiar with the Psalter in its Hebrew original.[291] But for this to be substantiated, further evidence needs to be adduced.

A third possibility is that πολεμίους καὶ τιμωρητάς in 2 Macc 4:16 is a verbal reminiscence of ἐχθρὸν καὶ ἐκδικητήν in LXX Ps 8:3c. For the sake of variation, the author of 2 Maccabees may have wanted to substitute ἐχθρός, a substantive that he virtually never uses, with πολέμιος, his default term for expressing the notion of "enemy,"[292] and the neologism ἐκδικητής with a neologism of his own, τιμωρητής. However, it is hard to see how the reference to Yahweh's cosmic enemies in Psalm 8, a hymn of joyous praise probably composed "in time of peace and prosperity"[293] and bearing no historical references, may have triggered this reminiscence or allusion in the context of the Hellenization crisis evoked in 2 Macc 4:16.

In contrast to the Greek Psalter's neologism ἐκδικητής, which was destined to survive into Modern Greek, τιμωρητής never gained any popularity, even among ecclesiastical writers. Between the second and the sixth centuries CE it recurs only a handful of times in the writings of Hermas, Methodius, Ephraem Syrus, and Theodore of Mopsuestia. Its

---

[289] A clue that might indicate that the author of 2 Maccabees knew LXX Ps 43 and alluded not only to the second hemistich of verse 17 (ἀπὸ προσώπου ἐχθροῦ καὶ ἐκδιώκοντος) but also to the first (ἀπὸ φωνῆς ὀνειδίζοντος καὶ παραλαλοῦντος) is that the combination of φωνή with ὀνειδίζω, which occurs in the latter, is found in 2 Macc 7:24 τὴν ὀνειδίζουσαν ὑφορώμενος φωνήν.

[290] This said, the semantic fields of the two terms often overlap. ἐχθρός, being a more generic term than πολέμιος, can also be used of a national foe (see *SGS* 3:496–97). In Hebrew, אֹיֵב denotes both the personal and the national enemy and can thus be indiscriminately rendered in Greek by πολέμιος or ἐχθρός (see W. Foerster, "ἐχθρός, ἔχθρα," *TDNT* 2:811–12). In 2 Maccabees, ἐχθρός and ἀντικείμενος occur only once in the book, at 10:26, ἐχθρεῦσαι τοῖς ἐχθροῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἀντικεῖσθαι τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις, which is a quotation from Exod 23:22; ὑπεναντίος is used three times (10:29, 30; 15:16) to designate the battle adversaries of the Jews; πολέμιος occurs sixteen times as a substantivized noun (at 15:39 it is used as an adjective), in fifteen of which it refers to military enemies of the Jews and once, at 3:38, to a personal enemy of King Antiochus. It appears, then, that the standard term used to denote the "enemy" in 2 Maccabees is πολέμιος and that it embraces both the personal and the external, national enemy. By contrast, in the Septuagint the instances of ἐχθρός (436) by far outnumber those of πολέμιος (41, of which 37 are found in the Apocrypha).

[291] That the author of 2 Maccabees was acquainted with both the Hebrew original of the Psalms and their Greek translation has been posited by Munnich (1982, 427, 429). See the comment on ἐμπαιγμός at 6.2.3.

[292] See supra, footnote 290.

[293] Briggs and Briggs 1906–1907, 1:62.

sole non-literary attestation is found in a sixth-century CE petition, wherein a wronged widow uses it to designate the murderer of her husband (*P.Cair.Masp.* 1.67005.16 [ca. 568 CE] ὁ εἰρημ(ένος) τιμωρητὴς [Σ]ενο(ύ)θης ἀνείλετο αὐτόν).

2.2.15 ὑπονοθεύω 'to obtain by underhand means,' 'to deceive'

> 4:7 ὑπενόθευσεν Ἰάσων ὁ ἀδελφὸς Ονίου τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην
> 4:26 ὁ μὲν Ἰάσων ὁ τὸν ἴδιον ἀδελφὸν ὑπονοθεύσας ὑπονοθευθεὶς[294] ὑφ' ἑτέρου φυγὰς εἰς τὴν Αμμανῖτιν χώραν συνήλαστο

ὑπονοθεύω is the only compound formed from the late simplex νοθεύω. Is it a neologism forged by the author of 2 Maccabees, as Abel (1949, 331) has suggested? Most likely not. Its very sparse occurrences in texts dating from before the Common Era attest that the verb was not unknown to the vocabulary of the late first century BCE. First, there is an instance in a fragment ascribed to the sixth book of Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History* where it denotes "to seduce" (6.5.1 ὑπονοθεύων αὐτάς [sc. τὰς γυναῖκας).[295] Yet, the passage in question is transmitted by Malalas, who does not quote with verbal exactness from Diodorus, but refers to him as being the source of the mythological account that he relates. Another instance is found in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, who uses it figuratively of a war-ravished land (11.18.2 τῇ ὑπονοθευομένῃ[296] χώρᾳ). Almost contemporary with Dionysius' *Antiquities* is the verb's sole epigraphical attestation. It occurs in the letter of a Roman magistrate—a governor or perhaps the emperor Augustus himself—to Mylasa concerning the collection of tribute from the city. The opening part of the inscription, where ὑπονοθεύω occurs, is fragmentary, yet it seems that the verb there designates the fraudulent methods by which the Mylasan tax-gatherers obtained property on behalf of the state treasury: *Mylasa* 133.2 [38 BCE/14 CE] καὶ [τ]ὰς ὑπὲρ τῶν δημοσίων κτήσεις εἴς τε τὸν κοινὸν τῆς | πόλεως καρφισμὸν τινῶν ἀνα<σ>[τά]σεις ὑπονοθεύειν.[297]

Another two occurrences of ὑπονοθεύω are found in an astrological fragment (*Cat.Cod.Astr.* 1:97–99 Olivieri) containing prognostications, based on the position of the planets, for the capture of fugitive slaves and thieves. The fragment is assigned to Timaeus (son of Praxidas) or Praxidikos, an astrologer presumed to have lived around

---

[294] Codex Alexandrinus has υπονομευθεις. However, there is no doubt that ὑπονοθευθείς is the original reading. The author likes to juxtapose etymologically related words that illustrate his belief in a tit-for-tat retribution, as, e.g., at 5:9 ὁ συχνοὺς τῆς πατρίδος ἀποξενώσας ἐπὶ ξένης ἀπώλετο. Cf. 9:5–6, 10:13.

[295] Abel (1949, 331) is slightly off the mark when he glosses ὑπονοθεύω as "obtenir une dignité comme les faveurs d'une courtisane, à prix d'argent." The verb is attested in the sense "to seduce" or "to corrupt" a woman, but is nowhere used of a paid courtesan.

[296] The unusual use of the verb here led Sylburg to suggest emendation to προνομευομένῃ.

[297] Johnson et al. (2003, 112) translate the line as "by corruption to obtain additional acquisitions on behalf of the public treasury and to procure the ruin of some persons for the meager common benefit of the city."

the first century BCE.[298] However, the text as we have it may not be from that period. The mention of εἰκονίσματα ἁγίων (97.7) stolen by the runaway slave suggests a date in the Christian era. In any case, the first time it occurs in this text ὑπονοθεύω refers to the *servi corruptio* (inciting another man's slave to run away or steal): 98.13 [ὁ δεδραπετευκὼς] ὑπὸ γείτονος ἤ τινος τῶν συνεστίων ὑπονενόθευται; the second time it denotes "to steal": 98.24 [ὁ φεύγων] ἄργυρον ἀποίσει μεθ' ἑαυτοῦ οὐκ ὀλίγον, καὶ ἄλλον τινὰ ὑπονοθεύσει. The verb reappears in literary texts from the second century CE onwards in the sense (a) to seduce or corrupt a woman,[299] (b) to deceive,[300] (c) to tamper with, to adulterate.[301] The rare nouns ὑπονοθευτής, "seducer," (Ptol. *Tetr.* 3.14.17, 30) and ὑπονόθευσις, "corruption, falsification," (Eus. *HE* 10.6.4) are attested in the second and the fourth centuries CE, respectively.

The aforecited instances of the verb give us a clue to its meaning in 2 Maccabees. At 4:7 it is construed with the accusative of the thing, τὴν ἀρχιερωσύνην: Jason usurped the high priesthood through fraud. Schwartz's (2008, 218) suggestion that the verb may connote that Jason "degraded" the office is valid given that ὑπονοθεύω is elsewhere attested in the sense "to falsify," or "to adulterate." At 4:26, where it is construed with the accusative of the person, τὸν ἀδελφόν, ὑπονοθεύω should be taken to mean "deceive, defraud."

The fact that, outside 2 Maccabees, the first securely dated instances of ὑπονοθεύω (in Dionysius of Halicarnassus and in the Mylasa inscription) are not earlier than the reign of Augustus should perhaps make us suspicious that the three instances of the verb in our book may not be as far as a century apart from them.

2.2.16 φρικασμός 'shudder'

3:17 περιεκέχυτο γὰρ περὶ τὸν ἄνδρα δέος τι καὶ φρικασμὸς σώματος

The φρικ- word-group in the Septuagint comprises φρίκη (Job 4:14a; Amos 1:11), φρικώδης (Hos 6:10), φρίττω (7x), φρικτός (Jer 5:30; 18:13; 23:14; Wis 8:15), φρικτῶς (Wis 6:5), and the neologisms φρικασμός (2 Macc 3:17) and ὑπόφρικος (3 Macc 6:20). φρικασμός is likely a coinage of the author of 2 Maccabees, unrepeated in subsequent literature, except for what seems to be a paraphrase of 2 Macc 3:17a in a twelfth-century Byzantine chronicle.[302] It cannot be excluded, of course, that it existed as a medical term,

[298] See W. Kroll, "Timaios" (9), PW 6A, col. 1228. Gundel and Gundel (1966, 111) assume that he lived before Antiochus of Athens (100 BCE–50 CE). Cramer (1954, 17) places him in the first century CE. The *EANS,* s.v. Timaios (Astrol.), assigns him a date between 75 BCE and 79 CE.

[299] Cf. Jo. Mal. *chron.* 2.16.12 Thurn ὑπονοθεύσας ἔφθειρεν αὐτὴν καὶ ἔγκυον ἐποίησεν.

[300] Cf. Arr. *FGrH* 2b, fr. 49b ὑπενόθευσεν αὐτὸν Τραϊανὸς βασιλεύς, ταξάμενος δοῦναι αὐτῷ τὴν βασιλείαν Περσῶν. Arrian is here quoted very freely by Malalas.

[301] Cf. *Hom. Clem.* 8.10.3 νόμον αἰώνιον ὥρισεν [sc. ὁ θεός] . . . μήθ' ὑπὸ ἀσεβοῦς τινος ὑπονοθευόμενον.

[302] Nicetas Choniates, *Χρονικὴ διήγησις*, reign Isaac 2, 1.358.10 van Dieten ἤδη γὰρ φόβος καὶ φρικασμὸς αὐτοὺς περιεκέχυτο σώματος; ib. reign Alex 3, 2.546.8 φρικασμὸς ἐπεγένετο σώματος.

since the verb from which it derives, φρικάζω, a *tris legomenon*, is first attested in the Hippocratic writings (*Coac.* 24). The suffix -ασμός, very productive in Ionic and in the Koine, is particularly well represented in the scientific vocabulary of Aristotle and the Hippocratics.[303] The Septuagint employs thirty-one *nomina actionis* in -ασμός, an impressive twenty-two of which are neologisms.[304] Four of these neologisms occur in 2 Maccabees, which has a total of nine nouns in -ασμός.[305] φρικασμός, used in lieu of the common φρίκη, was probably coined on the model of medical terms like σπασμός. The effect produced by its use at 3:16–17 in the pathopoeic description of the high priest Onias' agony about the fate of the Temple threatened by Heliodorus can be compared to that brought about by the juxtaposition in Nah 2:11 of five neologisms evoking the fear experienced by the inhabitants of Nineveh at the fall of their city: ἐκτιναγμὸς καὶ ἀνατιναγμὸς καὶ ἐκβρασμὸς καὶ καρδίας θραυσμὸς καὶ ὑπόλυσις γονάτων καὶ ὠδῖνες ἐπὶ πᾶσαν ὀσφύν, καὶ τὸ πρόσωπον πάντων ὡς πρόσκαυμα χύτρας, "shaking and quaking and trembling and shattering of heart and loosening of knees and pains in every loin, and the face of all like burnt earthenware" (NETS).

The description of Onias' anxiety and fear finds dim parallels in biblical books[306] and stronger ones in extra-biblical books such as Philo's historical treatises.[307] The vocabulary used to express the physiological symptoms of the high priest's agony is encountered in medical writings.[308] The noun with which φρικασμός is conjoined, δέος, does not appear anywhere else in the Septuagint. In its five instances in 2 Maccabees, it is coupled either with its quasi-synonym φόβος, the most common, generic term for fear in the Septuagint (198x), or with a noun denoting a symptom of fear: ταραχή (twice),

---

[303] See Chantraine 1933, 138–39.

[304] ἁγιασμός, ἀκριβασμός, γελοιασμός, γλυκασμός, γομφιασμός, διασπασμός, ἐκβρασμός, ἑκουσιασμός, ἐνεχυρασμός, ἐξιλασμός, ἐξιχνιασμός, ἱλασμός, μιασμός, παραπικρασμός, πειρασμός, περασμός, περιουσιασμός, πικρασμός, ῥεμβασμός, συγκλασμός, συνουσιασμός, φρικασμός.

[305] ἁγιασμός (2:17; 14:36, LXX neol.), ἀγορασμός (8:11, 25), ἐξιλασμός (12:45, LXX neol.), ἑτασμός (7:37), θαυμασμός (7:18), ἱλασμός (3:33, LXX neol.), περισπασμός (10:36), σπασμός (5:3, semantic neol.), and φρικασμός (3:17, neol.).

[306] Cf. Job 4:14–15; Isa 13:7–8; Jer 6:24; Ezek 21:12; Ps 54 [MT 55]:5–6; Add Esth D:5, 7. See Waldman 1975, 189–90.

[307] Cf. the description of Flaccus' and Agrippa's agony and fear in *Flacc.* 176 (πολλάκις δὲ ἐδειματοῦτο καὶ διεπτόητο καὶ φρίκῃ μὲν τὰ μέλη καὶ μέρη τοῦ σώματος κατεσείετο, φόβῳ δ' ὑπότρομον εἶχε τὴν ψυχὴν ἄσθματι καὶ παλμῷ τινασσομένην) and in *Legat.* 266–67 (ὑπ' ἀγωνίας παντοδαπὰς χρόας ἐνήλλαττεν ἐν ταὐτῷ γινόμενος αἱμωπός, ὠχρός, πελιδνός. ἤδη δὲ καὶ ἀπὸ κεφαλῆς ἄκρας ἄχρι ποδῶν φρίκῃ κατέσχητο, τρόμος τε καὶ σεισμὸς πάντα αὐτοῦ τὰ μέρη καὶ τὰ μέλη συνεκύκα).

[308] 3:16 τὸ τῆς χρόας παρηλλαγμένον (cf. Hp. *Int.* 20.23 χροιὴ μετηλλαγμένη); 3:17 περιεκέχυτο . . . φρικασμὸς σώματος (cf. Hp. *Loc.Hom.* 14.59 ἱδρὼς περιχεῖται ὅλον τὸ σῶμα; *Flat.* 7.19 διὰ παντὸς τοῦ σώματος ἡ φρίκη διῆλθεν . . . ἅπαν τὸ σῶμα φρίσσει; *Mul.* 35.5 φρῖκαι διὰ τοῦ σώματος διαΐσσουσιν); 3:17 τὸ κατὰ καρδίαν ἐνεστὸς ἄλγος (cf. Hp. *Epid.* 7.1.62 πρὸς καρδίην ἄλγος δεινόν). The description of Heliodorus' blackout further on in chapter 3 also employs medical language: 3:27 ἄφνω δὲ πεσόντα πρὸς τὴν γῆν καὶ πολλῷ σκότει περιχυθέντα (cf. Hp. *VC* 11.43 ἢν ὁ τρωθεὶς καρωθῇ, καὶ σκότος περιχυθῇ, καὶ δῖνος ἔχῃ, καὶ πέσῃ.

τρόμος, and φρικασμός.[309] The distinction made since the time of the sophists between φόβος and δέος[310] does not hold here. Konstan (2007, 154) argues that in common Greek usage the two terms actually overlap and may be used interchangeably in any kind of context, although he acknowledges that δέος has a "slightly more elevated tone" than φόβος and is thus more apt to evoke the sense of "reverent awe." The elevated tone of the relatively infrequent δέος and the novelty of φρικασμός are thus combined to verbally intensify one of the most emotionally charged scenes of the book.

2.2.17 χρονίσκος 'brief time'

11:1 μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ παντελῶς χρονίσκον[311]

Diminutives are usually considered to be a feature of colloquial language incompatible with high literary style.[312] They are completely absent in epic poetry and extremely rare in the tragedians, but the comic poets make copious use of them.[313] In the Hellenistic period, when the *Volkssprache* gradually infiltrated the literary language, certain diminutive suffixes became especially productive as can be evidenced in both vernacular and literary texts.[314] Later on, the Atticizing purists did not fail to frown upon the phenomenon of diminutives tending to replace their primitives.[315] According to Swanson (1958, 147–49), the Septuagint has a total of 74 (+11)[316] different diminutives,

---

[309] Cf. A. *Ag.* 1243 πέφρικα, καὶ φόβος μ' ἔχει; Gorg. fr. 11.56 D.-K. φρίκη περίφοβος; LXX Job 4:14a φρίκη δέ μοι συνήντησεν καὶ τρόμος; Ph. *Flacc.* 115.2 ὑπὸ δέους ἐπεφρίκει; Plu. *Comp.Lys.Sull.* 2.4.6 φρίκην καὶ δέος ἐμποιῶν.

[310] See Pl. *Prt.* 358d8–e1 and *La.* 198b7–9; cf. Ammon. *Diff.* 128. See also *SGS* 3:523–27 and de Romilly 1956, 119–20.

[311] Hanhart (2008, 18) considers the reading χρονισκον to be original, as it has strong textual support from the uncials A and V and the minuscules 106 (dependent on A) and 771. The rest of the minuscules have χρονον.

[312] Cf., e.g., Eust. *Commentarii ad Homeri Odysseam* 1.374.45 μηδὲ γὰρ κεῖσθαι τὸ τοῦ ὑποκορισμοῦ ταπεινὸν παρ' Ὁμήρῳ διὰ τὸ ὑψηλόφωνον καὶ ἡρωικὸν τῆς αὐτοῦ ποιήσεως.

[313] See Radermacher 1925, 37: "Deminutiva fehlen im hohen Stil, wie der attischen Tragödie, gänzlich. In der Komödie sind sie beliebt." See also Debrunner 1917, 147–48 and Chantraine 1933, 64 and 66. According to Swanson (1958, 134–35), there occur only 8 diminutives in the three Attic tragedians, 119 in Aristophanes, 68 in the Old Comedy fragments, and 55 in Menander.

[314] See Debrunner 1917, 147–48 and Moulton and Howard 1929, 2:345. Swanson (1958, 148–49) gives the following figures for the frequency of diminutives in Koine texts: Herodas: 10 diminutives in -ιον, 4 conglutinates of -ιον, 11 diminutives in -ίσκος, and 11 in -ίς; Polybius: 19 diminutives in -ιον, 10 conglutinates of -ιον, 9 diminutives in -ίσκος, and 4 in -ίς; NT: 15 diminutives in -ιον, 13 conglutinates of -ιον, 3 diminutives in -ίσκος, and 3 in -ίς; Ptolemaic papyri: 116 diminutives in -ίον, 57 conglutinates of -ιον, 10 diminutives in -ίσκος, and 3 in -ίς; Post-Ptolemaic papyri: 164 diminutives in -ίον, 201 conglutinates of -ιον, 15 diminutives in -ίσκος, and 7 in -ίς.

[315] Cf. Moer. Letter *omicron* 40 Hansen οὗς Ἀττικοί· ὠτίον Ἕλληνες. See Swanson 1958, 145–46.

[316] The figure given in parenthesis refers to the number of diminutives occurring in the Greek versions of later translators such as Aquila and Symmachus.

of which 37 (+5) are in -ιον, 12 (+5) are conglutinates of -ιον, 17 have the suffix -ίσκος, and 8 (+1) the suffix -ίς.[317] In 2 Maccabees only six diminutives occur:[318] θυρίς (3:19), μειράκιον (7:25), οἰκίδιον (8:33), νεανίσκος (7:12; 13:15), παιδίον (8:28), and χρονίσκος. Compared to other Hellenistic works, 2 Maccabees is found to have a very low number of diminutives, which indicates its author's concern to avoid colloquial diction: 2 Maccabees: 2,683 lemmata (different words), 6 diminutives; Letter of Aristeas: 2,468 lemmata, 10 diminutives;[319] Polybius: 11,990 lemmata, 42 diminutives;[320] Herodas: 1,605 lemmata, 39 diminutives; NT Matthew: 1,968 lemmata, 12 diminutives; Mark: 1,551 lemmata, 10 diminutives; Luke: 2,334 lemmata, 12 diminutives; John: 1,214 lemmata, 11 diminutives; Acts: 2,349 lemmata, 6 diminutives.[321] As can be seen, with regard to the number of diminutives, 2 Maccabees compares best with the literary Acts, which has roughly the same vocabulary size.

All the diminutives occurring in 2 Maccabees are fairly common, except χρονίσκος, which is not only a new coinage, but also an absolute *hapax legomenon* in the Greek language. Considering that the nouns in -ίσκος/-ίσκη commonly designate people, animals, plants, or parts of plants, parts of the body, and objects (ornaments, vessels, technological and architectural items, etc.),[322] the suffix -ίσκος seems rather ill-assorted for an abstract noun like χρόνος. In his treatment of the diminutive suffix -ισκο-/-ισκη-, Petersen (1913, 174) makes the following remark:

> As to the variety of 'diminutive' shadings, there is a difference between -ισκο- and -ιον in as much as the former is applied only to words of the most concrete kind, i.e. words representing visible or tangible objects of a distinct individuality. There is no example of a word in -ισκο- designating a small quantity, as e.g. in -ιον σαρκίον 'a little piece of flesh,'

---

[317] As regards the diminutives in -ίσκος/-ίσκη, we counted only 16: ἀγκωνίσκος (1x), ἀσπιδίσκη (6x), βασιλίσκος (2x), θυίσκη (25x), καλαμίσκος (13x), καρυίσκος (2x), μειρακίσκος (2x), μηνίσκος (4x), νεανίσκος (110x), ὀβελίσκος (2x), ὁρμίσκος (6x), παιδίσκη (98x), ῥοΐσκος (9x), τροχίσκος (1x), ὑδρίσκη (1x), χρονίσκος (1x). Of these, ἀγκωνίσκος, θυίσκη, καρυίσκος, ῥοΐσκος, and χρονίσκος are neologisms. We note that παιδίσκη denotes a young girl only in Gen 34:4; in all its other instances in the Septuagint it is used as the feminine of δοῦλος.

[318] In our list of diminutives occurring in 2 Maccabees we do not include nouns such as ἀργύριον, βιβλίον, θηρίον, πεδίον, χρυσίον, χωρίον, μερίς, etc., which have diminutive endings but no diminutive force, or which in Koine Greek lost their original diminutive value ("faded" diminutives). See Smyth 1920, 235 § 855 and Swanson 1958, 135 and 139–41. It also has to be noted that μειράκιον, in 2 Macc 7:25, is used interchangeably with νεανίας, without any particular diminutive force. The same probably holds for νεανίσκος at 13:15 (cf. 10:35).

[319] See Meecham 1935, 162. From Meecham's list of ten diminutives (ἀσπιδίσκος, θηρίον, κεφαλίς, κυλίκιον, κυμάτιον, ὀθόνιον, ὀψώνιον, παιδίον, ποτήριον, ῥοΐσκος), at least three (θηρίον, ὀψώνιον, and ποτήριον) have to be removed. Pelletier (1962, 63) goes so far as to dismiss all of them, bar παιδίον, as non-diminutives.

[320] de Foucault (1972, 22) counts 53 diminutives in Polybius, 13 of which are new formations.

[321] For the total number of lemmata in the works cited we rely here on the TLG; for the totals of the diminutives (the figures refer to different words, not to total appearances in the works cited), we rely on Swanson 1958, 142 and 148.

[322] See Petersen 1913, 175–79 and Chantraine 1933, 407–10.

> no word applying purely to the realm of sound, as φωνίον 'a slender sound,' no diminutive of a primarily abstract word, like βηχίον 'a little coughing fit,' ᾀσμάτιον 'a little song,' or θωπευμάτιον 'a little piece of flattery.'

And he adds in a footnote: "The same can be said of the suffix in all its uses. There are no abstracts nor collectives nor words designating quantity."[323] Petersen's non-exhaustive list of 208 common nouns having the suffix -ισκο-/-ισκη- (pp. 204–7) seems to justify his contention, yet χρονίσκος is absent from the list.[324] The incongruousness of this neologism, together with the increasing unproductiveness of the suffix -ίσκος,[325] may account for its status as a unique and unrepeated word in the Greek language.

The phrase μετ' ὀλίγον δὲ παντελῶς χρονίσκον in 2 Macc 11:1 is notable in more ways than one. To begin with, the author avoided using here the synonymous but less distinctive temporal expression μετ' οὐ πολὺν δὲ χρόνον that he uses earlier in the book (6:1); this expression is already to be found in Herodotus (1.60, passim). Moreover, the conjunction of χρονίσκος with the adjective ὀλίγος and the intensive adverb παντελῶς (the last two equating to the superlative ὀλίγιστος) creates a hyper-emphatic and redundant effect.[326] Similar pleonastic juxtapositions of diminutives with adjectives denoting smallness are not unusual in comic poetry and beyond.[327]

---

[323] Cf. Peppler 1902, 26: "Abstract words do not properly take the dim. suffix. They belong to a higher sphere than the sermo familiaris, which is the peculiar province of the dim. . . . When therefore the dim. suffix is attached to abstract words, it is no longer warm and passionate, but generally denotes over-refinement and subtlety of thought, and in this sense is employed by the comic poets for the purpose of ridicule."

[324] In his review of Petersen's monograph (*CP*, vol. 11, no. 1 [Jan. 1916], pp. 113–17), E.H. Sturtevant added another 44 common nouns having the suffix -ισκο-/-ισκη-, among which figures χρονίσκος.

[325] As Chantraine (1933, 412) notes, the diminutives in -ισκος/-ισκη may be well attested in the technical writers of the Hellenistic and Roman periods, but are little represented in the vernacular language as we know it from the New Testament and the papyri. In the Ptolemaic papyri (see Mayser 1936, 1.3:44–45 and 91) there are only four new words fitted out with these suffixes and in the Post-Ptolemaic papyri (see Palmer 1945, 91) only three.

[326] Compare the following expressions occurring in other writers: S. fr. 646.4 Radt ἐν βραχεῖ . . . κὠλίγῳ χρόνῳ; Is. 6.33; Pl. *Euthd.* 303e; D.H. 3.48.3; J. *AJ* 7.194 ἐν πάνυ ὀλίγῳ χρόνῳ; Plb. 1.59.12, passim ἐν πάνυ βραχεῖ χρόνῳ; 5.88.5 ἐν χρόνῳ βραχεῖ παντελῶς; Ph. *Spec.* 4.51 χρόνῳ δὲ παντάπασιν ὀλίγῳ; J. *AJ* 19.300 παντάπασιν δὲ ὀλίγου χρόνου διελθόντος; Hero Mech. *Aut.* 21.1 ὀλίγον παντελῶς χρόνον; D.S. 2.31.5 ἐν ἐλαχίστῳ χρόνῳ; Plu. *Mor.* 119A μικρὸν παντελῶς διασωπήσαντα χρόνον; M.Ant. 4.6.1 ἐντὸς ὀλιγίστου χρόνου; *P.Cair.Zen.* 1.59060.6 [257 BCE] σφόδρα ὀλίγου χρόνου.

[327] Cf. Ar. *Pax* 1002 χλανισκιδίων μικρῶν; *V.* 511 δικίδιον σμικρόν; ib. 803 δικαστηρίδιον μικρὸν πάνυ; *Lys.* 277 σμικρὸν πάνυ τριβώνιον; ib. 1205 σμικρὰ πολλὰ παιδία; *Pl.* 147, 240 μικρὸν ἀργυρίδιον; *Nu.* 630 σκαλαθυρμάτια μικρά; fr. 507 Kock τὰ μικρὰ τάδ' ἀφύδια; Stratt. fr. 58.3 Kock τὰ μίκρ' ὀρνίθια; Antiph. fr. 215.1 Kock μικρὸς κρωμακίσκος; Lync. fr. 1.6 Kock μικροὺς πέντε πινακίσκους; Pl. *Tht.* 195a σμικρόν . . . ψυχάριον; *Erx.* 394d ἐν σμικρῷ . . . οἰκιδίῳ; Arist. 631ª18 δελφινίσκον μικρόν; *PA* 684ª12 ἐν τοῖς μικροῖς ἰχθυδίοις; Lys. 19.28 χωρίδιον μικρόν; D. 56.1 βυβλιδίῳ μικρῷ πάνυ; Andoc. 1.130 τοῖς παιδαρίοις τοῖς μικροτάτοις; Hp. *Epid.* 3.3.4 πάνυ ἐπὶ σμικροῖσι τρωματίοισιν; Paeon *FHG* 4:2.14 δύο δὲ μικροὺς ἀνδριαντίσκους; Plb. fr. 163.5 πατταλίσκους μικρούς; D.S. 31.38.1 κυνίδια μικρά; Str. 6.2.11.44 μικρὰ νησίδια; 14.1.8.11 μικρόν . . . ποταμίσκον; Ascl. *Tact.* 1.2.13 μικρά τίς ἐστιν ἀσπιδίσκη; Gem. 3.11.4 ἀστερίσκοι πυκνοὶ καὶ μικροί; Dsc. 1.8.1.3 θαμνίσκος μικρός; Luc. *Nav.* 6.5

The author here wanted to underscore the shortness of the period that intervened between the defeat of Gorgias and Timotheos and Lysias' expedition against Judas.[328] The need to condense the events narrated at the beginning of chapter 11 seems to have arisen from his erroneous interpretation of the chronological data drawn from the epistolary documents quoted further on in the chapter and from his misdating Lysias' campaign to the reign of Antiochus V instead of to that of Antiochus IV.[329] This misunderstanding, and the subsequent reorganization of the narrative material in chapter 11, is thought to have originated with the epitomator rather than with Jason.[330] Thus, the coining of the gratuitous and incongruous diminutive χρονίσκος—an obvious stylistic blunder—can likely be attributed to the former.

2.3 Summary

The purpose of this chapter was to provide a list of the words whose first attestation in Greek occurs in 2 Maccabees, and which do not recur in the Septuagint, and to look closely at a sample of them. Of the fifty-nine words that we identified as falling into this category, we examined in detail seventeen. Most of these words are either unique or extremely rare: seven (ἀργυρολόγητος, ἀρρενωδῶς, δεινάζω, δοξικός, παρεισπορεύομαι, πολεμοτροφέω, χρονίσκος) are absolute *hapax legomena*, two (λεοντηδόν, φρικασμός) are non-absolute *hapax legomena*, and three (δυσπέτημα, ὁπλολογέω, προοδηγός) are *dis legomena*; the remaining five words are first attested in 2 Maccabees but recur more than twice in subsequent literature. It is likely that most, if not all, of the *hapax legomena* were coined by the author of the book and did not happen to be taken up by any posterior writers. The same may be true of the *dis legomena* and some of the other words, although no kind of certainty can be expressed about this.

The neologisms that we discussed in detail, as well as the other neologisms that we listed in Appendix 2, have been formed through the common processes of word-formation in Greek, namely affixation and compounding. With the exception perhaps of χρονίσκος, in which the suffix is unsuited for an abstract noun like χρόνος, they would not have seemed odd to a Koine-Greek speaker and would have posed no difficulty of comprehension.

The creation of the neologisms that we assume were coined by the author of 2 Maccabees seems to have been motivated by a variety of reasons. Some have been coined in analogy to more common words, to which they have been contextually juxtaposed (e.g. πολεμοτροφέω, coined on the model of ξενοτροφέω). In others, which are semantic variants of previously attested words used elsewhere in the book, we can see the author's

---

μικρός τις ἀνθρωπίσκος. Also in the Septuagint: Isa 11:6 παιδίον μικρόν; 1 Kgdms 20:35; 3 Kgdms 3:7, 11:17; 4 Kgdms 2:23, 5:14 παιδάριον μικρόν. See Kühner and Blass 1890–1892, 1:2.278 and Swanson 1958, 141n20.

[328] The parallel narrative in 1 Maccabees states that Lysias' expedition took place "in the year that followed" (4:28 ἐν τῷ ἐρχομένῳ ἐνιαυτῷ) Gorgias' defeat.

[329] See Goldstein 1983, 56–63 and 402; Schwartz 2008, 32–34 and 397; Doran 2012, 7–8.

[330] See 1.2.2.

striving after *variatio* (e.g. ἀρρενωδῶς, coined as a variant of ἀνδρείως and ἀνδρωδῶς, which are also used by the author). Further, the author's desire to allude to or to encapsulate in a single word a Septuagint verse or passage seems to have triggered the coinage of προοδηγός (alluding to Deut 1:30, 33) and perhaps of τιμωρητής (possibly coined in reminiscence of or in allusion to Ps 44:17(16) [LXX 43:17], either in its Hebrew original or in its Septuagint rendering), whereas his concern to avoid using the *genitivus hebraicus* commonly employed in the translated books of the Septuagint seems to have dictated the coinage of δοξικός.

The purposes served by the use of the neologisms discussed in this chapter include giving the text a tinge of poetic hue (e.g. δυσπέτημα, κρουνηδόν) or evoking epic/poetic imagery (e.g. λεοντηδόν); verbally highlighting passages charged with dramatic tension (e.g. κρουνηδόν, φρικασμός); and producing a particular stylistic effect, such as alliteration, antithesis, or homoioteleuton (e.g. δεινάζω, δυσπέτημα, πολεμοτροφέω, ὁπλολογέω).

An interesting fact is that some fifteen words (about a quarter of the total number of the neologisms listed in Appendix 2), which were probably not coined by the author of 2 Maccabees but just happened to be first attested in this book, recur in literary as well as in non-literary texts of the late first century BCE and the first century CE, that is, a hundred or a hundred and fifty years after their first recorded instance (if we accept as the date of composition of the epitome the year 124 BCE). ἀκατάγνωστος and ὑπογραμμός, for example, recur in the New Testament as well as in first-century CE inscriptions; four words (κρουνηδόν, ὁπλολογέω, προσεξηγέομαι, ψυχικῶς) do not recur earlier than Philo, yet—and despite the non-negligible verbal parallels with 2 Maccabees to be found in his works (see Appendix 17)—it cannot be established with any certainty that Philo was acquainted with 2 Maccabees; the instances of ὑπονοθεύω (which the author of 2 Maccabees uses three times in his work) in literary texts and inscriptions start clustering from the late first century BCE onwards; the instances of μετάφρασις, an important term in Greek rhetoric and literature from the Roman Imperial period through to the Late Byzantine period, start becoming frequent from the first half of the first century CE onwards. The same is true of a number of other neologisms, which are not discussed in detail in this chapter, as well as with a few neologisms, which are discussed in Chapters 3 and 4. The fact that no attestations of these words are recorded in literary or non-literary texts of the century to which the epitome is commonly dated may be easily accounted for by the piecemeal survival of texts from that century and of ancient texts in general. Yet, one might also envisage the possibility that their attestations in 2 Maccabees may be closer to the next earliest ones than commonly thought and that the epitome may have been composed by the epitomator or taken its final form by a subsequent redactor/editor at a date somewhat or considerably later than 124 BCE.

Chapter 3: The doubtful neologisms

3.1 Introduction

In the previous chapter, we listed some sixty words that we labelled as 'neologisms of 2 Maccabees,' and discussed in detail seventeen of them. The characterization of those words as neologisms was based on the fact that they are definitely not attested in any literary or non-literary text prior to 2 Maccabees, that is, prior to 124 BCE, which is the date for the composition of the epitome that we accepted as a working hypothesis in the present study. We will here examine thirteen words which can be characterized as 'doubtful neologisms,' because, for reasons that will be elucidated below, it cannot be established with confidence whether they are first attested in 2 Maccabees or in some other literary or non-literary text. Despite the uncertainty that surrounds their first occurrence, the examination of these words is not without interest and value, as it can provide us with insights into the vocabulary of 2 Maccabees and clues to the time frame within which the epitome was composed. These (non-exhaustively collected) 'doubtful neologisms' have been grouped into four types, each discussed below.

3.2 First type of doubtful neologisms

The first type of doubtful neologisms includes words whose first attestation cannot be pinned down with certainty owing to their being attested in 2 Maccabees as well as in roughly contemporary texts that defy precise dating.

3.2.1 ἀπαρασήμαντος 'unmarked,' 'without commemoration'

> 15:36 ἐδογμάτισαν δὲ πάντες μετὰ κοινοῦ ψηφίσματος μηδαμῶς ἐᾶσαι ἀπαρασήμαντον τήνδε τὴν ἡμέραν, ἔχειν δὲ ἐπίσημον τὴν τρισκαιδεκάτην τοῦ δωδεκάτου μηνός

The instances of the verbal adjective ἀπαρασήμαντος in literary texts from before and after the Common Era hardly exceed a dozen: outside of 2 Maccabees, we encounter it in a treatise on epistolary types (*Τύποι ἐπιστολικοί*), falsely attributed to Demetrius of Phalerum, and then only in the Church Fathers and a few late ecclesiastical writers. We

are also met with it in two Hellenistic inscriptions from Asia Minor recording honorific decrees. To determine whether its first attestation is found in 2 Maccabees, in Ps.-Demetrius' treatise, or in the honorific decrees is a far from easy task due to the difficulty of dating with precision the treatise and the inscriptions.

Brinkmann (1909, 311, 317) located the origin of Ps.-Demetrius' *Τύποι ἐπιστολικοί*[1] in Egypt and, on the basis of linguistic evidence, dated it very broadly to between the second century BCE and the mid-first century CE, asserting that it belongs to the earlier rather than the later part of this period. In the light of phraseological similarities between the treatise and papyri published after the publication of Brinkmann's study, Keyes (1935, 30) extended the upper date limit suggested by the latter to 300 CE, estimating that the treatise, in its original form, "must go back at least to 100 B.C. but . . . was subjected to a considerable amount of revision during the four hundred years following." Subsequent scholars have generally accepted this dating.[2] The latest translator and commentator of Ps.-Demetrius, Malosse (2004, 69–71 and 78–79), on the basis of internal, non-linguistic evidence, posited an even later date for the composition of *Τύποι ἐπιστολικοί*, in the late third or early fourth century CE,[3] hypothesizing that the compilator of this treatise employed material coming from an earlier letter-writing manual used for instructing chancery secretaries as well as from an earlier collection of epistolary *progymnasmata*. ἀπαρασήμαντος occurs in the 'congratulatory' type of letter (no. 19, l. 7), in the complimentary phrase τὸ γὰρ σὸν ἦθος οὐδὲ παρὰ θεοῖς ἀπαρασήμαντόν ἐστι, "your character has not escaped the notice of the gods."[4] The brevity and simple diction of this letter do not allow us to reach any secure conclusions about its possible date. Nevertheless, for what it's worth, we note that the phrase βουλομένης τῆς τύχης, in line 6, elsewhere occurs as late as in Libanius[5].

The first of the two epigraphical instances of ἀπαρασήμαντος occurs in an honorific decree (*IK Perge* 12) passed by the city of the Cilician Seleuceia on the Kalykadnos for the physician Asclepiades, son of Myron, from Perge. Having benefited from his services as an excellent doctor, the Seleuceians decided "not to let his conduct pass

---

[1] The Ps.-Demetrius, author of the *Epistolary Types,* is not to be confused with the Ps.-Demetrius, author of *On Style*, who will be mentioned further on in this chapter, at 3.2.5. In the past, both were erroneously identified with Demetrius of Phalerum.

[2] Koskenniemi 1956, 20: "Spätestens aus dem 1 Jahrh. n.Chr., möglicherweise aber auch aus früherer Zeit"; see also ib. 54–55; Stowers 1986, 34: "Probably dating from the first century BCE"; Malherbe 1988, 4: "It is likely that the handbook had undergone a number of revisions before it assumed its present form, and it is possible that it originated in pre-Christian times"; Klauck 2006, 195: "It may have reached its final form in the third century CE. . . . The preliminary phases of its current version may reach as far back as the second century BCE."

[3] See p. 71: "De tels indices font davantage penser au 'Nouvel Empire' de la fin du IIIe siècle après J.-C. ou du début du IVe qu'au Haut Empire ou aux monarchies hellénistiques."

[4] Trans. A.J. Malherbe in Malherbe 1988, 41.

[5] *Or.* 1.67.3 τῆς Τύχης βουλομένης; 1.136.2 βουληθείσης τῆς Τύχης. Cf. Plb. 2.2.10 ᾧ ποτ' ἂν ἡ τύχη βουληθῇ περιθεῖναι τοῦτον τὸν στέφανον.

undistinguished" (l. 46 μὴ ἀπαρασήμαντο[ν ἐᾶσαι τὴν προαίρε]|σιν αὐτοῦ).[6] Wilhelm (1932, 55, 57) dated the inscription (without providing the reasons) to the second century BCE, considering it to be roughly contemporary with a decree from Perge (*IK Perge* 14) honouring a certain Stasias, son of Bokios. On the basis of its letter-forms and diction, the latter was dated by Viale (1929, 375) to the second–first century BCE, "forse piu al II che al I." The latest editor of the inscription bearing the Seleuceian decree, Şahin (1999, 14–16), dated it broadly to the "hellenistisch-vorrömische Zeit," refraining from assigning it to a particular century.

The second epigraphical instance of ἀπαρασήμαντος is found in an honorific decree (*MbBerlin* 1880:646) issued by the obscure city of Hanisa in Cappadocia for a certain Apollonius, son of Abbas. The latter had successfully defended, before the authorities of the nearby city of Eusebeia at the Argaeus (the former Mazaca), his city's claim to an intestate estate that was contested by some of his fellow-citizens. In recognition of this benefaction, the council and the people of Hanisa resolved "not to let the civic excellence of this man pass undistinguished" (l. 21 μὴ ἀπαρασήμαντον ἐᾶσαι τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς καλοκαγα|θίαν). The inscription is dated in the year 7 of an unspecified era. Its first editor, Curtius (1894), dated it to the first century BCE on the basis of its letter-forms and ornamentation (p. 429). Furthermore, he detected Roman influence in the use of the term ἔδοξε, at the end of the decree, which he took to reflect the Roman formula *censuere*, typical of the *senatus consulta*, and accordingly assumed that the "year 7" corresponded to the seventh year of the Pompeian era, that is, to 58 BCE (pp. 431–32). Wilhelm (1913, 48–50), who emended line 8 of the inscription to read μετὰ καὶ ἑτέρων <- - ->ος instead of μετὰ καὶ Ἑτέρωνος, noted that expressions such as μετὰ καὶ ἑτέρων and μετὰ καὶ τῶν λοιπῶν occur in honorary decrees of the Roman Imperial period. Rostovtzeff (1941, 2:840, 3:1533n120), on the other hand, found it unlikely that the inscription dated to the Roman period and suggested that the "year 7" was "the regnal year of one of the last Ariarathai, not the year of the Pompeian or an unknown era." In his detailed commentary on the Hanisa decree, Robert (1963, 480–82) agreed with the latter opinion, but argued that the style and letter-forms of the inscription allowed for a broader dating than previously assumed, ranging from the reign of Ariarathes V, in the second half of the second century BCE, to the early rather than the late first century BCE.[7] Cumont (1932, 136–37) had already established the *terminus ante quem* for the inscription at 12–9 BCE, when Eusebeia changed its name to Caesarea.

---

[6] The first editors of the inscription, Paribeni and Romanelli (1914, 62), restored the missing part of l. 46 as μὴ ἀπαρασήμαντο[ν ἀφιέναι τὴν ἀξίαν καὶ τὴν προαίρε]|σιν αὐτοῦ, which Wilhelm (1932, 55, 59–60) found too long and shortened to μὴ ἀπαρασήμαντο[ν ἀφεῖναι τὴν προαίρε]|σιν αὐτοῦ. On the basis of the reading of l. 21 of the Hanisa decree (*MbBerlin* 1880:646), and of 2 Macc 15:36, Robert (1963, 488–89) suggested replacing ἀφιέναι/ἀφεῖναι with ἐᾶσαι, a restoration adopted by the most recent editor, Şahin (1999, 15).

[7] "D'après le style et l'écriture, je dirais: basse époque hellénistique, c'est-à-dire IIe ou Ier siècle a. C. Mais, à mon avis, rien n'attire vers la fin de cette période" (p. 481). "Je dirai seulement, que, jusqu'à plus ample informé, même les formes du *théta* et de l'*alpha* ne me paraissent point un obstacle à faire remonter la

Robert further pointed out that the decree passed by the relatively recently Hellenized city of Hanisa is couched in excellent, flawless Greek, in the same Hellenistic chancery style that was current throughout the Greek or Hellenized world (p. 487). In the rare formula μὴ ἀπαρασήμαντον ἐᾶσαι, in particular, he saw "une recherche de rhétorique" characteristic of the late Hellenistic period (p. 488). Both Wilhelm (1932, 60) and Robert (1963, 488–89) drew attention to the similarity of ἀπαρασήμαντος with the more frequent adjective ἀνεπισήμαντος, which is encountered in the same contexts as its synonym. Yet, unlike ἀπαρασήμαντος, ἀνεπισήμαντος is attested exclusively in literature and has no epigraphical instances. It occurs in Polybius (5.81.3; 11.2.1), in Diodorus Siculus (9x), in Philodemus (*Sign.* 52.22), and, from the second century CE onwards, in a handful of secular as well as ecclesiastical writers. Most often it occurs together with the verbs παραλείπω and παρατρέχω;[8] twice we encounter it in combination with the verb ἐάω, both times in Diodorus Siculus.[9] In its few Patristic instances, ἀπαρασήμαντος is in like manner used in combination with the verbs ἐάω, καταλείπω, and παρατρέχω.[10]

Second Maccabees does not employ, as perhaps would have been expected (given its antithetical juxtaposition with ἐπίσημος at 15:36), the adjective ἀνεπισήμαντος, which is attested in second- and first-century BCE authors, but the very rare ἀπαρασήμαντος, in the formula ἀπαρασήμαντον ἐᾶσαι, which is found only in the decree from Hanisa and possibly—if correctly restored—in the decree from Seleuceia. The author uses it in the context of a decree (ψήφισμα)[11] made by the Jews after their victory over Nicanor, by which they decided the institution of a feast commemorating the event. The phraseology of this Jewish decree, as transmitted by the author of 2 Maccabees, is evidently modelled on that of Greek civic decrees such as those preserved in the aforementioned honorific inscriptions from Asia Minor. The "recherche de rhétorique" pointed out by Robert apropos of the expression μὴ ἀπαρασήμαντον ἐᾶσαι is even more emphasized in 2 Macc 15:36, which exhibits the rhetorical figures of litotes (μηδαμῶς ἀπαρασήμαντον), antithesis and paronomasia (ἀπαρασήμαντον–ἐπίσημον), and *arsis-thesis*, that is, the presentation of an idea first negatively (μηδαμῶς ἐᾶσαι ἀπαρασήμαντον) and then positively (ἔχειν δὲ ἐπίσημον). It can be noted here that it is not only the conjunction of ἀπαρασήμαντος with ἡμέρα that is rare but also the combination ἐπίσημος ἡμέρα, "special, significant day," or "holiday." Aside from an early attestation in the

date du décret jusque dans la seconde moitié du IIe siècle a. C., à partir d'Ariarathe V, le grand roi philhellène qui a donné à Mazaka le nom d'Eusébeia" (p. 482).

[8] Cf. Plb. 11.2.1 οὐκ ἄξιον ἀνεπισήμαντον παραλιπεῖν; D.S. 19.98.1 οὐκ ἄξιον παραδραμεῖν ἀνεπισήμαντον.

[9] D.S. 26.24.1 οὐκ εἴασε τὴν τοῦ ἀνδρὸς ἀρετήν . . . ἀνεπισήμαντον; 30.17.1 τὴν οὕτως ἀγεννῆ ψυγὴν οὐκ ἄν . . . ἀνεπισήμαντον ἐάσαιμεν.

[10] Or. *comm. Jo.* 2.23.153 Blanc μηδὲ τοῦτο δὴ ἀπαρασήμαντον ἐάσωμεν; 20.41.381 οὐκ ἀπαρασήμαντον . . . ἐατέον; Ath. *inc.* 35.6 Kannengiesser οὐδὲ τοῦτο ἀπαρασήμαντον κατέλειψαν; Bas. *hom. hex.* 3.4.64 Giet μὴ παραδράμῃ δὲ ἡμᾶς μηδὲ ἐκεῖνο ἀπαρασήμαντον; *Eun.* PG 29:616.35 μηδὲ ἐκεῖνο ἀπαρασήμαντον καταλίπωμεν.

[11] On the meaning of ψήφισμα, see Goldstein 1976, 502–3 and Schwartz 2008, 279–80.

Hippocratic corpus (*Septim.* 9.13) and a few epigraphical instances,[12] up to the second century CE we find it occurring only in Jewish-Greek literature;[13] ἐπίσημος is otherwise not infrequent. Be it also noted that the combination κοινὸν ψήφισμα, which occurs at 15:36, and in two other places in 2 Maccabees,[14] is elsewhere attested from the late first century BCE onwards.[15]

A reasonable assumption is that the passage in 2 Maccabees in which the formula μὴ ἀπαρασήμαντον ἐᾶσαι occurs—the very last verse of the epitome, prior to the epitomator's epilogue—is roughly contemporary with the only other pre-Common Era text in which this formula is attested with certainty, the Hanisa decree, dated sometime in the first century BCE, according to a number of experts, or sometime in the last hundred and fifty years BCE, according to Robert's weighty opinion. The decree of the Seleuceians, in which the formula has been restored by analogy with that in the Hanisa decree, may also be from the same period, the late second or early first century BCE. With regard to the dating, we should also take into consideration that the variant formula οὐκ ἀνεπισήμαντον ἐᾶν is attested in the literature of the first century BCE, in Diodorus Siculus, and that the instances of ἀνεπισήμαντος in phrases containing verbs synonymous with ἐάω, such as παραλείπω and παρατρέχω, are also clustered in the first century BCE, again in Diodorus, who is actually the heaviest user of the adjective ἀνεπισήμαντος.[16]

As pointed out in the Introduction (1.2.4), Habicht (1979, 173, 177) has expressed himself uncertain whether 2 Macc 15:36 is to be ascribed to Jason, the epitomator, or the final redactor/editor of 2 Maccabees: "Erst wenn Jasons Zeit näher bestimmt ist, lässt sich darüber urteilen, ob dies [15:36] von ihm geschrieben worden sein kann oder nicht" (p. 173). In light of the above discussion, if Jason wrote his Maccabean history sometime between 161 and 124 BC., or, more narrowly, between 161 and 152 BCE, as Habicht and others believe, there is nothing strongly forbidding us from accepting that the verse in which ἀπαρασήμαντος occurs was written by him. Yet, on the basis of the epigraphical attestations of ἀπαρασήμαντος, which appear to date from after 150 BCE, or even after 100 BCE, and taking into consideration the rhetorical skill exhibited in the composition of the verse, we are inclined to assign 15:36 to the epitomator rather than to Jason.

---

[12] *MDAI(A)* 32 (1907) 273,10.28 [Pergamon, aft. 133 BCE]; *MDAI(A)* 35 (1910) 409,3.16 [Pergamon, 75–50 BCE]; *IK Laodikeia am Lykos* 82.7–8 [1st–2nd c. CE]. The earliest papyrological instance is from the second century CE (*P.Ryl.* 2.153.5 [169 CE]).

[13] Let. Aris. 180; Esth 5:4, Add E:22; Esth^{AT} 5:21(12); 2 Macc 15:36; J. *AJ* 3.129, 9.223.

[14] 10:8 ἐδογμάτισαν δὲ μετὰ κοινοῦ προστάγματος καὶ ψηφίσματος; 12:4 μετὰ δὲ τὸ κοινὸν τῆς πόλεως ψήφισμα.

[15] D.H. 10.10.5.4 διὰ κοινοῦ ψηφίσματος; D.C. 74.2.1.3 ψηφίσματι κοινῷ; *IK Perge* 251.10 [1st–2nd c. CE] [δι]|ὰ κοινοῦ ψηφίσ[ματος].

[16] Robert (1963, 489) adduces epigraphical examples of the "tournure recherchée" μὴ ἐᾶν from a first-century BCE Ionian inscription (*Priene* 33 [84/01 BCE] l. 35 οὐδὲ τὸν ὑστεροῦντα καιρὸν ἤασεν ἀφ[ρόντιστον]; l. 73 οὐδὲ τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα καιροὺς ἀχορηγήτους ἔασεν γενέσ|[θαι]).

3.2.2 ἀπροσδεής 'not in need of'

14:35 Σὺ κύριε, τῶν ὅλων ἀπροσδεὴς ὑπάρχων

Prior to the Common Era, ἀπροσδεής is attested only in the first three Books of the Maccabees (1 Macc 12:9; 2 Macc 14:35; 3 Macc 2:9) and in the Letter of Aristeas (211), which has defied precise dating. Meecham (1935, 83, 320, 333), on the basis of linguistic evidence, dated it to about 100 BCE, Pelletier (1962, 58) to the early second century BCE, and Bickerman (2007a, 133) to between 145 and 125 BCE. The latest commentator (Wright 2015, 28) assigns to it a date "ranging from the 150s BCE to the last decade of the second century BCE." The subsequent instances of ἀπροσδεής are recorded in Jewish-Greek (Philo, Josephus) and early Christian (First Epistle of Clement) literature. The first secular writer to use it is Plutarch.

The synonymous adjective ἀπροσδέητος is attested in Polybius (21.23.4), as well as in second- and first-century BCE literary and non-literary papyri. We find it in an untitled Epicurean ethical treatise (ascribed, by its first editor, to the third-century BCE philosopher Polystratus),[17] preserved in *P.Herc.* 346, fr. 3, col. 11a.3 Vogliano, in the fourth book of Philodemus' *On Rhetoric*, preserved in *P.Herc.* 1007, col. 12a.15 Sudhaus, and in the third book of Philodemus' *On the Gods*, preserved in *P.Herc.* 152/157, col. 13.23, in a passage quoting freely the fourth/third-century BCE Epicurean philosopher Hermarchus. LSJ and *DGE* cite the latter passage under the entry for ἀπροσδεής, apparently based on Diels' 1917 edition, which in col. 13.23 reads οὐδ' ἰχθῦς ἀπρ(οσ)δεεῖ[ς] | τοῦ ὕδατος οὐδ' ὄρνιθας πτερῶν. In her recent edition of Hermarchus' fragments, Longo Auricchio (1988, 67; see also the commentary on pp. 133–35) provides a new reading of 13.23, οὐδ' ἰχθῦς ἀπρ(οσ)δεή|τους ὕδατος οὐδ' ὄρνιθας πτερῶν. The adjective also occurs in the non-literary papyri *P.Tebt.* 1.23.9 [119–114 BCE], ib. 1.19.5 [114 BCE], and *P.Oslo* 3.148.6 [2nd/1st c. BCE].

The first surviving instance of ἀπροσδεής appears thus to be found either in the Letter of Aristeas or in 2 Maccabees.[18] Although there are a small number of phraseological correspondences between the Letter and the epitome, to be found nowhere else in the Septuagint, or in only a few deuterocanonical texts,[19] commentators generally do not

[17] See Vogliano 1928, 132.

[18] The adjective also occurs in 1 Maccabees, which, if dated to ca. 100 BCE, postdates 2 Maccabees (if we accept the date 124 BCE for the latter book). In 1 Macc 12:9 ἀπροσδεής is used in a non-religious context, in a letter of Jonathan the high priest to the Spartans.

[19] 1) Let. Aris. 30 προνοίας γὰρ βασιλικῆς οὐ τέτευχε; 2 Macc 4:6 ἑώρα γὰρ ἄνευ βασιλικῆς προνοίας ἀδύνατον εἶναι τυχεῖν εἰρήνης ἔτι τὰ πράγματα; cf. J. *AJ* 12.37 διὰ τὸ βασιλικῆς οὐ τετυχηκέναι προνοίας, 2) Let. Aris. 9 ἐπὶ τέλος ἤγαγεν . . . τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως πρόθεσιν; 2 Macc 3:8 τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως πρόθεσιν ἐπιτελεῖν; 3 Macc 2:26 ἀτενίζοντας εἰς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως πρόθεσιν, 3) Let. Aris. 202 τοῦ δὲ βασιλέως ἐπινεύσαντος; 2 Macc 4:10 ἐπινεύσαντος δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως, 4) Let. Aris. 104 ἔλεγον δὲ καὶ δι' ὅρκων πεπιστῶσθαι τὸ τοιοῦτον; 126 καὶ δι' ὅρκων ἐπιστοῦτο; 2 Macc 7:24 ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ὅρκων ἐπίστου, 5) Let. Aris. 16 τὸν πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην θεόν; 2 Macc 3:39 ὁ τὴν κατοικίαν ἐπουράνιον ἔχων ἐπόπτης ἐστὶ καὶ βοηθὸς ἐκείνου τοῦ τόπου; 7:35 τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπόπτου θεοῦ κρίσιν; 9:5 ὁ δὲ παντεπόπτης κύριος ὁ θεὸς τοῦ Ισραηλ, 3 Macc 2:21 ὁ πάντων ἐπόπτης θεός; Add Esth D:2

posit any sort of dependence between the two books. The Septuagint book that exhibits notable similarities with the Letter of Aristeas and which may be dependent on it is 3 Maccabees.[20] In the Letter of Aristeas (211 ὁ θεὸς δὲ ἀπροσδεής ἐστι καὶ ἐπιεικής) and in the prayers in 2 Maccabees (14:35 Σὺ κύριε, τῶν ὅλων ἀπροσδεὴς ὑπάρχων ηὐδόκησας ναὸν τῆς σῆς σκηνώσεως ἐν ὑμῖν γενέσθαι) and 3 Maccabees (2:9 σύ, βασιλεῦ, . . . ἡγίασας τὸν τόπον τοῦτον εἰς ὄνομά σοι τῷ τῶν ἁπάντων ἀπροσδεεῖ καὶ παρεδόξασας ἐν ἐπιφανείᾳ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ), ἀπροσδεής is used as an epithet of Yahweh. The phraseology in the prayer in 3 Maccabees clearly draws upon the prayer in 2 Macc 14:35–36 and upon 2 Macc 3:30 (οἱ δὲ τὸν κύριον εὐλόγουν τὸν παραδοξάζοντα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον . . . τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπιφανέντος κυρίου). It thus seems likely that the author of 3 Maccabees borrowed ἀπροσδεής directly from 2 Maccabees and not from the Letter of Aristeas. Second Maccabees, on its part, may be indebted to Ps.-Aristeas for this epithet, or else we are to posit that ἀπροσδεής was more common in Jewish-Greek (and possibly also in secular Greek) literature than its few surviving instances would lead us to believe. Indeed, the concept of God and of the divine cosmos as self-sufficient and in need of nothing can be traced back to Classical Greek literature, where it is expressed in terms which are close to the term ἀπροσδεής, yet it is unclear how and by whom this concept was first introduced into Jewish-Greek literature.[21] Commentators point out that the idea underlying 2 Macc 14:35 has precedents in such Old Testament passages as 1 Kgs 8:27 (Salomon's prayer), Ps 50:9–14, and Isa 1:11–17,[22] which emphasize that Yahweh does not stand in need of sacrifices and temple services, yet the Septuagint renderings of these passages contain no verbal cues that might have triggered the use of ἀπροσδεής in the Maccabean prayer.

ἐπικαλεσαμένη τὸν πάντων ἐπόπτην θεὸν καὶ σωτῆρα, 6) Let. Aris. 296 ἄξιοι θαυμασμοῦ κατεφαίνοντό μοι; 2 Macc 7:18 ἄξια θαυμασμοῦ γέγονε.

[20] See C.W. Emmet, "3 Maccabees," *APOT* 1:157; Meecham 1935, 323–24; Raup Johnson 2004, 141–69; Wright 2015, 60–62. For Emmet, the connection between the two books "seems to be of school and date." Meecham and Wright reject any dependence of one book on the other. For Raup Johnson (2004, 141), on the contrary, "direct contact" of 3 Maccabees with the Letter of Aristeas, 2 Maccabees, Esther, and Daniel "is certain."

[21] Cf. E. *HF* 1345–46 δεῖται γὰρ ὁ θεός, εἴπερ ἔστ' ὀρθῶς θεός, / οὐδενός; Antipho Soph. fr. 10 D.-K. διὰ τοῦτο οὐδενὸς δεῖται οὐδὲ προσδέχεται οὐδενός τι, ἀλλ' ἄπειρος καὶ ἀδέητος; Pl. *Ti.* 33d (speaking of the cosmos) ἡγήσατο γὰρ αὐτὸ ὁ συνθεὶς αὔταρκες ὂν ἄμεινον ἔσεσθαι μᾶλλον ἢ προσδεὲς ἄλλων. Cf. Chrysipp.Stoic. *apud* Plu. *Mor.* 1052D αὐτάρκης δ' εἶναι λέγεται μόνος ὁ κόσμος διὰ τὸ μόνος ἐν αὑτῷ πάντ' ἔχειν ὧν δεῖται. See Gärtner 1955, 216–17 and Enermalm-Ogawa 1987, 117–19. The term ἀπροσδεής is often tagged as 'Stoic' (see Norden 1913, 13–14; Harding 1994, 63; Jonquière 2007, 162–64, 240), yet it is hard to say if it originated in the Early Stoa and from there found its way into Jewish-Greek literature.

[22] See Grimm 1857, 199; Goldstein 1983, 491; Enermalm-Ogawa 1987, 117–19; Schwartz 2008, 486.

3.2.3 ἐντινάσσω 'to hurl'

4:41 οἱ μὲν πέτρους, οἱ δὲ ξύλων πάχη . . . ἐνετίνασσον εἰς τοὺς περὶ τὸν Λυσίμαχον
11:11 λεοντηδὸν δὲ ἐντινάξαντες εἰς τοὺς πολεμίους

Second Maccabees uses ἐντινάσσω both as transitive, at 4:41, in the sense *GELS*"to hurl against," and as intransitive, at 11:11, in the sense *GELS*"to hurl oneself." In the first construction and sense it also appears in 1 Macc 2:36 (οὐδὲ λίθον ἐνετίναξαν αὐτοῖς) and in a Carian inscription dated to ca. 39 BCE (*Panamara* 2.7 φλόγα πολλὴν [α]ὐτοῖς ἐνετίναξεν);[23] in the second construction and sense we find it in an excerpt, just seven lines long,[24] from the Greek translation of the Aramaic Book of Enoch, preserved in the eleventh-century Codex Vaticanus Gr. 1809 (1 En. 89:43 Black ὁ κριός . . . ἐνετίνασσεν εἰς τοὺς ἀλώπεκας).[25] The excerpt belongs to the section known as the Animal Apocalypse (1 En. 85–90), thought to have been composed in Aramaic in the 160s BCE, during the period of the Maccabean Revolt.[26] These are the only attestations of the verb in pre-Common Era texts. The Greek Book of Enoch, which has come down to us only in fragments belonging to different parts of the book that cannot be guaranteed to have been translated at the same time, defies dating with any precision. On the strength of lexical similarities between the texts of the Greek Enochic corpus and OG Daniel, Barr (2014b, 152) considers it probable that "the translation of Enoch into Greek belonged to the same general stage and stratum of translation as the LXX translation of Daniel." To situate OG Daniel in time is, however, no easy task, the dates that have been proposed for it ranging between 145 BCE and sometime in the first century BCE.[27] Larson (2005, 87–88) has assigned Greek Enoch to a broad date range of 150–50 BCE and Nickelsburg (2001, 14), on the basis, inter alia, of parallels with the Wisdom of Solomon, has suggested that "the Greek [Enoch] is the product of a Jewish translator who worked before the turn of the era."

[23] Cf. some later texts: *SB* 8.9882.3 [100–299 CE] τὸ ἐνοίτιον [=ἐνώτιον] . . . καὶ τὸ δ[ακ]τυλίδιον . . . ὁ ἀδελφός μου λαβὼν ἐνετίναξε αὐτῇ αὐτά; *P.Oxy*. 33.2672dupl.17 [218 CE] ἀλλὰ καὶ λίθῳ με ἐνετίναξεν κατὰ τῆς κεφαλῆς.

[24] See Denis 1970, 19; Nickelsburg 2001, 13.

[25] Cf. *P.Fouad* 28.12 [59 CE] εἷς τῶν ὄνων ἐνετίναξεν ἐπὶ τὸ δεξιὸν ἀντικνήμιον; Ael. *Tact*. 19.2.13 τὸ ζῷον εἰς τοὺς πλησίον ἵππους ἐντινάσσον. See Blomqvist 1985, 38–39.

[26] See Nickelsburg 2001, 361.

[27] See Appendix 1 and 6.2.4.

3.2.4 ἐπιλυπέω 'to cause somebody grief,' 'to harass'

4:37 ψυχικῶς οὖν ὁ Ἀντίοχος ἐπιλυπηθεὶς[28] καὶ τραπεὶς ἐπὶ ἔλεος καὶ δακρύσας
8:32 τὸν δὲ φυλάρχην τῶν περὶ Τιμόθεον ἀνεῖλον ἀνοσιώτατον ἄνδρα καὶ πολλὰ τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐπιλελυπηκότα

It is hard to establish which is the first occurrence of this very rare compound in surviving Greek literature. LSJ cites Hdt. 9.50 (where ἐπιλυπέω is a *varia lectio*) and 2 Macc 8:32 for the active voice, and S.E. *M* 11.127 and Iamb. *Protr.* 123.7 for the passive voice. To these we should add 3 Macc 7:9,[29] the inscriptions *IK Knidos I* 154.21[30] and *TAM II* 356.10,[31] the scholium 73a to Pi. *O.* 6,[32] and a few later papyrological instances. The earliest of these attestations are found in 2 and 3 Maccabees and in the Cnidian inscription.[33] The latter was assigned by its first editor (Newton 1863, 724) to a date ranging from 300 to 100 BCE, or perhaps later, and by its latest editor (Blümel 1992, 85) to the second or first century BCE. In the absence of a more precise dating, it is impossible to determine whether 2 Maccabees preserves or not the first instance of ἐπιλυπέω. In any case, its occurrence in a vernacular document like the inscription from Cnidus bearing the text of a curse attests that the verb, albeit rare, belonged to the lexicon of the last two centuries before our era and was not confined to literary usage.

In 2 Macc 4:37, ἐπιλυπέω has the emotive sense that the simplex λυπέω[34] commonly bears (cf. Tob^{GII} 3:10 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ ἐκείνῃ ἐλυπήθη ἐν τῇ ψυχῇ καὶ ἔκλαυσεν), whereas in 8:32 it is used in the military sense "to harass," in which λυπέω is attested in the Greek historiographers of the Classical period.[35]

---

[28] We note the following variant readings: at 4:37 υποληπηθεις A´; επι λυπη λυπηθεις V; λυπηθεις 71 *L´* 311, and at 8:32 λελυπηκότα 71 381.

[29] κατὰ τούτων [sc. τῶν Ἰουδαίων] ἐάν τι κακοτεχνήσωμεν πονηρὸν ἢ ἐπιλυπήσωμεν αὐτοὺς τὸ σύνολον.

[30] The inscription, engraved on a leaden tablet found along with a dozen similar tablets containing *Dirae* within the temenos of Demeter at Cnidus, contains an imprecation against a person suspected of having attempted to poison the writer. Though part of the text is mutilated, line 21 clearly reads: [. . .] δὲ ἐμὲ ἐπιλυπῆσαι (see Newton 1863, 742 and 743, plate 12).

[31] A hexameter inscription for a killed gladiator, engraved on a grave altar found in Xanthos (Lycia) and dated to the 2nd–3rd c. CE: οὐ γὰρ | καυχήσεται Εὐ|πρέπης κατ' ἐμο|ῦ οὐδ' ἐπιλυπήσει με | τὸν ἄθλιον οὐδὲ δύ|<ν>ατε.

[32] See Drachmann 1964, 170: VI.73a τοῦτον οὖν τίκτουσα καὶ ἐπιλυπουμένη καταλέλοιπεν ἐπὶ τῇ γῇ ἡ Εὐάδνη. The greater part of the Pindaric *Scholia vetera* goes back to Didymus' commentary compiled in the 1st c. BCE (see Deas 1931).

[33] We do not consider Hdt. 9.50, since the reading that appears in the majority of the Herodotean MSS is ἐλύπεε, whereas the variant ἐπελύπεε occurs only in two codices of inferior value, C=Laurentianus Conventi soppressi 207, 11th c., and P=Parisinus 1633, 14th c. Unlike LSJ, Powell's *A Lexicon to Herodotus* does not list ἐπιλυπέω; it cites 9.50 s.v. λυπέω.

[34] In the Septuagint, λυπέω occurs 65 times and forms compounds with ἐπι- (2x) and συν- (2x).

[35] Cf. Hdt. 9.40 ἡ μέντοι ἵππος ἡ Μαρδονίου αἰεὶ προσέκειτό τε καὶ ἐλύπεε τοὺς Ἕλληνας; 9.61 τὸ γὰρ προσκείμενόν σφεας ἐλύπεε; Th. 4.53 λῃσταὶ ἅμα τὴν Λακωνικὴν ἧσσον ἐλύπουν ἐκ θαλάσσης; 6.66 οἱ ἱππῆς τῶν Συρακοσίων ἥκιστ' ἂν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐν τῷ ἔργῳ καὶ πρὸ αὐτοῦ λυπήσειν; X. *An.* 2.3.23

3.2.5 λεληθότως 'secretly'

6:11 λεληθότως ἄγειν τὴν ἑβδομάδα
8:1 παρεισπορευόμενοι λεληθότως εἰς τὰς κώμας

Frohwein (1868, 20) provides a list of some forty-five Greek adverbs formed from perfect active participles. With very few exceptions, these adverbs are post-Classical and very rare. Four of them occur in the Septuagint: the Classical ἀραρότως (3 Macc 5:4) and εἰκότως (4 Macc 9:2), πεποιθότως (Zech 14:11), which is a Septuagint neologism, and λεληθότως. It is difficult to identify the first preserved instance of the latter adverb in Greek literature. A TLG search yields some 900 occurrences of it, the earliest of which are found in the pseudo-Platonic dialogue *Axiochus* (365c), in 2 Maccabees (2x), in Diodorus Siculus (5x), in Ps.-Demetrius' *On Style* (297), in the rhetorical works of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (6x), and in Strabo (7.2.1.30). There are also two instances of it in Latin literature, both in Cicero's letters (*Att.* 119 [6.5.3]; *Fam.* 177 [9.2.3]).

Half of the aforementioned works can be dated with certainty to the last century BCE. The two letters in which Cicero uses λεληθότως have been assigned precise dates: the first, addressed to Atticus, was written on June 25 or 26, 50 BCE; the second was sent to Varro on ca. April 22, 46 BCE. Diodorus' *Library of History* was written over a period of thirty years, extending roughly from the sixties to the thirties of the first century BCE.[36] Dionysius' treatises were composed in the last quarter of the same century.[37] The seventh book of Strabo's *Geography* was finished in 17/18 CE.[38] However, the passage in which λεληθότως occurs is borrowed from Posidonius;[39] it probably originates from the geographical treatise *On the Ocean*, which is estimated to have been completed shortly after 87/86 BCE.[40] If Strabo quotes verbatim from his source, he provides us with an attestation of the adverb which predates the instances in Cicero's letters and in Diodorus' *Library of History*.[41]

The pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus* and Ps.-Demetrius' *On Style* have resisted precise dating. Although a few scholars have dated *Axiochus* to as early as the fourth/third century BCE,[42] the majority of scholarly opinion seems to favour a date in the first

---

πορευοίμεθα δ' ἂν οἴκαδε, εἴ τις ἡμᾶς μὴ λυποίη; *HG* 6.3.14 κατὰ γῆν μὲν τίς ἂν ὑμῶν φίλων ὄντων ἱκανὸς γένοιτο ἡμᾶς λυπῆσαι; *Cyr.* 6.3.13 ὡς δὲ ὑμᾶς μὴ λυπῶσιν οἱ ἀπὸ τῆς μεγάλης τάξεως.

[36] See Chamoux 1993, viii–ix.

[37] See Aujac and Lebel 1981, 12n2.

[38] See Baladié 1989, 8.

[39] See Baladié 1989, 15, 19–20, 29 and Theiler 1982, 2:55–56.

[40] See Theiler 1982, 2:6 and Malitz 1983, 31.

[41] Diodorus, too, may be indebted to previous writers for the passages, in the *Library of History*, in which λεληθότως occurs.

[42] Buresch 1886, 18: "non ante a. 406"; Immisch 1896, 70: "Die nächsten Jahre nach 306 sind mithin am wahrscheinlichsten als Abfassungszeit des Axiochus zu bezeichnen. . . . Man über die letzten Jahre des vierten Jahrhunderts nicht wohl hinuntergehen kann"; Taylor (1960, 552), following Immisch: "As early as somewhere c. 305–300 B.C. . . . I see no need to suppose a date later than the time of Epicurus, whose

century BCE.[43] The examination of the dialogue's vocabulary and syntax, in particular, led Chevalier (1914, 43–66) to the conclusion that *Axiochus* reflects the language of the end of the Alexandrian and the beginning of the Roman periods and, considering that it employs many terms borrowed from the Neo-Pythagorean vocabulary that came into use in the first century BCE, he ascribed it to a date not earlier than the beginning of that century (ib. 65 and 115). Along the same line, Souilhé (1930, 135–36) argued that the author of the dialogue was a first-century BCE Academician, more rhetorician and littérateur than philosopher, as his recherché vocabulary and literary aspirations attest. More recently, Hershbell (1981, 20–21), following Chevalier and Souilhé, concluded that "the *Axiochus*' language, vocabulary and syntax points to the second-first centuries B.C."

Ps.-Demetrius' *On Style (Περὶ Ἑρμηνείας)* has similarly been assigned a broad possible date range, stretching from the third century BCE to the late first century CE.[44] Linguistic evidence, and in particular traces of early Atticism and the use of 'late' vocabulary, has been taken as indicative of a date of composition in the early first century BCE.[45] Recent scholarship seems to converge on dating it to the late second or, more likely, the early first century BCE.[46]

Apropos of λεληθότως, we can note here that Demetrius also uses the synonymous adverb λανθανόντως (181), which is indeed late: its other instances in literature are not earlier than the second century CE (Gal. 12.292.12 Kühn; Poll. 6.209.10; D.C. 66.5.3).[47] However, this does not necessarily provide evidence for a post-Common Era

---

Greek is much of the same stamp"; Thesleff 2009 [1982], 378: "Souilhé's dating of it in the first century BCE is probably too late. . . . A date in the first half of the 3rd c. BCE seems possible."

[43] Heidel 1896, 15 and 18; Chevalier 1914, 43–66, 114–15; Souilhé 1930, 123–36.

[44] See, for example, Roberts 1932, 271: "The writer on *Style,* whose work seems on internal grounds to come later than Dionysius (30 B.C.) and earlier than Hermogenes (A.D. 170), belongs to the days of Plutarch towards the end of the first century A.D."; Grube 1961, 56: "I incline to the view that our treatise was written about 270 B.C., or not very much later"; Schenkeveld 1964, 147: "We must suppose that in the first century A.D. a man called Demetrius wrote a treatise περὶ ἑρμηνείας, based almost exclusively on materials belonging to the second or early first century B.C." For a review of proposed dates, see Innes 1995, 310–12, and especially Chiron 1993, xiii–xv and 2001, 15–32.

[45] See Innes 1995, 318–19.

[46] See Chiron 1993, xxx (based on the evidence for Stoic influence on Ps.-Demetrius' treatise): "IIe s. av. J.-C. ou début du siècle suivant"; ib. xxxix (on the assumption that the author of *On Style* is Demetrius the Syrian, Cicero's teacher of rhetoric): "Datation à la charnière du IIe et du I^e siècle avant J.-C."; Innes 1995, 311: "I would agree with this growing consensus that the contents at least do not preclude and may best reflect the second century B.C."; ib. 319: "There may then be a few points of language to suggest a date of composition as late as the early first century B.C." The conclusion of Chiron (2001, 311–70), who has undertaken the most recent and thorough examination of *On Style*, is that the treatise can best be dated to the end of the second or, more likely, the beginning of the first century BCE: "Sa connaissance [sc. Ps.-Demetrius'] d'Artémon et sa familiarité avec Aristote peuvent conduire à le situer dans les premiers temps de la redécouverte de ce dernier, à Athènes, vers la fin du IIe ou, plus vraisemblablement, au début du Ier siècle av. J.-C. . . . La langue du traité ne semble pas devoir faire obstacle à cette hypothèse" (p. 370).

[47] Grube (1961, 152) remarks that "the forms λανθανόντως (181) and λεληθότως as adverbs formed from participles are typical of later Greek. The forms do not occur elsewhere before Roman times. (λεληθότως

dating of Demetrius' treatise, as it is not infrequent that words appear, disappear, and reappear at very irregular intervals, sometimes spanning centuries. This is the case, for example, of the adverb κεκρυμμένως, whose first attestation is found in the Septuagint of Jeremiah (13:17), composed sometime in the second century BCE, and which crops up again some three centuries later in Epictetus' *Discourses*.

Barring the two instances of λεληθότως in 2 Maccabees, we have, then, (a) a dozen attestations of the adverb in Greek literary texts dating roughly from the 60s of the first century BCE to the 20s of the first century CE, (b) two attestations in Greek texts which, according to the opinion of experts, likely date from the first century BCE or a little earlier, and (c) two instances in Latin texts firmly dated to 50 and 46 BCE, which deserve special comment.

As has often been noted, the Greek that Cicero intersperses in his private letters is, by and large (technical and specialized terms excepted), neither classicizing and bookish nor artificially learned, but rather reflects the living, colloquial Greek of his time, that a well-educated Roman might use in his oral or written communication.[48] λεληθότως is one of the approximately fifty different Greek adverbs that Cicero uses in his correspondence.[49] Some twenty of them are attested in Greek literature prior to Aristotle. Among the rest we find several rarities and a number of *proton* or *hapax legomena*, which would undoubtedly not appear as such to us, had we at our disposal the entire vocabulary of Greek that was in use in the first century BCE.[50] λεληθότως must have been quite current in Greek around 50 BCE for Cicero to quasi-casually embed it in his Latin letters to his friends twice over a period of four years.

Passing next to the semantics of the adverb, we have to note that, in all its above-cited instances, excepting those in 2 Maccabees and one in Diodorus Siculus, it is used in the sense of "imperceptibly"; Cicero, too, uses it in this sense.[51] Second Maccabees 6:11 and 8:1 and D.S. 17.115.4,[52] however, employ it in the sense of "secretly," which recurs in Josephus, in the late first century CE.[53]

In this regard, it is worth comparing the use of λεληθότως in the body of the epitome with the use of cognate or synonymous adverbs occurring in the letters attached to the

---

does occur in the pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus* 365c, but that is itself a work of uncertain date.)" However, on the basis of their instances in surviving Greek texts, it is clear that λανθανόντως becomes current considerably later than λεληθότως.

[48] See Steele 1900, 390–91; Rose 1921, 114–15; Dubuisson 1992, 194–95; Swain 2002, 146–47; Dubuisson 2005, 80.

[49] See Steele 1900, 405–6; Rose 1921, 93–114, and the *Index Graecitatis* in Shackleton Bailey 1970, 73–82.

[50] See Steele 1900, 390–91; Rose 1921, 115.

[51] *Att.* 119 [6.5.3] et mihi decessionis dies *λεληθότως* obrebepat. "And the day of my departure draws imperceptibly nearer"; *Fam.* 177 [9.2.3] et tamen *λεληθότως* consuetudo diu<tu>rna callum iam obduxit stomacho meo. "And after all, long custom has imperceptibly anaesthetized my spleen." Trans. D.R. Shackleton Bailey, LCL.

[52] Σειρῆνες διάκοιλοι καὶ δυνάμεναι λεληθότως δέξασθαι τοὺς ἐν αὐταῖς ὄντας.

[53] Cf. *AJ* 7.277 λεληθότως ἐλθόντες πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα; 15.366 πολλοί τε καὶ φανερῶς καὶ λεληθότως εἰς τὸ φρούριον ἀναγόμενοι; 18.344 λεληθότως αὐτῶν [sc. τῶν σεβασμάτων] θρησκείαν ἐποιεῖτο.

epitome, as well as in other books of the Septuagint and in the works of Polybius, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and Josephus. In the second of the two letters prefixed to 2 Maccabees, purportedly written in 164 BCE but probably dating from the first century BCE, we find the Classical adverb λαθραίως (1:19 λαθραίως κατέκρυψαν), which in the Septuagint also occurs in 1 Kgdms 24:5. The Septuagint also employs the Classical λάθρᾳ (9x), as well as the semantically cognate adverbs κρυφῇ (12x) and κρυφαίως (2x), both Classical, and κρυβῇ (3x), κρυπτῶς (2x), and κεκρυμμένως (1x), which first appear in the Septuagint. Of these adverbs, Polybius, writing around the mid-second century BCE, uses only λάθρᾳ (8x) and λαθραίως (1x). Diodorus, a century later, uses the same two adverbs, although with higher frequency (λάθρᾳ 60x, λαθραίως 7x), plus λεληθότως (5x). Dionysius of Halicarnassus employs κρύφα (22x), the poetic κρύβδα (1x), λάθρα (5x), λάθρη (1x), and λαθραίως (1x)—the last two in quotations from poetry—as well as λεληθότως (6x). Josephus, in the first century CE, uses λάθρᾳ (33x), λαθραίως (2x), λεληθότως (6x), κρύφα (27x), κρυφαίως (2x), κρυφίως (1x), and κρυπτῶς (6x). For illustration's sake, we may compare two passages, one from Polybius and one from Josephus, which offer verbal parallels to 2 Macc 8:1: Plb. 2.55.3 παρεισῆλθε διὰ τούτων λάθρᾳ νυκτὸς ἐντὸς τῶν τειχῶν; J. *BJ* 4.241 λεληθότως παρεισέρρευσαν εἰς τὴν ἱερὰν πόλιν.

Be it noted that, in one of its two instances in 2 Maccabees, λεληθότως occurs in the same verse (8:1) as Ἰουδαϊσμός, a term whose first recorded instance in Greek literature is found in the epitomator's prologue (2:21). This verse was in all likelihood penned by the epitomator and does not belong to the posited Jasonic substratum.

What can we tentatively deduce from the above discussion about the first appearance of λεληθότως in surviving Greek literature? There seem to be two possibilities. The first is that λεληθότως was already in use in the late second century BCE, both in the sense of "secretly, furtively" and "imperceptibly," and that 2 Maccabees and possibly (depending on the date one assigns to them) the pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus* and Ps.-Demetrius' *On Style* preserve its earliest extant instances in literature. The second and, in our eyes, more likely possibility is that the adverb was not in current use prior to the first century BCE and that its double occurrence in 2 Maccabees is an indication that the epitome was not composed earlier than in the first century BCE.

3.2.6 φιλοπολίτης 'loving one's fellow citizens'

> 14:37 Ραζις δέ τις . . . ἀνὴρ φιλοπολίτης καὶ σφόδρα καλῶς ἀκούων καὶ κατὰ τὴν εὔνοιαν πατὴρ τῶν Ἰουδαίων προσαγορευόμενος

In 2 Maccabees there occur thirteen compounds with φιλο- as their first element.[54] Among them we find the terms φιλάδελφος, applied to the prophet Jeremiah (15:14), and φιλοπολίτης, applied to the elder Razis.

φιλάδελφος is attested as early as Sophocles (*Ant.* 527) and Xenophon (*Mem.* 2.3.17) in the sense of "loving one's sibling." It is very frequent in the inscriptions and the papyri from the third century BCE onwards, especially as an epithet applied to kings and queens. In 2 Maccabees it is used in the extended sense of "loving one's brethren." This sense, previously unattested, recurs in the New Testament (1 Pet 3:8).[55]

φιλοπολίτης, by contrast, is extremely rare. In literature, aside from its instance in 2 Maccabees, it occurs only in Plutarch (5x) and in Dio Chrysostom (1x) in the second century CE, in Basil of Caesarea (1x) in the fourth century CE, and in George Pachymeres (3x) in the late thirteenth century CE.[56] Its instances in non-literary texts are also very sparse. The first is found in an Ephesian inscription containing an honorary decree for a certain Skythes Archidamou (*Ephesos* 116.3 [καθὼς δί]κα[ιόν] τε καὶ [ἐ]πιβάλ[λ]ον ἐστὶν ἀνδρὶ φιλοπολίτῃ καὶ φροντίζοντι δόξης καὶ τῆς παρὰ τοῖς πολίταις [εὐφη]|μίας). This inscription has defied precise dating. Robert (1965, 216) assigns it "à la basse époque hellénistique"; Engelmann, Knibbe, and Merkelbach (1980, 217) simply designate it as "hellenistisches"; and Blume (1989, 283) dates it to the first century BCE. Three other inscriptions are from Aphrodisias and are dated to the mid-first century CE:[57] a dedication to Aphrodite, Claudius, and others by Tiberius Claudius Diogenes, who bears the title Philopolites (*Aphrodisias* 106.1 Τιβέριος Κλαύδιος Διογένης Φιλοπολίτης); an honorary decree for probably the same Tiberius Claudius Diogenes (*Aphrodisias* 296.2 εὐεργέτην φιλάνθ[ρ]ωπον φιλοπολείτην νομοθέτην); and an honorary decree for Adrastos Nikoteimou (*Aphrodisias* 222.7 ἄνδρα μέγαν φιλόπατριν | καὶ φιλοπολείτην καὶ εὐεργέτην).[58] From a later period come an honorary inscription from Prusias ad Hypium for the soldier M. Aur. Antoninus (*SEG* 56.1406-1407.9 [early 3rd c. CE] τὸν φιλόπατριν | καὶ φιλοπολείτην | καὶ πάσης ἀρετῆς | ἄξιον) and an acclamation in honour of a prytanis at Oxyrhynchus (*P.Oxy.* 1.41 [300–325 CE] l. 6

---

[54] φιλάδελφος, φιλανθρωπέω, φιλανθρωπία, φιλάνθρωπος (τὰ φιλάνθρωπα), φιλανθρώπως, φιλαργυρέω, φιλονεικία, φιλοπολίτης, φιλοστοργία, φιλοστόργως, φιλοτίμως, φιλοφρονέω, φιλοφρόνως.

[55] See H. von Soden, "ἀδελφός, ἀδελφή, κτλ," *TDNT* 1:145: "In Judaism ἀδελφός means a co-religionist, who historically is identical with a compatriot." Cf. 2 Macc 1:1, 10:21, 11:7, 12:6, 24.

[56] Plu. *Arat.* 15.2; *Per.* 18.3; *Lyc.* 20.3; *Flam.* 13.9; *Mor.* 221D; D. Chr. 1.28; Bas. *Ep.* 42.3.12; Pach. *Decl.* 6.100, 175, 181.

[57] For the date of the first inscription, see Erim 1982, 278; for the date of the second, Reynolds 1981, 321; and for the third, Smith 2006, 22.

[58] We also note an epitaph from Konana, in Asia Minor, that bears the name Iulius Philopoleites (*SEG* 60 1482 [1st/2nd c. CE] Ἰουλίου | Φιλοπο|λείτου).

εὐτυχῶς τῷ φιλοπολίτῃ; l. 24 τὸν φιλοπολί\τη/ν τῇ πόλει). In contrast to the aforementioned epithet φιλάδελφος, which is frequent in documentary texts from Egypt but rare in Asia Minor,[59] φιλοπολίτης, bar the last-quoted papyrological occurrence, is exclusively attested in the latter region.

Much more frequent is the cognate φιλόπολις, an Attic word, attested some twenty-five times in the literature of the Classical period, beginning with Pindar and Aeschylus. In the literature of the post-Classical period it does not appear earlier than Dionysius of Halicarnassus. The chronological and geographical distribution of its epigraphical attestations is similar to that of φιλοπολίτης: with the exception of an early instance in the second letter of Alexander to the Chians (*SEG* 35.925.27 [ca. 330 BCE]), they range from the first to the third centuries CE and are found in six honorific decrees from Aphrodisias, another six from Prusias ad Hypium, and in eight more inscriptions from other areas of Asia Minor.

The semantically related adjective φιλόπατρις is first attested as late as the second century BCE, in both the literature (Polybius, Letter of Aristeas) and the inscriptions, but the majority of its numerous epigraphical instances date from the Roman Imperial period. Its geographical distribution is broader than that of φιλόπολις/φιλοπολίτης, only some 60 percent of its instances coming from Asia Minor. In two of the previously quoted inscriptions (*Aphrodisias* 222.7 and *SEG* 56.1406-1407.9), it is conjoined with φιλοπολίτης, their semantic difference lying in the fact that φιλόπατρις (as well as φιλόπολις) emphasizes the beneficent concern for the community as a whole, whereas φιλοπολίτης puts the accent on the care for the members of the community, one's fellow citizens.[60]

One may also mention the very rare term φιλόδημος (*SEG* 47:1502.5 [reign of Augustus] Ναβαταίων βασι[λεὺς φιλόδημος]; *SEG* 45:1262.1 [1st c. CE] φιλοκαίσαρα καὶ φιλόδημον) and the city- or region-specific terms φιλεφέσιος (*Ephesos* 1302.6 [ca. 100 CE] Τιβ(έριον) Κλαύδιον | Σεκοῦνδον . . . φιλεφέσι[ον]), φιλοκύμαιος (*IK Kyme* 19.31–33, passim [2 BCE–14 CE] ὁ δᾶμος στε|φανοῖ Λεύκιον Οὐάκκιον . . . φι|λοκύμαιον, εὐεργέταν), and φιλολύκιος (decree of Patara [Imperial], cited by L. Robert in *REA*, 62 (1960), n° 3–4, p. 326: ll. 24–25 φιλολύκιος οὖσα καὶ ἀνατεθεικυῖα τὸν ἑαυτῆς βίον εἰς τὴν πάντων Λυκίων εὐχαριστίαν), all from the Roman Imperial period.[61]

It is noteworthy that, with respect to the few noble figures that appear in 2 Maccabees, the author uses laudatory terms and formulas that pertain to the vocabulary of Hellenistic decrees honouring prominent citizens for their civic virtues and beneficent actions. For example, Judas Maccabeus is characterized as ὁ καθ' ἅπαν σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ πρωταγωνιστὴς ὑπὲρ τῶν πολιτῶν[62] and ὁ τὴν τῆς ἡλικίας εὔνοιαν εἰς ὁμοεθνεῖς

[59] See Horsley 1983, 87.

[60] So Reynolds 1981, 322. See also Robert 1965, 215–16; Blume 1989, 283; Veligianni 2001, 66–67.

[61] See Veligianni 2001, 66.

[62] Cf. *SEG* 60-1073.39–40 [Alabanda, 160s BCE?] ὅπως . . . γίνω[νται πρωτα]|γω[ν]ισταὶ ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρίδος; *SEG* 53-1312, B.15-16 [Metropolis, 145/144 or 144/143 BCE] πάντα δεύτερα τιθέμενος τῆς

διαφυλάξας[63] (15:30); the high priest Onias is praised for his εὐσέβεια and μισοπονηρία (3:1),[64] his σωφροσύνη καὶ εὐταξία (4:37),[65] and for τὸ σύμφορον κοινῇ καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν παντὶ τῷ πλήθει σκοπῶν;[66] he is also called εὐεργέτης τῆς πόλεως,[67] κηδεμὼν τῶν ὁμοεθνῶν (4:2),[68] καλὸς καὶ ἀγαθός, and ἐκ παιδὸς ἐκμεμελετηκὼς πάντα τὰ τῆς ἀρετῆς οἰκεῖα (15:12);[69] the martyr Eleazar is said to have left in his death a noble example to the young (6:28 τοῖς νέοις ὑπόδειγμα γενναῖον καταλελοιπώς; 6:31 οὐ μόνον τοῖς νέοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς πλείστοις τοῦ ἔθνους . . . ὑπόδειγμα γενναιότητος καὶ μνημόσυνον ἀρετῆς καταλιπών);[70] the elder Razis, aside from φιλοπολίτης, is designated as πατὴρ τῶν

πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα εὐνοίας ἐπρω|ταγωνίστει προσφερόμενος τὴν ἐς ἑαυτοῦ φιλοπονίαν καὶ σπουδὴν οὐδέποτε τῆς ἰδίας ὠφελίας ἕνεκεν ἀλλαξάμενος τὰ κοινὰ τῆς πόλεως πράγματα; *SEG* 34-1198.8–11 [Iulia Gordos, sh. aft. 133–130 BCE] ἐν τῷ πρὸς Ἀρισ|[τόνικον ἐν]στάντι πολέμῳ πρωταγω|[νιστῶν καὶ π]ρεσβεύων περὶ τῶν κοινῇ |[συμφερόντω]ν; *MDAI(A)* 35(1910)409,3.12 [Pergamon, 75–50 BCE] ὅπως . . . πρωταγωνιστῶσιν ὑπὲρ τῶν τῆς πατρίδος | δικαίων; *Mylasa* 50.8 [Hellenistic] προαιρούμενος πρωταγ[ωνιστ]εῖν ὑ[πὲρ τοῦ πᾶσι] συμφέροντος.

[63] Cf. *IG II*^{2} 653.27–28 [289/8 BCE] [προαιρούμεν]ος διαφυλάττειν τὴν | [εὔνοιαν, τὴν εἰς τὸν δῆμ]ον τὴν παραδεδομένην | [αὐτῷ παρὰ τῶν προγόνω]ν.

[64] Cf. *IG XII, 5* 869.22 [end 2nd/1st c. BCE] [ἄνδρα καλὸν κἀγαθ]ὸν καὶ μισοπόνηρον. See Panagopoulos 1977, 223–24.

[65] Cf. *IG II*^{2} 478.10 [305/4 BCE] ἐπ[αινέσαι τοὺ]|ς ἐφήβους . . . εὐταξίας ἕνεκα καὶ σωφροσύνης; *IK Kyme* 13.VI.18–19 [after 130 BCE] ἐπῃνῆσθαι ἐπί τε τῇ σ[ω]|φροσύνῃ τῇ ὑπαρχούσῃ περὶ αὐτὴν καὶ εὐταξίᾳ; *Iasos* 292.6–7 [n.d.] ἀρετῆς ἕνεκεν καὶ τῆς | κατὰ τὸν β[ίον εὐτ]αξίας τε καὶ | σωφροσύνης; *Herakleia Salbake* 68.7–8 [Imperial] διά τε τὴν ἰδίαν | [α]ὐτοῦ σωφροσύνην | [καὶ] εὐταξίαν καὶ κοσ|[μίαν ἀγω]γήν. Also in literary texts: Isoc. 12.115 ὑπ' εὐταξίας καὶ σωφροσύνης; Plb. 31.25.8 τὴν ἐπ' εὐταξίᾳ καὶ σωφροσύνῃ δόξαν; Phld. *Mus.* 4 fr. 121.15 Delattre πρὸς γενναιότητα καὶ σωφροσύνην καὶ εὐταξίαν.

[66] Cf. *IG XII,6* 1:11.48–50 [Samos, after 243/2 BCE] περὶ πλείστου ποιησάμενος τὸ κοινῇ συμφέρον . . .· | ἔν τε τοῖς λοιποῖς διατελεῖ πρόθυμον καὶ εὔνουν ἑα[υ]|τὸν παρεχόμενος καὶ [κο]ινῇ τῷ δήμῳ καὶ ἰδίᾳ ἑκάστῳ τῶν πολιτῶν; *Epigr. tou Oropou* 152.3–4 [ca. 240–180 BCE] διατελεῖ ἐμ παντὶ καιρῷ τὸ συμφέρον πράττων κοινῇ τε πᾶσι τοῖς πολίταις καὶ ἰδίᾳ | ἑκάστῳ; *Kerameikos III* A 2.4-5 [beg. 2nd c. BCE] [πρ]άττων καὶ κοινῇ π[ρὸς τὴν πόλιν τὰ συμφέ]|[ροντα καὶ κατ' ἰδίαν π]ρὸς ἕκαστον τῶν πολ[ιτῶν].

[67] The appellation εὐεργέτης τῆς πόλεως is attested from the early fourth century BCE onwards in numerous inscriptions. On the title εὐεργέτης, see Passoni dell'Acqua 1976 and Gardner 2007.

[68] Cf. *IG II*^{2} 3596.4–5 [ca. 134 CE] τὸν ἀρχιερέα τῶν Σε|βαστῶν καὶ κηδεμόνα τοῦ ἔθνους; *SEG* 11.923 [Gythion, Imperial] κηδεμὼν τῆς τοῦ ἔθνους καὶ τῆς πόλεως φυλακῆς καὶ σωτηρίας; *MDAI(A)* 32(1907) 257,8, col. II.ad1.39 [Pergamon, 75–50 BCE] γέγονεν τῆς πόλεως ἀγαθὸς κηδεμών; *IK Sinope* 98.5 [14/13 or 13/12 BCE] Γάϊον Μάρκιον | Κηνσωρῖνον . . . τὸν | κηδεμόνα τῆς | πόλεως; *Heberdey-Wilhelm, Reisen in Kilikien* 28,63.4–5 [1st c. BCE] τὸν εὐεργέτη[ν] | καὶ κηδεμόνα τοῦ δήμου; *Ephesos* 1288.12 [84/96 CE] διηνεκῆ ποιούμεν[ον] . . . τὴν πρὸς τὴν πόλιν | κηδεμο[ν]ίαν. See Mason 1974, 151–52, Panagopoulos 1977, 216, and Blume 1989, 283–84.

[69] Cf. *IG VII* 3059.8–12 [Boiotia, after 146 BCE] ἀνὴρ | ἀγαθὸς ὑπάρχων, ἀπὸ τῆς | [πρ]ώτης ἡλικίας ζηλω|[τ]ὴς γενόμενος τῶν πρὸς | [ἀρ]ετὴν καὶ δόξαν ἀνηκόν|[τω]ν; *IG XII,9* 236.5–6 [ca. 100 BCE] τὸν ἐπ' ἀρετῇ καὶ δόξῃ βίον ἐζηλωκὼς ἀπὸ τῆς | πρώτης ἡλικίας; *SEG* 53-1357.4–6 [Silandos, 2nd/1st c. BCE] ἀχθε[ὶς] | ἐκ παιδὸς ἡλικίας καλῶς καὶ κοσμίω[ς] | κατὰ πάντα πρὸς ἀρετὴν ἐπαιδεύθ[η]; *Sardis 7,1* 8.122 [5–1 BCE] ἀνὴρ ἀγαθὸς καὶ εὐγενής, ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας σπουδάσας περὶ ἀρετήν. On the use of the synonymous expressions ἀπὸ τῆς πρώτης ἡλικίας and ἀπὸ παιδὸς ἡλικίας in honorific inscriptions, see Kleijwegt 1991, 234–36. The terms καλὸς κἀγαθός and καλοκἀγαθία are among the most frequently attested in honorific decrees.

[70] Cf. *Aphrodisias* 340.9–12 [Imperial] ζήσαντα κοσμί|ως καὶ αἰδημόνως | πρὸς ὑπόδειγμα | ἀρετῆς; *MAMA III* 792.1 [Imperial] ἀρετῆς καὶ σωφροσύνης ὑπόδειγμα; *Priene* 50.58 [1st c. CE] [πολί]του καλὸν ὑπόδειγμα | [παραστήσας ὡς] ἐκ παιδε<ί>ας τὸ εἰκὸς τοῖς νέοις τὸν ἴδιον βίον. *IosPE I*^{2} 39.13 [Olbia, 2nd

Ἰουδαίων (14:37),[71] and is said to have had risked body and life for Judaism with the utmost zeal (14:38 σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ παραβεβλημένος μετὰ πάσης ἐκτενείας).[72] These model Jewish figures[73] appear thus to embody the very civic virtues

---

c. CE] ὑπόδειγμα τοῖ[ς] | νέοις ἐγείνετο τῆς τῶν καλῶν ὁμοιότητος. On ὑπόδειγμα/παράδειγμα, see Panagopoulos 1977, 210. Robert (1965, 226–27) notes that the formula πρὸς ὑπόδειγμα, which appears as early as the second and first centuries BCE, becomes frequent in the inscriptions of the Imperial period, especially in Aphrodisias (seventeen honorary/funerary inscriptions bearing the phrase πρὸς ὑπόδειγμα ἀρετῆς), but also elsewhere in Asia Minor.

[71] van Henten (1997, 206–8) remarks that the designation 'father of the Jews' "reminds one especially of Roman titles like *parens* or *pater patriae*, which have a military background. The rescue of an individual, a group or the entire people brought such titles as a reward for the saviour." Since Razis had earned the honorific title, on account of his εὔνοια, before his heroic death, one should perhaps not place too much emphasis on this parallelism. As Levine (2005, 404) notes, "the use of the term 'father' as a title of honor and respect has deep roots in ancient Judaism." In the Old Testament, it appears as an appellation addressed to a master by his disciple (2 Kgs 2:12; cf. 6:21 and 13:14). From the first century CE, the title "abba," "father," appears as an honorific prefix appended to the names of many prominent teachers of the Law (see Kohler 1901, 569–79). One of them, Rabbi Tarfon, is called in the Palestinian Talmud (*y. Yoma* 1:1) "father of all Israel." In Jewish inscriptions from the second century CE onwards we are met with titles such as πατὴρ συναγωγῆς/λαοῦ/στέματος (see Brooten 1982, 68–71). With regard to πατὴρ συναγωγῆς, Levine (2005, 429) notes that the title "was essentially honorific, denoting a major patron and benefactor of the community," yet it may also be that the person bearing the title "played a crucial and pivotal role in synagogue affairs generally" (ib. 430; see also van der Horst 1991, 93–94). The closest non-Jewish parallel is found in the title πατὴρ πόλεως, which occurs in Greek inscriptions from the Roman Imperial period onwards (cf. *TAM III,1* 83.A.4 [Termessos, 96 CE] [ἱε]ρέα Διὸς Σολυμέως . . . φιλόπατριν καὶ πατέρα πόλεως; *IGLSyr 1* 167.5–6 [Nikopolis, Rom. Imp.] τὸν φιλόπατριν | . . . καὶ εὐεργέ|[τ]ην κ[α]ὶ [κτί]στην [κ]αὶ [πατέρα] [τῆ]ς πόλεως; *IosPE I*^{2} 42.16–17 [Olbia, ca. 200–210 CE] λέγων τὰ ἄριστα καὶ πράττων τὰ συνφέροντα πα|τὴρ ἀπεδείχθη τῆς πόλεως; *IG VII* 3429 [Chaironeia, n.d] [ἡ βου]λὴ καὶ ὁ δ[ῆ]|[μος Ὀ]λύμπιχον | [Εὐά]νδρου τὸν | [πα]τέρα αὐτῶν | [εὐν]οίας εἵνεκεν καὶ | [εὐεργεσί]ας, which can be compared to 2 Macc 14:37 Ραζις . . . κατὰ τὴν εὔνοιαν πατὴρ τῶν Ἰουδαίων προσαγορευόμενος). The title was originally honorific, but in the Christian and Byzantine periods it evolved to designate a civic official responsible for public works (see Robert 1948, 130–31; id. 1966, 85–86; Roueché 1979). Horsley (1987, 260) thinks that the aforementioned Jewish title πατὴρ συναγωγῆς "may itself be an adaptation of the honorific 'father of the *ekklesia/boule/polis*' which appears on inscriptions in Asia Minor."

[72] Cf. *SEG* 39:1243, II.19–24 [Colophon, Claros, ca. 130–110 BCE] αὐτὸς δὲ τὸν ὑπὲρ ἁπάντων | κίνδυνον ἀναδεχόμενος | καὶ κατὰ γῆν καὶ κατὰ θάλασ|σαν σώματι κ<αὶ τ>ῇ ψυχῇ καὶ | τῷ παντὶ βίῳ περὶ τοῦ δήμου | παραβαλλόμενος; *IG XII,3* 171/1286.22–23 [Astypalaea, ca. end 2nd c. BCE] παραβαλόμ[ενοι τῶ]ι βίωι οὔτε σ[ώματος] | οὔτε [ψ]υχῆς ἐφείσαντο; *IGBulg I*^{2} 13.39 [Dionysopolis, ca. 48 BCE] περὶ τῆς πατρίδος τοὺς καλλίστου[ς] | διέθετο χρηματισμούς, καθόλου δὲ κατὰ πᾶσ<α>ν περίστασιν κ[αι]|[ρ]ῶν ψυχῇ καὶ σώματι παραβαλλόμενος. The phrase μετὰ πάσης ἐκτενείας is not attested in any literary text prior to 2 Maccabees, but is found in a few honorific decrees from the second century BCE onwards: *REG* 1996:2/3.14–15 [Lycia, 196 BCE] τῆς περὶ τὸ γυμνάσιον ἐπιμελείας | καὶ κατασκευῆς προέστη μετὰ πάσης ἐκτενεί|ας; *SEG* 48:1112.9 [Kos, ca. 150–100 BCE] μετὰ πάσας φιλοτιμίας καὶ ἐκτενε[ίας]; *IG XII,6* 1:330.6 [Samos, ca. 1–50 CE] τὴν ἱέρειαν . . . φιλοσέβαστον καὶ φιλόπατριν καὶ | εὐεργέτιν τοῦ δήμου δημιουργήσασαν | εὐσεβέστατα καὶ μετὰ πάσης ἐκτενείας. On ἐκτένεια, see *TLNT* 1:457–61.

[73] The attitude of Onias, Eleazar, and Razis is sharply contrasted with that of some negatively prominent Jews in 2 Maccabees, who turned against their fellow citizens and co-religionists, such as Menelaus (4:50 μέγας τῶν πολιτῶν ἐπίβουλος καθεστώς; 5:23 χείριστα τῶν ἄλλων ὑπερῄρετο τοῖς πολίταις, ἀπεχθῆ δὲ πρὸς τοὺς πολίτας Ἰουδαίους ἔχων διάθεσιν), Jason (5:8 πατρίδος καὶ πολιτῶν δήμιος), or Alcimus, who hypocritically claimed that he was concerned for the interests of his fellow citizens (14:8 τῶν ἰδίων πολιτῶν στοχαζόμενος).

that earned their contemporary elite Greek citizens the highly esteemed honours of their polis.

The concern to benefit one's co-citizens seems to have persisted through time as a distinguishing Jewish trait, as can be evidenced, for instance, in the Late Antique Jewish funerary inscriptions found in the Jewish catacombs of Rome. These inscriptions, composed in Greek, display a preponderance of φιλο-compound laudatory epithets, unattested in pagan or early Christian epitaphs, stressing the deceased's love for the Jewish community (e.g. φιλοσυνάγωγος, φιλόλαος, φιλοπένης) and the Jewish Law (e.g. φιλέντολος, φιλόνομος). All these epithets are neologisms denoting distinctively Jewish qualities.[74]

To be sure, φιλοπολίτης was not a neologism coined and used in a Jewish milieu; the inscriptional evidence disproves such an assumption. Indeed, the fact that this epithet is epigraphically attested almost exclusively in Asia Minor and that its literary and epigraphical instances are chronologically clustered in the first three centuries CE, with the earliest of them dating perhaps to the first century BCE,[75] may provide us with a clue as to the place and date of composition or final redaction of 2 Maccabees.[76] φιλοπολίτης, like the previously discussed adjective ἀπαρασήμαντος, is one of a number of words, which, prior to the Common Era, occur in 2 Maccabees and nowhere else, except in epigraphical documents.[77] This is the case of εὐαπάντητος (14:9),[78] of προήγορος (7:2, 4),[79] of ὑπεραγόντως (7:20),[80] and possibly of ἱέρωμα (12:40), which will be discussed further down in this chapter (3.3.3). The inscriptional attestations of

---

[74] See Rutgers 1995, 194–95. Cf. van der Horst 1991, 62–68, 132–33.

[75] Cf. Panagopoulos 1977, 215: ". . . *philopolitês*, employé par Plutarque dans une anecdote remontant à Théopompe, roi de Sparte à l'époque archaïque, mais qui est un mot d'époque romaine d'après les inscriptions."

[76] The possibility that the epitomator worked in Asia Minor was put forward hesitantly by Bickerman (2007g, 461): "He [sc. the epitomator] was a Jew who thought in Greek, writing in Syria (or Asia Minor?) towards the end of the second century before the Common Era, for Greek or hellenized readers." It is interesting that van Henten (1986, 149) has suggested that 4 Maccabees, a book that draws on 2 Maccabees, might have been written in Asia Minor, perhaps in a city of Cilicia.

[77] ἀπαρασήμαντος also occurs in Ps.-Demetrius' epistolary treatise, which, in the form that we know it, probably dates to the Common Era. See supra 3.2.1.

[78] Aside from 2 Maccabees, this very rare adjective is attested in an honorary decree of Aegina (*IG IV* 1.26), dated to 158–144 BCE, and in a funerary inscription from Kos (*Iscr. di Kos (Fun.)* EF 610.4), dated to the first century BCE. It recurs in the turn of the second century CE in Clement of Alexandria (*Strom.* 7.7.45.2) and much later in the writings of Theodore the Studite. An honorary decree from Apollonia on the Black Sea (*IGBulg I*^{2} 390.6), dated to the second or first century BCE (before 72 BCE), preserves the synonymous adjective εὐυπάντητος, which is an absolute *hapax legomenon*. Also epigraphically attested is the very rare εὐέντευκτος, one of the instances of which in a Koan honorary decree for Augustus (*IvO* 53 [bef. 4 CE] l. 28 [τὴν ἑ]αυτοῦ φιλανθρωπίαν εὐέντευκτον κατασκευά|[ζων]) provides a parallel with 2 Macc 14:9 (καθ' ἣν ἔχεις πρὸς ἅπαντας εὐαπάντητον φιλανθρωπίαν), as Robert (1935, 336) has pointed out.

[79] See Chapter 8.

[80] This *tris legomenon* is first attested in a letter of King Attalus II (*IK Pessinous* 7.7) dated to 158–156 BCE (see Welles 1934, 245–47, 250). After 2 Maccabees, it recurs in the third century CE, in Porphyry's *Homeric Questions on the Iliad* (*ad Il.* 18.100.4).

these very rare words are geographically located in Asia Minor and the Aegean islands. This may be a clue to the place of composition of the epitome, but may also be due to the fact that these areas have bequeathed us an especially large amount of epigraphical material. The dates of the documents in which the words occur vary. προήγορος, for example, is first attested as early as the fourth century BCE, but the bulk of its instances belong to the Roman Imperial period; εὐαπάντητος and ὑπεραγόντως are attested as late as the 150s BCE and φιλοπολίτης, as we saw, perhaps as late as the first century BCE. The chronological clues that they provide are precious, yet one has to keep in mind that these and other *verba rara* had presumably a more extended lifespan and a higher frequency of occurrence than those that the vagaries of survival of ancient Greek texts allow us to assume.

3.3 Second type of doubtful neologisms

The second type of doubtful neologisms includes words that appear to be attested prior to 2 Maccabees in texts fraught with textual uncertainties.

3.3.1 ἐπανδρόω 'to make manly'

> 15:17 λόγοις πάνυ καλοῖς καὶ δυναμένοις ἐπ' ἀρετὴν παρορμῆσαι καὶ ψυχὰς νέων ἐπανδρῶσαι

ἐπανδρόω, in 2 Macc 15:17, would have been an absolute *hapax legomenon*, were it not for a single other, dubious instance in Apollonius Rhodius' *Argonautica*. At 1.874, although most textual witnesses read ἐσανδρώσῃ, the latest editors[81] adopt the *varia lectio* ἐπανδρώσῃ: τὸν δ' ἐνὶ λέκτροις / Ὑψιπύλης εἰᾶτε πανήμερον, εἰσόκε Λῆμνον / παισὶν ἐπανδρώσῃ, "as for that fellow [sc. Jason] let him spend all day long in Hypsipyle's bed until he populates Lemnos with boys."[82] Platt (1920, 74) provides the rationale for this choice: "ἐσανδρώσῃ. So edd. with all MSS. but G, which has ἐπανδρώσῃ. As the sense is *re*-plenish, G must be right, for ἐπί in compounds frequently has this force whereas ἐς has not." Vian (1970, 93–94), the Budé editor of the *Argonautica*, justifies his preference of ἐπανδρόω over ἐσανδρόω thus:

> Le choix entre ἐπ-, ἐσ-, ἐν-ανδρώσῃ[83] est délicat. Nous optons pour la première forme, leçon de *w*, car elle nous paraît la plus apte à marquer l'ironie dont le scholiaste fait état. Il

[81] H. Fränkel in the Oxford Classical Texts series (1961) and F. Vian in the Budé series (1974).

[82] Trans. W.H. Race, LCL.

[83] As if the choice between the two types (ἐπανδρώσῃ-ἐσανδρώσῃ) attested in the MSS was not difficult enough, West (1963, 10) gratuitously suggested a third possibility: "εἰσανδρόω does not occur elsewhere; nor does ἐπανδρόω, except perhaps once in the Septuagint (2 Macc xv. 17), where it would have the sense

ne s'agit pas seulement pour Jason de peupler Lemnos avec des enfants mâles, mais de *viriliser* une Lemnos tombée aux mains des femmes: le jeu de mots est d'autant plus mordant que, pour réussir pareil exploit, Jason aurait une conduite aussi peu virile que possible, puisqu'il préférerait vivre aux pieds d'Hypsipyle plutôt que d'affronter des épreuves dignes d'un héros.

LSJ cites A.R. 1.874 for εἰσανδρόω, "fill with men,"[84] and 2 Macc 15:17 for ἐπανδρόω, "make manly." The Revised Supplement (1996, 123), s.v. ἐπανδρόω, adds: "2. *fill with men*, Λῆμνον A.R. 1.874 (v.l. ἐσ-)." *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* confusingly cites A.R. 1.874 under two different lemmas: s.v. ἐπανδρόω, "to depopulate" [*sic*],[85] together with 2 Macc 15:17, "to make manly," and s.v. εἰσανδρόω, "to populate." εἰσανδρόω recurs only once in subsequent literature, in the seventeenth-century poem *Hellas* (l. 708) by Leo Alatius. The adjective ἔπανδρος, "manly," from which ἐπανδρόω derives, appears to be first attested in a fragment (110 de Falco) of the fourth-century BCE orator Demades. Its attestations start clustering from the first century BCE onwards (*SEG* 51:1427.7,11 [78 BCE]; Phld. *Ir.* fr. 17, col. 31.17; D.S. 5.50.2), although the adverb ἐπάνδρως is epigraphically attested already in the second century BCE (*IG II*^{2} 1006.78 [122/1 BCE]; *IosPE I*^{2} 352.6 [ca. 107 BCE]; *TAM II* 582.7 [bef. 100 BCE]). The author of 2 Maccabees could very well have coined ἐπανδρόω independently of any previous instances, in Apollonius Rhodius or elsewhere.[86]

3.3.2 ἐφηβία 'ephebic institution'

4:9 ἐὰν ἐπιχορηγηθῇ διὰ τῆς ἐξουσίας αὐτοῦ γυμνάσιον καὶ ἐφηβίαν αὐτῷ συστήσασθαι

Early commentators and editors thought it necessary to emend the MSS reading ἐφηβίαν,[87] at 4:9, to ἐφηβεῖον[88] on the basis of a passage in Strabo (5.4.7.13 Meineke),[89] where the latter term, denoting, according to LSJ, the "principal court in the

of ἀνδρόω. The sense required in the present passage is 'populate with men'; for this one would expect *ἐνανδρόω, corresponding to *ἔνανδρος."

[84] Cf. See *Scholia in Apollonium Rhodium vetera,* p. 74.15 Wendel ἐσανδρώσῃ: ἀνδρῶν πληρώσῃ, εἰρωνικῶς.

[85] This must be a translation error, since Montanari's *Vocabolario della lingua greca* (2nd ed., 2004), on which *The Brill Dictionary of Ancient Greek* (2015) is based, gives the correct definition s.v. ἐπανδρόω: "popolare."

[86] On the possible acquaintance of the author of 2 Maccabees with the poetry of Apollonius Rhodius, see 7.7, footnote 120.

[87] On the spelling, see LSJ, s.v.; Hanhart 1961, [437] 15n2; Walters 1973, 40.

[88] Grotius 1776, 328, followed by Grimm 1857, 80. The emendation was adopted by Rahlfs in his *Septuaginta*.

[89] The text reads πλεῖστα δ' ἴχνη τῆς Ἑλληνικῆς ἀγωγῆς ἐνταῦθα [i.e. in Neapolis, Italy] σῴζεται, γυμνάσιά τε καὶ ἐφηβεῖα καὶ φρατρίαι καὶ ὀνόματα Ἑλληνικά. Jüthner ("Ephebeum," PW 5, col. 2737) suggests emending ἐφηβεῖα to ἐφηβεία.

παλαίστρα," is juxtaposed with γυμνάσιον, as in 2 Macc 4:9. Hanhart rightly retained the original reading, which is supported by the Old Latin translations into the bargain. The earliest literary attestation of ἐφηβεία is found in an epigram of Antipater of Sidon (*AP* 7.467), whose floruit may be placed around 140–130 BCE.[90] Antipater uses it in the sense of "youth," which is the one given for this word by ancient lexicographers.[91] In 2 Macc 4:9, however, the word designates the ephebate, a military and civic training institution for the youths of a polis, originally established in Athens and thence spread to some 190 cities throughout the Greek world up to the fourth century CE.[92] Although this institution is attested as early as the 30s of the fourth century BCE in literary texts such as Aristotle's *The Athenian Constitution* (42) and in a number of ephebic inscriptions,[93] the term that designates it, ἐφηβεία, is attested much later. Its first undisputed instance in the PHI database is in an Attic inscription from 100/99 BCE (*IG II*^{2} 1028.42). In *IG II*^{2} 1008.29–30, from 118/7 BCE, τῆς [ἐφη] | βείας can be restored with confidence on contextual grounds, whereas in *SEG* 26:98.21 and *IG II*^{2} 700.16, both from the third century BCE, the word has been postulated in lines heavily but reasonably restored.[94] Kennell (2006, 112) additionally refers to an inscription (*SGO* 1 05/02/02, a funerary epigram for an eighteen-year-old ephebe) found in the area of the Nymphaion, near Smyrna, in which the θεσμὸς ἐφηβείης is mentioned. The date that he gives is "150–100a," yet, the editors of the inscription (Merkelbach and Stauber 1998, 556) date it to the first century BCE or CE.

3.3.3 ἱέρωμα 'figurine representing a deity'

> 12:40 εὗρον δὲ ἑκάστου τῶν τεθνηκότων ὑπὸ τοὺς χιτῶνας ἱερώματα τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰαμνείας εἰδώλων, ἀφ' ὧν ὁ νόμος ἀπείργει τοὺς Ἰουδαίους

LSJ, s.v. ἱέρωμα, gives "*consecrated object, offering*, *ἰαρώματα Supp.Epigr.* 1.414.7 (Crete, v/iv B.C., nisi leg. *ἀρώματα*); *ἰαρ*[*ώ*]*ματα IG* 4.917 (Epid., iv B.C.), cf. LXX 2 *Ma.* 12.40, J. *AJ* 1.19.10, Dam. *Isid.* 71. II. = *σκόλλυς* (Lacon.), Hsch." The Revised Supplement of 1996, s.v., suggests the following modification: "for '*consecrated object, offering*' read '*sacred image*'; line 2, for '*ἰαρώματα . . . ἀρώματα*)' read '*ἰαρώματα Inscr.Cret.* 4.145.7 (Gortyn, iv B.C)'; line 3, delete '*ἰαρ*[*ώ*]*ματα IG* 4.917 (Epid., iv B.C.; read *ἰαρ*[*ε*]*ῖα τὰ*).'"

---

[90] Gow and Page (1965, 1:xv; 2:32) place Antipater of Sidon's death (or the collection of his epigrams) at about 125 BCE. Argentieri (2007, 147–48, 152) assigns him to 180/170–100 BCE.

[91] See Hsch. ε 7430 ἐφηβίαν· νεότητα; Suid. ε 3888 ἐφηβεία: νεότης. ἡ ἀκμὴ τῆς ἡλικίας.

[92] See Kennell 2006, vii–xv.

[93] See Friend 2009, 4–8; Casey 2013; Kennell 2006. For the ἐφηβεία in the papyri (attested from the first to the third centuries CE), see Montevecchi 1973, 183–84.

[94] See Friend 2009, 8n14.

The second of the two epigraphical documents cited by LSJ is a fourth-century BCE inscription from Epidaurus, recording a decree granting privileges to the Astypalaians. Its slightly damaged lines 8–11 read, in Fraenkel's (1902, 192–93) restoration, καὶ τὰ ἱαρ[ώ]ματα (τὰ) | τ]ῶν Ἀστυπαλ[αι]έων πέμπεσ|θα]ι σὺν τᾶι τ[ῶν] Ἐπιδαυρίων | πομ]πᾶι. Fraenkel ill-advisedly rejected Dittenberger's conjecture ἱα[ρεῖ]α, "sacrificial animals," in line 8, which would have fitted perfectly into the context ("the sacrificial animals of the Astypalaians are to take part in the procession of the Epidaurians"), on the grounds that the reading was incompatible with the letters that remain on the stone (p. 193: "Quod coniecit Dittenb. τὰ ἱα[ρεῖ]α τά repugnat lapidi"). When, in 1929, Hiller von Gaertringen re-edited this Epidaurian inscription (*IG IV*^{2}*,1* 47), he adopted the reading ἱα[ρεῖ]α, noting that the previous editors had been misled in their restoration by cracks in the stone (p. 7: "8 ἱα[ρεῖ]α, τὰ Hi. ἱαρ[ώ]ματα priores, fissuris decepti"). Robert (1981, 518), who called attention to this correction, did not miss the opportunity to point out the necessity of always checking for the latest edition of an inscription.[95]

The other epigraphical text cited by LSJ is a Cretan inscription from Gortyn, dated to ca. 400 BCE, wherein the type ἰαρώματα occurs twice. The text of this fragmentary, badly damaged inscription was first edited by Comparetti (1921), who offered an imaginative rather than reliable restoration and interpretation of it. According to this epigraphist, the inscription preserves a decree by which the Gortynians provided a physician from Tralleis, whom they had recruited during an epidemic that plagued their city, with the medical supplies that were necessary for the exercise of his art. In line 7, which preserves the letters [. . .]ΟΝΚΙΑΡΩΜΑΤ[. . .], Comparetti read *F*|οῖν]ον κ' ἰαρώματ[α], the latter word being, as he believed, a miswriting of ἀρώματα, "perfumes." Since perfumes were used not only for medicinal, disinfecting purposes, but also in cultic worship, the epigraphist assumed that ἀρώματα was commonly spelled as ἱαρώματα.[96] In line 12, he read [θύ|ματα κ' ἰα]ρώματα (ἐ)[πὶ τ]ῶν χόννων, the last word presumably designating the recipients for keeping perfumes and incenses. Schwyzer (1923, 93) accepted Comparetti's restoration and interpretation, noting that the κ(ι) preceding

[95] "Rechercher s'il n'y a pas eu quelque édition plus récente d'une inscription n'est pas l'effet d'une aspiration pédantesque à l'exhaustivité de la bibliographie; s'est un scrupule nécessaire qui peut mener à des changements de position radicaux."

[96] P. 199: "κἰαρώματα: della voce ἱέρωμα non si ha esempio che nel II dei Maccabei (c. 12 v. 40) ove indica oggetti sacri a idoli (*donaria idolorum*). Qui ἱαρώματα è erroneamente scritto, come forse pur si diceva, per ἀρώματα, voce che spesso va unita all'altra che più oltre leggiamo, θύματα, come pur si vede nelle intestazioni degli Inni Orfici. È noto quanta parte avessero nel culto ἀρώματα καὶ θύματα e quanta pure nell'uso medico di cui esclusivamente si tratta qui, benchè non senza ricordare l'uso sacro pel quale appunto potè avvenire che volgarmente si dicesse ἱαρώματα per ἀρώματα ed anche che così si scrivesse in atti ufficiali qual era questo"; p. 201: "Ma le principali sostanze purificatrici e disinfettanti, sulle quali più insiste il decreto, sono gli aromi e i profumi che disinfettavano così le persone come l'ambiente colle loro fumigazioni. . . . Gli aromi eran tanto di uso religioso anzitutto, che qui li vediam chiamati, non ἀρώματα ma ἱαρώματα."

ἀρώματα may be a reduced form of καί before a vowel-initial word.[97] On the basis of a careful re-examination of the inscription, Guarducci (1942, 177–85; 1950, 211–14) rejected Comparetti's fanciful restoration and suggested instead that the epigraphical document in question is a sacred law listing objects and ingredients provided by the civic and religious authorities of Gortyn for the worship rendered to Ares and perhaps Eos in a common sanctuary. With regard to the term ἰαρώματα, Guarducci considered arbitrary Comparetti's change of ἰαρώματα to ἀρώματα, yet expressed uncertainty as to the meaning of the word. As she noted, Hesychius glosses ἱάρωμα as κοσμάριον παιδικόν. μηνίσκοι, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα, "child's little ornament; neck-ornaments, and suchlike,"[98] but this meaning hardly fits the context in the Gortynian inscription, and besides ἰάρωμα, there, lacks aspiration; the latter fact makes it also difficult to assume that ἰαρώματα is a Doric form of ἱερώματα, "consecrated objects."[99]

According to the most recent and plausible restoration and interpretation of the inscription by Manganaro (1978), the Gortynian text refers to the agrarian and pastoral cult of Zeus Tallaios and enumerates offerings made to the god such as sacrificial animals, agricultural first-fruits, wine, wool, etc., as well as the utensils used in the worship. In lines 7 and 11–12, Manganaro reads κ' ἰαρώματ[α] and παρέχε[ν ἅμ|α ἰα]ρώματα ἐ[πὶ τ]ῶν χόννων ἀλη[τά], respectively, taking ἰαρώματα to be a Cretan variant, with prefixed iota, of ἀρώματα, that is, aromatic herbs that were grinded and put into ritual vases.[100]

In her study of the language of Cretan inscriptions, Bile (1988, 357) states that ιαρωματα, in *IC IV* 45.7, is a late term, meaning "offerings, consecrated objects," and that it is epigraphically attested elsewhere (in Epidaurus).[101] Yet, as we saw above,

---

[97] "ἰαρ. = ἀρώματα C. (scribendum videtur κ(α)ὶ ἀρ.; fortasse est κί loco formae καί; καί et κί iuxta occurrunt in tit. Beroeensi aet. Nervae imp. *Ἀρχ. Δελτ.* 2, 148."

[98] According to Hesychius, at Sparta the word was used of the κόννος, that is, the tuft left on the head when one offered one's hair to the gods: ι 331 ἱέρωμα τὸν κόννον Λάκωνες, ὅν τινες μαλλὸν <ἢ> σκόλλυν. See *DELG* and *EDG* s.v. σκόλλυς. Suidas informs us that κόννος was some sort of ornament given to girls: κ 2047 κόννους· ἐδωρεῖτο δὲ πᾶσι τὰ πρέποντα, τοῖς μὲν παισὶ κόννους καὶ ψέλλια, τοῖς δὲ νεανίσκοις δραμβὰς καὶ μαχαίρας. Hesychius' gloss of ἱάρωμα as κοσμάριον παιδικόν. μηνίσκοι, καὶ τὰ τοιαῦτα and of ἱέρωμα as κόννος are probably to be connected with Suidas' gloss of κόννος.

[99] Guarducci 1942, 182: "È arbitrario cambiare ἰαρώματα in ἀρώματα"; ib. 184: "Che cosa significhi questa parola è molto incerto. Una glossa di Esichio spiega ἱάρωμα con κοσμάριον παιδικόν; ma non si vede che cosa c'entrino qui gli ornamenti infantili, senza contare che lo ἰάρωμα della nostra epigrafe non ha l'aspirazione. Si potrebbe anche pensare, e per il senso ci troveremmo meglio, alla forma dorica della voce ἱερώματα indicante oggetti consacrati; ma anche in questo caso la difficoltà relativa alla mancanza di aspirazione resta intatta"; ead. 1950, 213: "Vox ἱαρώματα quid potissimum significet, incertum. An vocis ἱερώματα forma Dorica est res consecratas indicans? (cfr. Liddell-Scott, s.v.; qui tamen exemplum Epidaurium, *I.G.*, IV^2, 47, 8, haud recte adducit. An etiam Hesychii glossa, ἱάρωμα· κοσμάριον παιδικόν, huc referri potest?"

[100] P. 57: "Nel primo termine di linea 4 [sc. κ' ἰήρια] . . . andrà ritrovato il rendimento cretese di ἔρια ('lane') con un iota prolettico, come nel caso di ἰαρώματα per ἀρώματα. . . . Nella seconda espressione di linea 7 si tratterà di una variante cretese di ἀρώματα, 'erbe aromatiche', le sole che 'macinate' potevano essere contenute 'dentro i *chonnoi* (vasetti rituali)', ἐ[πὶ τ]ῶν χόννων ἀλη[τά]."

[101] "Le substantive, au pl., ιαρωματ[α] G *145* l. 7 (IVe siècle) "offrande, objet consacré", est un terme tardif et connu épigraphiquement (à Épidaure)."

ἱαρώματα does not occur in the Epidaurian inscription; moreover, the Gortynian inscription lists, as far as we can tell, specific products and utensils used in worship, which makes it difficult to accept that the term in question could mean something as generic as "offerings, consecrated objects." Most importantly, none of the aforementioned Italian epigraphists who studied the inscription from Gortyn accepts unreservedly that ιαρωματα=ἱερώματα: Comparetti and Manganaro equated ἰαρώματα to ἀρώματα, whereas Guarducci remained sceptical. To go back to LSJ and its Revised Supplement, one can only approve of the correction regarding the Epidaurian inscription, but one fails to see on the authority of which epigraphist the lexicographers decided to replace the comment "*ἰαρώματα* . . . nisi leg. *ἀρώματα*" with "*ἱαρώματα*," nor is it clear whether the latter should be understood as meaning "sacred images," according to the Supplement's revised gloss. As will be shown below, for the latter gloss the Revised Supplement is indebted to Robert (1981, 519), who, however, does not pronounce on the readings of the Gortyn inscription.

Coming to 2 Macc 12:40, the exact nature of the ἱερώματα τῶν ἀπὸ Ἰαμνείας εἰδώλων that were found under the tunics of the Jews killed in Idumaea has been a matter of debate. Abel (1949, 444n40) and Goldstein (1983, 448–49) believe that the ἱερώματα in question were precious objects, gold and silver ornaments or vessels dedicated to the idols of Iamneia, that Judas' soldiers looted when they raided the temples of that city. Robert (1981, 517–19), among others, finds it unlikely that the soldiers carried their loot with them in battle and argues that the ἱερώματα τῶν εἰδώλων were rather little idols of the gods of Iamneia, statuettes or miniature relief plaques, sacred images of the idols, or protective amulets that the soldiers wore on their bodies.[102] The idols in question may have been those of Heracles and Hauronas, which an inscription found in the sanctuary of the gods of Iamneia on Delos names as "the gods who rule over Iamneia."[103] Goldstein (1983, 449) counter-argues that (a) it was the soldiers' greed that caused them to steal and keep precious sacred objects rather than the faith they put in pagan gods, (b) "there is no ancient context in which *hierôma* can be shown to mean 'amulet'," and (c) ancient witnesses (namely the Old Latin translations

[102] P. 519: "Les *hiérômata* trouvés sur le corps des Hébreux tués en Idumée sont les petites idoles des dieux de Iamneia, comme le fait d'ailleurs attendre l'expression ἱερώματα τῶν εἰδώλων, petites statuettes en ronde-bosse ou petites plaques en reliefs, . . . idoles protectrices, amulettes, 'images sacrées des idoles.'"

[103] *ID* 2308.1–3 Ἡρακλῇ καὶ Αὐρώ|νᾳ, θεοῖς Ἰάμνει|αν κατέχουσιν. The inscription, dated to the end of the second or the beginning of the first century BCE (Bruneau 1970, 475), commemorates the erection of the sanctuary by three Iamnites, who dedicate it to the patron gods of their native place. According to Lévy (1965, 65–69), Heracles is to be identified with Baal Zebub or Zebul, the healing god of Akkaron, a city near Iamneia, to which the latter was subordinate in pre-Maccabean times. Baal Zebub was so renowned for his power to heal that even King Ahaziah of Israel (9th c. BCE), injured after a fall, sent men to consult him regarding his recovery. Ahaziah's punishment for seeking recourse to a god other than Yahweh was not to recover and die (2 Kgs 1:1–16). Judas' soldiers, seven centuries later, notes Lévy, were likewise punished with death by Yahweh for having put their trust in the protective power of Baal Zebub. The second god mentioned in the inscription, Hauronas, is to be identified with the Canaanite god Horon (Bruneau 1979, 410, 475; Isaac 1991, 139–40).

and a number of Lucianic MSS of 2 Maccabees)[104] support the view that the ἱερώματα were gold and silver ornaments or vessels dedicated to pagan gods. With regard to (a), it should be noted that neither 1 nor 2 Maccabees makes any mention of a raid on the temples of Iamneia. First Maccabees 5:58–60 relates the thwarted attack on the city of Iamneia by Judas' disobedient commanders Joseph and Azariah that resulted in two thousand Jewish casualties; 2 Macc 12:9 mentions the night attack of Judas' army upon the harbour of Iamneia and the burning of its ships (τοῖς Ἰαμνίταις νυκτὸς ἐπιβαλὼν ὑφῆψε τὸν λιμένα σὺν τῷ στόλῳ).[105] That "on either occasion, Jews may have plundered shrines outside the walls and concealed the loot under their tunics," as Goldstein (1983, 448) writes, is merely a hypothesis. Moreover, the soldiers who bore the ἱερώματα were not killed right after the attacks to Iamneia, but after several subsequent military operations, recounted in 2 Macc 12:10–40, from which a lot of booty must have been gathered; why would the soldiers in question, after all these operations, still carry under their clothes the booty taken specifically from Iamneia? With regard to (b) and (c), it should be remarked that, indeed, there is no ancient context in which ἱέρωμα means 'amulet,' but there is no ancient context in which it is used of gold and silver objects consecrated to gods, either. What Goldstein fails to mention is that there are literary, as well as epigraphical and papyrological, witnesses, chronologically earlier than or contemporary with the Old Latin translations of 2 Maccabees, which support the assumption that the ἱερώματα τῶν εἰδώλων were statuettes or sacred images of the idols.

The literary evidence is found in Josephus, who uses ἱέρωμα twice. The first time is in his retelling of Jacob's flight from Laban in Gen 31. In *AJ* 1.322, Laban orders a search to be made in order to find the ἱερώματα that had been stolen from his house (περὶ τῶν ἱερωμάτων ἐκέλευεν ἔρευναν ποιεῖσθαι). These ἱερώματα, which Josephus had earlier designated as τύποι τῶν θεῶν and ἱερὰ πάτρια, are said to have been objects of veneration and worship in his family ever since the time of his forefathers.[106] Rachel, who had stolen them, hid them in the pack-saddle of her camel and sat upon it, so that they would not be found during the search (κατατίθησι τοὺς τύπους εἰς τὴν σάγην τῆς φερούσης αὐτὴν καμήλου). In the corresponding passages in the Septuagint of Genesis, the Greek translator uses the terms εἴδωλα and οἱ θεοί[107] to render 'teraphim' (תְּרָפִים) and 'elohim' (אֱלֹהֵי), respectively. The first of the two Hebrew terms occurs in the Old Testament fifteen times, yet, as T.J. Lewis ("Teraphim," *DDD* 846) notes, "the number

[104] Most of the Old Latin translators understood ἱερώματα as referring to votive offerings (La^{V} donariis idolorum; La^{BM} idolorum dona; La^{P} dona simulacrorum). La^{X} speaks of the plates (apparently of precious metal) with which the idols of the sanctuaries of Iamneia were covered (de sacrariis yamnie laminas simulacrorum). The Lucianic MSS 19 62 93 542 have χρυσώματα.

[105] The "harbour of Iamneia" (Iamneia-on-the-Sea) was actually a separate entity from the inland town of Iamneia, located approximately 8 km away from it. See Isaac 1991, 139.

[106] *AJ* 1.310 τοὺς τύπους τῶν θεῶν, οὓς σέβειν πατρίους ὄντας νόμιμον ἦν; 1.311 τοὺς δὲ τύπους ἐπεφέρετο τῶν θεῶν; 1.316 ἱερά τε πάτρια . . . ὑπό τε τῶν ἐμῶν τιμηθέντα προγόνων καὶ ὑπ' ἐμοῦ θρησκείας τῆς αὐτῆς ἐκείνοις ἀξιωθέντα.

[107] Gen 31:19 ἔκλεψεν δὲ Ῥαχὴλ τὰ εἴδωλα τοῦ πατρὸς αὐτῆς; 31:30 ἵνα τί ἔκλεψας τοὺς θεούς μου; Cf. 31:32, 34, 35.

of conjectures regarding the identity and function of the *tĕrāpîm* surely would be tabulated in several multiples of fifteen." Indeed, with respect to their function, the teraphim have been associated, inter alia, with fertility, necromancy, divination, protection and healing, and property and inheritance rights.[108] As to their form, it is generally agreed that they were anthropomorphic objects, the size of which varied: the teraphim in 1 Sam 19:13–16 appears to have been life-size; the ones in Gen 31:34 cannot have had a height of more than 30–35 cm, since they could be hidden in a camel's saddlebag.[109] The latter were apparently household figurines representing divine beings, since they are also referred to as "gods," yet, as van der Toorn (1990) has suggested, they might as well have been ancestor figurines.

The second instance of ἱέρωμα in Josephus occurs in *AJ* 1.119, where the historian, speaking of the plain of Senaar in Babylonia, quotes Hestiaeus: μνημονεύει Ἑστιαῖος λέγων οὕτως· τῶν δὲ ἱερέων τοὺς διασωθέντας τὰ τοῦ Ἐνυαλίου Διὸς ἱερώματα λαβόντας εἰς Σεναὰρ τῆς Βαβυλωνίας ἐλθεῖν. H.St.J. Thackeray, in his translation of the *Jewish Antiquities* for the LCL, translates the quoted passage thus: "Now the priests who escaped took the sacred vessels of Zeus Enyalius and came to Senaar in Babylonia." However, in light of the preceding discussion, it seems more likely that the ἱερώματα which the priests who escaped the flood took with them were cultic statues of Zeus rather than vessels consecrated to his worship.

The question that arises here is whether the word ἱέρωμα occurred in the original text of Hestiaeus quoted by Josephus and whether the latter quoted faithfully from it. Of Hestiaeus we know next to nothing. Josephus refers to him in *AJ* 1.107 as the author of a Phoenician history. F. Jacoby ("Histiaios," 3, PW 8, col. 2050) dates him to the Late Hellenistic or the Roman period. The formula introducing Josephus' quotation seems to indicate that the historian renders his quote verbatim. Yet, this may not be so. Immediately before the quotation from Hestiaeus, Josephus quotes a passage on the tower of Babel from the third Sibylline Oracle, which he introduces with the same formula that he uses in the Hestiaeus quotation (1.118 μέμνηται καὶ Σίβυλλα λέγουσα οὕτως). In reality, Josephus quotes in prose verses 99–104 from Sib. Or. 3 not at first hand, but at second hand, through Alexander Polyhistor. If we compare Polyhistor's paraphrase of Sib. Or. 3.99–104, as transmitted by Georgius Syncellus (*Ecl. Chron.* 46 Mosshammer), with its quotation by Josephus, we see that the latter made minor lexical changes to the text of his source, e.g. converted Polyhistor's πύργον ὑπερμεγέθη and τοῦ δὲ θεοῦ ἀνέμους ἐμφυσήσαντος to the more prosaic πύργον ὑψηλότατον and οἱ δὲ θεοὶ ἀνέμους ἐπιπέμψαντες, respectively. Hence, we cannot be sure that Josephus did not make similar changes in his quotation from Hestiaeus and cannot confidently assert that the word ἱέρωμα occurred in Hestiaeus' text.

Let us now move to the Common Era epigraphical and papyrological attestations of ἱέρωμα, which have been ignored by LSJ and the commentators on 2 Maccabees. Three

[108] See T.J. Lewis, "Teraphim," *DDD* 846–50.

[109] See van der Toorn 1990, 205–11.

inscriptions bear the word. The first (*Bean-Mitford, Journeys 1964–68* 21,4) is from eastern Pamphylia and is carved in a panel on the rock face above a stream issuing from a cave; niches are found above and below the panel. The inscription records that a legionary, who had served in the Legio VI Ferrata, was discharged by Vespasian after twenty-seven years of service and, returning to his native place, dedicated an ἱέρωμα to the local Apollo (ll. 10–11 ἀνέθηκ[ε] | τὸ ἱέρωμα Ἀπόλλωνι). It is not known what this ἱέρωμα was; possibly a small statue placed in one of the niches above or below the inscription. Bean and Mitford (1970, 22) simply note that the adjacent cave, "while in itself spectacular enough, shows no other trace of worship; and its nameless Apollo can have been known to few indeed other than the natives of these parts." The earliest date to which the inscription can be assigned is 72 CE. The second inscription is also from Pamphylia (*IK Perge* 177) and has been dated by Şahin (1999, 196) to the time of the Antonines, around the mid-second century CE. It is carved on the base of a cultic statue of Apollo (smaller than life-size), dedicated by a certain Diodorus, son of Eumelus (ll. 3–6 τὸ ἱέρωμα | τοῦ Ἀπόλλω|νος ἐκ τῶν ἰδί|ων καθιέρωσε). The third inscription (*IGBulg II* 671) is from Nikopolis-on-Istros, in present-day Bulgaria, and dates from the Roman period, which in that area began in the first century CE. It is inscribed in the lower part of a marble relief (height 15 cm, length 27 cm), preserving two human feet and the lower part of an animal—possibly a depiction of Bacchus[110]—and records the donation of the ἱέρωμα (by which term the marble relief is presumably to be understood) by the three donors named at the beginning of the inscription (l. 3 [τ]ὸ ἱέρωμα ἐδωρήσαντον τῷ κοινῷ).

The papyrological attestations of ἱέρωμα come from the second and third centuries CE. They occur in three invitations to dinner in honour of Isis.[111] The exact nature of the ἱέρωμα Ἴσιδος mentioned in these invitations eludes us. Presumably it was a cult dinner, staged in a private house or the Iseum, on the occasion of a festival of Isis.[112] Similar dinners were held in honour of Sarapis, as can be deduced from some twenty invitations to a κλίνη (banquet) of Sarapis (and one to a κλίνη of Anubis), which are of the same type as the Isis invitations and employ the same phraseology. In his Hymn to Sarapis, which is roughly contemporary with some of these invitations, Aelius Aristeides makes mention of such dinners, which the god was invited to preside at both as host and guest.[113] Indeed, in one of the κλίνη invitations it is the god himself who invites his guests to dinner.[114] Youtie (1948, 13–14) and Castiglione (1961, 302) consider it likely

---

[110] See Mihailov 1958, 110 and 671.

[111] *P.Fouad* 76.1–4 ἐρωτᾷ σε Σαραποῦς δειπνῆσαι εἰς ἱέρωμα τῆς κυρίας Ἴσιδος ἐν τῇ οἰκίᾳ; *P.Oxy.* 66.4539.2–3 ἐρωτᾷ σε Ταῦρις δειπνῆσαι εἰς ἱέρωμα τῆς κυρίας Ἴσειδος ἐν τῷ Ἰσείῳ; *P.Oxy.* 75.5056.1–2 ἐρωτᾷ σε Ἀλεξάνδρα δειπ[νῆσαι] εἰς ἱέρωμα ἐν τῷ Ἰσίῳ.

[112] See the comment of D. Montserrat in Gonis et al. 1999, 227–28.

[113] Aristid. *Εἰς τὸν Σάραπιν*, p. 54 Jebb: καὶ τοίνυν καὶ θυσιῶν μόνῳ τούτῳ θεῷ διαφερόντως κοινωνοῦσιν ἄνθρωποι τὴν ἀκριβῆ κοινωνίαν, καλοῦντές τε ἐφ' ἑστίαν καὶ προϊστάμενοι δαιτυμόνα αὐτὸν καὶ ἑστιάτορα.

[114] *P.Köln* 1.57 καλεῖ σε ὁ θεὸς εἰς κλείνην γεινο(μένην) ἐν τῷ Θοηρείῳ αὔριον ἀπὸ ὥρ(ας) θ΄.

that the participants in a Sarapis κλίνη honoured the god with a sacrifice and that, the κλίνη being a *theoxenion* ("a table spread before the god"), the god was represented by his statue if the dinner took place in a temple, or by statuettes if it took place in a private home. We may conjecture that the ἱέρωμα Ἴσιδος also involved a cult meal, where an image of the goddess was displayed and a sacrifice was offered to her. The gloss of Hesychius s.v. ἱερώματα, "θυσίαι θεῖαι, θαυμασταί," may be relevant to the interpretation of ἱέρωμα in this context. One more papyrological instance of ἱέρωμα in the sense of "sacrifice" is found in a fragment of an alchemical papyrus dating from before 400 CE, which contains a recipe for dyeing animal skins.[115]

In the fourth century CE, Cyril of Alexandria uses ἱέρωμα of Abel's sacrificial offerings to the Lord,[116] and, in the twelfth century, Eustathius of Thessalonica, in his commentary on the *Iliad*, uses it of Odysseus' sacrifice to Athena, at which the hero was to dedicate not an animal but Dolon's arms to the goddess.[117] The only other occurrence of ἱέρωμα in literature is found in Damascius' *Life of Isidorus*, from the sixth century CE, in a disjoined passage of which (transmitted by Photius) the philosopher speaks vaguely of an ἱέρωμα that some people secretly broke and destroyed, with the result that, deprived of the divine help provided by it, the local Egyptians could hardly preserve the harbour.[118] Haas (2007, 475–76) asserts that the ἱέρωμα in question was a statue of Isis Pharia, "the patroness of sailors, whose shrine was close to the great lighthouse of Pharos."[119]

Having surveyed all the surviving occurrences of the word ἱέρωμα, we may now sum up the conclusions that emerge: (a) ἱέρωμα is not attested prior to 2 Maccabees; a question mark remains about the ἰ/ἱαρώματα attested in the Gortyn inscription, (b) its literary, epigraphical, and papyrological attestations are clustered between the first and the sixth centuries CE, (c) it is not attested between 2 Maccabees and Josephus; its occurrence in Hestiaeus, a historian predating Josephus, is doubtful, (d) in most of its instances, it denotes a cult figurine or statue of variable size; in its late instances, it denotes a sacrifice or a sacrificial offering, (e) in 2 Maccabees the term ἱερώματα should be understood as denoting figurines representing the gods of Iamneia, which the Jewish

---

[115] *P.Fior.* 57–61 ἐλαίου [δ]ηκταμ[νίνου], ὑὸς ῥύπου, [λ]οποῦ σεισ[. .]ων ἱερωμά[τ]ων, μέλανον πυρὶ ἐγρα(μ)[μ]ένον στύμμα, translated by Halleux (1981, 162) as "huile de dictamne, crasse de porc, écorce de *séséli*, noir de sacrifices, mordant précité."

[116] Cyr. *glaph. Gen.–Dt.*, PG 69.36.29 οὐκοῦν ἐπὶ μὲν τοῖς τοῦ Ἄβελ δώροις πῦρ καθιὲν οὐρανόθεν, δαπανᾶσθαι παρεσκεύασε τὰ ἱερώματα. Cf. Gen 4:4.

[117] Eust. 3.129.20 van der Valk φησὶ γάρ, ὡς ἔθηκεν Ὀδυσσεὺς αὐτὰ ἐν τῇ νηΐ, ὄφρα ἱερὸν ἑτοιμασαίατο Ἀθήνῃ, ἤτοι ἑτοιμάσαιντο αὐτὰ ὁ Διομήδης τε καὶ αὐτὸς ἱέρωμα τῇ Ἀθηνᾷ ἐν καιρῷ. Cf. Hom. *Il.* 10.570–71.

[118] Dam. *Isid.* fr. 71 Zintzen τινὲς δὲ ἔλαθον τὸ ἱέρωμα κατάξαντες καὶ διαφθείραντες, καὶ ἀπορούμενοι τελεστικῆς βοηθείας οἱ ἐπιχώριοι ἀνθρωπίνῃ σπουδῇ καὶ τέχνῃ τὸν λιμένα μόλις ἑαυτοῖς περισώζουσιν οἱ Αἰγύπτιοι.

[119] This possibility surprisingly escaped Robert (1981, 518n10), who, after quoting the conjecture of Zintzen, the editor of Damascius' text, that the ἱέρωμα might have been an Isis temple destroyed by the Christians ("Christiani templum Isidis nescio quo loco situm destruxerant"), confined himself to wondering: "S'agit-il d'un temple, puisqu'on a pu 'briser et endommager' en cachette?"

soldiers carried under their tunics for protection in battle. That statuettes or miniature reliefs depicting deities served this purpose is attested, inter alios, by Plutarch, who, in his *Life of Sulla*, relates that the Roman general always carried in his bosom, when he fought a battle, a gold statuette of Apollo from Delphi.[120]

3.4 Third type of doubtful neologisms

The third type of doubtful neologisms includes words whose first attestation appears to be found in a text coming from an author anterior to Jason of Cyrene and the epitomator, which, however, has been transmitted to us by a later author, who may or may not quote verbatim from his source.

3.4.1 παρεπιδείκνυμι 'to point out besides'

15:10 παρεπιδεικνὺς τὴν τῶν ἐθνῶν ἀθεσίαν

The TLG lists only thirteen attestations of this verb, eleven of which are clustered in the first two centuries CE, in the writings of Philo, Plutarch, Galen, Lucian, and Pollux.[121] The earliest two attestations appear to be found in 2 Maccabees and in the tenth book of Philodemus' treatise *On Vices* (Περὶ κακιῶν), which was likely written after 50 BCE.[122] The book is preserved in *PHerc.* 1008 and bears the title *On Arrogance* (Περὶ ὑπερηφανίας). In the last fifteen columns (10–24) of this book, Philodemus summarizes[123] a work entitled "On the Removal of Arrogance" (Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας), written in epistolary form by an otherwise unspecified Aristo. Philodemean scholarship has long debated whether the latter is to be identified with the Peripatetic philosopher Aristo of Keos, who was born sometime before 250 BCE, or the Stoic philosopher Aristo of Chios, who lived until at least 255 BCE.[124] The verb παρεπιδείκνυμι occurs in the second section (cols. 16.30–24.23) of Aristo's text, in the characterological description of the ironic man: 22.34 καὶ παρεπιδείκνυσθαι [sc. τὸν εἴρωνα] μὲν ὡς σοφά, προσάπτειν δ' [ἑτέροις] ὡς Ἀσπασίᾳ καὶ [Ἰσχομά]χῳ Σωκράτης.

[120] Plu. *Sull.* 29.6 λέγεται δὲ ἔχων τι χρυσοῦν Ἀπόλλωνος ἀγαλμάτιον ἐκ Δελφῶν ἀεὶ μὲν αὐτὸ κατὰ τὰς μάχας περιφέρειν ἐν τῷ κόλπῳ. See Dölger (1934, 68–69), who provides further examples (taken up by Robert 1981, 519–26).

[121] Ph. *Spec.* 1.56, *Contempl.* 31, *Legat.* 95; Plu. *Mor.* 43A, 43D, 71D, 129D; Gal. 8.600.18, 8.601.4 Kühn; Luc. *Hist.Conscr.* 57.3; Poll. 4.98.

[122] See Ranocchia 2007, 1.

[123] *PHerc.* 1008, col. 10.30 κεφαλαιώσομαι.

[124] On the two homonymous philosophers, see Ranocchia 2007, 67–207, who makes a case for Aristo of Chios being the author of Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας; on the dates of the two Aristos, see ib. 69 and 80.

This section is introduced by the phrase φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων (16.35) and closes with a φησίν (24.19), the subject of which is apparently the aforementioned Ἀρίστων. The φησίν formula was taken by some early scholars to indicate that Philodemus, in the last nine columns of his book, quotes literally from Aristo's letter.[125] The latest editor of Aristo's text, Ranocchia (2007), argues, on the other hand, that the formula in question does not necessarily guarantee that Aristo's letter was quoted verbatim by Philodemus, who may have made cuts here and there but retained, to a degree that cannot be specified with certainty, the wording and the style of the original.[126] In such a case, it is impossible to say confidently whether παρεπιδείκνυμι originated in Aristo's text or was introduced by Philodemus in his quotation of Aristo's text. Ranocchia (2007, 36) lists it among the twenty-two neologisms that occur in Περὶ τοῦ κουφίζειν ὑπερηφανίας. It can be noted here that Vooys' *Lexicon Philodemeum* lists four other compound verbs prefixed with παρεπι-, which are first attested in Philodemus: παρεπαισθάνομαι, παρεπιμολύνω, παρεπιφαίνομαι, and παρεφάπτομαι; παρεπιδείκνυμι, thus, does not differ from other similarly formed terms that form part of the Gadarene philosopher's vocabulary and could well have come from his pen. If this is the case, then the first attestation of the verb occurs in the epitome of 2 Maccabees,[127] which, if composed in 124 BCE, predates Philodemus' *On Arrogance*. If, on the other hand, Philodemus preserved the ipsissima verba of his *Vorlage*, then the first attestation of the verb is found in Aristo in as early as the third century BCE.

---

[125] So Jensen 1911, 399: "Philodem hat also den Text des Briefes im Auszug wiedergegeben. Das gilt aber nur für die Columnen X–XVI, denn von hier an beginnt er mit den Worten *φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων* wenigstens teilweise wörtlich zu citiren. Wir besitzen also durch Philodems Vermittlung einen 14 Seiten umfassenden Auszug aus einem Brief des Ariston, der sich z. T. an den Wortlaut der Vorlage anschliesst"; ib. 405: "Τοιοῦτος γάρ ἐστιν, φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων, οἷος . . . Diese Wendung leitet die eigenen Worte Aristons ein." Cf. Knögel 1933, 12: "Den Wortlaut der Sätze Aristons aber scheint er [sc. Philodem] unverändert übernommen zu haben . . . der zweite Teil aber ist nach Philodems ausdrücklichem Zitat (XVI 34 φησὶν ὁ Ἀρίστων) ein ungekürzter wörtlicher Abschnitt aus der Schrift Aristons."

[126] See p. 26: "Il semplice fatto di ripetere più volte la stessa espressione [sc. φησίν], del tutto rituale nel χαρακτηρισμός, non significa per ciò stesso che Filodemo si sentisse vincolato a riferire gli *ipsissima verba Aristonis*. Non si può dunque escludere la possibilità che anche nella seconda sezione il filosofo di Gadara abbia più volte riadattato le parole del suo autore, dedicandosi probabilmente più a decurtarle che ad alterarle"; ib. p. 35: "Lo scritto così come ci è pervenuto costituisce una libera citazione e solo nella seconda sezione Filodemo si avvicinava forse più volte alla citazione letterale. È comunque difficile stabilire con ragionevole sicurezza in quale grado il filosofo epicureo si mantenesse aderente alle testuali parole del suo autore e, come si è mostrato, egli rimaneggiò in più punti il suo originale. . . . La grande vivacità e originalità espressiva di quella parte del *De superbia* contenente l'opusculo di Aristone . . . ci autorizza in qualche modo a ritenere che nel riportare il pensiero, se non le parole stesse del suo autore, egli ci abbia trasmesso anche molti degli elementi linguistici e stilistici del testo originale."

[127] 2 Macc 15:10 preserves the only active voice instance of the verb, in the sense [LSJ]"point out beside or at the same time"; in all its other instances it is used in the middle voice.

3.4.2 τετραμερής 'divided into four parts'

8:21 τετραμερές τι τὸ στράτευμα ἐποίησεν

The first attestation of this compound adjective is probably found in an Aristotelian fragment quoted, perhaps verbatim,[128] in Ps.-Plutarch's *On Music* (1139B, F).[129] The adjective also occurs in the Pythagorean treatise *On the Nature of the Universe* (1.14 Harder), attributed to Ocellus, which cannot be dated with certainty; it may antedate or postdate 2 Maccabees.[130] Be it noted that De Bruyne (1922, 39) considers the phrase τετραμερές τι τὸ στράτευμα ἐποίησεν, in 2 Macc 8:21, to be a gloss, because five of the six Old Latin versions omit it.

3.4.3 ὑπεράγαν 'exceedingly'

10:34 ὑπεράγαν ἐβλασφήμουν
13:25 ἐδείναζον γὰρ ὑπεράγαν[131]

This adverb appears to be first attested in a passage of Theophrastus (fr. 187 Wimmer) quoted, perhaps verbatim, by Aelian (*NA* 3.38 Hercher ἔνθα νοτιώτερος ὁ ἀὴρ ὑπεράγαν, οἱ ἀλεκτρυόνες οὐκ ᾄδουσι, φησὶ Θεόφραστος).[132] It may also have occurred in the second-century BCE writer Heraclides Lembus (*FHG* 3, fr. 16) and in the first-century BCE writer Posidonius (fr. 19.20 Theiler), if Diogenes Laertius (3.26) and Strabo (3.2.9.27), respectively, quote these authors faithfully. All its other attestations are from the Common Era.

---

[128] The quotation is introduced by the formula Ἀριστοτέλης ὁ Πλάτωνος ταυτὶ λέγει. On the verbal accuracy of extracts from various authors quoted in authentic works of Plutarch and introduced by formulas such as φησί, γράφει, and the like, see Brunt 1980, 479.

[129] Cf. the rare verb γλωσσοτομέω, which is unattested prior to 2 Maccabees (7:4), unless the author of the pseudo-Plutarchian treatise *Lives of the Ten Orators* (849C) quotes verbatim from the third-century BCE biographer Hermippus: Ἕρμιππος δέ φησιν αὐτὸν γλωττοτομηθῆναι.

[130] For a date in the 2nd c. BCE, see Thesleff 1961, 38; J.M. Dillon, "Ocellus," *OCD* 1058: "probably around 150 B.C."; M. Frede, "Okellos," *DNP* 8:1155–56: "spätestens Mitte des I Jh v. Chr."

[131] At 8:35, Katz (1960, 15) and Kilpatrick (1963, 18) opt for the reading υπεραγαν, which is supported by *L′* 46-52 55 311, contra Hanhart (1961, [461] 39), who defends the reading preferred by him, ὑπὲρ ἅπαν, as "ursprünglich."

[132] Already in tragic poetry, ἄγαν is found in conjunction with ὑπέρ used adverbially (E. *Med.* 627 ἔρωτες ὑπὲρ μὲν ἄγαν ἐλθόντες) or as a modifier of compounds having ὑπέρ as their first component (A. *Eu.* 823 μηδ' ὑπερθύμως ἄγαν; *Pers.* 794 τοὺς ὑπερπόλλους ἄγαν, 827 τῶν ὑπερκόμπων ἄγαν; *Th.* 238 μηδ' ἄγαν ὑπερφοβοῦ; S. *Aj.* 951 ἄγαν ὑπερβριθές; E. *Heracl.* 388 ἄγαν ὑπερφρόνων). Cf. the adverb ὑπεραγόντως occurring in 2 Macc 7:20 and the New Testament adverbs ὑπερλίαν (2 Cor 11:5; 12:11) and ὑπερπερισσῶς (Mark 7:37).

3.5 Fourth type of doubtful neologisms

The fourth type of doubtful neologisms includes words that have acquired the status of neologisms of 2 Maccabees because they appear in the main text of the Göttingen critical edition of the book, although they are not attested in the major uncial MSS, the codices Alexandrinus and Venetus, but in only a few minuscules, which are considered to be important textual witnesses.

3.5.1 διεξίπταμαι 'to fly off in different directions'

> 10:30 εἰς δὲ τοὺς ὑπεναντίους τοξεύματα καὶ κεραυνοὺς ἐξερρίπτουν· διὸ συγχυθέντες ἀορασίᾳ διεξίπταντο ταραχῆς πεπληρωμένοι

The critical apparatus in Hanhart's edition of 2 Maccabees informs us that at 10:30 the uncial codices Alexandrinus (A) and Venetus (V), as well as the minuscules 106 (dependent on A) 46-52 55, read διεκοπτοντο, the minuscules of the Lucianic recension, plus 311, κατεκοπτοντο, and the minuscule 58 εκοπτοντο. The reading διεξιπταντο found in the main text of Hanhart's edition is attested in a family of ten minuscules known as the *q* group, which, according to Hanhart, constitutes a recension. The origin of the latter is not known, but it is thought to be "free from Lucianic influence and may on occasion be the lone preserver of the correct text."[133] In his "Einleitung" (p. 18), Hanhart notes that, in many cases where A and V, together with a number of minuscules dependent upon them, share the same reading, this reading can be taken to be original. Although admitting that διεκοπτοντο, at 10:30, is one such case that is worthy of special attention, he argues (p. 26) that the reading διεξιπταντο, together with a dozen other readings transmitted by the *q* group, deserved to be included in the main text.

In making this choice, which was accepted by almost all the subsequent commentators and translators of 2 Maccabees, Hanhart followed Kappler (1929, 58), who rested his conviction of the genuineness of the reading διεξιπταντο on the grounds that the verb ἐξίπταμαι is attested in Greek literature and that the sense "to fly off in different directions, to scatter," expressed by διεξίπταμαι, fits well with the context of 2 Macc 10:32:

> ἐξίπτασθαι cum certe apud scriptores Graecos legatur atque notio "in diversas partes volaverunt, dissipati sunt" optime huic loco apta sit, διεξίπτασθαι genuinum, διεκοπτοντο autem glossam esse persuasum habeo.[134]

---

[133] Goldstein 1983, 126.

[134] Cf. Abel 1949, 414: "Avec Kappler, nous adoptons la leçon *q* διεξίπταντο, car ἐξίπτασθαι existe chez les écrivains grecs et la notion 'in diversas partes volaverunt, dissipati sunt' convient fort bien au contexte, tandis que διεκόπτοντο et ses synonymes rentrent dans la série des gloses banales."

Let us examine whether Kappler's assumption is valid. ἐξίπταμαι, later form of ἐκπέτομαι, [LSJ]"to fly out or away," is a very rare verb. Literally, it is used of birds[135] and, figuratively, of a young man's heart that flutters at the sight of an alluring woman,[136] of the soul that flies out of the body,[137] of the ephemeral wealth that flies away,[138] or of words that fly out like arrows.[139] ἐκπέτομαι and ἐκπέταμαι[140] are mainly used literally of winged creatures such as birds, bees, butterflies, and the like.[141] More rarely do we see them used figuratively, e.g. of Hope, who, in Hesiod, does not fly out of Pandora's jar, of the soul, of words of praise flying like Cupids, or of clouds flying out like birds.[142]

As can be seen, ἐξίπταμαι/ἐκπέτομαι/ἐκπέταμαι are invariably used of birds, or other winged creatures, but not of humans, except in Aristophanes, where one man turns into a sparrow[143] and another is envisaged as being able to fly like a bird,[144] or when reference is made to Daedalus and Icarus, who flew with bird-like wings.[145] In the Septuagint, too, ἐκπέταμαι is used of humans who are likened to birds.[146] Therefore, we find it hard to agree with Kappler that διεξίπταμαι aptly fits into the military context of 2 Macc 10:30, which describes the confusion of the adversaries of the Jews as they are stricken by arrows and thunderbolts discharged by two celestial horsemen. The image of stricken soldiers flying off like birds in different directions seems rather cartoonish to us. To be sure, the incongruousness of the image passes unnoticed in most of the translations that follow Kappler and Hanhart, as the translators, in rendering the compound διεξίπταμαι,[147] emphasize the notion of scattering,[148] which is conveyed by the prefix

---

135 Arist. *apud* Ath. 9.41.29 Kaibel ὁ πέρδιξ . . . ἐξίπταται; Callix. *apud* Ath. 5.31.10 Kaibel περιστεραὶ καὶ φάσσαι καὶ τρυγόνες καθ' ὅλην ἐξίπταντο τὴν ὁδόν.

136 LXX Prov 7:10b ἡ δὲ γυνή . . . ποιεῖ νέων ἐξίπτασθαι καρδίας.

137 Phld. *Mort.* col. 8.18 Henry ἡ ψυχή . . . πῶς οὐ[κ] ἐξίπταται.

138 Crantor *apud* S.E. *M.* 11.55 ὁ γὰρ ὄλβος οὐ βέβαιος, ἀλλ' ἐφήμερος / ἐξίπτατ' οἴκων. Cf. E. *El.* 944.

139 Ach.Tat. 6.10.5 ὅταν οὖν ἡ Διαβολὴ τοξεύσῃ τὸν λόγον, ὁ μὲν δίκην βέλους ἐξίπταται. Cf. Plu. *Mor.* 90C ἔνια ἐξίπτασθαι τῶν ῥημάτων αὐτόματα.

140 LSJ, *DGE*, LEH, and *GELS* differ as regards the verb forms that they cite under the entries for ἐκπέτομαι, ἐκπέταμαι, ἐκπετάζω, and ἐκπετάννυμι. We here follow the *DGE*.

141 See Arist. 551ª23, passim; Thphr. *CP* 2.9.5, passim.

142 Hes. *Op.* 97–98 Ἐλπίς . . . ἔνδον ἔμεινε πίθου . . . οὐδὲ θύραζε / ἐξέπτη; Pl. *Ti.* 81e ἡ ψυχή . . . ἐξέπτατο; Batr. 211 ψυχὴ δὲ μελέων ἐξέπτη; Luc. *Rh.Pr.* 6.16 οἱ ἔπαινοι . . . Ἔρωσι μικροῖς ἐοικότες . . . ἐκπετόμενοι; Sir. 43:14b καὶ ἐξέπτησαν νεφέλαι ὡς πετεινά. Cf. the late verb διίπταμαι, which in the Septuagint occurs in Wis 5:11 ὡς ὀρνέου διιπτάντος ἀέρα.

143 *V.* 208 στροῦθος ἀνὴρ γίγνεται· / ἐκπτήσεται.

144 *Av.* 786–88 τῶν θεατῶν εἴ τις ἦν ὑπόπτερος . . . ἐκπτόμενος ἂν οὗτος ἠρίστησεν ἐλθὼν οἴκαδε.

145 Palaeph. 12 Δαίδαλος δὲ ποιήσας πτέρυγας . . . ἐξέπτη μετὰ τοῦ Ἰκάρου. Cf. D.S. 4.77.8.

146 Pss. Sol. 17:16 ἐφύγοσαν ἀπ' αὐτῶν οἱ ἀγαπῶντες συναγωγὰς ὁσίων, ὡς στρουθία ἐξεπετάσθησαν ἀπὸ κοίτης αὐτῶν; Hos 9:11 Εφραιμ ὡς ὄρνεον ἐξεπετάσθη.

147 The verb is not registered in LSJ. Of the Septuagint lexica, *GELS* glosses it as "to dash out in different directions" and *GS* as "fly off; (fig.) flee in all directions."

148 Bévenot 1931, 221: "wollten sie entfliehen"; ib. n. 29–31: "*diexiptanto* (=sie zerstreuten sich); Abel 1949, 415: "se dispersaient"; Goldstein 1983, 384: "they fled in all directions"; Habicht 1976, 253–54:

δια- (see LSJ, s.v., D.II "in different directions"), and not that of flying, which is expressed by the verb root. Yet, it is the latter that carries the core meaning of the compound verb, a meaning that should not be downplayed. It seems reasonable to assume that, if the author had wanted to say that the adversaries of the Jews were scattered, he would have chosen a verb like διασκεδάζω or (δια)σκορπίζω[149] that expresses more aptly this meaning, without involving a bird/flying metaphor, which, to the best of our knowledge, has no parallels in similar contexts in Greek literature.

One might argue that 2 Macc 10:30 alludes to David's song in 2 Kgdms 22 and/or to the royal Psalms 17 and 143, which are dependent upon it.[150] In these poetic texts, the epiphany of Yahweh, who sends forth lightning and arrows to confound and scatter the enemies of the king, is expressed in terms that are paralleled in the angelophany of 2 Macc 10: ἀστραπή corresponds to κεραυνοί, βέλη to τοξεύματα, and συνετάραξεν/συνταράξεις to ταραχή. σκορπίζω is the only term that has no apparent counterpart in 2 Macc 10:30, unless one accepts that διεξίπταντο or διεκόπτοντο express the same meaning as this verb, namely "to scatter." It has to be noted though that, although the author of 2 Maccabees uses imagery similar to that found in David's song and the two psalms, he makes no effort to reproduce quotation-wise the diction of these texts. His lexical choices show that he aimed to create broader intertextual connections. The use of κεραυνός—very rare in the Septuagint—instead of ἀστραπή, for example, links his epiphanic narrative with similar narratives in profane Greek literature (cf. Hdt. 8.37);[151] the use of ἀορασία, which has no counterpart in 2 Kgdms 22:15 and in Pss 17:15 and 143:6, produces, on the other hand, intra-Septuagintal connections with Gen 19:11 and 4 Kgdms 6:18.[152] The one-of-a-kind διεξίπταμαι, on the contrary, does not establish any connections either with profane Greek or with Septuagint texts.

The reading διεκοπτοντο, that Kappler regards as a gloss, certainly makes better sense contextually than διεξιπταντο. διακόπτω occurs in military contexts with reference to armies in Xenophon, in Polybius, and in later Greek writers, as well as in the Septuagint.[153] For these instances, LSJ, s.v., A.2 gives the meaning "to break through the enemy's line" and *DGE* A.I.3 "de ejércitos *destrozar, derrotar*; en v. pas. *ser destrozado, triturado*." The latter lexicon, under B.II, cites 2 Macc 10:30 as the sole passage exemplifying the meaning "*dispersarse* ref. a un ejército." Mauersberger, in his

---

"stoben die Feinde auseinander"; Schwartz 2008, 371: "scattered about in all directions"; Doran 2012, 205: "scattered."

[149] Cf. Isa 9:11 ὁ θεός . . . τοὺς ἐχθροὺς διασκεδάσει; Ps 17:15 καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν βέλη καὶ ἐσκόρπισεν αὐτούς; Ps 88:11b ἐν τῷ βραχίονι τῆς δυνάμεώς σου διεσκόρπισας τοὺς ἐχθρούς σου.

[150] 2 Kgdms 22:15 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν [ὁ ὕψιστος] βέλη καὶ ἐσκόρπισεν αὐτούς, ἀστραπὴν καὶ ἐξέστησεν αὐτούς; Ps 17:15 καὶ ἐξαπέστειλεν [ὁ ὕψιστος] βέλη καὶ ἐσκόρπισεν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἀστραπὰς ἐπλήθυνεν καὶ συνετάραξεν αὐτούς; Ps 143:6 ἄστραψον ἀστραπὴν καὶ σκορπιεῖς αὐτούς, ἐξαπόστειλον τὰ βέλη σου καὶ συνταράξεις αὐτούς.

[151] See Schwartz 2008, 383; Doran 2012, 211.

[152] See Doran 2012, 211. Goldstein (1983, 398) finds in 2 Macc 10:30 echoes of Isa 30:28, 30.

[153] Cf. 2 Kgdms 5:20 καὶ ἔκοψεν τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους ἐκεῖ, καὶ εἶπεν Δαυιδ Διέκοψεν κύριος τοὺς ἐχθρούς μου τοὺς ἀλλοφύλους ἐνώπιον ἐμοῦ ὡς διακόπτεται ὕδατα.

Polybios-Lexikon, I.2, s.v., cites Plb. 3.74.4 and 3.115.6 for the meaning "durchbrechen"[154] and 2.30.7 for the meaning "zersprengt, durcheinandergebracht sein (vgl. 2.30.7 διέστρεφον τοὺς κατόπιν § 4)."[155] For the last-cited passage, the older *Lexicon Polybianum* by Schweighäuser, s.v. διακόπτεσθαι, proposes the gloss "caedi, concidi, i. q. κατακόπτεσθαι, ibid. vs. 9." The two Polybian lexica are at variance here, because their compilers took into consideration different contextual information: Mauersberger was cued by the phrase διέστρεφον τοὺς κατόπιν (2.30.4) that comes before the participle διακοπτόμενοι at 2.30.7, and Schweighäuser by the phrase οἱ πεζοὶ τῶν Κελτῶν . . . κατεκόπησαν (2.30.9) that follows it. A careful reading of the battle description at 2.30 shows that it is the latter that offers the correct gloss. The translators of Polybius, for their part, have rightly rendered the participle διακοπτόμενοι: Paton (rev. by Walbank and Habicht, 2010, 347) as "almost cut to pieces," Pédech (1970, 73) as "criblés de blessures," and Drexler (1961–1963:1:140) as "niedergehauen wurden."

If we accept διεκοπτοντο to be the original reading in 2 Macc 10:30, are we to understand it as meaning "were dispersed," as *DGE* suggests, or "were cut down"? We do not know on what grounds the lexicographers of the *DGE* opted for explaining the verb as "dispersarse," a sense elsewhere unparalleled. But we do know that the translators of the Old Latin versions, who probably had before their eyes the reading εκοπτοντο or κατεκοπτοντο or διεκοπτοντο, are unanimous in rendering it as "were cut down."[156] In corroboration of this rendering comes the verb κατασφάζω, in the immediately following verse (10:31 κατεσφάγησαν δὲ δισμύριοι), which should be seen as a stronger synonym for διακόπτω, employed for the sake of variation. The same verb is paired with the simplex κόπτω in 2 Macc 5:12.[157] It also has to be noted that κόπτω and διακόπτω occur just a few verses after 10:30, at 10:35 (τὸν ἐμπίπτοντα ἔκοπτον) and 10:36 (τὰς πύλας διέκοπτον), respectively. The use of these verbs in close proximity may have been triggered by the earlier use of διακόπτω at 10:30.

There remains one more point to discuss, the principle *lectio difficilior potior* that apparently weighed significantly in Kappler's preference for διεξιπταντο over διεκοπτοντο. When applying this rule, it is necessary to keep in mind Albrektson's (1981, 9) note of caution: "It is not enough for a reading simply to be *difficilior*: it must also fit the context and make better sense than the rival variant (or at least not make poorer sense)." In our case, as we tried to show above, the sense "scattered" may well fit in 10:30 and its context, yet it is questionable whether the verb διεξίπταμαι can figuratively convey this sense in a military context such as that of 10:30, as Kappler assumes. The fact that the verb ἐξίπταμαι and its cognates, in their sparse instances in

[154] 3.74.4 πολλοὺς αὐτῶν ἀποκτείναντες διέκοψαν τὴν τῶν Καρχηδονίων τάξιν; 3.115.6 διέκοψαν ῥαδίως τὴν τῶν ὑπεναντίων τάξιν.

[155] τὸ δὲ πλῆθος . . . συμπεσὸν τοῖς πολεμίοις ἐκ χειρὸς ἐποίει μάχην ἰσχυράν· διακοπτόμενοι γὰρ ἔμενον ἐπ' ἴσον ταῖς ψυχαῖς.

[156] La^{LPX} caedebantur; La^{V} cadebant; La^{BM} concidebantur.

[157] καὶ ἐκέλευσε τοῖς στρατιώταις κόπτειν ἀφειδῶς τοὺς ἐμπίπτοντας καὶ τοὺς εἰς τὰς οἰκίας ἀναβαίνοντας κατασφάζειν. Cf. 10:17 κατέσφαζόν τε τοὺς ἐμπίπτοντας, ἀνεῖλον δὲ οὐχ ἧττον τῶν δισμυρίων.

the literature before and after 2 Maccabees, are used of birds, insects, and anything else that can fly in the air, literally or figuratively, makes them unsuitable to denote the scattering of soldiers in panic-stricken retreat. All in all, we think that the reading διεκοπτοντο, which has both strong textual support (A′, V, La) and fits the context nicely, is to be preferred here, and that the verb διεξίπταμαι is not really a neologism of 2 Maccabees.[158]

3.6 Summary

The preceding discussion concerned thirteen 'doubtful neologisms,' for which we cannot establish in a conclusive way whether their first attestation is found in 2 Maccabees. Six of them (ἀπαρασήμαντος, ἀπροσδεής, ἐντινάσσω, ἐπιλυπέω, λεληθότως, φιλοπολίτης) are first attested in 2 Maccabees as well as in literary and/or non-literary texts which cannot be assigned a date any more precise than within the last two centuries BCE; three (ἐπανδρόω, ἐφηβία, ἱέρωμα) appear to be attested in literary texts or inscriptions that predate the epitome of 2 Maccabees, yet their pre-Maccabean instances are surrounded with uncertainty due to the existence of competing manuscript readings (ἐπανδρόω) or dubious epigraphical readings (ἐφηβία, ἱέρωμα); three (παρεπιδείκνυμι, τετραμερής, ὑπεράγαν) appear to be first attested in texts anterior to 2 Maccabees, yet these texts are quoted with questionable verbal accuracy by authors posterior to our book; one (διεξίπταμαι) is a variant reading that the editor of the Göttingen critical edition of 2 Maccabees debatably assumed belonged to the original text.

With regard to the chronological attestations of these words, we pointed out that the formula in which ἀπαρασήμαντος occurs in 2 Maccabees is found exclusively in an honorific decree from Asia Minor, which has been dated to the first century BCE or the second half of the second century BCE at the earliest; that φιλοπολίτης is also attested in honorific decrees from Asia Minor, the bulk of which belong to the first three centuries CE, although the earliest may date from the first century BCE or earlier; that the attestations of ἱέρωμα start clustering from the first century CE onwards; and that

[158] We note here another choice of the Göttingen editor of 2 Maccabees that can be questioned. In 2 Macc 8:7, A′ *l* 55 preserve the reading διηχεῖτο (λαλιὰ τῆς εὐανδρίας αὐτοῦ διηχεῖτο πανταχῇ), whereas the other MSS read διεχεῖτο. διηχεῖτο is the *lectio difficilior*, as διηχέω, "to resound," is a rare verb, not attested prior to Plutarch (*Tim.* 21.6 ἡ Ἑλλὰς διήχει τὸ μέγεθος τοῦ κατορθώματος), whereas διεχεῖτο is the *lectio facilior*, as διαχέω, "to spread," is a Classical verb, attested in the Septuagint (29x) and in 2 Maccabees (10:28 τῆς ἀνατολῆς διαχεομένης). Rahlfs adopts the former reading, Hanhart the latter. Hanhart relies on the Old Latin versions, which unanimously read "fama . . . diffundebatur/diffusa," and adduces Dan 3:47 (διεχεῖτο ἡ φλόξ), where the MSS exhibit both διεχεῖτο and διηχεῖτο, although the latter reading evidently does not fit the context. A reason for preferring the *lectio difficilior* in 2 Macc 8:7 is that 3 Macc 3:2 uses the combination φήμη . . . ἐξηχεῖτο, which is a synonymic parallel to λαλιά . . . διηχεῖτο, in 2 Macc 8:7, and may even have been coined on the model of the latter. According to Hanhart's critical apparatus, in 3 Macc 3:2 Alexandrinus reads εξεκειτο. The verb διαχέω is not used figuratively of a spreading fame or rumor prior to Gregory of Nyssa (*v. Macr.* 33.4 Maraval φήμης διαχεθείσης), whereas διηχέω and ἐξηχέω are used in this figurative sense in Plutarch and in 3 Maccabees, respectively.

λεληθότως, which occurs twice in 2 Maccabees, has no securely-dated attestations in the second century BCE (doubt exists about a couple of texts that do not allow precise dating, but which most scholars date to the late second or, more likely, the early first century BCE), but has more than a dozen instances in the literature of the first century BCE. The occurrence of these words (as well as of others, discussed in the preceding and the following chapters) in 2 Maccabees may be taken to be a clue pointing to the first century BCE as the likely time of composition or final redaction of the epitome; however, the uncertainty over the dates of most of the literary and non-literary texts involved in the discussion of the aforecited words invites caution in drawing any strong conclusions.

Apropos of ἀπαρασήμαντος and φιλοπολίτης, we emphasized the affinities of the language of 2 Maccabees with that of Hellenistic epigraphical texts. The choice of the aforementioned words, which occur in second-/first-century BCE honorific inscriptions but not in literary texts, instead of the synonymous or semantically cognate ἀνεπισήμαντος and φιλόπολις/φιλόπατρις, respectively, which are attested in both literary and epigraphical texts, shows that the author of 2 Maccabees was well acquainted with the phraseology of the Greek civic decrees of his time. The terms and formulas that he uses to praise his Jewish exemplary figures, in particular, have, as we showed, striking parallels in second- and first-century BCE honorific decrees. The occurrence of ἀπαρασήμαντος, φιλοπολίτης, and other rare words and formulas exclusively or quasi-exclusively in inscriptions from Asia Minor may be a hint that the author, or the final redactor/editor of the epitome (if such a redactor/editor ever existed), worked at a place close to, if not in, this area rather than in Egypt or Palestine, but caution is again warranted when drawing inferences from a very small sample of words.

Of the other words examined in this chapter, ἀπροσδεής was identified as being originally peculiar to Jewish-Greek writers, since, prior to the Common Era, it occurs only in a small group of Jewish-Greek texts, the earliest of which seems to be the Letter of Aristeas; ἐπανδρόω seems to have been coined or used by the author of 2 Maccabees independently of its doubtful previous occurrence in Apollonius Rhodius; and, with regard to the absolute *hapax legomenon* διεξίπταμαι, we argued that it does not go back to the author of the epitome but to a subsequent scribe, and should thus not be regarded to be a neological coinage of our book.

Chapter 4: Neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and one more deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book

4.1 Introduction

The lexical affinities between 2 Maccabees and the other deuterocanonical/apocryphal books, or parts of books, especially those originally written in Greek, are evidenced by the vocabulary that 2 Maccabees has in common with them, and, in particular, the vocabulary that it shares exclusively with them, as well as by a number of word combinations that occur in 2 Maccabees and the other deuterocanonical/apocryphal texts and nowhere else in the Septuagint. The deuterocanonical book that has the highest number of Septuagint words shared exclusively with 2 Maccabees is 3 Maccabees (54 words), followed by 4 Maccabees (40 words), 1 Maccabees (14 words), Sirach (14 words), the Wisdom of Solomon (14 words), 1 Esdras (11 words), Judith (5 words), the Additions to Esther (5 words), and Tobit (4 words).[1] As can be seen from the (non-exhaustive) list in Appendix 5, it is chiefly with 3 Maccabees, and, to a lesser extent, with 4 Maccabees, 1 Maccabees, 1 Esdras, Sirach, Tobit, and the Additions to Esther, that 2 Maccabees shares the most word combinations. Several scholars have adduced these lexical and phraseological similarities between 2 Maccabees and the aforenamed books as evidence of possible dependence of some of the latter on the former. The dependence of 3 and 4 Maccabees on 2 Maccabees can be considered more or less established, despite occasional doubts.[2] The possible dependence of some of the

[1] See 1.2.5.

[2] C.W. Emmet (*APOT* 1:156–57), who provides lists of words and phrases which appear in 2 and 3 Maccabees and nowhere else in the Septuagint, or which are otherwise rare, remarks that although "it is usually assumed without any serious attempt at proof that the writer of 3 Maccabees used 2 Maccabees" . . . "it is not easy to establish a direct literary dependence on either side" (p. 157n1). Schwartz (2008, 87) is of the same opinion. The dependence of 3 Maccabees on 2 Maccabees has been posited by Bickermann [*sic*] ("Makkabäerbücher," PW 14, cols. 792–93, 798: "IIIM. ist von Iason von Kyrene bezw. vom II. Makkabäerbuch abhängig"), by Kopidakis (1987, 25–27), who provides a list of parallels between the two

other deuterocanonical/apocryphal books, or parts of books, on 2 Maccabees (or the other way around) is, on the other hand, a matter open to debate.[3]

Among the Septuagint words that are exclusively common to 2 Maccabees and one more deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book, there are a number of neologisms. These are listed in Appendix 4. Of the twelve words that we have identified as falling under this category, six occur in 2 and 3 Maccabees, three in 2 and 4 Maccabees, one in 2 Maccabees and the Addition E to Esther, one in 2 and 1 Maccabees, and one in 2 Maccabees and 1 Esdras. These words fall, for the most part, within the same main semantic domains that we identified in Chapter 2: 'moral and ethical qualities and related behaviour' (δυσσέβημα, τρισαλιτήριος), 'attitudes and emotions' (δειλανδρέω, ἐπιλυπέω, ὑψαυχενέω), 'violence, harm, destroy, kill' (γλωσσοτομέω, οἰωνόβρωτος), 'military activities' (ἐντινάσσω, ἐπιλυπέω[4]), 'divine attributes' (τερατοποιός), and 'patterns of behaviour' (Ἰουδαϊσμός). Only one of them (κατασφαλίζομαι) occurs outside the epitome, in the second prefixed letter; Ἰουδαϊσμός, arguably the most famous and most discussed of all the neologisms of 2 Maccabees,[5] occurs in the epitomator's prologue, as well as in the main text of the epitome; three words (γλωσσοτομέω, ἐπιλυπέω, ἐντινάσσω) are doubtful neologisms, two of which were briefly discussed in the preceding chapter; another couple of words (δυσσέβημα, ἔσθησις) could also be regarded as doubtful neologisms, for reasons that will become evident in our discussion of them, yet we preferred to treat them in detail here, together with the other neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and one more deuterocanonical book, or part of book. In the current chapter, we will closely examine seven words. The aims of our examination will mainly be to determine whether these neologisms were coined by the author/translator of one of the two deuterocanonical/apocryphal books in which they occur, to establish whether their occurrence in these books is indicative of the lexical dependence of one book upon the other, and, if so, to determine the direction of dependence, and to identify the possible intertextual connections that they give rise to within and beyond the Septuagint.

---

books, by Tromp (1995), and more recently by Alexander (2001, 33). On the dependence of 4 Maccabees on 2 Maccabees, see deSilva 2006, xxx–xxxi, with further bibliography.

[3] On the relationship between 2 Maccabees and 1 Esdras, see Gardner 1986, 20 and Canessa 1995, 87–89, 100; on the relationship between 2 Maccabees and the Greek Additions to Esther, see Motzo 1924, 271, 298n2; on the relationship between 2 and 1 Maccabees, see Kolbe 1926, 135–50 and Lévy 1955, 21–24.

[4] ἐπιλυπέω is used in both an emotive (4:37) and a military (8:32) sense.

[5] On this term, see Mason 2007. The term Ἑλληνισμός, which also occurs in 2 Maccabees (4:13), should rather be labelled 'doubtful neologism.' See Mason 2007, 464.

4.2 Discussion of the neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and one more deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book

4.2.1 δειλανδρέω 'to be cowardly'

> 8:13 οἱ δειλανδροῦντες καὶ ἀπιστοῦντες τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δίκην διεδίδρασκον καὶ ἐξετόπιζον ἑαυτούς

In the Septuagint there occur a variety of verbs deriving from δειλός: δειλιάω, *GELS*"to be afraid, fearful" (seventeen instances, of which one is in 2 Macc 15:8), δειλιαίνω, *GELS*"to make afraid" (only in Deut 20:8), δειλαίνομαι, *GELS*"to be overcome with fright" (only in 1 Macc 5:41), and δειλόομαι, *GELS*"to fear, be or become scared of" (only in 1 Macc 4:8, 21; 16:6). The compound δειλανδρέω is a neologism of 2 Maccabees. The adjective from which it derives, δείλανδρος, is not attested earlier than the second century CE, in a grammatical treatise by Herodian (Hdn.Gr. 3.1, p. 204.28 Lentz), and its cognate noun δειλανδρία makes its first appearance in surviving Greek literature even later, in the Byzantine *Alexander Romance* (Ps.-Callisth. rec. γ, 3.69, 93 Parthe). δειλανδρέω was taken up by the author of 4 Maccabees, who used it in two martyrological passages (10:14; 13:10) and who, in his turn, created the neologism δειλόψυχος (8:16; 16:5), which was not destined to recur in subsequent literature. From the two Maccabean books, the verb found its way into later ecclesiastical and hagiographical texts.

The δειλανδροῦντες of our verse are those cowardly companions of Judas who, upon hearing of the imminent arrival of Nicanor's army, fled the camp. Second Maccabees 8:13 corresponds to 1 Macc 3:56,[6] where, however, the coward soldiers do not flee on their own initiative, but are exempted from fighting by Judas, who in this case implements Deuteronomy 20:8, instructing that those who are afraid should be deferred from military duty, lest their fear should spread to the others.[7] The phrasing in 1 Macc 3:56 suggests that the translator of 1 Maccabees conflated freely in a single verse all four grounds for deferment from military duty listed in the Greek text of Deut 20:5–8.[8] From the phrase φοβούμενος καὶ δειλὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ, in Deut 20:8, he retained only the

---

[6] καὶ εἶπε τοῖς οἰκοδομοῦσιν οἰκίας καὶ μνηστευομένοις γυναῖκας καὶ φυτεύουσιν ἀμπελῶνας καὶ δειλοῖς ἀποστρέφειν ἕκαστον εἰς τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ κατὰ τὸν νόμον.

[7] τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ φοβούμενος καὶ δειλὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ; πορευέσθω καὶ ἀποστραφήτω εἰς τὴν οἰκίαν αὐτοῦ, ἵνα μὴ δειλιάνῃ τὴν καρδίαν τοῦ ἀδελφοῦ αὐτοῦ ὥσπερ ἡ αὐτοῦ. Cf. Judg^{A} 7:3 τίς δειλὸς καὶ φοβούμενος;

[8] Cf. Deut 20:5 τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ οἰκοδομήσας οἰκίαν καινήν–1 Macc 3:56 τοῖς οἰκοδομοῦσιν οἰκίας; 20:6 τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὅστις ἐφύτευσεν ἀμπελῶνα–1 Macc 3:56 φυτεύουσιν ἀμπελῶνας; 20:7 τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος, ὅστις μεμνήστευται γυναῖκα–1 Macc 3:56 μνηστευομένοις γυναῖκας; 20:8 τίς ὁ ἄνθρωπος ὁ φοβούμενος καὶ δειλὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ–1 Macc 3:56 δειλοῖς.

adjective δειλός. Second Maccabees 8:13, on the other hand, resonates very faintly with Deut 20:8, because of the author's choice to present the non-fighting of the coward not as an exemption sanctioned by the Law but as a personal choice. δειλὸς τῇ καρδίᾳ (הַלַּבָּב וְרַךְ, "fainthearted") appears to have as counterpart in 2 Macc 8:13 the participle δειλανδροῦντες, and φοβούμενος the participle ἀπιστοῦντες, which emphasizes the lack of faith rather than the fear as the cause of the cowards' faintheartedness.

By its second member, δειλανδρέω evokes contrastively the manly behaviour and qualities of those who loyally fought with Judas, expressed by such terms as εὐανδρία (2 Macc 8:7; 15:17), ἀνδραγαθέω (2:21), and ἀνδραγαθία (14:18). Considering that the only compound verbs in -ανδρέω attested prior to 2 Maccabees are πολυανδρέω, LSJ"to be full of men, to be populous," (Th. 6.17.2) and εὐανδρέω, LSJ"abound in men" (Let. Aris. 108), one may surmise that the author of 2 Maccabees modelled his neologism on one of these two verbs, most likely the latter.[9] The author of our book should probably also be credited with introducing the verb ἐπανδρόω (15:17 ψυχὰς νέων ἐπανδρῶσαι) in the sense LSJ"make manly." The verb may have a single previous occurrence in Apollonius Rhodius (1.874) in the sense LSJ"fill with men,"[10] but does not recur in any other text after 2 Maccabees. The author of the latter book, who evidently had a flair for terms denoting manly values,[11] probably coined it independently of its possible previous instance in Apollonius.

At 8:13, noteworthy is the initial assonance in *δ* (δειλανδροῦντες–δίκην–διεδίδρασκον), the medial assonance in *δρ* (δειλανδροῦντες–διεδίδρασκον), and the homoioteleuta (δειλανδροῦντες–ἀπιστοῦντες, διεδίδρασκον–ἐξετόπιζον) produced by the chiastically arranged participles and verbs of the sentence.[12]

The combination δειλανδροῦντες–ἀπιστοῦντες finds rough parallels in the New Testament (Matt 8:26 τί δειλοί ἐστε, ὀλιγόπιστοι; Mark 4:40 τί δειλοί ἐστε, οὔπω ἔχετε πίστιν; Rev 21:8 τοῖς δειλοῖς καὶ ἀπίστοις), yet it is unlikely that these parallels are due to a lexical influence from 2 Maccabees.

---

[9] The very few other compound verbs in -ανδρέω listed in LSJ are late and infrequent: ὀλιγανδρέω, "to be scant of men" (D.S. 15.63.1), λ(ε)ιπανδρέω, "to be in want of men" (Str. 6.1.6), μονανδρέω, "to have but one husband" (Malalas), ἀτισανδρέω, "ἀτιμάζω ἄνδρα" (Hsch).

[10] On the textual uncertainty in A.R. 1.874, see 3.3.1.

[11] Aside from the terms already mentioned, 2 Maccabees employs the adverbs ἀνδρείως (6:27), ἀνδρωδῶς (14:43), and ἀρρενωδῶς (10:35).

[12] Cf. 4:14 τοῦ μὲν νεὼ καταφρονοῦντες καὶ τῶν θυσιῶν ἀμελοῦντες; 12:14 λοιδοροῦντες καὶ προσέτι βλασφημοῦντες καὶ λαλοῦντες, ἃ μὴ θέμις.

4.2.2 δυσσέβημα 'impious act'

12:3 Ἰοππῖται δὲ τηλικοῦτο συνετέλεσαντο δυσσέβημα

The δυσσεβ- word-group is represented in 2 Maccabees by the adjective δυσσεβής[13] and its derivatives δυσσεβέω,[14] δυσσέβεια,[15] and δυσσέβημα. δυσσεβής and δυσσεβέω are used interchangeably with ἀσεβής and ἀσεβέω,[16] with respect to both Gentiles and Jews. In contrast to the members of the ἀσεβ- word-group, which, in the literature prior to 2 Maccabees, are more frequent in prose than in poetry,[17] the δυσσεβ- words occur almost exclusively in poetry.[18] In prose we only find δυσσέβεια and δυσσεβέω in the Hippocratic treatise *On the Sacred Disease* (1.67, 73)[19] and δυσσεβής in Demosthenes' *On the Crown* (323). In the Septuagint, δυσσεβής and its derivatives are met with only in the Apocrypha. In addition to their instances in 2 Maccabees, the adjective occurs in 3 Maccabees (3:1, 24; 5:47) and the nouns δυσσέβεια and δυσσέβημα in 1 Esdras (1:40 and 1:49, respectively).

The noun δυσσέβημα was coined analogically to ἀσέβημα, which is attested as early as Thucydides and the Attic orators. Polybius, who gives us a handy definition of it,[20] uses ἀσέβημα thirteen times. In the Septuagint, it occurs in Lev 18:17, in Deut 9:27, and in Lam 1:14 and 4:22. For the author of 2 Maccabees, the choice of δυσσέβημα instead of the more common ἀσέβημα can be accounted for by his constant striving after variation and his seeking after rare and poetic words. He uses this noun of the impious act of the Gentile citizens of Joppa, who drowned some two hundred Jewish inhabitants of their city. First Esdras uses the same noun of the impieties of the Jews, which incurred the wrath of God (1:49 θυμωθέντα αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ἔθνει αὐτοῦ διὰ τὰ δυσσεβήματα).

Now, the instance of δυσσέβημα in both 2 Maccabees and 1 Esdras, and nowhere else in the Septuagint, raises the question: is there possibly a lexical influence of the one book on the other? If so, what is the direction of the influence?

---

[13] 3:11 ὁ δυσσεβὴς Σίμων; 8:14, 15:33 τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Νικάνορος; 9:9 τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς [sc. Ἀντιόχου].

[14] 6:13 τὸ μὴ πολὺν χρόνον ἐᾶσθαι τοὺς δυσσεβοῦντας.

[15] 8:33 τὸν ἄξιον τῆς δυσσεβείας ἐκομίσατο μισθόν.

[16] 1:17 ὁ θεός, ὃς ἔδωκε τοὺς ἀσεβήσαντας; 4:13 τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς καὶ οὐκ ἀρχιερέως Ἰάσονος; 4:17 ἀσεβεῖν εἰς τοὺς θείους νόμους; 4:38 τὸν Ονίαν ἠσέβησεν; 8:2 τὸν ναὸν τὸν ὑπὸ τῶν ἀσεβῶν ἀνθρώπων βεβηλωθέντα; 10:10 υἱὸν τοῦ ἀσεβοῦς [sc. Ἀντιόχου].

[17] The instances of the ἀσεβ- word-group in poetry are as follows: ἀσεβής: Thgn. 1x, Xenoph. 1x, A. 5x, S. 3x, E. 2x, Eup. 1x; ἀσέβεια: E. 2x; ἀσεβέω: E. 1x., Ar. 1x, Philippid. 1x., Timocl. 1x, Alex. 1x, Philem. 1x, Men. 1x; ἀσέβημα: Men. 1x.

[18] δυσσεβής: A. 3x, S. 6x, E. 17x, Theoc. 1x, Lyc. 1x, Diph. 1x, Men. 1x, Moschio Trag. 1x; δυσσεβῶς: E. 1x; δυσσέβεια/δυσσεβία: A. 2x, S. 4x, E. 3x; δυσσεβέω: A. 1x, S. 2x, E. 1x.

[19] On the possible influence of tragic language on the vocabulary of *On the Sacred Disease*, see Lanata (1968) and the review of the latter by J. Jouanna in the *REG* 83, no. 394 (1970): 254–57.

[20] 36.9.15 ἀσέβημα μὲν γὰρ εἶναι τὸ περὶ τοὺς θεοὺς καὶ τοὺς γονεῖς καὶ τοὺς τεθνεῶτας ἁμαρτάνειν.

Like 2 Maccabees, 1 Esdras is usually dated to the second century BCE,[21] mainly on the grounds that its vocabulary presents similarities with that of Septuagint books deemed to have been translated or written in that century, namely OG Daniel, Esther, Judith, and 2 Maccabees.[22] Gardner (1986, 19–20, 24–25) has drawn parallels between people and events mentioned in 1 Esdras and 2 Maccabees (Nebuchadnezzar-Antiochus Epiphanes, Josiah-Onias and their successors, theft of sacred vessels from the Temple), arguing that the former book was written contemporaneously with the latter with the intention to offer succour to the Jews who lived at the time of the Maccabean crisis. She further contends that the use, in both books, of a number of exclusively shared words "suggests some kind of relationship between them, or at least that they both emerged from the same milieu" (op. cit., 20). Canessa (1995, 87–89, 100) goes so far as to claim that 1 Esdras was translated by Jason of Cyrene at the same time (around 150 BCE) that the latter was composing his five-volume historiographical work.[23]

Second Maccabees shares with 1 Esdras eleven words that occur nowhere else in the Septuagint: ἀκόλουθος, ἀκολούθως, ἀπονοέομαι, δαπάνημα, δυσσέβεια, δυσσέβημα, ἐπιβολή, ἐπινίκιον, ἱερατικός, προσφωνέω, χρυσοχάλινος. There are also nine words that the two books share with one more Septuagint book: ἔπαρχος (2 Esd), ἐπιφωνέω (3 Macc), ἐσθής (Esth^{AT}), εὐθαρσής (3 Macc), εὐφυής (Wis), μεταλλάσσω (Esth), μολυσμός (Jer), προσήκω (4 Macc), χρύσωμα (1 Macc), and eight words that they share with two other Septuagint books: ἀναγράφω (1 Macc, 4 Macc), αὐτόθι (Josh, Tob^{GII}), γραπτός (2 Chr, 2 Esd), διακομίζω (Josh, 3 Macc), ἐξοδεύω (Judg^{V}, 1 Macc), προστάτης (1, 2 Chr), φιλάνθρωπος (Wis, 4 Macc), χορηγία (2 Esd, 3 Macc). Moreover, the two books share a

[21] H.St.J. Thackeray, "Esdras, First Book of," *HDB* 1:762: "B.C. 170–100"; Pfeiffer 1949, 249: "Not later than 150 B.C."; Attridge 1984, 158–59: "After 165 B.C.E. . . . The Greek vocabulary and translation style . . . suggest a second-century B.C.E. date of composition"; Gardner 1986, 18: "Some time in the Second Century B.C."; Talshir 1999, 268: "We are dealing with a translator who drew heavily from his official linguistic milieu, which would seem to date him to the second century B.C.E."; Bird 2012, 6: "Somewhere in the (mid-)second century B.C.E."

[22] See Moulton 1899, 233–34; H.St.J. Thackeray, "Esdras, First Book of," *HDB* 1:761; S.A. Cook, "1 Esdras," *APOT* 1:3 and 5; Swete 1914, 310; Myers 1985, 6; Bird 2012, 6 and 22.

[23] This hypothesis could have been taken seriously if we could compare the original work of Jason of Cyrene with the translation of 1 Esdras or if we had the certainty that the linguistic form of the epitome reflects that of its *Vorlage*, without any interference on the part of the epitomator. But this is not so. Canessa has misunderstood the epitomator's programmatic statement at 2:29 and assumed that the latter's role was simply to reorganize the text "like an architect," without tampering with Jason's vocabulary: "La composition, la réorganisation du texte sont de l'abréviateur qui reconstruit le texte 'comme un architecte' . . ., mais la matière textuelle avec laquelle il travaille reste celle de Jason de Cyrène; l'abréviateur ne se préoccupe pas de chercher des synonymes pour changer le vocabulaire. Les mots utilisés sont ceux de Jason" (p. 89). However, the simile at 2:29 leaves no doubt that the "architect" is Jason and that the epitomator is the "painter," whose task is to decorate and adorn the text produced by the original author. Moreover, Canessa's identification of the translator of 1 Esdras with Jason of Cyrene is based on the fact that their books share 115 "rare" words, that is, words that appear in less than ten other Septuagint books (p. 87–88). These lexical coincidences might show, at best, that 2 Maccabees and 1 Esdras originated in the same linguistic milieu or that there is lexical dependence of one book on the other. Any further conclusions cannot really be substantiated.

small number of phraseological parallels which do not occur anywhere else in the Septuagint.[24]

Of the above-cited words, the one that may serve to establish a lexical connection between the two books and be indicative of dependence of one book upon the other is the adjective ἱερατικός.[25] In both 1 Esdras (4:54, 5:44) and 2 Maccabees (3:15) it modifies στολή, producing a combination which does not occur elsewhere in the Septuagint and does not recur in subsequent literature earlier than Josephus (9x), an author who made use of 1 Esdras[26] and was influenced by its diction,[27] but who does not seem to have used 2 Maccabees.[28] First Esdras 4:54 τὴν ἱερατικὴν στολήν, ἐν τίνι λατρεύουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ has no counterpart in a canonical text, but 5:44 στολὰς ἱερατικὰς ἑκατόν parallels Ezra 2:69, whose Septuagint rendering (2 Esd 2:69) is χιτῶνας τῶν ἱερέων ἑκατόν (Alexandrinus)/κοθωνοι τῶν ἱερέων ἑκατόν (Vaticanus). χιτῶνες/κοθωνοι render כְּתֹנֶת, "tunics," which in 2 Esd 17:70, 72 (MT Neh 7:70, 72) is transliterated as χοθωνωθ (χοθωνὼθ τῶν ἱερέων). The translator of 1 Esdras avoided either hellenizing or transliterating the vestment-denoting noun contained in his *Vorlage*. The choice of the noun στολή and of the adjective ἱερατικός, as well as the locution ἐν τίνι λατρεύουσιν ἐν αὐτῇ, at 4:54, which reflects a Semitic construction, indicate that he patterned the rendering of his *Vorlage* after the Greek translation of Exod 28:3 (καὶ ποιήσουσιν τὴν στολὴν τὴν ἁγίαν Ἀαρὼν εἰς τὸ ἅγιον, ἐν ᾗ ἱερατεύσει μοι) and 35:18–19 ([18]καὶ τὰς στολὰς τὰς ἁγίας Ἀαρὼν τοῦ ἱερέως, καὶ τὰς στολάς, ἐν αἷς λειτουργήσουσιν ἐν αὐταῖς, [19]καὶ τοὺς χιτῶνας τοῖς υἱοῖς Ἀαρὼν τῆς ἱερατείας).[29] Both στολή and χιτών in these verses translate בֶּגֶד, "garment." The relative clause ἐν ᾗ ἱερατεύσει, modifying στολή, and the genitive τῆς ἱερατείας, modifying τοὺς χιτῶνας, may have influenced him to use the adjective ἱερατικός, perhaps on the analogy of the neologism λειτουργικός in Exod 31:10 and 39:12 στολὰς λειτουργικάς.

It seems likely, then, that it was the translator of 1 Esdras who introduced the combination ἱερατικὴ στολή, possibly because of the similarity of his *Vorlage* at 4:54 with Exodus passages where the priestly garments are discussed and also because of his

[24] See Appendix 5, nos. 45, 47, 49, 50, 51.

[25] ἱερατικός is not a Septuagint neologism. It is first found in Pl. *Plt.* 290d and in Arist. *Pol.* 1285^{b}10. In the papyri and the inscriptions, it is attested from the second century BCE onwards. Cf. *O.Wilck.* 721.3 [159 BCE] ὑπ(ὲρ) ἱερ[ατικοῦ] (πυροῦ); *MUSJ* 29,2.1951/52.33,4 [92/91 BCE] ἐτελε|[ιώ]θη ἐκ τῶν ἱερατικῶν.

[26] See Bloch 1879, 69–77; S.A. Cook, "1 Esdras," *APOT* 1:3; Grabbe 1998, 81–83, 85–86.

[27] See a list of verbally corresponding passages in Bloch 1879, 69–77 and Pohlmann 1970, 76–91.

[28] See Schwartz 2008, 86–87.

[29] Cf. Exod 28:4 καὶ ποιήσουσιν στολὰς ἁγίας Ἀαρὼν καὶ τοῖς υἱοῖς αὐτοῦ εἰς τὸ ἱερατεύειν μοι; 31:10 καὶ τὰς στολὰς τὰς λειτουργικὰς Ἀαρὼν καὶ τὰς στολὰς τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ ἱερατεύειν μοι; 39:13 ἐποίησαν στολὰς λειτουργικὰς Ἀαρών, ὥστε λειτουργεῖν ἐν αὐταῖς; 39:19 καὶ τὰς στολὰς τοῦ ἁγίου, αἵ εἰσιν Ἀαρών, καὶ τὰς στολὰς τῶν υἱῶν αὐτοῦ εἰς τὴν ἱερατείαν; Ezek 44:19 ἐκδύσονται τὰς στολὰς αὐτῶν, ἐν αἷς αὐτοὶ λειτουργοῦσιν ἐν αὐταῖς.

predilection for words containing the ἱερ- root.[30] Second Maccabees 3:15, on the other hand, where the same combination occurs (οἱ ἱερεῖς πρὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἐν ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς στολαῖς ῥίψαντες ἑαυτούς), has no *Vorlage*, nor is it intertextually related to any of the aforequoted Exodus passages. We may compare it to its counterpart in 3 Maccabees, where the priestly garments are denoted by ἐσθήσεις τῶν ἱερέων (1:16 τῶν δὲ ἱερέων ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν προσπεσόντων).[31] The author of the latter book dexterously avoided the redundancy occasioned in 2 Macc 3:15 by the juxtaposition of οἱ ἱερεῖς with ἐν ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς στολαῖς. If a relation of textual dependence exists between 2 Maccabees and 1 Esdras, it would seem more likely that it was the author of the first-named book, like probably Josephus two centuries later, who picked up the combination ἱερατικὴ στολή from 1 Esdras rather than the reverse.

We can now move on to examine whether δυσσέβημα, too, could be a lexical borrowing of one book from the other. First Esdras 1:49 parallels 2 Chr 36:16, where, however, there is no mention of impieties committed by the Jews as being the cause of God's anger.[32] Talshir (2001, 83) conjectures that the reading that the translator of 1 Esdras had before his eyes in his *Vorlage* might have been similar to that in Ezra 9:7 (עָוֹן, "iniquity, guilt") or 9:13 (אַשְׁמָה, "wrong-doing, guilt), both rendered by ἁμαρτία in the corresponding passages in 1 Esdras (8:74, 83). δυσσέβεια in 1 Esd 1:40 (τὰ δὲ ἱστορηθέντα περὶ αὐτοῦ καὶ τῆς αὐτοῦ ἀκαθαρσίας καὶ δυσσεβείας) is also unrepresented in the parallel passage of 2 Chronicles (36:8a), which has תּוֹעֵבָה, "abomination." Talshir (op. cit., 71) supposes that δυσσέβεια is the result of "double translation," i.e. the single Hebrew term תּוֹעֵבָה was rendered by both ἀκαθαρσία, "a straightforward equivalent," and δυσσέβεια, "a term common in the translator's milieu when describing relations between God and man," or that the *Vorlage* that the translator of 1 Esdras read had two distinct terms, תּוֹעֵבָה and possibly חַטָּאת, "sin," as in 2 Kgs 21:17 and 2 Chr 33:19.

The fact that δυσσέβεια and δυσσέβημα (as well as the more common εὐσέβεια at 1:21) have no parallel in MT "may cause them to assume an undue importance in the thought-world of the translator," as Talshir (1999, 265) remarks, yet they leave us with

---

[30] ἱερός/ἱερόν, ἱερεύς, ἱερωσύνη, ἱερατεύω, ἱερατικός, ἱερόδουλος, ἱεροψάλτης, ἱεροστάτης (absolute *hapax legomenon*), ἀνιερόω, ἀρχιερεύς. See Talshir 1999, 249–55, especially 251. 2 Maccabees has an equally rich ἱερ- vocabulary: ἱερός/ἱερόν, ἱερεύς, ἱεράτευμα, ἱερατικός, ἱερόσυλος, ἱεροσυλία, ἱεροσυλέω, ἱεροσύλημα (absolute *hapax legomenon*), ἱέρωμα, ἀρχιερεύς, ἀρχιερωσύνη. Especially noteworthy is the combination ἱερὰ σκεύη, designating the sacred vessels of the Temple, which in the Septuagint occurs only in 1 Esdras (8x), in 2 Maccabees (3x), and in OG Daniel (1x). See Appendix 5, 46. Prior to the Septuagint, the combination ἱερὰ σκεύη is attested only in Thucydides (2.13.4); outside the Septuagint, it recurs in Philo and in Josephus. OG Dan 1:2 seems to be indebted to 1 Esdras for the combination ἱερὰ σκεύη τοῦ κυρίου, which occurs five times in the latter book. Also, the combination ἅγιον ἱερόν occurs in the Septuagint uniquely in 1 Esdras (1:50) and in 2 Maccabees (5:15; 13:11; 14:31).

[31] Cf. the designation of the priestly robes in other Jewish-Greek works: T. 12 Patr. 3.8.2 τὴν στολὴν τῆς ἱερατείας; Ph. *Legat.* 296 τῇ ἱερᾷ στολῇ; *Mos.* 2.109 ἱερὰν ἐσθῆτα; J. *AJ* 20.6 τὴν ἱερὰν στολήν; *BJ* 1.437 τὴν ἱερὰν ἐσθῆτα. ἱερὰ ἐσθής also occurs in two passages of 1 Esdras (8:68, 70).

[32] 2 Chr 36:16–17 ἕως ἀνέβη ὁ θυμὸς κυρίου ἐν τῷ λαῷ αὐτοῦ, ἕως οὐκ ἦν ἴαμα. καὶ ἤγαγεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς βασιλέα Χαλδαίων. Cf. 1 Esd 1:49 ἕως τοῦ θυμωθέντα αὐτὸν ἐπὶ τῷ ἔθνει αὐτοῦ διὰ τὰ δυσσεβήματα προστάξαι ἀναβιβάσαι ἐπ' αὐτοὺς τοὺς βασιλεῖς τῶν Χαλδαίων.

no clue about the reason why the translator used them in preference over other, more common terms such as ἀσέβεια, ἀσέβημα, or ἁμάρτημα. Their choice does not seem to have been motivated by his striving for variation, as they do not occur along their cognates with the privative prefix,[33] as is the case with ἀσεβέω/δυσσεβέω and ἀσεβής/δυσσεβής in 2 Maccabees. Moreover, unlike ἀσέβεια and ἀσέβημα, δυσσέβεια and δυσσέβημα were not "terms common in the translator's milieu," as Talshir (2001, 71) contends, although the concepts they embody were, of course, common.[34] As noted earlier, within the extant corpus of Greek literature prior to the second century BCE, δυσσέβεια occurs almost exclusively in tragic poetry, while δυσσέβημα first appears in the second century BCE, in 1 Esdras and 2 Maccabees, and, outside the Septuagint, in a poetic work that will be discussed further below. We may surmise that the latter term also originated in tragic poetry, possibly in Euripides, who has a distinctive flair for the δυσσεβ- words (22x) and for derivatives in -μα,[35] although there are no surviving attestations of its tragic usage.

Was the translator of 1 Esdras the first to transfer the δυσσεβ- family of words from the realm of pagan, poetic diction to the sphere of Jewish-Greek religious and ethical terminology? Or was he preceded by the author of 2 Maccabees?

The first possibility is not unlikely. The translator of 1 Esdras was a "litterateur in possession of a wide Greek vocabulary" (H.St.J. Thackeray, "Esdras, First Book of," *HDB* 1:760), who, sporadically, and to a much lesser extent than the author of 2 Maccabees, introduces into his translation words which to us are known as previously occurring exclusively or predominantly in poetry, e.g. ἐγχάσκω (4:19), "to gape,"[36] ἐπακουστός (4:12), "to be listened to, to be obeyed,"[37] χαμαιπετής (8:88), "prostrate."[38] Of especial note is the usage of ἐπινίκιον, which in the Septuagint occurs only in 1 Esdras and in 2 Maccabees. In 1 Esd 3:5, Darius' bodyguards expect that the one among them who will solve the riddle posed by the king will receive great gifts and prizes of

[33] The σεβ- word-group in 1 Esdras is represented by εὐσέβεια (1:21), ἀσεβέω (1:22, 47), δυσσέβεια (1:40), and δυσσέβημα (1:49).

[34] Neither are all the members of the δυσσεβ- word-group neologisms, as Rajak (2009, 170) contends: "New coinages also still arise. A nice example is the clutch of interrelated, almost onomatopoeic negative terms to connote impiety and impious action, *dussebein, dussebeia, dussebema, dussebeis*, obviously invented as extra-strong antitheses to the central Jewish-Greek term *eusebeia* (for various Hebrew terms), which appear in 1 Esdras, and in 2 and 3 Maccabees. *Asebeia*, by contrast, had been favoured by the Septuagint prophets."

[35] According to Peppler (1916, 460), Aeschylus uses 218 substantives in -μα, Sophocles 188, and Euripides 302, of which 80 are neologisms.

[36] In the sense LSJ"to grin or scoff at one": Ar. *Ach.* 221, 1197; *V.* 721, 1007, 1349; *Nu.* 1436; *Lys.* 271–72; *Eq.* 1313; *Th.* 1089. In the sense LSJ"to gape": Call. *Iamb.* 191.82 Pfeiffer.

[37] Emp. fr. 2.15 D.-K.

[38] Pi. *O.* 9.12; *P.* 6.37; A. *Ag.* 920; *Ch.* 964; E. *Cyc.* 386; *Tr.* 507; *Or.* 1491a; Pl. *Smp.* 203d; Aen.Tact. 32.9; Plb. 13.10.8.

victory: δώσει αὐτῷ Δαρεῖος ὁ βασιλεὺς δωρεὰς μεγάλας καὶ ἐπινίκια μεγάλα.[39] ἐπινίκια (sc. ἆθλα) is employed here in the very rare sense of "victory prizes," previously attested only in Sophocles (*El.* 692 ἐνεγκὼν πάντα τἀπινίκια). In 2 Maccabees, the word occurs in the context of Judas' victory over Timothy and Bacchides: after the battle, Judas and his men divided the booty (8:30 λάφυρα πλείονα ἐμερίσαντο), collected the enemies' weapons (8:31 ὁπλολογήσαντες αὐτούς), and brought the rest of the spoils to Jerusalem (8:31 τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τῶν σκύλων ἤνεγκαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα); on the occasion of their victory celebrations in the fatherland, they burned those who had set fire to the Temple gates, as well as Callisthenes, who had fled into a small house (8:33 ἐπινίκια δὲ ἄγοντες ἐν τῇ πατρίδι † τοὺς ἐμπρήσαντας τοὺς ἱεροὺς πυλῶνας καὶ Καλλισθένην ὑφῆψαν εἰς ἓν οἰκίδιον πεφευγότα). ἐπινίκια, in this very corrupt verse,[40] is unanimously taken to mean "victory feast."[41] One may wonder, though, whether the word may be understood here in the same way as in 1 Esdras, that is, to mean "victory prizes" and to refer to the σκῦλα/λάφυρα mentioned in the preceding verses: "Having brought victory prizes in the fatherland, they burned those who had set fire to the sacred gates and Callisthenes." That ἐπινίκια can have the military sense of "fruits of victory" is testified by D.H. 3.27.2 ἵνα κἀκεῖνοι [sc. οἱ ἐπιφανές τι κατὰ τὴν μάχην διαπραξάμενοι] τὴν ἐκ τῶν ἐπινικίων ἀπενέγκωνται μοῖραν. Hanhart (1961, 26–27 [448–49] n4) discusses another syntactical possibility, that of taking ἐπινίκια, in the sense of "victory prizes," in apposition to τοὺς ἐμπρήσαντας τοὺς ἱεροὺς πυλῶνας, a possibility that he rightly considers questionable because it would entail that only Callisthenes, and not those who had set fire to the sacred gates, was burned; the idea of retribution of impious acts, dear to the author of 2 Maccabees, would thus be missed.[42] A further difficulty involved in accepting this and the previous syntactical suggestion is that the participle of ἄγω, taken in this case to be a verb of motion, would have to be modified by a prepositional phrase introduced by ἐν (ἐν τῇ πατρίδι); however, ἐν for εἰς with verbs of motion is not unattested in the Septuagint (cf. Tob 5:5 πορευθῆναι μετὰ σοῦ ἐν Ῥάγοις)[43] or outside the Septuagint.[44]

---

[39] Cf. the rewards promised by King Nebuchadnezzar in OG Dan 2:6: λήμψεσθε δόματα παντοῖα (in Theodotion's version: δόματα καὶ δωρεὰς καὶ τιμὴν πολλὴν λήμψεσθε παρ' ἐμοῦ). Josephus, who in *AJ* 11.35 deviates from the wording of 1 Esd 3:5, has τούτῳ γέρας δώσειν ὑπισχνεῖται νικητήριον.

[40] See Kappler 1929, 63–64.

[41] The expression ἐπινίκια ἄγειν is previously unattested, but it occurs in later literature. Cf. Plu. *Sull.* 19 ταύτης δὲ τὰ ἐπινίκια τῆς μάχης ἦγεν ἐν Θήβαις; Paus. 6.22.1 τὰ ἐπινίκια ἤγαγον παρὰ τῇ θεῷ.

[42] "Der Vorschlag, ἐπινίκια als Apposition zu τοὺς ἐμπρήσαντας τοὺς ἱεροὺς πυλῶνας zu fassen ('nachdem sie diejenigen, die die heiligen Tore verbrannt hatten, als Siegespreis in der Heimat umhergeführt hatten . . .'), wodurch das καί entbehrlich würde, scheint mir eben aus dem Grunde bedenklich, weil auf diese Weise ὑφῆψαν nicht mehr auf τοὺς ἐμπρήσαντας bezogen wäre, und dadurch der dem Verfasser von Mac. II vertraute Gedanke der dem Vergehen entsprechenden Vergeltung an dieser Stelle aufgehoben wäre."

[43] See Johannesohn 1926, 330–32, and Blass, Debrunner, and Rehkopf 2001, §§ 205, 218. 2 Macc 5:27 ἀναχωρήσας ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι θηρίων τρόπων διέζη σὺν τοῖς μετ' αὐτοῦ cannot be adduced as an example of the use of ἐν for εἰς, because ἀναχωρέω is here used in an absolute way (see Hanhart 1961, 20 [442]). Besides, V *L′* $^{-542}$ 55 58 La Sy Arm Lucif read here ἀναχωρήσας εἰς τὴν ἔρημον.

[44] See examples in Jannaris 1897, 380.

The second possibility is not unlikely, either. The author of 2 Maccabees has a flair for compounds formed with δυσ-: he uses fifteen such words, among which figure four members of the δυσσεβ- word-group, whereas in 1 Esdras the only δυσ- compounds are δυσσέβεια and δυσσέβημα. He also uses several derivatives in -ημα, among which we find the previously unattested δυσπέτημα (5:20) and the absolute *hapax legomenon* ἱεροσύλημα (4:39). He could very well have drawn δυσσέβημα from a work unknown to us of Classical Greek literature or from a contemporary literary source, which need not necessarily have been 1 Esdras.

That δυσσέβημα occurred in profane literary works broadly contemporary with 2 Maccabees and 1 Esdras is attested by its two instances in two literary works of the second and first centuries BCE, which are uninfluenced by the language of the Septuagint. The first instance is found in the *Circuit of the Earth (Περίοδος γῆς)*, a geographical work composed in iambic trimeter by an unknown author conventionally designated as Pseudo-Scymnus, and dedicated to the Bithynian king Nicomedes III. The work has been dated to after 133 or 127/6 and before 110/9 BCE,[45] that is, it could be almost contemporary with the epitome of 2 Maccabees, assuming that the latter was composed in 124 BCE. δυσσέβημα, in line 684, is used of an act of impiety against a statue of Demeter (τὸν μὲν Ἰασίωνα δυσσέβημά τι / πρᾶξαι περὶ Δήμητρος λέγουσ' ἄγαλμα). The second instance occurs about a century later in the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus. In Decius' speech against Coriolanus, the latter is accused of being a proponent of impious acts (7.44.4 τοιούτων ὑμῖν δυσσεβημάτων εἰσηγητὴς ἐγένετο), which, however, are of a political rather than of a religious nature.[46]

The preceding discussion shows that, although there are conspicuous lexical points of contact between 1 Esdras and 2 Maccabees (ἱερατικός, δυσσέβημα, and arguably ἐπινίκια) that permit us to postulate the lexical dependence of one book on the other, it is very difficult to pronounce with any certainty on the direction of this dependence, so long as we cannot determine which book came first and which followed. The dating of 1 Esdras to around 150 BCE gives it chronological precedence over the epitome of 2 Maccabees, yet δυσσέβημα may belong to the Jasonic substratum of the epitome, which may date to the time of translation of 1 Esdras. Furthermore, its instance in a secular Greek text dating from approximately the same period as the epitome obliges us to list δυσσέβημα among the 'doubtful neologisms' of 2 Maccabees.

[45] See Marcotte 2000, 16. Other scholars have proposed slightly later dates, ranging from 110 to 100 BCE. See Marcotte 2000, 8n13.

[46] δυσσέβημα crops up again in the second century CE in Ps.-Apollodorus' *Bibliotheca* (3.103), and, from the fourth century CE, it is sparsely and almost exclusively attested in ecclesiastical writings.

4.2.3 ἔσθησις 'garment'

> 3:33 οἱ αὐτοὶ νεανίαι πάλιν ἐφάνησαν τῷ Ἡλιοδώρῳ ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν ἐστολισμένοι

With regard to the type ἐσθήσεσι, which occurs in 2 Macc 3:33, the BDAG lexicon gives the following comment under the word ἐσθής:

> The dat. pl. form ἐσθήσεσι, which is not unanimously attested either in Ac 1:10 or Lk 24:4 (but found 2 Macc 3:33; 3 Macc 1:16; Philo, Vi. Mos. 2, 152; BGU 16, 12 [159/60 AD]; PLond I, 77, 20, 32 p. 233 [VIII AD]. S. also Crönert 173, 1. The form ἐσθῆσιν Jos., Bell. 2, 176 becomes ἐσθήσεσιν in Eus., HE 2, 6, 7.), does not come from a word ἔσθησις, for which there is no reliable evidence in the sing., nor in the pl. except for the dative (s. L-S-J-M), but belongs to ἐσθής; it is the result of an attempt to make the dat. ending more conspicuous by doubling it (WSchulze. ZVS 42, 1909, 235, 2; Schwyzer I, 604).

It is true that the majority of attestations of the noun in question are in the dative plural. But it is also true that there is reliable evidence of its occurrence in cases other than the dative plural: in Pollux's *Onomasticon* (10.51) we encounter it in the genitive singular, in Aquila's version of Isaiah (23:18) in the accusative singular, in Athenaeus (1.32.27 Kaibel) in the accusative plural, and in John Chrysostom (*Theod. Laps.* 2:1.49) in the nominative singular. These instances are certainly no earlier than the second century CE, that is, they appear some three centuries after the earliest traceable attestations of the dative plural ἐσθήσεσι.

Existing evidence cannot substantiate the information given by the fourteenth-century rhetorician and grammarian Thomas Magister, in his *Ecloga nominum et verborum Atticorum* (p. 147.3 Ritschl), that ἔσθησις was an Attic word: ἐσθὴς εὕρηται παρὰ λογογράφοις καὶ ἔσθημα· τὸ δὲ ἔσθησις παρὰ ποιηταῖς καί τισι τῶν ῥητόρων.[47] In Classical Greek, ἔσθημα is predominantly a poetic word (there are only two instances in prose, in Th. 3.58.4 and in Hp. *Oct.* 12.15), whereas ἔσθησις is not attested in any of the poetic or rhetorical works that have come down to us. For the compilation of his *Ecloga* Thomas relied mainly on earlier lexica such as those of Phrynichus, Ammonius, Herodian, and Moeris;[48] however, there is no way to verify if his lexicological comment on ἔσθησις derives from one of these sources or from his own readings. It is thus uncertain whether ἔσθησις was a rare poetic/rhetorical word, whose earliest attestations have not survived, or whether it was a late coinage, created as a variant of ἐσθής on the

[47] Cf. the following etymological comment in the *Etymologicum Gudianum* (11th c.), s.v. ἐσθής: . . . τὸ δὲ ἔσθησις ἐσθήσεως σημαίνει καὶ αὐτὸ τὴν ἐσθῆτα. γίνεται οὕτως· ἕω ἕσω καὶ πλεονασμῷ τοῦ θ γίνεται θέμα περισπώμενον ἐσθῶ πρὸς ἀντιδιαστολὴν τοῦ ἔσθω τοῦ σημαίνοντος τὸ ἐσθίω, ὁ μέλλων ἐσθήσω καὶ ἐξ αὐτοῦ ἔσθησις ἐσθήσεως, ἐξ οὗ καὶ τὸ "ἦσαν ἄγγελοι ἐν ἐσθήσεσιν ἀστραπτούσαις."

[48] See J.F. Lockwood and R. Browning, "Thomas Magister," *OCD* 1470.

basis of the latter's lengthened dative plural ἐσθήσεσι and in analogy to ὑπόδεσις, "footgear" (Xenophon, Plato), and ἔνδυσις, "clothing" (LXX).

Modern grammarians and philologists generally treat the type ἐσθήσεσι as belonging to ἐσθής. They usually refer to an article by E. Fraenkel in the *Zeitschrift für vergleichende Sprachforschung* (no. 42, 1909, pp. 234–41), in which the German linguist discusses, inter alia, the pleonastic repetition of suffixes. One of the examples that he adduces is the Sanskrit locative plural *prtsu*, "in the battles," which is attested once in the *Rig Veda* (1.129.4) with a double ending, *prtsusu*. In a footnote (p. 235n2), one of the editors of the journal, W. Schulze, compares the latter example to ἐσθῆσι/ἐσθήσεσι. In a subsequent study, Fraenkel (1910, 106–7) embraced Schulze's suggestion that ἐσθήσεσι is a "pleonastische Erweiterung" of ἐσθῆσι and not a dative plural of ἔσθησις on the grounds that, unlike the dative plural ἐσθήσεσι, which is frequently attested in the Koine, there is only one (as he thought) instance of ἔσθησις in a case other than the dative, in Athenaeus (1.32.27 Kaibel ἡ περὶ τὰς ἐσθήσεις καὶ ὑποδέσεις . . . πολυτέλεια), where the accusative plural ἐσθήσεις is used in lieu of ἐσθῆτας, possibly in analogy to ὑποδέσεις, with which it is conjoined. Schwyzer (1953, 604) adduces another parallel ("ion. att. σφί-σι(ν) neben σφί etwa wie ἐσθήσεσι neben ἐσθῆσι") referring to Schulze's remark, as do Blass, Debrunner, and Rehkopf (2001, §47.4c and n. 7), who argue that the repetition, as it were, of the dative ending serves the purpose of clarity: "In ἐσθήσεσιν Lk 24,4vl Apg 1,10 ist die Dativendung zur Verdeutlichung gleichsam nochmals gesetzt (statt ἐσθῆσιν)." Moulton and Howard (1929, 133) consider ἐσθήσεσι to be a heteroclite dative plural of ἐσθής and refer to Crönert (1903, 173), who furnishes similar examples from MSS of Hellenistic writers. Lexicographers, on the other hand, from Stephanus onwards,[49] treat ἔσθησις as a word in its own right, apparently based on its few late instances in cases other than the plural dative, and it is for this reason that we have included it in our discussion.

In the Septuagint, ἐσθής is found only in 2 Maccabees and in 1 Esdras. In 2 Macc 8:35 (τὴν δοξικὴν ἐσθῆτα) it designates general Nicanor's splendid purple cloak; in 2 Macc 11:8 (ἐν λευκῇ ἐσθῆτι) it designates the white garment worn by the angel on horseback who led Judas' army to victory over Lysias; in 1 Esd 8:68, 70 (τὴν ἱερὰν ἐσθῆτα) it denotes Esdras' priestly robe. The Septuagintal instances of the type ἐσθήσεσι are confined to 2 and 3 Maccabees. In 2 Macc 3:33, in the Heliodorus episode, the two angelic youths who had previously scourged the Seleucid official appear again "dressed in the same clothing" (ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν[50] ἐστολισμένοι).[51] In their first appearance,

[49] See, s.v., Moulton and Milligan 1914–1929, LSJ, *GE*, LEH, *GELS*, *GS*. *SV* and BDAG cite ἐσθήσεσι under the entry for ἐσθής.

[50] The reading ἐσθήσεσιν is almost unanimously supported by the MSS; only three Lucianic minuscules (19 62 93) read εσθησιν.

[51] The two young men are commonly taken to be angels; however, as Lévy (1955, 26) and Bremmer (2008b, 222) have noted, their epiphanic appearance may have been modelled after similar appearances of the Dioscuri. Cf. the double apparition of the latter, before and after the battle of the Lake Regillus, in D.H. 13. See also Nestle 1905.

at 3:26, the author did not give any special description of their garments; the youths were simply said to be magnificently attired (διαπρεπεῖς τὴν περιβολήν). Is this an indication of narrative incoherence?

According to Bickerman (2007g, 1:446–64), the fact that, at 3:28, Heliodorus is being carried on a litter by his bodyguards (ἔφερον, imperfect), after having fallen to the ground (v. 27 πεσόντα πρὸς τὴν γῆν), whereas in the very next verse he appears to be still lying prostrate (ἔρριπτο, pluperfect), suggests that Jason of Cyrene wove together two different versions of the same story: version A, consisting of verses 3:24–25, 27–28, 30, was presumably drawn from a source narrating events in the early phase of Antiochus IV's persecution (p. 462), while version B, consisting of verses 3:26, 29, 31–36, may originally have been "an independent aretalogical narrative" (p. 463). Both versions, Bickerman maintains, "were surely invented immediately after the event itself," that is, after ca. 180 BCE (p. 464). Goldstein (1983, 210–12) endorses a similar position, although he assigns the verses, of which each version presumably consists, differently than does Bickerman, because of the μέν . . . δέ construction that tightly links vv. 29 and 30. His version A consists thus of vv. 24–25 and 29–30 and his version B of vv. 26–28 and 31–36. Goldstein assumes that the former version comes from the postulated "Common Source" of 1 and 2 Maccabees and the latter version from the postulated *Memoirs* of Onias IV. Habicht (1976, 172–73), on the other hand, although accepting Bickerman's two-version theory, argues that vv. 34–35 (which, according to Bickerman, belong to version B), as well as vv. 15–23 and 37–39, originate in a version that was embedded in the narrative by Jason, whereas version A was incorporated by a later hand. Doran (2012, 86; cf. id. 1981, 19–21), on the contrary, believes that the Heliodorus episode is a "unified account" and that the incompatibilities in the narrative, which have been pinpointed by the aforenamed scholars, are not really there. As regards the supposed contradiction between verses 28 and 29, he argues that "Bickerman and Goldstein both assume that v. 29 is speaking of Heliodorus lying prostrate in the very same spot. But Heliodorus, stretched out on a litter, is still prostrate. He cannot stand up or move around by himself. The effects of his being thrown down are still felt." This point carries little conviction. ἔρριπτο suggests, indeed, that Heliodorus was lying on the ground; it is not a verb that an author as sensitive to the nuances of the language[52] as the author of 2 Maccabees is would have used to designate a person lying on a litter that is being carried away. ἔκειτο would have been a more appropriate choice in that case and, in fact, in verse 31, Heliodorus is described as being ἐν ἐσχάτῃ πνοῇ κείμενος (although it has to be said that the author likes to use κεῖμαι figuratively in prepositional constructions of the type κεῖμαι ἐν+dative).[53] We are inclined to see the discrepancy

[52] As Bickerman (2007g, 447) has rightly pointed out, the choice of ἔρριπτο at 3:29 is significant in that it echoes the phrase ἐπιρριπτοῦντες αὐτῷ πληγάς three verses earlier (3:26). The etymological connection between the verb and the participle in these two verses underscores the cause and effect relation between the angels' flogging and Heliodorus' fall. This is not a "weak argument" to prove that verses 26 and 29 are connected, as Doran (1981, 20) argues.

[53] Cf. 3:11; 4:31, 34; 15:18.

between the verbs and their tenses in verses 28 and 29 as the result either of the merging of two versions or, rather, of sloppy abridgement or editing.

If Bickerman, Goldstein, and Habicht are right, verse 33, where the type ἐσθήσεσιν occurs, belongs to version B, which may have been derived from a pre-Jasonic source. If we look closely at verses 26 and 33, we see that they are clearly connected by verbal links: [26]ἕτεροι δὲ δύο προεφάνησαν αὐτῷ νεανίαι–[33]οἱ αὐτοὶ νεανίαι πάλιν ἐφάνησαν τῷ Ἡλιοδώρῳ; [26]παραστάντες–[33]στάντες. The phrase διαπρεπεῖς τὴν περιβολήν, in verse 26, however, does not correspond closely to the phrase ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν ἐστολισμένοι in verse 33. In the first place, the latter phrase seems redundant: since the young men who appeared after Heliodorus' scourging were the same men who had appeared earlier to inflict the scourging, it is superfluous to mention that they wore the same clothes. The emphasis on the sameness of the clothes seems to suggest that the author had previously given a somewhat more precise description of them—specifying perhaps their colour—than the one we find in verse 26 (διαπρεπεῖς τὴν περιβολήν). The heavenly horseman who appears together with the two young men is described, for instance, as wearing a gold armour (3:25 χρυσῆν πανοπλίαν ἔχων); another heavenly horseman, who leads Judas' army into battle against Lysias, is described as being clad in white (11:8 ἔφιππος ἐν λευκῇ ἐσθῆτι); the heavenly knights seen in the sky over Jerusalem during Antiochus' second invasion of Egypt are said to be dressed in robes inwrought with gold (5:2 διαχρύσους στολὰς ἔχοντας); it is only the five heavenly horsemen who lead the Jews into battle against Timothy that are vaguely described as "distinguished" (10:29 ἄνδρες πέντε διαπρεπεῖς), a designation that may refer to their splendid clothes, as it verbally echoes 3:26 (νεανίαι . . . διαπρεπεῖς τὴν περιβολήν). We may conjecture that the phrase ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν ἐστολισμένοι refers back to a description of the angels' clothing that was modified or shortened for brevity by the epitomator. The stylistic effect that the author aimed at by the use of the lengthened dative plural ἐσθήσεσι was evidently the alliteration produced by the repetition of -εσ- in an already heavily sigmatic phrase.[54]

The second Septuagintal instance of the type ἐσθήσεσι is found in 3 Macc 1:16, in the episode of Ptolemy Philopator's attempt to enter the Temple's Holy of Holies (1:10–2:24). This episode is patterned after the Heliodorus episode in 2 Maccabees. The thematic and verbal links between the two texts are many.[55] One of them is the prostration and supplication of the priests in the face of the imminent desecration: 2 Macc 3:15 οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς πρὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου ἐν ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς στολαῖς ῥίψαντες ἑαυτούς; 3 Macc 1:16 τῶν δὲ ἱερέων ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν προσπεσόντων. Tromp (1995, 320), commenting on the likeness between these verses, notes that "in 3 Maccabees, this mention of priestly garments is hardly functional; the point seems to be

[54] On the unpleasant effect produced by the excessive use of the s-sound, see D.H. *Comp.* 14 ἄχαρι δὲ καὶ ἀηδὲς τὸ σ καὶ πλεονάσαν σφόδρα λυπεῖ. On the avoidance of sigmatism in the Greek writers, especially the poets, see Denniston 1952, 125–26 and Rutherford 2012, 117.

[55] See C.W. Emmet, "3 Maccabees," *APOT* 1:156; Tcherikover 1961, 6; Tromp 1995, 318–22.

that the priests at that moment simply fall on the ground regardless of the possible consequences for their costly garments. The inescapable impression is that this detail is introduced in 3 Maccabees because of its occurrence in the author's source, namely, 2 Maccabees (or its source). The slight difference in terminology must be ascribed to redaction by the author of 3 Maccabees." Indeed, the author of the latter book may have changed the phrase ἐν ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς στολαῖς, that he found in his model text, to ἐν πάσαις ταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν, which echoes the ἐν ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν (that also occurs in his model text, but in a different context), in order to avoid the otiose repetition of the ἱερ- stem in ἱερεῖς-ἱερατικαῖς. Tromp (loc. cit., n. 16) further explains the difference in phrasing by noting 3 Maccabees' flair for the "expressive use of πᾶς" (3 Macc 5:30, 36; 6:8, 16, 30). Considering that 2 Maccabees exhibits an even more pronounced predilection for πᾶς,[56] one may wonder whether the author of 3 Maccabees picked up this feature, too, from 2 Maccabees.

The dative plural ἐσθήσεσι also occurs in other Jewish-Greek writers, who have no apparent dependence on either 2 or 3 Maccabees. Philo uses ἐσθής fifty-five times, fourteen of which with reference to the priestly or high-priestly vestments. He employs the dative plural ἐσθῆσι three times (*Virt.* 39.4 πολυτελέσιν ἐσθῆσι;[57] *Mos.* 1.153.4 ἐν ἐσθῆσι καὶ τροφαῖς; *Spec.* 2.20.9 ἐσθῆσιν ἁλουργίσι) and ἐσθήσεσι twice, in *On the Life of Moses*, with regard to Aaron's, the high priest's, and his sons' vestments (2.146.2 ταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν ἤσκησεν αὐτούς; 2.152.5 τοῖς ἱερεῦσι καὶ ταῖς ἐσθήσεσιν αὐτῶν). Josephus uses ἐσθής eighty-four times, eleven of which with reference to the priestly or high-priestly vestments. In Niese's critical edition of Josephus,[58] the dative plural ἐσθῆσι occurs six times (*BJ* 2.176, 255; 5.228; 7.137; *AJ* 11.327, 331) with reference to various types of garments, and ἐσθήσεσι once, with reference to the purple silk robes worn by the emperors Vespasian and Titus at their triumph in Rome (*BJ* 7.126 ἐν ἐσθήσεσιν σηρικαῖς).[59] The latter dative is followed, a few verses further on, by the dative ἐσθῆσι (7.137 ἁλουργαῖς ἐσθῆσι), which this time refers to the purple clothes worn by the attendants who led the beasts that took part in the emperors' triumphal procession. However, a look at Niese's critical apparatus (or, more conveniently, at Rengstorf's *Concordance to Josephus*, s.v. ἐσθής and ἔσθησις) shows that ἐσθῆσι is far from being the unanimous reading of the MSS in the six aforecited passages. Several MSS, among which are some of the best textual witnesses, read εσθησεσι /εσθητεσι/αισθησεσι instead. Eusebius (*HE* 2.6.7; 2.20.5), quoting from *Jewish War* (*BJ* 2.176, 255), also has ἐσθήσεσιν instead of ἐσθῆσιν; Eusebius' quotations are earlier than all the other textual witnesses of Josephus. As can be seen, the only apparent reason

[56] See 2 Macc 2:22; 3:1, 22, 24, 28, 29; 5:20; 7:31; 9:17; 11:4; 13:23; 14:36, 38; 15:1, 6, 7, 17.

[57] In the critical apparatus to his edition of *De virtutibus* (1906, 5:277), Cohn notes that at 39.4 ἐσθῆσι is the *lectio vulgata*; two MSS read αισθησεσι and some others εσθησεσι.

[58] Niese 1885–1895 (*editio maior*). The text was searched via the TLG, which has encoded this edition. On Josephus' text and Niese's edition, see Leoni 2016.

[59] In his *editio minor* of Josephus' works, Niese, in *BJ* 7.126, admitted ἐσθῆσιν into the main text and relegated the MSS reading ἐσθήσεσιν to the critical apparatus.

that may account for the use of ἐσθήσεσι instead of ἐσθῆσι in Philo is the reference to a specific type of garment, namely that worn by priests (as in 3 Maccabees); in Josephus there seems to be no discernible pattern in the use of ἐσθήσεσι/ἐσθῆσι as a result of the textual variation among the Josephan MSS.

In the New Testament there are two Lukan verses that are relevant to our discussion: the first is contained in the resurrection narrative (Luke 24:4 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο ἐπέστησαν αὐταῖς ἐν ⟨ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ⟩) and the second in the ascension narrative (Acts 1:10 καὶ ἰδοὺ ἄνδρες δύο παρειστήκεισαν αὐτοῖς ἐν ⟨ἐσθήσεσι λευκαῖς⟩). A number of textual witnesses read εσθησεσιν αστραπτουσαις instead of ἐσθῆτι ἀστραπτούσῃ in Luke 24:4, and εσθητι λευκη instead of ἐσθήσεσι λευκαῖς in Acts 1:10; in the latter verse, ἐσθήσεσι λευκαῖς is the reading of the most reliable witnesses, those of the Alexandrian text-type (Sinaiticus, Vaticanus, Alexandrinus, et al.). The interconnection of the two verses, featuring the same pair of angel-like men, apparently did not pass unnoticed by certain scribes of New Testament manuscripts, who sought to harmonize the wording between the two texts.

Could it be that the type ἐσθήσεσι in Acts 1:10 is a verbal reminiscence of 2 Macc 3:33? This possibility cannot be excluded. The vocabulary shared by 2 Maccabees and Luke exhibits noteworthy similarities.[60] According to Cadbury's (1919, 7) calculations, there are 451 common words between the two, 21 of which do not occur anywhere else in the Greek Bible; the Gospel of Mark, which served as a source for the Gospel of Luke, shares with Luke-Acts 383 words, only 9 of which are not found elsewhere in the Greek Bible. Cadbury cautiously warns that one should not deduce from this coincidence of vocabulary that there is any sort of dependence of Luke on 2 Maccabees: the latter "may not even have been known to him [sc. Luke]" (loc. cit). Other scholars, on the contrary, have allowed the possibility that Luke was acquainted with 2 Maccabees. Windisch (1932, 1–9) has adduced as suggestive but not conclusive evidence of such an acquaintance a number of thematic and structural parallels that can be found between the aforementioned epiphany to Heliodorus, in 2 Maccabees 3, and Paul's Damascus road epiphany, in Acts 9.[61] Luke's familiarity with the Heliodorus narrative in 2 Maccabees could account for the occurrence of the rare type ἐσθήσεσι in the ascension narrative in Acts, considering that the two narratives have in common the

[60] Cf. Th. Vogel, "Zur Charakteristik des Lukas nach Sprache und Stil" (1897, 54, quoted by Windisch 1932, 8): "Lukas hat mit keinem Autor, abgesehen von Josephus, bezüglich des Wortgebrauchs so viel Charakteristisches und jedenfalls zu Beachtendes gemein als mit Macc 2."

[61] Windisch's conclusion (p. 22) is this: "Bewusste literarische Reminiszenzen des Autors [sc. Lukas] sind wohl nur für die Bakchen und für die ATlichen Geschichten anzunehmen; doch ist auch nicht auszuschliessen, dass der Autor der Acta das II Macc kannte oder irgendeine andere Fassung der Heliodorlegende." Windisch was criticized by Löning (1973, 55–59), who argued that Acts 9 bears no overall structural resemblance to 2 Maccabees 3 and that the points of contact between the two texts are limited to details. In his recent discussion of the two epiphanic stories, Bremmer (2008b, 217–18) argues, without investigating the matter, that "the parallels [between the two epiphanies] are to be viewed as structural rather than due to a genetic influence, as the author of *Acts of Apostles* does not betray any influence from *II Maccabees*."

motif of the two heavenly men dressed in resplendent clothes. The respective contexts in which these heavenly men appear are quite different, though.

Let us now look at some instances of the type ἐσθήσεσι in non-Jewish Greek literature. They are clustered mainly between the first century BCE and the second century CE.[62] The earliest are located in passages of Posidonius transmitted by later authors. One such passage, mentioning the bright-coloured dresses of the Lusitanian women, is found in the third book of Strabo's *Geography* (3.3.7.24 [=Posidon. fr. 22 Theiler] ἀνθιναῖς ἐσθήσεσι).[63] Theiler assigns this passage to Posidonius' early work *On the Ocean*, which was likely completed shortly after 87/86 BCE.[64] Lasserre, on the other hand, considers that, for the composition of his third book, Strabo drew principally from Posidonius' *Histories* and the *History of Pompey*.[65] Posidonius wrote the parts of these works that, according to Lasserre, served as sources to Strabo after 72 BCE;[66] Strabo himself composed the third book of his *Geography* in 17 or 18 CE.[67] Another Posidonian passage bearing the type ἐσθήσεσι is found in Athenaeus, who, in an explicit quotation from the second book of the *Histories*, makes reference to the luxurious clothes worn by slaves in Etruria (4.38.36 Kaibel [=Posidon. fr. 82 Theiler] ἐσθήσεσι πολυτελέσι); ἐσθήσεσι, in this passage, was obviously chosen for the sake of homoioteleuton. Atheneaus, as noted previously, preserves the single attestation of the accusative plural ἐσθήσεις (1.32.27 Kaibel ἡ περὶ τὰς ἐσθήσεις καὶ ὑποδέσεις . . . πολυτέλεια), which is contemporary (second half of the second century CE) with the single instance of the genitive singular ἐσθήσεως in Pollux's *Onomasticon* (10.51 τὰ τῆς ἐσθήσεως εἴδη). In the same second century belong the instance in Polyaenus' *Strategemata* (6.49.1.9 οἰκετικαῖς ἐσθήσεσι), in Aquila's translation of Isaiah (23:18 εἰς ἔσθησιν μετάρσεως), and the earliest of the three papyrological instances (*BGU* 1.16.12 [159/160 CE] ἐρεαῖς ἐσθήσεσι).[68] It is hard to date with precision the occurrence of the dative plural in Memnon of Heraclea (*FHG* 3:59.28 ἐν πενθίμοις ἐσθήσεσι), a historian of the Imperial period, whose work cannot be placed later than the second century CE.[69]

Also worthy of note is a passage in Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Isocrates*, where the author quotes first freely and then literally the judgement of a certain Philonicus on the style of Isocrates. In the free quotation, Philonicus is said to have likened Isocrates to a painter who depicts all his models dressed in the same clothes and taking the same poses: 13.5–7 ἐοικέναι τέ φησιν αὐτὸν ζωγράφῳ ταῖς αὐταῖς ἐσθῆσι καὶ τοῖς αὐτοῖς σχήμασι

[62] Almost all the subsequent instances of the type ἐσθήσεσι are found in ecclesiastical writers who for the most part quote or paraphrase Luke 24:4 and Acts 1:10.

[63] On Strabo's dependence on Posidonius for this passage, see Lasserre 1966, 6.

[64] Theiler 1982, 1:40; 2:6.

[65] See Lasserre 1966, 5–7.

[66] See Lasserre 1966, 7.

[67] See Lasserre 1966, 3.

[68] The other two (*P.Herm.* 31.10; *P.Lond.* 1.77.20) date from the sixth century CE.

[69] See K. Meister, "Memnon" [5], *DNP* 7: cols. 1205–6.

πάσας ἐπικοσμοῦντι τὰς γραφάς. ἐσθῆσι is Ammon's emendation[70] of the MSS reading εσθησεσι/αισθησεσι, which was adopted by all editors since Usener and Radermacher.[71] The emendation is not really justified, given that the type ἐσθήσεσι is attested, as we saw, in authors slightly anterior or posterior to Dionysius (Posidonius, Philo). The question is whether ἐσθήσεσι might have originated with Dionysius or with Philonicus. The former uses ἐσθής forty-eight times, two of which are in the standard dative plural ἐσθῆσι (6.25.4.9; 6.51.2.8). Regarding Philonicus we have no information other than that provided by Dionysius (*Isoc.* 13.3), namely that he was a διαλεκτικός, "a member of the Dialektikoi, or a Stoic, or, even a sophist in general."[72] His date cannot be fixed more narrowly than between the fourth and the first centuries BCE. If the type ἐσθήσεσι originally occurred in Philonicus' criticism of Isocrates, and if Dionysius retained it in his free quotation of the latter, then the passage in *Isocrates*, wherein it occurs, could provide us with one of the earliest instances of this dative plural.[73]

To summarize, aside from 2 Maccabees, the type ἐσθήσεσι, plural dative of the postulated noun ἔσθησις, occurs in a very restricted number of texts—Jewish, Christian, and secular Greek—dating to the first centuries BCE and CE; in cases other than the dative, ἔσθησις is very sparsely attested from the second century CE. Third Maccabees and possibly Luke-Acts are indebted to 2 Maccabees for this type. The (most likely profane) source from which 2 Maccabees picked up this type is unknown. Its use at 3:33 seems to have been motivated by stylistic concerns.

4.2.4 οἰωνόβρωτος 'to be eaten by birds'

> 9:15 τοὺς δὲ Ἰουδαίους, οὓς διεγνώκει μηδὲ ταφῆς ἀξιῶσαι, οἰωνοβρώτους δὲ σὺν τοῖς νηπίοις ἐκρίψειν θηρίοις

A search in LSJ yields some thirty compound adjectives that have the verbal βρωτός as second member. Of these, only four are Classical,[74] some fifteen are first attested in literary and documentary texts from the time of Aristotle to the end of the first century BCE,[75] and the rest appear after the turn of the Common Era. In the Septuagint, we are

---

[70] See Ammon 1889, 89.

[71] See the *apparatus criticus* in Usener and Radermacher 1899, 72.

[72] See Schenkeveld 1991, 154n17.

[73] According to LSJ, ἔσθησις is *dubia lectio* in Arist. *Rh.* 1386^{a}32 τοὺς συναπεργαζομένους σχήμασι καὶ φωναῖς καὶ αἰσθήσει καὶ ὅλως ἐν ὑποκρίσει. αἰσθήσει is the reading of the most authoritative manuscript, A (Cod. Parisinus 1741). Other manuscripts read ἐσθῆτι. ἐσθῆσι, adopted by Ross in the Oxford edition and by Dufour in the Budé edition, is a conjecture proposed by Spengel. A few lines further down in the text (1386^{b}2) occurs the type ἐσθῆτας, which gives support to the reading ἐσθῆτι or to its emendation to ἐσθῆσι, which matches the plurals in the polysyndeton σχήμασι καὶ φωναῖς καὶ ἐσθῆσι.

[74] ἄβρωτος (S.), ἀθηρόβρωτος (S.), ἡμίβρωτος (X.), κελαινόβρωτος (A.).

[75] ἁλίβρωτος, εὔβρωτος, θηρ(ι)όβρωτος, θριπόβρωτος, ἰχθυόβρωτος, καρπόβρωτος, κυνόβρωτος, λυκόβρωτος, παιδόβρωτος, πυρίβρωτος, σητόβρωτος, σκωληκόβρωτος, ἀσκωληκόβρωτος,

met with θηριόβρωτος, GELS"eaten by wild beasts" (Gen 44:28), καρπόβρωτος, GELS"with edible fruit" (Deut 20:20), οἰωνόβρωτος (2 Macc 9:15; 3 Macc 6:34), and σητόβρωτος, GELS"moth-eaten" (Job 13:28b), which are neologisms, as well as with ἄβρωτος, GELS"inedible" (Prov 24:22e), first attested in the active sense of LSJ"without eating" in a Sophoclean fragment (967 Radt). Aside from 2 and 3 Maccabees, οἰωνόβρωτος occurs in Philodemus, in Strabo, and then only in lexicographical works.[76]

The two Septuagintal occurrences of the adjective are contextually similar: both 2 Macc 9:15 and 3 Macc 6:34 refer to the punishment that King Antiochus IV and the Friends and Kinsmen of King Ptolemy IV, respectively, wanted, but failed, to inflict on the Jews, namely to exterminate them en masse and leave their bodies unburied to be eaten by birds of prey. οἰωνόβρωτος is one of the fifty-four words exclusively shared between 2 and 3 Maccabees and not found anywhere else in the Septuagint. Its occurrence in 3 Macc 6:34 (οἵ τε πρὶν εἰς ὄλεθρον καὶ οἰωνοβρώτους αὐτοὺς [sc. τοὺς Ἰουδαίους] ἔσεσθαι τιθέμενοι), in the same context of an unfullfilled threat against the Jews, as in 2 Macc 9:15, suggests that it is a borrowing of the first-named book from the second.

In Philodemus' *On Death*, dated to ca. 43 BCE,[77] οἰωνόβρωτος, and its counterpart κυνόβρωτος, are used to describe the fate of soldiers killed in land battles (*Mort.* 33.21–22 Henry οἰωνόβρωτοι καὶ κυνόβρωτοι γε[γό]να[σι]); for those who are drowned in the sea and get eaten by fishes or are buried in the earth and feed maggots and worms the author uses periphrastic expressions instead (32.36–39 τό [δ'] ὑπ' ἰχθ[ύων κ]α[τα]βρω[θ]ῆναι χεῖρο[ν] . . . μ[η]θὲν ἔχει τοῦ γῆ<ι> κεκρυμμένον ὑπ' εὐλῶν καὶ σκωλήκων). The juxtaposition of οἰωνόβρωτος and κυνόβρωτος resonates with Homer's frequent pairing of οἰωνοί with κύνες to denote the scavengers that devour the bodies of slain warriors.[78] The quotation from the *Odyssey* (5.306–312) and the adaptation of an Iliadic verse (22.305) in the immediate context where the two adjectives occur indicate that the latter are meant to evoke Homeric epic.

The last instance of οἰωνόβρωτος in surviving Greek literature is found in Strabo. The geographer employs it with respect to the Zoroastrian Magi, whose corpses are not buried but exposed to the carrion-eating birds (15.3.20 τοὺς δὲ Μάγους οὐ θάπτουσιν, ἀλλ' οἰωνοβρώτους ἐῶσι).[79] The same information about this Persian religious custom is

---

ὁλοσκωληκόβρωτος, οἰωνόβρωτος, ὠμόβρωτος. About one third of these compounds are poetic coinages unrepeated in subsequent literature.

[76] Hsch. ο 453 οἰωνοβρώτους· ὑπὸ ὀρνέων βρωθέντας; Phot. ο 324 οἰωνόβρωτος: ὀρνεόβρωτος.

[77] Kuiper 1925, 96.

[78] Kuiper (1925, 86n8) sees in the conjunction of the two verbal adjectives an allusion to the opening lines of the *Iliad* (1.4–5 αὐτοὺς δὲ ἑλώρια τεῦχε κύνεσσιν / οἰωνοῖσί τε πᾶσι), yet κύνες and οἰωνοί are recurrently paired as carrion eaters in the *Iliad* and the *Odyssey* (cf. *Il.* 2.393; 8.379; 13.831; 22.335, 354; 24.411; *Od.* 3.259; 14.133), *pace* Segal (1971, 37 and 63), who states that the combination is of "surprisingly infrequent occurrence" and "a rather uncommon formula in the *Iliad*." The combinations θῆρες and οἰωνοί (*Od.* 24.292) and κύνες and γῦπες (*Il.* 18.271; 22.42) are indeed infrequent.

[79] Cf. 15.1.62, where Strabo, drawing on Aristobulus, one of Alexander's historians, reports that at Taxila the bodies of the dead are thrown to the vultures: τὸ γυψὶ ῥίπτεσθαι τὸν τετελευτηκότα.

given by Herodotus (1.140), who is probably Strabo's (and, earlier, Cicero's[80]) source: οὐ πρότερον θάπτεται ἀνδρὸς Πέρσεω ὁ νέκυς πρὶν ἂν ὑπ' ὄρνιθος ἢ κυνὸς ἑλκυσθῇ. Μάγους μὲν γὰρ ἀτρεκέως οἶδα ταῦτα ποιεῦντες· ἐμφανέως γὰρ δὴ ποιεῦσι. However, the Homeric tinge which is perceptible in the Herodotean passage (cf. *Il.* 22.335–336 σὲ μὲν κύνες ἠδ' οἰωνοὶ / ἑλκήσουσ' ἀϊκῶς) is absent in Strabo. This, together with the omission of the reference to the corpse-eating dogs and the use of the late compound οἰωνόβρωτος, may suggest that the geographer used an intermediary or supplementary source which eludes us.[81]

Dishonouring the corpse of an enemy or a felon by leaving it unburied to be eaten by birds of prey and wild beasts is a topos encountered in Greek epic and tragic poetry,[82] in Near Eastern literary and documentary texts,[83] and in the Hebrew Bible.[84] Schwartz (2008, 360) rightly notes that "it is impossible, but also unnecessary, to decide whether this is a Greek motif or a Hebrew one." Indeed, Hector taunting Ajax that he will sate the dogs and birds of Troy with his flesh uses practically the same words that Goliath uses to taunt David;[85] Creon ordering that Polyneices and the defeated Argives be left unburied to become carrion for birds and dogs[86] is as cruel as the Assyrian kings Esarhaddon and Ashurbanipal who issued similar decrees;[87] and when it comes to providing burial for those ordered to be left unburied, Tobit, stealing and burying at the risk of his life the bodies of his fellow Israelites slain by King Sennacherib and tossed behind the wall of Nineveh,[88] is no less compassionate than Antigone. Surprisingly, the author of 2 Maccabees does not charge Antiochus IV with actually leaving the corpses of the slain Jews unburied to be eaten by vultures and wild animals. The atrocity is presented as an intention on the part of the king (διεγνώκει), not as a fait accompli.[89]

---

[80] *Tusc.* 1.45.108 Magorum mos est non humare corpora suorum, nisi a feris sint ante laniata.

[81] Direct use of Herodotus by Strabo has been posited by Riemann (1967, 53) for a single passage in the *Geography* (7.3.8). Riemann (ib. 54–55) leaves open the possibility that the Strabonian description of the Persian νόμιμα (15.3.13–20) is also derived from a first-hand knowledge of Hdt. 1.131–140. See also de Jong 1997, 122–25 and 440–41.

[82] See Segal 1971, 9, 14, 27, 33, 37–40, 63; Vermeule 1979, 103–6; Griffin 1980, 115–17.

[83] See West 1997, 215–16; Griffin 1980, 45; Hillers 1964, 68–69.

[84] See Brown 1995–2001, 1:280–82; Griffin 1980, 115; Hillers 1964, 68–69.

[85] Compare *Il.* 13.831 Τρώων κορέεις κύνας ἠδ' οἰωνοὺς / δημῷ καὶ σάρκεσσι with 1 Kgdms 17:44 καὶ δώσω τὰς σάρκας σου τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῖς κτήνεσιν τῆς γῆς.

[86] Cf. A. *Th.* 1020–21 πετηνῶν τόνδ' ὑπ' οἰωνῶν δοκεῖ / ταφέντ' ἀτίμως τοὐπιτίμιον λαβεῖν; S. *Ant.* 28–30 φασὶν ἐκκεκηρῦχθαι τὸ μὴ / τάφῳ καλύψαι . . . / ἐᾶν δ' ἄκλαυτον, ἄταφον, οἰωνοῖς γλυκὺν / θησαυρὸν εἰσορῶσι πρὸς χάριν βορᾶς; 205–6 ἐᾶν δ' ἄθαπτον καὶ πρὸς οἰωνῶν δέμας / καὶ πρὸς κυνῶν ἐδεστόν; E. *Ph.* 1634 ἐᾶν δ' ἄκλαυτον, ἄταφον, οἰωνοῖς βοράν.

[87] Cf. the following passage from one of Esarhaddon's vassal treaties (quoted in Hillers 1964, 68): "I let the jackals (or vultures) eat the corpses of their warriors by not burying them," and a passage of the annals of Ashurbanipal (quoted in *ANET*, p. 288): "I fed their corpses, cut into small pieces, to dogs, pigs, *zîbu*-birds, vultures, the birds of the sky and (also) to the fish of the ocean."

[88] Tob 1:17–18.

[89] In 2 Maccabees it is the impious ex-high priest Jason who leaves the bodies of his fellow Jews unburied (5:10 ὁ πλῆθος ἀτάφων ἐκρίψας).

Yet, even the mention of this evil design is enough to associate Antiochus with some of the cruellest kings of Greek myth and Near Eastern history.

As regards the adjective οἰωνόβρωτος, it is rather unlikely that the author of 2 Maccabees chose, or coined, it on the basis of the similarly formed compound θηριόβρωτος in Gen 44:28, as there does not seem to be any intertextual connection between the latter verse and 2 Macc 9:15: θηριόβρωτος, a free rendering of טָרֹף טֹרַף, "he has been torn to pieces," is used by the translator of Genesis with respect to Joseph, whom his father, Jacob, considers killed by wild animals. Moreover, it is to be noted that, whereas in Greek epic and tragic poetry οἰωνός, the first member of the compound οἰωνόβρωτος, is formulaically coupled with κύων to denote the scavengers attacking corpses, in the Septuagint it appears only once (Num 24:1), in the sense of *GELS*"portent, presage." To designate the carrion-eating birds and animals, the Septuagint translators uniformly conjoin τὰ πετεινὰ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, or, rarely, τὰ ὄρνεα,[90] with τὰ θηρία τῆς γῆς/τοῦ πεδίου/τοῦ ἀγροῦ,[91] or, rarely, οἱ κύνες.[92] We may suppose, then, that the author of 2 Maccabees either coined οἰωνόβρωτος uninfluenced by any of its cognates occurring in the Septuagint or, more likely, gleaned it from some earlier or contemporary Greek source that is not known to us.

Still, there is a possible intertextual connection between 2 Macc 9:15 and Ps 79 [LXX 78]:2 that is worth investigating. The Asaphic Psalm 79 is a lament over the destruction of Jerusalem by the Gentiles, the massacre of its people, and the desecration of the Temple. The precise historical circumstances that gave rise to it are uncertain. It is assumed that it originated after the destruction of Jerusalem by Nebuchadnezzar in 587 BCE and was later adapted to bewail similar catastrophes, such as the assault on the city and the defilement of its sanctuary under Antiochus Epiphanes in 167 BCE.[93] Indeed, as early as the Church Fathers, the psalm was understood as a prophesy of those events and subsequent others.[94] Verses 2–3 of the psalm lament, in language echoing Deut 28:26

---

[90] Gen 40:19; Ezek 39:4. Cf. 2 Macc 15:33, where Judas cuts out the tongue of his defeated enemy Nicanor and threatens to give it piecemeal to the vultures: καὶ τὴν γλῶσσαν τοῦ δυσσεβοῦς Νικάνορος ἐκτεμὼν ἔφη κατὰ μέρος δώσειν τοῖς ὀρνέοις.

[91] Deut 28:26; 1 Kgdms 17:44, 46; 2 Kgdms 21:10; Ps 78:2; Isa 18:6; Jer 7:33, 16:4, 19:7, 41:20; Ezek 29:5; 32:4; 39:4, 17.

[92] 3 Kgdms 12:24m, 16:4, 20:24; Jer 15:3.

[93] See Briggs 1906–1907, 2:197–99; Kraus 1989, 133–34.

[94] Cf. Ath. *exp. Ps*. PG 27:357 τοῦτον ᾄδει τὸν ψαλμὸν ὑπὲρ τῶν ἀναιρεθέντων πικρῶς κατὰ τοὺς καιροὺς τοῦ Ἀντιόχου; Eus. *d. e*. PG 22:721 τὰ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑβδομηκοστοῦ ὀγδόου, ἐπληροῦτο κατὰ τοὺς Ἀντιόχου χρόνους τοῦ κληθέντος Ἐπιφανοῦς, ὅς . . . τοὺς Ἰουδαίους Ἑλληνίζων, πλείστους ὅσους αὐτῶν ἄνδρας καὶ γυναῖκας ὑπὲρ τοῦ οἰκείου νόμου καὶ τῆς πατρῴας εὐσεβείας ἀνῄρει, ποικίλαις προαικιζόμενος τιμωρίαις. εἰς ἐκεῖνον τοιγαροῦν τὸν καιρόν, καὶ εἰς τοὺς μετὰ ταῦτα τῷ Ἀντιόχῳ τὰ ἴσα πράξαντας, ἀναφωνεῖ ὁ Ἀσὰφ τὸ ἀπὸ τοῦ ἑβδομηκοστοῦ ὀγδόου ψαλμοῦ. μαρτυρεῖ δὲ τῷ λόγῳ ἡ τῶν καλουμένων Μακκαβαίων γραφή [continues by quoting 1 Macc 7:12–17]; Thdt. *Ps*. PG 80:1504 Ἀντιόχου, τοῦ ἐπίκλην Ἐπιφανοῦς, τὴν κατὰ τοῦ λαοῦ τῶν Ἰουδαίων μανίαν ὁ προφητικὸς θεσπίζει λόγος.

and Jer 7:33,[95] the slaughter that ensued the destruction of Jerusalem: [2]ἔθεντο τὰ θνησιμαῖα τῶν δούλων σου βρώματα τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ, τὰς σάρκας τῶν ὁσίων σου τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς· [3]ἐξέχεαν τὸ αἷμα αὐτῶν ὡς ὕδωρ κύκλῳ Ιερουσαλημ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν ὁ θάπτων. These verses are partially quoted in 1 Macc 7:17 (κρέας ὁσίων σου καὶ αἷμα αὐτῶν ἐξέχεαν κύκλῳ Ιερουσαλημ, καὶ οὐκ ἦν αὐτοῖς ὁ θάπτων) in the context of the murder by the Hellenizing high priest Alcimus of sixty Hasideans in 162 BCE. The phrase that introduces the quotation (κατὰ τὸν λόγον, ὃν ἔγραψεν αὐτόν) implies that the verses were written by the high priest himself; Goldstein (1976, 332–34) went so far as to argue that the entire Psalm 79 was penned by Alcimus. It seems more probable, though, that the translator of 1 Maccabees simply misread the Hebrew original, which would have "according to the word which was written" instead of "according to the word which he [sc. Alcimus] wrote it."[96] Thus, although Psalm 79 [LXX 78] was not written in the Maccabean period, its text served to actualize events that occurred in that period.[97]

Unlike the translator of 1 Maccabees, who, undoubtedly bound by his *Vorlage*, explicitly quoted from LXX Psalm 78, the author of 2 Maccabees may have wanted to utilize the motif of the non-burial and of the scavenging animals, contained in verses 2–3 of Psalm 78 and associated in Maccabean times with Antiochus' persecution, but couch it in a language closer to that of his secular Greek literary models rather than to that of the translator of the Greek Psalter. The choice of οἰωνόβρωτος is, in this regard, significative, considering that οἰωνός, in its double meaning of 'bird of prey' and 'bird of omen,' is generally avoided by the Septuagint translators, apparently because of its association with Gentile divinatory practices. From where our author may have picked up this rare adjective is impossible to say as it is futile to speculate on whether 2 Maccabees, Philodemus' *On Death*, and Strabo's *Geography*—works unrelated to one another—are indebted to the same source for it. One nonetheless cannot fail to observe that the latter two works were written between ca. 43 BCE and ca. 25 CE, and that 3 Maccabees, too, is dated roughly to the same period. Chronologically speaking, 2 Maccabees cannot have been very far from this cluster.

---

[95] Deut 28:26 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ νεκροὶ ὑμῶν κατάβρωμα τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς, καὶ οὐκ ἔσται ὁ ἀποσοβῶν; Jer 7:33 καὶ ἔσονται οἱ νεκροὶ τοῦ λαοῦ τούτου εἰς βρῶσιν τοῖς πετεινοῖς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ καὶ τοῖς θηρίοις τῆς γῆς.

[96] So Martola 1984, 260–61n12 and Doran 2006, 261–62.

[97] Dimant (1988, 390–91) adduces 1 Macc 7:17 as an example of the "exegetical procedure of actualization," in which "the contemporary situation is read into the psalm, which is apparently considered as a prophecy."

4.2.5 τερατοποιός 'wonder-working'

15:21 ἀνατείνας τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν τερατοποιὸν κύριον

Yahweh's miraculous, epiphanic interventions on behalf of the Jews is one of 2 Maccabees' core motifs, yet nowhere in the book do we encounter any of the Greek terms used in the Septuagint to denote the divine signs and wonders: τὰ θαυμάσια/τὰ θαυμαστά,[98] τὰ σημεῖα, and τὰ τέρατα, the two last terms often found in conjunction with one another.[99] The only word linking 2 Maccabees with the miracle terminology employed in the Septuagint is the adjective τερατοποιός, one of the three compounds that first appear in this book as appellations of Yahweh.[100]

τερατοποιός may not be recorded in the literature surviving from before 2 Maccabees, yet the noun τερατοποιία is attested in the *Historiae mirabiles* (6.1) of Apollonius Paradoxographer, probably dated to the second half of the second century BCE.[101] The author of 2 Maccabees may not have been the coiner of the adjective, but he was likely the first to use it as a divine epithet.

τερατοποιός occurs at 15:21, which introduces the prayer that Judas addresses to Yahweh before the decisive battle against the numerically superior and better-equipped army of Nicanor:

> 15 [22]Σύ, δέσποτα, ἀπέστειλας τὸν ἄγγελόν σου ἐπὶ Εζεκίου τοῦ βασιλέως τῆς Ἰουδαίας, καὶ ἀνεῖλεν ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς Σενναχηρειμ εἰς ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας. [23]καὶ νῦν, δυνάστα τῶν οὐρανῶν, ἀπόστειλον ἄγγελον ἀγαθὸν ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν εἰς δέος καὶ τρόμον· [24]μεγέθει βραχίονός σου καταπλαγείησαν οἱ μετὰ βλασφημίας παραγινόμενοι ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιόν σου λαόν.

This short prayer, and its introduction, interweave several intertextual references to biblical passages recounting the miraculous deliverance provided by Yahweh to the Israelites, when mortally threatened by crushingly superior adversaries.

In Exod 4:21, Yahweh commissions Moses to perform all the wonders that He had bestowed upon him in order to convince Pharaoh that he was invested with divine powers (ὅρα πάντα τὰ τέρατα, ἃ ἔδωκα ἐν ταῖς χερσίν σου, ποιήσεις αὐτὰ ἐναντίον Φαραώ): transform his shepherd's staff into a snake, restore his leprous hand, and turn some of the Nile's water into blood (4:2–9). Yahweh multiplies His "signs and wonders" (7:3; 11:9, 10 τὰ σημεῖα καὶ τὰ τέρατα) by unleashing through Moses the ten

---

[98] Exod 3:20; Deut 34:12; Josh 3:5; Judg 6:13, 13:19; 1 Chr 16:9, 12; 2 Esd 19:17; Ps 9:2b, passim; Isa 25:1; Jer 21:2; OG Dan 3:43, 4:34a; Mic 7:15; Sir 18:6b, passim. See G. Bertram, "θαῦμα, θαυμάζω, κτλ," *TDNT* 3:27–42.

[99] Exod 7:3, passim; Deut 4:34, passim; Add Esth F:6; Ps 77:43, passim; Isa 8:18, 20:3; Jer 39:20, 21; OG Dan 4:(37)34; Bar 2:11; Wis 8:8, 10:16. On the secular and biblical use of these terms, see K. Rengstorf, "σημεῖον, σημαίνω, κτλ," *TDNT* 7:200–269; id. "τέρας," *TDNT* 8:113–26.

[100] The other two are παντεπόπτης (9:5) and δικαιοκρίτης (12:41).

[101] See *EANS* s.v. Apollonios (Paradoxographer) and *DNP* s.v. Paradoxographi.

plagues upon Egypt. His shattering victory, through His wondrous acts, over the Egyptian oppressors of the Israelites, already prefigured at 3:20 (καὶ ἐκτείνας τὴν χεῖρα πατάξω τοὺς Αἰγυπτίους ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς θαυμασίοις μου, οἷς ποιήσω ἐν αὐτοῖς), is ultimately celebrated in the Song of the Sea (15:1–18), sung by Moses and his people after their deliverance through the Red Sea. The last part of the rhetorical question, at 15:11, τίς ὅμοιός σοι, δεδοξασμένος ἐν ἁγίοις, θαυμαστὸς ἐν δόξαις, ποιῶν τέρατα;, expresses in an exulting manner the wonder-working power of Yahweh, which the author of 2 Maccabees encapsulated in the epithet τερατοποιός.[102] The invocation of Yahweh as author of τέρατα is not the only allusion, in the context of Judas' prayer, to the Song of the Sea in Exodus. Judas' final appeal to Him to strike down with His arm the enemies of His people (15:24) clearly alludes to Exod 15:16 (ἐπιπέσοι ἐπ' αὐτοὺς φόβος καὶ τρόμος, μεγέθει βραχίονός σου ἀπολιθωθήτωσαν, ἕως ἂν παρέλθῃ ὁ λαός σου, κύριε).

The τέρας that Judas exhorts Yahweh to perform is apparently the apparition of an angel, who will go ahead of the Jewish army, instilling fear and trembling in the enemies, and the eventual annihilation of the latter by that angel and/or by Yahweh. For both the angelic functions evoked here, that of the guide/leader of the army and that of the destroyer, there are biblical precedents to which the author of 2 Maccabees implicitly alludes. In Exod 14:19, an angel of Yahweh, perhaps a manifestation or extension of Yahweh Himself, goes before the army of the Israelites on their way out of Egypt (ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ ὁ προπορευόμενος τῆς παρεμβολῆς τῶν υἱῶν Ἰσραήλ); in Exod 32:34 and 33:2, Yahweh sends an angel ahead of the Israelites to lead them to Canaan and drive out the indigenous inhabitants of the land (32:34 ὁδήγησον τὸν λαὸν τοῦτον εἰς τὸν τόπον, ὃν εἶπά σοι· ἰδοὺ ὁ ἄγγελός μου προπορεύσεται πρὸ προσώπου σου; 33:2 καὶ συναποστελῶ τὸν ἄγγελόν μου πρότερόν σου, καὶ ἐκβαλεῖ τὸν Ἀμορραῖον καὶ Χετταῖον); in Josh 5:13–15, an armed man, who introduces himself as the "commander-in-chief of the force of Yahweh," enigmatically appears to Joshua outside Jericho, apparently to make manifest the divine involvement in the battle that was about to take place. More often, however, it is Yahweh Himself who assumes the role of war leader on behalf of the Israelites, and, indeed, on another occasion, during the battle against Gorgias, Judas prays not that Yahweh send an angel but that He Himself appear as an ally of the Jews and their guide in war (12:36 ἐπικαλεσάμενος Ἰούδας τὸν κύριον σύμμαχον φανῆναι καὶ προοδηγὸν τοῦ πολέμου).[103]

Strangely enough, the phraseology at 15:23 (ἀπόστειλον ἄγγελον ἀγαθὸν ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν) does not evoke any of the aforequoted verses, but does bear resemblance to Gen 24:7, where Abraham promises the servant that he dispatches to find a wife for Isaac that

[102] The phrase ποιεῖν τέρατα also occurs elsewhere in the Septuagint, in verses drawing on Exodus (Deut 11:3, 34:11; Jer 39:20; Ezek 12:11; OG Dan 4:34; Add Esth F:6; Sir 45:19c, 48:14a), yet the fact that Judas' prayer contains one more allusion to the Song of the Sea (2 Macc 15:24 draws on Exod 15:16) leaves no doubt that the author of 2 Maccabees had Exod 15:11 in mind when using the adjective τερατοποιός.

[103] See the comment on προοδηγός at 2.2.13.

Yahweh will send an angel ahead of him to guide him in his journey (αὐτὸς ἀποστελεῖ τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ ἔμπροσθέν σου).

The angel that Judas asks Yahweh to dispatch is also expected to re-enact an extraordinary event which had occurred in the time of King Hezekiah, when an angel sent by Yahweh had slain one hundred and eighty-five thousand Assyrians in the camp of King Sennacherib, who had threatened Jerusalem.[104] Judas had already evoked this precedent before a previous battle against (the same or a different) Nicanor.[105] Here (15:22) he quotes Isa 37:36 (καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελος κυρίου καὶ ἀνεῖλεν ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας), whereas the parallel passage in 1 Macc 7:41 (ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελός σου καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας) is phraseologically closer to 4 Kgdms 19:35 (καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελος κυρίου καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας).[106]

The angel who annihilates Sennacherib's camp in Isa 37:36/2 Kgs [LXX 4 Kgdms] 19:35 is designated as "angel of Yahweh" (מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה), although he should rather be identified with the Destroyer (מַשְׁחִית). The latter, associated with mass slaughters, makes only two appearances in the Bible. The first occurs in Exodus and is related to one of the τέρατα, for which Yahweh is praised in the Song of the Sea:[107] in the narrative of the tenth plague, the Destroyer accompanies Yahweh and slays at His behest all the first-born in Egypt except for those of the Israelites (12:23 καὶ παρελεύσεται κύριος τὴν θύραν, καὶ οὐκ ἀφήσει τὸν ὀλεθρεύοντα εἰσελθεῖν εἰς τὰς οἰκίας ἡμῶν πατάξαι). The second is in the two parallel accounts (2 Sam [LXX 2 Kgdms] 24:16/1 Chr 21:15) of Yahweh's punishment of Israel in the wake of David's census.[108] Although the angel of Yahweh and the Destroyer are rather distinct in their functions and appearances in the Bible,[109] in Judas' prayer they conflate into a single angel, whose apparition is invoked as a manifestation of Yahweh's teratopoeic faculty. This angel is called ἀγαθός, as in the communal prayers in 2 Macc 11:6, an epithet which in this context might have an apotropaic or propitiatory character, given the tremendous annihilative force that the

[104] Cf. 2 Chr 32:21 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν κύριος ἄγγελον, καὶ ἐξέτριψεν πᾶν δυνατὸν πολεμιστὴν καὶ ἄρχοντα καὶ στρατηγὸν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ βασιλέως Ασσουρ.

[105] 2 Macc 8:19 προσαναλεξάμενος δὲ αὐτοῖς καὶ τὰς ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων γενομένας ἀντιλήμψεις καὶ τὴν ἐπὶ Σενναχηρειμ, ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα πέντε χιλιάδες ὡς ἀπώλοντο.

[106] Cf. Sir 48:21 ἐπάταξεν τὴν παρεμβολὴν τῶν Ἀσσυρίων, καὶ ἐξέτριψεν αὐτοὺς ὁ ἄγγελος αὐτοῦ.

[107] Cf. Propp 1999, 528: "The immediate referent [in Exod 15:11 ποιῶν τέρατα] is the Sea event, but one also thinks of the Plagues."

[108] 2 Kgdms 24:16 καὶ ἐξέτεινεν ὁ ἄγγελος τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ εἰς Ιερουσαλημ τοῦ διαφθεῖραι αὐτήν, καὶ παρεκλήθη κύριος ἐπὶ τῇ κακίᾳ καὶ εἶπεν τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ διαφθείροντι ἐν τῷ λαῷ; 1 Chr 21:15 καὶ ἀπέστειλεν ὁ θεὸς ἄγγελον εἰς Ιερουσαλημ τοῦ ἐξολεθρεῦσαι αὐτήν . . . καὶ εἶπεν τῷ ἀγγέλῳ τῷ ἐξολεθρεύοντι. The Destroyer may also be at work in Num 17:11–15 and in Ezek 9. See S.A. Meier, "Destroyer מַשְׁחִית," *DDD*, 241–43.

[109] See S.A. Meier, "Angel of Yahweh מַלְאַךְ יְהוָה," *DDD*, 53–43, and "Destroyer מַשְׁחִית," ib. 241–43.

Destroyer embodies;[110] the only other angel thus designated in the Septuagint is Raphael, who accompanied and protected young Tobit on his journey (Tob 5:22).

The single other occurrence of τερατοποιός in the Septuagint is found in 3 Macc 6:32: the Alexandrian Jews, having escaped the extermination attempted by Ptolemy IV Philopator, cease their lamentations and take up the "ancestral song," praising God, the wonder-working saviour of Israel (ἀνέλαβον ᾠδὴν πάτριον τὸν σωτῆρα καὶ τερατοποιὸν αἰνοῦντες θεόν). Croy (2006, 107), following Grotius (1776, 381), argues that the πάτριος ᾠδή mentioned here

> could be any hymn of praise, such as Ps 136 with its refrain 'for [God's] steadfast love endures forever,' which appears to have been a popular litany. . . . This song, like the prayers of Simon and Eleazar, presumably rehearsed the gracious past (and now present) acts of God in Israel's behalf, acts that involved deliverance and wonders (τερατοποιός; a possible allusion to Exod 15:11; cf. 2 Macc 15:21).

There can be no doubt, however, that the "ancestral song" in question is the Song of the Sea,[111] and that the author of 3 Maccabees makes here an intertextual reference to both Exod 15:1–18 and 2 Macc 15:21.

τερατοποιός was a neologism that did not catch on. Excluding the two occurrences in 2 and 3 Maccabees, one can only cite less than two dozen instances of this adjective in subsequent literature, confined to a few Byzantine writings where it mainly denotes a miracle-monger; in none but one of these instances is it used as an epithet of God. Its unpopularity could perhaps be attributed to the negative associations that it might have conjured up due to its ressemblance to other etymologically or semantically related compounds which were used in a pejorative way: the earlier-mentioned Apollonius Paradoxographer speaks of Pherecydes' "miracle-mongering" (6.1 τῆς τοῦ Φερεκύδου τερατοποιίας), which, as we know from other sources (D.L. 1.116), involved predictions of earthquakes and shipwrecks; τερατουργός, in D.S. 34/35.2.5, is used of a Syrian magician, who, by pretending that he saw the gods and could foretell the future, had become a laughing stock and entertained people at dinners and feasts; and, θαυματοποιός, already in Plato (*Sph.* 235b; *R.* 514b), denoted a juggler or a puppeteer. Thus, attributing an adjective of similar formation and meaning to God might have been interpreted as an audacious choice, which risked introducing connotations of

[110] The epithet ἀγαθός has perplexed many commentators. Schwartz (2008, 401) wonders, "Can anyone imagine that God might send a bad angel? True, God was presumed to have at His disposal angels of destruction, but why hint in prayer that without our special pleading He might send one?" and admits that he has "no solution for this puzzle." Goldstein (1983, 405) makes the point that "'good' appears perhaps because the angel mentioned at Exod 23:20–23 could also punish Israel." See also Doran 2012, 217.

[111] On the prominent place that the Song of the Sea enjoyed in Jewish worship, see Enermalm-Ogawa 1987, 137. Cf. Weitzman, 1997, 75: "By the Second Temple period the Song of the Sea was perceived as a model for how Jews were to praise God in their own divine worship." Philo, who calls it ἱεροπρεπεστάτη ᾠδή (*Som.* 2.269), describes choral performances of thanksgiving hymns modelled after it (*Contempl.* 84–88).

magic-working and trickery into the concept of God as author of miraculous acts. It has to be noted, though, that, of the aforecited adjectives, τερατουργός, while not attested in any Greek biblical text, came to be used in ecclesiastical literature as an epithet of God and Jesus Christ.

4.2.6 τρισαλιτήριος 'thrice impious'

> 8:34 ὁ δὲ τρισαλιτήριος Νικάνωρ ὁ τοὺς χιλίους ἐμπόρους ἐπὶ τὴν πρᾶσιν τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἀγαγών
> 15:3 ὁ δὲ τρισαλιτήριος [sc. Νικάνωρ] ἐπηρώτησεν, εἰ ἔστιν ἐν οὐρανῷ ὁ δυνάστης ὁ προστεταχὼς ἄγειν τὴν τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέραν

As much as the author of 2 Maccabees is sparing in his use of laudative epithets for the book's hero, Judas Maccabeus (he attributes only one to him, γενναῖος, at 12:42), is he lavish in the derogatory epithets that he applies to the book's negative characters. They are either Seleucid enemies of the Jews, such as King Antiochus IV, his minister Andronicus, and the generals Nicanor and Gorgias, or villainous Jews who harmed their own people like the high priests Jason, Alcimus, and Menelaus, and the latter's brothers Simon and Lysimachus. No less than fifteen such epithets are used throughout the book—"a veritable *thesaurus* of Greek vituperation," as Pfeiffer (1949, 513) has called them—alongside a number of other, periphrastic characterizations: ἀνόσιος (7:34; 8:32), ἀσεβής (4:13; 8:2; 10:10), βλάσφημος and ἀνδροφόνος (9:28), δυσσεβής (3:11; 8:14; 9:9; 15:33), δύσφημος (13:11; 15:32), ἱερόσυλος (4:42), κατάρατος (12:35), μιαιφόνος (4:38; 12:6), μιερός (4:19; 7:34; 9:13; 15:32), παμπόνηρος (14:27), παράνομος (13:7), and the cognates ἀλάστωρ (7:9), ἀλιτήριος (12:23; 13:4; 14:42), and τρισαλιτήριος.[112] Antiochus Epiphanes, as expected, is the most reviled of all the characters of the book, having eight of the aforecited epithets ascribed to him;[113] he is followed by the one or two Nicanor(s),[114] who has/have four epithets attached to his/their name,[115] among which the very distinctive and unique τρισαλιτήριος.

---

[112] For an almost complete list of these epithets and expressions, see Knabenbauer 1907, 266.

[113] He is called ἀλάστωρ, ἀνδροφόνος, ἀνόσιος, ἀσεβής, βλάσφημος, δυσσεβής, μιερός, and πάντων ἀνθρώπων μιαρώτατος.

[114] Regarding the question of whether Nicanor, son of Patroclus, Antiochus IV's general in chapter 8 (as well as in 1 Macc 3:38), and Nicanor, Demetrius I's general in chapters 14 and 15, are one and the same person, we declare a *non liquet*. The name Nicanor was quite common in the Seleucid period (Goldstein 1983, 327; Bar-Kochva 1989, 352); actually, another Nicanor, the commander of the Cyprians (Νικάνωρ ὁ Κυπριάρχης), not to be confused with the aforementioned one(s), is referred to at 12:2. The main argument of those who hold that the author himself does not differentiate the two Nicanors is precisely that he bestows on both the same novel and rare adjective τρισαλιτήριος (and, we may add, the somewhat less rare adjective δυσσεβής). See Abel 1949, 471; Habicht 1979, 239n9a, 243n34a, and 277n3a; Goldstein 1976, 258–59; id. 1983, 326–27, 341; Bar-Kochva 1989, 352; Schwartz 2008, 9, 421, 473, 497; Doran 2012, 270. One may, of course, counter-argue that the repetition of the name may simply have triggered the repetition of the abusive adjective. The author often applies the same adjective to more than one person, e.g. δυσσεβής is applied to Simon (3:11), to Nicanor (8:14, 15:33), and to King

This adjective is a Septuagint neologism. Aside from its two instances in 2 Maccabees, it also occurs in the fifth of the Greek Additions to Esther, both in the LXX (E:15 ἡμεῖς δὲ τοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ τρισαλιτηρίου παραδεδομένους εἰς ἀφανισμὸν Ἰουδαίους εὑρίσκομεν οὐ κακούργους ὄντας) and the Alpha Text (7(E):27(15) τοὺς οὖν ὑπὸ τοῦ τρισαλιτηρίου παραδεδομένους ὑμῖν Ἰουδαίους εὑρίσκομεν μὴ ὄντας κακούργους), where it is applied to the wicked Haman, King Artaxerxes' vizier, instigator of an eventually foiled pogrom against the Jews living in the Persian Empire. Of the five Additions to Esther, a Semitic *Vorlage* has been posited for A, C, D, and F, whereas B and E, containing royal decrees dictated in the name of King Artaxerxes by Haman and the righteous Jew Mordecai, respectively, are original Greek compositions,[116] most likely written by the same author[117] in what Wills (1995, 117) has justly called "perhaps the highest-level Greek in the entire Greek Bible." The date of composition of these two Additions cannot be determined precisely. Scholarly opinion is divided over the question whether they were written and integrated in LXX Esther by the translator himself, Lysimachus,[118] at the time of the translation of the book, or whether they came into existence at a previous[119] or later phase.[120] According to the 'colophon'[121] attached to LXX Esther (F:11), Lysimachus' translation was sent to Egypt from Jerusalem in the fourth year of the reign of Ptolemy and Cleopatra. If these rulers are identified with Ptolemy XII Auletes and Cleopatra V Tryphaena, as Bickerman (2007c, 224–25) has argued,[122] the redaction of

---

Antiochus IV (9:9), and ἔκθυμος, in the phrase ἔκθυμος γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς, which occurs thrice in the epitome, is used of two different kings, of Antiochus IV (7:3, 39) and of Demetrius I (14:27).

[115] In chapter 8, Nicanor is called δυσσεβής and τρισαλιτήριος; in chapter 15 (the same or different) Nicanor is called δυσσεβής, δύσφημος, μιερός, and τρισαλιτήριος.

[116] See Moore 1973, 384–85; id. 1977, 155; Tov 2008, 516. Martin (1975) examined the frequencies of occurrence of seventeen syntactical features in the six Additions and concluded that the Greek in Additions A, C, and D is translation Greek, in B and E original Greek, F being either original Greek or a free translation of a Semitic *Vorlage*. Jobes' (1996, 26–27) syntax analysis has shown that "A and B tend toward composition Greek; additions C, D, and F tend toward translation Greek" and that "Addition E in both the AT and the LXX tends so strongly toward composition Greek by every criterion that there is no doubt that it was composed in Greek." For Hanhart (1983, 96), the editor of the Göttingen critical edition of LXX Esther, "die apokryphen Partien sind ursprünglich griechisch." Haelewyck (1985, 30n39) expresses his certainty that B and E were originally composed in Greek and considers it highly probable that the other additions, too, are original Greek compositions.

[117] Moore 1973, 385; id. 1977, 166; Jobes 1996, 172–73.

[118] So Bickerman 2007b, 249; Hanhart 1983, 96; De Troyer 2000, 392; Tov 2008, 517, 519.

[119] Jobes (1996, 224–25) argues that the Additions originated in the Alpha Text of Esther, which she believes is older than the LXX, and from there were copied into the LXX. Haelewyck (1985, 13, 42; 2006, 472–73) opines that all the Additions were composed by the author of the first translation of Esther (made about 120–100 BCE), which preceded the LXX Esther and served as the model of the *Vetus Latina* of Esther.

[120] So Moore 1973, 386; id. 1977, 165.

[121] Bickerman's (2007a) widely accepted claim that Esth F:11 is a colophon, that is, a notation at the end of the manuscript made by a librarian, has been challenged by Cavalier (2003; ead. 2012, 28–29), who argues that it is the last verse of LXX Esther.

[122] It has also been argued that the Ptolemies to whom reference is made in the 'colophon' are Ptolemy IX Soter II and Cleopatra III (the fourth year of whose reign would be 114/113 BCE), preferred by Moore

the 'colophon' can be dated to 78/77 BCE[123] and Lysimachus' translation to sometime during the reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE).[124] De Troyer (2000, 237–38, 276, 398) has posited a *terminus post quem* of 164 BCE (the year of death of Antiochus IV) for the translation and the Additions, on the basis of the resemblances between LXX Esther 8:11 and the decrees of Antiochus IV and his son in 2 Macc 11:22–26, 27–33. The *terminus ante quem* is 93/94 CE, since Josephus, in his paraphrase of Esther in the *Jewish Antiquities* (11.184–296), draws on Additions B, C, D, and E.[125]

We here accept Bickerman's (2007d, 259) dating of LXX Esther to the first quarter of the first century BCE. However, we do not embrace his assumption, shared by Tov (2008, 517, 519) and De Troyer (2000, 392), that the author of all the Additions is Lysimachus, the translator of the canonical Esther. With regard to Additions B and E, Bickerman (2007d, 249) argues that "Lysimachus made a particularly conscious effort at fine writing in composing two royal edicts," wherein he "skillfully imitates the heavy bureaucratic prose of his time, with its long sentences, use of rare words, and the high moralizing tone." Earlier, Motzo (1924, 269–71) had argued that one and the same author might have produced B and E and the rest of the Additions, intentionally varying his style so as to make it conform to that of the texts that he took as models: a Semitizing, Septuagintal style for the religiously loaded prayers of Esther and Mordecai, in Addition C, and a chancery-like style, imitating that of the decrees of the Hellenistic kings of Syria and Egypt, for the edicts of Artaxerxes. More convincingly, in our opinion, Moore (1973, 385; 1977, 166) contends that it seems unlikely that the same person who exhibited an unusually high mastery of rhetorical Greek in composing the two edicts would also have been responsible for the prosaic Greek in which the translation of the canonical text of Esther was couched. He therefore maintains that the Additions were incorporated into LXX Esther at an unknown later date.[126] Furthermore, the discrepancies, pinpointed by Motzo (1924, 251–62), between the canonical text and the Additions make it unlikely that the latter originally formed part of the translation.[127] Lastly, Additions B and E have an "Egyptian flavour,"[128] evident in

(1973, 383; 1977, 250), or Ptolemy XIII and the great Cleopatra VII (the fourth year of whose reign would fall in 49/48 BCE), preferred by, inter alios, Motzo (1924, 294).

[123] Bar-Kokhba (in a paper written in Hebrew, cited by Koller 2014, 121n63) corrects this date to 77/76 BCE.

[124] So Bickerman 2007b, 259.

[125] In his rewriting of Addition E, Josephus uses of Haman the same adjective as the author of his source (ἀλιτήριος) but without the intensifying τρίς (*AJ* 11.279 ἐγὼ δὲ τοὺς ὑπὸ τοῦ ἀλιτηρίου πρὸς ἀπώλειαν ἐκδοθέντας Ἰουδαίους οὐ πονηροὺς κατανοήσας).

[126] Moore 1977, 165: "Just how soon after 114 B.C. [the date that Moore assigns to the translation of the Hebrew Esther by Lysimachus] Additions B and E were composed is impossible to say." See also Schürer 1973–1987, 3.2:719–20.

[127] E.g. in Add E:18 the king states that Haman was crucified at the gates of Susa "with all his household," whereas at 7:9–10 only Haman gets hanged and at 9:6–13 his ten sons get killed by the Jews nine months after their father, on the 13th of Adar.

[128] See Passoni dell'Acqua 2002, 55–61; ead. 2004, 78.

the use of Ptolemaic terminology, which speaks for an Egyptian/Alexandrian rather than Jerusalemitan provenance.[129]

For the reasons which we will clarify further on, we consider here that 2 Maccabees antedates Additions B and E.[130] Hence, we consider that the first instance of τρισαλιτήριος occurs in 2 Maccabees and not in Addition E to Esther.

The not so numerous adjectives compounded with the intensive τρίς and τρι- to be found in Greek literature previous to 2 Maccabees occur almost exclusively in poetry, especially in the comedies of Aristophanes and Menander.[131] In prose we encounter a single adjective expressing a positive meaning, τρισάσμενος, LSJ"thrice-pleased, most willing," in Xenophon (*An.* 3.2.24), and the negatively loaded τρισκακοδαίμων, LSJ"thrice-unlucky," in Aeschines (1.59), τρισκατάρατος, "thrice-accursed," in Demosthenes (25.82), and τρίπορνος, LSJ"a whore in the third degree," in Theopompus (*FGrH* 2b, 115, fr. 253.7). In the Septuagint, the mother of the seven martyrs is characterized as τρισαθλία, "thrice-unhappy," in 4 Macc 16:6. As regards the adjective ἀλιτήριος,[132] "sinful, impious," in Classical literature it is used either in a religious sense, of those who commit offensive or sacrilegious acts against the gods and are consequently regarded as polluted,[133] or in a political sense, of those statesmen whose policy has a

---

[129] See Passoni dell'Acqua 2004, 75–81, 86–88, with further references, and Koller 2014, 123.

[130] To our knowledge, the only scholar who has postulated that 2 Maccabees postdates the LXX version of Esther is Bardtke (1977, 27). He assigns the latter to an early date, in the period of the Maccabean revolt (167–161 BCE), whereas he dates 2 Maccabees to the first century BCE. Recently, Miller (2015, 65–75) argued for a date of composition of LXX Esther between 164 and 142 BCE, based on the assumption that the Ptolemies mentioned in the 'colophon' of the book are Ptolemy VIII Euergetes II Physcon (who reigned from 170 to 163 BCE, and then again from 145 to 116 BCE) and Cleopatra II, and that the fourth year of their reign fell in 142 BCE. However, this dating cannot be accepted, because, as Motzo (1924, 293) has pointed out, when Physcon re-occupied the throne, in 145 BCE, and married Cleopatra II, he did not start a new series of regnal years, but resumed the count from his joint rule with his brother, Ptolemy VI Philometor, which had started in 170 BCE. Thus, the year 145 BCE was the 25th of his reign. See H. Volkmann, "Ptolemaios VIII. Euergetes II.," PW 23.2, cols. 1722–23 and Samuel 1962, 145–47.

[131] τρίλλιστος (Hom. *Il.* 8.488; Call. *Cer.* 138), τριπάνουργος (Mel. *AP* 12.57), τριπόθητος (Mosch. 51; Bion 58), τρισάθλιος (S. *OC* 372; Ar. *Pax* 242; Men. *Asp.* 414; *Dysc.* 423, 466; *Epit.* 610; *Mis.* 260; *Pk.* 340; fr. 74.1 Kock; Macho fr. 17.396 Gow), τρισάλαστος (Mel. *AP* 12.137), τρισευδαίμων (B. *Epin.* 3.10 Irigoin), τρισκακοδαίμων (Ar. *Ach.* 1024; *Pax* 1271; *Th.* 209, 875; *Ra.* 19; *Ec.* 1098; *Pl.* 851; Men. *Dysc.* 523, 603; *Epit.* 145, 913; *Pk.* 978), τρισκατάρατος (Archestr. fr. 45.15 Brandt; Men. *Epit.* 1080; fr. 71.1 Kock), τρὶς μάκαρ (Hom. *Od.* 5.306; 6.154, 155; Hes. fr. 211.7; Ar. *Pax* 1334; Call. *Aet.* 178.32 Pfeiffer), τρισμακάριος (Archil. fr. 60.6 West; Ar. *Ach.* 400; *Nu.* 166; *V.* 1293; *Av.* 1273, 1707; Philem. fr. 93.1 Kock), τρισοιζυρός (Archil. fr. 228 West; Cerc. fr. 17, col.1.13 Powell), τρισόλβιος (S. fr. 837.1 Radt; Ar. *Ec.* 1129; Philem. fr. 93.1 Kock). On the intensive τρίς, "very commonly employed in affective speech," see Thesleff 1954, 177.

[132] A detailed investigation of the use of ἀλιτήριος and related words is Hatch 1908.

[133] Th. 1.126.11 ἐναγεῖς καὶ ἀλιτήριοι τῆς θεοῦ ἐκεῖνοί τε [sc. the Alcmaeonids, because of the slaughter of Cylon and his followers who had taken sanctuary at the altar of Athena] ἐκαλοῦντο καὶ τὸ γένος τὸ ἀπ' ἐκείνων; Ar. *Eq.* 445 ἐκ τῶν ἀλιτηρίων σέ φημι γεγονέναι τῶν τῆς θεοῦ (reference to the Alcmaeonids); And. 1.51 ἀναγραφέντας ἐν στήλαις ὡς ὄντας ἀλιτηρίους τῶν θεῶν; Lys. 6.52 εἴργεσθαι τῶν ἱερῶν αὐτὸν ὡς ἀλιτήριον ὄντα; 6.53 χρὴ νομίζειν . . . ἀπαλλαττομένους Ἀνδοκίδου τὴν πόλιν καθαίρειν καὶ ἀποδιοπομπεῖσθαι καὶ φαρμακὸν ἀποπέμπειν καὶ ἀλιτηρίου ἀπαλλάττεσθαι; 13.79 ὥσπερ ἀλιτηρίῳ

pernicious effect on the affairs of their state. But even when addressed as an insulting appellation to one's political adversary, it is not devoid of religious connotations: the political opponent is presented as a 'polluter' who has to be expelled, lest he should bring affliction to the city.[134] In the Middle and New Comedy, both these senses recede, and ἀλιτήριος ends up being used to designate any petty rascal, from a stingy brothel-keeper to a cook whose only misdeed is that he uses Homeric vocabulary to name the kitchen utensils.[135]

In 2 Maccabees, ἀλιτήριος is applied collectively, first to Timothy's soldiers put to flight by Judas (12:23 συγκεντῶν τοὺς ἀλιτηρίους διέφθειρέ τε εἰς μυριάδας τρεῖς ἀνδρῶν)[136] and then to the five hundred soldiers that the general Nicanor sends to seize Razis, the pious defender of Judaism, obliging him to a heroic suicide (14:42 εὐγενῶς θέλων ἀποθανεῖν ἤπερ τοῖς ἀλιτηρίοις ὑποχείριος γενέσθαι).[137] The two individuals who earn the designation of ἀλιτήριος and τρισαλιτήριος are Menelaus (13:4) and the one or two Nicanor(s), respectively. Menelaus, who had been appointed high priest through bribery (4:24), had stolen gold vessels from the Temple (4:32), instigated the murder of the ex-high priest Onias III (4:34), connived at acts of sacrilege committed by Lysimachus in Jerusalem (4:39), become a plotter against his compatriots and a traitor to his country (4:50, 5:15), and even led Antiochus IV to the Temple to plunder it (5:15), embodies the ἀλιτήριος *par excellence*, whose crimes and offences are of both a religious and a political nature. The Nicanor of chapter 8, who brought a thousand slave-traders to buy the Jews that he intended to capture (8:11), and the Nicanor of chapter 15, who caused the death of Razis (14:39–46), swore an oath to raze the Temple to the ground

---

οὐδεὶς ἀνθρώπων αὐτῷ διελέγετο. Cf. Suid. α 1257 ἀλιτήριος: ἀνόσιος, ὁ ἐνεχόμενος μιάσματι καὶ ἐξημαρτηκὼς εἰς θεούς. Exclusively in Antiphon (4.1.3; 4.1.4; 4.2.8; 4.3.7; 4.4.10), ἀλιτήριοι are the "avenging spirits" of a victim, who haunt the unpunished perpetrator of a murder until justice is done.

[134] D. 18.159 [speaking of Aeschines] ὅν . . . οὐκ ἂν ὀκνήσαιμ' ἔγωγε κοινὸν ἀλειτήριον τῶν μετὰ ταῦτ' ἀπωλολότων ἁπάντων εἰπεῖν, ἀνθρώπων, τόπων, πόλεων; Aeschin. 3.131 [speaking of Demosthenes] ὦ τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλειτήριε; 3.157 μηδενὶ τρόπῳ τὸν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλειτήριον στεφανοῦν; Din. 1.77 [speaking of Demosthenes] δεῖ ὑμᾶς . . . τὸν τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἀλιτήριον ἀποκτείναντας ἐξόριστον ἐκ τῆς πόλεως ποιῆσαι; Lycurg. 1.117 ἐψηφίσαντο εἰς ταύτην [sc. τὴν στήλην] ἀναγράφειν τοὺς ἀλιτηρίους καὶ τοὺς προδότας (reference to those who sided with the Persians). Cf. also a metrical ostracon of 485/4 BCE against Xanthippus son of Ariphron, Pericles' father, accusing him of some serious wrong doing: *SEG* 36:44, a[1] Χσάνθ[ιππον τόδε] φεσὶν ἀλειτερὸν πρυτάνειον | τὸστρακ[ον Ἀρρί]φρονος παῖδα μά[λ]ιστ' ἀδικεῖν. On the possible political reasons for Xanthippus' ostracism, see Figueira 1986, 274–79; on the religious connotations of ἀλειτερός in this context, see Parker 1983, 268–70 and Forsdyke 2005, 156–57.

[135] Eub. fr. 88.2 Kock τρέφει με Θετταλός τις, ἄνθρωπος βαρύς, / πλουτῶν, φιλάργυρος δὲ κἀλιτήριος; Strato Com. fr. 219.49 Austin καί μοι δοκεῖ ῥαψωιδοτοιούτου τινὸς / δοῦλος γεγονὼς ἐκ παιδὸς ἀλιτήριος / ἔπειτα πεπλῆσθαι τῶν Ὁμήρου ῥημάτων; See also Damox. fr. 2.8 Kock; Men. *Epit.* 894; fr. 563 Kock.

[136] An interesting parallel can be found in a papyrus letter relating a battle that took place on the sacred island of Souchos at Crocodilopolis between the natives and attackers from the neighbouring town of Hermonthis. The routed adversaries are called in this letter ἀλιτήριοι (if Crusius' emendation of λη̣τ̣η̣ρίους to ἀλιτηρίους is correct): *Chr.Wilck.* 11 A, 2,FrC.41 [Pathyris, 123 BCE] συνκρουσάντων δ' ἀλλήλων ἐν τῇ [ν]ήσῳ συνβῆναι τροπωθῆναι τοὺς λη̣τ̣η̣ρίους καὶ ἀκόσμως εἰς τὸν ποταμὸν ἐναλέσθαι.

[137] The adjective is also used in the plural in 3 Maccabees (3:16 τὸ ἱερὸν τῶν ἀλιτηρίων), in a letter that pretends to be written by Ptolemy IV Philopator; the king assigns the adjective to the Jews.

and build a temple to Dionysus in its place (14:33), and dared question the keeping of the Sabbath and present himself as a sovereign on earth on a par with the sovereign in heaven (15:3–5), are apparently deemed by the author to be more serious religious offenders and enemies of the Jews than Menelaus so as to deserve to be labelled with the stronger epithet τρισαλιτήριος. In Artaxerxes' decree in Esther, the same epithet is attributed to Haman because, according to the king, he schemed the destruction of Mordecai, of Queen Esther, of the sovereign himself, and of all the Jews of the empire, and further plotted the subjugation of the Persians to the Macedonians (Add E:10–14).[138] Haman's unaccomplished crimes are of a political rather than of a religious nature,[139] but still fall within the ambit of the offences for the commitment of which one may be called ἀλιτήριος.

A final point needs to be made about whether the occurrence of the above-discussed neologism in both 2 Maccabees and the Addition E to Esther betrays an influence of one text on the other. The adjective is so rare[140] that its exclusive use in these two original Greek compositions as a designation of two potential exterminators of the Jewish people[141] can hardly be fortuitous.

If we examine the number of words shared exclusively between 2 Maccabees and LXX Esther, and not appearing anywhere else in the Septuagint, we see that it is low: ἀτάραχος (2 Macc 11:23; Add Esth B:7, Add E:8), διδάσκαλος (2 Macc 1:10; Esth 6:1), μέθοδος (2 Macc 13:18; Add Esth E:13), πορευτός (2 Macc 5:21; Add Esth B:2), πρωτεύω (2 Macc 6:18, 13:15; Esth 5:11), σκοπέω (2 Macc 4:5; Add Esth E:7), τρισαλιτήριος (2 Macc 8:34, 15:3; Add Esth E:15), and ψήφισμα (2 Macc 6:8, 10:8, 12:4, 15:36; Esth 3:7, 9:24). As can be seen, in Esther five out of eight of these words occur in Additions B and E, which were originally written in Greek. Aside from τρισαλιτήριος, the word that can be taken to be most suggestive of a connection between the two books is ἀτάραχος, *GELS* "unaffected by disturbances," used figuratively, in both Additions, of a kingdom and its subjects: Add Esth B:7 ὅπως . . . εὐσταθῆ καὶ ἀτάραχα παρέχωσιν ἡμῖν διὰ τέλους τὰ πράγματα; Add E:8 εἰς τὸ τὴν βασιλείαν ἀτάραχον τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις μετ' εἰρήνης παρεξόμεθα. In 2 Maccabees, it occurs at 11:23 (τοὺς ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας ἀταράχους ὄντας), in the letter that King Antiochus V addressed to the

[138] A comment is called for here with regard to the following remark by De Troyer (2000, 379): "The 'threefold' element of the reference [to Haman as τρισαλιτήριος] should not be understood literally. . . . Is it not delightfully coincidental, however, that Haman has three wicked deeds on his conscience: the attack on the Jews, the planned hanging of Mordecai and the intended attempted rape of Esther." Haman neither intended nor attempted to rape Esther. That was a misapprehension on the part of the king (7:7–8).

[139] An intended offense of a religious nature is implied, however, in Esther's prayer, in Add C:20, where the queen refers to those who want "to destroy [the Lord's] inheritance and to stop the mouths of those who praise [Him] and to extinguish the glory of [His] house and [His] altar" (NETS).

[140] Outside the Septuagint, it only reccurs in a few Byzantine writers from the fifth century CE onwards. Hesychius (τ 1426) glosses it as ἁμαρτωλός.

[141] Cf. 2 Macc 8:9 Νικάνορα τὸν τοῦ Πατρόκλου τῶν πρώτων φίλων ἀπέστειλεν . . . τὸ σύμπαν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐξᾶραι γένος and Esth 3:6 καὶ ἐβουλεύσατο [sc. Αμαν] ἀφανίσαι πάντας τοὺς ὑπὸ τὴν Ἀρταξέρξου βασιλείαν Ἰουδαίους.

Jews in 163 BCE, granting them permission to live according to their laws and practice their religion.[142] De Troyer (2000, 276 and 398) maintains that this letter, together with the amnesty decree issued earlier, in 164 BCE, by Antiochus IV (11:27–33), "constitute a primary source of inspiration" for the author of Addition E, in terms of their content and terminology, and, accordingly, posits 164 BCE as the *terminus post quem* for LXX Esther and its Additions. If indeed the author of the fictional decrees contained in Additions B and E made use of the authentic[143] royal decrees of the Antiochi, we may suppose that he came to know them not as self-standing documents but as texts inserted in 2 Maccabees.

As a number of commentators have pointed out,[144] the most conspicuous phraseological parallel between LXX Esther and 2 Maccabees is that between Alcimus' speech in 2 Macc 14:6 (οὐκ ἐῶντες τὴν βασιλείαν εὐσταθείας τυχεῖν) and Haman's letter in Add B:5 (πρὸς τὸ μὴ τὴν βασιλείαν εὐσταθείας τυγχάνειν). Although εὐστάθεια and its cognate verb εὐσταθέω are elsewhere attested in contexts referring to political stability,[145] the combination εὐσταθείας τυγχάνειν/τυχεῖν occurring in the two deuterocanonical texts is unique.[146] The phraseological parallels between the canonical part of LXX Esther and 2 Maccabees that we were able to trace are few and non-significant.[147]

We also note the adverbial use of ταῖς ἀληθείαις, "in truth, really," in 2 Macc 3:9 and in Add Esth E:10, which is not attested anywhere else in the Septuagint.

As can be seen, the most notable and exclusive points of verbal contact between LXX Esther and 2 Maccabees (τρισαλιτήριος, ταῖς ἀληθείαις, and the combination of ἀτάραχος and βασιλεία and of εὐστάθεια and τυγχάνω) are clustered in the Additions B (one point of contact) and E (three points of contact) in Esther, but occur in six different chapters (3, 7, 8, 11, 14, 15) in 2 Maccabees.[148] If, on the basis of these points of contact, we are to posit a lexical influence between the two books, the direction of this influence seems to be from 2 Maccabees to the Additions; if the reverse was the case,

---

[142] The adjective is unattested in the corpus of preserved royal letters from the Hellenistic period (Welles 1934). In the figurative sense attested here, it is not used anywhere else before Diodorus Siculus (17.54.6; 18.18.6).

[143] On the authenticity of these documents, see 1.2.2.

[144] See J.A.F. Gregg, "Additions to Esther," *APOT* 1:668; Abel 1949, 459; Schwartz 2008, 472.

[145] Cf. *OGIS* 56,B.19 [238 BCE] οἱ θεοὶ δεδώκασιν αὐτοῖς εὐσταθοῦσαν τὴν βασιλείαν; *I. Aeg. Thrace* 205.30 [mid 2nd–early 1st c. BCE] αἱ πόλεις εὐστάθησαν; *IscM I* 54.37 [ca. mid 1st c. BCE] συνέβη τήν τε πόλιν εὐσταθεῖν καὶ τοὺς πο|λείτας σώ[ζ]εσθαι; *OGIS* 669.4 [68 CE] τὴν Αἴγυπτον ἐν εὐσταθείᾳ διάγουσαν; *IosPE I*^{2} 94.10 [Roman period] ὑπὲρ | εὐσταθείας τῆς πόλεως | καὶ εἰρήνης. Cf. also LXX Jer 30:9 ἔθνος εὐσταθοῦν; Wis 6:24 εὐστάθεια δήμου.

[146] In Add Esth B:7 we also find the phrase ὅπως . . . εἰς τὸν μετέπειτα χρόνον εὐσταθῆ καὶ ἀτάραχα παρέχωσιν ἡμῖν διὰ τέλους τὰ πράγματα, which is echoed closely in the following line from Ptolemy Philopator's decree in 3 Macc 3:26: διειλήφαμεν εἰς τὸν ἐπίλοιπον χρόνον τελείως ἡμῖν τὰ πράγματα ἐν εὐσταθείᾳ . . . κατασταθήσεσθαι.

[147] See Appendix 8, 35–37.

[148] See Appendix 5, 41–43.

the author of 2 Maccabees would have likely drawn not only from Additions B and E but also from other parts of LXX Esther.[149]

To be sure, the verbal agreements between the aforementioned Antiochan decrees in 2 Maccabees and the decrees of Artaxerxes in Additions B and E to Esther are not as many as those that can be found between the latter and the ones supposedly issued by King Ptolemy Philopator in 3 Maccabees (3:12–29, 7:1–9). Motzo (1924, 274–77), who has identified a non-negligible number of similarities of content, style, and language between the decrees in LXX Esther and those in 3 Maccabees, has advocated the priority of the latter over the former. As he argues, Philopator's decrees are an integral part of the narrative in 3 Maccabees, written in the Ptolemaic chancery style that the author of the book knew all too well, whereas in LXX Esther, Artaxerxes' decrees are foreign insertions, striving to adapt the Hellenistic chancery style to a Persian-period context (p. 277). He further argues that, in LXX Esther, the said similarities are concentrated in the Additions, whereas no notable correspondences with 3 Maccabees are to be found in the parts of Esther translated from Hebrew (p. 280). The editor of LXX Esther, Motzo concludes, had before his eyes 3 Maccabees and imitated it (pp. 278, 280).[150] More recently, Hacham (2007, 772–80) examined the vocabulary shared by 3 Maccabees and LXX Esther and occurring nowhere else in the Septuagint and found that most of the approximately twenty words and phrases or expressions which are *unique* to these books in the Septuagint occur in different sections of 3 Maccabees, while in Esther they are clustered in the royal decrees contained in Additions B and E. He thus posited a direction of influence going from 3 Maccabees to Additions B and E, for, in the opposite case, 3 Maccabees would likely have drawn not only from B and E but also from other parts of the Greek translation of Esther (pp. 779–80).[151]

---

[149] One might counter-argue, of course, that an author with high stylistic ambitions, like the author of 2 Maccabees, would have been attracted only by the elevated style of Additions B and E and would have been uninterested in the more prosaic parts of Esther. On the relationship and the possible points of contact between 2 Maccabees and LXX Esther see 5.3.

[150] For a critique of some of Motzo's arguments, see Magliano-Tromp 2009, 60–65.

[151] Kopidakis (1987, 22), on the contrary, has postulated an opposite direction of influence between the two works based on the fact that linguistic and thematic parallels with 3 Maccabees are also to be found in the parts of LXX Esther that are translated from the Hebrew. The list of verbal correspondences between 3 Maccabees and LXX Esther that he provides (pp. 19–22) seems to confirm Hacham's claim that, in LXX Esther, the *notable/exclusive* similarities with 3 Maccabees are concentrated in the Additions. There are, however, two words, κώθων (Esth 8:17; 3 Macc 6:31) and ὑπερχαρής (Esth 5:9; 3 Macc 7:20), which both Kopidakis (p. 21) and Hacham (p. 773) list, that seem to cast a shadow of doubt on this claim, since, in the Septuagint, they are exclusive to 3 Maccabees and LXX Esther, but, in the latter book, they occur outside the Additions. With regard to κώθων, Hacham writes that "because the verb κωθωνίζω appears elsewhere in the Septuagint this parallel carries less weight" (p. 774n39). One may concede this point to him because κώθων, in the sense of "drinking party, feast," is found in a very limited number of secular texts from the third and second centuries BCE (Macho fr. 18.442 Gow; *IG XII Suppl.* 365.17 [2nd c. BCE]). Of ὑπερχαρής, though—on which Hacham passes no comment—there are only half a dozen instances in the entire body of Greek literature: two in Polybius, two in the Septuagint, one in Josephus quoting Manetho, one in Polyaenus, and one in a 2nd/3rd c. CE inscription cited by LSJSupp. One may wonder what the chances are that the instances of these rare words in two Septuagint books that are acknowledged to have many linguistic affinities are unrelated to one another. We seize the opportunity

To sum up, Additions B and E to Esther appear to draw upon both 2 and 3 Maccabees.[152] The author of Addition E likely picked up the epithet τρισαλιτήριος from 2 Maccabees, where it occurs twice, along with an impressive number of other vituperative adjectives, for which the author of the latter book definitely has a flair. More specifically, he seems to have drawn it from 2 Macc 8:34, where it is applied to a mortal enemy of the Jews, as in Add E:15.[153]

4.2.7 ὑψαυχενέω 'to carry the neck high,' 'to behave haughtily'

> 15:6 καὶ ὁ μὲν Νικάνωρ μετὰ πάσης ἀλαζονείας ὑψαυχενῶν διεγνώκει κοινὸν τῶν περὶ τὸν Ἰούδαν συστήσασθαι τρόπαιον

The personification of hubris in 2 Maccabees is King Antiochus IV, whose God-defying arrogance is denoted by such terms as ἀγερωχία, ἀλαζονεία, μετεωρίζομαι and μετεωρισμός, ὑπερήφανος, ὑπερηφάνως, ὑπερηφανία, and φρυάττομαι,[154] as well as by highly poetic and hyperbolic metaphors.[155] Two other characters in the book embodying overbearing insolence are Antiochus' vice-regent Lysias and the general Nicanor. The former has his moment of hubris when, counting on the supremacy of his

---

here to point out that the phrase δόρατι καὶ πυρί (Esth E:24)/πυρὶ καὶ δόρατι (3 Macc 5:43), "the most significant parallel between Greek Esther and 3 Maccabees," according to Hacham (2007, 772), does not occur only in these two works and nowhere else in ancient Greek literature, as Hacham (loc. cit.) and Magliano-Tromp (2009, 66–67) state, but has a precedent in Euripides, in Andromache's lament (*Andr.* 105 δορὶ καὶ πυρὶ δηϊάλωτον). It is notable that it is Addition E that preserves the Euripidean order of the substantives and not 3 Maccabees, as one would have expected, if it was the latter text that first borrowed the expression from Euripides or some other poetic text. Was the author of Addition E aware of the precise origin of the phrase that he picked up from 3 Maccabees and consciously adjusted it so as to match the phrase used in the original poetic text? Neither is the combination ἐπαίρεσθαι θράσει (Esth B:2; 3 Macc 2:21) "unique," as Hacham (ib. 774) again writes. It occurs in Thucydides (1.120.5) and in authors of the first centuries BCE and CE (D.S. 2.34.4; D.H. 8.91.1; Ph. *Virt.* 2; J. *AJ* 18.2.5). An attractive theory that would explain the influence on the one hand of LXX Esther on 3 Maccabees and on the other hand of 3 Maccabees to Additions B and E has been put forward by Alexander (2001, 333–37).

[152] Additions B and E seem also to have copied verbatim a phrase that originates in the story of the three bodyguards in 1 Esdras. In 1 Esd 3:2, King Darius hosts a banquet for the high-ranking officials of his empire, ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς μέχρι τῆς Αἰθιοπίας ἐν ταῖς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἑπτά σατραπείαις. In LXX Esther, the same phrase occurs in the passages immediately preceding the Additions B and E (3:12 ἀπὸ Ἰνδικῆς ἕως τῆς Αἰθιοπίας, ταῖς ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ χώραις; 8:9 ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἕως τῆς Αἰθιοπίας, ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ σατραπείαις). The author of Additions B and E, taking the cue from these passages, uses the said phrase at the opening of Artaxerxes' letters (Add B:1 τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἕως τῆς Αἰθιοπίας ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ χωρῶν ἄρχουσι; Add E:1 τοῖς ἀπὸ τῆς Ἰνδικῆς ἕως τῆς Αἰθιοπίας ἑκατὸν εἴκοσι ἑπτὰ σατραπείαις χωρῶν ἄρχουσιν).

[153] Against Goldstein (1983, 503), who wonders: "Had the abridger read the Greek book of Esther? If so, he took the epithet "heinous sinner" (*trisaliterios*) . . . from Greek Esther 8:12^{p} Rahlfs. . . . We could then be sure that the abridger worked after the Greek book of Esther was brought to Egypt in 78/77 B.C.E."

[154] 5:17, 21; 7:34, 36; 9:4, 7, 8, 11, 12.

[155] See 5:21; 9:8, 10.

army, he envisages the subjugation of Jerusalem (11:2–4). His state of mind before his confrontation with Judas at Beth-Zur is designated by a semantic neologism, the verb φρενόομαι (11:4) in the previously unattested sense of "to be puffed up." With respect to Nicanor, who threatens to raze to the ground the Temple of Jerusalem (14:33) and boasts that he will erect a trophy of his victory over Judas (15:6), the author uses the substantive ἀλαζονεία,[156] already employed of Antiochus, and the verbs ὑψαυχενέω (15:6) and μεγαλαυχέω (15:32).

μεγαλαυχέω, first attested in Aeschylus (*Ag.* 1528), is sparsely found in prose prior to 2 Maccabees.[157] In the Septuagint it occurs five times. Its instance in Sir 48:18 presents a close parallel to 2 Macc 15:32: Rapsakes, the general of the Assyrian king Sennacherib, raises boastfully his hand against Zion (καὶ ἐπῆρεν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Σιων καὶ ἐμεγαλαύχησεν ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ αὐτοῦ)[158] in the same way that the general Nicanor stretches out his hand against the Temple and boasts that he can demolish it (15:32 τὴν χεῖρα . . . ἣν ἐκτείνας ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ παντοκράτορος οἶκον ἐμεγαλαύχησε).[159] This threatening, bellicose gesture[160] of both generals is patterned after biblical images of Yahweh stretching out His hand to punish and destroy.[161] In the Septuagint of Ezekiel, in particular, we frequently encounter the verb ἐκτείνω, the same verb that the author of 2 Maccabees uses,[162] employed with respect to Yahweh's hand.[163] Furthermore, both Sir 48:18 and 2 Macc 15:6 and 15:32 seem to evoke a passage in LXX Job, which recounts the troubles that befall the wicked man who raises his arm in arrogance against God: 15 [24]ἀνάγκη δὲ καὶ θλῖψις αὐτὸν καθέξει ὥσπερ στρατηγὸς πρωτοστάτης πίπτων. [25]ὅτι ἦρκεν χεῖρας ἐναντίον τοῦ κυρίου, ἔναντι δὲ κυρίου παντοκράτορος ἐτραχηλίασεν, [26]ἔδραμεν δὲ ἐναντίον αὐτοῦ ὕβρει, "distress and anguish will take hold of him; he will be like a general falling in the front rank. Because he lifted his hands against the Lord and stiffened his neck against the Lord Almighty and ran against him with insolence" (NETS). Verses 15:6 and 15:32 in 2 Maccabees share striking correspondences with the

---

[156] At 15:6, Codex Alexandrinus reads ασφαλειας instead of ἀλαζονείας.

[157] Isoc. (1x), Pl. (3x), Plb. (4x).

[158] Cf. Sennacherib's threats against Jerusalem delivered through Rapsakes in 4 Kgdms 18:29 (μὴ ἐπαιρέτω ὑμᾶς Εζεκιας λόγοις, ὅτι οὐ μὴ δύνηται ὑμᾶς ἐξελέσθαι ἐκ χειρός μου) and 18:35 (τίς ἐν πᾶσιν τοῖς θεοῖς τῶν γαιῶν, οἳ ἐξείλαντο τὰς γᾶς αὐτῶν ἐκ χειρός μου, ὅτι ἐξελεῖται κύριος τὴν Ιερουσαλημ ἐκ χειρός μου;), and in Isa 36:20. Schwartz (2008, 62) suggests a parallel between 2 Macc 14:33 and Isa 10:32, where an Assyrian king (Sennacherib or perhaps Sargon) is said to have "stretched out his hand against the mountain of the house/daughter of Zion," yet, the Septuagint translation of this verse eliminates the threatening character of the king's gesture (τῇ χειρὶ παρακαλεῖτε, τὸ ὄρος, τὴν θυγατέρα Σιων, "O mount . . . with your hand encourage daughter Sion" NETS).

[159] Cf. 1 Macc 7:47 τὴν δεξιὰν αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ Νικάνορος], ἣν ἐξέτεινεν ὑπερηφάνως.

[160] See Fohrer 1963, 274: "Das 'Ausrecken' der drohenden und bewaffneten Hand ist ein Bild für das Kämpfen selber."

[161] See Dhorme 1963, 144–45.

[162] The author also uses the verb προτείνω to describe Nicanor's gesture against the temple: 14:33 προτείνας τὴν δεξιὰν ἐπὶ τὸν νεώ.

[163] See Ezek 6:14; 13:9; 14:9, 13; 16:27; 25:7, 13, 16; 35:3. Cf. Exod 3:20; 7:5; 15:12; 2 Kgdms 24:16; Jer 15:6; 21:5; 28:25; Zeph 1:4; 2:13; Isa 5:25.

Joban passage: τὴν χεῖρα ἐκτείνας in 2 Macc 15:32 echoes the ἦρκεν χεῖρας in Job 15:25, ὑψαυχενέω in 2 Macc 15:6 corresponds to ἐτραχηλίασεν (the verb, a neologism of LXX Job, means [LSJ]"to arch the neck proudly, like a horse")[164] in Job 15:25, μετὰ πάσης ἀλαζονείας in 2 Macc 15:6 is equivalent to ὕβρει in Job 15:26,[165] and παντοκράτωρ is the adjective employed by both the translator of Job and the author of 2 Maccabees to designate God. Could it be that 2 Macc 15:6 and 15:32 constitute a reminiscence of Job 15:25–26 and that Jason or the epitomator used ὑψαυχενέω, alternatively with μεγαλαυχέω, in an attempt either to come up with a semantic variant of τραχηλιάω or, more unlikely, to render the Hebrew בְּצַוָּאר, "with the neck"?[166]

ὑψαυχενέω is itself a Septuagint neologism; its first surviving instances in Greek literature are found in 2 and 3 Maccabees. Some of its cognates are attested much earlier, though: in Classical Greek, the adjective ὑψαύχην occurs only in Euripides (*Ba.* 1061) and in Plato (*Phdr.* 253d), applied figuratively to a tall fir-tree and literally to a horse carrying its neck high, respectively; in the *Epitome* of Aristophanes of Byzantium there occur both ὑψαύχην and ὑψαύχενος, the first (2.593) referring to the Nisaean and the second (2.597) to the Arabian horses. Also attested are the rare substantive ὑψαυχενία, which, in the literature from before the turn of the Common Era, occurs only in Xenophon, who uses it of the high carriage of a horse's neck (*Eq.* 10.13), and the late denominative verb ὑψαυχενίζω, first found in an epigram (*AP* 9.777) of the first-century CE poet Philip of Thessalonica describing a bronze horse.

In their aforecited instances, all these compounds deriving from αὐχήν are not used with reference to humans and carry no connotations of arrogance and boastfulness. It is the verb ὑψαυχενέω, which, from its first appearance onwards, is used metaphorically of boastful individuals. The meaning "to boast" was probably transferred to it from the rare, poetic verb ὑψαυχέω,[167] a synonym of the previously discussed compound

---

[164] Cf. Hsch. τ 1292 τραχηλιῶ· ὑψῶ αὐχένα; τ 1291 τραχηλιάσας· ἐναντιωθείς. ἀπειθήσας; Suid. ε 3333 ἐτραχηλίασε: κατισχυρεύσατο· ἢ ἐγαυρίασεν. ἀπὸ τῶν βοῶν τῶν ἀποβαλλόντων τοῦ τραχήλου τὸν ζυγόν. Theodotion's version has κατισχύσατο.

[165] The translator of Job rendered וְאֶל־שַׁדַּי יִתְגַּבָּר, "bid defiance to the Almighty" (NRSV), with ἔναντι δὲ κυρίου παντοκράτορος ἐτραχηλίασεν, and בְּצַוָּאר, "with the neck," with ὕβρει, although it is clear that it was בְּצַוָּאר that sparked the coinage of the neologism τραχηλιάω.

[166] Dhorme (1967, 220) renders בְּצַוָּאר as "with neck outstretched" (cf. Vulg. *erecto collo*) and relates it to Ps 75:6(5) בְּצַוָּאר עָתָק, "[do not speak] with insolent neck" (NRSV). As he notes, the expression בְּצַוָּאר describes "the attitude of one who raises or stretches his neck in the tension of a great effort. Strength resides in the neck and the nape." Feuer (1985, 2:942), commenting on the aforequoted psalmic verse, remarks that "the צַוָּאר, *neck*, is an allegory for stubborn, unyielding *insolence*. The haughty men strut about with outstretched necks." It is in this latter, figurative sense that the Septuagint translator of Job understood בְּצַוָּאר and rendered it by ὕβρει (whereas Theodotion, Aquila, and Symmachus rendered it literally with τραχήλῳ). Cf. Isa 3:16 ὑψώθησαν αἱ θυγατέρες Σιων καὶ ἐπορεύθησαν ὑψηλῷ τραχήλῳ and see J. Hausmann, "צַוָּאר," *TDOT* 12:268.

[167] From an entry in Phrynichus' *Praeparatio Sophistica* (117.13 de Borries) we know that this verb was attested in Sophocles. The next time we encounter it is in a quotation from Chrysippus preserved by Plutarch (*SVF* 3:526) and in Jewish works written around the turn of the Common Era (Ps.-Phoc. 62; Sib. Or. 2.134). The cognate adjective ὑψαυχής occurs in Bacchylides (13.51 Irigoin ὑψαυχὴς κό[ρα], "a high-vaunting girl") and nowhere else.

μεγαλαυχέω. ὑψαυχέω and ὑψαυχενέω are semantically associated but etymologically unrelated.[168]

ὑψαυχενέω is one of the fifty-four words shared between 2 and 3 Maccabees and found nowhere else in the Septuagint. In 3 Maccabees it occurs in a letter presumably written by King Ptolemy IV Philopator, in which the Jews are accused of being "unique amongst the nations in their haughtiness towards their kings and benefactors" (NETS): 3:19 μονώτατοι τῶν ἐθνῶν βασιλεῦσιν καὶ τοῖς ἑαυτῶν εὐεργέταις ὑψαυχενοῦντες. The characterization of the Jews by Ptolemy as ὑψαυχενοῦντες recalls their appellation by Yahweh in Exodus and in Deuteronomy as a "stiff-necked people."[169] "Stiff-necked" (קְשֵׁה־עֹרֶף), expressing stubborness and recalcitrance (the metaphor is perhaps taken from the draught animals that stiffen their necks as a sign of refusal to go on or to submit to the yoke),[170] has been rendered in the Septuagint by the neologism σκληροτράχηλος. It is understandable that the author of 3 Maccabees would not have a Gentile king use of the Jews an expression that would be distinctly reminiscent of the one used by Yahweh, in the Greek version of the Torah, to reproach His people. He chose ὑψαυχενέω, probably borrowing it from 2 Maccabees, which expresses defiant arrogance rather than obstinacy.

ὑψαυχενέω does not seem to be a coinage of the author of 2 Maccabees, as it appears from around the last decade of the first century BCE onwards in secular Greek works that could not have been influenced by the vocabulary of 2 or 3 Maccabees. We find it in the *Roman Antiquities* of Dionysius of Halicarnassus (7.46.2), published in 7 BCE, in an astrological fragment of Critodemus (*Cat.Cod.Astr.* 5.2.52), possibly dating from around the turn of the Common Era,[171] in Plutarch (3x), and in the novels of Achilles Tatius (2.15.4) and Iamblichus (*Bab.* 1.44). At the same time, it occurs ten times in nine different works of Philo and has a modest *Nachleben* in ecclesiastical literature. Once again, it is difficult to answer the question whether 2 Maccabees preserves a very early, second-century BCE attestation of ὑψαυχενέω or whether we are to posit a time of composition of the epitome sometime in the first century BCE, near the period when the aforecited surviving attestations of the verb start clustering.

---

[168] Adontz (1937, 10) suggested that the words αὐχήν, "neck, throat," and αὐχή, "boasting," whose etymology is unknown, are related to the Armenian *awji-k'*, "collar." As evidence of the relation between the two Greek nouns he adduced the verbs ὑψαυχενέω and ὑψαυχέω: "Les mots *ὑψαυχενέω* 'relever la tête, être hautain,' *ὑψαυχέω* 'se vanter, être fier' [et] *ὑψαύχενος* prouvent que *αὐχή* 'jactance' se rattache à *αὐχήν* 'cou.'" Both *DELG* and *EDG*, s.v. αὐχέω, discard this conjecture as unconvincing.

[169] Exod 33:3, 5; 34:9; Deut 9:6, 13. Cf. Deut 10:16; Isa 48:4.

[170] See Dhorme 1963, 93 and M. Zipor, "עֹרֶף," *TDOT* 11:368.

[171] Cramer (1954, 14–15) and Gundel and Gundel (1966, 106) place Critodemus in the third century BCE. Neugebauer and van Hoesen (1987, 185–86) consider that he could be "at the latest a contemporary of Pliny, in the first century A.D.," although some evidence points to a later date. The *EANS*, 493 assigns him a date between 50 BCE and 50 CE; Pingree (2001, 10) dates him to the early first century CE.

4.3 Summary

In this chapter we examined seven words which first appear in the Septuagint, in 2 Maccabees and in one more deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book. Three of these words (δειλανδρέω, τερατοποιός, τρισαλιτήριος) are attested only in the Septuagint and the literature dependent on it; the rest (δυσσέβημα, ἔσθησις, οἰωνόβρωτος, ὑψαυχενέω) are attested in profane literature, too. These neologisms illustrate quite well the book's dual adherence to the biblical and the profane Greek literature: on the one hand, τερατοποιός points intertextually to Exod 15:11 and δειλανδρέω (less explicitly) to Deut 20:8; on the other hand, δυσσέβημα belongs to a word-group attested mainly in Greek tragic poetry, οἰωνόβρωτος resonates with Greek epic and tragic poetry, and τρισαλιτήριος with the vituperative language of Greek comedy and oratory. Moreover, most of these neologisms exhibit the author's penchant for stylistic effect, especially evident in the use of δειλανδρέω and ἔσθησις. With regard to the issue of lexical dependence, we argued that ἔσθησις, οἰωνόβρωτος, τερατοποιός, and ὑψαυχενέω were likely borrowed from 2 Maccabees by the author of 3 Maccabees, δειλανδρέω by the author of 4 Maccabees, and τρισαλιτήριος by the author of Addition E to Esther. In the case of δυσσέβημα, we consider it likely that its occurrence in both 2 Maccabees and 1 Esdras is indicative of the lexical influence of one book on the other, yet it is not clear whether the direction of influence was from 2 Maccabees (or its source-text, Jason's history) to 1 Esdras, or vice versa; however, the latter seems more probable. As regards the chronological clues that we can get from the neologisms presented here, it is noteworthy that, while δυσσέβημα is attested in both the Septuagint (1 Esdras) and a profane literary work (Ps.-Scymnus' *Circuit of the Earth*) as early as the second century BCE, the attestations of most of the other words are, outside 2 Maccabees, clustered in the first century BCE or start clustering from the first century BCE onwards. If Acts 1:10, where the type ἐσθήσεσι occurs, is a verbal reminiscence of 2 Macc 3:33, then Acts may provide a *terminus ante quem* for the epitome. The words listed in Appendix 2, whose earliest surviving attestation can, with some degree of confidence, and on the condition that we accept 124 BCE as the date of composition of the epitome, be established to be found in 2 Maccabees, can now be supplemented with seven more words: δειλανδρέω, οἰωνόβρωτος, τερατοποιός, τρισαλιτήριος, ὑψαυχενέω, as well as with κατασφαλίζομαι (which occurs in the second prefixed letter) and Ἰουδαϊσμός, which were not discussed in detail in this chapter. We hesitate to add ἔσθησις to the list of neologisms of 2 Maccabees, as it is ambiguous whether we are dealing with a word in its own right or whether the type ἐσθήσεσι, attested in the book, is a heteroclite dative plural of ἐσθής.

Chapter 5: Neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and the Alpha Text of Esther

5.1 Introduction

In this chapter, we will examine two neologisms which are shared by 2 Maccabees and a text that is neither canonical nor deuterocanonical/apocryphal, but a variant Greek form of a canonical Septuagint book with deuterocanonical additions: the Alpha Text of Esther.[1] The relationship of the latter with the Septuagint Esther, as well as with the other extant text-forms of Esther (the Masoretic Text and the *Vetus Latina*) has given rise to considerable debate, from which no consensus has emerged. Its relationship, as regards vocabulary and phraseology, with other Septuagintal texts is yet to be investigated. In the previous chapter, we examined a neologism (τρισαλιτήριος)[2] which occurs in 2 Maccabees and in Addition E to Esther, both in the Septuagint and the Alpha Text, and concluded that Addition E is indebted to 2 Maccabees for this lexical item. In the following, we will attempt to establish whether the occurrence in the Alpha Text of Esther of two other neologisms occurring in 2 Maccabees (δικαιοκρίτης and ἔκθυμος) testifies to the lexical influence of the latter text on the former and see whether the examination of these two neologisms can furnish us with some clues for the dating of both texts. We will further try to establish whether 2 Maccabees was acquainted with any of the other versions of Esther known to us.

[1] The Alpha Text of Esther (also known as 'Lucianic,' although it has no relation to Lucian's recension of the Septuagint) is not included in Rahlfs' *Septuaginta*. In vol. III, part I of *The Old Testament in Greek* (1940), Brooke, McLean, and Thackeray print without alteration de Lagarde's 'Lucianic' text from 1883 as an appendix to the Septuagint Esther (Εσθηρ α, pp. 32–42). In the Göttingen *Septuaginta*, Hanhart (1983) prints both the LXX (designated by the siglum *o´*) and the Alpha Text (designated by the siglum *L*) of Esther in the upper and the lower part of the page, respectively. For the verse numbering of both the LXX and the AT we here follow Hanhart's edition. On the Alpha Text, see further Hanhart 1983, 87–95; Haelewyck 1985; De Troyer 2000, 2–71.

[2] See 4.2.6.

5.2 Discussion of the neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and the Alpha Text of Esther

5.2.1 δικαιοκρίτης 'righteous judge'

> 12:41 πάντες οὖν εὐλογήσαντες τὰ τοῦ δικαιοκρίτου κυρίου τοῦ τὰ κεκρυμμένα φανερὰ ποιοῦντος

The divine nomenclature in 2 Maccabees is particularly varied and of diverse origin: it includes, inter alia, a title originally used of Egyptian and Assyrian kings and gods, and Achaemenid rulers, calqued in Greek, such as βασιλεὺς βασιλέων (13:4),[3] a pagan Greek divine designation originating in Greek lyric and dramatic poetry such as παγκρατής (3:22),[4] an epithet adopted from other Septuagint books such as παντοκράτωρ (11x),[5] but also terms that are not attested prior to the Septuagint, such as δικαιοκρίτης (12:41), παντεπόπτης (9:5), and τερατοποιός (15:21).

The compound δικαιοκρίτης occurs in chapter 12 together with the combination δίκαιος κριτής. At 12:41 God is invoked as δικαιοκρίτης for having brought to light and punished the sin of those of Judas' soldiers who had appropriated idolatrous objects. Earlier, at 12:6, Judas calls upon God, the righteous judge (ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸν δίκαιον κριτὴν θεόν), before avenging the death of the two hundred Jews who were drowned by the Joppites.[6] God's punitive justice is also evoked at 8:11 and 8:13, where the author prefigures general Nicanor's punishment for intending to sell as slaves the Jews that he expected to capture, and at 9:18, where Antiochus IV is struck by a fatal, God-sent disease, presumably on account of his anti-Jewish policy.[7] Further, the epithet δίκαιος, applied to God, appears in a chain of divine epithets in the second of the two letters prefixed to the epitome.[8]

Unlike the neologism τερατοποιός, at 15:21, which permits us to identify and even pinpoint the exact Pentateuchal verse (Exod 15:11) to which it alludes,[9] δικαιοκρίτης does not seem to allude to a specific verse in the Septuagint. Although the words δίκαιος and δικαιοσύνη, conjoined with κρίνω and its cognates, often occur in the Septuagint in

---

[3] See Appendix 5, 25n45.

[4] Cf. B. 11.44, 17.24; A. *Supp.* 816, *Eu.* 918, *Th.* 255; S. *OC* 609, *Aj.* 675; Ar. *Th.* 317, 368–69; E. *Rh.* 231; Simon. fr. 36.1.5 Page; *IC* III.ii.2 (Hymn to the Dictean Zeus); *AP* 7.2.

[5] See Montevecchi 1957 and van Henten 1996.

[6] Codex Venetus reads, reversely, δικαιοκριτην at 12:6 and δικαιου κριτου at 12:41.

[7] 8:11 οὐ προσδεχόμενος τὴν παρὰ τοῦ παντοκράτορος μέλλουσαν παρακολουθήσειν αὐτῷ δίκην; 8:13 οἱ ἀπιστοῦντες τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δίκην; 9:18 ἐπεληλύθει γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτὸν δικαία ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσις (cf. 7:35, 36).

[8] 1:24–25 Κύριε κύριε ὁ θεός . . . ὁ φοβερὸς καὶ ἰσχυρὸς καὶ δίκαιος . . . ὁ μόνος δίκαιος.

[9] See 4.2.5.

relation to God's justice,[10] the combination δίκαιος κριτής, aside from 2 Macc 12:6, is found only in Ps 7:12a and in Pss. Sol. 2:18 and 9:2c.[11] In Ps 7:12a,[12] the context is quite different from that of 2 Macc 12:6: God is presented as an arbitrating rather than punishing judge, as he is invoked to vindicate the psalmist's innocence against those who falsely accuse him. The verses from the Psalms of Solomon, especially 9:2c–3a, are contextually closer to 2 Macc 12:41, as they, too, refer not only to God's righteousness, but also to His omniscience, which permits Him to bring to light and punish hidden sins.[13] Be it noted that the Psalms of Solomon are chronologically posterior to 2 Maccabees, at least if one accepts 124 BCE as the date of composition of the epitome.[14] It appears, then, that, although 2 Macc 12:6 and 12:41, where δίκαιος κριτής and δικαιοκρίτης occur, verbally and conceptually resonate with passages in other Septuagint books, especially the Psalms and the Psalms of Solomon, they have no explicitly identifiable intertextual referents.

The phrase ὁ τὰ κεκρυμμένα φανερὰ ποιῶν, which is juxtaposed to δικαιοκρίτης at 12:41, is hardly more helpful in leading us to trace the provenance of the last-mentioned adjective. One may refer to such Septuagint verses as Job 12:22 ἀνακαλύπτων βαθέα ἐκ σκότους, ἐξήγαγεν δὲ εἰς φῶς σκιὰν θανάτου, 34:21–22 αὐτὸς γὰρ ὁρατής ἐστιν ἔργων ἀνθρώπων, λέληθεν δὲ αὐτὸν οὐδὲν ὧν πράσσουσιν, οὐδὲ ἔσται τόπος τοῦ κρυβῆναι τοὺς ποιοῦντας τὰ ἄνομα, OG Dan 2:22 καὶ ἀνακαλύπτων τὰ βαθέα καὶ σκοτεινὰ καὶ γινώσκων τὰ ἐν τῷ σκότει καὶ ἐν τῷ φωτί, 2:47 ὁ ἐκφαίνων μυστήρια κρυπτὰ μόνος, Sir 42:19b ἀποκαλύπτων ἴχνη ἀποκρύφων, which, however, contain no parallel mention of

[10] Cf. Deut 32:4 καὶ πᾶσαι αἱ ὁδοὶ αὐτοῦ κρίσις· θεὸς πιστός, καὶ οὐκ ἔστιν ἀδικία· δίκαιος καὶ ὅσιος κύριος; Jer 9:(23)24 ἐγώ εἰμι κύριος ποιῶν ἔλεος καὶ κρίμα καὶ δικαιοσύνην ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; 11:20 κύριε κρίνων δίκαια δοκιμάζων νεφροὺς καὶ καρδίας, ἴδοιμι τὴν παρὰ σοῦ ἐκδίκησιν ἐξ αὐτῶν; Ps 9:5b ὁ κρίνων δικαιοσύνην; 9:9a, 95:13c κρινεῖ τὴν οἰκουμένην ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ; 34:24a κρῖνόν με κατὰ τὴν δικαιοσύνην σου, κύριε ὁ θεός μου; 49:6 καὶ ἀναγγελοῦσιν οἱ οὐρανοὶ τὴν δικαιοσύνην αὐτοῦ, ὅτι ὁ θεὸς κριτής ἐστιν; 118:137 δίκαιος εἶ, κύριε, καὶ εὐθὴς ἡ κρίσις σου; Pss. Sol. 2:32b μέγας βασιλεὺς καὶ δίκαιος κρίνων τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανόν; 4:24b κριτὴς μέγας καὶ κραταιὸς κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἡμῶν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ; 8:24 αἰνετὸς κύριος ὁ κρίνων πᾶσαν τὴν γῆν ἐν δικαιοσύνῃ αὐτοῦ; 8:26b σὺ ὁ θεὸς τῆς δικαιοσύνης κρίνων τὸν Ισραηλ ἐν παιδείᾳ; Tob 3:2 δίκαιος εἶ, κύριε . . . καὶ κρίσιν ἀληθινὴν καὶ δικαίαν σὺ κρίνεις εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα. Descamps (1948) provides a comprehensive examination of the terminology used in reference to divine justice in the Greek Bible. For a list of δικ- words denoting divine names and attributes occurring in Hellenistic Jewish literature, see Marcus 1931–1932, 64–65.

[11] It may be noted that already in a line of Euripides' *Andromache* Apollo is called the judge of justice for all humans (1162 ὁ τῶν δικαίων πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις κριτής).

[12] ὁ θεὸς κριτὴς δίκαιος καὶ ἰσχυρὸς καὶ μακρόθυμος.

[13] Pss. Sol. 2:16–18 ὅτι ἀπέδωκας τοῖς ἁμαρτωλοῖς κατὰ τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν καὶ κατὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν τὰς πονηρὰς σφόδρα. ἀνεκάλυψας τὰς ἁμαρτίας αὐτῶν, ἵνα φανῇ τὸ κρίμα σου . . . ὁ θεὸς κριτὴς δίκαιος καὶ οὐ θαυμάσει πρόσωπον; 9:2c–3a ὅτι σὺ κριτὴς δίκαιος ἐπὶ πάντας τοὺς λαοὺς τῆς γῆς. οὐ γὰρ κρυβήσεται ἀπὸ τῆς γνώσεώς σου πᾶς ποιῶν ἄδικα.

[14] The Greek version of the Psalms of Solomon is thought to have been produced a little after the Hebrew original was composed, around the mid-first century BCE (so R.B. Wright, "Psalms of Solomon," *OTP* 2:639–41). The allusion to the conquest of Jerusalem by Pompey in 63 BCE, and to Pompey's death in Egypt in 48 BCE, permits the dating of Psalm of Solomon 2 to 48–40 BCE, whereas Psalm 9 does not allow a precise dating due to the lack of any historical references in it (see Atkinson 2004a, 53 and 193).

God's righteousness in their immediate context.[15] Schwartz (2008, 440) has plausibly suggested that the phrase alludes to Deut 29:(28)29 (τὰ κρυπτὰ κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ ἡμῶν, τὰ δὲ φανερὰ ἡμῖν καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις ἡμῶν εἰς τὸν αἰῶνα, ποιεῖν πάντα τὰ ῥήματα τοῦ νόμου τούτου). The context is similar to that of 2 Macc 12:41 (God's wrath against idol-worshippers) and the antithesis 'hidden–manifest' is expressed in quasi-identical terms in both texts (κρυπτά–φανερά, κεκρυμμένα–φανερά). The Deuteronomic verse has been variously interpreted, inter alia, as referring to man's hidden thoughts and motives that only God can discern, in contrast to things spoken and done openly that are known to all (Ph. *Cher.* 16), to hidden sins that are up to God to punish as opposed to acts made public, for which it is up to Israel to apply the Law (*Sanhedrin* 43b),[16] or to things that can or cannot become known to man due to the limitations of human wisdom.[17] Second Maccabees 12:41 may have been a free reformulation of Deut 29:(28)29 that the author understood along the same lines as later Philo and the Talmudic interpreter. Yet, it should be noted that God, in his quality as righteous judge, is not mentioned anywhere in the immediate and wider context of Deut 29:(28)29.

Aside from 2 Maccabees, δικαιοκρίτης turns up in two more texts that deserve our attention, the Addition E to Esther in the Alpha Text (AT) and the third book of the Sibylline Oracles.

LXX Add Esth E:4 reads τοῦ τὰ πάντα κατοπτεύοντος ἀεὶ θεοῦ μισοπόνηρον ὑπολαμβάνουσιν ἐκφεύξεσθαι δίκην, whereas AT 7(E):23(4) has τοῦ πάντα δυναστεύοντος δικαιοκρίτου μισοπόνηρον ἐκφυγεῖν διειληφότες, τὴν δίκην. The relationship between the LXX and the AT of Esther is a much debated issue. With regard to Additions B and E, in particular, although they are almost unanimously believed to have originally been written in Greek, it remains to be settled when and by whom their two strikingly similar versions, the LXX and the AT, were composed.[18] With few exceptions (e.g. Jobes 1996, 174, who argues that the earlier form of B and E is the one to be found in the AT), scholars tend to regard the AT of B and E as being subsequent to and dependent on the LXX text of B and E. Moore (1977, 161, 165), for instance, contends that LXX Additions B and E were not composed by Lysimachus, the translator of LXX Esther, but were added sometime after 114 BCE (when Moore believes that the translation of Esther into Greek was made), and that the AT subsequently borrowed Addition E from the LXX; De Troyer (2000, 363–93, 395–403), upon a detailed examination of Addition E, concludes that LXX E was likely integrated in LXX Esther by Lysimachus and that the author of the AT of Esther (whom De Troyer conjecturally identifies with Philo) reworked the text of LXX Esther, Addition E included, around 40–41 CE; Haelewyck (2006, 463, 472–73) posits that the

[15] Note, however, that God's eternal righteousness is mentioned at a distance of a few verses from Job 34:21 (34:17 ὄντα αἰώνιον δίκαιον).

[16] See Rofé 1985, 313.

[17] See Von Rad 1966, 180–81. On the interpretations of Deut 29:(28)29, see Dogniez and Harl 1992, 304.

[18] For an overview of scholarly opinions on this issue, see De Troyer 2000, 351–63 and Cavalier 2012, 33–37.

Additions were part of the earliest translation of Esther, made at the latest between about 120 and 100 BCE, which served as the *Vorlage* of the Old Latin translation (*Vetus Latina*); LXX Esther took the Additions from this early version, and, subsequently, the author of the AT took them from LXX Esther. The late redaction of the AT, posited by the aforenamed scholars, makes it unlikely that 2 Maccabees was indebted to that text for the use of δικαιοκρίτης; indeed, the reverse is more likely to be the case, as we will try to show further on in this chapter.

δικαιοκρίτης, in the AT, has no counterpart not only in the LXX but also in the *Vetus Latina* (La) of Esther, which, according to Haelewyck (1985, 42; 2003–2008, 1:93–94), is based on the primitive Greek translation of Esther that preceded the LXX and the AT. La^{R}, which exhibits the oldest, unrevised form of the Old Latin of Esther,[19] reads "dei semper omnia conspicientis," that is, it follows closely the LXX (τοῦ τὰ πάντα κατοπτεύοντος ἀεὶ θεοῦ). This makes it very likely that the word was an addition of the composer of the AT, who may have picked it up from 2 Maccabees. What connects the latter text with LXX E:4 and AT 7(E):23(4) is the phrase οὔπω γὰρ τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπόπτου θεοῦ κρίσιν ἐκπέφευγας (2 Macc 7:35), which seems to be echoed in τοῦ τὰ πάντα κατοπτεύοντος ἀεὶ θεοῦ μισοπόνηρον ὑπολαμβάνουσιν ἐκφεύξεσθαι δίκην (LXX) and τοῦ πάντα δυναστεύοντος δικαιοκρίτου μισοπόνηρον ἐκφυγεῖν διειληφότες, τὴν δίκην (AT). The acquaintance of the composer of the AT with the epitome of 2 Maccabees, and, in particular, with chapter 7, is testified, as we will argue later in this chapter,[20] by his use at 7:9(7) of the phrase ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς, which occurs in 2 Macc 7:3 and 7:39. The fact that, within the space of eighteen verses in the AT, there occur three very rare words/phrases (7:9(7) ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς; 7:23 δικαιοκρίτης; 7:27 τρισαλιτήριος), which, the three of them together, elsewhere occur only in 2 Maccabees, can hardly be coincidental.

In the third Sibylline Oracle, δικαιοκρίτης occurs in verse 704, together with two other divine epithets, κτίστης and μόναρχος. κτίστης also occurs in 2 Maccabees (1:24, 7:23) and elsewhere in the Septuagint, whereas μόναρχος, attested in Aeschylus (*Pr.* 324) as an epithet of Zeus, is first used attributively to Yahweh in Sibylline Oracle 3 and in 3 Macc 2:2.

The dates assigned to the third book of the Sibylline Oracles vary from the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor (180–164, 163–145 BCE; Collins ["Sibylline Oracles," *OTP* 1:355–56; id. 2000, 86] argues for a date of composition of the book in the latter part of Philometor's reign, probably between 160 and 150 BCE) to the reign of Cleopatra VII (42 BCE has been suggested as a possible date of composition of the entire book by Nikiprowetzky 1970, 215–17).[21] Momigliano (1975, 1079–83) posits that the most ancient nucleus of prophecies contained in the book (vv. 97–829) dates to the period following the outbreak of the Maccabean revolt (167–160 BCE), and even traces an

[19] See Haelewyck 2003–2008, 1:68, 79.

[20] See 5.2.2 and Chapter 8.

[21] For a summary of the dates proposed by various scholars, see Gruen 1998, 269–70n96.

allusion to the latter, in vv. 194–95.[22] He admits, though, that the final redaction of the book, incorporating later prophecies, cannot be earlier than the first century CE. Gruen (1998, 272) questions the existence of a main corpus or a primary redaction dating to the mid-second century BCE and argues that the third book is "a conglomerate, a gathering of various prophecies that stem from different periods ranging from the second century BCE through the Early Roman Empire." More recently, Buitenwerf (2003, 126–30, 133–34) argued against the multi-layered composition theory and in support of the literary unity of the book, which he assigns to ca. 80–40 BCE.

Given the uncertainty surrounding the date of composition of the third Sibylline book and the composite and eclectic nature of its vocabulary, which incorporates elements from Homer and other poets, the Koine, and the language of the Septuagint, as well as neologisms,[23] it would be unwise to pronounce on whether a single lexical item is an original coinage of the Sibyllist or was borrowed from an antecedent or contemporary source. Nikiprowetzky (1970, 217) contends that certain textual details that seem to link the third Sibylline book with 1 and 2 Maccabees can be adduced as evidence that the Sibyllist was acquainted with the Maccabean literature. He includes δικαιοκρίτης in a word list that comprises "poetically coloured neologisms or terms pertaining to poetry other than Homeric, and to the philosophical or late language" (p. 270).

To be sure, δικαιοκρίτης was not a poetic neologism and may not have originated in literature at all. The proper name Δικαιοκρίτα is attested in a third-century BCE funerary inscription (*Gonnoi II* 229). The two earliest instances of the cognate noun δικαιοκρισία are found in two Ptolemaic papyri petitions: in the first, dated to the second–first centuries BCE, a villager appeals to the "righteous judgement" of an *epistates*; in the second, dated to the first half of the first century BCE, a priest complains about not having obtained justice from the authorities.[24] Aitken (2009, 199) has plausibly suggested that δικαιοκρίτης, before being adopted by Jewish writers as an

[22] Barclay (1996, 223–24), too, finds in the third Sibylline book traces of the Jewish nationalistic sentiments kindled by the Maccabean revolt. Collins (*OTP* 1:356n13 and id. 2000, 89 and 91), on the contrary, sees no references to or echoes of the Maccabean revolt in the book.

[23] On the language of the third book of the Sibylline Oracles, see Nikiprowetzky 1970, 269–71 and 278–80, and Buitenwerf 2003, 324–31. On the language of the Sibylline Oracles in general, see Panayiotou 1987, 1:48–51.

[24] *P.Mich.* 15.688.10 [. . . δι]καιοκρισίαν; *PSI* 15.1514.17 δικαιοκρισίας οὐ τέτευχα. For later occurrences, see Moulton and Milligan 1914–1929, 161 and G. Schrenk, "δίκη, δίκαιος, κτλ," *TDNT* 2:224–25. The sole papyrological attestation of δικαιοκρίτης appears late, in a second-century CE petition of a beekeeper to the prefect of Egypt (*P.Ryl.* 2.113.35 [133 CE] ἀξιῶ σε τὸν κύριον καὶ δικαι[ο]κρίτην ἀκοῦσαί μου). Beside usage in secular judicial language, δικαιοκρισία is attested as a quality of God in the pseudepigraphic Testament of Levi, which may have originated in the Maccabean period (so H.C. Kee, "Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs," *OTP* 1:777–78); yet caution is in order with regard to the date of the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs, as they seem to consist of both Jewish and Christian strata that are not precisely datable. See Collins (2000, 174–77), who concludes that "there was a gradual process of growth in the formation of the *Testaments*, and so no single dating is valid for all the pre-Christian material" (p. 177).

epithet of Yahweh, may have been a term used in petitions addressed to officials with judicial powers. In a petition of this kind, preserved in a late Ptolemaic papyrus, we are also met with the epithet δικαιοδότης, "administrator of justice" (*BGU* 8.1846.9 [51/49 BCE] σοῦ τοῦ δικαιοδότου), which was later taken up by Christian writers as an epithet of God (Gr. Naz. *ep.* 64.5.3 Gallay). Furthermore, among the rare compounds having -κριτης as the second component, we find λαοκρίτης, a term appearing in a number of third- and second-century BCE Ptolemaic papyri, in which it designates the member of a court of Egyptian priests who dispensed justice to the indigenous Egyptian population. We may thus conjecturally locate the origin of the term δικαιοκρίτης in Egypt, in the language of Ptolemaic-era petitions.

Subsequently to the above-discussed texts, δικαιοκρίτης occurs mainly in ecclesiastical writers.

5.2.2 ἔκθυμος 'enraged'

7:3, 39 ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς; 14:27 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἔκθυμος γενόμενος

The adverb ἐκθύμως is attested much earlier than its cognate adjective. It makes its first recorded appearance, in the sense "readily," "eagerly," in a papyrus letter of 257 BCE (*P.Lond.* 7.1946.9 πάντα γάρ σοι ποιήσομεν ἐκθύμως). Polybius uses it seventeen times, exclusively in military contexts, of martial actions performed "zealously," "ardently," "vigorously," "valiantly."[25] Diodorus Siculus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus also employ it solely in martial contexts: the first conjoins it with the military verb ἀγωνίζομαι in twelve of the twenty times that he uses it; the second employs it five times, in all of them as modifier of ἀγωνίζομαι. The adverb's semantic range appears expanded in Philo, who uses it seven times, inter alia, with verbs of emotion, such as στέργω and φιλέω, to denote the sense "ardently," "passionately." Josephus, Plutarch, Appian, and other later writers also use it in the aforementioned senses.

Outside 2 Maccabees, the adjective ἔκθυμος, in non-adverbial use,[26] is not attested before the first century CE. Josephus uses it once, speaking of the "ardent entreaty" to remit their taxes that the Romans addressed to Caligula in the Circus Maximus (*AJ* 19.25 ἐκθύμῳ τῇ ἱκετείᾳ χρώμενοι); Plutarch speaks of the "eager services" offered to Aemilius Paulus by his friends (*Aem.* 12.2 φίλων ἐκθύμοις ὑπηρεσίαις) and the "valorous support" that Cleomenes received by his fellow citizens at the battle of Sellasia (*Cleom.* 28.1 ἐκθύμοις δὲ χρησάμενος τοῖς πολίταις); Appian uses it of a "fierce siege" (*BC* 5.4.38 τῆς τειχομαχίας, ἐκθυμοτάτης γενομένης) and Philostratus the Younger of a troop of Mysians, who rush upon the enemy "filled with fighting ardour" (*Im.* p. 875.28 Kayser ἔκθυμοί τε καὶ ἐξορμῶντες οἱ Μυσοὶ ἵενται). In its few instances in later

[25] See *PL* s.v. ἔκθυμος.

[26] The comparative and the superlative adjective forms ἐκθυμότερον and ἐκθυμότατα are used for the comparative and the superlative adverb, respectively, in Polybius and in Diodorus Siculus.

ecclesiastical writers and Byzantine historiographers, the adjective appears in the senses cited above.

In 2 Maccabees, ἔκθυμος appears in the sense of "enraged," "furious." It forms part of the formulaic phrase ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς/ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἔκθυμος γενόμενος, which in chapter 7 is used twice with respect to King Antiochus IV Epiphanes and in chapter 14 with respect to King Demetrius I Soter. The author of 2 Maccabees definitely has a flair for concocting out-of-the-ordinary phrases containing θυμός to refer to a king's anger: 4:25 θυμοὺς ὠμοῦ τυράννου; 9:4 ἐπαρθεὶς τῷ θυμῷ (of Antiochus IV); 9:7 πῦρ πνέων τοῖς θυμοῖς (of Antiochus IV); 13:4 ἐξήγειρε τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ Ἀντιόχου (of Antiochus V). Another formulaic phrase, πυροῦσθαι τοῖς θυμοῖς, unattested elsewhere in Greek literature, is more versatilely used of King Antiochus IV (4:38 πυρωθεὶς τοῖς θυμοῖς), of Judas' soldiers (10:35 πυρωθέντες τοῖς θυμοῖς),[27] and of the elder Razis (14:45 πεπυρωμένος τοῖς θυμοῖς).[28]

In the sense in which it is used in 2 Maccabees, ἔκθυμος does not recur in Greek literature,[29] except in the Alpha Text (AT) of Esther, which, at 7:9(7), recounting King Ahasuerus' reaction at Esther's disclosure of Haman's plot against the Jews, reads ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ πλησθεὶς ὀργῆς ἀνεπήδησε καὶ ἦν περιπατῶν, "The king, becoming angry and filled with rage, jumped up and was pacing around" (NETS). The corresponding verse in the Septuagint Esther (LXX) makes no reference to the king's anger (7:7 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἐξανέστη ἐκ τοῦ συμποσίου εἰς τὸν κῆπον, "The king rose from the banquet and went into the garden" [NETS]),[30] in contrast to the Masoretic Text (MT), which at 7:7 reads הַמֶּלֶךְ קָם בַּחֲמָתוֹ מִמִּשְׁתֵּה הַיַּיִן אֶל־גִּנַּת הַבִּיתָן, "The king rose from the feast in wrath and went into the palace garden" (NRSV). The *Vetus Latina* (La), which, according to Haelewyck (1985, 42; 2003–2008, 1:84–94; 2006, 472–73), reflects the very first, non-surviving Greek version of Esther, has the king rising from his place, dropping his napkin or his cup of wine, and going out into the garden. The MSS of the type R and I, which most likely represent the original, unrevised Old Latin text of Esther (Haelewyck 2003–2008, 1:68–69; 2006, 449), make no mention of the king's wrath, as opposed to the F type of text, which exhibits an extensive revision of the Old Latin text that integrates elements from the Alpha Text (Haelewyck, loc. cit.):

> La 7:7 [R]rex autem surrexit de loco suo proiciens mappam et exit in hortum; [I]rex autem surrexit de loco proiciens calicem meri et exit in hortum; [F]et audito hoc correptus furore rex exilivit de loco proiciens calicem meri et cum exiret in horto.[31]

[27] Cf. 10:28 καθηγεμόνα τῶν ἀγώνων ταττόμενοι τὸν θυμόν; 15:10 τοῖς θυμοῖς διεγείρας αὐτούς.

[28] On the motif of the royal anger in 2, 3, and 4 Maccabees and in other Septuagint books, see Rajak 2007.

[29] Hesychius attests the derivative verb ἐκθυμόω, "to enrage": ε 4007 ἐξώργισα· ἐξεθύμωσα.

[30] The Hexaplaric MSS add, after ἐξανέστη, εν οργη αυτου.

[31] The text of the *Vetus Latina* of Esther is quoted from Haelewyck 2003–2008.

Josephus, in his retelling of the Esther story, stresses the king's agitation rather than his anger: *AJ* 11.265 ταραχθέντος δὲ πρὸς τοῦτο τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ ἀναπηδήσαντος εἰς τοὺς κήπους ἐκ τοῦ συμποσίου, "But after the king in his perturbation at this statement had rushed from the banquet-hall into the garden."[32] Josephus' paraphrase has correspondences with both the LXX (ἐκ τοῦ συμποσίου εἰς τὸν κῆπον–εἰς τοὺς κήπους ἐκ τοῦ συμποσίου) and the AT (ἀνεπήδησε–ἀναπηδήσαντος);[33] for ταραχθέντος Josephus seems to have taken the cue from ἐταράχθη, which is said of Haman in the verse preceding 7:7 in the LXX (7:6 Αμαν δὲ ἐταράχθη ἀπὸ τοῦ βασιλέως καὶ τῆς βασιλίσσης), and the verse following 7:9(7) in the AT (7:10 καὶ ὁ Αμαν ἐταράχθη).[34]

The element of the king's wrath, which, of the five versions of Esther cited above, is present only in the MT and the AT, is overaccentuated in the latter through the use of the doublet ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ πλησθεὶς ὀργῆς. The AT generally tends to emphasize the emotion of anger. In four verses, it contains pluses with respect to the LXX, the MT, and (with one exception) the La, which throw this emotion into relief:

1) AT 3:6 *καὶ παραζηλώσας ὁ Αμαν καὶ κινηθεὶς ἐν παντὶ τῷ θυμῷ*[35] *αὐτοῦ ἐρυθρὸς ἐγένετο*
   LXX (no counterpart)
   MT (no counterpart)
   La (no counterpart)
   J (no counterpart)

2) AT 5(D):7(8) καὶ μετέβαλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ βασιλέως *καὶ μετέθηκε τὸν θυμὸν αὐτοῦ* εἰς πραότητα
   LXX D:8 καὶ μετέβαλεν ὁ θεὸς τὸ πνεῦμα τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς πραΰτητα
   MT (no counterpart)
   La D:8 [R]deus autem iram convertit in miserationem et furorem ipsius in tranquillitatem; [I]iudaeorum autem deus et universae creaturae dominus

[32] Trans. R. Marcus, LCL.

[33] Cf. 1 Kgdms 20:34 καὶ ἀνεπήδησεν Ιωναθαν ἀπὸ τῆς τραπέζης ἐν ὀργῇ θυμοῦ.

[34] On the question of Josephus' Greek model for his Esther narrative, see Hanhart 1983, 36–37; Feldman 1998, 525–26n22; Haelewyck 2003–2008, 1:72–74; Koller 2014, 118n45. In his study devoted to the topic, Motzo (1928, 88–91), after examining fifteen passages (among which the one discussed here, *AJ* 11.265), in which Josephus verbally agrees with the AT against LXX and La, concludes (p. 91) that it would be unjustified to deduce that Josephus was acquainted with the AT, because the readings that he has in common with LXX or with La are more numerous. Motzo believes that the text used by Josephus went back to the same common ancestor as LXX, AT, and La; although it was closer to LXX, it also had close correspondences to AT and La, but is not to be identified with any of those three texts (pp. 88, 105).

[35] θυμός here refers to the seat of emotions (cf. Clines 1984, 223: "disturbed with all his spirit" and Cavalier 2012, 161: "agité dans toute son âme") rather than narrowly to the emotion of anger (cf. Jobes, NETS: "all his rage was stirred up"). Haman's anger is expressed by his getting red in the face (ἐρυθρὸς ἐγένετο).

convertit iram eius in miserationem et furorem ipsius in tranquillitatem; [A]et convertit deus et transtulit indignationem eius in lenitatem; [F]iudeorum autem deus et universae creaturae dominus iram regis convertit in miseratione et furorem ipsius transtulit in tranquilitate
J *AJ* 11.237 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς κατὰ βούλησιν οἶμαι τοῦ θεοῦ τὴν διάνοιαν μετέβαλε

3) AT 5(D):11(13) καὶ ἐτάκη ἡ καρδία μου ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης *τοῦ θυμοῦ* σου, κύριε[36]
LXX D:13 καὶ ἐταράχθη ἡ καρδία μου ἀπὸ φόβου τῆς δόξης σου
MT (no counterpart)
La D:13 [RI]et turbatum est cor meum a timore gloriae tuae; [F]et liquefactum est cor meum a timore gloriae tuae
J *AJ* 11.240 ὑπεχώρει μοι τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ κατελειπόμην ὑπὸ τῆς ψυχῆς

4) AT 7:5 καὶ *ἐθυμώθη* ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ εἶπεν; 7:6 εἶπεν [ἡ βασίλισσα] *Μὴ ὀργίζου*, κύριε.
LXX 7:5 εἶπεν δὲ ὁ βασιλεύς
MT 7:5 וַיֹּאמֶר הַמֶּלֶךְ אֲחַשְׁוֵרוֹשׁ וַיֹּאמֶר לְאֶסְתֵּר הַמַּלְכָּה, "Then King Ahasuerus said to Queen Esther" (NRSV)
La 7:5 [RI]dixit autem rex reginae Hester; [F]et iratus rex dixit. . . . [Regina] dixit noli irasci rex
J *AJ* (no counterpart)

In another verse, the AT replaces the monolectic anger-denoting verb of the LXX with a periphrastic expression, which reflects the MT:

5) AT 1:12 ὁ βασιλεύς . . . ἐλυπήθη σφόδρα, καὶ *ὀργὴ ἐξεκαύθη ἐν αὐτῷ*
LXX 1:12 καὶ ἐλυπήθη ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ ὠργίσθη
MT 1:12 וַחֲמָתוֹ בָּעֲרָה בוֹ׃ וַיִּקְצֹף מְאֹד, "The king was enraged, and his anger burned within him" (NRSV)
La 1:12 [RI]contristatus est rex et iratus est valde; [J]contristatus est valde; [F]contristatus est et ira incensus
J *AJ* 11.192 εἰς ὀργὴν παροξυνθέντα τὸν βασιλέα

[36] Jobes (1996, 162) believes that the phrase ἀπὸ τῆς δόξης τοῦ θυμοῦ σου "can be explained if φόβου [the corresponding reading in the LXX] was mistaken for θυμοῦ, resulting in the difficult reading 'from the rage of your glory,' which was then transposed to read more smoothly 'from the glory of your rage.'" Rather than being a "mechanical error," the phrase in question may have been intentionally and creatively put together by the redactor of Addition D, who may have been prompted to do so by the preceding verses 5(D):5(7) τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτοῦ πεπυρωμένον ἐν δόξῃ ἐνέβλεψεν αὐτῇ ὡς ταῦρος ἐν ἀκμῇ θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ and 5(D):7(8) μετέθηκε τὸν θυμὸν αὐτοῦ εἰς πραότητα, which emphasize the king's wrath.

Lastly, at 3:5, by adding a plus, it gives rise to a doublet:

6) AT 3:5 [Αμαν] ἐθυμώθη τῷ Μαρδοχαίῳ, *καὶ ὀργὴ ἐξεκαύθη ἐν αὐτῷ*
LXX 3:5 [Αμαν] ἐθυμώθη σφόδρα
MT 3:5 וַיִּמָּלֵא הָמָן חֵמָה׃, "Haman was infuriated" (NRSV)
La 3:5 [R]iratus est vehementer; [I]iratus factus est valde; [J]iratus factus est Amman usque ad mortem; [F]accensus est ira usque ad mortem et adreptus omni furore tremefactus est
J *AJ* 11.210 [ὁ Ἀμάνης] ἠγανάκτησε

As can be seen, in four of the above-quoted examples (1, 3, 4, 6), the anger-denoting words or phrases seem to be additions of the composer of the AT, as they have no counterparts either in the MT or in the LXX and the La[RI]. They are what Haelewyck (1985, 27, 31, 33, 41) has called "ajouts d'ordre 'psychologique'," [37] aimed at enhancing the dramatic tension of the narrative. We also note that, at 3:5, the AT contains a doublet, ἐθυμώθη . . . καὶ ὀργὴ ἐξεκαύθη ἐν αὐτῷ, which is similar to the doublet at 7:9(7) (ἔκθυμος . . . καὶ πλησθεὶς ὀργῆς). The verb ἐθυμώθη of the AT is also found in the corresponding verse in the LXX, where it is strengthened by the adverb σφόδρα; both texts reflect here the MT. The phrase καὶ ὀργὴ ἐξεκαύθη ἐν αὐτῷ, which is a plus, occurs once more in the AT, at 1:12. In the latter verse, both the LXX and the AT reflect the doublet contained in the MT (וַחֲמָתוֹ בָּעֲרָה בוֹ׃ וַיִּקְצֹף מְאֹד, "the king was enraged, and his anger burned within him"). The first element of this doublet (וַיִּקְצֹף מְאֹד, "was enraged") is rendered by both the LXX and the AT by the verb ἐλυπήθη, which is here used in the sense of "annoyed";[38] the second element (וַחֲמָתוֹ בָּעֲרָה בוֹ׃, "his anger burned within him") is rendered in the LXX by the verb ὠργίσθη and in the AT, more literally, by the phrase ὀργὴ ἐξεκαύθη ἐν αὐτῷ. The latter is not a neological rendering of the AT; it is most likely drawn from one of the half dozen other Septuagint books, where the verb ἐκκαίομαι, with ὀργή[39] or θυμός[40] as its subject, is used with regard to Yahweh's wrath.[41] The composer of the AT uses it more prosaically of King Ahasuerus' (1:12) and Haman's (3:5) wrath.

---

[37] See also Cavalier 2012, 62. On other types of additions, see Fox 1991, 59–62.

[38] See *TLNT* 2.421–22: "This connotation of exasperation with *lypeomai* [in NT Matt 18:31] comes from the LXX, which sometimes links this verb with another denoting anger, sometimes gives it the meaning 'irritation, exasperation,' translating the Hebrew verbs *hārah* and especially *qāsap*—nuances that are known both in Greek and in the Koine."

[39] Deut 29:20 ἐκκαυθήσεται ὀργὴ κυρίου; 2 Kgdms 24:1 ὀργὴ κυρίου ἐκκαῆναι ἐν Ισραηλ; 4 Kgdms 22:13 ὀργὴ κυρίου ἡ ἐκκαιομένη ἐν ἡμῖν; Ps 88:47b ἐκκαυθήσεται ὡς πῦρ ἡ ὀργή σου; Jer 51:6 καὶ ἔσταξεν ἡ ὀργή μου καὶ ὁ θυμός μου καὶ ἐξεκαύθη ἐν πόλεσιν Ιουδα; Sir 16:6b ἐν ἔθνει ἀπειθεῖ ἐξεκαύθη ὀργή.

[40] 4 Kgdms 22:17 ἐκκαυθήσεται ὁ θυμός μου ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ; 2 Chr 34:21 μέγας ὁ θυμὸς κυρίου ἐκκέκαυται ἐν ἡμῖν; 34:25 ἐξεκαύθη ὁ θυμός μου ἐν τῷ τόπῳ τούτῳ; Ps 2:12c ὅταν ἐκκαυθῇ . . . ὁ θυμὸς αὐτοῦ; Jer 4:4 μὴ ἐξέλθῃ ὡς πῦρ ὁ θυμός μου καὶ ἐκκαυθήσεται.

[41] Although first attested in the Septuagint, the combination of ἐκκαίομαι with ὀργή is not unknown to profane Greek literature. We encounter it in Polybius (6.7.8 μίσους ἐκκαιομένου καὶ δυσμενικῆς ὀργῆς;

Returning to the doublet at 7:9(7), we notice that it conjoins the phrase ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς, which, as we saw, occurs in 2 Macc 7:3 and 7:39 (and, with different word order, at 14:27) and in no other literary text, with the phrase πλησθεὶς ὀργῆς, which is very rare elsewhere: in pre-Common Era texts it is only found in Herodotus (4.128 ὀργῆς ἐπλήσθησαν) and in Nicolaus of Damascus (*FHG* 3, fr. 101.951 ὀργῆς . . . ἐπίμπλατο).[42] However, the Septuagint uses the synonymous phrase ἐπλήσθη θυμοῦ of King Nebuchadnezzar in OG Dan 3:19. As we will argue further below, it is likely that the composer of the AT had the latter verse in mind when concocting the doublet ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ πλησθεὶς ὀργῆς.[43]

Since neither the MT nor the LXX nor the La^{RI}, at 7:7 contain any doublet referring to the king's wrath, one can hypothesize that (a) the AT reflects here a Hebrew *Vorlage* different from the MT, wherein a doublet existed, (b) the AT was composed on the basis of a Greek version of Esther which, in the verse in question, contained a doublet, or, more likely, (c) the composer of the AT introduced on his own initiative a doublet that did not exist in his Hebrew or Greek source text; it is one of those "ajouts 'psychologiques'" that we mentioned earlier, similar to that found at 3:6.[44]

What, then, is the origin of the phrase ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς in the AT of Esther? Is it an unconscious reminiscence or a conscious borrowing from 2 Maccabees, in the same way that the phrase ὀργὴ ἐξεκαύθη ἐν αὐτῷ, in the plus at 3:5, is in all likelihood drawn from the Septuagint? It having no other attestation in all of Greek literature except in 2 Maccabees, one cannot help wondering whether there is some connection between the two texts. One might envisage at least three possibilities: (a) the AT borrowed the phrase directly from 2 Maccabees, where it occurs three times, in the same sentence-initial position, (b) the AT borrowed the phrase from a non-surviving source, which was indebted to 2 Maccabees for it, (c) both the AT and 2 Maccabees independently borrowed the phrase from a non-surviving source. Although we cannot really rule out (b) or (c), (a) seems the more probable possibility. That it is the AT that borrowed the phrase from 2 Maccabees and not the opposite is rather clear: in 2 Maccabees, ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς is part of a set of anger-denoting phrases, which are all original, and some of them unique, whereas in the AT the anger-denoting

---

9.10.10 οὐ μόνον φθόνος ἀλλ' οἷον ὀργή τις ἐκκαίεται; 38.18.10 συνέβη μήτε τὴν τῶν Ῥωμαίων ὀργὴν καὶ θυμὸν ἐκκαυθῆναι πορρωτέρω), who is not dependent on the Septuagint.

[42] Cf. 2 Macc 4:40 ταῖς ὀργαῖς διεμπιπλαμένων; Memn. *FHG* 3, fr. 51.49 ὀργῆς ἀνεπίμπλατο. The phrase πίμπλασθαι ὀργῆς becomes current in later hagiographical texts. Cf. Mart. Ascen. Isa. 3.7 θυμοῦ πολλοῦ καὶ ὀργῆς πλησθεὶς ὁ βασιλεὺς Μανασσής; *Acts Phil.* 13.2 ὁ ἀρχιερεύς . . . ὀργῆς μεγάλης ἐπλήσθη.

[43] Not to be ignored, of course, is that 2 Macc 14:27 (ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ἔκθυμος γενόμενος καὶ ταῖς τοῦ παμπονήρου διαβολαῖς ἐρεθισθείς) contains a doublet (ἔκθυμος–ἐρεθισθείς), which may be replicated and echoed in AT 7:9(7) (ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ πλησθεὶς ὀργῆς).

[44] It is to be noted that the MT of Esther contains many "tautologischen Doppelausdrücken," as Gerleman (1966, 39) has called them (see 2:17; 3:1, 8, 13; 4:8, 14; 5:6; 7:4, 6; 8:3, 5, 11, 15, 16, 17; 9:5, 12, 27; 10:2), which to a certain extent are reflected in the LXX text of Esther.

phrases to be found in the previously quoted pluses lack originality, as they are borrowings from other Septuagint books.[45]

Corroborating evidence for the existence of a connection between the AT of Esther and 2 Maccabees comes from the vocabulary that occurs in these two texts and nowhere else in the Septuagint: in this chapter, we discussed the term δικαιοκρίτης, which occurs only in 2 Macc 12:41 and in AT Esth 7(E):23(4); in the previous chapter, we discussed the term τρισαλιτήριος, which occurs only in 2 Macc 8:34, 15:3, in LXX Esth E:15, and in AT Esth 7(E):27(15).[46] With regard to the latter, we argued that the AT likely depends on the LXX and that the LXX, in turn, likely depends on 2 Maccabees. Hanhart (1983, Einleitung, p. 90) also notes the words ἀφασία (2 Macc 14:17; AT Esth 6:17) and εὐεργέτημα (2 Macc 5:20; AT Esth 6:3(2)). There are also a few words which are shared exclusively between the AT of Esther, 2 Maccabees, and one more deuterocanonical book: διάχρυσος (2 Macc 5:2; AT Esth 5(D):4(6); Ps 44:10b), ἔφιππος (2 Macc 11:8, 12:35; AT Esth 6:18; 4 Macc 4:10), ὑπισχνέομαι (2 Macc 4:9, 8:11, 12:11; AT Esth 7:7; Wis 17:8), and ὠμότης (2 Macc 12:5; AT Esth 7(E):24(7); 3 Macc 5:20, 6:24, 7:5). Of all the above, the most significant (because of their rarity or even uniqueness) commonalities between the AT of Esther and 2 Maccabees are the noun δικαιοκρίτης, the adjective τρισαλιτήριος, and the phrase ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς.

If indeed AT Esth 7:9(7) is indebted to 2 Macc 7:3, 39 for the latter phrase, then the AT of Esther may provide us with a *terminus ante quem* for the composition of chapter 7 of 2 Maccabees and of the entire epitome.[47] The date of composition of the AT is, alas, no better established than its relation to the other versions of Esther. We will survey here the opinions of various scholars who in recent years have ventured dates for it.

In his introduction to the Göttingen edition of Esther, Hanhart (1983, 87, 90, 96) argues for the priority of the LXX over the other Greek text-forms of Esther. He believes that the LXX, including the Additions, came into existence in the first half of

---

[45] It is worth noting that the AT tends to employ words or phrases taken from the Septuagint of canonical and deuterocanonical books not only in the pluses but also in verses whose counterparts in the LXX text employ non-Septuagintal words or phraseology. For example, the verb σποδόομαι, *GELS*"to strew oneself with ashes," in AT 4:2 (ὁ δὲ Μαρδοχαῖος . . . σποδωθείς), occurs elsewhere in the Septuagint only in Jdt 4:11 ἐσποδώσαντο τὰς κεφαλὰς αὐτῶν; LXX Esth 4:1 reads instead κατεπάσατο σποδόν. LXX Esth C:24 reads μετάθες τὴν καρδίαν αὐτοῦ εἰς μῖσος τοῦ πολεμοῦντος ἡμᾶς, whereas AT 4(C):25(24) has μετάστρεψον τὴν καρδίαν. The combination μετατιθέναι τὴν καρδίαν occurs nowhere else in the Septuagint, whereas μεταστρέφειν τὴν καρδίαν is found in Exod 14:4, in Ps 104:25, and in Hos 11:8. The phrase ἀπολέσαι ὁλοριζεί, in LXX Esth B:6, which contains the absolute *hapax legomenon* ὁλοριζεί, is turned, in AT 3(B):18(6), to ὁλορίζους ἀπολέσαι, which has a parallel in Job 4:7b. The plus in AT 3:5 καὶ ἐζήτει ἀνελεῖν τὸν Μαρδοχαῖον is modelled after Exod 2:15 καὶ ἐζήτει ἀνελεῖν Μωυσῆν (cf. Dan$^{\theta'}$ 2:13). Cf. also the verbs ὀρθρίζω (AT 5:23(14)) and παραζηλόω (AT 3:6), and the phrases ἐν τῇ χειρί σου τῇ κραταιᾷ (AT 4(C):25) and ἀπὸ ἀρσενικοῦ ἕως θηλυκοῦ (AT 3:7), all taken from the Greek translations of canonical books of the Hebrew Bible.

[46] See 4.2.6.

[47] See further on this Chapter 8.

the first century BCE.[48] Soon, other Greek text-forms of Esther appeared: the AT, the base text of the *Vetus Latina*, and possibly a third one, traces of which can be detected in Josephus' Esther narrative. The AT is not a recension of the LXX, but is to a large extent based on it. In the passages that do not depend on the LXX, its vocabulary is that of the late Hellenistic period, exhibiting some affinities with the books of the Maccabees and Sirach. Hanhart notes, though, that the occurrence in the AT of words, which are not elsewhere attested prior to the first century CE (e.g. ἐξαλλοτρίωσις at 7(E):27(15)), should not lead us to posit a late date for the text, and that neologisms such as σκυθρωπόομαι (AT 6:20) and κυρίευσις (AT 7(F):56(8))[49] are typical of the Hellenistic Greek of the first century BCE or CE.

Fox (1991, 9, 17, 97, passim) posits the existence of a proto-AT, whose Hebrew *Vorlage*, despite some similarities with the MT, was independent of it. Both the *Vorlage* of the proto-AT and the MT had a common ancestor, a proto-Esther story. The translation of the MT into Greek, supplemented with the Additions, formed the LXX Esther. The proto-AT, which a redactor supplemented with the Additions, the ending, and other material taken from the LXX, formed the AT. As regards the date of redaction of the AT, Fox (ib. 37) accepts Bickerman's dating of LXX Esther to 73 (read: 78/77) BCE, which makes the latter date the *terminus post quem* for the supplementation of the proto-AT with the LXX-Esther material. A later *terminus post quem* could be set between 15/16 and 46/47 CE on the basis of AT A:1 μιᾷ τοῦ μηνὸς Αδαρ Νισαν (ὅς ἐστι Δύστρος Ξανθικός): the equation of the Babylonian months Adar-Nisan with the Macedonian months Dystros-Xandikos was introduced during the aforementioned period and remained constant until 176 CE.

Jobes (1996, 223–33) theorizes that the AT was translated outside of Judea, possibly in Egypt, in the early Hellenistic period, from a Semitic *Vorlage*, which, being an ancestor of the extant MT, was similar and at places identical with it. She believes that the AT preserves the oldest form of Additions A, B, C, E, and F, which were introduced to it subsequently to its original production, perhaps not all of them at the same time; Addition D was known to the author of 2 Maccabees, who, around 100 BCE, as Jobes thinks, made an allusion to it in the prologue to his work. In 114 or 78 BCE, a Greek translation of Esther, the LXX, made on the basis of the MT, appeared in Jerusalem. The LXX eventually supplanted the AT, having first borrowed the six Additions from it; the identical matches between the AT and the LXX attest to an attempt made to align the former to the latter. The AT, according to Jobes, remained in circulation in a non-Jewish community which used the Macedonian calendar, as evidenced from the 'translation,' in Addition A, of the month names of the Jewish calendar into those of the Macedonian calendar. Given that the adjustment that made the

[48] Hanhart (loc. cit.) accepts for the composition of LXX Esther the *terminus ante quem* of 78/77 BCE set by Bickerman 2007c.

[49] σκυθρωπόομαι is an absolute *hapax legomenon*; κυρίευσις ([LSJSup]"gaining possession of") is actually not a neologism of the AT. It is attested as early as 263/2 BCE in the Parian Marble inscription (*IG XII,5* 444.109a ἀπὸ τῆς Ἀλεξάν[δ]ρου μεταλλαγῆς καὶ Πτολεμαίου Αἰγύπτο[υ] | κυριεύσεως).

months Adar-Nisan correspond with Dystros-Xandikos took place, as said previously, between 15/16 and 46/47 CE and remained in place until 176 CE, Jobes dates the final redaction of the AT to somewhere between these dates, without excluding that some of its readings may date to a later period, extending up to the twelfth century, when the oldest of the four MSS that contain the complete text of the AT was copied.

De Troyer (2000, 402) posits that the AT was composed in Rome around 40–41 CE by a Jewish author who rewrote the LXX Esther, having in mind actual historical personages, such as Agrippa I, Flaccus, and Claudius, who could be paralleled to the fictitious characters of Mordecai, Haman, and King Ahasuerus, respectively. De Troyer quite implausibly suggests that the AT of Esther "was in fact one of the five books of Philo which dealt with the Jewish question (during the time of Gaius), of which only the *Legatio ad Gaium* and *In Flaccum* have survived."[50]

Haelewyck (1985, 40–44; 2003–2008, 1:84–94; 2006, 472–73), who has duly acknowledged the importance of the *Vetus Latina* for the reconstruction of the earliest Greek version of Esther, has suggested the following chronology for the various texts of Esther: a) The Hebrew text was likely composed between 164 and 140 BCE. b) The primitive Greek form of Esther appeared between 120 and 100 BCE at the latest. Its author did not simply translate the Hebrew text, but remodelled it thoroughly; he further composed and added the six Additions (A to F) that we find in the LXX, plus Addition H (prayer of the Jews), which is proper to the *Vetus Latina*. This translation did not survive, but it served as the model of the *Vetus Latina*. c) In the first years of the first century BCE at the latest, a primitive form of the AT came into being in Jerusalem or in Syria-Palestine. It depended on the Greek model of the *Vetus Latina*, but abridged it; it contained the Additions A, D, F, but not yet the Additions B, C, or E. d) In 78/77 BCE, the LXX Esther appeared. Its author revised the Greek model of the *Vetus Latina*, bringing it into alignment with the Hebrew text; moreover, he took Additions A to F from the Greek model of the *Vetus Latina*, as well as elements from the primitive form of the AT. e) When the LXX started to supplant the other Greek texts of Esther, the primitive form of the AT was aligned to it; with the insertion of Additions B, C, E of the LXX, the AT took the form in which we know it.

On the basis of the evidence provided by earlier scholarship, Cavalier (2012, 30–31) concludes that the date of the AT, in the form in which it has come down to us, is difficult to be pushed back to before the Common Era and that its author likely composed it in the second half of the first century CE. She also rightly points out that the points of verbal contact between the AT and Josephus' Esther narrative in the

[50] This idea has been taken up and elaborated by Miller (2015, 91–99), who maintains that "the fact that Philo would have been familiar with OG Esther in Alexandria, the fact that he had motive to rewrite elements of that version for a Gentile audience, and the fact that had opportunity to write in Rome while he waited to see Gaius indicates that what is now known as the Alpha Text of Esther could have been one of the books Philo wrote concerning Jewish issues in the time of Gaius Caligula" (p. 98). That an author of Philo's calibre could have produced as part of the same series as *On the Embassy to Gaius* and *Against Flaccus* nothing better than a poor replica of the LXX Esther is beyond any probability.

Jewish Antiquities do not necessarily indicate that the AT was one of the sources that Josephus utilized. Consequently, one cannot with any certainty take 93/94 CE, the date of publication of the *Jewish Antiquities,* as a *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the AT.[51]

In connection with the Common-Era dating of the AT suggested above, we would like here to draw attention to the combination δέσποτα παντοκράτορ in Mordecai's prayer at 4(C):13. The corresponding verse in the LXX Esther (C:2) reads κύριε, κύριε, βασιλεῦ πάντων κρατῶν. In the Septuagint, δεσπότης co-occurs with παντοκράτωρ in the prayer of the Jews in 3 Macc 2:2, where, however, the two epithets are not directly conjoined.[52] Outside the AT, the earliest attestation of the vocative address to God δέσποτα παντοκράτορ is found in the *Didache* (10.3), which has been dated from as early as the mid-first century CE to as late as the 20s of the second century CE.[53] It next recurs in the Testament of Abraham (recension A, 8:7 James), in the liturgies of St. Basil (PG 31:1644.48) and St. Gregory of Nazianzus (PG 36:700.45), and in the *Apostolic Constitutions* (7.25 Metzger, passim). Apropos of the instance of δέσποτα παντοκράτορ in the Testament of Abraham,[54] Allison (2003, 189) notes that the combination of παντοκράτωρ with δεσπότης—"unattested in the LXX, Philo, and Josephus—may be Christian" and that its instances in the above-cited ecclesiastical texts indicate that "the address belonged to the Christian liturgy." The use of this divine appellative seems, thus, to corroborate Jobes' (1996, 191, 226–27) positing of a "Christian stage" in the history of the AT and its preservation "within a Christian tradition."[55]

Another chronological clue may be found in AT 7:36 ἔθνος Ἰουδαίων ἀπειθὲς σπουδάσατε ταχέως ἀναπέμψαι μοι εἰς ἀπώλειαν. This verse occurs in a passage (AT 7:34–38) containing a short letter of Mordecai, which is absent from the MT, the LXX, and the La.[56] Outside the AT, the earliest attestations of the emphatic combination of σπουδάζω and ταχέως are found in the New Testament (2 Tim 4:9 σπούδασον ἐλθεῖν πρός με ταχέως) and in Josephus (*AJ* 7.141 ὡς σπουδάσειε ταχέως ἑλεῖν τὴν πόλιν). Both texts are from the second half of the first century CE.[57]

Be it noted that other scholars have adduced other lexical clues in support of different datings of the AT. Bickerman (2007d, 247), for example, asserts that the AT "must be pre-Roman," because at 7:19, King Ahasuerus' command is expressed by the imperative

---

[51] Contra De Troyer (2003, 66, 88–89) and Miller (2015, 114), who argue that the AT of Esther was composed in Rome and was known to Josephus. See supra, footnote 34.

[52] κύριε κύριε . . . δέσποτα πάσης τῆς κτίσεως . . . παντοκράτωρ. Cf. 2 Macc 5:20.

[53] See Draper 2015, 530.

[54] A date in the first century CE has been posited for the (Hebrew or Greek) original of the Testament of Abraham; in the form in which it has come down to us, recension A, in which the address to God δέσποτα παντοκράτορ occurs, is medieval. See Denis 1970, 36–37; E.P. Sanders, "Testament of Abraham," *OTP* 1:874–75; Allison 2003, 38–40.

[55] Cf. Clines' (1984, 111) comment on the use of the epithet ὁ δυνατός (AT 6:1) as a designation of God.

[56] See De Troyer 2003.

[57] In papyri letters the combination is attested even later. Cf. *SB* 3.6262.14 [3rd c. CE] σπούδασον οὖν τάχιον ἐλθεῖν πρὸς ἐμέ.

γινέσθω, "so be it," "a technical term of Hellenistic administration." The existence of various lexical clues pointing to different chronological periods seems to show that the AT underwent textual development over an extended period of time.

As can be seen from the foregoing survey, the divergent scholarly opinions on the AT of Esther do not allow drawing any clear-cut conclusions about its origin, date of composition, and relationship with the MT and the LXX Esther. There are, however, some points of at least partial scholarly convergence: (a) the AT likely took the form in which we know it sometime after 15/16–46/47 CE, although earlier compositional stages have to be posited, (b) the AT is dependent on LXX Esther for Additions B and E.

Returning to the three points of lexical contact between 2 Maccabees and the AT of Esther that we have examined in this study, we can make the following remarks: in 2 Maccabees, the words δικαιοκρίτης, ἔκθυμος, and τρισαλιτήριος are dispersed in five different chapters (δικαιοκρίτης: 12:41; ἔκθυμος: 7:3, 7:39, 14:27; τρισαλιτήριος: 8:34, 15:3). In the AT of Esther, they are clustered within the space of eighteen verses (δικαιοκρίτης: 7(E):23(4); ἔκθυμος: 7:9(7); τρισαλιτήριος: 7(E):27(15); δικαιοκρίτης and τρισαλιτήριος occur in Ahasverus' counter-decree, which corresponds to Addition E of the LXX Esther, and ἔκθυμος occurs in the text preceding the counter-decree). A reasonable conjecture is that the introduction into the AT of the lexical items drawn from 2 Maccabees took place when Additions B and E were copied from the LXX into the AT. The person who integrated Addition E into the AT retained the epithet τρισαλιτήριος, which he likely identified as being a lexical borrowing of LXX Addition E from 2 Maccabees, and introduced the epithet δικαιοκρίτης, which he picked up from the same source from which the author of LXX Addition E had drawn τρισαλιτήριος, namely 2 Maccabees. His familiarity with the Maccabean book also prompted him to introduce into the text preceding the inserted counter-decree the distinctive phrase ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς, memorably used three times in 2 Maccabees, in order to highlight the king's anger—an addition consistent with his concern to emphasize the psychological states of the book's characters. Considering that (a) the LXX Esther, probably without Additions B and E, was sent to Egypt in 78/77 BCE, and (b) Additions B and E were likely composed in Egypt, as their "Egyptian flavour"[58] seems to indicate, sometime after 78/77 BCE and perhaps as late as the Roman period,[59] we can plausibly place the introduction of the Maccabean lexical elements into the AT in the second half of the first century BCE or in the first century CE.

What motivated the composer of the AT to use a doublet that conjoins the phrase ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς, which is in all likelihood borrowed from 2 Maccabees,

[58] See Passoni dell'Acqua 2004, 75–81, 86–88 and Koller 2014, 123.

[59] Additions B and E seem to be dependent on 3 Maccabees, which is usually dated to the late Ptolemaic or early Roman period. See 4.2.6. K.H. Wynn (cited by Jobes 1996, 172, 227) dates them to as late as after Claudius' letter to the Alexandrians (41 CE). Dorothy (1997, 101, 180, 192) contends that the decree in Addition B exhibits affinities with decrees from the Roman rather than the Hellenistic period, whereas the one in Addition E is closer to the form of Hellenistic letters.

with the phrase πλησθεὶς ὀργῆς, which possibly originates in OG Daniel? In both 2 Macc 7:3 (ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς) and OG Dan 3:19 (τότε Ναβουχοδονοσορ ἐπλήσθη θυμοῦ), reference is made to the wrath of a king, Antiochus IV's and Nebuchadnezzar's, respectively; in both books, the wrath of the king is triggered by the refusal of a number of young Jewish men—the seven brothers, in the first book, and the Three Holy Children, in the second—to obey his commands: to partake of forbidden meat, in 2 Maccabees, and to worship his image, in OG Daniel; lastly, in both books the king's wrath leads him to cast the recalcitrant to be burned in a frying pan and a fiery furnace, respectively. The context in AT 7:9(7) is quite different from that in 2 Macc 7:3 and OG Dan 3:19, as King Ahasuerus' wrath is not stirred by or vented upon any Law-abiding Jews. Yet, it seems that the composer of the AT was a reader of at least the first of the last-mentioned texts and was perhaps preoccupied, for reasons related to his *Sitz im Leben*, with the theme of persecution and martyrdom.

A last point that calls for comment here is Jobes' (1996, 169–70, 225) aforementioned claim that the author of 2 Maccabees was acquainted with Addition D in its AT form. Jobes sees a connection between the words ἱδρώς and ἀγρυπνία in 2 Macc 2:26 (ἱδρῶτος δὲ καὶ ἀγρυπνίας τὸ πρᾶγμα), by which the epitomator describes his arduous effort to compose the epitome, and the word ἱδρώς in AT 5(D):12(14) (καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ πρόσωπον αὐτῆς μέτρον ἱδρῶτος), used of the sweat on Esther's face, and ἀγρυπνέω in AT 6:1 (καὶ ἦν ἀγρυπνῶν [sc. ὁ βασιλεύς]), used of Ahasuerus' staying awake at night; she also connects the banquet simile in 2 Macc 2:27 with the banquet being a "major motif" in Esther. On the strength of these similarities, she finds it plausible that the author of 2 Maccabees makes a "striking" and "deliberate" allusion to the AT of Esther. The first thing one can remark is that ἱδρώς and ἀγρυπνία are conjoined in 2 Macc 2:26, whereas ἱδρώς and ἀγρυπνέω are separated by fifteen verses in the AT and are used of two different persons and situations. Secondly, the epitomator's (figurative) sweat and night-long writing activity can hardly be intertextually linked with Esther's literal sweat and the king's sleeplessness. Thirdly, since the time of Callimachus,[60] the ἀγρυπνία, a writer's nocturnal vigil, was a literary topos, which the author of 2 Maccabees utilizes in his prologue (as does the translator of Sirach in the prologue to his translation).[61] As for the sympotic motif, it is not exclusive to Esther and 2 Maccabees, but is found elsewhere in the Septuagint and beyond.[62] We therefore find it quite unlikely that the epitomator was acquainted with Addition D in its AT form and alluded to it in the prologue to his work.

---

[60] Call. *Epigr.* 27.4 Pfeiffer. Cf., in Latin literature, Cinna fr. 11.1–2; Hor. *Ars* 268–9; Lucr. 1.141–44; Stat. *Theb.* 12.811. Aulus Gellius entitled his work *Noctes Atticae* in reference to the long nights spent writing it and Martianus Capella personified nocturnal literary labour in the character of Agrypnia. See Janson 1964, 97–98 and 147–48.

[61] Sir Prol:30 πολλὴν ἀγρυπνίαν καὶ ἐπιστήμην προσενεγκάμενος.

[62] Cf. Sir 31:12–32:13; 3 Macc 5:15–17, 6:33–34; Let. Aris. 182–294; Plu. *Mor.* 620A–622B.

5.3 2 Maccabees and Esther

Before we conclude our discussion on the relationship between 2 Maccabees and the AT of Esther, we would like to touch upon another relevant question: is there a relationship between 2 Maccabees and any of the other versions of Esther known to us? Are the claims that have been made about the acquaintance of 2 Maccabees with the Septuagint Esther valid?[63] We will start by reviewing some scholarly opinions.

Schwartz (2008, 35–36, 450, 472, 483, 512) finds in 2 Maccabees the following "echoes" of Esther:

a) The use of the adjective τρισαλιτήριος (8:34; 15:3). Cf. LXX Esth E:15; AT 7(E):27(15).
b) The phrase οὐκ ἐῶντες τὴν βασιλείαν εὐσταθείας τυχεῖν in Alcimus' speech (14:6). Cf. Esth LXX B:5; AT 3(B):16(4).
c) The tower of fifty cubits in height, in which Menelaus was executed (13:5). Cf. the gallows fifty cubits high, on which Haman was impaled or crucified (Esth MT, LXX 5:14, 7:9; AT 5:23(14), 7:12(9).
d) The three-day fast of Judas and his people (13:12). Cf. the three days of fasting of Esther and the Jews of Susa (Esth MT, LXX 4:16; the AT makes no mention of Esther's fasting).
e) The phrases "he was disconcerted," used of Nicanor at 14:28 (cf. the disconcert of the people of Susa in Esth MT, LXX 3:15), and "the King of kings aroused the anger of Antiochus" (NETS) at 13:4 (cf. Esth 6:1 "the Lord kept sleep from the king that night" [NETS]).
f) The reference to the festival of Purim (15:36). Cf. Esth MT 9:18–32; LXX 9:18–31; AT 7(9):47(20)–49(26), 7(F):59(10).

Schwartz (ib. 35–36) further remarks that many of the above-cited words/phrases in 2 Maccabees that recall Esther are clustered in the episode of Menelaus' death, for which he posits the use by the epitomator of a Jewish source other than Jason's history.

In the previous chapter (4.2.6), we discussed (a) and (b) and concluded that it is Additions B and E of LXX Esther that seem to draw on 2 Maccabees rather than vice versa. With regard to (c), it has to be admitted that it does not seem very coincidental that Menelaus and Haman are executed on a gallows and a tower, respectively, fifty cubits high. As Koller (2014, 111) notes, "the execution of Menelaus cannot but remind us of the execution of Haman. In both cases, the foreign king, who has been turned against the Jews by a rogue loyalist, realizes that he has been duped, and has the 'scoundrel' executed on a structure fifty cubits high. . . . The author deploys a key word or phrase in order to cue the reader to think about the two stories in light of each other." However, it cannot be excluded that the Beroia tower, where Menelaus met his

[63] Motzo (1924, 271 and 298–99n2), for example, goes so far as to argue that the author of 2 Maccabees (that is, the epitomator) was also the editor of LXX Esther (the author of *il rifacimento greco*, as he calls it), and dates both works to ca. 50 BCE. See also Goldstein 1983, 503 and Miller 2015, 71–73.

end, was indeed fifty cubits high. Fifty cubits seems to have been a regular height for a tower;[64] Haman's fifty cubits (ca. 22.5 metres) gallows, on the other hand, was unnaturally and impractically high. With respect to (d), the aforementioned Koller (loc. cit.) believes that the three-day fast is "far more striking a parallel than a superficial numerical equivalence. Judah Maccabee declared the three-day fast in preparation for meeting the king [sc. in battle], just as Esther declared her fast in preparation for meeting the king." The connection is possible, but we are rather inclined to see in both books an instance of the 'three-day motif,' which is not infrequent in the Old Testament.[65] As for (e), we do not think that the phrases adduced by Schwartz establish any strong connection between 2 Maccabees and Esther.

More worth examining is (f), the reference to the feast of Purim. Second Maccabees 15:36 states that the victory of Judas Maccabeus over the Seleucid general Nicanor was decreed to be celebrated on the thirteenth of Adar, a day before the 'Day of Mordecai' (τῆς Μαρδοχαϊκῆς ἡμέρας). Why is the 14th of Adar designated as the 'Day of Mordecai,' or, more precisely, the 'Mordechaic Day'?[66] Can this designation be taken as a clue to the author of 2 Maccabees' acquaintance with a specific version of the Esther story?

In the MT and the LXX Esther (9:1–32(31)), the Jews in Susa fight their enemies on the 13th and 14th of Adar and make the 15th a day of feasting; the Jews in the provinces fight on the 13th of Adar and make the 14th a day of feasting. Mordecai institutes the celebration of the deliverance of his people by writing to the Jews living in Ahasuerus' (MT)/Artaxerxes' (LXX) kingdom and enjoining them to celebrate annually the 14th and 15th of Adar. These days are called Purim (פּוּרִים) in the MT and Φρουραι in the LXX (9:26).[67] Esther, too, writes to the Jews to confirm Mordecai's letter concerning the celebration of Purim/Φρουραι. In the AT of Esther (7(9):42(3)–49(26)), Mordecai writes to the Jews living in Ahasuerus' kingdom, enjoining them to celebrate annually the 14th and 15th of Adar, which, in this text, are called Φουραια (7(9):49(26)).[68] Esther writes no letter to the Jews. In the *Vetus Latina*, Mordecai and Esther write to the Jews about the celebration of the 14th and 15th of Adar; their letter is called *epistula*

---

[64] Cf. J. *BJ* 5.242; *AJ* 9.219.

[65] Compare LXX Esth 4:16 νηστεύσατε ἐπ' ἐμοὶ καὶ μὴ φάγητε μηδὲ πίητε ἐπὶ ἡμέρας τρεῖς νύκτα καὶ ἡμέραν with 1 Kgdms 30:12, which speaks of a young Egyptian servant, who οὐ βεβρώκει ἄρτον καὶ οὐ πεπώκει ὕδωρ τρεῖς ἡμέρας καὶ τρεῖς νύκτας. Cf. Joseph's and Taxo's three-day fast in T. 12 Patr. 11.3.5 and in As. Mos. 9:6, respectively. On the 'three-day motif,' see Bauer (1958) and Landes (1967). On the role of the number three in Esther, see Cavalier 2012, 48–49, 51.

[66] The author of 2 Maccabees uses an adjective (Μαρδοχαϊκός) instead of a genitive (τοῦ Μαρδοχαίου) as he does elsewhere (see the comment on δοξικός at 2.2.4). Bardtke (1971, 99–101) notes that the construction *yom* + personal name is unknown to the Hebrew Old Testament and that the Septuagint offers no other example of a time-denoting substantive like ἡμέρα being conjoined with an adjectivised personal name. For some late, non-biblical attestations of Jewish feasts designated as 'the day of + personal name' (Day of Nicanor, Day of Trajan, and *dies Herodis*), see Attali (2013).

[67] The following MS variants are also attested: φρουριν, φρουριμ, φουρουρειμ, φουρειν, φουριμ.

[68] MS variants: φουρδια, φαραια, φουρμαια.

custodientium (9:29). In Josephus' Esther narrative (*AJ* 11.289–296), the Jews in the provinces fight their enemies on the 13th of Adar and celebrate on the 14th, whereas the Jews in Susa fight on the 13th and 14th and celebrate on the 14th—apparently a lapsus of Josephus—and the 15th; Mordecai (but not Esther) writes to the Jews, asking them to celebrate the 14th and 15th of Adar; these days are called *φρουρεαι (11.295).[69]

In all the above-mentioned versions of the Esther story, Mordecai institutionalizes a feast that is to be observed on two successive days, the 14th and 15th of Adar. This feast has a name, Purim, from the word "pur" (פּוּר, κλῆρος, "lot"), that is, 'the feast of the lots,' in commemoration of the lots that Haman cast to determine the day on which the Jews would be destroyed (13th of Adar). In the Greek versions of Esther, פּוּרִים, Purim, has been rendered by such terms as Φρουραι, Φουραια, and their variants, which are relatively close transliterations of the Hebrew term, and, at the same time, reminiscent of declinable Greek words such as φρουρά ("watch," "guard") and its cognates.[70] If the author of 2 Maccabees was acquainted with any of the Greek versions of Esther known to us and wanted to explicitly allude to it, he would have likely used one of the Greek renderings cited above, e.g. πρὸ μιᾶς ἡμέρας τῶν (ἡμερῶν τῶν) Φρουραι. This not being the case, 2 Macc 15:36 cannot be taken as providing evidence of 2 Maccabees' acquaintance with any of the Greek versions of Esther that have come down to us.

For the designation of the 14th of Adar as Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα several suppositions have been put forward. Bar-Kochva (1989, 373n26) and Schwartz (2008, 511) contend that the author of 2 Maccabees chose it by analogy with 'Nicanor's Day' that was decreed to be celebrated on the previous day, the 13th of Adar, in commemoration of the victory of Judas Maccabeus over the Seleucid general Nicanor at Adasa, in 161 BCE. It may be observed, however, that neither 2 Maccabees (15:36) nor 1 Maccabees (7:49) nor Josephus (*AJ* 12.412) nor any other Greek source call the 13th of Adar 'Nicanor's Day'; the latter designation does not occur earlier than the first-century CE *Megillat Ta'anit*, which mentions it along with the late-established and obscure 'Trajan's Day,' celebrated on the 12th of Adar.[71] One may indeed doubt whether the 13th of Adar was originally called 'Nicanor's Day,' considering that it would have been strange and unprecedented to name the day celebrating a great victory of the Jews after the name of the defeated

[69] Josephus gives the word in the accusative plural, φρουρεας. MS variants: φρουραιας, φρουρεους.

[70] In LXX Esther 9:26 (ἐπεκλήθησαν αἱ ἡμέραι αὗται Φρουραι διὰ τοὺς κλήρους, ὅτι τῇ διαλέκτῳ αὐτῶν καλοῦνται Φρουραι), Φρουραι is not the nominative plural of φρουρά, as one might suppose (cf. the rendering of the *Vetus Latina*: *custodientes*), but an indeclinable word (as can be seen from 9:28 αἱ δὲ ἡμέραι αὗται τῶν Φρουραι, 9:29 τῆς ἐπιστολῆς τῶν Φρουραι, and F:11 τὴν προκειμένην ἐπιστολὴν τῶν Φρουραι), which Josephus tried to hellenize by giving it an adjectival ending. See Pelletier 1975, 229. Motzo (1924, 307–11) argues, not very convincingly, for a Greek origin of the term, which might have arisen in Egypt, where Jews were settled in forts (φρούρια) as garrisons (φρουραί) and were allotted pieces of land (κλῆροι).

[71] See Newman 1969, 81; Pelletier 1975, 229.

enemy (Nicanor) instead of that of the victor (Judas). It would have been tantamount to calling Purim 'Haman's Day.'[72]

Burns (2006, 15) underlines the implicit parallelism in 2 Macc 15:36 between Nicanor and Haman, Mordecai's enemy in the Esther story: "By caricaturing Nicanor as a *nouveau* Haman, the author of 2 Maccabees gives licence to the Day of Nicanor as a celebration of religious significance not unlike Purim." Although the author of 2 Maccabees does not seem to have had the intention to caricature Nicanor, the mention of the feast commemorating his defeat together with the feast commemorating Mordecai's triumph over Haman establishes an association between the two vanquished villains: both attempted mass extermination of the Jews (Esth 3:6; 2 Macc 8:9); both posed a threat to Jewish religion (Esth C:20; 2 Macc 14:33); both were impaled after their defeat (Esth 7:10; 2 Macc 15:35).

Goldstein (1983, 502) suggests that the author of 2 Maccabees coined the phrase Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα to imply a parallelism between Mordecai and Judas Maccabeus: both were connected with victories over enemies of the Jews and both established feasts held on the anniversaries of those victories. Lacocque (1999, 308) similarly points out that "Esther was not a male like Judas" and that "when the 'heroine' is Esther, the accent is not what the author of 2 Maccabees would elect for his purpose." These remarks are pertinent, yet one may wonder whether the author of 2 Maccabees, who is generally commended for the accuracy of his nomenclature, would have so easily tampered with the name of an established feast and arbitrarily overplayed the role of Mordecai in the Esther story.

In the Hebrew version of Esther, as transmitted in the MT, Mordecai is not the protagonistic figure and there is nothing really heroic about him.[73] It is Esther who, at the risk of her life, discloses to the king Haman's scheming against the Jews; it is Esther, who, after Haman's execution, "sets Mordecai over the house of Haman" (8:2); it is Esther who falls at the king's feet pleading with him to annul the edict ordering the annihilation of the Jews (8:3); it is Esther who demands that the Jews in Susa continue

[72] Goldstein (1983, 502n36) observes that "other Jewish sources name days of great Jewish victories after the vanquished enemy, not after the victorious leader, e.g. the Day of Midian (Isa 9:3)." One should specify, though, that the last-mentioned example contains a toponym, not an anthroponym. Aster (2012, 35–36) remarks that "the syntax *yom* + GN in the Hebrew Bible refers to the day on which the location designated by the geographic name was defeated or destroyed" and adduces as examples, aside from Isa 9:3, the "day of Jezreel" in Hos 1:11 (2:2) and the "day of Jerusalem" in Ps 137:7—one may add the "day of Egypt" in Ezek 30:9. As a modern parallel, he cites *le jour de la Bastille*, yet it has to be pointed out that the French never use this phrase to designate the 14th of July, their National Day. Although 'Nicanor's Day' can very well be understood, by analogy, as referring to the day of Nicanor's defeat, to our best knowledge, there is no other example of a day, let alone feast, designated by the name of a hated, defeated enemy. Some scholars argue that the '*yom Turianos*,' recorded in the *Megillat Ta'anit*, commemorated the death of the Roman emperor Trajan, seen as an enemy of the Jews, yet it may well have been instead an honorific feast celebrating the emperor's benefactions to the Jews. See Attali 2013, 4–5, 7–8.

[73] Cf. Cazelles 1961, 21: "Mardochée lui même n'a rien de très spécialement héroïque et doit sa fortune plus à une dénonciation et à sa pression sur Esther qu'à son courage."

for a second day the killing of their enemies (8:13); lastly, it is Esther who confirms Mordecai's letter establishing the feast of Purim (9:29–31): "The command of Queen Esther fixed these practices of Purim, and it was recorded in writing" (9:32 NRSV).[74]

In the non-canonical Additions to be found in the LXX, the AT, and the La, Mordecai has a more dynamic role: Additions A and F relate his dream and its interpretation, respectively, in which he and Haman are envisioned as fighting dragons; in Addition A he further denounces the plot of the two eunuchs to assassinate the king, thus saving the latter's life; Addition C contains his prayer, which precedes that of Esther; and in Addition E he is called "saviour" and "benefactor" of the king. Bardtke (1971, 103–9; 1977, 25) maintains that Mordecai's rise to herodom, evidenced in the Additions, originated in the period of the Maccabean revolt, which produced a real-life hero and champion of the Jewish people, Judas Maccabeus.

The *Vetus Latina* of Esther, which, as previously said, is an indirect witness to a lost Greek version—perhaps the oldest of all Greek versions of Esther—contains certain details, absent from the other versions, which enhance Mordecai's political and religious profile: it introduces him not only at A:2 and 2:5 but also at 4:1; it names him as one of the five princes of the Persians and Medes who are close to the king (1:14); it has him and not Memucan suggest to the king the deposition of Vashti, which paves the way for Esther to become queen (1:16); it has even Haman and his wife acknowledge him as a "servant of God" and a "prophet" (6:11, 13); lastly, it has him address his fellow Jews, when presenting the interpretation of his dream (F:1), a fact that highlights his leading position within the Jewish community.[75]

The AT assigns Mordecai a more prominent place than any of the other versions of Esther. It has him, and not Esther, receive from the king all of Haman's property after the execution of the latter (7:15), and demand from the king that Haman's decree be revoked (7:16). It quotes a short letter that he wrote to the Jews of Susa (7(8):33(14)–38), informing them of the foiling of Haman's plot; this letter is *Sondergut*, that is, it is not found in the other versions of Esther. It also presents him as the sole initiator of the feast of Purim, as it is only he who writes to the Jews of Persia, calling them to hold the festival on the 14th and 15th of Adar; Esther does not confirm this festal letter.[76] One may venture the hypothesis that, if the phrase Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα evidences the acquaintance of the author of 2 Maccabees with one of the versions of Esther known to us, that version would more likely be that of the AT, perhaps in an early stage of its textual development.[77]

---

[74] See Bardtke 1971, 102–3.

[75] See Cavalier 2009 and Bellmann 2017.

[76] See Haelewyck 1985, 33, 41; id. 2003–2008, 101n165; Jobes 1996, 128–38, 225; Lacocque 1999, 308, 320; De Troyer 2003, 70n42: "For the AT, Mordecai is the person who 'saves' the Jews, not Esther"; ib. 85.

[77] Cf. Haelewyck 1985, 41: "En fin de compte, l'appellation ἡ μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα désignant la fête de Purim en II M 15,36 conviendrait au mieux à cette forme du livre d'Esther [sc. the AT]"; id., quoted by Bogaert

A final possibility that can be considered here is that, at the time of composition of 2 Maccabees, and in the Greek-Jewish milieu of its author, Purim was commonly known as the 'Day of Mordecai.'[78] What can justify this assumption, in the first place, is that, for the feasts and festivities that he mentions in his work, both Jewish and pagan, the author of 2 Maccabees uses names known to us from other sources.[79] Even for the πρωτοκλήσια (4:21), which are otherwise unknown to us, we have no particular reason to suspect that it is a term whimsically coined by the author of our book; its non-attestation in other sources may be a matter of sheer chance. If the designation Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα appeared already in Jason of Cyrene's history, we may assume that in the 60s and 50s of the second century BCE, that is, at the time of the Maccabean revolt and the time when Jason presumably wrote his history, respectively, the feast was observed under that name.[80] The period 167–161 BCE, in particular, marked by the heroic deeds of Judas Maccabeus, may have seen the historicization of the feast of Purim and its renaming to 'Day of Mordecai,' on account of the heroization of Mordecai, seen as a literary counterpart of Judas.[81]

Second Maccabees 15:36, however, also raises questions about the day of celebration of the Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα. The Mishnah (*Meg.* 1:1) states that the Scroll of Esther was read on the 15th of Adar in the cities walled since the days of Joshua, whereas in the

---

2009, 69: "En définitive, le texte *L* [=AT] aurait dû s'appeler le livre de Mardochée. D'ailleurs, en 2 M 15,36, la fête de Pourim n'est-elle pas désignée par les mots 'Jour de Mardochée'?"

[78] We note here, for what it's worth, Lewy's (1939) theory that the Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα celebrated on the 14th of Adar was actually unrelated to the Mordecai of the Esther story and designated instead the day of the Mardukians, that is, the worshippers of the Babylonian god Marduk. According to Lewy, the biblical story of Esther was the Jewish transmutation of a Babylonian tale dealing with the enmity between the worshippers of Mithra (cf. Haman's epithet Bougaios=Bagaios, derived from *baga,* which designates Mithra), and the worshippers of Marduk (cf. Mordecai); when King Artaxerxes II promoted the cult of Mithra in Susa, the god's worshippers threatened with extermination the Mardukians, who were saved by the goddess Ishtar (cf. Esther). The Mardukians had adopted an Old Persian festival named *Farvardigan* (cf. the designation of Purim as φουρδια in one of the MSS of the AT), which was celebrated from Adar 11 to 15. This festival was in turn adopted by the Jews of the Diaspora and celebrated on the 14th of Adar as the 'Mardukian Day.' We also note Milik's (1992, 354, 389) suggestion that the 'Day of Mordecai' might have commemorated the historical Mordecai mentioned in 1 Esd 5:8 and 2 Esd 2:2.

[79] γενέθλιος ἡμέρα τοῦ βασιλέως (6:7), ἑβδομάς (6:11; 12:38; 15:4), ἑορτὴ τῶν ἑβδομάδων (12:31)/πεντηκοστή (12:32), ἑορτή Διονυσίων (6:7), ἑορτὴ τῶν σκηνῶν (10:6), ἡμέρα καταπαύσεως (15:1), ἡμέρα τοῦ σαββάτου/τῶν σαββάτων (5:25; 15:3), σάββατον (8:26, 27, 28; 12:38), σαββατίζω (6:6), καθαρισμός/ἐγκαινισμός (2:19; cf. 1:18, 2:16, 10:5).

[80] Horbury (1991, 224–25) connects the Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα named in 2 Maccabees with a Jewish funerary inscription from Alexandria, dated to the late 3rd–mid 2nd century BCE, which records the name Μαρδοχαῖος (*SEG* 8:418 Ἤδιννα ἡ Μαρδοχαίου). He hypothesizes that the story of Mordecai was known in Egypt and/or in Palestine and the eastern Diaspora (the Mordecai of the inscription might have immigrated to Egypt from Judea or the east) in the period to which the inscription has been assigned, and that the 'Day of Mordecai' was celebrated already before the mid-second century BCE, so that the Μαρδοχαῖος of the inscription might have been named after the Mordecai of Susa, in honour of whom the feast was instituted. The celebration of the 'Day of Mordecai' may have prepared the ground for the translation of the book of Esther into Greek and facilitated its reception in Egypt. This is an ingenious theory, but perhaps Horbury infers too much from too little.

[81] See Bardtke 1971, 108; 1977, 25–27.

villages and large towns it was read on the 14th, in accordance with the distinction made in Esth 9:19 between the celebration of Purim in the capital of Susa on the 15th, and in the villages and towns of the provinces on the 14th of Adar. From 2 Macc 15:36, we are to understand that, in 161 BCE, the Mordechaic Day, that is, Purim, was celebrated in Jerusalem on the 14th of Adar. Jerusalem, being a fortified city since the days of Joshua,[82] would have been expected to celebrate the Susan Purim on the 15th of Adar. Was Purim celebrated on the 14th because the walls of Jerusalem had been demolished by Antiochus IV in 168 BCE so that in 161 BCE only the citadel of David was fortified?[83] Or is it that the spatio-temporal distance from the events that he relates induced the Diaspora author of the book into error? Moreover, Zeitlin (1919–1920, 290n312; 1954, 23, 247n36) points out that 161 BCE was a leap year, so that a thirteenth month, Adar II, following the twelfth month, Adar I, was intercalated into the calendar; Nicanor's defeat at Adasa occurred in Adar I, whereas Purim was celebrated in Adar II. This, according to Zeitlin, explains why the author of 1 Maccabees, who was probably aware of the intercalation of the month, does not mention Purim in connection with the establishment of 'Nicanor's Day.' Yet, could it be that Purim in 161 BCE was celebrated both in Adar I and II, as a late source, Mishnah, tells us was the case in leap years?[84]

Elsewhere in this study,[85] we argued, on the basis of lexical evidence, that 2 Macc 15:36 is to be ascribed to the epitomator rather than to Jason of Cyrene. It is possible that, composing his epitome at least some forty years after the events recounted in it, at some place other than Jerusalem, the epitomator erred in assuming that, in 161 BCE, Purim was celebrated in Jerusalem on the 14th of Adar I. But it is also possible that the date and the name of the feast were already in his *Vorlage*, Jason's history. The multiplicity of questions posed by 2 Macc 15:36 allows only speculation as to when and how the feast designated as Μαρδοχαϊκὴ ἡμέρα was in reality celebrated in 161 BCE.

To go back to the question that we raised earlier, whether the author of 2 Maccabees was acquainted with a specific version of the Esther story, we can conclude the following: the last-discussed designation of Purim as Day of Mordecai indicates either that the author of 2 Maccabees was acquainted with a version of the Esther story, in which Mordecai held a prominent role, or that already in the time of the Maccabean revolt a version that gave a place of preeminence to Mordecai was popular enough to impose the latter's name on the name of the feast that we otherwise know as Purim. That version can hardly have been that of the Hebrew book of Esther, in which the eponymous queen is the central figure. One of the Greek versions (the Alpha Text rather than the LXX or the Greek *Vorlage* of the *Vetus Latina*), which turn the spotlight on Mordecai, may, on the contrary, have been known to the author of 2

[82] See *m. 'Arak.* 9:6.

[83] Cf. 1 Macc 1:30–34 and see Cazelles 1961, 17–18.

[84] *Meg.* 1:4 A "[If] they read the scroll in the first Adar, and then the year was intercalated, they read it [again] in the second Adar." Trans. J. Neusner. See Bar-Kochva 1989, 372–73.

[85] See 3.2.1.

Maccabees, if not in its extant form, at least in some primitive form, with only some of the Additions. The other points of contact that Esther shares with 2 Maccabees, e.g. the fifty-cubit high construction of execution and the three-day fast, are common to all the versions and thus cannot settle the issue. Additions B and E, which were likely added to LXX Esther, and subsequently to the AT, after 78/77 BCE, are, on the other hand, lexically indebted to 2 Maccabees.

5.4 Summary

In this chapter we examined two words, δικαιοκρίτης and ἔκθυμος, which, together with τρισαλιτήριος, which we dealt with in the previous chapter, are shared exclusively by 2 Maccabees and the Alpha Text of Esther. All three words are first attested in 2 Maccabees, although they are not (with, perhaps, the exception of τρισαλιτήριος) coinages of this book. In 2 Maccabees, they occur in five different chapters, whereas in the AT they are clustered in chapter 7, and, more specifically, in the decree contained in Addition E (δικαιοκρίτης, τρισαλιτήριος) and in the text that precedes it (ἔκθυμος). In the AT, τρισαλιτήριος is a borrowing from LXX Addition E (which had previously borrowed it from 2 Maccabees), whereas δικαιοκρίτης and ἔκθυμος are pluses with regard to the LXX and the *Vetus Latina* of Esther, and the MT, the LXX, and the *Vetus Latina*, respectively. The last two words were likely introduced into the AT, when Additions B and E of LXX Esther were inserted into it. Considering that these Additions, originally written in Greek, were, as we believe, added to LXX Esther after the latter was sent to Egypt in 78/77 BCE, we conjecturally dated the insertion of the Maccabean lexical items into the AT to the second half of the first century BCE, or, more likely, to the first century CE, when, as many scholars believe, the AT's final redaction took place. The composer of the AT seems to have been familiar with 2 Maccabees, and especially with the martyrological chapter 7: his use of δικαιοκρίτης at 7(E):23(4) seems to have been triggered by the verbal resemblance of this verse with 2 Macc 7:35, whereas the phrase ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς is copied *en bloc* from 2 Macc 7:3 and 7:39. That 2 Maccabees 7 can thus be faintly discerned in the background of AT 7 may hint that the latter text emerged at a time of persecution, during which its composer sought recourse in the story of the Maccabean brothers, whose faith in divine justice and punishment helped them defy a ferocious tyrant. Having established that the direction of lexical influence between 2 Maccabees and AT Esther runs from the former to the latter, we further sought to establish whether 2 Maccabees may have exerted an influence on or received an influence from LXX Esther. We concluded, mainly on the basis of its designation of the feast of Purim as 'Day of Mordecai,' that 2 Maccabees was familiar with the Esther story and that some elements of this story may be echoed in it, yet we found no strong evidence, lexical or other, that it was acquainted specifically with LXX Esther. It is 2 Maccabees, on the contrary, that seems to have exerted a lexical influence on LXX Addition E and possibly B.

Chapter 6: Neologisms of the canonical books of the Septuagint that occur in 2 Maccabees

6.1 Introduction

One of the features of 2 Maccabees that is often pointed out by commentators is its dearth of biblical quotations and allusions.[1] Although the imprint of biblical language is substantially noticeable in the two prefixed letters, as well as in chapter 7, it is only sporadically discernible in the rest of the book.[2] In his study on the use of the Greek Bible in 2 Maccabees, van der Kooij (1999, 128–32) discusses four explicit biblical quotations,[3] three of which occur in the prefixed letters and in chapter 7[4] and one in chapter 10,[5] and two implicit quotations, one of which is found in the second prefixed letter and the other in chapter 15.[6] These six quotations are from Exodus, Deuteronomy, 2 Chronicles, and Isaiah. Lange and Weigold (2011, 242) have identified

[1] See Schwartz 1998, 225; id. 2008, 61–63; deSilva 2002, 272–73.

[2] In his study on the diversity of Greek in 2 Maccabees, Le Moigne (2012, 271) concludes that there is "un balancement entre recours à un grec délibérément non biblique et recours à un grec inspiré, de manière très claire, de celui de la LXX." This is a pertinent remark, yet it results from Le Moigne's assumption that 2 Maccabees is a homogeneous text, written from 1:1 to 15:39 by one and the same person, which he designates as "l'auteur de 2M." Consequently, he attributes to "the author of 2 Maccabees" the Septuagintisms and the Hebraisms that occur in the two prefixed letters, which, by general consensus, are considered to have been translated from Hebrew or Aramaic, most likely by a person other than the author of the epitome, or in chapter 7, for which an origin independent of 2 Maccabees and possibly a Semitic *Vorlage* have been posited by some scholars.

[3] An explicit quotation is a biblical phrase of at least two or three words, introduced by a quotation formula or another explicit reference to the source text, and reproduced more or less verbatim. An implicit quotation is a phrase of at least three or four words, which is morphologically more or less identical with the biblical source text, but is embedded in the new text, without being introduced by a quotation formula or an explicit reference to the source. See 1.8.2.

[4] 2 Macc 1:29–Exod 15:17; 2 Macc 2:17–Exod 19:6a; 2 Macc 7:6–Deut 1:5, 31:21, and 32:36a. See also Dimant 1986, 4–7.

[5] 2 Macc 10:26–Exod 23:22.

[6] 2 Macc 2:10–2 Chr 7:1; 2 Macc 15:22–Isa 37:36.

thirty biblical quotations and allusions[7] in 2 Maccabees: eighteen are from the Pentateuch, seven from the historical books, and five from the Prophets;[8] eleven occur in the two prefixed letters, six in chapter 7, two in chapter 8, four in chapter 10, one in chapter 12, and six in chapter 14. To be sure, the number of biblical allusions contained in 2 Maccabees cannot be specified with precision. Goldstein (1983, 22) is perhaps slightly exaggerating when he states that "the writer on his own or by borrowing from his sources has made the narrative teem with scriptural allusions, almost as much as did the Hasmonean propagandist [viz. the author of 1 Maccabees]." The twenty-three pages long "Index of passages from the Bible, the Apocrypha, and the Pseudepigrapha," at the end of his commentary on 2 Maccabees,[9] is certainly not indicative of the amount of scriptural allusions to be found in 2 Maccabees, as many of his suggestions are conjectural or debatable.[10]

Aside from the explicit and implicit quotations from and allusions to the Septuagint, the debt of the author of 2 Maccabees to the language of the Greek Bible can be traced in the use of a number of words, most of which pertain to the religious domain, whose first attestation in Greek is found in the translation of the Pentateuch and some other canonical books of the Hebrew Bible. Appendix 7 contains two dozen such words, which, between the time of the translation of the Pentateuch in the third century BCE and the time of composition of the New Testament in the first century CE, are not attested in any secular literary or non-literary text, but occur exclusively in the Septuagint and the literature related to it.[11] Most of these words are real *voces biblicae*,

---

[7] The difference between a biblical quotation and a biblical allusion has to do with whether the posterior text reproduces verbatim or freely the anterior text. According to the definitions proposed by Lange and Weigold (2011, 25–26), an implicit allusion is a verbal parallel of at least three words (or two *rare* words), which is "linguistically recognizable in the posterior text but not morphologically identical with it"; in an explicit allusion, the anterior text is "paraphrased or a keyword or theme of it are employed," yet it is identifiable by means of a quotation formula or another kind of reference.

[8] Gen 2x, Exod 6x, Lev 5x, Deut 5x, Josh 1x, 2 Sam 1x, 1 Kgs 1x, 2 Kgs 2x, 2 Chr 2x, Jer 3x, Dan 1x, Zech 1x.

[9] Goldstein 1983, 573–95.

[10] See Schwartz 1998, 226 and cf. id. 2008, 63: "The biblical allusions in our book are not very numerous, and even if suggestions may be added to the list, it is not always clear . . . that allusion to the Bible was in fact intended."

[11] Excluded from the Appendix list are thus: (a) words whose first attestation is found in the Septuagint, but which, between the time of translation of the Pentateuch and the time of composition of the New Testament, have even a single instance in an extra-Septuagintal text. E.g. ἀορασία is attested in the Septuagint and the literature dependent on it (Gen 19:11; Deut 28:28; 4 Kgdms 6:18, 2 Macc 10:30, Wis 19:17, Philo 3x), but also in Polybius (12.25g.4), who was not influenced by the language of the Septuagint; even the common σάββατον/σάββατα, is attested outside the Septuagint as early as the mid-third century BCE (*P.CairZen.* 4.59762.6), and later in an epigram of Meleager (*AP* 5.160), and (b) words of which the bulk of attestations are concentrated in the Septuagint, but for which there is evidence that they were in use prior to the translation of the Pentateuch. E.g. ῥομφαία (259x in the Septuagint), would have been thought to be a biblical word were it not for a scholion of Maximus the Confessor informing us that it was discussed in a work of the third-century BCE historian Phylarchus (*FGrH* 2a.81, fr. 57 ἡ γὰρ ῥομφαία βαρβαρικόν ἐστιν ὅπλον, ὡς ἱστορεῖ Φύλαρχος), and ἐτασμός, occurring in Gen

that is, they do not occur in secular literature even after the New Testament.[12] These neologisms were either coined by the translators of the Septuagint books in which they first occur, or possibly pre-existed in the translators' Jewish-Greek milieu. More than half of them are neologisms of the Greek Pentateuch that were subsequently adopted by the translators of other canonical books and the authors of works originally composed in Greek such as 2 Maccabees; the rest, prior to being taken up by 2 Maccabees and a few other deuterocanonical books, were introduced into literary usage in the Greek versions of a relatively small group of historical (Judges and 1 Samuel), prophetic (Jeremiah, Ezekiel, Daniel, Amos, Joel), and poetic (Psalms, Proverbs, and Job) books. The most common among them occur in as many as twenty-one (εὐλογητός), twenty-two (παντοκράτωρ), and thirty-four (ἁγιάζω, θυσιαστήριον) Septuagint books; five (ἁγιωσύνη, βδελυκτός, ἐποργίζομαι, ἱεράτευμα, and τροφοφορέω) occur in 2 Maccabees and a single other book of the Septuagint. As regards their instances in 2 Maccabees, four of them (ἁγιάζω, βδελυκτός, ἐξουθενέω, and ἱεράτευμα) are found in the two prefixed letters, twenty occur in the epitome, and six (ἁγιασμός, ἐγκαινισμός, εὐλογητός, καθαγιάζω, καθαρισμός, and παντοκράτωρ) occur in both the prefixed letters and the epitome. Only one of them (ἱεράτευμα) is contained in an explicit quotation.[13]

In the following, we will examine about one third of these neologisms that occur in 2 Maccabees. Our focus will be on the ones that have the fewer instances in the Septuagint and are shared between the epitome of 2 Maccabees and only a small number of other Septuagint books. Our examination will attempt to answer the following questions: For what purpose did the author of 2 Maccabees employ these Septuagint neologisms in the epitome? Do they constitute some sort of monolectic allusions to the Septuagint books where they first occur or to other Septuagint books in which they recur? If so, can they provide us with clues to the establishment of a relative chronology between the epitome and the Septuagint books to which the epitome is indebted for these words?

The discussion of these neologisms will be occasionally supplemented and supported by the evidence furnished by a number of word combinations shared by the epitome of 2 Maccabees and the Greek versions of the canonical books of the Hebrew Bible. A (non-exhaustive) list of these word combinations, which, for the most part, occur exclusively in the Septuagint and are unattested in contemporary secular Greek literature, is provided in Appendix 8.

12:17, Jdt 8:27, and 2 Macc 7:37, but also in *P.Sorb.* 1.9.2 [268 BCE], was an Attic word, according to the lexicon of the Antiatticist (s.v. ἐτασμόν; see Lee 1983, 44–45).

[12] Unlike, e.g., ἱλασμός, which occurs in Plutarch (*Sol.* 12.9) and σαπρία, which occurs in a first-century CE medical treatise (Dsc. 1.84.2).

[13] 2 Macc 2:17–Exod 19:6a.

6.2 Discussion of a sample of neologisms of the canonical books of the Septuagint that occur in 2 Maccabees

6.2.1 ἁγιωσύνη 'holiness'

3:12 τοὺς πεπιστευκότας τῇ τοῦ τόπου ἁγιωσύνῃ

ἁγιωσύνη is a neologism of the Greek Psalter. In three of its four instances in this book it is used with reference to Yahweh (29:5b, 96:12b καὶ ἐξομολογεῖσθε τῇ μνήμῃ τῆς ἁγιωσύνης αὐτοῦ; 144:5a τὴν μεγαλοπρέπειαν τῆς δόξης τῆς ἁγιωσύνης σου λαλήσουσιν). At 95:6b, where it qualifies God's sanctuary (ἁγιωσύνη καὶ μεγαλοπρέπεια ἐν τῷ ἁγιάσματι αὐτοῦ), it is a free rendering of עֹז, "power, strength" (cf. its more accurate rendering in 1 Chr 16:27 ἰσχὺς καὶ καύχημα ἐν τόπῳ αὐτοῦ). The only other instance in which this substantive is used to denote the sanctity of the Temple is in 2 Macc 3:12.

The opening verses of Psalm 95 [MT 96] invite all people to praise Yahweh's name, to announce the good news of the salvation that he provided (v. 2b εὐαγγελίζεσθε . . . τὸ σωτήριον αὐτοῦ), and to proclaim his glory and his wondrous deeds among the nations (v. 3 ἀναγγείλατε ἐν τοῖς ἔθνεσιν τὴν δόξαν αὐτοῦ, ἐν πᾶσι τοῖς λαοῖς τὰ θαυμάσια αὐτοῦ); verses 6–9 celebrate his theophany in the sanctuary, the Jerusalem Temple, where he receives the homage of the congregation.[14] The allusion to the Septuagint version of this psalm, through the use of the neologism ἁγιωσύνη at the beginning of the account of Heliodorus' visit to the Temple in 2 Maccabees 3, serves as a prefiguration of the eventual epiphany of Yahweh, which repulses the threat posed to the Temple's sanctity by Heliodorus, of the wondrous salvation of the Temple and of the stricken Heliodorus (3:32 ὑπὲρ τῆς τοῦ ἀνδρὸς σωτηρίας), and of the proclamation of Yahweh's glory by the congregation (3:30 οἱ δὲ τὸν κύριον εὐλόγουν τὸν παραδοξάζοντα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον), as well as by the potential desecrator himself (3:34 διάγγελλε πᾶσι τὸ μεγαλεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος; 3:36 ἐξεμαρτύρει δὲ πᾶσιν, ἅπερ ἦν ὑπ' ὄψιν τεθεαμένος ἔργα τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ).

The acquaintance of 2 Maccabees with the Septuagint of Psalms has been posited by Munnich (1982, 426–29) on the basis of the use of ἐμπαιγμός in 2 Macc 7:7, which, according to the French scholar, is influenced by both LXX Ps 37:8 and its *Vorlage* (MT 38:8(7)). As we will explain further on in this chapter, in our comment on ἐμπαιγμός (6.2.3), this influence is rather doubtful, yet the dependence of 2 Maccabees on the Septuagint of Psalms can arguably be postulated on the basis of the previously discussed substantive ἁγιωσύνη, as well as on the basis of the adjective ἐπουράνιος, which, like ἁγιωσύνη, occurs in the Heliodorus episode.

[14] See Weiser 1962, 629.

In the Septuagint, ἐπουράνιος occurs only in Ps 67:15a (ἐν τῷ διαστέλλειν τὸν ἐπουράνιον βασιλεῖς ἐπ' αὐτῆς), in 2 Macc 3:39 (ὁ τὴν κατοικίαν ἐπουράνιον ἔχων), and in 3 Macc 6:28 (τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπουρανίου θεοῦ ζῶντος) and 7:6 (τὸν ἐπουράνιον θεόν).[15] Before being adopted as an epithet of Yahweh, ἐπουράνιος was very sparingly employed in secular Greek poetry, always in connection with the gods of Olympus: it is found in Homer (*Il.* 6.129, 131, 527; *Od.* 17.484), in Ps.-Theocritus (25.5), and in Moschus (*Eur.* 21), who may have been a near contemporary of the Greek translator of the Psalms. The latter introduced this pagan divine designation in the Septuagint to render שַׁדַּי, "Almighty," in Ps 68:15(14); the Hebrew noun occurs once more in the Psalms, at 91:1 [LXX 90:1], where the Greek translator rendered it as θεὸς τοῦ οὐρανοῦ. In 2 Macc 3:39 ἐπουράνιος is applied not to Yahweh Himself but to his abode. This likely alludes to LXX Ps 67 [MT 68], where Yahweh "rides upon the sunset" (v. 5b τῷ ἐπιβεβηκότι ἐπὶ δυσμῶν), "rides to the sky of the skies" (v. 34a τῷ θεῷ τῷ ἐπιβεβηκότι ἐπὶ τὸν οὐρανὸν τοῦ οὐρανοῦ), and resides on Mount Zion, "the mount which [He] was pleased to live in it" (v. 17b τὸ ὄρος, ὃ εὐδόκησεν ὁ θεὸς κατοικεῖν ἐν αὐτῷ). Elsewhere in the Psalms, Yahweh is designated as "the one who resides in the sky" (2:4a ὁ κατοικῶν ἐν οὐρανοῖς; 122:1c τὸν κατοικοῦντα ἐν τῷ οὐρανῷ). Third Maccabees may be indebted directly to Ps 67 for this adjective, or may have taken it up from 2 Maccabees.[16]

If the author of 2 Maccabees was familiar with the Septuagint of Psalms, as the evidence presented above and the phraseological parallels listed in Appendix 8, 38–44, seem to indicate,[17] the date of translation of the Psalms could serve as a *terminus post quem* for the composition of the epitome. Most scholarly opinion converges on a second-century BCE date for the Greek Psalter. Munnich (1982, 150, 527) considers it to have been one of the first books to have been translated after the Pentateuch and Isaiah, perhaps as early as the end of the third century BCE.[18] Schaper (1995, 42, 45, 150; 2014, 174–75) detected in the Greek rendering of Pss 60 [LXX 59] and 108 [LXX 107] allusions to Judas Maccabaeus and the house of the Hasmonaeans, and, accordingly, dated it to the second half of the second century BCE, and, even more precisely, to the last third of that century; evidence for the dependence of the Septuagint of Isaiah and Proverbs, and of 1 Maccabees, on the Septuagint of Psalms led Williams (2001, 263, 272, 275–76) to suggest a date for the translation of the latter book "sometime prior to the first c. BCE" (p. 272), either in the first part of the second century BCE or, if LXX Ps 59:9c Ιουδας βασιλεύς μου is an allusion to Judas Maccabaeus, "after, perhaps not long after, the events of 161 BCE" (p. 276). An early date of translation, soon after 161 BCE, would have made it possible for Jason of Cyrene to have received the linguistic influence of the Greek Psalms; a date in the last third of the second century would make

[15] It also occurs in the "Morning Hymn" included in the *Odes* (14:11), which, however, is a Christian composition.

[16] In the Septuagint we also find the unprefixed οὐράνιος applied to Yahweh in 1 Esd 6:14 τὸν κύριον τοῦ Ἰσραὴλ τὸν οὐράνιον.

[17] See also the comment on τιμωρητής, at 2.2.14, and on οἰωνόβρωτος, at 4.2.4.

[18] See 1.8.2.

it more likely that it was the epitomator who was familiar with the vocabulary of the Greek Psalter.

Second Maccabees introduces a neologism very similar to ἁγιωσύνη, ἁγιότης (15:2), a Septuagint *hapax,* which prior to the Epistle to the Hebrews (12:10) occurs only in the Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs (T. Levi 3:4).

6.2.2 ἐλαττονόω 'to defeat'

> 12:11 ἐλαττονωθέντες οἱ νομάδες
> 13:19 ἐπὶ Βαιθσούροις φρούριον ὀχυρὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων προσῆγεν, ἐτροποῦτο, προσέκρουεν, ἠλαττονοῦτο

The Septuagint employs both the Classical verb ἐλαττόω and the post-Classical verbs ἐλαττονέω and ἐλαττονόω. ἐλαττόω occurs twenty-nine times in the sense *GELS*"to reduce the quantity of," "to lower the status of," and "to remove, take away"; ἐλαττονέω is used in the sense *GELS*"to fail to reach an amount due or desired" (Exod 16:18, 30:15; 3 Kgdms 17:14) and *GELS*"to suffer from the lack of" (3 Kgdms 11:22; Prov 11:24b); ἐλαττονόω is attested in the sense *GELS*"to decrease" (Gen 8:3, 5; 3 Kgdms 17:16), "to reduce" (Lev 25:16), "to be smaller in quantity" (Gen 18:28; Sir 19:7), "to lower the value or status of" (Prov 14:34b), "to take no notice of" (Tob^{GII} 14:4), and, in 2 Maccabees, in the military sense "to defeat, vanquish." ἐλαττονέω must have been current at the time of the translation of the Pentateuch as it is attested outside the Septuagint in a papyrus written in 218 BCE (*P.Enteux.* 34, l. 9 ἐλαττονοῦντα κεράμια; l. 12 τῶν ἐλαττονούντων ιδ κεραμίων).[19] ἐλαττονόω, on the contrary, is attested only in the Septuagint and in later ecclesiastical writers dependent on the Septuagint. The sense in which it is used in 2 Maccabees is unparalleled elsewhere. The reason for this is that the author of this book uses the Septuagintal ἐλαττονόω to denote the sense "to defeat," which in extra-Septuagintal Greek is expressed by ἐλαττόω.[20] From Herodotus onwards, Greek historiographers occasionally use the latter verb in this figurative military sense.[21] Second Maccabees also uses ἐλάττωμα in the military sense of "defeat" (11:13 τὸ γεγονὸς περὶ αὐτὸν ἐλάττωμα), as do Polybius and Diodorus Siculus.[22]

---

[19] Cf. the illiterate *BGU* 4.1195.19 [11/10 BCE?] ἐλατωνῖ [=ἐλαττονεῖ] ἀπὸ τῶν (ἀρταβῶν) μς ἐλέου [=ἐλαίου] and *P.Oxy.* 24.2407.54 [275–299 CE] [πλέ]ον [ἐξε]υρε[ῖ]ν καὶ μὴ ἐλαττονῖν [=ἐλαττονεῖν]. See Moulton and Milligan 1914–1929, 201.

[20] This is perhaps why the MSS of the Lucianic recension 'corrected' ἐλαττονωθέντες, at 12:11, and ἠλαττονοῦτο, at 13:19, to ελαττωθεντες and ηλαττουτο, respectively.

[21] Cf. Hdt. 6.11 ἢ οὐ συμμείξειν τοὺς πολεμίους ἢ συμμίσγοντας πολλὸν ἐλασσωθήσεσθαι; Plb. 1.59.4 ἐλαττωθέντες τῇ περὶ τὰ Δρέπανα ναυμαχίᾳ; D.S. 13.16.7 ὅτε μὲν ἴδοιεν τοὺς ἰδίους εὐημεροῦντας, ἐπαιάνιζον, ὅτε δ' ἐλαττουμένους, ἔστενον; 20.34.7 τοὺς πολεμίους ἠλάττωσεν; D.H. 3.50.2 ἐν ἁπάσαις δὲ ταῖς συμπλοκαῖς ἐλαττούμενοι.

[22] Plb. 1.32.2 διακούσας τὸ γεγονὸς ἐλάττωμα; 2.19.6 προσφιλονικήσαντες πρὸς τὸ γεγονὸς ἐλάττωμα; 3.96.8 προσπεσόντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ γεγονότος ἐλαττώματος; 5.87.2 διὰ τὸ γεγονὸς ἐλάττωμα περὶ αὐτόν; D.S. 14.23.6 τὸ περὶ τὸν βασιλέα γεγονὸς ἐλάττωμα; 15.85.8 τὸ γεγονὸς περὶ τοὺς συμμάχους ἐλάττωμα;

With regard to 13:19, commentators have drawn attention to the asyndetic juxtaposition of the four verbs προσῆγεν, ἐτροποῦτο, προσέκρουεν, ἠλαττονοῦτο, which introduces the peculiarly telegraphic style of the ensuing verses 20–26. Gil (1958, 21) has praised the "exquisitely elaborate" construction of this asyndeton, which exhibits antithesis, homoioteleuton, parallelism (in the increasing number of syllables, 3:4, 4:5), and chiasmus (in the placement of the four-syllable verbs ἐτροποῦτο and προσέκρουεν). Others (Schwartz 2008, 35n73) have found the style of this passage "ugly and nigh unbearable" and have supposed that the epitomator simply jotted down notes that he took from his source and which he did not eventually rework; Mugler (1931, 420) went as far as to consider the entire passage an interpolation. Although this asyndetic style has precedents in the best Greek writers,[23] its isolated use at the end of chapter 13 seems to indicate that the author was in a hurry to deal with the material of this part of his epitome rather than that he sought to experiment stylistically. What has not been noted is that two of the four verbs at 13:19, ἐλαττονόω and τροπόω, are not used by any Greek historiographer of the Classical or the Hellenistic period. τροπόω, LSJ(A)"make to turn, put to flight," which also occurs at 8:6 (οὐκ ὀλίγους τῶν πολεμίων τροπούμενος) and 9:2 (τροπωθέντα τὸν Ἀντίοχον), is used fourteen times by the translators of the historical books of the Hebrew Bible and nine times by the translator of 1 Maccabees. Its instance in a Ptolemaic papyrus (*Chr.Wilck*. 11 A. Col. II.40) recounting a conflict between the towns of Crocodilopolis and Hermonthis in 123 BCE and in a second-/first-century BCE funerary inscription from Terenouthis (*SEG* 8:497.2) shows that it was current in Egypt around the time of the translation of these books. ἐλαττονόω and τροπόω are among the rare (mainly or exclusively) Septuagintal verbs that the author of 2 Maccabees, who was certainly well versed in the military vocabulary used by the historiographers of the Classical and the Hellenistic periods, employs in his work.

18.58.1 τῶν γεγενημένων περὶ αὐτὸν ἐλαττωμάτων. Cf. *IosPE I*^{2} 32, B.14 [3rd c. BCE] ἄλλα γεγενῆσθαι ἐλαττώματα πολλὰ κατὰ τὴγ χώραν.

[23] *Pace* Schwartz (2008, 34–35), who finds it "nigh impossible to imagine any Greek author who could write this way." See the richly documented chapter "Asyndeton" in Denniston 1952, 99–123.

6.2.3 ἐμπαιγμός 'humiliating mistreatment'

> 7:7 μεταλλάξαντος δὲ τοῦ πρώτου [sc. ἀδελφοῦ] τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον τὸν δεύτερον ἦγον ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμπαιγμόν

ἐμπαιγμός occurs eight times in the Septuagint, in two books that have a Hebrew *Vorlage* (Ps 37:8a; Ezek 22:4) and in five books originally written in Greek or that have no surviving *Vorlage* (2 Macc 7:7; 3 Macc 5:22; Wis 12:25; Sir 27:28a; Pss. Sol. 2:11a; 17:12b). The earliest occurrence appears to be that in Psalm 37, with the Greek translation of Ezekiel and the composition/translation of the other Septuagint books in which ἐμπαιγμός occurs being considered as postdating the translation of the Psalms.[24]

In the two instances in which the Greek text can be checked against its *Vorlage*, ἐμπαιγμός translates different Hebrew words: in Ps 37:8a [MT 38:8(7)], it translates נִקְלָה, the niphal participle of קָלָה I, [BDB]"roast, parch" (ὅτι αἱ ψύαι μου ἐπλήσθησαν ἐμπαιγμῶν,[25] "my loin muscles were filled with mockeries" [NETS]), whereas in Ezek 22:4 it translates קֶלֶס, "mocking" (δέδωκά σε εἰς ὄνειδος τοῖς ἔθνεσι καὶ εἰς ἐμπαιγμὸν πάσαις ταῖς χώραις, "I have given you as a disgrace to the nations and for mocking to all the countries" [NETS]). The translator of Ezekiel was apparently not indebted to LXX Psalm 37:8a for the use of ἐμπαιγμός at 22:4.[26]

In 2 Maccabees, ἐμπαιγμός and its cognate verb ἐμπαίζω occur in the martyrology of chapter 7. The second of the seven brothers is led ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμπαιγμόν (7:7), is scalped, has his limbs severed, and is fried in a frying pan; after him, the third brother is submitted to the same treatment (7:10 μετὰ δὲ τοῦτον ὁ τρίτος ἐνεπαίζετο).

The translators of and commentators on 2 Maccabees are divided as to whether ἐμπαιγμός and ἐμπαίζω in chapter 7 have to do with mockery[27] or with torture.[28] The

---

[24] See Munnich 1982, 526 and Harl 1992, 43, 44.

[25] There are interesting MSS variants (η ψυχη μου επλησθη for αἱ ψύαι μου ἐπλήσθησαν and εμπαιγματων for ἐμπαιγμῶν), on which see Munnich 1982, 88–90 and Harl 1992, 43–44.

[26] See Munnich 1982, 480.

[27] La[LXV] "sequentem ducebant ad inludendum . . . tertius inludebatur; La[P] ducebant ad inlusionem"; Habicht 1976, 234 "schleppten sie den zweiten zur Verspottung . . . wurde der dritte verspottet"; Schwartz 2008, 296 "they led up the second to make sport of him . . . they made sport of the third"; Doran 2012, 145, 146 "they led the second along, mocking him . . . the third was being mocked"; NETS "they brought forward the second for their sport . . . the third was the victim of their sport."

[28] La[BM] "sequentem adduxerunt ad poenam . . . tertius ad poenam applicitus est"; Cf. Abel 1949, 373, 375 "on amena le second pour le supplice . . . on châtia le troisième"; Goldstein 1983, 289 "they brought the second to be wantonly tortured . . . the third was subjected to wanton torture"; Brodersen and Nicklas, *SD* "führten sie den zweiten der Quälerei zu . . . wurde der dritte gequält." Moffatt (*APOT* 1:141) tried to combine torture and mockery: "brought the second to the shameful torture . . . the third was made a mocking-stock." Likewise, Bévenot (1931, 203) "führte man den zweiten zur rohen Misshandlung . . . wurde der dritte zum Spielzeug (ihrer Graumsamkeit)" and Kellerman (1979, 23–24) "führte man den zweiten erniedrigenden Quälereien zu . . . wurde der dritte mit Hohn gequält." Regarding ἐμπαιγμός, Kellermann (1979, 23nb) notes that "es geht um erniedrigende körperliche Misshandlungen vor oder bei dem Strafvollzug."

lexica clearly favour the first option.[29] Yet, the context in which these terms occur does not really justify their rendering as "mocking" and "to mock," respectively. None of the nine martyrs in chapters 6 and 7 appear to be submitted to mockery; on the contrary, it is the martyrs who mock the king who orders their execution.[30]

Munnich (1982, 426–29) attempted to explain the use of ἐμπαιγμός in 2 Macc 7:7 in the light of LXX Ps 37:8a. He hypothesized that the author of 2 Maccabees was bilingual in Hebrew and Greek and well acquainted with both the Hebrew original of the Psalms and their Greek translation. To designate the torture by fire, to which Antiochus submitted the seven brothers, argues Munnich, the author used the term ἐμπαιγμός, found in LXX Ps 37:8a, under which lies the niphal participle of קָלָה I, "to roast." By intertextually linking his narrative with Psalm 37, he sought to actualize the sacred text and establish a parallelism between the tortured and burned Maccabean martyr and the suffering psalmist who repents before God. As corroborative evidence, Munnich adduces the fact that the immediate context of v. 8, in Psalm 37, speaks of maltreatment (v. 9a ἐκακώθην καὶ ἐταπεινώθην ἕως σφόδρα) and that the psalmist sees his suffering as a consequence of and a punishment inflicted upon him by God for his sins (v. 4b οὐκ ἔστιν εἰρήνη τοῖς ὀστέοις μου ἀπὸ προσώπου τῶν ἁμαρτιῶν μου); similarly, the youngest of the seven martyrs regards his and his brothers' suffering as punishment for their sins (7:32 ἡμεῖς γὰρ διὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτίας πάσχομεν). Munnich (pp. 426, 429) further assumes that the author of 3 Maccabees likewise alludes to LXX Psalm 37 when he uses ἐμπαιγμός, at 5:22, to designate the various torments that Ptolemy IV Philopator's courtiers devised for the Jews gathered into the hippodrome and doomed to be trodden under the feet of elephants.

Munnich's hypothesis is ingenious, but not altogether convincing. First, it has to be noted that the penitential Psalm 38 [LXX 37] is a prayer of a person suffering from a physical malady, perhaps leprosy;[31] the psalmist's pain is not the result of maltreatment and physical abuse inflicted by others, but a symptom of illness. Although a non-literal reading and interpretation of the psalm is of course possible, it does not seem very likely that the author of 2 Maccabees would have so promptly associated the situation of a person undergoing an excruciating torture and death with that of a person whose suffering has illness-related causes. The "burning" in the loins, being perhaps the "burning of feverish wounds,"[32] does not readily trigger an association with the burning of a man on a frying pan. Moreover, if the author of 2 Maccabees was indeed bilingual and a good connoisseur of the Psalms, in their Hebrew original and their Greek version, as Munnich postulates, he would have easily perceived that the translator of Psalm 38

[29] LSJ and LEH, s.v. ἐμπαιγμός, "mockery, mocking"; *DGE*, citing 2 Macc 7:7 s.v. ἐμπαιγμός, "mofa, escarnio"; *GELS*, citing 2 Macc 7:10 and 8:17 s.v. ἐμπαίζω 2, "to mock"; BDAG, s.v. ἐμπαιγμός, gives: "2 Macc 7:7, derision of an esp. painful kind."

[30] Cf. 7:24 ὁ δὲ Ἀντίοχος οἰόμενος καταφρονεῖσθαι καὶ τὴν ὀνειδίζουσαν ὑφορώμενος φωνήν; 7:27 [ἡ μήτηρ] χλευάσασα τὸν ὠμὸν τύραννον; 7:39 [ὁ βασιλεὺς] πικρῶς φέρων ἐπὶ τῷ μυκτηρισμῷ.

[31] See Weiser 1962, 324.

[32] So Briggs 1906–1907, 1:342.

rendered נִקְלֶה by ἐμπαιγμός because he understood it as deriving from קָלָה II, [BDB]Niph. "be lightly esteemed, dishonoured," Hiph. "treat with contempt, dishonour," and not from its homonym קָלָה I, [BDB]"to roast, parch." Aquila and Symmachus would later translate the verse along the same lines.[33] To posit that the author of 2 Maccabees (a) took נִקְלֶה, in Ps 38:8(7), as deriving from קָלָה I, (b) understood that the Greek translator of the psalm took the Hebrew word as deriving from קָלָה II, and accordingly rendered it with ἐμπαιγμός, and (c) employed ἐμπαιγμός at 7:7 to allude to both LXX Psalm 37 and its Hebrew *Vorlage*—an allusion that would have escaped most readers—is an unnecessarily complicated scenario. The use of ἐμπαιγμός in 2 Macc 7:7 can be understood without reference to LXX Psalm 37 and/or its *Vorlage*.

As Harl (1992, 43–45, 56) has noted, ἐμπαιγμός may appear for the first time in literature in LXX Psalm 37, but can hardly have been a neologism coined by the translator of this text; most likely, it was current in the translator's milieu and, as its sparse subsequent attestations in a restricted number of Jewish-Greek texts show, continued to be in use until around the second century CE. With regard to the sociohistorical context in which we should locate this term and the phenomenon that it designates, Harl (p. 58) has suggested the Gentile persecutions of the Jews in Egypt or in Palestine and has related ἐμπαιγμός and its cognates to occasions on which the Jews were publicly humiliated and submitted to insults and mistreatment, e.g. victory celebrations of kings, involving processions and festivities modelled after the Dionysiac κῶμοι, in which the Jews were compelled to participate. Bertram ("ἐμπαίζω," *TDNT* 5:633) more specifically speaks of a "distinct vocabulary which developed in Jewish passion piety."

Harl (1992, 48–49) and Fernández Marcos (2014, 94–97) draw attention to a particularly telling scene of ἐμπαιγμός in the Septuagint, that of Samson in Judg 16:25–27. In these verses, the Masoretic Text says that the blinded Samson was taken out of his prison and led to a house full of Philistines: "[25]'Call Samson, and let him entertain (וִישַׂחֶק) us.' So they called Samson out of the prison, and he performed (וַיְצַחֵק) for them. . . . [27]and on the roof there were about three thousand men and women, who looked on while Samson performed (בְּשָׂחֳקוֹ)" (NRSV). What sort of performance Samson gave before the Philistines is not clarified: he may have played a musical instrument (so Bertram, "ἐμπαίζω," *TDNT* 5:631n5), or danced, as the Syriac and the Arabic versions surmise, or performed feats of strength, as Milton (*Samson Agonistes* 1313–15) has him do. The Greek textual witnesses of Judges differ as regards the rendering of these verses: Codex Vaticanus, along with a number of MSS transmitting the *kaige* revision of Judges, follows closely the MT and renders vv. 25–27 thus: [25]Καλέσατε τὸν Σαμψων . . . καὶ παιξάτω ἐνώπιον ἡμῶν. καὶ ἐκάλεσαν τὸν Σαμψων ἀπὸ οἴκου δεσμωτηρίου, καὶ ἔπαιζεν ἐνώπιον αὐτῶν, καὶ ἐρράπιζον αὐτόν. . . . [27]καὶ ἐπὶ τὸ δῶμα ὡς ἑπτακόσιοι ἄνδρες καὶ γυναῖκες οἱ θεωροῦντες ἐν παιγνίαις Σαμψων. The

[33] A. ὅτι αἱ λαγόνες μου ἐπληρώθησαν ἀτιμίας; S. ὅτι αἱ ψύαι μου ἐπλήσθησαν ἀτιμίας.

phrase καὶ ἐρράπιζον αὐτόν,[34] which has no equivalent in the MT, introduces an element that is absent in the *Vorlage*, that of Samson's physical mistreatment by the Philistines during his performance. Codex Alexandrinus and several other MSS, which, although bearing traces of Hexaplaric influence, stand close to the earliest Greek translation of Judges (the Old Greek), deviate from the MT and present Samson not as a performing subject but as an object of mockery: in v. 25 they read ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ and in v. 27 ἐμβλέποντες ἐμπαιζόμενον τὸν Σαμψων. A number of MSS transmitting the Lucianic or Antiochene recension, which is believed to best represent the Old Greek of Judges,[35] in v. 25 read καὶ ἐνέπαιζον αὐτῷ καὶ ἐρράπιζον αὐτόν, thus unambiguously turning Samson into a victim of both verbal and physical maltreatment. Fernández Marcos (2014, 96–97) argues that the interpretative rendering of 16:25–27 may indicate that OG Judges originated at a time of persecution, such as that of the Seleucid suppression of the Jewish cult, when the Jews were often submitted to derision and other forms of public humiliation by the Gentiles.

ἐμπαιγμός and ἐμπαίζω in 2 Maccabees 7 are to be understood in light of the above-provided insights.

Second Maccabees 6:7 mentions two occasions on which the Jews were possibly subjected to ἐμπαιγμός: on the king's birthday, when they were forced to partake of the meat of pagan sacrifices (ἤγοντο δὲ μετὰ πικρᾶς ἀνάγκης εἰς τὴν κατὰ μῆνα τοῦ βασιλέως γενέθλιον ἡμέραν ἐπὶ σπλαγχνισμόν), and in Dionysiac feasts, during which they were compelled to take part in processions wearing ivy wreathes (γενομένης δὲ Διονυσίων ἑορτῆς ἠναγκάζοντο κισσοὺς ἔχοντες πομπεύειν τῷ Διονύσῳ). The phrase ἤγοντο . . . ἐπὶ σπλαγχνισμόν verbally links 6:7 with 7:7 τὸν δεύτερον ἦγον ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμπαιγμόν.[36] ἐμπαιγμός, in this context, is the humiliating, forced partaking of pagan meat, followed, in case of refusal, by corporal[37] or even, as is the case with Eleazar, the seven brothers, and their mother, by capital punishment. The term refers to the entire degrading session of σπλαγχνισμός, which included the participation in a pagan sacrifice, the trial-like questioning (7:2 τί μέλλεις ἐρωτᾶν; 7:7 ἐπηρώτων Εἰ φάγεσαι πρὸ τοῦ τιμωρηθῆναι τὸ σῶμα κατὰ μέλος;), the forced eating of pork meat (6:18 ἀναχανὼν ἠναγκάζετο φαγεῖν ὕειον κρέας), and not solely to its conclusion, the infliction of physical violence, culminating in the execution of the recalcitrant.

More importantly, as already pointed out, ἐμπαιγμός, in 2 Maccabees, does not involve any explicit mockery in words or deeds. In the martyrdom of Eleazar, those appointed to carry out the σπλαγχνισμός (6:21 οἱ πρὸς τῷ παρανόμῳ σπλαγχνισμῷ τεταγμένοι) initially show kindness and benevolence (6:29 εὐμένειαν) towards the Jewish elder, owing to their old friendship with him, and even suggest helping him cheat

[34] In secular authors, the verb ῥαπίζω is used in the sense "to strike with a club or rod"; in biblical literature, in the sense "to slap"; see BDAG, s.v.

[35] See Fernández Marcos 2014, 88.

[36] Harl (1982, 46n13) notes that the prepositional phrase ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμπαιγμόν, in which the substantive is preceded by the definite article, denotes the place of torture, "sur le lieu du supplice."

[37] Cf. 7:1 ἀναγκάζεσθαι . . . ἀπὸ τῶν ἀθεμίτων ὑείων κρεῶν ἐφάπτεσθαι μάστιξι καὶ νευραῖς αἰκιζομένους.

in order to save his life (6:21 διὰ τὴν ἐκ τῶν παλαιῶν χρόνων πρὸς τὸν ἄνδρα γνῶσιν ἀπολαβόντες αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν παρεκάλουν; 6:22 ἵνα . . . διὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς φιλίαν τύχῃ φιλανθρωπίας). The author only notes that, at Eleazar's refusal, their initial εὐμένεια turns into δυσμένεια (6:29). In the quasi-theatrical staging of the martyrdom in chapter 7, the spotlight falls exclusively on the king, the seven brothers, and their mother; there is no hint at the presence of an audience of onlookers, as, for example, in LXX Judg^{A} 16:27, where Samson is mocked by three thousand Philistines; the torturers/executioners are shadowy, undesignated figures, the presence and actions of which are suggested by the plural form of the verbs (ἦγον; ἐπηρώτων; ἐβασάνιζον; ἠκίζοντο). They cruelly execute the orders of the king, but do not mock or otherwise ridicule their victims. Doran (2012, 156) perhaps reads too much between the lines when he argues that "the use of the imperfect ἐπηρώτων ("they were questioning") while the brother's skin is being torn off suggests mockery"; as previously noted, in chapter 7 the author employs an unambiguous and varied vocabulary of derision, which he puts in the mouth of the seven brothers and their mother. Their mockery and derision are targeted at the king, who, implausibly, responds with exhortations and even intercedes to the mother for the salvation of her youngest son (7:24 ἐποιεῖτο τὴν παράκλησιν; 7:25 τὴν μητέρα παρῄνει γενέσθαι τοῦ μειρακίου σύμβουλον ἐπὶ σωτηρίᾳ; 7:26 πολλὰ δὲ αὐτοῦ παραινέσαντος). Indeed, it is surprising that the person who wrote this gruesomely realistic episode missed the opportunity to add mockery to the king's and his servants' cruelty, as did, for example, the author of 4 Maccabees.[38] One may simply compare it to the scene of Jesus' mockery in the Gospels,[39] where the soldiers ridicule Jesus in both words and deeds.

Aside from ἐμπαιγμός, 2 Maccabees employs the verb ἐμπαίζω, at 8:17, with regard to Jerusalem, subjected to the outrages of the Gentiles (τὸν τῆς ἐμπεπαιγμένης πόλεως αἰκισμόν). As in the case of the tortured martyrs, the humiliation of the personified city is here associated with the torments (αἰκισμός) inflicted on her 'body' by the Gentiles, that is, the establishment of a gymnasium under the acropolis (4:12), the slaughter of its people (5:12–14; 5:26), and the acts of sacrilege culminating in the desecration of its Temple (4:39; 5:15–16). The verse connects well with the martyrology of the preceding chapter, yet it seems to allude to Ezek 22:4–5, where the prophet declares that Yahweh has given Jerusalem "as a disgrace to the nations and for mockery to all the countries" (NETS) for having committed the sins of bloodshed and idolatry ([4]δέδωκά σε εἰς ὄνειδος τοῖς ἔθνεσι καὶ εἰς ἐμπαιγμὸν πάσαις ταῖς χώραις [5]ταῖς ἐγγιζούσαις πρὸς σὲ καὶ ταῖς μακρὰν ἀπεχούσαις ἀπὸ σοῦ, καὶ ἐμπαίξονται ἐν σοί). Ezekiel 22:4–5, 2 Macc 8:17,

[38] In 4 Macc 5:11, the king scoffs at Eleazar's "silly philosophy" (οὐκ ἐξυπνώσεις ἀπὸ τῆς φλυάρου φιλοσοφίας), which provokes a fierce reaction from the Jewish elder (5:22 χλευάζεις δὲ ἡμῶν τὴν φιλοσοφίαν; 5:27 τυραννικὸν δὲ οὐ μόνον ἀναγκάζειν ἡμᾶς παρανομεῖν, ἀλλὰ καὶ ἐσθίειν, ὅπως τῇ ἐχθίστῃ ἡμῶν μιαροφαγίᾳ ταύτῃ ἐπεγγελάσῃς; 5:28 ἀλλ' οὐ γελάσεις κατ' ἐμοῦ τοῦτον τὸν γέλωτα).

[39] Matt 27:27–31; Mark 15:16–20; John 19:1–3.

and Zech 12:3[40] are the only Septuagint passages in which ἐμπαίζω is used in connection with the personified Jerusalem.

Now, if one looks at the use of ἐμπαίζω and ἐμπαιγμός in 1 and 3 Maccabees, one sees that, in these books, too, these words hardly involve any explicit mockery. First Maccabees 9:26 recounts that, after the death of Judas, his friends were being arrested and brought to Bacchides, who ἐξεδίκα αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐνέπαιζεν αὐτοῖς. It is rather unlikely that the meaning of this phrase is "took vengeance on them and made sport of them" or "retaliated against them and taunted them," as NRSV and NETS, respectively, render it; ἐνέπαιζεν, here, has a stronger meaning. Josephus, who in *AJ* 13:4 gives the same account, based on 1 Maccabees, expands his source thus: ὁ δὲ [sc. Βακχίδης] βασανίζων πρῶτον αὐτοὺς καὶ πρὸς ἡδονὴν αἰκιζόμενος ἔπειθ' οὕτως διέφθειρεν. Josephus rightly understood that Bacchides' retaliation included the physical maltreatment of his captives.[41]

In 3 Maccabees, ἐμπαιγμός is used in relation to the Jews of Alexandria, who, by order of King Ptolemy IV Philopator, were confined in the hippodrome, destined to be trodden upon by drunken elephants. On the night before their execution, the king's courtiers devise all sorts of ἐμπαιγμοί for the doomed Jews (5:22 εἰς τὸ παντοίους μηχανᾶσθαι τοῖς ταλαιπώροις δοκοῦσιν ἐμπαιγμούς). Were these ἐμπαιγμοί "mockeries" (NETS), "insults" (NRSV; Croy 2006, 21), or something worse? To be sure, the reason for the Jews being detained in the hippodrome was to expose them to the public eye and the public disgrace (4:11 πρὸς παραδειγματισμόν; 6:9 ὑβριζομένοις; 6:31 ἐπονείδιστοι).[42] Yet, the author emphasizes that the spectacle they provided to the gathering crowds was a pitiful one (5:24 οἰκτροτάτη θεωρία). What the king's courtiers and friends had in mind was likely to subject the Jews to further physical abuse prior to having them killed by the elephants; this can be inferred from the letter that the king sends to his generals after the deliverance of the Jews (7:1–9), in which he accuses his entourage of having convinced him to inflict extraordinary punishments upon the Jews (7:3 κολάσασθαι ξενιζούσαις . . . τιμωρίαις) and of having shown a cruelty more savage than that of the Scythians (7:5 νόμου Σκυθῶν ἀγριωτέραν ἐμπεπορπημένοι ὠμότητα). The reference to the Scythian cruelty links the punishments and torments to which the Jews are subjected in 3 Maccabees with the tortures of the martyrs in 2 Maccabees 7; one of these tortures was the 'scalping in the Scythian fashion' (7:4 περισκυθίσαντας).[43] The

---

[40] θήσομαι τὴν Ιερουσαλημ λίθον καταπατούμενον πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι· πᾶς ὁ καταπατῶν αὐτὴν ἐμπαίζων ἐμπαίξεται.

[41] See Harl 1992, 46; Bertram, "ἐμπαίζω," *TDNT* 5:633.

[42] Cf. Philo's description of the tortures to which the Jews of Alexandria were submitted in the theatre of the city prior to their execution at the command of the Roman prefect Flaccus, a few years after Jesus' crucifixion. These tortures were seen as theatrical diversions aimed at entertaining the public (*Flacc.* 85 καὶ ταῦτ' εἰργάζετο μετὰ τὸ πληγαῖς αἰκίσασθαι ἐν μέσῳ τῷ θεάτρῳ καὶ πυρὶ καὶ σιδήρῳ βασανίσαι . . . Ἰουδαῖοι μαστιγούμενοι, κρεμάμενοι, τροχιζόμενοι, καταικιζόμενοι, διὰ μέσης τῆς ὀρχήστρας ἀπαγόμενοι τὴν ἐπὶ θανάτῳ· τὰ δὲ μετὰ τὴν καλὴν ταύτην ἐπίδειξιν ὀρχησταὶ καὶ μῖμοι καὶ αὐληταὶ καὶ ὅσα ἄλλα σκηνικῶν ἀθύρματα ἀγώνων.

[43] See 2.2.11.

ἐμπαιγμοί referred to in 3 Macc 5:22 are thus likely to have been envisioned as including αἰκίαι similar to those that the Maccabean martyrs were submitted to. It is plausible, then, that 3 Macc 5:22 is dependent, for the use of ἐμπαιγμός, on 2 Maccabees 7 rather than on Ps 37:8a, as Munnich (1982, 426, 429) has suggested.

Another text that is relevant to our discussion is the Epistle to the Hebrews. Commentaries on Heb 11:36, ἕτεροι δὲ ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ μαστίγων πεῖραν ἔλαβον, ἔτι δὲ δεσμῶν καὶ φυλακῆς, "others suffered mocking and flogging, and even chains and imprisonment" (NRSV), invariably refer to 2 Maccabees 7[44] as being the martyrological example that the author of the epistle had in mind. They also assume that the preceding verse, 11:35, ἄλλοι δὲ ἐτυμπανίσθησαν, οὐ προσδεξάμενοι τὴν ἀπολύτρωσιν, ἵνα κρείττονος ἀναστάσεως τύχωσιν, "others were tortured, refusing to accept release, in order to obtain a better resurrection" (NRSV), is an allusion to the martyrdom of Eleazar in 2 Maccabees 6.[45]

One may first express some doubt as to whether these verses allude specifically to 2 Maccabees 6–7. Eleazar was beaten to death on the τύμπανον (6:20), but in his *ante mortem* speech makes no mention of resurrection, as the martyr brothers do. The verb τυμπανίζω, used in Heb 11:35 of those tortured on the τύμπανον, occurs in the Septuagint (1 Kgdms 21:14) in a different sense ("to beat a drum)," but the Classical verb ἀποτυμπανίζω, "to beat to death, to put to death,"[46] is found in 3 Maccabees (3:27 αἰσχίσταις βασάνοις ἀποτυμπανισθήσεσθαι), and, in the sense "to beat," in two third- and second-century BCE papyri.[47] τύμπανον and its cognate verbs are thus not exclusive to 2 Maccabees and Hebrews. To use the phrase ἐμπαιγμῶν καὶ μαστίγων to refer to the tortures of the Maccabean brothers, who were not only scourged but also scalped, had their tongues and limbs severed, and were burned on frying pans, would have been a strange understatement, considering that in the immediately following verse the author does not refrain from mentioning grisly deaths by stoning and sawing (11:37 ἐλιθάσθησαν, ἐπρίσθησαν). Furthermore, if the author of Hebrews had in mind Eleazar and the seven brothers and their mother, whose martyrdoms are narrated consecutively in 2 Maccabees 6–7, he would not have differentiated them by putting them into different groups (v. 35 ἄλλοι δέ; v. 36 ἕτεροι δέ); he would also not have coupled "mocking and flogging" with "chains and imprisonment," as the Maccabean martyrs were not submitted to the latter punishments.

---

[44] Cf. 7:1 μάστιξι καὶ νευραῖς αἰκιζομένους; 7:7 ἐπὶ τὸν ἐμπαιγμόν; 7:10 ἐνεπαίζετο.

[45] See discussion in van Henten 2010. van Henten considers likely the allusion of Heb 11:35c–e to Eleazar's martyrdom, but uncertain the allusion of Heb 11:36a–c to the martyrdom of the seven brothers and their mother. Steyn (2015, 280–84) finds clear intertextual links between Heb 11:35, 36, 38 and 2 Macc 5:27; 6:11, 19; 7:9, 14, 23, 29; 10:6.

[46] See Owen 1929.

[47] *P.Enteux.* 86.6, 8 [Magdola, 221 BCE] τοὺς μάρτυράς μου ἀνεσόβησεν πάντας, λέ[γ]ων ἀποτυπανιεῖν αὐτοὺς καὶ ἐμὲ καὶ ἐγβαλεῖν ἐκ τῆς κώμης . . . ἐλοιδόρησεν πολλὰ καὶ ἔφη καὶ τοῦτον ἀποτυπανιεῖν; *UPZ* 1.119.37 [Memphis, 156 BCE] τὸν Ὀννῶφριν εἰρηκέναι τοῖς κικιουργοῖς εὐλαβεῖσθαι μὴ ὑπνῶσαι ἐν τῷ τῆς Ἀφροδίτης πασ[τοφορίῳ, ἵνα] μὴ ἀκποτυπανισθῶσιν. Cf. *SB* 20.15001.10 [Krokodilopolis, 217 BCE] ἠρεύνων ζη[τοῦντ]ές με ὅπως προσαποτυπα[νί]σωσ[ίν με].

The author of Hebrews, at 11:36, may thus not have intended to refer specifically to the Maccabean martyrs. Indeed, the description, in this verse, of the travails endured by the heroes of faith also partly fits Samson, whose name and exploits are mentioned or alluded to in the preceding verses.[48] One might argue, of course, that the author had a very loose reminiscence of the Maccabean text, yet it is hard to imagine that anyone who has read the narrative of the treatment of the seven brothers and their mother in 2 Maccabees 7 can retain only the opening section, which mentions the μάστιγες (7:1) and the ἐμπαιγμός (7:7), and not the horrendous follow-up. One might also argue, in light of the preceding discussion, that ἐμπαιγμός, at 11:36, does not denote mockery, but is used to designate the submission to torture. Yet, had this been the case, the author would not have paired ἐμπαιγμός with μάστιγες, which designates a relatively light form of torture.[49] The first term is apparently meant to denote mockery, e.g. of the kind inflicted upon Jesus (ἐμπαίζω is coupled with μαστιγόω in Matt 10:19 and Mark 10:34, in the context of Jesus' Passion, yet it is debatable whether the author of Hebrews knew these Gospels); if the author had 2 Macc 7:7 in mind,[50] we have to assume that he understood the word there as denoting mockery.

To go back to 2 Macc 7:7 and 7:10 and sum up, the author employs two words that denote mockery, ἐμπαιγμός and ἐμπαίζω, in a gruesome scene where Jews are tortured by the Gentiles. These words are the only indication that these Jews may have been submitted to mockery too, as the author does not elaborate further on the issue. A closely comparable scene in the Septuagint is that of Samson's appearance before the Philistines in Judg 16:25–27; in deviation from the MT, the OG of Judges transforms Samson from one who provides entertainment to the Philistines to one who is made sport of by the latter.

Could the author of 2 Maccabees 7 have drawn on OG Judg 16:25–27? The only clue to a possible acquaintance of 2 Maccabees with OG Judges is a number of verbal parallels,[51] one of which is shared exclusively between the two books: Judg^{A} 6:2 ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ τοῖς σπηλαίοις[52]—2 Macc 10:6 ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις; this phrase recurs only in the New Testament, in Heb 11:38 καὶ ὄρεσιν καὶ σπηλαίοις καὶ

[48] 11:32 Σαμψών; 11:33 ἔφραξαν στόματα λεόντων; 11:34 ἐδυναμώθησαν ἀπὸ ἀσθενείας. See Fernández Marcos 2014, 96.

[49] In 2 Maccabees, μάστιξ is paired with νευρά, at 7:1 (μάστιξι καὶ νευραῖς αἰκιζομένους), to designate the corporal punishment inflicted on the seven brothers for refusing to eat pork meat, and with ἐτασμός, at 7:37 (μετὰ ἐτασμῶν καὶ μαστίγων), to designate Antiochus' eventual punishment: the ἐτασμοί (cf. Gen 12:17) refer to the physical pains suffered by the king at 9:5–18, whereas μάστιξ, which evokes Heliodorus' literal whipping (3:26, 34, 38; 5:18), is used figuratively (cf. 9:11 θείᾳ μάστιγι).

[50] Despite the doubts expressed above, it must be admitted that the reference to women who received their dead by resurrection and to men who died by the τύμπανον, with the hope of being resurrected, or were submitted to ἐμπαιγμοί and μάστιγες, in Heb 11:35–36, as well as the phrase ἐπὶ ἐρημίαις πλανώμενοι καὶ ὄρεσιν καὶ σπηλαίοις καὶ ταῖς ὀπαῖς τῆς γῆς, a little further down, at 11:38, cumulatively point to 2 Maccabees 6–7 and 5:27, 10:6.

[51] See Appendix 8, 25–28.

[52] MSS d g l n p t w of Brooke-McLean's edition of the Septuagint, which stand closest to the Old Greek of Judges, read εν τοις ορεσιν και εν τοις σπηλαιοις.

ταῖς ὀπαῖς τῆς γῆς, just two verses after the alleged allusion to 2 Maccabees 7. This evidence, though not conclusive, leaves open the possibility that ἐμπαιγμός in 2 Maccabees 7 comes from OG Judges 16:25–27 (although only the verb ἐμπαίζω and not its cognate noun occurs there) or at least that both texts originated from the same period, that of the Maccabean persecution, and perhaps in the same milieu. In that milieu, ἐμπαίζω and ἐμπαιγμός possibly went through a process of semantic extension, acquiring the connotation of humiliating physical mistreatment, which is exhibited in 2 Maccabees 7.

6.2.4 ἐποργίζομαι 'to become angered at'

> 7:33 εἰ δὲ χάριν ἐπιπλήξεως καὶ παιδείας ὁ ζῶν κύριος ἡμῶν βραχέως ἐπώργισται, καὶ πάλιν καταλλαγήσεται τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις

ὀργίζομαι occurs eighty-three times in the Septuagint. Of its compounds, παροργίζω occurs fifty-eight times, διοργίζομαι and ἐποργίζομαι twice, and ἀποργίζομαι only once. διοργίζομαι, which first appears in Polybius, occurs in 3 Maccabees (3:1; 4:13); ἀποργίζομαι is a *dis legomenon*, which prior to 2 Maccabees (5:17) is found only in Menander's *Samia* (l. 683); ἐποργίζομαι occurs in 2 Maccabees (7:33) and in OG Daniel (11:40). Outside the Septuagint, the latter verb recurs only in two Byzantine writers of the ninth century CE.[53]

The passages in 2 Maccabees wherein ἀποργίζομαι and ἐποργίζομαι occur are presumed to be non-Jasonic. 5:17–20 is generally assumed to contain personal reflections of the epitomator.[54] The martyrological chapter 7 is thought by some scholars to have originated from a source independent of Jason's work, which the epitomator, or a subsequent redactor/editor, dexterously integrated in the epitome.[55]

The contexts in which the two compounds of ὀργίζομαι appear in 2 Maccabees are similar: both verbs are used in reference to Yahweh's wrath and both are modified by the same adverb, βραχέως (5:17 διὰ τὰς ἁμαρτίας τῶν τὴν πόλιν οἰκούντων ἀπώργισται[56] βραχέως ὁ δεσπότης; 7:33 ὁ ζῶν κύριος ἡμῶν βραχέως ἐπώργισται[57]). As commentators note,[58] 2 Macc 5:17 relates to Isa 54:7–8 (χρόνον μικρὸν κατέλιπόν σε καὶ μετὰ ἐλέους μεγάλου ἐλεήσω σε, ἐν θυμῷ μικρῷ ἀπέστρεψα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπὸ σοῦ),

[53] Only one of these writers, the deacon Procopius, author of a *Laudatio* in honour of the martyr Procopius of Caesarea, seems to have picked up the verb from the martyrology of the seven brothers in 2 Maccabees 7.

[54] See 1.2.1.

[55] See 1.2.4 and Chapter 8.

[56] A few minuscules have the variants παρωργισται (381, 55), εποργιστε (93), and αποργησθαι (106).

[57] Codex Venetus and the minuscules 534, 58, and 771 here read παρωργισται; minuscule 130 reads απωργισται. On these textual variants, see Schwartz 2003, 109.

[58] See Goldstein 1983, 260 and Schwartz 2003, 110n9; id. 2012, 261.

and 57:17 (δι' ἁμαρτίαν βραχύ τι ἐλύπησα αὐτὸν καὶ ἐπάταξα αὐτὸν καὶ ἀπέστρεψα τὸ πρόσωπόν μου ἀπ' αὐτοῦ). The latter verse has a closer verbal correspondence with 2 Macc 5:17, at least as regards the terms δι' ἁμαρτίαν and βραχύ τι.[59]

The differentiation in the prefixes attached to these two compounds can, at first sight, be ascribed to the epitomator's fondness for *variatio*. With regard to ἐποργίζομαι, in particular, Doran (2012, 162) notes that the choice of its prefix may have been triggered by the proximity of the compound noun ἐπίπληξις. This is possible, yet it would seem more likely that the author wanted to encapsulate in a single compound verb the periphrasis ἐπάγειν τὴν ὀργὴν ἐπί,[60] which occurs a few verses further down, at 7:38; elsewhere in the Septuagint, this periphrasis occurs in Isaiah (26:21, 42:25) and only a few other books.[61]

However, the prefix variation can also be theologically significant, as Schwartz (2003; 2008, 68) has ingenuously demonstrated: at 5:17, the prefix ἀπο- may be meant to denote that Yahweh, in His anger, turns His face *away from* the Jews, letting others (the Gentiles) punish them for their sins, whereas at 7:33, ἐπι- may be intended to show that divine wrath falls directly *upon* the Jews and that Yahweh assumes for Himself the role of punisher. These Maccabean passages, according to Schwartz, seem to reflect two different concepts of divine anger expressed in Deuteronomy: 2 Macc 5:17 appears to be informed by Deut 31:17–18 and 32:20 (God turning His face away from His chosen people), and 2 Macc 7:33 by both Deut 8:5 (disciplining and edifying purpose of God's punishment) and 32:36 (God's reconciliation with His servants). Thus, Schwartz contends, the seemingly insignificant change from *α*, in chapter 5, to *ε*, in chapter 7, in the prefix of ὀργίζομαι, may in fact be indicative of a development, within 2 Maccabees, in the author's representation of God's anger against the Jews.

Here, we will examine one more possibility that might explain the use of the rare verb ἐποργίζομαι in 2 Maccabees.

This compound, as previously noted, also occurs in OG Dan 11:40: καὶ καθ' ὥραν συντελείας συγκερατισθήσεται αὐτῷ ὁ βασιλεὺς Αἰγύπτου, καὶ ἐποργισθήσεται αὐτῷ βασιλεὺς βορρᾶ. It does not occur, though, in Theodotion's version, which reads συναχθήσεται ἐπ' αὐτόν instead of ἐποργισθήσεται αὐτῷ. Both Greek versions deviate here from the Masoretic Text, which reads וְיִשְׂתָּעֵר עָלָיו, "shall rush upon him like a whirlwind" (NRSV).

Daniel 11:21–45 contains prophecies concerning a "contemptible person," identified as King Antiochus IV Epiphanes, who "shall come in without warning and obtain the kingdom [of Israel]" (11:21 NRSV). In OG Daniel, Antiochus is presented as an especially wrathful king, whose anger is first denoted by ὀργίζομαι, at 11:30 (καὶ ἐπιστρέψει [καὶ ὀργισθήσεται] ἐπὶ τὴν διαθήκην τοῦ ἁγίου), then by παροργίζομαι, at 11:36 (ποιήσει κατὰ τὸ θέλημα αὐτοῦ ὁ βασιλεὺς καὶ παροργισθήσεται), and

[59] Note that ἐλύπησα αὐτόν [sc. Israel], in Isa 57:17, stands for MT קָצַפְתִּי, "I was angry" (NRSV).

[60] τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργὴν τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ σύμπαν ἡμῶν γένος δικαίως ἐπηγμένην.

[61] See Appendix 8, 50.

ἐποργίζομαι, at 11:40, and finally by ἐν θυμῷ ἰσχυρῷ, at 11:44. By contrast, the Masoretic Text, and Theodotion's version, which follows it closely, make mention of the king's wrath only at 11:30 (MT וְזַעַם; *θ´* θυμωθήσεται) and at 11:44 (MT בְּחֵמָא גְדֹלָה; *θ´* ἐν θυμῷ πολλῷ). Wrath is one of Antiochus' vices in 2 Maccabees, too, yet the author of this book utilizes terms from the θυμ- word-group to refer to the king's wrath[62] and reserves the ὀργ- terms mainly for Yahweh's wrath.[63] The successive use, in OG Dan 11:30–44, of the simplex ὀργίζομαι and its compounds παροργίζομαι and ἐποργίζομαι does not seem to be motivated by any reason other than the pursuit of lexical variation.

The occurrence of the neologism ἐποργίζομαι in both 2 Maccabees and OG Daniel, and practically nowhere else in Greek literature, gives rise to the reasonable question of whether one book borrowed the verb from the other, and, if so, in what direction this borrowing flowed. Although a fortuitous coincidence cannot be ruled out entirely, the exclusive use of this compound verb by the author and the translator, respectively, of 2 Maccabees and OG Daniel, two perhaps roughly contemporary books, speaks in favour of a lexical borrowing. The direction of this possible borrowing can be established by determining the chronological priority of one book over the other. Such a task is not easy. The Hebrew-Aramaic book of Daniel is thought to have been composed prior to the end of Antiochus IV's persecution of the Jews and the king's death in 164 BCE.[64] On the basis of a few verbal similarities it exhibits with 1 Esdras[65] and especially with 1 Maccabees, which are assumed to have been translated around 150 and 100 BCE, respectively, a date within these *termini* (closer to the latter than to the former), or later, in the early first century BCE, has been posited for the OG translation of Daniel.[66] Grelot (1974, 22–23) has suggested an earlier date (around 145 BCE) on the strength of the book's verbal affinities with the aforementioned deuterocanonical/apocryphal books as well as with the third book of the Sibylline Oracles, which the French scholar, following Nikiprowetsky, questionably dates to around 140 BCE.[67] Similarly, on the grounds of three lexical similitudes between OG Daniel and Judith, Delcor (1967, 175 and 179) argued for the chronological priority of the former book over the latter, accepting a date around 145 BCE for OG Daniel and between 164 BCE and the reign of John Hyrcanus (135–104 BCE) for Judith. With regard to 2 Maccabees, we can only say that Jason's history was undoubtedly composed after the completion of the

---

[62] 4:38 πυρωθεὶς τοῖς θυμοῖς; 7:3, 39, 14:27 ἔκθυμος; 9:4 ἐπαρθεὶς τῷ θυμῷ; 9:7 πῦρ πνέων τοῖς θυμοῖς; 13:4 τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ Ἀντιόχου.

[63] 5:20 ἐν τῇ τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργῇ; 7:38 τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργήν; 8:5 τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ κυρίου. Cf. 5:17, 7:33. The plural ὀργαί is used at 4:25 of Jason's rageful disposition (θυμοὺς ὠμοῦ τυράννου καὶ θηρὸς βαρβάρου ὀργὰς ἔχων) and at 4:40 of an angry crowd of Jews (τῶν ὄχλων ταῖς ὀργαῖς διεμπιπλαμένων). Cf. Meecham 1935, 68: "θυμός=outburst of wrath; ὀργή=settled anger, propensity for wrath. ὀργή is, therefore, more fittingly used of God."

[64] See Hartman and Di Lella 1978, 42; Collins 1993, 38.

[65] For a list of parallel phrases, see Riessler 1899, 52–56, and Torrey 1910, 84–85. For the vocabulary shared by the two books, see Swete 1914, 310–11.

[66] See Montgomery 1927, 38; Hartman and Di Lella 1978, 78; Collins 1993, 8–9.

[67] Collins (1993, 9) argues that Grelot's dating rests on weak grounds.

Hebrew-Aramaic Daniel. If we accept the date commonly assigned to the epitome (124 BCE) and a late second-century BCE date for OG Daniel, we can even postulate the priority of the former over the latter, unless we can verify a direction of influence going from OG Daniel to 2 Maccabees.

As already noted, the dependence of 1 Maccabees on OG Daniel has been posited on the grounds of a small number of phraseological correspondences between the two books.[68] An analogous relation of dependence of one book on the other could be established if significant lexical or phraseological similarities between OG Daniel and 2 Maccabees could be detected. To our knowledge, the only verbal parallel between the two books that has been put forth as suggestive of influence is that between OG Dan 12:2 (καὶ πολλοὶ τῶν καθευδόντων ἐν τῷ πλάτει τῆς γῆς ἀναστήσονται, οἱ μὲν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, οἱ δὲ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν, οἱ δὲ εἰς διασποράν [καὶ αἰσχύνην] αἰώνιον) and 2 Macc 7:9 (ὁ δὲ τοῦ κόσμου βασιλεὺς ἀποθανόντας ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῦ νόμων εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει), where the belief in the resurrection of the dead is expressed. This belief, although already present in apocalyptic literature (early parts of 1 Enoch) predating Daniel, was strengthened during the persecution of the Jewish religion under Antiochus Epiphanes, and is nowhere in the Hebrew Bible as unambiguously formulated as in Daniel 12.[69]

The eschatological prophecy in Dan 12:1–3 comes immediately after the prediction of Antiochus Epiphanes' death at 11:45. It is the end of the tyrant's reign that will signal the deliverance of the Jewish people and the vindication and condemnation of the defenders of the Law and the renegades, respectively. The prophet forecasts a resurrection of a group of righteous individuals (those martyred for the Torah under Antiochus' persecution) to everlasting life and a resurrection of a group of wicked individuals (the Hellenizing apostates) to eternal shame and contempt.[70] In 2 Maccabees, the expectation of the restoration to life of the righteous permeates the account of the martyrial death of the seven brothers and their mother in chapter 7.[71] Put to the torture by Antiochus, the second brother expresses his belief in an "eternal revivification of life" (εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς),[72] of which Antiochus, as the fourth brother points out,

---

[68] Bludau (1897, 8–9) gives a list of a dozen phraseological similarities between 1 Maccabees and OG Daniel. More recent scholars (Montgomery 1927, 38; Charles 1929, lxxii; Hartman and Di Lella 1978, 78) accept only four as actually relevant, the most characteristic being the βδέλυγμα ἐρημώσεως (Dan 9:27, 11:31, 12:11; 1 Macc 1:54), yet even the significance of these few has been questioned (see Collins 1993, 9n73).

[69] See Collins 1993, 394–97. Isa 26:19 ἀναστήσονται οἱ νεκροί, καὶ ἐγερθήσονται οἱ ἐν τοῖς μνημείοις, which phraseologically underlies Dan 12:2, has been variously interpreted as referring to an actual resurrection from the dead (Nickelsburg 1972, 17–18) or, figuratively, to the national restoration of Israel (Collins 1993, 395). For other biblical passages that seem to reflect the resurrection belief, see Cavallin 1974, 28n1.

[70] On the interpretation of these verses, see Nickelsburg 1972, 11–27; Cavallin 1974, 26–31; Collins 1993, 390–394.

[71] See 7:9, 11, 14, 23, 29, 36 and cf. 12:43–44 and 14:46.

[72] Katz (1960, 14) and Habicht (1979, 234), following a conjecture of Schleusner, prefer to read here εἰς αἰωνίου ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς, because, as the first-named scholar argues, "life is eternal, the resurrection is

will not partake (7:14 σοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωὴν οὐκ ἔσται). Goldstein (1983, 305–6) argues that the redundancy involved in the phrase εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς results from the author's wish to allude to OG Dan 12:2, where a double resurrection of the righteous and the wicked is predicted. The addition of the neologism ἀναβίωσις, Goldstein argues, is meant to distinguish the resurrection to eternal life that awaits the martyrs from the resurrection to eternal dispersal and contempt that will be the fate of the wicked.

Although the idea of resurrection can be traced in a few other second-century BCE texts, such as the aforementioned 1 Enoch and Jubilees,[73] it is only in Daniel and in 2 Maccabees that it is expressed in the context of a more or less clearly discernible historical situation, namely the religious persecution instigated by Antiochus Epiphanes. Despite the differences that have been observed with respect to the concept of resurrection put forward in these two books,[74] it is quite clear that 2 Macc 7:9 presupposes OG Dan 12:2 not only conceptually but also verbally.[75] The phrase εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, in OG Dan 12:2, rendering לְחַיֵּי עוֹלָם, "to everlasting life," which does not appear anywhere else in the Hebrew Bible, is reflected in 2 Macc 7:9 εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς and 7:36 ἀενάου ζωῆς.[76] In the Septuagint, the combination ζωὴ αἰώνιος/αἰωνία occurs only in OG Daniel, in the Psalms of Solomon (3:12b), which date to the mid-first century BCE, and in 4 Maccabees (15:3), which was written in the first or second century CE. Outside the Septuagint, it is not attested before the first century BCE.[77]

Old Greek Daniel 11:21–12:2 and 2 Maccabees 7 have, then, at least two points of verbal contact between them, the phrase αἰώνιος ζωή and the verb ἐπεργίζομαι, which, together with the thematic similarities exhibited in the respective chapters wherein these terms occur (Antiochus Epiphanes' persecution, belief in the resurrection), may suggest an influence going from the Old Greek translation of Daniel to the story of the martyrdom of the seven brothers in 2 Maccabees.[78] That the verb ἐπεργίζομαι, which

---

not." Doran (1981, 22) rightly defends the MSS reading by saying that the prepositional phrase is an example of hypallage.

[73] On these texts, see Nickelsburg 1972, 28–47 and Cavallin 1974, 36–52.

[74] In 2 Maccabees no resurrection of the wicked is envisioned. See Hartman and Di Lella 1978, 309; van Henten 1997, 173n205; Kellermann 1979, 63 and 67.

[75] Cf. Kellermann 1979, 63: "Der Satz [sc. 2 Macc 7:9 εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει] spielt dabei deutlich auf Dan 12,2 an: 'Sie werden *auferstehen*, die einen zum *ewigen Leben*'."

[76] It is also echoed in the words that the fourth brother addresses to the king: 7:14 σοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωὴν οὐκ ἔσται. See Kellermann 1979, 67.

[77] It occurs in the Greek translation of 1 Enoch (10.10), which probably dates from before the turn of the Common Era (Nickelsburg 2001, 14), and in which it denotes a lifespan of 500 years, and later in Philo (*Fug.* 78). Its instances in the Sibylline Oracles (1:349, 2:336, 8:255, 401, 410) and in the Testament of Asher (T. 12 Patr. 10:5) are most probably later.

[78] ἐπεργίζομαι aside, the Septuagint vocabulary shared exclusively by 2 Maccabees and OG Daniel (ἀπομερίζω, ἐνδέχομαι, πρόσοψις, συγκεράννυμι) is not especially significant for establishing lexical connections between the two books. A couple of phraseological parallels that they share are also found in 1 Maccabees. See Appendix 8, 57–58, and Appendix 5, 25n50.

OG Dan 11:40 uses of the contemptible "king of the north," namely Antiochus Epiphanes, may have been picked up by the author of 2 Maccabees and used with regard to God is not as strange or improbable as it might at first seem. In the same martyrological context wherein this verb occurs we encounter one of the rarest Septuagint neologisms, the verb τροφοφορέω,[79] borrowed from Deut 1:31, where it is used of God who nourished the Israelites in the desert. The author of 2 Maccabees puts it in the mouth of the mother of the seven martyrs, who reminds her youngest son how she raised and nurtured him to manhood (7:27). Second Maccabees 7 provides several such examples of intra-Septuagintal borrowings. Indeed, the verse in which ἐποργίζομαι occurs (ὁ ζῶν κύριος ἡμῶν βραχέως ἐπώργισται, καὶ πάλιν καταλλαγήσεται τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις) constitutes a small intertextual mosaic: the combination ὁ ζῶν κύριος, recurring at 15:4 (ὁ κύριος ζῶν), is a variant of θεὸς ζῶν occurring in Deut 4:33 and 5:26 and in at least a dozen other places in the Septuagint;[80] βραχέως ἐπώργισται, as noted previously, echoes Isa 54:7–8 and 57:17; the phrase καταλλαγήσεται τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις, repeated further along in the text, at 8:29 (καταλλαγῆναι τοῖς αὐτοῦ δούλοις), alludes to the Song of Moses in Deuteronomy (32:36 καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ παρακληθήσεται); the author replaces here the verb παρακαλέομαι with καταλλάσσομαι, although earlier in the text, at 7:6, he quotes the Deuteronomic verse verbatim.[81] The indebtedness of this verse to different sources makes it likely that ἐποργίζομαι is not an original coinage of the epitomator but a borrowing from another text, for which only one candidate exists, OG Daniel.

Our concluding remark, then, is that ἐποργίζομαι is likely to be a neologism of OG Daniel, which may have been taken up by the author of 2 Maccabees either for the sake of variation or because it served his theological agenda. From the point of view of chronology, the assumption that chapter 7 of 2 Maccabees is informed by OG Daniel 11–12 entails either that OG Daniel had come into existence before 124 BCE, as Grelot and other scholars have postulated, or, if we stick with the commonly accepted date for OG Daniel (late second or early first century BCE),[82] that chapter 7, and with it the rest of the epitome,[83] was written or took its final form not earlier than the turn of the second and first centuries BCE.

---

[79] See 6.2.9.

[80] Cf. Josh 3:10; 1 Kgdms 17:36; 4 Kgdms 19:4, 16; Ps 41:3a, 83:3b; Hos 1:10, 4:15; Isa 37:4, 17; Dan 4:19, 5:23; Esth 6:13, Add E:16; 3 Macc 6:28. On θεὸς ζῶν in the Septuagint, see Zimmermann 2007, 387–98.

[81] See Schwartz 1998, 228–32; id. 2008, 302–3.

[82] See Collins 1993, 8–9 and McLay, "Daniel (Old Greek and Theodotion)," in *CCS*, 546.

[83] See Chapter 8.

6.2.5 καθαγιάζω 'to consecrate,' 'to sanctify'

1:26 διαφύλαξον τὴν μερίδα σου καὶ καθαγίασον
2:8 ἵνα ὁ τόπος καθαγιασθῇ μεγάλως
15:18 ὁ περὶ τοῦ καθηγιασμένου ναοῦ φόβος

ἁγιάζω is a frequent verb in the Septuagint (196x), but the intensified[84] compound καθαγιάζω occurs only six times, three of which in 2 Maccabees. It first appears in Leviticus, where it is used in connection with cultic objects and animals: at 8:9, the combination τὸ καθηγιασμένον ἅγιον (נֵזֶר הַקֹּדֶשׁ, "holy crown, diadem") denotes the golden leaf fastened on the headband worn by the high priest[85] and at 27:26 καθαγιάζω is used of the dedication of the firstborn of the cattle to Yahweh. The only other canonical book that employs this verb, also in a cultic context, is 1 Chronicles. At 26:20, τὰ καθηγιασμένα (קָדָשִׁים, "holy things") designates the dedicated gifts housed in the Temple treasuries. In 2 Maccabees, καθαγιάζω occurs both in the second prefixed letter and in the last chapter of the epitome. In the prayer of Nehemiah (1:24–29), ἁγιάζω and καθαγιάζω are used in two consecutive verses, both taking a human object: at 1:25 Yahweh is invoked as the one who sanctified the patriarchs (ὁ ποιήσας τοὺς πατέρας ἐκλεκτοὺς καὶ ἁγιάσας αὐτούς) and at 1:26 He is asked to consecrate His μερίς, that is, His people (διαφύλαξον τὴν μερίδα σου καὶ καθαγίασον).[86] At 2:8 (ἵνα ὁ τόπος καθαγιασθῇ) and 15:18 (τοῦ καθηγιασμένου ναοῦ), on the other hand, the verb has the cultic application that we saw in Leviticus, this time with regard to the Temple.

6.2.6 παραδοξάζω 'to treat with distinction,' 'to render illustrious'

3:30 οἱ δὲ τὸν κύριον εὐλόγουν τὸν παραδοξάζοντα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον

παραδοξάζω is a neologism of the Greek Pentateuch. We first meet with it in the plagues narrative in Exodus. On three occasions Yahweh declares to Moses that He will make a distinction between the Israelites and the Egyptians, so as to protect the former from the plague of flies (8:22), the plague on livestock (9:4), and the plague on the firstborn (11:7). In all three instances, παραδοξάζω translates the root פָּלָה, BDB"Niph. be separated, distinct; Hiph. make separate (by treating differently), set apart." However, as commentators note, due to their homographic and homophonic closeness, the translator

[84] See Grimm 1857, 45 (referring to 2 Macc 1:26): "nur verstärktes Simplex"; Abel 1949, 295: "καθαγιάζειν, composé propre aux LXX, a peut-être pour but de marquer l'intensité de l'action de sanctifier ou de consacrer." See also Enermalm-Ogawa 1987, 74.

[85] Cf. Let. Aris. 98 τὸ καθηγιασμένον βασίλειον, "the consecrated diadem."

[86] On the meaning of μερίς here, see Enermalm-Ogawa 1987, 73–74 and Schwartz 2008, 155. Cf. 3 Macc 6:3 μερίδος ἡγιασμένης σου λαόν.

of Exodus probably confused פֶּלֶה with פלא, BDB"be surpassing, extraordinary."[87] He thus rendered the latter by the neologism παραδοξάζω, which he derived from παράδοξος (ὁ παρὰ δόξαν ὤν), LSJ"contrary to expectation, incredible." Accordingly, the verb's meaning is "to render extraordinary" rather than "to deal gloriously, render glorious" (Wevers 1990, 117), as if it came from δόξα in the sense of "glory."[88] The translator of Deuteronomy picked up this neologism to render פלא at 28:59: καὶ παραδοξάσει κύριος τὰς πληγάς σου, "the Lord will make exceptional your plagues" (NETS).[89] The translator of Sirach, in his turn, had probably the latter verse in mind when he rendered the contextually similar 10:13c as παρεδόξασεν κύριος τὰς ἐπαγωγάς, "the Lord brought on incredible attacks" (NETS).

In 2 Macc 3:30 (as well as in 3 Macc 2:9, which echoes this verse), the verb is used with reference to a place, the Temple, metonymically called ὁ τόπος, which was miraculously protected by Yahweh from Heliodorus' violation. The only other instance in which παραδοξάζω is used with respect to a place is in Exod 8:22, where Yahweh "sets apart" the land of Goshen (παραδοξάσω . . . τὴν γῆν Γεσεμ), so that it is exempted from the fourth plague. The author of 2 Maccabees is likely to have had this specific verse in mind when he chose to use παραδοξάζω in the context of Yahweh's protection of the Temple. Actually, there are three ways in which one can understand the Exodic neologism as used in 2 Maccabees: (a) Yahweh treated the Temple with distinction, (b) Yahweh did wondrous things on behalf of the Temple, and (c) Yahweh glorified the Temple; (a) presupposes knowledge of the underlying Hebrew text of Exod 8:22, (b) connects παραδοξάζω with παράδοξος, whereas (c) etymologizes it from δόξα in the sense of "honour, glory, magnificence." The Old Latin versions, as well as the modern translations of 2 Maccabees, render 3:30 along the lines of (c) or of (b) and (c).[90]

It is true that δοξάζω is used with reference to the Temple in 2 Maccabees[91] and elsewhere in the Septuagint, especially in the deuterocanonical books.[92] Goldstein (1983,

---

[87] See Le Boulluec and Sandevoir 1989, 34; Wevers 1990, 117

[88] See G. Kittel, "δοκέω, δόξα, κτλ," *TDNT* 2:255. Perkins (2011), however, sees behind the coinage of παραδοξάζω the intent of the Exodus translator to emphasize in his translation the concept of Yahweh's glory. In support of this he adduces the heavy use of δόξα and its cognates δοξάζω, ἔνδοξος, ἐνδόξως, and ἐνδοξάζομαι (another neologism) that the translator of the Pentateuchal book makes.

[89] See Wevers 1995, 454.

[90] La^L magnificat locum suum; La^X honorabit; La^V magnificauit; La^B glorificabat; La^M glorificauit; La^P benedicebant dominum qui praeter opinionem locum suum magnificabat; Bevenot 1931, 184: "priesen die anderen den Herrn, der wider Erwarten seine (heilige) Stätte verherrlichte"; Abel 1949, 325: "bénissaient le Seigneur qui avait miraculeusement glorifié son saint lieu"; Goldstein 1983, 196: "blessed the Lord who had glorified His Place by a miracle"; Schwartz 2008, 183: "were praising the Lord who had wonderfully glorified His own Place"; Habicht 1976, 213: "rühmten den Herrn, der seine Stätte so wunderbar verherrlicht hatte"; Doran 2012, 77: "they were praising the Lord who had marvelously distinguished his own place"; NETS: "they praised the Lord who had acted marvelously for his own place."

[91] 3:2 συνέβαινε . . . τοὺς βασιλεῖς τιμᾶν τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν ἀποστολαῖς ταῖς κρατίσταις δοξάζειν. Cf. 5:16 τὰ ὑπ' ἄλλων βασιλέων [σκεύη] ἀνασταθέντα πρὸς αὔξησιν καὶ δόξαν τοῦ τόπου; 5:20 ὁ τόπος . . . μετὰ πάσης δόξης ἐπανωρθώθη.

196) has even suggested that 2 Macc 3:30 may echo Isa 60:7 καὶ ὁ οἶκος τῆς προσευχῆς μου δοξασθήσεται and that the author of 2 Maccabees may have seen the deliverance of the Temple from the threat posed by Heliodorus as a "partial fulfilment" of this verse. Although such an intertextual connection does not seem very likely, Goldstein's suggestion helps make evident that, by being transferred from its original plagues-related context in Exodus to the Temple-related context in 2 Maccabees, παραδοξάζω acquired (if it did not have it already)[93] the connotation "to hold in honour, to magnify, to glorify," resulting from its association with δόξα/כָּבוֹד and δοξάζω.[94] The author of 3 Maccabees, who at 2:9 evidently draws upon 2 Macc 3:30, emphasizes even more this connotation by juxtaposing παραδοξάζω with δόξα in the sense of "honour, glory": παρεδόξασας [τὸν τόπον] ἐν ἐπιφανείᾳ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ σύστασιν ποιησάμενος αὐτοῦ πρὸς δόξαν τοῦ μεγάλου καὶ ἐντίμου ὀνόματός σου.

6.2.7 σαββατίζω 'to keep the Sabbath'

6:6 ἦν δ' οὔτε σαββατίζειν οὔτε πατρῴους ἑορτὰς διαφυλάττειν

The denominative σαββατίζω (from the Aramaic loanword σάββατα), "a barbarous neologism," as Bickerman (2007b, 1:178n43) has called it, first occurs in Exod 16:30 (καὶ ἐσαββάτισεν ὁ λαὸς τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ) and in Lev 23:32 (σαββατιεῖτε τὰ σάββατα ὑμῶν) in the sense *GELS*"to observe a sabbath," and in Lev 26:34, 35 (σαββατιεῖ ἡ γῆ . . . σαββατιεῖ ἃ οὐκ ἐσαββάτισεν ἐν τοῖς σαββάτοις ὑμῶν) in the figurative sense *GELS*"to lie inactive, 'lie fallow'." In the latter sense, it recurs in 2 Chr 36:21 (ἕως τοῦ προσδέξασθαι τὴν γῆν τὰ σάββατα αὐτῆς σαββατίσαι . . . ἐσαββάτισεν εἰς συμπλήρωσιν ἐτῶν ἑβδομήκοντα)—which refers back to Lev 26:34 and 26:35—and in 1 Esd 1:55 (σαββατιεῖ εἰς συμπλήρωσιν ἐτῶν ἑβδομήκοντα), which corresponds to 2 Chr 36:21. In 2 Macc 6:6 it is used as in Exod 16:30 and in Lev 23:32. It is likely that the verb was in use amongst Greek-speaking Jews even before the translation of the Pentateuch.

Elsewhere in 2 Maccabees, the author designates the Sabbath-keeping by a variety of periphrastic expressions such as ἄγειν τὴν ἑβδομάδα (6:11), περὶ τὸ σάββατον ἐγίνοντο (8:27), τὸ σάββατον διήγαγον (12:38), ἄγειν τὴν τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέραν (15:3), and ἀσκεῖν τὴν ἑβδομάδα (15:4). These expressions are not found in the rest of the Septuagint, which standardly employs φυλάσσειν/φυλάσσεσθαι τὰ σάββατα (11x, first

[92] Cf. Isa 60:13 δοξάσαι τὸν τόπον τὸν ἅγιόν μου; 1 Esd 8:25 δοξάσαι τὸν οἶκον αὐτοῦ; 8:64 ἐδόξασαν τὸ ἔθνος καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ κυρίου; 8:78 δοξάσαι τὸ ἱερὸν ἡμῶν; 2 Esd 7:27 δοξάσαι τὸν οἶκον κυρίου τὸν ἐν Ἰερουσαλήμ; 8:36 ἐδόξασαν τὸν λαὸν καὶ τὸν οἶκον τοῦ θεοῦ; 1 Macc 14:15 τὰ ἅγια ἐδόξασε; 15:9 δοξάσομέν σε καὶ τὸ ἔθνος σου καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν δόξῃ μεγάλῃ ὥστε φανερὰν γενέσθαι τὴν δόξαν ὑμῶν ἐν πάσῃ τῇ γῇ; Sir 50:11c-d ἐν ἀναβάσει θυσιαστηρίου ἁγίου ἐδόξασεν περιβολὴν ἁγιάσματος.

[93] See Perkins 2011.

[94] Cf. Grimm 1857, 74 "*παραδοξάζειν* bei den LXX *wunderbar machen*, indem sie es von *παράδοξον* abgeleitet zu haben scheinen; hier [sc. 2 Macc 3:30] dagegen und 3 Macc. 2, 9 wahrscheinlich *gegen die Erwartung*, d. i. *ausserordentlich verherrlichen*." Cf. Enermalm-Ogawa 1987, 106n10.

occurring in Exod 31:13). For the designation of the Sabbath as ἡμέρα καταπαύσεως, at 15:1, 2 Maccabees is clearly indebted to Exod 35:2 τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμη κατάπαυσις, ἅγιον, σάββατα, ἀνάπαυσις κυρίῳ.

6.2.8 σαπρία 'rottenness'

9:9 ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς ὀσμῆς αὐτοῦ πᾶν τὸ στρατόπεδον βαρύνεσθαι τὴν σαπρίαν

σαπρία occurs in 2 Macc 9:9, in Job (6x), in Joel 2:20, and in Pss. Sol. 14:7a and 16:14a. The combination of rotting flesh (τὰς σάρκας αὐτοῦ διαπίπτειν), worms (σκώληκας ἀναζεῖν), and stench (ὑπὸ τῆς ὀσμῆς αὐτοῦ) in the description of Antiochus Epiphanes' fatal disease in 2 Macc 9:9, verbally links this passage with Job 2:9cα and 7:5a (ἐν σαπρίᾳ σκωλήκων) and with Joel 2:20 (καὶ ἀναβήσεται ἡ σαπρία αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἀναβήσεται ὁ βρόμος αὐτοῦ).

In Joel 2:20, σαπρία renders בָּאֵשׁ, "stench." This Hebrew noun recurs only in Amos 4:10, mistranslated in the Septuagint, and in Isa 34:3, rendered in the Septuagint by ὀσμή.[95] Its counterpart at 2:20, βρόμος, "stink,"[96] translates the Hebrew צַחֲנָה, "stench." In Joel 2:20, then, σαπρία is set in synonymous parallelism with βρόμος to denote the stink of putrefaction. Second Maccabees 9:9 may reflect this pair of synonyms in its juxtaposition of ὀσμή and σαπρία. In such a case, the latter term would designate the smell of rotting flesh rather than the "rotten, decayed state."[97] Its use would serve the purpose of introducing variation into a context where ὀσμή is repeated three times in four consecutive verses (9:9 ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς ὀσμῆς αὐτοῦ; 9:10 διὰ τὸ τῆς ὀσμῆς ἀφόρητον βάρος; 9:12 μηδὲ τῆς ὀσμῆς αὐτοῦ δυνάμενος ἀνέχεσθαι).

The "stench that will rise up" in Joel 2:20 is that of the "northerner" (LXX ὁ ἀπὸ βορρᾶ) who Yahweh proclaims to His people that He will chase away and "drive into a parched and desolate land, its front into the eastern sea, and its rear into the western sea" (NRSV). This is a military metaphor usually taken to refer to the repulse of the invasion of locusts mentioned in Joel 1:4.[98] As early as the Church Fathers, this invasion received multiple interpretations involving the identification of the "northerner" not only with locusts but also with various historical or mythical and allegorical enemies such as the Assyrians, the Babylonians, or Satan himself. Accordingly, the stench was understood as coming from rotting locusts, slain soldiers, or the demons shut up in Hades and the

[95] See Harl et al. 1999, 65–66.

[96] LSJ glosses βρόμος (A) as "any loud noise"; s.v. βρῶμος (B), "stink, noisome smell," it notes that βρόμος frequently occurs as *falsa lectio* for βρῶμος. It appears, though, that βρόμος, "loud noise," acquired the connotation "stink" through the following development: noise>crepitus ventris>stink. See Walters 1973, 72–73 and Muraoka 1989, 207 for further references.

[97] This is how the Old Latin translators understood it: La^{LXV} odore etiam illius et foetore; La^{BM} ab odore etiam tetro eius; La^{P} odore quoque eius . . . <et> foetore.

[98] See Crenshaw 1995, 151.

depths of the sea.[99] Kjeld Jensen (1941, 107–12) attempted to identify the "northerner" with the "king of the North" in Dan 11:40, that is, Antiochus Epiphanes, and read the prophecies in Joel 2:20 in light of the Maccabean events of the years 164–162 BCE, as narrated in 1 and 2 Maccabees, namely the death of Antiochus, preceded by a disease that caused the foul-smelling putrefaction of his body, and the subsequent invasion of Lysias in Judea. Jensen postulated that the original text of Joel (the Proto-Joel, as he calls it), describing an assault of locusts, the ensuing hunger, and the final intervention of Yahweh, was reworked around 163 BCE by a contemporary of the author of Daniel, "endowed with prophetic gifts and a knowledge of the Scriptures," who saw in the aforementioned description a prediction of the Maccabean events of his time and experienced them as an incipient realisation of the Day of Yahweh. Although this theory has been deemed implausible,[100] it does not seem unlikely that the Joelic "stench of the northerner" was indeed interpreted by the contemporaries of the Maccabean revolt as a prophecy of the death of Antiochus. Thus, the possibility that 2 Macc 9:9 alludes, via the use of σαπρία, to Joel 2:20 cannot be ruled out.

It is to be noted that Joel shares with 2 Maccabees two verbal parallels that do not occur anywhere else in the Septuagint: 2:12 ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ ἐν κλαυθμῷ (cf. 2 Macc 13:12 μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ καὶ νηστειῶν) and 2:17 ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς κρηπῖδος καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κλαύσονται οἱ ἱερεῖς (cf. 2 Macc 10:26 ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπέναντι τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κρηπῖδα προσπεσόντες). The latter, which is at a distance of three verses from the reference to the "northerner" and his "stench," also parallels 2 Macc 3:15 (οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς πρὸ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου . . . ῥίψαντες ἑαυτούς).[101]

Job 2:9ca (σύ τε αὐτὸς ἐν σαπρίᾳ σκωλήκων κάθησαι) has no equivalent in the MT. 2:9a–e, containing the speech of Job's wife, is one of two lengthy additions to the Hebrew text to be found in the Greek translation of Job. This addition was probably not penned by the Greek translator of the book, but came from a later hand, at a relatively early stage of the transmission of the Greek text.[102] The phrase σαπρίᾳ σκωλήκων, at 2:9ca, was drawn from 7:5a (φύρεται δέ μου τὸ σῶμα ἐν σαπρίᾳ σκωλήκων), where it renders רִמָּה, "worms," and עָפָר, "dry earth, dust." The idea of an affliction, seen as punishment, that causes a still living body to rot and worms to come out of it, is common to Job 7:5 and 2 Macc 9:9,[103] which makes it not unlikely that it was from Job 7:5a that the author of 2 Maccabees drew the noun σαπρία. The acquaintance of 2 Maccabees with the Greek translation of Job can be posited on the grounds of a significant verbal parallel that the two books share, the combination καταπάσσειν γῆν. The verb καταπάσσω occurs only six times in the Septuagint, in Jer 6:26 and in Esth 4:1, where it is conjoined with σποδός, and in Micah, Job, and 2

[99] See Wolff 1977, 62 and Harl et al. 1999, 66.
[100] See Wolff 1977, 62 and Crenshaw 1995, 152.
[101] See Schwartz 2008, 197, 387.
[102] See Gray 1920, 434–38.
[103] See Lindhagen 1950, 42, 45.

Maccabees, where it is conjoined with γῆ. In the two last-named books, the verbal parallels are morphologically identical (Job 2:12d καταπασάμενοι γῆν; 2 Macc 10:25 γῇ τὰς κεφαλὰς καταπάσαντες;[104] 14:15 καταπασάμενοι γῆν).[105]

Joel and the other Minor Prophets are considered by most scholars to have been translated into Greek around the middle of the second century BCE.[106] The date of OG Job cannot be fixed with accuracy. A passage from the work Περὶ Ἰουδαίων, written by the profane historiographer Aristeas the Exegete, seems to be dependent on OG Job. This passage was excerpted by Alexander Polyhistor sometime in the mid-first century BCE. Old Greek Job must thus predate both Aristeas and Alexander Polyhistor. Gerleman (1946, 74) dates it to around the middle of the second century BCE; Harl, Dorival, and Munnich (*BGS*, 91) and Cox (2006, 106) date Aristeas to the first half of the first century BCE at the latest, and accordingly place the Greek translation of Job at the same period, or a little earlier, in the second half of the second century BCE. If 2 Maccabees was indeed acquainted with this translation, it must by necessity have postdated it.

As a final note on 2 Macc 9:9, we may mention that the phrase ὑπὸ τῆς ὀσμῆς . . . βαρύνεσθαι seems to be a Sophoclean reminiscence: prior to 2 Maccabees, the combination of ὀσμή and βαρύνομαι occurs only in *Philoctetes* and in a fragment of *Philoctetes at Troy*,[107] where it designates the bad smell emanating from the hero's wound, which is unbearable to his companions. Moreover, the combination ἐν ὀδύναις καὶ ἀλγηδόσι is previously attested only in Plato.[108] 9:9 is thus an eloquent example of the admixture of secular Greek and Septuagint vocabulary and phraseology that is often found in 2 Maccabees.

6.2.9 τροφοφορέω 'to sustain by providing food'

> 7:27 ἐλέησόν με τὴν ἐν γαστρὶ περιενέγκασάν σε . . . καὶ θηλάσασάν σε . . . καὶ ἐκθρέψασάν σε καὶ ἀγαγοῦσαν εἰς τὴν ἡλικίαν ταύτην καὶ τροφοφορήσασαν

τροφοφορέω occurs in 2 Macc 7:27, in the address of the mother of the seven martyrs to her youngest son. The mother's child-bearing and rearing is evoked by a string of five participles, the last of which, τροφοφορήσασα, seems not only pleonastic, as its meaning overlaps with that of the third participle, ἐκθρέψασα, but also displaced, as it follows rather than precedes the phrase ἀγαγοῦσαν εἰς τὴν ἡλικίαν ταύτην, "brought you to

[104] Compare with Job 1:20b καὶ ἐκείρατο τὴν κόμην τῆς κεφαλῆς, to which Codex Alexandrinus adds και κατεπασατο γην επι της κεφαλης αυτου.

[105] See also the comment on ὑψαυχενέω at 4.2.7.

[106] See J.M. Dines, "The Minor Prophets," *CCS* 441.

[107] S. *Ph.* 890–91 τούτους δ' ἔασον, μὴ βαρυνθῶσιν κακῇ / ὀσμῇ; fr. 697 Radt ὀσμῆς μόνον / ὅπως . . . μὴ βαρυνθήσεσθέ μου.

[108] See Appendix 11, 26.

your present age." Most commentators have justifiably suspected it to be a marginal gloss added by a scribe, a suspicion bolstered by the fact that five of the six Old Latin translations omit it.[109] Hanhart (1961, 24 [446]) has defended it, though, as being "ursprünglich," and Goldstein (1983, 315) has offered a convincing explanation for its unnatural position in the verse: a scribe who wanted to clarify the meaning of this rare verb added ἐκθρέψασαν as a marginal note, which was eventually incorporated in the text in the wrong place.

The verb originates in Deut 1:31, where the Israelites are reminded of how Yahweh's providence preserved them in the wilderness. The translator of Deuteronomy rendered נָשָׂא יְהוָה אֱלֹהֶיךָ כַּאֲשֶׁר יִשָּׂא־אִישׁ אֶת־בְּנוֹ, "how the Lord your God carried you, just as one carries a child" (NRSV), by ὡς ἐτροφοφόρησέν σε κύριος ὁ θεός σου, ὡς εἴ τις τροφοφορήσαι ἄνθρωπος τὸν υἱὸν αὐτοῦ, "how the Lord your God nursed you, as some person would nurse his son" (NETS). Behind the loose rendering of נָשָׂא, "to carry, bear," by the neologism τροφοφορέω lies the translator's envisioning Yahweh as a nourishing father, probably on account of His provisioning the Israelites with manna in the wilderness.[110] The same Hebrew verb occurs in Num 11:12, where Moses addresses to Yahweh the following complaints about the weight of leading the Israelites to the Promised Land: "Did I conceive (LXX ἐν γαστρὶ ἔλαβον) all this people? Did I give birth (ἔτεκον) to them, that you should say to me, 'Carry them in your bosom, as a nurse carries (ὡσεὶ ἄραι τιθηνός) a sucking child'?" (NRSV). What Moses strangely implies here is that Yahweh is the mother of the Israelites, who should show maternal concern for his/her children. Putting the distinctive verb τροφοφορέω into the mouth of the mother of the seven martyrs seems, thus, to be a daring choice, as the mother can be thought to be paralleling herself to Yahweh. Yet, the choice of this verb seems to serve the author's rhetorical purpose to use in the speech of the mother a rarefied vocabulary, which includes such other unusual terms as στοιχείωσις and διαρρυθμίζω (7:22).

It seems reasonable to assume that the person who embedded τροφοφορέω in 2 Macc 7:27 was also responsible for the coinage of προοδηγός at 12:36, given that the latter noun resonates with Deut 1:30 and 1:33, namely the verses that precede and follow the verse in which τροφοφορέω occurs.[111] This adds support to the idea that the Deuteronomic verb belongs to the original text of 2 Maccabees.

The only other biblical allusion to Deut 1:31 is found in the New Testament, in Acts 13:18, where, however, the textual tradition is divided between ἐτροφοφόρησεν and the variant ἐτροποφόρησεν, which is transmitted in a few Deuteronomy MSS.[112]

---

[109] See de Bruyne 1922, 51; id. 1932, xi; Abel 1949, 378; Katz 1960, 19; Habicht 1979, 236; Goldstein 1983, 315.

[110] See Wevers 1995, 18.

[111] See 2.2.13.

[112] In Deut 1:31, Codex Vaticanus and twenty-eight other MSS read ἐτροφοφόρησεν, whereas ten MSS read ἐτροποφόρησεν. See Metzger 1994, 405.

6.3 Summary

In this chapter we examined a sample of nine words which are first attested in the Greek translations of the canonical books of the Bible and which occur in the epitome of 2 Maccabees. For three of these words (ἁγιωσύνη, ἐποργίζομαι, and τροφοφορέω), which occur exclusively in the epitome and a single other Septuagint book, we consider it likely that the author picked them from the Greek Psalter, OG Daniel, and the Greek Deuteronomy, respectively; it is also likely that καθαγιάζω, παραδοξάζω, and σαββατίζω were taken from the Septuagint Pentateuch and σαπρία either from the Septuagint Job or from the Septuagint Joel; for the use of ἐμπαιγμός it is doubtful whether 2 Maccabees is indebted to a specific Septuagint book, yet the Samson episode in OG Judges, where the cognate verb ἐμπαίζω occurs, could have been a source of inspiration; as for the semantic neologism ἐλαττονόω, it is Septuagintal in form, but it borrows its military meaning, "to defeat," from ἐλαττόω, which, in this sense, is used only by secular Greek historiographers. With regard to the distribution of these words in the epitome, we notice two small clusters, one in the Heliodorus episode, in chapter 3 (ἁγιωσύνη, παραδοξάζω), and another in the martyrological chapter 7 (ἐμπαιγμός, ἐποργίζομαι, τροφοφορέω). Two other groups of words stand out: one related to the Temple (ἁγιωσύνη, καθαγιάζω, παραδοξάζω, as well as βεβηλόω, ἐγκαινισμός, and καθαρισμός, which are not discussed in detail in this chapter) and another related to Yahweh (ἐποργίζομαι, παραδοξάζω, μακροθυμέω, which is not discussed here). What seems to have motivated the use of these neologisms in the epitome is the author's need to use a rarefied vocabulary (τροφοφορέω), to achieve lexical variation (σαββατίζω), to express a certain theological point of view (ἐποργίζομαι), or to activate intertextual connections with Greek biblical texts (ἁγιωσύνη, παραδοξάζω, σαπρία). As regards the relative dating of 2 Maccabees vis-à-vis the Septuagint books from which it likely drew the lexical items discussed in this chapter, as well as at least some of the phraseology presented in Appendix 8, we may posit that the epitome postdates the translation of the Pentateuch (third century BCE), of OG Judges (160s BCE at the earliest), of the Psalms (after 161 BCE and perhaps as late as the last third of the second century BCE), of Isaiah (ca. 145 BCE), and of Joel (mid-second century BCE) and/or Job (second half of the second century BCE). Especially noteworthy is the case of ἐποργίζομαι: if its instance in 2 Maccabees 7 attests to the lexical influence of OG Daniel, and if the latter book dates from around the turn of the second and first centuries BCE, as many authorities believe, the composition of chapter 7, and of the rest of the epitome, should be dated later than OG Daniel.

Chapter 7: Polybian neologisms in 2 Maccabees

7.1 Introduction

In his study entitled "The language of Polybius since Foucault and Dubuisson," Langslow (2012, 86) makes the following remark: "There is little literary prose surviving from the period separating Polybius from Theophrastus (d. *c.* 287), and the only straightforward (near-) contemporary comparanda are inscribed letters and documentary papyri, with which comparisons have been made since the nineteenth century." And he adds in a footnote: "I may be understating the value of certain books of the Septuagint as potentially informative comparanda."[1] Indeed, the idea of comparing Polybius with some of the books of the Septuagint, especially those whose original language is Greek, has hitherto attracted minimal scholarly interest. While there have been a few studies that have looked at the possible use of Polybius' *Histories* as a source for some of the books of the Septuagint—more specifically, the first three books of the Maccabees—one can find in the literature on Polybius or the Septuagint little more than passing remarks on the linguistic and stylistic affinities that can be traced between the *Histories* and these books.

Taking as a starting point the observation made by several commentators that 2 Maccabees' diction exhibits some notable similarities with that of Polybius, we will explore in this chapter the possibility that there might have been an influence of the latter on the former, by looking closely at the use of a number of Polybian neologisms in 2 Maccabees. First, we will briefly survey the scant literature on the subject. Then, we will examine (a) a number of words that first appear in Polybius and then recur in 2 Maccabees and in only a few other subsequent works, (b) a number of words that are attested earlier than Polybius, but appear in the *Histories* in a new sense that is also exhibited exclusively or almost exclusively in 2 Maccabees, and (c) a number of word combinations shared by the *Histories* and 2 Maccabees. Lastly, we will try to assess whether the occurrence of these words and word combinations in 2 Maccabees betrays the influence of Polybius' diction on it and whether they may provide us with a clue as to the period in which the Septuagint book was composed.

[1] Cf. de Foucault 1972, 6.

7.2 Polybius and 1 and 3 Maccabees

Unlike Josephus, who expressly names Polybius as one of his historiographical sources (*AJ* 12.135, 137, 358, 359; *Ap.* 2.84), the authors of the first three books of the Maccabees nowhere mention the Megalopolitan (or any other earlier or contemporary) historian. Consequently, although the influence on Josephus of Polybius' historiographical ideas, themes, and vocabulary has become an object of research,[2] very few scholars have endeavoured to explore the possibility that 1, 2, and 3 Maccabees, too, written in the period between Polybius and Josephus, owe an unacknowledged debt, however minimal, to Polybius.

With regard to 1 Maccabees, Gryglewicz (1950, 201) has remarked that, when recounting the same events, the Jewish author of this book and the Greek Polybius are in agreement, and, further, that the former seems to adhere to the principles of history writing laid down by the latter. This he considers to be one of the paradoxes of 1 Maccabees, given the anti-Hellenic stance endorsed by the author of this book and the fact that "we find no evidence that the author [sc. of 1 Maccabees] was acquainted with the Greek writers, in particular Polybius." Gryglewicz explains this paradox by arguing that both authors were good historians, who had researched well the events they described, and by positing that the Jewish embassy that Simon Maccabaeus sent to Rome in 140 BCE may have had the opportunity to become acquainted with Polybius' work (the first part of which had only too recently been made known to the Roman public) and his historiographical principles.

Pursuing this line of investigation farther, Wajdenbaum (2014), in a rather impressionistic study somewhat misleadingly entitled *The Books of the Maccabees and Polybius*,[3] compared a number of passages in 1 Maccabees with some more or less relevant passages in Polybius' *Histories*, in order to demonstrate that the latter was one of the sources of the former. The similarities that Wajdenbaum traces are, for the most part, weak and can be explained without resort to speculations about Polybius' direct influence on 1 Maccabees.[4] That the author of the latter book may have drawn upon

[2] See Cohen 1982 and Eckstein 1990. On the influence of Polybius' vocabulary on Josephus, see Shutt 1961, 102–6 and Eckstein 1990, 190–91.

[3] The study is focused on 1 Maccabees.

[4] For example, Wajdenbaum (2014, 200) mentions as "a notable detail" that "both the author of 1 Maccabees and Polybius call the drivers leading elephants 'Indians'" and presents it as "indicative of textual dependence." The truth is that Hellenistic historiographers commonly call the drivers of war elephants 'Indians' (cf. D.S. 18.34.2; D.H. 20.12.3) because of the practice of the Seleucids, the Ptolemies, and the Carthaginians to import Indians to train or drive the elephants that they used in battle (see Tarn 1930, 94). Moreover, the fact that both 1 Macc 6:30 and Plb. 11.20.2 speak of 32 elephants taking part in two unrelated battles is an insignificant similarity, since a unit of 32 elephants, called "keratarchy," was a standard division of an elephant-corps (see Ael. *Tact.* 23.1.12; Ascl. *Tact.* 9). One also fails to see in which way "Eleazar's heroic sacrifice [1 Macc 6:43–46] resembles the death of Hasdrubal, brother of Hannibal [Plb. 11.2.1]" (p. 201). Eleazar was crushed to death by one of the enemy elephants when he crept under it and stabbed it; he did this "to save his people and to secure for himself an everlasting name" (1 Macc 6:44, NETS); Hasdrubal died bravely in battle, but his death was

Greek historiographical sources, Polybius' *Histories* among them, cannot be excluded, yet this remains to be proved by an investigation that will avoid easy conclusions based on the comparison of superficially resembling passages.

As regards 3 Maccabees, commentators, beginning with the French philologist and theologian Casaubon in the sixteenth century,[5] have observed that it presents noteworthy points of contact with Polybius. They generally accept that the account of the events related to the battle of Raphia at the opening section of the book (1:1–7) by and large agrees with the account of the same events by Polybius (5:79–87).[6] This agreement may indicate that the author of 3 Maccabees used Polybius either as his sole or as a complementary source. However, a number of divergences between the two accounts may imply, as Emmet (*APOT* 1:159, 163) believes, that the author of 3 Maccabees used for this section a source other than Polybius, conjecturally Ptolemy of Megalopolis. Tcherikover (1961, 3) likewise holds that the author of 3 Maccabees did not draw on Polybius but on a well-informed Greek historian, who might also have been one of the sources of Polybius. Gera (1998, 18), on the other hand, after comparing the two narratives, concludes that the account of the battle of Raphia and Ptolemy's visit to Jerusalem in 3 Maccabees is "merely an adaptation of Polybius' narrative," but adds in a footnote (ib. note 52) that "there may have been a common source for both Polybius and the author of 3 Maccabees." Without excluding the possibility that, for the account of the battle of Raphia, 3 Maccabees drew on Ptolemy of Megalopolis or another lost source which may also have been known to Polybius, Raup Johnson (2004, 194, 200–201) considers it highly likely that the author of the Septuagint book had direct knowledge of Polybius. The latter's work, she argues (p. 200), "had existed for at least a generation before the earliest date at which 3 Maccabees could have been written, and given the author's evident literary pretensions, it would be surprising if he was completely unaware of a major Hellenistic author."[7] As for the

no sacrifice, as Wajdenbaum (p. 200, 201) contends. Polybius says that he "fell in the thick of the fight" (11.2.1 ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ κατέστρεψε τὸν βίον). Indeed, although praising his bravery and his determinacy "to conquer or die" and "suffer nothing unworthy of his past" (11.1.4; 11.2.10), the historian does not fail to note that Hasdrubal "was more careful of nothing in action than of his own safety" (11.2.9, trans. W.R. Paton, LCL). Wajdenbaum further compares 1 Macc 6:39 (description of the battle of Beth Zacharia) with Plu. *Aem.* 18.8 (description of the battle of Pydna) on the grounds that they both illustrate the motif of the shining weapons, already to be found in Homer. Assuming that "the story told by Plutarch in his *Life of Aemilius* is openly taken from the narrative of Polybius, which is, for the most part, lost," he argues that we can "infer that this detail of the weapons glittering in the plain, common to 1 Maccabees 6 and Plutarch, would come from a common source in book XXIX of Polybius" (p. 203). This is an ill-informed inference, since Plutarch relied on more than one source for the description of the battle of Pydna. For the passage wherein the shining weapons motif occurs he explicitly states that he draws on the eyewitness testimony of Cornelius Scipio Nasica (*Aem.* 18.5 φησίν [Νασικᾶς]), who had written an account of the battle of Pydna in a letter to a king (*Aem.* 15.5). See *FGrH* 2B.233; Schwarze 1891, 35; Flacelière and Chambry 1966, 64, 92n1.

[5] See Mélèze Modrzejewski 2008, 35.

[6] See C.W. Emmet, "3 Maccabees," *APOT* 1:159, 163; Kopidakis 1987, 18; Raup Johnson 2004, 194; Croy 2006, 38.

[7] This opinion is shared by Mélèze Modrzejewski 2008, 36.

differences in the respective accounts of the battle of Raphia by Polybius and the author of 3 Maccabees, she suggests that the latter may have tampered with the historical data that he drew from the former, so as to make them conform to the pathetic style of writing that he affected (pp. 200–201). Kopidakis (1987, 18, 87n22) further discerns in the opening section of the book traces of the influence of Polybius' style,[8] *pace* Grimm (1857, 214), who asserts that 3 Maccabees lacks the affinities with the language of Polybius, which are, instead, characteristic of 2 Maccabees.

7.3 Polybius and 2 Maccabees

Before we discuss the possible relation between 2 Maccabees and Polybius' *Histories*, we need to take into account certain chronological considerations concerning the dates of these works. The date of composition and publication of the *Histories* is uncertain.[9] Walbank (1972, 21–22) hypothesizes that Polybius had written and published books 1 to 15 between 168 and 147 BCE and that the final forty-volume work, on which he had been working for about half a century, had appeared in his lifetime, that is, before 118 BCE, when he presumably died. The composition of Jason of Cyrene's history has been dated by some scholars to between 160 and 152 BCE and the epitomator's abridgment to 124 BCE, or later.[10] If one accepts these dates, one is obliged to admit that it is within the realm of chronological possibility that Jason's history may have undergone an influence in its content and style from Polybius; indeed, if Jason of Cyrene is identified with Jason, son of Eleazar, whom Judas Maccabeus sent on an embassy to Rome, together with Eupolemus, in 161 BCE,[11] it is tempting to postulate that he had the opportunity there to come across the first books of Polybius' *Histories*. If one assigns Jason's history to a later date, as several scholars have done,[12] it is even more conceivable that Jason may have drawn upon Polybius. However, most scholars would agree that the Cyrenean historian was a contemporary of the Megalopolitan historian rather than that he belonged to a subsequent generation.[13] As for the time gap between the date of publication assigned to the first books of the *Histories* and the assumed date of

---

[8] Kopidakis (1987, 87n22) adduces three phrases from 3 Macc 1:1–7 that have verbal parallels in Polybius: 3 Macc 1:4 ἐπιπορευσαμένη τὰς δυνάμεις παρεκάλει–Plb. 5.53.6 παρεκάλει τὰς δυνάμεις ἐπιπορευόμενος [cf. 15.10.1 (ἐπ)επορεύετο παρακαλῶν τὰς δυνάμεις]; 3 Macc 1:5 καὶ οὕτως συνέβη τοὺς ἀντιπάλους ἐν χειρονομίαις διαφθαρῆναι–Plb. 1.57.8 ἀεὶ συνέβαινε διαφθείρεσθαι . . . τοὺς ἐν χειρῶν νόμῳ; 3 Macc 1:9 παραγενόμενος εἰς τὸν τόπον–Plb. 31.9.11 παραγενόμενος δ' ἐπὶ τοὺς τόπους. Of these, only the first is suggestive, as it is elsewhere unparalleled; the other two also occur in other Hellenistic historians.

[9] See the various theories summarized by K. Ziegler, "Polybios," PW 21.2, cols. 1485–89.

[10] See 1.2.1 and 1.2.4.

[11] See 1.2.1.

[12] E.g, Bickermann [*sic*],"Makkabäerbücher," PW 14, col. 793 suggests a date for Jason's work around 100 BCE and Goldstein (1983, 72, 83) a date between the late reign of John Hyrcanus and 86 BCE.

[13] See 1.2.1.

composition of the epitome, it is certainly broad enough to allow us to posit that the latter work may have received an influence, not so much on its content as on its style, from the former.

At first blush, the *Histories* and 2 Maccabees appear to be very dissimilar works. As commentators have noted, 2 Maccabees does not adhere to the same principles of history-writing as those espoused by Polybius. The theological explanation and justification of historical events, the epiphanic episodes, the martyrdom legends, the pathopoeia—elements that led scholars in the past to debatably classify 2 Maccabees into a genre labelled "tragic historiography," which Polybius was presumably all too eager to critique—are more or less avoided in the latter's work, although, as Doran (1979, 109; 1987, 291–92) has pointed out, he did not altogether abstain either from introducing emotion and drama in his narrative or from writing in a "tragic vein."

Furthermore, the comparanda that can be identified in the two works are few. In a fragment of the sixteenth book of the *Histories* (16.39.4–5), Polybius refers to the "holy place called Jerusalem" and promises to talk more extensively about it and the splendour of its Temple, yet the relevant account has not come down to us. Pédech (1964, 562n276) postulates that the historian had visited Jerusalem and that his account dealt with the dedication of the Temple to Zeus Olympius or its plundering by Antiochus IV, events that are mentioned in 2 Maccabees. Regrettably, the revolt of the Maccabees is nowhere treated in the surviving Polybian corpus. The author of the *Histories* does, however, discuss, in a few surviving fragments, the political and military activities, as well as the personality and death, of Antiochus IV Epiphanes, whose anti-Jewish measures sparked the Maccabean revolt,[14] and who is described in the blackest colours in 2 Maccabees. Some scholars have attempted to establish links between the *Histories* and 2 Maccabees on the basis of these fragments. In his previously referred to study, Wajdenbaum (2014, 196–98) argues, for example, that "the games organized in Tyre in 2 Maccabees 4, under Antiochus IV, in which a delegation of Judean athletes participated" (p. 196) "could partly be based on the description given by Polybius of the games in Daphne" (p. 198). This is very unlikely. The games celebrated in Tyre in 173 or 172 BCE (2 Macc 4:18–20) had nothing to do with the games that took place in Daphne in 166 BCE (Plb. 30.25–26);[15] the former were quinquennial games in honour of Heracles/Melqart (in which no "delegation of Judean athletes" was sent; 2 Macc 4:19 simply says that Jason sent religious envoys, θεωρούς, on which see *DNP*, s.v. theoria), whereas the latter were an ad hoc celebration.[16] The author of 2 Maccabees does not give any description of the games held in Tyre, so he need not have drawn on Polybius'

[14] See Plb. 26.1–14; 28.1, 18–23; 29.26–27; 30.25–27; 31.9. Pédech (1964, 144) posits that, in the lost parts of the *Histories*, Polybius also discussed the personality of and the influence exercised by another prominent figure in 2 Maccabees, Lysias, who served as Antiochus IV's regent, during the latter's campaign in the East, and as tutor to his son, Antiochus V.

[15] On the date of the games in Tyre, see Mittag 2006, 154; on the date of the games in Daphne, see Walbank 1957–1979, 3:449, Geller 1991, 1–2, and Gera and Horowitz 1997, 240–43.

[16] See Schwartz 2008, 226–27; Walbank 1957–1979, 3:449.

description of the games in Daphne, which is focused almost exclusively on the procession (mainly military in character) that opened the festival.[17]

The accounts of the death of Antiochus IV in Polybius and in 2 Maccabees have also been adduced as evidence of the latter's supposed dependence or non-dependence on the former. According to Polybius (31.9), Antiochus died at Tabae in Persia after having unsuccessfully attempted to rob the sanctuary of Artemis in Elymais. The king, writes the historian, "was smitten with madness, as some people say, owing to certain manifestations of divine displeasure when he was attempting this outrage on the above sanctuary" (trans. W.R. Paton, rev. by F.W. Walbank and C. Habicht, LCL). Second Maccabees, for its part, presents two different versions of how and why Antiochus died, one in the second prefixed letter (1:13–16) and the other in the epitome (9:1–28). 1:13–16 relates that the king was killed by the priests of the temple of Nanea in Persia, when he attempted to appropriate the temple treasures; in 9:1–28, on the contrary, we are told that, after his foiled attempt to rob the temples at Persepolis, Antiochus received at Ecbatana news of his general Nicanor's defeat and rushed back to Jerusalem to vent his fury upon the Jews. On his way, Yahweh struck him with an intestinal disease, followed by a fall from a galloping chariot, which eventually caused his body to putrefy and led him to his death—but not before he had repented of his sins against the Jews.[18]

For Richnow (1966, 64), the fact that Polybius' account of the death of Antiochus is at variance with both the versions put forth in 2 Maccabees is proof enough that the latter was not acquainted with the *Histories*. Willrich (1900, 141–44), on the other hand, argues that the tradition preserved in 2 Maccabees about Antiochus' temple-robbing expedition in Persia, where he feigned to marry a goddess in order to lay hands on the treasure of her temple, his death, and the carrying of his corpse back to Antioch, has its origin in Polybius. According to Willrich, this is confirmed by the account of the death of Antiochus given by the second-century CE Roman historian Granius Licinianus (28.7–9 Criniti), which, in the German scholar's opinion, ultimately goes back to Polybius. Licinianus mentions that at Hierapolis Antiochus pretended to marry Artemis, in order to take the treasures of her temple as a dowry (28.6), and that, after his death, due to a "nocturnal terror," his body was carried back to Antioch but fell into a river when the mules that transported it suddenly took fright, and it subsequently disappeared (28.7–9). Second Maccabees' points of contact with Licinianus are found at 1:14, where Antiochus is said to have wanted to marry the goddess Nanea, so as to get the money of her temple by way of dowry, at 9:7, where the king falls from his chariot running at full speed, and at 9:29, where one of his companions, Philip, takes Antiochus' corpse back home. However, one can readily see that in these parallels between the Jewish and the Roman versions of Antiochus' death there are as many

[17] Cf. Wajdenbaum's following unconvincing remark (p. 198): "The envoys of Jason carried silver drachmae for the sacrifice to Hercules, which seems consistent with the description of the procession of the images of the gods and demi-gods at the games of Daphne (Plb. 30.25:14–15)." On the 300 drachmae carried by Jason's envoys, see Goldstein 1983, 233.

[18] On the different versions of Antiochus IV's death, see Gauger 2002.

differences as there are similarities. Moreover, there is no way to verify that the author of 2 Maccabees and Licinianus were indebted to Polybius for their shared points of contact.[19] "Jason von Kyrene hat zweifellos den polybianischen Bericht über den Leichenzug des Epiphanes gekannt, von welchem wir zum Glück einen dürftigen Rest bei Licinianus a. a. O. besitzen," asserts Willrich (p. 142), yet where is that passage in Polybius that speaks of the transportation of Antiochus' corpse?[20]

7.4 Similarities of diction and style between Polybius and 2 Maccabees

The lexical and phraseological similarities between Polybius' *Histories* and 2 Maccabees caught early on the eye of several commentators. Grimm (1857, 7) was probably the first to notice that 2 Maccabees displays some "interesting affinities in phraseology with Polybius." Niese (1900, 298) went a step further, stating that the language of the epitome "is essentially the language of Polybius." Subsequent commentators did not fail, either, to take note of the linguistic and stylistic resemblances between 2 Maccabees and the *Histories*. Emmet (*APOT* 1:156) remarked that the style of the Septuagint book is "akin to the style of Polybius," an opinion shared by Habicht (1979, 190), who likewise ascertained that the manner of expression of the author of 2 Maccabees is "close to the style of the historians Polybius and Diodorus." Other scholars (Abel 1949, xxxvi; Mugler 1931, 420n2; Pfeiffer 1949, 518; Gil 1958, 18) contented themselves with pointing to the presence of words or expressions common to 2 Maccabees and the *Histories*, without, however, seeking to investigate whether this shared vocabulary betrays a lexical influence of the latter work on the former or whether it may be simply owed to both these historiographical works being among the rare preserved specimens of the second/first-century BCE literary Koine. The latter assumption was maintained by Palm (1955, 199–201; 1957, 65–66), who ascribed the resemblances in the phraseology and the sentence structure between 2 Maccabees, Polybius' *Histories* and Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History* to the fact that these historiographical works belong to the same literary milieu and exemplify the *Litteratursprache* of the last two centuries BCE.

---

[19] According to Holleaux (1916, 80n1), Licinianus' account of Antiochus IV's death "parait n'être qu'une repetition altérée de II Makk. 1, 13–16." See also Schwartz 2007, 258n8.

[20] We are also sceptical about Le Rider's (1965, 323) supposition (previously put forth by J. Starcky) that the author of 2 Maccabees actually followed Polybius' account of Antiochus IV's ultimate expedition and death, but transposed the place-names, in order to facilitate the Jewish reader's geographical orientation: "Il est visible que l'auteur du deuxième livre des Maccabées situe à Persépolis ce que Polybe place en Élymaïde. . . . Ce récit [2 Macc 9:1–2] est clairement une transposition de celui de Polybe. Comme l'indique J. Starcky dans son commentaire du passage . . ., l'auteur de ce livre des Maccabées a 'préferé situer le fait dans une ville connue de tous.' Il en est de même lorsqu'il a fait mourir Antiochos IV aux environs d'Ecbatane, κατ' 'Εκβάτανα: cette ville 'constituait un meilleur repère pour le lecteur juif.'" Cf. Drew-Bear 1980, 156.

Richnow (1966), who, in his dissertation on the language and style of 2 Maccabees,[21] drew up a list of words and phrases which Polybius' *Histories* and 2 Maccabees share exclusively or use in the same special sense, similarly concluded that the numerous lexical and stylistic similarities between the two works are due to their both adhering to the same style of Hellenistic literary prose, and that to postulate a dependence between them is to draw a "mistaken conclusion."[22] Schwartz (2008, 67) summarized the state of affairs regarding the linguistic affinities between 2 Maccabees and Polybius as follows: "Its [sc. 2 Maccabees'] vocabulary is quite similar to that of another historian of the second century BCE, Polybius, and indeed this comparison is frequently quite useful. But that is not to imply any special relationship between the two works."

In the lack of a thorough, comparative examination of the language and style of 2 Maccabees and Polybius' *Histories*, Schwartz's statement about the absence of a "special relationship" between the two works remains a categorical assertion. True, the mere presence of vocabulary common to two roughly contemporary literary works does not suffice to establish the existence of a connection, contact or influence, between them. Yet, the more exclusive and rarefied this vocabulary is, the more likely it is that it may evidence something more than a fortuitous affinity between the works that share it. The occurrence, in particular, in a given writer's work of vocabulary and phraseology that are peculiar to another writer may furnish an important clue for determining whether there is dependence, however minimal, on the level of diction of the one writer on the other. Words coined by an author, or—to be more cautious, given the difficulty of ascertaining the paternity of a 'novel' word occurring in an ancient Greek literary work—words first attested in the work of a certain author and subsequently recurring in the works of only a small number of other writers, are especially apt at revealing possible lexical borrowings and intertextual connections between literary works.

In both Polybius' *Histories* and 2 Maccabees there occur a considerable number of neologisms. In his study on the language and style of Polybius, de Foucault (1972, 325–88) has drawn up a—certainly non-exhaustive and now out-of-date[23]—list of some 2,500 words, either new ones, coined by Polybius himself or first attested in the *Histories*, or previously attested ones, which in Polybius appear in a new sense or admit

[21] "Exkurs: Übereinstimmungen mit dem Wortschatz des Polybios," pp. 63–71.

[22] Pp. 63–64: "Es wurde schon öfter bemerkt, dass Stil und Wortschatz des zweiten Makkabäerbuches grosse Ähnlichkeiten mit Polybios aufweisen. . . . Vergleiche mit anderen Prosaschriftstellern dieser Zeit sowie mit den Inschriften und Papyri zeigen nun freilich, dass die Sprache dieser beiden Autoren keine Ausnahme bildet, sondern dass sie im Grossen und Ganzen den Stil der hellenistischen literarischen Prosa repräsentiert. . . . Es wäre also ein Fehlschluss, auf Grund von zahlreichen stilistischen Ähnlichkeiten eine Abhängigkeit zwischen Polybios und II Makk. zu postulieren."

[23] To detect the Polybian neologisms and the *hapax legomena*, de Foucault relied basically on the LSJ lexicon and on previous studies (see pp. 18 and 325). An examination of Polybius' vocabulary with the aid of the electronic databanks of Greek texts nowadays available would undoubtedly produce a different list.

of a different construction.[24] Approximately 250 (10%) of these words are marked with a + to indicate that they are *hapax legomena*. A considerable number of Polybian neologisms recur with varying frequency in later writers (e.g. in Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Strabo, Josephus, Plutarch, Appian, Dio Cassius), who were readers of the Megalopolitan historian and who may or may not have drawn them from him.[25] Some of these neologisms recur in more than one writer (e.g. παλιμπροδοσία [5.96.4], LSJ"double treachery," reappears only in Diodorus Siculus [15.91.5], in Dionysius of Halicarnassus [3.25.1; 3.26.2; 8.32.5], and in Plutarch [*Alc.* 25.11; *Mor.* 327C]), while others happen to recur in only one writer (e.g. συμπεριποιέω [3.49.9], LSJ"help in procuring," χερρονησίζω [1.73.4; 10.10.5], LSJ"form a peninsula," and φιλοστεφανέω [1.16.10; 7.10.3], LSJ"to love crowns, i.e. honour and glory," crop up again only in Diodorus Siculus [11.81.2], in Strabo [5.2.6.11, passim], and in Plutarch [*Mor.* 1000B], respectively).[26] In a few cases, when a Polybian neologism recurs exclusively in a writer who uses it in a context quasi-identical or very similar to that in Polybius, the lexical dependence is unquestionable. For example, the *dis legomena* δυσποτμέω, LSJ"despair of oneself," and μυριόπλεθρος, LSJ"of immense extent," occur in Polybius (33.17.2 and 36.16.9, respectively) and then in two passages of Diodorus Siculus (31.43.1 and 32.16.1, respectively) paraphrasing Polybius.[27] In some other cases, the dependence can be plausibly posited, even if there is no contextual similarity. The *dis legomenon* στιβαδοκοιτέω, LSJ"sleep on litter," for instance, which Polybius uses at 2.17.10 of the people of the tribes living in the plain of the Po, recurs only in Strabo (3.3.7), who uses it of the mountaineers of Lusitania. Now, *Quellenforschung* studies of Strabo reveal that for the passage in which the verb in question occurs, the geographer had used as his source Posidonius, who in his turn had likely drawn upon a non-surviving passage of Polybius.[28] Strabo seems thus to be indirectly indebted to Polybius

[24] See also three older studies: Kaelker (1880, 296–98), enumerating the words that occur only in Polybius; Mollenhauer (1888), recording the neologisms to be found among the verbs compounded with prepositional prefixes in Polybius; and Limberger (1923), listing Polybius' nominal neologisms.

[25] On Polybius' influence on subsequent Greek and Roman historians, see K. Ziegler, "Polybios," PW 21.2, cols. 1572–74.

[26] We may take note here of Pédech's (1974, 48–49) reservations concerning, on the one hand, the originality of Polybius' language and, on the other hand, the paternity of a number of psychological terms that appear for the first time in the *Histories*: "Ces termes et les autres que nous n'avons pas cités sont-ils des créations de Polybe? Il est difficile de l'admettre, car son style ne se distingue pas par la hardiesse et l'originalité; il s'efforce au contraire de rester conforme à la fois au langage administratif, à la langue littéraire et à l'usage courant. . . . De plus, certains termes qui apparaissent chez lui pour la première fois se retrouvent un peu plus tard chez Diodore, Denys d'Halicarnasse et Plutarque. Il faut donc en conclure que seule la perte de textes contemporains a isolé ces mots chez Polybe et qu'en réalité il les doit aux moralistes et aux psychologues de son temps et aux raffinements de leurs analyses."

[27] Plb. 33.17.2 πρὸς παραπλησίαν διάθεσιν ἦλθον τοῖς ἐν τοῖς πολυχρονίοις ἀρρωστίαις δυσποτμοῦσι; D.S. 31.43.1 εἰς παραλόγους ἐννοίας ἐνέπιπτε καὶ παραπλησίους τοῖς ἐν ταῖς μακραῖς νόσοις δυσποτμοῦσιν; Plb. 36.16.9 ἑκάστῳ τῶν υἱῶν ἐν διαστάσει μυριοπλέθρους ἀγροὺς κατασκευάσας; D.S. 32.16.1 ἑκάστῳ τῶν υἱῶν ἀπολιπεῖν ἀγρὸν μυριόπλεθρον.

[28] See Lasserre 1966, 12n2.

for this verb. In many other cases, however, the exclusive occurrence of a Polybian neologism in one or two subsequent writers may be due solely to the random survival of ancient Greek texts. The instances, e.g., of κωλυσιεργέω, [LSJ]"hinder," in Polybius (6.16.5), in Philo (4x), in Josephus (*AJ* 15.425), and nowhere else in ancient Greek literature, or of βιαιομαχέω, [LSJ]"fight at close quarters," uniquely in Polybius (3x) and in Philodemus (*Rh.* 1.195), might give the illusory impression that Philo and Philodemus may have picked the respective words from Polybius, a rather unlikely possibility, given that there is no other evidence suggesting that these authors were readers of the historian's work.

As for 2 Maccabees, as has already been pointed out,[29] it displays a high number of neologisms, more than twenty of which are absolute *hapax legomena* in the Greek language. It also teems with unusual, rare, or poetic words, which the author apparently took great pains to glean from the literary resources that were available to him, in order to embellish his work.[30] As can be seen in Appendices 9 and 10, some two dozen words have but a single attestation in the whole of Greek that has come down to us from before 2 Maccabees and some two dozen other words do not occur in more than two or three authors/texts preceding 2 Maccabees. Among the former, one can single out a small group of five words that first appear in Polybius. In the following, we will examine whether the author of 2 Maccabees may possibly have derived them from the *Histories*. Together with these five Polybian neologisms[31] we will examine three words, which, albeit not new, are attested in Polybius in a novel sense that recurs either uniquely in 2 Maccabees or in 2 Maccabees and in very few other works. Our assessment will also take into consideration a number of word combinations which are either exclusive to Polybius and 2 Maccabees or shared by Polybius, 2 Maccabees, and a few subsequent writers.

Before we proceed, it is necessary to emphasize again[32] how dramatically small the fraction of Hellenistic literature that has been bequeathed to us is. "We know about, say, 5% of the literature which was in existence and which influenced the writers of late antiquity. We do not really know their literary world," writes Mortley (1996, 4). Save for fragments, usually transmitted second-hand, the historiographical and other sources from which Polybius, Jason of Cyrene, and/or the epitomator might have drawn part of their novel—or, rather, of what it seems to us to be novel—vocabulary are totally lost to us.

With these caveats in mind, we may now turn to a close examination of the Polybian neologisms that can be detected in 2 Maccabees.

---

[29] See 1.2.5 and Appendices 2 and 18.

[30] See the epitomator's statement at 2:26–31.

[31] The term 'Polybian neologism' here denotes a word that is first attested in the *Histories*, without implying that it was coined by Polybius.

[32] See 1.3.2.

7.5 Polybian neologisms in 2 Maccabees

7.5.1 ἀναστρατοπεδεύω 'to break camp'

Polybius uses στρατοπεδεύω with nine prefixes: ἀνα- (5x), ἀντι- (13x), ἐπι- (6x), μετα- (3x), κατα- (85x), παρα- (10x), περι- (9x), προς- (14x), and συν- (1x). ἀντιστρατοπεδεύω first appears in Herodotus, καταστρατοπεδεύω, περιστρατοπεδεύω, μεταστρατοπεδεύω, and συστρατοπεδεύω are first attested in Xenophon, and ἀναστρατοπεδεύω, ἐπιστρατοπεδεύω, παραστρατοπεδεύω, and προσστρατοπεδεύω first occur in Polybius. The latter also introduces the derivative nouns ἀναστρατοπεδεία, ἀντιστρατοπεδεία, and ἐπιστρατοπεδεία, which do not recur in extant Greek literature. The Septuagint employs the most common of the compounds formed from στρατοπεδεύω, καταστρατοπεδεύω (Josh 4:19; Jdt 3:10, 7:18; 2 Macc 4:22), as well as the Polybian neologisms ἀναστρατοπεδεύω (2 Macc 3:35) and ἐπιστρατοπεδεύω (Jdt 2:21).

In 2 Maccabees, ἀναστρατοπεδεύω occurs near the end of the Heliodorus episode, when the Seleucid official returns to King Seleucus IV after his thwarted attempt to seize the Temple treasure (ὁ δὲ Ἡλιόδωρος . . . ἀνεστρατοπέδευσε[33] πρὸς τὸν βασιλέα). A number of scholars (Bickerman 2007g, 1:446–64; Goldstein 1983, 210–12; Habicht 1979, 172–73) believe that this episode amalgamates two different versions (named A and B) of the same story.[34] Verse 35, in which ἀναστρατοπεδεύω is found, is ascribed by these scholars to version B, which may have been derived from an independent, pre-Jasonic source. The choice of the military verb ἀναστρατοπεδεύω is worthy of notice, as it suggests that, in his tour of inspection of the cities of Coele-Syria and Phoenicia (3:8 ὡς τὰς κατὰ Κοίλην Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην πόλεις ἐφοδεῦσαι), Heliodorus was at the head of a substantial military force, a fact not really made evident in the main part of the episode, where it is merely said that the Seleucid envoy was accompanied by a large retinue and all his bodyguard (3:24 σὺν τοῖς δορυφόροις; 3:28 μετὰ πολλῆς παραδρομῆς καὶ πάσης δορυφορίας). The last detail, as Willrich (1900, 165–66) has rightly remarked, is an "Unmöglichkeit," as the δορυφόροι could only accompany a king,[35] not a general or a minister.[36] Willrich suspected that 2 Macc 3:28 copied 3 Macc

[33] Codex Venetus has εστρατοπεδευσε.

[34] See 4.2.3.

[35] On the δορυφόροι, see Bikerman 1938, 26, 37, 52 and Corradi 1929, 306. The sole occurrence of δορυφορία prior to 2 Maccabees can be found in Xenophon. In *Cyr* 2.2.9–10, one of Cyrus' captains recounts an anecdote illustrating the naïve obedience of his young recruits: when he orders one of his lieutenants to fetch him a letter, the whole platoon runs along with him, so that the letter is brought with full military escort. The anecdote excites a general laugh (*Cyr.* 2.2.10 ἐγέλων ἐπὶ τῇ δορυφορίᾳ τῆς ἐπιστολῆς). In its subsequent instances, it is mainly used of the bodyguard of a king (Polyaen. 8.50.1.11), of a pretender to the throne (Memn. *FHG*, fr. 12.18), of a king's sister (Hld. 8.9.16) or of a rich man (Luc. *Par.* 59.6). 4 Maccabees (5:2; 6:1, 8, 23; 8:13; 9:16, 26; 11:9, 27; 17:1) mentions the δορυφόροι of King Antiochus IV, who serve as bodyguards and at the same time as torturers and executioners of the

2:23, where King Ptolemy IV Philopator, when attempting to enter the Jerusalem Temple, is accompanied by his σωματοφύλακες, yet it is more likely to have been the other way around. Bickerman argues that 2 Macc 3:28 belongs to version A, which was supposedly drawn from a pre-Jasonic source, Goldstein ascribes it to version B, whereas Habicht to version A, which, as he contends, was incorporated in the narrative by a hand later than that of Jason. Habicht's assumption seems to be more plausible than the other two, as it is rather unlikely that Jason, who has been so much praised by modern scholars for his accurate knowledge of the administrative and other terminology of his time,[37] would have erred so blatantly or that he would have embedded in his narrative material from a source that would have contained such a blunder. The version on which 3:28 drew probably recounted the attempted desecration of the Temple by a king (Ptolemy IV? Antiochus IV?) rather than by a high-ranking official.

The fact that 3:24 and 3:28 present Heliodorus accompanied by a retinue and bodyguards—a royal prerogative—whereas 3:35 has him at the head of a military force can be adduced as evidence supporting the two-version theory advanced by the aforementioned scholars. If this theory holds true and verse 35 belongs to version B, which is supposedly of pre-Jasonic origin, the verb ἀναστρατοπεδεύω, which occurs in this verse, can hardly have been borrowed from Polybius.

ἀναστρατοπεδεύω does not recur in 2 Maccabees, which elsewhere uses the much more common ἀναζευγνύω (13:26 [ὁ Λυσίας] ἀνέζευξεν εἰς Ἀντιόχειαν). In subsequent literature, it occurs only in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (4x), in Josephus (2x), in

---

seven brothers. The term παραδρομή, in the sense of "train, retinue," recurs in Posidon. fr. 136a Theiler [=Ath. 12.59.26 Kaibel; cf. D.S. 34/35.2.34], who speaks of a rich man who drove through the country on a chariot accompanied by flatterers and a bodyguard of slaves who ran around his chariot (διὰ μὲν τῆς χώρας τετρακύκλους ἀπήνας περιαγόμενος καὶ ἵππους καὶ θεράποντας ὡραίους καὶ παραδρομὴν ἀνάγωγον κολάκων τε καὶ παίδων στρατιωτικῶν). In the Septuagint, we encounter the term παρατρέχοντες, which designates the 'runners' who ran before the royal chariot or guarded the doors of the king's palace (1 Kgdms 22:17; 2 Kgdms 15:1; 3 Kgdms 1:5, 14:27; 4 Kgdms 10:25, 11:6, 19; 2 Chr 12:11). Abel (1949, 325) considers that παραδρομή may designate here "l'entourage des amis et fonctionnaires, la clique du chancelier," yet one does not see why Heliodorus, sent by the king on a mission of a financial nature, would be accompanied by all his clique. His entourage seems rather to have been modelled after that of a king. Compare, for instance, 3 Macc 2:23, where King Ptolemy IV Philopator attempts to enter the Temple accompanied by "his friends and bodyguards" (φίλοι καὶ σωματοφύλακες). In the corresponding episode in 4 Maccabees, when attempting to force his way into the Temple treasury, the general Apollonius is accompanied by neither bodyguards nor friends but by a strong military force (4:5 μετὰ βαρυτάτου στρατοῦ; 4:10 μετὰ καθωπλισμένης τῆς στρατιᾶς). These texts probably reflect or mingle two different traditions relating to attempts to desecrate the Temple, one involving a king accompanied by friends and bodyguards and another involving a general or a minister at the head of a military force.

[36] Heliodorus bore the office of "minister of affairs" (2 Macc 3:7 ὁ ἐπὶ τῶν πραγμάτων), on which see Corradi 1929, 256–67 and Bikerman 1938, 187–88.

[37] See 1.2.1 and cf. Habicht 1979, 190: "Mit Recht gerühmt worden ist immer die ausgezeichnete und präzise Kenntnis, die 2 Makk hinsichtlich der gemeingriechischen und besonders der seleukidischen Institutionen und der im königlichen Dienst stehenden Funktionäre und ihrer Amtsbezeichnungen beweist. Diese Daten machen das Werk zu einer der wichtigsten Informationsquellen für die seleukidische Monarchie und stellen zugleich Jason das Zeugnis eines vortrefflich informierten Historikers aus."

Plutarch (1x), in Appian (1x), and in Dio Cassius (1x). All these writers were readers of Polybius and familiar with his military terminology.[38]

7.5.2 ἐναπερείδομαι 'to vent upon'

In Polybius ἐρείδω is compounded with ἀντι-, ἀπο-, δια-, ἐναπο-, ἐξ-, ἐπι-, προς-, προσαπο-, προσεξ-, and συν-. Except for ἐναπερείδομαι and προσεξερείδομαι, all these verbs are attested in previous literature. προσεξερείδομαι is an absolute *hapax legomenon*. ἐναπερείδομαι occurs only once in the *Histories*, in a fragment of the non-extant twenty-second book transmitted through the Constantine Excerpts (*De legationibus* 1:44.22 de Boor) and paraphrased by Livy (39.34). Polybius uses it in the figurative sense "to take out on," "to vent upon": 22.13.2 Φίλιππος ὁ βασιλεύς . . . ἐναπηρείσατο τὴν ὀργὴν εἰς τοὺς ταλαιπώρους Μαρωνείτας[39] ("King Philip [V] . . . vented his fury on the unhappy people of Maronea" [trans. W.R. Paton, revised by F.W. Walbank and C. Habicht, LCL]). In the same sense, the verb recurs only in 2 Macc 9:4 ᾤετο καὶ τὴν τῶν πεφυγαδευκότων αὐτὸν κακίαν εἰς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους ἐναπερείσασθαι ("[King Antiochus IV] conceived the idea of turning upon the Judeans the injury done by those who had put him to flight" [NETS]) and in Diodorus Siculus (31.11.2 προσεύχεσθαι τῷ θεῷ . . . εἰ πάντως αὐτῷ τι πρᾶξαι δέδοκτο δυσχερές, τοῦτ' εἰς αὐτὸν ἐναπερείσασθαι "if it was certainly the divine pleasure to bring some hardship to pass, [Aemilius implored the god] that the burden might fall on him" [trans. F.R. Walton, LCL]).[40]

The Diodoran passage comes from a speech on the reversals of fortune that the Roman general Aemilius Paullus addressed to the public assembly after his triumph over King Perseus of Macedon, which coincided with the death of his two sons. Aemilius Paullus' speech, which in Diodorus is given in *oratio obliqua*, is reproduced in *oratio recta* in Livy (45.41) and in Plutarch (*Aem.* 36.3–9), and in *obliqua* switching into *recta* in Appian (*Mac.* 19). The general's confession that, in the midst of all his successes, he had prayed that if destiny had some misfortune in store it might befall him rather than the state, is found only in Diodorus (loc. cit.) and in Livy (45.41.8 mutationem eius domus mea potius quam res publica sentiret), but is echoed in the other two writers, too (Plu. *Aem.* 36.7 τηλικαύτῃ με προσπταῖσαι δυστυχίᾳ περὶ τὸν οἶκον; App. *Mac.* 19.3 εἰς ἐμὲ δὲ ἀποσκήψαντος τοῦ κακοῦ). As Schwarze (1891, 69–73) concluded from his comparison of the parallel passages in the aforementioned writers, the narrative of the death of Aemilius Paullus' sons and the speech delivered by him to the assembly must

[38] See K. Ziegler, "Polybios," PW 21.2, cols. 1573–74.

[39] In Livy's words: in Maronitas iram effundit.

[40] *DGE*, s.v. ἐναπερείδω A II.3, gives Plb. 22.13.2 and J. *BJ* 2.30 as examples of the meaning "descargar sobre." Josephus, however, in *BJ* 2.30, uses the verb in a different sense: τὸν ἀγῶνα τοῦ λόγου παντὸς ἐναπηρείσατο τῷ πλήθει τῶν περὶ τὸν ναὸν φονευθέντων ("proceeding to the main contention of his speech, he laid great stress on the multitude of Jews who had been massacred around the sanctuary" [trans. H.St.J. Thackeray, LCL]).

have been derived from one and the same source, a non-surviving passage of Polybius.[41] If this is so, one may conjecture that, of the four historians, Diodorus, at 31.11, adhered more closely to the phrasing of his source, as the occurrence of the Polybian verb ἐναπερείδομαι in his version of Aemilius' speech suggests. In its sparse attestations in subsequent Greek literature the verb appears in such different contexts and with such different meanings[42] that one is tempted to postulate that, in the specific sense in which it appears exclusively in Polybius, in 2 Maccabees, and in Diodorus Siculus, it was peculiar to the first-mentioned writer and that the other two derived it from him. Polybius also uses the more frequently attested compound ἀπερείδομαι, whose basic meaning is [LSJ]"to support onself upon, to rest upon,"[43] in the same figurative sense as ἐναπερείδομαι and conjoined with the same emotive terms (θυμός, ὀργή),[44] a usage that is found again in Josephus and in Plutarch.[45]

---

[41] Schwarze 1891, 73: "Comparatione igitur inter Plutarchum, Livium, Diodorum, Appianum absoluta, quoniam permultis locis non solum de rebus, sed etiam de singulis verbis inter se mirum in modum congruunt, facile quivis concesserit fieri non posse, quin statuamus illos esse secutos unum eundemque fontem. Quem fuisse Polybium quis tam caecus est, qui neget?" Cf. Nissen 1863, 278: "Es ist augenscheinlich, dass alle vier aus einer gemeinsamen Quelle, d. h. aus Polybios geschöpft haben müssen."

[42] Cf. Phld. *Lib.* col. XXIVa.6 θέ[λ]ουσ[ι δ]ὲ καὶ νομίζουσι συνφέρειν ἄρχειν πάντων κ[α]ὶ πά[ν]τα [δ'] αὑτοῖς ἐναπ[ερείδε]σθ[αι] καὶ ὑποτετάχθαι ("they [sc. the kings] wish, and believe that it is advantageous, to rule over everything and that everything [depend on] and be subordinated to themselves" [trans. Konstan et al. 1998, 127]); Philo *Spec.* 4.107 καθάπερ γὰρ τὸ μηρυκώμενον ζῷον, ὅταν διατεμὸν τὴν τροφὴν ἐναπερείσηται τῇ φάρυγγι ("for just as a cud-chewing animal after biting through the food keeps it at rest in the gullet" [trans. F.H. Colson, LCL]); Plu. *Mor.* 126E πιέζομεν σφόδρα τὰς ἁμαρτίας, ἐναπερειδόμενοι τῇ μνήμῃ ("we try hard to stifle the thought of our wrongdoings, setting ourselves against their remembrance"); 236D ἐπέδραμε τῇ λόγχῃ διαράμενος, καὶ ἐναπερείδων εἶπε ("he ran at it [sc. the ghost] with uplifted spear, and, as he thrust at it, he exclaimed" [trans. F.C. Babbitt, LCL]); Gal. 8.196 Kühn ὅταν ὁ σκορπίος ἐναπερείσηται τὸ κέντρον εἰς νεῦρον ("when the scorpion fixes his sting in a nerve"); Phalar. *Ep.* 69.2 βούλομαι τῶν παρ' ἐμοὶ χρημάτων μοῖραν οὐκ ὀλίγην ἐν ὑμῖν . . . ἐναπερείσασθαι ("I want to bestow no small part of my property to you"); Ael. *NA* 15.10 μία δὲ [sc. πηλαμὺς] ἡ μάλιστα προτένθης ὅταν τὸ στόμα ἐναπερείσῃ ("when the 'foretaster' [among the tunnies] has applied its mouth to them [sc. the baits]" [trans. A.F. Scholfield, LCL]).

[43] It occurs nine times in the Septuagint, in the sense [GELS]"to position (oneself) firmly," "to deposit."

[44] 1.69.7 ἀπερείσονται καὶ τὴν ὑπὲρ ἐκείνων ὀργὴν εἰς αὐτοὺς οἱ Καρχηδόνιοι; 15.25.25 τὴν ὀργὴν εἰς τὸν Ἀγαθοκλέα καὶ τὴν Ἀγαθόκλειαν ἀπερείσονται; 15.32.6 καὶ τοῦ πλήθους ἐπ' οὐδένα δυναμένου πέρας ἀπερείσασθαι τὴν ὁρμήν; 18.36.4 ἵνα μή . . . εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἀπερείδηται τὴν ὀργὴν ὁ Φίλιππος; 36.7.5 ἐπὶ τούτους ἀπηρείσαντο τὸν θυμόν.

[45] J. *BJ* 2.642 βοώντων δὲ τῶν λοιπῶν αἴτιον εἶναι μάλιστα τῆς ἀποστάσεως Κλεῖτόν τινα καὶ παρακαλούντων εἰς ἐκεῖνον ἀπερείδεσθαι τὴν ὀργήν; Plu. *Arist.* 7.2 τὴν πρὸς τὸ λυποῦν ἀπερειδομένου δυσμένειαν; *Mor.* 537A τὸ δὲ μῖσος ὥρισται, καθ' ὑποκειμένων ἀεί τινων ἀπερειδόμενον προσώπων; 775E οὐκ ἔχοντες δ' οἱ Λακεδαιμόνιοι, ὅπη τὸν θυμὸν ἀπερείσωνται. Cf. Suid. α 3039 ἀπερείσασθαι, ἐκβαλεῖν, ἐκκενῶσαι. ὥσπερ εἰς ἐκείνους βουλόμενοι ἀπερείσασθαι τὸν θυμόν. καὶ Ἰώσηπος· πρὸς τὸν αἴτιον ἀπερείδεσθαι ἔλεγε τὴν ὀργήν.

7.5.3 προεξαποστέλλω 'to send out before'

Of the ten compounds of στέλλω[46] employed by Polybius to express various nuances of "to send," only the triple-prefixed προεξαποστέλλω and συνεξαποστέλλω are previously unattested. συνεξαποστέλλω (7x in Polybius) recurs once in Diodorus Siculus (14.20.3) and then in a few Byzantine writers from the seventh century CE onwards. προεξαποστέλλω is even rarer, as, aside from 2 Maccabees (12:21 τὴν δὲ ἔφοδον μεταλαβὼν Ἰούδου προεξαπέστειλεν[47] ὁ Τιμόθεος τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀποσκευὴν εἰς τὸ λεγόμενον Κάρνιον), its only other instances in surviving Greek literature are found in the *Physiologus* (second century CE), and in a homily by the twelfth-century monk Neophytos the Recluse. In its three instances in Polybius (3.86.3; 18.19.5, 6), προεξαποστέλλω is used in contexts that differ from that in 2 Macc 12:21; be it noted, however, that the synonymous, but double-prefixed compound προαποστέλλω is used in combination with ἀποσκευή (as προεξαποστέλλω in 2 Macc 12:21) exclusively in Polybius (5.24.6 ὁ Φίλιππος . . . τὴν μὲν ἀποσκευὴν προαπέστειλε) and in Diodorus Siculus (19.26.3 αὐτὸς δὲ τὴν μὲν ἀποσκευὴν προαπέστειλε; 19.32.1 τὰ βαρύτατα τῆς ἀποσκευῆς προαπέστειλεν).

7.5.4 προσυπομιμνήσκω 'to remind in addition'

μιμνήσκω forms six compounds in Polybius: the single-prefixed ἀναμιμνήσκω (14x), ἐπιμιμνήσκομαι (3x), and ὑπομιμνήσκω (15x), and the double-prefixed παρυπομιμνήσκω (1x), προσαναμιμνήσκω (6x), and προσυπομιμνήσκω (2x). The first three verbs are attested as early as Homer, whereas the last three first occur in Polybius and are very rare thereafter. In the literature surviving from before the turn of the Common Era, παρυπομιμνήσκω, [LSJ]"record incidentally," recurs only in Philodemus' *On Vices* (*Vit.* cols. XII.12–13 and XIV.2–3 Jensen), written after 50 BCE, in a passage considered to paraphrase a work on arrogance by the Peripatetic Aristo of Ceos or the Stoic Aristo of Chios (both lived in the third century BCE),[48] προσαναμιμνήσκω, [LSJ]"remind of," is found again in a passage of Nicolaus of Damascus (*FHG* 3:49.198), and προσυπομιμνήσκω only in 2 Maccabees (15:9 προσυπομνήσας[49] δὲ [sc. ὁ Ἰούδας] αὐτοὺς καὶ τοὺς ἀγῶνας, οὓς ἦσαν ἐκτετελεκότες) and in Philodemus' *On Anger* (fr. 17, col. 3.16 Indelli). From the last-mentioned verb derives the adjective προσυπομνηστέον, which occurs in Strabo (17.3.1.4) and nowhere else. The author of 2 Maccabees has a liking for compounds (particularly double-prefixed) beginning with προς-; three such

[46] ἀνταποστέλλω (2x), ἀποστέλλω (90x), διαποστέλλω (7x), ἐξαποστέλλω (207x), ἐπαποστέλλω (12x), ἐπιστέλλω (1x), προαποστέλλω (8x), προεξαποστέλλω (3x), συναποστέλλω (2x), συνεξαποστέλλω (7x).

[47] V *q L′* read προσεξαπεστειλεν. The Old Latin translations unanimously render the verb by "pr(a)emisit."

[48] On the identity of the author quoted by Philodemus, see the discussion in Ranocchia 2007, 67–207 and cf. 3.4.1.

[49] Codex Alexandrinus has προσυμνησας.

compounds appear for the first time in the epitome.[50] Thus, it cannot be excluded that he coined or used προσυπομιμνήσκω independently of Polybius.

7.5.5 σπειρηδόν 'divided into σπεῖραι'

Adverbs of manner in -ηδόν are rather rarely encountered in ancient Greek poetry and prose.[51] The historiographers of the Classical period make a very sparing use of them: Herodotus has eight, Thucydides four, Xenophon none. Their Hellenistic confreres do not favour them particularly either: Polybius uses six, Diodorus Siculus three, Dionysius of Halicarnassus seven, Josephus three. Second Maccabees, a work one twenty-fifth the size of Polybius' *Histories* and one thirty-third the size of Diodorus' *Library of History*, has four. Half of the six adverbs ending in -ηδόν occurring in Polybius are attested in prior literature: ἀγεληδόν (1x) is first found in Homer, φαλαγγηδόν (3x) is previously attested only in Homer, and μετωπηδόν (7x) previously occurs only in Herodotus and in Thucydides. The other three adverbs, ζῳηδόν, a solitary *hapax* in the Greek language, σωρηδόν (3x), and σπειρηδόν (2x), are new formations.[52] σωρηδόν crops up again in Dionysius of Halicarnassus (1x), in an epigram of Antipater of Sidon (*AP* 7.713), in Philo (9x), in Josephus (1x), and in several subsequent writers. In the Septuagint it occurs only in Wis 18:23 (σωρηδὸν γὰρ ἤδη πεπτωκότων ἐπ' ἀλλήλων νεκρῶν), which offers a verbal parallel to Plb. 15.14.2 (τῶν νεκρῶν . . . αἱμοφύρτων καὶ σωρηδὸν πεπτωκότων).

σπειρηδόν as a military term derives from σπεῖρα in the sense of "tactical unit." Feyel (1935, 45–47), discussing the office of σπειράρχης, first attested in the military code of Amphipolis[53] issued around 200 BCE during the reign of Philip V, considers the σπεῖρα to be equivalent to the 256-man-strong σύνταγμα, the basic tactical unit of the Macedonian phalanx under Alexander, deployed in a sixteen-by-sixteen square.[54] Since σπεῖρα is not attested in any document referring to the army of Alexander or the Lagids[55] and σύνταγμα does not appear in the sources describing the organization of the

---

[50] προσαναλέγομαι (8:19), in the *hapax* sense LSJ"recount besides," προσεξηγέομαι (15:11), LSJ"relate besides," and the absolute *hapax legomenon* προσπυρόω (14:11), LSJ"kindle or incense still more."

[51] Hom. 6x, Hes. 2x, A. 3x, S. 1x, Ar. 6x, Hdt. 8x, Th. 4x, X. 0x, Hp. 4x, Pl. 1x, Arist. 3x, Thphr. 1x, Theoc. 1x, A.R. 4x, Plb. 6x, D.S. 3x, Str. 4x, D.H. 7x, LXX 7x, NT 1x, Philo 10x, J. 3x.

[52] See de Foucault 1972, 33–34.

[53] See text in Hatzopoulos 2001, 161–64 and translation in Austin 2006, 180–82.

[54] See also Walbank 1940, 293; Connolly 1987, 77; Hatzopoulos 1996, 453; id. 2001, 76–77.

[55] According to Bar-Kochva (1976, 66), the σπεῖραι were units in both the Antigonid and the Ptolemaic phalanx. Yet, the only instances of σπεῖρα in the Ptolemaic documentation, in two fragmentary Heracleopolite papyri (*BGU* 8.1806 [51/50 BCE] l. 4 [τ]ῆς Διφίλου σπείρας and *BGU* 8.1763 [49 BCE] l. 10 ἐκ τοῦ Σαδαλείου σπεῖρ[α]), are not earlier than the mid-first century BCE, that is, they postdate the arrival of the first Roman legions in Egypt. Van 't Dack (1988, 201, 222) considers it unlikely that an officer bearing the Greek name Δίφιλος would be the commander of a Roman unit at that date and believes that the term σπεῖρα, in the aforementioned papyri, probably corresponding to the Latin term

armies in the Greek continent after the death of Alexander, Feyel supposes that the former term was substituted for the latter in the Macedonian, Epirote, and confederate armies of the Greek continent after the death of Alexander.

Polybius, in the mid-second century BCE, uses σπεῖρα to designate three types of units: the just-mentioned 256-man-strong tactical unit in Philip V's, Antigonus Doson's, Pyrrhus', and Philopoemen's armies,[56] fighting groups of unspecified size in the Illyrian, Carthaginian, Celtic, and Iberian infantry,[57] and, most often, the tactical unit of the Roman infantry of his time, the maniple (Lat. *manipulus*), comprising 120 men, in the lines of the *hastati* and the *principes*, and 60 men, in the line of the *triarii*;[58] to designate the latter unit he also employs the terms τάγμα and σημαία.[59] Three maniples, the historian further informs us, formed a cohort.[60] Around 104–102 BCE, Marius' tactical reforms resulted in the replacement of the maniple by the cohort as the chief unit of the Roman army. Under the Empire, the cohort numbered 480 men; from the Flavian period, larger cohorts of 800–1,000 auxiliaries (*cohortes militariae*) were formed.[61] Consequently, the term σπεῖρα came to be used in Greek of the cohort in place of the maniple.[62] Greek historiographers of the first centuries BCE and CE employ σπεῖρα for Roman cohorts variously numbering from 500 to 1,000 men.[63] Be it noted that none of

---

cohors, attests to the influence of the occupant's army on the terminology and the institutions of the Lagids. See also Fischer-Bovet 2014, 113n245–46 and 147.

[56] 2.66.5; 2.67.2; 2.68.3, 8; 8.14.5; 11.12.5; 18.28.10.

[57] 2.3.2 (σπεῖραι of Illyrians, "probably kinship groups" [Walbank 1957–1979, 1:155]); 2.29.8 (σπεῖραι of Celts that fought in the battle of Telamon; probably "tribal contingents" [Allen 2001, 29]); 3.19.5 (σπεῖραι of Illyrians, as in 2.3.2); 3.114.4 (σπεῖραι of Celts and Iberians fighting under Hannibal in the battle of Cannae; probably "tribal units of irregular size" [Daly 2002, 96; 102; 163–64], perhaps numbering between 100 and 500 men [Connolly 1987, 187]); 9.3.2 (σπεῖραι of Carthaginians).

[58] 2.30.6; 2.33.4, 7; 3.110.6; 3.113.3; 3.115.6, 12; 6.24.5, 6, 7, 8; 11.23.1, 6; 14.8.7; 15.9.7. At 15.9.9 (ταῖς τῶν γροσφομάχων σπείραις) "σπεῖρα is 'company', used in a non-technical sense; the *velites* [γροσφομάχοι] were not divided into maniples" (Walbank 1957–1979, 2:455). See further Debrunner 1930, 244; Hatzopoulos 2001, 76; Fields 2007, 22–23; Keppie 1994, 33–35.

[59] Cf. 6.24.5 καὶ τὸ μὲν μέρος ἕκαστον ἐκάλεσαν καὶ τάγμα καὶ σπεῖραν καὶ σημαίαν, τοὺς δ' ἡγεμόνας κεντυρίωνας καὶ ταξιάρχους. Polybius uses the three terms indiscriminately. See the relevant passages in *PL* s.v. σπεῖρα, and cf. Lesquier 1973, 93; Feyel 1935, 46n1; Kromayer and Veith 1928, 132; Dubuisson 1985, 49–50.

[60] Plb. 11.23.1 τρεῖς σπείρας—τοῦτο δὲ καλεῖται τὸ σύνταγμα τῶν πεζῶν παρὰ Ῥωμαίοις κοόρτις. See Walbank 1957–1979, 2:302.

[61] See Keppie 1994, 63–67, 182–83 and Gmirkin 1996, 100–101.

[62] See Dubuisson 1985, 44.

[63] Cf. D.H. 9.63.5 ἦσαν δὲ δύο σπεῖραι περὶ αὐτὸν οὐ πλείους ἀνδρῶν ἔχουσαι χιλίων; 9.71.1 τέτταρας ἐξεστρατευμένας σπείρας, ἀνδρῶν ἑξακοσίων ἑκάστην; 10.43.3 σπεῖραν ἐπαγόμενος ὀκτακοσίων ἀνδρῶν; 11.25.2 σπεῖραν ἀνδρῶν ὀκτακοσίων . . . ἐπαγόμενον; J. *BJ* 3.67 τῶν δὲ σπειρῶν αἱ δέκα μὲν εἶχον ἀνὰ χιλίους πεζούς, αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ δεκατρεῖς ἀνὰ ἑξακοσίους μὲν πεζούς, ἱππεῖς δὲ ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν. On the use of the term σπεῖρα in the New Testament, see Brown 1995–2001, 3:116–118 and Schürer 1973–1987, 1:362–66 and 372n86.

the military theoreticians who wrote treatises on tactics between the first century BCE and the second century CE (Asclepiodotus, Aelian, Arrian) use the term σπεῖρα.[64]

To designate the arrangement in σπεῖραι Polybius uses either the adverbial phrase κατὰ σπείρας[65] or the adverb σπειρηδόν, formed on the analogy of the Homeric φαλαγγηδόν. De Foucault (1972, 33–34) considers σπειρηδόν to be a coinage of Polybius and notes that the historian likes to juxtapose an adverb in -ηδόν with an adverbial expression with κατά, as in 3.115.12 οὐκέτι φαλαγγηδόν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἄνδρα καὶ κατὰ σπείρας (not σπειρηδόν). Dubuisson (1985, 44, 56) further notes that σπειρηδόν corresponds to the Latin *manipulatim*, but remarks that Polybius does not use it in Roman contexts.

The adverb occurs twice in the *Histories*. The first time we are met with it is in the context of Philip V of Macedon's siege of Palus in 218 BCE. The king, the historian recounts, sent forward the peltasts under Leontius, having drawn them up in σπεῖραι (5.4.9 πρώτους ἐφῆκε τοὺς πελταστὰς τοὺς ὑπὸ Λεόντιον ταττομένους, σπειρηδὸν τάξας). Philip V's Macedonian σπεῖραι, as already explained, most likely consisted of 256 men.[66] The second occurrence of the adverb is found in the description of Philopoemen's army arrangement before the battle of Mantinea in 207 BCE. The Achaean general drew up his phalanx "in battalions with intervals between the companies"[67](11.11.6 τὴν φάλαγγα κατὰ τέλη σπειρηδὸν ἐν διαστήμασιν ἐπέστησε). The ancient tacticians describe τέλος as a phalanx division containing 2,048 men; [68] however, the term is often used in the general sense of "military unit," "division," regardless of the unit's manpower.[69] Polybius does not inform us either of the strength of Philopoemen's phalanx (the army of the Achaean League is assessed by modern historians as about 15,000–20,000 men; in the battle of Mantinea there were probably

[64] We may add here that one of the earliest attestations of σπεῖρα as a military term is found in Latin literature. In a line of Ennius' *Annales* (170s BCE), transmitted by the lexicon of Festus, the Greek word, transliterated into Latin, is used of a multitude of men: Enn. *apud* Fest. 490.15 'spira' dicitur . . . basis columnae . . . Ennius quidem hominum multitudinem ita appelat cum dicit—spiras legionibus nexit. Grilli (1974, 281–83) argues that 'spira,' in this line, does not refer to Roman maniples but to Greek σπεῖραι attached to Roman legions as *auxilia*. He hypothesizes that Ennius' line comes from a description of the battle of Magnesia (190 BCE), in which, according to Livy (37.39.9), the four legions of Lucius Cornelius Scipio were supported, on the right wing, by the 3,000 auxiliaries of King Eumenes of Pergamum. Grilli believes that these 3,000 men were the 'spirae' about which Ennius speaks. All this is, of course, pure speculation.

[65] 2.3.2 προῆγον κατὰ σπείρας ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν Αἰτωλῶν στρατοπεδείαν; 2.66.5 ὁ βασιλεὺς ἀντέταξε τῶν τε Μακεδόνων τοὺς χαλκάσπιδας καὶ τοὺς Ἰλλυριούς, κατὰ σπείρας ἐναλλὰξ τεταγμένους; 3.115.12 οὗτοι μὲν οὖν οὐκέτι φαλαγγηδόν, ἀλλὰ κατ' ἄνδρα καὶ κατὰ σπείρας . . . ἐποιοῦντο τὴν μάχην; 9.3.2 τῶν πεζῶν κατὰ σπείρας προσπιπτόντων. See Walbank 1957–1979, 1:155 and 280. Cf. the expressions κατὰ σημαίας and κατὰ τάγμα (see Dubuisson 1985, 43 and 50).

[66] See Walbank 1940, 293; Walbank 1957–1979, 1:541; Dubuisson 1985, 44.

[67] Trans. F.W. Walbank in Walbank 1957–1979, 2:286. On the meaning of the phrase, see also Kromayer 1903, 296n5 and Feyel 1935, 46.

[68] Arr. *Tact.* 10.5 αἱ δὲ δύο χιλιαρχίαι μεραρχία, δισχιλίων ἀνδρῶν καὶ ὀκτὼ καὶ τεσσαράκοντα . . . οἳ δὲ καὶ τέλος τοῦτο ὀνομάζουσιν. Cf. Ael. *Tact.* 9.7; Ascl. *Tact.* 2.10.

[69] See Kromayer 1903, 296.

no more than 12,000–14,000 men, perhaps 1,000 cavalry and 12,000 infantry)[70] or of the number and strength of its divisions. Yet, since Philopoemen had adopted the tactical unit of the Macedonian army,[71] we may assume that the σπεῖραι, of which the τέλη consisted, had a strength of 256 men each.

Aside from Polybius' *Histories*, the periphrasis κατὰ σπείρας recurs in the Septuagint, in Diodorus Siculus, and in Dionysius of Halicarnassus.[72] The adverb σπειρηδόν, as a military *terminus technicus*,[73] resurfaces only in 2 Maccabees and in Strabo. We will first examine the occurrence of the term in the latter author.

In a passage from the third chapter of the third book of his *Geography*, probably written in the second decade of the first century CE, Strabo describes the mode of life of the mountaineer tribes (Callaicans, Asturians, Cantabrians) living in the north of Iberia. Among their other usages, says the geographer, "they hold contests, for light-armed and heavy-armed soldiers and cavalry, in boxing, in running, in skirmishing, and in fighting by squads" (trans. H.L. Jones, LCL) (3.3.7.8 τελοῦσι δὲ [sc. οἱ ὄρειοι] καὶ ἀγῶνας γυμνικοὺς καὶ ὁπλιτικοὺς καὶ ἱππικούς, πυγμῇ καὶ δρόμῳ καὶ ἀκροβολισμῷ καὶ τῇ σπειρηδὸν μάχῃ). Schulten (1911, 580–81) has argued that Strabo's direct source for section 7 of chapter 3, in which the Polybian adverb is found, as well as for the preceding sections 3–6, which contain the description of Lusitania, is Polybius, who, in the thirty-fourth book of his *Histories*, now surviving only in fragments transmitted by later writers, dealt, inter alia, with Iberia. Lasserre (1966, 12n2) more credibly maintains that the ethnographic account of 3.3.5–7 passed to Strabo via Posidonius, Polybius' continuator, who, not having visited Lusitania himself, drew upon the latter's first-hand account of the region. Posidonius, Lasserre argues, reworked all the material that he drew from his source. Theiler (1982, 2:38), too, firmly ascribes 3.3.7 to Posidonius. Be that as it may, it seems highly likely that the ultimate source of the Strabonian passage in which σπειρηδόν occurs is Polybius.

It remains to examine whether the single other occurrence of the adverb as a military term, the one in 2 Maccabees, can also be referred back to Polybius. But first, it is necessary to look at how the author of 2 Maccabees uses the term σπεῖρα.

In the Septuagint, σπεῖρα occurs only in Jdt 14:11 and in 2 Macc 8:23, 12:20, and 12:22. Both the author/translator of Judith and the author of 2 Maccabees use σπεῖρα with reference to a military unit consisting of Jewish soldiers.[74] We do not know what the Hebrew counterpart of σπεῖρα could have been in Judith's *Vorlage*, supposing that it

---

[70] See Kromayer 1903, 289–90; Roloff 1903, 118; Walbank 1957–1979, 2:282.

[71] See Walbank 1957–1979, 2:286.

[72] Jdt 14:11 ἐξήλθοσαν κατὰ σπείρας ἐπὶ τὰς ἀναβάσεις τοῦ ὄρους; D.S. 23.2.1 κατὰ σπείρας μαχομένων; D.H. 5.42.2 παρεκάθηντο . . . οἱ Ῥωμαῖοι κατὰ σπείρας; 8.65.2 τὸ πεζὸν τῷ πεζῷ κατὰ σπείρας μαχόμενον; 8.84.1 οἱ στρατιῶται . . . κατὰ σπείρας τε καὶ κατὰ λόχους συνέβαλλον; 10.44.1 τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἔτασσεν ἱππεῖς τε καὶ τοὺς πεζοὺς κατὰ σπείρας.

[73] σπειρηδόν occurs in Josephus and in other later writers in the non-military sense "in coils."

[74] On the vocabulary affinities between Judith and 1 and 2 Maccabees, see Moore 1985, 50–51, 239 and Gera 2014, 40–41, 55.

ever had one.[75] Nor is the strength of the σπεῖραι that went out to the mountain passes to fight the Assyrians (14:11 καὶ ἀνέλαβεν πᾶς ἀνὴρ τὰ ὅπλα αὐτοῦ καὶ ἐξήλθοσαν κατὰ σπείρας ἐπὶ τὰς ἀναβάσεις τοῦ ὄρους) specified in the book. Baslez (2004, 367) is right in presuming that those σπεῖραι were small-sized units capable of operating in the mountains, but probably errs in pinning down their strength to 256 men each.[76] The author/translator of Judith seems to be using the expression κατὰ σπείρας in a fluid way, perhaps referring to kinship groups, as Polybius on a number of occasions does.[77]

In 2 Maccabees, the numerical data for the Maccabean forces are more precise, yet the terminology is puzzling. At 8:16–23, before the battle at Emmaus against Nicanor (165

[75] On the possibility of Judith being an original Greek composition, see Joosten 2012, 195–209.

[76] "Dans le texte de *Judith* (Jdt 4 [read 14], 11), *speira* doit manifestement être pris dans le sens polybien de "compagnie" de 256 hommes, puisqu'il s'agit d'une sortie, qui n'engage pas l'ensemble de l'armée." As the previous discussion has made clear, in Polybius σπεῖρα does not designate a unit having a standard numerical strength of 256 men. It may indeed refer to the tactical unit of 256 men in the Macedonian, Epirote, and confederate armies of the Greek continent, but more often it renders the Latin *manipulus*, a unit of 120 men, and in a few instances it is used as a general term for 'company.' Baslez (loc. cit.) further asserts that "l'emploi des termes *speira* (Jdt 14,11), 'stratège' (Jdt 2,14; 5,2; 7,8; 14,3 et 12) et 'chiliarque' (Jdt 14,12) évoque l'organigramme suggéré par Polybe pour l'armée séleucide, dont on n'a pas autrement traces (note 27: Polybe XVIII, 30, 1. Voir Bar Kochva (1976), p. 66). Selon l'historien grec, 'stratège' s'appliquait à un commandant de corps de 4000 hommes, 'chiliarque' au commandant d'un régiment de 1000 hommes, qui était subdivisé en *speirai* de 256 hommes, elles-mêmes réparties en 'tétrarchies' de 64 hommes, puis en 'décades' ou 'files' de 16. . . . On pourrait en induire que l'auteur de *Judith* était réellement familier des réalités militaires séleucides." What Bar-Kochva (1976, 66), to whom Baslez refers, actually writes is the following: "Next to nothing is known about the tactical units of the Seleucid phalanx and their subdivisions. It is generally assumed, on the evidence of some scattered references, that the Antigonid and Ptolemaic phalanx was divided into *strategiai* of 4,000 each, the *strategiai* into four chiliarchies of 1,000, the chiliarchy into four *speirai* of 256, the *speira* into four *tetrarchies* of sixty four, and the *tetrarchy* into four 16-man *dekades* or *semaiai* in Egypt, and *lochoi* in Antigonid Macedon. All these subdivisions are obviously based on the file of 16 men (see Polyb. 18.30.1). . . . The *strategia* itself is never mentioned as a tactical unit in the Seleucid army, but some of the Seleucid *strategoi*, usually regarded as governors of provinces or officers of independent contingents, may well have been commanders of *strategiai*. . . . Smaller subunits are mentioned twice: . . . *tagmata* . . . and . . . *semaiai*." The point is that we have no concrete evidence from Polybius (who, at 18.29–30, describes the organization of the Macedonian phalanx, not that of the Seleucid army) or from elsewhere that the σπεῖρα was a unit in the Seleucid army and cannot securely infer from the use of the term in Judith and in 2 Maccabees that their respective authors were familiar with the Seleucid military realities. The confusion as regards the type and the numerical strength of the σπεῖραι mentioned in Septuagint texts is evident even in the specialized lexica. For σπειρηδόν, *GELS* gives the meaning "in groups of 60 or 120 troops," assuming that the Maccabean σπεῖρα had a strength equal to that of a Roman maniple, and LEH "by cohorts, in troops," although σπεῖρα in the Septuagint and in Polybius does not designate a Roman cohort.

[77] When referring, for instance, to companies of non-Greek or non-Roman infantry. See Walbank (1957–1979, 1:155), who, apropos of the Illyrians advancing κατὰ σπείρας on the Aetolian camp, in Plb. 2.3.2, quotes Hom. *Il.* 2.362–63 κρῖν' ἄνδρας κατὰ φῦλα, κατὰ φρήτρας, Ἀγάμεμνον, / ὡς φρήτρη φρήτρηφιν ἀρήγῃ, φῦλα δὲ φύλοις and Tac. *Germ.* 7.3 non casus nec fortuita conglobatio turmam aut cuneum facit, sed familiae et propinquitates, and reminds us that "in recent times the Albanians, descendants of Agron's Illyrians, fought in tribes and 'bairaq' (smaller kinship groups), and the Montenegrin Slavs in 'bratstva' (brotherhoods)."

BCE), Judas divides his army of circa 6,000 men into four units, each 1,500 strong, and places them under the command of his brothers, while he himself leads the first σπεῖρα:

> 8 [16]συναγαγὼν δὲ ὁ Μακκαβαῖος τοὺς περὶ αὐτὸν ὄντας ἀριθμὸν ἑξακισχιλίους . . . [21]τετραμερές τι τὸ στράτευμα ἐποίησεν.[78] [22]τάξας καὶ τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς αὐτοῦ προηγουμένους ἑκατέρας τάξεως, Σίμωνα καὶ Ἰώσηπον καὶ Ιωναθαν, ὑποτάξας ἑκάστῳ χιλίους πρὸς τοῖς πεντακοσίοις, [23]ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ελεάζαρον, παραναγνοὺς τὴν ἱερὰν βίβλον καὶ δοὺς σύνθημα θεοῦ βοηθείας τῆς πρώτης σπείρης αὐτὸς προηγούμενος συνέβαλε τῷ Νικάνορι.[79]
>
> 8 [16]Maccabeus, gathering the 6000 in number who were with him . . . [21]He divided them into something of a four-part army. [22]After he appointed his brothers Simon, Joseph and Jonathan as leaders of each unit, assigning to each 1500 men, [23]and also Eleazar, and after reading the sacred book and giving the motto "God's help," he himself led the first unit and threw himself at Nicanor. (Trans. Schwartz 2008, 321)[80]

How are we to understand this passage? At least three possibilities present themselves to us.

The first possibility is that the author is using σπεῖρα interchangeably with τάξις to designate each of the four divisions of Judas' army. If that is so, numerically speaking, the strength of the Maccabean σπεῖρα (1,500 men) would far exceed that of the Antigonid σπεῖρα of 256 men or the Roman σπεῖρα/*manipulus* of 120 men, of which Polybius talks, or the post-Marian Roman cohort of 480 men, or even the *cohors militaria* of 800–1,000 auxiliaries; it could only be paralleled with that of each of the six

---

[78] De Bruyne (1922, 39) rightly suspects the phrase τετραμερές τι τὸ στράτευμα ἐποίησεν, which is omitted by all the Old Latin versions bar La^{P}, to be a gloss meant to make the narrative clearer.

[79] The problematic, perhaps corrupt, text of these verses has given rise to considerable debate concerning the number and the names of the commanders of Judas' army: 1 Macc 2:2–5, followed by Josephus (*AJ* 12.266), names John, Simon, Eleazar, and Jonathan as brothers of Judas; 2 Macc 8:22 mentions a Joseph instead of John. The phrase ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ελεάζαρον implies that Eleazar (named Esdras in the Old Latin versions) was appointed, along with Simon, Joseph and Jonathan, commander of one of the four units. Wellhausen (1905, 133n3), Katz (1960, 14), Habicht (1979, 241n21), and Doran (2012, 169, 177) take this phrase to be an interpolation meant to supply us with the name of the only brother of Judas not included in the polysyndeton Σίμωνα καὶ Ἰώσηπον καὶ Ιωναθαν. Yet, the figure that we find here, that is, the addition of an extra element, introduced by ἔτι δὲ καί, to an array of two or three other elements, occurs often in 2 Maccabees (cf. 8:30 ἰσομοίρους αὐτοὺς καὶ τοῖς ᾐκισμένοις καὶ ὀρφανοῖς καὶ χήραις, ἔτι δὲ καὶ πρεσβυτέροις ποιήσαντες; 9:7 οὐδαμῶς τῆς ἀγερωχίας ἔληγεν, ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας ἐπεπλήρωτο; 10:7 θύρσους καὶ κλάδους ὡραίους, ἔτι δὲ καὶ φοίνικας ἔχοντες; 10:19 ἀπολιπὼν Σίμωνα καὶ Ἰώσηπον, ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ζακχαῖον), so that one can hardly argue that at 8:23 it is a gloss. We may even ascribe it to the epitomator, since the first time it occurs in 2 Maccabees is in the latter's prologue (2:20 τὰ δὲ κατὰ τὸν Ἰούδαν τὸν Μακκαβαῖον καὶ τοὺς τούτου ἀδελφοὺς καὶ τὸν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ μεγίστου καθαρισμὸν καὶ τὸν τοῦ βωμοῦ ἐγκαινισμὸν ἔτι τε τοὺς πρὸς Ἀντίοχον . . . πολέμους). Grimm (1857, 140–41), Abel (1949, 391), and Goldstein (1983, 334–35), by adopting the reading παραναγνῶναι instead of παραναγνούς (τάξας . . . Ελεάζαρον παραναγνῶναι τὴν ἱερὰν βίβλον), assign Eleazar the non-military, priestly function of reading from the sacred book before the battle.

[80] We give here Schwartz's translation, which, unlike NETS and other translations, in these verses follows closely Hanhart's text.

τάξεις of Alexander's 'foot companions' (πεζέταιροι).[81] That would mean that the author of 2 Maccabees does not use the term σπεῖρα in the strict technical sense in which Polybius in the second century BCE uses it when speaking of Macedonian or Roman infantry forces, but loosely, to simply denote a 'military unit,' a 'division.'[82] Polybius himself occasionally employs the term in this non-specific sense with regard to non-Greek/Roman army units,[83] as, for instance, when describing the 5,000 Illyrians advancing against the Aetolians κατὰ σπείρας (2.3.2), "i.e. in small companies, probably kinship groups," as Walbank (1957–1979, 1:155) remarks. In such a case, however, one would have at least expected the author of 2 Maccabees to have known (as the author/translator of Judith apparently knew) that σπεῖρα could be used of a numerically small unit, but hardly of a 1,500-man division.

The second possibility is that each 1,500-strong τάξις was divided into smaller units of indeterminate size that the author of 2 Maccabees thought could be aptly termed as σπεῖραι; the four τάξεις were under the command of Judas' four brothers, whereas Judas himself was at the head of the first σπεῖρα of the τάξις that led the attack. However, as Goldstein (1983, 335) has rightly remarked, "Judas surely did not assign to himself a smaller unit than those he had allotted to his brothers."[84] The author uses for him the same participle, προηγούμενος, that he uses for the rest of his brothers, which seems to suggest that all the Maccabean brothers named at 8:22–23 had the same unit-commanding role in the battle. To account for the fact that there were five brothers for four units, one may accept with Schwartz (2008, 340) that "Judas himself took command of the first of the four units mentioned in v. 22, although he had appointed a separate commander for it." That Judas had the *Gesamtbefehl* in the ensuing battle is made clear by his leading the attack.

The third possibility is that the usage of σπεῖρα here indicates a time of composition or final redaction of the passage under consideration after the second century BCE, when the term came to designate large units (cohorts), ranging in size from 500 to 1,000 troops.[85] Goldstein (1983, 335) rightly assumed that we may get "a clue that he [sc. the

---

[81] See Kromayer and Veith 1928, 99; Hatzopoulos 1996, 247–48n8; Heckel and Jones 2006, 10–11 and 43.

[82] Cf. Abel 1949, 392 and Doran 2012, 177 and 241.

[83] See the relevant passages in *PL* s.v. σπεῖρα, 2. On Polybius' 'non-technical' usage of terms rendering Roman realities, see Dubuisson 1985, 56–57: "Bon nombre des termes employés ne sont pas réservés aux contextes romains, ni même caractéristiques de ceux-ci. Οὐλαμός et ἴλη désignent non seulement la *turma*, mais aussi, de façon générale, tout escadron de cavalerie, quelle que soit sa nationalité. Il en va de même, dans l'infanterie, pour σπεῖρα, et κατὰ σπεῖραν, qui correspond au *manipulatim* romain, se trouve à propos de batailles entre Grecs. . . . Le caractère parfois très imparfait des équivalences choisies, l'emploi des termes dans des contextes non romains et leur polysémie, tout concourt à montrer que le vocabulaire appliqué par Polybe aux réalités romaines n'est pas technique, c'est-à-dire qu'il n'est pas constitué d'un ensemble de mots pourvus d'un sens précis et spécifique et appliqués chacun à rendre un concept déterminé." See also Langslow 2012, 102–104.

[84] Goldstein (ad loc.) assumes that Judas was one of the four commanders of the Jewish force and that Eleazar was "an extra commander available to replace any of his brothers should one be incapacitated."

[85] See J. *BJ* 3.67 τῶν δὲ σπειρῶν αἱ δέκα μὲν εἶχον ἀνὰ χιλίους πεζούς, αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ δεκατρεῖς ἀνὰ ἑξακοσίους μὲν πεζούς, ἱππεῖς δὲ ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν. In NT Acts 21:31, a σπεῖρα is under the command of a

author of 2 Maccabees] wrote no earlier than the end of the second century BCE"; however, the fact that the Maccabean σπεῖρα "is considerably larger even than a Roman cohort of 1,000" led him to conclude that "the word here is not a secure clue as to date." It has to be remarked, though, that a σπεῖρα of 1,500 men is numerically closer to a cohort of 1,000 men than to the 256-strong Macedonian σπεῖρα and the 120-strong Roman *manipulus* that could have been known to a second-century BCE writer. Jason of Cyrene could not have been so ignorant of the military *realia* of his time as to call a 1,500-strong unit a σπεῖρα, but the epitomator, or possibly a subsequent redactor/editor, living perhaps in the first century BCE, or later, in the first century CE, would have been more justified in doing so.

It should be noted that the information about the division of the Maccabean army set forth in 2 Macc 8:21–23 differs from that given in the corresponding passage of 1 Maccabees. First Maccabees 3:55 says that Judas appointed leaders of the people (i.e. the army), officers of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens (κατέστησεν Ἰούδας ἡγουμένους τοῦ λαοῦ, χιλιάρχους καὶ ἑκατοντάρχους καὶ πεντηκοντάρχους καὶ δεκαδάρχους). This is the traditional, 'biblical' division of Jewish militias, as known from Exod 18:21, 18:25 and Deut 1:15,[86] as well as from other texts such as the War Scroll from Qumran, which is thought to reflect the organization and the tactics of the Maccabean army.[87] In 1QM 4.1–5, the force of the Sons of Light is also arranged in divisions of thousands, hundreds, fifties, and tens. Moreover, both 1 Maccabees (5:33) and the War Scroll (1QM 8.6) feature the 'biblical' organisation of the army into three sections (see Judg 6:16 and 9:43; 1 Kgdms 11:11; 2 Kgdms 18:1–2).[88] Bar-Kochva (2002, 256) rightly remarks that the tactical distribution in 2 Macc 8:21–23 "has no parallel in either Jewish or Hellenistic military tradition" and "can hardly be considered more reliable than 1 Maccabees." We may thus envisage a fourth possibility, namely that the author of 2 Maccabees was misinformed as regards the division of the Maccabean army at Emmaus and that Judas divided his 6,000 men into six chiliarchies.[89]

---

chiliarch (τῷ χιλιάρχῳ τῆς σπείρης). Appian even speaks of a preatorian cohort numbering 2,000 men (*BC* 4.15.115 ἦγε δὲ καὶ στρατηγίδα σπεῖραν, ἐς δισχιλίους ἄνδρας).

[86] Cf. J. *AJ* 12.301 διατάξας δὲ [sc. ὁ Ἰούδας] τὸν ἀρχαῖον αὐτοὺς τρόπον καὶ πάτριον κατὰ χιλιάρχους καὶ ταξιάρχους. Josephus is, of course, following 1 Maccabees.

[87] According to Davies (1977, 65–67), cols. 2–9 of the War Scroll, presenting the disposition of the troops, the weapons, and the battle tactics of the Sons of Light, were compiled on the basis of a Jewish military manual illustrating the Maccabean warfare practices. Gmirkin (1998, 202, 208) argues that the War Scroll was "the official war manual of the Maccabean army," and that the composition of cols. 2–9, which he dates to 164/163 BCE, soon after the restoration of the Temple, "was primarily motivated by the urgent need to professionally train the new army of the second phase of the Maccabean revolt in Roman military organization and tactics."

[88] See Avi-Yonah 1952, 1–3; Davies 1977, 60–61; Gmirkin 1996, 125.

[89] Avi-Yonah (1976, 160), in an effort to reconcile the contradicting evidence found in 1 Macc 3:55 and in 2 Macc 8:21–22, has ingeniously posited that "the full complement of the Hasmonean army was divided into six groups of 1,000 men each. Four of them were commanded by the Hasmonean brothers (with the exception of Johanan) and the remaining two by Joseph and Azariah [the commanders mentioned in 1 Macc 5:56]." This hypothesis, however, is based on the frail assumption that the Joseph mentioned in 1

Let us now look closely at the two instances of the adverb σπειρηδόν in 2 Maccabees, starting with the one at 12:20. Before launching the attack against Timotheos near Karnion (164/163 BCE), Judas divides his army, this time of unspecified size, but probably of no less than 6,000 and possibly as many as 8,000 men,[90] into σπεῖραι, and once again leads himself the attack:

> 12 [19]Δωσίθεος δὲ καὶ Σωσίπατρος τῶν περὶ τὸν Μακκαβαῖον ἡγεμόνων ἐξοδεύσαντες ἀπώλεσαν τοὺς ὑπὸ Τιμοθέου καταλειφθέντας ἐν τῷ ὀχυρώματι πλείους τῶν μυρίων ἀνδρῶν. [20]ὁ δὲ Μακκαβαῖος διατάξας τὴν περὶ αὑτὸν στρατιὰν σπειρηδὸν κατέστησεν αὐτοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν σπειρῶν καὶ ἐπὶ τὸν Τιμόθεον ὥρμησεν. . . . [22]ἐπιφανείσης δὲ τῆς Ἰούδου σπείρης πρώτης . . .
>
> 12 [19]Dositheus and Sosipater, two of Maccabeus' officers, set out and destroyed those Timothy had left behind in the fortress—more than 10,000 men. [20]And Maccabeus, having divided his army into units, appointed them over the units and stormed out after Timothy. . . . [22]When Judas' first unit appeared . . . (Trans. Schwartz 2008, 415)

Here, too, the text is not very enlightening as regards the division of the army and the tactical details of the battle, either because Jason was not particularly interested in providing that information or, more likely, because the epitomator sacrificed precision to brevity. How many were the σπεῖραι and their commanders? What was the manpower of each σπεῖρα?

The phrase κατέστησεν αὐτοὺς (the pronoun most likely refers to the previously mentioned commanders Dositheos and Sosipatros) ἐπὶ τῶν σπειρῶν implies that there were two σπεῖραι, or rather three, since Judas, too, along with Dositheos and Sosipatros, appears to have been one of the commanders, commanding the first σπεῖρα.[91] Grimm (1857, 178), Abel (1949, 438), Habicht (1979, 263n20a), and Doran (2012, 232) prefer to read here, instead of the received αὐτούς, which Hanhart (2008, 30) defends as "ursprünglich," τούς (κατέστησε τοὺς ἐπὶ τῶν σπειρῶν, "he set men in command of the divisions" [NETS]), a reading suggesting that there were several divisions and respective commanders.

Macc 5:56 is the Joseph of 2 Macc 8:22, and that Azariah, who is also mentioned in 1 Macc 5:56 as having been defeated, together with Joseph, by Gorgias, two years after the battle at Emmaus, was one of the commanders of Judas' army at Emmaus.

[90] The number 6,000 is given only by one of the Old Latin translations (La^{V} ordinatis circum se sex milibus), probably on the analogy of the size that Judas' army is said to have had at 8:16. The number 8,000 is postulated on the basis of 1 Macc 5:20. See Goldstein 1983, 442. 2 Maccabees gives the exact numerical strength of the enemy force: 122,500 men (12:20).

[91] Note the difference between 8:23, where Judas leads the *first* σπεῖρα (τῆς πρώτης σπείρης αὐτὸς προηγούμενος) and 12:22, where he leads his *own* σπεῖρα (ἐπιφανείσης δὲ τῆς Ἰούδου σπείρης πρώτης).

Apropos of this conjecture, Habicht (loc. cit.) makes the following comment:

> Grimms von Fritzsche und Abel, S. 438, gebilligte Konjektur τούς statt αὐτούς ist aus sprachlichen und sachlichen Gründen unabweisbar, denn σπεῖρα, eine kleine Einheit, die der römischen *cohors* von regelmässig 500 Mann etwa entspricht, kann schwerlich auf die Hälfte des Gesamtheeres angewendet worden sein. Und sprachlich kann sich αὐτούς an dieser Stelle nicht mehr auf die lange zuvor genannten Kommandeure beziehen, sondern nur noch auf die 10,000 erschlagenen Feinde.

Habicht takes the σπεῖρα to be equivalent to the 500-man-strong Roman *cohors*. This is not accurate, since, as previously explained, the Antigonid σπεῖρα and the σπεῖρα/*manipulus* of the second century BCE differed in size from the σπεῖρα/*cohors* that we know from the first century BCE onwards. Even if Judas had organized his army along Roman lines, as Goldstein (1983, 335) and Gmirkin (1996), for instance, have suggested, his σπεῖραι would have been of a size equivalent to that of the Roman maniples of his time, which numbered 120 men. Further, Habicht's grammatical argument for rejecting αὐτούς cannot be considered to be very strong. Dositheos and Sosipatros are prominently mentioned at the beginning of verse 19 (subjects of the verb of the sentence) and the 10,000 casualties of the enemy at the end (object of the verb of the sentence). αὐτούς, in the ensuing verse 20, may grammatically refer back to either Dositheos and Sosipatros or the 10,000 casualties, but semantically it can only refer to the former; the distance of the anaphoric pronoun from the subjects of the previous sentence is not so great as to cause semantic confusion.[92]

Grimm's (1857, 178) argument for dismissing αὐτούς is also weak: if the author had wanted to say that Judas divided his army into two parts and appointed Dositheos and Sosipatros as leaders of each part, he would have chosen a clearer expression ("das hätte deutlicher ausgedrückt werden müssen"), so that one might not understand that they were both placed at the head of the entire army, and, besides, one would have expected ἐκείνους instead of αὐτούς. This is not the only instance, alas, in which the epitome does not comply with our expectations for clarity, and, as regards the pronoun, one may adduce 8:22, where ἑκάτερος is "abnorm gebraucht," as the same Grimm (1857, 140) remarks, in lieu of ἕκαστος. The reading τούς not being supported by any Greek manuscript,[93] it is wiser to retain the admittedly unclear received text and understand it

[92] Other verses in 2 Maccabees give rise to more serious ambiguity. Cf., for instance, 12:10 ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀποσπάσαντες σταδίους ἐννέα, ποιουμένων τὴν πορείαν ἐπὶ τὸν Τιμόθεον, προσέβαλον Ἄραβες αὐτῷ οὐκ ἐλάττους τῶν πεντακισχιλίων. Here αὐτῷ does not refer to the just-mentioned Timotheos, but to Judas, who is the subject of the verbs of the preceding verses.

[93] It is corroborated only by the Syriac version (cf. Grimm 1857, 178 and Hanhart 2008, 30). The Old Latin translations omit any reference to the assignment of commanders (La^L Ad macchabeus, ordinata circum se militia et constitutis super cohortes; La^V At machabeus, ordinatis circum se sex milibus et constitutis per cohortes; La^B Machabeus autem ordinans exercitum suum per turmas et choortes, constituit eos in ordines; La^M Machabeus itaque ordinans exercitum suum per turmas et choortes, constituit eos in ordine; La^P machabeus, disposito exercitu suo per quohortes, constituit eos in ordines). In La^X (Maccabeus autem ordinabit circum se militiam et constituit super coortes) the missing object of

as meaning that Judas divided his army into *three* parts: two σπεῖραι were under the command of Dositheos and Sosipatros,[94] and the third σπεῖρα, that led the attack, was under Judas' command. This understanding of the text allows us to harmonize 2 Macc 12:20 with 1 Macc 5:33, which tells us that in one of the stages of his campaign against Timotheos, Judas divided his army into three parts: καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἐν τρισὶν ἀρχαῖς ἐξόπισθεν αὐτῶν.[95] However that may be, the term σπεῖρα appears once again to be designating a unit over a thousand men strong.

The other instance of σπειρηδόν occurs earlier in the narrative, at 5:2, in the context of an epiphany which took place prior to Antiochus IV's second campaign against Egypt (170/169 BCE). For forty days, the author tells us,

> 5 [2]there appeared over all the city [sc. Jerusalem] golden-clad cavalry charging through the air, in companies fully armed with lances and drawn daggers—[3]troops of cavalry drawn up, attacks and counterattacks made on this side and on that, brandishing of shields, massing of spears, hurling of missiles, the flash of golden trappings and armor of all kinds. (Trans. J. Schaper, NETS)

> 5 [2]συνέβη δὲ καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν . . . φαίνεσθαι διὰ τῶν ἀέρων τρέχοντας ἱππεῖς διαχρύσους στολὰς ἔχοντας καὶ λόγχας σπειρηδὸν ἐξωπλισμένους [3]καὶ μαχαιρῶν σπασμοὺς[96] καὶ ἴλας ἵππων διατεταγμένας καὶ προσβολὰς γινομένας καὶ καταδρομὰς ἑκατέρων καὶ ἀσπίδων κινήσεις καὶ καμάκων πλήθη καὶ βελῶν βολὰς καὶ χρυσέων κόσμων ἐκλάμψεις καὶ παντοίους θωρακισμούς.

At first glance, the adverb σπειρηδόν seems inapposite here: the σπεῖρα was an infantry unit,[97] but in the above-described epiphanies the aerial battles appear to be fought by cavalry troops alone, as the terms ἱππεῖς and ἴλαι ἵππων at 5:2–3 suggest.[98] Goldstein

---

constituit could have been a term designating the unit commanders, e.g. *duces*. See Abel 1949, 438. We note here that, in rendering σπεῖρα as *cohors*, the Old Latin translations of 2 Maccabees reflect the terminology of the time in which they were made (second and third centuries CE).

[94] In the ensuing battle, Dositheos and Sosipatros are the only commanders mentioned aside from Judas: 12:23–24 ἐποιεῖτο δὲ τὸν διωγμὸν εὐτονώτερον Ἰούδας . . . αὐτὸς δὲ ὁ Τιμόθεος ἐμπεσὼν τοῖς περὶ τὸν Δωσίθεον καὶ Σωσίπατρον.

[95] Cf. Goldstein 1983, 441: "The data on how Judas subdivided his army here [=2 Macc 12:20] (under two commanders) and at I [=1 Macc] 5:33 (in three columns) refer to different stages of the campaign and need not be in conflict."

[96] The phrase καὶ μαχαιρῶν σπασμούς is rather to be moved after πλήθη, as suggested by the Old Latin versions. See Habicht 1979, 225.

[97] Occasionally, we do find mention of Roman σπεῖραι (=cohorts) containing both infantry and cavalry: D.H. 10.44.1 τοὺς μὲν ἄλλους ἔτασσεν ἱππεῖς τε καὶ τοὺς πεζοὺς κατὰ σπείρας; J. *BJ* 3.67 τῶν δὲ σπειρῶν αἱ δέκα μὲν εἶχον ἀνὰ χιλίους πεζούς, αἱ δὲ λοιπαὶ δεκατρεῖς ἀνὰ ἑξακοσίους μὲν πεζούς, ἱππεῖς δὲ ἑκατὸν εἴκοσιν; App. *BC* 1.10.87 σπεῖραι πέντε πεζῶν καὶ δύο ἱππέων. Polybius, too, at 15.4.4, uses the term σημαία, equivalent to the Greek σπεῖρα and the Latin *manipulus*, with regard to companies of foot and horse (προσλαβὼν δέκα σημαίας Ῥωμαϊκὰς ἱππέων καὶ πεζῶν). See Walbank 1957–1979, 2:445.

[98] The weapons mentioned here are mainly (but not exclusively) cavalry weapons. The κάμαξ and the μάχαιρα were weapons for fighting from horseback at close quarters (see Spence 1993, 51–56); for the

(1983, 247) ingeniously suggested that λόγχη should be taken here in the poetic sense of "troop of spearmen," attested in Sophocles and Euripides,[99] and accordingly translated 5:2b as "there were cavalry at a gallop, dressed in garments of cloth of gold, and troops of armed spearmen formed into regiments" (ib. 244). However, if that were the case, the perfect participle of ἐξοπλίζομαι would have agreed in gender with λόγχας (λόγχας σπειρηδὸν ἐξωπλισμένας). Since we have no reason to question the reading ἐξωπλισμένους, which is almost unanimously supported by the Greek manuscripts,[100] we should rather dismiss this suggestion. The problem can be remedied if we accept Abel's (1949, 348) proposal to read λόχους, '(infantry) companies,' instead of λόγχας, 'lances.'[101] In the Hellenistic period, the λόχος was the basic infantry unit, generally numbering sixteen men;[102] sixteen λόχοι formed the 256-strong σπεῖρα previously discussed apropos of the Macedonian phalanx.[103] If we adopt this emendation, we are to understand the phrase λόχοι σπειρηδὸν ἐξωπλισμένοι as a periphrastic—and, indeed, strange—way of referring to σπεῖραι units: it sounds natural to say that Judas arranged his army in σπεῖραι (12:20 τὴν περὶ αὑτὸν στρατιὰν σπειρηδὸν κατέστησεν), but it sounds odd to say that the λόχοι (units smaller than the σπεῖραι) were arranged σπειρηδόν. Moreover, if we accept the reading λόχους, we are to assume that the description involves three groups of adversaries: the ἱππεῖς διαχρύσους στολὰς ἔχοντας, the λόχους σπειρηδὸν ἐξωπλισμένους, and the ἴλας ἵππων διατεταγμένας. However, the pronoun ἑκατέρων, at 5:3, indicates that the author envisages only two adversaries. If, on the other hand, we retain λόγχας, considering that λόγχη recurs in 2 Maccabees (15:11 ἕκαστον δὲ αὐτῶν καθοπλίσας οὐ τὴν ἀσπίδων καὶ λογχῶν ἀσφάλειαν), unlike λόχος, which does not occur anywhere in the Septuagint, then we are to visualize the

---

κάμαξ, cf. Hsch. κ 557 κάμακες· δοράτια ἱππικά; for the Macedonian cavalry μάχαιρα, see Hatzopoulos 2001, 51; for the Hellenistic cavalry ἀσπίς, see Bar-Kochva 1976, 74 and Hatzopoulos 2001, 51–54; on the λογχοφόροι cavalrymen, see Bar-Kochva, loc. cit., and Sekunda 1994, 20. On the gold-clad cavalrymen and their trappings of gold, cf. the description of the elite cavalry units that took part in Antiochus IV's parade at Daphne (Plb. 30.25.6–11). βέλος is a generic term that may refer to a variety of missile weapons such as arrows, javelins, or projectiles launched by a war engine; it may also denote the war engine itself (cf. Plb. 5.4.6). In its only other instance in 2 Maccabees it denotes a missile thrown by a war engine (12:27 ὀργάνων καὶ βελῶν πολλαὶ παραθέσεις), yet it need not have the same meaning here. The phrase παντοῖοι θωρακισμοί may refer to cataphract cavalry, on which see Bar-Kochva, loc. cit., and Sekunda 1994, 21.

[99] Cf. S. *OC* 1312 σὺν ἑπτὰ τάξεσιν σὺν ἑπτά τε / λόγχαις τὸ Θήβης πεδίον ἀμφεστᾶσι πᾶν; E. *Ph.* 442 μυρίαν ἄγων / λόγχην.

[100] Only the minuscule 71 reads καθωπλισμενας.

[101] The reading λόχους is preserved in a small number of Lucianic manuscripts (64*-236-728-19-62-93). Of the Old Latin translations, La^{LXBM} reflect the reading λόχους (acies/ordines) and only La^{VP} the reading λόγχας (hastis/lanceas). Apart from Abel, Habicht (1979, 224) and Schwartz (2008, 253) also adopted this reading, the first "wegen der Symmetrie der Satzglieder und der ihnen beigefügten Appositionen," and the second on the grounds that "the present verse [sc. 5:2] deals with units and only the next with their weapons."

[102] See Bar-Kochva 1976, 66; id. 2002, 9; Van 't Dack 1988, 51. It is to be noted that in the Ptolemaic army, λόχος was a subdivision of a cavalry ἴλη. See Lesquier 1973, 91.

[103] See Connolly 1987, 76 and 78.

epiphanic battles as ἱππομαχίαι, involving σπεῖραι of gold-clad λογχοφόροι cavalrymen and ἶλαι ἵππων. In this case, we are presented with two analogically constructed phrases, ἱππεῖς σπειρηδὸν ἐξωπλισμένοι and ἶλαι ἵππων διατεταγμέναι, in which ἐξωπλισμένοι corresponds to διατεταγμέναι,[104] and ἱππεῖς σπειρηδόν (=σπεῖραι ἱππέων) corresponds to ἶλαι ἵππων. On the basis of this analogy, and considering that the Hellenistic cavalry ἴλη numbered 64 men,[105] we can assume that the σπεῖραι would have been of a relatively small size, analogous to that of the ἶλαι. The major impediment to understanding the text in this way is the inappropriateness of the adverb σπειρηδόν, used of cavalry units. But, as was made evident by the other instances of σπεῖρα and σπειρηδόν in 2 Maccabees, one should not expect from its author the terminological accuracy of a military tactician. Besides, what is described here is not a real-life battle but an apparition, which allows for some poetic licence.

To summarize and conclude: epigraphic evidence from ca. 200 BCE attests to σπεῖρα being a unit, probably 256-strong, in the Antigonid army. We have no evidence for the existence of units called σπεῖραι in the Seleucid army, while in the Ptolemaic army σπεῖραι-units are attested from the mid-first century BCE. The tactical treatises of the ancient military theorists, beginning with Asclepiodotus in the first century BCE, ignore the term. Polybius, in the mid-second century BCE, uses it in a versatile way to denote units of 256 men in late third- and early second-century BCE armies of the Greek continent, units of an unspecified but presumably small size in non-Greek armies of the same period, and the Roman *manipulus* of 120 men. Polybius also uses the adverb σπειρηδόν, which recurs only in 2 Maccabees and in a passage of Posidonius taken up by Strabo, which may ultimately go back to Polybius. It is impossible to say whether the term was current in the Greek military terminology of the time or whether it was Polybius who introduced it in analogy to the Latin *manipulatim*. However that may be, as the 'lifespan' of σπειρηδόν, as a military term, extends from the mid-second century BCE (Polybius) to the turn of the Common Era (Strabo), it seems reasonable to place 2 Maccabees, which also uses this term, somewhere within these limits.

In 2 Maccabees, σπεῖρα and σπειρηδόν occur in passages fraught with textual uncertainties, which do not allow us to reach unambiguous conclusions about the use of these terms in the book. The σπεῖραι in the heavenly apparitions in chapter 5 are arguably of a small size, consistent with that of the σπεῖραι mentioned in Polybius, whereas the numerical strength of the Maccabean σπεῖραι in chapters 8 and 12 seems to far exceed that of the Antigonid σπεῖραι, the Roman σπεῖραι/*manipuli* of the second century BCE, or the Roman σπεῖραι/*cohortes* of the first centuries BCE and CE. The author of 2 Maccabees seems to be using the term σπεῖρα in a particularly loose way, apparently unaware of, or unconcerned with the actual numerical strength that σπεῖραι-units had in contemporary armies.

---

[104] See LSJ s.v. ἐξοπλίζω, "get under arms, stand in armed array," and s.v. διατάσσω A.2, "draw up an army, set in array."

[105] See Bar-Kochva 2002, 14; Van 't Dack 1988, 51.

Considering, then, that, as far as we can tell from surviving evidence, the second-century BCE Seleucid and Ptolemaic armies had no units called σπεῖραι, and that the second-century Roman maniples that a Greek author like Polybius calls σπεῖραι were of a very small size (120/60 men), why would a Jewish author (Jason and/or the epitomator), presumably living in the second-century BCE Ptolemaic Egypt or Seleucid Palestine, use this term to designate units of the Jewish Maccabean army?

We can put forth two conjectures—both not entirely satisfactory. The first is that the terms σπεῖρα and σπειρηδόν did not occur in the original history by Jason, supposedly written in the second-century BCE, but were used either by the epitomator or the posited final redactor/editor sometime in the first century BCE or CE; they reflect the military terminology of the time, when σπεῖρα could be used of Roman cohorts numbering between 500 and 1,000 troops. Granted, the strength of the Maccabean σπεῖραι in chapter 8 exceeds that of even the biggest Roman cohorts, yet, in the absence of a term that could designate units as large as the 1,500-strong divisions of the Maccabean army, the epitomator or the final redactor/editor may have made do with σπεῖρα, which could be used of units numerically close to the ones mentioned in 2 Maccabees.

The second conjecture is that Jason, or, more likely, the epitomator, was indebted to literary sources for the use of the terms σπεῖρα and σπειρηδόν. Polybius is one of the possible sources. The polysemy of the term σπεῖρα in the *Histories*, where, often within one and the same book, it is employed with reference to units of varying size,[106] may have misled the author of 2 Maccabees to assume that σπεῖρα could be used of any military units, irrespective of their size. How can one, for instance, deduce from Plb. 2.3.2, where the historian relates that 5,000 Illyrians advanced σπειρηδόν against the camp of the Aetolians, what the exact size of the σπεῖραι mentioned was? With regard to σπειρηδόν, in particular, on the basis of the surviving evidence, we can only point to Polybius as being the source from which 2 Maccabees drew this adverb. The borrowing may have been either direct or indirect, as in the case of Strabo, who most likely derived σπειρηδόν from Polybius via Posidonius. A weak (inter)textual clue that might corroborate this conjecture is the aorist participle διατάξας, to which σπειρηδόν is attached in 2 Macc 12:20 (ὁ δὲ Μακκαβαῖος διατάξας τὴν περὶ αὑτὸν στρατιὰν σπειρηδόν), reminiscent of the σπειρηδὸν τάξας in Plb. 5.4.9 (ἐφῆκε τοὺς πελταστὰς τοὺς ὑπὸ Λεόντιον ταττομένους, σπειρηδὸν τάξας).

[106] In the second book, for example, σπεῖρα denotes the Antigonid tactical unit of 256 men (2.66.5), the Roman maniple of 120 men (2.30.6; 2.33.4, 7), and Celtic "tribal contingents" of unspecified size (2.29.8).

7.6 Polybian semantic neologisms in 2 Maccabees

Here, we will examine three words, which, although attested at least once prior to Polybius, appear in the *Histories* in a new sense that recurs only in 2 Maccabees, or in 2 Maccabees and very few other works.

7.6.1 παρακλείω 'to kill'

This compound first occurs in Herodotus in the sense "to displace, to exclude": in Sparta, writes the historian, the office of herald was hereditary, so that no outsiders could 'shut out' the sons of heralds from the profession (6.60 οὐ . . . ἄλλοι σφέας παρακληίουσι). The only two other occurrences of the verb in ancient Greek literary texts[107] are found in Polybius and in 2 Maccabees. At 5.39.3 Polybius relates that King Cleomenes III and his Spartan men, exiled in Egypt, attacked Ptolemy, the governor of Alexandria, dragged him from his chariot, and 'shut him up' (τοῦτον κατασπάσαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ τεθρίππου παρέκλεισαν). The Polybian lexica render παρακλείω as "imprison"—probably on the analogy of συγκλείω, which is used in this sense with regard to Cleomenes at 5.36.8 and 5.38.6—noting that παρέκλεισαν is a *lectio dubia*.[108] The reading has good textual support, though: it is transmitted, inter alia, by the oldest and most authoritative Polybian manuscript, Codex Vaticanus gr. 124. On the basis of a parallel passage in Plutarch's *Cleomenes* (37.4 αὐτὸν δὲ κατασπάσαντες ἀπὸ τοῦ ἅρματος ἀπέκτειναν), which probably draws from Polybius, or from a source common to both authors, presumably Phylarchus,[109] editors and commentators have suggested emendations in order to bring Polybius' text into consonance with Plutarch's: παρέκτειναν (Schweighäuser), παρεκέντησαν (Schenkelius), κατέσφαξαν (Hultsch). Walbank (1957–1979, 1:569), assuming that παρέκλεισαν means "imprisoned," comments that "it is hard to imagine how the Spartans found time to take a prisoner, and despite other divergences between P[olybius] and Plutarch, it seems probable that the reading is at fault. Alternatively P[olybius] has misunderstood the common source." That παρέκλεισαν is the original Polybian reading, which Plutarch, and possibly the author of 2 Maccabees before him, correctly understood as a euphemism for "killed," may be confirmed by 2 Macc 4:34, where the author uses the same verb to designate the treacherous murder of the ex-high priest Onias III by Andronicus, Antiochus IV's minister: παραχρῆμα παρέκλεισεν οὐκ αἰδεσθεὶς τὸ δίκαιον. The characterisation of

[107] The verb recurs in a few non-literary texts: in a first-century CE treatise on pneumatics (Hero *Spir.* 2.36.27), in the *Onomasticon* of the second-century CE grammarian Pollux (10.25), as well as in Byzantine commentaries and scholia.

[108] Schweighäuser, s.v.: "incluserunt, *sive* in carcerem conjecerunt, *si sana lectio*"; *PL*, s.v.: "einschliessen, -sperren (zweifelhaft)." LSJ, s.v., citing Plb. 5.39.3 (dub. l.), also gives "shut up in prison."

[109] See Walbank 1957–1979, 1:565–66; Flacelière and Chambry 1976, 12.

Andronicus' act as ἄδικος φόνος in the immediately following verse leaves no doubt that παρέκλεισεν denotes an assassination.[110]

Could this idiomatic, and elsewhere unattested, use of the very rare verb παρακλείω by both Polybius and the author of 2 Maccabees be coincidental? The most facile assumption would be that the latter picked it up from the former; however, it is also thinkable that both authors drew it from another, possibly the same, source. In the case of Polybius, this source could have been Phylarchus, whom the Megalopolitan historian seems to have utilized for his Cleomenes narrative.[111]

7.6.2 ῥύδην 'with a rushing motion'

There are two very rare, poetic adverbs derived from ῥέω, "to flow": ῥυδόν, found only in Homer and in Callimachus, who use it of abounding riches, of wealth flowing in streams[112] (Hom. *Od.* 15.426 κούρη . . . Ἀρύβαντος ῥυδὸν ἀφνειοῖο; Call. *Hec.* fr. 366 Pfeiffer ῥυδὸν ἀφνύνονται), and ῥύδην, of which only a couple of fragmentary attestations are preserved in the literature before Polybius and 2 Maccabees: in a satirical fragment of the sixth-century BCE iambographer Hipponax it is used of a glutton who feasts lavishly every day on tuna and spiced cheese-cake (fr. 26 West ῥύδην / θύννάν τε καὶ μυσσωτὸν ἡμέρας πάσας / δαινύμενος);[113] and a gloss in Photius' *Lexicon* attests to its use in a no longer extant play of the Old Comedy poet Cratinus.[114] It resurfaces in a fragment of Polybius preserved in Suidas (α 3571 ἀποσφαλμήσας), where it modifies the verb φέρομαι, said of a horse running at full speed (ὁ δὲ ἵππος ἀπὸ τῆς πληγῆς ἀποσφαλμήσας ἐφέρετο ῥύδην διὰ τοῦ μεταξὺ τόπου τοῦ στρατοπέδου), as in 2 Macc 3:25 (φερόμενος δὲ ῥύδην ὁ ἵππος ἐνέσεισε τῷ Ἡλιοδώρῳ τὰς ἐμπροσθίους ὁπλάς). The same verb is used in 2 Macc 9:7 to designate the rushing motion of Antiochus' chariot (τοῦ ἅρματος φερομένου ῥοίζῳ), this time intensified by ῥοίζῳ, "with a rushing motion," which apparently corresponds to ῥύδην in 3:25. The use of the synonymous ῥύδην and ῥοίζῳ may be due to the author's striving after lexical variation. It may also

[110] See Abel 1949, 342. In 2 Macc 13:21 ([ὁ Ῥόδοκος] ἀνεζητήθη καὶ κατελήμφθη καὶ κατεκλείσθη) κατακλείω may also have the meaning "to kill." De Bruyne (1921, 408–9) reasonably assumes that a traitor like Rhodocus could not have been simply put in prison; he must have immediately been executed, as the staccato string of verbs ἀνεζητήθη, κατελήμφθη, κατεκλείσθη seems to imply. Schwartz (2008, 458) more cautiously remarks that "the fact that we at times know that a person who was 'shut away' or 'closed in upon' was killed does not turn that into the meaning of the verb." Indeed, ἐγκλείω at 5:8 ([ὁ Ἰάσων] ἐγκλεισθεὶς πρὸς Ἀρέταν) has the meaning "to incarcerate," although it is perhaps preferable to accept here Luther's emendation ἐγκληθείς, "accused" (see Habicht 1979, 225 and Goldstein 1983, 256).

[111] See Walbank 1957–1979, 565–66 and Flacelière and Chambry 1976, 10, 12.

[112] See Hsch. ρ 471 ῥυδὸν ἢ ῥύδην· χύδην, δαψιλῶς, ῥευστικῶς, σφοδρῶς; Suid. ρ 283 ῥυδόν: ῥυδὸν ἀφνύνονται. ἀντί τοῦ ῥύδην καὶ ῥευστικῶς πλουτοῦσιν. ἢ κεχυμένως. ἀντὶ τοῦ πάνυ.

[113] The adverb also occurs, probably in the same sense, in the very mutilated fragment 104.11 West.

[114] Phot. ρ p. 492 ῥύδην: σφοδρῶς καὶ ἀθρόως· οὕτως Κρατῖνος.

be that 3:25 and 9:7 were penned by different hands.[115] As explained earlier apropos of ἀναστρατοπεδεύω (7.5.1), three authorities on 2 Maccabees—Bickerman (2007g, 1:446–64), Goldstein (1983, 210–12), and Habicht (1979, 172–73)—have posited that, for the Heliodorus episode in chapter 3, two varying versions of the same story have been merged. All three scholars agree that 3:25, where ῥύδην occurs, belongs to version A, but they differ with regard to the origin of this posited version: Bickerman and Goldstein consider it to be pre-Jasonic, whereas for Habicht it is post-Jasonic. Be that as it may, it seems risky to venture an opinion about who is responsible for the diction of 3:25 on the basis of the two-version hypothesis. We note that the conjunction ῥύδην φέρεσθαι, used of horses, does not recur in literature except in ecclesiastical writers quoting or paraphrasing 2 Macc 3:25. Plutarch (*Brut.* 50.1; *Cleom.* 21.6; *Sull.* 21.1), however, uses the combination ῥύδην ἐλαύνειν with reference to horsemen.

7.6.3 συνερείδω 'to meet in close conflict'

συνερείδω, attested from Homer onwards in the sense [LSJ]"press together, close; bind together, bind fast," appears in Polybius as a military term meaning [LSJ]"to meet in close conflict."[116] Polybius uses it at 5.84.2 of elephants clashing in battle (ὀλίγα μὲν οὖν τινα [sc. θηρία] τῶν παρὰ Πτολεμαίου συνήρεισε τοῖς ἐναντίοις) and in fr. 168 Büttner-Wobst[117] of the Macedonians clashing with the barbarians (τῶν δὲ Μακεδόνων ἐκ μεταβολῆς συνερεισάντων τοῖς βαρβάροις, εὐθέως ἐκκλίναντες ἔφευγον). In the same sense the verb recurs only in 2 Macc 8:30, where Judas' army clashes with the forces of Timotheos and Bacchides (καὶ τοῖς περὶ Τιμόθεον καὶ Βακχίδην συνερείσαντες[118] ὑπὲρ τοὺς δισμυρίους αὐτῶν ἀνεῖλον), and later in Diodorus Siculus (13.46.1 ὁπότε δὲ συνερείσειαν αἱ ναῦς) and in Plutarch (*Them.* 14.4 αἱ νῆες ἀντίπρῳροι προσπεσοῦσαι καὶ συνερείσασαι), where, however, it is used of ships coming close and dashing together. It

[115] Four of the six Old Latin translations of 2 Maccabees (La^{LXBM}), as well as the Armenian translation, omit the phrase φερόμενος δὲ ῥύδην ὁ ἵππος ἐνέσεισε τῷ Ἡλιοδώρῳ τὰς ἐμπροσθίους ὁπλάς, so that de Bruyne (1922, 51; 1932, xi) and Bévenot (1934, 278) consider it an interpolation.

[116] See *PL* s.v. συνερείδω, b): "mit j-m (τινί) zusammenstossen, aneinander geraten."

[117] This unattributed fragment, preserved in Suid. κ 481 (καταβολή), was assigned to Polybius by Valesius.

[118] In this verse, A′ V 55 106 771 have συνερίσαντες, a reading supported by the majority of the Old Latin translations, whereas the MSS of the *q* group have συνερείσαντες, which is supported by La^{P} (confligentes). The first reading was adopted by Rahlfs, whereas Hanhart (2008, 26) rightly opted for the second arguing that "die Art der Überlieferung (vgl. App.) legt es nahe, dass hier kein gewöhnlicher itazistischer Fehler vorliegt"). συνερίζω, "to contend with," hardly fits the context of 2 Macc 8:30: the Maccabean army did not "contend with" Timotheos' and Bacchides' forces, but engaged with them in a full-fledged battle that resulted in more than twenty thousand casualties. Hence, it is hard to accept Abel's (1949, 394n30) explanation that "le choix d'un mot inusité tel que συνερίζειν, *contendere inter* se, disputer ensemble, est une de ces litotes dont la recherche a demandé veilles et sueur à notre epitomator." συνερίζω is in fact unattested in pre-Common Era Greek literature (συνερίζειν in Hp. *Coac.* 230 is a *falsa lectio*; see LSJ s.v. συνερείδω). Its earliest surviving occurrence in the aforementioned sense is found in the "Monad" or "Eighth Book of Moses," a sacred book contained in a magical papyrus dated to the fourth century CE (*PGM* 13.179, 497 ὁ δὲ Ἑρμῆς συνηρίσθη αὐτῇ [sc. τῇ Μοίρᾳ]).

is thus only in Polybius and in 2 Maccabees that συνερείδω is used of human adversaries clashing in battle.

7.7 Combinations of words shared by Polybius and 2 Maccabees

A look at Appendix 11, which contains a (non-exhaustive) list of word combinations, which are attested in only one or two authors/texts prior to 2 Maccabees and do not recur or are very rare thereafter, yields some interesting findings. One can spot right away a number of two- to four-word combinations that can be traced back to Homer (1–4),[119] the tragic poets (5–14), Apollonius Rhodius (16),[120] Herodotus and Xenophon (17–25), Plato (26–27), and the Attic orators (29–35). However, it is hard to say how many of these rare combinations are conscious, direct borrowings, second-hand borrowings, unconscious reminiscences, or chance coincidences.

Appendix 12 contains forty-five word combinations, which are first found in Polybius and which, in the subsequent Greek literature up to the second century CE, recur only in 2 Maccabees or in 2 Maccabees and in very few other literary and non-literary texts. A handful of them are shared exclusively by the *Histories* and 2 Maccabees, whereas the rest are also sparingly found in Diodorus Siculus, in Dionysius of Halicarnassus, in Josephus, and in a few other writers. Polybius appears thus to have the highest number of shared word combinations with 2 Maccabees than any other secular author. He is followed very closely by Diodorus Siculus, who, as can be seen in Appendices 12 and 13, shares with 2 Maccabees an almost equal number of word combinations, some of which are not to be found anywhere else.

Adducing lists of shared word combinations as evidence of lexical promixity or affinity between two works, or even of lexical dependence of one work on another, is, of

[119] Cf. the combination οἰκτίστῳ μόρῳ (2 Macc 9:28), which resonates with the Homeric οἰκτίστῳ θανάτῳ (*Od.* 11.412). See Appendix 13, 28. A Homeric reminiscence may also underlie 2 Macc 8:18, where Judas Maccabeus expresses his reliance on the almighty God, who with a single nod (ἑνὶ νεύματι) can strike down not only the enemies of the Jews but the entire world. Cf. *Il.* 1.528–30, where Zeus' nod of assent to Thetis makes Olympus tremble (ἦ καὶ κυανέῃσιν ἐπ' ὀφρύσι νεῦσε Κρονίων . . . μέγαν δ' ἐλέλιξεν Ὄλυμπον), and Antipater of Sidon's epigram (*AP* 7.2) praising Homer for having sung the "all-powerful nod of Zeus" (νεῦμα Κρονίδαο τὸ παγκρατές).

[120] The parallel between King Phineas, whose food was snatched or fouled by the Harpies, so that "a truly painful and unending necessity (πικρὴ καὶ ἄατος ἀνάγκη) compelled [him] to stay there and, staying, to put it in [his] cursed stomach" (A.R. 2.232–233, trans. W.H. Race, LCL), and the Jews, who were taken, "under bitter constraint" (μετὰ πικρᾶς ἀνάγκης), to partake of forbidden sacrificial meat (2 Macc 6:7), was pointed out by Lévy (1955, 27), who saw in it "une ingénieuse transposition qui atteste la familiarité de son auteur [sc. the author of 2 Maccabees] avec une poésie difficile" and adduced it as evidence that the epitome was composed in the Roman Imperial period rather than in the second century BCE: "Y avait-il dans la colonie juive de Cyrène, au second siècle, un homme assez profondément imbu de la culture grecque pour réaliser ce tour de force?"

course, meaningful only if these shared combinations are distinctive, exceptional, or unique. Indeed, in order to make a serious case for lexical dependence between two works, one should be able to prove that the word combinations shared by them are peculiar to one of the two. In our case, one cannot really assert that expressions like θεᾶσθαι ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν (Appendix 12, 4) or pairings such as ἀνδρωδῶς καὶ γενναίως (Appendix 12, 44) are peculiar to Polybius, although they are first attested in the *Histories* and, aside from their instances in 2 Maccabees, do not occur anywhere else. One should not forget that, for their historiographical works, Polybius, and even more so Diodorus Siculus, utilized a variety of sources now lost to us, from which they undoubtedly borrowed vocabulary and phraseology. Were these sources, which only survive in bits and pieces assembled in Jacoby's *Fragmente der Griechischen Historiker*, still extant, the examples contained in our appendices would not seem so rare or isolated as they seem now.

That being said, one cannot disregard the high number of close and approximate lexical similarities between the *Histories* and 2 Maccabees. How is one to account for it? The easiest explanation would be to posit that the Jewish author of 2 Maccabees was a reader of Polybius, who took the *Histories* as a model of Greek style and diction. It would be difficult to consider it a coincidence, for instance, that the distinctive phrase ἐπαρθεὶς τῷ θυμῷ (Appendix 12, 23), in 2 Macc 9:4, is elsewhere found only in Polybius (and, with the participle in the perfect tense, in Diodorus, in a fragment of the thirty-first book of the *Library of History*, whose source is Polybius[121]) and that the verb ἐναπερείδομαι, occurring in the same verse, is used in a sense elsewhere attested only in Polybius and in a passage of Diodorus, which most likely draws on Polybius (see 7.5.2). Similarly, the combination ἀπολογεῖσθαι ἐνδεχομένως (Appendix 12, 39) may occur only in 2 Macc 13:26 and in D.S. 31.7.2, yet the Diodoran passage depends on Plb. 31.1.5,[122] where the phrase ἐνδεχομένως ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἀπολογίαν is used.

An alternative explanation is that 2 Maccabees lexically and stylistically drew on the same, non-surviving sources on which Polybius and, later, Diodorus drew. The fact that almost half the phraseological matches between Polybius and 2 Maccabees also occur in Diodorus Siculus seems to point in that direction. Polybius' *Histories* were certainly one of the sources of Diodorus (indeed, the main source of books 28–32), yet the latter also mentions by name in his *Library of History* some fifty other historians, geographers, and mythographers, in whose works he quarried[123] (and presumably he drew on some other sources, too, that he does not name), so that it is improbable that all the phraseological matches between 2 Maccabees, the *Library of History*, and the *Histories* are due to the author of 2 Maccabees' and Diodorus' indebtedness to Polybius. The following example can illustrate this point. In 2 Macc 3:24 the phrase πάντας . . . καταπλαγέντας τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν (Appendix 13, 5) occurs in the context of Yahweh's epiphanic intervention

[121] See E. Schwartz, "Diodoros (38)," PW 5, col. 690 and Chamoux 1993, xxiv.

[122] See E. Schwartz, "Diodoros (38)," PW 5, col. 690.

[123] See a list of these authors in Chamoux 1993, xxiii–xxv.

to protect the Jerusalem temple from Heliodorus' threat. An almost identical phrase (πάντας καταπλαγέντας τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἐνέργειαν) occurs in D.S. 11.14.3, in the narrative (based on Herodotus) of the deliverance, through the epiphany of Zeus and Apollo, of the Delphic oracle from the Persian invaders, and a very similar one (καταπλαγεὶς ὁ βάρβα[ρος] | τὰν τᾶς θεοῦ ἐπιφάνειαν) in the Lindian Temple Chronicle (*Lindos II* 2 col. D.33), recording the epiphany of Athena, who rescued Lindos from the Persian threat. Apparently, what we have here are variants of a set phrase peculiar to narratives recounting the epiphanic intervention of a patron deity for the deliverance of a threatened city or temple, on which the authors of the three above-quoted texts independently drew.

A look at Appendix 13, which contains some forty non-trivial word combinations shared by 2 Maccabees and a number of first-century BCE and CE literary works, but not occurring in Polybius or in any other previous writer, offers some interesting insights: about a dozen of these combinations are found only in 2 Maccabees and in Diodorus Siculus; some fifteen are shared exclusively by 2 Maccabees and authors whose works postdate Diodorus' *Library of History*, such as Dionysius of Halicarnassus, Nicolaus of Damascus, Memnon of Heraclea, Philo, and Josephus; five are found only in 2 Maccabees and in Dionysius of Halicarnassus. Second Maccabees 9:28, ἐπὶ ξένης ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν οἰκτίστῳ μόρῳ κατέστρεψε τὸν βίον, for instance, is composed of word combinations that do not recur earlier than Dionysius (6.21.3 ἐπὶ ξένης τὸν βίον κατέστρεψαν; 2.68.4 τὸν οἴκτιστον μόρον ἀποθανοῦσαν; 5.27.1 τὸν οἴκτιστον ἀπολέσθαι μόρον; 6.7.2 τὸν οἴκτιστον μόρον ἀποθανεῖν). That there is a relation of direct dependence between the epitome of 2 Maccabees and the works of the aforenamed authors is most unlikely. It does seem likely, though, that the epitome belongs to the same, post-Polybian linguistic milieu as these works. How otherwise to explain the occurrence in a literary text, presumably composed in the late second century BCE, of a considerable number of turns of phrase that recur in other literary texts only a century later?

The phraseological similarities between the epitome of 2 Maccabees, Polybius' *Histories*, Diodorus' *Library of History*, Dionysius' *Roman Antiquities*, and some other first-century BCE and CE works may thus provide us with a means of approximating a date for the composition of the first-named book. We may venture the supposition that the epitome was composed between the time of Polybius' *Histories* (ca. 167 to ca. 118 BCE) and the turn of the Common Era. The examples presented in Appendix 13 seem to suggest that it may be closer to the latter terminus than to the former. If we look, for instance, at the distinctive temporal phrases in Appendix 13, 29, consisting of a "numeral+-ετής" compound and χρόνος (e.g. διετὴς χρόνος instead of δύο ἔτη), we notice that, aside from a few early instances, the bulk of attestations of these phrases belong to the first century BCE. They are totally absent in Polybius, whereas Diodorus, and also Dionysius of Halicarnassus, use them often. The epigraphical and papyrological attestations, too, start clustering from the first century BCE onwards. The three

instances in 2 Maccabees (4:23, 10:3, 14:1) would thus fit better into a first- rather than a second-century BCE linguistic and literary context.

7.8 Summary

Second Maccabees presents the following paradox: while it evidently belongs to a different type of historical writing than Polybius' *Histories* and does not seem to have used the latter work as a source, it nevertheless exhibits noteworthy similarities with its diction, some of which would best be explained if one posited that the author of 2 Maccabees was a reader of Polybius. Our lexical investigation of a number of Polybian neologisms occurring in 2 Maccabees did not provide incontestable evidence to support the latter suggestion; yet, it did furnish some significant indication of a non-fortuitous connection between the *Histories* and the Septuagint book. Of the lexical items examined, two (the verb ἐναπερείδομαι and the adverb σπειρηδόν) are the most suggestive: in the sense in which Polybius uses it, the first recurs only in 2 Maccabees and in a passage of Diodorus Siculus, which very probably draws on Polybius; as a military term, the second recurs only in a passage of Strabo, for which the geographer is directly or indirectly (via Posidonius) indebted to Polybius. Corroborative evidence comes from words that appear in Polybius in a previously unattested sense that recurs exclusively in 2 Maccabees (e.g. the verb παρακλείω), as well as from word combinations that are shared exclusively by the *Histories* and 2 Maccabees or that occur in these two works and in very few subsequent others. The direct or indirect influence of Polybius' diction on 2 Maccabees cannot thus be excluded. We also drew attention to the many phraseological parallels between the epitome and literary works from the first centuries BCE and CE, especially those of Diodorus Siculus and Dionysius of Halicarnassus, and ascribed them to a common linguistic milieu shared by the last-mentioned authors and the author of the epitome. Although the evidence that we presented in this chapter cannot be in any way conclusive given the minute portion of Greek literature from the last two centuries BCE that we possess and the resulting lack of sufficient comparative data, it provides us with some grounds for placing the epitome of 2 Maccabees in the interim between Polybius' *Histories* and the works of Diodorus and Dionysius—arguably closer to the latter than to the former.

Chapter 8: Excursus: some remarks on 2 Maccabees 7

One of the prominent stylistic features of 2 Maccabees is the recurrence throughout the epitome not only of non-trivial individual words but also of non-trivial combinations of words. These combinations usually consist of two to five words. They recur not only at a short distance from one another, within the same chapter (e.g. 6:22 ἵνα . . . ἀπολυθῇ τοῦ θανάτου, 6:30 ἀπολυθῆναι τοῦ θανάτου; 12:10, 17 ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀποσπάσαντες; 14:3 ἐν τοῖς τῆς ἀμιξίας χρόνοις, 14:38 ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις τῆς ἀμιξίας), but also at a considerable distance from one another, in different chapters. For example, verse 35 in chapter 10 (ὑποφαινούσης δὲ τῆς πέμπτης ἡμέρας εἴκοσι νεανίαι τῶν περὶ τὸν Μακκαβαῖον πυρωθέντες τοῖς θυμοῖς διὰ τὰς βλασφημίας προσβαλόντες τῷ τείχει ἀρρενωδῶς καὶ θηριώδει θυμῷ τὸν ἐμπίπτοντα ἔκοπτον) contains four word combinations which recur in six other chapters,[1] and verse 30 in chapter 3 (οἱ δὲ τὸν κύριον εὐλόγουν τὸν παραδοξάζοντα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον, καὶ τὸ μικρῷ πρότερον δέους καὶ ταραχῆς γέμον ἱερὸν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπιφανέντος κυρίου χαρᾶς καὶ εὐφροσύνης ἐπεπλήρωτο) contains five word combinations which recur in five other chapters.[2] Some of these combinations occur elsewhere in the Septuagint (e.g. in the last-quoted example, εὐλογεῖν τὸν κύριον), others are very sparely attested in profane Greek literature (e.g. δέος καὶ ταραχή is previously found in Lysias and Isocrates and ὑποφαίνει ἡμέρα in Xenophon and Polybius), whereas others are peculiar to the author of the epitome (e.g. κόπτειν τὸν ἐμπίπτοντα, πυροῦσθαι τοῖς θυμοῖς). Indeed, the more marked the recurring combinations are, the more likely it is that they originate with the author of the epitome. Their occurrence in more than one verse and in more than one chapter attests that the verses which bear them were written by the same hand. To a certain extent, they afford evidence of the authorial unity of the epitome.

Now, if we look at the distribution of these word combinations in the epitome, we notice that: a) chapters 3 and 4 contain combinations that recur in all the other chapters

[1] 13:17 ὑποφαινούσης δὲ ἤδη τῆς ἡμέρας; 10:16, 25, 33 οἱ δὲ περὶ τὸν Μακκαβαῖον; 11:6 οἱ περὶ τὸν Μακκαβαῖον; 12:19 τῶν περὶ τὸν Μακκαβαῖον ἡγεμόνων; 4:38 πυρωθεὶς τοῖς θυμοῖς; 14:45 πεπυρωμένος τοῖς θυμοῖς; 5:12 κόπτειν ἀφειδῶς τοὺς ἐμπίπτοντας.

[2] 15:34 εὐλόγησαν τὸν ἐπιφανῆ κύριον λέγοντες Εὐλογητὸς ὁ διατηρήσας τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον ἀμίαντον; 10:7 καθαρισθῆναι τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον; 6:29 τὴν μικρῷ πρότερον εὐμένειαν; 9:10 τὸν μικρῷ πρότερον . . . δοκοῦντα; 13:16 τὴν παρεμβολὴν δέους καὶ ταραχῆς ἐπλήρωσαν; 6:4 τὸ μὲν γὰρ ἱερὸν ἀσωτίας καὶ κώμων . . . ἐπεπλήρωτο.

of the epitome, b) most other chapters contain combinations that recur in all but one, two or three other chapters of the epitome, c) chapter 6 contains combinations that do not recur in four chapters of the epitome (5, 8, 12, 13), and d) a little less than a dozen word combinations that occur in the epitome also occur in the two prefixed letters;[3] all but four of them[4] also occur elsewhere in the Septuagint. With regard to chapter 7, about which doubts have been expressed as to whether it was composed by the epitomator or was inserted later by a final redactor/editor, perhaps as late as the second half of the first century CE,[5] we notice that in twenty-four of its forty-two verses there occur thirty-three non-trivial word combinations[6] which are also found in the other chapters of the epitome, with the exception of chapter 11 (half of which is occupied with the embedded diplomatic documents). Eighteen of these combinations occur in 2 Maccabees and nowhere else in the Septuagint; six recur in 3 and 4 Maccabees, which are likely to be indebted to 2 Maccabees for them. One can even establish second- or third-degree connections between chapter 7 and the rest of the epitome: e.g. 7:3 and 7:39 are connected to 14:27 through the use of the phrase ἔκθυμος γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς, and 14:27 is further connected to 11:1 through the use of the combination βαρέως φέρειν, which occurs in both verses; 7:33 shares with 8:29 the phrase καταλλαγῆναι τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις, 8:29 is further linked to 10:38, with which it shares the phrase ταῦτα δὲ διαπραξάμενοι, and 10:38 shares with 12:37 the combination μεθ' ὕμνων; and so on and so forth.

Moreover, there are individual words that tellingly connect chapter 7 with other chapters, as well as with the epitomator's prologue and epilogue: a) ἔμπνους is used of the first martyred brother at 7:5 and of Razis at 14:45, b) ὑπερηφανία and μάστιξ, used at 7:36 (τὰ πρόστιμα τῆς ὑπερηφανίας ἀποίσῃ) and 7:37 (μετὰ ἐτασμῶν καὶ μαστίγων), respectively, with reference to Antiochus Epiphanes, prefigure the king's punishment at 9:11 (τῆς ὑπερηφανίας λήγειν . . . θείᾳ μάστιγι), c) the adverb παντελῶς occurs five

[3] 1:6 προσευχόμενοι περὶ ὑμῶν, 15:14 προσευχόμενος περὶ τοῦ λαοῦ; 1:9 ἄγητε τὰς ἡμέρας, 2:16 ἄγοντες τὰς ἡμέρας, 10:8 ἄγειν τὰσδε τὰς ἡμέρας; 1:10, 9:19 χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν; 1:12 ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλει, 3:1 τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως, 9:14 τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν, 15:14 τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως; 1:18 τὸν καθαρισμὸν τοῦ ἱεροῦ, 2:19 τὸν τοῦ ἱεροῦ τοῦ μεγίστου καθαρισμόν; 1:18 ἀνήνεγκε θυσίας, 2:9 ἀνήνεγκε θυσίαν, 3:35 θυσίαν ἀνενέγκας, 10:3 ἀνήνεγκαν θυσίας; 1:19 φρέατος τάξιν ἔχοντος ἄνυδρον, 9:18 ἐπιστολὴν ἱκετηρίας τάξιν ἔχουσαν; 1:29 εἰς τὸν τόπον τὸν ἅγιόν σου, 2:18, 8:17 εἰς τὸν ἅγιον τόπον; 2:1 Ιερεμίας ὁ προφήτης, 15:14 Ιερεμίας ὁ τοῦ θεοῦ προφήτης; 2:18 τὸν τόπον ἐκαθέρισεν, 10:7 καθαρισθῆναι τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον. See van Henten 1997, 45–46n83.

[4] χαίρειν καὶ ὑγιαίνειν, ὁ καθαρισμὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, genitive+τάξιν ἔχειν, καθαρίζειν τὸν τόπον. On the basis of these word combinations, as well as of single words shared between the letters and the epitome (e.g. ἁγιασμός, ἀνυπόστατος, διασαφέω, διάφορα, ἐγκαινισμός, ἐκβράζω, καθαγιάζω, καταλλάσσω, κτίστης, μεγάλως, ὑπομνηματισμός), scholars like Torrey (1940, 138–39) posited that the epitomator himself translated the letters and prefixed them to the epitome. With regard, especially, to the combination καθαρισμὸς τοῦ ἱεροῦ, which occurs in the second prefixed letter (1:18) and then at the beginning of the epitomator's prologue (2:19), Torrey (1940, 139) asserts that "a more obvious and effective 'bridge' [between the letters and the epitome] could hardly be imagined."

[5] See 1.2.4.

[6] See Appendix 15.

times in 2 Maccabees (3:12, 31; 7:40; 11:1; 14:46) and nowhere else in the Septuagint, d) the comparative conjunction καθάπερ, for which the epitomator seems to have a flair, occurs twice in the prologue (2:27, 29), once in the epilogue (15:39), and four times in the main body of the epitome, two of which are in chapter 7 (7:6, 37) and one which is in a passage thought to contain a reflection of the epitomator (6:14), e) the conjunction διόπερ, another favourite of the epitomator's, occurs five times in 2 Maccabees: at 7:8, in two verses thought to contain reflections of the epitomator (5:20; 6:16), and at 6:27 (Eleazar's martyrdom) and 14:19; the only other book of the Septuagint that uses it is Judith (8:17), f) the second aorist participle of γίγνομαι, used with a substantive, an adjective or a prepositional phrase, occurs nine times in chapter 7[7] and a dozen other times in the rest of the epitome,[8] and g) Ἰουδαῖος occurs fifty-nine times in 2 Maccabees, but Ἑβραῖος occurs only three: at 7:31, at 11:13, and in the epitomator's epilogue (15:37).

From the above evidence, one can reasonably conclude that:

a) One and the same person penned chapter 7 and the rest of the epitome. That person was in all likelihood the epitomator and not a redactor/editor, who supposedly added chapter 7 to the epitome. If the latter were the case, this would mean that the posited redactor/editor took great pains, indeed, to create so many verbal interconnections between the inserted text and practically all the other chapters of the epitome.[9] Some authorities have argued that the diction and style of chapter 7 differ from those of the preceding account of the martyrdom of Eleazar (6:18–31) because chapter 7 was not originally composed in Greek, but was translated from Hebrew.[10] "The suggestion that the influence of a Hebrew original, with a more paratactic style, is what sets the style of chapter 7 apart is quite plausible," writes Himmelfarb (1998, 32). One may remark, however, that even the epitomator's prologue exhibits two styles: the simple, paratactic style of 2:19–23 and the periodic, rhetorical style of 2:24–32.[11] This said, it cannot be

[7] 7:2 γενόμενος προήγορος; 7:3, 39 ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος; 7:4 τὸν γενόμενον . . . προήγορον; 7:5 ἄχρηστον . . . γενόμενον; 7:9 ἐν ἐσχάτη δὲ πνοῇ γενόμενος; 7:14 γενόμενος πρὸς τὸ τελευτᾶν; 7:29 ἄξιος γενόμενος; 7:31 πάσης κακίας εὑρετὴς γενόμενος.

[8] 2:22 ἵλεως γενομένου; 3:32 ὕποπτος δὲ γενόμενος; 3:34 ἀφανεῖς ἐγένοντο; 8:5 γενόμενος δέ . . . ἐν συστέματι; 8:24 γενομένου δέ . . . τοῦ παντοκράτορος συμμάχου; 10:14 γενόμενος στρατηγός; 10:22 προδότας γενομένους; 10:26 ἵλεως . . . γενόμενον; 13:13 καθ' ἑαυτὸν δέ . . . γενόμενος; 14:27 ἔκθυμος γενόμενος; 14:41 περικατάλημπτος γενόμενος. Cf. 4:1, 5; 5:15, 27; 7:18, 25, 37; 8:30; 9:8; 10:16, 17; 11:19; 13:11, 23; 14:42, 46.

[9] We can quote here Lichtenberger (2007, 108), who refers to a personal communication with B. Meissner (Halle-Wittenberg), "a colleague, who has expertise in examining vocabulary and the use of particles in consideration of authorship." Meissner examined the epitome's prologue and epilogue, as well as the passages attributed to the epitomator (4:17, 5:17–20, 6:12–17), and concluded that "a single person composed the entire book": "Insgesamt ergibt sich ein Bild, das, soweit die Häufigkeitsstatistik es zeigen kann, recht homogen ist" (loc. cit., footnote 34).

[10] See Habicht 1979, 171, 233n7a.

[11] A not unimaginable scenario would be that 2:19–32, usually referred to as 'the epitomator's prologue,' was actually written by two hands: 2:19–23 was penned by an abridger, who produced an unpretentious

excluded that the episode of the seven brothers and their mother was not included in Jason of Cyrene's original work, but was added by the epitomator, who may have adapted material coming from another source.

b) The epitomator's hand is also visible in the account of the martyrdom of Eleazar (6:26 τὰς τοῦ παντοκράτορος χεῖρας οὔτε ζῶν οὔτε ἀποθανὼν ἐκφεύξομαι and 6:31 τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον μετήλλαξεν having verbal parallels to 7:31 οὐ μὴ διαφύγῃς τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ θεοῦ and 7:7 μεταλλάξαντος δὲ τοῦ πρώτου τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον, respectively) and of the suicide of Razis (14:38 σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ παραβεβλημένος and 14:46 ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸν δεσπόζοντα τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ταῦτα αὐτῷ πάλιν ἀποδοῦναι having verbal parallels to 2:21 ὑπὲρ τοῦ Ἰουδαϊσμοῦ, 7:37 σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν προδίδωμι περὶ τῶν πατρίων νόμων, and 7:23 τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ὑμῖν πάλιν ἀποδίδωσι, respectively).

c) The epitomator penned verses 3:31 and 3:34, in the Heliodorus episode, which share word combinations with 7:9 and 7:17, respectively; 3:34 also shares a word combination with 2:21, in the epitomator's prologue.[12] This runs counter to Habicht's (1979, 173)[13] assumption that verses 3:34–35 (which have verbal correspondences with 9:16–17), together with verses 3:15–23 and 3:37–39, originate with Jason of Cyrene. Not only 3:34 but also 3:39 is linked to chapter 7, since the word ἐπόπτης, in the last-cited verse, is also used of Yahweh at 7:35.

d) The version of Antiochus' punishment and death, presented in chapter 9 of the epitome, is by the same hand that penned chapter 7, namely that of the epitomator. Verses 9:4 τῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κρίσεως, 9:5 ἄρτι δὲ αὐτοῦ καταλήξαντος τὸν λόγον, 9:7 συνέβη δὲ καὶ πεσεῖν αὐτόν, 9:11 τῆς ὑπερηφανίας λήγειν . . . θείᾳ μάστιγι, and 9:18 δικαία ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσις share verbal correspondences with, respectively, verses 7:11 ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ταῦτα κέκτημαι, 7:30 † ἄρτι † δὲ ταύτης καταληγούσης, 7:1 συνέβη δὲ καί . . . ἀναγκάζεσθαι, 7:35 θεοῦ κρίσιν, 7:36 τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσει δίκαια τὰ πρόστιμα τῆς ὑπερηφανίας ἀποίσῃ, and 7:37 μετὰ ἐτασμῶν καὶ μαστίγων.[14] The doubts that have been raised about whether chapter 9 is an integral part of the epitome or an interpolation made after 70 CE[15] do not seem to be justified. As can be seen in Appendix 16, in all but four verses of 9:1–18 occur nineteen word combinations that recur in twelve other chapters of the epitome; seven of these combinations (Appendix 16, 10–14, 16–17) are also found in chapter 3, in the Heliodorus episode. Moreover, the

---

epitome of Jason's work, and 2:24–32 was later added by a more ambitious reviser, who reworked the epitome and is responsible for the diction and style of the work in the form that it has come down to us. See further Chapter 9.

[12] 3:31 τῷ . . . ἐν ἐσχάτῃ πνοῇ κειμένῳ; 7:9 ἐν ἐσχάτῃ δὲ πνοῇ γενόμενος; 3:34 ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μεμαστιγωμένος; 3:34 τὸ μεγαλεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος; 2:21 τὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενομένας ἐπιφανείας; 7:17 τὸ μεγαλεῖον αὐτοῦ κράτος.

[13] See 1.2.4 and 4.2.3.

[14] See van Henten 1997, 170.

[15] See Gauger 2002.

formula that introduces the most likely falsified letter of Antiochus IV in chapter 9 (v. 18 ἐπιστολήν . . . περιέχουσαν οὕτως) is the same that introduces the authentic letters of Lysias and Antiochus V in chapter 11 (vv. 16 ἐπιστολαί . . . περιέχουσαι τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον and 22 ἡ . . . ἐπιστολὴ περιεῖχεν οὕτως, respectively).[16]

If, then, chapter 7 belongs to the same stratum as the rest of the epitome, the clues to the date of its composition that we can derive from it can possibly offer us hints about the date of composition of the entire epitome. The following lexical clues can be helpful in this direction:

a) Combinations of words, which, outside 2 Maccabees, are attested in secular writers not earlier than the second half of the first century BCE or later. For example, the combinations ἀπολύειν τοῦ ζῆν (7:9), μεταλλάσσειν ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων (7:14), ἐπιδέχεσθαι τὸν θάνατον (7:29), and ὑπακούειν τοῦ προστάγματος (7:30) do not recur earlier than Diodorus Siculus;[17] the combination πάτριος φωνή, which occurs five times in the epitome, three of which are in chapter 7 (7:8, 21, 27; 12:37; 15:29), does not recur elsewhere earlier than Dionysius of Halicarnassus and Nicolaus of Damascus;[18] the same goes for the combinations γενναῖον φρόνημα (7:21),[19] and μάστιξιν αἰκίζεσθαι (7:1);[20] the closing verse of chapter 7 (7:42 τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τοὺς σπλαγχνισμοὺς καὶ τὰς ὑπερβαλλούσας αἰκίας ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον δεδηλώσθω) finds parallels in Josephus, although it has a remote precedent in Herodotus.[21]

b) The use of the substantive προήγορος (7:2, 4) to designate the first martyred brother, who spoke on behalf of his family. προήγορος is not attested in any literary text prior to 2 Maccabees; after 2 Maccabees, we find it cited in Pollux's *Onomasticon* (2.126), and then it occurs almost exclusively in ecclesiastical writers, beginning with Origen.[22] The word has, however, several epigraphical

---

[16] Cf. 1 Macc 15:2 καὶ ἦσαν [sc. αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ] περιέχουσαι τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον.

[17] D.S. 3.33.5 ἀπολύονται τοῦ ζῆν προθύμως; 31.9.1 οὐδ' ὡς ἀπολυθῆναι τοῦ ζῆν ἤθελε; Plu. *Mor.* 241E τοῦ ζῆν ἀπόλυσον; D.S. 18.56.2 μεταλλάξαντος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; Arr. *Peripl.M.Eux.* 23.4 μεταλλάξαι ἐξ ἀνθρώπων; D.S. 8.27.2 ἐπιδέχεσθαι τὸν ἔντιμον θάνατον; 14.67.2 τοῦ Διονυσίου προστάγμασιν ὑπακούομεν; J. *AJ* 3.319 ὑπακούειν τοῖς Μωυσέος προστάγμασι; 5.154 ἀλλοτρίοις ὑπακούειν προστάγμασι; 12.269 τοῖς Ἀντιόχου προστάγμασιν . . . ὑπακούει.

[18] D.H. 1.35.2; Nic.Dam. *FHG* 3, fr. 81.7; J. *BJ* 1.17; Arr. *Tact.* 33.1; Luc. *Alex.* 51; *P.Oxy.* 51.3614.3 [200 CE].

[19] D.H. 7.9.3, 19.18.5; Ph. *Virt.* 71; J. *AJ* 1.232; *BJ* 3.183.

[20] D.H. 3.40.3, 5.51.3, 6.30.1, 7.10.5, 9.40.4, 20.5.5; 20.16.2; Ph. *Flacc.* 75; J. *BJ* 7.200, 373; *Vit.* 147.

[21] J. *AJ* 3.187 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτόν μοι δεδηλώσθω; 6.343 τὰ μὲν περὶ τῆς γυναικὸς ἐν τοσούτοις ἀρκεῖ δεδηλῶσθαι; 7.394 περὶ μὲν τούτων ἡμῖν τοσοῦτον ἀπόχρη δεδηλῶσθαι. Cf. Hdt. 2.33 ὁ μὲν δὴ τοῦ Ἀμμωνίου Ἐτεάρχου λόγος ἐς τοσοῦτο μοι δεδηλώσθω.

[22] The word also appears in its Doric form in Cicero's second Verrine oration, where it designates the highest magistrate in the Sicilian cities of Catania and Tyndaris (2.4.23.50 proagorum, hoc est summum magistratum; cf. 2.4.39.85 and 2.4.42.92). The exact functions of the Sicilian *proagori* are not clear. According to Manganaro (1963, 219), they were provisional magistrates who were appointed, when need was, on account of their oratorical abilities by the senates of the Sicilian cities to represent them to the

attestations spanning from the second half of the fourth century BCE to the third century CE. The earliest of these attestations are found in the "Sacrilege Inscription" from Ephesos (*Ephesos* 572), dated to the late fourth century BCE,[23] and in the honorific decree for Boulagoras of Samos (*IG XII,6* 1:11), dated to after 243/2 BCE. The first inscription relates that the advocates on behalf of the goddess Artemis (l. 1 οἱ προήγοροι ὑπὲρ τῆς θεοῦ) sentenced to death forty-five Sardians for having abused the sacred ambassadors sent from Ephesos and profaned the sacred objects that the latter carried with them. The προήγοροι in this case were likely magistrates or citizens of Ephesos commissioned to defend the interests of their city, or of goddess Artemis, at the trial of the sacrilegious persons that took place at Sardis.[24] In the second inscription, Boulagoras, son of Alexis, is honoured, inter alia, because "when chosen by the people on several occasions to be advocate in public trials (ll. 20–21 προήγορος ταῖς δημοσίαις δίκαις) he constantly showed himself eager and zealous and procured many benefits and advantages to the city from the verdicts."[25] By successfully defending in court the interests of their cities, προήγοροι like Boulagoras recovered public money loaned to individual citizens or state property that had been encroached upon by individuals, and thereby helped augment state revenues.[26]

More than a dozen other epigraphical instances of προήγορος date to the Roman Imperial period and all but two are from Asia Minor.[27] The earliest of them is found in a decree of Sardis dated by Robert (1950, 8–9) to the Augustan

---

Roman governor. Ardizzone (1967, 171) sees them as the chief magistrates of their cities, who represented them in their dealings with Rome; they were responsible for the cities' administration and obliged to render account to the ἁλία and the βουλή. See also H. Schaefer, "προήγορος," PW 23.1, col. 105.

[23] On the date see Hanfmann 1987, 1 ("the events described [in the inscription] took place between 334 . . . and 281 B.C."), and Masson 1987, 225 (following L. Robert: "vers 340–320").

[24] See Masson 1987, 228.

[25] Trans. M. Austin in Austin 2006, 244.

[26] See Robert 1950, 13–14.

[27] *SEG* 56-1489.14 [Akmonia, 64 CE] Σωσθένης Ἀσκληπιάδου προήγορος τῆς γερουσίας; *Aphrodisias* 9.37 [127 CE] εἶναί τε προήγορον διὰ βίου τῆς | [συνόδου]; *BCH* 10 (1886) 148,1.12 [Attaleia, 138 CE] συνήγορον καὶ προήγορον | τῆς πατρίδος διηνεκῆ; *IK Iznik* 73.2-3 [Nikaia, 1st–2nd c. CE] π[ρ]ο|ήγορον δίκα[ιον καὶ] | ἀσιάρχη[ν]; *IK Prusias ad Hypium* 10.2 [bef. 212 CE] φιλότειμον καὶ [φ]|ιλόπ[ο]λιν καὶ προήγορον; *IK Prusias ad Hypium* 47.3 [2nd c. CE] προή[γο]ρ[ον] | [τοῦ ἔ]θνους; *SEG* 35-1363.8-9 [Ankyra, mid-2nd c. CE] [τὸν] | ἑαυτῆς πατέρα καὶ προή[γορ]|ον; *SEG* 57:1444.3 [Termessos, late 2nd c. CE] προήγορον | τῆς πόλεως ἀεὶ γενόμενον; *SEG* 41-1583.2 [Dionysias, 2nd–3rd c. CE] Ἰούλιον Πρόκλον | προήγορον | ἀμέμπτως καὶ | καλῶς πολε||ιτεύσα[ντα]; *IK Perge* 294.1 [3rd c. CE] ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος καὶ προηγόρου καὶ συναγωγέως τοῦ λαμπροτάτου Παμφύλων ἔθνους; *IK Perge* 321.2-3 [200–250 CE?] ἐπὶ ἄρχοντος καὶ π[ρο]|ηγόρου καὶ συναγωγέ[ως] | τῆς Παμφυλίας; *IK Prusa ad Olympum* 20.3 [date unspecified] ἡ γερου[σία τὸν ἑαυτῆς] | [προ]στάτην καὶ προήγο[ρον] | [ἀνέ]στησεν; *TAM III,1* 128.3-4 [Termessos, date unspecified] τὸν προ|ήγορον [τῆς πα]|[τρίδος]. To these should be added an inscription from Byblos (not included in the PHI and the SEG databases) quoted by Robert (1950, 12): [τὸν δεῖνα] ῥήτορα Ἀπαμέα τὸν προήγορον τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῆς πόλεως.

period.[28] The προήγοροι mentioned in the inscriptions of the Greek East from that period appear to have been highly qualified attorneys, who acted as spokesmen for and defended the interests of a sanctuary, a local civic body such as the γερουσία, a city, or even an entire province (ἔθνος).[29] A term related to προήγορος is συνήγορος and, indeed, a second-century CE inscription from Attaleia (*BCH* 10 (1886) 148,1) commemorates a certain M. Gavius Gallicus, who served as συνήγορος καὶ προήγορος διηνεκὴς τῆς πατρίδος (ll. 12–13) and was honoured by many cities in Pamphylia, Lycia, and Asia for having pleaded their cases (l. 19 ἐπὶ συνηγορίαις) before the emperors and provincial governors (ll. 22–26 πολλοὺς ὑπὲρ τῆς πατρί|δος καὶ πόλεων πλείστων | ἀγῶνας εἰρηκότα ἐπί τε | τῶν Σεβαστῶν καὶ τῶν ἡγε|[μ]όνων). The distinction between the two terms is not clear-cut, yet it seems that the προήγορος defended his own city or province, whereas the συνήγορος also offered his services to cities or provinces other than his own.[30]

The Old Latin translators of 2 Maccabees understood προήγορος, at 7:2 and 7:4, to mean "the one who speaks first,"[31] apparently because it is used of the older of the seven brothers, who was the first to address the king. Although the brother in question does not really act as his family's advocate in the way his youngest brother eventually does (7:30–38), the trial context, in which his laconic pronouncement is situated, suggests that the term προήγορος is used of him in a loosely judicial sense. Earlier in the epitome, at 4:48, the author uses the cognate verb προηγορέω, [LSJ]"to be spokesman for others," of the three men sent by the Jerusalem γερουσία to Antiochus IV to bring charges against Menelaus, who had stolen holy vessels from the Temple;[32] it seems likely that these Jewish delegates exercised a judicial function analogous to that of the προήγοροι τῆς γερουσίας mentioned in some of the aforecited Asia Minor inscriptions. προηγορέω is an extremely rare verb: prior to 2 Maccabees, it occurs only in Xenophon, where it is used in the general sense "to speak on behalf of others";[33] in its Doric form, προαγορέω, it is attested in a second- or first-century BCE inscription from Agrigento, wherein it has to be understood in light of Cicero's testimony concerning the magistracy of προάγορος in a number of Sicilian

[28] The decree is not included in the PHI or the SEG databases. Lines 5–8, in Robert's (1950, 8) transcription, run as follows: βουλευ|τῶν καὶ Μηνογένου καὶ Ἀττάλου καὶ Κλε|άνδρου στρατηγῶν καὶ προηγόρων γνώ|μη. See also H. Schaefer, "προήγορος," PW 23.1, col. 106.

[29] See Robert 1950, 11–12 and Fernoux 2004, 339–40.

[30] See Robert 1950, 12n4 and Balland 1981, 229–30.

[31] La^{L} 7:2 unus autem ex illis, ita primus, ait; 7:4 qui prior erat locutus; La^{X} 7:2 primus ex ais ait; 7:4 qui prior fuerat locutus; La^{V} 7:2 qui erat primus; 7:4 qui prior fuerat locutus; La^{BM} 7:2 prior incipiens; 7:4 qui locutus erat prior; La^{P} 7:2 princeps sermonis existens; 7:4 qui principe loco uerba fecit.

[32] 4:44 καταντήσαντος δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως εἰς Τύρον ἐπ' αὐτοῦ τὴν δικαιολογίαν ἐποιήσαντο οἱ πεμφθέντες τρεῖς ἄνδρες ὑπὸ τῆς γερουσίας; 4:48 ταχέως οὖν τὴν ἄδικον ζημίαν ὑπέσχον οἱ περὶ πόλεως καὶ δήμων καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν σκευῶν προηγορήσαντες.

[33] *HG* 1.1.27, 2.2.22; *An.* 5.5.7. See H. Schaefer, "προήγορος," PW 23.1, col. 104.

cities;[34] all its other attestations are clustered in the first and second centuries CE.[35] Indeed, 2 Macc 4:48 finds a verbal parallel in a first/second-century CE honorary decree from Pisidia.[36]

To summarize, before 2 Maccabees, προήγορος, as a judicial term, has only two epigraphical instances in the fourth and third centuries BCE; subsequently, it occurs almost exclusively in some fifteen Asia Minor honorary decrees from the time of Augustus onwards. The attestations of the cognate verb προηγορέω are likewise clustered in the first two centuries CE, with a couple of instances of it occurring earlier in the fourth and the second or first centuries BCE. Although, then, both the substantive and the verb were in use as early as the fourth century BCE, the bulk of their preserved instances dates from the Roman Imperial period. One may wonder whether the epitome of 2 Maccabees, which uses both προήγορος and προηγορέω, comes from the latter period, too, rather than from the second century BCE, when the words in question have no attestations.[37]

c) The phrases ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς (7:3, 39; cf. 14:27) and ἀπολλυμένους υἱοὺς ἑπτά . . . μιᾶς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ἡμέρας (7:20) can help set a *terminus ante quem* for chapter 7. As we showed at 5.2.2, the first phrase recurs verbatim only in AT Esth 7:9(7), which is in all likelihood indebted to 2 Macc 7:3 and 7:39. When the Alpha Text of Esther was composed cannot be determined with any precision, yet a date around 40 CE (De Troyer 2000, 402) or in the second half of the first century CE (Cavalier 2012, 30–31) does not seem unlikely. The phrase μιᾶς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ἡμέρας recurs in 3 Macc 4:14 (ἀφανίσαι μιᾶς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ἡμέρας) and nowhere else in Greek. In both 2 and 3 Maccabees it is used to designate the time of an execution, that of the seven brothers and of the Alexandrian Jews, respectively. Third Maccabees 4:14 parallels Esth 3:13, where another massive execution of Jews is planned: ἀφανίσαι τὸ γένος τῶν Ἰουδαίων ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ.[38] The author uses the same verb, ἀφανίσαι, yet, instead of the trivial ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ, he opts for the idiomatic μιᾶς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ἡμέρας, which he apparently draws from 2 Macc 7:20. The uniqueness of the temporal phrase, on the one hand, and the numerous lexical and phraseological similarities between 2 and 3 Maccabees,[39] on the other hand, support the

[34] *IGUR* I 2.5 προαγοροῦντος | Διοκλέος τοῦ Διοκλέος. See Manganaro 1963, 216–19 and Ardizzone 1967, 172–76. On the Sicilian προάγορος see supra footnote 22.

[35] J. *AJ* 2.101; Plu. *Brut.* 6.6, *Cor.* 6.3, *Mor.* 386B 11; Arr. *An.* 7.29.2; Aristid. p. 564, l. 24 Jebb.

[36] *JÖAI* 4(1901) Bbl., 37–46.9 [Pisidia, Pogla] προηγορήσ[αν]τα καὶ | [σ]υν[δικήσ]αντα ὑπὲ[ρ τῆς πό]λεως.

[37] With the exception, perhaps, of the aforementioned inscription from Agrigento (*IGUR* I 2), in which προαγορέω occurs. The inscription has been variously dated from as high as the late third century BCE to the late second century BCE. See Ardizzone 1967, 173n78. Manganaro (1963, 213) places it to the first half of the first century BCE.

[38] Cf. Esth 3:7 ὥστε ἀπολέσαι ἐν μιᾷ ἡμέρᾳ τὸ γένος Μαρδοχαίου; Add B:7 ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ βιαίως εἰς τὸν ᾅδην κατελθόντες; 1 Macc 5:27 καὶ ἐξᾶραι πάντας τούτους ἐν ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ; Ph. *Virt.* 138.7 ἐνὶ καιρὶ καὶ ἡμέρᾳ μιᾷ ἔγγονον ὁμοῦ καὶ μητέρα κτείνειν.

[39] See a selection in Appendix 5, 9–30.

assumption that the latter text borrowed the phrase from the former. The dates that have been proposed for the composition of 3 Maccabees range from 100 BCE to 50 CE.[40] The latest possible date that has been suggested is the reign of Caligula or the subsequent reign of Claudius.[41] Of course, the earlier the date one ascribes to 3 Maccabees, the earlier the *terminus ante quem* set by this book for 2 Maccabees 7 and the rest of the epitome is. By accepting a *terminus post quem* of ca. 40 CE for the Alpha Text of Esther and a *terminus ante quem* of ca. 50 CE for 3 Maccabees, we can tentatively posit a *terminus ante quem* around the 40s CE for chapter 7 of 2 Maccabees. Admittedly, this is a frail *terminus*, because of the uncertain date of composition of both the Alpha Text of Esther and of 3 Maccabees.

The conclusions that we can draw from the discussion in this excursus are: a) the amount of intratextual connections between chapter 7 and almost all the other chapters of the epitome shows that chapter 7 was written by the same person who authored the rest of the epitome, its prologue included, b) there is lexical evidence that connects the vocabulary and the diction of chapter 7 with those of literary and non-literary texts from not earlier than the second half of the first century BCE, and c) chapter 7 was likely written before the 40s CE.

[40] See Croy 2006, xi–xiii.

[41] See Kopidakis 1987, 29–34; Collins 2000, 124–26.

Chapter 9: Summary and conclusion

The present study attempted to investigate a hitherto under-researched topic in Septuagint studies, the Septuagint neologisms, that is, the words which are first attested in the Septuagint, taking as a case in point one of the deuterocanonical/apocryphal books originally written in Greek, the Second Book of Maccabees. What prompted the study was the markedly high number of different types of neologisms that occur in this book. These neologisms include: words which are first attested in 2 Maccabees and do not recur anywhere else in the Septuagint (Septuagint *hapax legomena*) or anywhere else in Greek (absolute *hapax legomena*); words which first appear in 2 Maccabees and recur in other deuterocanonical/apocryphal books; words first attested in the canonical books of the Septuagint, which were taken up by 2 Maccabees; words first attested in 2 Maccabees, which recur in extra-Septuagintal literary and non-literary texts; and words first attested in secular Greek texts, contemporary or roughly contemporary with 2 Maccabees, which also occur in the latter book. The examination of these multifarious neologisms aimed at providing insights into the language of 2 Maccabees, its relationship to other Septuagintal and secular Greek works, and its date of composition.

The study was structured in eight chapters. In the introductory chapter we addressed issues related to the Septuagint book under investigation and the phenomenon under study. We started by highlighting the composite, multi-layered character of 2 Maccabees, resulting from its being the epitome of an older historiographical work, to which various letters, and possibly other external material, were attached or inserted. We also discussed the issues of authorship and dating, which are especially complex, since the aforementioned constituent parts of the book come from different hands and were likely written at different times. As a working hypothesis we accepted C. Habicht's thesis that 2 Maccabees is composed of three layers (Jason of Cyrene's original history, the epitome, and the final work, established perhaps by a final redactor/editor) and that the epitome dates from the time of redaction of the first letter prefixed to it, i.e. 124 BCE. We then proceeded to look at how the neologisms have been heretofore defined and identified in Septuagint scholarship, and especially in Septuagint lexicography. After pointing out the shortcomings and inadequacies of the Septuagint lexica as regards the marking and the method of identification of the Septuagint neologisms, we proposed a strictly chronological definition of neologism, which equates it with the first attested instance of a given word. We further emphasized that, in order to accurately identify the first attestations of the words occurring in a Septuagint book, it is imperative that the lexical resources of the ancient Greek language, especially the electronic databases of

ancient Greek texts, are scoured as exhaustively as possible. We concluded the introduction by discussing some previous studies which have used the neologisms as chronological and intertextual markers, and by presenting the procedures followed in the present study for the identification of the neologisms of 2 Maccabees and the criteria used to assess the intertextual relationships in which the neologisms are involved, and the chronological clues that the latter can provide.

Chapter 2 set as its aim, first, to identify the neologisms of 2 Maccabees, and, second, to provide lexical comments on about one third of them. We identified a total of fifty-nine words which are not attested prior to the posited date of composition of the epitome and do not recur in Septuagint books posterior to it. The main semantic domains in which these neologisms belong are those of 'moral and ethical qualities,' 'religious beliefs and activities,' 'divine attributes,' 'attitudes and emotions,' 'military activities,' and 'violence, harm, destroy, kill.' About half of them were 'stillborn' neologisms, in the sense that they were not taken up by any writers before or even after 600 CE and remained *hapax legomena* in the Greek language; ten have between two and three attestations in all of Greek up to ca. 600 CE; the rest are more frequently attested in literary and non-literary texts, yet most of them do not recur earlier than the first century CE. Although it is hazardous to speculate whether the words that we identified as neologisms were coined by the author of 2 Maccabees or just happened to be first attested in the epitome, it is likely that many of the *hapax legomena* were indeed coinages of the author of 2 Maccabees which did not catch on with subsequent writers. The same can be assumed for some of the words that have more than one attestation, yet the truth is that there can be no real certainty about who the original coiner of any of the words that we labelled as neologisms was. This also holds for the epitomator's prologue and epilogue, where we tracked four neologisms, which do not recur before the first century CE, and for the passages that scholarship assigns to the epitomator, where another four neologisms occur, among which one *hapax legomenon* and two *dis legomena*. Behind the use of the neologisms in the epitome we discerned the author's striving after variation and stylistic effect, his desire to give his language a poetic tint or to accentuate pathos, and his intention to generate intertextual references to both Septuagintal and secular Greek texts.

Chapter 3 dealt with the doubtful neologisms, namely the words for which, for one reason or another, it cannot be ascertained whether or not their first attestation is found in 2 Maccabees. The first instances of most of the words examined in this chapter occur in the epitome, as well as in other Jewish-Greek (e.g. in the Letter of Aristeas and in 1 Enoch) or profane Greek literary works (e.g. in the pseudo-Platonic *Axiochus* and in Ps.-Demetrius' *On Style*) or in various epigraphical texts, the dates of which cannot be determined precisely, but fall roughly within the second and first centuries BCE. The most notable findings concerned the occurrence in 2 Maccabees of words and turns of phrase that are otherwise known to us not from contemporary literary texts but from inscriptions recording honorific decrees, and of words, which, their instance in 2 Maccabees aside, do not have secure attestations earlier than the first century BCE, or

later, or whose attestations start accumulating from the first century BCE onwards. The fact, in particular, that, prior to the second century CE, words such as ἀπαρασήμαντος (2 Macc 15:36) and φιλοπολίτης (2 Macc 14:37) are attested exclusively in 2 Maccabees and in Asia Minor honorific inscriptions may be a telling clue to the place of composition of the epitome or to the geographical and linguistic background of its author. Another term, προήγορος, discussed in Chapter 8, is also almost exclusively attested in Asia Minor honorific decrees and may point in the same direction.

In Chapter 4 we investigated the Septuagint neologisms that occur in 2 Maccabees and in one more deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book, in order to determine whether they attest to a relation of lexical dependence between the books which share them. Our examination of half a dozen such neologisms (some of which may have been coined by the author of 2 Maccabees), supported by the evidence furnished by phraseological parallels exclusively common to 2 Maccabees and the other deuterocanonical/apocryphal books, showed that 3 and 4 Maccabees and Addition E to Esther are indebted to 2 Maccabees for a number of neologisms that first occur in the latter book. A similar relation of dependence seems to exist between 2 Maccabees and 1 Esdras; although it is difficult to ascertain the direction of this dependence, it is likely that the former book is indebted to the latter for the neologism that they share exclusively within the Septuagint.

In Chapter 5 we examined two neologisms which occur in 2 Maccabees and one of the two extant Greek versions of Esther, the Alpha Text. We established that the latter text borrowed both neologisms from 2 Maccabees; one of the two is actually part of an implicit quotation of 2 Macc 7:3 and 7:39. We conjectured that these neologisms were introduced into the Alpha Text sometime in the first century CE, when the final redaction of this text likely took place, perhaps within a *Sitz im Leben* of persecution, which would explain the implicit quotation from the martyrological narrative in 2 Maccabees. We also examined whether 2 Maccabees was acquainted with the canonical LXX Esther, but found no cogent evidence of such an acquaintance; the deuterocanonical Additions B and E seem, on the contrary, to be indebted to 2 Maccabees for a phrase parallel and a neologism, respectively.

In Chapter 6 we attempted to trace the neologisms of the canonical books of the Septuagint that occur in 2 Maccabees. Our examination found that the epitome is certainly indebted for a number of them to the Septuagint Exodus and Deuteronomy, very likely to the Septuagint Psalms, and possibly to OG Daniel and the Septuagint Job and/or Joel. A survey of a selection of phraseological parallels that occur between the Greek versions of the canonical books and the epitome further showed that, aside from the aforenamed books, the author of the epitome was acquainted with the Septuagint of Isaiah and, possibly, with OG Judges.

In Chapter 7 we undertook an investigation of the lexical similarities between Polybius' *Histories* and 2 Maccabees in order to assess whether or not they attest to the lexical influence of the former historiographical work on the latter. The examination of half a dozen morpho-semantic and a few semantic Polybian neologisms which occur in 2

Maccabees provided indications of the deuterocanonical book's lexical dependence on the *Histories*, but no strongly conclusive evidence. The tracking down of phraseological parallels between 2 Maccabees and secular Greek historiographical works dating from the second century BCE to the second century CE showed that Polybius' *Histories*, Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History*, and, to a lesser extent, Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities*, display the highest number of phrase similarities with 2 Maccabees. From this evidence we postulated that the epitome belongs, roughly speaking, to the same linguistic milieu as the aforenamed works, and dates to approximately the same period as they, namely to somewhere between the 150s–120s and the last third of the first century BCE, perhaps closer to the latter period than to the former.

In Chapter 8 (Excursus) we focused on the diction of chapter 7 of 2 Maccabees and tried to establish whether or not this chapter was a later addition, as argued by some scholars. The fact that every second verse of this chapter has verbal correspondences with almost all the other chapters of the epitome, the epitomator's prologue included, led us to consider that it comes from the same hand as the rest of the epitome. Further, we detected in it individual lexical items and combinations of words, which, outside 2 Maccabees, are attested in secular Greek literary and non-literary texts from the second half of the first century BCE onwards. On the basis of the implicit quotation of 2 Macc 7:3 and 7:39 in the Alpha Text of Esther and an exclusive phraseological similarity between 2 Macc 7:20 and 3 Macc 4:14 we posited that chapter 7, and the rest of the epitome, came into existence before the 40s CE.

The fifty-eight neologisms of all kinds that we examined in detail in this study and the phraseological parallels between the epitome and Septuagintal as well as extra-Septuagintal texts that we adduced were enough, we think, to illustrate the double allegiance of the author of the epitome to Jewish-Greek and to secular Greek literature and culture. His language, as we showed, combines, in different proportions, elements drawn from sources as diverse as Homer and tragic poetry, Greek historiography of the Classical and the Hellenistic periods, Hellenistic honorific decrees, the Greek translations of books of the Hebrew Bible, and other Jewish-Greek writings. The author of 2 Maccabees certainly aimed at being a *novator verborum*, yet his contribution to the Greek lexicon should not be assessed on the basis of the very high number of neologisms that we tracked: indeed, of the total of sixty-eight words that we listed as being first attested in 2 Maccabees, less than thirty are likely to have been coined by the author of this book and most of them remained nonce-coinages. Of the words that are not (absolute or non-absolute) *hapax legomena* and recur in literary and non-literary texts, about a dozen have attestations in the first century BCE, another dozen have attestations not earlier than the first century CE, and the rest are sparely attested after the second century CE. The fact that about two dozen words which were not, in all likelihood, coined by the author of 2 Maccabees are attested outside of this book in the first centuries BCE and CE, but not in the second century BCE, to which the epitome is commonly dated, is a noteworthy fact that has to be taken into consideration when discussing the date of 2 Maccabees.

On the basis of the evidence derived from our above-summarized investigation, we can tentatively situate the epitome in the period after the translation of the Pentateuch, Isaiah, the Psalms, and possibly OG Judges, Job and/or Joel, and OG Daniel, after the Letter of Aristeas but before the composition of 3 and 4 Maccabees and Additions B and E to Esther, as well as after the publication of Polybius' *Histories* and not far from the time of composition/publication of Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History* and Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities*. As we argued, neither Philo's works nor the Letter to the Hebrews can provide an indisputable *terminus ante quem* for the composition of the epitome of 2 Maccabees, as some scholars believe, since, despite the existence of verbal and other points of contact between the epitome and the aforenamed works, it cannot be proven conclusively that Philo or the author of Hebrews or Luke—if Acts 1:10 is in any way dependent on 2 Macc 3:33—knew 2 Maccabees. The relationship of literary dependence between 2 and 3 Maccabees makes the latter book especially apt at providing a *terminus ante quem* for the former book; this *terminus* cannot be later than the 40s CE. The general time frame of the composition of the epitome that emerges from the above evidence falls thus very roughly between the late second century BCE and the mid-first century CE. More specifically:

1) Lexical evidence that seems to point to a date of composition of the epitome in the second half of the second century BCE at the earliest comes from:

a) The neologisms and the word combinations shared between 2 Maccabees and the Greek versions of canonical and deuterocanonical books of the Septuagint such as Isaiah, the Psalms, and 1 Esdras, which are thought to have been made before the end of the second century BCE.
b) The Polybian neologisms that occur in 2 Maccabees and the numerous phraseological similarities between the epitome and the *Histories*, which, even if they do not result from a direct influence of the latter work on the former, may attest to their rough proximity in time.

2) Lexical evidence that seems to support a date of composition of the epitome in the first century BCE is the following:

a) As already noted, a dozen words occur in 2 Maccabees which are next attested in the first century BCE, when they appear in both literary and non-literary texts. These words were apparently not coined by the author of 2 Maccabees. It seems reasonable to posit that the latter book was written in the first century BCE, when the words that appear to be first attested in it have instances in secular Greek texts, rather than that it preserves some early (if not the earliest) second-century BCE instances of them.
b) The use in 2 Maccabees of temporal expressions consisting of a numeral+-ετής compound and χρόνος (e.g. διετὴς χρόνος instead of δύο ἔτη) becomes current in literary and non-literary texts from the first century BCE onwards.
c) If the author of the epitome knew OG Daniel, as we posited, and if the latter was produced around the turn of the first century BCE, as Daniel scholarship posits,

the epitome was composed at least as early as the beginning of the first century BCE.

d) There are phraseological parallels between 2 Maccabees and secular Greek literary works of the first century BCE (Diodorus Siculus' *Library of History*, Dionysius of Halicarnassus' *Roman Antiquities*), which do not occur between 2 Maccabees and earlier historiographical works, e.g. Polybius' *Histories*, from the second century BCE. It is especially noteworthy that in the epitomator's prologue, as well as in chapter 7, one can identify a number of phrases that find parallels in secular Greek works of the first centuries BCE and CE.

e) Both the author of 2 Maccabees (4:47) and Cicero, in his second Verrine oration (2.5.150) of 70 BCE, use an identical expression to refer to the judicial severity of the Scythians (εἰ καὶ ἐπὶ Σκυθῶν ἔλεγον/si haec apud Scythas dicerem). This expression may have been in vogue in the rhetorical schools of the early first century BCE, so that both Cicero and the author of 2 Maccabees, who seems to have had rhetorical training and aspirations, could use it independently.

3) There is even evidence that may be taken to point to a later, first-century CE date of the epitome:

a) A dozen neologisms of 2 Maccabees, among which are three that occur in the epitomator's short prologue, recur in literary and non-literary texts not earlier than the first century CE. Many, if not most, of these words were probably not coined by the author of 2 Maccabees. Especially noteworthy is the rhetorical term μετάφρασις, which occurs in the epitomator's prologue. Outside the epitome, this term has no attestations earlier than the first half of the first century CE, in both Greek and Latin literature; its cognate verb μεταφράζω is not attested earlier than Dionysius of Halicarnassus.

b) There exist exclusive phraseological parallels between 2 Maccabees and a number of works of Philo—parallels which, if not due to the lexical influence of the former on the latter, may be indicative of the chronological proximity of the epitome with Philo's works.

c) The military term σπεῖρα, as used in 2 Maccabees, seems to refer to units of a very large size, comparable to that of the σπεῖραι/cohorts of the Roman Imperial period and not to that of the σπεῖραι/maniples of the second century or the σπεῖραι/cohorts of the early first century BCE.

d) The judicial term προήγορος, which occurs in the martyrology of chapter 7 of the epitome, although not a neologism (there occur a couple of instances in inscriptions of the fourth and third centuries BCE), has a significant number of exclusively epigraphical attestations clustered in the Roman Imperial period.

e) There is evidence for scalping (see 2 Macc 7:4) being performed in Roman, but not in Seleucid, Palestine.

At the beginning of our study, we accepted as a working hypothesis that the epitome, in the linguistic form that we know it, was produced as early as 124 BCE, the date that the first prefixed letter bears. However, this does not seem to be supported by our findings.

The internal lexical evidence that we adduced would rather support a date in the first century BCE or around the turn of the Common Era. Another postulate included in our working hypothesis, namely that the pièce de résistance of the epitome, chapter 7, may have been an interpolation inserted by a later redactor/editor, who did not tamper with the language and diction of the rest of the epitome, is also not supported by our findings. The martyrology in chapter 7 seems to have been penned by the same person who authored the prologue and some of the core episodes of the epitome (the martyrdom of Eleazar, the death of Razis, and the death of Antiochus Epiphanes) and to belong to the same stratum as the other chapters of the work, although its author may have relied for its composition on a source other than Jason of Cyrene's history. Two possibilities present themselves here:

a) Epitomator+final author: a primitive epitome of Jason of Cyrene's work was produced sometime in the third quarter of the second century BCE (shortly after Jason's death, or, more unlikely, during his lifetime) and sent, for heortological purposes, to Egypt, together with at least the first prefixed letter, dated to 124 BCE. At a later date, in the first century BCE, or around the turn of the Common Era, a redactor/editor thoroughly reworked the original epitome, adding chapter 7, and possibly other material, and imposed his literary style on the entire work, the prologue included, giving it its final shape.
b) Epitomator=final author: only one epitome was produced in the first century BCE, or later, by the person introducing himself in the prologue of the work as the epitomator. The only intervention on the part of a subsequent editor might have involved the two letters—perhaps archival material—which, owing to their relevance to the subject matter of the epitome, were deemed worthy of being attached to and read together with the latter.

If we were to hazard a guess as to when the final author might have lived and composed (or, if one accepts the first possibility above, reworked) the epitome, we would pinpoint the Herodian period. Scholars like Lévy (1955), Gauger (2002), Atkinson (2004b), and van Henten (2006) have already noted the similarities between events that transpired during the reign of Herod I, as we know them from Josephus, and events that occurred during the reign of Antiochus IV, as we know them from 2 Maccabees: the burning and slaughtering by the soldiers of Herod of the Jews who had taken refuge in the caves of Arbela, among whom was an old man, who preferred to kill his seven sons and his wife and cast them down a precipice, before throwing himself, too (J. *BJ* 1.304–306, 310–313; *AJ* 14.421–30; cf. 2 Macc 6:11; 7; 14:37–46); the destruction of the golden eagle erected by Herod over the gate of the Temple by some forty youths, incited by two teachers of the Law; all of them were arrested, interrogated by Herod, and executed by burning, as they chose to adhere to the Law, at the cost of their lives, and receive posthumous recompense (J. *BJ* 1.648–655, 2.5–7; *AJ* 17.149–167; cf. 2 Macc 6 and 7); Herod's fatal disease, involving intestinal pain, putrefaction, and worms, seen as divine punishment (J. *BJ* 1.656; *AJ* 17.168–170; cf. 2 Macc 9:5–9); Herod's intention to execute all the notables of Judaea (J. *BJ* 1.659–660; *AJ* 17.174; cf. 2 Macc 9:4, 14);

Herod's deathbed letter to his troops asking them to show εὔνοια to his son and successor (J. *BJ* 1.667; *AJ* 17.194; cf. 2 Macc 9:18–27). Some of the contemporaries of these events cannot have failed to associate the days and deeds of Herod with those of Antiochus Epiphanes, as can be inferred from the pseudepigraphic Assumption of Moses, which likely dates from the period after Herod's death, and seen the last-named ruler as an Antiochus *redivivus*. If indeed the description of Antiochus' disease and death was informed by oral or written accounts concerning the disease and death of Herod, then the composition (or actualization) of the epitome of 2 Maccabees may not have taken place long after Herod's death in 4 BCE, and most likely earlier than the 40s of the first century CE.

But let us not venture more into speculation. Throughout this study, we have emphasized time and again that the investigation of the neologisms, the *hapax legomena*, and other lexical features occurring in 2 Maccabees, or in any other ancient Greek text for that matter, is seriously hindered, if not undermined, by the fragmentariness of the surviving evidence of ancient Greek, the incompleteness of our corpora, and the imperfection of our research tools. We have also emphasized the uncertainty that is inherent in the endeavour to discuss issues of intertextuality and chronology on the basis of individual words, however rare and distinctive they may be. However, despite these caveats, we believe that the examination of the neological vocabulary of 2 Maccabees undertaken in this study provided some new insights into the language of this book, its relationship to other Septuagintal as well as secular Greek texts, and the date of its composition, that will prompt further research.

Appendices

Appendix 1: A tentative chronology of the books of the Septuagint

The following chronological table is mainly based on *BGS* and *CCS* (see 1.9).[1] The latter provides the most up-to-date survey of old and recent opinions concerning the chronology of the books of the Septuagint. As even a cursory look and comparison of the chronological conjectures put forth in scholarly literature makes clear, divergence of opinion rather than consensus prevails. The books of the Septuagint cannot be pinned down to a particular year, decade, or, in a few cases, even century. Accordingly, establishing their order of translation/composition seems an unattainable task. The date chart presented below has thus only an indicative and tentative value and in no case is it used uncritically in this study. Alongside the posited dates of the books of the Septuagint are also cited the dates of a number of contemporary, extra-Septuagintal works (most of which are mentioned in this study) for the purpose of better placing the Septuagint corpus within the wider literary context of its time. The names of the contributors to the *CCS* volume are given in parentheses, whereas the names of the scholars whose datings are cited by the former are given in square brackets.

LXX book	Date of translation/composition	Extra-LXX works
Genesis	*BGS*, 96: "Surely before 210, probably before 260, perhaps before 282 BCE." *CCS* (Scarlata, 15): "Third or middle second century B.C.E."	Menander, *Dyscolus*: 316 BCE;[2] Theophrastus, *History of Plants*, 314 (?) BCE.[3]
Exodus	*BGS*, 96: "Surely before 210, probably before 260, perhaps before 282 BCE." *CCS* (Salvesen, 31): Before the end of the third century BCE.	Callimachus, *Hymn to Zeus*, 280s BCE.[4]

[1] See also the chronological table in Siegert 2001, 42–43 and the dates given in Dines 2004, 41–46 (note the reservations expressed on p. 45 about some of the dates proposed in *BGS*).

[2] *GAT*, 400.

[3] *GAT*, 607.

[4] Easterling and Knox 1985, 550.

Leviticus	*BGS*, 96: "Surely before 210, probably before 260, perhaps before 282 BCE." *CCS* (Voitila, 45): "Leviticus was translated at the same time as the rest of the Pentateuch, commonly dated to the third century B.C.E."	Theocritus, *Women at the Adonia*, 275–270 BCE.[5]
Numbers	*BGS*, 96: "Surely before 210, probably before 260, perhaps before 282 BCE." *CCS* (Evans, 59–60): Third century BCE.	Apollonius Rhodius, *Argonautica*: ca. 250 BCE.[6]
Deuteronomy	*BGS*, 96: "Surely before 210, probably before 260, perhaps before 282 BCE." *CCS* (Perkins, 70–71): Third or second century BCE; *terminus ante quem*: mid-second century BCE.	Philo of Byzantium: 240–200 BCE.[7]
Joshua	*BGS*, 96: "Before 132 BCE, if the book is one of the 'Prophets' referred to in the prologue of Sirach." *CCS* (van der Meer, 89): "Late third century B.C.E. . . . in the period between the fourth (219–217 B.C.E.) and fifth (202–195 B.C.E.) Syrian wars."	Phylarchus, *Histories*: ca. 230–200 BCE.[8]
Judges	*BGS*, 96: "The translation dates from the same period as the OG of 1–4 Kingdoms [Barthélemy]. It is posterior to the translation of the Psalms [Munnich]. First half of the second century BCE (?)" *CCS* (Satterthwaite, 105): "LXX Judges was in existence by the end of the second century B.C.E. . . . It was produced no earlier than the 160s B.C.E."	
1–2 Kingdoms	*BGS*, 96–97: "Probably beginning of the second century BCE. . . . It seems that 1 Kingdoms was translated at the same time as Isaiah and Judges." *CCS* (Hugo, 129): "Early second century B.C.E., with the translation of the first book perhaps circulating before the second; *kaige* recension: first century B.C.E."	
3–4 Kingdoms	*BGS*, 96–97: "2 and 3 Kingdoms are posterior to the Psalms [Munnich]; 3 Kingdoms is anterior to 150 BCE." *CCS* (Law, 149–50): "The middle of the second century [B.C.E.] is the latest date for the translation of Kingdoms. . . . The *kaige* revision of 3–4 Kingdoms can be dated to the first century B.C.E."	
1–2 Chronicles (*Paraleipomena*)	*BGS*, 97: "Before 150 BCE [Gerleman]." *CCS* (Good, 169): "Second century B.C.E. prior to the citations of the Greek translation in Eupolemus (ca. 150 B.C.E.)."	Sibylline Oracles 3 (main corpus): 163–145 BCE.[9]
Proverbs	*BGS*, 97: "150 BCE [Gerleman]." *CCS* (Aitken and Cuppi, 342–43): "Early second century B.C.E. [Cook]; in the reign of Ptolemy VI Philometor (181–145 B.C.E.) [d'Hamonville]."	Testaments of the Twelve Patriarchs: date of origin in the Maccabean period.[10]
Psalms	*BGS*, 97: "Probably beginning of the second century BCE [Munnich]; first century BCE [van der Kooij]." Schaper 1995, 150: "The Psalter was almost certainly translated in the last third of the second century BC." *CCS* (Aitken, 321): "Second century B.C.E. [Munnich, Williams]; end of the second or beginning of the first century B.C.E. [Schaper, van der Kooij]."	Polybius, *Histories*: first part composed between 167 and 151 BCE; second part composed after 146 BCE.[11]

[5] Easterling and Knox 1985, 570.
[6] *GAT*, 50.
[7] *EANS*, 654.
[8] *FGrH* 2A, 1.
[9] Collins, *OTP* 1:355.
[10] Kee, *OTP* 1:778.
[11] Pédech 1969, xiv–xv. Cf. Walbank 1972, 21–22.

Ezekiel	*BGS*, 97: "After the Psalms but before Isaiah." Olley 2009, 15: "Around 150 BCE." *CCS* (Hauspie, 532): "Second century B.C.E. . . . after the composition of the Psalms and before Isaiah."	
Job	*BGS*, 97: "150 BCE [Gerleman]." *CCS* (Cox, 388): "As early as the mid-second century B.C.E., but probably it is somewhat later."	
The Minor Prophets	*BGS*, 97: "Translation posterior to the Psalms [Munnich] but anterior to Isaiah [Seeligmann]. First half of the second century BCE." *CCS* (Dines, 441): "The XII belong plausibly to the second century B.C.E. . . . Most scholars suggest the middle of the century."	
Isaiah	*BGS*, 97: "Between 170 and 132 BCE." *CCS* (Ngunga and Schaper, 458): "Sometime in the second century B.C.E. . . . later in the translation process than some of the prophets. . . . Completed before the translator's preface to Sirach was written (ca. 132 or 117 B.C.E.); ca. 145 B.C.E. [Seeligmann] or ca. 140 B.C.E. [van der Kooij]."	Agatharchides of Cnidus, *On the Erythrean Sea*: shortly after 145 or shortly after 132 BCE.[12]
Jeremiah	*BGS*, 97: "First half of the second century BCE." *CCS* (Shead, 472–73): "OG text: before 116 B.C.E.; revised text: early part of the period 116 B.C.E.–50 C.E. [Tov]."	
Baruch	*BGS*, 97: "1:1–3:8 translated at the same time as Jeremiah [Tov]; 3:9–end, around 80 CE [Thackeray]." *CCS* (Ryan, 488–90): "*Terminus ante quem*: ca. 165 B.C.E. [Dancy, Burke, Marttila]; first century B.C.E. [Watson]; 116 B.C.E. for Bar 1:1–3:8, if the translator/redactor of Bar 1:1–3:8 is the same as the translator of LXX Jer 29–52."	
Epistle of Jeremiah	*BGS*, 85: "Before 100 BCE." *CCS* (Wright, 521): "A second-century B.C.E. date seems most probable."	
1 Esdras	*BGS*, 97: "1–2 Esdras. Before 100 BCE. 1 Esdras might be slightly anterior to 2 Esdras [Hanhart]." *CCS* (Patmore, 183): "Sometime in the mid-second century B.C.E."	
Tobit	*BGS*, 97: "Second century BCE [Festugière]." *CCS* (Stuckenbruck and Weeks, 241–42): Early date on the basis of orthographic evidence (forms with *theta* of the pronouns οὐδείς/μηδείς, which become rare in documentary texts after the second century BCE).	
Sirach (Ecclesiasticus)	*BGS*, 88, 97: "Between 132 and 117 BCE." *CCS* (Wright, 412–13): "Slightly before or after 117 B.C.E."	
2 Maccabees	*BGS*, 85: "Perhaps 124 BCE [Momigliano], in any case before Pompey (=63 BCE [rev. Schürer])." *CCS* (Shaw, 275–77): 125–63 BCE [Attridge]; 124 BCE [Momigliano, Habicht, rev. Schürer, Harrington]; 41–44 CE [Zeitlin-Tedesche]; "The book may belong almost anywhere in the last 150 years B.C." [Bartlett].	Letter of Aristeas: "A date ranging from the 150s BCE to the last decade of the second century BCE."[13]
1 Maccabees	*BGS*, 97: "Last third of the second century BCE or beginning of the first century BCE [rev. Schürer]." *CCS* (Williams, 263–65): Between 104 and 63 BCE; ca. 130 BC [Schwartz]; the book appeared in two editions, the first ca. 130 BCE and the (expanded) second ca. 100 BCE [Williams].	

[12] Burstein 1989, 16–17.

[13] Wright 2015, 28.

Judith	*BGS*, 97: "Seems to be from the same period as 1 Maccabees [Festugière and rev. Schürer]: before 100 BCE." Gera 2014, 44: "Circa 100 B.C.E., give or take a decade or two on either end." *CCS* (Corley, 224–25): Between 161 and 63 B.C.E. [Moore]; between 104 and 63 B.C.E., if Judith depends on 1 Maccabees; *terminus post quem* 114 or 77 B.C.E., if Judith depends on LXX Esther; soon after the death of Alexandra Salome (who reigned 76–67 B.C.E.), if the character of Judith was modelled after this queen [Boccaccini].	
Prayer of Manasseh (*Odes* 12)	*CCS* (Aitken, 336): "Sometime before the first century B.C.E."	
Daniel (Old Greek and Theodotion)	*BGS*, 97: "OG: shortly before 145 BCE [Grelot]; θ': between 30 and 50 CE." *CCS* (McLay, 546–47): OG: around the beginning of the first century B.C.E. [Montgomery, Hartman and Di Lella]; θ': first century B.C.E.	
The Additions to Daniel	*CCS* (Lahey, 557): "They would seem to have been added to OG Daniel when the translation was made 135–120 B.C.E. . . . They were likely included in Proto-Theodotion early in the first century B.C.E."	Meleager, *Garland*: 100–90 BCE.[14]
Esther	Bickerman (2007d, 259): reign of Alexander Jannaeus (103–76 BCE). *BGS*, 90, 97: "Beginning of the first century BCE . . . before 78/77 BCE." *CCS* (Boyd-Taylor, 205): "Late second or early first century B.C.E."	Posidonius, *On the Ocean*: 80s BCE; *Histories*: 80s–50s BCE.[15]
The Additions to Esther	*BGS*, 85: "Probably at the time of the translation [of Esther], shortly before 78/77 BCE." *CCS* (Boyd-Taylor, 206–7): Additions A, F: late second century BCE, *terminus post quem*: 116 BCE [Jobes]; Additions B and E: after 3 Maccabees [Hacham]; Addition C: introduced to LXX Esther prior to or at the same time as E [Jobes].	Philodemus, *On Rhetoric* 1–3: 75–50 BCE; *On Vices and Virtues, On Death*: after 50 BCE.[16]
Psalms of Solomon	*BGS*, 97: "Second half of the first century BCE [Hahn]." *CCS* (Pevarello, 426–29): Before and/or after Pompey's siege of Jerusalem (63 BCE); final redaction possibly in the Herodian period [Wright].	Diodorus Siculus, *Library of History*: completed after 36 BCE after 30 years of work.[17]
3 Maccabees	*BGS*, 85: "Between 120 BCE and 70 CE [rev. Schürer]." Croy 2006, xiii: "Anywhere within the range of 100 BCE to 50 CE." *CCS* (Raup Johnson, 295): "Sometime in the last century of Ptolemaic rule (ca. 100–30 B.C.E.) or the early decades of Roman rule (30 B.C.E.–70 C.E.)."	Dionysius of Halicarnassus, *Roman Antiquities*: 7 BCE.[18] Nicolaus of Damascus, *Histories*: ca. 14–3 BCE.[19]
Lamentations	*BGS*, 97: "Work of the *kaige* group in the first half of the first century BCE [Barthélemy]." *CCS* (Youngblood, 504): "LXX Lamentations fits comfortably between 50 B.C.E. and 50 C.E."	Strabo, *Geography*: probably posthumous edition (after 24 CE).[20]

[14] Cameron 1993, 56.
[15] Malitz 1983, 30–32.
[16] Gigante 2002, 29, 38–47.
[17] *GAT*, 201.
[18] *GAT*, 216.
[19] *FGrH* 2A, 2.
[20] *GAT*, 566.

Wisdom of Solomon	*BGS*, 85: "Last third of the first century BCE [Larcher]." *CCS* (Aitken, 402–4): "Early period of Roman rule of Egypt, 31–10 B.C.E. [Larcher]; first century B.C.E., before Philo [Engberg-Pedersen]; reign of Caligula, 37–41 C.E. [Winston]."	Philo *Against Flaccus*: 40/41 CE.[21]
Canticles (Song of Songs)	*BGS*, 97: "Translated by the *kaige* group in the first half of the first century CE [Barthélemy]." *CCS* (Auwers, 371): "Probably in the first century C.E. or at the earliest during the first century B.C.E."	Josephus, *Jewish War*: 79–81 CE; *Jewish Antiquities*: 93/94 CE.[22]
Ruth	*BGS*, 96: "Translated by the *kaige* group in the first half of the first century CE [Barthélemy]." *CCS* (Bons, 119): First century CE (?)	Group *kaige* and Theodotion: 30–50 CE.[23] Gospels and Acts: 70–100 CE Hebrews: ca. 100 CE.[24]
4 Maccabees	*BGS*, 85: "Between 35 CE [Bickerman] and 100 CE [Dupont-Sommer]." van Henten (1986, 145, 149): "Around 100 CE." *CCS* (Hiebert, 308–9): "First or second century CE; *terminus ante quem*: 72 C.E."	Plutarch, *Lives*: after 96 CE.[25] 1–2 Clement: ca. 100–150 CE.[26]
Ecclesiastes	*BGS*, 97: "Perhaps the work of young Aquila." *CCS* (Aitken, 358): "At the earliest it should be placed in the first century C.E., with a *terminus ad quem* of Aquila in the early second."	Revision of Aquila: 128–129 CE or later.[27] Arrian, *Tactics*: ca. 135 CE.[28]
2 Esdras	*CCS* (Wooden, 196): "Latter half of the second century C.E."	Revision of Symmachus: 161–180 CE [Gwynn, Mercati].[29] Old Latin translations of 2 Maccabees: mid-first century CE–beginning of third century CE.[30]

[21] van der Horst 2003, 4.
[22] *GAT*, 328.
[23] *BGS*, 152.
[24] *GAT*, 115.
[25] *GAT*, 489.
[26] *GAT*, 53.
[27] *BGS*, 144.
[28] *GAT*, 80.
[29] *BGS*, 148.
[30] Goldstein 1983, 126.

Appendix 2: List of the neologisms of 2 Maccabees

The following list includes the words whose earliest recorded instance in Greek is found in 2 Maccabees (accepting, as a working hypothesis, that the epitome was composed in 124 BCE).[31] These neologisms do not occur anywhere else in the Septuagint. They are listed in the order in which they appear in the text of 2 Maccabees and are cited as in the *GELS*. Excluded are transliterations of Semitic words (e.g. νεφθαρ, νεφθαι [1:36]) and proper names. Included are words such as Κυπριάρχης and Μαρδοχαϊκός, which Hatch and Redpath in their *Concordance to the Septuagint* treat as proper names, and which the *SV,* the LEH, the *GELS*, and the *GS* lexica omit, as well as Μυσάρχης, which Hatch and Redpath treat as a common name[32] and which the Septuagint lexica also omit. It should be noted that for a number of neologisms listed below, the major textual witnesses of 2 Maccabees are not unanimous in their readings.[33]

The list also provides information on whether a neologism is an (absolute or non-absolute) *hapax*, a *dis* or a *tris legomenon*;[34] for the words that are attested more than once, at least the first of their subsequent occurrences in literary or documentary texts that postdate 2 Maccabees is recorded.

Neologisms	2 Maccabees	*Hapax/dis/tris legomenon*	Next occurrence in:
ὑπογραμμός	2:28		*TAM V,1* 688.12 [Ioulia Gordos, 1st c. CE]; NT 1 Pet 2:21; 1 Clem. 5.7.5, passim
μετάφρασις	2:31		Herenn.Phil. *FGrH* 3c, 790 fr. 2.52; Sen. *Suas*. 1.12; Plu. *Dem*. 8.2
φρικασμός	3:17	*h.l.*	

[31] It should be specified here that only the neologisms that occur in the main text of Hanhart's critical edition of 2 Maccabees have been identified and listed. The neologisms to be found among the variant readings included in the critical apparatus (e.g. ἀνδρολόγ(ε)ιον [12:43 ανδρολογειον], ἀντιδοκέω [9:8 αντιδοκων], διηχέω [8:7 διηχειτο; see 3.5.1, footnote 158], εὐγεννασία [10:13 ευγεννασιας], εὐθαρσέως [7:10 ευθαρσεως], προσυμνέω [15:9 προσυμνησας], all attested in Codex Alexandrinus) have not been considered.

[32] The military title Μυσάρχης, "commander of the Mysians," was understood by some ecclesiastical writers (cf. Thdr. Stud. *ep*. 421.12) as a punning, derogatory epithet, having μύσος, "defilement," rather than Μυσός, "Mysian," as its first component. See LSJ and Revised Supplement, and LBG, s.v.

[33] E.g. 4:13 ἀναγνείαν] αγν(ε)ιαν A (671) 381-534 771, αγνοιαν 19-62 46-52 106; 5:3 θωρακισμούς] τεθωρακισμενοις V, τεθωρακισμενους 19-62 La^{LBMP}; 5:18 προενέχεσθαι] προσενεχεσθαι A´ 29-71-107-120 (προσενεχθηναι 671); 5:26 συνεξεκέντησε] συνεκεντησε(ν) V *L´* 46-52 55 311; 6:20 προπτύσας] πρωτευσας V^{i}, προσπτυσας *L´* (-πυσ. 19) 55 58 311, προτυπωσας 106^{1} (-τυσας) [see Katz 1961]; 13:25 διαστάλσεις] διαστασεις V *L´* 52 106 311; 14:18 ὑπευλαβεῖτο] επευλαβειτο V 71 *L* 55 311, απηυλαβειτο 771; 14:20 ὁμοιοψήφου] ομοψηφου V *L*$^{-381}$ 55 58 311 771, ομοψυχου 381-*l*, ομοιοψυχου 74 106; 15:11 προσεξηγησάμενος] προσηγησαμενος A´. Rahlfs in his *Septuaginta* and Habicht (1976, 284–85) have shown preference for some of these variants: the first for προσενέχομαι instead of προενέχομαι, the second for προτυπόω instead of προπτύω, and both for ὁμόψηφος instead of ὁμοιόψηφος.

[34] On the definitions of these terms, see 1.7b.

πρόπτωσις	3:21; 13:12		Crateuas fr. 8.6 Wellmann [1st c. BCE?]; Ascl. *Tact.* 5.1.6, 12 [1st c. BCE]
ὑπονοθεύω	4:7, 26		*Mylasa* 133.2 [38 BCE–14 CE]; D.H. 11.18.2.2; *Cat.Cod.Astr.* 1.98.13, 24 [1st c. BCE?]
ἀλλοφυλισμός	4:13; 6:24	abs. *h.l.*	
ἀναγνεία	4:13	abs. *h.l.*	
τιμωρητής	4:16		Herm. Sim. 7.1, 6 [66.1.3, 66.6.3 Whittaker] [2nd c. CE]
πρωτοκλήσιον	4:21	abs. *h.l.*	
ᾀδουχία	4:22		*Priene* 51.167 [ca. 120 BCE]; *CIRB* 130.9 [ca. 50 BCE–50 CE]
δεξιάζω	4:34	*tris legomenon*	*CPR.* 25.1.5 [Hermopolites, 101–300 CE]; *Chr.Mitt.* 300.5 [Hermopolis, 376–400 CE]
δεινάζω	4:35; 13:25	abs. *h.l.*	
συμμισοπονηρέω	4:36	abs. *h.l.*	
ψυχικῶς	4:37; 14:24		Ph. *Leg.* 2.81.7; Apollon. *Lex.* 153.11 [1st–2nd c. CE]
ἱεροσύλημα	4:39	abs. *h.l.*	
διεμπίμπλημι	4:40	abs. *h.l.*	
ἀκατάγνωστος	4:47		*IG X,2 1* 623, D.1 [Macedonia, 48 CE]; *SEG* 58-1759.B.3-4 [Jerusalem, 1st c. CE]; NT Titus 2:8
θωρακισμός	5:3		Hdn. *Epim.* 59.12 Boissonade [2nd c. CE]; Epiph. *haer.* 3.83.20, 3.84.14 Holl
συσσύρω	5:16		Aq. 1 Kgdms 12:25, 15:6; Sm. 1 Kgdms 26:10; Phryn. 402 Fischer [2nd c. CE]; Eus. *PE* 14.8.2
προενέχομαι	5:18	*h.l.*[35]	
δυσπέτημα	5:20	*dis legomenon*[+36]	Mac. Mgn. *apocr.* 3.113.17 Blondel [4th–5th c. CE]
Μυσάρχης	5:24	*h.l.*	
συνεκκεντέω	5:26	*dis legomenon*[+]	Gr. Naz. *ep.* 77.7 Gallay, *or.* 14, PG 35.861.11
χορτόδης	5:27		Dsc. 4.69.1 Wellmann [1st c. CE]
σπλαγχνισμός	6:7, 21; 7:42	abs. *h.l.*	
συμφλογίζω	6:11	*tris legomenon*	Thd. Isa 42:25; Bars. *resp.* 48.65 Neyt and de Angelis-Noah [6th c. CE]
ἐλευστέον	6:17	*dis legomenon*[+]	Didym. *in Zach.* 4.15 Doutrelaeu [4th c. CE]
προπτύω	6:20	abs. *h.l.*	
ἐνενηκονταετής	6:24		D.H. 6.21.3 (ἐνενηκονταέτης); Ign. *ep.* 3.3.3 Diekamp and Funk [1st–2nd c. CE]
ἀπευθανατίζω	6:28	abs. *h.l.*	
περισκυθίζω	7:4		Mel. *AP* 12.95.6; Or. *mart.* 23.12 Koetschau; Gal. *Fasc.* 18a.790.17 Kühn; Phalar. *Ep.* 147.3.11 Hercher
ἀναβίωσις	7:9		Plu. *Luc.* 18, 364F.8, 389A.6
παρεισπορεύομαι	8:1	abs. *h.l.*	
προσαναλέγομαι	8:19	abs. *h.l.*	
ὁπλολογέω	8:27, 31	*dis legomenon*	Ph. *Flacc.* 92.2
δοξικός	8:35	abs. *h.l.*	
παντεπόπτης	9:5		1 Clem. 55.6, 64.1 [1st c. CE]; *Bernand, Inscr.Métr.* 166.18 [end 1st–3rd c. CE]
ἐποξύνω	9:7		Them. *in PN* 5,6.10.30 Wendland [4th c. CE]
ἀποστρεβλόω	9:7	*h.l.*	
πολεμοτροφέω	10:14, 15; 14:6	abs. *h.l.*	

[35] See LBG, s.v.

[36] The symbol + indicates that the word designated as a *dis legomenon* (see 1.7b) has a few more attestations after 600 CE.

ἀρρενωδῶς	10:35	abs. *h.l.*	
χρονίσκος	11:1	abs. *h.l.*	
ἀργυρολόγητος	11:3	abs. *h.l.*	
λεοντηδόν	11:11	*h.l.*	
Κυπριάρχης	12:2	abs. *h.l.*	
προοδηγός	12:36	*dis legomenon*	Sib. Or. 8.24 [2nd c. CE]
δευτερολογέω	13:22	*dis legomenon*+	Epiph. *haer.* 3.339.30 Holl [4th–5th c. CE]
διάσταλσις	13:25	abs. *h.l.*	
προσπυρόω	14:11	abs. *h.l.*	
ὑπευλαβέομαι	14:18	*tris legomenon*	Memn. *FHG* 3:42.5 [1st c. BCE–1st c. CE]; Meth. *symp.* 3.13.21 Debidour and Musurillo
ὁμοιόψηφος	14:20	abs. *h.l.*	
αὐλαῖος (adj.)	14:41	*h.l.*[37]	
κατευθικτέω	14:43	abs. *h.l.*	
κρουνηδόν	14:45		Ph. *Mos.* 1.99, 1.211; *Flacc.* 190
ἁγιότης	15:2		T. 12 Patr. 3.3.4.2; NT Heb 12:10
βαρβάρως	15:2		Str. 10.3.17.16
προσεξηγέομαι	15:11		Ph. *Legat.* 197
Μαρδοχαϊκός	15:36	*dis legomenon*	Or. *or.* 13.2.10 Koetschau [2nd–3rd c. CE]
εὐθίκτως	15:38		Hdn. 4.7.2.5 Stavenhagen [2nd–3rd c. CE]

Appendix 3: List of the doubtful neologisms

Neologisms	2 Maccabees	LXX	Extra-LXX instances[38]
1. ἐφηβία	4:9		*IG II*^{2} 1008.29–30 [118/7 BCE]; *IG II*^{2} 1028.42 [100–99 BCE]
2. ἐπιλυπέω	4:37; 8:32	3 Macc 7:9	*IK Knidos I* 154.21 [2nd–1st c. BCE]; S.E. *M.* 11.127
3. ἐντινάσσω	4:41; 11:11	1 Macc 2:36	1 En. 89:43; *Panamara* 2.7 [ca. 39 BCE]
4. λεληθότως	6:11; 8:1		Pl. *Ax.* 365c; Demetr. *Eloc.* 297; D.S. (5x)
5. τετραμερής	8:21		Ocell. 1.14 Harder; Plu. 1139B, F
6. διεξίπταμαι	10:30		abs. *h.l.*
7. ὑπεράγαν	10:34; 13:25		Thphr. *apud* Ael. *NA* 3.38
8. ἱέρωμα	12:40		J. *AJ* 1.119, 322; *Bean-Mitford, Journeys 1964–68* 21,4.11 [ca. 72 CE]
9. ἀπροσδεής	14:35	1 Macc 12:9; 3 Macc 2:9	Let. Aris. 211
10. φιλοπολίτης	14:37		*Ephesos* 116.3 [Hellenistic]; *Aphrodisias* 106.1 [41/54 CE]; *Aphrodisias* 296.2 [mid-1st c. CE]
11. παρεπιδείκνυμι	15:10		Aristo *Stoic* (?) *apud* Phld. *Vit.* p. 39 Jensen
12. ἐπανδρόω	15:17		A.R. 1.874

[37] αὐλαῖος, as a substantive meaning perhaps "doorkeeper," is attested in an undated inscription from Thebes (*Syringes* 199.2). For the instances of αὐλαῖος as an adjective in Byzantine literature, see LBG, s.v.

[38] This column cites only the earliest extra-Septuagintal instances of the words listed in the table.

Appendix 4: List of the neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and one more deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book

Neologisms	2 Maccabees	Other deuterocanonical/ apocryphal books	Extra-LXX instances[39]
1. κατασφαλίζομαι	1:19	3 Macc 4:9	*Priene* 32.26 [84/01 BCE]; Memn. *FHG* 3.36.21; *Ephesos* 2538.3 [Roman]
2. Ἰουδαϊσμός	2:21; 8:1; 14:38	4 Macc 4:26	NT Gal 1:13, 14; *BCH* 56 (1932) 291.8–9 [163/164 CE]
3. ἔσθησις?[40]	3:33	3 Macc 1:16	Posidon. fr. 22 Theiler (*apud* Str. 3.3.7.24); Memn. *FHG* 3.59.28; Ph. *Mos.* 2.146, 152; NT Acts 1:10; J. *BJ* 7.127
4. ἐπιλυπέω?[41]	4:37; 8:32	3 Macc 7:9	*IK Knidos I* 154.21 [2nd–1st c. BCE]; S.E. *M.* 11.127
5. ἐντινάσσω?[42]	4:41; 11:11	1 Macc 2:36	1 En. 89.43; *Panamara* 2.7 [ca. 39 BCE]; Ael. *Tact.* 19.2.13
6. γλωσσοτομέω?[43]	7:4	4 Macc 10:19, 12:13	Hermipp.Hist. *apud* Plu. *Mor.* 849C
7. δειλανδρέω	8:13	4 Macc 10:14, 13:10	*A.Paul.et Thecl.* 25.7
8. τρισαλιτήριος	8:34; 15:3	Add Esth E:15 Esth^{AT} 7(E):27(15)	Philost. *h.e.* 2.1a.11
9. οἰωνόβρωτος	9:15	3 Macc 6:34	Phld. *Mort.* col. 33.21; Str. 15.3.20.8
10. δυσσέβημα?	12:3	1 Esd 1:49	Scymn. *GGM* 1.684; D.H. 7.44.4.11
11. ὑψαυχενέω	15:6	3 Macc 3:19	Critodem. *Cat.Cod.Astr.* 5.2.52.34; D.H. 7.46.2.6; Ph. (10x)
12. τερατοποιός	15:21	3 Macc 6:32	Theodos. *Sp.* 54.2 Göttling; Georgius *Vit. Theod. Syc.* 1.12

[39] This column cites only the earliest extra-Septuagintal instances of the words listed in the table.

[40] The question mark indicates a doubtful neologism.

[41] See 3.2.4.

[42] See 3.2.3.

[43] See footnote 129 at 3.4.2.

Appendix 5: Combinations of words shared exclusively between 2 Maccabees and at least one deuterocanonical/apocryphal book, or part of book

1) 2 Macc 3:2 τὸ ἱερὸν ἀποστολαῖς ταῖς κρατίσταις δοξάζειν
   1 Macc 2:18 καὶ σὺ καὶ οἱ υἱοί σου δοξασθήσεσθε ἀργυρίῳ καὶ χρυσίῳ καὶ ἀποστολαῖς πολλαῖς
2) 2 Macc 3:8 ὡς τὰς κατὰ Κοίλην Συρίαν καὶ Φοινίκην πόλεις ἐφοδεῦσαι
   1 Macc 16:14 Σίμων δὲ ἦν ἐφοδεύων τὰς πόλεις
3) 2 Macc 4:34 δοὺς δεξιάν; 11:26 δοὺς δεξιάς; 12:11 ἠξίουν δοῦναι τὸν Ἰούδαν δεξιάν; 13:22 δεξιὰν ἔδωκεν, ἔλαβεν; 14:19 δοῦναι καὶ λαβεῖν δεξιάς
   1 Macc 6:58 δῶμεν δεξιάς; 11:50 δὸς ἡμῖν δεξιάς; 11:62 ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς δεξιάς; 11:66 ἠξίωσαν αὐτὸν τοῦ δεξιὰς λαβεῖν, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς; 13:45 ἀξιοῦντες Σίμωνα δεξιὰς αὐτοῖς δοῦναι; 13:50 ἐβόησαν πρὸς Σίμωνα δεξιὰς λαβεῖν, καὶ ἔδωκεν αὐτοῖς
4) 2 Macc 6:10 δὺο γὰρ γυναῖκες ἀνήχθησαν περιτετμηκυῖαι τὰ τέκνα . . . ἐκ τῶν μαστῶν κρεμάσαντες τὰ βρέφη
   1 Macc 1:60 τὰς γυναῖκας τὰς περιτετμηκυίας τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν; 1:61 καὶ ἐκρέμασαν τὰ βρέφη ἐκ τῶν τραχήλων αὐτῶν
5) 2 Macc 8:20 διὰ τὴν γενομένην αὐτοῖς ἀπ' οὐρανοῦ βοήθειαν
   1 Macc 12:15 ἔχομεν γὰρ τὴν ἐξ οὐρανοῦ βοήθειαν βοηθοῦσαν ἡμῖν; 16:3 ἡ δὲ ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ βοήθεια ἤτω μεθ' ὑμῶν
6) 2 Macc 10:5–6 συνέβη . . . τὸν καθαρισμὸν γενέσθαι τοῦ ναοῦ, τῇ πέμπτῃ καὶ εἰκάδι τοῦ αὐτοῦ μηνός, ὅς ἐστι Χασελευ. καὶ μετ' εὐφροσύνης ἦγον ἡμέρας ὀκτώ
   1 Macc 4:59 ἵνα ἄγωνται αἱ ἡμέραι τοῦ ἐγκαινισμοῦ . . . ἡμέρας ὀκτὼ ἀπὸ τῆς πέμπτης καὶ εἰκάδος τοῦ μηνὸς Χασελευ μετ' εὐφροσύνης καὶ χαρᾶς
7) 2 Macc 11:16 ἦσαν γὰρ γεγραμμέναι τοῖς Ἰουδαίοις ἐπιστολαί . . . περιέχουσαι τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον
   1 Macc 15:2 καὶ ἦσαν [sc. αἱ ἐπιστολαὶ] περιέχουσαι τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον
8) 2 Macc 12:3 σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις
   1 Macc 5:23 σὺν ταῖς γυναιξὶ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις; 13:45 σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τοῖς τέκνοις
   3 Macc 3:25 σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις
   Add Esth B:6 σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις[44]

[44] The extra-Septuagintal attestations of the expression σὺν γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις start clustering from the first centuries BCE and CE: D.S. 26.23.1; D.H. 4.11.5; J. (15x); NT Acts 21:5; Hp. *Ep.* 27.41 [the Hippocratic *Letters* likely date from the first century BCE; see Trapp 2003, 27]; *Aphrodisias* 28.2.11–12 [88 BCE]; *OGIS* 194.21 [42 BCE]; *BGU* 4.1185.6 [ca. 60 BCE]; *P.Tebt.* 2.302.29 [71–72 CE]. There is a single second-century BCE attestation in *Magnesia* 3.20. Polybius uses the expressions ὁμοῦ γυναιξὶ καὶ τέκνοις (21.35.2) and μετὰ γυναικῶν καὶ τέκνων (9x).

9) 2 Macc 3:8 τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως πρόθεσιν ἐπιτελεῖν

3 Macc 2:26 ἀτενίζοντας εἰς τὴν τοῦ βασιλέως πρόθεσιν; 5:29 βασιλεῦ, κατὰ τὴν σὴν ἐκτενῆ πρόθεσιν

10) 2 Macc 3:19 αἱ δὲ κατάκλειστοι τῶν παρθένων

3 Macc 1:18 αἵ τε κατάκλειστοι παρθένοι

11) 2 Macc 3:24 ὁ . . . πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης

3 Macc 5:51 τὸν τῆς ἁπάσης δυνάμεως δυνάστην

12) 2 Macc 3:30 τὸν κύριον εὐλόγουν τὸν παραδοξάζοντα τὸν ἑαυτοῦ τόπον

3 Macc 2:9 ἡγίασας τὸν τόπον τοῦτον . . . καὶ παρεδόξασας ἐν ἐπιφανείᾳ μεγαλοπρεπεῖ

13) 2 Macc 3:31 τὸ ζῆν χαρίσασθαι; 3:33 σοι κεχάρισται τὸ ζῆν ὁ κύριος

3 Macc 7:6 τὸ ζῆν αὐτοῖς χαρισάμενοι

14) 2 Macc 3:39 ὁ τὴν κατοικίαν ἐπουράνιον ἔχων ἐπόπτης ἐστὶ καὶ βοηθός; 7:35 τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπόπτου θεοῦ κρίσιν

3 Macc 2:21 ὁ πάντων ἐπόπτης θεός

Add Esth D:2 ἐπικαλεσαμένη τὸν πάντων ἐπόπτην θεὸν καὶ σωτῆρα

Cf. Let. Aris. 16 τὸν πάντων ἐπόπτην καὶ κτίστην θεόν

15) 2 Macc 4:16 καθ' ἅπαν ἤθελον ἐξομοιοῦσθαι; 15:30 ὁ καθ' ἅπαν σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ πρωταγωνιστής

3 Macc 3:29 κατὰ πᾶν ἄχρηστος [καθ' ἅπαν ἄχρηστος (Rahlfs)]

16) 2 Macc 5:27 θηρίων τρόπον διέζη; 10:6 θηρίων τρόπον ἦσαν νεμόμενοι

3 Macc 4:9 κατήχθησαν δὲ θηρίων τρόπον

17) 2 Macc 6:1 τοῖς τοῦ θεοῦ νόμοις μὴ πολιτεύεσθαι

3 Macc 3:4 σεβόμενοι δὲ τὸν θεὸν καὶ τῷ τούτου νόμῳ πολιτευόμενοι

4 Macc 5:16 θείῳ πεπεισμένοι νόμῳ πολιτεύεσθαι

18) 2 Macc 7:20 μιᾶς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ἡμέρας

3 Macc 4:14 μιᾶς ὑπὸ καιρὸν ἡμέρας

19) 2 Macc 8:17 πρὸ ὀφθαλμῶν λαβόντας

3 Macc 4:4 λαμβάνοντας πρὸ τῶν ὀφθαλμῶν

20) 2 Macc 8:19 τὰς ἐπὶ τῶν προγόνων γενομένας ἀντιλήμψεις

3 Macc 5:50 τὰς ἔμπροσθεν αὐτῶν γεγενημένας ἀντιλήμψεις

21) 2 Macc 9:6 ξενιζούσαις συμφοραῖς

3 Macc 7:3 ξενιζούσαις . . . τιμωρίαις

Cf. Add Esth B:5 διαγωγήν . . . ξενίζουσαν

22) 2 Macc 9:16 καλλίστοις ἀναθήμασι κοσμήσειν

3 Macc 3:17 καλλίστοις ἀναθήμασιν τιμῆσαι

23) 2 Macc 9:17 πάντα τόπον οἰκητὸν ἐπελεύσεσθαι

3 Macc 4:3 τίς τὸ σύνολον οἰκητὸς τόπος

24) 2 Macc 11:13 τοῦ δυναμένου θεοῦ συμμαχοῦντος αὐτοῖς

3 Macc 7:6 τὸν ἐπουράνιον θεόν . . . διὰ παντὸς συμμαχοῦντα

25) 2 Macc 13:4 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων ἐξήγειρε τὸν θυμὸν τοῦ Ἀντιόχου

3 Macc 5:35 τὸν ἐπιφανῆ θεὸν κύριον βασιλέα τῶν βασιλέων ᾔνουν[45]

26) 2 Macc 13:16 τὴν παρεμβολὴν δέους καὶ ταραχῆς ἐπλήρωσαν

3 Macc 6:19 τὴν δύναμιν τῶν ὑπεναντίων ἐπλήρωσαν ταραχῆς καὶ δειλίας

27) 2 Macc 14:35 σὺ κύριε, τῶν ὅλων ἀπροσδεὴς ὑπάρχων

3 Macc 2:9 εἷς ὄνομά σοι τῷ τῶν ἁπάντων ἀπροσδεεῖ

28) 2 Macc 15:7 ἦν ἀδιαλείπτως πεποιθὼς μετὰ πάσης ἐλπίδος ἀντιλήμψεως τεύξασθαι παρὰ τοῦ κυρίου

3 Macc 2:33 εὐέλπιδες δὲ καθειστήκεισαν ἀντιλήμψεως τεύξασθαι

29) 2 Macc 15:28 μετὰ χαρᾶς ἀναλύοντες

3 Macc 5:21 μετὰ χαρᾶς οἱ παρόντες ὁμοῦ συναινέσαντες εἰς τὸν ἴδιον οἶκον ἕκαστον ἀνέλυσεν; 7:13 μετὰ χαρᾶς ἀνέλυσαν

30) 2 Macc 15:34 εὐλόγησαν τὸν ἐπιφανῆ κύριον

3 Macc 5:35 τὸν ἐπιφανῆ θεὸν κύριον βασιλέα τῶν βασιλέων ᾔνουν

31) 2 Macc 3:3 ὥστε καὶ Σέλευκον τὸν τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλέα

4 Macc 3:20 ὥστε καὶ τὸν τῆς Ἀσίας βασιλέα Σέλευκον

32) 2 Macc 3:6 τὸ ἐν Ἱεροσολύμοις γαζοφυλάκιον

4 Macc 4:3 ἐν τοῖς Ιεροσολύμων γαζοφυλακίοις

33) 2 Macc 4:25 ὠμοῦ τυράννου; 7:27 τὸν ὠμὸν τύραννον

4 Macc 9:30 πάντων ὠμότατε τύραννε

34) 2 Macc 6:23 ὁ δὲ λογισμὸν ἀστεῖον ἀναλαβὼν καὶ ἄξιον τῆς ἡλικίας

4 Macc 5:11 οὐκ . . . ἀποσκεδάσεις τῶν λογισμῶν σου τὸν λῆρον καὶ ἄξιον τῆς ἡλικίας ἀναλαβὼν νοῦν

35) 2 Macc 7:2 ἕτοιμοι γὰρ ἀποθνῄσκειν ἐσμὲν ἢ παραβαίνειν τοὺς πατρίους νόμους

4 Macc 9:1 ἕτοιμοι γάρ ἐσμεν ἀποθνῄσκειν ἢ παραβαίνειν τὰς πατρίους ἡμῶν ἐντολάς

36) 2 Macc 7:3 τήγανα καὶ λέβητας

4 Macc 8:13 λέβητας, τήγανά τε

37) 2 Macc 7:18 μέλλων ἀποθνῄσκειν

4 Macc 10:9 μέλλων δὲ ἀποθνῄσκειν; 12:15 ἀποθνῄσκειν μέλλων

38) 2 Macc 7:23 ὁ τοῦ κόσμου κτίστης; 13:14 τῷ κτίστῃ τοῦ κόσμου; cf. 1:24 ὁ πάντων κτίστης

4 Macc 5:25 ὁ τοῦ κόσμου κτίστης; 11:5 τὸν πάντων κτίστην

39) 2 Macc 7:37 ἐπικαλούμενος τὸν θεὸν ἵλεως ταχὺ τῷ ἔθνει γενέσθαι

4 Macc 12:17 ἐπικαλοῦμαι δὲ τὸν πατρῷον θεὸν ὅπως ἵλεως γένηται τῷ ἔθνει ἡμῶν

---

[45] In the Septuagint, the title βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων (on which see Griffiths 1953, Schäfer 1974, 33–41, and Brown 1995–2001, 3:83–86) is used of Yahweh only in 2 and 3 Maccabees. In OG Dan 4:(37)34, Ziegler's 1954 Göttingen edition of Daniel reads κύριος τῶν κυρίων καὶ βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων, whereas the 1999 edition, revised by Munnich, reads κύριος τῶν κυρίων καὶ κύριος τῶν βασιλέων, and relegates to the critical apparatus the reading βασιλεὺς τῶν βασιλέων, which is attested in the Syrohexaplar and in MS 88.

40) 2 Macc 11:13 συννοήσας ἀνικήτους εἶναι τοὺς Ἑβραίους
4 Macc 9:18 μόνοι παῖδες Εβραίων ὑπὲρ ἀρετῆς εἰσιν ἀνίκητοι

41) 2 Macc 3:9 εἰ ταῖς ἀληθείαις ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχοντα τυγχάνει; 7:6 ὁ θεὸς ἐφορᾷ καὶ ταῖς ἀληθείαις ἐφ' ἡμῖν παρακαλεῖται
Add Esth E:10 ταῖς ἀληθείαις ἀλλότριος τοῦ τῶν Περσῶν αἵματος
Esth^{AT} 7(E):25(10) ταῖς ἀληθείαις ἀλλότριος τοῦ τῶν Περσῶν φρονήματος

42) 2 Macc 11:23 βουλόμενοι τοὺς ἐκ τῆς βασιλείας ἀταράχους ὄντας
Add Esth E:8 τὴν βασιλείαν ἀτάραχον τοῖς πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις μετ' εἰρήνης παρεξόμεθα
Esth^{AT} 7(E):24(8) τὴν βασιλείαν ἀτάραχον παρέχειν πᾶσι τοῖς ἔθνεσι

43) 2 Macc 14:6 οὐκ ἐῶντες τὴν βασιλείαν εὐσταθείας τυχεῖν
Add Esth B:5 πρὸς τὸ μὴ τὴν βασιλείαν εὐσταθείας τυγχάνειν
Esth^{AT} 3(B):16(4) πρὸς τὸ μηδέποτε τὴν βασιλείαν εὐσταθείας τυγχάνειν

44) 2 Macc 3:2 τιμᾶν τὸν τόπον καὶ τὸ ἱερόν . . . δοξάζειν
1 Esd 8:64 ἐδόξασαν τὸ ἔθνος καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν τοῦ κυρίου; 8:78 δοξάσαι τὸ ἱερὸν ἡμῶν
1 Macc 15:9 δοξάσομέν σε καὶ τὸ ἔθνος σου καὶ τὸ ἱερὸν δόξῃ μεγάλῃ

45) 2 Macc 3:15 ἐν ταῖς ἱερατικαῖς στολαῖς
1 Esd 4:54 τὴν ἱερατικὴν στολήν; 5:44 στολὰς ἱερατικάς

46) 2 Macc 4:48 τῶν ἱερῶν σκευῶν; 5:16, 9:16 τὰ ἱερὰ σκεύη
1 Esd 1:39 ἀπὸ τῶν ἱερῶν σκευῶν; 1:43 τοῖς ἱεροῖς σκεύεσιν; 1:51, 2:9, 6:17, 25, 8:17, 55 τὰ ἱερὰ σκεύη
OG Dan 1:2 τῶν ἱερῶν σκευῶν

47) 2 Macc 5:15 ἁγιώτατον ἱερόν; 13:11 ἱεροῦ ἁγίου; 14:31 ἐπὶ τὸ μέγιστον καὶ ἅγιον ἱερόν
1 Esd 1:50 περικύκλῳ τοῦ ἁγίου αὐτῶν ἱεροῦ

48) 2 Macc 9:18 ἔγραψε πρὸς τοὺς Ἰουδαίους τὴν ὑπογεγραμμένην ἐπιστολήν
1 Esd 2:15 κατέγραψεν αὐτῷ . . . τὴν ὑπογεγραμμένην ἐπιστολήν
3 Macc 6:41 ὁ βασιλεὺς ἔγραψεν αὐτοῖς τὴν ὑπογεγραμμένην ἐπιστολήν
Cf. Esth^{AT} 3(B):14(1) καὶ ὑπέγραψε τὴν ὑποτεταγμένην ἐπιστολήν; 7(E):22(1) καὶ ἔγραψε τὴν ὑποτεταγμένην ἐπιστολήν

49) 2 Macc 10:38 τὸ νῖκος αὐτοῖς διδόντι
1 Esd 3:9 αὐτῷ δοθήσεται τὸ νῖκος

50) 2 Macc 11:15 ὅσα . . . ἐπέδωκε τῷ Λυσίᾳ διὰ γραπτῶν περὶ τῶν Ἰουδαίων
1 Esd 2:2 καὶ ἐκήρυξεν ἐν ὅλῃ τῇ βασιλείᾳ αὐτοῦ καὶ ἅμα διὰ γραπτῶν λέγων
Cf. Let. Aris. 56 ὅσα δ' ἂν ᾖ ἄγραφα . . . ὅσα δὲ διὰ γραπτῶν

51) 2 Macc 14:38 ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις
1 Esd 1:22 ἐν τοῖς ἔμπροσθεν χρόνοις

52) 2 Macc 6:26 τὰς τοῦ παντοκράτορος χεῖρας οὔτε ζῶν οὔτε ἀποθανὼν ἐκφεύξομαι; 7:31 σὺ δέ . . . οὐ μὴ διαφύγῃς τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ θεοῦ
Tob 13:2 οὐκ ἔστιν ὃς ἐκφεύξεται τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ [sc. τοῦ θεοῦ]; Tob^{GII} 13:2 οὐκ ἔστιν οὐδέν, ὃ ἐκφεύξεται τὴν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ
Cf. Wis 16:15 τὴν δὲ σὴν χεῖρα φυγεῖν ἀδύνατόν ἐστιν

53) 2 Macc 11:6 ἱκέτευον . . . τὸν κύριον ἀγαθὸν ἄγγελον ἀποστεῖλαι; 15:23 ἀπόστειλον ἄγγελον ἀγαθόν ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν

Tob 5:22 ἄγγελος γὰρ ἀγαθὸς συμπορεύσεται αὐτῷ; Tob^{GII} 5:22 ἄγγελος γὰρ ἀγαθὸς συνελεύσεται αὐτῷ

54) 2 Macc 12:16 τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ θελήσει

Tob 12:18 τῇ θελήσει τοῦ θεοῦ

55) 2 Macc 14:35 ηὐδόκησας ναὸν τῆς σῆς σκηνώσεως ἐν ἡμῖν γενέσθαι

Tob 1:4 καὶ ἡγιάσθη ὁ ναὸς τῆς κατασκηνώσεως τοῦ ὑψίστου; Tob^{GII} 1:4 καὶ ἡγιάσθη ὁ ναὸς τῆς κατασκηνώσεως τοῦ θεοῦ

56) 2 Macc 14:46 ἑκατέραις ταῖς χερσίν

Tob^{GII} 11:12 ἑκατέραις ταῖς χερσίν

57) 2 Macc 3:1 τῶν νόμων ὅτι κάλλιστα συντηρουμένων

Sir 32(35):1a ὁ συντηρῶν νόμον; 44:20a ὃς συνετήρησεν νόμον ὑψίστου

58) 2 Macc 3:31 ἐπικαλέσασθαι τὸν ὕψιστον

Sir 46:5a ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν ὕψιστον δυνάστην; 47:5a ἐπεκαλέσατο γὰρ κύριον τὸν ὕψιστον

59) 2 Macc 6:4 ἐν τοῖς ἱεροῖς περιβόλοις

Sir 50:2b περιβόλου ἱεροῦ

60) 2 Macc 12:15 ἐπικαλεσάμενοι τὸν μέγαν τοῦ κόσμου δυνάστην; 12:28 ἐπικαλεσάμενοι δὲ τὸν δυνάστην τὸν μετὰ κράτους συντρίβοντα τὰς τῶν πολεμίων ὁλκάς

Sir 46:5a-b ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν ὕψιστον δυνάστην ἐν τῷ θλῖψαι αὐτὸν ἐχθροὺς κυκλόθεν; 46:16a-b καὶ ἐπεκαλέσατο τὸν κύριον δυνάστην ἐν τῷ θλῖψαι ἐχθροὺς αὐτοῦ κυκλόθεν

61) 2 Macc 15:32 τὴν χεῖρα τοῦ δυσφήμου, ἣν ἐκτείνας ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιον τοῦ παντοκράτορος οἶκον ἐμεγαλαύχησε

Sir 48:18c-d καὶ ἐπῆρεν χεῖρα αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ Σιων καὶ ἐμεγαλαύχησεν ἐν ὑπερηφανίᾳ αὐτοῦ

Appendix 6: List of the neologisms shared between 2 Maccabees and the Alpha Text of Esther

Neologisms	2 Maccabees	Alpha Text Esther	Next earliest extra-LXX instances
1. δικαιοκρίτης	12:41	Esth^{AT} 7(E):23(4)	Sib. Or. 3.704; *P.Ryl.* 2.113.35 [Letopolis, 133 CE]
2. ἔκθυμος	7:3, 39; 14:27	Esth^{AT} 7:9(7)	J. *AJ.* 19.25; Plu. *Aem.* 12.2

Appendix 7: List of the neologisms of the canonical books of the Septuagint that occur in 2 Maccabees

Neologisms	LXX	2 Maccabees	Extra-LXX instances prior to the NT
1. ἁγιάζω	196x	1:25	Aristob., Jub., Ph., NT
2. ἁγιασμός	Judg 17:3; Ezek 45:4; Amos 2:11; 3 Macc 2:18; Sir 7:31d, 17:10a; Pss. Sol. 17:30c	2:17, 14:36	T. 12 Patr., NT
3. ἁγιωσύνη	Ps 29:5b, 95:6b, 96:12b, 144:5a	3:12	T. 12 Patr., NT
4. βδελυκτός	Prov 17:15b	1:27	Ph., NT
5. βεβηλόω	Exod 1x; Lev 17x; Num 3x; Ps 6x; Isa 3x; Jer 2x; Lam 1x; Ezek 29x; Dan$^{\theta'}$ 1x; Amos 1x; Zeph 1x; Mal 3x; 2 Esd 2x; Jdt 2x; 1 Macc 9x; 3 Macc 1x; Sir 2x; Pss. Sol. 2x	8:2, 10:5	T. 12 Patr., Ph., NT
6. ἐγκαινισμός	Num 7:10, 11, 84; 2 Chr 7:9; Ps 29:1a; OG Dan 3:2, 5:pro; Dan$^{\theta'}$ 3:3; 1 Esd 7:7; 1 Macc 4:56, 59	2:9, 19	
7. ἐλαττονόω	Gen 8:3, 5, 18:28; Lev 25:16; 3 Kgdms 17:16; Prov 14:34b; Sir 19:6b, 7b; Tob^{GII} 14:4	12:11, 13:19	
8. ἐμπαιγμός	Ps 37:8a; Ezek 22:4; 3 Macc 5:22; Sir 27:28a; Wis 12:25; Pss. Sol. 2:11a, 17:12b	7:7	NT
9. ἐξιλασμός	Exod 30:10; Lev 23:27, 28; 1 Chr 28:11; Ezek 7:25, 43:23, 45:19; 1 Esd 9:20; Sir 5:5a, 16:11d, 17:29b, 18:12b, 20b, 32:5b; Wis 18:21	12:45	
10. ἐξουθενέω	1 Kgdms 8:7, 10:19; Prov 1:7d; Jer 6:14; Amos 6:1; OG Dan 4:28; Sir 22:13c; Wis 3:11, 4:18	1:27	1 En., Ph., NT
11. ἐπεργίζομαι	OG Daniel 11:40	7:33	
12. εὐλογητός	101x	1:17, 15:34	Alex.Polyh., 1 En., Ph., NT
13. θυσιαστήριον	437x	12x	Let. Aris., Alex.Polyh., Jub., Ph., LAE, J., NT
14. ἱεράτευμα	Exod 19:6, 23:22 (Rahlfs)	2:17	Ph., NT
15. ἱλασμός	Lev 25:9; Num 5:8; Ps 129:4; Ezek 44:27; Esth^{AT} 7:6; Dan$^{\theta'}$ 9:9; Amos 8:14	3:33	Ph., NT
16. καθαγιάζω	Lev 8:9, 27:26; 1 Chr 26:20	1:26, 2:8, 15:18	Let. Aris., Ph.
17. καθαρισμός	Exod 29:36, 30:10; Lev 14:32, 15:13; Num 14:18; 1 Chr 23:28; Job 7:21b; Ps 88:45a; Prov 14:9a; OG Dan 12:6; 2 Esd 22:45; 4 Macc 7:6; Sir 51:20b	1:18, 36, 2:16, 19, 10:5	T. 12 Patr., NT
18. μακροθυμέω	Job 7:16a; Prov 19:11a; Bar 4:25; Sir 2:4b, 18:11a, 29:8a, 32:22c	6:14	T. 12 Patr., NT
19. παντοκράτωρ	181x	11x	Let. Aris., Aristob., Sib. Or., Ph., NT
20. παραδοξάζω	Exod 8:22, 9:4, 11:7; Deut 28:59; Sir 10:13c; 3 Macc 2:9	3:30	
21. σαββατίζω	Exod 16:30; Lev 23:32, 26:34, 35; 2 Chr 36:21; 1 Esd 1:55	6:6	
22. σαπρία	Job 2:9cα, 7:5a, 8:16b, 17:14b, 21:26b, 25:6a; Joel 2:20; Pss. Sol. 14:7a, 16:14a	9:9	
23. τροφοφορέω	Deut 1:31	7:27	

Appendix 8: Combinations of words which first occur in one of the canonical books of the Septuagint and then recur in other canonical and deuterocanonical books, the epitome of 2 Maccabees[46] included

1) Gen 24:7 αὐτὸς ἀποστελεῖ τὸν ἄγγελον αὐτοῦ ἔμπροσθέν σου; 32:3 ἀπέστειλεν δὲ Ἰακὼβ ἀγγέλους ἔμπροσθεν αὐτοῦ

   2 Macc 15:23 ἀπόστειλον ἄγγελον ἀγαθὸν ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν

2) Gen 39:3 ὅσα ἂν ποιῇ, κύριος εὐοδοῖ ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ (Rahlfs); 39:23 ὅσα αὐτὸς ἐποίει, κύριος εὐώδου ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ

   OG Dan 8:25 εὐοδωθήσεται τὸ ψεῦδος ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ

   1 Esd 6:9 εὐοδούμενον τὸ ἔργον ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτῶν

   2 Esd 5:8 τὸ ἔργον . . . εὐοδοῦται ἐν χερσὶν αὐτῶν

   1 Macc 2:47 κατευοδώθη τὸ ἔργον ἐν χειρὶ αὐτῶν; 3:6 εὐοδώθη σωτηρία ἐν χειρὶ αὐτοῦ; 14:36 εὐοδώθη ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν αὐτοῦ; 16:2 εὐοδώθη ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν ἡμῶν

   Wis 11:1 εὐόδωσεν τὰ ἔργα αὐτῶν ἐν χειρὶ προφήτου ἁγίου

   2 Macc 10:23 τοῖς δὲ ὅπλοις τὰ πάντα ἐν ταῖς χερσὶν εὐοδούμενος

3) Gen 49:24 καὶ συνετρίβη μετὰ κράτους τὰ τόξα αὐτῶν

   Ps 75:4a ἐκεῖ συνέτριψεν τὰ κράτη τῶν τόξων

   2 Macc 12:28 τὸν μετὰ κράτους συντρίβοντα τὰς τῶν πολεμίων ὁλκάς

4) Exod 1:11 καὶ ἐπέστησεν αὐτοῖς ἐπιστάτας τῶν ἔργων, ἵνα κακώσωσιν αὐτοὺς ἐν τοῖς ἔργοις

   2 Macc 5:22 κατέλιπε δὲ καὶ ἐπιστάτας τοῦ κακοῦν τὸ γένος

5) Exod 15:6 ἡ δεξιά σου χείρ, κύριε, ἔθραυσεν ἐχθρούς; 15:7 καὶ τῷ πλήθει τῆς δόξης σου συνέτριψας τοὺς ὑπεναντίους

   Jdt 13:14 ἀλλ' ἔθραυσεν τοὺς ἐχθροὺς ἡμῶν διὰ χειρός μου

   2 Macc 15:16 λάβε τὴν ἁγίαν ῥομφαίαν . . ., δι' ἧς θραύσεις τοὺς ὑπεναντίους

6) Exod 15:9 μεριῶ σκῦλα

   Isa 53:12 μεριεῖ σκῦλα

   Judg[AB] 5:30 διαμερίζοντα σκῦλα; Zech 14:1 διαμερισθήσεται τὰ σκῦλά σου

   2 Macc 8:28 τοῖς ᾐκισμένοις καὶ ταῖς χήραις καὶ ὀρφανοῖς μερίσαντες ἀπὸ τῶν σκύλων τὰ λοιπὰ αὐτοὶ καὶ τὰ παιδία διεμερίσαντο

7) Exod 15:16 ἐπιπέσοι ἐπ' αὐτοὺς φόβος καὶ τρόμος, μεγέθει βραχίονός σου ἀπολιθωθήτωσαν

   2 Macc 15:23 ἀπόστειλον ἄγγελον ἀγαθὸν ἔμπροσθεν ἡμῶν εἰς δέος καὶ τρόμον; 15:24 μεγέθει βραχίονός σου καταπλαγείησαν οἱ μετὰ βλασφημίας παραγινόμενοι ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιόν σου λαόν

[46] The two prefixed letters, which are a mosaic of Septuagint phraseology, have not been considered here.

8) Exod 17:15 Κύριός μου καταφυγή

Ps 9:10a καὶ ἐγένετο κύριος καταφυγὴ τῷ πένητι; 17:3a κύριος στερέωμά μου καὶ καταφυγή μου; 89:1b Κύριε, καταφυγὴ ἐγενήθης ἡμῖν; 90:2a ἐρεῖ τῷ κυρίῳ Ἀντιλήμπτωρ μου εἶ καὶ καταφυγή μου; 93:22a καὶ ἐγένετό μοι κύριος εἰς καταφυγήν

Jer 16:19 Κύριε ἰσχύς μου καὶ βοήθειά μου καὶ καταφυγή μου

2 Macc 10:28 τὴν ἐπὶ τὸν κύριον καταφυγήν

9) Exod 20:8 μνήσθητι τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων; 35:3 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων; Lev 24:8, Num 15:32, 28:9 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων; Deut 5:12 φύλαξαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων; 5:15 ὥστε φυλάσσεσθαι τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων; Jer 17:21, 22, 24, 27 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων; Ezek 46:1, 4, 12 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων; Jdt 10:2 ἐν ταῖς ἡμέραις τῶν σαββάτων; 1 Macc 2:32 ἐν τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων; 2:34 τὴν ἡμέραν τῶν σαββάτων; 2:41, 9:34, 43 τῇ ἡμέρᾳ τῶν σαββάτων

2 Macc 15:3 ἄγειν τὴν τῶν σαββάτων ἡμέραν

10) Exod 23:22 ἐχθρεύσω τοῖς ἐχθροῖς σου, καὶ ἀντικείσομαι τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις σοι

2 Macc 10:26 ἐχθρεῦσαι τοῖς ἐχθροῖς αὐτῶν καὶ ἀντικεῖσθαι τοῖς ἀντικειμένοις

11) Exod 29:37 καὶ ἔσται τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἅγιον τοῦ ἁγίου; 40:9 καὶ ἔσται τὸ θυσιαστήριον ἅγιον τῶν ἁγίων

Sir 50:11c ἐν ἀναβάσει θυσιαστηρίου ἁγίου

2 Macc 14:3 πρὸς τὸ ἅγιον θυσιαστήριον

12) Exod 34:22 καὶ ἑορτὴν ἑβδομάδων ποιήσεις μοι

Deut 16:10 καὶ ποιήσεις ἑορτὴν ἑβδομάδων; 16:16 ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ τῶν ἑβδομάδων

2 Chr 8:13 ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ τῶν ἑβδομάδων

2 Macc 12:31 τῆς τῶν ἑβδομάδων ἑορτῆς

13) Exod 34:29 δεδόξασται ἡ ὄψις τοῦ χρωτὸς τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ; 34:30 καὶ ἦν δεδοξασμένη ἡ ὄψις τοῦ χρωτὸς τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ

Dan$^{\theta'}$ 3:19 καὶ ἡ ὄψις τοῦ προσώπου αὐτοῦ ἠλλοιώθη

2 Macc 6:18 τὴν πρόσοψιν τοῦ προσώπου κάλλιστος

Cf. Symmachus in Hab 1:9 ἡ πρόσοψις τοῦ προσώπου αὐτῶν ἄνεμος καύσων

14) Exod 35:2 ἓξ ἡμέρας ποιήσεις ἔργα, τῇ δὲ ἡμέρᾳ τῇ ἑβδόμῃ κατάπαυσις

2 Macc 15:1 τῇ τῆς καταπαύσεως ἡμέρᾳ

15) Exod 39:18 καὶ τὴν τράπεζαν τῆς προθέσεως . . . καὶ τοὺς ἄρτους τοὺς προκειμένους; 40:21 καὶ προέθηκεν ἐπ' αὐτῆς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως

1 Kgdms 21:7 τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως

1 Chr 9:32 ἐπὶ τῶν ἄρτων τῆς προθέσεως; 23:29 εἰς τοὺς ἄρτους τῆς προθέσεως

2 Chr 4:19 ἄρτοι προθέσεως; 13:11 προθέσεις ἄρτων

2 Macc 10:3 τῶν ἄρτων τὴν πρόθεσιν ἐποιήσαντο

16) Lev 23:34 ἑορτὴ σκηνῶν

Deut 16:13 ἑορτὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ποιήσεις σεαυτῷ

2 Chr 8:13 ἐν τῇ ἑορτῇ τῶν σκηνῶν

2 Esd 3:4 ἐποίησαν τὴν ἑορτὴν τῶν σκηνῶν

2 Macc 10:6 τὴν τῶν σκηνῶν ἑορτήν

17) Num 16:22; 27:16 θεὸς τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης σαρκός

2 Macc 3:24 ὁ τῶν πνευμάτων καὶ πάσης ἐξουσίας δυνάστης

Cf. 1 En. 38.2, 4, 6.

18) Num 16:27 καὶ αἱ γυναῖκες αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν καὶ ἡ ἀποσκευὴ αὐτῶν

1 Macc 5:13, 45 τὰς γυναῖκας αὐτῶν καὶ τὰ τέκνα αὐτῶν καὶ τὴν ἀποσκευήν

2 Macc 12:21 τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὴν ἄλλην ἀποσκευήν

Cf. Plb. 1.68.3 τὰ τέκνα καὶ τὰς γυναῖκας καὶ σὺν τούτοις τὰς ἀποσκευάς

19) Deut 4:19 ἀναβλέψας εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ ἰδὼν τὸν ἥλιον καὶ τὴν σελήνην καὶ τοὺς ἀστέρας καὶ πάντα τὸν κόσμον τοῦ οὐρανοῦ

2 Macc 7:28 ἀναβλέψαντα εἰς τὸν οὐρανὸν καὶ τὴν γῆν καὶ τὰ ἐν αὐτοῖς πάντα ἰδόντα

20) Deut 7:6, 14:2, 20 λαὸς ἅγιος εἶ κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου; 26:19 εἶναί σε λαὸν ἅγιον κυρίῳ τῷ θεῷ σου; 28:9 ἀναστήσαι σε κύριος ἑαυτῷ λαὸν ἅγιον

Isa 30:19 λαὸς ἅγιος ἐν Σιων οἰκήσει; 62:12 καὶ καλέσει αὐτὸν λαὸν ἅγιον

OG Dan 7:27 λαῷ ἁγίῳ; 12:7 λαοῦ ἁγίου

Hos 11:12 λαὸς ἅγιος κεκλήσεται θεοῦ

Pss. Sol. 17:26a καὶ συνάξει λαὸν ἅγιον

3 Macc 2:6 τὸν λαόν σου τὸν ἅγιον Ισραηλ

2 Macc 15:24 ἐπὶ τὸν ἅγιόν σου λαόν

21) Deut 12:5, 14, 26; 14:24; 16:6; 17:8; 18:6; 26:2 εἰς τὸν τόπον, ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξηται κύριος ὁ θεός; 12:11, 21; 14:23 ὁ τόπος, ὃν ἂν ἐκλέξηται κύριος ὁ θεός; 12:18; 14:22; 15:20; 16:2, 7, 11, 15; 31:11 ἐν τῷ τόπῳ, ᾧ ἂν ἐκλέξηται κύριος ὁ θεός

Josh 9:27 εἰς τὸν τόπον, ὃν ἐὰν ἐκλέξηται κύριος

2 Macc 5:19 τὸν τόπον ὁ κύριος ἐξελέξατο

22) Deut 13:17 ἵνα ἀποστραφῇ κύριος ἀπὸ θυμοῦ τῆς ὀργῆς αὐτοῦ καὶ δώσει σοι ἔλεος

2 Macc 8:5 τῆς ὀργῆς τοῦ κυρίου εἰς ἔλεον τραπείσης

23) Deut 31:21 καὶ ἀντικαταστήσεται ἡ ᾠδὴ αὕτη κατὰ πρόσωπον μαρτυροῦσα

2 Macc 7:6 διὰ τῆς κατὰ πρόσωπον ἀντιμαρτυρούσης ᾠδῆς

24) Deut 32:36 καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ παρακληθήσεται

Ps 89:13b καὶ παρακλήθητι ἐπὶ τοῖς δούλοις σου; 134:14b καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ παρακληθήσεται

2 Macc 7:6 καὶ ἐπὶ τοῖς δούλοις αὐτοῦ παρακληθήσεται; cf. 7:33 καὶ πάλιν καταλλαγήσεται τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις; 8:29 τὸν ἐλεήμονα κύριον ἠξίουν . . . καταλλαγῆναι τοῖς αὑτοῦ δούλοις

25) Judg^{A} 2:2 καὶ τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτῶν κατασκάψετε; 6:28 καὶ ἰδοὺ κατεσκαμμένον τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ Βααλ; 6:30 κατέσκαψεν τὸ θυσιαστήριον τοῦ Βααλ; 6:31, 32 κατέσκαψεν τὸ θυσιαστήριον αὐτοῦ[47]

3 Kgdms 18:32 τὸ θυσιαστήριον τὸ κατεσκαμμένον; 19:10 τὰ θυσιαστήριά σου κατέσκαψαν

[47] In all these verses, in lieu of κατασκάπτω Codex Vaticanus has καθαιρέω.

Hos 10:2 αὐτὸς κατασκάψει τὰ θυσιαστήρια αὐτῶν

Amos 3:14 καὶ κατασκαφήσεται τὰ κέρατα τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου

2 Macc 14:33 καὶ τὸ θυσιαστήριον κατασκάψω

Judg^{A} 5:28 διὰ τῆς θυρίδος διέκυπτεν[48]

2 Kgdms 6:16 διέκυπτεν διὰ τῆς θυρίδος; 4 Kgdms 9:30 διέκυψεν διὰ τῆς θυρίδος

Ezek 41:16 καὶ αἱ θυρίδες δικτυωταί . . . ὥστε διακύπτειν

2 Macc 3:19 διὰ τῶν θυρίδων διέκυπτον[49]

26) Judg^{A} 6:2 ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ τοῖς σπηλαίοις καὶ τοῖς ὀχυρώμασιν[50]

2 Macc 10:6 ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσι καὶ ἐν τοῖς σπηλαίοις

27) Judg^{A} 9:51 πύργος ἦν ὀχυρός[51]

1 Macc 1:33 πύργοις ὀχυροῖς; 4:60 πύργους ὀχυρούς; 6:37 πύργοι . . . ὀχυροί

2 Macc 10:18 πύργους ὀχυρούς

28) 1 Kgdms 15:12 τὰ πρῶτα τῶν σκύλων, ὧν ἤνεγκεν ἐξ Αμαληκ

2 Kgdms 3:22 σκῦλα πολλὰ ἔφερον μετ' αὐτῶν

2 Chr 15:11 ἀπὸ τῶν σκύλων, ὧν ἤνεγκαν; 28:8 καὶ ἤνεγκαν τὰ σκῦλα εἰς Σαμάρειαν

2 Macc 8:31 τὰ δὲ λοιπὰ τῶν σκύλων ἤνεγκαν εἰς Ἱεροσόλυμα

29) 2 Kgdms 7:15; 1 Chr 17:13 τὸ ἔλεός μου οὐκ ἀποστήσω ἀπ' αὐτοῦ

Ps 65:20a εὐλογητὸς ὁ θεός, ὃς οὐκ ἀπέστησεν τὴν προσευχήν μου καὶ τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ἀπ' ἐμοῦ

OG Dan 3:35 καὶ μὴ ἀποστήσῃς τὸ ἔλεός σου ἀφ' ἡμῶν

Jdt 13:14 αἰνεῖτε τὸν θεόν, ὃς οὐκ ἀπέστησεν τὸ ἔλεος αὐτοῦ ἀπὸ τοῦ οἴκου Ἰσραήλ

Pss. Sol. 9:8c καὶ μὴ ἀποστήσῃς ἔλεός σου ἀφ' ἡμῶν; 16:6a μὴ ἀποστήσῃς τὸ ἔλεός σου ἀπ' ἐμοῦ

2 Macc 6:16 οὐδέποτε μὲν τὸν ἔλεον ἀφ' ἡμῶν ἀφίστησι

30) 4 Kgdms 19:15 σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μόνος; 19:19 σὺ κύριος ὁ θεὸς μόνος

Isa 37:16 σὺ θεὸς μόνος εἶ; 37:20 σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μόνος

Ps 85:10b σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς μόνος ὁ μέγας

Sir 24:24c κύριος παντοκράτωρ θεὸς μόνος ἐστίν

OG Dan 3:45 σὺ εἶ μόνος κύριος ὁ θεός (Rahlfs)

2 Macc 7:37 μόνος αὐτὸς θεός ἐστιν

1 Chr 29:9 Δαυιδ ὁ βασιλεὺς εὐφράνθη μεγάλως

1 Esd 9:54 εὐφρανθῆναι μεγάλως

2 Esd 22:43 ὁ θεὸς εὔφρανεν αὐτοὺς μεγάλως

2 Macc 15:27 τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ μεγάλως εὐφρανθέντες ἐπιφανείᾳ

---

[48] Codex Vaticanus reads παρέκυψεν.

[49] Codex Venetus reads διεξέκυπτον.

[50] Codex Vaticanus reads τὰς τρυμαλιὰς τὰς ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν καὶ τὰ σπήλαια τὰ κρεμαστά.

[51] Codex Vaticanus reads ἰσχυρός.

31) 2 Chr 11:11 καὶ ὠχύρωσεν αὐτὰς τείχεσιν καὶ ἔδωκεν ἐν αὐταῖς ἡγουμένους καὶ παραθέσεις βρωμάτων

1 Macc 9:52 καὶ ὠχύρωσε τὴν πόλιν . . . καὶ τὴν ἄκραν καὶ ἔθετο ἐν αὐταῖς δυνάμεις καὶ παραθέσεις βρωμάτων

2 Macc 12:14 πεποιθότες τῇ τῶν τειχέων ἐρυμνότητι τῇ τε τῶν βρωμάτων παραθέσει

Cf. Phylarch. *FGrH* 2a, 81, fr. 44.12 βρωμάτων παντοδαπῶς πεποιημένων παραθέσεις

32) 2 Chr 13:11 θυμιῶσιν τῷ κυρίῳ ὁλοκαυτώματα πρωὶ καὶ δείλης καὶ θυμίαμα συνθέσεως, καὶ προθέσεις ἄρτων ἐπὶ τῆς τραπέζης . . . καὶ οἱ λύχνοι τῆς καύσεως ἀνάψαι δείλης

2 Macc 10:3 καὶ θυμίαμα καὶ λύχνους καὶ τῶν ἄρτων τὴν πρόθεσιν ἐποιήσαντο

33) Esth 2:22 καὶ αὐτὴ ἐνεφάνισεν τῷ βασιλεῖ τὰ τῆς ἐπιβουλῆς

2 Macc 3:7 συμμείξας δὲ ὁ Ἀπολλώνιος τῷ βασιλεῖ περὶ τῶν μηνυθέντων αὐτῷ χρημάτων ἐνεφάνισεν

34) Esth 4:7 τὴν ἐπαγγελίαν, ἣν ἐπηγγείλατο Αμαν τῷ βασιλεῖ εἰς τὴν γάζαν ταλάντων μυρίων

1 Macc 11:28 καὶ ἐπηγγείλατο αὐτῷ [sc. τῷ βασιλεῖ] τάλαντα τριακόσια

2 Macc 4:8 ἐπαγγειλάμενος τῷ βασιλεῖ . . . ἀργυρίου τάλαντα ἑξήκοντα

35) Esth 8:3 προσέπεσεν πρὸς τοὺς πόδας αὐτοῦ, καὶ ἠξίου

2 Macc 10:26 ἐπὶ τήν . . . κρηπῖδα προσπεσόντες ἠξίουν

36) Ps 5:8b, 27:2b, 137:2a πρὸς ναόν ἅγιόν σου; 10:4a ἐν ναῷ ἁγίῳ; 17:7c ἐκ ναοῦ ἁγίου; 64:5d ἅγιος ὁ ναός σου; 78:1c τὸν ναὸν τὸν ἅγιόν σου

Sir 49:12c ναὸν ἅγιον

Jonah 2:5 πρὸς τὸν ναὸν τὸν ἅγιόν σου; 2:8 εἰς ναὸν ἅγιόν σου

Hab 2:20 ἐν ναῷ ἁγίῳ

2 Macc 9:16 ἅγιον νεώ

37) Ps 12:6c ᾄσω τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ εὐεργετήσαντί με

2 Macc 10:38 εὐλόγουν τῷ κυρίῳ τῷ μεγάλως εὐεργετοῦντι τὸν Ισραηλ

38) Ps 13:6b ὅτι κύριος ἐλπὶς αὐτοῦ ἐστιν; 61:8b ἡ ἐλπίς μου ἐπὶ τῷ θεῷ; 70:5b κύριος ἡ ἐλπίς μου; 72:28b τίθεσθαι ἐν τῷ κυρίῳ τὴν ἐλπίδα μου; 77:7a ἵνα θῶνται ἐπὶ τὸν θεὸν τὴν ἐλπίδα αὐτῶν; 90:9a ὅτι σύ, κύριε, ἡ ἐλπίς μου; 145:5b ἡ ἐλπὶς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ κύριον τὸν θεὸν αὐτοῦ

Prov 22:19a ἵνα σου γένηται ἐπὶ κύριον ἡ ἐλπίς

Jer 17:7 καὶ ἔσται κύριος ἐλπὶς αὐτοῦ

Pss. Sol. 8:31b καὶ ἐπὶ σὲ ἡ ἐλπὶς ἡμῶν, κύριε; 17:39a ἡ ἐλπὶς αὐτοῦ ἐπὶ κύριον

2 Macc 7:20 διὰ τὰς ἐπὶ κύριον ἐλπίδας

39) Ps 43:17a ἀπὸ φωνῆς ὀνειδίζοντος καὶ παραλαλοῦντος

2 Macc 7:24 τὴν ὀνειδίζουσαν ὑφορώμενος φωνήν

40) Ps 61:13a ὅτι τὸ κράτος τοῦ θεοῦ, καὶ σοί, κύριε, τὸ ἔλεος

Jdt 9:14 σὺ εἶ ὁ θεὸς πάσης δυνάμεως καὶ κράτους

Pss. Sol. 17:3b τὸ κράτος τοῦ θεοῦ ἡμῶν

3 Macc 3:11 οὐ καθορῶν τὸ τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ κράτος

2 Macc 3:34 διάγγελλε πᾶσι τὸ μεγαλεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος; 7:17 θεώρει τὸ μεγαλεῖον αὐτοῦ κράτος; 9:17 καταγγέλλοντα τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος; 11:4 οὐδαμῶς ἐπιλογιζόμενος τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος

41) Ps 75:9a ἐκ τοῦ οὐρανοῦ ἠκούτισας κρίσιν

2 Macc 9:4 τῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ δὴ κρίσεως συνούσης αὐτῷ

42) Ps 120:5b κύριος σκέπη σου ἐπὶ χεῖρα δεξιάν σου

2 Macc 13:17 διὰ τὴν ἐπαρήγουσαν αὐτῷ τοῦ κυρίου σκέπην

43) Prov 4:3b υἱός . . . ἀγαπώμενος ἐν προσώπῳ μητρός; 8:30 εὐφραινόμην ἐν προσώπῳ αὐτοῦ; 25:7 ταπεινῶσαί σε ἐν προσώπῳ δυνάστου

Jer 52:25 ἑπτὰ ἄνδρας ὀνομαστοὺς ἐν προσώπῳ τοῦ βασιλέως

Sir 32:6a μὴ ὀφθῇς ἐν προσώπῳ κυρίου κενός

2 Macc 14:24 εἶχε τὸν Ἰούδαν διὰ παντὸς ἐν προσώπῳ

44) Job 2:12d καταπασάμενοι γῆν

Mic 1:10 γῆν καταπάσασθε

2 Macc 10:25 γῇ τὰς κεφαλὰς καταπάσαντες; 14:15 καταπασάμενοι γῆν

45) Joel 2:12 καὶ ἐν νηστείᾳ καὶ ἐν κλαυθμῷ καὶ ἐν κοπετῷ

2 Macc 13:12 μετὰ κλαυθμοῦ καὶ νηστειῶν καὶ προπτώσεως

46) Joel 2:17 ἀνὰ μέσον τῆς κρηπῖδος καὶ τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κλαύσονται οἱ ἱερεῖς

2 Macc 10:26 ἐπὶ τὴν ἀπέναντι τοῦ θυσιαστηρίου κρηπῖδα προσπεσόντες

47) Isa 14:6 πατάξας ἔθνος θυμῷ πληγῇ ἀνιάτῳ

2 Macc 9:5 ἐπάταξεν αὐτὸν ἀνιάτῳ καὶ ἀοράτῳ πληγῇ

48) Isa 26:21 ἰδοὺ γὰρ κύριος ἀπὸ τοῦ ἁγίου ἐπάγει τὴν ὀργὴν ἐπὶ τοὺς ἐνοικοῦντας ἐπὶ τῆς γῆς; 42:25 καὶ ἐπήγαγεν ἐπ' αὐτοὺς ὀργὴν θυμοῦ αὐτοῦ

Jer 25:17 καὶ ἐπάξω ἐπ' αὐτοὺς κακά, τὴν ὀργὴν τοῦ θυμοῦ μου

Ps 7:12b ὁ θεὸς κριτὴς δίκαιος . . . μὴ ὀργὴν ἐπάγων καθ' ἑκάστην ἡμέραν

Sir 23:16b δύο εἴδη πληθύνουσιν ἁμαρτίας, καὶ τὸ τρίτον ἐπάξει ὀργήν; 47:20c ἐπαγαγεῖν ὀργὴν ἐπὶ τὰ τέκνα σου

2 Macc 7:38 τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργὴν τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ σύμπαν ἡμῶν γένος δικαίως ἐπηγμένην

49) Isa 32:11 περιζώσασθε σάκκους τὰς ὀσφύας

3 Kgdms 20:27 καὶ ἐζώσατο σάκκον ἐπὶ τὸ σῶμα αὐτοῦ; 21:32 περιεζώσαντο σάκκους ἐπὶ τὰς ὀσφύας αὐτῶν

Jdt 4:14 σάκκους περιεζωσμένοι τὰς ὀσφύας αὐτῶν

2 Macc 10:25 τὰς ὀσφύας σάκκοις ζώσαντες

50) Isa 37:36 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελος κυρίου καὶ ἀνεῖλεν ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας

4 Kgdms 19:35 καὶ ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελος κυρίου καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν τῇ παρεμβολῇ τῶν Ἀσσυρίων ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας

1 Macc 7:41 ἐξῆλθεν ἄγγελός σου καὶ ἐπάταξεν ἐν αὐτοῖς ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας

2 Macc 15:22 ἀπέστειλας τὸν ἄγγελόν σου . . . καὶ ἀνεῖλεν ἐκ τῆς παρεμβολῆς Σενναχηρειμ εἰς ἑκατὸν ὀγδοήκοντα πέντε χιλιάδας

51) Isa 40:12 τίς ἔστησε τὰ ὄρη σταθμῷ καὶ τὰς νάπας ζυγῷ;

2 Macc 9:8 πλάστιγγι τὰ τῶν ὀρέων οἰόμενος ὕψη στήσειν

52) Isa 48:2 τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἁγίας; 52:1 Ιερουσαλημ πόλις ἡ ἁγία; 66:20 εἰς τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν Ιερουσαλημ

OG Dan 3:28 ἐπὶ τὴν πόλιν σου τὴν ἁγίαν

Joel 4:17 καὶ ἔσται Ιερουσαλημ πόλις ἁγία (Rahlfs)

Tob 13:9 Ἱεροσόλυμα πόλις ἁγία

2 Esd 21:1 ἐν Ἰερουσαλὴμ τῇ πόλει τῇ ἁγίᾳ

1 Macc 2:7 τῆς πόλεως τῆς ἁγίας

3 Macc 6:5 ἐπὶ τὴν ἁγίαν σου πόλιν

2 Macc 1:12 ἐν τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλει; 3:1 τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως; 9:14 τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν; 15:14 τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως

53) Isa 65:4 οἱ ἔσθοντες κρέα ὕεια; 66:17 ἔσθοντες κρέας ὕειον

4 Macc 5:2 κρεῶν ὑείων . . . ἀναγκάζειν ἀπογεύεσθαι

2 Macc 6:18 ἠναγκάζετο φαγεῖν ὕειον κρέας; 7:1 ἀπὸ τῶν ἀθεμίτων ὑείων κρεῶν ἐφάπτεσθαι

54) Ezek 26:20 μηδὲ ἀνασταθῇς ἐπὶ γῆς ζωῆς

OG Dan 12:2 πολλοὶ τῶν καθευδόντων ἐν τῷ πλάτει τῆς γῆς ἀναστήσονται, οἱ μὲν εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον, οἱ δὲ εἰς ὀνειδισμόν

Pss. Sol. 3:12b οἱ δὲ φοβούμενοι τὸν κύριον ἀναστήσονται εἰς ζωὴν αἰώνιον

2 Macc 7:9 εἰς αἰώνιον ἀναβίωσιν ζωῆς ἡμᾶς ἀναστήσει; 7:14 σοὶ μὲν γὰρ ἀνάστασις εἰς ζωὴν οὐκ ἔσται

55) OG Dan 4:26 μετὰ πάσης τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ περιεπάτει

1 Macc 14:5 καὶ μετὰ πάσης τῆς δόξης αὐτοῦ ἔλαβε τὴν Ἰόππην εἰς λιμένα

2 Macc 5:20 μετὰ πάσης δόξης ἐπανωρθώθη

56) OG Dan 10:1 τὸ πλῆθος τὸ ἰσχυρόν

1 Macc 3:17 πολεμῆσαι πρὸς πλῆθος τοσοῦτο ἰσχυρόν

2 Macc 14:1 μετὰ πλήθους ἰσχυροῦ καὶ στόλου

Appendix 9: Words with a single attestation prior to 2 Maccabees

1. ἐπιψάλλω	1:30	S. fr. 60* Radt
2. κατάκλειστος	3:19	Call. *Epigr.* fr. 401 Pfeiffer
3. ἀναστρατοπεδεύω	3:35	Plb. (5x)
4. ἐνδείκτης	4:1	*UPZ* 1.69.7–8 [152 BCE]
5. σπειρηδόν	5:2; 12:20	Plb. 5.4.9; 11.11.6
6. ἀποργίζομαι	5:17	Men. *Sam.* 683
7. κρημνίζω	6:10	Ar.Byz. *Epit.* 2.581 Lampros
8. τηγανίζω	7:5	Posidipp. fr. 5 Kock
9. ὑπεραγόντως	7:20	*IK Pessinous* 7.7 [158–156 BCE]
10. διαρρυθμίζω	7:22	*IG I*^{3} 475.70 [409/8 BCE]
11. μακροτονέω	8:26	Ph.Mech. *Bel.* 68.15 Thevenot
12. ἐναπερείδομαι	9:4	Plb. 22.13.2
13. πρώταρχος[52]	10:11	A. *Ag.* 1192
14. εὐγενίζω	10:13	Philem. fr. 180.2 Kock
15. προσαποστέλλω	11:14	Th. 4.108.6
16. ἀναγώγως	12:14	Macho fr. 16.322 Gow
17. προεξαποστέλλω	12:21	Plb. 3.86.3; 18.19.5, 6
18. εὐαπάντητος[53]	14:9	*IG IV* 1.26 [158–144 BCE]
19. ἐλεφαντάρχης	14:12	Phylarch. *FGrH* 2a, 81, fr. 31.6
20. δίφραξ	14:21	Theoc. 14.41
21. περικατάλη(μ)πτος	14:41	Philippid. fr. 24 Kock
22. προσυπομιμνήσκω	15:9	Plb. 22.18.7; 38.8.2
23. ἐπανδρόω[54]	15:17	A.R. 1.874

[52] Grimm (1857, 158–59), Bikerman (1938, 204), Hanhart (1961, 48 [470]), and Schwartz (2008, 380), consider πρώταρχος to be a common noun or adjective, contra Habicht (1976, 251nc), Goldstein (1983, 387), and Doran (2012, 206–7), who argue that it should be taken as a proper name.

[53] The absolute *hapax legomenon* εὐυπάντητος occurs in *IGBulg I*^{2} 390.6, dated to the 2nd/1st c. BCE.

[54] See 3.3.1.

Appendix 10: Words attested in two or three authors/texts prior to 2 Maccabees

1. συγκεραυνόω	1:16	Archil. fr. 120.2 West; Cratin. fr. 187.4 Kock
2. ἀντιλάμπω	1:32	A. *Ag.* 294; Anaxag. D.-K. fr. 19; X. *Cyn.* 5.18.6
3. ἀντρώδης	2:5	X. *An.* 4.3.11; Arist. *Pr.* 932ᵃ2
4. εἰσκυκλέω	2:24	Ar. *V.* 1475; *Th.* 265; Men. *Dysc.* 758
5. ἐξεργαστικός	2:31	X. *Mem.* 4.1.4; Chrysipp.*Stoic.* fr. 264.27; Plb. 15.37.2
6. κατατολμάω	3:24, 5:15	Plb. (8x); *UPZ* 1.42.20 [162 BCE]
7. προηγορέω[55]	4:48	X. *An.* 5.5.7; *HG* 1.1.27, 2.2.22; *IGUR* I 2.5 [late 2nd/early 1st c. BCE]
8. μισοπονηρέω	4:49, 8:4	Lys. 30.35; Plb. 9.39.6; *UPZ* 1.2.25 [163 BCE]
9. δυσημερία	5:6	A. fr. 236 Radt [=Ar. *Ra.* 1287]; S. fr. 591.4 Radt; Demad. fr. 60 de Falco
10. ἐκπλήρωσις	6:14	Hippod. p. 98.14 Thesleff; Aesar. p. 49.17 Thesleff; *P.Köln* 8.346.54 [250–201 BCE]
11. προήγορος[56]	7:2, 4	*Ephesos* 572.1 [4th c. BCE]; *IG XII,6* 1:11.20–21 [after 243/2 BCE]
12. περισύρω	7:7	Hyp. fr. 264 Jensen; Plb. (2x); LXX Gen 30:37
13. προσκύπτω	7:27	Ar. *V.* 608; Pl. *Euthd.* 275e, *R.* 449b; Thphr. *Char.* 2.10
14. πάμφυλος	8:9, 12:27	Ar. *Av.* 1063; Pl. *Plt.* 291a
15. ἁρματηλάτης	9:4	Pi. *P.* 5.115; S. *El.* 700; X. (5x)
16. φιλαργυρέω	10:20	Herodor. *FHG* 2:24b; Epicur. *Sent.Vat.* 43 Arrighetti; *IG IX,2* 338.12 [196–194 BCE]
17. ἐρυμνότης	10:34, 12:14	X. *Cyr.* 6.1.23; Arist. *Pol.* 1330ᵇ37, 41; Plb. (3x)
18. δυσπολιόρκητος	12:21	X. *HG* 4.8.5; Plb. 5.3.4
19. δυσπρόσιτος	12:21	E. *IA* 345; Hp. *Decent.* 7.2
20. δρεπανηφόρος	13:2	X. (10x); Plb. 5.53.10
21. καταπειράζω	13:18	Lys. 30.34; Plb. (29x)
22. αὐστηρία	14:30	Thphr. *CP* 6.12.6; Plb. 4.21.1; *MDAI(A)* 33 (1908) 381,3.16 [after 133 BCE]
23. σκήνωσις	14:35	Ar.Byz. *Epit.* 2.46.17; Agatharch. *GGM* 1:47.24

[55] See Chapter 8.

[56] See Chapter 8.

Appendix 11: Combinations of words attested in only one or two authors/texts prior to 2 Maccabees

1) Hom. *Il.* 8.367 εὖτέ μιν εἰς Ἀΐδαο πυλάρταο προὔπεμψεν

   2 Macc 6:23 προπέμπειν εἰς τὸν ᾅδην

   Ph. *Mos.* 1.195 εἰς ᾅδου προπέμπων

2) Hom. *Il.* 5.394 τότε καί μιν ἀνήκεστον λάβεν ἄλγος

   2 Macc 9:5 ἔλαβεν αὐτὸν ἀνήκεστος τῶν σπλάγχνων ἀλγηδών

   Ph. *Leg.* 3.216 μετ' ὀδύνης καὶ ἀλγηδόνων ἀνηκέστων

3) Hom. *Il.* 3.277 'Ηέλιός θ', ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾷς; *Od.* 11.109, 12.323 μῆλα 'Ηελίου, ὃς πάντ' ἐφορᾷ

   S. *El.* 175 Ζεύς, ὃς ἐφορᾷ πάντα

   X. *Cyr.* 8.7.22 θεούς γε τούς . . . πάντ' ἐφορῶντας

   2 Macc 12:22 τοῦ τὰ πάντα ἐφορῶντος; 15:2 ὑπὸ τοῦ πάντα ἐφορῶντος

   Cf. LXX Job 28:24a αὐτὸς γὰρ τὴν ὑπ' οὐρανὸν πᾶσαν ἐφορᾷ; 34:23b ὁ γὰρ κύριος πάντας ἐφορᾷ; Zech 9:1 κύριος ἐφορᾷ ἀνθρώπους καὶ πάσας φυλὰς τοῦ Ισραηλ

4) Hom. *Od.* 4.242, 271; 20.393; 8.139 καρτερὸς ἀνήρ

   Pi. *P.* 4.239 καρτερὸν ἄνδρα

   Mosch. 102 οἱ μεγάλοι καὶ καρτεροί, οἱ σοφοὶ ἄνδρες

   2 Macc 12:35 ἔφιππος ἀνὴρ καὶ καρτερός

   D.Chr. 1.56 ἀνδρὶ καρτερῷ

5) A. *Pr.* 682 οἰστροπλὴξ δ' ἐγὼ / μάστιγι θείᾳ γῆν πρὸ γῆς ἐλαύνομαι

   2 Macc 9:11 ἤρξατο . . . εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἔρχεσθαι θείᾳ μάστιγι κατὰ στιγμὴν ἐπιτεινόμενος ταῖς ἀλγηδόσιν[57]

6) A. *Supp.* 705–6 πατρῴαις . . . τιμαῖς

   E. *Heracl.* 810 τιμὰς πατρῴους

   2 Macc 4:15 τὰς πατρῴους τιμάς

   Nic.Dam. *FHG* 3:101.149, 715 τὰς πατρῴους τιμάς; 101.966 τῆς πατρῴας τιμῆς; 101.1007 τῇ πατρῴα τιμῇ

7) S. *Ph.* 890–91 τούτους δ' ἔασον, μὴ βαρυνθῶσιν κακῇ / ὀσμῇ; fr. 697 Radt ὀσμῆς μόνον / ὅπως . . . μὴ βαρυνθήσεσθέ μου

   2 Macc 9:9 ὑπὸ δὲ τῆς ὀσμῆς αὐτοῦ πᾶν τὸ στρατόπεδον βαρύνεσθαι τὴν σαπρίαν

8) E. fr. 1059.7 Nauck δημιουργὸς ὢν κακῶν

   Pl. *R.* 552d πάντων τῶν τοιούτων κακῶν δημιουργοί

   2 Macc 4:1 τῶν κακῶν δημιουργὸς καθεστηκώς

   Ph. *Sobr.* 2 ὅσων δημιουργὸς κακῶν ἡ μέθη; *Decal.* 5 τῦφος καὶ πολλῶν ἄλλων κακῶν δημιουργός ἐστιν

[57] The very rare combination οὐρανίων ἄστρων, which occurs in the preceding verse (9:10), is also most likely borrowed from Aeschylus' *Prometheus Bound* (l. 1049).

9) E. *Hec.* 1221 πατρῴας γῆς ἀπεξενωμένοις

2 Macc 5:9 ὁ συχνοὺς τῆς πατρίδος ἀποξενώσας

Plu. *Alex.* 69.2 ἀποξενώσαντα τῆς πατρίδος ἑαυτόν

Cf. LXX Prov 27:8b-c ἄνθρωπος δουλοῦται, ὅταν ἀποξενωθῇ ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων τόπων

10) E. *Andr.* 190 τοὺς κρείσσους λόγους / πικρῶς φέρουσι τῶν ἐλασσόνων ὕπο; *Ion* 610 αὐτὴ καθ' αὑτὴν τὴν τύχην οἴσει πικρῶς

Plb. 4.4.9 πικρῶς ἤνεγκε καὶ βαρέως τὸ ῥηθέν

2 Macc 7:39 πικρῶς φέρων ἐπὶ τῷ μυκτηρισμῷ

4 Macc 10:5 πικρῶς ἐνέγκαντες τὴν παρρησίαν τοῦ ἀνδρός

J. *AJ* 5.320 πικρῶς ἐπὶ τοῖς συμβεβηκόσι φέρουσα

Plu. *Mor.* 558B μὴ φέρε πικρῶς

11) E. *Ph.* 1071 λήξασ' ὀδυρμῶν πενθίμων τε δακρύων

2 Macc 11:6 μετὰ ὀδυρμῶν καὶ δακρύων ἱκέτευον

D.S. 13.57.1 παρὰ μὲν τοῖς Ἕλλησιν ἦν ὀδυρμοὺς καὶ δάκρυα θεωρεῖν

J. *BJ* 6.111 μετ' ὀδυρμοῦ καὶ δακρύων

Plu. *Nic.* 26.5, *Cat.Min.* 63.2 εἰς δάκρυα καὶ ὀδυρμούς

12) E. *El.* 812 ἁγνὸν πῦρ

2 Macc 13:8 πῦρ ἁγνόν

13) E. *Ph.* 1051 δι' αἱμάτων δ' ἀμείβει / μυσαρὸν εἰς ἀγῶνα; 1292 δι' ἀσπίδων, δι' αἱμάτων; *Or.* 1547 ἔπεσε μέλαθρα τάδε δι' αἱμάτων

2 Macc 14:18 ὑπευλαβεῖτο τὴν κρίσιν δι' αἱμάτων ποιήσασθαι

D.H. 3.9.1 εἰ δι' αἵματος καὶ φόνων ἀναγκασθείημεν κρῖναι τὸν συγγενῆ πόλεμον; 6.80.3 δι' αἵματος καὶ φόνων ἐμφυλίων; 11.55.3 δι' ὅπλων καὶ δι' αἵματος ἐμφυλίου

14) *Trag.Adesp.* fr. 424 ἁγνὸν εἰς σηκὸν θεοῦ

2 Macc 14:33 τόνδε τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ σηκὸν εἰς πεδίον ποιήσω

Posidon. fr. 131a17 Theiler [=D.S. 34/35.1.3] Ἀντίοχος ὁ προσαγορευθεὶς Ἐπιφανής . . . εἰσῆλθεν εἰς τὸν ἄδυτον τοῦ θεοῦ σηκόν

Sib. Or. 3.290 καινὸν σηκὸν θεοῦ; 3.665 σηκὸν μεγάλοιο θεοῦ

D.S. 17.50.3 τὸν τοῦ θεοῦ σηκόν

D.H. 2.48.3 εἰς τὸν σηκὸν εἰστρέχει τοῦ θεοῦ

15) Ar. *Ra.* 1472 ὦ μιαρώτατ' ἀνθρώπων

D. 25.28 ὦ μιαρώτατε πάντων τῶν ὄντων ἀνθρώπων; cf. Aeschin. 3.101 ὁ μιαρὸς καὶ ἀνόσιος ἄνθρωπος

2 Macc 7:34 ὦ ἀνόσιε καὶ πάντων ἀνθρώπων μιαρώτατε

D.H. 4.38.4 ὦ μιαρώτατε ἀνθρώπων; 5.28.4 ὦ μιαρώτατε πάντων ἀνθρώπων

16) A.R. 2.232–233 ἀλλά με πικρὴ δῆτα καὶ ἄατος ἴσχει ἀνάγκη / μίμνειν καὶ μίμνοντα κακῇ ἐν γαστέρι θέσθαι

2 Macc 6:7 ἤγοντο δὲ μετὰ πικρᾶς ἀνάγκης . . . ἐπὶ σπλαγχνισμόν

17) Hdt. 2.33 ὁ μὲν δὴ τοῦ Ἀμμωνίου Ἐτεάρχου λόγος ἐς τοσοῦτό μοι δεδηλώσθω

2 Macc 7:42 τὰ μὲν οὖν περὶ τοὺς σπλαγχνισμοὺς καὶ τὰς ὑπερβαλλούσας αἰκίας ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον δεδηλώσθω

J. *AJ* 3.187 καὶ ταῦτα μὲν ἐπὶ τοσοῦτόν μοι δεδηλώσθω

Paus. 5.27.7 τάδε μὲν ἐς τοσοῦτο ἡμῖν δεδηλώσθω

18) Hdt. 1.76 μάχης δὲ καρτερῆς γενομένης; 3.11 μάχης δὲ γενομένης καρτερῆς

Th. 4.43.3 ἦν ἡ μάχη καρτερά; 8.61.3 καρτερᾶς γενομένης ναυμαχίας

2 Macc 10:29; 12:11 γενομένης δὲ καρτερᾶς μάχης

3 Macc 1:4 γενομένης δὲ καρτερᾶς μάχης

D.S. 11.7.1, passim γενομένης δὲ μάχης καρτερᾶς; 11.32.2, passim γενομένης δὲ καρτερᾶς μάχης

D.H. 1.64.4 μάχης δὲ γενομένης καρτερᾶς; 6.42.2, passim γενομένης δὲ μάχης καρτερᾶς

J. *AJ* 1.175, passim καρτερᾶς τῆς μάχης γενομένης; 15.111 μάχης καρτερᾶς γενομένης; *Vit.* 327 μάχης δὲ γενομένης καρτερᾶς

19) Hdt. 7.40 ἱροὶ Νησαῖοι καλεόμενοι ἵπποι δέκα, κεκοσμημένοι ὡς κάλλιστα

2 Macc 3:25 ὤφθη γάρ τις ἵππος αὐτοῖς . . . καλλίστῃ σαγῇ διακεκοσμημένος

20) Hdt. 1.117 τοιούτῳ μόρῳ ἐχρήσατο ὁ παῖς; 1.167 οὗτοι μὲν τῶν Φωκαιέων τοιούτῳ μόρῳ διεχρήσαντο

2 Macc 13:7 τοιούτῳ μόρῳ τὸν παράνομον συνέβη θανεῖν

21) X. *Cyn.* 10.7 ὅπως ἂν εἰς τὸν κόλπον διὰ τῶν βρόχων αἱ αὐγαὶ τοῦ φέγγους ὡς μάλιστα ἐνέχωσιν

2 Macc 12:9 ὑφῆψε τὸν λιμένα . . . ὥστε φαίνεσθαι τὰς αὐγὰς τοῦ φέγγους εἰς τὰ Ἱεροσόλυμα

Ph. *Spec.* 1.298 ἡ τοῦ ἱερωτάτου φέγγους ἐν τοῖς ἀδύτοις αὐγή

22) X. *Cyr.* 2.1.31 καὶ τοὺς ἀμφὶ τὸ στράτευμα δὲ ὑπηρέτας ἰσομοίρους πάντων ἀεὶ ἐποίει; 2.2.18 ἰσομοίρους πάντας ποιεῖν; 4.6.12 ἰσόμοιρον δὲ ἐποίησαν καὶ τὸν παρὰ Κυαξάρου ἄγγελον

2 Macc 8:30 ἰσομοίρους αὐτοὺς καὶ τοῖς ἠκισμένοις καὶ ὀρφανοῖς καὶ χήραις . . . ποιήσαντες.

D.H. 8.72.2 ἰσομοίρους ἡμῖν Ἕρνικάς τε καὶ Λατίνους ποιεῖν

23) X. *Cyr.* 4.2.11 φαιδρῶς καὶ προθύμως ἐξωρμῶντο

Plb. 3.35.6 ἵνα προθύμως ἐξωρμῶσι

2 Macc 11:7 προθύμως ἐξώρμησαν

24) X. *Cyr.* 5.2.9; 5.2.10 τείχη ἐρυμνά

Arist. *Pol.* 1330^{b}37 διὰ τῆς τῶν τειχῶν ἐρυμνότητος; 1330^{b}41 τὴν ἀσφαλεστάτην ἐρυμνότητα τῶν τειχῶν

2 Macc 12:14 πεποιθότες τῇ τῶν τειχέων ἐρυμνότητι

Ph. *Prob.* 151 ἐρυμνότατον τεῖχος

25) X. *An.* 1.9.6 μακαριστὸν ἐποίησε; *Cyr.* 7.2.6 μακαριστοὺς ποιῆσαι

2 Macc 7:24 μακαριστὸν ποιήσειν

J. *AJ* 4.183 μακαριστὸν ποιῆσαι τὸν βίον

26) Pl. *Phlb.* 42d λῦπαί τε καὶ ἀλγηδόνες καὶ ὀδύναι; *Prt.* 354b ὀδύνας τὰς ἐσχάτας παρέχει καὶ ἀλγηδόνας; *Grg.* 525b δι' ἀλγηδόνων καὶ ὀδυνῶν; *R.* 413b ὀδύνη τις ἢ ἀλγηδών

2 Macc 9:9 ἐν ὀδύναις καὶ ἀλγηδόσι

Ph. *Leg.* 3.216 μετ' ὀδύνης καὶ ἀλγηδόνων ἀνηκέστων

27) Pl. *Phd.* 58e ὡς ἀδεῶς καὶ γενναίως ἐτελεύτα [sc. ὁ Σωκράτης]

2 Macc 7:5 ἀλλήλους παρεκάλουν σὺν τῇ μητρὶ γενναίως τελευτᾶν

28) Ps.-Pl. *Hipparch.* 228e γεῦμα λαμβάνοντες αὐτοῦ τῆς σοφίας

2 Macc 13:18 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς εἰληφὼς γεῦμα τῆς τῶν Ἰουδαίων εὐτολμίας

29) Lycurg. 1.35 προδότης ἐστὶν τῆς πατρίδος καὶ τῶν ἱερῶν καὶ τῶν νόμων

2 Macc 5:15 τὸν καὶ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος προδότην γεγονότα

30) D. 4.34 ἀμύθητα χρήματα

2 Macc 3:6 χρημάτων ἀμυθήτων

D.Chr. 40.14 χρήματα ἀμύθητα

31) D. 4.41 καὶ στρατηγεῖσθ' ὑπ' ἐκείνου [sc. τοῦ Φιλίππου]

Plb. 3.71.1 Ἀννίβας . . . ἐγίνετο πρὸς τὸ στρατηγεῖν τοὺς ὑπεναντίους; 9.25.6 ἀεὶ μᾶλλον ἑαυτοὺς ἢ τοὺς πολεμίους στρατηγεῖν; 29.7.3 λοιπὸν ἦν ἐξαπατᾶν καὶ στρατηγεῖν ἀλλήλους

2 Macc 14:31 γενναίως ὑπὸ τἀνδρὸς ἐστρατήγηται

32) Isoc. 19.28 τὰ χαλεπώτατα . . . καὶ δυσχερέστατα

D. 60.24 δυσχερὴς καὶ χαλεπὸς ἅπας . . . ὁ βίος

2 Macc 6:3 χαλεπὴ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὅλοις ἦν δυσχερὴς ἡ ἐπίστασις τῆς κακίας

33) Isoc. 15.173 διακριβοῦσθαι περὶ ἑκάστου

2 Macc 2:28 τὸ διακριβοῦν περὶ ἑκάστων

34) Isoc. 14.40 τὴν δύναμιν τὴν ὑμετέραν ἀνυπόστατον δοκοῦσαν εἶναι; 15.25 ἀνυπόστατον τὴν αὑτοῦ δύναμιν ἅπασιν εἶναι δόξειν

2 Macc 1:13 ἡ περὶ αὐτὸν ἀνυπόστατος δοκοῦσα εἶναι δύναμις

35) Lys. 6.35 ἀπαλλάξας δέους καὶ ταραχῆς τῆς τότε

Isoc. 15.169 ἐπαυσάμην τοῦ δέους καὶ τῆς ταραχῆς ταύτης

2 Macc 3:30 τὸ μικρῷ πρότερον δέους καὶ ταραχῆς γέμον ἱερόν; 13:16 τὴν παρεμβολὴν δέους καὶ ταραχῆς ἐπλήρωσαν

D.H. 10.15.1 μέγα δέος καὶ πολλὴν ταραχὴν Ῥωμαίοις παρασχόντα

J. *AJ* 6.24 εἰς ταραχὴν ἄγει καὶ δέος; 9.87 εἰς τὸ δέος καὶ τὴν ταραχὴν ἐκείνην ἐνέβαλεν; *BJ* 5.92 πάλιν ἐμπίπτει ταραχὴ καὶ δέος

Plu. *Rom.* 29.3 μετὰ δέους καὶ ταραχῆς; *Sull.* 18.2 ἀνέπλησαν δέους καὶ ταραχῆς τὸ πλεῖστον μέρος; *Caes.* 67.1 κατέπλησε ταραχῆς καὶ δέους ἀπόρου τὸν δῆμον; *Cat. Mi.* 28.5 ὥστε τοῖς περὶ τὸν Μέτελλον ἐμπεσεῖν ταραχὴν καὶ δέος

36) Phylarch. *FGrH* 2a, 81, fr. 45.33 οὐδὲ οὕτως ἔληξαν τῆς ὑπερηφανίας

2 Macc 9:7 ὁ δ' οὐδαμῶς τῆς ἀγερωχίας ἔληγεν; 9:11 ἤρξατο τὸ πολὺ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας λήγειν

37) Polystr. col14a.7 Wilke τὸν ἄξιον μ[ι]σ[θό]ν . . . κομίζονται

2 Macc 8:33 τὸν ἄξιον τῆς δυσσεβείας ἐκομίσατο μισθόν

J. *AJ* 1.183 μισθοὺς οὓς ἄξιόν ἐστίν σε . . . κομίζεσθαι

Luc. *Phal.* 2.5 μισθὸν κομίσασθαι τῆς εὐσεβείας

Cf. E. *Hipp.* 1050 [μισθὸς γὰρ οὗτός ἐστιν ἀνδρὶ δυσσεβεῖ][58]

38) Philod.Scarph. 114 θυσίαν δὲ φαίνει[ν] σὺν Ἑλλάδος ὀλβίας πα[νδ]ήμοις ἱκετείαις

2 Macc 3:18 ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν ἀγεληδὸν ἐξεπήδων ἐπὶ πάνδημον ἱκετείαν

39) Philod.Scarph. 120 ἀγήρων ἀμίαντον ἃ κτίσῃ ναὸ[ν ἄ]νακ[τι] Φοίβῳ

2 Macc 14:36 διατήρησον εἰς αἰῶνα ἀμίαντον τόνδε τὸν προσφάτως κεκαθαρισμένον οἶκον

Appendix 12: Combinations of words shared by Polybius, 2 Maccabees, and a few subsequent authors

1) Plb. 7.2.2 τούτους μὲν εἰς Ἰταλίαν ἀπέστειλε, δοὺς ἐντολάς; 29.3.4 τοῦτον ἐξαπέστειλε, δοὺς ἐντολάς; 29.3.9 προχειρισάμενος Παρμενίωνα καὶ Μόρκον ἐξαπέστειλε, δοὺς ἐντολάς; 31.7.3 ἀξιωματικὰς δὲ δοὺς ἐντολὰς ἐξαπέστειλε τοὺς πρέσβεις; 33.7.4 παραχρῆμ' ἐξαπέστειλεν, ἐντολὰς αὐτοῖς δοῦσα

2 Macc 3:7 προχειρισάμενος Ἡλιόδωρον . . . ἀπέστειλε δοὺς ἐντολάς; 14:12 προχειρισάμενος δὲ εὐθέως Νικάνορα . . . ἐξαπέστειλεν δοὺς ἐπιστολάς[59]

D.S. 17.2.5 προχειρισάμενος Ἑκαταῖον ἐξαπέστειλεν . . . δοὺς ἐντολάς; 23.10.1 ἀπέστειλέ τινα τῶν φίλων εἰς Καρχηδόνα δοὺς ἐντολάς

2) Plb. 3.52.5 διασαφούντων ὅτι πάρεισι διὰ ταῦτα

2 Macc 3:9 τίνος ἕνεκεν πάρεστι διεσάφησεν

3) Plb. 3.102.4 εἰς τοῦτ' ἦλθον καταφρονήσεως; 4.35.4 διὰ τὴν ὠμότητα τῶν τολμώντων εἰς τοῦτ' ἦλθε καταφρονήσεως [sc. τὸ ἱερόν]

UPZ 1.8.27–28 [161 BCE] ἀνεπιπλήκτων αὐτῶν ὄντων εἰς μείζονα καταφρόνησιν [με] ἐλθεῖν

2 Macc 3:18 διὰ τὸ μέλλειν εἰς καταφρόνησιν ἔρχεσθαι τὸν τόπον [sc. the Jerusalem Temple]

J. *AJ* 9.257 ἐπὶ τοσοῦτον δ' ὀλιγωρίας καὶ καταφρονήσεως ἦλθεν [sc. ὁ βασιλεὺς Ἄχαζος]

4) Plb. 1.26.9 θεώμενος ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν; 4.41.9 θεωροῦντας ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν; 8.21.1 τοῦ πράγματος ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν θεωρουμένου; 10.18.13 θεωρῶν ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν; 38.20.3 ἃ τίς οὐκ ἂν ὑπὸ τὴν ὄψιν θεασάμενος ἐν νῷ λάβοι;

2 Macc 3:36 ἐξεμαρτύρει δὲ πᾶσιν, ἅπερ ἦν ὑπ' ὄψιν τεθεαμένος ἔργα τοῦ μεγίστου θεοῦ; cf. 12:42 ὑπ' ὄψιν ἑωρακότας τὰ γεγονότα

[58] The bracketed text is found in the MSS, but editors suspect it as spurious.

[59] V *L* 55 La Arm read here εντολας.

5) Plb. 4.73.2 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ὡς θᾶττον ἧκε

2 Macc 4:31 θᾶττον οὖν ὁ βασιλεὺς ἧκε

Ph. *Mos.* 1.237 τοῦ μὴ θᾶττον ἥκειν

J. *AJ* 15.78 θᾶττον ἥξειν; *Vit.* 218, 373 ἥκειν θᾶττον

6) Plb. 5.58.1 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς σαφῶς ἕκαστα τούτων ἐπεγνωκώς; 6.9.11 ταῦτά τις σαφῶς ἐπεγνωκώς

IC I xxiv 2.20–21 [2nd c. BCE] ἁμὲν ἐ[πεγν]ωκότεν σαφίως τὰν Σαμίων εὔνοιαν

2 Macc 4:33 σαφῶς ἐπεγνωκὼς ὁ Ονίας; 14:9 ἕκαστα δὲ τούτων ἐπεγνωκὼς σύ, βασιλεῦ

7) Plb. 1.39.11, 3.78.8, 20.10.15 διαδοθείσης (τῆς) φήμης; 31.28.7 φήμης περὶ αὐτοῦ (δια)διδομένης

2 Macc 4:39 διαδοθείσης ἔξω τῆς φήμης

D.S. 4.41.1, 16.26.3, 16.84.3 τῆς φήμης διαδοθείσης; 4.47.2, 17.88.7, 29.34.2 διαδοθείσης (τῆς) φήμης; 3.73.5 διαδιδομένης περὶ αὐτοῦ φήμης; 32.7.1 τῆς περὶ αὐτοῦ φήμης διαδιδομένης; 13.61.2 διεδόθη δὲ καὶ φήμη τις; 31.25.1 φήμη διεδόθη

Ph. *Contempl.* 64 τὴν διαδοθεῖσαν φήμην

4 Macc 4:22 φήμης διαδοθείσης

8) Plb. 34.1.9 σχεδὸν ἐφ' ἡμέρας τετταράκοντα

2 Macc 5:2 σχεδὸν ἐφ' ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα

D.S. 19.19.2 σχεδὸν ἐφ' ἡμέρας τεσσαράκοντα

9) Plb. 30.25.14 τὰ δ' [εἴδωλα] ἠμφιεσμένα στολαῖς διαχρύσοις

2 Macc 5:2 ἱππεῖς διαχρύσους στολὰς ἔχοντας

Esth^{AT} 5(D):4(6) ὁ βασιλεύς . . . πᾶσαν στολὴν ἐπιφανείας ἐνδεδύκει, ὅλος διάχρυσος

Posidon. fr. 200 Theiler [=D.S. 36.13.1] στολὴν ἀνθίνην διάχρυσον

J. *AJ* 11.331 τὸν δὲ ἀρχιερέα ἐν τῇ ὑακινθίνῳ καὶ διαχρύσῳ στολῇ

10) Plb. 6.39.5 τοῖς δὲ πόλεως καταλαμβανομένης πρώτοις ἐπὶ τὸ τεῖχος ἀναβᾶσι; 9.25.6 πόλεως καταλαμβανομένης

2 Macc 5:5 τῶν δὲ ἐπὶ τῷ τείχει συνελασθέντων καὶ τέλος ἤδη καταλαμβανομένης τῆς πόλεως

D.S. 13.57.1 τῆς πόλεως καταλαμβανομένης; 17.13.1 τῆς δὲ πόλεως τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον καταλαμβανομένης

Plu. *Brut.* 8.7 ἤδη τῆς πόλεως καταλαμβανομένης

11) Plb. 30.11.5 ἀποτεθηριωμένοι τὰς ψυχάς

2 Macc 5:11 τεθηριωμένος τῇ ψυχῇ

D.S. 17.9.6 ἀποθηριωθεὶς τὴν ψυχήν

12) Plb. 39.1.4 διὰ τοῦ προοιμίου παρεκάλει τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας

2 Macc 6:12 παρακαλῶ οὖν τοὺς ἐντυγχάνοντας τῇδε τῇ βίβλῳ μὴ συστέλλεσθαι διὰ τὰς συμφοράς

J. *AJ* 1.15 τοὺς ἐντευξομένους τοῖς βιβλίοις παρακαλῶ; *Ap.* 2.147 παρακαλῶ δὲ τοὺς ἐντευξομένους τῇ γραφῇ μὴ μετὰ φθόνου ποιεῖσθαι τὴν ἀνάγνωσιν

Dsc. 1 Pr 5 παρακαλοῦμεν δὲ σὲ καὶ τοὺς ἐντευξομένους τοῖς ὑπομνήμασι μὴ τὴν ἐν λόγοις δύναμιν ἡμῶν σκοπεῖν

13) Plb. 4.74.8 ταῦτα μὲν οὖν ἡμῖν τῆς Ἠλείων ὑπομνήσεως εἰρήσθω χάριν

2 Macc 6:17 ἕως ὑπομνήσεως ταῦθ' ἡμῖν εἰρήσθω

D.H. *Comp.* 3.68 ἐμοὶ δ' ὑπομνήσεως ἕνεκα λέγοντι ἀρκεῖ ταῦτα μόνα εἰρῆσθαι

Str. 11.1.2.6 εἴρηται δὲ ταῦθ' ἡμῖν καὶ πρότερον, ἀλλ' εἰρήσθω καὶ νῦν ὑπομνήσεως χάριν

14) Plb. 16.17.8 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὴν πατρίδα φιλοστοργίαν

2 Macc 6:20 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ ζῆν φιλοστοργίαν

D.S. 3.59.1 διὰ τὴν πρὸς τὸ μειράκιον φιλοστοργίαν

J. *AJ* 4.273 διὰ τὴν εὔνοιαν καὶ τὴν πρὸς τὰ οἰκεῖα φιλοστοργίαν

15) Plb. 1.30.11 οἱ δὲ μισθοφόροι πάνυ γενναίως καὶ προθύμως ἐκβοηθήσαντες

2 Macc 6:28 εἰς τὸ προθύμως καὶ γενναίως . . . ἀπευθανατίζειν

J. *AJ* 14.95 γενναίως οἱ Ἰουδαῖοι καὶ προθύμως ἀγωνισάμενοι

16) Plb. 8.38b.2 ἀδήλοις ἐλπίσι

2 Macc 7:34 ἀδήλοις ἐλπίσιν

Agatharch. 15.6 ἀδήλους ἐλπίδας

Plu. *Mor.* 496E ἐλπίδες ἄδηλοι

17) Plb. 9.19.3 δυνατὸς ἦν οὐχ οἷον παραλιπεῖν διὰ τὰ τοιαῦτα τοὺς ἰδίους καιρούς, ἀλλὰ καὶ συνεργοῖς χρήσασθαι; 18.53.4 καὶ χεῖρα βαρεῖαν ἔχων συνεργὸν καὶ καιρόν; 18.55.2 λαβὼν γὰρ συνεργὸν τὴν ἀγριότητα τὴν Χαριμόρτου

2 Macc 8:7 τὰς νύκτας πρὸς τὰς τοιαύτας ἐπιβολὰς συνεργοὺς ἐλάμβανε; 14:5 καιρὸν δὲ λαβὼν τῆς ἰδίας ἀνοίας συνεργόν

1 Macc 12:1 καὶ εἶδεν Ιωναθαν ὅτι ὁ καιρὸς αὐτῷ συνεργεῖ

D.H. 2.14.2 ἦσαν δὲ μέσαι τηνικαῦτα νύκτες, καὶ πολλὴ καθ' ὅλην τὴν πόλιν ἡσυχία, ἣν συνεργὸν λαβών

IosPE I^{2} 352.22 [ca. 107 BCE] Παλά|[κου] δὲ συνεργεῖν τὸν καιρὸν ἑαυτῷ νομίζοντος

Plu. *Mor.* 660A καιρὸν λαβοῦσα πειθοῦς φιλανθρώπου καὶ χάριτος συνεργόν

18) Plb. 2.27.3 τὴν παρουσίαν ἀμφοτέρων τῶν στρατοπέδων ἀνήγγελλον; 28.12.4 ἐὰν ὁ στρατηγὸς εὐδοκῇ τῇ παρουσίᾳ τοῦ στρατοπέδου

2 Macc 8:12 μεταδόντος τοῖς σὺν αὐτῷ τὴν παρουσίαν τοῦ στρατοπέδου

SEG 39:1244 col. II.8 [aft. 120/119 BCE] ἐμ πολέμῳ καὶ παρουσίᾳ στρατοπέδων Ῥωμαϊκῶν

19) Plb. 3.115.4 γενναίως διαγωνιζομένων τῶν Ῥωμαίων; 16.5.2 ἀγωνίζεσθαι γενναίως; 21.27.9 γενναίως ἀγωνισαμένων

2 Macc 8:16 ἀγωνίσασθαι γενναίως; 13:14 γενναίως ἀγωνίσασθαι

D.S. 11.31.1, 15.34.5, 38/39.15.1 γενναίως ἀγωνισάμενος; 14.57.6 γενναίως ἀγωνιζομένων; 14.104.3 γενναίως ἀγωνισαμένους; 15.3.6 γενναίως ἀγωνισαμένου; 15.12.1 γενναίως ἀγωνιζόμενοι; 17.23.3 γενναίως ἀγωνίσασθαι

D.H. 6.6.3 γενναίως ἀγωνιζομένοις

J. *AJ* 6.368, *BJ* 1.172, 3.251 γενναίως ἀγωνιζόμενοι; *AJ* 14.95 γενναίως ἀγωνισάμενοι; *BJ* 1.154, 5.163 γενναίως ἀγωνισαμένους; 4.429 γενναίως ἀγωνισάμενος; 6.142 γενναίως ἀγωνίσαιτο

20) Plb. 18.7.3 ἤδη δὲ τῆς ὥρας συγκλειούσης; 18.9.2 διὰ τὸ καὶ τὴν ὥραν εἰς ὀψὲ συγκλείειν; 2.60.4 ὑπὸ τῶν καιρῶν συγκλειόμενος; fr. 36.2 ἐπεὶ τὸν Φίλιππον ἐκκλείουσιν οἱ καιροί

2 Macc 8:25 ὑπὸ τῆς ὥρας συγκλειόμενοι

D.S. 10.4.6 ἤδη δὲ τῆς ὥρας συγκλειούσης; 19.77.7 τῆς χειμερινῆς ὥρας συγκλειούσης; 18.3.1 ἐκκλεισθεὶς ὑπὸ τῶν καιρῶν

Cf. Hdt. 1.31.11 ἐκκληιόμενοι τῇ ὥρῃ; *P.Enteux.* 54.4 [218 BCE] συνέβη ὑπὸ τῆς ὥρας ἐκκλεισθέντας

21) Plb. 26.1.5 τὴν βασιλικὴν ἀποθέμενος ἐσθῆτα

2 Macc 8:35 τὴν δοξικὴν ἀποθέμενος ἐσθῆτα

D.S. 20.104.4 ἀποθέμενος τὴν Λακωνικὴν ἐσθῆτα

22) Plb. 2.54.10, 3.82.1, 5.110.5, 8.26.4, 16.1.7 ποιησάμενος (τὴν) ἀναζυγήν; 9.5.7 ἐποίησε τὴν ἀναζυγήν; 9.19.2 ποιησαμένου τὴν ἀναζυγήν; 10.49.2 ποιεῖσθαι παρήγγειλε τὴν ἀναζυγήν

2 Macc 9:2 ἀσχήμονα τὴν ἀναζυγὴν ποιήσασθαι

J. *AJ* 17.251 τὴν ἀναζυγὴν ἐποιεῖτο

23) Plb. 3.34.7 ἐπαρθεὶς τῷ θυμῷ

2 Macc 9:4 ἐπαρθεὶς δὲ τῷ θυμῷ

D.S. 31.43.1 ὁ τῶν Ῥοδίων δῆμος ἐπηρμένος τῷ θυμῷ

24) Plb. 38.7.9 οὐκ ἀπελπίζειν τὰ καθ' αὑτούς

2 Macc 9:18 τὰ κατ' αὐτὸν[60] ἀπελπίσας

25) Plb. 18.46.1 διὰ τὴν προσδοκίαν τῶν ἀποβησομένων

2 Macc 9:25 προσδοκῶντας τὸ ἀποβησόμενον

26) Plb. 8.13.1 ἐγκρατὴς γενέσθαι τῶν τόπων τούτων; 8.14.10 ἐγκρατὴς γενόμενος τῶν προειρημένων τόπων

2 Macc 10:17 ἐγκρατεῖς ἐγένοντο τῶν τόπων

J. *Ap.* 1.186 ἐγένετο τῶν περὶ Συρίαν τόπων ἐγκρατής

27) Plb. 6.32.4 εἰς τὸν κατεπείγοντα πρὸς τὴν χρείαν τόπον

2 Macc 10:19 εἰς ἐπείγοντας τόπους

Agatharch. *GGM* 1:32.18 εἰς τὸν ἐπιφερῆ καὶ κατεπείγοντα τόπον

28) Plb. 2.25.8 ἅμα δὲ τῷ συνεγγίζειν τοῖς πολεμίοις; 14.4.2, 14.8.2 συνεγγίσας δὲ τοῖς πολεμίοις

2 Macc 10:27 συνεγγίσαντες δὲ τοῖς πολεμίοις

29) Plb. 3.113.1, 11.22.6 ἄρτι τῆς κατὰ τὸν ἥλιον ἀνατολῆς ἐπιφαινομένης

2 Macc 10:28 ἄρτι δὲ τῆς ἀνατολῆς διαχεομένης

[60] A number of minuscules read here καθ αυτον.

30) Plb. 1.53.5; 1.60.6; 15.31.1 ἤδη τῆς ἡμέρας ὑποφαινούσης; 3.105.1 ἄρτι τῆς ἡμέρας διαφαινούσης; 5.6.6, 11.11.2 ἄρτι τῆς ἡμέρας ἐπιφαινούσης; 8.30.10 τῆς δ' ἡμέρας ἐπιφαινομένης

2 Macc 10:35 ὑποφαινούσης δὲ τῆς πέμπτης ἡμέρας; 13:17 ὑποφαινούσης δὲ ἤδη τῆς ἡμέρας

D.S. 16.18.3 διαφαινούσης ἤδη τῆς ἡμέρας; 20.6.1 ὑποφαινούσης τῆς ἕω

J. *AJ* 3.51 ἠργμένης δὲ ὑποφαίνειν τῆς ἡμέρας; 6.111 ὑποφαινούσης ἤδη τῆς ἡμέρας

Arr. *An.* 3.21.3 ἅμα ἡμέρᾳ ὑποφαινούσῃ

Cf. Hdt. 7.219.6 ἤδη διαφαινούσης ἡμέρης; X. *HG* 5.1.21 ὡς δὲ ἡμέρα ὑπέφαινεν; *An.* 4.2.7; *Cyr.* 4.5.14 ἐπεὶ δ' ἡμέρα ὑπέφαινεν; Pl. *Prt.* 312a ἤδη γὰρ ὑπέφαινέν τι ἡμέρας

31) Plb. 7.18.6 οἱ δὲ τὰς παρακειμένας διέκοπτον πύλας

2 Macc 10:36 οἱ δὲ τὰς πύλας διέκοπτον

D.H. 6.91.3 τὰς πύλας διακόψαντες

Cf. X. *An.* 7.1.16 οἱ δὲ στρατιῶται ἔκοπτον τὰς πύλας

32) Plb. 1.32.2 διακούσας τὸ γεγονὸς ἐλάττωμα; 2.19.6 προσφιλονικήσαντες πρὸς τὸ γεγονὸς ἐλάττωμα; 3.96.8 προσπεσόντος αὐτοῖς τοῦ γεγονότος ἐλαττώματος; 5.87.2 διὰ τὸ γεγονὸς ἐλάττωμα περὶ αὐτόν

2 Macc 11:13 ἀντιβάλλων τὸ γεγονὸς περὶ αὐτὸν ἐλάττωμα

D.S. 14.23.6 τὸ περὶ τὸν βασιλέα γεγονὸς ἐλάττωμα; 15.85.8 τὸ γεγονὸς περὶ τοὺς συμμάχους ἐλάττωμα; 18.58.1 τῶν γεγενημένων περὶ αὐτὸν ἐλαττωμάτων

33) Plb. 24.15.6 εὐθέως ἀναζεύξαντες

2 Macc 11:22 εὐθέως ἀναζεύξας

1 Macc 14:16 εὐθέως ἀναζεύξας

D.S. 12.65.7 εὐθὺς δ' ἐπαναζεύξας; 17.64.3 εὐθὺς ἀνέζευξε

34) Plb. 2.66.10 ἐποίει δὲ τοῦτο διὰ τὴν στενότητα τῶν τόπων; 5.3.4 ὁρῶν τό τε πολισμάτιον δυσπολιόρκητον ὂν καὶ τὴν χώραν στενήν

2 Macc 12:21 ἦν γὰρ δυσπολιόρκητον καὶ δυσπρόσιτον τὸ χωρίον διὰ τὴν πάντων τῶν τόπων στενότητα

D.S. 17.40.4 ὁρῶν κατὰ θάλατταν δυσπολιόρκητον οὖσαν τὴν πόλιν

D.H. 11.47.3 χωρίον . . . ὑψηλὸν καὶ δυσπρόσιτον

J. *AJ* 2.249 ἦν δὲ δυσπολιόρκητον σφόδρα τὸ χωρίον

Cf. X. *HG* 4.8.5 ποῖον μὲν <ἂν> ἰσχυρότερον Σηστοῦ λάβοιτε χωρίον, ποῖον δὲ δυσπολιορκητότερον;

35) Plb. 8.15.2 τοῦτον ὁ Σωσίβιος διὰ πλειόνων λόγων πιστωσάμενος

2 Macc 12:25 πιστώσαντος δὲ αὐτοῦ διὰ πλειόνων τὸν ὁρισμόν

36) Plb. 2.34.14 διεμάχοντο πρὸς τοὺς ἐπικειμένους εὐρώστως

2 Macc 12:27 εὐρώστως ἀπεμάχοντο

D.S. 11.22.2 συνάψαντες μάχην εὐρώστως ἠγωνίζοντο; 17.96.4 μαχομένων εὐρώστως

37) Plb. 3.102.10 ποιεῖσθαι τὴν στρατοπεδείαν; 4.23.3 ποιήσεται τὴν στρατοπεδείαν

2 Macc 13:14 ἐποιήσατο τὴν στρατοπεδείαν

D.S. 14.26.2 τὴν στρατοπεδείαν ἐποιήσατο; 17.95.2 ποιήσασθαι στρατοπεδείαν; 18.15.5 ἐποιήσαντο τὴν στρατοπεδείαν

38) Plb. 10.12.8 κατ' ἐκλογὴν τῶν ἀρίστων ἀνδρῶν προκεκριμένων

2 Macc 13:15 μετὰ νεανίσκων ἀρίστων κεκριμένων

D.S. 37.1.6 τῶν ἐξ αἰῶνος ἀρίστων κεκριμένων

Plu. *Ages.* 36.1 ἄνδρα τῆς Ἑλλάδος ἄριστον κεκριμένον

39) Plb. 31.1.5 οἳ καὶ παρελθόντες εἰς τὴν σύγκλητον ἐνδεχομένως ἔδοξαν πρὸς ἅπαντας τοὺς κατηγοροῦντας ποιήσασθαι τὴν ἀπολογίαν

2 Macc 13:26 ἀπελογήσατο ἐνδεχομένως

D.S. 31.7.2 ἐνδεχομένως ἀπολογησάμενοι

40) Plb. 13.6.3 τοὺς κατὰ πλέον πλούτῳ διαφέροντας ἢ δόξῃ προγονικῇ; 20.5.4 ἐγκαταλειπομένου τῆς προγονικῆς δόξης

2 Macc 14:7 ἀφελόμενος τὴν προγονικὴν δόξαν

Posidon. fr. 227.1 Theiler [=D.S. 37.17.1] οὗτος γὰρ οὐ προγονικὴν δόξαν οὐδ' ἀφορμὴν ἰδίαν ἔχων

D.H. 6.27.2 ὅσοι πλούτους ἢ δόξας προγονικὰς εἶχον

TAM II 838.defg11 [134 CE?] προσκεκόσμηκεν τὰς προγονικὰς ἀρετὰς καὶ δόξας

41) Plb. 31.19.2 ὁ δὲ βασιλεὺς ταῦτα διακούσας, εὐθέως προχειρισάμενος Κομανὸν καὶ Πτολεμαῖον τοὺς ἀδελφοὺς ἐξεπέστελλε πρεσβευτάς

2 Macc 14:12 προχειρισάμενος δὲ εὐθέως Νικάνορα . . . ἐξαπέστειλε

42) Plb. 5.42.1 ἐπίβουλον ὄντα καὶ προδότην τῆς βασιλείας

2 Macc 14:26 τὸν ἐπίβουλον τῆς βασιλείας αὐτοῦ Ἰούδαν

J. *AJ* 6.255.4 ὄντι τῆς ἐμῆς βασιλείας ἐπιβούλῳ

43) Plb. 33.10.3 ἀπέστειλε δεσμίους

2 Macc 14:27 δέσμιον ἐξαποστέλλειν

LXX Zech 9.11 ἐξαπέστειλας δεσμίους σου

D.S. 18.66.3 ἀπέστειλε δεσμίους

44) Plb. 1.31.8 οὕτως ἀνδρωδῶς ἔστη καὶ γενναίως ὥστε πᾶν ὑπομένειν εἵλετο . . . ἐφ' ᾧ μηδὲν ἀγεννὲς μηδ' ἀνάξιον τῶν πρὸ τοῦ πράξεων ὑπομεῖναι; 5.83.6 παρεκάλουν ἀνδρωδῶς καὶ γενναίως χρήσασθαι τῷ παρόντι κινδύνῳ

2 Macc 14:42–43 εὐγενῶς θέλων ἀποθανεῖν ἤπερ τοῖς ἀλιτηρίοις ὑποχείριος γενέσθαι καὶ τῆς ἰδίας εὐγενείας ἀναξίως ὑβρισθῆναι . . . ἀναδραμὼν γενναίως ἐπὶ τὸ τεῖχος κατεκρήμνισεν ἑαυτὸν ἀνδρωδῶς εἰς τοὺς ὄχλους

45) Plb. 8.30.5 πλήρης ἡ πόλις κραυγῆς ἐγίνετο καὶ ταραχῆς

2 Macc 15:29 γενομένης δὲ κραυγῆς καὶ ταραχῆς

D.H. 13.7.4 ταραχή τε καὶ κραυγὴ καὶ δρόμος ἁπάντων ἦν

Appendix 13: Combinations of words shared by 2 Maccabees, Diodorus Siculus, Dionysius of Halicarnassus, et al., but not found in Polybius

1) 2 Macc 2:22 τὸ περιβόητον καθ' ὅλην τὴν οἰκουμένην ἱερόν

   D.S. 17.70.3 τὰ δὲ μεγάλα καὶ κατὰ πᾶσαν τὴν οἰκουμένην περιβόητα βασίλεια

   J. *AJ* 20.49 τὸ πᾶσιν ἀνθρώποις περιβόητον ἱερὸν τοῦ θεοῦ

2) 2 Macc 2:25 ἐφροντίσαμεν τοῖς μὲν βουλομένοις ἀναγινώσκειν ψυχαγωγίαν . . . πᾶσι δὲ τοῖς ἐντυγχάνουσιν ὠφέλειαν

   Posidon. fr. 85.114 Theiler [=D.S. 32.12.1] τὰς περιπετείας ταύτας ἀναγραφῆς ἠξιώσαμεν, οὐ ψυχαγωγίας ἀλλ' ὠφελείας ἕνεκα τῶν ἀναγινωσκόντων

   D.H. *Imit.* 31.5.7 εἰς ὠφέλειαν τῶν ἐντυγχανόντων

   Ph. *Mut.* 126 ἐπ' ὠφελείᾳ τῶν ἐντευξομένων

3) 2 Macc 3:18 οἱ δὲ ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν ἀγεληδὸν ἐξεπήδων

   D.S. 15.24.3 πολλοὶ μὲν μετὰ τῶν ὅπλων ἐξεπήδων ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν; 15.48.3 τινὲς ἐξεπήδων ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν; 19.6.6 ἐξεπήδων ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν εἰς τὰς ὁδούς; 19.45.7 ἐξεπήδησαν ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν

   D.H. 7.26.4 ἐξεπήδων ἅπαντες ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν; 11.39.6 ἐξεπήδων γὰρ ἐκ τῶν οἰκιῶν γυναῖκές τε καὶ παρθένοι

4) 2 Macc 3:20 ἐποιοῦντο τὴν λιτανείαν; 10:16 ποιησάμενοι λιτανείαν

   D.H. 4.67.1 πολλὰς λιτανείας . . . ποιησαμένη

5) 2 Macc 3:24 πάντας . . . καταπλαγέντας τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν εἰς ἔκλυσιν καὶ δειλίαν τραπῆναι

   Lindos II 2 col. D.33 [99 BCE] καταπλαγεὶς ὁ βάρβα[ρος] | τὰν τᾶς θεοῦ ἐπιφάνειαν

   D.S. 11.14.3 πάντας δὲ καταπλαγέντας τὴν τῶν θεῶν ἐνέργειαν φυγεῖν ἐκ τῶν τόπων

6) 2 Macc 3:27 εἰς φορεῖον ἐνθέντες

   Nic.Dam. *FHG* 3:101.583 ἐνθέμενοι τὸν νεκρὸν εἰς φορεῖον

7) 2 Macc 3:29 καὶ ὁ μέν . . . ἄφωνος . . . ἔρριπτο

   D.H. 10.7.4 ἀκίνητόν τε καὶ ἄφωνον εἶδε ἐρριμμένον

8) 2 Macc 4:10 ἐπὶ τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτῆρα τοὺς ὁμοφύλους μετέστησεν

   D.H. *Pomp.* 3.16 ἡ . . . τὸν Ἑλληνικὸν χαρακτῆρα σῴζουσα διάλεκτος

   Hdn. 3.2, p. 404.23 Lentz ὅπερ ἐστὶν ἀσύντακτον, τουτέστιν οὐκ ἔχον χαρακτῆρα Ἑλληνικόν

9) 2 Macc 4:16 ὧν ἐζήλουν τὰς ἀγωγάς

   D.H. *Dem.* 36.32 τὴν μικτὴν καὶ μέσην ἐζήλωσαν ἀγωγήν

10) 2 Macc 4:31 τῶν ἐν ἀξιώματι κειμένων

    D.S. 28.2.1 τῶν ἐν ἀξιώματι κειμένων φίλων

11) 2 Macc 4:42 πολλοὺς μὲν αὐτῶν τραυματίας ἐποίησαν . . . πάντας δὲ εἰς φυγὴν συνήλασαν

D.S. 16.50.2 τινὰς δὲ τραυματίας ποιήσαντες τοὺς λοιποὺς συνήλασαν εἴς τι μέρος τῆς πόλεως

12) 2 Macc 5:6 ἐποιεῖτο σφαγάς . . . ἀφειδῶς; 5:12 κόπτειν ἀφειδῶς τοὺς ἐμπίπτοντας

Arr. *An.* 3.15.2 ἔκοπτόν τε καὶ ἐκόπτοντο ἀφειδῶς

D.C. 74.13.2 τὰ δὲ δὴ πλοῖα αὐτῶν ἀφειδῶς ἔκοπτον

Cf. Hdt. 1.207 τῶν προβάτων ἀφειδέως πολλὰ κατακόψαντας; D.S. 17.13.1 ἀφειδῶς ἀνῄρουν πάντας τοὺς περιτυγχάνοντας

13) 2 Macc 5:9 ὡς διὰ τὴν συγγένειαν τευξόμενος σκέπης

D.S. 17.82.3 οἱ κατοικοῦντες πολλῆς σκέπης τυγχάνουσιν

14) 2 Macc 5:10 ὁ πλῆθος ἀτάφων ἐκρίψας

D.S. 3.59.1 τὰ σώματα ἐκρίψαντος ἄταφα; 16.16.4 ἄταφον ἐξέρριψαν

J. *BJ* 3.377 ἀτάφους ἐκρίπτειν

App. *Sam.* 9.5.3 ἐξερρίφησαν ἄταφοι; *Mith.* 210 ἄταφον ἐκρίψας

15) 2 Macc 5:16 ἀνατεθέντα πρὸς αὔξησιν καὶ δόξαν τοῦ τόπου

D.S. 15.13.5 τὰ συντείνοντα πρὸς αὔξησιν πόλεως καὶ δόξαν; 16.33.1 μεγάλης αὐξήσεώς τε καὶ δόξης

Cf. *IMT Skam/NebTaeler* 185.23 [Ilion, last third of the 3rd c. BCE] πρὸς τὴν τῆς πανηγύρεως ἐπαύξησιν καὶ δόξαν

16) 2 Macc 6:8 εἰς τὰς ἀστυγείτονας Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις

D.S. 14.40.3 δεινὸν εἶναι περιιδεῖν ἀστυγείτονας Ἑλληνίδας πόλεις

17) 2 Macc 6:19 ὁ δὲ τὸν μετ' εὐκλείας θάνατον μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν μετὰ μύσους βίον ἀναδεξάμενος

D.S. 15.86.3 εὐγενῶς ἀνεδέχετο τὸν ὑπὲρ τῆς δόξης θάνατον; 38/39.2.2 τὸν μετ' ἐλευθερίας θάνατον εὐγενῶς ἀναδέξεσθαι

18) 2 Macc 6:21 ἀπολαβόντες αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν

D.H. 19.14.1 ἰδίᾳ δὲ τὸν Φαβρίκιον ἀπολαβών

NT Mark 7:33 ἀπολαβόμενος αὐτὸν ἀπὸ τοῦ ὄχλου κατ' ἰδίαν

J. *BJ* 2.109 ἀπολαβόμενος οὖν αὐτὸν κατ' ἰδίαν

19) 2 Macc 6:22 διὰ τὴν ἀρχαίαν πρὸς αὐτοὺς φιλίαν

D.H. 6.21.2 τὴν ἀρχαίαν φιλίαν

Memn. *FHG* 3:6.7 τὴν ἀρχαίαν φιλίαν

20) 2 Macc 6:26 ἐξελοῦμαι τὴν ἐξ ἀνθρώπων τιμωρίαν

D.S. 1.83.8 ἐξελέσθαι τῆς τιμωρίας τὸν ἄνθρωπον

21) 2 Macc 7:14 μεταλλάσσοντας ἀπ' ἀνθρώπων

D.S. 18.56.2 μεταλλάξαντος ἐξ ἀνθρώπων

Arr. *Peripl.M.Eux.* 23.4 μεταλλάξαι ἐξ ἀνθρώπων

22) 2 Macc 7:29 ἐπίδεξαι τὸν θάνατον

D.S. 8.27.2 ἐπιδέχεσθαι τὸν ἔντιμον θάνατον

23) 2 Macc 8:6 πόλεις δὲ καὶ κώμας ἀπροσδοκήτως ἐρχόμενος ἐνεπίμπρα

D.S. 14.90.5 ἀπροσδοκήτως δὲ νυκτὸς ἐπιφανεὶς τῇ πόλει τὰς πύλας ἐνέπρησε

24) 2 Macc 8:21 εὐθαρσεῖς αὐτοὺς παραστήσας

3 Macc 1:7 εὐθαρσεῖς τοὺς ὑποτεταγμένους κατέστησεν

D.S. 15.54.4 πρὸς τὴν μάχην εὐθαρσεῖς ταῖς ψυχαῖς κατέστησαν; 17.56.4 πρὸς τοὺς ἐπιφερομένους κινδύνους εὐθαρσεῖς καταστήσας; 18.51.6 πρὸς τοὺς κινδύνους εὐθαρσεῖς κατέστησαν

25) 2 Macc 8:25 συνδιώξαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐφ' ἱκανόν

D.S. 12.70.2 ἐφ' ἱκανὸν τόπον ἐδίωξαν; 13.100.1 οἱ δ' Ἀθηναῖοι διώξαντες ἐφ' ἱκανὸν τοὺς ἡττημένους

BGU 8.1770.4 [64–63 BCE] συνδιηπόρησα ἐφ' ἱκανόν; cf. *P.Polit.Iud.* 7.6 [134 BCE] προ{σ}εστάτησα αὐτοῦ ἐφ' ἱκανὸν χρόνον; *IC III* iv 9.34 [112/111 BCE] ἐφ' ἱκανὸν προσκείμενοι

26) 2 Macc 9:2 ἐπὶ τὴν τῶν ὅπλων βοήθειαν ἐτράπησαν

D.S. 3.23.2 μηδεμίαν βοήθειαν ὅπλων ἔχοντες

27) 2 Macc 9:28 ἐπὶ ξένης ἐν τοῖς ὄρεσιν οἰκτίστῳ μόρῳ κατέστρεψε τὸν βίον

D.H. 6.21.3 ἐπὶ ξένης τὸν βίον κατέστρεψαν

28) 2 Macc 9:28 οἰκτίστῳ μόρῳ κατέστρεψεν τὸν βίον

D.H. 2.68.4 τὸν οἴκτιστον μόρον ἀποθανοῦσαν; 5.27.1 τὸν οἴκτιστον ἀπολέσθαι μόρον; 6.7.2 τὸν οἴκτιστον μόρον ἀποθανεῖν

J. *BJ* 2.143 οἰκτίστῳ μόρῳ διαφθείρεται

Cf. Hom. *Od.* 11.412; 24.34 οἰκτίστῳ θανάτῳ; A.R. 4.1296 οἰκτίστῳ θανάτῳ; Ph. *Leg.* 3.203 θάνατος οἴκτιστος; J. *BJ* 7.203 θανάτων τὸν οἴκτιστον

29) 2 Macc 10:3 μετὰ διετῆ χρόνον; 4:23, 14:1 μετὰ δὲ τριετῆ χρόνον

Posidon. fr. 85.90 Theiler [=D.S. 32.11.1] διετῆ μὲν οὖν χρόνον συνεβίωσε τἀνδρί

D.S. 2.2.1 χρόνον ἑπτακαιδεκαετῆ καταναλώσας; 2.47.6 τὸν ἐννεακαιδεκαετῆ χρόνον; 3.17.3 τὰ δ' ὑπὲρ πενταετῆ χρόνον ὄντα; 4.54.1 συμβιώσαντα δεκαετῆ χρόνον; 7.5.2 κατασχὼν τριετῆ χρόνον; 11.1.5 τριετῆ χρόνον . . . ἀσχοληθέντες; 11.2.1 τριετῆ χρόνον παρασκευασάμενος; 11.38.7 ἑπταετῆ χρόνον ἐβασίλευσεν; 11.55.2 φεύγειν ἐκ τῆς πατρίδος . . . πενταετῆ χρόνον; 14.92.4 διετῆ χρόνον Ἀργαῖον βασιλεῦσαι; 14.117.8 διελθὼν δὲ τριακονταετῆ χρόνον; 15.9.2 διετῆ χρόνον τὸν ἐπὶ πᾶσι συνεχῶς πολεμηθείς; 17.80.2 τριετῆ χρόνον ἐν φυλακῇ διετέλεσε; 17.94.1 σχεδὸν ὀκταετῆ χρόνον; 19.91.2 τετραετῆ χρόνον γεγονὼς σατράπης; 20.90.2 διετῆ χρόνον ἀναλώσας; 24.14.1 δεκαετῆ χρόνον πολιορκήσαντες; 29.25.1 οὐδὲ διετῆ χρόνον ἐπεβίωσε; 31.9.5 διετῆ χρόνον φιλοψυχήσας

D.H. 1.71.2 ὀκταετῆ χρόνον ἐβασίλευσεν; 2.67.2 χρόνον τριακονταετῆ μένειν . . . ἁγνάς; 3.38.3 τριετῆ χρόνον ὑπὸ τοῖς Λατίνοις γενομένην; 3.58.1 τριετῆ χρόνον ἀποστερήσας; 3.69.2 χρόνον ἐπιβιώσας . . . τετραετῆ; *Amm.* 5.10 χρόνον εἰκοσαετῆ διέτριψε σὺν αὐτῷ; 5.15 διέτριψε χρόνον ὀκταετῆ παρ' αὐτῷ; 11.23 διέμειναν ἑπταετῆ χρόνον

MDAI (A) 32 (1907) 243.4 [Pergamon, 75–50 BCE] πολυετῆ χρόνον; *IG V*, 1.1145.16 [Gytheion, ca. 70 BCE] διετῆ χρόνον; *BGU* 8.1827.32 [52/51 BCE] τριετοῦς χρόνου; *SEG* 29:756.7–8 [Tenos, ca. 50 BCE] χρόνον δούς . . . ἑνδεκαετῆ; *BGU* 8.1848.10–11 [48–46 BCE] διετὴς χρόνος; *BGU* 4.1120.21 [5 BCE] μετὰ τὸν πενταετῆ χρόνον; *IG*

XII,5 860.29 [Tenos, 1st c. BCE] εἰς ἅλ|λον πενταετῆ συνεγράψατο χρόνον; *EAD XXX* 484bis.2 [Delos, 1st c. BCE] [τὸν εἰ]κοσέτη μὴ παραβᾶσα χρόνον

Ph. *Jos.* 100 μετὰ γὰρ διετῆ χρόνον

Str. 5.2.6.8 διετῆ χρόνον ἐπολιορκήθησαν; 9.1.20.21 δεκαετῆ χρόνον ὃν ἦρχε Μακεδόνων Κάσανδρος

NT Acts 13:18 τεσσαρακονταετῆ χρόνον ἐτροποφόρησεν αὐτοὺς ἐν τῇ ἐρήμῳ

J. *AJ* 2.74 διετῆ χρόνον τοῖς δεσμοῖς κακοπαθοῦντα

Plu. *Pyrrh.* 26.1 ἑξαετῆ χρόνον ἀναλώσας; *Mor.* 844C τετραετῆ χρόνον αὐτὸν διεπόνησε

Cf. S. *Ph.* 715 μηδ' οἰνοχύτου πώματος ἥσθη δεκέτει χρόνῳ; Hdt. 2.2.16 ὡς γὰρ διέτης χρόνος ἐγεγόνεε

IG XII,3 328.3 [Thera, ca. 260? BCE] τριετοῦς δὲ [χρόνου διελθόντος]

30) 2 Macc 10:34 τῇ ἐρυμνότητι τοῦ τόπου πεποιθότες; 12:14 πεποιθότες τῇ τῶν τειχέων ἐρυμνότητι

D.S. 12.46.3 ταῖς ὑπεροχαῖς τῶν τειχῶν πεποιθότες; 17.28.2 τῇ τῶν τόπων ἐρυμνότητι πιστεύοντες

D.H. 3.50.4 τοῦ τείχους τῇ ἐχυρότητι πεποιθότων

J. *Vit.* 373 πεποιθότες τῇ τῶν τειχῶν ὀχυρότητι

31) 2 Macc 11:12 οἱ πλείονες δὲ αὐτῶν τραυματίαι γυμνοὶ διεσώθησαν

Arr. *An.* 1.6.11 γυμνοὶ τῶν ὅπλων διεσώθησαν

32) 2 Macc 12:5 τὴν γεγονυῖαν εἰς τοὺς ὁμοεθνεῖς ὠμότητα

D.S. 13.27.6 μὴ βάρβαρον ὠμότητα πρὸς ὁμοεθνεῖς ἀνθρώπους ἐνδείξασθαι

33) 2 Macc 12:6 τὸν λιμένα νύκτωρ ἐνέπρησε

Str. 7.4.7 τό . . . γεφυρωθὲν μέρος νύκτωρ ἐνεπίμπρασαν

Plu. *Alc.* 39.9 ἐμπρῆσαι τὴν οἰκίαν νύκτωρ

34) 2 Macc 12:23 ἐποιεῖτο τὸν διωγμὸν εὐτονώτερον

D.S. 2.6.3 τὸν διωγμὸν ποιησάμενοι; 13.60.7 τὸν διωγμὸν ποιουμένους; 17.37.2 ἐποιεῖτο τὸν διωγμόν; 20.5.4 ἐποιοῦντο τὸν διωγμόν

35) 2 Macc 12:29 ἀναζεύξαντες δὲ ἐκεῖθεν; 14:16 ἐκεῖθεν εὐθέως ἀναζεύξας

D.S. 14.14.5, 14.117.4 ἐκεῖθεν δ' ἀνέζευξεν; 14.15.1 ἐκεῖθεν δ' ἀναζεύξας; 14.29.2 ἀναζεύξαντες δ' ἐκεῖθεν

J. *BJ* 7.96 ἐκεῖθεν δὲ ἀναζεύξας

36) 2 Macc 13:8 πάνυ δικαίως· ἐπεὶ γὰρ συνετελέσατο πολλά . . . ἁμαρτήματα

D.H. *Rh.* 8.3 καὶ πάνυ δικαίως· εἰ γὰρ οἷς λέγει τις τὰ ἐναντία βούλεται

Ph. *Spec.* 2.243 πάνυ δικαίως· οὐ γὰρ θέμις ζῆν

37) 2 Macc 13:15 ἐπιβαλὼν νύκτωρ ἐπὶ τὴν βασιλικὴν αὐλήν

D.H. 1.79.13 ἐπὶ τὰ μανδρεύματα αὐτῶν νύκτωρ ἐπέβαλον

Str. 8.3.27 Φεαῖς ἐπιβάλλειν νύκτωρ

38) 2 Macc 13:19 ἐπὶ Βαιθσούροις φρούριον ὀχυρὸν τῶν Ἰουδαίων

Posidon. fr. 197.17 Theiler [=D.S. 36.7.2] τὸ δὲ φρούριον ὀχυρώτατον ὄν

D.S. 14.32.1, 14.58.2, 15.40.5, 16.25.2 φρούριον ὀχυρόν; 18.46.2 ὀχυρῶν φρουρίων; 19.16.1 ἔν τινι φρουρίῳ καθ' ὑπερβολὴν ὀχυρῷ

D.H. 3.51.3 φρούρια ἐχυρά; 8.16.5 εἰς τὰ πλησίον φρούρια, εἴ τινα ἦν ἐχυρώτατα

J. *AJ* 14p.31 τὸ φρούριον ὀχυρὸν ὄν

39) 2 Macc 14:4 καὶ τὴν ἡμέραν ἐκείνην ἡσυχίαν ἔσχε

D.H. 3.23.5 ἐκείνην μὲν τὴν ἡμέραν ἡσυχίαν ἔσχε

40) 2 Macc 14:11 τοιούτων δὲ ῥηθέντων ὑπὸ τούτου

D.S. 19.97.6 ῥηθέντων δὲ τοιούτων λόγων

D.H. 10.32.4 τοιούτων ῥηθέντων ὑπ' αὐτοῦ λόγων

41) 2 Macc 15:33 τὰ δ' ἐπίχειρα τῆς ἀνοίας κατέναντι τοῦ ναοῦ κρεμάσαι

D.S. 13.103.1 ἐπίχειρα τῆς ἀγνοίας ἔλαβον; 29.6.3 ὁ δὲ Ἀντίοχος ταχὺ τῆς ἰδίας ἀνοίας τἀπίχειρα κομισάμενος

Ph. *Prov.* fr. 2.58 ἀνοίας τἀπίχειρα εὑράμενοι

Cf. Plb. 4.63.1 ἀγνοίας καὶ φιλονεικίας τἀπίχειρα κεκομισμένος; 8.12.6 τοιαῦτα τἀπίχειρα κεκόμισται τῆς εὐνοίας

Appendix 14: Combinations of words which occur and recur in chapter 7

1) 7:2 οὕτως ἔφη

7:14 οὕτως ἔφη

7:27 οὕτως ἔφησε

2) 7:11 διὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ νόμους ὑπερορῶ ταῦτα[61]

7:23 ὡς νῦν ὑπερορᾶτε ἑαυτοὺς διὰ τοὺς αὐτοῦ νόμους

3) 7:18 μὴ πλανῶ μάτην

7:34 μὴ μάτην μετεωρίζου

4) 7:18 ἡμεῖς γὰρ δι' ἑαυτοὺς ταῦτα πάσχομεν ἁμαρτόντες εἰς τὸν ἑαυτῶν θεόν

7:32 ἡμεῖς γὰρ διὰ τὰς ἑαυτῶν ἁμαρτίας πάσχομεν[62]

[61] 7:11 is omitted by three of the six Old Latin translations (La^{LBM}) and by the Armenian version; de Bruyne (1932, xi) considers it to be an interpolation by a reviser who wanted to give a short speech to the third brother, too. See also Bévenot 1934, 278–79.

[62] 7:32 is omitted by La^{LXBM}; de Bruyne (1932, xi) considers it to be an interpolation.

Appendix 15: Combinations of words which occur in chapter 7 and recur in other chapters of the epitome

1) 7:1 συνέβη δὲ καὶ ἑπτὰ ἀδελφούς
   9:7 συνέβη δὲ καὶ πεσεῖν αὐτόν; cf. 3:2, 5:2, 9:2, 10:5
2) 7:1 ὑείων κρεῶν ἐφάπτεσθαι
   6:18 φαγεῖν ὕειον κρέας
3) 7:2 ἕτοιμοι γὰρ ἀποθνῄσκειν ἐσμέν
   8:21 ἑτοίμους ὑπὲρ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποθνῄσκειν
4) 7:2 παραβαίνειν τοὺς πατρίους νόμους; 7:24 μεταθέμενον ἀπὸ τῶν πατρίων; 7:37 περὶ τῶν πατρίων νόμων
   6:1 μεταβαίνειν ἀπὸ τῶν πατρίων νόμων
5) 7:3, 39 ἔκθυμος δὲ γενόμενος ὁ βασιλεύς
   14:27 ὁ δὲ βασιλεύς ἔκθυμος γενόμενος
6) 7:5 τῆς δὲ ἀτμίδος ἐφ' ἱκανὸν διαδιδούσης
   8:25 συνδιώξαντες δὲ αὐτοὺς ἐφ' ἱκανόν
7) 7:5 ἄχρηστον δὲ αὐτὸν τοῖς ὅλοις γενόμενον
   6:3 χαλεπὴ δὲ καὶ τοῖς ὅλοις ἦν δυσχερής
8) 7:6 ὁ κύριος ὁ θεὸς ἐφορᾷ
   8:2 τὸν κύριον ἐπιδεῖν
9) 7:6 ταῖς ἀληθείαις ἐφ' ἡμῖν παρακαλεῖται
   3:9 εἰ ταῖς ἀληθείαις ταῦτα οὕτως ἔχοντα τυγχάνει
10) 7:7 μεταλλάξαντος δὲ τοῦ πρώτου τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον
    6:31 τοῦτον τὸν τρόπον μετήλλαξεν
    14:46 τόνδε τὸν τρόπον μετήλλαξεν
11) 7:8 ἀποκριθεὶς τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ; 7:21 παρεκάλει τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ; 7:27 ἔφησε τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ; 12:37 καταρξάμενος τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ
    15:29 εὐλόγουν τὸν δυνάστην τῇ πατρίῳ φωνῇ
12) 7:9 ἐν ἐσχάτῃ δὲ πνοῇ γενόμενος
    3:31 τῷ παντελῶς ἐν ἐσχάτῃ πνοῇ κειμένῳ
13) 7:9 ἀποθανόντας ἡμᾶς ὑπὲρ τῶν αὐτοῦ νόμων
    8:21 ἑτοίμους ὑπὲρ τῶν νόμων καὶ τῆς πατρίδος ἀποθνῄσκειν
14) 7:10 τὰς χεῖρας εὐθαρσῶς προέτεινε
    3:20 πᾶσαι δὲ προτείνουσαι τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν
    14:34 οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς προτείναντες τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν
    15:12 τὰς χεῖρας προτείναντα

15) 7:11 ἐξ οὐρανοῦ ταῦτα κέκτημαι[63]
2:21 τὰς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ γενομένας ἐπιφανείας
3:34 σὺ δὲ ἐξ οὐρανοῦ μεμαστιγωμένος
9:4 τῆς ἐξ οὐρανοῦ κρίσεως
10:29 ἐφάνησαν . . . ἐξ οὐρανοῦ
16) 7:12 ἐν οὐδενὶ τὰς ἀλγηδόνας ἐτίθετο
4:15 τὰς μὲν πατρῴους τιμὰς ἐν οὐδενὶ τιθέμενοι
17) 7:14 τὰς ὑπὸ τοῦ θεοῦ προσδοκᾶν ἐλπίδας πάλιν ἀναστήσεσθαι ὑπ' αὐτοῦ
12:44 ἀναστῆναι προσεδόκα
18) 7:17 τὸ μεγαλεῖον αὐτοῦ κράτος
3:34 τὸ μεγαλεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος
19) 7:22 οὐδὲ ἐγὼ τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ὑμῖν ἐχαρισάμην; 7:23 τὸ πνεῦμα καὶ τὴν ζωὴν ὑμῖν πάλιν ἀποδίδωσι
14:46 ἐπικαλεσάμενος τὸν δεσπόζοντα τῆς ζωῆς καὶ τοῦ πνεύματος ταῦτα αὐτῷ πάλιν ἀποδοῦναι
20) 7:23 ὁ τοῦ κόσμου κτίστης
13:14 τῷ κτίστη τοῦ κόσμου
21) 7:24 ὁ δὲ Ἀντίοχος οἰόμενος
5:21 ὁ γοῦν Ἀντίοχος . . . οἰόμενος
22) 7:27 τὸν ὠμὸν τύραννον
4:25 ὠμοῦ τυράννου
23) 7:30 † ἄρτι † δὲ ταύτης καταληγούσης
9:5 ἄρτι δὲ αὐτοῦ καταλήξαντος τὸν λόγον
24) 7:31 οὐ μὴ διαφύγῃς τὰς χεῖρας τοῦ θεοῦ
6:26 τὰς τοῦ παντοκράτορος χεῖρας οὔτε ζῶν οὔτε ἀποθανὼν ἐκφεύξομαι
25) 7:33 βραχέως ἐπώργισται
5:17 ἀπώργισται βραχέως
26) 7:33 ὁ ζῶν κύριος
15:4 ἔστιν ὁ κύριος ζῶν αὐτός
27) 7:33 καταλλαγήσεται τοῖς ἑαυτοῦ δούλοις
8:29 καταλλαγῆναι τοῖς αὑτοῦ δούλοις
28) 7:35 οὔπω γὰρ τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ἐπόπτου θεοῦ κρίσιν ἐκπέφευγας
6:26 τὰς τοῦ παντοκράτορος χεῖρας οὔτε ζῶν οὔτε ἀποθανὼν ἐκφεύξομαι
29) 7:36 τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσει δίκαια τὰ πρόστιμα . . . ἀποίσῃ
9:18 ἐπεληλύθει γὰρ ἐπ' αὐτὸν δικαία ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσις
30) 7:37 καὶ σῶμα καὶ ψυχὴν προδίδωμι
14:38 σῶμα καὶ ψυχήν . . . παραβεβλημένος

[63] As previously noted, the omission of 7:11 in the Old Latin and the Armenian versions may be indicative of an interpolation.

15:30 σώματι καὶ ψυχῇ πρωταγωνιστής

31) 7:37 ἐπικαλούμενος τὸν θεὸν ἵλεως ταχὺ τῷ ἔθνει γενέσθαι
2:22 τοῦ κυρίου μετὰ πάσης ἐπιεικείας ἵλεως γενομένου αὐτοῖς
10:26 ἠξίουν ἵλεως αὐτοῖς γενόμενον

32) 7:38 τὴν τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργήν
5:20 ἐν τῇ τοῦ παντοκράτορος ὀργῇ

33) 7:38 τὴν ἐπὶ τὸ σύμπαν ἡμῶν γένος
8:9 τὸ σύμπαν τῆς Ἰουδαίας ἐξᾶραι γένος
14:8 τὸ σύμπαν ἡμῶν γένος[64]

Appendix 16: Combinations of words which occur in chapter 9 and recur in other chapters of the epitome

1) 9:1 περὶ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν ἐκεῖνον
5:1 περὶ δὲ τὸν καιρὸν τοῦτον

2) 9:2 εἰς τὴν λεγομένην Περσέπολιν
10:32 εἰς Γαζαρα λεγόμενον ὀχύρωμα
12:17 πρὸς τοὺς λεγομένους Τουβιαηνούς Ἰουδαίους; 12:21 εἰς τὸ λεγόμενον Κάρνιον; 12:32 μετὰ δὲ τὴν λεγομένην πεντηκοστήν
14:6 οἱ λεγόμενοι τῶν Ἰουδαίων Ασιδαῖοι

3) 9:3 ὄντι δὲ αὐτῷ [sc. τῷ βασιλεῖ] κατ' Ἐκβάτανα προσέπεσε τὰ κατὰ Νικάνορα . . . γεγονότα
5:11 προσπεσόντων δὲ τῷ βασιλεῖ περὶ τῶν γεγονότων

4) 9:3 τὰ κατὰ Νικάνορα . . . γεγονότα
15:37 τῶν οὖν κατὰ Νικάνορα χωρησάντων

5) 9:4 παραγενόμενος ἐκεῖ
15:31 παραγενόμενος δὲ ἐκεῖ

6) 9:5 ἄρτι δὲ αὐτοῦ καταλήξαντος τὸν λόγον
7:30 † ἄρτι † δὲ ταύτης καταληγούσης

7) 9:6 πάνυ δικαίως
13:8 πάνυ δικαίως

8) 9:7 ἔτι δὲ καὶ τῆς ὑπερηφανίας
8:17 ἔτι δὲ τὴν τῆς προγονικῆς πολιτείας κατάλυσιν; 8:23 ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ελεάζαρον; 8:30 ἔτι δὲ καὶ πρεσβυτέροις

[64] One may add some more trivial word combinations, e.g. 7:24 οὐ μόνον διὰ λόγων . . . ἀλλὰ καὶ δι' ὅρκων, 6:31 οὐ μόνον τοῖς νέοις, ἀλλὰ καὶ τοῖς πλείστοις τοῦ ἔθνους; 7:12 τὸν βασιλέα καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ, 1:14 ὅ τε Ἀντίοχος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ φίλοι, 8:1 Ἰούδας δὲ ὁ καὶ Μακκαβαῖος καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, 10:1 Μακκαβαῖος δὲ καὶ οἱ σὺν αὐτῷ, 10:19 Ζακχαῖον καὶ τοὺς σὺν αὐτῷ.

10:2 ἔτι δὲ τεμένη; 10:7 ἔτι δὲ καὶ φοίνικας; 10:19 ἔτι δὲ καὶ Ζακχαῖον
12:2 ἔτι δὲ Ἱερώνυμος
15:18 ἔτι δὲ ἀδελφῶν καὶ συγγενῶν

9) 9:7 συνέβη δὲ καὶ πεσεῖν αὐτόν
7:1 συνέβη δὲ καὶ ἑπτὰ ἀδελφούς; cf. 3:2, 5:2, 9:2, 10:5

10) 9:8 κατὰ γῆν γενόμενος ἐν φορείῳ παρεκομίζετο
3:27 πεσόντα πρὸς τὴν γῆν . . . εἰς φορεῖον ἐνθέντες

11) 9:8 τοῦ θεοῦ . . . τὴν δύναμιν
3:24 τὴν τοῦ θεοῦ δύναμιν
3:38 θεοῦ δύναμιν

12) 9:10 τὸν μικρῷ πρότερον
3:30 τὸ μικρῷ πρότερον
6:29 τὴν μικρῷ πρότερον

13) 9:11 εἰς ἐπίγνωσιν ἔρχεσθαι
3:18 εἰς καταφρόνησιν ἔρχεσθαι
8:8 εἰς προκοπὴν ἐρχόμενον

14) 9:14 τὴν ἁγίαν πόλιν
1:12 τῇ ἁγίᾳ πόλει
3:1 τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως
15:14 τῆς ἁγίας πόλεως

15) 9:16 τὰ ἱερὰ σκεύη
4:48 τῶν ἱερῶν σκευῶν
5:16 τὰ ἱερὰ σκεύη

16) 9:16 τὰς δὲ ἐπιβαλλούσας πρὸς τὰς θυσίας συντάξεις ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων προσόδων χορηγήσειν
3:3 χορηγεῖν ἐκ τῶν ἰδίων προσόδων πάντα τὰ πρὸς τὰς λειτουργίας τῶν θυσιῶν ἐπιβάλλοντα δαπανήματα

17) 9:17 καταγγέλλοντα τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος
3:34 διάγγελλε πᾶσι τὸ μεγαλεῖον τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος
7:17 τὸ μεγαλεῖον αὐτοῦ κράτος
11:4 τὸ τοῦ θεοῦ κράτος

18) 9:18 ἡ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσις
7:36 τῇ τοῦ θεοῦ κρίσει

19) 9:18 τὴν ὑπογεγραμμένην ἐπιστολήν . . . περιέχουσαν δὲ οὕτως
11:16 ἦσαν γὰρ γεγραμμέναι . . . ἐπιστολαί . . . περιέχουσαι τὸν τρόπον τοῦτον
11:22 ἡ δὲ τοῦ βασιλέως ἐπιστολή . . . περιεῖχεν οὕτως

Appendix 17: 2 Maccabees and Philo

Philo's acquaintance with 2 Maccabees has been posited by several scholars (Lucius 1881, 37–39; Moffatt, "The Second Book of Maccabees," *APOT* 1:131; Bévenot 1931, 11; Habicht 1979, 177; Bond 1998, 30), mainly on the basis of thematic parallels between *Every Good Man is Free* and 2 Maccabees. Indeed, the possibility that Philo had in mind Antiochus Epiphanes as depicted in 2 Maccabees 5 and 7 in his description of the ruler who, with animal-like ferocity, slaughters his victims by cutting them up while they are still alive, limb by limb, like a cook would (*Prob.* 89) cannot be excluded. However, the certainty expressed by Lucius (1881, 37) regarding the connection between the two books is rather excessive.[65] Zeitlin (1954, 29), Schürer (1973–1987, 3.1.534), Momigliano (1994, 45), and Schwartz (2008, 67, 86) have considered this evidence too flimsy to build a case on. Shepkaru (2006, 35), who posits a late date for the martyrologies in 2 Maccabees, has, on the other hand, argued that it could have been Philo who "inspired the language of 2 Maccabees 7." At the level of vocabulary, the verbal similarities between 2 Maccabees and Philo that Bond (1998, 30) has adduced are trivial. There are, however, other not so trivial commonalities involving both individual words and combinations of words that occur exclusively, or almost exclusively, in 2 Maccabees and the works of Philo, which may be regarded as suggestive of some kind of lexical influence of the former on the latter. Without claiming to be exhaustive, we note here the *tris legomenon* ὁπλολογέω, which is attested only in 2 Maccabees (8:27, 31) and in Philo (*Flacc.* 92), the very rare compound προσεξηγέομαι (2 Macc 15:11, Ph. *Legat.* 197), the verb ἐπιψάλλω, which, between Sophocles (fr. 60* Radt) and Plutarch (*Mor.* 713B), occurs only in 2 Maccabees (at 1:30, in the second prefixed letter) and in Philo (*Deus* 25; *Somn.* 1.73), as well as the following combinations of words:

1) 2 Macc 3:12 τῇ τοῦ . . . ἱεροῦ σεμνότητι
   Ph. *Legat.* 198 λυμηνάμενος τὴν τοῦ ἱεροῦ σεμνότητα
2) 2 Macc 3:19 αἱ δὲ κατάκλειστοι τῶν παρθένων
   3 Macc 1:18 αἵ τε κατάκλειστοι παρθένοι ἐν θαλάμοις
   Ph. *Flacc.* 89.4 γύναια κατάκλειστα . . . καὶ θαλαμευόμεναι παρθένοι
3) 2 Macc 3:20 πᾶσαι δὲ προτείνουσαι τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν; 14:34 οἱ δὲ ἱερεῖς προτείναντες τὰς χεῖρας εἰς τὸν οὐρανόν
   Ph. *Flacc.* 121.2 προτείνοντες τὰς χεῖρας εἰς οὐρανόν
4) 2 Macc 3:38 εἴ τινα ἔχεις πολέμιον ἢ πραγμάτων ἐπίβουλον
   Ph. *QE* isf, fr. 32.2 σύνοικον ἔχει τὸν ἐπίβουλον καὶ πολέμιον
5) 2 Macc 4:2 ζηλωτὴν τῶν νόμων
   Ph. *Spec.* 2.253 ζηλωταὶ νόμων
   Cf. NT Acts 21:20 ζηλωταὶ τοῦ νόμου

[65] "Es ist dies Antiochus Epiphanes, und zwar sind alle Züge, mit welchen ihn QOPL. [*Quod omnis probus liber sit*] schildert, unstreitig entnommen dem zweiten Makkabäerbuch."

6) 2 Macc 4:13 ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἀναγνείαν
Ph. *Spec.* 2.56 ὑπερβάλλουσαν ἁγνείαν

7) 2 Macc 5:27 θηρίον τρόπον . . . διέζη; 10:6 θηρίων τρόπον ἦσαν νεμόμενοι
3 Macc 4:9 κατήχθησαν δὲ θηρίων τρόπον
Ph. *Ebr.* 1.3 δοῦλοι θηρίων τρόπον ἀποζῶντες
Aristid. *Or.* 20.2 Jebb ἔζων τρόπον θηρίων

8) 2 Macc 6:19 τὸν μετ' εὐκλείας θάνατον μᾶλλον ἢ τὸν μετὰ μύσους βίον ἀναδεξάμενος
Ph. *Virt.* 32.8 ζωῆς ἀδόξου τὸν σὺν εὐκλείᾳ θάνατον προκρίνουσα; *Prob.* 120.3 πρὸ ἀδόξου βίου τὸν μετ' εὐκλείας θάνατον ᾑροῦντο

9) 2 Macc 6:23 λογισμὸν ἀστεῖον
Ph. *Det.* 170 ἀστεῖον λογισμόν; *Mos.* 1.48 λογισμὸν ἀστεῖον

10) 2 Macc 6:23 προπέμπειν εἰς τὸν ᾅδην
Ph. *Mos.* 1.195 εἰς ᾅδου προπέμπων[66]

11) 2 Macc 7:21 τὸν θῆλυν λογισμὸν ἄρσενι θυμῷ διεγείρασα
Ph. *Legat.* 320 ἀρρενωθεῖσα τὸν λογισμόν

12) 2 Macc 9:5 ἔλαβεν αὐτὸν ἀνήκεστος τῶν σπλάγχνων ἀλγηδών[67]
Ph. *Leg.* 3.216 ἀλγηδόνων ἀνηκέστων

13) 2 Macc 10:3 μετὰ διετῆ χρόνον
Ph. *Jos.* 100 μετὰ διετῆ χρόνον

14) 2 Macc 10:24 δυνάμεις παμπληθεῖς
Ph. *Legat.* 9.5 παμπληθεῖς δυνάμεις
D.C. 36.23.4 δυνάμει παμπληθεῖ

15) 2 Macc 14:23 τοὺς συναχθέντας ἀγελαίους ὄχλους
Ph. *Her.* 303 πᾶς ὁ τῶν ἀγελαίων καὶ ἠμελημένων ἀνθρώπων ἀπατώμενος ὄχλος; *Congr.* 27 ὁ πολὺς καὶ ἀγελαῖος ἀνθρώπων ὄχλος

16) 2 Macc 15:33 τὰ ἐπίχειρα τῆς ἀνοίας
D.S. 29.6.3 τῆς ἰδίας ἀνοίας τἀπίχειρα
Ph. *Prov.* 2.58 ἀνοίας τἀπίχειρα

The fact that the above phraseological parallels are dispersed in many different works of Philo makes it unlikely that the Jewish philosopher drew them all from 2 Maccabees and seems rather to point to a common linguistic milieu, which in its turn may speak for a time of composition of the epitome not far from Philo's time.

[66] Cf. Hom. *Il.* 8.367 εὖτέ μιν εἰς Ἀΐδαο πυλάρταο προὔπεμψεν.
[67] Echoing the Homeric τότε καί μιν ἀνήκεστον λάβεν ἄλγος (*Il.* 5.394).

Appendix 18: Final list of the neologisms of 2 Maccabees[68]

1.	ἁγιότης	15:2
2.	ἀκατάγνωστος	4:47
3.	ἀλλοφυλισμός	4:13; 6:24
4.	ἀναβίωσις	7:9
5.	ἀναγνεία	4:13
6.	ἀπευθανατίζω	6:28
7.	ἀποστρεβλόω	9:7
8.	ἀργυρολόγητος	11:3
9.	ἀρρενωδῶς	10:35
10.	αὐλαῖος (adj.)	14:41
11.	βαρβάρως	15:2
12.	δᾳδουχία	4:22
13.	δειλανδρέω	8:13
14.	δεινάζω	4:35; 13:25
15.	δεξιάζω	4:34
16.	δευτερολογέω	13:22
17.	διάσταλσις	13:25
18.	διεμπίμπλημι	4:40
19.	δικαιοκρίτης	12:41
20.	δοξικός	8:35
21.	δυσπέτημα	5:20
22.	ἔκθυμος	7:3, 39; 14:27
23.	ἐλευστέον	6:17
24.	ἐνενηκονταετής	6:24
25.	ἐποξύνω	9:7
26.	εὐθίκτως	15:38
27.	θωρακισμός	5:3
28.	ἱεροσύλημα	4:39
29.	Ἰουδαϊσμός	2:21; 8:1; 14:38
30.	κατασφαλίζομαι	1:19
31.	κατευθικτέω	14:43
32.	κρουνηδόν	14:45
33.	Κυπριάρχης	12:2
34.	λεοντηδόν	11:11
35.	Μαρδοχαϊκός	15:36
36.	μετάφρασις	2:31
37.	Μυσάρχης	5:24
38.	οἰωνόβρωτος	9:15

[68] This list incorporates the fifty-nine neologisms listed in Appendix 2, seven of the neologisms included in Appendix 4, and the two neologisms included in Appendix 6.

39.	ὁμοιόψηφος	14:20
40.	ὁπλολογέω	8:27; 8:31
41.	παντεπόπτης	9:5
42.	παρεισπορεύομαι	8:1
43.	περισκυθίζω	7:4
44.	πολεμοτροφέω	10:14, 15; 14:6
45.	προενέχομαι	5:18
46.	προοδηγός	12:36
47.	προπτύω	6:20
48.	πρόπτωσις	3:21; 13:12
49.	προσαναλέγομαι	8:19
50.	προσεξηγέομαι	15:11
51.	προσπυρόω	14:11
52.	πρωτοκλήσιον	4:21
53.	σπλαγχνισμός	6:7, 21; 7:42
54.	συμμισοπονηρέω	4:36
55.	συμφλογίζω	6:11
56.	συνεκκεντέω	5:26
57.	συσσύρω	5:16
58.	τερατοποιός	15:21
59.	τιμωρητής	4:16
60.	τρισαλιτήριος	8:34; 15:3
61.	ὑπευλαβέομαι	14:18
62.	ὑπογραμμός	2:28
63.	ὑπονοθεύω	4:7, 26
64.	ὑψαυχενέω	15:6
65.	φρικασμός	3:17
66.	χορτώδης	5:27
67.	χρονίσκος	11:1
68.	ψυχικῶς	4:37; 14:24

Appendix 19: Final list of the doubtful neologisms[69]

1.	ἀπαρασήμαντος	15:36
2.	ἀπροσδεής	14:35
3.	γλωσσοτομέω	7:4
4.	διεξίπταμαι	10:30
5.	δυσσέβημα	12:3
6.	ἐντινάσσω	4:41; 11:11
7.	ἐπανδρόω	15:17
8.	ἐπιλυπέω	4:37; 8:32
9.	ἔσθησις	3:33
10.	ἐφηβία	4:9
11.	ἱέρωμα	12:40
12.	λεληθότως	6:11; 8:1
13.	παρεπιδείκνυμι	15:10
14.	τετραμερής	8:21
15.	ὑπεράγαν	10:34; 13:25
16.	φιλοπολίτης	14:37

[69] This list includes the thirteen doubtful neologisms listed in Appendix 3 and three of the neologisms listed in Appendix 4.

Index of the chief Greek words discussed in this study

ἁγιωσύνη, 161, 277, 278, 280, 303, 373
ἀναστρατοπεδεύω, 315, 316, 336, 381
ἀπαρασήμαντος, 81, 113, 171, 172, 173, 174, 175, 188, 206, 207, 353, 406
ἀπροσδεής, 176, 177, 206, 207, 366, 406
ἀργυρολόγητος, 113, 116, 118, 121, 169, 366, 404
ἀρρενωδῶς, 81, 112, 122, 123, 169, 170, 212, 366, 404
δειλανδρέω, 122, 210, 211, 212, 248, 367, 404
δεινάζω, 91, 112, 123, 124, 169, 170, 365, 404
διεξίπταμαι, 202, 203, 204, 205, 206, 207, 366, 406
δικαιοκρίτης, 232, 249, 250, 251, 252, 253, 254, 255, 261, 265, 274, 372, 404
δοξικός, 125, 126, 169, 170, 268, 365, 404
δυσπέτημα, 81, 83, 111, 112, 127, 128, 169, 170, 219, 365, 404
δυσσέβημα, 85, 127, 128, 210, 213, 214, 216, 217, 219, 248, 367, 406
ἔκθυμος, 237, 249, 253, 255, 256, 257, 259, 260, 261, 265, 274, 292, 342, 343, 348, 372, 398, 404
ἐλαττονόω, 280, 281, 303, 373
ἐμπαιγμός, 27, 102, 162, 278, 282, 283, 284, 285, 286, 287, 289, 290, 303, 373
ἐναπερείδομαι, 81, 83, 317, 318, 338, 340, 381
ἐντινάσσω, 178, 206, 210, 366, 367, 406
ἐπανδρόω, 89, 122, 189, 190, 206, 207, 212, 366, 381, 406
ἐπιλυπέω, 85, 179, 206, 210, 366, 367, 406
ἐποργίζομαι, 277, 290, 291, 292, 294, 295, 303, 373
ἔσθησις, 210, 220, 221, 224, 227, 248, 367, 406
ἐφηβία, 190, 206, 366, 406
ἱέρωμα, 188, 191, 192, 193, 195, 196, 197, 198, 206, 216, 366, 406
καθαγιάζω, 124, 277, 296, 303, 342, 373
κρουνηδόν, 111, 129, 130, 170, 366, 404
λεληθότως, 144, 145, 180, 181, 182, 183, 206, 207, 366, 406
λεοντηδόν, 123, 130, 132, 169, 170, 366, 404
Μαρδοχαϊκός, 111, 112, 125, 268, 364, 366, 404
μετάφρασις, 111, 112, 132, 133, 134, 135, 137, 138, 170, 356, 364, 404
οἰωνόβρωτος, 83, 113, 210, 227, 228, 230, 231, 248, 279, 367, 404

ὁπλολογέω, 111, 112, 139, 140, 141, 169, 170, 365, 402, 405
παραδοξάζω, 124, 296, 297, 298, 303, 373
παρακλείω, 334, 335, 340
παρεισπορεύομαι, 144, 169, 365, 405
παρεπιδείκνυμι, 199, 206, 366, 406
περισκυθίζω, 85, 111, 112, 145, 148, 150, 152, 153, 154, 365, 405
πολεμοτροφέω, 91, 112, 154, 155, 169, 170, 365, 405
προεξαποστέλλω, 83, 319, 381
προήγορος, 81, 83, 85, 188, 343, 345, 346, 347, 348, 353, 356, 382
προοδηγός, 70, 111, 155, 156, 157, 158, 159, 169, 170, 233, 302, 366, 405
προσυπομιμνήσκω, 319, 381
ῥύδην, 335, 336
σαββατίζω, 272, 298, 303, 373
σαπρία, 277, 299, 300, 303, 373
σπειρηδόν, 83, 130, 320, 322, 323, 324, 328, 330, 332, 333, 340, 381
συνερείδω, 336
τερατοποιός, 86, 156, 210, 232, 233, 235, 248, 250, 367, 405
τετραμερής, 201, 206, 366, 406
τιμωρητής, 111, 112, 159, 160, 162, 170, 279, 365, 405
τρισαλιτήριος, 210, 236, 237, 239, 240, 241, 242, 244, 248, 249, 253, 261, 265, 267, 274, 367, 405
τροφοφορέω, 157, 277, 295, 301, 302, 303, 373
ὑπεράγαν, 123, 201, 206, 366, 406
ὑπονοθεύω, 111, 112, 163, 164, 170, 365, 405
ὑψαυχενέω, 83, 86, 210, 244, 245, 246, 247, 248, 301, 367, 405
φιλοπολίτης, 81, 184, 185, 186, 188, 206, 207, 353, 366, 406
φρικασμός, 70, 112, 164, 165, 169, 170, 364, 405
χρονίσκος, 166, 167, 168, 169, 366, 405

Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia

Ediderunt Birger Bergh & Jerker Blomqvist (1–7), Jerker Blomqvist & Anders Piltz (8–13), Anders Piltz & Staffan Wahlgren (14), Karin Blomqvist & Arne Jönsson (15–17), Karin Blomqvist, Arne Jönsson & Vassilios Sabatakakis (18–22), Karin Blomqvist & Arne Jönsson (23).

1. Arne Jönsson, *Alfonso of Jaén. His Life and Works with Critical Editions of the* Epistola Solitarii*, the* Informaciones *and the* Epistola Serui Christi. 1989. 207 pp.
2. Bengt-Arne Roos, *Synesius of Cyrene. A Study in his Personality*. 1991. xviii+157 pp.
3. Brita Larsson, *Johannes Magnus' Latin Letters. A Critical Edition with Introduction and Commentary*. 1992. v+193 pp.
4. Lars Nyberg, *Unity and Coherence: Studies in Apollonius Rhodius'* Argonautica *and the Alexandrian Epic Tradition*. 1992. v+193 pp.
5. Dimitrios Karadimas, *Sextus Empiricus against Aelius Aristides. The Conflict between Philosophy and Rhetoric in the Second Century A. D.* 1996. xx+270 pp.
6. Arne Jönsson, *St. Bridget's Revelations to the Popes. An Edition of the so-called* Tractatus de summis pontificibus. 1997. 69 pp.
7. Karin Kulneff-Eriksson, *On 'have' in Ancient Greek. An Investigation on ἔχω and the construction of εἶναι with a dative as expression for 'have'*. 1999. xxii+192 pp.
8. Georg Walser, *The Greek of the Ancient Synagogue. An Investigation on the Greek of the Septuagint, Pseudepigrapha and the New Testament*. 2001. xxvi+197 pp.
9. Vassilios Sabatakakis, *Aspects of Morphological and Stylistic Variation of the Verb in* Erotokritos. 2004. 163 pp.
10. Rea Ann-Margaret Mellberg, *Minnet går gränsvakt. Fyra poeter ur 1970-talets grekiska diktargeneration*. 2004. xix+282 pp.
11. Cajsa Sjöberg, *Ubi est Unitas? The Latin Letters from Johannes Annorelius, a Swedish Catholic Convert, to his Brother. A Critical Edition with an Introduction*. 2005. 352 pp.
12. Johanna Akujärvi, *Researcher, Traveller, Narrator: Studies in Pausanias'* Periegesis. 2005. xxviii+314 pp.
13. Fotini Skenteri, *Herodes Atticus Reflected in Occasional Poetry of Antonine Athens*. 2005. xii+119 pp.

14. Elisabet Göransson, *Letters of a Learned Lady. Sophia Elisabeth Brenner's Correspondence, with an Edition of her Letters to and from Otto Sperling the Younger*. 2006. 262 pp.
15. Magdalena Öhrman, *Varying Virtue. Mythological Paragons of Wifely Virtues in Roman Elegy*. 2008. 218 pp.
16. Aron Sjöblad, *Metaphors Cicero lived by. The Role of Metaphor and Simile in* De Senectute. 2009. 209 pp.
17. Sanita Balode, *Verbs of Motion with Directional Prepositions and Prefixes in Xenophon's* Anabasis. 2011. xvi+220 pp.
18. Marianna Smaragdi, *Fire, Poison, and Black Tears. Metaphors of Emotion in Rebétiko*. 2012. x+206 pp.
19. Johanna Svensson, *Latin Letters from Clergymen in the Province of Scania (Eastern Denmark-Southern Sweden) in the Seventeenth Century. A Critical Edition with Introduction, Translation and Commentaries*. 2015. 430 pp.
20. Aron Sjöblad, *Metaphorical Coherence. Studies in Seneca's* Epistulae Morales. 2015. 84 pp.
21. Astrid Nilsson, *Johannes Magnus and the Composition of Truth*. Historia de omnibus Gothorum Sueonumque regibus. 2016. 324 pp.
22. Martina Björk, *Ovid's* Heroides *and the Ethopoeia*. 2016. 353 pp.
23. Nikolaos Domazakis, *The neologisms in 2 Maccabees*. 2018. 412 pp.

Printed by Media-Tryck, Lund 2018 NORDIC SWAN ECOLABEL 3041 0903

Lund University
Faculty of Humanities and Theology
Centre for Languages and Literature

ISBN 978-91-7753-541-6
ISSN 1100-7931 Studia Graeca et Latina Lundensia 23